

THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY
REFERENCE

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL,
THEOLOGICAL and
ECCLESIASTICAL
LITERATURE

Paul - Pensaben, Marco

by James Strong & John McClintock

To the Students of the Words, Works and Ways of God:

Welcome to the AGES Digital Library. We trust your experience with this and other volumes in the Library fulfills our motto and vision which is our commitment to you:

MAKING THE WORDS OF THE WISE
AVAILABLE TO ALL — INEXPENSIVELY.

AGES Software Rio, WI USA
Version 1.0 © 2000

Paul

(Παῦλος, the Greek form of the common Latin name *Paulus*), originally (see below) *Saul* (q.v.), the specially appointed “Apostle to the Gentiles.” (In the following treatment of this important character, we endeavor to weave in the Scripture narrative whatever illustration may be gathered from modern researches and speculations.

I. *Preliminary Inquiries.* —

1. Original Authorities. Nearly all the authentic materials for the life of the apostle Paul are contained in the Acts of the Apostles and in the Pauline Epistles. Out of a comparison of these authorities the biographer has to construct his account of the really important period of the apostle’s life. The early traditions of the Church appear to have left almost untouched the space of time for which we possess those sacred and abundant sources of knowledge; and they aim only at supplying a few particulars in the biography beyond the points at which the narrative of the Acts begins and terminates.

The inspired history and the Epistles lie side by side, and are to all appearance quite independent of one another. It was not the purpose of the historian to write a life of Paul, even as much as the received name of his book would seem to imply. The book called the Acts of the Apostles is an account of the beginnings of the kingdom of Christ on the earth. The large space which the apostle occupies in it is due to the important part which he bore in spreading that kingdom. As to the Epistles, nothing can be plainer than that they were written without reference to the history; and there is no attempt in the canon to combine them with it so as to form what we should call in modern phrase the apostle’s “Life and Letters.” What amount of agreement and what amount of discrepancy may be observed between these independent authorities is a question of the greatest interest and importance, and one upon which various opinions are entertained. The most adverse and extreme criticism is ably represented by Dr. Baur of Tubingen (*Paulus der Apostel Jesu Christi* [Stuttg. 1845]), who finds so much opposition between what he holds to be the few authentic Pauline Epistles and the Acts of the Apostles that he pronounces the history to be an interested fiction. But his criticism is the very caricature of captiousness. We have but to imagine it applied to any history and letters of acknowledged authenticity, and we feel irresistibly how arbitrary and

unhistorical it is. Putting aside this extreme view, it is not to be denied that difficulties are to be met with in reconciling completely the Acts and the received Epistles of Paul. What the solutions of such difficulties may be, whether there are any direct contradictions, how far the apparent differences may be due to the purpose of the respective writers, by what arrangement all the facts presented to us may best be dovetailed together — these are the various questions which have given so much occupation to the critics and expositors of Paul, and upon some of which it seems to be yet impossible to arrive at a decisive conclusion. We shall assume the Acts of the Apostles to be a genuine and authentic work of Luke, the companion of Paul, and shall speak of the Epistles at the places which we believe them to occupy in the history.

2. Name. — There can be no doubt that the apostle's name, as a Jew, was *Saul*; but when or how he received the Roman name *Paul*, which he bears in the Acts of the Apostles from Acts 13:9, which he uses in his Epistles, and by which he is called by Peter (^{<40B5>}2 Peter 3:15), is unknown. It is quite probable that he had borne the name of Paul as a Roman citizen; and it is no objection to this view that then this name would have appeared first, and that of Saul later (Witsius, *Meletem. Leid.* p. 47). If it is not merely accidental that Luke first calls him Paul in the passage mentioned, the reason may be that the apostle then first commenced his public and separate ministry; and Paul, a Gentile name, was that which the apostle of the Gentiles always on in Church history (Baur, *Paul.* p. 93). Even if the Jews still used the old Jewish name, there was afterwards no occasion for Luke to mention it. The account of Jerome that Paul assumed this name upon the conversion by him of Sergius Paulus (^{<40B7>}Acts 13:7; comp. August. *Confess.* 8:4; Bengel and Olshausen, *on* ^{<40B9>}Acts 13:9) is perhaps not a tradition, but a mere suggestion of that father himself, on the ground that the name Paul first appears in the passage following that account. Indeed, Baur (p. 93) would have us believe that this was the view of Luke himself, and that the whole account of the conversion of Sergius Paulus was built up to illustrate this change of name! But if there had been any connection between the two events, it would have been natural for the writer to indicate it (see Neander, p. 108). It is easy to suppose simply that, in becoming a Christian, according to the Eastern custom, **SEE NAME**, he assumed the name Paul, as one common among Greeks and Romans, and quite similar in sound to Saul (comp. Chrysost. and Theophyl. in Suicer, *Thesaur.* 2:648), perhaps with some reference to the etymological

signification of the name (comp. ^{<419>}1 Corinthians 15:9; *Paulus*, Lat. *small, little*; comp. Gr. Παῦρος). Yet we should then expect that Luke would employ the name Paul from ^{<409>}Acts 9:19 onward. (For another view, see Kuinol, *Comment. ad loc.*) *SEE SERGIUS PAULUS.*

II. Personal History. — We purpose under this head to gather together all the information given either directly or incidentally in the Acts and Epistles concerning the apostle's life, relegating to a subsequent head the various disputes that have been raised on some of them.

1. Youth and Early Career. — Paul was a native of Tarsus, a city of Cilicia (^{<427>}Acts 22:3, etc.), and was of Jewish descent, of the tribe of Benjamin (^{<518>}Philippians 3:5). From his father he inherited the rights of Roman citizenship, which had probably been earned by some of his ancestry through services rendered to the Roman state (Lardner, *Works*, 1:228, ed. 1788, 8vo; Grotius, *ad Acta* 22:28). The supposition that he enjoyed them in virtue of being a native of Tarsus is not well founded; for though that city had been created by Augustus an *urbs libera* (Dion. Chrysost. 2:36, ed. Reiske; Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* v. 27), it does not follow from this that all its natives enjoyed the privilege of Roman citizenship; and besides, from ^{<409>}Acts 21:39 compared with ^{<424>}Acts 22:24, 27, it may be inferred that, as the chief captain knew Paul to be a native of Tarsus, and yet was not aware of his Roman citizenship, the latter of these was not necessarily associated with the former. From his receiving the name *Saul* it has been supposed that he was the first-born son of his parents, and that they had long desired and often asked for such a favor from God; that he was not their only child, however, appears from the mention made (^{<426>}Acts 23:16) of his “sister’s son.” Whether Andronicus, Junia, and Herodion, whom he terms, in the Epistle to the Romans (^{<516>}Romans 16:7, 11), συγγενεῖς μου, were of the number of his blood relations, or only belonged to the same tribe with him, is a question on which learned men have taken different sides (comp. Lardner, *Works*, 6:235; Estius, *Commn. ad loc.*). (See below.)

At that time Tarsus was the rival of Athens and Alexandria as a place of learning and philosophical research (Strabo, 14:5); but to what extent the future “Apostle of the Gentiles” enjoyed the advantage of its schools we have no means of accurately determining. Attempts have been made to show from his writings that he was familiar with Greek literature. and Dr. Bentley has not hesitated to affirm that “as Moses was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, so it is manifest from this chapter alone (Acts

xxvii), if nothing else had been now extant, that Paul was a great master in all the learning of the Greeks” (*Boyle Lectures*, serm. 3, *sub init.*). An authority like that of Bentley in a question of Greek literature is not to be lightly set aside; yet on referring to the evidence in support of this opinion it will not be found to justify it. It must be allowed, however, that the mere circumstance of his having spent his early years in such a city as Tarsus could not but exert a very powerful influence on the mind of such a man as Paul, in the way of sharpening his faculties, refining his tastes, and enlarging the circle of his sympathies and affections. “If even to the meanest citizen,” as Eichhorn remarks, “such a circumstance affords — unless he be by nature utterly unobservant — much information which otherwise he could not have obtained, and in consequence of this a certain activity of mind, how much greater may not its effect be supposed to have been on a great mind like that of Paul? To his birth and early residence in Tarsus may be traced the urbanity which the apostle at no time laid aside, and of which he was frequently a perfect model, many insinuating turns which he gives to his epistles, and a more skillful use of the Greek tongue than a Jew born and educated in Palestine could well have attained” (*Einleit. ins N.T.* 3:5). (See below.)

But whatever uncertainty may hang over the early studies of the apostle in the department of Greek learning, there can be no doubt that, being the son of a Pharisee, and destined, in all probability, from his infancy to the pursuits of a doctor of Jewish law, he would be carefully instructed from his earliest years in the elements of Rabbinical lore. It is probable also that at this time he acquired his skill in that handicraft trade by which in later years he frequently supported himself (~~417B~~ Acts 17:3; ~~4012~~ 1 Corinthians 4:12, etc.). This trade is described by Luke as that of a **σκηνοποιός**, a word regarding the meaning of which there has been no small difference of opinion. (See below.) It does not follow that the family were in the necessitous condition which such manual labor commonly implies; for it was a wholesome custom among the Jews to teach every child some trade, though there might be little prospect of his depending upon it for his living. **SEE HANDICRAFT.**

When Paul made his defense before his countrymen at Jerusalem ~~421B~~ (Acts 22), he told them that, though born in Tarsus, he had been “brought up” (**ἀνατεθραμμένος**) in Jerusalem. He must, therefore, have been yet a boy when he was removed, in all probability for the sake of his education, to the Holy City of his fathers. We may imagine him arriving there perhaps at

some age between ten and fifteen, already a Hellenist, speaking Greek and familiar with the Greek version of the Scriptures, possessing, besides the knowledge of his trade, the elements of Gentile learning — to be taught at Jerusalem “according to the perfect manner of the law of the fathers.” He learned, he says, “at the feet of Gamaliel.” He who was to resist so stoutly the usurpations of the law had for his teacher one of the most eminent of all the doctors of the law. Gamaliel is supposed to be the person of that name who is celebrated in the writings of the Talmudists as one of the seven teachers to whom the title “Rabban” was given (Lightfoot, *Horace Hebr. in Act.* v. 34; Neander, *Apostol. Zeitalter*, p. 62; Otho, *Lex. Rabbinico-Philippians* s.v. Rabbi). Besides acquaintance with the Jewish law, and a sincere conviction of the supreme excellence of Judaism, Gamaliel appears to have possessed a singularly calm and judicious mind, and to have exercised a freedom of thought as well as pursued a range of study very unlike what was common among the party to which he belonged (~~Acts~~ Acts 5:34-39; comp. Neander, l.c.). How much the instructions and the example of such a teacher may have influenced the mind of Paul favorably we may imagine, but cannot affirm. **SEE GAMALIEL.** It is singular that on the occasion of his well-known intervention in the apostolical history the master’s counsels of toleration are in marked contrast to the persecuting zeal so soon displayed by the pupil. The temper of Gamaliel himself was moderate and candid, and he was personally free from bigotry; but his teaching was that of the strictest of the Pharisees, and bore its natural fruit when lodged in the ardent and thoroughgoing nature of Saul. Other fruits, besides that of a zeal which persecuted the Church, may no doubt be referred to the time when Saul sat at the feet of Gamaliel. A thorough training in the Scriptures and in the traditions of the elders under an acute and accomplished master must have done much to exercise the mind of Saul, and to make him feel at home in the subjects in which he was afterwards to be so intensely interested. Nor are we at all bound to suppose that, because his zeal for the law was strong enough to set him upon persecuting the believers in Jesus, he had therefore experienced none of the doubts and struggles which, according to his subsequent testimony, it was the nature of the law to produce (see ~~Acts~~ Romans 7). On the contrary, we can scarcely imagine these as absent from the spiritual life of Saul as he passed from boyhood to manhood. Earnest persecutors are, oftener than not, men who have been tormented by inward struggles and perplexities. The pupil of Gamaliel may have been crushing a multitude of conflicts in

his own mind when he threw himself into the holy work of extirpating the new heresy. *SEE MORAL SENSE.*

Paul is introduced to our notice by the sacred historian for the first time in connection with the martyrdom of Stephen, in which transaction he was, if not an assistant, something more than a mere spectator. A.D. 29. He is described at this time (^{<407B>}Acts 7:58) as “a young man” (*νεανίας*); but this term was employed with so much latitude by the Greeks that it is impossible from the mere use of it to determine whether the party to whom it was applied was under thirty, or between that and forty. The probability is that Paul must have reached the age of thirty at least; for otherwise it is not likely that he would have shared the counsels of the chief priests, or been intrusted by them with the entire responsibility of executing their designs against the followers of Jesus, as we know was the case (^{<4E3D>}Acts 26:10, 12). For such a task he showed a painful aptitude, and discharged it with a zeal which spared neither age nor sex (^{<4E3D>}Acts 26:10, 11). At that time the Church experienced the sudden expansion which was connected with the ordaining of the Seven appointed to serve tables, and with the special power and inspiration of Stephen. Among those who disputed with Stephen were some “of them of Cilicia.” We naturally think of Saul as having been one of these, when we find him afterwards keeping the clothes of those suborned witnesses who, according to the law (^{<617D>}Deuteronomy 17:7), were the first to cast stones at Stephen. “Saul,” says the sacred writer, significantly, “was consenting unto his death.” The angelic glory that shone from Stephen’s face, and the divine truth of his words, failing to subdue the spirit of religious hatred now burning in Saul’s breast, must have embittered and aggravated its rage. Saul was passing through a terrible crisis for a man of his nature. But he was not one to be moved from his stern purpose by the native refinement and tenderness which he must have been stifling within him. He was the most unwearied and unrelenting of persecutors. As for Saul, he made havoc of the Church, entering into every house (*κατὰ τοὺς οἴκους*, *house by house*), and haling men and women, committed them to prison” (^{<44RB>}Acts 8:3).

2. Conversion. — But while thus, in his ignorance and unbelief, he was seeking to be “injurious” to the cause of Christ, the great Author of Christianity was about to make him a distinguished trophy of its power, and one of the most devoted and successful of its advocates. The persecutor was to be converted. A.D. 30. What the nature of that conversion was we are now to observe.

Having undertaken to follow up the believers “unto strange cities,” Saul naturally turned his thoughts to Damascus, expecting to find among the numerous Jewish residents of that populous city some adherents of “the way” (τῆς ὁδοῦ), and trusting, we must presume, to be allowed by the connivance of the governor to apprehend them. What befell him as he journeyed thither is related in detail three times in the Acts, first by the historian in his own person, then in the two addresses made by Paul at Jerusalem and before Agrippa. These three narratives are not repetitions of one another: there are differences between them which some critics choose to regard as irreconcilable. Considering that the same author is responsible for all the accounts, we gain nothing, of course, for the authenticity of their statements by bringing them into agreement; but it seems quite clear that the author himself could not have been conscious of any contradictions in the narratives. He can scarcely have had any motive for placing side by side inconsistent reports of Paul’s conversion; and that he should have admitted inconsistencies on such a matter through mere carelessness is hardly credible. Of the three narratives, that of the historian himself must claim to be the most purely historical: Paul’s subsequent accounts were likely to be affected by the purpose for which he introduced them. Luke’s statement is to be read in ^{<400>}Acts 9:3-19, where, however, the words, “It is hard for thee to kick against the pricks,” included in the Vulgate and English version, ought to be omitted. The sudden light from heaven; the voice of Jesus speaking with authority to his persecutor; Saul struck to the ground, blinded, overcome; the three days’ suspense; the coming of Ananias as a messenger of the Lord; and Saul’s baptism — these were the leading features, in the eyes of the historian, of the great event, and in these we must look for the chief significance of the conversion.

Let us now compare the historical relation with those which we have in Paul’s speeches (Acts 22 and 26). The reader will do well to consider each in its place. But we have here to deal with the bare fact of agreement or difference. With regard to the light, the speeches add to what Luke tells us that the phenomenon occurred at mid-day, and that the light shone round, and was visible to Saul’s companions as well as to himself. The second speech says that at the shining of this light the whole company (“we all”) fell to the ground. This is not *contradicted* by what is said (^{<400>}Acts 9:7), “The men which journeyed with him stood speechless,” for there is no emphasis on “stood,” nor is the standing antithetical to Saul’s falling down. We have but to suppose the others rising before Saul, or standing still

afterwards in greater perplexity, through not seeing or hearing what Saul saw and heard, to reconcile the narratives without forcing either. After the question, "Why persecutest thou me?" the second speech adds, "It is hard for thee to kick against the goads." Then both the speeches supply a question and answer — "I answered, Who art thou, Lord? And he said, I am Jesus (of Nazareth), whom thou persecutest." In the direction to go into Damascus and await orders there, the first speech agrees with Acts 9. But whereas according to that chapter the men with Saul "heard the voice," in the first speech it is said "they heard not the voice of him that spake to me." It seems reasonable to conclude from the two passages that the men actually heard sounds, but not, like Saul, an articulate voice. With regard to the visit of Ananias, there is no collision between the ninth chapter and the first speech, the latter only attributing additional words to Ananias. The second speech ceases to give details of the conversion after the words, "I am Jesus, whom thou persecutest. But rise, and stand on thy feet." Paul adds, from the mouth of Jesus, an exposition of the purpose for which he had appeared to him. It is easy to say that in ascribing these words to Jesus, Paul or his professed reporter is violating the order and sequence of the earlier accounts. But, if we bear in mind the nature and purpose of Paul's address before Agrippa, we shall surely not suppose that he is violating the strict truth, when he adds to the words which Jesus spoke to him at the moment of the light and the sound, without interposing any reference to a later occasion, that fuller exposition of the meaning of the crisis through which he was passing, which he was not to receive till afterwards. What Saul actually heard from Jesus on the way as he journeyed was afterwards interpreted, to the mind of Saul, into those definite expressions. For we must not forget that, whatever we hold as to the external nature of the phenomena we are considering, the whole transaction was essentially, in any case, a *spiritual* communication. That the Lord Jesus manifested himself as a living person to the man Saul, and spoke to him so that his very words could be understood, is the substantial fact declared to us. The purport of the three narratives is that an actual conversation took place between Saul and the Lord Jesus. It is remarkable that in none of them is Saul said to have *seen* Jesus. The grounds for believing that he did so are the two expressions of Ananias (^{<4017>}Acts 9:17), "The Lord Jesus, who appeared unto thee in the way," and (^{<4024>}Acts 22:14) ' That thou shouldest see the Just One,' and the statement of Paul (^{<4038>}1 Corinthians 15:8), "Last of all he was seen of me also." Comparing these passages with the narratives, we conclude either that Saul had an

instantaneous vision of Jesus as the flash of light blinded him, or that the “seeing” was that apprehension of his presence which would go with a real conversation. *How* it was that Saul “saw” and “heard,” we are quite unable to determine. That the light, and the sound or voice, were both different from any ordinary phenomena with which Saul and his companions were familiar, is unquestionably implied in the narrative. It is also implied that they were specially significant to Saul, and not to those with him. We gather therefore that there were real outward phenomena, through which Saul was made inwardly sensible of a presence revealed to him alone. (See below.) Externally, there was a flash of light. Spiritually, “the light of the Gospel of the glory of the Christ, who is the image of God,” shone upon Saul, and convicted the darkness of the heart which had shut out love and knew not the glory of the cross. Externally, Saul fell to the ground. Spiritually, he was prostrated by shame, when he knew whom he had been persecuting. Externally, sounds issued out of heaven. Spiritually, the Crucified said to Saul, with tender remonstrance, “I am Jesus. why persecutest thou me?” Whether audibly to his companions, or audibly to the Lord Jesus only, Saul confessed himself in the spirit the servant of him whose name he had hated. He gave himself up, without being able to see his way, to the disposal of him whom he now knew to have vindicated his claim over him by the very sacrifice which formerly he had despised. The Pharisee was converted, once for all, into a disciple of Jesus the Crucified.

The only mention in the Epistles of Paul of the outward phenomena attending his conversion is that in ^{615}1 Corinthians 15:8,” Last of all he was seen of me also.” But there is one important passage in which he speaks distinctly of his conversion itself. Dr. Baur (*Paul*. p. 64), with his readiness to find out discrepancies, insists that this passage represents quite a different process from that recorded in the Acts. It is manifestly not a repetition of what we have been reading and considering, but it in the most perfect harmony with it. In the Epistle to the Galatians (^{8015}Galatians 1:15, 16) Paul has these words, “When it pleased God, who separated me from my mother’s womb, and called me by his grace, *to reveal his Son in me*, that I might preach him among the heathen” ... (ἀποκαλύψαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐμοί). What words could express more exactly than these the spiritual experience which occurred to Saul on the way to Damascus? The manifestation of Jesus as the Son of God is clearly the main point in the narrative. This manifestation was brought about through a removal of the veils of prejudice and ignorance which blinded the eyes of Saul to a

crucified Deliverer conquering through sacrifice. Whatever part the senses may have played in the transaction, the essence of it in any case must have been Saul's inward vision of a spiritual Lord close to his spirit, from whom he could not escape, whose every command he was henceforth to obey in the spirit.

It would be groundless to assume that the new convictions of that mid-day immediately cleared and settled themselves in Saul's mind. It is sufficient to say that he was then *converted*, or turned round. For a while, no doubt, his inward state was one of awe and expectation. He was "led by the hand" spiritually by his Master, as well as bodily by his companions. Thus entering Damascus as a servant of the Lord Jesus, he sought the house of one whom he had, perhaps, intended to persecute. Judas may have been known to his guest as a disciple of the Lord. Certainly the fame of Saul's coming had preceded him; and Ananias, "a devout man according to the law," but a believer in Jesus, when directed by the Lord to visit him, wonders at what he is told concerning the notorious persecutor. He obeys, however; and going to Saul in the name of the Lord Jesus, who had appeared to him in the way," he puts his hands on him that he may receive his sight and be filled with the Holy Ghost. Thereupon Saul's eyes are immediately purged, and his sight is restored. "The same hour," says Paul (⁴²¹³Acts 22:13), "I looked up upon him. And he said, The God of our fathers hath chosen thee, that thou shouldest know his will, and see the Just One, and shouldest hear the voice of his mouth. For thou shalt be his witness unto all men of what thou hast seen and heard." Every word in this address strikes some chord which we hear sounded again and again in Paul's Epistles. The new convert is not, as it is so common to say, converted from Judaism to *Christianity of the God of the Jewish fathers chooses him*. He is chosen *to know God's will*. That will is manifested *in the Righteous One*. Him Saul *sees and hears*, in order that he may be *a witness of him* to all men. The eternal will of the God of Abraham; that will revealed in a righteous Son of God; the testimony concerning him, a Gospel to mankind—these are the essentially Pauline principles which are declared in all the teaching of the apostle, and illustrated in all his actions.

3. Sojourn in Damascus and Arabia. — After the recovery of his sight, Saul received the external symbol of the washing away of his sins in baptism. He then broke his three days' fast, and was strengthened — an image, again, of the strengthening of his faint and hungering spirit through a participation in the divine life of the Church at Damascus. He was at once

received into the fellowship of the disciples, and began without delay the work to which Ananias had designated him; and to the astonishment of all his hearers he proclaimed Jesus in the synagogues, declaring him to be the Son of God. This was the natural sequel to his conversion: he was to proclaim Jesus the Crucified, first to the Jews as their own Christ, afterwards to the world as the Son of the living God.

The narrative in the Acts tells us simply that he was occupied in this work, with increasing vigor, for “many days,” up to the time when imminent danger drove him from Damascus. From the Epistle to the Galatians (^{<R017>}Galatians 1:17, 18) we learn that the many days were at least a good part of “three years,” and that Saul, not thinking it necessary to procure authority to preach from the apostles that were before him, went after his conversion into Arabia, and returned from thence to Damascus. We know nothing whatever of this visit to Arabia — to what district Saul went, how long he stayed, or for what purpose he went there. (Stanley suggests, *Sin. and Pal.* p. 50, that he may even have visited Mount Sinai.) From the antithetical way in which it is opposed to a visit to the apostles at Jerusalem, we infer that it took place before he deliberately committed himself to the task of proclaiming Jesus as the Christ; and also, with some probability, that he was seeking seclusion, in order that, by conferring “not with flesh and blood,” but with the Lord in the Spirit, he might receive more deeply into his mind the commission given him at his conversion. That Saul did not spend the greater portion of the “three years” at Damascus seems probable, for these two reasons:

- (1) that the anger of the Jews was not likely to have borne with two or three years of such a life as Saul’s now was without coming to a crisis; and
- (2) that the disciples at Jerusalem would not have been likely to mistrust Saul as they did if they had heard of him as preaching Jesus at Damascus for the same considerable period. We can hardly resist the conviction that the time was spent in private preparation, perhaps in receiving those remarkable disclosures which he afterwards called “my gospel” (^{<R018>}2 Timothy 2:8), analogous to the corresponding period of the other apostles personal intercourse with the Lord. Thus we may venture to suppose he received that Gospel which afterwards he preached “by revelation” from Christ (^{<R012>}Galatians 1:12). Neander (l.c. sec. 121) and Anger (*De Temp. in Actis App. Ratione.* p. 123) have endeavored to show that Paul went

into Arabia to preach the Gospel; but the reasons they adduce have little weight (comp. Olshausen, on ^{<402>}Acts 9:20-25).

Now that we have arrived at Saul's departure from Damascus, we are again upon historical ground (A.D. 33), and have the double evidence of Luke in the Acts (^{<402>}Acts 9:21 sq.) and of the apostle in his Second Epistle to the Corinthians (^{<413>}2 Corinthians 11:32). According to the former, the *Jews* lay in wait for Saul, intending to kill him, and watched the gates of the city that he might not escape from them. Knowing this, the disciples took him by night and let him down in a basket from the wall. According to Paul (^{<413>}2 Corinthians 11:32), it was the *ethnarch* under Aretas the king who watched for him, desiring to apprehend him. There is no difficulty in reconciling the two statements. We might similarly say that our Lord was put to death either by the Jews or by the Roman governor. There is more difficulty in ascertaining how an officer of king Aretas should be governing in Damascus, and why he should lend himself to the designs of the Jews. But we learn from secular history that the affairs of Damascus were, at the time, in such an unsettled state as to make the narrative not improbable.

SEE ARETAS. Having escaped from Damascus, Saul betook himself to Jerusalem, and there "assayed to join himself to the disciples; but they were all afraid of him, and believed not that he was a disciple." In this natural but trying difficulty Saul was befriended by one whose name was henceforth closely associated with his. Barnabas became his sponsor to the apostles and Church at Jerusalem. assuring them-from some personal knowledge, we must presume-of the facts of Saul's conversion and subsequent behavior at Damascus. It is noticeable that the *seeing* and *hearing* are still the leading features in the conversion, and the name of Jesus in the preaching. Barnabas declared how "Saul had seen the Lord in the way, and that he had spoken to him, and how that he had preached boldly at Damascus in the name of Jesus." Barnabas's introduction removed the fears of the apostles, and Paul "was with them coming in and going out at Jerusalem." His Hellenistical education made him. like Stephen, a successful disputant against the "Grecians;" and it is not strange that the former persecutor was singled out from the other believers as the object of a murderous hostility. He was therefore again urged to flee; and by way of Caesarea took himself to his native city, Tarsus (^{<402>}Acts 9:26-30. In ^{<402>}Galatians 1:20, the order of the localities is not strictly observed).

In the Epistle to the Galatians (^{<407>}Galatians 1:17-23) Paul adds certain particulars, in which only a perverse and captious criticism could see

anything contradictory to the facts just related. He tells us that his motive for going up to Jerusalem rather than anywhere else was that he might see Peter; that he abode with him fifteen days; that the only apostles he saw were Peter and James the Lord's brother; and that afterwards he came into the regions of Syria and Cilicia, remaining unknown by face, though well known for his conversion, to the churches in Judaea which were in Christ. Paul's object in referring to this connection of his with those who were apostles before him was to show that he had never accepted his apostleship as a commission from them. On this point the narrative in the Acts entirely agrees with Paul's own earnest asseverations in his Epistles. He received his commission from the Lord Jesus, and also mediately through Ananias. This commission included a special designation to preach Christ to the Gentiles. Upon the latter designation he did not act until circumstances opened the way for it. But he at once began to proclaim Jesus as the Christ to his own countrymen. Barnabas introduced him to the apostles, not as seeking their sanction, but as having seen and heard the Lord Jesus, and as having boldly spoken already in his name.

4. Ministry at Antioch. — During this stay of Paul at Tarsus, which lasted several years, occupied doubtless with those elsewhere unrecorded labors to some of which he occasionally alludes (^{<4712>}2 Corinthians 11:24, 25), a movement was going on at Antioch which raised that city to an importance second only to that of Jerusalem itself in the early history of the Church. In the life of the apostle of the Gentiles Antioch claims a most conspicuous place. It was there that the preaching of the Gospel to the Gentiles first took root, and from thence that it was afterwards propagated. Its geographical position, its political and commercial importance, and the presence of a large and powerful Jewish element in its population, were the more obvious characteristics which adapted it for such a use. There came to Antioch, when the persecution which arose about Stephen scattered upon their different routes the disciples who had been assembled at Jerusalem, men of Cyprus and Cyrene, eager to tell all who would hear them the good news concerning the Lord Jesus. Until Antioch was reached, the word was spoken "to none but unto Jews only" (^{<4119>}Acts 11:19). 'But here the Gentiles also (οἱ Ἑλληνας) — not, as in the A.V., "the Grecians" — were among the hearers of the word. A great number believed; and when this was reported at Jerusalem, Barnabas was sent on a special mission to Antioch.

As the work grew under his hands, and “much people was added unto the Lord,” Barnabas felt the need of help, and went himself to Tarsus to seek Saul. Possibly at Damascus, certainly at Jerusalem, he had been a witness of Saul’s energy and devotedness, and skill in disputation. He had been drawn to him by the bond of a most brotherly affection. He therefore longed for him as a helper, and succeeded in bringing him to Antioch. There they labored together unremittingly for “a whole year,” mixing with the constant assemblies of the believers, and “teaching much people.” All this time, as Luke would give us to understand, Saul was subordinate to Barnabas. Until “Saul” became “Paul,” we read of Barnabas and Saul” (~~Acts~~ Acts 11:30; 12:25; 13:2, 7). Afterwards the order changes to “Paul and Barnabas.” It seems reasonable to conclude that there was no marked peculiarity in the teaching of Saul during the Antioch period. He held and taught, in common with the other Jewish believers, the simple faith in Jesus the Christ, crucified and raised from the dead. Nor did he ever afterwards depart from the simplicity of this faith. But new circumstances stirred up new questions; and then it was to Saul of Tarsus that it was given to see, more clearly than any others saw, those new applications of the old truth, those deep and world-wide relations of it, with which his work was to be permanently associated. In the mean time, according to the usual method of the divine government, facts were silently growing, which were to suggest and occasion the future developments of faith and practice, and of these facts the most conspicuous was the unprecedented accession of Gentile proselytes at Antioch.

An opportunity soon occurred, of which Barnabas and Saul joyfully availed themselves, for proving the affection of these new disciples towards their brethren at Jerusalem, and for knitting the two communities together in the bonds of practical fellowship. A manifest impulse from the Holy Spirit began this work. There came “prophets” from Jerusalem to Antioch: “and there stood up one of them, named Agabus, and signified by the Spirit that there should be great dearth throughout all the world.” The “prophets” who now arrived may have been the Simeon and Lucius and Manaen mentioned in 13:1, besides Agabus and others. The prediction of the dearth need not have been purposeless; it would naturally have a direct reference to the needs of the poorer brethren and the duty of the richer. It is obvious that the fulfillment followed closely upon the intimation of the coming famine. For the disciples at Antioch determined to send contributions immediately to Jerusalem; and the gift was conveyed to the elders of that

Church by the hands of Barnabas and Saul. The time of this dearth is vaguely designated in the Acts as the reign of Claudius. It is ascertained from Josephus's history that a severe famine did actually prevail in Judaea, and especially at Jerusalem, at the very time fixed by the event recorded in ~~Acts~~ Acts 12, the death of Herod Agrippa. This was in A.D. 44. *SEE AGABUS.*

It could not have been necessary for the mere safe conduct of the contribution that Barnabas and Saul should go in person to Jerusalem. We are bound to see in the relations between the Mother-Church and that of Antioch, of which this visit is illustrative, examples of the deep feeling of the necessity of union which dwelt in the heart of the early Church. The apostles did not go forth to teach a system, but to enlarge a body. The spirit which directed and furthered their labors was essentially the spirit of fellowship. By this spirit Saul of Tarsus was practically trained in strict cooperation with his elders in the Church. The habits which he learned now were to aid in guarding him at a later time from supposing that the independence which he was bound to claim should involve the slightest breach or loosening of the bonds of the universal brotherhood.

Having discharged their errand, Barnabas and Saul returned to Antioch, bringing with them another helper, John surnamed Mark, sister's son to Barnabas. The work of prophesying and teaching was resumed. Several of the oldest and most honored of the believers in Jesus were expounding the way of God and organizing the Church in that busy metropolis. Travelers were incessantly passing to and fro. Antioch was in constant communication with Cilicia, with Cyprus, with all the neighboring countries. The question must have forced itself upon hundreds of the "Christians" at Antioch, "What is the meaning of this faith of ours, of this baptism, of this incorporation, of this kingdom of the Son of *God, for the world?* The Gospel is not for Judaea alone: here are we called by it at Antioch. Is it meant to stop here?" The Church was pregnant with a great movement, and the time of her delivery was at hand. We forget the whole method of the divine work in the nurture of the Church if we ascribe to the impulses of the Holy Ghost any theatrical suddenness, and disconnect them from the thoughts which were brooding in the minds of the disciples. At every point we find both circumstances and inward reasonings preparing the crisis. Something of direct expectation seems to be implied in what is said of the leaders of the Church at Antioch, that they were "ministering to the Lord, and fasting," when the Holy Ghost spoke to them. Without doubt

they knew it for a seal set upon previous surmises, when the voice came clearly to the general mind, "Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them." That "work" was partially known already to the Christians of Antioch: who could be so fit for it as the two brothers in the faith and in mutual affection, the son of exhortation, and the highly accomplished and undaunted convert who had from the first been called "a chosen vessel, to bear the name of the Lord before the Gentiles, and kings, and the people of Israel?"

When we look back, from the higher ground of Paul's apostolic activity, to the years that passed between his conversion and the first missionary journey, we cannot observe without reverence the patient humility with which Saul waited for his Master's time. He did not say for once only, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" Obedience to Christ was thenceforth his ruling principle. Submitting, as he believed, to his Lord's direction, he was content to work for a long time as the subordinate colleague of his seniors in the faith. He was thus the better prepared, when the call came, to act with the authority which that call conferred upon him. He left Antioch, however, still the second to Barnabas. Everything was done with orderly gravity in the sending forth of the two missionaries. Their brethren, after fasting and prayer, laid their hands on them, and so they departed. A.D. 44.

5. First Missionary Journey. — Much must have been hidden from Barnabas and Saul as to the issues of the journey on which they embarked. But one thing was clear to them, that *they were sent forth to speak the Word of God*. They did not go in their own name or for their own purposes; they were instruments for uttering what the Eternal God himself was saying to men. We shall find in the history a perfectly definite representation of what Paul announced and taught as he journeyed from city to city. But the first characteristic feature of his teaching was the absolute conviction that he was only the bearer of a heavenly message. It is idle to discuss Paul's character or views without recognising this fact. We are compelled to think of him as of a man who was capable of cherishing such a conviction with perfect assurance. We are bound to bear in mind the unspeakable influence which that conviction must have exerted upon his nature. The writer of the Acts proceeds upon the same assumption. He tells us that as soon as Barnabas and Saul reached Cyprus, they began to "announce the Word of God."

Picture for Paul 1

The second fact to be observed is, that for the present they delivered their message in the synagogues of the Jews only. They trod the old path till they should be drawn out of it. But when they had gone through the island, from Salamis to Paphos, they were called upon to explain their doctrine to an eminent Gentile. Sergius Paulus, the proconsul. This Roman officer, like so many of his countrymen, had already come under the influence of Jewish teaching; but it was in the corrupt form of magical pretensions, which throve so luxuriantly upon the godless credulity of that age. A Jew, named Barjesus, or Elymas, a *magus* and false prophet, had attached himself to the governor, and had no doubt interested his mind, for he was an intelligent man, with what he had told him of the history and hopes of the Jews. *SEE ELYMAS*. Accordingly, when Sergius Paulus heard of the strange teachers who were announcing to the Jews the advent of their true Messiah, he wished to see them, and sent for them. The impostor, instinctively hating the apostles, and seeing his influence over the proconsul in danger of perishing, did what he could to withstand them. Then Saul, “who is also called Paul,” denouncing Elymas in remarkable terms, declared against him God’s sentence of temporary blindness. The blindness immediately fell upon him; and the proconsul, moved by the scene and persuaded by the teaching of the apostle, became a believer.

There is a singular parallelism in several points between the history of Paul and that of Peter in the Acts. Baur presents it in a highly effective form (*Paul*. p. 91 etc.), to support his theory of the composition of this book; and this is one of the services which he has incidentally rendered to the full understanding of the early history of the Church. Thus Paul’s discomfiture of Elymas reminds us of Peter’s denunciation of Simon Magus. The two incidents bring strongly before us one of the great adverse elements with which the Gospel had to contend in that age. Everywhere there were counterfeits of the spiritual powers which the apostles claimed and put forth. It was necessary for the preachers of Christ, not so much to prove themselves stronger than the magicians and soothsayers, as to guard against being confounded with them. One distinguishing mark of the true servants of the Spirit would be that of *not trading* upon their spiritual powers (~~400~~ Acts 8:20). Another would be that of shunning every sort of concealment and artifice, and courting the daylight of open truth. Paul’s language to Elymas is studiously directed to the reproof of the tricks of the religious impostor. The apostle, full of the Holy Ghost, looked steadily on

the deceiver, spoke in the name of a God of light and righteousness and straightforward ways, and put forth the power of that God for the vindication of truth against delusion. The punishment of Elymas was itself symbolical, and conveyed "teaching of the Lord." He had chosen to create a spiritual darkness around him; and now there fell upon him a mist and a darkness, and he went about seeking some one to lead him by the hand. If on reading this account we refer to Peter's reproof of Simon Magus, we shall be struck by the differences as well as the resemblance which we shall observe. But we shall undoubtedly gain a stronger impression of this part of the apostolic work, viz. the conflict to be waged between the Spirit of Christ and of the Church and the evil spirits of a dark superstition to which men were surrendering themselves as slaves. We shall feel the worth and power of that candid and open temper in which alone Paul would commend his cause; and in the conversion of Sergius Paulus we shall see an exemplary type of many victories to be won by truth over falsehood.

This point is made a special crisis in the history of the apostle by the writer of the Acts. Saul now becomes Paul, and begins to take precedence of Barnabas. Nothing is said to explain the change of name. No reader could resist the temptation of supposing that there must be some connection between Saul's new name and that of his distinguished Roman convert. But on reflection it does not seem probable that Paul would either have wished, or have consented, to change his own name for that of a distinguished convert. If we put Sergius Paulus aside, we know that it was exceedingly common for Jews to bear, besides their own Jewish name, another borrowed from the country with which they had become connected (see Conybeare and Howson, 1:163, for full illustrations). Thus we have Simeon also named Niger, Barnabas also named Justus, John also named Marcus. There is no reason therefore why Saul should not have borne from infancy the other name of Paul. In that case he would be Saul among his own countrymen, Paulus among the Gentiles. We must understand Luke as wishing to mark strongly the transition point between Saul's activity among his own countrymen and his new labors as the apostle of the Gentiles, by calling him Saul only during the first, and Paul only afterwards. (See above.)

The conversion of Sergius Paulus may be said, perhaps, to mark the beginning of the work among the Gentiles; otherwise, it was not in Cyprus that any change took place in the method hitherto followed by Barnabas and Saul in preaching the Gospel. Their public addresses were as yet

confined to the synagogues; but it was soon to be otherwise. From Paphos “Paul and his company” set sail for the mainland, and arrived at Perga in Pamphylia. Here the heart of their companion John failed him, and he returned to Jerusalem. From Perga they traveled on to a place, obscure in secular history, but most memorable in the history of the kingdom of Christ — Antioch in Pisidia (q.v.). Here “they went into the synagogue on the Sabbath-day, and sat down.” Small as the place was, it contained its colony of Jews, and with them proselytes who worshipped the God of the Jews. The degree to which the Jews had spread and settled themselves over the world, and the influence they had gained over the more respectable of their Gentile neighbors, and especially over the women of the better class, are facts difficult to appreciate justly, but are proved by undoubted evidence, and are very important for us to bear in mind. This Pisidian Antioch may have been more Jewish than most similar towns, but it was not more so than many of much greater size and importance. What took place here in the synagogue and in the city is interesting to us not only on account of its bearing on the history, but also because it represents more or less exactly what afterwards occurred in many other places. It cannot be without design that we have single but detailed examples given us in the Acts of the various kinds of addresses which Paul used to deliver in appealing to his different audiences. He had to address himself, in the course of his missionary labors, to Jews, knowing and receiving the Scriptures; to ignorant barbarians; to cultivated Greeks; to mobs enraged against him personally; to magistrates and kings. It is an inestimable help in studying the apostle and his work that we have specimens of the tone and the arguments he was accustomed to use in all these situations. These will be noticed in their places. In what he said at the synagogue in Antioch we recognize the type of the addresses in which he would introduce his message to his Jewish fellow-countrymen.

The apostles sat silent with the rest of the assembly, while the Law and the Prophets were read. They and their audience were united in reverence for the sacred books. Then the rulers of the synagogue sent to invite them, as strangers but brethren, to speak any word of exhortation which might be in them to the people. Paul stood up, and beckoning with his hand, he spoke. (The speech is given in ~~4136~~ Acts 13:16-41.) The characteristics we observe in it are these: The speaker begins by acknowledging “the God of this people Israel.” He ascribes to him the calling out of the nation and the conduct of its subsequent history. He touches on the chief points of that

history up to the reign of *David*, whom he brings out into prominence. He then names JESUS as the promised Son of David. To convey some knowledge of Jesus to the minds of his hearers, he recounts the chief facts of the Gospel history; the preparatory preaching and baptism of John (of which the rumor had spread perhaps to Antioch); the condemnation of Jesus by the rulers “who knew neither him nor the prophets,” and his resurrection. That Resurrection is declared to be the fulfillment of all God’s promises of life, given to the fathers. Through Jesus, therefore, is now proclaimed by God himself the forgiveness of sins and full justification. The apostle concludes by drawing from the prophets a warning against unbelief. If this is an authentic example of Paul’s preaching, it was impossible for Peter or John to start more exclusively from the Jewish covenant and promises than did the apostle of the Gentiles. How entirely this discourse resembles those of Peter and of Stephen in the earlier chapters of the Acts! There is only one specially Pauline touch in the whole—the words in ver. 39, “By Him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses.” “Evidently foisted in,” says Baur (p. 103), who thinks we are dealing with a mere fiction, to prevent the speech from appearing *too* Petrine, and to give it a slightly Pauline air.” Certainly, it sounds like an echo of the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians. But is there therefore the slightest incongruity between this and the other parts of the address? Does not that “forgiveness of sins” which Peter and Paul proclaimed with the most perfect agreement connect itself naturally, in the thoughts of one exercised by the law as Saul of Tarsus had been, with justification not by the law but by grace? If we suppose that Saul had accepted just the faith which the older apostles held in Jesus of Nazareth, the Messiah of the Jews, crucified and raised from the dead according to the teaching of the prophets, and in the remission of sins through him confirmed by the gift of the Holy (host; and that he had *also* had those experiences, not known to the older apostles, of which we see the working in the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians, this speech, in all its parts, is precisely what we might expect: this is the very teaching which the apostle of the Gentiles must have everywhere and always set forth, when he was speaking “God’s Word” for the first time to an assembly of his fellow-countrymen.

The discourse thus epitomized produced a strong impression; and the hearers (not “the Gentiles,” which the best MSS. omit) requested the apostles to repeat their message on the next Sabbath. During the week so

much interest was excited by the teaching of the apostles that on the Sabbath-day “almost the whole city came together to hear the Word of God.” It was this concern of the Gentiles which appears to have first alienated the minds of the Jews from what they had heard. They were filled with envy. They probably felt that there was a difference between those efforts to gain Gentile proselytes in which they had themselves been so successful and this new preaching of a Messiah in whom a justification which the law could not give was offered to men. The eagerness of the Gentiles to hear may have confirmed their instinctive apprehensions. The Jewish envy once roused became a power of deadly hostility to the Gospel; and these Jews at Antioch set themselves to oppose bitterly the words which Paul spoke. We have here, therefore, a new phase in the history of the Gospel. In these foreign countries it is not the cross or Nazareth which is most immediately repulsive to the Jews in the proclaiming of Jesus. It is the wound given to Jewish importance in the association of Gentiles with Jews as the receivers of the good tidings. If the Gentiles had been asked to become Jews, no offense would have been taken. But the proclamation of the Christ could not be thus governed and restrained. It overleaped, by its own force, these narrowing methods. It was felt to be addressed not to one nation only, but to mankind.

The new opposition brought out new action on the part of the apostles. Rejected by the Jews, they became bold and outspoken, and turned from them to the Gentiles. They remembered and declared what the prophets had foretold of the enlightening and deliverance of the whole world. In speaking to the Gentiles, therefore, they were simply fulfilling the promise of the Covenant. The gift, we observe, of which the Jews were depriving themselves, and which the Gentiles who believed were accepting, is described as “eternal life” (ἡ αἰώνιος ζωή). It was the life of which the risen Jesus was the fountain, which Peter and John had declared at Jerusalem, and of which all acts of healing were set forth as signs. This was now poured out largely upon the Gentiles. The Word of the Lord was published widely, and had much fruit. Henceforth Paul and Barnabas knew it to be their commission, not the less to present their message to Jews first, but in the absence of an adequate Jewish medium to deal directly with the Gentiles. But this expansion of the Gospel work brought with it new difficulties and dangers. At Antioch now, as in every city afterwards, the unbelieving Jews used their influence with their own adherents among the Gentiles, and especially the women of the higher class, to persuade the

authorities or the populace to persecute the apostles, and to drive them from the place.

With their own spirits raised, and amid much enthusiasm of their disciples, Paul and Barnabas now traveled on to Iconium, where the occurrences at Antioch were repeated, and from thence to the Lycaonian country, which contained the cities Lystra and Derbe. Here they had to deal with uncivilized heathens. At Lystra the healing of a cripple took place, the narrative of which runs very parallel to the account of the similar act done by Peter and John at the gate of the Temple. The agreement becomes closer, if we insert here, with Lachmann, before “Stand upright on thy feet,” the words, “I say unto thee in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ.” The parallel leads us to observe more distinctly that every messenger of Jesus Christ was a herald of life. The spiritual life—the *ζωὴ αἰώνιος*—which was of faith, is illustrated and expounded by the invigoration of impotent limbs. The same truth was to be conveyed to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and to the heathens of Lycaonia. The act was received naturally by these pagans. They took the apostles for gods, calling Barnabas, who was of the more imposing presence, Zeus (Jupiter), and Paul, who was the chief speaker, Hermes (Mercurius). This mistake, followed up by the attempt to offer sacrifices to them, gives occasion to the recording of an address in which we see a type of what the apostles would say to an ignorant pagan audience. Appeals to the Scriptures, references to the God of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, would have been out of place. The apostles name the living God, who made heaven and earth and the sea, and all things therein: the God of the whole world, and all the nations in it. They declare themselves to be his messengers. They expatiate upon the tokens of himself which the Father of men had not withheld, in that he did them good, sending rain from heaven and fruitful seasons, the supporters of life and joy. They protest that in restoring the cripple they had only acted as instruments of the living God. They themselves’ were not gods, but human beings of like passions with the Lycacinians. The living God was now manifesting himself more clearly to men, desiring that henceforth the nations should not walk in their own ways, but his. They therefore call upon the people to give up the vanities of idol worship, and to turn to the living God (comp. ~~1~~ 1 Thessalonians 1:9, 10). In this address the name of Jesus does not occur. It is easy to understand that the apostles preached him as the Son of that living God to whom they bore witness, telling the people of his death and resurrection, and announcing his coming again.

Although the people of Lystra had been so ready to worship Paul and Barnabas, the repulse of their idolatrous instincts appears to have provoked them, and they allowed themselves to be persuaded into hostility by Jews who came from Antioch and Iconium, so that they attacked Paul with stones, and thought they had killed him. He recovered, however, as the disciples were standing round him, and went again into the city. The next day he left it with Barnabas, and went to Derbe, and thence they returned once more to Lystra, and so to Iconium and Antioch, renewing their exhortations to the disciples, bidding them not to think their trials strange, but to recognize them as the appointed door through which the kingdom of heaven, into which they were called, was to be entered. In order to establish the churches after their departure, they solemnly appointed “elders” in every city. Then they came down to the coast, and from Attalia they sailed home to Antioch in Syria, where they related the successes which had been granted to them, and especially the “opening of the door of faith to the Gentiles.” Thus the First Missionary Journey ended.

6. Apostolic Council at Jerusalem (~~445~~Acts 15; ~~811~~Galatians 2). — Upon that missionary journey follows most naturally the next important scene which the historian sets before us—the council held at Jerusalem to determine the relations of Gentile believers to the law of Moses. A.D. 47. In following this portion of the history, we encounter two of the greater questions which the biographer of Paul has to consider. One of these is historical. What were the relations between the apostle Paul and the twelve? The other is critical. How is Galatians 2 to be connected with the narrative of the Acts?

The relations of Paul and the twelve will best be set forth in the narrative. But we must explain here why we accept Paul’s statements in the Galatian epistle as additional to the history in Acts 15. The first impression of any reader would be a supposition that the two writers might be referring to the same event. The one would at least bring the other to his mind. In both he reads of Paul and Barnabas going up to Jerusalem, reporting the Gospel preached to the uncircumcised, and discussing with the older apostles the terms to be imposed upon Gentile believers. In both the conclusion is announced that these believers should be entirely free from the necessity of circumcision. These are main points which the narratives have in common. On looking more closely into both, the *second* impression upon the reader’s mind may possibly be that of a certain incompatibility between the two. Many joints and members of the transaction as given by Luke do not

appear in the account of Paul. Others in one or two cases are substituted. Further, the visit to Jerusalem is the third mentioned in the Acts, after Saul's conversion; in Galatians, it is apparently mentioned as the second. Supposing this sense of incompatibility to remain, the reader will go on to inquire whether the visit to Jerusalem mentioned in Galatians coincides *better* with any other mentioned in the Acts as the second (11:30) or the fourth (18:22). He will, in all probability, conclude without hesitation that it does *not*. Another view will remain, that Paul refers to a visit not recorded in the Acts at all. This is a possible hypothesis; and it is recommended by the vigorous sense of Paley. But where are we to place the visit? The only possible place for it is some short time before the visit of ch. 15. But it can scarcely be denied that the language of ch. 15 decidedly implies that the visit there recorded was the first paid by Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem after their great success in preaching the Gospel among the Gentiles. We suppose the reader, therefore, to recur to his first impression. He will then have to ask himself, "Granting the considerable differences, are there after all any plain *contradictions* between the two narratives, taken to refer to the same occurrences?" The answer must be, "There are *no plain contradictions*." This, he will perceive, is a very weighty fact. When it is recognized, the resemblance first observed will return with renewed force to the mind. (The chronological question will be considered below.)

We proceed then to combine the two narratives. While Paul and Barnabas were staying at Antioch, "certain men from Judaea" came there and taught the brethren that it was necessary for the Gentile converts to be circumcised. This doctrine was vigorously opposed by the two apostles, and it was determined that the question should be referred to the apostles and elders at Jerusalem. Paul and Barnabas themselves, and certain others, were selected for this mission. In ~~<411D>~~ Galatians 2:2 Paul says that he went up "by revelation" (*κατ' ἀποκάλυψιν*), so that we are to understand him as receiving a private intimation from the Divine Spirit, as well as a public commission from the Church at Antioch. On their way to Jerusalem, they announced to the brethren in Phoenicia and Samaria the conversion of the Gentiles; and the news was received with great joy. "When they were come to Jerusalem, they were received by the Church, and by the apostles and elders, and they declared all things that God had done with them" (~~<415D>~~ Acts 15:4). Paul adds that he communicated his views "privately to them which were of reputation," through anxiety as to the success of his work

(~~AMP~~ Galatians 2:2). The apostles and the Church in general, it appears, would have raised no difficulties; but certain believers who had been Pharisees thought fit to maintain the same doctrine which had caused the disturbance at Antioch. In either place, Paul would not give way to such teaching for a single hour (~~AMP~~ Galatians 2:5). It became necessary, therefore, that a formal decision should be reached upon the question. The apostles and elders came together, and there was much disputing. Arguments would be used on both sides; but when the persons of highest authority spoke, they appealed to what was stronger than arguments — the course of *facts*, through which the will of God had been manifestly shown. Peter, reminding his hearers that he himself had been first employed to open the door of faith to Gentiles, points out that God had himself bestowed on the uncircumcised that which was the seal of the highest calling and fellowship in Christ, the gift of the Holy Ghost. “Why do you not acquiesce in this token of God’s will? Why impose upon Gentile believers ordinances which we ourselves have found a heavy burden? Have not we Jews left off trusting in our law, to depend only on the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ?”—Then, carrying out the same appeal to the will of God as shown in facts, Barnabas and Paul relate to the silent multitude the wonders with which God had accompanied their preaching among the Gentiles. After they had done, James, with incomparable simplicity and wisdom, binds up the testimony of recent facts with the testimony of ancient prophecy, and gives a practical judgment upon the question.

The judgment was a decisive one. The injunction that the Gentiles should abstain from pollutions of idols and from fornication explained itself. The abstinence from things strangled and from blood is desired as a concession to the customs of the Jews who were to be found in every city, and for whom it was still right, when they had believed in Jesus Christ, to observe the law. Paul had completely gained his point. The older apostles, James, Ce’phas, and John, perceiving the grace which had been given him (his effectual apostleship), gave to him and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship. At this point it is very important to observe precisely what was the matter at stake between the contending parties (comp. Prof. Jowett on “St. Paul and the Twelve,” in *St. Paul’s Epistles*, 1:417). Peter speaks of a heavy yoke; James of troubling the Gentile converts. But we are not to suppose that they mean merely the outward trouble of conforming to the law of Moses. That was not what Paul was protesting against. The case stood thus: Circumcision and the ordinances of the law were witnesses of a

separation of the chosen race from other nations. The Jews were proud of that separation. But the Gospel of the Son of Man proclaimed that the time had come in which the separation was to be done away, and God's goodwill manifested to all nations alike. It spoke of a union with God, through trust, which gave hope of a righteousness that the law had been powerless to produce. Therefore to insist upon Gentiles being circumcised would have been to deny the Gospel of Christ. If there was to be simply an enlarging of the separated nation by the receiving of individuals into it, then the other nations of the world remained as much on the outside of God's covenant as ever. Then there was no Gospel to mankind; no justification given to men. The loss, in such a case, would have been as much to the Jew as to the Gentile. Paul felt this the most strongly; but Peter also saw that if the Jewish believers were thrown back on the Jewish law, and gave up the free and absolute grace of God, the law became a mere burden, just as heavy to the Jew as it would be to the Gentile. The only hope for the Jew was in a Savior who *must be* the Savior of mankind. It implied therefore no difference of belief when it was agreed that Paul and Barnabas should go to the heathen, while James and Cephas and John undertook to be the apostles of the circumcision. Paul, wherever he went, was to preach "to the Jew first;" Peter was to preach to the Jews as free a Gospel, was to teach the admission of the Gentiles without circumcision as distinctly as Paul himself. The unity of the Church was to be preserved unbroken; and in order to nourish this unity the Gentiles were requested to remember their poorer brethren in Palestine (~~412~~ Galatians 2:10). How zealously Paul cherished this beautiful testimony of the common brotherhood we have seen in part already (~~412~~ Acts 11:29, 30), but it is yet to appear more strikingly.

The judgment of the Church was immediately recorded in a letter addressed to the Gentile brethren in Antioch and Syria and Cilicia. That this letter might carry greater authority, it was entrusted to "chosen men of the Jerusalem Church, Judas surnamed Barnabas, and Silas, chief men among the brethren." The letter speaks affectionately of Barnabas and Paul (with the elder Church Barnabas still retained the precedence, 15:12, 25) as "men who have hazarded their lives for the name of our Lord Jesus Christ." So Judas and Silas came down with Paul and Barnabas to Antioch, and comforted the Church there with their message, and when Judas returned "it pleased Silas to abide there still."

It is usual to connect with this period of the history that rebuke of Peter which Paul records in ^{<R21>}Galatians 2:11-14. The connection of subject makes it convenient to record the incident in this place, although it is possible that it took place before the meeting at Jerusalem, and perhaps most probable that it did not occur till later, when Paul returned from his long tour in Greece to Antioch (^{<H82>}Acts 18:22, 23). (The presence of Peter, and the growth of Jewish prejudice, are more easily accounted for, if we suppose Paul in the meanwhile to have left Antioch for a long time; and there was but a very short interval between the council at Jerusalem and his second missionary tour.) Peter was at Antioch, and had shown no scruple about “eating with the Gentiles,” until “certain came from James.” These Jerusalem Christians brought their Jewish exclusiveness with them, and Peter’s weaker and more timid mood came upon him, and through fear of his stricter friends he too began to withdraw himself from his former free association with the Gentiles. Such an example had a dangerous weight, and Barnabas and the other Jews at Antioch were partly seduced by it. It was an occasion for the intrepid faithfulness of Paul. He did not conceal his anger at such weak dissembling, and he publicly remonstrated with his elder fellow-apostle. “If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?” (^{<R14>}Galatians 2:14). Peter had abandoned the Jewish exclusiveness, and deliberately claimed common ground with the Gentile: why should he, by separating himself from the uncircumcised, require the Gentiles to qualify themselves for full communion by accepting circumcision? This “withstanding” of Peter was no opposition of Pauline to Petrine views; it was a faithful rebuke of blamable moral weakness.

Picture for Paul 2

7. *Second Missionary Journey.* — The most resolute courage, indeed, was required for the work to which Paul was now publicly pledged. He would not associate with himself in that work one who had already shown a want of constancy. This was the occasion of what must have been a most painful difference between him and his comrade in the faith and in past perils, Barnabas. After remaining a while at Antioch, Paul proposed to Barnabas to revisit the brethren in the countries of their former journey. Hereupon Barnabas desired that his nephew John Mark should go with them. But John had deserted them in Pamphylia, and Paul would not try him again. “And the contention was so sharp between them that they departed asunder one from the other; and so Barnabas took Mark, and sailed unto

Cyprus; and Paul chose Silas, and departed.” A.D. 47. Silas, or Silvanus, now becomes a chief companion of the apostle. The two went together through Syria and Cilicia, visiting the churches, and so came to Derbe and Lystra. Here they found Timotheus, who had become a disciple on the former visit of the apostle, and who so attracted the esteem and love of Paul that “he would have him go forth with him.” Him Paul took and circumcised. If this fact had been omitted here and stated in another narrative, how utterly irreconcilable it would have been, in the eyes of some critics, with the history in the Acts! Paul and Silas were actually delivering the Jerusalem decree to all the churches they visited. They were no doubt triumphing in the freedom secured to the Gentiles. Yet at this very time our apostle had the wisdom and largeness of heart to consult the feelings of the Jews by circumcising Timothy. There were many Jews in those parts, who knew that Timothy’s father was a Greek, his mother a Jewess. That Paul should have had, as a chief companion, one who was uncircumcised, would of itself have been a hinderance to him in preaching to Jews; but it would have been a still greater stumbling-block if that companion were half a Jew by birth, and had professed the Jewish faith. Therefore in this case Paul “became unto the Jews as a Jew that he might gain the Jews.”

Luke now steps rapidly over a considerable space of the apostle’s life and labors. “They went throughout Phrygia and the region of Galatia” (^{<411>}Acts 16:6). At this time Paul was founding “the churches of Galatia” (^{<412>}Galatians 1:2). He himself gives us hints of the circumstances of his preaching in that region, of the reception he met with, and of the ardent though unstable character of the people, in the following words: “Ye know how through infirmity of the flesh (ὄτι δι’ ἀσθένειαν τῆς σαρκός) I preached the Gospel unto you at the first (τὸ πρότερον), and my temptation which was in my flesh ye despised not, nor rejected; but received me as an angel of God, even as Christ Jesus. Where is then the blessedness ye spake of (ὁμακαρισμὸς ὑμῶν, q. d. *your beautification of me*)? for I bear you record that, if it had been possible, ye would have plucked out your own eyes, and have given them to me” (4:13). It is not easy to decide as to the meaning of the words δι’ ἀσθένειαν τῆς σαρκός. Undoubtedly their grammatical sense implies that “weakness of the flesh” — an illness — was the *occasion* of Paul’s preaching in Galatia; and De Wette and Alford adhere to this interpretation, understanding Paul to have been detained by illness, when otherwise he would have gone rapidly

through the country. On the other hand, the form and order of the words are not what we should have expected if the apostle meant to say this; and professor Jowett prefers to assume an inaccuracy of grammar, and to understand Paul as saying that it was *in* weakness of the flesh that he preached to the Galatians. In either case Paul must be referring to a more than ordinary pressure of that bodily infirmity of which he speaks elsewhere as detracting from the influence of his personal address. It is hopeless to attempt to determine positively what this infirmity was. But we may observe here (1) that Paul's sensitiveness may have led him to exaggerate this personal disadvantage; and (2) that, whatever it was, it allowed him to go through sufferings and hardships such as few ordinary men could bear. It certainly did not repel the Galatians; it appears rather to have excited their sympathy and warmed their affection towards the apostle. (See below.)

Paul at this time had not indulged the ambition of preaching his Gospel in Europe. His views were limited to the peninsula of Asia Minor. Having gone through Phrygia and Galatia, he intended to visit the western coast, *SEE ASIA*; but "they were forbidden by the Holy Ghost to preach the Word" there. Then, being on the borders of Mysia, they thought of going back to the north-east into Bithynia; but again "the Spirit of *Jesus* (so the best MSS. read in ~~Acts~~ Acts 16:6) suffered them not." So they passed by Mysia, and came down to Troas. A.D. 48. Here the Spirit of Jesus, having checked them on other sides, revealed to them in what direction they were to go. Paul saw in a vision a man of Macedonia, who besought him, saying, "Come over into Macedonia and help us." The vision was at once accepted as a heavenly intimation; the help wanted by the Macedonians was believed to be the preaching of the Gospel. It is at this point that the historian, speaking of Paul's company, substitutes "we" for 'they.'" He says nothing of himself; we can only infer that Luke, to whatever country he belonged, became a companion of Paul at Troas. It is perhaps not too arbitrary a conjecture that the apostle, having recently suffered in health, derived benefit from the medical skill and attendance of" the beloved physician." The party, thus reinforced, immediately set sail from Troas, touched at Samothrace, then landed on the continent at Neapolis, and from thence journeyed to Philippi. They hastened to carry the "help" that had been asked to the first considerable city in Macedonia. Philippi was no inapt representative of the Western world. A Greek city, it had received a body of Roman settlers, and was politically a Colonia. We must not assume that

to Saul of Tarsus, the Roman citizen, there was anything very novel or strange in the world to which he had now come. But the name of Greece must have represented very imposing ideas to the Oriental and the Jew; and we may silently imagine what it must have been to Paul to know that he was called to be the herald of his Master, the crucified Jesus, in the center of the world's highest culture, and that he was now to begin his task. He began, however, with no flourish of trumpets, but as quietly as ever, and in the old way. There were a few Jews, if not many, at Philippi; and when the Sabbath came round, the apostolic company joined their countrymen at the place by the river-side where prayer was wont to be made (οὐ ἐνομιζέτο προσευχῇ εἶναι) *el'vat*, where was the usual *proseucha* or chapel which supplied the purpose of a synagogue). The narrative in this part is very graphic: "We sat down," says the writer (^{<41613>}Acts 16:13), "and spoke to the women who had come together." Among these women was a proselyte from Thyatira (σεβομένη τὸν θεόν), named Lydia, a dealer in purple. As she listened "the Lord opened her heart" to attend to what Paul was saying. The first convert in Macedonia was but an Asiatic woman who already worshipped the God of the Jews; but she was a very earnest believer, and besought the apostle and his friends to honor her by staying in her house. They could not resist her urgency, and during their stay at Philippi they were the guests of Lydia (ver. 40).

But a proof was given before long that the preachers of Christ had come to grapple with the powers in the spiritual world to which heathenism was then doing homage. A female slave, who brought gain to her masters by her powers of prediction when she was in the possessed state, beset Paul and his company, following them as they went to the place of prayer, and crying out, "These men are servants of the Most High God, who publish to you (or to us) the way of salvation." Paul was vexed by her cries, and addressing the spirit in the girl, he said, "I command thee in the name of Jesus Christ to come out of her." Comparing the confession of this "spirit of divination" with the analogous confessions made by evil spirits to our Lord, we see the same singular character of a true acknowledgment extorted as if by force, and rendered with a certain insolence which implied that the spirits, though subject, were not willingly subject. The cries of the slave-girl may have sounded like sneers, mimicking what she had heard from the apostles themselves, until Paul's exorcism, "in the name of Jesus Christ," was seen to be effectual. Then he might be recognised as in truth a servant of the Most High God, giving an example of the salvation which he

brought, in the deliverance of this poor girl herself from the spirit which degraded her. *SEE PYTHONESS.*

But the girl's masters saw that now the hope of their gains was gone. Here at Philippi, as afterwards at Ephesus, the local trade in religion began to suffer from the manifestation of the Spirit of Christ, and an interested appeal was made to local and national feelings against the dangerous innovations of the Jewish strangers. Paul and Silas were dragged before the magistrates, the multitude clamoring loudly against them, upon the vague charge of "troubling the city," and introducing observances which were unlawful for Romans. If the magistrates had desired to act justly they might have doubted how they ought to deal with the charge. On the one hand Paul and Silas had abstained carefully, as the preachers of Christ always did, from disturbing public order, and had as yet violated no express law of the state. But on the other hand, the preaching of Jesus as King and Lord was unquestionably revolutionary, and aggressive upon the public religion in its effects; and the Roman law was decided, in general terms, against such innovations (see in Conybeare and Howson, 1:324). But the praetors or duumviri of Philippi were very unworthy representatives of the Roman magistracy. They yielded without inquiry to the clamor of the inhabitants, caused the clothes of Paul and Silas to be torn from them, and themselves to be beaten, and then committed them to prison. The jailer, having received their commands, thrust them into the inner prison, and made their feet fast in the stocks." This cruel wrong was to be the occasion of a signal appearance of the God of righteousness and deliverance. It was to be seen which were the true servants of such a God, the magistrates or these strangers. In the night Paul and Silas, sore and sleepless, but putting their trust in God, prayed and sang praises so loudly that the other prisoners could hear them. Then suddenly the ground beneath them was shaken, the doors were opened, and every prisoner's bands were struck off (compare the similar openings of prison-doors in ~~4426~~ Acts 12:6-10, and 5:19). The jailer awoke and sprang up, saw with consternation that the prison-doors were open, and, concluding that the prisoners had all fled, drew his sword to kill himself. But Paul called to him loudly, "Do thyself no harm; we are all here." The jailer's fears were then changed to an overwhelming awe. What could this be? He called for lights, sprang in and fell trembling before the feet of Paul and Silas. Bringing them out from the inner dungeon, he exclaimed, "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" (τί με δεῖ ποιεῖν ἵνα σωθῶ). They answered, "Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt

be saved, and thy house.” And they went on to speak to him and to all in his house “the Word of the Lord.” The kindness he now showed them reminds us of their miseries. He washed their wounds, took them into his own house, and spread a table before them. The same night he received baptism, “he and all his,” and rejoiced in his new-found faith in God.

In the morning the magistrates, either having heard of what had happened, or having repented of their injustice, or having done all they meant to do by way of pacifying the multitude, sent word to the prison that the men might be let go. But legal justice was to be more clearly vindicated in the persons of these men, who had been charged with subverting public order. Paul denounced plainly the unlawful acts of the magistrates, informing them moreover that those whom they had beaten and imprisoned without trial were Roman citizens. “And now do they thrust us out privily? Nay, verily, but let them come themselves and fetch us out.” The magistrates, in great alarm, saw the necessity of humbling themselves (“*Facinus est vinciri civem Romanum, scelus verberari,*” Cicero, in *Verrem*, v. 66). **SEE CITIZENSHIP**. They came and begged them to leave the city. Paul and Silas consented to do so, and, after paying a visit to “the brethren” in the house of Lydia, they departed.

The Church thus founded at Philippi, as the firstfruits of the Gospel in Europe (save the nucleus already formed at Rome, ^{<420>}Acts 2:10), was called, as we have seen, in the name of a spiritual deliverer, of a God of justice, and of an equal Lord of freemen and slaves. That a warm and generous feeling distinguished it from the first we learn from a testimony of Paul in the Epistle written long after to this Church. “In the beginning of the Gospel,” as soon as he left them, they began to send him gifts, some of which reached him at Thessalonica, others afterwards (^{<3045>}Philippians 4:15, 16). Their partnership in the Gospel (**κοινωνία εἰς εὐαγγέλιον**) had gladdened the apostle from the first day (^{<3005>}Philippians 1:5).

Leaving Luke, and perhaps Timothy for a short time, at Philippi, Paul and Silas traveled through Amphipolis and Apollonia, and stopped again at Thessalonica. At this important city there was a synagogue of the Jews. True to his custom, Paul went in to them, and for three Sabbath-days proclaimed Jesus to be the Christ, as he would have done in a city of Judaea. As usual, the proselytes were those who heard him most gladly, and among them were many women of station, Again, as in Pisidian Antioch, the envy of the Jews was excited. They contrived to stir up the

lower class of the city to tumultuous violence by representing the preachers of Christ as revolutionary disturbers, who had come to proclaim one Jesus as king instead of Caesar. The mob assaulted the house of Jason, with whom Paul and Silas were staying as guests, and, not finding them, dragged Jason himself and some other brethren before the magistrates. In this case the magistrates, we are told, and the people generally, were “troubled” by the rumors and accusations which they heard. But they seem to have acted wisely and justly, in taking security of Jason and the rest, and letting them go. After these signs of danger the brethren immediately sent away Paul and Silas by night.

The Epistles to the Thessalonians, written soon after the apostle’s visit, contain more particulars of his work in founding that Church than we find in any other Epistle. The whole of these letters ought to be read for the information they thus supply. Paul speaks to the Thessalonian Christians as being mostly Gentiles. He reminds them that they had turned from idols to serve the living and true God, and to wait for his Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead, “Jesus who delivers us from the coming wrath” ([1 Thessalonians 1:9, 10](#)). The apostle had evidently spoken much of the coming and presence of the Lord Jesus Christ, and of that wrath which was already descending upon the Jews ([2:16, 19, etc.](#)). His message had had a wonderful power among them, because they had known it to be really the word of a God who also wrought in them, having had helps towards this conviction. in the zeal and disinterestedness and affection with which Paul (notwithstanding his recent shameful treatment at Philippi) proclaimed his Gospel among them ([2:2, 8-13](#)). He had purposely wrought with his own hands, even night and day, that his disinterestedness might be more apparent ([1 Thessalonians 2:9](#); [2 Thessalonians 3:8](#)). He exhorted them not to be drawn away from patient industry by the hopes of the kingdom into which they were called, but to work quietly, and to cultivate purity and brotherly love ([1 Thessalonians 4:3, 9, 11](#)). , Connecting these allusions with the preaching in the synagogue ([Acts 17:3](#)), we see clearly how the teaching of Paul turned upon the person of Jesus Christ as the Son of the living God, prophesied of in the Scriptures, suffering and dying, raised up and exalted to a kingdom, and about to appear as the Giver of light and life, to the destruction of his enemies and the saving of those who trusted in him. (See below.)

When Paul and Silas left Thessalonica they came to Beroea. Here they found the Jews more noble ([εὐγενέστεροι](#)) — more disposed to receive

the news of a rejected and crucified Messiah, and to examine the Scriptures with candor, than those at Thessalonica had been. Accordingly they gained many converts, both Jews and Greeks; but the Jews of Thessalonica, hearing of it, sent emissaries to stir up the people, and it was thought best that Paul should himself leave the city, while Silas and Timothy remained behind. Some of the brethren went with Paul (probably by sea) as far as Athens, where they left him, carrying back a request to Silas and Timothy that they would speedily join him. He apparently did not like to preach alone, and intended to rest from his apostolic labor until they should rejoin him; but how could he refrain, with all that was going on at Athens round him? There he witnessed the most profuse idolatry side by side with the most pretentious philosophy. Either of these would have been enough to stimulate his spirit. To idolaters and philosophers he felt equally urged to proclaim his Master and the living God. So he went to his own countrymen and the proselytes in the synagogue and declared to them that the Messiah had come; but he also spoke, like another Socrates, with people in the market, and with the followers of the two great schools of philosophy, Epicureans and Stoics, naring to all Jesus and the Resurrection. The philosophers encountered him with a mixture of curiosity and contempt. The Epicurean, teaching himself to seek for tranquil enjoyment as the chief object of life, heard of One claiming to be the Lord of men, who had shown them the glory of dying to self, and had promised to those who fought the good fight bravely a nobler bliss than the comforts of life could yield. The Stoic, cultivating a stern and isolated moral independence, heard of One whose own righteousness was proved by submission to the Father in heaven, and who had promised to give his righteousness to those who trusted not in themselves, but in him. To all, the announcement of a Person was much stranger than the publishing of any theories would have been. So far as they thought the preacher anything but a silly trifler, he seemed to them, not a philosopher, but a “setter forth of strange gods” (ξένων δαιμονίων καταγγελεύς). But any one with a novelty was welcome to those who “spent their time in nothing else but either to hear or to tell some new thing.” They brought him therefore to the Areopagus, that he might make a formal exposition of his doctrine to an assembled audience. *SEE AREOPAGUS.*

We are not to think here of the council or court, renowned in the oldest Athenian history, which took its name from Mars' Hill, but only of the elevated spot where the council met, not covered in, but arranged with

benches and steps of stone, so as to form a convenient place for a public address. Here the apostle delivered that wonderful discourse reported in ~~Acts~~ Acts 17:22-31, which seems as fresh and instructive for the intellect of the 19th century as it was for the intellect of the 1st. In this we have the Pauline Gospel as it addressed itself to the speculative mind of the cultivated Greeks. How the “report” was obtained by the writer of the history we have no means of knowing. Possibly we have it in notes written down before or after the delivery of this address by Paul himself. Short as it is, the form is as perfect as the matter is rich. The loftiness and breadth of the theology, the dignity and delicacy of the argument, the absence of self, the straightforward and reverent nature of the testimony delivered — all the characteristics so strikingly displayed in this speech — help us to understand what kind of a teacher had now appeared in the Grecian world. Paul, it is well understood, did not begin with calling the Athenians “too superstitious.” “I perceive you,” he said, “to be eminently religious” (εὐδαιμονοεστέροι, see Conybeare and Howson, *ad loc.*). He had observed an altar inscribed Ἄγνωστω θεῷ, “To an unknown God.” It meant, no doubt, “To *some* unknown God.” “I come,” he said, “as the messenger of that unknown God.” He then proceeded to speak of God in terms which were not altogether new to Grecian ears. They had heard of a God who had made the world and all things therein, and even of One who gave to all life, and breath, and all things. But they had never learned the next lesson which was now taught them. It was a special truth of the new dispensation that “God hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation, that they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after him, and find him.” **SEE UNKNOWN GOD.**

Comparing this with the teaching given to other audiences, we perceive that it laid hold of the deepest convictions which had ever been given to Greeks, while at the same time it encountered the strongest prejudices of Greeks. We see, as at Lystra, that an apostle of Christ had no need to refer to the Jewish Scriptures when he spoke to those who had not received them. He could speak to *men* as God’s children, and subjects of God’s educating discipline, and was only bringing them further tidings of him whom they had been always feeling after. He presented to them the Son of Man as acting in the power of him who had made all nations, and who was not far from any single man. He began to speak of him as risen from the

dead, and of the power of a new life which was in him for men; but his audience would not hear of him who thus claimed their personal allegiance. Some mocked, others, more courteously, talked of hearing him again another time. The apostle gained but few converts at Athens, and he soon took his departure and came to Corinth. A.D. 49. *SEE ATHENS*.

Athens still retained its old intellectual predominance; but Corinth was the political and commercial capital of Greece. It was in places of living activity that Paul labored longest and most successfully, as formerly at Antioch, now at Corinth, and afterwards at Ephesus. The rapid spread of the Gospel was obviously promoted by the preaching of it in cities where men were continually coming and going; but, besides this consideration, we may be sure that the apostle escaped gladly from dull ignorance on the one side, and from philosophical dilettanteism on the other, to places in which the real business of the world was done. The Gospel, though unworldly, was yet a message to practical and inquiring men, and it had more affinity to *work* of any kind than to torpor or to intellectual frivolity. One proof of the wholesome agreement between the following of Christ and ordinary labor was given by Paul himself during his stay at Corinth. Here, as at Thessalonica, he chose to earn his own subsistence by working at his trade of tent-making. This trade brought him into close connection with two persons who became distinguished as believers in Christ, Aquila and Priscilla. They were Jews, and had lately left Rome in consequence of an edict of Claudius, *SEE CLAUDIUS*; and as they also were tent-makers, Paul “abode with them and wrought.” Laboring thus on the six days, the apostle went to the synagogue on the Sabbath, and there by expounding the Scriptures sought to win both Jews and proselytes to the belief that Jesus was the Christ.

He was testifying with unusual effort and anxiety (συνείχετο τῷ λόγῳ), when Silas and Timothy came from Macedonia and joined him. We are left in some uncertainty as to what the movements of Silas and Timothy had been since they were with Paul at Bercea. From the statements in the Acts (⁴¹⁷⁵Acts 17:15, 16) that Paul, when he reached Athens, desired Silas and Timotheus to come to him *with all speed*, and *waited for them* there, compared with those in 1 Thessalonians (⁵¹¹¹1 Thessalonians 3:1, 2), “When we could no longer forbear, we thought it good to be left at Athens alone, and sent Timotheus, our brother and minister of God, and our fellow-laborer in the Gospel of Christ, to establish you and to comfort you concerning your faith,” Paley (*Horae Paulinae*, 1 Thessalonians No. iv)

reasonably argues that Silas and Timothy had come to Athens, but had soon been despatched thence, Timothy to Thessalonica, and Silas to Philippi, or elsewhere. From Macedonia they came together, or about the same time, to Corinth, and their arrival was the occasion of the writing of the First Epistle to the Thessalonians.

This is the first extant example of that work by which the apostle Paul has served the Church of all ages in as eminent a degree as he labored at the founding of it in his lifetime. All commentators upon the New Testament have been accustomed to notice the points of coincidence between the history in the Acts and these Letters. Paley's *Horae Paulinae* is famous as a special work upon this subject. But more recently important attempts have been made to estimate the Epistles of Paul more broadly, by considering them in their mutual order and relations, and in their bearing upon the question of the development of the writer's teaching. Such attempts must lead to a better understanding of the Epistles themselves, and to a finer appreciation of the apostle's nature and work. It is notorious that the order of the Epistles in the book of the N.T. is not their real, or chronological order. The mere placing of them in their true sequence throws considerable light upon the history; and happily the time of composition of the more important Epistles can be stated with sufficient certainty. The two Epistles to the Thessalonians belong — and these alone — to the present missionary journey. The Epistles to the Galatians, Romans, and Corinthians were written during the next journey. Those to Philemon, the Colossians, the Ephesians, the Philippians, and the Hebrews belong to the captivity at Rome. With regard to the Pastoral Epistles, there are considerable difficulties, which require to be discussed separately.

The *First* Epistle to the Thessalonians was probably written soon after Paul's arrival at Corinth, and before he turned from the Jews to the Gentiles. It was drawn from Paul by the arrival of Silas and Timothy. The largest portion of it consists of an impassioned recalling of the facts and feelings of the time when the apostle was personally with them. But we perceive gradually that those expectations which he had taught them to entertain of the appearing and presence of the Lord Jesus Christ had undergone some corruption. There were symptoms in the Thessalonian Church of a restlessness which speculated on the times and seasons of the future, and found present duties flat and unimportant. This evil tendency Paul seeks to correct, by reviving the first spirit of faith and hope and mutual fellowship, and by setting forth the appearing of Jesus Christ-not

indeed as distant, but as the full shining of a day of which all believers in Christ were already children. The ethical characteristics apparent in this Letter, the degree in which Paul identified himself with his friends, the entire surrender of his existence to his calling as a preacher of Christ, his anxiety for the good fame and well-being of his converts, are the same which will reappear continually. *SEE THESSALONIANS, FIRST EPISTLE TO THE.*

What interval of time separated the *Second* Letter to the Thessalonians from the First we have no means of judging, except that the later one was certainly written before Paul's departure from Corinth. The Thessalonians had been disturbed by announcements that those convulsions of the world which all Christians were taught to associate with the coming of Christ were immediately impending. To meet these assertions, Paul delivers express predictions in a manner not usual with him elsewhere; and while reaffirming all he had ever taught the Thessalonians to believe respecting the early coming of the Savior and the blessedness of waiting patiently for it, he informs them that certain events, of which he had spoken to them, must run their course before the full manifestation of Jesus Christ could come to pass. At the end of this epistle Paul guards the Thessalonians against pretended letters from him, by telling them that every genuine letter, even if not written by his hand throughout, would have at least an autograph salutation at the close of it. *SEE THESSALONIANS, SECOND EPISTLE TO.*

We now return to the apostle's preaching at Corinth. When Silas and Timotheus came, he was testifying to the Jews with great earnestness, but with little success. So "when they opposed themselves and blasphemed, he shook out his raiment," and said to them, in words of warning taken from their own prophets (^{<3304>}Ezekiel 33:4), "Your blood be upon your own heads; I am clean, and henceforth will go to the Gentiles." The experience of Pisidian Antioch was repeating itself. The apostle went, as he threatened, to the Gentiles, and began to preach in the house of a proselyte named Justus. Already one distinguished Jew had become a believer, Crispus, the ruler of the synagogue, mentioned (^{<4114>}1 Corinthians 1:14) as baptized by the apostle himself: and many of the Gentile inhabitants were accepting the Gospel and receiving baptism. The envy and rage of the Jews were consequently excited in an unusual degree, and seem to have pressed upon the spirit of Paul. He was therefore encouraged by a vision of the Lord, who appeared to him by night, and said, "Be not afraid, but speak,

and hold not thy peace: for I am with thee, and no man shall set on thee, to hurt thee; for I have much people in this city.” Corinth was to be an important seat of the Church of Christ, distinguished, not only by the number of believers, but also by the variety and the fruitfulness of the teaching to be given there. At this time Paul himself stayed there for a year and six months, “teaching the Word of God among them.”

Corinth was the chief city of the province of Achaia, and the residence of the proconsul. During Paul’s stay, we find the proconsular office held by Gallio, a brother of the philosopher Seneca. *SEE GALLIO*. Before him the apostle was summoned by his Jewish enemies, who hoped to bring the Roman authority to bear upon him as an innovator in religion. But Gallio perceived at once, before Paul could “*open* his mouth” to defend himself, that the movement was due to Jewish prejudice, and refused to go into the question. “If it be a question of words and names and of your law,” he said to the Jews, speaking with the tolerance of a Roman magistrate, “look ye to it; for I will be no judge of such matters.” Then a singular scene occurred. The Corinthian spectators, either favoring Paul, or actuated only by anger against the Jews, seized on the principal person of those who had brought the charge, and beat him before the judgment-seat. (See on the other hand Ewald, *Geschichte*, 6:463-466.) Gallio left these religious quarrels to settle themselves. The apostle therefore was not allowed to be “hurt,” and remained some time longer at Corinth unmolested. *SEE CORINTH*.

We do not gather from the subsequent Epistles to the Corinthians many details of the founding of the Church at Corinth. The main body of the believers consisted of Gentiles (“Ye know that ye were Gentiles,” ^{<402>}1 Corinthians 12:2). But, partly from the number who had been proselytes, partly from the mixture of Jews, it had so far a Jewish character that Paul could speak of “*our* fathers” as having been under the cloud (^{<400>}1 Corinthians 10:1). The tendency to intellectual display, and the traffic of Sophists in philosophical theories, which prevailed at Corinth, made the apostle more than usually anxious to be independent in his life and simple in bearing his testimony. He wrought for his living, that he might not appear to be taking fees of his pupils (^{<408>}1 Corinthians 9:18); and he put the person of Jesus Christ, crucified and risen, in the place of all doctrines (^{<401>}1 Corinthians 2:1-5; 15:3, 4). What gave infinite significance to his simple statements was the nature of the Christ who had been crucified, and his relation to men. Concerning these mysteries Paul had uttered a wisdom,

not of the world, but of God, which had commended itself chiefly to the humble and simple. Of these God had chosen and called not a few “into the fellowship of his Son Jesus Christ the Lord of men” (~~4183~~1 Corinthians 2:6, 7; 1:2, 7, 9).

Having been the instrument of accomplishing this work, Paul took his departure for Jerusalem, wishing to attend a festival there. A.D. 51. Before leaving Greece, he cut off his hair at Cenchrea, in fulfillment of a vow (~~4183~~Acts 18:18. The act *may be* that of Aquila, but the historian certainly seems to be speaking not of him, but of Paul). We are not told where or why he had made the vow; and there is considerable difficulty in reconciling this act with the received customs of the Jews. *SEE VOW*. A passage in Josephus, if rightly understood (*War*, 2:15, 1), mentions a vow which included, besides a sacrifice, the cutting of the hair and the beginning of an abstinence from wine thirty days before the sacrifice. If Paul’s was such a vow, he was going to offer up a sacrifice in the Temple at Jerusalem, and the “shearing of his head” was a preliminary to the sacrifice. The *principle* of the vow, whatever it was, must have been the same as that of the Nazaritish vow, which Paul afterwards countenanced at Jerusalem. There is therefore no difficulty in supposing him to have followed in this instance, for some reason not explained to us, a custom of his countrymen. — When he sailed from the Isthmus, Aquila and Priscilla went with him as far as Ephesus. Paul paid a visit to the synagogue at Ephesus, but would not stay. He was anxious to be at Jerusalem for the approaching feast, but he promised, God willing, to return to them again. Leaving Ephesus, he sailed to Casarea, and from thence went up to Jerusalem, and “saluted the Church.” It is argued (Wieseler, p. 48-50), from considerations founded on the suspension of navigation during the winter months, that the festival was probably the Pentecost. From Jerusalem, almost immediately, the apostle went down to Antioch, thus returning to the same place from which he had started with Silas.

Picture for Paul 3

8. *Third Missionary Journey, including the Stay at Ephesus* (~~4183~~Acts 18:23-21:17). — Without inventing facts or discussions for which we have no authority, we may connect with this short visit of Paul to Jerusalem a very serious raising of the whole question, What was to be the relation of the new kingdom of Christ to the law and covenant of the Jews? Such a Church as that at Corinth, with its affiliated communities, composed chiefly

of Gentile members, appeared likely to overshadow by its importance the Mother-Church in Judaea. The jealousy of the more Judaical believers, not extinguished by the decision of the council at Jerusalem, began now to show itself everywhere in the form of an active and intriguing party-spirit. This disastrous movement could not indeed alienate the heart of Paul from the law or the calling or the people of his fathers — his antagonism is never directed against these; but it drew him into the great conflict of the next period of his life, and must have been a sore trial to the intense loyalty of his nature. To vindicate the *freedom*, as regarded the Jewish law, of believers in Christ — but to do this for the very sake of maintaining *the unity of the Church* — was to be the earnest labor of the apostle for some years. In thus laboring he was carrying out completely the principles laid down by the elder apostles at Jerusalem; and may we not believe that, in deep sorrow at appearing, even, to disparage the law and the covenant, he was the more anxious to prove his fellowship in spirit with the Church in Judaea, by “remembering the poor,” as “James, Cephas, and John” had desired that he would? (<R11>Galatians 2:10). The prominence given, during the journeys upon which we are now entering, to the collection to be made among his churches for the benefit of the poor at Jerusalem, seems to indicate such an anxiety. The great Epistles which belong to this period — those to the Galatians, Corinthians, and Romans—show how the “Judaizing” question exercised at this time the apostle’s mind.

Paul “spent some time” at Antioch, and during this stay, as we are inclined to believe, his collision with Peter (<R11>Galatians 2:11-14), of which we have spoken above, took place. When he left Antioch, he “went over all the country of Galatia and Phrygia in order, strengthening all the disciples,” and giving directions concerning the collection for the saints (<R11>1 Corinthians 16:1). A.D. 51. It is probable that *the Epistle to the Galatians* was written soon after this visit. **SEE GALATIANS, EPISTLE TO.** When he was with them he had found the Christian communities infested by Judaizing teachers. He had “told them the truth” (<R11>Galatians 4:16), he had warned them against the deadly tendencies of Jewish exclusiveness, and had reaffirmed the simple Gospel, concerning Jesus Christ the Son of God, which he had preached to them on his first visit (τὸ πρότερον, <R11>Galatians 4:13). But after he left them the Judaizing doctrine raised its head again. The only course left to its advocates was to assail openly the authority of Paul; and this they did. They represented him as having derived his commission from the older apostles, and as therefore acting

disloyally if he opposed the views ascribed to Peter and James. The fickle minds of the Galatian Christians were influenced by these hardy assertions; and the apostle heard, when he had come down to Ephesus, that his work in Galatia was nearly undone, and his converts were partially seduced from the true faith in Christ. He therefore wrote the Epistle to remonstrate with them—an Epistle full of indignation, of warning, of direct and impassioned teaching. He recalls to their minds the Gospel which he had preached among them, and asserts in solemn and even awful language its absolute truth (~~ROMS~~ Galatians 1:8, 9). He declares that he had received it *directly from Jesus Christ the Lord*, and that his position towards the other apostles had always been that, not of a pupil, but of an independent fellow-laborer. He sets before them Jesus the Crucified, the Son of God, as the fulfillment of the promise made to the fathers, and as the pledge and giver of freedom to men. He declares that in him, and by the power of the Spirit of sonship sent down through him, men have inherited the rights of adult sons of God; that the condition represented by the law was the inferior and preparatory stage of boyhood. He then, most earnestly and tenderly, impresses upon the Galatians the responsibilities of their fellowship with Christ the Crucified, urging them to fruitfulness in all the graces of their spiritual calling, and especially to brotherly consideration and unity.

This Letter was, in all probability, sent from Ephesus. This was the goal of the apostle's journeyings through Asia Minor. He came down upon Ephesus from the upper districts (τὰ ἀνωτερικὰ μέρη) of Phrygia. What Antioch was for "the region of Syria and Cilicia," what Corinth was for Greece, what Rome was, we may add, for Italy and the West — that Ephesus was for the important province called Asia. Indeed, with reference to the spread of the Church Catholic, Ephesus occupied the central position of all. This was the meeting-place of Jew, of Greek, of Roman, and of Oriental. Accordingly the apostle of the Gentiles was to stay a long time here, that he might found a strong Church, which should be a kind of Mother Church to Christian communities in the neighboring cities of Asia. *SEE EPHESUS.*

A new element in the preparation of the world for the kingdom of Christ presents itself at the beginning of the apostle's work at Ephesus. He finds there certain disciples (τινὰς μαθητάς) — about twelve in number — of whom he is led to inquire, "Did ye receive the Holy Ghost when ye believed? They answered, No, we did not even hear of there being a Holy Ghost. Unto what then, asked Paul, were ye baptized? And they said, Unto

John's baptism. Then said Paul, John baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying to the people that they should believe on him who was coming after him, that is, on Jesus. Hearing this, they were baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus, and when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came upon them, and they began to speak with tongues and to prophesy" (⁴⁸⁰Acts 19:1-7). — It is obvious to compare this incident with the apostolic act of Peter and John in Samaria, and to see in it an assertion of the full apostolic dignity of Paul. But besides this bearing of it, we see in it indications which suggest more than they distinctly express, as to the spiritual movements of that age. These twelve disciples are mentioned immediately after Apollos, who also had been at Ephesus just before Paul's arrival, and who had taught diligently concerning Jesus (τὰ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ), knowing only the baptism of John. But Apollos was of Alexandria, trained in the intelligent and inquiring study of the Hebrew Scriptures, which had been fostered by the Greek culture of that capital. We are led to suppose therefore that a knowledge of the baptism of John and of the ministry of Jesus had spread widely, and had been received with favor by some of those who knew the Scriptures most thoroughly, before the message concerning the exaltation of Jesus and the descent of the Holy Ghost had been received. What the exact belief of Apollos and these twelve "disciples" was concerning the character and work of Jesus, we have no means of knowing; but we gather that it was wanting in a recognition of the full lordship of Jesus and of the gift of the Holy Ghost. The Pentecostal faith was communicated to Apollos by Aquila and Priscilla, to the other disciples of the Baptist by Paul.

The apostle now entered upon his usual work. He went into the synagogue, and for three months he spoke openly, disputing and persuading concerning "the kingdom of God." At the end of that time the obstinacy and opposition of some of the Jews led him to give up frequenting the synagogue, and he established the believers as a separate society, meeting "in the school of Tyrannus." This continued (so closely as not to allow any considerable absence of Paul) for two years. During this time occurred the triumph over magical arts, and the great disturbance raised by the silversmiths who made shrines for Artemis; also the writing of the First Epistle to the Corinthians.

"God wrought special miracles" (δυνάμεις οὐ τὰς τυχούσας), we are told, "by the hands of Paul." "It is evident that the arts of sorcery and magic — all those arts which betoken the belief in the presence of a spirit,

but not of a Holy Spirit — were flourishing here in great luxuriance. Everything in the history of the Old or New Testament would suggest the thought that the exhibitions of *Divine* power took a more startling form where superstitions grounded mainly on the reverence for *diabolical* power were prevalent; that they were the proclamations of a beneficent and orderly government, which had been manifested to counteract and overcome one that was irregular and malevolent” (Maurice, *Unity of the New Testament*, p. 515). The powers of the new kingdom took a form more nearly resembling the wonders of the kingdom of darkness than was usually adopted, when handkerchiefs and aprons from the body of Paul (like the shadow of Peter, ^{<465>}Acts 5:15), were allowed to be used for the healing of the sick and the casting out of daemons. But it was to be clearly seen that all was done by the healing power of the Lord Jesus himself. Certain Jews, and among them the seven sons of one Sceva (not unlike Simon Magus in Samaria), fancied that the effect was due to a magic formula, an ἐπωδή. They therefore attempted to exorcise, by saying, “We adjure you by Jesus whom Paul preacheth.” But the evil spirit, having a voice given to it, cried out, “Jesus I know, and Paul I know, but who are ye?” And the man who was possessed fell furiously upon the exorcists and drove them forth. The result of this testimony was that fear fell upon all the inhabitants of Ephesus, and the name of the Lord Jesus was magnified. The impression produced bore striking practical fruits. The city was well known for its Ἐφέσια γράμματα, forms of incantation, which were sold at a high price. Many of those who had these books brought them together and burned them before all men, and when the cost of them was computed it was found to be 50,000 drachme = \$8850. “So mightily grew the word of the Lord, and prevailed.”

While Paul was at Ephesus his communications with the Church in Achaia were not altogether suspended. There is no good reason, however, to believe that a personal visit to Corinth was made by him, nor any lost letter sent, of which there is no mention in the Acts. (See below.) The first of the extant epistles to that place, however, dates at this time. Whether the First Epistle to the Corinthians was written before or after the tumult excited by Demetrius cannot be positively asserted. He makes an allusion in that Epistle to “a battle with wild beasts” fought at Ephesus (ἐθηριομάχῃσιν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, ^{<465>}1 Corinthians 15:32), which it is usual to understand figuratively, and which is by many connected with that tumult. But such a connection is arbitrary, and without much reason. As it would seem from

Acts 20:1, that Paul departed immediately after the tumult, it is probable that the Epistle was written before, though not long before, the raising of this disturbance. Here then, while the apostle is so earnestly occupied with the teaching of believers and inquirers at Ephesus and from the neighboring parts of “Asia,” we find him throwing all his heart and soul into the concerns of the Church at Corinth.

There were two external inducements for writing this Epistle.

(1.) Paul had received information from members of Chloe’s household (ἔδηλώθη μοι ὑπὸ τῶν Χλόης, 1:11) concerning the state of the Church at Corinth.

(2.) That Church had written him a letter, of which the bearers were Stephanas and Fortunatus and Achaicus, to ask his judgment upon various points which were submitted to him (7:1; 16:17). He had learned that there were divisions in the Church; that parties had been formed which took the names of Paul, of Apollos, of Cephas, and of Christ (1:11, 12); and also that moral and social irregularities had begun to prevail, of which the most conspicuous and scandalous example was that a believer had taken his father’s wife, without being publicly condemned by the Church (5:1; 6:7; 11:17-22; 14:33-40). To these evils we must add one doctrinal error, of those who said “that there was no resurrection of the dead” (15:12). It is probable that the teaching of Apollos the Alexandrian, which had been characteristic and highly successful (Acts 18:27, 28), had been the first occasion of the “divisions” in the Church. We may take it for granted that his adherents did not form themselves into a party until he had left Corinth, and therefore that he had been some time with Paul at Ephesus. But after he was gone, the special *Alexandrian* features of his teaching were remembered by those who had delighted to hear him. Their Grecian intellect was captivated by his broader and more spiritual interpretation of the Jewish Scriptures. The connection which he taught them to perceive between the revelation made to Hebrew rulers and prophets and the wisdom by which other nations, and especially their own, had been enlightened, dwelt in their minds. That which especially occupied the Apollos school must have been a *philosophy of the Scriptures*. It was the tendency of this party which seemed to the apostle particularly dangerous among the Greeks. He hardly seems to refer specially in his letter to the other parties, but we can scarcely doubt that in what he says about “the wisdom which the Greeks sought” (1:22), he is referring not only to the

general tendency of the Greek mind, but to that tendency as it had been caught and influenced by the teaching of Apollos. It gives him an occasion of delivering his most characteristic testimony. He recognises wisdom, but it is the wisdom of God; and that wisdom was not *only* a **Σοφία** or a **Λόγος** through which God had always spoken to all men; it had been perfectly manifested in Jesus the Crucified. Christ crucified was both the Power of God and the Wisdom of God. To receive him required a spiritual discernment unlike the wisdom of the great men of the world; a discernment given by the Holy Spirit of God, and manifesting itself in sympathy with humiliation and in love.

For a detailed description of the Epistles the reader is referred to the special articles upon each. But it belongs to the history of Paul to notice the personal characteristics which appear in them. We must not omit to observe therefore, in this Epistle, how loyally the apostle represents Jesus Christ the Crucified as the Lord of men, the Head of the body with many members, the Centre of Unity, the Bond of men to the Father. We should mark at the same time how invariably he connects the Power of the Spirit with the name of the Lord Jesus. He meets all the evils of the Corinthian Church—the intellectual pride, the party spirit, the loose morality, the disregard of decency and order, the false belief about the resurrection—by recalling their thoughts to the person of Christ and to the Spirit of God as the Breath of a common life to the whole body.

We observe also here, more than elsewhere, the *tact*, universally recognised and admired, with which the apostle discusses the practical problems brought before him. The various questions relating to marriage (ch. 7), the difficulty about meats offered to idols (ch. 8, 10), the behavior proper for women (ch. 11, 14), the use of the gifts of prophesying and speaking with tongues (ch. 14), are made examples of a treatment which may be applied to all such questions. We see them all discussed with reference to first principles; the object, in every practical conclusion, being to guard and assert some permanent principle. We see Paul no less a lover of order and subordination than of freedom. We see him claiming for himself, and prescribing to others, great variety of conduct in varying circumstances, but under the strict obligation of being always true to Christ, and always seeking the highest good of men. Such a character, so steadfast in motive and aim, so versatile in action, it would be difficult indeed to find elsewhere in history.

What Paul here tells us of his own doings and movements refers chiefly to the nature of his preaching at Corinth (ch. 1, 2); to the hardships and dangers of the apostolic life (4:9-13); to his cherished custom of working for his own living (ch. 9); to the direct revelations he had received (11:23; 15:8); and to his present plans (ch. 16). He bids the Corinthians raise a collection for the Church at Jerusalem by laying by something on the first day of the week, as he had directed the churches in Galatia to do. He says that he shall tarry at Ephesus till Pentecost, and then set out on a journey towards Corinth through Macedonia, so as perhaps to spend the winter with them. He expresses his joy at the coming of Stephanas and his companions, and commends them to the respect of the Church. *SEE CORINTHIANS, FIRST EPISTLE TO.*

Having despatched this Epistle, he stayed on at Ephesus, where “a great door and effectual was opened to him, and there were many adversaries.” The affairs of the Church at Corinth continued to be an object of the gravest anxiety to him, and to give him occupation at Ephesus: but it may be most convenient to put off the further notice of these till we come to the time when the Second Epistle was written. We have now no information as to the work of Paul at Ephesus until that tumult occurred which is described in ~~Acts~~ Acts 19:24-41. The whole narrative may be read there. We learn that “this Paul” had been so successful, not only in Ephesus, but “almost throughout all Asia,” in turning people from the worship of gods made with hands, that the craft of silversmiths, who made little shrines for Artemis, were alarmed for their manufacture. — They raised a great tumult. and not being able, apparently, to find Paul, laid hands on two of his companions and dragged them into the theater. Paul himself, not willing that his friends should suffer in his place, wished to go in among the people; but the disciples, supported by the urgent request of certain magistrates called Asiarchs, dissuaded him from his purpose. The account of the proceedings of the mob is highly graphic, and the address with which the town-clerk finally quiets the people is worthy of a discreet and experienced magistrate. His statement that “these men are neither robbers of churches nor yet blasphemers of your goddess” is an incidental testimony to the temperance of the apostle and his friends in their attacks on the popular idolatry. But Paul is only personally concerned in this tumult in so far as it proves the deep impression which his teaching had made at Ephesus, and the daily danger in which he lived.

Paul had been anxious to depart from Ephesus, and this interruption of the work which had kept him there determined him to stay no longer. He set out therefore for Macedonia, and proceeded first to Troas (~~ACT2~~2 Corinthians 2:12), where he might have preached the Gospel with good hope of success. But a restless anxiety to obtain tidings concerning the Church at Corinth urged him on, and he advanced into Macedonia, where he met Titus, who brought him the news for which he was thirsting. The receipt of this intelligence drew from him a letter, the Second to the Corinthians, which reveals to us what manner of man Paul was when the fountains of his heart were stirred to their inmost depths. How the agitation which expresses itself in every sentence of this letter was excited is one of the most interesting questions we have to consider. Every reader may perceive that, on passing from the First Epistle to the Second, the scene is almost entirely changed. In the *First*, the faults and difficulties of the Corinthian Church are before us. The apostle writes of these, with spirit indeed and emotion, as he always does, but without passion or disturbance. He calmly asserts his own authority over the Church, and threatens to deal severely with offenders. In the *Second*, he writes as one whose personal relations with those whom he addresses have undergone a most painful shock. The acute pain given by former tidings, the comfort yielded by the account which Titus brought, the vexation of a sensitive mind at the necessity of self-assertion, contend together for utterance. What had occasioned this excitement?

We have seen that Timothy had been sent from Ephesus to Macedonia and Corinth. He had rejoined Paul when he wrote this Second Epistle; for he is associated with him in the salutation (~~ACT2~~2 Corinthians 1:1). We have no account, either in the Acts or in the Epistles, of this journey of Timothy, and some have thought it probable that he never reached Corinth. Let us suppose, however, that he arrived there soon after the First Epistle, conveyed by Stephanas and others, had been received by the Corinthian Church. He found that a movement had arisen in the heart of that Church which threw (let us suppose) the case of the incestuous person (~~ACT1~~1 Corinthians 5:1-5) into the shade. This was a deliberate and sustained attack upon the apostolic authority and personal integrity of the apostle of the Gentiles. The party-spirit which, before the writing of the First Epistle, had been content with underrating the powers of Paul compared with those of Apollos, and with protesting against the laxity of his doctrine of freedom, had been fanned into a flame by the arrival of some person or

persons who came from the Judæan Church, armed with letters of commendation, and who openly questioned the commission of him whom they proclaimed to be a self-constituted apostle (^{<4002>}2 Corinthians 3:1; 11:4, 12-15). As the spirit of opposition and detraction grew strong, the tongue of some member of the Church (more probably a Corinthian than the stranger himself) seems to have been loosed. He scoffed at Paul's courage and constancy, pointing to his delay in coming to Corinth, and making light of his threats (^{<4017>}2 Corinthians 1:17, 23). He demanded proofs of his apostleship (^{<4021>}2 Corinthians 12:11,12). He derided the weakness of his personal presence and the simplicity of his speech (^{<4000>}2 Corinthians 10:10). He even threw out insinuations touching the personal honesty and self devotion of Paul (^{<4012>}2 Corinthians 1:12; 12:17,18). When some such attack was made openly upon the apostle, the Church had not immediately called the offender to account; the better spirit of the believers being cowed, apparently, by the confidence and assumed authority of the assailants of Paul. A report of this melancholy state of things was brought to the apostle by Timothy or by others; and we can imagine how it must have wounded his sensitive and most affectionate nature, and also how critical the juncture must have seemed to him for the whole Western Church. He immediately sent off Titus to Corinth, with a verbal message reinforcing his former letter with the sharpest rebukes (see ^{<4008>}1 Corinthians 4:18-21), *using* the authority which had been denied, and threatening to enforce it speedily by his personal presence (^{<4002>}2 Corinthians 2:2, 3; 7:8). As soon as the messenger was gone — how natural a trait!-he began to repent of having sent him. He must have hated the appearance of claiming homage to himself; his heart must have been sore at the requital of his love; he must have felt the deepest anxiety as to the issue of the struggle. We can well believe him therefore when he speaks of what he had suffered: "Out of much affliction and anguish of heart I wrote to you with many tears" (^{<4004>}2 Corinthians 2:4); "I had no rest in my spirit" (^{<4003>}2 Corinthians 2:13); "Our flesh had no rest, but we were troubled on every side; without were fightings, within were fears" (^{<4005>}2 Corinthians 7:5). It appears that he could not bring himself to hasten to Corinth so rapidly as he had intended (^{<4015>}2 Corinthians 1:15, 16); he would wait till he heard news which might make his visit a happy instead of a painful one (^{<4002>}2 Corinthians 2:1). When he had reached Macedonia, Titus, as we have seen, met him with such reassuring tidings. The offender had been rebuked by the Church, and had made submission (^{<4006>}2 Corinthians 2:6, 7); the old spirit of love and reverence towards Paul had

been awakened, and had poured itself forth in warm expressions of shame and grief and penitence. The cloud was now dispelled; fear and pain gave place to hope and tenderness and thankfulness. But even now the apostle would not start at once for Corinth. He may have had important work to do in Macedonia. But another letter would smooth the way still more effectually for his personal visit; and he accordingly wrote the Second Epistle, and sent it by the hands of Titus and two other brethren to Corinth.

When the Epistle is read in the light of the circumstances we have supposed, the symptoms it displays of a highly wrought personal sensitiveness, and of a kind of ebb and flow of emotion, are as intelligible as they are noble and beautiful. Nothing but a temporary interruption of mutual regard could have made the joy of sympathy so deep and fresh. If he had been the object of a personal attack, how natural for the apostle to write as he does in [2 Corinthians 2:5-10](#). In [2 Corinthians 7:12](#), "he that suffered wrong" is Paul himself. All his protestations relating to his apostolic work, and his solemn appeals to God and Christ, are in place; and we enter into his feelings as he asserts his own sincerity and the openness of the truth which he taught in the Gospel (ch. 3, 4). We see what sustained him in his self-assertion; he knew that he did not preach himself, but Christ Jesus the Lord. His own weakness became an argument to him, which he could use to others also, of the power of God working in him. Knowing his own fellowship with Christ, and that this fellowship was the right of other men too, he would be persuasive or severe, as the cause of Christ and the good of men might require (ch. 4, 5). If he was appearing to set himself up against the churches in Judaea, he was the more anxious that the collection which he was making for the benefit of those churches should prove his sympathy with them by its largeness. Again he would recur to the maintenance of his own authority as an apostle of Christ against those who impeached it. He would make it understood that spiritual views, spiritual powers, were *real*; that if he knew no man after the flesh, and did not war after the flesh, he was not the less able for the building up of the Church (ch. 10). He would ask them to excuse his anxious jealousy, his folly and excitement, while he gloried in the practical proofs of his apostolic commission, and in the infirmities which made the power of God more manifest; and he would plead with them earnestly that they would give him no occasion to find fault or to correct them (ch. 11, 12, 13).

The hypothesis upon which we have interpreted this Epistle is not precisely that which is most commonly received. According to the more common view, the offender is the incestuous person of ~~1~~1 Corinthians 5, and the message which proved so sharp but wholesome a medicine was simply the First Epistle. But this view does not account so satisfactorily for the whole tone of the Epistle, and for the particular expressions relating to the offender; nor does it find places so consistently for the missions of Timothy and Titus. It does not seem likely that Paul would have treated the sin of the man who took his father's wife as an offense against himself, nor that he would have spoken of it by preference as a *wrong* (ἀδικία) *done to another* (supposed to be the father). The view we have adopted is said, in DeWette's *Exegetisches Handbuch*, to have been held, in whole or in part, by Bleek, Credner, Olshausen, and Neander. More recently it has been advocated with great force by Ewald, in his *Sendschreiben des A. P.* p. 223-232. The ordinary account is retained by Stanley, Alford, and Davidson, and with some hesitation by Conybeare and Howson. **SEE CORINTHIANS, SECOND EPISTLE TO.**

The particular nature of this Epistle, as an appeal to facts in favor of his own apostolic authority, leads to the mention of many interesting features of Paul's life. His summary, in 11:23-28, of the hardships and dangers through which he had gone, may probably be referred, as above suggested, to the period of his first labors at Tarsus. Of the particular facts stated in the following words, "Of the Jews five times received I forty stripes save one; thrice was I beaten with rods, once was I stoned, thrice I suffered shipwreck, a night and a day I have been in the deep" — we know only of *one*, the beating by the magistrates at Philippi, from the Acts. The daily burden of "the care of all the churches" seems to imply a wide and constant range of communication, by visits, messengers, and letters, of which we have found it reasonable to assume examples in his intercourse with the Church of Corinth. The mention of "visions and revelations of the Lord," and of the "thorn (or rather *stake*) in the flesh," side by side, is peculiarly characteristic both of the mind and of the experiences of Paul. As an instance of the visions, he alludes to a trance which had befallen him fourteen years before, in which he had been caught up into paradise, and had heard unspeakable words. Whether this vision *may* be identified with any that is recorded in the Acts must depend on chronological considerations; but the very expressions of Paul in this place would rather lead us not to think of an occasion in which words *that could be reported*

were spoken. We observe that he speaks with the deepest reverence of the privilege thus granted to him; but he distinctly declines to ground anything upon it as regards other men. Let them judge him, he says, not by any such pretensions, but by facts which were cognizable to them (12:1-6). He would not, even inwardly with himself, glory in visions and revelations without remembering how the Lord had guarded him from being puffed up by them. A stake in the flesh (σκόλοψ τῆ σαρκί) was given him, a messenger of Satan to buffet him, lest he should be exalted above measure. The different interpretations which have prevailed of this σκόλοψ have a certain historical significance.

(1) Roman Catholic divines have inclined to understand by it strong *sensual temptation*.

(2) Luther and his followers take it to mean temptation to *unbelief*. But neither of these would be “infirmities” in which Paul could “glory.”

(3) It is almost the unanimous opinion of modern divines and the authority of the ancient fathers on the whole is in favor of it—that the σκόλοψ represents some vexatious *bodily infirmity* (see especially Stanley, *ad loc.*). It is plainly what Paul refers to in ^{<4014>}Galatians 4:14: “My temptation in my flesh ye despised not nor rejected.” This infirmity distressed him so much that he besought the Lord thrice that it might depart from him. But the Lord answered, “My grace is sufficient for thee; for my strength is made perfect in weakness.” We are to understand therefore the affliction as remaining; but Paul is more than resigned under it, he even glories in it as a means of displaying more purely the power of Christ in him. That we are to understand the apostle, in accordance with this passage, as laboring under some degree of ill-health, is clear enough. But we must remember that his constitution was at least strong enough, as a matter of fact, to carry him through the hardships and anxieties and toils which he himself describes to us, and to sustain the pressure of the imprisonment at Caesarea and in Rome. *SEE THORN IN THE FLESH.*

After writing this Epistle, Paul traveled through Macedonia (A.D. 54), perhaps to the borders of Illyricum (^{<4519>}Romans 15:19), and then carried out the intention of which he had spoken so often, and arrived himself at Corinth. The narrative in the Acts tells us that “when he had gone over those parts (Macedonia), and had given them much exhortation, he came into Greece, and there abode three months” (^{<401D>}Acts 20:2, 3). A.D. 55. There is only one incident which we can connect with this visit to Greece,

but that is a very important one — the writing of another great Epistle, addressed to the Church at Rome. That this was written at this time from Corinth appears from passages in the Epistle itself, and has never been doubted.

It would be unreasonable to suppose that Paul was insensible to the mighty associations which connected themselves with the name of Rome. The seat of the imperial government to which Jerusalem itself, with the rest of the world, was then subject, must have been a grand object to the thoughts of the apostle from his infancy upward. He was himself a citizen of Rome; he had come repeatedly under the jurisdiction of Roman magistrates; he had enjoyed the benefits of the equity of the Roman law, and the justice of Roman administration. And, besides its universal supremacy, Rome was the natural head of the Gentile world, as Jerusalem was the head of the Jewish world. In this august city Paul had many friends and brethren. Romans who had traveled into Greece and Asia, strangers from Greece and Asia who had gone to settle at Rome, had heard of Jesus Christ and the kingdom of heaven from Paul himself or from other preachers of Christ, and had formed themselves into a community, of which a good report had gone forth throughout the Christian world. We are not surprised therefore to hear that the apostle was very anxious to visit Rome. It was his fixed intention to go to Rome, and from Rome to extend his journeys as far as Spain (^{<6154>}Romans 15:24, 28). He would thus bear his testimony both in the capital and to the extremities of the Western or Gentile world. For the present he could not go on from Corinth to Rome, because he was drawn by a special errand to Jerusalem — where indeed he was likely enough to meet with dangers and delays (^{<6155>}Romans 15:25-32). But from Jerusalem he proposed to turn towards Rome. In the meanwhile he would write them a letter from Corinth.

The letter is a substitute for the personal visit which he had longed “for many years” to pay; and, as he would have made the visit, so now he writes the letter, *because he is the apostle of the Gentiles*. Of this office, to speak in common language, Paul was proud. All the labors and dangers of it he would willingly encounter; and he would also jealously maintain its dignity and its powers. He held it of Christ, and Christ’s commission should not be dishonored. He represents himself grandly as a priest, appointed to offer up the faith of the Gentile world as a sacrifice to God (^{<6156>}Romans 15:16). He then proceeds to speak with pride of the extent and independence of his apostolic labors. It is in harmony with this language that he should address

the Roman Church as consisting mainly of Gentiles: but we find that he speaks to them as to persons deeply interested in Jewish questions. To the Church thus composed, the apostle of the Gentiles writes to declare and commend the Gospel which he everywhere preaches. That Gospel was invariably the announcement of Jesus Christ the Son of God, the Lord of men, who was made man, died, and was raised again, and whom his heralds present to the faith and obedience of mankind. Such a κήρυγμα might be variously commended to different hearers. In speaking to the Roman Church, Paul represents the chief value of it as consisting in the fact that, through it, the righteousness of God, as a righteousness not for God only, but also for men, was revealed. It is natural to ask what led him to choose and dwell upon this aspect of his proclamation of Jesus Christ. The following answers suggest themselves:

- (1.) As he looked upon the condition of the Gentile world, with that *coup d'ail* which the writing of a letter to the Roman Church was likely to suggest, he was struck by the awful wickedness, the utter dissolution of moral ties, which has made that age infamous. His own terrible summary (~~4012~~ Romans 1:21-32) is well known to be confirmed by other contemporary evidence. The profligacy which we shudder to read of was constantly under Paul's eye, especially at Corinth. Along with the evil he saw also the beginnings of God's judgment upon it. He saw the miseries and disasters, begun and impending, which proved that God in heaven would not tolerate the unrighteousness of men.
- (2.) As he looked upon the condition of the Jewish people, he saw them claiming an exclusive righteousness, which, however, had manifestly no power to preserve them from being really unrighteous.
- (3.) Might not the thought also occur to him, as a Roman citizen, that the empire which was now falling to pieces through unrighteousness had been built up by righteousness, by that love of order and that acknowledgment of rights which were the great endowment of the Roman people? Whether we lay any stress upon this or not, it seems clear that to one contemplating the world from Paul's point of view, no thought would be so naturally suggested as that of the need of the *true* Righteousness for the two divisions of mankind. How he expounds that God's own righteousness was shown, in Jesus Christ, to be a righteousness which men might trust in — sinners though they were — and by trusting in it submit to it, and so receive it as to show forth the fruits of it in their own lives; how he

declares the union of men with Christ as subsisting in the divine idea and as realized by the power of the Spirit may be seen in the Epistle itself. The remarkable exposition contained in ch. 9, 10, 11 illustrates the personal character of Paul, by showing the intense love for his nation which he retained through all his struggles with unbelieving Jews and Judaizing Christians, and by what hopes he reconciled himself to the thought of their unbelief and their punishment. Having spoken of this subject, he goes on to exhibit in practical counsels the same love of Christian unity, moderation, and gentleness, the same respect for social order, the same tenderness for weak consciences, and the same expectation of the Lord's coming and confidence in the future which appear more or less strongly in all his letters. *SEE ROMANS, EPISTLE TO.*

Before his departure from Corinth, Paul was joined again by Luke, as we infer from the change in the narrative from the third to the first person. We have already seen that he was bent on making a journey to Jerusalem, for a special purpose and within a limited time. With this view he was intending to go by sea to Syria. But he was made aware of some plot of the Jews for his destruction, to be carried out through this voyage; and he determined to evade their malice by changing his route. Several brethren were associated with him in this expedition, the bearers, no doubt, of the collections made in all the churches for the poor at Jerusalem. These were sent on by sea, and probably the money with them, to Troas, where they were to await Paul. He, accompanied by Luke, went northwards through Macedonia. The style of an eyewitness again becomes manifest. "From Philippi," says the writer, "we sailed away after the days of unleavened bread, and came unto them to Troas in five days, where we abode seven days." The marks of time throughout this journey have given occasion to much chronological and geographical discussion, which brings before the reader's mind the difficulties and uncertainties of travel in that age, and leaves the *precise* determination of the dates of this history a matter for reasonable conjecture rather than for positive statement. But no question is raised as to the times mentioned which need detain us in the course of the narrative. During the stay at Troas there was a meeting on the first day of the week "to break bread," and Paul was discoursing earnestly and at length with the brethren. He was to depart the next morning, and midnight found them listening to his earnest speech, with many lights burning in the upper chamber in which they had met, and making the atmosphere oppressive. A youth named Eutychus was sitting in the window, and was gradually overpowered by

sleep, so that at last he fell into the street or court from the third story, and was taken up dead. The meeting was interrupted by this accident, and Paul went down and fell upon him and embraced him, saying, "Be not disturbed, his life is in him." His friends then appear to have taken charge of him, while Paul went up again, first presided at the breaking of bread, afterwards took a meal, and continued conversing until daybreak, and so departed.

While the vessel which conveyed the rest of the party sailed from Troas to Assos, Paul gained some time by making the journey by land. At Assos he went on board again. Coasting along by Mitylene, Chios, Samos, and Trogyllium, they arrived at Miletus. The apostle was thus passing by the chief Church in Asia; but if he had gone to Ephesus he might have arrived at Jerusalem too late for the Pentecost, at which festival he had set his heart upon being present. At Miletus, however, there was time to send to Ephesus; and the elders of the Church were invited to come down to him there. This meeting is made the occasion for recording another characteristic and *representative* address of Paul (~~4018~~ Acts 20:18-35). This spoken address to the elders of the Ephesian Church may be ranked with the Epistles, and throws the same kind of light upon Paul's apostolical relations to the churches. Like several of the Epistles, it is in great part an appeal to their memories of him and of his work. He refers to his labors in "serving the Lord" among them, and to the dangers he incurred from the plots of the Jews, and asserts emphatically the *unreserve* with which he had taught them. He then mentions a fact which will come before us again presently, that he was receiving inspired warnings, as he advanced from city to city, of the bonds and afflictions awaiting him at Jerusalem. It is interesting to observe that the apostle felt it to be his duty to press on in spite of these warnings. Having formed his plan on good grounds and in the sight of God, he did not see, in dangers which might even touch his life, however clearly set before him, reasons for changing it. Other arguments might move him from a fixed purpose — not dangers. His one guiding principle was to discharge the ministry which he had received of the Lord Jesus, to testify the Gospel of the grace of God. Speaking to his present audience as to those whom he was seeing for the last time, he proceeds to exhort them with unusual earnestness and tenderness, and expresses in conclusion that anxiety as to practical industry and liberality which has been increasingly occupying his mind. In terms strongly resembling the language of the Epistles to the Thessalonians and Corinthians, he pleads his

own example, and entreats them to follow it, in “laboring for the support of the weak.” “And when he had thus spoken, he kneeled down and prayed with them all: and they all wept sore, and fell on Paul’s neck, and kissed him, sorrowing most of all for the words which he spake, that they should see his face no more. And they accompanied him to the ship.” This is the kind of narrative in which some learned men think they can detect the signs of a moderately clever fiction.

The course of the voyage from Miletus was by Cos and Rhodes to Patara, and from Patara in another vessel past Cyprus to Tyre. Here Paul and his company spent seven days; and there were disciples “who said to Paul through the Spirit that he should not go up to Jerusalem.” Again there was a sorrowful parting: “They all brought us on our way, with wives and children, till we were out of the city; and we kneeled down on the shore and prayed.” From Tyre they sailed to Ptolemais, where they spent one day, and from Ptolemais proceeded, apparently by land, to Caesarea. In this place was settled Philip the Evangelist, one of the seven, and he became the host of Paul and his friends. Philip had four unmarried daughters, who “prophesied,” and who repeated, no doubt, the warnings already heard. Caesarea was within an easy journey of Jerusalem, and Paul may have thought it prudent not to be too long in Jerusalem before the festival; otherwise it might seem strange that, after the former haste, they now “tarried many days” at Caesarea. During this interval the prophet Agabus (~~441B~~ Acts 11:28) came down from Jerusalem, and crowned the previous intimations of danger with a prediction expressively delivered. It would seem as if the approaching imprisonment were intended to be conspicuous in the eyes of the Church, as an agency for the accomplishment of God’s designs. At this stage a final effort was made to dissuade Paul from going up to Jerusalem, by the Christians of Caesarea, and by his travelling companions. But “Paul answered, What mean ye to weep and to break mine heart? for I am ready not to be bound only, but also to die at Jerusalem for the name of the Lord Jesus. And when he would not be persuaded, we ceased, saying, The will of the Lord be done.” So, after a while, they went up to Jerusalem, and were gladly received by the brethren. This is Paul’s fifth and last visit to Jerusalem.

9. *First Imprisonment.* —

(1.) *Arrest at Jerusalem* (A.D. 55). He who was thus conducted into Jerusalem by a company of anxious friends had become by this time a man

of considerable fame among his countrymen. He was widely known as one who had taught with pre-eminent boldness that a way into God's favor was opened to the Gentiles, and that this way did not lie through the door of the Jewish law. He had moreover actually founded numerous and important communities, composed of Jews and Gentiles together, which stood simply on the name of Jesus Christ, apart from circumcision and the observance of the law. He had thus roused against himself the bitter enmity of that unfathomable Jewish pride which was almost as strong in some of those who had professed the faith of Jesus as in their unconverted brethren. This enmity had for years been vexing both the body and the spirit of the apostle. He had no rest from its persecutions; and his joy in proclaiming the free grace of God to the world was mixed with a constant sorrow that in so doing he was held to be disloyal to the calling of his fathers. He was now approaching a crisis in the long struggle, and the shadow of it had been made to rest upon his mind throughout his journey to Jerusalem. He came "ready to die for the name of the Lord Jesus," but he came expressly to prove himself a faithful Jew, and this purpose emerges at every point of the history.

Luke does not mention (except incidentally. ^{<4817>}Acts 24:17) the contributions brought by Paul and his companions for the poor at Jerusalem. But it is to be assumed that their first act was to deliver these funds into the proper hands. This might be done at the interview which took place on the following day with "James and all the elders." As on former occasions, the believers at Jerusalem could not but glorify God for what they heard; but they had been alarmed by the prevalent feeling concerning Paul. They said to him, "Thou seest, brother, how many thousands of Jews there are which believe; and they are all zealous of the law; and they are informed of thee that thou teachest all the Jews which are among the Gentiles to forsake Moses, saying that they ought not to circumcise their children, neither to walk after the customs." This report, as James and the elders assume, was not a true one; it was a perversion of Paul's real teaching, which did not, in fact, differ from theirs. In order to dispel such rumors, they ask him to do publicly an act of homage to the law and its observances. They had four men who were under the Nazaritish vow. The completion of this vow involved (^{<4813>}Numbers 6:13-21) a considerable expense for the offerings to be presented in the Temple; and it was a meritorious act to provide these offerings for the poorer Nazarites. Paul was requested to put himself under the vow with those other four, and

to supply the cost of their offerings. He at once accepted the proposal, and on the next day, having performed some ceremony which implied the adoption of the vow, he went into the Temple. announcing that the due offerings for each Nazarite were about to be presented and the period of the vow terminated. It appears that the whole process undertaken by Paul required seven days to complete it. Towards the end of this time certain Jews from "Asia," who had come up for the Pentecostal feast, and who had a personal knowledge both of Paul himself and of his companion Trophimus, a Gentile from Ephesus, saw Paul in the Temple. They immediately set upon him, and stirred up the people against him, crying out, "Men of Israel, help: this is the man that teacheth all men everywhere against the people, and the law, and this place; and further brought Greeks also into the Temple, and hath polluted this holy place." The latter charge had no more truth in it than the first: it was only suggested by their having seen Trophimus with him, not in the Temple, but in the city. They raised, however, a great commotion: Paul was dragged out of the Temple, of which the doors were immediately shut, and the people, having him in their hands, were proposing to kill him. But tidings were soon carried to the commander of the force which was serving as a garrison in Jerusalem, that "all Jerusalem was in an uproar;" and he, taking with him soldiers and centurions, hastened to the scene of the tumult. Paul was rescued from the violence of the multitude by the Roman officer, who made him his own prisoner, causing him to be chained to two soldiers, and then proceeded to inquire who he was and what he had done. The inquiry only elicited confused outcries, and the "chief captain" seems to have imagined that the apostle might perhaps be a certain Egyptian pretender who had recently stirred up a considerable rising of the people, apparently the same impostor mentioned by Josephus (*Ant.* 20:7, 6; *War*, 2:13, 5). The account in the Acts (21:34-40) tells us with graphic touches how Paul obtained leave and opportunity to address the people in a discourse which is related at length.

This discourse was spoken in Hebrew — that is, in the native dialect of the country — and was on that account listened to with the more attention. It is described by Paul himself, in his opening words, as his "defense," addressed to his brethren and fathers. It is in this light that it ought to be regarded. As we have seen, the desire which occupied the apostle's mind at this time was that of vindicating his message and work as those of a faithful Jew. The discourse spoken to the angry people at Jerusalem is his own justification of himself. He adopts the historical method, after which all the

recorded appeals to Jewish audiences are framed. He is a servant of facts. He had been from the first a zealous Israelite like his hearers. He had changed his course because the God of his fathers had turned him from one path into another. It is thus that he is led into a narrative of his conversion. We have already noticed the differences, in the statement of bare facts, between this narrative and that of the 9th chapter. The business of the student, in this place, is to see how far the purpose of the apostle will account for whatever is special to this address. That purpose explains the detailed reference to his rigorously Jewish education, and to his history before his conversion. It gives point to the announcement that it was by a direct operation from without upon his spirit, and not by the gradual influence of other minds upon his, that his course was changed. Incidentally we may see a reason for the admission that his companions "heard not the voice of him that spake to me" in the fact that some of them, not believing in Jesus with their former leader, may have been living at Jerusalem, and possibly present among the audience. In this speech the apostle is glad to mention, what we were not told before, that the Ananias who interpreted the will of the Lord to him more fully at Damascus was "a devout man according to the law, having a good report of all the Jews which dwelt there," and that he made his communication in the name of Jehovah, the God of Israel, saying "The God of our fathers hath chosen thee, that thou shouldest know his will, and see the Righteous One, and hear a voice out of his mouth; for thou shalt be a witness for him unto all men of what thou hast seen and heard." Having thus claimed, according to his wont, the character of a simple instrument and witness, Paul goes on to describe another revelation of which we read nothing elsewhere. He had been accused of being an enemy to the Temple. He relates that after the visit to Damascus he went up again to Jerusalem, and was praying once in the Temple itself, till he fell into a trance. Then he saw the Lord, and was bidden to leave Jerusalem quickly, because the people there would not receive his testimony concerning Jesus. His own impulse was to stay at Jerusalem, and he pleaded with the Lord that there it was well known how he had persecuted those of whom he was now one-implying, it would appear, that at Jerusalem his testimony was likely to be more impressive and irresistible than elsewhere; but the Lord answered with a simple command, "Depart; for I will send thee far hence unto the Gentiles."

Until this hated word, of a mission to the Gentiles, had been spoken, the Jews had listened to the speaker. They could bear the name of the

Nazarene, though they despised it; but the thought of that free declaration of God's grace to the Gentiles, of which Paul was known to be the herald, stung them to fury. Jewish pride was in that generation becoming hardened and embittered to the utmost; and this was the enemy which Paul had come to encounter in its stronghold. "Away with such a fellow from the earth." the multitude now shouted; "it is not fit that he should live." The Roman commander, seeing the tumult that arose, but not understanding the language 'of the speech, might well conclude that Paul had committed some heinous offense; and, carrying him off, he gave orders that he should be forced by scourging to confess his crime. Again the apostle took advantage of his Roman citizenship to protect himself from such an outrage. To the rights of that citizenship he, a free-born Roman, had a better title than the chief captain himself; and if he had chosen to assert it before, he might have saved himself from the indignity of being manacled.

The Roman officer was bound to protect a citizens and to suppress tumult; but it was also a part of his policy to treat with deference the religion and the customs of the country. Paul's present history is the resultant of these two principles. The chief captain set him free from bonds, but on the next day called together the chief priests and the Sanhedrim, and brought Paul as a prisoner before them. We need not suppose that this was a regular legal proceeding: it was probably an experiment of policy and courtesy. If, on the one hand, the commandant of the garrison had no power to convoke the Sanhedrim, on the other hand he would not give up a Roman citizen to their judgment. As it was, the affair ended in confusion, and with no semblance of a judicial termination. The incidents selected by Luke from the history of this meeting form striking points in the biography of, Paul, but they are not easy to understand. The difficulties arising here, not out of a comparison of two independent narratives, but out of a single narrative which must at least have appeared consistent and intelligible to the writer himself, are a warning to the student not to draw unfavorable inferences from all apparent discrepancies. Paul appears to have been put upon his defense, and with the peculiar habit, mentioned elsewhere also (^{<413>}Acts 13:9), of looking steadily when about to speak (**ἀτενίσας**), he began to say, "Men and brethren, I have lived in all good conscience (or, to give the force of **πεπολίτευμαι**, I have lived a conscientiously loyal life) unto God, until this day." Here the high-priest Ananias commanded them that stood by him to smite him on the mouth. With a fearless indignation, Paul exclaimed, "God shall smite thee, thou whited wall: for sittest thou to

judge me after the law, and commandest me to be smitten contrary to the law?" The bystanders said, "Revilest thou God's high-priest?" Paul answered, "I knew not, brethren, that he was the high-priest; for it is written, Thou shalt not speak evil of the ruler of thy people." The evidence furnished by this admission of Paul's respect both for the law and for the high-priesthood was probably the reason for relating the outburst which it followed. Whether the writer thought that outburst culpable or not does not appear. St. Jerome (*contra Pelag.* iii, quoted by Baur) draws an unfavorable contrast between the vehemence of the apostle and the meekness of his Master; and he is followed by many critics, as, among others, De Wette and Alford. But it is to be remembered that He who was led as a lamb to the slaughter was the same who spoke of "whited sepulchres," and exclaimed, "Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how shall ye escape the damnation of hell?" It is by no means certain, therefore, that Paul would have been a truer follower of Jesus if he had held his tongue under Ananias's lawless outrage. But what does his answer mean? How was it possible for him not to know that he who spoke was the high-priest? Why should he have been less willing to rebuke an iniquitous high-priest than any other member of the Sanhedrim, "sitting to judge him after the law?" These are difficult questions to answer. It is possible that Ananias was personally unknown to Paul; or that the high-priest was not distinguished by dress or place from the other members of the Sanhedrim. The least objectionable solution seems to be that for some reason or other—either because of some defect in his eyesight, or if some obstruction or confusion, or temporary inadvertance — he did not at the moment recognize the rank of the person who ordered him to be smitten; and that he wished to correct the impression which he saw was made upon some of the audience by his threatening protest, and therefore took advantage of the fact that he really did not know the speaker to be the high-priest, to explain the deference he felt to be due to the person holding that office. That Paul's language cannot have been a mere apology for a sudden outburst of passion is clear from his own direct assertion that he did not at the time know whom he was addressing, and is confirmed by the apparently prophetic impulse under which he spoke. *SEE ANANIAS*, 13.

The next incident which Luke records seems to some, who cannot think of the apostle as remaining still a Jew, to cast a shadow upon his rectitude. He perceived, we are told, that the council was divided into two parties, the Sadducees and Pharisees, and therefore he cried out, "Men and brethren, I

am a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee; concerning the hope and resurrection of the dead I am called in question.” This declaration, whether so intended or not, had the effect of stirring up the party spirit of the assembly to such a degree that a fierce dissension arose, and some of the Pharisees actually took Paul’s side, saying, “We find no evil in this man: suppose a spirit or an angel has spoken to him?” — Those who impugn the authenticity of the Acts point triumphantly to this scene as an utterly impossible one; others consider that the apostle is to be blamed for using a disingenuous artifice. But it is not so clear that Paul was using an artifice at all, at least for his own interest in identifying himself as he did with the professions of the Pharisees. He had not come to Jerusalem to escape out of the way of danger, nor was the course he took on this occasion the safest he could have chosen. Two objects, we must remember, were dearer to him than his life: (1) to testify of Him whom God had raised from the dead, and (2) to prove that in so doing he was a faithful Israelite. He may well have thought that both these objects might be promoted by an appeal to the nobler professions of the Pharisees. The *creed* of the Pharisee, as distinguished from that of the Sadducee, was unquestionably the creed of Paul. His belief in Jesus seemed to him to supply the ground and fulfillment of that creed. He wished to lead his brother Pharisees into a deeper and more living apprehension of their own faith.

Whether such a result was in any degree attained we do not know: the immediate consequence of the dissension which occurred in the assembly was that Paul was like to be torn in pieces, and was carried off by the Roman soldiers. In the night he had a vision, as at Corinth (~~418D~~ Acts 18:9, 10) and on the voyage to Rome (~~472B~~ Acts 27:23, 24), of the Lord standing by him, and encouraging him. ‘Be of good cheer, Paul,’ said his Master; ‘for as thou hast testified of me in Jerusalem, so must thou bear witness also at Rome.’ It was not safety that the apostle longed for, but opportunity to bear witness of Christ.

Probably the factious support which Paul had gained by his manner of bearing witness in the council died away as soon as the meeting was dissolved. On the next day a conspiracy was formed, which the historian relates with a singular fullness of details. More than forty of the Jews bound themselves under a vow neither to eat nor to drink until they had killed Paul. Their plan was to persuade the Roman commandant to send down Paul once more to the council, and then to set upon him by the way and kill him. This conspiracy became known in some way to a nephew of

Paul, his sister's son, who was allowed to see his uncle and inform him of it, and by his desire was taken to the captain, who was thus put on his guard against the plot. This discovery baffled the conspirators, and it is to be presumed that they obtained some dispensation from their vow. The consequence to Paul was that he was hurried away from Jerusalem. The chief captain, Claudius Lysias, determined to send him to Caesarea, to Felix, the governor or procurator of Judaea. He therefore put him in charge of a strong guard of soldiers, who took him by night as far as Antipatris. Thence a smaller detachment conveyed him to Caesarea, where they delivered up their prisoner into the hands of the governor, together with a letter, in which Claudius Lysias explained to Felix his reason for sending Paul, and announced that his accusers would follow. Felix, Luke tells us, with that particularity which marks this portion of his narrative, asked of what province the prisoner, was; and being told that he was of Cilicia, he promised to give him a hearing when his accusers should come. In the mean time he ordered him to be guarded — chained, probably, to a soldier — in the government-house, which had been the palace of Herod the Great.

(2.) *Detention at Caesarea.* — Paul was henceforth, to the end of the period embraced in the Acts, if not to the end of his life, in Roman custody. This custody was in fact a protection to him, without which he would have fallen a victim to the animosity of the Jews. He seems to have been treated throughout with humanity and consideration. His own attitude towards Roman magistrates was invariably that of a respectful but independent citizen; and while his franchise secured him from open injustice, his character and conduct could not fail to win him the good-will of those into whose hands he came. The governor before whom he was now to be tried, according to Tacitus and Josephus, was a mean and dissolute tyrant. *SEE FELIX.* “Per omnem saevitiam ac libidinem jus regium servili ingenio exercuit” (Tacitus, *Hist.* v. 9). But these characteristics, except perhaps the *servile ingenium*, do not appear in our history. The orator or counsel retained by the Jews, and brought down by Ananias and the elders, when they arrived in the course of five days at Caesarea, begins the proceedings of the trial professionally by complimenting the governor. The charge he goes on to set forth against Paul shows precisely the light in which he was regarded by the fanatical Jews. He is a pestilent fellow (λοιμός); he stirs up divisions among the Jews throughout the world; he is a ringleader of the sect (αἰρέσεως) of the Nazarenes. His last offense had been an attempt to

profane the Temple. Paul met the charge in his usual manner. He was glad that his judge had been for some years governor of a Jewish province; “because it is in thy power to ascertain that, not more than twelve days since, I came up to Jerusalem to worship.” The emphasis is upon his coming up to worship. He denied positively the charges of stirring up strife and of profaning the Temple. But he admitted that “after the way (τὴν ὁδόν) which they call a sect, or a heresy” so he worshipped the God of his fathers, believing all things written in the law and in the prophets. Again he gave prominence to the hope of a resurrection, which he held, as he said, in common with his accusers. His loyalty to the faith of his fathers he had shown by coming up to Jerusalem expressly to bring alms for his nation and offerings, and by undertaking the ceremonies of purification in the Temple. What fault, then, could any Jew possibly find in him? — The apostle’s answer was straightforward and complete. He had *not* violated the law of his fathers; he was still a true and loyal Israelite. Felix, it appears, knew a good deal about “the way” (τῆς ὁδοῦ), as well as about the customs of the Jews, and was probably satisfied that Paul’s account was a true one. He made an excuse for putting off the matter, and gave orders that the prisoner should be treated with indulgence, and that his friends should be allowed free access to him. After a while Felix heard him again. His wife, Drusilla, was a Jewess, and they were both curious to hear the eminent preacher of the new faith in Christ. But Paul was not a man to entertain an idle curiosity. He began to reason concerning righteousness, temperance, and the coming judgment, in a manner which alarmed Felix, and caused him to put an end to the conference. He frequently saw him afterwards, however, and allowed him to understand that a bribe would procure his release. But Paul would not resort to this method of escape, and he remained in custody until Felix left the province. The unprincipled governor had good reason to seek to ingratiate himself with the Jews; and to please them he handed over Paul, as an untried prisoner, to his successor Festus.

At this point, as we shall hereafter see, the history of Paul comes into its closest contact with external chronology. Festus, like Felix, has a place in secular history, and he bears a much better character. Upon his arrival in the province he went up without delay from Caesarea to Jerusalem, and the leading Jews seized the opportunity of asking that Paul might be brought up there for trial, intending to assassinate him by the way. But Festus would not comply with their request. He invited them to follow him on is

speedy return to Caesarea, and a trial took place there, closely resembling that before Felix. Festus saw clearly enough that Paul had committed no offense against the law, but he was anxious at the same time, if he could, to please the Jews, "They had certain questions against him," Festus says to Agrippa, "of their own superstition (or religion), and of one Jesus, who was dead, whom Paul affirmed to be alive. And being puzzled for my part as to such inquiries, I asked him whether he would go to Jerusalem to be tried there." This proposal, not a very likely one to be accepted, was the occasion of Paul's appeal to Caesar. In dignified and independent language he claimed his rights as a Roman citizen. We can scarcely doubt that the prospect of being forwarded by this means to Rome, the goal of all his desires, presented itself to him and drew him onwards, as he virtually protested against the indecision and impotence of the provincial governor, and exclaimed, "I appeal unto Caesar." Having heard this appeal, Festus consulted with his assessors, found that there was no impediment in the way of its prosecution, and then replied, "Hast thou appealed to Caesar? To Caesar thou shalt go." Properly speaking, an appeal was *made from the sentence* of an inferior court to the jurisdiction of a higher. But in Paul's case no sentence had been pronounced. We must understand, therefore, by his appeal, a demand to be tried by the imperial court, and we must suppose that a Roman citizen had the right of electing whether he would be tried in the province or at Rome. *SEE APPEAL.*

The appeal having been allowed, Festus reflected that he must send with the prisoner a report of "the crimes laid against him." But he found that it was no easy matter to put the complaints of the Jews in a form which would be intelligible at Rome. He therefore took advantage of an opportunity which offered itself in a few days to seek some help in the matter. The Jewish prince Agrippa arrived with his sister Berenice on a visit to the new governor. To him Festus communicated his perplexity, together with an account of what had occurred before him in the case. Agrippa, who must have known something of the sect of the Nazarenes, and had probably heard of Paul himself, expressed a desire to hear him speak. The apostle therefore was now called upon to bear the name of his Master "before Gentiles and kings." The audience which assembled to hear him was the most dignified which he had yet addressed, and the state and ceremony of the scene proved that he was regarded as no vulgar criminal. Festus, when Paul had been brought into the council-chamber, explained to Agrippa and the rest of the company the difficulty in which he found

himself, and then expressly referred the matter to the better knowledge of the Jewish king. Paul, therefore, was to give an account of himself to Agrippa; and when he had received from him a courteous permission to begin, he stretched forth his hand and made his defense.

In this discourse (~~401~~ Acts 26) we have the second explanation from Paul himself of the manner in which he had been led, through his conversion, to serve the Lord Jesus instead of persecuting his disciples; and the third narrative of the conversion itself. Speaking to Agrippa as to one thoroughly versed in the customs and questions prevailing among the Jews, Paul appeals to the well-known Jewish and even Pharisaical strictness of his youth and early manhood. He reminds the king of the great hope which sustained continually the worship of the Jewish nation — the hope of a deliverer, promised by God himself, who should be a conqueror of death. He had been led to see that this promise was fulfilled in Jesus of Nazareth; he proclaimed his resurrection to be the pledge of a new and immortal life. What was there in this of disloyalty to the traditions of his fathers? Did his countrymen disbelieve in this Jesus as the Messiah? So had he once disbelieved in him; and had thought it his duty to be earnest in hostility against his name. But his eyes had been opened: he would tell how and when. The story of the conversion is modified in this address, as we might fairly expect it to be. We have seen that there is no absolute contradiction between the statements of this and the other narratives. The main points — the light, the prostration, the voice from heaven, the instructions from Jesus — are found in all three. But in this account, the words “I am Jesus whom thou persecutest” are followed by a fuller explanation, as if then spoken by the Lord, of what the work of the apostle was to be. The other accounts defer this explanation to a subsequent occasion. But when we consider how fully the mysterious communication made at the moment of the conversion *included* what was afterwards conveyed, through Ananias and in other ways, to the mind of Paul; and how needless it was for Paul, in his present address before Agrippa, to mark the stages by which the whole lesson was taught, it seems merely captious to base upon the method of this account a charge of disagreement between the different parts of this history. They bear, on the contrary, a striking mark of genuineness in the degree in which they approach contradiction without reaching it. It is most natural that a story told on different occasions should be told differently; and if in such a case we find no contradiction as to the facts, we gain all the firmer impression of the substantial truth of the story. The particulars

added to the former accounts by the present narrative are, that the words of Jesus were spoken in Hebrew, and that the first question to Saul was followed by the saying, "It is hard for thee to kick against the goads." (This saying is omitted by the best authorities in the 9th chapter.) The language of the commission which Paul says he received from Jesus deserves close study, and will be found to bear a striking resemblance to a passage in Colossians (⁵⁰¹²Colossians 1:12-14). The ideas of light, redemption, forgiveness, inheritance, and faith in Christ, belong characteristically to the Gospel which Paul preached among the Gentiles, Not less striking is it to observe the older terms in which he describes to Agrippa his obedience to the heavenly vision. He had made it his business, he says, to proclaim to all men "that they should repent and turn to God, and do works meet for repentance" — words such as John the Baptist uttered, but not less truly Pauline. He finally reiterates that the testimony on account of which the Jews sought to kill him was in exact agreement with Moses and the prophets. They had taught men to expect that the Christ should suffer, and that he should be the first that should rise from the dead, and should show light unto the people and to the Gentiles. Of such a Messiah Saul was the servant and preacher.

At this point Festus began to apprehend what seemed to him a manifest absurdity. He interrupted the apostle discourteously, but with a compliment contained in his loud remonstrance: "Paul, thou art beside thyself; much learning doth make thee mad." The phrase *τὰ πολλὰ γράμματα* may possibly have been *suggested* by the allusion to Moses and the prophets; but it probably *refers* to the books with which Paul had been supplied, and which he was known to study during his imprisonment. As a biographical hint, this phrase is not to be overlooked. "I am not' mad, most noble Festus," replied Paul; "but speak forth the words of truth and soberness." Then, with an appeal of mingled dignity and solicitude, he turns to the king. He was sure the king understood him. "King Agrippa, believest thou the prophets? I know that thou believest." The answer of Agrippa can hardly have been the serious and encouraging remark of our English version. Literally rendered, it appears to be, You are briefly persuading me to become a Christian; and it is generally supposed to have been spoken ironically. It rather signifies, You are *slightly* (*ἐν ὀλίγῳ*) successful. "I would to God," is Paul's earnest answer, "that not only thou, but also all that hear me this day, were both almost and altogether (*καὶ ἐν ὀλίγῳ καὶ ἐν πολλῷ*) such as I am, except these bonds." He was wearing a

chain upon the hand he held up in addressing them. With this prayer, it appears, the conference ended. Festus and the king, and their companions, consulted together, and came to the conclusion that the accused was guilty of nothing that deserved death or imprisonment. Agrippa's final answer to the inquiry of Festus was, "This man might have been set at liberty, if he had not appealed unto Caesar."

Picture for Paul 4

(3.) *Voyage to Rome.* — No formal trial of Paul had yet taken place. It appears from ~~Acts~~ Acts 28:18 that he knew how favorable the judgment of the provincial government was likely to be. But the vehement opposition of the Jews, together with his desire to be conveyed to Rome, might well induce him to claim a trial before the imperial court. After a while arrangements were made to carry "Paul and certain other prisoners," in the custody of a centurion named Julius, into Italy; and among the company, whether by favor or from any other reason, we find the historian of the Acts. The narrative of this voyage is accordingly minute and circumstantial in a degree which has excited much attention. The nautical and geographical details of Luke's account have been submitted to an apparently thorough investigation by several competent critics, especially by Mr. Smith, of Jordanhill, in an important treatise devoted to the subject, and by Mr. Howson. The result of this investigation has been that several errors in the received version have been corrected, that the course of the voyage has been laid down to a very minute degree with great certainty, and that the account in the Acts is shown to be written by an accurate eye-witness, not himself a professional seaman, but well acquainted with nautical matters. We shall hasten lightly over this voyage, referring the reader to the works above mentioned, and to the articles on the names of places and the nautical terms which occur in the narrative. *SEE SHIPWRECK.*

The centurion and his prisoners, among whom Aristarchus (~~Colossians~~ Colossians 4:10) is named, embarked at Caesarea on board a ship of Adramyttium, and set sail for the coast of Asia. On the next day they touched at Sidon, and Julius began a course of kindly and respectful treatment by allowing Paul to go on shore to visit his friends. The westerly winds, still usual at the time of year (late in the summer), compelled the vessel to run northwards under the lee of Cyprus. Off the coast of Cilicia and Pamphylia they would find northerly winds, which enabled them to reach Myra in

Lycia. Here the voyagers were put on board another ship, which had come from Alexandria and was bound for Italy. In this vessel they worked slowly to windward, keeping near the coast of Asia Minor, till they came over against Cnidus. The wind being still contrary, the only course now was to run southwards, under the lee of Crete, passing the headland of Salmone. They then gained the advantage of a weather shore, and worked along the coast of Crete as far as Cape Matala, near which they took refuge in a harbor called Fair Havens, identified with one bearing the same name to this day.

It now became a serious question what course should be taken. It was late in the year for the navigation of those days. The fast of the day of expiation (^(~~R237~~)Leviticus 23:27-29), answering to the autumnal equinox, was past, and Paul gave it as his advice that they should winter where they were. But the master and the owner of the ship were willing to run the risk of seeking a more commodious harbor, and the centurion followed their judgment. It was resolved, with the concurrence of the majority, to make for a harbor called Phoenix, sheltered from the south-west winds, as well as from the northwest. (The phrase βλέποντα κατὰ λίβα is rendered either “looking down the south-vest [Smith and Alford], or “looking towards the south-west,” when observed *from the sea* and towards the land enclosing it [Howson].) **SEE PHOENICE**. A change of wind occurred which favored the plan, and by the aid of a light breeze from the south they were sailing towards Phoenix (now Lutro), when a violent north-east wind, **SEE EUROCLYDON** came down from the land (κατ’ αὐτῆς, scil. Κρήτης), caught the vessel, and compelled them to let her drive before the wind. In this course they arrived under the lee of a small island called Claudia, about twenty miles from Crete, where they took advantage of comparatively smooth water to get the boat on board, and to undergird, or frap, the ship. There was a fear lest they should be driven upon the Syrtis on the coast of Africa, and they therefore “lowered the gear,” or sent down upon deck the gear connected with the fair-weather sails, and stood out to sea “with storm-sails set and on the starboard tack” (Smith). The bad weather continued, and the ship was lightened on the next day of her way-freight, on the third of her loose furniture and tackling. For many days neither sun nor stars were visible to steer by, the storm was violent, and all began to despair of safety. The general discouragement was aggravated by the abstinence caused by the difficulty of preparing food, and the spoiling of it; and in order to raise the spirits of the whole company, Paul stood forth one

morning to relate a vision which had occurred to him in the night. An angel of the God “whose he was and whom he served” had appeared to him and said, “Fear not, Paul: thou must be brought before Caesar; and lo, God hath given thee all them that sail with thee.” At the same time he predicted that the vessel would be cast upon an island and be lost.

This shipwreck was to happen speedily. On the fourteenth night, as they were drifting through the sea, *SEE ADRIA*, about midnight, the sailors perceived indications, probably the roar of breakers, that land was near. Their suspicion was confirmed by soundings. They therefore cast four anchors out of the stern, and waited anxiously for daylight. After a while the sailors lowered the boat with the professed purpose of laying out anchors from the bow, but intending to desert the ship, which was in imminent danger of being dashed to pieces. Paul, aware of their intention, informed the centurion and the soldiers of it, who took care, by cutting the ropes of the boat, to prevent its being carried out. He then addressed himself to the task of encouraging the whole company, assuring them that their lives would be preserved, and exhorting them to refresh themselves quietly after their long abstinence with a good meal. He set the example himself, taking bread, giving thanks to God, and beginning to eat in presence of them all. After a general meal, in which there were two hundred and seventy-six persons to partake, they further lightened the ship by casting overboard the cargo (τὸν σῖτον, the “wheat” with which the vessel was laden). When the light of the dawn revealed the land, they did not recognize it, but they discovered a creek with a smooth beach, and determined to run the ship aground in it. So they cut away the anchors, unloosed the rudder-paddles, raised the foresail to the wind, and made for the beach. When they came close to it they found a narrow channel between the land on one side, which proved to be an islet, and the shore; and at this point, where the “two seas met,” they succeeded in driving the fore part of the vessel fast into the clayey beach. The stern began at once to go to pieces under the action of the breakers; but escape was now within reach. The soldiers suggested to their commander that the prisoners should be effectually prevented from gaining their liberty by being killed; but the centurion, desiring to save Paul, stopped this proposition, and gave orders that those who could swim should cast themselves first into the sea and get to land, and that the rest should follow with the aid of such spars as might be available. By this creditable combination of humanity and discipline the

deliverance was made as complete as Paul's assurances had predicted it would be.

The land on which they had been cast was found to belong to Malta. *SEE MALTA*. The very point of the stranding is made out with great probability by Mr. Smith. The inhabitants of the island received the wet and exhausted voyagers with no ordinary kindness, and immediately lighted a fire to warm them. This particular kindness is recorded on account of a curious incident connected with it. The apostle was helping to make the fire, and had gathered a bundle of sticks and laid them on the fire, when a viper came out of the heat, and fastened on his hand. When the natives saw the creature hanging from his hand they believed him to be poisoned by the bite, and said among themselves, "No doubt this man is a murderer, whom, though he has escaped from the sea, yet Vengeance suffers not to live." But when they saw no harm come of it, they changed their minds and said he was a god. This circumstance, as well as the honor in which he was held by Julius, would account for Paul being invited with some others to stay at the house of the chief man of the island, whose name was Publius. By him they were courteously entertained for three days. The father of Publius happened to be ill of fever and dysentery, and was cured by Paul; and when this was known many other sick persons were brought to him and were cured. So there was a pleasant interchange of kindness and benefits. The people of the island showed the apostle and his company much honor, and when they were about to leave loaded them with such things as they would want. The Roman soldiers would carry with them to Rome a deepened impression of the character and the powers of the kingdom of which Paul was the herald.

After a three months' stay in Malta the soldiers and their prisoners left in an Alexandrian ship for Italy. A.D. 56. They touched at Syracuse, where they stayed three days, and at Rhegium, from which place they were carried with a fair wind to Puteoli, where they left their ship and the sea. At Puteoli they found "brethren," for it was an important place, and especially a chief port for the traffic between Alexandria and Rome; and by these brethren they were exhorted to stay awhile with them. Permission seems to have been granted by the centurion; and while they were spending seven days at Puteoli news of the apostle's arrival was sent on to Rome. The Christians at Rome, on their part, sent forth some of their number, who met Paul at Appii Forum and Tres Tabernae; and on this first introduction

to the Church at Rome the apostle felt that his long desire was fulfilled at last. "He thanked God and took courage."

(4.) *Confinement at Rome.* — On their arrival at Rome the centurion doubtless delivered up his prisoners into the proper custody, that of the praetorian prefect. Paul was at once treated with special consideration, and was allowed to dwell by himself with the soldier who guarded him. He was not released from this galling annoyance of being constantly chained to a keeper; but every indulgence compatible with this necessary restraint was readily allowed him. He was now therefore free "to preach the Gospel to them that were at Rome also;" and proceeded without delay to act upon his rule — "to the Jew first." He invited the chief persons among the Jews to come to him, and explained to them that though he was brought to Rome to answer charges made against him by the Jews in Palestine, he had really done nothing disloyal to his nation or the law, nor desired to be considered as hostile to his fellow-countrymen. On the contrary, he was in custody for maintaining that "the hope of Israel" had been fulfilled. The Roman Jews replied that they had received no tidings to his prejudice. The sect of which he had implied he was a member they knew to be everywhere spoken against; but they were willing to hear what he had to say. It has been thought strange that such an attitude should be taken towards the faith of Christ by the Jews at Rome, where a flourishing branch of the Church had existed for some years; and an argument has been drawn from this representation against the authenticity of the Acts. But it may be accounted for without violence from what we know and may probably conjecture.

(1.) The Church at Rome consisted mainly of Gentiles, although it must be supposed that they had previously been for the most part Jewish proselytes.

(2.) The real Jews at Rome had been persecuted and sometimes entirely banished, and their unsettled state may have checked the contact and collision which would have been otherwise likely.

(3.) Paul was possibly known by name to the Roman Jews, and curiosity may have persuaded them to listen to him.

Even if he were not known to them, yet here, as in other places, his courteous bearing and strong expressions of adhesion to the faith of his fathers would win a hearing from them. A day was therefore appointed, on

which a large number came expressly to hear him expound his belief; and from morning till evening he bore witness to the kingdom of God, persuading them concerning Jesus, both out of the law of Moses and out of the prophets. So the apostle of the Gentiles had not yet unlearned the original apostolic method. The hope of Israel was still his subject. But, as of old, the reception of his message by the Jews was not favorable. They were slow of heart to believe at Rome as at Pisidian Antioch. The judgment pronounced by Isaiah had come, Paul testified, upon the people. They had made themselves blind and deaf and gross of heart. The Gospel must be proclaimed to the Gentiles, among whom it would find a better welcome. He turned therefore again to the Gentiles, and for two years he dwelt in his own hired house, and received all who came to him, proclaiming the kingdom of God, and teaching concerning the Lord Jesus Christ with all confidence, no man forbidding him.

These are the last words of the Acts. This history of the planting of the kingdom of Christ in the world brings us down to the time when the Gospel was openly proclaimed by the great apostle in the Gentile capital, and stops short of the mighty convulsion which was shortly to pronounce that kingdom established as the divine commonwealth for all men. The work of Paul belonged to the preparatory period. He was not to live through the time when the Son of Man calmed in the destruction of the Holy City and Temple, and in the throes of the New Age. The most significant part of his work was accomplished when in the Imperial City he had declared his Gospel, "to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile." But his career is not abruptly closed. Before he himself fades out of our sight in the twilight of ecclesiastical tradition, we have letters written by himself, which contribute some particulars to his external biography, and give us a far more precious insight into his convictions and sympathies.

10. *Subsequent History.* —

(1.) *Later Epistles.* — We might naturally expect that Paul, tied down to one spot at Rome, and yet free to speak and write to whom he pleased, would pour out in letters his love and anxiety for distant churches. It has hence been supposed by some that the author of the extant Epistles wrote very many which are not extant. But of this there is not a particle of evidence; nor were the circumstances of Paul after all very favorable for extended epistolary correspondence. It is difficult enough to connect in our minds the *writing* of the known Epistles with the external conditions of a

human life; to think of Paul, with his incessant chain and soldier, sitting down to write or dictate, and producing for the world an inspired epistle. But it is almost more difficult to imagine the Christian communities of these days, samples of the population of Macedonia or Asia Minor, receiving and reading such letters. Yet the letters were actually written; and they must of necessity be accepted as representing the kind of communications which marked the intercourse of the apostle and his fellow-Christians. When he wrote, he wrote out of the fullness of his heart; and the ideas on which he dwelt were those of his daily and hourly thoughts. To that imprisonment to which Luke has introduced us the imprisonment which lasted for such a tedious time, although tempered by much indulgence — belongs certainly the noble group of Letters to Philemon, to the Colossians, to the Ephesians, and to the Philippians, and probably also that peculiar one, the Letter to the Hebrew Christians. The first three of these were written at one time and sent by the same messengers. Whether that to the Philippians was written before or after these we cannot determine; but the tone of it seems to imply that a crisis was approaching, and therefore it is commonly regarded as the latest of the four.

Paul had not himself founded the Church at Colossae. But during his imprisonment at Rome he had for an associate — he calls him a “fellow-prisoner” (^{<520>}Philemon 23) — a chief teacher of the Colossian Church named Epaphras. He had thus become deeply interested in the condition of that Church. It happened that at the same time a slave named Onesimus came within the reach of Paul’s teaching, and was converted into a zealous and useful Christian. This Onesimus had run away from his master; and his master was a Christian of Colossae. Paul determined to send back Onesimus to his master; and with him he determined also to send his old companion Tychicus (^{<400>}Acts 20:4), as a messenger to the Church at Colosse and to neighboring churches. This was the occasion of the letter to Philemon, which commended Onesimus, in language of singular tenderness and delicacy, as a faithful and beloved brother, to his injured master; and also of the two letters to the Colossians and Ephesians. That to the Colossians, being drawn forth by the most special circumstances, may be reasonably supposed to have been written first. It was intended to guard the Church at Colosse from false teaching, which the apostle knew to be infesting it. For the characteristics of this Epistle we must refer to the special article. The end of it (^{<500>}Colossians 4:7-18) names several friends

who were with Paul at Rome, as Aristarchus, Marcus (Mark), Epaphras, Luke, and Demas. *SEE COLOSSIANS, EPISTLE TO THE*. For the writing of the Epistle to the Ephesians there seems to have been no more special occasion than that Tychicus was passing through Ephesus. The highest characteristic which these two Epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians have in common is that of a presentation of the Lord Jesus Christ, fuller and clearer than we find in previous writings, as the Head of creation and of mankind. All things created through Christ, all things coherent in him, all things reconciled to the Father by him, the eternal purpose to restore and complete all things in him — such are the ideas which grew richer and more distinct in the mind of the apostle as he meditated on the Gospel which he had been preaching, and the truths implied in it. In the Epistle to the Colossians this divine Headship of Christ is maintained as the safeguard against the fancies which filled the heavens with secondary divinities, and which laid down rules for an artificial sanctity of men upon the earth. In the Epistle to the Ephesians the eternity and universality of God's redeeming purpose in Christ, and the gathering of men unto him as his members, are set forth as gloriously revealed in the Gospel. In both, the application of the truth concerning Christ as the Image of God and the Head of men to the common relations of human life is dwelt upon in detail. *SEE EPHESIANS, EPISTLE TO THE*.

The Epistle to the Philippians resembles the Second to the Corinthians in the effusion of personal feeling, but differs from it in the absence of all soreness. The Christians at Philippi had regarded the apostle with love and reverence from the beginning, and had given him many proofs of their affection. They had now sent him a contribution towards his maintenance at Rome, such as we must suppose him to have received from time to time for the expenses of "his own hired house." The bearer of this contribution was Epaphroditus, an ardent friend and fellow-laborer of Paul, who had fallen sick on the journey or at Rome (⁵⁸¹⁷Philippians 2:27). The Epistle was written to be conveyed by Epaphroditus on his return, and to express the joy with which Paul had received the kindness of the Philippians. He dwells therefore upon their fellowship in the work of spreading the Gospel, a work in which he was even now laboring, and scarcely with less effect on account of his bonds. His imprisonment had made him known, and had given him fruitful opportunities of declaring his Gospel among the imperial guard (1:13), and even in the household of the Caesar (4:22). He professes his undiminished sense of the glory of following Christ, and his expectation

of an approaching time in which the Lord Jesus should be revealed from heaven as a deliverer. There is a *gracious* tone running through this Epistle, expressive of humility, devotion, kindness, delight in all things fair and good, to which the favorable circumstances under which it was written gave a natural occasion, and which helps us to understand the kind of ripening which had taken place in the spirit of the writer. *SEE PHILIPPIANS, EPISTLE TO THE.*

To the close of this imprisonment apparently also belongs the Epistle to the Hebrews (q.v.).

(2.) *Last Labors and Martyrdom.* — In both these last Epistles Paul expresses a confident hope that before long he may be able to visit the persons addressed in person (^{<5025>}Philippians 1:25, οἶδα, κ. τ. 50:; 2:24, πέποιθα, κ. τ. λ.; ^{<5839>}Hebrews 13:19, ἵνα τάχιστα, κ. τ. λ.; 23, ὄψομαι ὑμᾶς). Whether this hope were fulfilled or not belongs to a question which now presents itself to us, and which has been the occasion of much controversy. According to the general opinion, the apostle was liberated from his imprisonment and left Rome soon after the writing of the letter to the Philippians, spent some time in visits to Greece, Asia Minor, and Spain, returned again as a prisoner to Rome, and was put to death there. In opposition to this view it is maintained by some that he was never liberated, but was put to death at Rome at an earlier period than is commonly supposed. The arguments adduced in favor of the common view are: (1) the hopes expressed by Paul of visiting Philippi (already named) and Colossae (^{<5022>}Philemon 1:22); (2) a number of allusions in the Pastoral Epistles, and their general character; and (3) the testimony of ecclesiastical tradition. The arguments in favor of the single imprisonment appear to be wholly negative, and to aim simply at showing that there is no proof of a liberation or departure from Rome. It is contended that Paul's expectations were not always realized, and that the passages from Philemon and Philippians are effectually neutralized by ^{<4025>}Acts 20:25, "I know that ye all (at Ephesus) shall see my face no more;" inasmuch as the supporters of the ordinary view hold that Paul went again to Ephesus. This is a fair answer, but inconsistent, inasmuch as it assumes the certainty of Paul's expectations, which this theory had just denied. The argument from the Pastoral Epistles is met most simply by a denial of their genuineness. The tradition of ecclesiastical antiquity is affirmed to have no real weight.

The decision must turn mainly upon the view taken of the Pastoral Epistles. It is true that there are many critics, including Wieseler and Dr. Davidson, who admit the genuineness of these Epistles, and yet, by referring 1 Timothy and Titus to an earlier period, and by strained explanations of the allusions in 2 Timothy, get rid of the evidence they are generally understood to give in favor of a second imprisonment. The voyages required by the two former Epistles, and the writing of them, are placed within the three years spent chiefly at Ephesus (~~44B~~ Acts 20:31). But the hypothesis of voyages during that period not recorded by Luke is just as arbitrary as that of a release from Rome, which is objected to expressly because it is arbitrary; and such a distribution of the Pastoral Epistles is shown by overwhelming evidence to be untenable. The whole question is discussed in a masterly and decisive manner by Alford in his *Prolegomena* to the Pastoral Epistles. If, however, these Epistles are not accepted as genuine, the main ground for the belief in a second imprisonment is cut away. For a special consideration of the Epistles, let the reader refer to the articles on *SEE TIMOTHY* and *SEE TITUS*.

The difficulties which have induced such critics as De Wette and Ewald to reject these Epistles are not inconsiderable, and will force themselves upon the attention of the careful student of Paul. But they are overpowered by the much greater difficulties attending any hypothesis which assumes these Epistles to be spurious. We are obliged therefore to recognize the modifications of Paul's style, the developments in the history of the Church, and the movements of various persons, which have appeared suspicious in the Epistles to Timothy and Titus, as nevertheless historically true. And then, without encroaching on the domain of conjecture, we draw the following conclusions:

- (1) Paul must have left Rome, and visited Asia Minor and Greece; for he says to Timothy (~~500B~~ 1 Timothy 1:3), "I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus, when I was setting out for Macedonia." After being once at Ephesus, he was purposing to go there again (~~504B~~ 1 Timothy 4:13), and he spent a considerable time at Ephesus (~~501B~~ 2 Timothy 1:18).
- (2) He paid a visit to Crete, and left Titus to organize churches there (~~500B~~ Titus 1:5). He was intending to spend a winter at one of the places named Nicopolis (~~501B~~ Titus 3:12).

(3) He traveled by Miletus (^{<5001>}2 Timothy 4:20), Troas (^{<5003>}2 Timothy 4:13), where he left a cloak or case, and some books, and Corinth (^{<5004>}2 Timothy 4:20).

(4) He is a prisoner at Rome, “suffering unto bonds as an evil-doer” (^{<5009>}2 Timothy 2:9), and expecting to be soon condemned to death (^{<5006>}2 Timothy 4:6). At this time he felt deserted and solitary, having only Luke of his old associates to keep him company; and he was very anxious that Timothy should come to him without delay from Ephesus, and bring Mark with him (^{<5015>}2 Timothy 1:15; 4:9-12, 16).

These facts may be amplified by probable additions from conjecture and tradition. There are strong reasons for placing the three Epistles at as advanced a date as possible, and not far from one another. The peculiarities of style and diction by which these are distinguished from all his former epistles, the affectionate anxieties of an old man, and the glances frequently thrown back on earlier times and scenes, the disposition to be hortatory rather than speculative, the references to a more complete and settled organization of the Church, the signs of a condition tending to moral corruption, and resembling that described in the apocalyptic letters to the Seven Churches — would incline us to adopt the latest date which has been suggested for the death of Paul, so as to interpose as much time as possible between the Pastoral Epistles and the former group. Now the earliest authorities for the date of Paul’s death are Eusebius and Jerome, who place it, the one (*Chronic. Ann.* 2083) in the thirteenth, the other (*Cat. Script. Eccl. Paulus*) in the fourteenth year of Nero. These dates would allow some seven or eight years between the first imprisonment and the second. During these years, according to the general belief of the early Church, Paul accomplished his old design (^{<5153>}Romans 15:28) and visited Spain. Ewald, who denies the genuineness of the Pastoral Epistles, and with it the journeyings in Greece and Asia Minor, believes that Paul was liberated and paid this visit to Spain (*Geschichte*, 6:621, 631,632); yielding upon this point to the testimony of tradition. The first writer quoted in support of the journey to Spain is one whose evidence would indeed be irresistible if the language in which it is expressed were less obscure. Clement of Rome, in a hortatory and rather rhetorical passage (*Ep. 1 ad Cor.* c. 5), refers to Paul as an example of patience, and mentions that he preached ἔν το τῆ ἀνατολῆ καὶ ἐν τῆ δύσει, and that before his martyrdom he went ἐπὶ τὸ τέρμα τῆς δύσεως. It is probable, but can hardly be said to be certain, that by this expression, “the goal of the west,”

Clement was describing Spain, or some country yet more to the west. The next testimony labors under a somewhat similar difficulty from the imperfection of the text, but it at least names unambiguously a “profectionem Pauli ab urbe ad Spaniam proficiscentis.” This is from Muratori’s Fragment on the Canon (Routh, *Rel. Sac.* 4:1-12). (See the passage quoted and discussed in Wieseler, *Chron. d. apost. Zeitalt.* p. 536, etc., or Alford, 3:93.) Afterwards Chrysostom says simply, **Μετὰ τὸ γένεσθαι ἐν Ῥωμῇ, πάλιν εἰς τὴν Σπανίαν ἀπῆλθεν** (on ^{ROM}2 Timothy 4:20); and Jerome speaks of Paul as set free by Nero, that he might preach the Gospel of Christ “in Occidentis quoque partibus” (*Cat. Script. Eccl.* “Paulus”). Against these assertions nothing is produced, except the absence of allusions to a journey to Spain in passages from some of the fathers where such allusions might more or less be expected. Dr. Davidson (*Introd. to the New Test.* 3:15, 84) gives a long list of critics who believe in Paul’s release from the first imprisonment. Wieseler (p. 521) mentions some of these, with references, and adds some of the more eminent German critics who believe with him in but one imprisonment. These include Schrader, Hensen, Winer, and Baur. The only English name of any weight to be added to this list is that of Dr. Davidson. (See further below.)

We conclude, then, that after a wearing imprisonment of two years or more at Rome, Paul was set free, and spent some years in various journeyings eastwards and westwards. Towards the close of this time he pours out the warnings of his less vigorous but still brave and faithful spirit in the letters to Timothy and Titus. The first to Timothy and that to Titus were evidently written at very nearly the same time. After these were written, he was apprehended again and sent to Rome. As an eminent Christian teacher Paul was now in a far more dangerous position than when he was first brought to Rome. The Christians had been exposed to popular odium by the false charge of being concerned in the great Neronian conflagration of the city, and had been subjected to a most cruel persecution. The apostle appears now to have been treated, not as an honorable state-prisoner, but as a felon (^{ROM}2 Timothy 2:9). But he was at least allowed to write this second letter to his “dearly beloved son” Timothy; and though he expresses a confident expectation of his speedy death, he yet thought it sufficiently probable that it might be delayed for some time, to warrant him in urging Timothy to come to him from Ephesus. Meanwhile, though he felt his isolation, he was not in the least daunted by his danger. He was more than ready to die (4:6),

and had a sustaining experience of not being deserted by his Lord. Once already, in this second imprisonment, he had appeared before the authorities; and “the Lord then stood by him and strengthened him,” and gave him a favorable opportunity for the one thing always nearest to his heart, the public declaration of his Gospel.

This epistle, surely no unworthy utterance at such an age and in such an hour even of a Paul, brings us, it may well be presumed, close to the end of his life. For what remains, we have the concurrent testimony of ecclesiastical antiquity that he was beheaded at Rome, about the same time that Peter was crucified there. The earliest allusion to the death of Paul is in that sentence from Clemens Romanus, already quoted: “Having gone to the boundary of the West, and testified before rulers, so he departed out of the world” (ἐπὶ τὸ τέλος τῆς δόσεως ἐλθὼν καὶ μαρτυρήσας ἐπὶ τῶν ἡγουμένων, οὕτως ἀπηλλάγη τοῦ κόσμου), which just fails of giving us any particulars upon which we can conclusively rely. The next authorities are those quoted by Eusebius in his *Hist. Eccl.* 2:25. Dionysius, bishop of Corinth (A.D. 170), says that Peter and Paul went to Italy and taught there together, and suffered martyrdom about the same time. This, like most of the statements relating to the death of Paul, is mixed up with the tradition, with which we are not here immediately concerned, of the work of Peter at Rome. Caius of Rome, supposed to be writing within the 2d century, names the grave of Peter on the Vatican, and that of Paul on the Ostian Way. Eusebius himself entirely adopts the tradition that Paul was beheaded under Nero at Rome. Among other early testimonies, we have that of Tertullian, who says (*De Praescr. Haeret.* 36) that at Rome “Petrus passioni Dominicas adequatur, Paulus Johannis [the Baptist] exitu coronatur;” and that of Jerome (*Cat. Scr.* “Paulus”), “Hic ergo 14^{to} Neronis anno (eodem die quo Petrus) Romae pro Christo capite truncatus sepultusque est, in via Ostiensi.” It would be useless to enumerate further testimonies of what is undisputed.

It would also be beyond the scope of this article to attempt to exhibit the traces of Paul’s apostolic work in the history of the Church. But there is one indication, so exceptional as to deserve special mention, which shows that the difficulty of understanding the Gospel of Paul and of reconciling it with a true Judaism was very early felt. This is in the apocryphal work called the Clementines (τὰ Κλημέντια), supposed to be written before the end of the 2d century. These curious compositions contain direct assaults (for though the name is not given, the references are plain and undisguised)

upon the authority and the character of Paul. Peter is represented as the true apostle, of the Gentiles as well as of the Jews, and Paul as ὁ ἐχθρὸς ἄνθρωπος, who opposes Peter and James. The portions of the Clementines which illustrate the writer's view of Paul will be found in Stanley's *Corinthians* (Introd. to 2 Cor.); and an account of the whole work, with references to the treatises of Schliemann and Baur, in Gieseler, *Eccl. Hist.* i, § 58.

III. Special Investigations. — We propose here briefly to take up the various disputed points above referred to, the discussion of which, in their respective connections, would have interrupted the narrative.

1. On the *chronology* of Paul's life, see the following works: Pearson, *Annales Paulini*, in his *Posthum. Op.* (Lond. 1688, and separately at Halle, 1719); Hottinger, *Pentas dissertat. Bibl. Chronm* p. 305 sq.; Vogel, in Gabler's *Journal f. auserl. theol. Lit.* 1:229 sq.; Haselaar, *De nonnullis Act. Apost. et Epp. Paul. ad hist. P. pertinent. locis* (L. B. 1806); Hug, *Einleit.* 2:263; SUskind, in Bengel's *A archiv*, 1:156 sq., 297 sq.; Schmidt, in Keil's *Analekt.* III, 1:128 sq.; Schrader, *Paculus*, vol. i; Schott, *Erörterung wichtiger chronol. Punkte in d. Lebensgesch. d. P.* (Jena, 1832);- Anger, *De tempor. in Actis.* (Leips. 1833); Wurm, in the *Tiibing. Zeitschr. fur Theol.* 1833; Wieseler, *Chronologie des apostol. Zeitalters* (Getting. 1848); Conybeare and Howson, *Life and Letters of St. Paul* (Lond. 1850); Davidson, *Introd. to the New Test.* (ibid.) vol. ii; Lewin, *Elements of Early Christ. Chron.*; Browne, *Ordo Sceclorum*. The fundamental points on which this chronology depends are his joining the Christian Church (Kuchler, *De Anno quo P. ad Sac. Christ. Conver. est*, Leips. 1828), and his journey to Jerusalem. It is of course utterly impossible to determine the year of Paul's birth. According to an old tradition (*Orat. de Petro et Paulo in Chrysost. Opp.* ed. Bened. 8:10), it falls in the second year after Christ. Schrader places it in the fourteenth year after Christ. It is easier to determine the time of his joining the Church than of his visit to Jerusalem (comp. ^{<412>}Acts 9:22 sq. with ^{<413>}2 Corinthians 11:32). But two difficulties arise: first, we are not certain whether this open act of allegiance to Christianity took place during the first or second stay of Paul, after his conversion, at Damascus (^{<4017>}Galatians 1:17; the latter seems probable, according to ^{<4026>}Acts 9:26); and, second, the year in which an ethnarch of the Arabian king Aretas ruled in Damascus affords no satisfactory ground for chronology. (Yet see Neander, *Pfanz.* 1:127 sq.). It is even urged that the Arabian ethnarch was

present only as a private man (Anger, p. 181); but this is improbable in view of the expressions used by Paul (<4713>2 Corinthians 11:32). We must, however, be content to give up the hope of using this as a safe starting-point for Paul's chronology. **SEE ARETAS**. We have, however, the death of king Agrippa (Acts 12), and the arrival of the procurator Porcius Festus in his province of Judaea (<4427>Acts 24:27), as the two extreme points between which the active missionary life of Paul lies. Now we know certainly that king Agrippa died in the year 44, and the arrival of Festus may be fixed with high probability in the summer of the year 55. **SEE FESTUS**. But with regard to the details of the events which occurred between these periods the widest diversity of opinion exists, even among the ablest investigators, on grounds which we cannot here set forth. **SEE CHRONOLOGY**. The chronological arrangement which seems, on the whole, the most probable, is given under the head ACTS **SEE ACTS** (q.v.).

2. On the *family* of Paul, Jerome remarks that Paul was of the tribe of Benjamin, and the town of Gischala, in Judaea (comp. Γίσχαλα, a small city in Galilee: Joseph. *War*, 2:20, 6; 4:1, 1; *Life*, 10:38; and Reland, *Palaest.* p. 813), and, when this town was taken by the Romans, he emigrated with his parents to Tarsus, in Cilicia. But this is plainly contradicted by <4213>Acts 22:3, where Paul speaks of himself as a native of Tarsus; nor is it easy to see how Gischala could have been taken by the Romans during Paul's childhood, so that residents judged it prudent to emigrate. A story of the Ebionites (Epiphanius. *Haer.* 30, 16:25) tells us that Paul was by birth a heathen, but became a Jew in Jerusalem, in order to obtain the high-priest's daughter in marriage! It is not certainly known how Paul's father obtained the right of Roman citizenship (see Becker, *Romans Alterthumsk.* II, 1:89 sq.; Cellar. *Dissertat.* 2:710 sq.; Deyling, *Observat.* 3:388 sq.; Arntzen, *Diss. de civitate Pauli*, Traj. ad Rhen. 1725). Either some ancestor, perhaps the father of Paul himself, had obtained it by great service to the state (Grotius, *ad loc.*; Cellarius, *ut sup.* p. 726 sq.), or he had purchased it (Gronov. *Ad Joseph. Decr. pro Jud.* p. 42; Deyling, *ut sup.* p. 393 sq.). The supposition that the whole city of Tarsus received the right from Augustus is without ground (comp. Bengel, on <4467>Acts 16:27). **SEE TARSUS**. If the reading υἱὸς Φαρισαίου, "son of a Pharisee," in <4216>Acts 23:6, were correct, we might infer that only Paul's father had belonged to this sect; but if, with the best manuscripts, we read, υἱὸς Φαρισαίου, "son of Pharisees," it would imply that his ancestors had been Pharisees for several or many generations; and perhaps that they had

been reckoned among the most aristocratic of the Jews. We know nothing further of Paul's family, save that he had a sister and a nephew, the latter living in Jerusalem (⁴²³⁶Acts 23:16), and that he was not himself married (⁴¹⁰⁷1 Corinthians 7:7; comp. 9:5; and see Schmid, *De Apostolis Uxoratis*, p. 80 sq., where also the account of Clemens Alexand. in Euseb. 3:30, is examined; esp. see Usher, *Prolegom. in Ignat.* c. 17; Append. to 2d vol. *Patres Apost.* ed. Coteler. Cleric. p. 226 sq.). The tradition affirms that Paul led with him for some time as a companion the young woman Thecla, of Iconium, whom he had converted (*Menolog. Graec.* 1:66).

3. As to Paul's *trade*, on the word "tent-maker" (σκηνοποιός) we may refer to the Lexicons, to Bertholdt (v. 2698 sq.), and Schurtzfleisch (*De Paullo σκηνοποιῶ*, Leips. 1699). Luther makes it "carpet-maker;" Morus (*in Act.* 18:3) and others, "maker of mats or mattresses;" Michaelis (*Einkl. ins N.T.* § 216) and Hanleimn (*inl. ins NV. T.* 3:301), "tool-maker;" Chrysostom and others, "worker in leather" (=σκυτοτόμος); Hug (*Introd.* p. 505, Fosdick's transl.) and Eichhorn (*Einkl. ins N.T.* 3:8), "maker of tent-cloth;" but most critics agree with our translators in rendering it "tent-maker" (comp. Kuinol, Dindorf, Rosenmüller, Olshausen, Schleusner). Shepherds, travelers, and others used small tents of cloth or leather as a protection against the weather, especially at night. The manufacture of them was a flourishing and profitable employment. **SEE TENT.** Paul accordingly preferred, when opportunity offered, to support himself by laboring at this trade, rather than to live upon the gifts of the Church (⁴¹⁰⁸Acts 18:3; ⁴¹⁰²1 Corinthians 4:12; ⁴¹⁰⁹1 Thessalonians 2:9; ⁴¹⁰³2 Thessalonians 3:8). There was a goat's-hair cloth called *Cilicium*, manufactured in Cilicia, and largely used for tents. Paul's trade was probably that of making tents of this haircloth.

4. As to Paul's *education*, there was a flourishing Greek academy in Tarsus, and the residents were respected in other countries for their cultivation. Whether and how far this circumstance influenced Paul while young cannot be determined; probably he was yet very young when he went to Jerusalem, and obtained his facility in the use of the Greek language and his Hellenistic education rather by his travels among the Greeks than in his native city. It is not in itself probable that he attended a Greek school in Tarsus, nor can it be proved from his writings. He shows in them rather the learning of a Jewish rabbi, for which position he had been educated (⁴¹⁰⁴Galatians 1:14), and the logical training of a Pharisee (Ammon, *Opuscula*, p. 63 sq.), supported by a remarkable natural

endowment; and the few quotations from Greek poets which are found in his epistles and speeches (see Jerome, on Isaiah 1), as in ^{<4653>}1 Corinthians 15:33; ^{<4478>}Acts 17:28 (see *Progr.* by Benner [Giess. 1753], on ^{<5012>}Titus 1:12; Schickendanz, *De trib. a Paulo profanor. scriptis allegatis* [Servest. 1764]; Von Seelen, *Meditt. Exeg.* 2:312 sq.; Hoffmann, *De Paulo Apost. Scriptor. prof. allegante* [Tub. 1770]), might have been picked up in the course of his travels, as they are merely general, and perhaps proverbial, sentences. So as regards the few words quoted from Aratus, we need not suppose, with Tholuck, that the apostle had read him, although this is not very improbable (Neander, 1:111); nor must we forget that Paul seems to indicate (^{<4861>}Galatians 6:11) that it was not easy for him to write in Greek letters (see Thalemann, *De EFluditione Panlli Judaica non Griceca* [Leips. 1769]; Michaelis, *Einl.* 1:162 sq.; Henke, on Paley, *lorae Paulinoe*, p. 469 sq. On the contrary side, Strombach, *De Eruditione Paulli* [Leips. 1708]; Schramm, *De stupenda Eruditione Paulli* [Herborn, 1710]; Miller, in the *Biblioth. Lubec.* v. 104 sq.). The active mind of the apostle did not remain ignorant even of the philosophical speculations of the day. But by the philosophy of Paul (see Zobel, *De Paulo philosopho* [Aldorf, 1701]; Feller, *De Patho philosopho plane divino* [Viteb. 1740]; Bieck, *De Pauli philosophia*, in Heumann's *Act. Philos.* 13:124 sq.) is not meant a formal system or scientific view, but simply that his mind had a philosophical turn. In the same manner the acquaintance he betrays occasionally with the Roman law does not at all pass beyond the most common legal relations, and cannot be called jurisprudence (Kirchmaier, *De jurisprudentia Paullina* [Viteb. 1730]; Westenburg, *Opusc. Academ.* ed. Piittmann [Leips. 1794]; Stryck, *De jurisprud. Paul.* [Halle, 1705]; Freiesleben, *De jurisprud. Paul.* [Leips. 1840]). The style of Paul's Epistles shows that he had acquired a real facility in expressing himself in Greek; and the Greek coloring which appears through all the Hebraisms of his style excludes the supposition that he conceived his letters in Hebrew (Arameean). Translations from the Hebrew by a foreign hand, and that, as it is urged in excess of learned trifling, an unskilled one would read quite otherwise. The Greek style of Paul rises even at times to eloquence (Hug, *Einleit.* 2:285), although he may have seemed to the Greeks "rude in speech" (^{<4706>}2 Corinthians 11:6), and a better Pauline system of rhetoric could easily be derived from his works than Baur suggests (Halle, 1782, 2:8; see Kirchmaier, *De P. Eloquentia* [Viteb. 1695]; Baden, *De Eloquent. Pauli* [Havn. 1786]; Tzschirner, *Observat. Pauli epistol. scriptoris ingenium concernentes* [Viteb. 1800], 3:4; Hoffmann, *De stilo Pauli* [Tubing. 1757]). Paul not

only talked Greek in the ordinary intercourse of life, but was able to make extemporaneous speeches in Greek (^{<4237>}Acts 21:37; 17:22 sq.). Nor can there be any doubt of the acquaintance of the apostle with Latin, and his ability to speak it (see Ehrhardt, *De Latinitate Pauli* [Silus. 1755]. 2:4). But perhaps his idiomatic facility in the Greek had failed him, and led to his employment of an amanuensis. Extravagant claims have often been made on the apostle's behalf as to his classical education, based upon slender evidence. This evidence consists (1) of a few supposed references, in the discourse alluded to by Dr. Bentley, to certain dogmas of the Greek philosophers; but even supposing the apostle to have had these in his eye, it will not follow that he must have studied the writings in which these dogmas were unfolded and defended, because he might have learned enough of them to guide him to such referenced, as by the supposition he makes in that discourse, from those controversial encounters with "the philosophers of the Epicureans and of the Stoics" which we are told he had in the market-place of Athens, previous to the delivery of his oration on the Areopagus; (2) of three quotations made by him from Greek poets: one from the *Phoenomena* (ver. 5), of his countryman Aratus (^{<4478>}Acts 17:28), one from a lost play of Menander (^{<4653>}1 Corinthians 15:33), and one from Epimenides (^{<5012>}Titus 1:12), all of which, however, bear the general character of gnomes or proverbs, and might consequently find their way to the apostle merely as a part of the current coin of popular conversation, without his having once visited the treasury whence they were originally drawn; and (3) of certain similarities of idea and expression between some passages of the apostle and some that are found in classic authors (Horne, *Introd.* 4:343); but none of which are of such a nature as to necessitate the conclusion that the coincidence is more than purely accidental. **SEE EDUCATION.**

5. On the *conversion* of Paul there are various views (see Lyttleton, *Observ. on the Convers. of Paul* [Lond. 1747], and Kuinol, *Comment.* 4:329 sq.). The older view, and the prevailing one still in England and America, which interprets the accounts literally, and supposes a visible manifestation of Jesus, is brought forward by Miller (*De Je u a Paulo Viso* [Gott. 1778]). But the prevailing current of German opinion, under rationalistic influence, has for a long time been to explain away the supernatural elements in this narrative, either by referring them to the imagination of Paul and his followers, working on natural events (see Ammon, *De repentina Sauli ad doct. Christi conversione* [Erl. 1792],

also in his *Opusc. Theol.* 1 sq.; Eichhorn, *Biblioth. der bibl. Lit.* vi sq.; Greiling, in Henke's *Mus.* 3:226 sq.; Schulz, in Heinrich's *Beitr. z. Beford. d. theol. Wiss.* 1:47 sq.; Bengel, *Observ. de Pauli ad rem Christ. conver.* [Tubing. 1819], 2:4 [this work takes, however, a middle course, and shows more than usual regard for the narrative]; Planck, *Gesch. der ersten Periode d. Christen*, 2:90 sq. But Neander [i. 116] and Olshausen [on ~~400~~ Acts 9:1] return partially to the old view), or reject the narrative entirely as a relation of actual facts (so Bretschneider, *Land. der Dogmatik*, 1:325 sq., who considers all as a vision; Baur, p. 63 sq., who makes the account a fable, framed out of Paul's internal experience, by his defenders, as an offset to Peter's vision, ~~400~~ Acts 10:11).

The apologetic bearing of Saul's conversion, according to the obvious meaning of the Scripture narrative, upon the question of the supernatural origin of Christianity is too obvious not to have rendered the subject a field of fierce debate among the contending parties. The Christian Church, as a whole, has ever appealed to this remarkable event as furnishing irresistible evidence of the truth of the crowning miracle of the Gospel, the resurrection of our Lord. Upon this one fact, the "conversion and apostleship of Paul," a well-known author (Lyttleton) has consented to lay the whole stress of the argument. Was Paul an impostor, or an enthusiast, or deceived by others? Let us weigh the probabilities. This is not the case of a rude Galilasan peasant, whose untutored perceptions might be supposed incapable of distinguishing between natural and miraculous phenomena; but of a man of acute and discriminating intellect, well versed in Jewish learning, and not unacquainted with classic lore; and so far from being predisposed towards the Christian cause, or even, like his master Gamaliel, content to remain neutral, or to leave the event to a higher power, animated by sentiments of the bitterest hostility to Christ and to Christ's followers. His most cherished associations, his temporal prospects, alike pointed to his continuance in the Jewish faith. His subsequent course furnishes no evidence of any change of mind. His convictions and his zeal know no abatement, and at length he seals his ministry with a martyr's death. If we examine his extant letters, we find in them not a trace of the credulous or the enthusiastic or the fanatical temperament, which might explain the phenomenon. According to the ordinary motives of human action, Paul's conversion is, if the facts were not as stated, unaccountable.

Feeling the force of this, the modern opponents of the supernatural have retreated from the position of the elder deists, and, admitting that Paul

believed that he saw and heard the risen Savior, have attempted to explain the matter either on a combination of natural and psychological grounds, or on the latter purely. The very excess of Paul's antichristian zeal paved the way to his conversion. It brought him into contact with the Christians, and thus made him acquainted with the arguments for and against the claims of Jesus to be the Messiah. Was the scandal of the cross decisive against this claim? An impartial examination of the prophets would prove that the idea of a suffering Messiah was familiar to them. To himself as a Pharisee the idea of a resurrection from the dead would present no difficulties. The patience and joy with which the Christians encountered suffering must have produced a deep impression upon him. Thus a state of doubt and hesitation would naturally succeed to that of unreasoning prejudice. Might not the death of Christ, shameful as it appeared, be really, as the Christians considered it, God's ordinance for the salvation of the world? If his resurrection were but a fact, it would turn the scale. The more this thought fixed itself in Paul's mind, the more, in the agony of suspense to which it would give rise, would he long for some convincing proof of what he had come to hope might be true. On that memorable journey the crisis took place. As he was vainly endeavoring, by redoubled efforts against the Christian faith, to stifle the remonstrances of conscience and the growth of conviction, either a sudden thunder-storm which overtook him (Ammon), or his own excited imagination without any external cause aiding (Baur, Holsten), so affected the nerves of vision and hearing that an appearance or phantasm of the risen Savior, uttering words of reproach and admonition, figured itself on his retina, and produced the effects recorded.

Such is the latest form of the rationalistic theory on this subject. To us it appears wholly inadequate to support the conclusion intended, viz. that no external manifestation of Christ took place. We can but briefly touch upon its inherent improbabilities. That Paul fully believed that the transaction had an existence external to himself is plain, not merely from his own references to it (⁴⁰²⁶Acts 22:6-10), but from his unhesitating claim to be an apostle of Christ, in no wise inferior to those who had seen the Savior in his humiliation (⁴⁰⁹⁰1 Corinthians 9:1). Now it was the special qualification for the apostolic office that the holder of it should have beheld the Lord in his glorified body, so as to be able to testify to the fact of his resurrection. (See especially ⁴⁰²²Acts 1:22, and the addresses of Peter in ch. ii and iii of that book.) As certainly, therefore, as Paul claimed to be an apostle, so certainly was it his conviction that, like his colleagues, he had had ocular

demonstration of our Lord's resurrection: on no other ground could he have asserted a coordinate rank and authority. Still, it is no doubt possible that he might have mistaken vision for reality; or at least that Luke, the historian, might have confounded the two. But, in fact, both writers exhibit a perfect consciousness of the difference between them. Peter's "vision" (~~400~~ Acts 10) is expressly described as such (ver. 3); and that the distinction was familiar to the historian is proved by his observation in the account of the same apostle's miraculous deliverance, that he "wist not that it was true which was done by the angel, but thought he saw a vision." We are told that it was in a "vision" that Christ appeared to Ananias (~~400~~ Acts 9:10), and to Paul himself on subsequent occasions (~~400~~ Acts 18:9; 22:17). The apostle speaks in various passages of his Epistles of a state of ecstatic trance, as not unfrequent with him; and in such cases whether he was "in the body or out of the body" he could not tell; a description which presents a strong contrast to the positive matter-of-fact style which the apostle uses in describing what took place on the journey to Damascus.

It is clear then that both Luke and Paul, far from placing all supernatural communications in the same category, drew a distinction, well-known and acknowledged, between a mere vision, or rapture, and an external manifestation; and, therefore, if they had regarded that appearance of Christ which issued in the conversion of the latter as an instance of vision merely, they would have described it as such. The hypothesis, therefore, that they were unable to distinguish the one from the other falls to the ground. Not less ungrounded, as far as the evidence is concerned, is the "psychological" explanation. There is no trace in the history of any intercourse between Paul and Christians of a friendly nature previous to his conversion. Neither is there any evidence of a growing struggle in his own mind between prejudice and conviction as to the truth of Christianity. His mental and moral conflicts were wholly of a *legal* character (Romans 7). Is it credible that if, as the theory supposes, such a struggle had been going on he would have continued, as he did, in his career of persecution to the last moment? Moreover, is it agreeable to experience that a change, not merely of view but of heart, so vast as to be called by Paul himself a "new creation," should have been wrought by the unaided exercise of the natural powers? The theory sinks under an accumulation of inherent improbabilities. There remains only the other alternative, that Paul really beheld the risen Savior piercing the clouds of heaven as he will do at the last day, and visible in his glorified body. Nor can we fail to perceive the

divine wisdom in this extraordinary conversion. Natures like Paul's can only be transformed, if at all, suddenly and with a mighty shock: a lightning stroke of conviction must fuse the hard metal; or, to vary the image, the veil that was upon his heart must be split *from without*, if the light of heaven was to visit the darkened chamber.

6. Evangelistic Labor. — Paul's personal efforts for the spread of the Gospel consisted chiefly in oral preaching, enforced with eloquence of the heart. He did not usually occupy himself with baptism (^{<4014>}1 Corinthians 1:14 sq.), but left this ceremony to his companions and attendants (οἱ διακονοῦντες αὐτῷ, ^{<4492>}Acts 19:22; οἱ συνεργοὶ αὐτοῦ, ^{<5162>}Romans 16:21; ^{<3725>}Philippians 2:25; ^{<5024>}Philemon 1:24), of whom he gradually collected a considerable number (^{<4304>}Acts 20:4; ^{<5024>}Philemon 1:24), and used them as emissaries (^{<4492>}Acts 19:22; 17:14; ^{<4047>}1 Corinthians 4:17; ^{<3725>}Philippians 2:25; ^{<5192>}1 Thessalonians 3:2). After he parted with Barnabas and Mark (^{<4157>}Acts 15:37 sq.) he numbered among them especially Silas (comp. ^{<4454>}Acts 15:40), Timothy (^{<4401>}Acts 16:1 sq.), Luke the physician, Titus, Demas, Erastus, and Epaphroditus. He first came in contact with the original apostles of Jesus and the Mother-Church in Jerusalem through Barnabas (^{<4492>}Acts 9:27), but he renewed his acquaintance with them by frequent tarrying in that city (^{<4150>}Acts 15:4; Galatians 2; ^{<4218>}Acts 21:18). In his fundamental view of the invalidity of the Mosaic law for Christians, Paul disagreed with some of the apostles, and on this ground had at one time a dispute with Peter at Antioch (^{<4211>}Galatians 2:11 sq.; see Bockel, *De controversia inter Paul. et Petr.* Leips. 1817, and Winer, *Comment. ad loc.*), and continued always to be an object of suspicion to the Jerusalem Christians (^{<4211>}Acts 21:21). But this did not prevent him from making collections wherever he could in behalf of the poor Christians in Jerusalem and Judaea (^{<5155>}Romans 15:25 sq.; 1 Corinthians 16; 2 Corinthians 8 sq.; ^{<4210>}Galatians 2:10; ^{<4247>}Acts 24:17). He extended his apostolic labors from Syria to the north and north-west (^{<5159>}Romans 15:19), where he could not fear to disturb the sphere of work of others (^{<47016>}2 Corinthians 10:16; ^{<5150>}Romans 15:20); but even there he was not, it seems, altogether unaffected by the authorities of the Church in Palestine (^{<4012>}1 Corinthians 1:12; 3:22). His whole life was a struggle against adversaries as wily as they were unwearied (Scharling, *De Paullo ejusq. adversariis*, Havn. 1836). Not only did the Jews in Palestine and elsewhere persecute their former companion with the whole weight of their national and religious hatred (^{<4423>}Acts 9:23; 13:50; 14:5 sq.; 17:5; 18:12;

21:27 sq.; 23:12), but even within the Christian Church itself, openly and secretly, Judaizing Christians and philosophizing Christians opposed him; and while Paul was defending Christian freedom against the stiff legality of the former, he was compelled to rescue the historical basis of Christianity from the errors of the latter. Like other great teachers, too, he was forced sometimes to meet misunderstanding of his own instructions (^{<4615>}1 Corinthians 15:10; 8:9). Although Paul saw the necessary end of the Jewish ritual, yet, in dealing with the weak, he was no bigoted opponent of it (9:19, 20); he not only had Timothy circumcised (^{<4410>}Acts 16:3), but himself fulfilled a Jewish vow (21:24 sq.; *SEE NAZARITE*, and Lakemacher, *Observ.* 6:364 sq.). Only where Jewish prejudices pressed in with bold demands, and threatened serious trouble, did he manifest severity (^{<4114>}Galatians 2:4 sq.). On the other hand, his opponents left nothing untried to diminish his apostolical authority, descending even to slander (2 Corinthians 1; comp. 10). They had even forged letters under Paul's name (^{<4512>}2 Thessalonians 2:2; see Neander, 1:281). Thus his life was really a series of continuous strife and danger (^{<4712>}2 Corinthians 11:23 sq.).

7. Visits to Corinth. — From several passages of 2 Corinthians (2:1; 12:14, 21; 13:1, 2) it has appeared to many that before the writing of that epistle Paul had *twice* visited Corinth, and that one of these visits had been after the Church there had fallen into an evil state. The words (^{<4724>}2 Corinthians 12:14) **τρίτον τοῦτο ἐτοίμως ἔχω ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς** are usually explained as meaning only, "I am a third time *prepared* to come," and in accordance with this it is thought that **τρίτον τοῦτο ἔρχομαι** (^{<4710>}2 Corinthians 13:1) may be rendered "This third time I am purposing to come to you;" so that it is not of a third *visit*, but simply of a third *purpose* to visit that Paul speaks. Against this the following arguments are urged:

(1) That though **ἔρχομαι** may signify "I am coming" in the sense of "purposing to come," the whole phrase **τρίτον τοῦτο ἔρχομαι** cannot be rendered "this is the third time I have purposed to come to you;" as De Wette remarks (*Erklhörung*, ad loc.), it is only when the purpose is close on its accomplishment, not of an earlier purpose, that **ἔρχομαι** can be so used. But in this case the **ἔρχομαι** does *not* refer to any previous purpose; that is implied only in the **τρίτον**: so that the instance fairly comes under the usage of the pres. for the determined fut. (Kruiger, *Griech. Sprachl.* 1:148, 149; Winer, *Gr. Gr.* p. 281). Moreover, we have the apostle's own epexegetis of his *usus loquendi* in the parallel passage, showing that **τοῦτο** denoted the intention or readiness (**ἐτοίμως**) only.

(2) The contrast of **τρίτον** in 13:1 with **δεύτερον** in ver. 2 leads to the conclusion that it is of a third visit, and not of a third purpose to visit, that Paul is writing; he had told them formerly when he was present with them the second time, and now when absent, in announcing a third visit, he tells them again, etc. Some render, as in the A.V., **ὡς παρών** by *as if present*, so as to make the apostle intimate that he had not been oftener than once before at Corinth; but it is very doubtful if **ὡς** is ever used to express the supposition of a case which does not exist (~~cf.~~ 1 Corinthians 5:3 is not a case in point, for there the case supposed actually did exist), and, moreover, as it is connected here as well with **ἀπών** as with **παρών**, if we translate it “as if,” the whole clause will read thus, “I tell you beforehand, as if I were present the second time, and were now absent,” etc., which is of course as inadmissible on the ground of sense as the rendering in the A.V. is on critical grounds. If, however, as is far more natural, we construe **τὸ δεύτερον** with **παρών** immediately preceding, rather than with either of the verbs in the beginning of the verse, and render as one present the second time,” we have a direct argument (in harmony with all the other passages which speak of his determination as if already a fact) that there had been but *one* previous visit to Corinth, namely, that during which the Church was planted.

(3) In 12:14 the apostle intimates his being ready to go to Corinth in connection with his resolution not to be burdensome to the Christians there. Now, inasmuch as it was not Paul’s *purpose* to visit them that could impose any burden on them, but his actual presence with them, it is said that there seems no fitness in such a connection in his telling them of his mere repeated purpose to visit them; in order to make congruity out of this, we must regard him as saying, “I was not burdensome to you when with you before, and now I have a third time formed a purpose to visit you; but when I make out this visit, I will not be burdensome to you any more than at first, though it be a thrice purposed visit.” Accordingly it is claimed that to find all this in the few words he utters is to attribute to the apostle a somewhat improbable breviloquence. Nevertheless, nothing could be more natural than the phraseology here, on the supposition that the second intended visit had not taken place. The purpose still remained, and the visit was looked upon as certain; *when it did occur*, Paul hoped not to be a burden to his hosts. And if we construe (as we may properly do, despite Alford’s subjective emendation) the **τρίτον** here also with its nearer verb **ἔχω**, we have again a positive statement of a third preparation only to

make the visits. The reason why the apostle is so emphatic on this point is that his enemies had charged him with fickleness respecting it (1:17), and had even questioned it altogether (~~4015~~ 1 Corinthians 4:18). See in favor of this intermediate visit, Bleek (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1830; *Einleit.* p. 393) and others; against it, Davidson (*Introd.* 2:213 sq.) and Lange (*Apost. Zeitalter*, 1:199 sq.).

On the other hand we have the following arguments:

(1) In ~~4015~~ 2 Corinthians 1:15, 16, the apostle speaks of a *second* benefit as to be anticipated by the Corinthians from his visiting them; from which it is argued that he could only have been there *once* before, else would he have used consistent language, and spoken of a *third* benefit, and not a *second* only. To escape from this difficulty various expedients have been devised, such as taking *δευτέραν χάριν* here for a *double benefit* (*διπλῆν χάραν*, Bleek and Neander, after Chrysostom and Theodoret), and supposing the term of the apostle's residence at Corinth (~~4480~~ Acts 18:1-11) divided into two parts, in the interval between which he had made a short excursion from Corinth and back again, so that in one sense he had twice before visited that city, and, in another sense, had only once before visited it. But these are violent expedients, manifestly devised for maintaining a previous hypothesis. The only tenable solution that will save the supposed visit seems to be that proposed by Meyer, who takes the expression (*δευτέρα χάρις*) in connection with the return from Macedonia (*πάλιν ἀπὸ Μακεδονίας ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς*); the apostle determines to visit them first before going to Macedonia, and thereby secure to them a double benefit by going thence to Macedonia, and returning to them from Macedonia in place of going to the latter place first (so also Alford, *ad loc.*). But it is very harsh thus to refer the *πρότερον*, "before" (whether construed with the actual coming, *ἐλθεῖν*, or with the simple purpose, *ἐβουλόμην*), to the journey into Macedonia, which had not yet been spoken of; it clearly designates something prior to the time of writing, namely, the design of an earlier and second visit that should bring an additional conferment of spiritual gifts. It may therefore be fairly set off against whatever force there may be thought to remain in the first of the above arguments on the other side. There was a third intention of a second visit.

(2) Those who suppose this second visit already made are greatly perplexed where to locate it: they generally fix upon some presumed

interval in the apostle's three years' stay at Ephesus. Now it should be noted that this is not only a pure hypothesis, without a word to sustain it in the direct history covering this very period, but Paul's time is stated to have been exclusively employed in the labors at Ephesus, both by his own explicit statement respecting the whole three years (~~448B~~ Acts 20:31, "by the space of three years I *ceased not* to warn every one night and day"), and also by Luke's nearly as strong language concerning the first two years ("disputing *daily* in the school of Tyrannus; and this continued by the space of two years," ~~449D~~ Acts 19:9, 10), during which, if at all, the supposed trip to Corinth occurred. There is certainly no room for it in the narrative there.

(3) If such a visit were made, how comes it that neither in the Acts nor in Paul's letters are there any positive and definite notices of it or of its results? It is altogether unsafe to found so palpable a historical conclusion upon these few, slight, and ambiguous expressions. A treatise has been written by Muller, *De Tribus Pauli Itin.* (Basle, 1831). *SEE CORINTHIANS.*

8. *Paul's imprisonment at Rome* is represented as a lax one (~~448I6~~ Acts 28:16, 23, 30), but still imprisonment; for by the words "in his own hired house" (ver. 30), Luke cannot mean a life at freedom, or he must have mentioned Paul's liberation before. Bottger (*Beitrag*e, etc., pt. 2) would prove, by reference to the judicial customs of the Romans, and on the supposition that the letters to the Ephesians, Colossians, Philippians, and Philemon were written in Caesarea, that Paul was confined but a few days in Rome. But the artificial argument which he uses will not satisfy any one who desires a firm historical ground for his belief. (See remarks in reply by Olshausen and Neander, *Gesch. d. Pflanz.* 1:428.) But it is puzzling that Luke, giving so particularly the period of two years, says nothing of what Paul did after the two years. Did he end this work at their close? This seems probable, although *the Acts* was certainly written after *the Gospel*, according to ~~449C~~ Acts 1:1 (see Hug, *Einleit.* 2:262 sq.). The apostolic history is completed by the tradition in Abdias (*Hist. Apost.* 2:6 sq.), which makes Paul's imprisonment end with his execution. But since the 4th century the prevailing tradition has been that Paul was at that time released, and made several apostolic journeys afterwards (Niceph. 2:34), especially one to Spain (Cyril. of Jerus. *Catech.* c. 17; Jerome, *in Jes.* 11:14; see Weller, *De verosim. P. in Hisp. martyrio* [Argent. 1787]; comp. against this view Spier, *Diss. qua testimonia patrum de Pauli itinere Hisp. labefactantur* [Viteb. 1740]; *Hist. Crit. de Hisp. P. itinere* [1742];

Harenburg, *Otia Gandershem*. p. 161 sq.), or even farther (Theodoret, in *Psalm cxvi*), as into Britain (Minter, *Stud. u. Krit.* 1833, 1:55); and at last was again imprisoned in Rome, and put to death at the same time with Peter (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* 2:22, 25; comp. *Acta Petri et Pauli*, Gr. ed. Thilo [Hal. 1838]). The oldest tradition of Paul's release, and the only one worthy of any attention, is that in Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* 2:22; comp. Danz, *Pr. de loco Euseb. H. E.* 2:21 [Jena, 1816]). But he simply mentions it as a report (λόγος ἔχει), and the confirmation which he draws from the Second Epistle to Timothy would lead us to suppose that those who originated this report had derived, as the moderns have, the idea of a second imprisonment of Paul from that epistle. But no such stress should be laid upon the First Epistle of Clemens Romanus to the Corinthians, as has been given it, for example, by Neander (1:653 sq.) and Bohl (p. 95 sq.; comp. Baur, *ut sup.* p. 150; Schenkel, in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1841, p. 56 sq.; yet see Neander, 1:454). It is mainly the peculiar difficulty of referring this Second Epistle to Timothy to any point in the known life of the apostle which has led to the supposition of a second imprisonment. This argument has been urged with great acuteness by Neander (1:453 sq.). The following authors have opposed the idea of a second imprisonment of Paul: Oldendorp, in *D. Brem. u. Verdenzsch. Biblioth.* 3:1027 sq.; Schmidt, *Einleit. ins N.T.* p. 198 sq.; Eichhorn, *Einleit.* 3:364 sq.; Wolf, *De altera P. ap. captivitate* (Leips. 1819), 2:8; Schrader, *Paulus*, 1:227 sq.; Goschen, in Hensen, p. 736 sq.; Schenkel, in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1841, 1:53 sq.; Baur, *Paul.* p. 229 sq.; Niedner, *Kirchengesch.* p. 104 sq.; De Wette. *Einleit.* 2:220 sq. On the other hand, in favor of the journey, see Heyrdenreich, *Bearbeit. d. Pastoralbr.* 2:6 sq.; Mynster, *Kleine theol. Schrift.* p. 291 sq.; Neander, *ut sup.*; Bohl, *Abfass. der Briefe an Tim. u. Titus* p. 81 sq.; Schott, *Erörterung*, p. 116 sq.; Wurm, in the *Tubing. Zeitschr.* 1853, 1:82 sq.; Guericke, *Einleit. ins N.T.* p. 338 sq.; Walch, *Biblioth. Theol.* 3:455. Others are cited above.

Picture for Paul 5

9. Personal Appearance and Character. — All testimony; his own included (2 Corinthians 10:10), leads to the conclusion that in outward appearance the apostle had nothing to command admiration or respect. His figure was diminutive, his eyesight defective (comp. Acts 23:5; Galatians 4:15), and his speech such as produced little effect. An ancient writer adds that he was bald, and had a hooked nose like an eagle's beak. The combination of these features presents such a figure as one may

often see among the Jews of our own day, especially in the humbler class of them. Such pictorial representations of the apostle as have come down to us in paintings and mosaics agree in the main with this, though they give more of power and dignity to the apostle's countenance than this would lead us to expect. They are the early pictures and mosaics described by Mrs. Jameson, and passages from Malalas, Nicephorus, and the apocryphal *Acta Pauli et Theclae* (concerning which see also Conybeare and Howson, 1:197). They all agree in ascribing to the apostle a short stature, a long face with high forehead, an aquiline nose, close and prominent eyebrows. Other characteristics mentioned are baldness, gray eyes, a clear complexion, and a winning expression. According to Hug, the apostle's temperament was sanguine; but as Tholuck, with better reason, says (*Stud. u. Krit. loc. cit.*), *sanguine-bilious*. On his person, we have only an untrustworthy tradition (in the *Dialog. Philopatriis*, c. 12, and Malalas, *Chron.* x, p. 257, Bonn). Too much stress must not be laid upon the allusions in the Epistles (~~415~~ 1 Corinthians 15:9; ~~4700~~ 2 Corinthians 10:10; see Bengel, on ~~4430~~ Acts 13:9; Tholuck, *op. cit.* p. 381). It is probable, however, that the general appearance of Paul did not correspond well with his greatness of mind and heart. But a strong, healthy body he must have had, to endure such journeys and hardships (~~47123~~ 2 Corinthians 11:23 sq.), and he seems to have had great mental energy and endurance (comp. ~~4400~~ Acts 20:7; ~~47123~~ 2 Corinthians 11:28), but could not undergo much bodily toil (~~3300~~ 1 Thessalonians 2:9; ~~3308~~ 2 Thessalonians 3:8).

Of his mental temperament and character Paul is himself the best painter. His speeches and letters convey to us, as we read them, the truest impressions of those qualities which helped to make him the great apostle. We perceive the warmth and ardor of his nature, his deeply affectionate disposition, the tenderness of his sense of honor, the courtesy and personal dignity of his bearing, his perfect fearlessness, his heroic endurance; we perceive the rare combination of subtlety, tenacity, and versatility in his intellect; we perceive also a practical wisdom which we should have associated with a cooler temperament, and a tolerance which is seldom united with such impetuous convictions. When he first comes before our view in the history, we see a man of intense energy, firm decision, iron resolution, and uncompromising zeal; and these qualities, tempered by purer religious feeling, guided by higher knowledge, and modified by experience, continue to characterize him so long as he appears upon the stage of life. His natural mental endowments were of the highest order. He

had great breadth of view, great clearness of apprehension, a capacity of firmly grasping principles, the power of arranging his thoughts in their proper logical order, and the ability to utter them in forcible and fitting words. The dialectician predominates in his writings; but he could also play the orator after no mean fashion; and there are passages in his epistles which could have come only from the pen of one who had in him the faculties of the poet. In his moral development everything is great and noble. To honesty of purpose and sincerity of speech, he added humility and self-distrust, generous regard for the welfare of others, a tender sympathy with those he loved, and a philanthropy that embraced the race; while the absence of everything mean, mercenary, or selfish, and a noble devotedness, at whatever cost, to the interests of a great cause, combine to shed around a character, in other respects so beautiful, traits of sublimity and grandeur. We feel that here is a man at once to be admired and loved—a teacher at whose feet one might sit with unhesitating docility—a friend on whose bosom one might lean with confidence and affection. The vigorous intellect and the large heart which belonged to him by nature would have brought him distinction under any circumstances; but his highest claim to honor is derived from his having, under the constraining power of the love of Christ, consecrated himself, body, soul, and spirit, to the service of God in promoting the best interests of men. In this respect he stands foremost among the Church's heroes and the benefactors of the race. The principle which harmonized all these endowments and directed them to a practical end was, beyond dispute, a knowledge of Jesus Christ in the Divine Spirit. Personal allegiance to Christ as to a living Master, with a growing insight into the relation of Christ to each man and to the world, carried the apostle forward on a straight course through every vicissitude of personal fortunes and amid the various habits of thought which he had to encounter. The conviction that he had been entrusted with a Gospel concerning a Lord and Deliverer of men was what sustained and purified his love for his own people, while it created in him such a love for mankind that he only knew himself as the servant of others for Christ's sake.

A remarkable attempt has recently been made by Prof. Jowett, in his Commentary on some of the Epistles, to qualify what he considers to be the blind and indiscriminating admiration of Paul, by representing him as having been, with all his excellences, a man "whose appearance and discourse made an impression of feebleness," "out of harmony with life and nature," a confused thinker, uttering himself "in broken words and

hesitating forms of speech, with no beauty or comeliness of style,” and so undecided in his Christian belief that he was preaching, in the fourteenth year after his conversion, a Gospel concerning Christ which he himself, in four years more, confessed to have been carnal. In these paradoxical views, however, Prof. Jowett stands almost alone; the result of the freest, as of the most reverent, of the numerous recent studies of St. Paul and his works (among which Prof. Jowett’s own Commentary is one of the most interesting) having been only to add an independent tribute to the ancient admiration of Christendom. Those who judge Paul as they would judge any other remarkable man confess him unanimously to have been “one of the greatest spirits of all time;” while those who believe him to have been appointed by the Lord of mankind, and inspired by the Holy Ghost, to do a work in the world of almost unequalled importance, are lost in wonder as they study the gifts with which he was endowed for that work, and the sustained devotion with which he gave himself to it. On the intellectual and moral character of Paul, see Niemeyer, *Charakter*, 1:206 sq., Hug, *Einleit.* 2:283 sq.; Hartmann. in Scherer’s *Schriftforsch.* 1:1 sq.; *Journ.f. Pred.* 28:298 sq.; Palmer, *Paulus u. Gamaliel, ein Beitrag zur ältesten Christengesch.* (Giess. 1806); Olshausen, *Bibl. Comment.* III, 1:11 sq.

10. Apocryphal Writings. — In addition to the letters usually given as Paul’s, a farged correspondence between him and the philosopher Seneca (six letters of the apostle and eight of Seneca, comp. Jerome, *Viri Illustr.* 11; August. Ep. 153) is printed in Fabricius (*Apocryph.* 2:880 sq.). That it is not genuine, see his *Biblioth. Lat.* 2:9; *Apocryph. N.T.* 3:710 sq. The whole tradition of intimacy between Paul and Seneca has perhaps grown by conjecture out of ^{<41812>}Acts 18:12 (see Schmidt, *Einleit. ins N.T.* p. 268 sq.). Yet it has found a defender in Gelpe (*Defamiliaritate quae Paulo c. Seneca intercessione traditur verisimillima* [Leips. 1812]), who is answered by Eckhard (in *Miscell. Leips.* 9:90 sq.), in an attempt to show that Seneca was a firm heathen and opponent of Christianity. On other writings attributed to Paul, see Fabricius, *Apocryph.* 2:918, 943 sq.; 3:667 sq.; and B. Elsing, *De Pseudepigraphis P. Apost.* (Leips. 1707). Zeltner (*Fragment.*

Pauli quond. perversi ὀθεόπνευστον [Altdorf, 1713]) thinks he has discovered in the Talmud a Hebrew form of prayer composed by Paul before his conversion. Tischendorf has published the “editio princeps” of the apocryphal “*Apocalypsis Pauli*” in his *Apocalypses Apocryphm* (Lips. 1866). Several other ancient apocryphal productions are ascribed to Paul,

most of which are now lost. Among them were “the Acts of Paul,” or “the Preaching of Paul;” this appears to have formed the conclusion of the so-called “Preaching of Peter,” and dates probably from about the middle of the 2d century. The Acts of Paul and Thecla, the Epistles of Paul to Seneca, with those of Seneca to Paul, and the Epistle to the Laodiceans, were translated by Mr. Jer. Jones, in his work *On the Canon*. A good translation of the apocryphal epistles to the Corinthians will be found in Whiston’s *Authentic Records*. See Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Romans Biog.* 3:147. *SEE APOCRYPHA.*

III. Literature. — This is very copious, as the subject is more or less handled in nearly all the Introductions and Commentaries on the New Test., as well as in many treatises on Scripture history and theology in general, and in numerous articles in religious periodicals. The most important special treatises have been mentioned in the preceding discussion; we name below only such recent works of considerable extent as relate exclusively to the apostle. For others see Danz, *Worterbuch*, s.v.; Darling, *Cyclopedia*, col. 1870 sq.; Malcom, *Theological Index*, s.v.; Reuss, *Gesch. d. hil. Schrifft*, § 58 sq.; Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, p. 77 sq.

1. On Paul’s *Life* in general: Menken, *Blicke in d. Leb n*, etc. (Brem. 1828, 8vo); Schafer, *Paulus der Apostel* (Leips. 1874, 8vo); Hensen, *Der Ap. Paulus* (G6tt. 1830, 8vo); Schrader, *Der Ap. Paulus* (Leips. 1830-36, 5 vols. 8vo); Scharling, *De Paulo Apost.* (Hafn. 1836, 8vo); Hessel, *Leben Paul.* (Leips. 1837, 8vo); Tate, *Continuous Hist.* (in new ed. of Paley’s *lorce l’aulince*, Lond. 1840, 8vo); Blunt, *Hist. of St. Paul* (new ed. *ibid.* 1858, 2 vols. 12mo); Tholuck, *Life and Writings of Paul* (transl. in the *Biblical Cabinet*, Edinb. 1859, 12mo); Hausrath, *Der Ap. Paulus* (Heidelb. 1865, 8vo); Vidal, *St. Paul, sa Vie et ses (Euvres* (Paris, 1865, 2 vols. 8vo); Baur, *Paulus der Apostel* (2d ed. Leips. 1866, 8vo); Binney, *Paul’s Life and Ministry* (Lond. 1866, 12mo); Howson, *Scenes in the Life of St. Paul* (*ibid.* 1866, 8vo); Bungener, *Vie, OEuvres, et Epitres de St. Paul* (Paris, 1867, 8vo); Krenkel, *Paulus der Apostel* (Leips. 1869, 8vo); Renan, *Vie de Saint Paul* (Paris, 1869, 8vo); Conybeare and Howson, *Life and Epistles of Mst. Paul* (3d ed. Lond. 1870, 8vo); Neveux, *Vie de St. Pal* (Palis, 1870, 8vo); Rivington, *Paul the Apostle* (Lond. 1874, 8vo); Lewin, *Life and Letters of St. Paul* (new ed. *ibid.* 1874, 2 vols. 4to).

2. On Paul's *doctrines* as a whole: Meyer, *Entwicklung d. Paul. Lehrbegs isf* (Altona, 1801, 8vo); Dahne, *idem* (Halle, 1835, 8vo); Usteri, *idem* (6th ed. Zur. 1851, 8vo); Rabiger (against Baur), *De Christologia Paulina* (Vratsl. 1852, 8vo); Lipsius, *Die Pauliaische Rechtfertigungslehre* (Leips. 1853, 8vo); Whately, *Essays on St. Paul's Writings* (8th ed. Lond. and Andover, 1865, 8vo); Irons, *Christianity as taught by St. Paul* ("Bampton Lecture for 1870," 2d ed. Lond. 1876, 8vo); Pfleiderer, *Der Panlinismus* (Leips. 1873, 8vo).

3. On *special points* relating to Paul: Saville, *Introduction of Christianity (by Paul) into Britain* (Lond. 1861, 8vo); Howson, *Character of St. Paul* ("Hulsean Lectures for 1862," *ibid.* 1864, 8vo; N.Y. 1873, 12mo, new ed.); Lasonder, *De linguce Paulinoe idiomate* (Tr. ad Rb. 1866. 8vo); Marcken, *Paulus und Petrus in Antiochien* (Leips. 1866, 8vo); Smith, *Voyage of St. Paul* (3d ed. Lond. 1866, 12mo); Howson, *Metaphors of St. Paul* (*ibid.* 1868, 8vo); the same, *Companions of St. Paul* (*ibid.* 1871, 8vo).

Paul, Festival Of The Conversion Of,

a feast held by the Church of Rome on January 25. *SEE PETER.*

Paul, Father

whose original name, before he embraced the monastic profession, was PIETRO SARPI, is celebrated as the historian of the Council of Trent. He was born at Venice Aug. 14, 1552, of a respectable commercial family. His father, however, was unsuccessful in trade; and his mother, a woman of sense and virtue, was early left a widow in indigent circumstances. Fortunately her brother was the master of an excellent school, and under his care she placed her son, who from infancy displayed a quick apprehension, a prodigious memory, and great strength of judgment, in short, an extraordinary aptitude for study. Before the completion of his fourteenth year he had made great progress in mathematics and logic, as well as in general literature, and in the languages, particularly the Greek and Hebrew; and at that boyish age, having become a pupil of the logician Capella of Cremona, who was of the Servite Order, this connection led him, contrary to the urgent advice of his uncle and mother, to adopt the monastic habit and rule of his preceptor. In his twentieth year he solemnly took the vows of the order. At the same period the ability which he displayed in a public disputation, held at Mantua during a chapter of his

order, attracted the favorable notice of the reigning prince of the house of Gonzaga, and he was appointed to the professorship of divinity in the cathedral of that city. But, though he was honored with many marks of regard by the Mantuan duke, a public life was little to his taste; and he shortly resigned his office, and returned to the learned seclusion which he loved. In that retirement he continued to cultivate learning and science; and in his twenty second year he was not only acknowledged master of the Latin, Greek, Hebrew, and Chaldee languages, but was also noted as a proficient in the civil and canon law, in various departments of philosophy, in mathematics and astronomy, in chemistry, medicine, and anatomy. In these last sciences he became deeply versed for his times, and it is alleged that he was acquainted with the theory of the circulation of the blood, for the discovery of which Harvey is celebrated. The claim of Sarpi as the discovered rests on the authority of Veslingius; who states, in his *Epist. Anat. et Medicæ*, ep. xxvi, that he had read a MS. by Sarpi, belonging to his pupil and successor Fulgentius, in which the circulation was described. George Ent (Harvey's commentator and friend) admitted the testimony, but said that whatever Sarpi knew of the circulation he learned from Harvey. Ridanus, Harvey's chief adversary, gives no credit for the discovery to Sarpi; and Fulgentius himself does not claim it for him. Several writers attribute to Sarpi the discovery of the valves of the veins, which gave Harvey the first idea of a circulation; but Fabricius was acquainted with them in 1574, when Sarpi was but twenty-two years old, and it is certain that he (Fabricius) taught Harvey their existence. The above is on the authority of Haller (*Bibliotheca Anatomica*), who does not attribute any part of the discovery to Sarpi. The pursuit of such diversified studies, and the renown which they procured for father Paul, no less than the freedom of his expressed opinions in correspondence with the kindred minds of his age, drew upon him the envy and suspicion of the mean and bigoted; and he was twice arraigned before the Inquisition on a false and absurd accusation of heresy, and on a better-founded charge of having declared in a letter his detestation of the papal court and its corruptions. His high reputation protected him in both cases; but the court of Rome never forgave him, and at a subsequent period revenged and justified his bad opinion of its administration by refusing him a bishopric.

It has been said that secretly father Paul was at the time of these trials before the Inquisition a Protestant; but, even if this were true, his Protestantism was confined to an acceptance of the first simple positions of

the Augsburg Confession, if he really held even these. At least father Paul, all his life long, daily read mass. Indeed it would be impossible to give a name to the creed to which, in his own mind, he was attached; it was a body of opinions, symptoms of which are often to be found in the men who at that period devoted themselves to the natural sciences; deviating from the common standards of orthodoxy, inquisitive and searching, yet in itself neither decided nor completely matured. But this much is certain, that father Paul indulged towards the secular influence of the popedom a determined and implacable detestation. It was perhaps the only passion he cherished, and of it very little was manifested until the famous dispute which arose between the Roman see and the republic of Venice, during the pontificate of Paul V, in the year 1696, drew the speculative recluse from the quietude which had only been thus partially interrupted, and brought him into open and dangerous collision with the papal power. When Paul V endeavored to revive the doctrine of the supremacy of the popedom over all temporal princes and governments, and reduced these pretensions to practice by laying the Venetian state under an interdict and excommunication for having subjected priests to the secular jurisdiction, the senate of Venice, not contented with setting these papal weapons at defiance, determined to support by argument the justice of their cause. The most eloquent and successful advocate whom they employed for this purpose was father Paul; and, animated both by zeal in the service of his native state and by indignant opposition to the Romish usurpations, he fulfilled his task with equal courage and ability, and signally exposed the papal pretensions. Paul was finally compelled to consent to an accommodation very honorable to the Venetian state. The papal party, however, though reduced to yield to the power of that republic and the strength of her cause, was resolved not to forego its vengeance against her defenders, and among them father Paul was signally marked for a victim. Several attempts were made to assassinate him; and even in the apparent security of his retreat at Venice he was attacked one night as he was returning home to his monastery by a band of ruffians, who inflicted on him no fewer than twenty-three wounds. The assassins escaped in a ten-oared boat; and the papal nuncio and the Jesuits were naturally suspected of being the authors of a plot prepared with such a command of means and expensive precautions. The wounds of father Paul, however, were mortal; and preserving one of the stilettoes which the assassins had left in his body, he surmounted it with the inscription, "Stilo della chiesa Romana" (The pen [or dagger] of the Romish Church).

These attempts upon his life compelled father Paul to confine himself to his monastery, where he employed his constrained leisure in the great literary composition by which he is chiefly remembered — The History of the Council of Trent (*Historia del Concilio Tridentino* di Pietro Soave Polano) — a work which has been not more deservedly commended for its style as a model of historical composition than for the extent of its learning, the generous candor of its spirit, the unbiassed integrity of its principles, and the unostentatious piety of its sentiments. While occupied in this and other labors of minor import, a neglected cold produced a fever, and after lying for nearly twelve months on a bed of sickness, which was supported with the most edifying cheerfulness and piety, he expired in the beginning of the year 1623. His memory was honored by the gratitude of the Venetian republic with a public funeral, which was distinguished by its magnificence, and the vast concourse of nobility and persons of all ranks attending it; and the senate, out of gratitude to his memory, erected a monument to him, the inscription upon which was written by John Anthony Venerio, a noble Venetian.

Father Paul was of middle stature: his head very large in proportion to his body, which was extremely lean. He had a wide forehead, in the middle of which was a very large vein. His eyebrows were well arched, his eyes large, black, and sprightly; his nose long and big, but very even; his beard but thin. His aspect, though grave, was extremely soft and inviting; and he had a fine hand. Cardinal Perron thought proper to deliver himself concerning our author in these terms: “I see nothing eminent in that man; he is a man of judgment and good-sense, but has no great learning. I observe his qualifications to be mere common ones, and little superior to an ordinary monk’s.” But the learned Morhoff (*Polyhistor*. p. 293 sq.) has justly remarked that “this judgment of Perron is absurd and malignant, and directly contrary to the clearest evidence; since those who are acquainted with the great things done by father Paul, and with the vast extent of his learning, will allow him to be superior, not only to monks, but cardinals, and even to Perron himself.” Courayer, his French translator, says, in his *Vie abregee de Fra Paolo*, prefixed to the *Hist. du Concile de Trent*, that, “in imitation of Erasmus, Cassander, Thuanus, and other great men, Paul was a Catholic in general, and sometimes a Protestant in particulars. He observed everything in the Roman religion which could be practiced without superstition, and in points which he scrupled took great care not to scandalize the weak. In short, he was equally averse to all extremes: if he

disapproved the abuses of the Romanists, he condemned also the too great heat of the Reformed; and used to say to those who urged him to declare himself in favor of the latter that God had not given him the spirit of Luther.” Courayer likewise observes that “Paul wished for a reformation of the papacy, and not the destruction of it; and was an enemy to the abuses and pretences of the popes, not their place.” Walton tells us that the contests between the court of Rome and the senate of Venice “were the occasion of father Paul’s knowledge and interest with king James, for whose sake principally he compiled that eminent history of the remarkable Council of Trent; which history was, as fast as it was written, sent in several sheets in letters by Sir Henry Wotton, Mr. Bedell, and others, unto king James and the then bishop of Canterbury, into England.” Wotton relates that James himself had a hand in it, for the benefit,” he adds, “of the Christian world” (*Reliquiae Wottonianae*, p. 486). This history of the Council of Trent was first published at London (1619, fol.), and dedicated to James I by Antony de Dpminis, archbishop of Spalatro. It had been written by Paul in Italian, and sent in manuscript to England by Sir Henry Wotton, so that the English was the first edition. The Italian edition was first brought out in 1629 at Genoa, and was afterwards translated into Latin, English, French, and other languages; and a new translation of it into French by Dr. Le Courayer, with notes critical, historical, and theological, was published at London in 1736 (2 vols. fol.). Burnet’s account of this work may serve to show the opinion which Protestants entertain of it. “The style and way of writing,” says he, “is so natural and masculine, the intrigues were so fully opened, with so many judicious reflections in all the parts of it, that it was read with great pleasure, and it was generally looked on as the rarest piece of history which the world ever saw. The author was soon guessed, and this raised the esteem of the work; for as he was accounted one of the wisest men in the world, so he had great opportunities to gather exact information. He had free access to all the archives of the republic of Venice, which has been looked upon for several ages as very exact, both in getting good intelligence, and in a most careful way of preserving it; so that among their records he must have found the despatches of the ambassadors and prelates of that republic who were at Trent; which being so near them, and the council being of such high consequence, it is not to be doubted but there were frequent and particular informations both of more public and secret transactions transmitted thither. He had also contracted a close friendship with Camillus Oliva, that was secretary to one of the legates, from whom he had many discoveries of

the practices of the legates, and of their correspondence with Rome; besides many other materials and notes of some prelates who were at Trent, which he had gathered together. His work came out within fifty years of the conclusion of the council, when several who had been present there were still alive, and the thing was so recent in men's memories that few thought a man of so great prudence as he was would have exposed his reputation by writing in such a nice manner things which he could not justify. Never was there a man more hated by the court of Rome than he was, and now he was at their mercy if he had abused the world by such falsehoods in matter of fact as have since been charged on his work; but none appeared against him for fifty years" (preface to a book entitled *The Policy of Rome, or the Sentiments of the Court and Cardinals there concerning Religion and the Gospel, as they are delivered by Cardinal Pallavicini in his History of the Council of Trent* (Lond. 1681, 8vo). Ranke says: "The memory of Paul Sarpi is justly held in high honor throughout all Roman Catholic states. He it was that fought for and won the fundamental principles to which we may refer the spiritual privileges which they all enjoy in common. The pope found it beyond his power to set him aside." Father Paul is also the author of *A Treatise of beneficiary Matters, or a History of Ecclesiastical Benefices and Revenues, in which are set forth their Rise and Progress, and the various Means by which they have accrued to the Church*, translated, with the notes of Amelot de Houssaie (Westminst. 1727, 8vo). A complete edition of father Paul's works in the original language was published at Verona and Naples in 1761, 1768, and 1790. See, besides the memoir appended to the different editions of father Paul's *History of the Council of Trent* and his collected works, Ranke, *Hist. of the Papacy*, 1:616 sq.; Brischar, *eurtheilung Sarpi's u. Pallavicini's* (Tub. 1843, 2 vols. 8vo); Werner, *Gesch. der apo'getischen u. polem. Literatur*, 4:386-579; and the references under PALLAVICINI *SEE PALLAVICINI* and *SEE TRENT* (*Council of*).

Paul Von Bernried.

SEE PAULUS VON BERNRIED.

Paul Of Burgos.

SEE PAULUS BURGENSIS.

Paul Of Constantinople,

a historian of note, was a native of Persia, and is said to have been a disciple of the heresiarch Nestorius. Nothing is known of his personal history except that he was a deacon of the Church of Constantinople, and one of the most ardent supporters of Nestorianism at the time of the outbreak of the controversy respecting it. He wrote a work, *De Judicio*, and apparently another work, *De vero Bono*. A fragment of the former is quoted in the proceedings of the Lateran Council, held under pope Martin I, A.D. 649 (Actio s. Secretarius V, apud *Concilia*, vol. 6, col. 320, ed. Labbe), and by the confessor St. Maximus, in his *Tomus Dogmaticus adversus Heraclii Ecthesin* (*Opera*, 2:91, ed. Combefis). An extract on the subject indicated by the title of the second work, and from which the existence of the work itself is inferred, is among the *Excerpta Miscellanea* extant in MS. in the Imperial Library at Vienna. It may be that the title is appropriate only to the extract, and this may have been taken from the work *De Judicio*. See Cave, *Hist. Litt.* ad ann. 436, 1:426.

Paul I

Patriarch OF CONSTANTINOPLE, was born in Thessalonica, and flourished in the early part of the 4th century. On the death of patriarch Alexander (A.D. 336), Paul, one of the presbyters of that Church, and comparatively a young man, was chosen to succeed him by the *Homoousian*, or orthodox party, while the Arians were anxious for the election of the deacon Macedonius, who sought to prevent the election of Paul by some charge of misconduct, which, however, he did not persist in. Both men appear to have been previously marked out for the succession by their respective partisans; and Alexander had, before his death, passed a judgment on their respective characters. The Homoousians had carried their point; but the election was annulled by a council summoned by the emperor, either Constantine the Great or his son Constantius II, and Paul, being ejected, was banished into Pontus (Athanas. *Histor. Arianor. ad Monachos*, c. 7), and Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, was appointed by the council in his place. On the death of Eusebius, who died A.D. 342, the orthodox populace of Constantinople restored Paul, who appears to have been previously released from banishment, or to have escaped to Rome, while the bishops of the Arian party elected Macedonius. The emperor, Constantius II, being absent, the contest led to many disturbances, in which a number of people were killed; and an attempt by Hermogenes, *magister*

militum, to quell the riot and expel Paul, led to the murder of that officer by the mob. The emperor immediately returned to Constantinople and expelled Paul, without, however, as yet confirming the election of Macedonius. Paul hastened back to Rome and sought the support of Julius I, bishop of that city, who, glad to exercise the superiority implied in this appeal to him, sent him back with a letter to the bishops of the Eastern churches, directing that he and some other expelled prelates should be restored to their respective sees, and bitterly accusing those who had deposed him. Paul regained possession of the Church of Constantinople, but the Eastern bishops, in a council at Antioch (A.D. 343), returned a spirited answer to the arrogant pretensions of Julius; and the emperor, who was also at Antioch, wrote to Philippus, *præfectus prætorio*, to expel Paul again. Philippus, to avoid a commotion, sent the prelate away privately; but when he attempted to establish Macedonius in possession of the Church, a riot occurred, in which above three thousand lives were lost. Paul was banished, according to Socrates, to Thessalonica, and then into the Western empire, being forbidden to return into the East. But the account of Socrates is disputed, and Tillemont's opinion is probably correct, that it was at this time that Paul was loaded with chains and exiled to Singara, in Mesopotamia, and afterwards to Emesa, in Syria, as mentioned by Athanasius (*l.c.*). If Tillemont is correct, the banishment into the Western empire may probably be referred to the former expulsion of Paul, when he appealed to pope Julius I, or possibly Paul may have been released from banishment and allowed to retire to Rome, which, according to Photius, he did three several times. The cause of Paul and of Athanasius, who was also in banishment, was still supported by the Western Church, and was taken up by the Western emperor Constans, brother of Constantius; and the Council of Sardica (A.D. 347) decreed their restoration. Constantius, however, refused to restore them until compelled by the threats of his brother; upon whose death, shortly after, Paul was again expelled by Constantius, and exiled to Cucusus, in Cappadocia, amid the defiles of the Taurus, where, it is said, he was privately strangled by his keepers (A.D. 351), and buried at Ancyra. It was reported that his keepers, before strangling him, attempted to starve him to death. Great obscurity hangs over his death; and it is not clear whether he died by violence or disease. But he was regarded by his party as a martyr; and when orthodoxy triumphed under the emperor Theodosius the Great, that prince brought his remains in great state to Constantinople, and deposited them in a church which was subsequently called by his name. See, besides Athanasius,

Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* 2:6, 7, 12, 13, 15, 16, 20, 22, 23, 26; v. 9; Sozomen, *Hist. Eccles.* 3:3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 20; 4:2; Theodoret, *Hist. Eccles.* 1:19; 2:5, 6; Photius, *Bibl. Cod.* p. 257; Tillemont, *Memoires*, 7:251, etc.; Neale, *Hist. of the East. Ch.* 2:35 sq.

Paul II Of Constantinople,

patriarch of Constantinople, flourished in the 7th century. When, on the accession of Constans II as sole emperor, and the banishment of his colleague Heracleonas, the patriarch Pyrrhus was deposed, Paul succeeded to the patriarchate of Constantinople, of the Church of which he had been a presbyter, and also ceconomus. He was consecrated patriarch in October, 642. He is charged with being a monothelite, and with having induced the emperor (A.D. 648) to issue an edict prohibiting a discussion of the question whether there were in Christ one will or operation, or two. On account of his heretical opinions, he was declared by the pope Theodore I, in a council held at Rome (A.D. 648), to be deposed; but as the pope had no power to enforce the sentence, though confirmed by the Lateran Council (A.D. 649), held under Theodore's successor in the papacy, Martin I, Paul retained his patriarchate till his own death (A.D. 652). He even retaliated the attempts of the popes by urging the emperor to depose Martin, and exile him to Chersona, where he died. Paul died not long after the banishment of Martin, and is said to have repented of the evil which he had brought upon his antagonist. There are extant of the writings of Paul: *Epistola Theodoro* (i.e. pope Theodore, the predecessor of Martin): — part of an *Epistola ad Theodorum* (i.e. Theodore of Pharan): — part of an *Epistola ad Jacobum* — all printed in the *Concilia (Concil. Lateran. secret. iv, Concil. Constantin. iii, act. x, vol. vi, ed. Labbe, col. 221, 837, 839, and vol. iii, ed. Hardouin, col. 815, 1246, 1247)*. See Anastatius Bibliothecarius, *Collectanea (Commensoratio eorum quae acta sunt in Martinum Papaam, etc.)*, apud Galland, *Biblioth. Patrum*, 13:47; id. *De Vitis Roman. Pontif. (Theodori et Martini)*, apud Muratori, *Rerum Italic. Scriptores*, vol. iii; Baronius, *Annales*, ad ann. 642, 1:648, i, etc.; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* ad ann. 642, 1:585; Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, vol. i, col. 229.

There were two other Pauls patriarchs of Constantinople, viz. PAUL III (A.D. 686-692) and PAUL IV (A.D. 780-784.).

Paul Of Cordova,

SEE PAULUS, ALVAREZ.

Paul De La Croix,

generally known as *Paul Francois de Danei*, founder of the Order of the Passionists (q.v.), was born Jan. 3, 1694, at Ovieda, Geneva. He was early consecrated to a life of piety, and while still a layman was entrusted by his bishop with teaching the catechism to children; and this incited Paul to the design of establishing an order for the conversion of souls. To this end he assumed a mendicant dress of black, to which he attached the emblems of Christ's passion, and with bare feet and head he retired in 1720 to a hermitage, where he prepared himself by, rigid mortifications to write the rules of the new society, with the aid of his younger brother, Jean Baptiste. He then repaired to Rome, where he was ordained priest by Benedict XIII, and returned to establish his order, of which he was elected general. He died Oct. 18, 1775, and was canonized in 1852. See *Abregi de la Vie de P. de la Croix* Tournay, 1857, 12mo).

Paul The Deacon

(*Paulus Diaconus*), called also by his patronymic WARNEFRIDUS, one of the most learned ecclesiastics of the Middle Ages, is noted especially as a historical writer and iconographer. He was born about 740, at the town of Friuli (Forum Julii). He became attached to the court of Rachis, king of the Lombards, and received a superior education at Pavia. About 763 he left the court, and was ordained deacon of the Church at Aquileia. He returned to the court on the invitation of Desiderius, successor of Rachis, by whom he was made chancellor. About the part of his life which followed the overthrow of the kingdom of Desiderius by Charlemagne in 774 we know nothing for certain; but the most probable account is that he retired to a monastery, and afterwards entered the celebrated monastery of Monte Casino, whence he addressed to Charlemagne in the year 781 an elegy, in which he implores the release of a brother who had been taken prisoner in the Lombard war. About this time Charlemagne appears to have attached him to his court. Paul was employed to instruct in Greek the clergymen who were to accompany the emperor's daughter Rotrude in her journey to Constantinople to wed the son of the empress Irene. Paul visited France, and stayed some time at Metz, of the early bishops of which city he wrote a history. He afterwards returned to Monte Casino, where he died about the

year 799. As a poet, Paul is spoken of in the most extravagant terms of praise by his contemporary Peter of Pisa. His poems, which are really good, consist chiefly of *hymens* and other short pieces in Latin. Of his hymns, the song in praise of John the Baptist is still in use in our day in the Roman Catholic Church. Paul's fame rests however chiefly on his merits as a historian. His works were: *Historial Miiscellanea*, a Roman history consisting of twenty-four books, of which the first eleven contain the history of Eutropius; the next five, by Paul himself, contain the period from the reign of Valentinian to that of Justinian; the remaining books are attributed to Landulphus Sagax. The best edition of this work is in Muratori's "Rerum Italicarum Scriptores." This Roman history is a work of no great value at present, for it is a mere compilation of works that have been preserved to us; but in the Middle Ages it was greatly used, as the many MSS., recensions, and continuations of it attest: — *De Gestis Longobardarum Libri Sex*, a history of the Lombards; his most valuable work. It is unfortunately incomplete; he lived to bring it down only to the death of Luitprand, in A.D. 744. There are several editions of this work. It is characterized by remarkable candor, and a style unusually pure for that age. The high repute in which this work was long held is attested by the great number of MSS. and continuations. This is also contained in Muratori's collection: — *Gesta Episcoporum Metensium*; this history of the bishops of Metz was undertaken at the request of Angilram, bishop of Metz. it was the first work of the kind south of the Alps, and became an example which was soon very generally followed: — *Vita S. Gregorii Magni* (later much interpolated): — *Excerpta* from Festus, "De Verborum Significatione." There are also extant a collection of homilies and two sermons which are attributed to him. The *Homiliarium* was collected from the best sources at emperor Charlemagne's request, and was introduced into the whole Frankish Church. It was printed several times between the years 1482 and 1569, and translated into German and Spanish. See Wattenbach and Bethmann, *Paulus Diaconus Leben u. Schriften*, in the "Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde," vol. x (1851); Potthast, *Bibl. Med. AEv.* p. 484 sq., where the bibliography regarding Paulus is almost complete; Piper, *Monumental-Theologie*, p. 828 sq.; Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* vol. ii.

Paul Of Emesa,

an Eastern prelate of note, who flourished in the first half of the 5th century, was among the bishops who, at the General Council of Ephesus

(A.D. 431), united with patriarch John of Antioch in supporting the cause of Nestorius. When negotiations were in progress for a reconciliation between John and the Oriental bishops with Cyril of Alexandria, Paul was sent by John to Cyril, but the latter would by no means comply with the solicitations of John until his messenger Paul had delivered some homilies before him, and presented to him a confession of faith, in which the term **θεοτόκος** was applied to the Virgin Mary, and had joined in anathematizing Nestorius. Having satisfied Cyril in these points, Paul concluded the negotiations successfully. The few facts known of the life of Paul are given by Tillemont, *Memoires*, vol. 14, and by Christianus Lupus, in his *Scholia et Note ad varior. PP. Epistolas*, forming the second volume of the work cited below. Paul wrote, *Libellus quem (s. Libelli quos) Paulus Episcopus Emesenus Cyrillo Archiepiscopo Alexandrice obtulit, a Joanne Antiocheno Episcopo missus: — Homilia Pauli Episcopi Emesseni . . . de Nativitate Domini et Salvatoris nostri Jesu Christi, et quod beata Virgo Maria sit Dei Genitrix, et quod non duos, sed unum Filium et Dominum Christum dicamus, etc.: — Ejusdem Pauli Homilia . . . in Christi Domini et Salvatoris nostri Nativitatem*. These pieces are given in the *Concilia*, vol. iii, col. 1090, 1095, 1098, ed. Labbe: — *Epistola Pauli Emeseni Episcopi ad Anatholium Magistrum Militie*, given in a Latin version in the *Ad Ephesinum Concilium variorum Patrum Epistoloe* of Christianus Lupus (Louvain, 1682, 4to), Ep. 107.

This Paul of Emesa is to be distinguished from a predecessor of the same name, who was present at the Council of Seleuceia (A.D. 359), and adhered to the party of Acacius (Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, vol. ii, col. 839, but he does not give his authority); but who seems afterwards, under the emperor Jovian, to have united himself with the orthodox (Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* 3:25; 4:12; Sozomen, *Hist. Eccles.* 6:4, 12), and to have acted with them possibly at the Synod of Antioch (A.D. 363), certainly at that of Syana (A.D. 367 or 368). Gennadius (*De Viris Illustribus*, c. 31) mentions “Paulus Episcopus,” he does not say of what see, as having written a little book on repentance (*De Punitentia Libellus*), in which he cautions the penitent against such an excess of sorrow as might lead to despair. We have no means of identifying this Paul. The period occupied by the writers enumerated by Geuuadius includes that in which Paul of Emesa flourished; and as he was the most eminent prelate of the time of his name, he may possibly be the writer named by Gennadius.

Paul (St.) The Hermit.

SEE ANTHONY, ST.

Paul Of Pannonia

lived probably in the 5th century; according to Trithemius and Cave, in A.D. 430. Gennadius calls him *Paulus Presbyter*, and states that he knew from his own testimony (*ex dictis ejus*) that he was a Pannonian, but does not say to what Church he belonged. Paul wrote *De Virginitate servinda et contemptu Mundi ac Vitae Institutione Libri duo*, addressed to a holy virgin, Constantia. He took the opportunity of abusing “the heretic Jovinian,” the great opponent of monasticism, as a luxurious glutton. The work is lost. In some MSS. of Gennadius, and by Honorius of Autun (*De Scriptor. Eccles.* 2:74), he is called, not Paulus, but Petrus. See Cave, *Hist. Litt.* 1:414; Trithemius, *De Scriptor. Eccles.* c. 146; Fabricius, *Biblioth. Med. et Infim. Latinitat.* v. 217, ed. Mansi.

Paul The Presbyter.

SEE PAUL OF PANNONIA.

Paul Of Samosata,

a noted Eastern ecclesiastic of the 3d century, was a native of Samosata, and must have been born shortly after the opening of the century. Very little is accessible as to his early personal history. He was elevated to the bishopric of Antioch in A.D. 260. His original calling seems to have been that of a sophist; how he obtained admittance into the clerical order is unknown; his elevation, or at least his continuance in the see, he owed to the celebrated Zenobia, to whom his literary attainments and his political talents may be supposed to have recommended him. The charge that his personal character was not all that could be desired for the episcopal office seems groundless, when we consider the silence of the ecclesiastical writers of that period, who, if they had had the opportunity, would have gladly laid hold of anything to his disadvantage; and we should rather think that his character must have been remarkably pure and worthy to have led to his being raised from an originally obscure condition to the highest dignity in the Church. After his elevation he was apparently less scrupulous and humble, and it may be reasonably inferred from what his enemies say of him — and they are the only ones who have written about Paul of

Samosata — that he manifested in the episcopal office great rapacity, arrogance, and vanity. The encyclical letter issued by the council which deposed him (see below) was published at the time of his condemnation (A.D. 269), and if the charges had been capable of refutation or denial, Paul would not have suffered them to go unanswered. He obtained, while holding his bishopric, the secular office of *procurator decenarius* (so called from the holder of it receiving a yearly salary of two hundred sesteria), and is said to have loved the pomp and state of his secular calling better than the humbler and more staid deportment which became his ecclesiastical office; and it was probably by the exercise, perhaps the abuse of his procuratorship, that he amassed the immense wealth which, contrasted with his original poverty, so scandalized his opponents. He was led also by his habits of secular grandeur, and the pride they inspired, to introduce into the Church a greater degree of pomp than had as yet been allowed, erecting for himself an episcopal tribunal (βῆμα) and a lofty seat (θρόνον ὑψηλόν), and having this seat placed in a recess screened from public observation, in imitation of the higher judges and magistrates (see Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* 7:30). When abroad he assumed all the airs of greatness, being attended by a numerous retinue, and affecting to read letters and to dictate as he went, in order to inspire the spectators with an idea of the extent and pressing character of his engagements. The decencies of public worship he also violated. He encouraged his admirers of both sexes to manifest their approval by waving their handkerchiefs and rising up and shouting, as in the theatres, and rebuked and insulted those whom a sense of propriety restrained from joining in these applauses. His style of preaching tended to aggravate the disaffection which his general deportment inspired. He was equally unsparing in his strictures on those former teachers of the Church whose memory was held in reverence, and in his praises of himself, “after the manner rather of a rhetorician or a mountebank than of a bishop” (Eusebius). He allowed and excited women to sing his praises publicly in the church, amid the solemnities of Easter, and encouraged his flatterers among the neighboring bishops to praise him in their discourses to the people, and extol him “as an angel from heaven.” To these charges of open and ascertainable character, his accusers add others of more secret and therefore of more dubious nature, resting in fact on mere suspicion. But it is very probable that these offensive traits would have excited less animadversion had they not been connected with heretical theological opinions. Indeed, his accusers admit that, “though all groaned and lamented his wickedness in secret,” they feared his power too much to

provoke him by attempting to accuse him; but the horror excited by his heresy inspired a courage which indignation at his immorality had failed to excite; and they declare that, when he set himself in opposition to God, they were compelled to depose him and elect another bishop in his place (Eusebius). Mosheim, who is inclined to take the most favorable view of Paul's failings, says:

“That Paul was publicly lauded by women, and by neighboring bishops and presbyters, I can believe without much difficulty; but that he was so infatuated and so greedy of praise as boldly to urge forward these proclaimers of his virtues, I cannot believe so easily. I suspect that Paul, after the controversy arising from his novel opinions had become warm, and the people had become divided into factions and parties, persuaded some bishops and presbyters to defend and support his cause in public discourses; and, through his satellites, he encouraged some women, on Easter-day, when the people were all assembled, suddenly to shout forth his praise, in order to conciliate popular favor to him, and to check the rising storm of opposition. He allowed his presbyters and deacons, among other wrong things, to keep the so-called *sub-introduced* (συνεισάκτας, *subintroductas*) women: and he himself kept *two* young women, and carried them with him when he traveled. This was not contrary to the custom of the priests of that age, of which I have spoken elsewhere. But the bishops do not accuse Paul of any illicit intercourse with these women; whence it appears that, though a luxurious liver, he was not altogether regardless of the laws of chastity and decorum.

“Respecting the impiety of Paul of Samosata, scarcely any writer since the 3d century, who has treated of the trinity of persons in God, and of Christ, either formally or incidentally, is silent; and the writers on heresies, one and all, place him among the worst corrupters of revealed truth, and vehemently inveigh against him: so Epiphanius, Theodoret, Augustine, Damascenus, and the rest. Moreover, some of the public documents of the proceedings against him have reached us, a circumstance which has not occurred in regard to most of the other heretics. For there is extant (1) a great part of the epistle of the bishops by whose decision he was condemned in the council at Antioch, addressed to all the bishops of Christendom, to make it manifest that they had good

reasons for what they had done (in Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 1. vii, c. 30, p. 279, etc.). But it is to be regretted that Eusebius has preserved only that part of the epistle which recounts the vices and delinquencies of the man, omitting the part which stated his doctrines or errors. If the latter had been preserved, we could more confidently and more definitely determine what were his principles. There is extant (2) a copy of one of the epistles of the bishops of the council, addressed to Paul, relating to the controversy with him (in the *Bibliotheca Patrum Parisiensis* [ed. Paris], 1644, fol., 11:302). In this epistle, six of the bishops state their own opinions respecting God and Christ, and inquire of him whether he disagrees with them. There is extant (3) an epistle of Dionysius of Alexandria to Paul of Samosata, in which the writer chides and confutes him (in the same *Bibliotheca Patrum*, 11:273). Though it is true that some, and for reasons worthy of consideration, deny that this epistle was written by Dionysius (q.v.), it is as unquestionably true that the epistle is very ancient. It was probably addressed to Paul by some bishop or presbyter, whose name being omitted in the early copy, some person, recollecting that Dionysius was an opposer of Paul, ascribed the epistle to him. There are extant (4) ten questions of Paul of Samosata, addressed to Dionysius of Alexandria, and the answers of the latter to these questions (in the same *Bibliotheca Patrum*, 11:278). But this unequalled abundance of documents relative to Paul's heresy has not prevented a great diversity in opinion, both among the ancients and the moderns, respecting his real sentiments. For the ancients speak, sometimes obscurely, sometimes inconsistently, and sometimes they mistake, either from passion or prejudice; and hence the moderns differ widely, some criminating and some vindicating the man. We collect together all that can be learned respecting Paul's sentiments from these ancient documents, and compare with these statements whatever has reached us from other ancient sources.

“I. The bishops by whom Paul was condemned, in their epistle, preserved by Eusebius say: First, That *he denied his God and Lord: τὸν θεὸν ἑαυτοῦ καὶ Κύριο ἄρνούμενου* (p. 280). Secondly, That before the bishops, assembled in council, he would not acknowledge that the Son of God descended from heaven: *τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ καταλελυθέναι*. Thirdly, That he distinctly said *Jesus*

Christ originated on earth: λέγει Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν κάτωθεν.

Fourthly, That he went over to the abominable heresy of Artemas. What the heresy of Artemas was, with which they tax Paul, is a question of doubt and uncertainty. I shall therefore pass by this charge, and consider only the others; in which, doubtless, the chief error of Paul was included, and that error which was the cause of so much odium against him. From these charges it is evident that he would not acknowledge *Jesus Christ* to be *both God and man*; or he denied that *Jesus Christ* was a person — if I may so say — *compounded* of God and man. For when he said *the Son of God did not descend from heaven, but originated on the earth*, what could he mean but that *Christ* was a *mere man*, though divinely begotten of the *Virgin Mary*? And what could the bishops *mean*, when they taxed him with *denying his God and Lord*, but that he divested *Christ* of his *divinity*, or denied that a *divine person* received the *man Christ* into union with himself? From the same charges it also appears that he called the *man Christ* the *Son of God*; and this, undoubtedly, because he was supernaturally produced from the *Virgin Mary*. For he denied that the *Son of God descended from heaven*; and as this, most certainly, must be understood as referring to *Christ*, it is manifest that he applied the title *Son of God* to the *man Christ*. This alone is a sufficient refutation of the error of those who believe what *Marius Mercator* asserts (*De Anathematismis Nestorii*, in his *Opp.* 2:128), that *Paul of Samosata represented Christ as being a man, born like other men of two parents*. Yet we have a better witness for confuting this error in *Paul* himself, who distinctly says (*Questio V* in the *Biblioth. Patr.* 11:286), Ἰησοῦς ὁ γεννηθεὶς ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου. — That the bishops, whose charges we are considering, did him no injustice, he himself makes manifest. For all his *ten questions* now extant, whether addressed to *Diounsus* or to another person, have one sole aim, namely, to evince, by means of various texts of *Scripture* brought together, that *Christ* was a *mere man*, and destitute of any *divinity*; or, what amounts to the same thing, to confute the belief that the *divine* and *human* natures united in *Christ* produced *one person*. It is therefore not necessary to produce the testimony of others among the ancients to the same point. Yet I will add that of *Simeon Betharsamensis*, a celebrated *Persian*, near the beginning of the 6th century, whose testimony I regard as of more value than that of all the *Greek* and *Latin* fathers. In his epistle on the heresy of the *Nestorians*

(in Jos. Sim. Assemlani's *Bibliotheca Oriental.* 1:347) he says: Paulus Samosatenus de *beata* Maria haec dicebat: “*udum hominem genuit Maria, nec post partum virgo permansit. Christum autem appellavit creatum, factum, mortalem et filium (Dei) ex gratia.*” De se ipso vero dicebat: “Ego quoque si voluero, Christus ero, quum *ego et Christus unius, ejusdemque simnis nature.*” These statements accord perfectly with the allegations of the bishops, and with the character of Paul, who was rash and extravagant. Epiphanius also (*Hoeres.* 65:617) says of him that *he gave himself the appellation of Christ*; a declaration which is elucidated by the quotation from the Persian Simeon.

“II. The six bishops of the Council of Antioch, in their letter to Paul before sentence was pronounced upon him, while they state their own doctrine respecting God and Christ, condemn some errors of their adversary. In the first place, they say it could not be endured that he should inculcate *υἷὸν τοῦ θεοῦ θεὸν μὴ εἶναι πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου*, and *δύο θεοὺς καταγγέλλεσθαι, ἔὰν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ θεὸς κηρύσσεται* (*Biblioth. Patr.* 11:303). The bishops speak less definitely than could be wished; in consequence, perhaps, of the studied obscurity of Paul, who did not wish his real sentiments to be distinctly known. Yet it is not difficult to see whither tend the sentiments they attribute to him. First, he acknowledged *that there is something in God, which the Scriptures call the Son of God*. He therefore supposed that there are *two Sons of God* — *the one by grace*, the man Christ; the other *by nature*, who existed long before the other Son. Secondly, *He denied that the latter Son of God was God anterior to the creation of the world*. Thirdly, Consequently he held *that this Son of God became God at the time the world was created*. These statements appear confused, and very different from the common apprehensions; but they will admit of elucidation. Paul meant to say that the *energy* — or, if any prefer it, the *Divine energy* which he denominated the *Son of God*, was hidden in God, before the creation of the world; but that, in a sense, it issued out from God, and began to have some existence exterior to God, at the time God formed the created universe. Fourthly, Hence he inferred that (p. 710) *those profess two Gods* (or speak of *two* as in the place of the *one God*) *who proclaim the Son of God to be God*; but undoubtedly, considering what precedes, the limitation should be added, *before the creation of the world*. His belief was that *they divide the one God into two Gods*, who make the Son of God to have existed

as a *person*, distinct from the Father, before the foundation of the world. He did not deny, as we have seen, that the Son of God was, in some sense, made God at the time the world was created. From all this we learn that Paul denied the *eternal generation* of the Son of God, and also his personal *distinctness* from the Father; and he supposed that when God was about to create the world he sent out from himself a certain *energy*, which is called the *Son of God*, and also *God*, although it is nothing distinct from God. These ideas may be further illustrated by the subsequent charge of the bishops; in which they not obscurely tax Paul with representing God the Father as creating the world by the *Word* (ὡς δὲ ὀργάνου καὶ ἐπιστήμης ἀνυποστάτου) *as by an instrument, and by intelligence, having no separate existence or personality*. For it hence appears that by the *Son or Word of God*, he understood the divine *wisdom* (ἐπιστήμην); which, before the world was created, had been at rest in God, and hidden during numberless ages: but now, when the supreme God formed the purpose of creating the world, it exhibited its powers, and, as it were, came out from the bosom of the Father; or, in other words, it manifested its presence by discriminating, acting, and operating. From that time onward it is called, though figuratively, the *Son of God*, because it proceeded forth from God, just as a son does from his parents; and also *God*, because it is essentially God, and can be conceived of as separate from him only by an abstraction of the mind. In perfect accordance with these views are the statements of other ancient writers. Thus Epiphanius (*inceres.* 65:608) states the sentiments of Paul: *God the Father, Son, and Spirit are one God. The Word and Spirit are ever in God, as reason is in man; the Son of God has no separate existence, but he exists in God....* νῖος ἐν τῷ πατρὶ, ὡς λόγος ἐν ἀνθρώρῳ. *The Son is in the Father, as reason (not speech, sermo, as Petavits rendered it; but ἐπιστήμη, as the bishops term it) is in man.* Epiphanius, who as an author as not distinguished for his accuracy and research, has not stated all that Paul held, but what he has stated is very well. I omit similar citations from Athanasius and others, that the discussion may not be too prolix.

“**III.** Dionysius, or whoever wrote the epistle bearing his name (in the *Biblioth. Patr.* 11:273, 274), says that Paul taught: δύο (esse) ὑποστάσεις καὶ δύο πρόσωπα τοῦ ἑνὸς ἡμῶν Χριστοῦ, καὶ δύο Χριστοὺς, καὶ δύο υἱοὺς, ἓνα φύσει τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ προϋπάρχοντα, καὶ ἓνα κατ’ ὁμονυμίαν Χριστὸν καὶ υἱὸν τοῦ

Δαβίδ. Whether Paul so expressed himself, or whether Dionysius so inferred from the language of Paul, there is nothing here disagreeing with the opinions of Paul. For since he declared Christ to be a mere man, born of Mary; and denied that the Wisdom of God, combined with the man Christ, constituted one person; and yet asserted that the eternal Son of God, by whom the world was created, dwelt in the man Christ; and as he also called the man Christ the Son of God, and applied the same appellation, Son of God, to that power of the divine Wisdom which projected the world — it must necessarily be that, in some sense, he recognized *two* distinct and separate things in Christ, *two forms, two Sons, two Christs*. Here it should be noticed that the word **ὑπόστασις**, in the language of Dionysius, is not to be understood in *our* sense of the term, but in a broader acceptation. From the questions of Paul (*Quast.* vii, p. 280) it appears that he used the word **ὑπόστασις** in a broad sense, as applicable to anything that is or exists, whether it subsists by itself or only in something else. The eternal Son of God, which Paul acknowledged to exist in Christ, he could not have regarded as truly an **ὑπόστασις** or person. For, if he had so regarded it, he would have admitted the very thing which he denied, namely, that the Son of God is a *person* distinct from the person of the Father. In this same epistle (p. 274) Dionysius blames Paul for saying, **ἄνευ τῆς ἀσκητικῆς καὶ ἐπιπόνου δικαιοσύνης**. He therefore admitted that God, in the sense before explained, i.e. as being the *Wisdom of God*, dwelt in Christ. But he added that God dwelt in Christ, *sine laborios ajustitioe exercitacione*. This well explains the views of Paul, and in part confirms my former remarks. For Paul's meaning is that *Christ*, while obeying the commands of the law, and suffering its penalties, acted and suffered *alone*; nor did *God*, as present with him, either act or suffer along with the man Christ. Hence it appears that Paul rejected altogether the *union* of the divine and human natures in Christ. In this manner Dionysius correctly understood him, as appears from the confutation he subjoined, in which he endeavors to show, by many proofs, that God was *born* in Christ, and *suffered* the penalties, and *died*. More passages of a similar character might be drawn from this epistle; but they are not needed.

“**IV.** In the *ten questions* proposed by Paul to Dionysius, the sole aim of Paul is to prove that the *man* born of Mary had no *community of nature* or of *action* with *God* dwelling in him. Hence he brings forward

the texts in which the soul of Christ is said to be *troubled* and *sorrowful* (^{<6127>}John 12:27; ^{<4138>}Matthew 26:28). He then asks: Can the nature of *God* be sorrowful and troubled? (p. 712). He also lays before his antagonist the words of Christ to the Jews, *Destroy this temple*, etc. (^{<6119>}John 1:19), and then demands, Can *God* be dissolved? This objection, so easy of solution, Dionysius answers miserably, by resorting to a mystical interpretation. For he would have Paul believe that by the *temple* which Christ represents as to be *dissolved* must be understood the *disciples* of Christ; because these the Jews actually *dissolved*, that is, dispersed and scattered. Some of the other answers are no better. In Question V (p. 286) Paul says: Luke tells us (ch. 2:40) that Christ *grew*. But can *God* grow? If, therefore, *Christ* grew, he was nothing but a *man*. With this argument the good Dionysius is greatly puzzled. But at length he finds his way out, and says: ‘The *boy* who, as Luke tells us, *grew and waxed strong*, is the *Church*, so that **Ἀύξησις τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἐστὶ**, *the growth of God, relates to the Church*: for it is recorded in the Acts that the Church increased daily and was enlarged, and that the Word of God increased every day.’ How ingenious and beautiful! If all the bishops who opposed Paul were like this Dionysius for acuteness and genius, I do not wonder they could not refute him. And lest this fine response should lose its force and beauty, Dionysius closes it with exquisite taunts.

“But I will desist. Paul, undoubtedly, had wrong views, and views very different from those which the Scriptures inculcate. But his adversaries also appear to have embraced more than one error, and they had not sufficiently precise and clear ideas on the subject they discussed. These statements, derived from the best and most credible documents on the subject, if carefully examined and compared together, will give us easy access to the real sentiments of Paul of Samosata. The system he embraced, so far as it can be ascertained at the present day, is contained in the following propositions:

- 1.** God is a perfectly *simple unit*, in whom there is no division into parts whatever!
- 2.** Therefore, all that common Christians teach respecting different *persons* in God, an eternal Son of God, and his generation from eternity, is false, and should be corrected by the Holy Scriptures.

3. The Scriptures speak indeed of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. But those texts must be so understood as not to militate with the clearest and most certain doctrine of both reason and Scripture respecting the *unity* of the divine nature.

4. The Son of God mentioned in the Scriptures is merely the *Reason* (λόγος) and *Wisdom* (ἐπιστήμη) of God. Those who have translated the Greek writers concerning Paul into Latin (De Valois, Petavius, and others) commonly render the Greek word λόγος by the Latin word *Verbum*. This is wrong. From the epistle of the bishops at Antioch to Paul, it is clear that *he* understood by λόγος the divine *Wisdom*. Hence this Greek word is equivalent to the Latin word *ratio*. Marius Mercator, whom many follow (*De Anathematisno L'estoriano*, in his *Opp.* 2:128, ed. Garnerii), erroneously says: ‘Verbum Dei Patris, non substantivum, sed prolativum, vel imperativum, sensit Samosatenus.’ But Paul did not recognize the word προφορικόν (*prolativum*); and by the word λόγος he intended the *Wisdom* or the *Reason* of God, as is manifest from Epiphanius (p. 713), who, it must be confessed, is not always sufficiently accurate (*uceres.* 65:609): Λόγον νομίζουσι σοφίαν, οιον ἐν ψυχῇ ἀνθρώπου ἕκαστος ἔχει λόγον.

5. This *Reason* of God was at rest in him from eternity, and did not project or attempt anything exterior to God. But when God determined to create the visible universe, this *Reason* in a sense *proceeded* out from God, and acted exteriorly to God. On this account, in the Scriptures, it is metaphorically called the *Son of God*.

6. The *Spirit* is that *power* which God possesses of producing and animating all things at his pleasure. It first received the name of *Spirit* when it manifested itself in the creation of the world; and it is so called because it may be compared to the *wind* or the *breath*, which produces motions in the air. When it excites pious emotions in the souls of men, it is called the *Holy Spirit*.

7. Therefore, until God entered on the creation of the world, and operated externally, there was neither any Son of God nor any Holy Spirit. Yet both may, in a certain sense, be pronounced *eternal*, because they eternally existed in God.

8. When God would make known to men a way of salvation superior to that of Moses, he, by means of that eternal *power* of his, which gives life, and motion to all things, and which is called the *Holy Spirit*, begat, of the Jewish Virgin Mary, that very holy and most perfect man *Jesus*: and this *man*, because he was begotten by the power of God, without any intervening agency, is also called the *Son of God*; just as a house receives the name of its builder (see Dionysius, *Epistle to Paul*, ut sup. up. 274).

9. This extraordinary *man*, though he was more holy and more noble than any other mortal, yet lived and acted in the way and manner of other men, and was subject to all the wants and frailties which are incident to our nature. All the things which he either did or suffered prove clearly that he was a *mere man*.

10. But to enable him to perform the functions of a *divine ambassador*. without failure (for, as a man, he was liable to errors and defects), that same divine *Reason*, which proceeded forth, as it were, from God at the time the world was created, joined itself to his soul, and banished from it all ignorance on religious subjects and all liability to failure. At what *time*, in the opinion of Paul, the divine Reason or Wisdom became associated with the soul of Christ, I do not find stated. I can suppose that the advent of the Reason or Word of God to be made Christ was delayed till the commencement of his public functions; because, previously, the man-Christ did not need the aid of this eternal Wisdom.

11. This presence of the divine Wisdom (which is nothing different from God himself) in the man Christ, makes it proper that this man should be, and he is, called *God*. Athanasius (*De Synodis*, in *Opp.* 2:739): Οἱ ἀπὸ Παύλου τοῦ Σαμωσατέως λέγονται, Χριστὸν ὕστερον (p. 714) μετὰ τὴν ἐνανθρώπησιν ἐκ προκοπῆς τοθεοποιῆσθαι, τῷ τὴν φύσιν ψιλὸν ἄνθρωπον γεγόνενα. 1

12. It will be no mistake, then, if we say there are *two* Sons of God, and that there were in Christ two. ὑποστάσεις, or two distinct separately existing things, two *forms* or πρόσωπα.

13. But we must be careful not to commingle and confound the acts of these two Sons of God. Each acts alone, and without the other. The *divine Reason*, with no co-operation of the man, speaks by

Christ, instructs, discourses, sways the minds of the auditors, and performs the miracles. On the other hand, the *man*, with no cooperation of the divine Reason dwelling in him, is begotten, is hungry, sleeps, walks, suffers pain, and dies.

14. At length, when the man Christ had fulfilled his mission, the divine *Reason* left the *man*, and returned to God. Epiphanius (*Haeres.* lxxv, § 1, p. 608): **Φησὶ Παύλος Ἐλθὼν ὁ λόγος ἐνήργησε μόνος, καὶ ἀνήλθε πρὸς τὸν πατέρα.** This passage is miserably translated by Dion. Petavius as are many other passages in Epiphanius) thus: ‘Sed solum, inquit Paulus, adveniens verbum, totum illud administravit, et ad patrem revertit.’ The true meaning of the passage is: *The divine Reason came* (to the man Christ, long after his birth, and when in mature life), *and solely* (without any community of action with the human nature) *operated in him, and afterwards returned to God*” (Mosheim, *History of Christianity in the First Three Centuries*, 2:228 sq.).

The writers on the history of doctrines vary in their opinions respecting the relation in which Paul of Samosata stands, whether to Sabellianism or to the Unitarianism of the Artemonites (see Euseb. v. 28, ab init.); comp. Schleiermacher, p. 389 sq.; Baumgarten-Crusius, 1:204; Augusti, p. 59; Meier, *Dogmengesch.* p. 74, 70; Dorner, p. 510). The difference between Sabellius and Paul may be said to have consisted in this, that the former thought that the whole substance of the divine Being, the latter that only one single divine power had manifested itself in Christ. Trechsel (*Geschichte des Antitrinitarismus*, 1:81) agrees with this, calling Samosatianism “the correlate of Sabellianism, according to the measures of the mere understanding.” The divine here comes only into an external contact with man, touches human nature only on the surface; while, on the other hand, the human element comes to its rights more than in the system of Sabellius. Dionysius of Alexandria, as we have seen, was the first to write against Paul, and afterwards assembled some councils against him at Antioch, about 264. In the last of these councils, which appears to have met in the year 269, one Malchion, a rhetorician, an acute and eloquent man, so skillfully drew Paul out of the subterfuges in which he had before lurked that his error became manifest to all. As he would not renounce his error, he was divested of the episcopal office, and excluded from the communion by common suffrage. This decision Paul resisted; and relying perhaps on the patronage of queen Zenobia, and on the favor of the people,

he refused to give up the house in which the bishop resided, and in which the Church was accustomed to assemble. But when Zenobia was conquered by the emperor Aurelian, in the year 272, and the contest was taken before the emperor, the case was referred for arbitrament to the Romish and Italian bishops, who decided against Paul. It is probable that Paul, notwithstanding his deposition, continued to preach and to propagate his opinions. Nothing subsequent, however, is known of him. His followers, and he had many, formed themselves into a sect, and flourished under the name of *Paulians* (q.v.), or *Paulianists*, for some time after.

Paul does not seem to have written much. The ten questions and propositions extant under his name, and addressed, according to the existing title, to Dionysius of Alexandria, have been noticed. A Greek MS. work, ascribed by some to John of Damascus, contains a fragment of a work by Paul, entitled *Οἱ πρὸς Σαβειανὸν λόγοι* (*Ad Sabianum Libri*), and some fragments of this are cited in the *Concilia* (3:388, ed. Labbe). Vincentius Lirinensis, in his *Conmonitorium*, states that the writings of Paul abounded in quotations from the Scriptures both of the O.T. and the N.T. To introduce his Christology into the mind of the people, he undertook to alter the Church hymns, but was shrewd enough to accommodate himself to the orthodox formulas, calling Christ, for example, “God of the Virgin” (*θεὸς ἐκ παρθένου*), and ascribing to him even homoousia with the Father, but of course in his own sense. See, besides the authorities already referred to, Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* 7:27-30; Mansi, *Coll. Conc.* 1:1033 sq., especially *Epistol. Episcopar. ad Paul.* v. 393; Epiphanius, *Hist. Eccles.* 65, 1; Maji, *Nov. Collect.* 7:1, p. 68, 299 sq.; Fragments in Leont. Byz. *Contr. Nestor. et Eutyech.* iii; Ehrlich, *Dissertatio de Errorib. Pauli Samos.* (Leips. 1745, 4to), p. 23; Fuerlin, *De Hceres. Pauli Samos.* (Gotting. 1741, 4to); Schwab, *De Pauli Samos. vita atq. Doctr.* (Herbip. 1839); Cave, *Hist. Litter.* ad ann. 260, 1:135; Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, 1:705; Tillemont, *Memoires*, 4:289 sq.; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 2:269 sq.; id. *Diogenus*, 1:169, 206; Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* 1:289 sq.; Pressense, *The Early Years of Christianity (Heresy and Christian Doctrine)*, p. 131 sq.; Baur, *Dreieinigkeitslehre*, 1:293-335; Haugenbach, *History of Doctrines*, vol. i; and his *Erste drei Jahrh.* etc., vol. 16; Hefele, *Conciliengesch.* 1:109 sq., 225, 411, 507; Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* 3:149 sq.

Paul The Silentary,

a Christian poet of the 5th century, was of a noble family, the son of Cyrus and grandson of Florus, and possessed of great wealth. He held in the palace of Justinian the office of chief of the Silentarii, a class of persons who had the care of the emperor's palace. When the church of St. Sophia at Constantinople was rebuilt by Justinian in 562, Paul wrote a description (or ἔκφρασις) of the edifice, in 1026 Greek hexameters, with a proemium consisting of 134 iambic verses. It is evident from this poem that he was a Christian. The work was edited, with notes and a Latin translation, by Ducange (Paris, 1670); the text, edited by Becker, is contained in the Bonn edition of the "Byzantine Historians" (1837), with a second part, consisting of 275 hexameters and a procemium of 29 iambs, not included in the edition of Ducange. Paul was also the author of a poem entitled Εἰς τὰ ἐν Πυθίοις θέρμα, and of several epigrams, which are included in the Greek Anthology. See Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Graeca* (ed. Harles), 4:487; 7:581; Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Romans Biog. and Mythol.* 3:151 (18); Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* vol. ii, s.v.

Paul The Simple

(*Paulus Simplex*), so called on account of the childlike simplicity of his character, was a disciple of St. Anthony, who flourished in the 4th century. His native country appears to have been Egypt, but the place of his residence is not described. He was a poor countryman, who, till the age of sixty, had served God in the married state. His retirement into the desert was occasioned by his surprising his wife, who was exceedingly beautiful, and must have been much younger than himself, in the act of adultery with a paramour, with whom she appears to have long carried on a criminal intercourse. Abandoning to the care of the adulterer, not only his guilty wife, but also his innocent children, according to Palladius and Socrates, he took his departure, after having, "with a placid smile," said to the adulterer, "Well, well; truly it matters not to me. By Jesus! I will not take her again. Go; you have her, and her children; for I am going away, and shall become a monk." The incident affords a curious illustration of the apathy which was cherished as a prime monastic virtue, and offers an instance of what was probably in that day still rarer, monastic swearing. A journey of eight days brought him to the cell of St. Anthony, then in the zenith of his reputation. "What do you want?" said the saint. "To be made a monk," was Paul's answer. "Monks are not made of old men of sixty," was the

caustic rejoinder. The fervor of the candidate induced him to remain three days without food at the door of the hermit; and Anthony, won by his importunity and earnestness, at length admitted him as a disciple. After a long and rigorous practice of obedience, he was placed in a cell at three miles' distance from Anthony's, who came to regard Paul as the holiest among his followers. Paul is reputed to have possessed the gift of miracles in a far more eminent degree than his great master; and to him, it is said, St. Anthony was in the habit of sending such sick or possessed persons as he himself was unable to cure. The date of Paul's retirement and the time of his death are not known; but an anecdote recorded in the *Eccles. Graec. Monumenta* of Cotelerius (1:351) shows that he was living at the accession of the emperor Constantius II, A.D. 337. See Palladius, *Hist. Lausiaca*. c. 28, in the *Biblioth. Patrum* (Paris, 1654, fol.), 13:941; Sozomen, *Hist. Eccles.* 1:13; Tillemont, *Memoires*, 6:144; Neale, *Hist. of the Holy East. Church (Patriarchate of Alexandria)*, 1:152; Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* 3:151.

Paul Of Thebes,

a saint of the early Christian Church, whose personal history is enshrouded in mystery by legends and traditions, was born, according to Jerome, in the second half of the 3d century. He early lost his rich Christian parents, and during the Dacian persecutions fled into the Theban wilderness, where he lived for ninety-seven years in communion with his God, to be seen only by man in his dying hours, when the anchorite Antonius found him.

Paul Veronese.

SEE PAOLO VERONESE.

Paul I

pope of Rome, was a native of the city of Rome, a brother of pope Stephen III (q.v.), whom he succeeded, and by whom he was employed in important political missions. Paul I began his pontificate May 29, 757, amid much opposition and disorder. There were at the time two parties at Rome, the Frankish and the Italian. He owed his elevation to the Frankish party. The Italians were led by Theophylactus, who disputed for a while the right to the pontificate with Paul; the latter, however, proved strongest in the contest, and finally secured submission. Paul's pontificate is distinguished partly by efforts for the complete and secure papal possession of the

territories which were claimed as granted by the Frankish king, and partly by the remarkable growth of papal power in Rome itself. Baxmann (*Gesch. der Politik der Papste*, 2:251) says: "Very seldom have the politics of Rome seen so much deceit and fraud, or so borne the character of unconscientiousness and double-tonguedness, as under pope Paul I." In order to retain the newly acquired exarchate of Ravenna, and to strengthen himself against the attacks of the Lombards and the Byzantines, Paul sought the good graces of king Pepin, and prevented this ruler from alliance with the iconoclastic Greeks (see the *Codex Carolinus*, in Muratori, vol. 3, pt. ii, p. 116 sq.). One of the most troublesome neighbors of the papal territory was the Lombard king Desiderius, who devastated it several times. He was, however, conciliated in A.D. 766, and we find Desiderius at Rome that year engaged in his devotions, and putting the Church in possession of some portions of his property. Pope Paul I is venerated by the Romish Church as a saint (June 28). He was a friend of the monks, and erected a monastery in his parental home. He was kind towards the poor, and exhibited a compassionate spirit for all troubled hearts. He died June 28, 767, and was succeeded by his brother, who is known as Constantine II. Pope Paul's letters are preserved in the collections of the councils, and in Gretser's collection; but as one of them bears a date after the decease of this pontiff, their genuineness is called in question. See Raynaldus, *Annales*; Chacon, *Vitae Pontificum Romanorum*; Bower, *Hist. of the Popes*, vol. 3; Riddle, *Hist. of the Papacy*, 1:322-324; Reichel, *Hist. of the Roman See in the Middle Ages*, p. 113 sq.; Neander, *Church Hist.* vol. 3; Milman, *Hist. of Lat. Christianity*, 2:428-432; Aschbach (R. C.), *Kirchen-Lexikon*, s.v.

Paul II

pope of Rome, was a Venetian by birth. His original name was *Pietro Barbo*, and he was the nephew of pope Eugenius III, through the sister of the latter. Barbo had been successively archdeacon at Bologna and bishop of Cervia. He entered upon the pontificate in 1464. Paul II began by correcting abuses, and checking the exactions of the officers and secretaries of the papal court, who levied contributions at pleasure from those who had occasion to apply to Rome for licenses, rescripts, and other official papers. He endeavored also to form a league of the Christian princes against the Turks. But while he resumed the design of his predecessor for a general crusade against the Mohammedans, Paul adopted a course of policy which perpetuated disunion in Christendom. He aided

Ferdinand in expelling the partisans of Anjou from Naples (q.v.), and consequently quarreled with that monarch respecting certain fiefs and arrears of tribute claimed by the Holy See; he attacked Podiebrad, king of Bohemia, on the ground that he favored the Hussite movement, and sent a legate to Louis XI to claim the definite revocation of the Pragmatic Sanction. And so, while Paul opposed the king of France, excited a civil war in Bohemia (q.v.; *SEE HUSSITES; SEE POLAND*), and fomented the discords of Italy, the common interests of Christendom were forgotten, and the Turks continued to acquire new territory. When, by their taking of Negropont, the establishment of the naval power of the Turks in Europe seemed a certainty, and they threatened Italy, he proclaimed (in 1468) a general peace among the Italian governments, threatening with excommunication those who did not observe it. But the decision had been reached too late, and ere the final preparations for a united attack of the Turks had been perfected, pope Paul II died suddenly, July 25, 1471. He was the first pontiff who openly declared himself a foe to the progress of knowledge. An academy had been formed at Rome for the cultivation of Greek and Roman antiquities and philology, of which Pomponius, Laetus, Platina, and other learned men were members. Paul, who, unlike his predecessor Pius II, had no taste for profane learning, became suspicious of the academicians and their meetings. Some one probably excited his suspicions by accusing them of infidelity and of treasonable designs. The academy was proscribed, some of its members ran away, others were seized and tortured, and among them Platina, who after a year's imprisonment was released through the intercession of several cardinals. It may easily be supposed that Platina, in his *Lives of the Popes*, which he wrote afterwards under Sixtus IV, did not spare the memory of Paul II. But besides Platina, other contemporary writers, such as Corio Ammirato, an anonymous chronicler of Bologna, and the monk Jacopo Filippo of Bergamo, all speak unfavorably of this pope. Cardinal Querini has undertaken the defense of Paul II in his *Vindiciae aduersus Platinam aliosque Obtrectatores*, and Romanists claim that Paul II is maligned by Protestants because he proved the persecutor of the Hussites. There is however no justice in this accusation, for many Romanists themselves confess that Paul II was envious, malicious, and hypocritical. His vacillating policy speaks for itself. He was ambitious for the extension of papal power, and resolved to maintain the privileges of ecclesiastics, and their exemption from the jurisdiction of temporal courts, as is most clearly proven in his conduct towards Louis XI, and the treacherous cardinal

Balluc, who deserved to be executed for the betrayal of his sovereign to Charles of Burgundy at Perronne. See Muratori, *Script. Rer. Ital.* vol. iii, pt. ii, p. 993; Bower, *Gesch. der Romischen Papste*, 9:312; Artaud, *Hist. des Souverains Pontifs Romains* (Paris, 1847), 3:341 sq.; *Hist. of Popery* (Lond. 1838, 8vo), ch. xvi; Reichel, *Hist. of the Roman See in the Middle Ages*, p. 235 sq.; Wetzler u. Welte (R. C.), *Kirchen-Lexikon*, s.v.; Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, s.v.

Paul III

a noted pope of Rome, flourished in a most critical period of the history of the Christian Church. His original name was *Allessandro Farnese*. He was born at Carino, in Tuscany, in 1468. He was educated at the university of the Medici at Florence, and there acquired great familiarity with the Latin and the Greek. After this he lived at Rome, largely given up to pleasure and frivolity. He kept low company, supported mistresses, became a father, and in many ways gained an unenviable notoriety. He finally, however, became more serious, and determined to enter the service of the Church. He was first employed in the apostolical chancellory, and soon gained friends by his learning and promptness in the discharge of all duties. In 1493 he was made bishop of Montefiascone, and in 1499 was created a cardinal. As such he served in important trusts, and eventually became bishop of Ostia and dean of the Sacred College.

On the death of Clement VII, in 1534, Farnese was elected pope, just at the crisis when the most urgent applications were made by the various states of Europe to Rome for the assembling of a general council, which was required by the state of the Western Church, distracted by the disavowal of the papal supremacy by Luther and Zwingli, as well as by the measures of Henry VIII of England. For a while it seemed as if the new pontiff was well adapted for the settlement of the great controversies. He showed himself favorable to the Reforming party within the Church. He made choice of discreet and honorable men for his college of cardinals. Of those to whom Paul III gave the red hat shortly after his accession were Contarini, Caraffa, Pole, Sadolet, and others, most of whom had belonged to the Oratory of Divine Love, and some of whom were friendly to the Protestant doctrine of salvation. He also appointed commissioners of reform, whose duty it was to point out and remove the much-complained-of abuses in the Roman curia. He even entered into negotiations with the Protestants of Germany, through his nuncio, Peter Paul Vergerins, and it

seemed not impossible that the concessions which he was ready to make would once more unite these and all Protestants with the Romish body. In 1537 Paul gave further expression to his desire for peace and union by his call of the council to meet in Mantua in the month of May. The German Protestants, believing the pontiff sincere in his endeavors, were encouraged to appoint Luther to draw up a clear statement of their grievances and differences of opinion, and at the meeting of the League of Smalcald (q.v.), in February, adopted the articles which Luther had written out and presented. But as they feared that their radical position about the papal and episcopal authority would not be likely to find favor with Romanists, the assembly rejected the invitation to the council, and simply placed in the hands of the papal nuncio and the imperial vice-chancellor the articles adopted. The Romanists, discouraged and maddened by the boldness of the Protestant party, now hoped to bring about by threats what they had failed to carry in kindness. They encouraged the leading Roman Catholic estates to join themselves together in Christian union, or, as they called the body, the *Holy League* (q.v.). The Protestants, seeing the hostile array of the Romanists, now strengthened the Smalcald leaguers, and entered into friendly relations with Switzerland. Every preparation was made on both sides for conflict, and not for peace, and yet both claimed to be preparing simply for defense. In 1540 the emperor Charles of Germany called another conference, for the purpose of effecting a religious union that might have the approval of the pope. *SEE INTERIM OF RATISBON*. The good feeling which prevailed at the opening of this conference at Ratisbon, in 1541, made the sanguine Contarini and his friends very hopeful; but while Bucer and Melancthon were moderate and yielding, Luther was dissatisfied with the platform adopted on account of its want of definiteness, and had no confidence in the practicableness of a union. On the Romish side, the same opposition and distrust manifested itself. Caraffa would not approve of the terms of the agreement which Contarini had sanctioned, though he conceded that there was need of practical and immediate reforms. "Caraffa stood forth as the representative and leader of those who were resolved to defend to the last the polity and dogmas of the Church against all innovation, while at the same time they aimed to infuse a spirit of strict and even ascetic purity and zeal into all its officers, from the highest to the lowest." Paul III took sides with Caraffa and his party. Some, and it seems reasonably, claim that there was jealousy of Charles V at Rome, and that the project of this conference was frustrated because it was feared that Charles V, strengthened by the destruction of the Protestant league of

Smalcald, would prove treacherous to the papacy, like Henry VIII of England. The papal party, therefore, not only broke up the Ratisbon conference, but shortly after the papal troops which had been sent Charles were recalled, and Francis I was even induced to side with the Protestants, who were now in conflict with the imperial forces. The result was that the Protestant cause, at the moment when it was possibly on the verge of extinction, was strengthened by its worst enemies (see Fisher, p. 49, 165). A general council of the Church was indispensable, if the Protestants were ever to be gained over again to the old fold. Henry VIII had been excommunicated, and England was greatly distanced from papal interests; and the Jesuitic order, which had been sanctioned, had failed to effect a healing of the discord. In 1542, finally, the call was issued by papal will, but the war between Charles and Francis which was now waging delayed the assembling of the conference (at Trent) until 1545. These delays are also charged upon Paul, but it can hardly be doubted that much of it was due to the difficulties of the times. We need hardly add that the council, *SEE TRENT*, failed to bring about the much-desired result. Paul himself did not live to see the close of the council, which occurred in 1563. He died Nov. 10, 1549, and was succeeded by Julius III (q.v.). Pope Paul was devotedly attached to his own friends, and though he favored reform, he lacked boldness, and feared too much from defections, which were probably never intended, or even conceived, except in his own imagination. The charges of vacillation in his dealings with the Protestants may be true or not, but the charges of simony and selfishness which have been presented against him are not so easily answered. He was anxious to aggrandize his own family. His natural son, Pier Luigi Farnese, he made first duke of Castro, and afterwards duke of Parma and Piacenza. For his grandson Ottavio he obtained the hand of Margaret, a natural daughter of Charles V, and made him duke of Camerino. The pope subdued the people of Perugia who had revolted against him, put to death several of the leaders, and built a citadel to keep the citizens in awe. He also attacked the Colonna, the most powerful baronial family in the neighborhood of Rome, took all their strongholds, and obliged the members of that family to take refuge in the fiefs which they held in the kingdom of Naples. He received in the same year the news of the tragical death of his son Pier Luigi, who was murdered at Piacenza, where he had made himself odious by his tyranny and his lust. Overcome with grief at the news, he told his two grandsons, who were with him at the time, to take warning from their father's death, and to live in the fear of God. Pope Paul III maintained a correspondence

with Erasmus and cardinal Sadolet, and also wrote some *Notes* to several of Cicero's letters. See Panvinius, *Vita Pauli III*; Querini, *Imago pontificis Pauli III*; Raynaldus, *Annales*; Ranke, *Hist. of the Papacy*, 1:112 sq.; Riddle, *Hist. of the Papacy*, vol. i; Gieseler, *Eccles. Hist.* iv,] 65; Burnet, *Hist. of the Reformation*, vol. iii; Fisher, *Hist. of the Reformation*, p. 3, 49, 165, 395, 401; Lea, *Hist. of Sacerdotal Celibacy*; Ffoulkes, *Hist. of the Divisions of Christendom*, i, § 63; Robertson, *Hist. of Charles V*; *Zeitschrift für historische Theologie*, April, 1875, art. i; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon* (R. C.), 8:231.

Paul IV

pope of Rome, was the descendant of a noble Neapolitan family named *Caraffa*, and was born in Naples in 1476. His early career was distinguished for ascetic rigor. In 1507 he was appointed bishop of Chieti, in which see he labored most earnestly for the reformation of abuses, and for the revival of religion and morality. With this view he established, in conjunction with several congenial reformers, the congregation of secular clergy called *Theatines* (q.v.), and was himself the first superior. He was made cardinal in 1536, and organized the tribunal of the Inquisition in Rome. On the death of Marcellus II in 1555, although in his seventy-ninth year, he was elected to succeed. He entered upon the wider career which his new position opened for him with all the ardor of a young man, and with all the stern enthusiasm which had characterized him during life. He was remarkably large and lean, walked with a hurried step, and seemed to be all sinew. As he had never confined himself hitherto in his daily habits to any precise rules — he would often sleep during the day and study at night — so he ever followed in other matters the impulses of the moment. But these were swayed by opinions formed in the course of a long life, and which had now become a second nature. He seemed to know no other duty and no other business than the restoration of the old faith to its former domination. He enforced vigorously upon the clergy the observance of all the clerical duties, established a censorship, and completed the organization of the Roman Inquisition. But while he was thus intent upon strengthening the papal hierarchy, he also manifested good qualities of head and heart. Thus, e.g., he took measures for the alleviation of the burdens of the poorer classes, and for the better administration of justice, not sparing even his own nephews, whom he banished from Rome on account of their corrupt conduct and profligate life. His foreign relations involved him in much perplexity. He was embroiled with the emperor Ferdinand, with

Philip II of Spain, and with Cosmo, grand-duke of Tuscany. Having condemned the principles of the Peace of Augsburg, he protested against its provisions. Under the weight of so many cares his old age gave way. He died Aug. 18, 1559. As soon as the news of his death became known to the people of Rome, they rose in insurrection, ran to the prison of the Inquisition, wounded a Dominican monk who acted as commissary, delivered all the prisoners, and burned the papers. They then threw down the statue of the pope, crying out, "Death to the Caraffas!" The tumult lasted several days, after which the conclave elected as new pope Pius IV (q.v.). Paul IV wrote, *Tractat. de symbolo, de emendanda ecclesia ad Paulum III, regulas Theatinorum*: — *Tractat. de ecclesia Vaticana et ejus sacerdotum principatu de quadragesimal. observantia*: — *Parcenes ad Bernardum Ochium*: — *Note in Aristotelis Ethicam*: — *Public fidei profess*: — *Orationes et Epistole*. See Caraccioli, *Collectanea hist. de Vita Pauli IV* (Colossians 1612, 4to); Magi, *Disquisit. hist. de Pauli IV inculcata vita* (Neap. 1672); Bromato, *Vita di Paolo IV* (Ravenna, 1748, 2 vols. 8vo); Ranke, *Hist. of the Papacy*, 1:207, 234; Ffoulkes, *Divisions of Christendom*, vol. i, § 67; Bower, *Hist. of the Popes*, vol. vii; Riddle, *Hist. of the Papacy*, vol. ii; Schrockh, *Kirchengesch. seit der Reformation*, 3:148 sq., 249 sq., 258 sq.; Hausser, *Reformationsgesch.* (1868) p. 296 sq.; Robertson, *Hist. of Charles V.* bk. xi and xii; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon* (Romans Cath.), 8:231, 232.

Paul V

a noted pope of Rome, was originally named *Camillo Borghese*. He was born at Rome in 1552. In his early life he was a distinguished canonist and theologian; and, after the ordinary prelatial career at Rome, he rose first to the post of nuncio at the Spanish court, and afterwards to the cardinalate in 1596 under Clement VIII. On the death of Leo XI in 1605, cardinal Borghese was elected to succeed him. His pontificate is rendered memorable by the concern to maintain its pretensions in Italy in all their integrity. Thus he was involved in the celebrated conflict with the republic of Venice, into which he was plunged at the very outset of his career. The original ground of dispute was the question of immunity from the jurisdiction of civil tribunals conceded to the clergy, who claimed to be tried by ecclesiastical tribunals alone. This claim the senate resisted; and further causes of dispute were added by a mortmain law, and a law prohibiting the establishment of new religious orders or associations unless with the sanction of the senate. Each party remaining inflexible in its

determination, Paul V issued a brief directing a sentence of excommunication against the doge and the senate, and placing the republic under an interdict unless submission should be made within twenty-four days. The senate forbade the publication of the bull; and as the members of several monastic orders professed that they could not continue to perform religious worship in a country placed under interdict, they were allowed to quit Venice, and the senate appointed secular priests to perform service in their stead. The people remained perfectly quiet, and the bishops and vicars continued their functions as usual; but there was, nevertheless, an animated conflict maintained by the pen, in which the celebrated Fra Paolo Sarpi, *SEE PAUL, Father.* on the side of the republic, and on the papal side Bellarmine and Baronius, were the leaders. There were three points at issue between the pope and the senate:

- (1) The senate had made a decree that no new convent or religious congregation should be founded without their permission;
- (2) that no property or perpetual revenue of any kind should be bequeathed to the Church without their approbation;
- (3) that clerical men accused of crime should be judged by the secular power like other citizens.

The king of France and the emperor took the part of Venice, the court of Spain that of the pope, and Italy was threatened with a war, like that of the *Investitures* (q.v.). Henry IV of France, however, proposed his mediation, and sent to Venice cardinal De Joyeuse, who, after consulting with the senate, proceeded to Rome, where he succeeded in effecting a compromise in 1607, and peace was restored, although dissatisfaction afterwards arose on the subject of the nomination of a patriarch. The decrees of the senate were maintained, but the two clerical culprits, in compliance with the wish of the French king, were given up to the pope, "saving the right of the republic to punish all offenders, clerical or lay, within its dominions." Upon this arrangement being made the interdict was removed. A misunderstanding of a similar nature arose between the pope and the crown of France (Louis XIII) as to the right of censorship of books, and as to the approval of the disciplinary decrees of the Council of Trent; but it was removed by mutual explanations. *SEE SUAREZ.* Pope Paul's administration was vigorous and enlightened. He reformed many abuses in the tribunals of the Roman court, and did much for the promotion of public works, for the restoration and preservation of antiquities, the improvement

of the museums and libraries, and the embellishment of the city of Rome. He enlarged the Vatican and Quirinal palaces, restored the church of Santa Maria Maggiore, constructed or repaired aqueducts, made additions to the Vatican Library, collected statues and other antiquities, and built the handsome villa Mondragone at Frascati. Paul V was also much given to the improvement and providing of charitable and pious institutions. He likewise established the fortune of the Borghese family, which is one of the wealthiest of the Roman families. Paul V died Jan. 28, 1621, and was succeeded by Gregory XV. Paul V avoided decisions in all dogmatical controversy. Thus he reserved his judgment in the controversies on the doctrine of mercy, *SEE MOLINA*; *SEE QUIETISM*, and commanded silence to both parties in the controversy regarding the immaculate conception. He sainted Loyola and Charles Borromeo. See Bzovius, *Vita Pauli V*; De Montor, *Hist. des souv. Pont. Romains*; Muratori, *Annales d'Italie*, ann. 1616 and sq.; Ranke, *Hist. of the Papacy*, 1:604; Bower, *Hist. of the Popes*, vol. vii; Schrickh, *Kirchengesch. seit der Ref.* 3:346 sq.; 4:305 sq.; Le Bret, *Gesch. v. Italien*, 3:203 sq.; Riddle, *Hist. of the Popes*, vol. ii; Wetzler u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon* (Romans Cath.), 8:232, 233.

Paul, David

a celebrated Polish Unitarian divine, flourished near the middle of the 16th century. In 1563 he took part in a discussion against the Lutherans at Weissenburg, and was so persuasive in his arguments that the princes and the chief nobles of the country embraced his doctrines. There is scarcely anything else known of his history. See Krasinski, *Hist. of the Ref. in Poland*, 1:356.

Paul, Vincent de

one of the most eminent saints of the modern Romish Church, and founder of the congregation of "Priests of the Missions," was born of very humble parentage at Ranquines, in the diocese of Dax, France, in 1576. The indications of ability which he exhibited as a youth interested in him several people of influence and means, and he was sent to Toulouse to be educated. He became an ecclesiastical student, and was admitted to priest's orders in 1600. For a time he was tutor in a noble family, and was then made principal of the college "Des Bons Enfants." On a voyage which he was making from Marseilles to Narbonne the ship in which he had taken passage was captured by corsairs, and he was sold into slavery at Tunis.

After having spent several years in the most forlorn condition, he succeeded in claiming his master, a renegade Christian, to the true faith, and together with him Paul made his escape from Barbtry. They landed in France in 1607. Shortly after this he went to Rome, and was entrusted by the pontiff with an important mission to the French court in 1608. He now took up his residence in Paris, and became the almoner of Marguerite de Valois. He also taught, and as tutor of the children of M. de Gondy, the commandant of the galleys at Marseilles, gained the friendship of this distinguished man, and secured the appointment as almoner-general of the galleys in 1619. It was at this time that the well-known incident occurred of his offering himself and being accepted in the place of one of the convicts, whom he found overwhelmed with grief and despair at having been obliged to leave his wife and family in extreme destitution. But Vincent de Paul is especially noted for having laid the foundation of what eventually grew into the great and influential congregation of "Priests of the Missions," an association of priests who devote themselves to the work of assisting the parochial clergy by preaching and hearing confessions periodically in those districts to which they may be invited by the local pastors. The rules of this congregation were approved by Urban VIII in 1632, and in the following year the fathers established themselves in the so-called priory of St. Lazare, in Paris, whence their name of *Lazarists* (q.v.) is derived. From this date his life was devoted to the organization of works of charity and benevolence. To him Paris owes the establishment of the Foundling Hospital, and the first systematic efforts for the preservation of the lives and the due education of a class theretofore neglected, or left to the operation of chance charity. The pious Sisterhood of Charity is an emanation of the same spirit, and Vincent was intrusted by St. Francis de Sales with the direction of the newly founded order of Sisters of the Visitation. The queen, Anne of Austria, warmly rewarded his exertions, and Louis XIII chose him as his spiritual assistant in his last illness. Vincent de Paul was placed by the queen-regent at the head of the *Conseil de Conscience*, the council chiefly charged with the direction of the crown in ecclesiastical affairs; and the period of his presidency was long looked back to as the golden sera of impartial and honest distribution of ecclesiastical patronage in France. Vincent was not, in any sense of the word, a scholar; but his preaching, which (like that of the fathers of his congregation of Lazarists) was of the most simple kind, was singularly affecting and impressive. He left nothing behind him but the *Rules or Constitutions of the Congregation of the Mission* (1685); *Conferences* on these

Constitutions (4to), and a considerable number of letters, chiefly addressed to the priests of the mission, or to other friends, on spiritual subjects. He died at an advanced age at St. Lazare, Sept. 27, 1660, and was canonized by Clement XII in 1737. His festival is held on July 19, the day of his canonization. See Mrs. Jameson, *Legends*; Jervis, *Hist. of the Church of France*, 1:319 sq.; 2:11; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* 7:592.

Paul, William

D.D., an English prelate, flourished near the middle of the 17th century. Of his early history we know scarcely anything. He was not educated for the sacred office of the ministry, but had entered the mercantile profession, and, possessed of a large property, had made himself quite prominent in that walk of life, when, through the influence of bishop Sheldon, Paul was called into the ministry, and finally given the important see of Oxford. It was hoped that his vast wealth would be expended for the good of the bishopric, and, to judge from the preparations he made for the rebuilding of the dilapidated episcopal palace at Cuddesden, the hope was not unfounded. He died suddenly in 1665, having held the see only two years. He also held the valuable rectory of Chinnor *in commendam*. See Stoughton, *Eccles. Hist. of England (Church of the Restoration)*, 1:490.

Paula

ST. ([Ἀγία Παῦλα](#)), was a noble Roman matron, a pupil and disciple of Jerome. Though descended from the Scipios and the Gracchi, and accustomed to luxurious self-indulgence, she preferred to follow her saintly teacher to Bethlehem and devote herself to a religious life. The church dedicated to St. Jerome at Rome is said to be upon the spot where the house of Paula stood, in which she entertained that holy man during his stay in Rome, A.D. 382. She studied Hebrew, in order to understand the Scriptures better. She built a monastery, hospital, and three nunneries at Bethlehem. Her daughter St. Eustochia was with her. The rule for these convents was very strict, and her own austerities were so severe that she was reprimanded for them by St. Jerome. Her granddaughter Paula was sent to her at Bethlehem to be educated, and succeeded her as superior of the monastery. Paula died (A.D. 404) making the sign of the cross on her lips, and was buried in the church of the Holy Manger, where her empty tomb is now seen near that of St. Jerome. Her relics are said to be at Sens. She is commemorated Jan. 26.

Paula Francis Of.

SEE FRANCIS.

Paula, Vincentius

SEE VINCENTIUS.

Pauli, Ernest L.

SEE PAULI, PHILIP REINHOLD.

Pauli, Gregorius

a Unitarian divine of Italian descent, flourished at Brzeziny in Poland near the middle of the 16th century. In 1556 he attended the Synod of Secemin, and favored Gonesius (q.v.), who there proclaimed his anti-Trinitarian opinions. Being accused at the Synod of Pinczow on that account, he threw off every restraint, and proclaimed from the pulpit his opinions respecting the mystery of the Trinity. He rejected the Nicene Creed and the doctrine of the first five oecumenical councils. He went even much farther than Gonesius and Arius, maintaining that Christ did not exist before his birth, and consequently reduced him to the condition of man. He condemned the baptism of infants, and maintained that Christ had abolished the temporal powers, that death did not separate the soul from the body, and that the body did not in reality die; that the Holy Scriptures do not establish any difference between the resurrection of the soul and of the body, but that they will both have a common resurrection; that the spirit formed not a separate and independent substance; that God raised from the dead the body of Christ, which entered heaven; that the doctrine about the death of the body was introduced by the antichrist, who established by it purgatory and the invocation of the saints. Pauli was also inclined to a community of goods. These daring propositions were strenuously opposed by Sarnicki and the orthodox party, which was strong at that synod. They boldly denounced the doctrine of Pauli as dangerous, and subversive of Christianity itself. The synod separated, however, without giving any final decision, but a war from the pulpit was begun on the subject. The Synod of Rogow, in July, 1562, convened for the purpose of conciliating the parties, evinced a leaning to the doctrines of Pauli, and that of Pinczow (August, 1562) was composed of a majority of his adherents; but Sarnicki refused to acknowledge its authority. Another synod, which met at the same place

(Nov. 4, 1562), tried to preserve a union by a proposition that the confession of the Helvetian Church should be signed, but that all should be permitted to examine and to explain it without limitation. This proposition was rejected by the orthodox party. But the conference of Piotikow, which was held the same year, established a final separation, as the anti-Trinitarian party, guided by the ministers Pauli, Stanislav, Ludomirski, Martinus Krowicki, George Shoman, and the nobles John Niemojowski, Hieronymus Filipowski, and John Kazanowski, solemnly declared their rejection of the mystery of the Trinity. Sarnicki, supported by the influence of Boucer, castellan of Biecz, and by Myrzkowski, palatine of Cracow, assembled on May 14, 1562, at the last-named capital, a synod of the staunch adherents of the Helvetian Church. It condemned in an unqualified manner the anti-Trinitarian doctrines, and summoned Pauli, who was minister of the congregation of Cracow, to resign his office. He was obliged to comply with this injunction, but remained for some time at the head of a separate congregation which had embraced his opinions. He retired to Pinczow, whence he passed to Racow, and presided over the congregation of that place until his death in 1591. He advocated all his life the doctrine that a Christian should neither accept civil offices nor bear arms. See Krasinski, *Hist. of the Ref. in Poland*, 1:357 sq.

Pauli, Philip Reinhold

one of the pioneer ministers of the German Reformed Church in this country, was born in the city of Magdeburg, Prussia, June 22, 1742. His father, Ernest L. Pauli, was a clergyman of high standing, and at one time courtpreacher. Philip completed his literary course in the universities of Halle and Leipsic, traveled for some time in Europe, and came to this country in 1783. For several years he taught school, last at Philadelphia Academy; in 1789 he was ordained to the ministry, and placed over several congregations in Montgomery County, Pa. In 1793 he removed to Reading, Pa., where "he labored with great zeal and activity as pastor of the German Reformed Church for a period of twenty-one years and nine months," at the same time conducting a "Latin and French School." He died Jan. 27, 1815. Mr. Pauli was a man of good parts and finished education. "He was regarded in his day as an eloquent preacher." Two of his sons entered the ministry of the Church. See Harbaugh, *Fathers of the Ref. Church*, 3:21-24.

Pauli Joannites

a name given to the *Attingians*, and sometimes to all the *Paulicians*.

Paulianists

the followers of Paul of Samosata. *SEE PAULIANS*.

Paulians, Or Paulianists, Or Samosatians

the followers of Paul of Samosata, who was made bishop of Antioch in 260, and deposed by the unanimous sentence of a great council held in Antioch in 269 or 270. *SEE PAUL OF SAMOSATA*. He refused to submit to the decision of the council, and the exercise of Aurelian's authority to enforce their decree is memorable as the earliest instance on record of the interference of the secular power in the internal affairs of the Church. One of the canons of Nice required the Paulians to be rebaptized, because in baptizing they did not use the only lawful form according to Christ's command. See Forbes, *Nicene Creed* (see Index). *SEE ARTEMONITES*.

Paulicians

is the name of a powerful Eastern sect, which originated probably in or before the 6th century. According to Peter of Sicily and Photius, the sect was originated in Armenia by two brothers, one named Paul (from whom they are alleged to have received their name) and the other named John, who flourished as far back as the 4th century. Others trace them to an Armenian named Paul who lived under Justinian II (A.D. 670-711). Still others trace them back to even an earlier period than the 4th century, and hold that their name was probably derived from the high esteem which they cherished as a body for the apostle Paul. According to Gieseler and Neander they had their origin from one Constantine of Mananalis (near Samosata), an Armenian, who had received a present of two volumes — one containing the four Gospels, and the other the Epistles of Paul — and who afterwards assumed the name of Paul, in testimony of his great veneration for that apostle. They were undoubtedly believers in the two original principles of good and evil; but they combined with this dualism a high value for the universal use of the Scripture, a rejection of all external forms in religion, and a special abhorrence of the use of images. Their opinions are known, like so many other sects, only through the representations of their adversaries, by whom they have been designated as

Manichaeans. It seems, indeed, most probable that they were descended from some one of the ancient Gnostic sects; but they differed widely from the Manichaeans, at least in Church government; for they rejected the government by bishops, priests, and deacons, to which the Manichaeans adhered; and admitted no order or individuals set apart by exclusive consecration for spiritual offices. They were charged by their enemies with gross immorality, and at one time there seems to have been good ground for the accusation. Baanes, their leader at the end of the 8th century, was notorious for his immorality; but about the year 800 a reformer arose among them named Sergius, whose opposition to this immorality, together with his exertions to extend the sect, gained him the reputation of a second founder. Both before and after this reform they were subject to much suspicion and bitter persecution, and were repressed with great severity by the Eastern emperors: Constans, Justinian II, and especially Leo the Isaurian opposed them. Indeed, with the exception of Nicephorus Logotheta (802-811), it may be said that all the emperors persecuted them with more or less rigor. Their greatest enemy, however; was Theodora (841-855), who, having ordered that they should be compelled to return to the Greek Church, had all the recusants cruelly put to the sword or driven into exile. A bloody resistance, and finally an emigration into the Saracen territory, was the consequence. About A.D. 844 some of the Paulicians, especially the adherents of Baanes, entered into a league with the Sergists, under the leadership of Carbeus, an officer of the greatest valor and resolution, and, supported by the Saracens, declared war against the Greeks, and for fifty years the conflict was waged with the greatest vehemence and fury. The Paulicians were more or less successful in the combat, made inroads upon the Byzantine territory, and in 867 reached as far as Ephesus, but they were ultimately overpowered and forced to submission. In 970 the greater part of them were removed into the neighborhood of Philippopolis, in Thrace, where they were granted religious freedom. Thence the Paulicians became settlers also of Bulgaria, and there made many converts to their sect. The renewal of persecutions against them in the century forced them into Western Europe. Their first migration was into Italy (comp. Baird, *Sketches of Protestantism in Italy*, p. 14), whence, in process of time, they sent colonies into almost all the other provinces of Europe, and gradually formed a considerable number of religious assemblies who adhered to their doctrine, and who were afterwards persecuted with the utmost vehemence by the Roman pontiffs. In Italy they were called *Patarini* (q.v.), from a certain place

called *Pataria*, being a part of the city of Milan, where they held their assemblies; and *Gathari*, or *Gazari*, from Gazaria, or the Lesser Tartary. In France they were called *Albigenses* (q.v.). The first religious assembly which the Paulicians formed in Europe is said to have been discovered at Orleans in 1017, under the reign of Robert, when many of them were condemned to be burned alive. A few Paulicians, of course, remained in the East for some time after the migration of the general body. As late as the 17th century there was a remnant of them existing in Bulgaria (Mosheim, 2:238). Whether any Paulicians exist at present it is difficult to tell. There are so-called Paulicians in the Danubian provinces, but these heretics practice bloody sacrifices, and by their barbarism would seem to have more kinship with the *Bogomiles* (q.v.). At present an accurate account of the religion and opinions of the Paulicians is really a desideratum.

The Paulicians, as we have said above, have been accused of Manichaeism; but there is reason to believe this was only a slanderous report raised against them by their enemies, and that they were, for the most part, men who were disgusted with the doctrines and ceremonies of human invention, and desirous of returning to the apostolic doctrine and practice. They refused to worship the Virgin Mary, the saints, and the cross, which was sufficient in those ages to procure for them the name of atheists; and they also refused to partake of the sacraments of the Greek and Roman churches, which will account for the allegation that they rejected them altogether, though it is asserted by Neander and Gieseler that they simply denied the material presence of Christ in the Eucharist. It is, however, barely possible that some may, like the Quakers and some other sects, actually have discarded them as outward ordinances. See Mosheim, *Church Hist.* 2:363; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (student's edition, p. 506 sq.; large edition, ch. liv); Jones, *Hist. of the Christian Church*; Neander, *Church Hist.* vol. iii; Gieseler, *Eccles. Hist.* vol. i; and *Theol. Studien und Kritiken*, 1829, vol. ii, No. 1; *Journal der theol. Lit.* by Winer u. Engelhart, vol. vii, No. 1 and 2; Hardwick, *Church Hist. of the Middle Ages*, p. 84, 91, 201, 302, 305 sq.; Marsden, *Dict. of Church Hist.* (see Index).

Paulinus Of Antioch

flourished as bishop of that see in the 4th century. He was ordained presbyter by Eustathius, bishop of Antioch, and was a leader among the Eustathian party in that city. When Athanasius, after his return from exile,

on the death of the emperor Constantius II, and the murder of George of Cappadocia, the Arian patriarch, assembled a council at Alexandria, Paulinus sent two deacons, Maximus and Calimerus, to take part in its deliberation. He was shortly after ordained by the hasty and impetuous Lucifer of Cagliari bishop of the Eustathians at Antioch—a step unwarrantable and mischievous, as it prolonged the schism in the orthodox party, which would otherwise probably have been soon healed. His ordination took place in A.D. 362. He was held, according to Socrates (*Hist. Eccles.* 4:2) and Sozomen (*Hist. Eccles.* 6:7), in such respect by the Arian emperor Valens as to be allowed to remain when his competitor Meletius was banished. Possibly, however, the smallness of his party, which seems to have occupied only one small church (Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* 3:99; Sozomen, 6:13), rendered him less obnoxious to the Arians, and they may have wished to perpetuate the division of the orthodox by exciting jealousy. Paulinus's refusal of the proposal of Meletius to put an end to the schism is mentioned elsewhere, *SEE MELETIUS OF ANTIOCH*, but he at length consented that whichever of them died first, the survivor should be recognised by both parties. On the death of Meletius, however (A.D. 381), this agreement was not observed by his party, and the election of Flavianus disappointed the hopes of Paulinus, and embittered the schism still more. In A.D. 382 Paulinus was present at a council of the Western Church, which had all along recognised his title, and now ardently supported his cause; but the Oriental churches generally recognised Flavianus, who was *de facto* bishop of Antioch. Paulinus died A.D. 388 or 389. His partisans chose Evagrius to succeed him. A confession of faith by Paulinus is preserved by Athanasius and Epiphanius in the works cited below. See Epiphanius, *Hoeres.* 77. 21, ed. Petavii; Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* 3:6, 9; 4:2; v. 5, 9, 15; Sozomen, *Hist. Eccles.* v. 12, 13; 6:7; 7:3, 10, 11, 15; rheodoret, *Hist. Eccles.* 3:5; v. 3, 23; Athanasius, *Concil. Alexandrin. Epistol. seu Tomus ad Antiochenses*, c. 9; Jerome, *Epistol. ad Eustoch.* No. 2, 7, ed. vett.; 36, ed. Benedict; 108, § 6, ed. Vallars.; *In Rufin.* lib. 3:22; *Chronicon*, ed. Vallars.; Theophanes, *Chronog.* p. 47, 57, 59, ed. Paris; p. 37, 45, 47, ed. Venice; p. 85, 104, 109, ed. Bonn; Le Quidn, *Oriens Christian.* vol. ii, col. 715; Tillemont, *Memoires*, vol. viii; Fabricius, *Biblioth. Graeca*, 9:314; Neale, *Holy Eastern Church* (Patriarchate of Alexandria), 1:193 sq.

Paulinus Of Aquileia, St.,

a noted prelate of the Eastern Church in the second half of the 8th century, is known especially for his exertions to maintain the orthodox standard of the Trinitarian dogma. He was a native of Friaul, and appears to have been a teacher of philosophy, at least Charlemagne calls him in 773 “*artis grammaticae magister*.” He was elevated to the patriarchal dignity in A.D. 776, and belongs to that class of scholars upon whom Charlemagne depended for counsel in all literary and ecclesiastical affairs. Paul of Aquileia took part in the synods at Regensburg in 792, and Frankfort in 794, which dealt with the heresy of the Adoptianists (q.v.). He also attended several provincial councils, and labored with zeal for the Christianizing of Carinthia and the Avari. He probably died A.D. 804. His works, whose authenticity is in part called in question, were published by Madrisius at Venice in 1737. His memory is observed on January 21. Paulinus, in the council held at Forum Julium (Friuli) (A.D. 791 or 796), defended the Western Church against the charge of falsifying the creed on the doctrine of the Holy Ghost. He held that if the creed were explained according to the meaning of its author, it could not be said that it was altered. As the fathers of the council at Constantinople had enlarged the Nicene Creed according to the mind of the original framer of it by the statements respecting the Holy Spirit, in the same manner it was added by the Church that the Spirit proceeded from the Son. As Christ himself said, the Father is inseparably in the Son and the Son in the Father, but the Holy Spirit is of the same nature with the Father and the Son, so must we say that he proceeds from both essentially and inseparably. See Neander, *Dogmas*, 2:436; *Acta SS.* Jan. 1, p. 317 sq.; and the biographical sketches prefixed to his works.

Paulinus À St. Bartholomaeus

a noted Orientalist, of the Order of the Carmelites, whose original name was JOHN PHILIP WERDIN, was born near Mannersdorf, in Austria, April 25, 1748. He studied philosophy and theology at Prague, and afterwards learned some of the Oriental languages in the college of his order at Rome, which he had joined in 1769. He was sent as missionary to the coast of Malabar in 1774, where he remained for fourteen years. and was successively appointed vicar-general and apostolic visitor. In 1790 he returned to Rome, in order to superintend the religious works which were printed by the Propaganda for the use of the missionaries in Hindostan. He

died at Rome Jan. 7, 1806. Paulinus was one of the earliest Europeans who acquired a knowledge of the Sanscrit language. In consequence of his being settled in the south of Hindostan, he could not obtain so accurate a knowledge of the Sanscrit as if he had been brought in contact with the Brahmins, but he nevertheless gained quite a mastery of the tongue, and even published a Sanscrit grammar (in the Tamul characters instead of the Devanagari) at Rome in 1790, under the title of *Sidharubam, senu Grammatica Samscredamica, cum Dissertatione historicocritica in Linguam Samscredamicam*; and also in a fuller and different form in 1804, under the title of *Vyacarana, seu locupletissima Samscredamicæ Linguae Institutio*; but both these works are entirely superseded by later, more accurate, and complete grammars. Paulinus also wrote and edited many other works, of which the most important are, *Systema Brahmanicum liturgicum, mythologicum, civile, ex monumentis Indicis, etc., dissertationibus historicis illustratum* (Rome, 1791): — *India Orientalis Christiana, continens Fundationes Ecclesiarum, Seriem Episcoporum, Missiones, Schismata, Persecutiones, Viros illustres* (ibid. 1794): — *Viaggio alle Indie Orientali* (ibid. 1796): — *Amarashinha, seu Dictionarii Samscredamici sectio prima, de Cælo; ex tribus ineditis Codicibus Indicis Manuscriptis, cum Versione Latina* (ibid. 1798) (the whole of this dictionary, of which Paulinus has edited the first part, was printed at Serampore, in 1808, under the care of Colebrooke): *De Antiquitate et Affinitate Lingue Zendicæ et Samscredamicæ Germanicæ Dissertatio* (ibid. 1798; Padua, 1799): and *De Latini Sermonii Origine et cum Orientalibus Linguis Connexione* (Rome, 1802). See Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliogr.* 2:2313.

Paulinus Of Biterre

(the modern Beziers), in Gaul, an ecclesiastic of note, was bishop of that city about AD. 420. Some have thought that the *Acta S. Genesii notarii Arelatensis* are to be ascribed to this Paulinus rather than to Paulinus of Nola, under whose name they have commonly been published. Paulinus of Biterræ wrote an encyclical letter, giving an account of several alarming portents which had occurred at Biterre. This letter is lost. Oudin has mistakenly said that it is cited in the *Annales* of Baronius. Possibly Paulinus of Biterre is the Paulinus to whom Gennadius (*De Viris Illustribus*, c. 68) ascribes several *Tractatus de Initio Quadragesimæ*, etc. See Idatius, *Chron.* ad ann. xxv, Arcad. et Honor.; Mirseus, *Auctar. de Scriptorib. Eccles.* c. 63; Tillemont, *Memoires*, v. 569; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* ad ann. 410, 1:389; Oudin, *De Scriptorib. Eccles.* vol. i, col. 923; Fabricius, *Bibl.*

Groec. 9:315; *Biblioth. Med. et Injins. Latinit.* v. 205, ed. Mansi; *Acta Sanctor. Aug.* v. 123, etc.; *Gallia Christiana*, vol. vi, col. 295 (ed. Paris, 1739); *Hist. Litt. de la France*, 2:131.

Paulinus Of Milan,

an Eastern ecclesiastic of much celebrity near the opening of the 3d century, was the secretary of St. Ambrose, after whose death he became a deacon, and repaired to Africa, where, at the request of St. Augustine, he composed a biography of his former patron. While residing at Carthage he encountered Coelestius, detected the dangerous tendency of the doctrines disseminated by that active disciple of Pelagius, and, having preferred an impeachment of heresy, procured his condemnation by the council which assembled in A.D. 212 under Aurelius. The accusation was divided into seven heads, of which six will be found in that portion of the *Acts of the Synod* preserved by Marius Mercator. At a subsequent period (217, 218) we find Paulinus appearing before Zosimus for the purpose of resisting the appeal against this decision, and refusing obedience to the adverse decree of the pope. Nothing further is known with regard to his history, except that we learn from Isidore that he was eventually ordained a presbyter. We possess the following works of this author: *Vita Ambrosii*, which, although commenced soon after A.D. 200. could not, from the historical allusions which it contains, have been finished until 212. This piece will be found in almost all the editions of St. Ambrose. In many it is ascribed to Paulinus Nolanus, and in others to Paulinus Episcopus: — *Libellus adversus Coelestium Zosimo Papae oblatas*, drawn up and presented towards the close of A.D. 217. It was printed from a Vatican MS. by Baronius in his *Annales*, under A.D. 218; afterwards by Labbe, in his *Collection of Councils* (Par. 1671, fol.), 2:1578; in the Benedictine edition of St. Augustine, vol. 10, App. pt. 2; and by Constant, in his *Epistole Pontificum Romanorum* (ibid. 1721, fol.), 1:963: — *De Benedictionibus Patriarcharum* is mentioned by Isidore (*De Viris Illustr.* c. 4), but was not known to exist in an entire form until it was discovered by Mingarelli in a very ancient MS. belonging to the library of St. Salvador at Bologna, and inserted by him in the *Anecdota*, published at Bologna (1751, 4to), vol. ii, pt. i, p. 199. A corrupt fragment of this tract will be found in the fifth volume of the Benedictine edition of St. Jerome. where it is ascribed to Rufinus. The three productions enumerated above are placed together in the *Bibliotheca Patrum* of Galland (Venet. 1773, fol.), 9:23. See

Cassianus, *De Incarn.* c. 7; Isidornis, *De Viris Illustr.* c. 4; Galland, *Bibl. Patr.* vol. ix, Proleg. c. ii; Schinemann, *Bibl. Patrum Lat.* vol. ii, § 21.

Paulinus (Pontius Meropius) Of Nola, St.,

a noted prelate of the early Christian Church, was born about A.D. 353, at Bordeaux, of a noble family. He was a pupil of Ausonius, and was recommended by him to the emperor Gratian, who appointed him consul in 378, and afterwards advanced him to several offices of great importance. Through the influence and exhortations of St. Ambrose, he was induced to relinquish the world and give his property to the Church. He retired from official life, caused himself and his wife to be baptized, and lived quietly for a while in the vicinity of the Pyrenees. But he was finally induced to enter the service of the Church, and was ordained presbyter, in 393, at Barcelona, in Spain. He did not, however, long remain to exercise his ecclesiastical functions in this region of country, but crossed over the Alps to Italy. Passing through Florence, where he was greeted with much cordiality by St. Ambrose, he proceeded to Rome, and, after meeting with a cold reception from pope Siricius, who probably looked with suspicion on the hasty irregularity of his ordination, reached Nola, in Campania, where he possessed some property, soon after Easter, A.D. 394. In the immediate vicinity of this city were the tomb and miracle-working relics of Felix, a confessor and martyr, over which a church had been erected, with a few cells for the accommodation of pilgrims. In these Paulinus, with a small number of followers, took up his abode, conforming in all points to the observances of monastic establishments, except that his wife appears to have been his companion. After nearly fifteen years, passed in holy meditations and acts of charity, he was chosen bishop of Nola in A.D. 409 (or, according to Pagi, in A.D. 403), and during the stormy inroad of the Goths attended in the episcopal capacity the Council of Ravenna (q.v.) in 419. He died in 431. Paulinus wrote several works, of which only a few have come down to us; the principal of them are a discourse on almsgiving, some letters, and some thirty poems on religious subjects. Paul was intimate with the most distinguished theologians of his time, and is frequently mentioned in the Epistles of St. Augustine and St. Jerome. Paul of Nola was, in a sense, a believer in image and saint worship. He caused Biblical pictures to be exhibited annually at the festival season, on the ground "that by them the Bible scenes were made clear to the uneducated rustic as they could not otherwise be, and impressed themselves on his memory, awakened in him holy feelings and thoughts, and restrained him

from all kinds of vice.” His poems, too, are full of direct prayers for the intercession of the saints, especially of St. Felix, in whose honor he erected a basilica, and annually composed an ode, and whom he calls his patron, his father, his lord. He relates that the people came in great crowds around the wonder-working relics of this saint on his memorial day, and could not look on them enough. His works were published for the first time by Badius (Paris, 1516); but the best editions are by Muratori (Verona, 1736, fol.), and by Le Brun (Paris, 1685, 2 vols. 4to). See Jortin, *Remarks on Eccles. Hist.* 2:339 sq.; Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* 2:442; 3:568, 598; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* i; 228; Alzog, *Patrologie*, § 69; Ceillier, *Hist. des Auteurs Sacre*, vol. viii; Tillemont, *Memoir Ecclesiastiques*, vol. xiv; Schonemann, *Biblioth. Patr. Lat.* vol. i, cap. 4, § 30; Bahr, *Gesch. der Romischen Literatur* (supplement vol.), pt. i, § 23-25; pt. ii, § 100; Buse, *Paulinus von Nola und seine Zeit* (Regensb. 1856, 2 vols. 8vo); Gilly, *Vigilantius and his Times* (Lond. 1844). The article in Smith’s *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. and Mythol.*, we think, underestimates the pious character of Paul of Nola, and belittles his ability and scholarship. It is, however, a nearly exhaustive sketch of the life and writings of this personage.

Paulinus Of Pella

surnamed the *Penitent*, was born in A.D. 376, at Pella, in Macedonia. He was the son of Hesperius, proconsul of Africa. He was taken at three years of age to Bordeaux, where he appears to have been educated. An illness at the age of fifteen interrupted his studies, and the indulgence of his parents allowed him to pursue a life of ease and pleasure, in the midst of which, however, he kept up a regard for morality. At the age of twenty he married a lady of ancient family and of some property. At thirty he lost his father, whose death was followed by a dispute between Paulinus and his brother, who wished to invalidate his father’s will to deprive his mother of her dowry. In A.D. 414 Paulinus joined Attalus, who attempted to resume the purple in Gaul under the patronage of the Gothic prince Ataulphus, and from whom he accepted the title of “Comes Rerum Privatarum,” thinking thus to be secure from the hostility of the Goths. He was, however, disappointed. The city where he resided (apparently Bordeaux) was taken, and his house plundered; and he was again in danger when Vasates (Bazas), to which he had retired, was besieged by the Goths and Alans. He proposed now to retire to Greece, where his mother had rich estates, but his wife would not consent. He then thought of becoming a monk, but his friends diverted him from this plan. Misfortunes now thickened about him:

he lost his mother, his mother-in-law, and his wife; his children forsook him, with the exception of one, who was a priest, and who suddenly died soon after. His estates in Greece yielded him no revenue; and he retired to Massilia (Marseilles), where he hired and farmed some land, but this resource failed him, and alone, destitute, and in debt, he was reduced to depend on charity. During his residence at Massilia he became acquainted with many religious persons, and their conversation combined with his sorrows and disappointments to impress his mind deeply with religious sentiments. He was baptized in A.D. 422, in his forty-sixth year, and lived at least till his eighty-fourth year (A.D. 460), when he wrote a poem embodying his Christian sentiments. Some have supposed, but without good reason, that he is the Benedictus Paulinus to whose questions of various points of theology and ethics Faustus Reiensis wrote an answer (*Histoire Litteraire de la France*, 2:343, etc., 461, etc.). See also Fabricius, *Biblioth. Med. et Infim. Latinit.* v. 206, ed. Mansi; and Cave, *Hist. Litt.* 1:290, in his article on Paulinus Nolanus. — Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Romans Biog. and Mythol.* s.v.

Paulinus Of Treves

an ecclesiastic who flourished about the middle of the 4th century as successor to Maximian in the bishopric of Treves, belonged to the most zealous Athanasians of the West. On account of his opposition to Constantine, and those who with him labored for the establishment of the semi-Arian doctrines in the Church, he was exiled, according to Athanasius, during the Council of Milan, A.D. 335; according to Jerome and Sulpicius Severus, much earlier. He died about 358. He is commemorated by the Church of Rome Aug. 31. The Church of Treves continues to revere his memory scrupulously. According to tradition, his remains were brought from Phrygia to Treves, but there is doubt as to the accuracy of this report. See Tillemont, *Memoires Ecclesiastiques*, vol. vi.

Paulinus Of Tyre,

an Eastern prelate, flourished in the early part of the 4th century. He was the contemporary and friend of Eusebius of Caesarea, who addressed to him the tenth book of his *Historia Ecclesiastica*. Paulinus is conjectured, from an obscure intimation in Eusebius (*Contra Marcel. Ascyr.* 1. 4), to have been a native of Antioch. He was bishop of Tyre, and the restorer of the church there after it had been destroyed by the heathens in the

Diocletian persecutions. This restoration took place after the death of Maximin Daza, in A.D. 313; consequently Paulinus must have obtained his bishopric before that time. On the dedication of the new building, an oration (*Oratio panegyrica*) was addressed to Paulinus, apparently by Eusebius himself, who has preserved the prolix composition (*Hist. Eccles.* 10:1, 4). On the outbreak of the Arian controversy, Paulinus is represented as one of the chief supporters of Arianism. But it is not clear that he took a decided part in the controversy; he appears to have been, like Eusebius, a moderate man, averse to extreme measures, and to the introduction of unscriptural terms and needless theological definitions. Arius distinctly names him among those who agreed with him: but then Arius gave to the confession to which this statement refers the most orthodox complexion in his power (Theodoret, *Hist. Eccles.* 1, 5). Eusebius of Nicomedia wrote to Paulinus, rebuking him for his silence and concealment of his sentiments; but it is not clear whether he was correctly informed what those sentiments were. Athanasius (*De Synodis*, c. 17) charges Paulinus with having given utterance to Arian sentiments, but gives no citation from him. He certainly agreed with the bishops of Palestine in granting to Arius the power of holding assemblies of his partisans. but at the same time these prelates recommended the heresiarch to submit to his diocesan. Alexander of Alexandria, and to endeavor to be readmitted to the communion of the Church. Paulinus's concurrence in the steps shows that, if not a supporter of Arianism, he was at any rate not a bigoted opponent (Sozomen, *Hist. Eccles.* c. 15). Paulinus was shortly before his death translated to the bishopric of Antioch (Eusebius, *Contra Marcel.* 1. 4; Philostorgius, *Hist. Eccles.* 3:15); but it is disputed whether this was before or after the Council of Nice; some place his translation in A.D. 323, others in A.D. 331. Whether Paulinus was present at the Council of Nice, or even lived to see it, is not determined. The question is argued at considerable length by Valesius (note ad Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* x, i), Hanckius (*De Rerum Byzant. Scriptor.* pt. i, cap. i, § 235, etc.), and by Tillemont (*Memoires*, 7:646, etc.). We are disposed to acquiesce in the judgment of Le Quieln, who places the accession of Paulinus to the see of Antioch in A.D. 323 or 324, and his death in the latter year. See, besides Eusebius, Sozomen, Theodoret, and Philostorgius, Tillemont, *Memoires*, vol. vi and vii; Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, vol. ii, col. 708, 803.

Paulinus

OF YORK, *St.*, an ecclesiastic of the 7th century, noted as the companion of St. Augustine in his mission in England, was sent from Rome by pope Gregory I in A.D. 601. He soon made himself the favorite of the English princes, and obtained positions of influence and trust at court. In A.D. 625 he was consecrated bishop by archbishop Justus to attend Athelburga, daughter of Aethelbert, king of Kent, to the North on her marriage with Edwin, king of the Northumbrians. In A.D. 626 and 627 his missionary labors resulted in marvellous successes; thousands were baptized by him, and his fame was in all the land. He was made bishop of York, where he founded the cathedral, about 628, and in 631 consecrated Honorius archbishop of Canterbury at Lincoln. In 633, on the death of king Edwin, he was obliged to flee before the invading Northumbrians, and settled in Kent. He there became bishop of Rochester, and died about 643. Wordsworth gives a word-picture of Paulinus of York thus:

— *“of shoulders curved, and stature tall,
Black hair and vivid eye, and meagre cheek,
His prominent feature like an eagle’s beak.”*

See Mrs. Clement, *Handbook of Legends and Mythology*, p. 248; Inett, *Hist. of the Church of England* (see Index); Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity*, 2:186 sq.

Paulists (Or Paulites)

Picture for Paulists

also called *hermits of St. Paul*, are a class of Roman Catholic monastics who profess to imitate the life of the great apostle. They have no written rules, and are not strictly a particular order. They have no superior except the bishop in whose diocese they reside. They usually wear a short cloak, with cowl attached, and go barefooted. They are to be met with in Italy, France, Spain, Germany, and many other countries. There is also a congregation of Paulists sometimes called *Barnabites* (q.v.). In Hungary a congregation of Paulists was formed in the 13th century, but was made subject to the rules of the *Augustinians* (q.v.), and ranked with them. During the Reformation movement they became extinct in Hungary; but at Rome the Paulists still maintain a religious house. Their dress is white. They wear a woollen shirt, and hood attached to the collar, which covers

the shoulders. When they go to town they wear a black hat, and a mantle of the same color. In Portugal an order of Paulists was founded in 1652, and their principal monastery is on Mount Ose. They are also subject to the Augustinian rule.

In the United States the "Congregation of the Missionary Priests of St. Paul the Apostle," commonly called "Paulists," was established in New York City, 1858, by Rev. Isaac T. Hecker and several other priests, whom the pope allowed to leave the Redemptorists for the purpose of founding an independent organization for missionary purposes better suited to this country. This congregation reports a house and church in New York, a superior, six other priests, and twelve students preparing for the priesthood. The Paulists are the originators of the Catholic Publication Society, of its monthly periodical, *The Catholic World*, etc., and occupy a very influential position.

Paulitae

an obscure sect of the *Acephali*, followers of Paul, a patriarch of Alexandria, who was deposed by a council (A.D. 541) for his uncanonical consecration by the patriarch of Constantinople, and who after his deposition sided with the Monophysites (Nicephorus, *Hist. Eccles.* c. xlix). The Paulitae are mentioned under the name of *Paulianists* in the treatise on the reception of heretics which was written by Timothy, of Constantinople (Timoth. *De Triplici Recept. lueret.* in *Cotelerii Monument.* 3:377).

Paull, George

a missionary of the Presbyterian Church, was born near Connellsville, Fayette Co., Pa., Feb. 3, 1837. He pursued his preparatory studies first under Rev. Ross Stevenson, of Ligonier, Pa., then in the Dunlap Creek Presbyterian Academy, and afterwards under Prof. John Frazer; graduated at Jefferson College, Canonsburg, Pa., in 1858, in the spring of which year he made a profession of religion, and united with the Church at Connellsville; after leaving college he went South, and engaged in teaching for a time in Mississippi; but, feeling called to preach the Gospel, he returned, and entered the Western Theological Seminary, Allegheny City, Pa.; was licensed by Redstone Presbytery in April, 1861, and graduated at the seminary in 1862. He gave his name to the General Assembly's Board of Foreign Missions as a candidate for missionary work, but owing to the embarrassed state of the board, arising from the civil war. he could not be

sent on his mission immediately. For a time, therefore, he supplied the vacant churches of Tyrone and Sewickley, in his own presbytery; then ministered to a weak Church in Morrison, Whiteside Co., Ill., in Rock River Presbytery; but in 1863 he entered on his own chosen work, being ordained as missionary to Africa, by Redstone Presbytery, at Connellsville. He was appointed to take charge of the mission at Evangasimba, where he labored till, in 1865, at his urgent request, he received an appointment to Bonita, a point on the continent where he hoped to build up a new station. His labors of preaching and teaching, together with the superintendence of building, proved too great even for his strong physical powers, and he died May 14, 1865. Mr. Paull was a man who sought to consecrate all his powers to the service of his Divine Master. He was endowed with a comprehensive understanding, sound judgment, and refined tastes. As a preacher, he was eminently popular-his thought always being pungent, tender, earnest, and practical. See Wilson, *Presbyterian Historical Almanac*, 1866, p. 141. (. L. S.)

Paulli, Just Henrik Voltelen

a Danish Lutheran divine, was born at Copenhagen in 1809. In 1835 he was appointed curate at the church of the Holy Spirit; in 1837 he became chaplain of the Christiansburg palace-chapel; and in 1857 he was elected pastor of the church of the Virgin, and dean of the Zealand diocese. He was for thirty years one of the most noted preachers in Copenhagen. From 1854 till his death, in 1865, he also lectured at the theological seminary. See Barfods, *Fortoellinger*, p. 859. (R. B. A.)

Paulo, Antoine De

a grand-master of the Order of Malta, was born at Toulouse in 1551, and was descended of a family originally from Genoa. In 1590 he was received Chevalier of Malta, and became successively commander of Marseilles, of Sainte-Eulalie, Grand Cross in 1612, and shortly after prior of Saintfilles. Elected grand-master of the order March 10, 1623, three days after the death of Louis de Vasconcelios, he was in the following year called before the pontifical tribunal, accused of disorderly conduct, and with having purchased his nomination with money. Antoine fully justified himself, but was nevertheless engaged in quarrels with pope Urban VIII on the subject of the commanderies of Italy. Under his command the order experienced several reverses on the part of the Turks, and in 1631 there was a general

chapter, which reformed several statutes of the preceding chapters, especially that of 1602, which gave the illegitimate sons of the dukes and peers of France, and of the grandees of Spain, admission into the order. This privilege was then limited to the illegitimate children of kings and princes only. Paulo died June 10, 1636. See De Vertot, *Hist. des Cheval. de Saint Jean de Jerusalem*; *Biog. Toulousaine*; Moreri, *Dict. histor. s.v.*

Paulsen, Hermann Christian

a German divine, noted for his researches in Palestine, flourished as pastor at Crempe, and died there in 1780. He wrote, in Latin, the ecclesiastical history of the Tartars, with a map of Tartary according to modern geographers, which was published as Mosheim's production, because the latter had furnished the materials and revised the work. Paulsen also wrote *Die Regierung des Morgenlandes* (Altona, 1755), and *Zuverldssige Nachricht vom Ackerbau des Morgenlandes* (Helmstadt, 1748).

Paul(us), Von Bernried

an ecclesiastic of the first half of the 12th century, was canon of the cathedral at Regensburg. He was a devoted adherent of the cause of the emperor Henry IV, and a hater of pope Gregory VII. Persecuted by the clergy, he took refuge in the Augustinian convent at Bernried, in Bavaria. In 1128 he went to Rome, and wrote there an apology and a life of Gregory VII (in which are inserted some documents), and a life of St. Hercula, a prophetess and contemporary of his.

Paulus, Burgensis, Or De Santa Maria

a noted Christian convert from Judaism, whose original name was rabbi *Solomon Levi*, was born about 1352, and flourished at Burgos. Until his fortieth year he was a teacher among the Jews, eminent alike for birth and learning. At that age he became acquainted with the writings of Thomas Aquinas, whose treatise *De Legibus* made so deep an impression upon his mind that his national prejudices against Christianity fell to the ground, and he finally embraced Christianity. In the year 1392 he received baptism, together with his four sons, then young children, but who all in after-life inherited their father's high character and great celebrity. His wife was already dead, but his mother and his brothers followed his example, by making public profession of their faith in Christ. He now devoted himself as assiduously to the study of Christian theology as he had before done to

that of the Jews. He obtained the degree of doctor of divinity at Paris, and preached at Avignon, to a very numerous audience, in the presence of Peter de Luna, afterwards pope Benedict XIII, and then one of the candidates for the papacy. Paulus was made archdeacon of Burgos, bishop of Carthagená, and, lastly, bishop of Burgos, a dignity to which his son succeeded during his father's lifetime. All Spanish historians and chroniclers are unanimous in their praises of this descendant of the house of Israel, both as a bishop and statesman, to which latter position (as high chancellor) he was appointed by king Henry III, who even entrusted to him the education of his son and successor, John II. The historians generally style him the excellent — “el varon excelente” — and speak of him as “a man able to govern his tongue, and in all ways well calculated to guide and advise kings.” Paulus Burgensis died in the year 1435, on a journey which he made to visit the different churches of his diocese, although the bishopric itself had already passed to his son Alphonso. His indefatigable activity as a student and expounder of Scripture is attested by his writings, of which two, in particular, deserve our notice: his *Additions to the Postilla of Nicholas de Lyra* (q.v.), and his *Scrutinium Scripturarum*. The latter is of the later date, although published first, and contains, in the form of a dialogue between Paul and Saul, a refutation of Jewish objections to the Christian faith. The introduction, in which the venerable bishop dedicates his work on the whole Bible to his son Don Alphonso of Carthagená, at that time archdeacon of Compostella; affords us an insight into his character and private feelings. He speaks of his own blindness and incredulity, and how he was called from darkness to light, and from the depth of the pit to the open air of heaven. He gives his son the experience of his past life in order that what he has not seen with his eyes may yet be engraven on his memory as coming from the lips of his father, that in his turn he may tell to those who are younger than himself; and they to their descendants, not to forget the works of the Lord, nor cease from the study of his holy Word. He continued to labor at it in his old age, and had the satisfaction of finishing it a little before his death. It is chiefly intended to bring conviction to his former coreligionists, and for that purpose is filled with striking passages in support of the Christian faith, quoted from rabbinical writers, giving their views of the person, the distinguishing characteristics, and the promised kingdom of Messiah. That the bishop was not only sincere in his convictions, but also in his zeal for the Church and the conversion of his former coreligionists, cannot be denied, but the more remarkable is the malicious manner in which the Jewish historian Gritz

speaks of this convert. See Furst, *Bibl. Jud.* 1:137; Gratz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, 8:84 sq.; Da Costa, *Israel and the Gentiles*, p. 313-326; Kalkar, *Israel u. die Kirche*, p. 29 sq.; Basnage, *Hist. des Juifs*, p. 691 (Taylor's English transl.); Wolf, *Bibl. Hebr.* 3:901 sq.; Schudt, *Jüdische Merkwürdigkeiten*, 4:291; Kitto, *Cyclop.* s.v.; Colomesius, *Italia et Hispan. Orient.* p. 231; Kayserling, *Sephardim*, p. 61 sq.; Antonii *Bibl. veterum Hispan.* 2:157 sq.; Fabricius, *Delectus argumentorum et syllabus scriptorum*, etc., p. 575 sq. (Hamburg, 1752); Schmucker, *Hist. of the Modern Jews* (Phila. 1867), p. 167 sq.; De Castro, *Hist. of the Jews in Spain* (Engl. transl. by Kirwan, Lond. 1851), p. 105 sq.; Pick, in the *Evang. Rev.* July, 1876, p. 35 sq., and reprinted in the *Jewish Intelligencer* (Lond. Nov. 1876); Diestel, *Geschichte des A Ilen Testaments in der christl. Kirche* (Jena, 1869), p. 199, 201; Simon, *Hist. Crit.* etc. (Rotterdam, 1685), p. 415 sq.; Delitzsch, *Wissenschaft, Kunst u. Judenthum*, p. 128 sq.; Margoliouth, *The Hebrews in East Anglia* (Lond. 1870), p. 57 sq. (B. P.)

Paulus Canossa,

also PARADISUS, a convert from Judaism, flourished in the 16th century in Italy. For about five years, from 1533-1538, he was professor of Hebrew, and wrote *Dialogus de modo legendi Hebraica* (Paris, 1534). John Quinquarboreus (in Colomesius, *Italia et Hispania*, p. 68) says of him that, like his great namesake, he was also of the tribe of Benjamin; and in a work which he dedicated to Paradisus he addresses him in his dedication in the following manner, "Omnes in tui admirationem ingenii dexteritate trahis." Paradisus died in 1543, greatly lamented by Quinquarboreus, who gives vent to his feelings in the following lines: "Descende hue iterum, tui precantur, Nam postquam invida fata tulerunt, Nemo substitui tibi meretur. Hac ergo ratione nunc necesse est, Ut sis suppositus tibi ipse." See Furst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3:65; Wolf, *Bibl. Hebr.* iii, n. 1811 b; 4:950, n. 1811 f; Jocher, *Allgem. Gelehrten - Lexikon*, s.v.; Kalkar, *Israel und die Kirche*, p. 76. (B. P.)

Paulus (Or Paululus) Of Fulda

a convert from Judaism, flourished towards the end of the 11th century. Of his early life we know nothing, not even the year when he embraced Christianity. He entered the monastery at Fulda, and wrote the *Life of S. Erhard, bishop of Regensburg* (reprinted in Bollandi *Acta Sanctorum*, vol. i, Jan. 8), and *De Conversione S. Pauli Apostoli*. Whether he is the same as

Paulus Bernriedensis, as some suggest, is difficult to say. See Jocher, *Allgem. Gelehrten-Lexikon*, s.v. (B. P.)

Paulus Of Prague,

originally named ELCHANAN BEN-MENACHEM; was born of Jewish parents about the year 1540, and embraced Christianity at Nuremberg in 1556. He died near the close of the 16th century. Paulus wrote, in Hebrew verse, a treatise on the Messiah according to the Jewish Kabbalah (Helmstadt, 1580; afterwards translated into Latin, *Demonstratio cabbalistica*, ibid. 1580): — *Solida et perspicua demonstratio de SS. Trinitate*, etc. (Leips. 1574): — *Confessio fidei et testimonia Scripturae sacrae de resurrectione moartuorum*, printed in the 2d edition of his *Solida* (ibid. 1576): — *Symbolum apostolicum ex Vetere Testamento confirmatum* (Wittenberg, 1580): — *Jona quadrilinguis*, the book of Jonah in Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and German (Helmstadt, 1580). See Furst, *Bibl. Jud.* 1:229; 3:69; Wolf, *Bibl. Hebr.* 1:143, 964; 3:910; *Saat auj Hoffnung* (Erlangen, 1869-1870), 7:374; Fabricii *Delectus argumentorum. et syllabus scriptorum* (Hamburg, 1725), p. 581. (B. P.)

Paulus, Alvarez, Of Cordova,

the biographer of his friend the martyr Eulogius, flourished in the middle of the 9th century. Of his early life nothing is known beyond the fact that he was of Jewish parentage. The times in which Alvarez lived were very troublesome to the Christians. When, in July, A.D. 711, the last Gothic king, Rodriguez, perished at the great fight near Xeres de la Frontera, and Spain had become a province of the Eastern caliphate, an impetuous ambition moved the Arab leaders to extend their conquests beyond the Pyrenees, and from the borders of Catalonia they reached the walls of Tours. Here, however, they had to meet face to face the chivalrous Charles Martel, who utterly overthrew the invading host, thus washing away the insult offered to his country in a deluge of blood. By this most critical and decisive victory the European countries were saved from the ravages of a universal war, and the infamy of subjugation to the Mohammedan power. In the battles fought in those times many Christians fell, while not a few sought martyrdom. Two parties divided the Church, the rigid and the more liberal: the latter thought that under these difficult circumstances everything should be done to preserve and foster the friendly relations subsisting between them and the Mohammedan magistrates, while the

former looked upon such conduct as being a violation of the duty to confess Christ before men, and not be ashamed of him. One of the fiercest representatives of the latter class was Paulus Alvarez, who, in his *Indiculus Luminosus*, casts it as a reproach upon the Christians that by accepting offices at court they became guilty of participating in infidelity, and styles them leopards, taking upon themselves every color. He justified those who voluntarily entered the Mohammedan circles in order to defy the false prophet, and thus become martyrs for Christ's sake. He compared these martyrs with the witnesses for the truth of olden times, who fearlessly came forward before princes and people. His zeal was not always in the right direction, but he felt an ardent hatred against the unbelievers, as well as against all priests who would not recognize the glory of martyrdom.

Among his many epistles there is one written to a certain Eleazar, in which he confesses his belief that Messiah had already come, and then continues: "Which of us has the most right to the name of Jew; you, who have passed from the worship of idols to the knowledge of one God, or I, who am an Israelite both by birth and faith? Yet I no longer call myself a Jew, because that new name is given to me which the mouth of the Lord hath named! Abraham is in truth my father, but not only because my ancestors proceed from him. Those who have expected that Messiah should come, but who also receive him because he is already come, are more truly Israelites than those who, after long waiting for him, rejected him when he came, and yet cease not to expect his coming." See Neander, *Hist. of the Christian Religion and Church*, 3:337 sq. (Torrey's ed. Boston, 1872); Gieseler, *Church Hist.* 2:95 sq. (Smith's ed. N.Y. 1865); Da Costa, *Israel and the Gentiles*, p. 310 sq.; Kalkar, *Israel u. d. Kirche*, p. 21; Antonii *Bibl. Hist.* 1:349; Florez, *Espania Sagrada* (Madrid, 1747-1801. 42 vols. 4to), 11:62, where the works of Alvarez are given; also Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* vol. 115, where the biography of Eulogius is to be found. (B. P.)

Paulus, Gottfried

was a convert from Judaism, of whom nothing is known, not even the time in which he lived. As he wrote in the Dutch language, he probably lived in Holland. He is the author of *Inleiding, waar in bewesen word, dat de Jooden van den Vleek allsen door Christus verlost worden, item Eenige Bewysen van de Gottheyd Messias uyt Sohar Bereschit*, s. 1. et a. See Furst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3:69; Wolf, *Bibl. Hebr.* 3:906. (B. P.)

Paulus, Heinrich Eberhard Gottlob

a German theologian of great note in his day, and one of the leaders of the Rationalists at the close of the last and the first quarter of the present century, was born at Leonberg, near Stuttgart, Sept. 1, 1761. He at first intended devoting himself to the study of medicine, but becoming interested in the Pietistic movement, he soon turned all his attention to the study of theology, and proceeded to Tübingen, to devote himself to studies preparatory to entering the ministry. He also spent some time traveling in Franconia and Saxony. Next he gave himself to the study of Oriental languages at Göttingen, and afterwards went to London and Paris to continue his researches. In 1789 he was called to the professorship of Oriental languages at Jena, and in 1793, on the death of Doderlein, became professor of theology. Here he especially signalized himself by the critical elucidation of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments in so far as they present Oriental characteristics. The results of his labors may be seen in his *Philologisch-kritischer und historischer Commentar über das Neue Testament* (Lubeck, 1800-1804, 4 vols.): — *Clavis über die Psalmen* (Jena, 1791): — *Clavis über den Jesaias*, and other writings belonging to this period of his literary activity. In 1803 he removed to Würzburg; in 1808, to Bamberg; in 1809, to Nuremberg; and in 1811 to Ansbach. During these various changes he had ceased to be a professor, and became a director of ecclesiastical and educational affairs; but in 1811 he accepted the professorship of exegesis and ecclesiastical history at Heidelberg, and was thus once more given the opportunities of academical life. In 1819 he started a kind of historico-political journal entitled *Sophronizon*, in which he continued to write for about ten years. His contributions were marked by weighty sense, moderation, and knowledge of his various subjects, and won him great renown at the time. His essays upon passing important subjects, such as proselytizing, the influence of the popish government on the national Roman Catholic Church of Germany, and others, gained great applause. As a theological writer he was anxious to warn his readers equally against a one-sided nationality and a speculative deviation from the original doctrines of Christianity, as from mysticism and Jesuitism. With these ideas he began in 1825 a theological year-book, called *Der Denkylaubige*, published from 1825 to 1829, and another journal called *Kirchenbeleuchtungen*, published in 1827. From his numerous writings we select for mention the following: *Memorabilien* (Leips. 1791-1796): — *Sammlung der merkwürdigsten Reisen in den Orient* (Jena, 1792-1803, 7

vols.): — *Leben Jesu, als Grundlage einer reinen Geschichte des Urchristenthums* (Heidelb. 1828, 2 vols.): — *Aufklrende Beitrege zur Doymnen Kitchen und Religions geschichte* (Bremen, 1830): — and *Exegetisches handbuch uber die drei ersten Evangelien* (Heidelb. 1830-1833, 3 vols.). His services to Oriental literature are numerous and important. While at Jena he edited the “Repertory of Biblical and Oriental Literature,” the Arabic version of Isaiah by Saadias, and Abdollatif’s “Compendium Memorabil. Egypti,” etc. As a theologian, he is generally looked upon as the type of pure, unmitigated rationalism — a man who sat down to examine the Bible with the profound conviction that everything in it represented as supernatural was only natural or fabulous, and that true criticism consisted in endeavoring to prove this. Perhaps none of the German Rationalists have done more to spread the infection of neological opinions and modes of thinking than Paulus. Under the imposing pretense of superior deference to the reasoning power in man, he, with others, had great success in weakening the hold of salutary divine truth on the educated mind of Germany, and bred great skepticism, not only as to the doctrines, but the authority of revelation. Paulus died Aug. 10, 1851, having lived long enough to see his own rationalistic theory of Scripture give place to the “mythical” theory of Strauss, and that in its turn to be shaken to its foundations partly by the efforts of the Tubingen school, and partly by those of Neander and the “Broad Church” divines of Germany. See his *Skizzen aus meiner Bildungs- und Lebensgeschichte zum A ndenken an meininfzigjahrige Jubilaum* (Heidelb. 1839); Meldegg, *Paulus u.s.Zeit* (Stuttg. 1853, 2 vols. 8vo); Kahnis, *Hist. of German Protestantism*, p. 171; Hurst, *Hist. of Rationalism*, p. 36; Hurst’s Hagenbach, *Church Hist. of the 18th and 19th Centuries*; Ebrard, *Kitchenu. Dogmengesch.* vol. iv.

Paulus de Heredia Of Aragon

was born about 1405. When yet in connection with the synagogue he used to dispute with Christian theologians about the merits of Judaism; nevertheless he afterwards became a convert of Christianity. He wrote, *Ensis Pauli*: — *Iggeret ha-Sadot*, treating of the divinity, death, and resurrection of the Messiah, which a certain Nechunjah ben-ha-Kanah, who lived towards the end of the second Temple, is said to have written: — *De Mysteriis Fidei*, against the Talmud: — and *Corona Regia*, on the immaculate conception of Mary, which he dedicated to pope Innocent VIII. When Paulus died is uncertain, but in 1485 he was yet alive. See

Furst, *Bibl. Jud.* 1:385; Wolf, *Bibl. Hebr.* 1:963; De Castro, *Biblioth.* 1:363 sq.; Gratz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, 8:231 sq. (2d ed. Leips. 1875, p. 232); Kalkar, *Israel u. die Kirche*, p. 31. (B. P.)

Pauperes Catholici

(i.e. *Poor Catholics*) was the name of a Romish order which was formed in the 12th century, and confirmed by pope Innocent III. It consisted of Waldenses who had conformed to the dominant Church. Some ecclesiastics from the south of France, who had once been Waldensians, took the lead in the formation of this order, particularly a person named Durand de Osca. It maintained itself for some time in Catalonia. The design of this society is thus described by Neander: "The ecclesiastics and better educated were to busy themselves with preaching, exposition of the Bible, religious instruction, and combating the sects; but all the laity who were not qualified to exhort the people and combat the sects should occupy houses by themselves, where they were to live in a pious and orderly manner. This spiritual society, so remodeled, should endeavor to bring about a reunion of all the Waldenses with the Church. As the Waldenses deemed it unchristian to shed blood and to swear, and the presiding officers of the new spiritual society begged the pope that those who were disposed to join them should be released from all obligation of complying with customs of this sort, the pope granted at their request that all such as joined them should not be liable to be called upon for military service against Christians, nor to take oath in civil processes, adding, indeed, the important clause — so far as this rule could be observed in a healthful manner without injury or offense to others, and especially with the permission of the secular lords. In Italy and Spain also the zeal of these representatives of the Church tendency among the Waldenses seemed to meet with acceptance. The pope gladly lent a hand in promoting its more general spread, and he was inclined to grant to those who came over to it, when they had once become reconciled to the Church, various marks of favor. But he insisted on unconditional submission, and refused to enter into any conditional engagements." The principles of the Waldenses were too firmly rooted to be seriously affected by the society of the *Pauperes Catholici*, and accordingly it is said to have died away.

Pauperes Christi

(i.e. *The Poor of Christ*), a Roman Catholic order which arose in the 12th century, formed by a zealous ecclesiastic named Robert of Arbriscelles, on whom pope Urban II had conferred the dignity of apostolic preacher. The society was composed of persons of both sexes, and of ecclesiastics and laymen, who wished to learn the way of spiritual living under the direction of the founder of the order.

Pauperes de Lombardia

(i.e. *Poor Men of Lombardy*) was a name applied in the 12th century to the *Waldenses* in the north of Italy. It is derived from the province in which they were chiefly found at that time. *SEE WALDENSES*.

Pauperism

is the state of indigent persons requiring help, or, as it is technically called, “relief,” or, as the Bible terms it, “charity.” “The poor shall never cease out of the land” was said ages ago, when land was “free,” and of a “chosen people,” watched over by a “special providence,” pasturing their flocks in fertile valleys, bright with the sunshine of a genial climate — a nature which needed no stimulus from “high-farming,” but flung her wealth with prodigal hand into the lap of a community whose primitive manners ignored fashion, and whose social life was unfevered by the lavish expenditure of a high civilization. As the possession of every natural advantage was no preventive to want, but “the poor” were there, so there and everywhere they will “never cease out of the land,” because human nature is weak, self-contradictory, and therefore sinful; because it is self-sufficient and indolent, and therefore ignorant and miscalculating; because it is proud and ambitious, and therefore liable to fall. Besides, in so far as poverty depends upon passion and error, the poor will increase *pari passu* with an artificial condition of society, for civilization intensifies the vices as well as the virtues of mankind. Therefore it is not amiss to call the poverty of the *masses* a product of modern civilization. It may be specially called the product of our progress in the industries, and of the employment of steam instead of simple manual labor. By these, our progressive steps, casualties and accidents have increased in this age at such a ratio among the working people that it must stand out as one of the most provoking causes of pauperism. Besides, the tremendous spread of the bad habits of intemperance, *SEE TEMPERANCE*, has considerably lessened the

resources of this stratum of society, and thereby provoked a vast increase in paupers.

Pauperism, then, is a subject of our day which requires the gravest consideration of the philanthropist, and forces itself upon the attention of the Church as well as of the State. Indeed, we believe that the suppression of pauperism is a task of Christian ethics, for although the solution of the problem is within the province of politics, it is nevertheless true that Christian ethics must provide the motive and pave the way. It may, therefore, be well to point out in this place the principle on which all poor legislation should rest.

Paley affirms that the claim of the poor is founded on the law of nature, because all things having been originally common, the exclusive possession of property was and is permitted on the expectation that every one should have enough for subsistence, or the means of procuring it. We may doubt whether this opinion is sound, notwithstanding that it has the advocacy of some of the ablest English thinkers, and that even such an unbelieving mind as Mill approved it, but we cannot doubt that the Poor Laws rest upon *moral* and *political* considerations of great weight. If statesmen cannot contemplate masses of population in a condition of semi-starvation without anxiety and fear, Christians certainly should not suffer society to be thus endangered so long as the ethical principles of Christianity can be brought to influence not only the private life of the individual, but all conditions and numbers. For the successful, i.e. prompt and general alleviation of all suffering and want, the State has stepped in to enforce obedience to an admitted moral obligation, which might otherwise be recognized by the conscientious and disregarded by the selfish. This is the purpose of the modern *Poor Laws*. Different states have different methods by which this principle is evolved in practice. The general practice is for the State to delegate to the parochial authorities the proper execution of the Poor-Law principle, supplying homes called workhouses for those who are homeless. and affording assistance in money and provisions for those who are temporarily or permanently out of employment. The charges which are brought against this system are many, and some of them are serious enough to require consideration here.

It was the wise rule of Napoleon the Great that the first duty of a charitable institution is to prevent the need of charity. Hence he favored domiciliary visitation, or what is technically called in the science of pauperism “out-

door relief.” In England, on the other hand, the maxim of the State is that the poor have a *right* to relief, or, in other words, that charity is a fund on which they can confidently depend. By Napoleon’s principle, the object of charity is the reduction of pauperism; by the English, relief is the privilege of the poor, regardless of the consequences. Both systems have been tried nearly all over the Continent, and it is quite clear that Napoleon’s rule alone is adapted to modern society, and should govern in the dispensing of charity. Few things degrade men in their own estimation so quickly as the habit of relying on alms for support. *The divine plan for developing manhood is to make self-exertion a stern necessity.* But when the State makes a working man sure of charitable support in time of need, it takes from him the sharpest spur to self-exertion; it tempts him to form unthrifty habits; it teaches him to lean on its support in his possible emergencies, instead of stores provided by his own economical forethought for the sure-coming “rainy day.” This feeling demoralizes him by sapping his self-respect, his pride of character, and his sense of manly independence. In other words, legal provision making his support certain, prepares him to become a pauper whenever the battle of life waxes hot. That this is not a mere theory, but a condensed statement of historic fact, can be shown by reference to the painful results of the English poor laws. Those laws, strangely enough, were made necessary by the abolition of serfdom in the 14th century. At first they were wisely framed, making provision for the “impotent poor” only, and for the punishment of vagrant laborers. Gradually, however, they gave birth to the idea of the “right of all persons to claim relief of the State.” Then came the erection of almshouses, and the establishment of “poor rates.” Finally, the idea culminated in a law, passed in 1782, granting outdoor relief through the agency of the State officers. The effect was to multiply the number of paupers with fearful rapidity, and, as a writer in the *Westminster Review* has aptly said, to bring the “country almost to the verge of ruin... Poor rates rose to such an extent that it became hardly worth while in some instances to retain the land in cultivation.” So clearly did this peculiar provision for out-door relief tend to increase the number of paupers, that in 1834 an act was passed chiefly aiming “to check out-door relief, . . . and then, within a few years, both rates and pauperism decreased to no small extent.”

The maxim of Malthus is (*Essay on Population*, 2:430) that “it is in the highest degree important to the general happiness of the poor that no man should look to charity as a fund on which he may confidently depend,” and

it is a good one to be adopted by those who regard charity as a Christian obligation; but with this maxim should be coupled a recognition of the obligation upon society to make education *general* and *free*. It is a noteworthy fact that both in England and in France pauperism has been on the increase, although the efforts have been most persistent for its diminution; and it is further evident that in countries where education is general, free, and obligatory, as, e.g. in Germany, school training has acted as a direct *counter-agent* to pauperism. It may reasonably be supposed that, "had the 'right of education' been as familiar an axiom with the English masses as the 'right of relief,' we should not now hear of a million paupers in a population of 22,000,000, and know that the problem of pauperism presents itself as an almost insoluble question to the best of the English reformers" (Charles L. Bruce). The influences of workhouse or almshouse life are pernicious in the extreme to the occupants. It is of the very first importance to society that pauperism should not be inherited and transmitted, from the familiar scientific principle that inherited evil is intensified in each new generation. It has been found that places of refuge for the poor, as such, are the propagators of pauperism, inasmuch as they take from its occupants all self-respect and independence. Hence in our day France and England, as well as Germany, are abandoning the workhouse system, and are adopting, or are taking steps for the adoption of what is called the "door of relief" principle; but the relief is given by a *local* relieving officer, and that in time to prevent absolute dependence, or, as it may be really stated, to prevent the needy from acquiring the *habits* of pauperism.

In the United States of America, where the influence both of general suffrage and of the Protestant faith largely cultivates individual self-respect and independence, pauperism has not yet acquired much hold. Some go so far as to claim that the abundance of arable land, and the comparatively slight pressure of population on subsistence, as well as our methods of popular education, must prevent a development of pauperism. But those who reason in this way lose sight of the fact that the Old World pours in upon us continually such vast numbers of idlers, vagabonds, and poor, to whom dependence is as natural as breathing, and in whom that feeling of self-respect which spurns reliance on public charity has never been developed, and that pauperism is therefore sure to become, sooner or later, a fixed element in our population. In view of this possibility, if not probability, the subject requires most considerate attention from the

Church of Christ. It is true the State has here and there created central boards of charity, which tend to give unity of administration to parish and town management of the poor; classification is introduced into the care of paupers; and above all, the effort has begun in New York State and Massachusetts to withdraw all pauper children not diseased in mind or body from almshouses, and to place them in private families, in order to prevent an inherited pauperism but none of these measures, we fear, adequately meet our *coming* wants. Were our society stationary we might succeed, but in our surging condition there must be a judicious system of out-door relief, and it can be accomplished only by *close personal visitation*. This in our body politic the Church alone is fitted to assume. Voluntary associations of the best citizens in every community are alone fit to judge of the deserving character of all claimants for relief; and, as besides these there are many needy ones who, in horror at receiving alms, would rather suffer death by starvation than seek for relief from the public, the noblest type of society, and not the ward politician, are proper persons to counsel and relieve the American pauper. Indeed, we would have it understood that it is not simply relief that the needy ones stand in want of; they should have such *counsel* as may prevent a recurrence of disaster and failure in life. Christian benevolence should not simply feed the hungry and clothe the naked, it should teach the ignorant and raise the degraded.

The most successful experiment with pauperism is notably that of Elberfeld, a German manufacturing town near Cologne, on the Rhine. This municipality was sorely afflicted, some twenty years since, with a chronic condition of pauperism. The usual machinery of almshouses or of private charity did not diminish it. If people gave freely and indiscriminately, the poor came to depend on alms; if too many public means of relief were afforded, there was a current of paupers thither from the surrounding country. In 1853, with a population of 50,364, there were relieved 4224 paupers, or about one in twelve. A certain benevolent gentleman — Herr von der Heydt, the Prussian minister of commerce — then undertook to introduce a reform in the following manner: He had the city divided for the purpose into eighteen districts, and an overseer, serving voluntarily, appointed by the common council, over each. Every district again was divided into fourteen sections, and a visitor appointed for each section. This visitor was required to be of the male sex, and he was never allowed to visit more than four families, and sometimes only two. These families he was obliged to visit at least once a fortnight, report to the overseer, discuss

their cases of relief, receive their money for the ensuing two weeks, and give account of what they had already spent. The most particular inquiries were thus made into every case relieved, whether each person was doing all in his power for his own support, and whether his relatives were obeying the law in contributing towards his maintenance. The object of the visitors of the poor was not merely to give alms, but to encourage and advise unfortunate and ignorant people, and thus prevent poverty. The whole system was thus one of close supervision and moral assistance of the poor by the more comfortable classes. The fortunate and the unfortunate were brought together; the well-off and intelligent had an official right to direct the ignorant and destitute. To complete the organization, the overseers themselves met and reported to the poor commissioners of the town, and received from them the moneys for out-door relief. The best citizens were found willing to serve gratuitously as visitors or overseers; indeed, the place was considered one of some honor. The commissioners were appointed by the common council and mayor, and served for three years. At the present time the poor administration of this city of nearly 80,000 inhabitants consists of a commission of 9 members, 18 overseers, and 252 visitors, all serving gratuitously. The theory of the system, it will be observed, is a close house-to-house visitation and careful inspection, by citizens serving under officials, whose object is to prevent, not encourage, pauperism. What have been the results? A brief table will convey them best, the reader bearing in mind that the new system was introduced in 1854:

Year.	Population.	Paupers relieved.
1853	50,364	4224
1855	51,259	2948
1860.....	54,002	1521
1865	63,686	1289
1873.....	(about) 78,000	980

Or, in other words, before the new plan was introduced, one in twelve was a pauper, and now one in eighty. The cost has also fallen from about \$38,000 in 1847 to about \$17,000 in 1873. The average cost of relief in 1855-59 was only some \$18,000 per annum. A still greater reduction of cost would have been shown but for the increased prices of provisions and all commodities during the past few years.

We realize that in our review of the subject the wandering pauper, or, as he is familiarly called, *tramp*, has had no consideration. There are everywhere numerous persons so lazy or vicious that they prefer to be supported rather than to labor for their bread; it is scarcely necessary to say that it is not the proper province of either the State or charitable individuals to relieve such drones. The alternative of work or starvation should be forced upon all such with unbending persistence. Those who, away from home and friends, need help, we can safely trust to the benevolent intentions of such individuals as we would see placed in charge of the charities of every town in the land. See Walker, *Science of Wealth*, p. 411 sq.; Greeley, *Political Economy*, p. 17 sq.; *North Amer. Rev.* April, 1875, art. 3, where much important literature is quoted. See also *Brit. Quarterly*, April, 1876, art. 6; *Westminster Review*, April, 1874; January, 1875.

Pausarii

a name given to the priests of His (q.v.) at Rome, because in their religious processions they were accustomed to make pauses at certain places, where they engaged in singing hymns and performing other sacred rites.

Pauw, Cornelius

a Dutch divine, noted as a writer, was born at Amsterdam in 1739. He studied at Gottingen, and was afterwards made canon of Xanten, in the duchy of Cleves. He applied himself to literature, and wrote several works in French on the history and physiology of various nations and countries. His *Recherches historiques sur les Americains* contain some curious information, many sensible reflections, and also many unsupported assertions set forth in a dogmatic tone. Pauw had not visited America, and his object seems to have been to collect all the passages which he could find in other writers, and which could support some preconceived opinion of his concerning the great inferiority of that part of the world, its productions and its native races. (See Pernety, *Dissertation sur l'Amerique; et les Americains contre les Recherches historiques de M. de Pauw*, which is found at the end of some editions of Pauw's work.) In his chapter on Paraguay, Pauw shows himself particularly hostile to the Jesuits. His *Recherches sur les Grecs*, in which he had better guides, is written with greater sobriety of judgment; but even, in this work his dogmatic spirit is perceptible. Pauw published also *Recherches sur les Egyptiens et les Chinois*. The French Revolution, and the subsequent

invasion of the duchy of Cleves, deprived Pauw of his peace of mind. He became dejected, and burned all his papers, among others his *Recherches sur les Allemands*, which is said to have been the most elaborate of his works, but which was never printed. He died at Xanten in 1799.

Pavan

a Hindu deity who is believed to preside over the winds. He was the father of Hanuman, the ape-god.

Pavanne, Jacques

a Christian martyr to the Protestant cause, was born in France about the opening of the 16th century. He became an early convert to the Reformation doctrines, but in 1524, at Christmas, recanted. After this he lost his peace of mind, and could do nothing but weep and sigh, until he was one day brought before the tribunal of the Sorbonne because he had been to Meaux, and had had converse with the heretical teachers. This was all that Pavanne desired another opportunity to confess his true Lord and his cause. "He felt his mind relieved as soon as the fetters were fastened on his limbs, and recovered all his energy in the open confession of Jesus Christ" (D'Aubigne). The proceedings against him were conducted with all possible despatch, and a very short time had elapsed before a pile was erected in the Place de Grove, on which Pavanne made a joyful end. See D'Aubigne, *Hist. of the Reformation*, 3:482, 483.

Pavels, Claus

a Norwegian prelate, was born Aug. 1, 1769. in Vaudei parish, near Christians and, in Norway. He graduated with the highest honors at the gymnasium in Christians and and at the University of Copenhagen. From 1799 to 1805 lie preached in Copenhagen, but was then called to Christiania, Norway, where he remained until 1817. From 1817 until he died, in 1822, he was bishop of Bergen. He enjoyed a great reputation as a pulpit orator, and published a number of sermons and religious treatises. He also wrote poetry, and kept a diary, in which he recorded all the more important events of his time. His grandson, C. P. Riis, has published two of his writings; the one, *Bishop Claus Pavels Autobiographi* (Christiania, 1866); the other, *Claus Pavels Dagbogs Optegnelser* (ibid. 186467). (R. B. A.)

Pavement

is the rendering in the A.V. of $\text{hP}\chi\text{f}\alpha\text{it}\text{spah}'$, originally a *stone* heated for baking purposes, and hence a *tesselated pavement* (^{<1408>}2 Chronicles 7:3; ^{<17006>}Esther 1:6; Ezekiel xl, 17, 18; 42:3), once of the cognate term $\text{t}\text{p}\chi\text{r}\text{h}\text{i}$ *martse'pheth*, a *paved floor* (^{<12167>}2 Kings 16:17). In ^{<4913>}John 19:13 it is the rendering of $\lambda\text{i}\theta\acute{o}\sigma\text{t}\rho\omega\tau\omicron\varsigma$, which is immediately explained by the Heb. equivalent *Gabbatha* (q.v.). In the account of the sacrilege of Ahab, we read that he removed the brazen oxen upon which the base in the Temple rested, and substituted a stone pavement (^{<12167>}2 Kings 16:17). The lower stories of Eastern houses and palaces, in later days, were usually paved with marble (^{<17006>}Esther 1:6), but in the time of Moses marble was not used for pavements. The "paved work of a sapphire stone" mentioned in ^{<12240>}Exodus 24:10 is therefore supposed to refer to the splendid floors known in Egypt, which were formed of painted tiles or bricks. Champollion and Rosellini have given specimens of these ornamented floors, and fragments of such may be seen in the British Museum. This taste still prevails in the East. Le Bruyn tells us that the mosque at Jerusalem is almost all covered over with green and blue bricks, which are glazed, so that when the sun shines the eye is perfectly dazzled; and Dr. Russell likewise mentions that a portion of the pavement of some of the houses in Syria is composed of mosaic work. *SEE HOUSE.*

Pavement Of Churches.

Picture for Pavement

From the 4th century churches were carefully paved, as the Jewish Temple had an artificial floor. The narthex was laid with plaster, the nave with wood, and the sanctuary with mosaic. The custom of burying within churches between the 7th and 10th centuries led to the practice of covering the pavement with memorials of the departed; and at length the floors were laid with stone, marble, or tesselated or plain tiles. Rich pavements, like *marqueterie* in stone or Roman mosaic, occur in most parts of Italy, at St. Omer, St. Denis, in the Rhine country, at Canterbury, Westminster, and in the churches. of St. Mary Major, St. Laurence without the Walls, of the time of Adrian I, and St. Martin of the period of Constantine at Rome. The patterns are usually geometrical, but figures, flowers, animals, and the zodiac are frequently introduced with an effect equal to the richest tapestry. This decoration lasted till the 12th century, but at that time, and in

the subsequent period, marble became rare, and hard blocks of freestone were used, and lastly tiles.

Pavia

a city of Northern Italy, capital of the province of the same name, on the left bank of the Ticino, twenty miles south of Milan, and three miles above the confluence of the Ticino and the Po, was in ancient times called the "city of a hundred towers." It is a very old city, and many of its antiquities remain to this day; but the palace of Theodoric and the tower where Boethius wrote the treatise *De Consolatione Philosophiae* no longer exist; among the remaining ones are those of Belcredi and Del Maino, which are each 169 feet high. Its oldest church, and perhaps the oldest in Italy, is that of San Michele, which, although the date of its foundation is uncertain, is first mentioned in 661. The cathedral, containing some good paintings, was commenced in 1484, but was never finished. In a beautiful chapel attached to it are the ashes of St. Augustine, in a sarcophagus ornamented with fifty bassirilievi, ninety-five statues, and numerous grotesques. In the church of San Pietro in Ciel d'Auro are deposited the remains of the unfortunate Boethius. The Certosa of Pavia, the most splendid monastery in the world, is four miles without the city. It was founded in 1396. The University of Pavia is greatly celebrated for its learned professors, large libraries, and museums. About 1600 students attend here annually. Pavia is the ancient *Ticinum* (afterwards *Papia*, whence the modern name), and was founded by the Ligurii; it was sacked by Brennus and by Hannibal, burned by the Huns, conquered by the Romans, and became a place of considerable importance at the end of the Roman empire. Then it came into the possession of the Goths and Lombards, and the kings of the latter made it the capital of the kingdom of Italy. It became independent in the 12th century, then, weakened by civil wars, it was conquered by Matthew Visconti in 1345. After that period its history is merged in that of the conquerors of Lombardy. Since 1859 it has been included within the reorganized kingdom of Italy.

Pavia, Council Of

(*Concilium Papiense* or *Ticiense*). Several ecclesiastical councils have been held in Pavia.

I. The first of these was convened in December, 850, by order of the emperor Louis, who attended himself. Bishop Angelbert of Milan presided.

As secular matters were also considered by this body, the ecclesiastical character of the council is sometimes called in question. We append a notice of the principal topics contained in the twenty-five canons of ecclesiastical discipline enacted by this council:

1. Directs that bishops shall keep about them priests and deacons of known probity to be witnesses of their secret acts.

2. Directs that bishops shall celebrate mass not only on Sundays and holy days, but, when possible, every day; and that they shall not neglect privately to offer prayers for themselves, their fellow-bishops, kings, all the rulers of God's Church, and for all those who have desired their prayers, but especially for the poor.

3. Orders them to exercise frugality at table, to receive pilgrims and poor and sick people, and to exhort them and read to them.

4 and 5. Direct that they shall not hunt, hawk, etc., nor mix in worldly pleasures; bids them read the Holy Scriptures, explain them to their clergy, and preach on Sundays and holy days.

7. Directs that priests shall examine whether penitents really perform their acts of penance, give alms largely, etc.; public offenders to be reconciled by the bishop only.

9. Warns all fathers of families to marry their daughters as soon as they are of age, lest they fall into sill; and forbids the marriage blessing to those who marry after fornication.

14. Orders bishops immediately to re-establish those monasteries in their dioceses which have gone to decay through their negligence.

18. Declares that priests and deacons (acephali) who are under no episcopal jurisdiction are not to be looked Upon as belonging to the clergy.

21. Forbids usury.

22. Enjoins bishops to watch over those who have the care of orphans, and to see that they do not injure or oppress them. If such oppressors refuse to listen to their remonstrances, they are ordered to call the emperor's attention to the case.

23. Orders bishops to arrest clerks and monks who wander about the country, agitating useless questions and sowing the seeds of error, and to bring them before the metropolitan.

25. Condemns to a very severe course of penance those who deal in magical arts, who pretend to cause love or hatred by their incantations, and who are suspected of having caused the death of others; enjoins that they shall not be reconciled except on their death-bed.

See Labbe, *Concil.* 8:61.

II. A second council was convened at Pavia in A.D. 876 by Charles the Bald. Seventeen bishops from Tuscany and Lombardy attended. The archbishop of Milan presided. Fifteen canons were published. Of these the most noteworthy enactments are:

1. Orders respect and veneration everywhere for the holy Roman Church, as the head of all churches.

2 and 3. Also relate to the respect, etc., due to the Roman see, and to the pope John.

4. Orders respect for the priesthood.

5. Orders respect for the imperial dignity. The three following relate to the duties of bishops. The acts of this council were confirmed in that of Pontyon, held in the same year. In this council an ancient document was produced, said to have been given to the archbishop of Milan by Gregory the Great, or Charlemagne, by which they claimed for themselves the right of electing the king of Italy fourteen days after the death of the last (Muratori, *Rer. Ital.* vol. ii, pt. ii col. 148). See Labb, *Concil.* 9:279.

III. A third council was convened Aug. 1, 1022. Pope Benedict VIII in this council complained of the licentious life of the clergy, and showed that it dishonored the Church; he declared that they consumed the wealth given to them by the liberality of princes in keeping women and providing for their children. A decree in seven articles was published for the reformation of the clergy, which the emperor confirmed, adding temporal penalties against the refractory. See Labbe, *Concil.* 9:819.

IV. At a council held at Pavia in 1160 the anti-pope, Victor III (Octavianus), was acknowledged as pope instead of Alexander III, by the emperor Frederick I. See Labbe, *Concil.* 10:1387.

V. At a council held at Pavia in 1423, convoked by the Council of Constance, and opened in the month of May, some deputies from England, France, and Germany were present. On June 22 this council was transferred to Siena, on account of the plague which threatened Pavia, and the enactments are given under the heading of SIENA. See Hefele, *Conciliengesch.* vol. 4 and 5; Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity*, 4:292; 7:534.

Pavia, Giacomo

a painter, was born at Bologna Feb. 18, 1655, according to authentic documents. There is much discrepancy as to the time of his birth, and about his instruction. He is said to have studied under Antonio Crespi, who was twenty-six years his junior. Lanzi says he was the pupil of Cav. Giuseppe Maria Crespi, ten years his junior; and the canon Luigi Crespi, son of Giuseppe, states, in the third volume of the *Felsian Pittoriae*, that he was instructed by Gio. Gioseffo dal Sole, four years his junior. He acquired considerable reputation at Bologna, and executed several works for the churches, which were admired for the fine taste displayed in their composition. The most esteemed of these is a picture of *St. Anne teaching the Virgins to read*, in S. Silvestro; and the *Nativity*, in S. Giuseppe. He went to Spain, where he distinguished himself, and executed many works for the churches. He died in 1740.

Pavie, Jean- Baptiste-Raimond De

abbe De Fourguevaux, grandson of Francois, was born in 1693 at Toulouse. He enlisted in the regiment of the *Roi d'Infanterie*, and obtained a lieutenancy. Upon the urgent entreaties of his mother he left the profession of arms, and in 1717 entered the society of Saint Hilaire, in Paris. He died Aug. 2, 1768, at the chateau De Fourguevaux. In devoting him self to works of piety, he took part in religious quarrels, and wrote many books of devotion or controversy: we cite from him, *Traité de la Confiance Chreitiezne* (Paris, 1728,.1781), which occasioned great disputes; and *Catechisme historique et dogmatigell* (ibid. 1729, 2 vols.

12mo; reprinted in 1766 in 5 vols. with the sequels). See *Nouvelles Ecclesiast. Feb. 7, 1769.*

Pavilion

Picture for Pavilion 1

Picture for Pavilion 2

the rendering in the A.V. of **Ēsok** (^{<1976>}Psalm 27:5; elsewhere “tabernacle,” “den,” or “covert,” which last is the literal meaning), or **hksu** (^{<1022>}2 Samuel 22:12; ^{<1002>}1 Kings 20:12, 16; ^{<1981>}Psalm 18:11; 31:20), *sukkah*, which signifies *a booth, hut*, formed of green boughs and branches interwoven (^{<0317>}Genesis 33:17; ^{<3045>}Jonah 4:5). It is rendered “booth” (^{<0234>}Leviticus 23:40-43; ^{<1685>}Nehemiah 8:15, 17); “tabernacles” (^{<0234>}Leviticus 23:34; ^{<1663>}Deuteronomy 16:13, 16; ^{<2006>}Isaiah 4:6); “cottage” (^{<2008>}Isaiah 1:8). It sometimes signifies *tent, tents* for soldiers; rendered “tent” (^{<0011>}2 Samuel 11:11); “pavilions,” margin “tents” (^{<1002>}1 Kings 20:12,16),. **SEE TENT**. It is also used poetically for the dwelling of God (^{<1981>}Psalm 18:11), where the Psalmist sublimely describes Jehovah as surrounding himself with dark waters, and thick clouds of the skies. as with a tent, or “pavilion” (^{<1869>}Job 36:29). **SEE TABERNACLE**. Among the Egyptians pavilions were built in a similar style to houses, though on a smaller scale, in various parts of the country, and in the foreign districts through which the Egyptian armies passed, for the use of the king; and some private houses occasionally imitated these small castles by substituting for the usual parapet wall and cornice the battlements that crowned them, and which were intended to represent Egyptian shields (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egg.* 1:23). The Hebrew word **ryrꝑvi**, *shaphrir*, rendered “royal pavilion” (^{<2430>}Jeremiah 43:10), is properly *throne-ornament, tapestry*, with which a throne is hung. **SEE THRONE**.

Pavilion, Nicolas

a noted French prelate, celebrated especially for his relation to the Jansenistic retreat in Paris known as “Port-Royal,” and one of the ablest of the Gallican Church advocates, was born in Paris Nov. 17, 1597. Even as a boy he displayed purity of character seldom seen in youth, and as a student was all that the most exacting could expect. Gifted with remarkable intellectual power, he was the favorite of St. Vincent de Paul, his

confessor, who employed Pavillon, as soon as his age would permit, in different missions, and finally placed him at the head of the assemblies of charity and the conferences of St. Lazare. Pavillon had great misgivings about assuming any responsibility, and did not enter the priesthood until he was thirty years of age, and then, without being attached to any parish, devoted himself to the exercises of the holy ministry by assisting different curates, especially in the pulpit. He had determined in his own mind never to preach at Paris, but Vincent de Paul prevailed upon him to change his mind, and in 1637 he preached at the church of St. Croix. Crowds were attracted by his eloquence and simplicity, and the city was soon in a general excitement concerning the new preacher. Cardinal Richelieu and others of distinction went to hear him, and were so pleased that he was appointed to the bishopric of Alet, and was consecrated Aug. 21, 1639, at Paris. He left that city Oct. 8, with the resolution of never more returning to it. In his diocese his predecessor, Etienne de Polverel, had maintained a conduct little edifying, and his clergy had imitated him only too well. Nicolas Pavillon set himself at work immediately for the instruction and reform of the clergy, and in consequence of his wise regulations he succeeded in remedying the most deplorable abuses. His diocese very soon changed its condition; ignorance and disorders were banished from it. In 1647 bishop Pavillon got into difficulties with the Jesuits, who refused to acknowledge his diocesan power, and from this time forward his work was more or less impaired by their opposition, which, at first confined to his own see, gradually reached the court, and he fell under a cloud, notwithstanding his devotion to the good work, and his piety and untiring industry. Thus Pavillon had founded a seminary for theological instruction, and one for lady teachers; had paid special attention to the secular school, and by his personal supervision greatly improved their condition. As he was in intimate relations with Dr. Arnauld (q.v.) and his partisans, the Jesuits accused Pavillon of heresy and disloyalty, and by every means in their power plotted his destruction. His friend, Vincent de Paul, made strenuous efforts to draw Pavillon away from his Port-Royalist associations; but Pavillon took no notice of his opponents, and unhesitatingly endorsed the good doctor. After the death of St. Vincent Pavillon pronounced against the spreading of the heretical practices in Mariolatry even more openly.

In the year 1656 Pascal brought out his *Provincial Letters*, and shortly after Arnauld directed to Pavillon a pamphlet on the Jansenistic propositions which had just been condemned by the Jesuitical

interpretation. The result was that Pavillon was so impressed with the justice of the Jansenistic complaints that, when Pascal was replied to in the *Apology for the Consuists*, he felt constrained to call a provincial council (in 1658), and by it caused the *Apology* to be condemned as containing “doctrines false, precipitate, scandalous, and calculated to corrupt the manners and to injure the discipline of the Church” — a censure which the clergy of Paris approved. Of course such a step forever sealed the fate of the bishop of Alet. In 1661, by request of the king, an assembly of the clergy of France pronounced it incumbent upon all bishops to sign the formulary which condemned the five propositions supposed to be contained in the Jansenistic heresy. Pavillon saw in this measure not only injustice to the Jansenists, who rightly claimed that none of Jansenius’s true views were embodied in it, but also against the bishops whose authority was thereby impaired. All the bishops of France looked to Pavilion to take the lead. He was not long in deciding. Aware that the king must have been moved to the measure by the intriguing Jesuits, he wrote to the king in remonstrance, but in all kindness, explaining the inconsistent action of a state like France, which had recognized the supremacy of the Church in things spiritual, yet directing her bishops how to judge of and deal with heresy. The king, unable to free himself from the influence that surrounded him, was only the more decided in his course, and in 1662 issued a royal edict for the immediate signature of the formulary. Still years passed on. In 1664 the new archbishop of Paris also demanded compliance with the king’s edict. Now Pavilion could no longer hesitate as to his future course. The courageous bishop, disdaining to equivocate under such circumstances, published a mandement, June 1, 1665, in which his views as to the limits of Church authority were set forth with transparent clearness. Truths revealed by God, of which the Church is the ordained guardian, must be accepted on her testimony, with an entire subjection of the reason and of all the faculties of the mind; but with regard to other truths, not so revealed, God has not provided any infallible arbiter; so that when the Church declares that certain propositions are contained in a given book, or that such and such is the meaning of a particular author, she acts only by *human* knowledge, and may be mistaken. For decisions of this kind the Church cannot require positive internal belief; nevertheless the faithful are not permitted to impugn her judgments, which in all cases must be treated with submission, for the preservation of due order and discipline. The high character and saintly life of Pavilion added immense weight to his pastoral instructions. His sentiments were shared by other prelates, particularly by

Henri Arnauld, bishop of Angers; Nicolas Choart de Buzanval, bishop of Beauvais; and Francois de Caulet, bishop of Pamiers; these issued mandements of precisely similar import, as did also the bishops of Noyon and Laon; but the two latter, on receiving notice of the displeasure of the court, retracted, and adopted a tone of exact accordance with the papal bull. An arret of the council of state, July 20, canceled the mandements of the four refractory bishops, and forbade the clergy to obey them. It was determined to take judicial proceedings against the prelates who had thus boldly constituted themselves the apostles of Jansenism; but this was an affair of considerable delicacy and difficulty. According to Roman jurisprudence, the pope was the sole judge of bishops; on the other hand, it was one of the most cherished of the Gallican liberties that bishops in France could only be tried, in the first instance, before their metropolitan and his comprovincials. Application having been made to the pope on the subject by the French ambassador at Rome, his holiness proposed to name the archbishop of Paris and two other prelates as delegates for hearing the cause; but the king decidedly objected to this method of adjudication, as an invasion of the privileges which he was bound to defend. After a tedious negotiation, it was at length arranged that the pope should nominate a commission of nine prelates to proceed to the trial of their colleagues; that seven should be competent to act; that the president should have power to appoint substitutes in the room of those who might decline to act; and that the accused should not be at liberty either to challenge the judges or to appeal from their decision. The mandements of the four bishops were at the same time denounced by a decree of the Congregation of the Index; upon which the bishops of Languedoc wrote to the king in terms of energetic remonstrance against the encroachments of the court of Rome on the rights of the episcopate, and Louis replied by assuring them that he would always uphold their lawful jurisdiction and the liberties of the Gallican Church. The prosecution of the bishops was suspended by the death of Alexander VII, which occurred May 20, 1667. Cardinal Giulio Rospigliosi, who succeeded him under the name of Clement IX, was known to be of moderate opinions, and disposed to a pacification; and measures were immediately concerted in France for taking advantage of this favorable change of circumstances. It was proposed that the bishops, without being required to retract their mandements, should sign the formulary afresh, as if they had taken no steps in the matter before, and should cause it to be signed by their clergy; but any explanatory remarks which they might wish to make should be made by a process-verbal at their diocesan synods, such

written statements not to be published, but to be deposited in the registry of each diocese; and that they should afterwards join in a letter to the pope, informing him of this new act of dutiful submission to his authority. This expedient was approved by the nuncio, accepted on his recommendation by the pope, and ultimately adopted. The bishop of Alet proved for some time intractable. Courier after courier was dispatched to urge him to compliance, but in vain. At last, persuaded that the peace of the Church would be maintained by his submission, he yielded to the importunate entreaties of the bishop of Comminges, Antoine Arnauld, and other friends, and appended his signature, Sept. 10, 1668. The other prelates assented without difficulty, and the matter was forever closed. In 1675 Pavillon was involved anew in conflict with the state authority. By the decree of the crown, ratified by Parliament, declaring the law of Regale in general force, in 1673 the question had been forced home to Pavillon whether he would suffer in his own diocese appointments by the crown while he was at the head of the see. The treasurership of his cathedral was conferred in 1679 in Regale upon a young ecclesiastic of Toulouse, who in the absence of the bishop came to take possession. When Pavillon returned, he prohibited this appointee from assuming the duties of the office; and when he appealed to the archbishop of Paris to assist him against the court at which the appointee had sought redress, Pavillon was unfavorably replied to, and he found himself obliged to stand in his own strength. In March, 1676, he published an ordinance against the intrusion of any person into any benefice or dignity in virtue of the Regale. Of course a decree of the ecclesiastical council of Paris, readily granted upon request of the crown, set aside Pavillon's ordinance; and though the good bishop wrote to the king, and pleaded for the rights of the Church as he interpreted them, his position was condemned, and he was only suffered to remain in his see by reason of his great age. He died Dec. 8, 1677. Pavillon published a sort of "Compendium Theologicum," which he entitled *Rituel a l'usage du Diocese d'Aleth* (Paris, 1667, 4to, and often), and which was designed especially for his own diocese. It was published anonymously; and, as it was attributed to Arnauld, it was condemned at Rome by a decree of April 9, 1668, though it surpassed anything that had previously appeared for clear statements of doctrine and sound Christian instruction. Pavillon published in July following a pastoral letter against this brief, and, notwithstanding the anathemas, he had his book printed again, adding to it the approvals of twenty-nine French prelates.. The ritual continued to be observed in the diocese of Alet, and was extensively circulated throughout

France. The death of pope Clement only a few months later terminated this unpleasant affair, especially as the casuists could get no encouragement from the new pope, Innocent XI, who became a most ardent admirer of Pavillon. Indeed, our good prelate was highly esteemed by all honorable characters, for he was a brave defender of the Christian doctrine of grace, maintained strictly the rules of Christian morality, and protected, or strove to protect, the rights and immunities of the Church. Other works by bishop Pavillon are, *Ordonnances et Statuts Synodaux* (Toulouse, 1670; Paris, 1675, 12mo): — *Lettre écrite au Roi* (1664, 4to). There was a question of the royal prerogative to which Pavillon refused to submit; and this letter, upon the charge of the general counsellor Talon, was suppressed by a decree of the Parliament of Paris of Dec. 12, 1664. See *Vie de If. Nicolas Pavillon, eveque d'Aleth* (Saint Hiel, 1738, 3 vols. 12mo); *Necrologe de Port-Royal*, p. 464; Mrs. Schimrelpeninck, *Select Memoirs of Port-Royal*; *Life of Nicolas Pavillon*, by a Layman of the Church of England (Oxf. and Lond. 1869, 12mo): Jervis, *Hist. of the Church of France*, 1:465 sq.

Pavona, Francesco

an Italian painter, was born at Udine in 1692. He first studied under Giovanni Gioseffo dal Sole. He afterwards studied at Milan, and thence proceeded to Genoa. He next went to Spain, Portugal, and Germany, at all which courts he was well received and executed many works. He resided some time at Dresden, and there married and had a family. He subsequently returned to Bologna, where he remained a considerable time, and executed some works for the churches. Lanzi says he was an excellent painter in oil, and better in crayons. He painted many large altar-pieces, well designed and colored and also excelled in portraits. He died at Venice in 1777.

Pavonii

priests among the ancient Romans who conducted the worship of *Pavor* (q.v.).

Pavor

a personification of *Fear*, worshipped among the ancient Romans as a companion of Mars, the god of war. The worship of this deity is said to have been instituted by Tullus Hostilius.

Paw

is the rendering in the A.V. of the Heb. *āKī kaph* (^{<B117>}Leviticus 11:27), the *palm* or hollow “hand” (as elsewhere rendered), and *dy; yad* (^{<B175>}1 Samuel 17:37), the open *hand* (as elsewhere rendered), applied to an animal, in the latter case metaphorically in the sense of *power*.

Pax

a personification of *Peace*, worshipped by the ancient Romans. A festival was celebrated annually in honor of this goddess on April 30.

Pax

called also PACIFICA *SEE PACIFICA* (q.v.) and OSCULTATORIUM *SEE OSCULTATORIUM* (q.v.), is used to designate the so-called ceremony known as the *Kiss of Peace* (q.v.). It is also employed to describe a small tablet having on it a representation of the crucifixion, or some other Christian symbol, offered to the congregation in the Romish Church to be kissed in the celebration of the mass. It was usually of silver or other metal, with a handle at the back, but was occasionally of other materials; sometimes it was enameled and set with precious stones. The pax was introduced when the *osculum pacis*, or kiss of peace the custom in primitive times for Christians in their public assemblies to give one another a holy kiss, or kiss of peace — was abrogated on account of the confusion which it entailed, and in consequence of some appearance of scandal which had arisen out of it. The tablet, after it had received the kiss of the officiating minister (priest or bishop), was by him presented to the deacon, and by him again to the people, each of whom kissed it in turn, thus transmitting throughout the whole assembly the symbol of Christian love and peace without the possibility of offense. In the Syrian churches the following seems to be the way in which the same thing is symbolized: In a part of the prayers which has a reference to the birth of Christ. on pronouncing the words, “Peace on earth, good will towards men,” the attending ministers take the officiating priest’s right between both their hands, and so pass the *peace* to the congregation, each of whom takes his neighbor’s right hand, and salutes him with the word *peace*. In the Romish Church the pax is still used. By the Church of England it was omitted at the Reformation as a useless ceremony. The practice of saluting each other — the men, men, and the

women, women — during public worship, and particularly in the *agape*, or love-feast, is frequently alluded to by ancient writers, as Cyril of Jerusalem (*Catech.* 15) and St. Augustine (*Serm.* 227). All the ancient liturgies, without exception, refer to it as among the rites with which the Eucharist was celebrated; but they differ as to the time and the place in the Eucharistic service in which it is introduced. In the Eastern liturgies it is before, in the Western after the Offertory (q.v.); and in the Roman it immediately precedes the communion. The ceremony, which is now confined to the priesthood, commences with the celebrating bishop or priest, who salutes upon the cheek the deacon; and by him the salute is tendered to the other members, and to the first dignitary of the assistant clergy. It is only when the mass is celebrated by a high dignitary that the utensil called the pax is used. Having been kissed by the celebrant, and by him handed to the deacon, it is carried by the latter to the rest of the clergy. In ordinary cases the pax is given by merely bowing, and approaching the cheek to the person to whom it is communicated. The pax is omitted in the mass of Maundy-Thursaday (q.v.), to express horror of the treacherous kiss of Judas.

Pax vobis

or VOBISCUM (i.e. *Peace be to you*), was an ordinary salutation among the ancient Christians. It was addressed by the bishop or pastor to the people at his first entrance into the church, a practice which is frequently mentioned by Chrysostom, who derives it from apostolic practice. The same form of salutation was employed in commencing all the offices of the Church, but more especially by the reader when beginning the reading of the Scriptures. The custom continued in the African churches until the third Council of Carthage forbade its use by the reader. This form of salutation, “Peace be with you,” to which the people usually replied, “And with thy spirit,” was commonly pronounced by a bishop, presbyter, or deacon in the church, as Chrysostom informs us. It was customary to repeat the *Pax vobis* before beginning the sermon, and at least four times in the course of the communion service. It was also used when dismissing the congregation at the close of divine worship. The deacon sent the people away from the house of God with the solemn prayer, “Go in peace.” In the Liturgy of the Church of England a similar salutation occurs, “The Lord be with you,” to which the people reply, “And with thy spirit.” **SEE PEACE.**

Paxton, George

D.D., a Scottish divine of note, was born at Dalgowry, East Lothian, in 1762. He entered the work of the ministry before 1789, and was in that year a member of the General Associate Synod, and subsequently under the same authority professor of divinity at Edinburgh. His places of pastoral labors were Kilmaurs and Stewarton. He died in 1837. He was a man greatly respected in the denomination to which he belonged, and possessed in his youth and prime rare-gifts of popular eloquence. He wrote, *An Inquiry into the Obligations of Religious Covenants upon Posterity* (1801, 8vo): — *Illustrations of the Holy Scriptures* (Lond. 1819, 2 vols. 8vo; and often in England and America); a valuable supplement to Harmer, containing a large amount of various and useful knowledge on subjects relating to Eastern geography, natural history, and manners and customs. See Orme, *Biblioth. Biblia*, s.v.; Nevin, *Biblical Antiquities* (Appendix), p. 441.

Paxton, William

D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Lancaster County, Pa., April 1, 1760. His early education was limited, and when the Revolution broke out he joined the Continental army. When about twenty-four years of age he entered the Strasburg Academy, near Lancaster City, Pa., where he greatly distinguished himself, and was by the Newcastle Presbytery licensed to preach April 8, 1790. After supplying for a while the churches of West Nottingham and Little Britain, he was, Oct. 3, 1792, ordained and installed pastor of the churches of Lower Marsh Creek and Toms Creek. After a lapse of some years he devoted himself exclusively to the former congregation, where the greatest success and usefulness attended the forty-nine years of his ministry. His health obliged him to resign his charge Oct. 19, 1841, after which he gradually declined until his death, April 16, 1845. Although his sermons and other literary productions were marked by great talent and profound learning, his modesty prevented their publication. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 3:554. Payne, Joseph, one of the noted English educators of our times, was born in 1808. He received his educational training at the University of London, and early distinguished himself as a teacher of English. For a number of years he was connected with his alma mater. In 1873 he was appointed to the newly founded professorship of education in the College of Preceptors, the first chair in any public institution in England assigned to that subject. He devoted

himself in this position, and also by his writings, to the promotion of education, making the improvement of methods of teaching his special object. He was the author of *Lectures on Education*, and numerous lectures and pamphlets on allied subjects. He also took all active part in the work of the Woman's Educational Union. Mr. Payne contributed several papers to the *Proceedings of the Philological Society*, chiefly on English dialects, and the relation of Old English to Norman French. Among his other publications were text-books in English literature, entitled *Studies in English Poetry* (5th ed. Lond. 1864, cr. 8vo), *Studies in English Prose* (1867, cr. 8vo), and *Select Poetry for Children*; the last of which especially had a very large circulation (15th ed. 1868, 18mo). Payne died at Bayswater April 30, 1876.

Payne, William

D.D., F.R.S., an excellent and learned English divine, flourished in the second half of the 17th century. He was rector of St. Mary's, Whitechapel, in 1681, and prebendary of Westminster in 1694. In 1681 he was admitted Fellow of the Royal Society; and died in 1696. His publications are, *Learning and Knowledge recommended to the Scholars of Brentwood School, at their First Feast: a sermon on ~~21007~~Proverbs 1:7* (Lond. 1682, 4to): — *A Discourse concerning the Adoration of the Host, in Answer to T. G. and Mr. Boileau* (Gibson's *Preservative*, 10:116; originally published 1685): — *A Discourse concerning Communion in One Kind, in Answer to the Archbishop of Meaux* (Gibson's *Preservative*, 8:320, and 9:1; originally published anonymously, 1687, 4to): — *A Discourse on the Sacrifice of the Mass* (Lond. 1688, 4to also in Gibson's *Preservative*, 6:215): — *The Texts examined which Papists cite out of the Bible to prove their Doctrine concerning the Celibacy of Priests and Vows of Continence: in two parts* (ibid. 2:382; originally published 1688): — *Bellarmino examined, 6th Note: Agreement in Doctrine with the Primitive Church* (ibid. 3:292; originally published 1688): — *Family Religion, or the Duty of taking Care of Religion in Families, and the Means of doing it: a sermon on ~~16245~~Joshua 24:15* (Lond. 1691, 4to): — *A Practical Discourse of Repentance, rectifying the Mistakes about it, especially such as lead to Despair or Presumption, persuading and directing to the true Practice of it, and demonstrating the invalidity of a Death-bed Repentance* (ibid. 1693, 8vo): — *Discourses upon several Practical Subjects: with a Preface, giving some Account of his Life, Writings, and Death* (ibid. 1698,

sm. 8vo). See Stoughton, *Eccles. Hist. of England (Church of the Restoration)*, 2:70; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliogr.* vol. ii, S. V.

Payson, Edward

D.D., a noted American divine, one of the most illustrious of the orthodox Congregational body, was the son of the succeeding, and was born at Rindge, N. H., July 25, 1783, where his father was then pastor. Both the intellectual and moral powers of young Payson were developed at an unusually early age. He was often known to weep under preaching when three years old, and was a good reader at four. He entered Harvard College in 1800, and graduated in 1803. It was said of him while there, by his fellowstudents, that he had left off taking books from the alcoves of the library because he had read all that were there. His religious awakenings seem to have come powerfully after the death of his brother in 1804; and, when finally resolved to live for God and his cause altogether, he consecrated himself fully to the service in a written covenant. After three years spent as principal of a school in Portland, feeling that he was called to the work of the ministry, he began his theological studies under the direction of his father. His great aim and purpose was to be a thorough Biblical scholar — not so much to acquaint himself with systems of divinity, or to learn about the Bible, but to know the truth. Having completed his theological studies, he was called and ordained colleague of Mr. Kellogg, Dec. 16, 1807, and afterwards the sole pastor of the Congregational Church of Portland, Maine. This was his first and only pastoral charge, and he remained in it for a period of twenty years, though his pulpit utterances were of the most startling and uncompromising character. It may be truly said of Edward Payson that he labored not to please men, but God; and his pulpit thundered and lightened like another Sinai against every form of ungodliness and iniquity. Nor must it be supposed that his pastorate was lengthened in one charge because his labors were not appreciated elsewhere. Calls came to him from Boston and New York, but he persistently declined them. So conscientiously devoted was Payson to his work that he refused to receive an increase of his salary, although it was generously offered him by his people. Over seven hundred persons were received by him under his ministrations, and many happy souls in other places will rise up in the final day to bless the name of Edward Payson. These vast labors heavily taxed his physical strength, and the impaired condition of his health, due to sedentary habits, soon exhausted him when sickness finally came. He died Oct. 22, 1827. In his

distressing sickness he displayed, in the most interesting and impressive manner, the power of Christian faith. Smitten down in the midst of his days and usefulness, he was entirely resigned to the divine will; for he perceived distinctly that the infinite wisdom of God could not err in the direction of events, and it was his joy that God reigneth. His mind rose over bodily pain, and in the strong visions of eternity he seemed almost to lose the sense of suffering. In a letter to his sister, Sept. 19, 1827, he says:

“Were I to adopt the figurative language of Bunyan, I might date this letter from the land of Beulah, of which I have been for some weeks a happy inhabitant. The celestial city is fill in my view. Its glories beam upon me, its odors are wafted to me, its sounds strike upon my ears, and its spirit is breathed into my heart. Nothing separates me from it but the river of death, which now appears but as an insignificant rill, that may be crossed at a single step whenever God shall give permission. The Son of Righteousness has gradually been drawing nearer and nearer, appearing larger and brighter as he approached, and now he fills the whole hemisphere, pouring forth a flood of glory, in which I seem to float like an insect in the beams of the sun; exulting, yet almost trembling, while I gaze on this excessive brightness, and wondering, with unutterable wonder, why God should deign thus to shine upon a silful worm. A single heart and a single tongue seem altogether inadequate to my wants. I want a whole heart for every separate emotion, and a whole tongue to express that emotion.”

Among his uncommon intellectual powers, a rich, philosophical, and consecrated imagination was the most conspicuous. Without any of the graces of the orator. his preaching had the most vivid eloquence of truth and feeling. In his prayers especially there was a solemnity, fullness, originality, variety, pathos, and sublimity seldom equaled. His eloquent address to the Bible Society has been published as one of the tracts of the American Tract Society. He published a discourse on the *Worth of the Bible*, an *Address to Seamen*, and a *Thanksgiving Sermon*. A memoir of his *Life*, by Dr. Asa Cummings, was published (2d ed. 1830); also a volume of *Sermons* (1828, 8vo); another volume (1831. 12mo); another, to families (1833). In 1859 Dr. Payson’s *Complete Works* were brought out at Philadelphia. with the memoir by Cummings (3 vols. 8vo). The *North British Review* (Nov. 1859), in noticing this edition, takes occasion to say of Dr. Payson: “To a close and familiar acquaintance with the Scriptures,

he added great breadth of intellect and varied literary attainments. Intimate knowledge of the human conscience was joined to massiveness of thought vouching the ways of God to man. In several of the sermons we have again and again had suggested to us one in whom these features found an almost perfect expression—the late Edward Irving... We are not acquainted with any recent work in practical theology which better deserves a place in the library of every Christian gentleman and minister than this edition of the memoir and works of Dr. Payson.” We regret to say that the edition of Dr. Payson’s life and works is now exhausted. They should certainly be reissued in a more popular and abridged form, so as to have a wide circulation among ministers and Christians of all denominations. The Rev. E. L. Janes, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, has done a good work in extracting from the volumes referred to some of their choice gems, and giving a very concise view of the salient points of his character and ministry. In the absence of the large volumes, this book (N.Y. 1872, 8vo) may be read with great profit. See also Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 2:503; Allen, *Dict. of Amer. Biog.* s.v.; Dr. Levi R. Dunn, in *Christian Advocate*, 1872; *Our Pastor, or Reminiscences of Rev. E. Payson, D.D.*, by one of his flock (Boston, 1855, 12mo); *Sketches of Eloquent Preachers* (1864, 12mo); Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, vol. 2 s.v.

Payson, Seth

D.D., a Congregational minister, father of the preceding, was born in September, 1758. He graduated at Harvard College in 1777, and was ordained pastor at Rindge, N. H., December, 1782. He was made D.D. by Dartmouth College in 1809, and trustee in 1813; and in 1819 was one of a committee to choose a site for Williams College, about to be removed. Immediately after finishing this duty, he was taken sick, and died Feb. 26, 1820. Dr. Payson published “*Proofs of the Existence and dangerous Tendency of modern Illuminism*” (1802), and several occasional sermons. See Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, 2:209.

Paz

SEE GOLD.

Pazmany, Peter,

a Hungarian cardinal, was born Oct. 4, 1570, at Grosswardein. At the age of thirteen he was converted to Romanism, and shortly after entered the Order of the Jesuits, and taught theology at Gritz. In 1607 he returned to his own country, and devoted himself from that time to combating the progress of Protestantism. Joining to an enchanting eloquence the most charming manners, he succeeded well in his efforts. Appointed in 1616 archbishop of Gran, he used his position as primate of the kingdom to elect to the throne, in 1618, Ferdinand, archduke of Austria. In 1632 he returned to Rome, to negotiate the mediation of pope Urban VIII in favor of the establishment of peace. Three years previously he had been appointed cardinal. He died at Presburg March 19, 1637. Pazmany spent more than half a million of florins in founding institutions of learning, such as the University of Tyrnau, which, transported to Pesth, still exists; the *Pazmanium*, at Vienna, etc. He wrote in Latin and Hungarian; the latter tongue he used to better advantage and with greater purity than any of his contemporaries. Fifteen works of his are polemic and devotional, and among these we will quote, *Hodegus, seu dux ad veritatem, in quo ostenditur vanitas sectarum Catholicae fidei adversantium* (Pesth, 1813, 3 vols. fol.): — *Conciones in Evangelia omnium ominicarum* (1636 and 1767, fol.). See Horanyi, *Memorie Hungarorum*, vol. iii; Podhradezkv, *Life of Pazmany*, in Hungarian (Buda, 1836).

Pazzi, Cosmo

an Italian prelate, was born at Florence in 1467, and was on his mother's side a descendant of the Medicis. He was provided by pope Alexander VI with a canonicate in the church of Orlon, in France, and soon after with its episcopal chair, of which he never took possession. The Florentines had already sent him, Sept. 14, 1496, to the emperor Maximilian to mediate concerning the war of Pisa and the league of Italy. On his return he was elected, April 17, 1497, bishop of Arezzo, and he renounced his pretensions to the seat of Oleron. Alexander VI charged him with a diplomatic commission to Spain, and then to France. Pope Julius II transferred him to the archbishopric of Florence, July 5, 1508, and premature death alone deprived him of the purple, to which he would certainly have been raised by his maternal uncle, Leo X. Pazzi died at Florence April 9, 1515. He first became known by a Latin translation, the *Dissertations* of Maximus of Tyre. Three editions of this translation

(Rome, 1517; Basle, 1519; Paris, 1554, fol.) preceded the publication of the original Greek text brought out by Estienne at Paris (1517, 8vo). The translation of Pazzi was published under the editorship of his brother, Pierre Pazzi. See *Italia Sacra*, 1:431; 2:182; *Hist. de la Noblesse du Comtat Venaissin*, vol. ii, s.v.; Combes-Dounous, *Dissertations de Maxime de Tyr* (Introd.).

Pazzi, Pietro Antonio

an Italian engraver, was born at Florence in 1706. It is not known under whom he studied, but he executed many plates of portraits, and other subjects, after the Italian masters, which are held in estimation. His works are to be found in the Museo Fiorentino, Museo Capitolino, and the Museo Etrusco. Among them the following are of interest to us: *The Holy Family* (after L. Cabiassi); *The Assumption of the Virgin* (after Raffaele); *The Virgin and Infant Christ* (after Vandyck); *St. Zanobi resuscitating a dead Person* (after Betti); *St. Philip refusing the Popedom* (id.); *A Sibyl* (after Crespi).

Peabody, David

a Congregational minister, was born April 16, 1805, in Topsfield, Mass. He graduated at Dartmouth College in 1828; entered the ministry April, 1831. and was ordained pastor of the First Church, Lynn, Mass., November, 1832. from which charge he was, however, soon dismissed, on account of ill-health. He became pastor of the Calvinist Church, Worcester, July 15, of the following year. In 1838 he accepted the professorship of rhetoric at Dartmouth College, but died the next year, Oct. 17, 1839. Mr. Peabody published *A Memoir of Horace Bassett Morse* (1830): — *A Discourse on the Conduct of Men considered in Contrast with the Law of God* (1836): — *A Sermon on the Sin of Covetousness considered in respect to Intemperance, Indian Oppression, etc.* (1838): — *The Patriarch of Hebron, or the History of Abraham* (1841); and wrote a number of valuable articles for the *Amer. Biblical Repository*. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 2:744; Dr. Lord's *Sermon* on his death.

Peabody, Ephraim

D.D., a Unitarian divine of distinction, was born at Wilton, N. H., in 1807, and was educated at Bowdoin College, class of 1827. He subsequently studied theology at Cambridge, and in 1831 became pastor of a Unitarian

Church at Cincinnati. In 1838 he removed to New Bedford, Conn., as pastor of a Unitarian congregation, and in 1846 accepted a call to the pastorate of King's Chapel. He died in 1846. During his lifetime he published a number of addresses, essays, and sermons; also several review articles. After his death appeared *Sermons, with a Memoir* by S. A. Elliot (Boston, 1857, 12mo): — *Christian Days and Thoughts* (1858, 12mo, and often; London, 1868, fcp. 8vo). Dr. Peabody also wrote a number of poems. He was a pious man, and practical in his purposes. He displayed a fertile yet chastened imagination, and vigorous expression in all his writings, and they therefore impress the reader. Favorable notices were given of his works, not only in this country, but also in Europe. See *Lond. A then.* 1840, p. 626; *Westm. Rev.* Oct. 1857; *North Amer. Rev.* July, 1857, p. 278, 521.

Peabody, George

an American merchant, whose name deserves to be held in remembrance on account of his munificent philanthropy, was born at Danvers, Mass., Feb. 18, 1795. His parents were poor, and his only education was received at the district school. At the age of eleven he was placed with a grocer, and at fifteen in a haberdasher's shop in Newburyport. When twenty-two years old, he was a partner with Elisha Riggs in Baltimore. In 1827 he went to England to buy merchandise, and to transact financial business for the State of Maryland. In 1837 he permanently removed to London, and in 1843 became a banker. He accumulated a large fortune, but did not forget his humble origin or place of birth. In 1852, on the two hundredth anniversary of the settlement of his native town, he sent home \$20,000 to found an educational institute and library, a sum which he afterwards increased to \$60,000, with \$10,000 to North Danvers. He also contributed \$10,000 to the first Grinnell Arctic Expedition, \$500,000 to the city of Baltimore for an institute of science, literature, and the fine arts; and in 1863, on retiring from active business in London, he made the splendid donation of £150,000 sterling for the benefit of the poor of London, and in 1866 enlarged this donation by another contribution of £150,000. He also gave to Harvard University \$150,000 for a museum, etc.; and in 1867 devoted \$2,000,000 to found common schools in the Southern States. He died in London, Nov. 4, 1869. His adopted country honored his remains in many ways, and his native country honored itself by sending a government ship of war to convey the body of this philanthropist to the place of his birth for interment. Great Britain, however, would not suffer any but one of her

own ships to take the remains from her country, and the transportation consequently took place in the British man-of-war *Monarch*.

Peabody, Oliver

a Congregational minister, was born in 1698 at Boxford, Mass. He graduated at Harvard College in 1721, and was immediately employed by the commissioners for propagating the Gospel to preach at Natick (1721). There were then but two families of white people in the town. The Indian Church, which the apostolic Eliot had founded, was now extinct, the Indian preacher, Tahhowompait, having died in 1716; and all records were lost. A new Church was formed, Dec. 3, 1729, consisting of three Indians and five white persons, and Peabody was ordained at Cambridge, Dec. 17. Through his influence many of the Indians were induced to abandon savage life, and to attend to husbandry as the means of subsistence. He had the happiness of seeing many of the Indian families with comfortable houses, cultivated fields, and flourishing orchards. But his chief aim was to teach them the religion of Jesus Christ. There were added to the Church in the first year twenty-two persons, several of whom were Indians; in July, 1743, he stated that in the two preceding years about fifty had been received into the Church. Against the vice of intemperance among the Indians he set himself with great zeal and much success. Altogether during his residence at Natick he baptized one hundred and eighty-nine Indians and four hundred and twenty-two whites; and he received into the Church thirty-five Indians and thirty whites; and there died two hundred and fifty-six Indians, one of whom was a hundred and ten years old. During one season he went on a mission to the Mohicans. He died in great peace. Feb. 2. 1752. Mr. Peabody was eminently pious, and greatly beloved and lamented. He published *Artillery Election Sermon* (1732): — *On a Good and Bad Hope of Salvation* (1742). See *Panoplist*, 7:49-56; Allen, *Amer. Biogr.* s.v.; Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, 1:318.

Peabody, William Bourn Oliver

D.D., a Unitarian clergyman, was born at Exeter, N. H., July 9, 1799. He entered Harvard University in 1813, and after graduation also studied theology at Cambridge. He was ordained to preach in Springfield Oct. 12, 1820. He was a preacher of so-called liberal doctrines, but he avoided controversy, and sought only to do good. In 1823 he published a *Poetical Catechism for the Young*. Several pieces were subjoined to this catechism,

including the hymn found in some of our principal collections entitled *Autumn Evening* — “Behold the western evening sky.” Dr. Peabody’s tastes extended over a wide field, including poetry, biography, theology, and natural history. In 1839 he supplied the account of the birds in the report of the survey of the State of Massachusetts. Besides biographical review articles, he wrote several lives in Jared Sparks’s “American Biography.” He died May 28, 1847. See *Christian Examiner*, 46:129; Wilson, in Sparks, *Amer. Biogr.* (S. S.)

Peace

The Hebrew word **שָׁלוֹם**; *shalom*, usually translated *peace*, means, properly, *health, prosperity, welfare*. It is the same as the *salam* of the modern Arabs, and is in like manner used in salutations (q.v.). The Greek **εἰρήνη** from having been frequently used as a rendering of the Heb. word, naturally passed over in the same sense into the N.T.

Accordingly “*peace*” is a word used in Scripture in different senses. Generally it denotes quiet and tranquillity, public or private; but often prosperity and happiness of life; as to “go in peace;” to “die in peace;” “God give you peace;” “Peace be within this house;” “Pray for the peace of Jerusalem.” Paul in the titles of his Epistles generally wishes grace and peace to the faithful, to whom he writes. Our Savior recommends to his disciples to have peace with all men, and with each other. God promises his people to water them as with a river of peace (^{<2362>}Isaiah 66:12), and to make with them a covenant of peace (^{<2325>}Ezekiel 34:25).

Peace, properly, is that state of mind in which persons are exposed to no open violence to interrupt their tranquillity.

1. *Social peace* is mutual agreement one with another, whereby we forbear injuring one another (^{<2314>}Psalms 34:14; 132).
2. *Ecclesiastical peace* is freedom from contentions, and rest from persecutions (^{<2313>}Isaiah 11:13; 32:17; ^{<2324>}Revelation 12:14).
3. *Spiritual peace* is deliverance from sin, by which we were at enmity with God (^{<2311>}Romans 5:1); the result is peace in the conscience (^{<2302>}Hebrews 10:22). This peace is the gift of God through Jesus Christ (^{<2316>}2 Thessalonians 3:16). It is a blessing of great importance (^{<2316>}Psalms 119:165). It is denominated perfect (^{<2313>}Isaiah 26:3); inexpressible

(^{<3047>}Philippians 4:7); permanent (^{<8309>}Job 34:29; ^{<6162>}John 16:22); eternal (^{<2570>}Isaiah 57:2; ^{<8049>}Hebrews 4:9). *SEE HAPPINESS.*

Peace Of God.

SEE PAX.

Peace, Kiss Of.

SEE KISS.

Peace-offering

(fully, **μυμβαν**] **βζ**, also simply: **μυμβαν**][but this sometimes in a singular sense, as ^{<2655>}Ezekiel 45:15; comp. ^{<8774>}Leviticus 7:14; 9:22, etc.], once merely the sing. **μλ ν**, Amos v. 22; Sept. usually **εἰρηνικὴ ἑθυσία**], also **σωτήριον** or , **θυσία σωτηρίου**; Vulg. *victima pacifica*, or simply *pacificum*), a voluntary sacrifice offered by the pious Jews in token of gratitude — *thank-offering* (hence Josephus calls it **χαριστήριος** [**θυσία**], *Ant.* 3:9, 1 sq.; comp. 19:6, 1). These sacrifices, which are often mentioned in connection with burnt offerings (^{<0204>}Exodus 20:24; 24:5; ^{<8885>}Leviticus 3:5; ^{<8881>}Joshua 8:31; ^{<1085>}1 Kings 3:15, etc.), consisted of spotless (yet see ^{<0223>}Leviticus 22:23) neat or small cattle of either sex (^{<8881>}Leviticus 3:1, 6; 9:4, 18; 22:21; 23:19; see Joseph. *Ant.* 3:9, 2; comp. ^{<0245>}Exodus 24:5; ^{<1085>}1 Kings 8:63), and were offered, along with meat-offerings and drink-offerings (in the same manner as burnt-offerings), either by individuals or in the name of the people. The latter was customary on occasions of festive inauguration (^{<0245>}Exodus 24:5; ^{<1067>}2 Samuel 6:17 sq.; ^{<1085>}1 Kings 8:63; ^{<2627>}Ezekiel 43:27; comp. 1 Mace. 4:56); on the election of kings (^{<0915>}1 Samuel 11:15); and upon the fortunate issue of important enterprises (^{<8207>}Deuteronomy 27:7; ^{<8881>}Joshua 8:31); but they were expressly prescribed at the Feast of Pentecost (the young lambs, ^{<8239>}Leviticus 23:19). Private peace offerings were the result of free impulse (**twbdn**), or in fulfillment of a vow (^{<8776>}Leviticus 7:16; 22:21; ^{<0458>}Numbers 15:8), so regularly at the expiration of a Nazaritish vow (^{<0464>}Numbers 6:14), and were often determined upon in consequence of a special favor received from Jehovah (*thank-offering*, fully **μυμβαν**] **τδιωδ j βζ**, -or more briefly **hdwδhij βζ**, or simply **hdwδ**, **θυσία ἀγέσεως**, ^{<8772>}Leviticus 7:12; 22:29). The festivals were honored by peace-offerings (^{<0400>}Numbers 10:10; ^{<4402>}2 Chronicles 30:22). Solomon arranged three times a year a

sacrificial festival of burnt-offerings and drink-offerings (^{<1025>}1 Kings 9:25). All peace-offerings were to be presented with imposition of hands (^{<088B>}Leviticus 3:2; 8:13); only the fat parts (which in the case of cattle and goats consisted of the fat covering the inwards [omentum], all the fat of the inwards [between them], the kidneys with the fat connected with them [leaf-fat], the fat on the thigh-muscles, and finally the large lobe of the liver; in the case of a lamb, of the fat tail ["rump"] and the inside fat; see Josephus, *Ant.* 3:9, 2; comp. Bahr, *Symbol.* 3:353 sq.) were burned on the altar (^{<088B>}Leviticus 3:3 sq., 9 sq., 14 sq.; comp. 4:9 sq., 26; 6:12; ^{<1052>}Amos 5:22), and the blood was sprinkled around the altar (^{<088B>}Leviticus 3:2; 7:14; 9:18; 17:6; ^{<1263>}2 Kings 16:13). The remainder of the flesh belonged, in the peace-offerings of the Pentecost and the other public occasions, to the priests (^{<0831>}Leviticus 23:20); in the case of private offerings, the priests were entitled to the breast and shoulder (^{<0461>}Numbers 6:20; comp. ^{<0227>}Exodus 29:27; ^{<0873>}Leviticus 7:31; 10:14), which were the heave-offering and the wave-offering (^{<0873>}Leviticus 7:30, 34: 9:21; ^{<0461>}Numbers 6:20), and the rest was used by the offerer in joyful meals at the sanctuary (^{<0896>}Leviticus 19:6 sq.; 22:30; ^{<1527>}Deuteronomy 12:17 sq.; 27:7; comp. ^{<0831>}Jeremiah 33:11). Yet the whole must be consumed in the case of thank-offerings on the same day (^{<0875>}Leviticus 7:15; 22:29), or in other cases at farthest on the second day (^{<0876>}Leviticus 7:16 sq.; comp. 19:6); if anything remained on the third day it was to be burned. The reason of this last prescription is not to be sought so much in the intention of the lawgiver to set a limit to the feasting, as in the design that the flesh of the offering, instead of being dried and preserved (comp. Rosenmüller, *Morgenl.* 3:159), should really be employed for the meals at the time. Bahr (*Symbol.* 2:374 sq.) has not fairly met the point, since putrefaction, which he assigns as the ground of the objection to the retention to the third day (^{<1 WGPæ>}^{<0878>}Leviticus 7:18; 19:7), might be obviated in the mode suggested, as in the modern East. A special rule respecting *thank-offerings* proper was that, in addition to a slice of leavened dough, unleavened sacrificial cakes (see on the contrary ^{<1045>}Amos 4:5) must be presented, of which, however, only one belonged to Jehovah, while the remainder went to the priest (^{<0872>}Leviticus 7:12 sq.). But these cakes were deposited in a basket only in the peace-offerings attendant upon a Nazaritish vow (^{<0465>}Numbers 6:15 sq.). The Mishna adds but little to the Biblical ordinances. The Pentecostal peace-offerings were reckoned among the most sacred offerings, in comparison with which all the other *pacificat* are of trifling esteem. The pieces of the flesh (cooked or roasted) might be eaten anywhere in the

Holy City, and in the enjoyment of the portions of the offering allotted to the priests, their wives, children, and slaves also might share (see *Zebach.* v. 5 sq.). The quantity of meal to be used in making the thank-offering cakes is prescribed (*Menach.* 7:1). **SEE OFFERING.**

The **μῦμβαν** were, according to etymology and definition, *compensation offerings* (from **μλῶ** *to requite*), i.e. such as, so to speak, repaid Jehovah by way of thanks, praise, or vow, and hence had (especially in the repasts which were peculiar to these sacrifices, Josephus, *Ant.* 3:9, 1) the character of cheerfulness and joy (see ^{<09115>}1 Samuel 11:15; comp. Baihr, *Symbol.* 2:368 sq.). This signification, however, as a token of gratitude, sometimes becomes obscure (^{<09130>}1 Samuel 13:9), and occasionally disappears altogether (^{<07116>}Judges 20:26; 21:4; ^{<10225>}2 Samuel 24:25). In the first instance, just cited, the offering in question was presented before a military undertaking; in the three others it followed a public calamity. The two-fold import of the **μῦμβαν** is reconciled by the statement of Philo (*Opp.* 2:244) and the Rabbins (see Outram, *De Sacrif.* p. 108), that they were offered for a deliverance *to be obtained*, as well as for one *already secured*; and thus the Israelitish system of offerings did not *lack precatory* sacrifices. But that the last-named character altogether belonged to the **ῥδν, ῡμβαν** and **ἡδωθ ῡμβαν** is not only improbable from the nature of the case, but also from the signification of the term **ἡδωθ**, *thank-offering*, itself; although in some instances (as ^{<10225>}2 Samuel 24:25) the peace-offering had that significance. On the other hand, the other passages cited above, in which **μῦμβαν** were offered after a public misfortune, are explainable upon no theory of this kind of sacrifice hitherto adduced, and we are left to conclude that they were irregularly introduced during the ritual confusion of the period of the Judges. See generally Reland, *Antiq. Sacr.* p. 317 sq.; Outram, *De Sacrif.* I, ii; Scholl, in the *Stud. d. Wurtemb. Geistl.* V, 1:108 sq. **SEE THANK-OFFERING.**

Peace Societies

SEE WAR.

Peacham, Henry

an English writer who in early life was intending to enter the ministry, but finally became a traveling teacher, is supposed to have been tutor in the

earl of Arundel's family. He was reduced to poverty in his old age, and wrote for bread. He published in early life a *Sermon upon the last Three Verses of the First Chapter of Job* (Lond. 1590, 16mo). But he is principally known to readers of polite literature. Among his publications are some complimentary poems, *The Gentleman's Exercise*, intended as a treatise on art; *Minerva Britannica*, a collection of emblems in verse, illustrated with plates; and *The Complete Gentleman*. This latter work is the one for which he was most celebrated, and it has been frequently reprinted. He died about 1640. See Chambers, *Cyclop. of Engl. Literature*; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.*

Peacock

It is a question, perhaps, more of geographical and historical than of Biblical interest to decide whether טֻקְיִים (*tukkiyim*; Sept. ταῶνες; Vulg. *parni*. ^{<1112>}1 Kings 10:22, also written טֻקְיִים, ^{<1412>}2 Chronicles 9:21) denotes peacocks strictly so called, or some other species of animal or bird; for on the solution of the question in the affirmative depends the real direction of Solomon's fleet; that is, whether, after passing the Strait of Bab-el-Mandeb, it proceeded along the east coast of Africa towards Sofala, or whether it turned eastward, ranging along the Arabian and Persian shores to the peninsula of India, and perhaps went onwards to Ceylon, and penetrated to the great Australian, or even to the Spice Islands. Bochart, unable to discover a Hebrew root in *tukiyim*, rather arbitrarily proposes a transposition of letters by which he converts the word into *Cuthyim*, denoting, as he supposes, the country of the *Cuthei*, which, in an extended sense, is applied, in conformity with various writers of antiquity, to Media and Persia; and Greek authorities show that peacocks abounded in Babylonia, etc. (See Aelian, *Anim.* 13:18; Curtius, 9:1, 13; Diod. Sic. 2:53. Peacocks are called "Persian birds" by Aristophanes, *Aves*, 484; see also *Acharn.* 63.) This mode of proceeding to determine the species and the native country of the bird is altogether inadmissible, since Greek writers speak of Persian peacocks at a much later period than the age of Solomon; and it is well known that they were successively carried westward till they passed from the Greek islands into Europe, and that, as Juno's birds the Romans gradually spread them to Gaul and Spain, where, however, they were not common until after the 10th century. They do not occur on the Assyrian or Egyptian monuments. But even if peacocks had been numerous in Media and Northern Persia at

the time in question, how were they to be furnished to a fleet which was navigating the Indian Ocean, many degrees to the south of the colder region of High Asia? and as for the land of the Cuthei, or of Cush, when it serves their purpose writers remove it to Africa along with the migrations of the Cushites. The *tukkyim* have been presumed to derive their appellation from an exotic word implying “tufted” or “crested,” which, though true of the peacock, is not so obvious a character as that afforded by its splendid tail; and therefore a crested parrot has been supposed to be meant: so Hudt (*Diss. de Nav. Sal.* 7, § 6) and one or two others. Parrots, though many species are indigenous in Africa, do not appear to have existed in ancient Egypt; they were unknown till the time of Alexander, and then both Greeks and Romans were acquainted only with species from Ceylon, destitute of crests, such as *Psittacus Alexandri* (see Antiphanes in *Athen.* 14:654; Horace, *Sat.* 2:2, 23; and esp. Bochart, *Hieroz.* 2:709 sq.); and the Romans for a long time received these only by way of Alexandria, though in the time of Pliny others became known. Keil (*Diss. de Ophir*, p. 104, and *Comment.* on ^{<1112>}1 Kings 10:22), with a view to support his theory that Tarshish is the old Phoenician Tartessus in Spain, derives the Hebrew name from Tucca, a town of Mauretania and Numidia, and concludes that the *Aves Aumidicae* (Guinea-fowls) are meant: which birds, however, in spite of their name, never existed in Numidia, nor within a thousand miles of that country. Again, the pheasant has been proposed as the bird intended; but *Phas. Colchicus*, the only species known in antiquity, is likewise without a prominent crest, and is a bird of the colder regions of the central range of Asiatic mountains. Following a line of latitude, it gradually reached westward to High Armenia and Colchis, whence it was first brought to Europe by Greek merchants, who frequented the early emporium on the Phasis. The center of existence of the genus, rich in splendid species, is in the woody region beneath the snowy peaks of the Himalayas, reaching also eastward to Northern China, where the common pheasant is abundant, but not, we believe, anywhere naturally in a low latitude. (Other interpretations are supported in Hase’s *Biblioth. Brem.* 2:468 sq.; Ugolino, *Thesaur.* vii.)

All versions and comments agree that after the *Cebi* or apes (probably *Cercopithecus Eantellus*, one of the sacred species of India), some kind of remarkable bird is meant; and none are more obviously entitled to the application of the name than the peacock, since it is abundant in the jungles of India, and would be met with, both wild and domesticated, by

navigators to the coasts from Camboge to Ceylon, and would better than any of the others bear a long sea voyage in the crowded ships of antiquity. Moreover, we find it still denominated *togei* in the Malabaric dialects of the country, which may be the source of *thuki*, as well as of the Arabic *tawas* and Armenian *taus*. Gesenius (*Thesaur.* p. 1502) cites many authorities to prove that the *tucci* is to be traced to the Tamul or Malabaric *toyei*, “peacock;” which opinion has recently been confirmed by Sir E. Tennent (*Ceylon*, 2:102, and i, p. 20, 3d ed.), who says, “It is very remarkable that the terms by which these articles (ivory, apes, and peacocks) are designated in the Hebrew Scriptures are identical with the Tamil names, by which some of them are called in Ceylon to the present day — *tukeyim* may be recognized in *tokei*, the modern name for these birds.” Thus Keil’s objection “that this supposed *togei* is not yet itself sufficiently ascertained” (*Comment.* on ~~1~~1 Kings 10:22) is satisfactorily met. With regard to the objection that the long ocellated feathers of the rump, and not those of the tail, as is commonly believed, are the most conspicuous object offered by this bird, it may be, answered that if the name *togei* be the original, it may not refer to a tuft, or may express both the erectile feathers on the head of a bird and those about the rump or the tail; and that those of the peacock have at all times been sought to form artificial crests for human ornaments. One other point remains to be considered, namely, whether the fleet went to the East, or proceeded southward along the African shore? No doubt, had the Phoenician trade guided the Hebrews in the last-mentioned direction, gold and apes might have been obtained on the east coast of Africa, and even some kinds of spices in the ports of Abyssinia; for all that region, as far as the Strait of Madagascar, was at that early period in a state of comparative affluence and civilization. But in that case a great part of the commercial produce would have been obtained within the borders of the Red Sea, and beyond the Strait; the distance to be traversed, therefore, being but partially affected by the monsoons, never could have required a period of three years for its accomplishment; and a prolonged voyage round the Cape to the Guinea and Gold Coast is an assumption so wild that it does not merit serious consideration; but intending to proceed to India, the fleet had to reach the Strait of Bab-el-Mandeb in time to take advantage of the western monsoon; be in port, perhaps at or near Bombay, before the change; and after the storms accompanying the change it had to proceed during the eastern monsoon under the lee of the land to Coodramalli, or the port of Palesimundus in Taprobana, on the east coast of Ceylon; thence to the Coromandel shore, perhaps to the site of the

present ruins of Mahabalipuram; while the return voyage would again occupy one year and a half. The ports of India and Ceylon could furnish gold, precious stones, Eastern spices, and even Chinese wares; for the last fact is fully established by discoveries in very ancient Egyptian tombs. Silks, which are first mentioned in ^{<3822>}Proverbs 31:22, could not have come from Africa, and many articles of advanced and refined social life, not the produce of Egypt, could alone have been derived from India. *SEE OPHIR.*

Though in this short abstract of the arguments respecting the direction of Solomon's fleet there may be errors, none, we believe, are of sufficient weight to impugn the general conclusion which supports the usual rendering of *tukyim* by "peacocks;" although the increase of species in the West does not appear to have been remarkable till some ages after the reign of the great Hebrew monarch, when the bird was dedicated to Juno, and reared at first in her temple at Samos. There are only two species of true peacocks, viz. that under consideration, which is the *Pavo cristatus* of Linn.; and another, *Pavo Muticus*, more recently discovered, which differs in some particulars, and originally belongs to Japan and China. Peacocks bear the cold of the Himalayas; they run with great swiftness, and where they are serpents do not abound, as they devour the young with great avidity, and, it is said, attack with spirit even the *cobra de capello* when grown to considerable size, arresting its progress and confusing it by the rapidity and variety of their evolutions around it, till, exhausted with fatigue, it is struck on the head and dispatched. The ascription of the quality of vanity to the peacock is as old as the time of Aristotle, who says (*Hist. An.* 1:1, § 15), "Some animals are jealous and vain like the peacock."

The A.V. in ^{<3813>}Job 39:13, speaks of "the goodly wings of the peacocks;" but there the Hebrew words are different (*hsl [f pynac] ānk*) *the wing of the renanim is lifted up*, or flutters joyously), and have undoubted reference to the "ostrich" (q.v.). *SEE ADRAMMELECH.*

Picture for Peacock

PEACOCK in *Christian symbolism* was an emblem of the *resurrection*. It is well known that this bird loses its brilliant plumes every year at the approach of winter ("annuis vicibus," as Pliny expresses it, *Hist. Nat.* 10:22), and renews them in spring, when nature seems to reissue from the tomb. Hence interpreters of Christian archeology regard this bird as an

unequivocal type of the resurrection (Bosio, *Sotl.* p. 641; compare Aringhi, *Rom. subter.* c. 36, p. 612); although Mamachi (*Antiq. Christ.* 3:92) observes that this opinion rests solely upon the authority of the fathers. Anthony of Padua has made the same representation (*Serm. fer. 5 post Trinit.*). St. Augustine finds another token of the resurrection in the incorruptibility which his age attributed to the flesh of the peacock (*De Civit. Dei*, 21:4). These references are corroborated by the figures of this bird found in early Roman cemeteries. We figure one of these from the cemetery of Sts. Marcellin and Peter (Bottari, vol. 2, pl. 97), of a peacock rising from a globe as an emblem of this world. For others, see Boldetti (*Civit.* p. 163), Lupi (*Dissert.* II, 1:204); D'Agincourt (*Peinture*, pl. 2, No. 9), Polidori (*Sopra alcuni sepolcri*, etc., p. 57).

Pe(a)Cock, Reginald (Or Reynald),

a learned and worthy English prelate, was born in Wales about 1390, and was educated at Oxford, where he became fellow of Oriel College. He took holy orders, and, after filling minor appointments, became successively bishop of St. Asaph and Chichester, by the favor of Humphrey, the good duke of Gloucester. He labored most earnestly for the conversion of the Lollards, by the use of candid arguments; but his moderation turned the Romanists against him, and he was deposed for resisting the papal authority and denying transubstantiation, with other articles of the Roman Catholic faith. He was obliged to recant his notions, and his books were publicly burned; after which he was confined in Thorney Abbey, where he died in 1460. He was the author of a number of works, of which those not destroyed remain in MS., except his *Treatise of Faith*, which was published by Wharton in 1688; and *Repressor of overmuch Blaming of the Clergy* (1860), which may be compared to Locke's *Reasonableness of Christianity*. It is an appeal to reason, but is not open to the charge of Deism. His life was written by the Rev. John Lewis (1744), and it is a sequel to the life of Wickliffe. "It forms a fitting introduction to the history of the English Reformation." See Hardwick, *Church History of the Middle Ages*, p. 395, 396; Farrar, *Crit. Hist. of Free Thought*, lect. iii; Hallam, *Lit. Hist. of Europe*; *Lond. Athen.* 1860, 1:878; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* vol. 8:s.v. Peacock; Lewis, *Life of R. Peacock* (1744).

Peah

SEE TALMUD.

Peal, James G.,

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church. He was a native of England; was converted while young; and enlisted as a soldier in May, 1805, and afterwards served in Spain, Portugal, and Germany. During nine years' service he preached much to the soldiers, and formed a considerable society. In 1815 the royal staff corps, to which he belonged, came to Halifax, and thence to Coteau-du-Lac, Lower Canada. Here he was discharged by the governor with honor, that he might enter the itinerant ministry, which he did in 1818, as a member of the Genesee Conference, and labored with much acceptability and usefulness until his death, Dec. 25, 1822. He was a faithful and devoted man, and died from exposure undergone in the duties of his work. The most prominent traits of his character were zeal, firmness, and perseverance in the discharge of his duties. See *Minutes of Conferences*, 1:405; Conable, *Hist. of the Genesee Conference* (N.Y. 1875, 8vo), p. 201, 202.

Pear, Prickly

SEE THORN.

Pearce, Samuel

an English Baptist divine, was born at Plymouth July 20, 1766. In 1786 he became a student at Bristol College, and was there converted. He was called to the pastorate of Cannon Street Baptist Church, in Birmingham, in 1790, on recommendation of Robert Hall, who had been one of his tutors. He was one of the founders of the Baptist Missionary Society at Kettering in 1792, and shortly after offered himself as one of its missionaries to India. But as his ministry had been almost one continual revival of religion, and his counsel seemed necessary in the successful management of the society, he was dissuaded from going. He died of consumption Oct. 10, 1799. Samuel Pearce was the author of several hymns, of which those entitled *Hymn in a Storm* and *In the Floods of Tribulation* have found their way into several collections. He also published, *Corporation and Test Acts Exposed* (1790, 8vo), and *Sermons* (Lond. 1791, 8vo). His memoirs were published by Andrew Fuller in 1800, and have passed through numerous editions in England and America. "There have been few men," says Fuller, "in whom has been united a greater portion of the contemplative and the active; holy zeal and genuine candor; spirituality and rationality; talents that attracted almost universal applause, yet the most unaffected modesty;

faithfulness in bearing testimony against evil, with the tenderest compassion to the soul of the evil-doer; fortitude that would encounter any difficulty in the way of duty, without anything boisterous, noisy, or overbearing; deep seriousness with habitual cheerfulness; and a constant aim to promote the highest degree of piety in himself and others, with a readiness to hope the best of the lowest." See, besides the *Memoirs*, Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Brown, *Religious Cyclop.* s.v.

Pearce, Zachary

D.D., an eminent British divine and scholar, and a prelate of the English Church, was born at London in 1690. He was the son of a distiller in Holborn, and went to Westminster Grammar School; thence he passed to Trinity College, Cambridge. where he obtained a fellowship. At Cambridge Pearce was best known as a polite classical scholar, and it was in 1716, before he took orders, that he published his edition of Cicero *De Oratore*. He inscribed it, at a friend's suggestion, to lord chief justice Parker, afterwards earl of Macclesfield, though he was not known to him, and this circumstance led to a friendship and patronage which were of the greatest use to him. The lord chief justice, being made lord chancellor soon after, took Mr. Pearce into his family as his domestic chaplain. Preferment now opened up to him. He was presented to the living of Stapleford Abbots in Essex, St. Bartholomew, near the Royal Exchange, and finally of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, London. The last appointment was in 1723. He was made dean of Winchester in 1739, in 1748 bishop of Bangor, and in 1756 bishop of Rochester, with the deanery of Westminster annexed. Bishop Pearce, though well fitted for the episcopal dignity, was a man of great modesty and humility, and as anxious to avoid preferments, and to resign them when forced upon him, as most men were to gain and hold them. His anxiety to retire from the high station to which he was thus involuntarily raised was so sincere, as well as strong, that at length, in 1768, the government yielded to his repeated request, and allowed him to resign the more valuable appointment, his deanery, in favor of Dr. Thomas; Pearce retaining, however, the bishopric, to the retiring from which there existed some objections of an ecclesiastical nature. He died at Little Eating Jan. 29, 1774. Bishop Pearce was as distinguished for his charity and munificence as for his learning. He enriched the Widow's College, in the immediate neighborhood of his palace at Bromley, by a donation of £5000. His tracts on theological subjects are numerous and valuable. Of these the principal

are, *A Commentary on the Gospels and Acts of the Apostles* (2 vols. 4to), greatly praised by Dr. Adam Clarke and other eminent Biblical scholars: — *Letters to Dr. Conyers Middleton, in Defence of Dr. Waterland*: — *A Reply to Woolston on the Miracles*; of which Leland says that it was a work deservedly much esteemed: — *A Review of the Text of Milton*: — and an edition of Longinus *On the Sublime*, with a Latin translation annexed; and another of Cicero's *Offices*; also, four volumes of *Sermons*, etc. See his *Life* prefixed to his *Commentary*; Jones, *Christ. Biog.* s.v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, vol. ii, s.v.; Perry, *Hist. of the Church of England*, 3:331, 333.

Pearl

Picture for Pearl

(*vybægabish*, from a root which in the Arabic means to *freeze*, but in the Chaldee to *collect*; Sept. merely Graecizes, *γαβίς*; Vulg. *eminentia*). The Heb. word occurs, in this form, only in ^{<1038>}Job 28:18, where the price of wisdom is contrasted with that of *ramdth* (“coral”) and *gabish*; and the same word, with the prefixed syllable *el* (*l a*), is found in ^{<1031>}Ezekiel 13:11, 13; 38:22, with *abne*, “stones,” i.e. “stones of ice” (A.V. “hailstones”). The ancient versions contribute nothing by way of explanation. Schultens (*Comment. on Job, l.c.*) leaves the word untranslated: he gives the signification of “pearls” to the Heb. term *pennim* (A.V. “rubies”) which occurs in the same verse. Gesenius, Furst, Rosenmüller, Maurer, and commentators generally, understand “crystal” by the term, on account of its resemblance to ice. Lee (*Comment. on Job, l.c.*) translates *ramoth ve-gabish*, “things high and massive.” Carey renders *gabish* by “mother-of-pearl,” though he is by no means content with this explanation. On the whole, the balance of probability is in favor of “crystal,” since *gabish* denotes “ice” (not “hailstones,” as Carey supposes, without the addition of *abne*, “stones”) in the passages of Ezekiel where the word occurs. There is nothing to which ice can be so well compared as to crystal. The objection to this interpretation is that crystal is not an article of much value; but perhaps reference may here be made to the beauty and pure luster of rock crystal, or this substance may by the ancient Orientals have been held in high esteem. Pearls (*μαργαρίται*), however, are frequently mentioned in the N.T.: comp. ^{<1035>}Matthew 13:45, 46, where the kingdom of heaven is likened unto “a merchantman seeking goodly pearls.” Pearls formed part of women's attire (^{<1019>}1 Timothy 2:9; ^{<1070>}Revelation

17:4). “The twelve gates” of the heavenly Jerusalem were twelve pearls (^{<621>}Revelation 21:21); perhaps “mother-of-pearl” is here more especially intended. In ^{<107>}Matthew 7:6 pearls are used metaphorically for anything of value; or perhaps more especially for “wise sayings,” which in Arabic, according to Schultens (*Harsiri Consess.* 1:12; 2:102), are called pearls. See Parkhurst, *Gr. Lex.* s.v. **Μαργαρίτης**) Other words supposed by some to mean pearls (besides **μυγαδία** above) are **ἰρίδης**, *bedolach* (“bdellium,” ^{<1072>}Genesis 2:12); and **ῥόδον**, *dar* (“white,” ^{<1706>}Esther 1:6). See each in its place.

The above intimations seem to indicate that pearls were in more common use among the Jews after than before the Captivity, while they evince the estimation in which they were held in later times (Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* 9:54; 12:41; Elian, *Anim.* 10:13; comp. Ritter, *Erdkunde*, 2:164; Wellsted, *Travels*, 1:181 sq.). The island of Tylos (Bahrein) was especially renowned for its fishery of pearls (Pliny, 6:32; comp. Straboi xvi, p. 767; Athen. 3:93; Heeren, *Ideen*, I, 2:244 sq.); the Indian Ocean was also known to produce pearls (Arrian, *Indica*, p. 194; Pliny, 9:54; 34:48; Strabo, 15, p. 717). Heeren feels assured that this indication must be understood to refer to the strait between Taprobana, or Ceylon, and the southernmost point of the mainland of India, Cape Comorin, whence Europeans, even at present, derive their principal supplies of these costly natural productions (*Ideen*, I, 2:224). See further, Bochart, *Hieroz.* 3:601 sq.; Hartmann, *Hebr.* 3:84 sq.; Rosenmüller, *Alterthum*, IV, 2:458 sq.; Gesen. *Thes.* p. 24,1113.

The excessive passion for the use of pearls in decorative costume which prevails at the present day in the East is shown by the state costume of the shall of Persia. Sir Robert Ker Porter, describing it, mentions “the diamonds, *pearls*, rubies, and emeralds” of which the tiara is composed, “the pear-formed pearls of an immense size” with which the plumes are tipped; the “two strings of pearls, probably the largest in the world,” which crossed the king’s shoulders; and the “large cushion encased in a network of pearls,” against which he reclined (*Travels*, 1:325). Sir Harford Brydges dilates on other objects: “The king’s tippet . . . is a piece of pearl-work, of the most beautiful pattern; the pearls are worked on velvet, but they stand so close together that little, if any, of the velvet is visible. It took me an hour to examine this single article, which I have no fear in saying cannot be matched in the world. The tassel which on such occasions is appended to the state dagger is formed of pearls of the most uncommon size and

beauty; and the emerald which forms the top of the tassel is, perhaps, the largest perfect one in the world” (*Mission to Persia*, p. 383). Sir William Ouseley, describing the “royal apparel” of Futteh Ali Shah, says: “Of the king’s dress I could perceive that the color was scarlet, but to ascertain exactly the materials would have been difficult, from the profusion of large pearls that covered it in various places, and the multiplicity of jewels that sparkled all around; for the golden throne seemed studded at the sides with precious stones of every possible tint, and the back resembled a sun of glory, of which the radiation was imitated by diamonds, garnets, emeralds, and rubies. Of such, also, was chiefly composed the monarch’s ample and most splendid crown, and the two figures of birds that ornamented the throne, one perched on each of its beautiful enameled shoulders” (*Travels*, 3:131). From the immutability of custom in the East we are ready to conclude that the elements of this magnificence must have been common to the ancient Oriental courts. But there are some circumstances which seem to militate against the very great antiquity of the use of pearls, at least to an extravagant extent. The costume of the monarchs of Egypt, as depicted in the numerous paintings which have come down to us from their own times, is comparatively simple; the principal article of adornment which can be called jewelry being the collar. This indeed was rich and elaborate, and seems to have been composed either of gold or of gems set in gold. Yet pearls do not seem, so far as we can judge from the representations, to have taken a prominent place in the construction of these or similar articles. Many examples of ladies’ jewelry, as necklaces, bracelets, and earrings, have been found in the tombs, and are preserved in the museums and cabinets of Europe. In these pearls are sometimes mounted, as well as gems; but their occurrence is by no means profuse. The discovery of Ninevite remains has made us comparatively familiar with the appearance and usages of the Assyrian court and people at a much later period than that of the Egyptian monuments. The portraits of successive monarchs have been exhumed, and numerous representations exist of royal costume. Generally this is gorgeous enough, but there is little evidence to show that pearls were much used in personal decoration. The circlets of the tiara, the ear-rings, necklaces, and collars, the armbands and bracelets, the sword and dagger hilts, all show the jeweller’s art; but for the most part these objects were evidently wrought in gold. In settings and strings of gems do occur, but the angled and faceted forms of these almost invariably show that stones or imitations of stones are intended. According to Colonel Rawlinson’s reading of the inscription on the Black Obelisk, however,

Temenbar received as “tribute from the kings of the Chaldees gold, silver, gems, and *pearls*.” What we think manifest from the evidence of Egyptian and Assyrian monuments is not the absolute lack of pearls in costume, but great moderation in the use of them. “A necklace of twenty-seven pearls” is mentioned in the *Ramdyana* (i, sect. 14), a Hindu poem of an antiquity probably at least as great as that of the Assyrian remains. The possession of the rich pearl-banks in the Persian Gulf would naturally make the court of Shushan the chief depository of these elegant luxuries; and the taste for effeminate luxury in costume which has always distinguished that court, at least from Grecian times, would suggest the manner of appropriating them. We know that the fishery was actively prosecuted, both in the gulf and the Indian Ocean, in the time of Pliny and Strabo. The island called Tylos, the modern Bahrein, on the southern shore of the Persian Gulf, was the seat of the former, and that of the latter probably the strait between Ceylon and the shore of India; and these two constitute the chief sources of pearls to this day. From the Persian court the taste for pearls spread to that of the Ptolemies. Cleopatra, at a supper with Antony, of which Pliny has given us the details, took from her ear one of a pair of pearls of the value of £80,000 sterling — “the singular and only jewels of the world, and even nature’s wonder;” and having dissolved it in vinegar, swallowed the absurdly precious draught; and would have done the same with its fellow had it not been rescued from her “pride and wanton trauverie.” From Egypt the fashion passed to Rome; and the degenerate descendants of the iron republicans rivaled even the Persian monarchs in their ambition to

————— “*Wear*
The spoils, of nations in an ear,
Chang’d for the treasure of a shell.”

Pliny’s picture of a Roman lady is amusing enough, especially as seen through the glass of old Philemon Holland’s translation: “I myselfe haue seen Lollia Paulina (late wife, and after widdow, to Caius Caligula the emperor), when she was dressed and set out, not in stately wise, nor of purpose for some great solemnity, but only when she was to go to a wedding supper, or rather unto a feast, when the assurance was made, and great persons they were not that made the said feast; I have seen her, I say, so beset and bedeckt all over with hemeraulds and pearles, disposed in rows, ranks, and courses one by another; round about the attire of her head, her cawle, her borders, her peruk of hair, her bond grace and chaplet; at her eares pendant about her neck in a carcanet, upon her wrest in

bracelets, and on her fingers in rings; that she glistened and shon again like the sun as she went. The value of these ornaments she esteemed and rated at four hundred thousand sestertii, and offered openly to prove it out of hand by her bookes of accounts and reckonings,” etc. Julius Caesar is reported to have presented Servilia, the mother of M. Brutus, with a pearl worth a quarter of a million of dollars; and Claudius, the son of AEsop the successful Roman actor, imitated and even exceeded the wanton folly of Cleopatra.

Pearls are accidental concretions of shelly matter deposited within the valves of certain bivalve *Mollusca*, of which the most celebrated species is the *Avicula margaritifera*, which is spread over the whole of the tropical parts of the Indian and Pacific oceans. In all bivalves the surface of the mantle has the power of depositing calcareous matter in thin layers, which hardening forms a shelly coat on the inner side of the valves, and in most species this lining has a pearly lustre. A pearl is nothing but an abnormal shell, reversed; that is to say, the nacreous coat is here external. The peculiar lustre of nacre is dependent on the fact that the surface is not perfectly smooth, but covered with the irregularly sinuous edges of innumerable layers of inconceivable thinness, which are deposited one over the other. The distance of these edges from each other varies indefinitely, the pearls of the finest water having them closest; they are always, however, too fine to be detected by the naked eye. These edges make so many steps, so to speak; and the iridescence is produced by the mutual interference of the rays of light reflected from these thousands of angles. For their *water*, or lustre, as distinguished from *iridescence*, pearls are indebted to their being composed of thin layers, which allow light to pass through them, while their numerous surfaces disperse and reflect the light in such a manner that it returns and mingles with that which is directly reflected from the exterior. The thinner and more transparent the constituent layers, the more perfect is the lustre (Kelaart and Mobius, *Annals of Nat. Hist.* Feb. 1858). The immediate occasion of the production of a pearl appears to be always the presence of some extraneous substance, such as a grain of sand, an egg either of the mollusk or of some other animal, some parasitic intruder, or the silicious shell of one of the *Diatomaceae* on which the oyster feeds. Hence pearls may be artificially educed by inserting foreign matters properly shaped and fastened inside the shell. Though pearl-fisheries have been established in various parts of the world, yet the most productive are still those which have been worked

from antiquity. The annual produce of the Bahrein bank — the ancient Tylos — is set down at \$1,000,000. The fishery near Cape Comorin — probably the Perimula of Pliny — yielded to the British government (in 1867) a net revenue of 81,917 star-pagodas. That on the western coast of Ceylon is, however, stated to be the richest of all; it is a monopoly in the hands of the British government, but we have no statistics of its actual value. The fullest details of the pearl-fishery are those given of this last by Captain Percival (*Hist. of Ceylon*); by Dr. Kelaart in his *Report* of the same, and by Dr. Mobius in his general resumd of the subject (*Die echten Perlen*, Hamb. 1857). The *Unio margaritiferus*, *Mytilus edulis*, and *Ostrea edulis* (common oyster) of our own country, occasionally furnish pearls. The shell of the pearl-oyster constitutes the well-known mother-of-pearl, which is extensively used for ornaments, especially in Bethlehem. Those of Palestine are procured from the Red Sea. *SEE GEM.*

Pearne, William N.

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Rochester, England, and came to this country in 1822. He resided at New York Mills some years as the principal business agent and accountant of a large manufacturing establishment. We are not able to state at what time he became a member of the Methodist Church. Most likely it was before his immigration to this country. His social relations in England were of a high order. Dr. Paddock, when stationied in Utica, formed a class in Pearne's house and made him leader. He sustained an unblemished character, and his powers rapidly developing, he soon became an able minister. He was calm and dispassionate, but there was enough of emotion and of thought to command a deep and profound attention. In 1833 he joined the late Oneida Conference, and filled acceptably some of the most important appointments, among which were Binghamton, Cortlandville, and Utica. He was possessed of an amiable disposition, was a faithful friend and a Christian gentleman. As a minister he was clear, chaste, practical, and fearless, and a passionate admirer of the beautiful. His poetical productions found admirers, and as an amateur painter in his later years he manifested a measure of genius. When inquired of concerning the state of his mind in his last hours he exclaimed, "Happy! Happy!" while his beaming countenance and uplifted eye told better than words could do the rapture of his closing hour. He died in Kington, N.Y., April 30, 1868. He had the happiness and honor of giving to the ministry of the Church two sons well and extensively known, Rev. William Hall Pearne, of Memphis, and Rev. Thomas Hall

Pearne, D.D., of Knoxville, Tenn. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1868.

Pearsall, Richard

an English Dissenting divine, was born at Kidderminster in 1698, and was educated at Jones's Academy in Tewkesbury. After having been ordained for the ministry, he became pastor at Bromyard, Herefordshire, where he remained ten years; was then made pastor at Warminster, and sixteen years later became pastor at Taunton, where he served his congregation for fifteen years. He died in 1772. He published, *Power and Pleasure of the Divine Life* (Lond. 1744, 8vo): — *Sermons* (1758, 8vo): — *Reliquioe Sacroe, or Meditations on select Passages of Scripture*, etc. (1765, 12mo), of which last named Hervey says that "refined fancy and a delicate philosophy compose a chaplet for evangelical divinity." See Allibone, *Dict of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, vol. 2, s.v.

Pearse, Edward

an English Nonconformist divine, flourished in the second half of the 17th century. He was minister of St. Margaret's, Westminster, but was ejected at the Restoration for nonconformity, though a pious man and a useful preacher. He died in 1673, about forty years old. He published, *The Best Match, or the Soul's Espousal to Christianity* (Glasgow, 1672, 12mo; Lond. 1673, sm. 8vo; new ed. 1843, 8vo): — *A Beam of Divine Glory, and the Soul's Rest in God* (1674, 8vo; 1704, 12mo): — *The Grand Concern* (17th ed. 1692, 12mo; new ed. 1840, 18mo). See Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* 2:2317, 2318.

Pearse, James

an English Dissenting divine, flourished near the middle of last century as minister in Tadley, Hants. He published *Twenty-one Sermons* (Lond. 1763, 8vo), which are "excellent. but of rare occurrence." See Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* 2:2318.

Pearson, Edward

D.D., a learned English divine, and the great champion of Arminianism in the Church of England near the close of last century and the opening of this, was born about 1760 at Ipswich, Sussex, and educated at Sidney College, Cambridge. He was for a while fellow and tutor of Sidney

College, and afterwards master (1808), and was elected the Christian advocate in 1809. He was also appointed rector of Rempstone, in Nottinghamshire. He died August 17, 1811. Dr. Pearson was considered an excellent preacher, and one of the most learned men of his times. Besides numerous single sermons preached by him on public occasions, he was the author of a volume of *Thirteen Sermons addressed to Academic Youth* (delivered in St. Mary's Church, Cambridge). He published also *A Collection of Prayers for the Use of Families: — Twelve Lectures on the Subject of the Prophecies relating to the Christian Church; being a portion of the Lectures founded at Lincoln's-Inn Chapel by the late Bishop Warburton* (Lond. 1811, 8vo), and various tracts in divinity not professedly controversial. But his fame chiefly rests on his controversial writings against antagonists of necessitarian proclivities. There are two treatises of his against those who adopt Dr. Paley's views on the general theory of moral obligation, and those who follow him in some of the practical conclusions to which that celebrated divine and moralist conducts his readers. These treatises, entitled *Annotations on the Practical Part of Dr. Paley's Moral and Political Philosophy* (Ipswich, 1801, 8vo): — *Remarks on the Theory of Morals: in which is contained an Examination of the Theoretical Part of Dr. Paley's Moral and Political Philosophy* (ibid. 1800, 8vo), excited, when first published, great attention, and well deserve to be read by all in connection with the treatise on *Moral and Political Philosophy* to which they relate. On the other side, Dr. Pearson was among the first to sound an alarm respecting the danger to which the Church was exposed by the spread in it of Calvinistic views of Christian doctrine. On this subject he published various tracts at the beginning of the present century, several of which were expressly directed against Mr. Simeon, who was the great maintainer of Calvinism in the university to which Dr. Pearson belonged. In fact, Dr. Pearson was the champion of the Arminian clergy in the Church, and the champion of the Church itself against whatever seemed to threaten its integrity and its perpetuity. The most important on this subject are, *Remarks on the Doctrine of Justification by Faith; in a Letter to the Rev. John Overton* (Lond. 1802, 8vo): — *Remarks on the Controversy subsisting, or supposed to subsist, between the Arminian and Calvinistic Ministers of the Church of England; in a second Letter to the Rev. John Overton* (ibid. 1802, 8vo). We have not room, nor does it seem necessary, to give the titles of all his writings; but it may be useful to say that a complete list, arranged chronologically, may be seen in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for 1811. where it is also said of him

that he was a good man, of gentle and benevolent manners, kind and charitable, easy and pleasant in conversation, modest, unassuming, much respected, and beloved. See also Hunt. *Memoirs of the Life of E. Pearson* (1845); *English Review*, 3:441; Collier, *Eccles. Hist.*; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* vol. 2, s.v.

Pearson, Eliphalet

LL.D., an eminent Congregational minister, was born June, 1752, in Byfield, Mass. He graduated at Harvard College in 1773, and was soon after licensed to preach. In April, 1778, he was made preceptor of Phillips Academy, then just started, in which place he remained until 1786. when he was elected professor of Hebrew in Harvard College, and after president Willard's death, in 1804, he acted as president. In 1806 he resigned and removed to Andover, where he was very active in founding the theological seminary, in which he was chosen professor of sacred literature in 1808, but resigned this position after serving only one year. He remained a trustee of the seminary, and was a member of the Massachusetts Historical Society and other associations. He died Sept. 12, 1826. He published a *Lecture on the Death of President Willard* (1804), and four separate *Sermons* (1811, 1812, 1813, 1815). See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 2:126-131; *North Amer. Review*, 64:181.

Pearson, John

an English prelate of high celebrity, and one of the greatest divines of his age, was born in 1612 at Snoring, in Norfolk, of which place his father was rector. He was educated first at Eton, and then at King's College, Cambridge, and took the degree of M.A. in 1639. In the same year he took orders, and was collated to a prebend in Salisbury Cathedral. In 1640 he was appointed chaplain to Finch, lord-keeper of the great seal, and on the outbreak of the civil war became chaplain to lord Goring, and afterwards to Sir Robert Cook, in London. In 1650 he was appointed minister of St. Clement's, Eastcheap, London; and this was the chief scene of his labors as a parochial minister. In 1659 he published the great work by which he will be remembered as long as the English tongue shall last and Christian theology continue to have any interest for men, *An Exposition of the Apostle's Creed*. It was dedicated to his flock, to whom the substance of it had been preached some years before in a series of discourses. The laborious learning and the judicial calmness displayed by the author in this

treatise have long been acknowledged, and command the respect even of those who take exception to his elaborate argumentation. It was republished, with the author's corrections, in folio, first in 1676, and again in 1686; since that time it has gone through many editions, and still sustains its reputation. It is used as a text-book at the universities, and is regarded as one of the principal standards of appeal on doctrinal matters in the Church of England. It was translated into Latin for use on the Continent. It has also been republished in this country in Dobson's edition of 1840 (see Allibone); besides which there are editions by Burton (1847) and Chevalier (1849). It is generally acknowledged to be one of the most remarkable productions of what is usually called the greatest age of English theology — the 17th century. Dibdin says: "The *Exposition of the Creed* has nothing superior to it in any language. Metaphysics, logic, classical and theological erudition, are all brought to bear upon that momentous subject, in a manner so happy and so natural that the depths of research and variety of knowledge are most concealed by the felicitous manner of their adaptation. Well might the great Bentley say of this yet greater man that his 'very dust was gold' (*Literary Companion*, p. 56). Dr. Samuel Johnson recommends Pearson as one of the three authors (Dr. Clarke and Grotius are the others) whom every man whose faith is unsettled should study. During the same year which brought out the *Creed*, Dr. Pearson published *The Golden Remains of the ever-memorable Mr. John Hales, of Eton*. At the Restoration a proper regard was had for Pearson's eminent merits, and honors and emoluments were lavishly showered upon him. Before the close of 1660 he received the rectory of St. Christopher's, in London; was created D.D. at Cambridge; installed prebendary of Ely and archdeacon of Surrey, and made master of Jesus College, Cambridge. In 1661 he obtained the Margaret professorship of divinity, and was one of the most prominent commissioners in the famous Savoy Conference; in 1662 he was made master of Trinity, Cambridge, and assisted in the course of that year in the revision of the Liturgy — a task for which his previous publications had indicated him as peculiarly well fitted. In 1673 he was promoted to the bishopric of Chester. The year preceding he had published his *Vindiciae Epistolarum S. Ignatii*, in answer to Daille, who had denied the genuineness of the Epistles. It was imagined for years that Pearson had triumphed in this controversy, but recent investigations have weakened Pearson's arguments. *SEE IGNATIUS*. In 1682 bishop Pearson published *Annales Cyprianici*, together with bishop Fell's edition of Cyprian. *SEE FELL*. He edited, with a preface of 19 pp., *Vetum Testamentum Graecum*

ex Vers. LXX (1665, 12mo), and was one of the editors of the *Critici Sacri*. Bishop Pearson died July 16, 1686. His *Opera Posthuma Chronologica* were published by Dodwell (Lond. 1688, 4to, in Le Clerc's *Bibl. Univ.* 9:127). They contain (1) the *Annales Paulini*, which bishop Randolph inserted in his Enchiridion *Theologicum*, of which an English translation, with notes, was published by Williams (Cambr. 1825, and often)-a critical dissertation on the series of events in the life of the apostle Paul; (2) the *Lectiones in Acta Apostolorum*, which extend from the first to the ninth chapter of the Acts, "and (as might be expected) contain many valuable critical and chronological observations for the elucidation of the apostle Luke's narrative" (Horne, *Bibl. Bib.* p. 315). Both the lectures on Acts and Annals of St. Paul were brought out in an English version by Crowfoot, also with notes (1853, 8vo). Besides these writings were published, *Adversaria lesychian2a* (Lond. 1844, 2 vols. 8vo): — *Minor Theological Works*, with memoir, notes, and index by Churton (Qxf. 1844, 2 vols. 8vo). His *Orationes, Conciones, et Determinationes Theologicae* contain much valuable matter. Bishop Burnet thought Pearson "in all respects the greatest divine of his age." See Burnet, *My Own Times* (ed. 1833), 3:142 sq.; *Biographia Brit.* s.v.; Macaulay, *Hist. of England*, vol. ii, ch. vi; Hallam, *Literary Hist. of Europe*; Perry, *Ch. Hist. of Elnngland*, 2:323, 661; Stoughton, *Eccles. Hist. of England (Ch. of the Restor.)*; Whewell, *Moral Philos.* p. 174; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* vol. ii, s.v.; (*Lond.*) *Gentleman's Magazine*, February, 1848, p. 158 sq.

Pearson, William

LL.D., an English divine, flourished in the second half of the 17th century. He was prebend of York in 1689, archdeacon of Nottingham in 1690, subdean of York in 1695, and then chancellor of York and residentiary of the church of York. He died Feb. 6, 1716. He published three separate *Sermons*, and after his death appeared *Thirteen Sermons on several Occasions, preached at the Cathedral of York* (Lond. 1718, 8vo). See Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliogr.* vol. 2, s.v.

Pearson, William Wesley

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Morgan County, Ala., Sept. 27. 1837. His father, Edmund Pearson, was a minister; hence his son was brought in daily contact with religious example in his

boyhood, and early led to seek an interest in religious topics. At the age of sixteen he connected himself with the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. He was educated at Sarepta and Pontotoc; afterwards taught school a while, but becoming impressed that God had called him to the work of the ministry, he entered the itinerancy in the Memphis Conference about 1860. He filled eight regular appointments in the Conference; then, his health failing, he sustained a supernumerary relation one year, and the last two years of his life he was superannuated. He died Nov. 3, 1872. Pearson was a good practical preacher. His sermons were plain, earnest, and forcible. His life was an example of uniform, unpretending piety, and in death he testified that all was well with him. When he found that his end was near, he said, "My preparation for death was made long ago. All is well; I shall rest in heaven." See *Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the Meth. Episc. Church, South*, 1872, p. 707.

Peasants' War

is the name given to the great insurrection of the German and Swiss peasantry in the Reformation period. It is a subject so intimately connected with the origin of Protestantism that we briefly refer to it here. The war broke out in the beginning of the year 1525. Zschokke has described it as the "terrible scream of oppressed humanity." The oppression of the peasants had gradually increased in severity as the nobility became more extravagant and the clergy more sensual and degenerate. The example of Switzerland encouraged the hope of success, and from 1476 to 1517 there were risings here and there among the peasants of the south of Germany. A peasant rebellion, called in popular phrase the *Bundschuh* (Laced Shoe), took place in the Rhine countries in 1502, and another, called the "League of Poor Conrad," in Wurtemberg, in 1514, both of which were put down without any abatement of the grievances that had occasioned them. The Reformation, by the mental awakening which it produced, and the diffusion of sentiments favorable to freedom, must be reckoned among the causes of the great insurrection itself; although Luther, Melancthon, and the other leading Reformers, while urging the nobles to justice and humanity, strongly reprobated the violent proceedings of the peasants. The Anabaptists, however, and in particular Munzer, encouraged and excited them, and a peasant insurrection took place in the Hegau in 1522. Another, known as the "Latin War," arose in 1523 in Salzburg, against an unpopular archbishop, but these were quickly suppressed. On Jan. 1, 1525, the peasantry of the abbacy of Kempten, along with the townspeople, suddenly

assailed and plundered the convent, compelling the abbot to sign a renunciation of his rights. This proved the signal for a rising of the peasants on all sides throughout the south of Germany. Many of the princes and nobles at first regarded the insurrection with some measure of complacency, because it was directed in the first instance chiefly against the ecclesiastical lords; some, too, because it seemed likely to promote the interests of the exiled duke of Wurtemberg, who was then upon the point of reconquering his dominions by the help of Swiss troops; and others, because it seemed to set bounds to the increase of Austrian power. But the archduke Ferdinand hastened to raise an army, the troops of the empire being for the most part engaged in the emperor's wars in Italy, and entrusted the command of it to the Truchsess Von Waldburg, a man of stern and unscrupulous character, but of ability and energy. Von Waldburg negotiated with the peasants in order to gain time, and defeated and destroyed some large bodies of them, but was himself defeated by them on April 22, when he made a treaty with them, not having, however, the slightest intention of keeping it. Meanwhile the insurrection extended, and became general throughout Germany, and a number of towns took part in it, as Heilbronn, Muhlhausen, Fulda, Frankfort, etc., but there was a total want of organization and cooperation. Towards Easter, 1525, there appeared in Upper Swabia a manifesto, which set forth the grievances and demands of the insurgents. They demanded the free election of their parish clergy; the appropriation of the tithes of grain, after competent maintenance of the parish clergy, to the support of the poor and to purposes of general utility; the abolition of serfdom, and of the exclusive hunting and fishing rights of the nobles; the restoration to the community of forests, fields, and meadows which the secular and ecclesiastical lords had appropriated to themselves; release from arbitrary augmentation and multiplication of services, duties, and rents; the equal administration of justice, and the abolition of some of the most odious exactions of the clergy. The conduct of the insurgents was not, however, in accordance with the moderation of their demands. Their many separate bands destroyed the convents and castles, murdered, pillaged, and were guilty of the greatest excesses, which must indeed be regarded as partly in revenge for the cruelty practiced against them by Von Waldburg. A number of princes and knights concluded treaties with the peasants conceding their principal demands. The city of Wurzburg joined them, but the castle of Liebfrauenberg made an obstinate resistance, which gave time to Von Waldburg and their other enemies to collect and strengthen their forces. In

May and June, 1525, the peasants sustained a number of severe defeats, in which large bodies of them were destroyed. The landgrave Philip of Hesse was also successful against them in the north of Germany. The peasants, after they had been subjugated, were everywhere treated with terrible cruelty. In one instance a great body of them were perfidiously massacred after they had laid down their arms. Multitudes were hanged in the streets, and many were put to death with the greatest tortures. Weinsberg, Rothenburg, Wurzburg, and other towns which had joined them, suffered the terrible revenge of the victors, and torrents of blood were shed. It is supposed that more than 150,000 persons lost their lives in the Peasants' War. Flourishing and populous districts were desolated. The lot of the defeated insurgents became harder than ever, and many burdens of the peasantry originated at this period. The cause of the Reformation also was very injuriously affected. See Sartorius, *Versuch einer Geschichte des deutschen Bauernkriegs* (Berlin, 1795); Oechsle, *Beitrage zur Geschichte des deutschen Bauernkriegs* (Heilbronn, 1829); Wachsmuth, *Der deutsche Bauernkrieg* (Leipsic, 1834); Zimmermann, *A hgeneine Geschich to des grossen Bauernkriegs* (Stuttgard, 1841-43, 3 vols.).

Pease, Calvin

D.D., an eminent Presbyterian minister (O. S.), was born in Canaan, Conn., Aug. 12, 1813. He graduated at the University of Vermont in 1838, became a teacher in Montpelier, and professor of Greek and Latin in the University of Vermont in 1842. He held this post until 1855, when he was ordained to the ministry, and appointed president of the university. In 1861 he became pastor of the First Presbyterian Church in Rochester, N.Y., and died on a visit to Burlington, Sept. 17, 1863. His scholarly culture was wide, yet thorough; and both in the university and in his parish he measured fully up to the demands of duty. He published several *Sermons*, and contributed a number of articles to the *Bibliotheca Sacra*. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1864. p. 188; Appleton's *Annual Cyclop.* 1863, p. 737; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, vol. ii, s.v.

Pease, Ebenezer

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Georgia, Franklin County, Vt., Sept. 9, 1802. At the age of fourteen he was converted, and soon after united with the Methodist Church, and became a bright example of youthful piety. He received a license to exhort in 1823.

His first local preacher's license was granted in 1826. In 1845 he joined the Black River Conference, and successively served the following charges: Brasher and Massena, two years; Chateaugay, two years; Heuvelton and Depeyster, two years; Massena, two years; Lisbon, one year; Bangor, two years; next, and last, Hopkinton. He served all of these charges with great acceptability and profit to his people. He was a clear, instructive preacher, and a faithful pastor. A few years previous to his death he was afflicted with what was supposed to be softening of the brain. His mental attention to religious and temporal affairs entirely failed him, so that he had to be treated as a child. He died at Lawrenceville, St. Lawrence County, N.Y., Dec. 1, 1873. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1874, p. 72; Smith, *Memorials of N.Y. and N.Y. East Conf.*: p. 226.

Peck, Francis

a learned English divine, noted especially as an industrious antiquary, was born at Stamford, in Lincolnshire, May 4, 1692. He received his preparatory education in his native town. He afterwards went to Trinity College, Cambridge, where he took the degree of B.A. in 1715, and M.A. in 1727. In 1723 he was presented to the rectory of Godeby Maureward, in Leicestershire: and in 1736 he received a prebendal stall in the cathedral of Lincoln. He died in 1743. His principal works are, *The Antiquarian Annals of Stanford, in Lincoln, Rutland, and Northampton Shires* (Lond. 1727, fol.): — *Desiderata Curiosa*, the first volume of which was printed in folio, London, 1732, followed by the second in 1735, both reprinted in 4to in 1779: — *A Catalogue of all the Discourses written both for and against Popery in the Time of King James II* (Lond. 1735, 4to): — *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Oliver Cromwell* (1740, 4to): — *New Memoirs of the Life and Poetical Works of John Milton* (1740, 4to). He also published some sermons and discourses. His first publication was Τὸ ὕψος ἄγιον , or an Exercise on the Creation, and a Hymn to the Creator of the World; written in the express Words of the Sacred Text, as an Attempt to show the Beauty and Sublimity of the Holy Scriptures (1716, 8to). See Chalmers, *Biogr. Dict.* 24:235; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, vol. ii, s.v.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliogr.* vol. ii, s.v.

Peck, George

D.D., a noted minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, one of the pioneers in American Methodism, and a most valued leader in the literary

department of this branch of the Wesleyan body, was born in Middlefield, Otsego County, New York, August 8, 1797. His parents were from Danbury, Connecticut, descendants of sturdy Puritan stock. His mother was gifted with a strong mind and possessed great force of character; she was eminently pious and devotional which constituted her a remarkable woman in her religious and social influence, and enabled her to give all her five sons to the Methodist ministry. His father was a Methodist class-leader, and to the time of his death a devoted Christian. Under these genial influences George united, in 1812, with the Methodist Episcopal Church. In 1816 he commenced his useful career as a Methodist preacher, being then only nineteen years of age. He traveled circuits till 1821. and that year he took charge of Paris station, and the two following years of the station at Utica. So rapidly did the young, gifted preacher advance in his earnest pulpit efforts and devotion to the work, that he was appointed, in 1824, presiding elder of the Susquehanna District, which large district embraced all the territory contained in the Wyoming Conference previous to the General Conference of 1868, and nearly as much more now within the bounds of the Central New York and Genesee Conferences. The same year he was elected delegate to the General Conference, and he was chosen a delegate to every General Conference since, except the last, during his lifetime. Early in his history the youthful preacher was drawn into controversy, and soon gave evidence of special talents in that direction. In 1825 he was challenged to a public debate by a Unitarian preacher at Kingston, Pennsylvania; so decisive was the victory in favor of the young champion of Methodism that his opposer was completely vanquished. One year afterward he accepted a challenge to write in a Universalist magazine, which event led to his first appearance as an author. In 1835 he was elected principal of the Oneida Conference Seminary. His uniform, well-balanced, strong mind, combined with the great interest and enthusiastic devotion he felt in the cause of education and the establishment of this young, promising seat of learning, peculiarly adapted him to fill successfully this new, honorable sphere of usefulness. After four years of trials and labors as the head and controlling spirit of this now so well-known school, he determined to return once more to the active duties of the ministry, and was again appointed to the eldership of the Susquehanna District, the early field of his achievements and triumphs. In 1840 he was elected editor of the *Methodist Quarterly Review*, which position he filled with honor and credit to the Church for the period of eight years. Under his able management the *Review* took its place among the first literary journals of the country,

commanded the esteem and favorable criticism of the most erudite and cultivated scholars, and exerted a benign and salutary influence even beyond the pale of the Methodist Episcopal Church. In 1846 the New York Central Conference appointed Dr. Peck delegate to the great General Convention of the Evangelical Alliance in London, and in that extraordinary meeting the doctor took a leading and prominent part in the deliberations. In 1848 Dr. Peck was elected editor in chief of the *Christian Advocate and Journal*, published at New York, and he served the Church in that distinguished position for four years. It was during this period that the great political debates took place which at one time threatened to convulse the country into anarchy and rebellion. Being naturally averse to exciting political discussions and exhibitions of violent partisanship, and not liking the animus of the controversy on such subjects, he declined a re-election to the editorial office in 1852, and returned to his early home and the scenes of his early ministry in the beautiful Valley of Wyoming, where he was cordially received by his many friends. He was successively made preacher in charge of Wilkesbarre, Scranton, Providence, and Dunmore, and presiding elder of the Lackawanna District and Wyoming District. He was superannuated in 1873, and died May 20, 1876. In Church and Conference Dr. Peck was always eminent and useful, whether as counselor or advocate. The faithful discharge of all important trusts committed to him insured for him a high position in the Church. He was conservative, but at the same time eminently progressive. Says one of his contemporaries: "I view him as one of the most remarkable men of our times — one whose genius and piety are indelibly stamped on the ecclesiastical polity and wonderful growth of the Church — whose wise counsels and herculean labors are interwoven in its development for the past fifty years. His whole life has been distinguished by devoted love to the Church, and unswerving loyalty to honest convictions of truth. Young preachers have ever found in him a friend and counselor — one to whom they could look as a 'father in Israel.' I have for the past twenty-five years mingled with all classes of professional and business men in our valley, but I have never yet heard one word of censure from preacher or layman against Dr. Peck, which fact I esteem as the highest tribute to his manly Christian character." As a preacher, Dr. Peck ranked among the foremost and ablest pulpit orators in our country. The symmetrical structure of his mind, and his analytical powers, were of the highest order, combined with a clearness of perception and convincing force of unerring logic. Whenever the strong powers of his mind were brought into full play on a subject, and he felt the heavenly

unction on his sympathetic heart, the effect of his preaching was overwhelming. His public labors included a period of sixty years. It thus appears that he entered the Methodist itinerancy in time to test his consecration and integrity by pioneer exertions requiring the heroism of the fathers. He “endured hardness as a good soldier,” on very large circuits, with no railroads or steamboats, in the new and uncultivated regions of the states of New York and Pennsylvania, traveling immense distances on horseback, through forests, and in the midst of wild beasts and rude people, preaching in log shanties, schoolhouses, barns, and groves, all without a murmur, and taking his appointments without being consulted, and in the most unquestioning loyalty. He had therefore original experience in the great circuit system to prepare him for any other work to which he might be called. When stations were demanded and cautiously conceded, and George Peck was one of the younger men called to fill them, he was found to have the habits of devotion and study which they required. His library had grown (one can hardly tell how) to be large and valuable, and he was master of its contents. The progress in available scholarship which ministers of other churches made *with* tuition, he made largely *without*. He preached two or three sermons every Sunday to the same congregation, with fresh research and elaborations, characterized by thorough originality and great spiritual power. He was besides a faithful pastor. He had marked success in revivals, and fully equal success in the nurture and edification of the Church. As a presiding elder he shrank from no hardships of travel or labor or discipline, and rendered available marked executive ability in every department of official responsibility. As an educator he promptly qualified himself to teach in studies nearly as new to him as to his students, and when he resigned the principalship of the seminary, he with unimpaired zeal pushed forward the enterprises of learning in the Church, and gave to young ministers the guidance and help of his large intelligence and ripe experience. In the most responsible editorial chairs of the Church he held with a firm hand all the historical positions of Methodism, and advanced every Christian enterprise in the true spirit of progress. When by reason of age he found his strength failing, in a calm, dignified manner he resigned the effective relations, and gracefully accepted superannuation. When complicated diseases gathered in strength upon him, he laid him down to die with the same composure and dignity which characterized his most difficult life-labors when in health. The humility so marked in his history was more conspicuous, mellow, and tender as he approached the cold river. The faith which gave him a lifetime near the cross made him a

conqueror in his struggle with the last enemy. Dr. Peck's published works are, *Universalism Examined* (1826): — *History of the Apostles and Evangelists* (1836): — *Scripture Doctrine of Christian Perfection* (1841; abridged 1845. and revised in 1848): — *Rule of Faith* (1844): — *Reply to Bascorn* (1845): — *Manly Character* (1852): — *History of Wyoming* (1858), a work which received high commendations not only in this country but in Europe (see *North Amer. Rev.* July, 1858, p. 280; *Lond. Athencumn*, Aug. 28, 1858, p. 260): — *Early Methodism within the Bounds of the Old Genesee Conf. from 1788 to 1828* (1860), of which the *North Amer. Review* says that "it has the charm of romance, together with the edifying qualities of religious annals:" *Our Country, its Trials and its Triumphs* (1865). Dr. Peck was literally a "father of ministers," having left two sons and two nephews in the pastoral work in his own Conference, and one daughter, Mrs. Rev. Dr. Crane, of the Newark Conference. See *Ladies' Repository*, 1871; *Pulpit and Pew*, 1871, p. 90 sq.; *Northern Christian Advocate*, 1876, June 22; *Life and Times of Geo. Peck, D.D., written by Himself* (N.Y. 1874, 12mo); Conable, *Hist. of the Genesee Conf.* ch. i, § 4, 7, 8. 9; ch. iv, § 3 and 53; *Meth. Qu. Rev.* Oct. 1874, p. 693-696.

Peck, James

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, of whose early history we have no data, was one of the four ministers who constituted the Washington Conference, organized by bishop Scott Oct. 27, 1864. He was then appointed to Asbury Church, in Washington, D. C. After six months he was appointed presiding elder of the Potomac District, in which capacity he served until he was appointed to Sharp Street, Baltimore; but after eight months he was reappointed presiding elder of the Potomac District. He was elected delegate to the General Conference held in Brooklyn, N.Y., 1872. He was next sent to Asbury Church, Baltimore, where he died in peace, March 6, 1874. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1875, p. 14.

Peck, John

a Baptist minister, was born in Stanford, Dutchess County, N.Y., Sept. 11, 1780. His early education was limited. He began preaching as a licentiate in 1800 at Norwich and Sherburne, N.Y., and in 1804 became pastor of the First Baptist Church in Cazenovia, N.Y., where he was ordained June 11, 1806, and remained until November, 1834, during which time he had the

satisfaction of witnessing several revivals among his congregation. He had been appointed general agent of the Baptist Missionary Convention in 1824, and after resigning his pastoral charge he devoted himself entirely to that institution. In May, 1839, he was appointed general agent of the Baptist Home Mission Association. He traveled extensively in that connection, and his services proved very valuable. He continued to preach whenever opportunity presented until his death, Dec. 15, 1849. Mr. Peck was associate editor of a religious periodical called *The Vehicle*, and afterwards of *The Western Baptist Magazine*, which was commenced in 1814, and some twelve years after merged in *The New York Baptist Register*. In 1837, in connection with the Rev. John Lawton, he published *A Historical Sketch of the Baptist Missionary Convention of the State of New York*, etc. He also published a *Scriptural Catechism*, and two *Discourses* in 1845. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 6:431.

Peck, John Mason

D.D., a Baptist minister of note, was born at Litchfield. Conn., Oct. 31, 1789. He had limited early advantages for education, but made such use of them as to find employment as a school-teacher. He removed in 1811 to Greene County, N.Y., where he united with a Baptist Church, and in 1812 was licensed to preach, becoming in 1814 pastor of a church in Amenia, N.Y. In 1816 he repaired to Philadelphia, and spent some time in study with the Rev. Dr. Staughton, who was accustomed to receive students for the ministry into his family. In 1817 Peck went as an itinerant missionary to the West, laboring in Illinois and Missouri. He visited New England in 1826 to plead for missions, and solicit aid for a literary and theological seminary. A school was established at Rock Spring, Ill., on land given by him for the purpose, of which he was the principal in 1830-31. In 1832 he was connected with the Rev. Dr. Jonathan Going in originating the "American Baptist Home Mission Society." Shurtleff College having been established at Upper Alton, Ill., in 1835, the Rock Spring Seminary was merged in it. Mr. Peck traveled 6000 miles, and raised \$20,000 — a small sum compared with the millions given for educational endowments in recent years, but for the time an important contribution. He was also actively interested at a later period in founding the "Covington, Ky., Theological Seminary," and in 1843-45 was secretary of the "American Baptist Publication Society." He was the pastor of several churches at different times, and an industrious writer. He established in 1829 a periodical, *The Pioneer*, which was published several years. As an

antiquarian he was an assiduous and successful collector of books and pamphlets. He died March 15.1858. He published in 1832 *The Emigrant's Guide*, which had a large circulation, and in 1834 a *Gazetteer of Illinois*. He was the author of the *Life of Daniel Boone*, in Sparks's "American Biography," and of a *Life of Father Clarke*, a Western preacher. See *Forty Years of Pioneer Life; Memoir of 'John Mason Peck, D.D.*, edited from his journals and correspondence by Rufus Babcock (Phila. 1864, 12mo); Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 6:402; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, vol. ii, s.v.; Drake, *Dict. of Amer. Biog.* s.v.; *New-Englander*, 1865. (L. E, S.)

Peck, Solomon

D.D., another Baptist minister, was born at Providence, R. I., Jan. 25, 1800; graduated at Brown University in 1817. and served his alma mater as tutor. He spent four years in Andover Theological Seminary, one year as a resident graduate, and was elected in 1825 to a professorship in Amherst College. He was an instructor in Brown University in 1834-5, but declined a professorship offered to him, and urged upon him by Dr. Wayland. He was appointed in 1836 assistant corresponding secretary, and in 1838 corresponding secretary of the American Baptist Missionary Union, holding the office till 1856. During his period of service as secretary he visited the Baptist missions on the continent of Europe, and also, as one of a deputation, visited the missions in Southern India and in Burmah. He was pastor of a colored Church at Beaufort, S. C., from 1861 to the close of the war, and was chaplain of the Disabled Soldiers' Home, Boston, and secretary of the Freedmen's Aid Society. He died at Rochester, N.Y., June 12, 1874. (L. E. S.)

Peckam, John.

SEE PECKHAM.

Peckham, John, D.D.,

a noted English prelate of the Middle Ages, was a native of Sussex, and of very humble parentage. He was born probably in 1240. He received his early education in the poor-school of the Cluniac monks of Lewes. He then went to Oxford, and was there a favorite student of St. Bonaventura. To continue his theological studies, Peckham also went to Paris University, and had the honor to be a doctor of both these schools. He also made the

tour of all the Italian universities, and in the pope's own palace lectured on sacred letters to a crowd of bishops and cardinals who were proud to be his attentive listeners, and who every day, as he passed through their ranks to his pulpit, arose from their seats to show him reverence. He subsequently became a Minorite friar, but was suddenly drawn from his retirement by the pope in 1278, and elevated to the archbishopric of Canterbury. The crown did not oppose the appointment, and Peckham so zealously discharged the duties of the primacy that all parties in England esteemed him. He began his administration by calling a provincial synod, and among its most memorable acts is the one enjoining every parish priest to explain to his flock the fundamentals of the Christian faith, laying aside all the niceties of school distinction. Peckham not only visited his whole diocese, but traveled over the greater part of England, informing himself of the exact state of ecclesiastical affairs in the country. He also took an active interest in the university reform at Oxford. He was such a rigid disciplinarian that he made many enemies, and was by them accused of a too great love of money, and of having favored his own family in the disposition of offices. But these charges seem unreasonable when we consider his simplicity of character and habits, and his studious application to the wants of all, poor or rich, exalted or humble. Thus he hesitated not to remonstrate with king Edward I for his tyranny and to rebuke the great earl of Warren for allowing his deer and cattle to trample down a poor man's field of corn. It is a significant fact that he always retained a prebend attached to the see of Lyons, in case he might at any time be forced to quit England; and Godwin tells us that after Peckham's time this benefice continued to be annexed to the see of Canterbury, in order to provide against the case of the more than probable exile of the primates. He died in 1292. He is spoken of in appearance as "stately in gesture, gait, and outward show, yet of an exceeding meek, facile, and liberal temper" (Harfsfield). Archbishop Peckham was a voluminous writer. Besides his theological and scholastic works, there are poems, treatises' on geometry, optics, and astronomy, others on mystical divinity, others on the pastoral office intended for the use of the parochial clergy, and some apparently drawn up to facilitate the instruction of the poor. His most important works are, *Pithsani Archiepi-Canthuariensis, Ordinis fratrum minorum, liber de oculi morali* (s. 1. et a.; but published by A. Sorg., c. 1475, fol.): — *Perspectiva Communis* (Venice, 1504, 4to; Norimb. 1542, 4to; Paris, 1556, 4to; Colon. 1592, 4to): — *De Summa Trinitate, et Fide Catholica* (Lond. 1510, 16mo):—*Collectanea Bibliorum, libri quinque* (Colon.

1510, 1591; Paris, 1514). See Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.; Wood, *Annals*; Wharton, *Anglia Sacra; Archceol.* vol. x; Churton, *Hist. of the Early English Church*, p. 370 sq.; Collier, *Eccles. Hist. of England*, vol. i, bk. v, p. 484; Fleury, *Hist. Ecclesiastique*, 18:562; Green, *Short Hist. of the English People*, p. 174.

Pecori, Domienico Aretino,

a painter of Arezzo, who flourished about 1450, studied under Dol Bartolomeo della Gatta, and afterwards improved himself by studying the works of other masters. In the parochial church of his native city is a picture by him of the *Virgin* receiving under her mantle the people of Arezzo, who are recommended to her protection by their patron saint. Lanzi says it is a judicious composition, enriched with good architecture, the airs of the heads resembling those of Francia. He used less gilding than was usual at the time.

Pectorale

(*breast-covering*), the same as pallium (q.v.).

Peculiar

(Fr. *peculier*, i.e. private) is in English ecclesiastical law a particular parish or church having jurisdiction within itself, and which is not subject to the ordinary of the diocese in which it is locally situated, but has an ordinary of its own. There are various kinds of peculiars:

1. Royal peculiars, subject only to the king. The king's chapel is a royal peculiar, reserved to the immediate government of the king himself.
2. Archbishops' peculiars, exclusive of the jurisdiction of bishops and archdeacons. The archbishop has many such peculiars, it being an ancient privilege of the see of Canterbury that whenever any manors or advowsons belong to it, they forthwith become exempt from the ordinary, and are peculiars to that see.
3. Bishops' peculiars, exclusive of the jurisdiction of the bishop of the diocese in- which they are situated.
4. Peculiars of bishops in their own diocese, exclusive of archidiaconal jurisdiction.

5. Peculiarities of deans, deans and chapters, prebendaries, and the like, which are places wherein, by ancient compositions, the bishops have parted with their jurisdiction. Under the statute 1 George I and II, c. 10, all donatives (which are in their nature peculiarities) receiving augmentation from queen Anne's bounty are thenceforth to become subject to the jurisdiction of the bishop of the diocese. *SEE DONATIVE.*

Peculiar People

is the name of a recently founded religious sect which originated in England, and is to be met with chiefly in the county of Kent, but they themselves claim to be strong in numbers also in Essex, Sussex, and Surrey. Their principles are very similar to those of the American *Tinkers* (q.v.). They are a sort of *Perfectionists*. They claim to be the real exemplars of true and undefiled religion. If a man cannot say he lives without sin, they set him down as no Christian. Religion has no difficulties for them, no mysteries; nothing beyond the reach of man; neither heights to which he cannot ascend, nor depths which he cannot fathom. To come together and declare their unspeakable joy is all that they have to do. For this the beginner is as competent as the gray-haired believer, the sister as well as the brother, the ignorant as well as the learned; and thus, in turn, they all preach and pray. In Church membership they have no preliminaries. All who come are of the Church; those whom the Lord calls will surely join them. They consider that every service is the sacrament, and they have no special form. In the same way they have no baptism; infant or adult creeds, confessions of faith, forms of prayer, ministers—all these things they have done away with. They profess to have no leaders; yet they have elders, but they claim that they are simply elders by lapse of time alone. They have great faith in prayer. If one lack anything, it is to be looked for by asking of God. Hence it is a prime article of faith of this denomination never, under any circumstances, to call in a doctor. They believe only in anointing with oil and prayer as a means of restoring the sick. The English government has therefore interfered with them in recent times, and several trials of members of this sect have occurred. Thus, at Plumstead, a little girl of an elder of the Peculiar People had the smallpox. The elders prayed over her; they laid hands on her; they anointed her; and, generally speaking, "put their trust in God." In eleven days, without the administration of any medicine, with only a little arrow-root and wine to nourish the body, the poor thing died. Of course the Peculiar People are consistent enough to believe neither in vaccination nor contagion. In this case a jury returned a

verdict of “manslaughter” against the father. There are no statistics or extensive data from which to judge of their number and the power of the sect. We have given all that is accessible to outside parties by personal observation.

Peculium Clericale

is that property of a priest which is derived from benefices conferred on him, and from the performance of clerical duties. Ancient ecclesiastical usage did not permit the disposal of its surplus either by gift or will, but this was returned to the Church; and so also the Council of Trent ordered (sess. 25, cap. i, *De Reform.*). But in modern times the priest has the same privileges in disposing of the “peculium clericale” as over his own private property and private earnings.

Pedagogics

SEE PAEDAGOGICS.

Ped' ahel

(Heb. *Pedahel'*, **אֶהֱלֵךְ**) *preserved of God*; Sept. **Φαδάήλ**), the son of Ammihud, and the prince or chief man of the tribe of Naphtali, appointed by Moses, in connection with one from each of the other tribes; to divide Western Palestine (^{<0628>}Numbers 34:28). B.C. 1618.

Pedah'zur

[many *Ped'ahzur*] (Heb. *Pedahtsur'*, **רֹחַבֶּן**) *preserved of the Rock*; Sept. **Φαδασούρ**, **Φαδασούρ**), the head of a family in the tribe of Manasseh; father of the Gamaliel who was appointed with others to aid Moses in numbering the people (^{<0610>}Numbers 1:10; 2:20; 7:54, 59; 10:23). B.C. cir. 1657.

Peda'iah

[some *Pedai'ah*] (Heb. *Pedayah'*, **יְהִי**) *preserved of Jehovah*; written also *Pedaydhu*, **יְהִי** with the same meaning, ^{<1371>}1 Chronicles 27:20; Sept. **Φαδαΐα** or **Φαδαΐας**), the name of at least six Hebrews.

1. The father of Joel, which latter was ruler of the half-tribe of Manasseh during the latter part of David's reign (^{<1372>}1 Chronicles 27:20). B.C. ante 1013.
2. A citizen "of Rumah," and the father of the Zebudah who was wife to Josiah, and mother of Jehoiakim (^{<1236>}2 Kings 23:36). B.C. ante 648.
3. The father of Zerubbabel, by the widow of his brother Salathiel (^{<1388>}1 Chronicles 3:18), under the Levirate law (comp. Strong's *Harmony*, p. 17). B.C. ante 536.
4. A "son of Parosh;" an Israelite who aided in repairing the walls of Jerusalem under Nehemiah (^{<1625>}Nehemiah 3:25). B.C. cir. 446.
5. Son of Kolaiah, and father of Joed of the tribe of Benjamin, mentioned only in the genealogy of Sallu (^{<1610>}Nehemiah 11:7). B.C. ante 445.
6. A Levite whom Nehemiah appointed one of the sacred treasurers, or disbursers (^{<1633>}Nehemiah 13:13); apparently the same who stood on the left of Ezra while he read the law, but of whom nothing further is known (^{<1604>}Nehemiah 8:4). B.C. 445.

Pedalia

is an ecclesiastical term used to denote (1) foot-cloths in front of the altar; (2) collections of the creeds and canons of general councils in the Greek Church.

Pedaries

is an ecclesiastical term used to designate consecrated sandals for pilgrims.

Peddie, James, D.D.

an able and judicious English divine, was born at Perth in 1759. He entered the University of Edinburgh in 1775; was admitted a student in the divinity hall of the Secession Church, under the Rev. John Brown, of Haddington, in 1777; was ordained minister of Bristo Street congregation, Edinburgh, in 1783, and continued in that charge until his death in 1845. His sermons are eminently clear, well arranged, scriptural, and instructive. In expository lectures he greatly excelled. He published, *The Revolution the Work of God, and a Cause of Joy*; two sermons on ^{<1366>}Psalm 136:6 [Nov. 5] (Edinb. 1789, 8vo): — *The Perpetuity, Advantages, and Universality of*

the Christian Religion; a sermon preached before the Edinburgh Missionary Society on ~~1727~~ Psalm 72:17 (ibid. 1796, 8vo): — *Jehovah's Care to perpetuate the Redeemer's Name*; a sermon preached before the Missionary Society on ~~1817~~ Psalm 45:17 (Loud. 1809, 8vo): — *A practical Exposition of the Book of Jonah, in Ten Lectures* (Edinb. 1842, 12mo). After his death appeared *Discourses, with a Memoir of his Life*, by his son, the Rev. William Peddie, D.D. (ibid. 1846, 8vo).

Pedersen, Christiern,

one of the most noted characters of Denmark and Sweden in the Reformation period, was born at Swendborg, in Denmark, in 1480. He studied in Roskilde, and, after completing his course there, he became a canon in Lund. Later he studied for several years in Paris, and upon his return to Denmark he was appointed chancellor under Hans Weze, archbishop of Lund. When the archbishop fled, Pedersen remained to take charge of the affairs of the diocese, but he was constantly suspected and persecuted by his enemies. When Soren Nordby entered Skaane, in 15²⁵, he joined him as a faithful adherent of the legitimate king; but for this reason he was found guilty of high-treason, his goods were confiscated, and he was obliged to leave Denmark. He sought his fugitive king, Christian II, in the Netherlands, and there he spent several years advocating the cause of the Reformation. But when king Christian II was taken prisoner in 1532, and confined in Sonderborg, Christiern Pedersen was permitted to return and live in Malmo, where he is said to have acted as Jirgen Kok's secretary during the Count's Feud. The last ten years of his life he spent with a relative who was minister at Helsing, in the northern part of Zealand. He died there, Jan. 16, 1554. He was not one of the leading Reformers in Denmark, partly because he was absent during the most important struggle, and partly because he lacked courage and force of character, and oftentimes thought the Reformers proceeded too violently. He had always loved peace and quiet, and during the most turbulent times he withdrew to his friends. Besides he was not, like so many of the friends of the Lutheran Reformation in his day, an enemy of the past, and he sought to reconcile his love of the old songs and stories of his fatherland with his love of the emancipated Gospel. During his whole life, both while he was yet a Catholic and after he had become a Protestant, he labored zealously for the enlightenment of his countrymen, and he is justly considered the founder of modern Danish literature. At Antwerp he published in 1529 a Danish translation of the New Testament and of the

Psalms of David, and he was one of the main workers in the translation of the so-called Christian III's Bible, published in 1550. His principal theological works are his book on the Mass and his *Book of Miracles*, both of which he wrote while he was yet a Catholic. His *Right Way to Heaven*, *On Marriage and the Bringing-up of Children*, and *On Study and the Education of Children* are free translations from Luther. His patriotism led him to rescue from oblivion the famous work of Saxo Grammaticus, which, at the request of Christian II, he published in Paris in 1514. This work, translated into Danish by Gruntowig, is deservedly the most popular of all secular books in the Danish tongue. He fought against the absurdity of using Latin instead of Danish, and insisted that if the apostles had preached in Denmark, they would have talked Danish. By his translation of the Bible and other works he accomplished for Denmark what Luther had already accomplished for Germany. See Barfods, *Fortaellinger*, p. 427-429. (R. B. A.)

Pedigree

SEE GENEALOGY.

Pedilavium

SEE FOOT-WASHING.

Pedobaptism

SEE PEDOBAPTISM.

Pedrali, Gracomo

an Italian painter of Brescia, was born about 1590. It is not known with whom he studied; but he associated himself with Domenico Bruni, in conjunction with whom he executed some perspective pieces for the churches in his native city, and also in Venice, which are highly commended by Orlandi. He died about the year 1660.

Pedrella

is a name for the thing on which the altar-shrine rests, or cases in which formerly the relics of saints were kept.

Pedretti, Giuseppe

a Bolognese painter, was born in 1694. He studied under Marc Antonio Franceschini, whose manner he adopted. Soon after leaving his master, Pedretti passed through Germany to Poland, where he resided many years in the employment of the court. He afterwards returned to his native city, and painted a great many pictures and altar-pieces for the churches: the most esteemed are the *Martyrdom of St. Peter*, in S. Petronio; *Christ Bearing the Cross*, in S. Giuseppe; and *St. Margaret*, in the Annunziata. He died in 1778.

Pedro, Alfonso

a noted convert from Judaism, whose original name was *Moses Cohen*, a native of Huesca, in Aragon, was born in the year 1062. At the age of forty-four he was baptized in the cathedral of his native city, in 1106, on St. Peter's day; and, in honor of the saint, and his godfather, king Alfonso VI, he took the name of Pedro Alfonso. He afterwards wrote a defense of Christianity and a refutation of Jewish incredulity, in the form of a dialogue between Moses and Pedro Alfonso, under the title *Dialogi in quibus impie Judaeorum opiniones evidenter inmiscuitur tam naturalis quam celestis philosophiae argumentis confutantur, quaedamque Prophetarum abstrusiora loca illustrantur* (Cologne, 1536). This work is spoken of in high terms, and has been of great use in Spain. We have also by him a *Disciplina clericalis*, under the title of "Proverbs," in which he seems to have borrowed from the Arabic writers, especially the tales and fables of Pilpay. A part of this work still exists in the Hebrew translation, and is known as the *Book of Enoch* (Idris). See Furst, *Bibl. Judaica*, 1:36; Da Costa, *Israel and the Gentiles*, p. 312; Finn, *Sephardiis*, p. 181; Lindo, *Jews in Spain*, p. 56; Kalkar, *Israel und die Kirche* (Hamb. 1869), p. 22; Steinschneider, *Jewish Literature*, p. 174; *Catal. libr. liebr. in Bibl. Bodlej.* No. 3546; Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenthums*, 3:38; De Castro, *History of the Jews in Spain* (Cambridge, 1871), p. 57; Adams, *History of the Jews* (Boston, 1812), 1:260; Delitzsch, *Jeschurun-* (Grimma, 1838), p. 137 sq.; id. *Saat auf Hoffnung* (Erlangen, 1876), 13:142 sq.; *Evangelical (Lutheran) Rev.* (Gettysburg, 1876), p. 359 sq. (B. P.)

Pedroni, Pietro

an Italian painter, was born at Pontremoli, in the Florentine territory. He first studied at Florence, and afterwards at Parma and Rome. He executed

a few excellent works for the churches at Florence, and in his native place; but, in consequence of ill-health, he opened an academy under the protection of the senator Martelli, which produced many able artists. "If not a rare painter," says Lanzi, "he was at least an able master, profound in theory and eloquent in conveying knowledge to his pupils, of whom history will treat in the ensuing age. Their success, their affection and esteem for Pedroni, is the best eulogium on him which I can transmit to posterity." He died in 1803.

Pedum rectum

(*straight staff*) is a name for the straight shepherd crook of the pope, adorned with a cross on the top. *SEE CROOK.*

Peet, Stephen

a somewhat noted missionary of the Congregational Church in Wisconsin, was born at Sandgate, Vt., in 1795. He was educated at Yale College, where he graduated in 1823, and after entering the ministry preached seven years at Euclid, near Cleveland, Ohio; was afterwards a chaplain at Buffalo, editing the *Bethel Magazine* and *Buffalo Spectator*; became minister of Green Bay, Wis., in 1837; assisted in founding Beloit College and thirty churches; was settled as minister of Milwaukee; afterwards took charge of an institute at Batavia, Ill., and was then made agent of an association in Michigan to found a theological seminary. He died at Chicago March 21, 1855. He published *Hist. of the Presb. and Cong. Churches and Ministers of Wisconsin* (1851, 18mo).

Pegasus

in Greek mythology, a winged horse which arose with Chrysaor from the blood of the Gorgon Medusa, when she was slain by Perseus. He is said to have received his name because he first made his appearance beside the springs (πηγαί) of Oceanus. He afterwards ascended to heaven, and was believed to carry the thunder and lightning of Zeus. According to later authors, however, he was the horse of Eos. The myth concerning Pegasus is interwoven with that of the victory of Bellerophon over the Chimaera. Bellerophon had in vain sought to catch Pegasus for his combat with this monster, but was advised by the seer Polyidos of Corinth to sleep in the temple of Minerva, and the goddess appearing to him in his sleep gave him a golden bridle and certain instructions, upon which he acted, and made

use of Pegasus in his combat with the Chimaera, the Amazons, and the Solymi. Pegasus is also spoken of in modern times as the horse of the Muses, which, however, he was not. The ancient legend on this subject is that the nine Muses and the nine daughters of Pieros engaged in a competition in singing by Helicon, and everything was motionless to hear their song, save Helicon, which rose ever higher and higher in its delight, when Pegasus put a stop to this with a kick of his hoof, and from the point arose Hippocrene, the inspiring spring of the Muses. But that Pegasus is the horse of the Muses is entirely a modern idea, being first found in the *Orlando Innamorato* of Boiardo.

Pegge, Samuel, LL.D., F.A.S.,

an eminent English divine, noted especially as an industrious antiquarian, was born at Chesterfield, Staffordshire, in 1704. He was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge, of which he became fellow in 1726. He became vicar of Godmersham, Kent, in 1731; and rector of Whittington, Staffordshire, in 1751. He was also rector of Heath, perpetual curate of Wingerworth, and prebendary of Lichfield and of Lincoln. He died in 1796. He published, *An Examination of the Inquiry into the Meaning of Daemoniacs in the New Testament. Inn a Letter to the Author. Wherein it is shown that the word Daemon does not signify a Departed Soul, either in the Classics or the Scriptures; and, consequently, that the whole of the Inquiry is without Foundation* (Lond. 1739): — *Popery, an Encourager of Vice and Immorality*; a sermon on ⁽²⁰⁸⁾Isaiah 5:20 [on occasion of rebellion] (ibid. 1746, 8vo): — *The Life of Robert Groteste, the celebrated Bishop of Lincoln, with an Account of the Bishop's Works, and an Appendix* (ibid. 1793, 4to). Other works of his are, *Dissertations on some Anglo-Saxon Remains* (ibid. 1756, 4to): — *Memoirs of Roger de Wesehan* — (ibid. 1761, 4to): — *Essay on the Coins of Cunobelin* (ibid. 1766, 4to): — *The Forme of Cury* (ibid. 1780, 8vo): — *Anonymiana* (ibid. 1809), etc. See Darling, *Cyclop. of Bibliog. s.v.*; (London) *Gentleman's Magazine*, 1796, pt. ii, p. 66 sq.; Nichol. *Literary Anecdotes*, 7:1813-1816.

Pehlevi

(*Valor, Power*) is the name of an ancient West-Iranian (Median and Persian) idiom, in use chiefly during the period of the Sassanidee (A.D. 235-640), who, wishing fully to restore the ancient Persian empire, endeavored also to reinstate the primitive national language, fallen into

disuse as a court-language since the time of Alexander's conquest. Yet they did not fix upon the pure Persian as it was still spoken in the interior, but upon the dialect of the western provinces, largely mixed with Shemitic words, to which Aryan terminations were affixed. The grammatical structure of the Pehlevi presents almost the same poverty of inflections and terminations as the present Persian. Although, however, less rich than Zend (q.v.) in inflection and accentuation, it yet boasts of the same copiousness of words as that dialect, to which it in reality succeeded. It is written from right to left, and the letters are mostly joined. The remnants of Pehlevi extant consist of coins, inscriptions (found at Hajiabad, Persepolis, Kirmanshah, etc.), and a number of books, all relating to the religion of Zoroaster. The most important of these are the translation of the chief part of the Zend-Avesta (Yazna, Visparad, and Vendidad), and such original religious works as the Bundelesh, Shikandgumani, Dinkart, Atash Baram, etc. The Pehlevi of the books differs from that of the inscriptions and coins to such a degree—according to the larger or smaller preponderance of the Shemitic element—as to have misled investigators (Westergaard and others) to assume that two utterly distinct languages, a purely Iranic and a Shemitic one, had been used somewhat indiscriminately at the time. The non-Iranian element is called Huzvareh (Huzfiresh) by the Parsee priests, who, taking advantage of the ambiguity of the Pehlevi alphabet, often substitute the corresponding Persian for the foreign words. The Iranian part of the Pehlevi differs little from the Persian of our own day, and, in fact, the Pehlevi changed first into Parsee, and subsequently into modern Persian, simply by getting rid first of its Chaldee and then of those of its Iranian words which had become obsolete. The chief use of the Pehlevi dialect at present is the assistance it offers towards the elucidation of the Zend itself. *SEE PERSIA.*

Peirce, Cyrus

a Congregational minister, noted as an American educator, was born at Waltham, Mass., Aug. 15, 1790. He was educated at Harvard University, where he graduated in 1810. He taught a private school in Nantucket two years; then studied theology at Cambridge three years, and resumed his school at Nantucket. He commenced preaching in 1818; was minister of a Congregational Church at North Reading from May, 1819, to May, 1827, but, preferring the vocation of a teacher, opened a school at North Andover; from 1830 to 1836 he managed a large school at Nantucket; became principal of its high school in 1837; and from 1839 to 1842 was

principal of the first Normal School in America, at Lexington, Mass. After two years of rest he took charge of the Female Normal School at West Newton, where he continued till his death. He published *A Letter on Normal Schools*, addressed to the Hon. Henry Barnard (1851), and a prize essay on *Crime, its Cause and Cure* (1853). He died April 5, 1860. See *National Teachers' Monthly*, Sept. 1875, p. 325 sq.; Barnard's *American Journal of Education*, December, 1857.

Peirce, James

a learned English Dissenting divine, is noted for the part he took in the Exeter Disputes of the last century, which resulted in the weakening of Presbyterianism in England and the establishment of Unitarianism. He was born in the city of London in 1673. Losing his parents early, he was placed under the care of Mr. Matthew Mead (one of the ejected ministers of 1662, and then pastor of a Nonconformist congregation at Stepney), who had him educated, along with his own sons, under his own roof; after which Peirce went to Utrecht, where he had his first academical instruction. He afterwards removed to Leyden, where he studied for some time; and having passed between five and six years at these two celebrated universities, attending the lectures of Witsius, Leydecker, Graevius, Spanheim, and other learned men, he returned to England. On his arrival he took up his abode for some time in London, and set up a Sabbath-evening lecture at Miles's Lane, which he continued for two years, when he accepted an invitation from a congregation of Dissenters at Cambridge to become their pastor. In 1713 he was unanimously invited by the three dissenting congregations in Exeter to succeed one of their ministers, lately deceased, the surviving ministers joining the people in the invitation. He accepted the offer, and accordingly settled in that city, where his residence, for the first three years, proved exceedingly agreeable to him. During this period he published his *Vindication of the Protestant Dissenters*, written first in Latin, but by him translated into English, and published with large additions (Lond. 1717, 8vo). Peirce compares the constitution of the Established Church, its forms and ceremonials, its ritual, and the origin of the administration of its revenues, with the practices which prevailed in the early ages of Christianity. The work became in a brief period the most popular defense of Nonconformity, and was one of two subsequently recommended by Doddridge for the education of Nonconformists. But, notwithstanding his popularity, Peirce was much suspected of Arian principles; and when in 1718 the excitement ran high, not only in Exeter

but also in London, on the Trinitarian doctrine, and Peirce did not so clearly pronounce himself as to be beyond the suspicion of heresy, and even refused to sign a document clearing himself from the charge, he was ejected from his chapel by the trustees, although the majority of his congregation were opposed to it. These summary proceedings against him and others implicated in a like charge had a tendency to arouse public opinion in their favor, and a chapel was promptly built for him and the other ejected ministers. Those who had hoped to break up Arian sentiments had by their rash measures only strengthened it, and at Exeter in a very short time very little was known of Presbyterianism. It is needless to add here that the same course pursued in other parts of England finally resulted in the dismemberment of the Presbyterian Church in England. *SEE PRESBYTERIANISM*. Peirce continued to preach at Exeter until his death in 1726. He is charged with double-dealing. But there seems to be no reasonable ground for so severe an accusation. He was probably semi-Arian in *tendency*, but not in *principle*. At a conference of ministers, when all were asked to give individually their declaration on the Trinitarian doctrine, Peirce said: "I am not of the opinion of Sabellius, Arius, Socinus, or Sherlock. I believe there is but one God, and can be no more. I believe the Son and Holy Ghost to be divine persons, but subordinate to the Father; and the unity of God is, I think, to be resolved into the Father's being the fountain of the divinity of the Son and the Spirit." Opposition drove him into *Latitudinarianism* (q.v.), and finally he came out a Unitarian. His publications are numerous, amounting in all to about twenty-four; but that by which he is best known is his continuation of Mr. Hallett's *Paraphrase and Notes on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Lond. 1733, 4to). This work was translated into Latin by Michaelis, and published at Halle in 1747. That great divine speaks in the highest terms of admiration of the profound learning and acute discernment of Peirce. He also gave to the public a volume containing *Fifteen Sermons on various Occasions*, and an *Essay on the Ancient Practice of giving the Eucharist to Children*. See Jones, *Christ. Biog.* s.v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* s.v.; Bogue and Burnett, *History of Dissenters*, vol. iii; Skeats, *Hist. of the Free Churches of England*, p. 302-10; *Prot. Dissenter's Magazine*, vol. ii.

Pe'kah

(Heb. *Pekach*, **j qP**, *an opening*, as of the eyes; Sept. **Φακέε**; Josephus, **Φακέας**; Vulg. *Phacee*), son of Remaliah, originally a captain of Pekahiah, king of Israel, murdered his master, seized the throne, and became the eighteenth sovereign (and last but one) of the northern kingdom. His native country was probably Gilead, as fifty Gileadites joined him in the conspiracy against Pekahiah; and if so, he furnishes an instance of the same undaunted energy which distinguished, for good or evil, so many of the Israelites who sprang from that country, of which Jephthah and Elijah were the most famous examples (Stanley, *Sin. and Pal.* p. 327). Under his predecessors Israel had been much weakened through the payment of enormous tribute to the Assyrians (see especially ^{<1215>}2 Kings 15:20), and by internal wars and conspiracies. Pekah seems steadily to have applied himself to the restoration of its power. For this purpose he sought the support of a foreign alliance, and fixed his mind on the plunder of the sister kingdom of Judah. He must have made the treaty by which he proposed to share its spoil with Rezin, king of Damascus, when Jotham was still on the throne of Jerusalem (^{<1420>}2 Kings 15:37); but its execution was long delayed, probably in consequence of that prince's righteous and vigorous administration (^{<1420>}2 Chronicles 27). When, however, his weak son Ahaz succeeded to the crown of David, the allies no longer hesitated, and formed the siege of Jerusalem. The history of the war, which is sketched under AHAZ, is found in 2 Kings 16 and 2 Chronicles 28; and in the latter (ver. 6) we read that Pekah "slew in Judah one hundred and twenty thousand in one day, which were all valiant men," a statement which, even if we should be obliged to diminish the number now read in the text, from the uncertainty as to numbers attaching to our present MSS. of the books of Chronicles (Kennicott, *Hebrew Text of the Old Testament Considered*, p. 532), proves that the character of his warfare was in full accordance with Gileaditish precedents (^{<0713>}Judges 11:33; 12:6). The war is famous as the occasion of the great prophecies in ^{<2300>}Isaiah 7-9. Its chief result was the capture of the Jewish port of Elath, on the Red Sea; but the unnatural alliance of Damascus and Samaria was punished through the final overthrow of the ferocious confederates by Tiglath-Pileser, king of Assyria, whom Ahaz called to his assistance, and who seized the opportunity of adding to his own dominions and crushing a union which might have been dangerous. The kingdom of Damascus was finally suppressed, and Rezin put to death, while Pekah was deprived of at least

half of his kingdom, including all the northern portion, and the whole district to the east of Jordan. For though the writer in ^{<1253>}2 Kings 15:29 tells us that Tiglath-Pileser “took Ijon, and Abelbeth-maachah, and Janoah, and Kedesh, and Hazor, and *Gilead*, and Galilee, all the land of Naphtali,” yet from comparing ^{<1335>}1 Chronicles 5:26, we find that Gilead must include “the Reubenites and the Gadites and half the tribe of Manasseh.” The inhabitants were carried off, according to the usual practice, and settled in remote districts of Assyria. Pekah himself, now fallen into the position of an Assyrian vassal, was of course compelled to abstain from further attacks on Judah. Whether his continued tyranny exhausted the patience of his subjects, or whether his weakness emboldened them to attack him, we do not know; but, from one or the other cause, Hoshea the son of Elah conspired against him, and put him to death. Josephus says that Hoshea was his friend (*Ant.* 9:13, 1). Comp. ^{<2386>}Isaiah 8:16, which prophecy Hoshea was instrumental in fulfilling. Pekah ascended the throne B.C. 757. In order to bring down the date of Pekah’s murder to the date of Hoshea’s accession, some chronologists propose to read twenty-nine years for twenty in ^{<1257>}2 Kings 15:27. Most, however, prefer to let the dates stand as at present in the text, and suppose that an interregnum, not expressly mentioned in the Bible, occurred between those two usurpers. The words of Isaiah (^{<2300>}Isaiah 9:20, 21) seem to indicate a time of anarchy in Israel. **SEE CHRONOLOGY.** Pekah must have begun to war against Judah B.C. 740, and was killed B.C. 737. The order of events above given is according to the scheme of Ewald’s *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, 3:602. Mr. Rawlinson (*Bampton Lectures for 1859*, lect. 4) seems wrong in assuming two invasions of Israel by the Assyrians in Pekah’s time, the one corresponding to ^{<1253>}2 Kings 15:29, the other to ^{<1247>}2 Kings 16:7-9. Both these narratives refer to the same event, which in the first place is mentioned briefly in the short sketch of Pekah’s reign, while, in the second passage, additional details are given in the longer biography of Ahaz. It would have been scarcely possible for Pekah, when deprived of half his kingdom, to make an alliance with Rezin, and to attack Ahaz. We learn further from Mr. Rawlinson that the conquests of Tiglath-Pileser are mentioned in an Assyrian fragment, though there is a difficulty, from the occurrence of the name *Menahem* in the inscription, which may have proceeded from a mistake of the engraver. Comp. the title, *son of Khumri* (Omri), assigned to Jehu in another inscription; and see Rawlinson, note 35 on lect. 4. As may be inferred from Pekah’s alliance with Rezin, his

government was no improvement, morally and religiously, on that of his predecessors. *SEE ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF.*

Pekahi'ah

(Heb. *Pekachyah'*, **הַיְיָ הַפְּ**] *opening* [of the eyes] by *Jehovah*; Sept. **Φακεσίας** v.r. **Φακείας**; Josephus, **Φακείας**, *Ant.* 9:11, 1; Vulg. *Phaceja*), son and successor of Menahem, was the seventeenth king of the separate kingdom of Israel. After a brief reign of two years (B.C. 758, 757), a conspiracy was organized against him by "one of his captains" (probably of his body guard), Pekah, son of Remaliah, who, at the head of fifty Gileadites, attacked him in his palace at Samaria, assassinated him and his friends Argob and Arieah, and seized the throne. This reign was no better than those which had gone before; and the calf-worship was retained (¹²¹⁵²2 Kings 15:22-26). *SEE ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF.*

Pe'kod

(Heb. *Pekod'*, **דַּוְקָפ]** *visitation*), a symbolical appellative applied to the Chaldaeans in Jeremiah 1, 21, and to the Chaldaeans in ¹²²²³Ezekiel 23:23, in the latter of which passages it is connected with Shoa and Koa, as if these three were in some way subdivisions of "the Babylonians and all the Chaldaeans." Authorities are undecided as to the meaning of the term. It is regularly formed from the root *pcakd*, "to visit," and in its secondary senses means "to punish," and "to appoint a ruler:" hence Pekod may be applied to Babylon in Jeremiah 1 as significant of its impending punishment, as in the margin of the A.V. "visitation." But this sense will not suit the other passage, and hence Gesenius here assigns to it the meaning of "prefect" (*Thesaur.* p. 1121), as if it were but another form of *pakid*. It certainly is unlikely that the same word would be applied to the same object in two totally different senses. Hitzig seeks for the origin of the word in the Sanscrit *bhavan*, "noble" — Shoa and Koa being respectively "prince" and "lord;" and he explains its use in Jeremiah 1 as a part for the whole. The Sept. treats it as the name of a district (**Φακούκ**; Alex. **Φούδ**) in Ezekiel, and as a verb (**ἐκδίκησον**) in Jeremiah. Fiirst, however, remarks (*Heb. Lex.* s.v.) that the name is selected in Jeremiah by assonance with **dqP**; *to punish* (1, 18), and , **hDqP**](1, 27, 31), while the association in Ezekiel shows it must have been a people. Hence he suggests the *Poetyrians* of Herodotus (3:93; 7:67), and the city of *Pekod* in the Talmud (*Jerus. Nedarim*, 10), both in Babylonia. *SEE KOA.*

Pelagianism

is the system of doctrine respecting sin promulgated by Pelagius (q.v.) in the early Christian Church.

I. *Origin of these Views.* — From a very early period the Church discussed the question of the origin of the human soul, and the speculations indulged in on this subject tended very directly to give form and complexion to the views held on the doctrines of sin and of grace. “Whence sprang the soul of each individual human being?” “What is its precise relation to the body as regards the time when they both began to exist?” Such questions as these presented matter of deepest interest to many of the most thoughtful minds among the writers in the early ages of Christianity. The influence of Grecian philosophy still lingered among them, and blended itself with their speculations. This influence is very apparent in the manner in which these questions are discussed by them. The Greek philosophy, however, specially prevailed in the East, while other and healthier influences controlled the practical mind of the West; thus there arose in process of time a divergence between the anthropology of the Eastern or Greek Church and that of the Church of the West. In the Eastern Church, particularly in that of Alexandria, the doctrinal system of Origen, and his peculiar manner of interpreting Scripture, prevailed. They further maintained the doctrine that all human souls, in the aggregate, were created by God in the beginning before the creation of man; that these souls were at their first creation angelic beings, but that, having sinned in their angelic state, they were, as a punishment, doomed to dwell in human bodies, and to sojourn for a certain time on this earth, where, by the discipline through which they must pass, they would all in due time be prepared for resuming again their original angelic life. This strange theory has its roots in the Pythagorean doctrine of metempsychosis, and in the speculations of Plato, though Origen attempts to find support for it in the teachings of Scripture, by his favorite mode of allegorizing, according to his own particular fancy, the narrative of the earlier chapters of the book of Genesis, and certain other portions of Scripture, which he regarded as furnishing illustrations of the same principle. This “*stulta persuasio*” of Origen’s, as Jerome styles it, found but few to embrace it; nay, it met with very strenuous opposition from many quarters, and by the end of the 4th century was almost wholly forgotten.

There were, however, two other opinions propounded regarding the origin of the human soul which gained more currency.

1. The theory advanced by Jerome, that God “quotidie fabricatur animas.” This view was mainly advocated in the East, although it also found a few advocates in the West. According to this theory, each human soul is a distinct and separate creation out of nothing. This position, it is obvious, leaves no room for such a doctrine as that of original sin; for every separately created soul, coming directly from the Creator’s hands, must be absolutely pure and holy. If so, how comes it to be polluted by sin? If polluted by sin at all, this must be by the direct act of God; and, therefore, the restoration and recovery of such a soul must be an act of justice on the part of God, and not of grace.

2. The theory that is specially associated with the name of Tertullian, because it was first maintained and defended by him, viz. that human souls are propagated *per traduciamn*. This, which is generally styled the theory of traducianism — as Jerome’s is called the theory of creationism — affirms that the souls as well as the bodies of men are propagated; that God’s work of creating *de nihilo* was finished absolutely on the sixth day, and that since that time there has, properly speaking, been exerted by God no creative energy; that the soul has the power of reproducing itself in individual souls, just in the same manner as the first created seed of any given kind in the vegetable world possesses the power of reproducing others of the same kind. Mainly through the influence of Augustine, who adopted it, the traducian theory was almost universally embraced in the North African and the Western churches. True, that father nowhere in his writings formally exhibits and advocates it, yet all his discussions on the doctrine of sin, and on the relation of men individually to Adam, are evidently based upon it, and take it for granted.

These speculations regarding the origin of individual human souls imparted, to a very large extent, a particular complexion to the opinions promulgated regarding sin. Both in the East and the West the great doctrinal conflict of the early Christians was against the assaults of Gnosticism. The Gnostic idea that man, by his very creation, is sinful; and that he has no freedom of will, was keenly opposed by them. They strenuously affirmed, on the contrary, that man at his creation was holy, that he was absolutely free from all taint of moral evil, and that he became a sinner only by his voluntary rebellion against God. The prevalence of Gnosticism led them to give much prominence to the doctrine that man is a free moral agent, and that he is the author of his own sin. But while strongly and rightly maintaining against the Gnostics that man was a free

responsible moral agent, they did not at all entertain the question of the influence of depravity and apostasy from God on the actings of the human will. This question did not arise till the time of the Pelagian controversy, and then it was found that there existed a diversity of opinion concerning it. The Alexandrian school, e.g. Origen and Clement, strongly affirmed man's entire freedom of will, his full power to believe or not to believe, to obey God or not to obey him. The fathers of that school asserted that the first movement of man towards holiness was wholly the spontaneous self-caused action of his own will; although they acknowledged that he afterwards needed the help of the Divine Spirit to bring his own effort to a satisfactory issue. They taught that the soul has an inherent power to begin the work of renewal; that God concurs with and helps this willingness on the part of man; that the beginning of all right:action was wholly of man, although its completion depended on divine help; that original sin did not dwell in the **πνεῦμα**, the soul, the pre-existent spiritual nature which came down from the angelic sphere to inhabit the body assigned to it, but that it had its seat only in the **σῶμα** and the **ψυχή**, the body and the sensuous nature; and that the **πνεῦμα**, though living, so to speak, in contact with sin, was not necessarily defiled by it, but, on the contrary, had the inherent power of warring against it, and of finally overcoming it. Hence it followed that there was no guilt in this corruption, since guilt could only be predicated of the **πνεῦμα**, being only possible when the **πνεῦμα** transgressed God's law. While corruption therefore descends from Adam, lodging in the bodily and physical nature, guilt, properly speaking, does not descend, because it is only the result of the action of the individual **πνεῦμα**; and where the **πνεῦμα** does transgress, and thereby incur guilt, its doing so is of its own free choice, and not because of any connection with Adam or with his transgression. This doctrine, fully developed by Clement and Origen, was universally accepted in the East, and was also received with much favor in the West. It experienced some modification from the fathers of the Antiochian and the later Alexandrian school, by their adoption of Jerome's theory of the origin of the soul of man; and in this modified form continued dominant in the East. Here we may find all the germs of Pelagianism. In his *Liber apologeticus contra Pelagium de arbitrii libertate*, as quoted by Worter, Orosius affirms that in Pelagius and Coelestius Origen lived and spake: "Haec venatissimorum dogmatum abominatio habet etiam nunc viventes mortuos, mortuosque viventes. Nam Origines et Priscillianus et Jovinianus, olim apud se mortui in his vivunt; et non solum vivunt verum etiam loquuntur: nunc vero Pelagius et Coelestius,

si in his perseveraverint viventes mortui, ecce adversus ecclesiam, quod miserum est, et quod multo miserius est, in ecclesia palam sibilant,” etc. Pelagianism is certainly countenanced by the Greek anthropology. The latter prepared the way for Pelagianism when it taught that original sin exists only as a disorder in the sensuous nature of man; and that it is not culpable, not guilt, till the $\pi\nu\epsilon\delta\mu\alpha$ yields to the temptation which arises from this disorder; that our physical nature has, in virtue of its derivation from Adam, strong animal and sensual passions which tempt to sin, and that this is all the corruption we inherit from Adam; that sin is not inherited, but is the result of the action of the individual will of man, and that the will is in no respect whatever influenced or biased one way or another because of our descent from Adam, further than what is implied in its being tempted by the sensuous nature; which temptation it has abundant power to resist. Holding such a doctrine regarding sin, the fathers of the Eastern Church, as a natural consequence, held also the doctrine of Synergism in regeneration. They maintained that man in his natural state has a certain tendency towards that which is good; and that by giving free scope to this tendency he works together with God or with the Divine Spirit, towards the attainment of holiness. The Spirit and man, they said, cooperate in this great work; but the first step towards its accomplishment is taken by man. The natural result of teachings such as these was Pelagianism.

There was, however, a current of thought at the same time moving in a different direction. Tertullian occupies a prominent and chief place among those who guided and gave intensity to the force of this current. He found existing in the public opinions expressed by the fathers in the West indistinct traces of the theory of traducianism — the theory which affirms that man in his entire humanity, soul as well as body, is procreated; that the entire of human nature was originated by God in *creation*, and that that nature is individualized by *procreation*. Tertullian gave form and prominence to that theory, which was afterwards embraced as the true theory of the origin of human souls by the whole Western Church. Hence it was rightly argued, if the soul is propagated, there must be also a propagation of *sintradux animce, tradux peccati*. Juster views then began to be entertained regarding the innate sinfulness of the soul, and as a consequence also regarding the true nature of regeneration as the effect of the agency of the Divine Spirit alone — *monergism* — seeing that the soul, the $\pi\nu\epsilon\delta\mu\alpha$, has no tendency, no inclination, and can have none towards

holiness till it is acted upon by the power of the Spirit of God. Man has no desire towards holiness in himself. That desire is *originated* and carried forward solely by the Spirit of God. Tertullian did not fully evolve these doctrines, but he led the way to that result. The North African Church gave them fuller development, till in the time of Augustine they received their amplest exhibition.

Cyprian in the 3d, and Ambrose and Hilary in the 4th century, made very considerable advances on Tertullian. They were more separated from those influences of the Greek anthropology than Tertullian was, and hence presented in a clearer light than he did the doctrine of man's original sinfulness, and of his utter moral inability and disinclination towards holiness. They began to grapple with the doctrine of the distinction between the *guilt* and the *corruption* of man, both of which they assumed had descended from Adam, and to exhibit the doctrine with considerable clearness of statement, according to the mode of argument adopted by the apostle in the fifth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans.

At the close of the 4th century, when this was the state of matters in the Christian Church, touching the opinions that had been published on the subjects of sin and of divine grace, Pelagius appeared, and developed, and gave full expression to, the doctrines which he had learned from the Oriental Church teachers. The opposite system of doctrine that had already in some degree been unfolded in the writings of Augustine influenced him also in the direction of leading him to assume more decidedly the attitude of antagonism. He conceived that certain practical consequences resulted from Augustine's doctrine of man's moral inability and of grace, which in his view were hurtful to the interests of holiness. He saw around him, in Rome and elsewhere, many errors of practical life among professing Christians, which he supposed had their roots in the system of doctrine taught by Augustine, and generally accepted throughout the Church.

Thus we may regard Pelagius as influenced by two tendencies in the development of his doctrinal views: by the false elements which had in the course of the past ages mingled themselves with the speculations on Christian doctrine, partly in the West, but more especially in the East; and by the tendency to pervert Christian truth, and convert the doctrine of human depravity, and of the necessity of divine grace, into a cloak to practical ungodliness. Such a perversion of Christianity gave strength and activity to his opposition to the doctrines with which it was connected.

From the beginning there had been those who had said, "Let us continue in sin, that grace may abound." His abhorrence of such a principle, together with other influences operating in the same direction, led him to construct a system by which he might counteract the evils which he looked upon as resulting from the doctrine of "salvation by grace," as it may have been imperfectly or falsely taught by some, especially as it was falsely and perversely practiced by many. His effort was in the interests, as he supposed, of virtue and holiness. He ignored altogether the doctrine of the sinfulness of human nature and the necessity of divine grace, and constructed a system of pure naturalism — a system from which everything peculiar to the Gospel as a revelation of God's plan of mercy towards man is eliminated.

II. *Life and Writings of Pelagius.* — Very little trustworthy information can be obtained regarding the personal history and character of Pelagius, though his name is associated with one of the most extensive and important controversies within the domain of Christian doctrine. He usually has the name, among his contemporaries, of Pelagius *Brito*, and hence it has been concluded that he was a native of Britain. Jerome also speaks of him as "Scotorum pulibus praegravatum." He seems to have spent the earlier and greater part of his life in the retirement of the cloister, where he probably gave himself to the diligent study of the writings of the fathers of the Eastern Church, who were held to be of authority in Britain. These writings undoubtedly moulded his forms of thought, and gave a complexion to all his theological speculations. He was a man of great learning, but there is no evidence in his writings of profundity of thought or of depth of feeling. Augustine says of him, "Istum, sicut eum qui noverunt, loquuntur bonum ac praedicandum virum." He appears to have borne among his contemporaries the reputation of a man of blameless moral excellence, but the development of his character in its relation to sin seems to have been altogether imperfect. In forming an estimate of his character from the spirit and tendency of his writings, Neander remarks that it is manifest he had never passed through any great mental struggle like that which his great opponent Augustine has passed through ere he attained to fixed conceptions of Christianity. He had never known any deep inner conflicts with sin. He had never vividly realized the true nature and the need of Christian holiness. His whole system proves that he failed to recognize the difference between morality and true evangelical holiness;

and indeed this was an error into which his whole training as monk was very apt to lead him.

About the beginning of the 5th century we find Pelagius at Rome. Acted upon by such influences as we have described, he began his great enterprise. He wrote a commentary on the Pauline epistles: *Expositionum in Epistolas Pauli libri 14*. This Work, in which he brings out his peculiar views, consists of brief comments on all the epistles of Paul, with the exception of that to the Hebrews. It has a place in the Benedictine edition of Jerome's works. Indeed, all that remains to us of the writings of Pelagius, with the exception of extracts which are found in Augustine's controversial treatises, are usually printed along with the works of Jerome. For a long time they were regarded as the genuine works of that father. The original editors of Jerome's works considered it as a part of their duty carefully to purge away everything that, to them, savored of heresy from his productions, and therefore they used great liberties with the books which passed through their hands. We have the works of Pelagius therefore only in a mutilated form.

In 411 Pelagius passed over to North Africa, in company with his disciple and admirer Coelestius. The name of Coelestius now becomes prominently mixed up with the controversy which soon began to agitate the whole Church. He was probably a native of Scotland. Mercator says of him, "Pelagio adhaesit Coelestius, nobills natu quidem, et illius temporis auditorialis scholasticus." On reaching Carthage, Pelagius wrote a respectful letter to Augustine, who was bishop of Hippo, and received from him a friendly reply. He does not seem to have given prominence to his peculiar opinions, and he escaped at this time all suspicions of heresy. After a short time Pelagius proceeded to Palestine, where he was warmly welcomed by Jerome, then residing at Bethlehem as the head of a theological school of great repute. Meanwhile Ccelestius, whom he had left behind him in Carthage, came under the particular notice of the Church there. He gave himself forth as a candidate for the office of presbyter, and his doctrinal opinions were therefore narrowly inquired into. Paulinus, a deacon of Milan, challenged them as heretical. A council of the Church of Carthage was convened (412), presided over by bishop Aurelius, to investigate the accusations of unsoundness in the faith that had been laid against him. Marius Mercator, in his *Commonitorium adversus haeresin Pelagii et Coelestii*, published in 429, records the charges brought against

Coelestius on this occasion by Paulinus. They are the following, as quoted by Worter:

- “1. That Adam was created mortal, and would have died whether he had sinned or not.
2. That Adam’s sin injured himself alone, and not the human race.
3. That new-born infants are in the same condition in which Adam was before his transgression.
4. That since neither by the death nor transgression of Adam the whole human race dies, so neither will the whole human race rise again from the dead on account of Christ’s resurrection.
5. That the law guides into the kingdom of heaven as well as the Gospel.
6. That there were men who lived without sin (*intpeccabiles, i.e. sinepeccato*) before the advent of our Lord.” Thus far quoting Mercator, Worter continues: “If we add,
7. That the grace of God is not absolutely necessary to lead men to holiness; and,
8. That grace is given to men in proportion to their merit, we will then have a pretty complete summary of the doctrines taught by Pelagius and his followers.”

Coelestius, in his defense, endeavored to argue that the points of difference between him and his accusers were quite unimportant, and, therefore, that he ought not to be condemned for his opinions. The council, however, judged differently. They would make no compromise. They unanimously declared the opinions of Coelestius to be heretical; and, on his refusing to retract his errors, excommunicated him. This is *the first* of a succession of ecclesiastical decisions come to by different synods and councils of the Church of that age on the great Pelagian controversy.

Up to this time the controversies that had been carried on within the Church had reference mainly to the doctrines of the person of Christ and of the Holy Trinity, as the Arian, the Nestorian, the Eutychian, and the Monophysite controversies. But now, for a number of years, the whole energies of the Church were concentrated on the discussion of the

doctrines of sin and of grace in connection with the Pelagian controversy. The controversy did not terminate with Pelagius and his immediate associates. Others arose after them. The forms and aspects of the controversy gradually changed. In some respects, indeed, that controversy may be said to be continued to the present day; for it is the old opposition to the doctrine of the sovereignty of divine grace, the old overestimating of the value of human effort, which lies at the root of many of the doctrinal controversies of modern times. But still, in its first, and what may be called its grossest form, Pelagianism rose to its maturity, and again sunk from view in the time of Pelagius himself.

At the time of the meeting of this synod at Carthage, by which Coelestius was condemned, Orosius, a young Spanish ecclesiastic, happened to be in that city with the view of consulting Augustine regarding the errors of the Priscillianists. He afterwards went, by the advice of Augustine, to study theology under Jerome at Bethlehem. On his arrival there he reported what had occurred at Carthage in the matter of Coelestius and his doctrines. The report of Orosius at once gave rise to suspicions regarding the orthodoxy of Pelagius, whose friend and disciple Coelestius was known to be. At a synod assembled in Jerusalem, under the presidency of the bishop John, these suspicions were examined into. Orosius appeared as his accuser. The president was inclined to shelter Pelagius. The presbyters who were assembled there were, for the most part, inclined to adopt the opinions of John, and hence the accuser of Pelagius was received with little favor. When Orosius quoted the opinion of Augustine, whose name was an authority in the Western Church, as opposed to that of Pelagius, the latter replied, "And what is Augustine to me?" (*et quis est mihi Augustinus*). This was a bold saying; yet it pleased the Orientals, who had not yet learned to venerate the name of the great bishop of Hippo. The doctrinal points having been gone into, and explanations given by Pelagius, his judges declared themselves quite satisfied with his orthodoxy. In the same year (415) another council, consisting of fourteen presbyters, was held at Diospolis (Lydda) in Palestine — Jerome styles it a "miserable synod" — under the presidency of Eulogius, metropolitan of Caesarea, before which Pelagius was again accused of holding and propa. gating unsound opinions. Two bishops from the Gallican Church, viz. Heros of Arles and Lazarus of Aqua (Aix), took a prominent part in the proceedings against him. They appeared, indeed, as his chief accusers. Here again Pelagius did not find it difficult to persuade his judges of his orthodoxy. Their own opinions were

not very greatly different from those of the accused. They understood not the distinctions on which the doctrinal system prevalent in the West was formed. By the use of ambiguous phraseology, and by abstaining from giving any definition of what he really meant by “grace” and “free will,” he easily convinced them that his views were quite in accordance with the doctrines of the Church. The learned Jesuit historian, Petavius (*Rationar. Temp.* 1:257), thus describes the appearance he made on this occasion: “Ab iis interrogatus Pelagius, facile Graecos homines linguae illius ac fraudis ignaros captiosis responsibus elusit.” The following was the sentence pronounced by his judges: “Since we are satisfied with the declarations of the monk Pelagius, here present, who acknowledges the holy doctrine, and condemns whatsoever is contrary to the faith of the Church, we declare that he is in the communion of the Catholic Church.” This singular condition, however, was attached to the sentence, that he should anathematize all who taught the contrary opinions, not as heretics, but as fools — “tanquam stultos, non tanquam haereticos!” The Eastern Church had never, with such fullness and precision of expression as the Western, given an authoritative deliverance on the doctrines of sin and of divine grace. The anthropology there prevailing, and moulding all their forms of thought, was still that of the second and third centuries, and thus Pelagius escaped so easily when his opinions were inquired into.

It seemed as if in the East the cause of Pelagius and his followers would triumph. They exulted at the victories they had gained over their opponents. But the Western bishops were roused to more resolute efforts than ever to expose and condemn the deadly errors which were growing up under the sanction, seemingly, of the Eastern synods. Jerome condemned these synods as themselves heretical. The vigilant and energetic Augustine now girded on his armor, and stood in the foreground as the great champion for the doctrine of grace. His penetrating and philosophic mind, and the deep insight he had gained in the school of Christian experience into the true nature of the Gospel, enabled him to see through the disguise under which the system of Pelagius was concealed, and to discover the fatal character of its doctrines. He contended earnestly for the faith. He agitated the African Church to investigate the whole matter, and to give forth an unambiguous decree on the subjects in dispute. At the same time he published his first work on the controversy, entitled *De gestis Pelagii*, in which he spoke strongly against the Eastern bishops in allowing themselves to be so grievously misled by the plausible reasonings and ambiguities of

Pelagius. This was the first of a series of works which Augustine published from time to time during the space of about twenty years, during which he was engaged mainly in conducting this controversy.

Two provincial synods were held in the year following (416); one at Mileum, in Numidia, composed of sixty-one bishops, among whom was Augustine, presided over by Silvanus, and the other at Carthage, presided over by Aurelius, by both of which the opinions promulgated by Pelagius and Coelestius were examined, and being found heretical were solemnly condemned. These synods respectively sent letters to Innocent I, the Roman bishop, giving him an account of their proceedings, and asking his concurrence in the sentence they had pronounced. A third letter, sent in the names of five African bishops — Augustine, Aurelius, Alypius, Enotheus, and Possidius — conveyed to him fuller information regarding the heretical character of the opinions entertained by Pelagius. They at the same time also sent him one of the books published by Pelagius, that he might examine it for himself. Innocent, in reply to those letters, expresses himself well pleased with the dutiful conduct of the North African bishops in referring the matter to the bishop of Rome, the successor of Peter, and the legitimate head therefore of Christendom! He then declares his full concurrence in the sentence they had pronounced against the heresy. “We can neither affirm nor deny,” he says, “that there are Pelagians in Rome; because, if there are any, they take care to conceal themselves, and are not discovered in so great a multitude of people.” It had been reported to him that the Eastern Council had acquitted Pelagius. With reference to this he says, “We cannot believe that he has been justified, notwithstanding that some laymen have brought to us acts by which he pretends to have been absolved. But we doubt the authenticity of these acts, because they have not been sent us by the council, and we have not received any letters from those who assisted at it. For if Pelagius could have relied on his justification, he would not have failed to oblige his judges to acquaint us with it. And even in these acts he has not justified himself clearly, but has only sought to evade and perplex matters. We can neither approve nor blame this decision. If Pelagius pretends he has nothing to fear, it is not our business to send for him, but rather his to make haste to come and get himself absolved. For if he still continues to entertain the same sentiments, whatever letters he may receive, he will never venture to expose himself to our sentence. If he is to be summoned, that ought rather to be done by those who are nearest to him. We have perused the book said to be written

by him, which you sent us. We have found therein many propositions against the grace of God, many blasphemies, nothing that pleased us, and hardly anything but what displeased us, and ought to be rejected by all the world." Pelagius, being made aware of the anathema which had been pronounced against him and Coelestius, immediately drew up a confession of his faith, and sent it with a letter to Innocent; but that pope meantime dying, the communication fell into the hands of his successor, Zosimus, who came probably originally from the East, a man whose knowledge of Christian truth was superficial and indefinite. Coelestius went to Rome to prosecute in person his appeal against the decree of the African synods. Zosimus readily favored the appeal to his judgment. He was so far influenced by the written statements and explanation of Pelagius ("subdola Pelagii epistola deceptus," says Petavius), and by a letter in favor of Pelagius from bishop Praylus of Jerusalem, as well as by the more detailed oral explanation and promises of submission to the papal decision made by Coelestius, that he reversed the sentence of his predecessor Innocent, and declared in very strong terms his disapproval of the decision of the councils of Mileum and Carthage. He sent two letters to the African Church in which he, declared that they were guilty of doing a great wrong to Pelagius and his associate, by condemning them as heretics on grounds altogether insufficient. He complained that they had too hastily given heed to the representations of Heros and Lazarus. "whose ordinations," says he, "we have found to be irregular: and no accusation ought to have been received from them against an absent person, who being now present explains his faith and challenges his accusers. If these accusers do not appear at Rome within two months, to convict him of having other opinions than those which he professes, he ought to be deemed innocent to all intents and purposes."

The African clergy were by no means satisfied with this result, as might be expected. They accordingly again met in general council in Carthage in 418, and drew up a full statement of their views, showing why they could not accept the explanation of Pelagius and Coelestius, and why they still adhered to their former sentence against them. In their letter to pope Zosimus they say, "We have ordained that the sentence given by the venerable bishop Innocent shall subsist until they shall confess without equivocation that the grace of Jesus Christ does assist us not only to know, but also to do justice in every action; insomuch that without it we can neither think, say, nor do anything whatever that belongs to true piety.

Coelestius's having said in general terms that he agrees with Innocent's letter is not satisfactory in regard to persons of inferior understanding, but you ought to anathematize in clear terms all that is bad in his writings, lest many should believe that the apostolical see approves of their errors." The council having entered fully into an examination of the various heretical opinions of Pelagius and Coelestius, drew up and published in nine separate propositions — *canones* — doctrinal statements in opposition to the errors which they condemned.

Zosimus was induced, by the various representations that were made, to reconsider the matter. He accordingly summoned Coelestius before him, that he might examine into his opinions. He fled, however, from Rome without submitting to such a trial, whereupon Zosimus recalled the sentence of approval he had formally given, and confirmed that of his predecessor, "haereticorum calliditate detecta." At the same time he sent an "Epistola Tractoria," or circular letter, in accordance with the new decision he had come to, accepting the decision of the Council of Carthage against Pelagius, addressed to all the bishops of the Western Church for their approval. They all subscribed it, with the exception of eighteen Italian bishops, the chief of whom was Julian, bishop of Eclanum, a small village in Apulia, "a man of a penetrating genius, learned in the Scriptures, and an accurate scholar both in the Greek and Latin languages." These refractory bishops were all deposed from their office as favorers of the opinions of Pelagius. They afterwards fled to Constantinople, where they associated with Nestorius and his party. Some of them, however, again returned to Rome, and, retracting their errors and professing penitence, they were restored to their office. Julian continued to espouse the cause of Pelagius, whereupon, as Petavius remarks, "Cum Augustino grande certamen iniit, homo lingua promptus ac disertus sed procax et temerarius."

The civil as well as the ecclesiastical authorities were now moved to pronounce against Pelagianism. The case having been represented to the emperor Honorius, he issued a "Sacrum Rescriptum," dated from Ravenna, in April, 418, addressed to the praetorian prefect of Italy, who immediately, in conjunction with the prefects of the East and of Gaul, published an edict, commanding that all who were convicted of holding the errors of Pelagius should suffer banishment and confiscation of their goods. Such an appeal to the civil powers was quite in accordance with the opinions which Augustine had already propounded during the Donatist controversy as to the sphere of the magistrate's authority. In replying to

Julian, who complained that an appeal had been made to the civil magistrate in a matter that ought to be decided by an appeal to “reason,” he says — “*Vis non timere potestatem? bonum fac. Non est autem bonum, contra apostolicurn sensum exserere et asserere hbereticum sensum. Damnata ergo haeresis ab episcopis non adhuc examinanda, sed coercenda est a potestatibus Christianis.*”

From the time of these decrees against him Pelagius passes away from the field of history. It is not known what was his subsequent career. it is conjectured by some that he returned to his native country, and there continued to teach the same doctrines which had already elsewhere involved the Church in so much controversy.

III. *Subsequent Controversies On the Subject.* — In 429 Marius Mercator published in the East, and dedicated to Theodosius II, his work entitled *Commonitorium adversus haeresin Pelnagii et Caelestii*. It was translated into Latin, and published in the West in 431. That work contains a powerful vindication of the Christian doctrine of sin and of grace, in opposition to Pelagianism, very much after the manner of Augustine. The Eastern Ecumenical Council of Ephesus, also held in 431, gave forth a sentence in harmony with those that had been issued at Carthage against Pelagius and his opinions. Thus it became manifest that the agitations of these years had resulted in a triumphant overthrow of the heresy which was taught by Pelagius. Yet it is obvious that the influence of the teachings of Origen, which prevailed so generally in the East, mitigated and modified to a great degree the opposition of the Church there to Pelagius and his opinions.

There was a violent antagonism, on the subject of divine grace, between the views of Pelagius and those of Augustine. Augustine held the doctrine of salvation by grace in the strictest Calvinistic sense of the phrase — that every one who is saved owes his salvation entirely to divine grace, without any meritorious cooperation of his own.

There were some, even opponents of Pelagianism, who held that such a view necessarily led to the conclusion that the withholding of divine grace must be the cause of the eternal ruin of the non-elect, and that hence they are not responsible for their perdition. This led to the adoption of a middle course between Pelagianism and Augustinianism. Hence there sprang up a sect at first known by the name of Massiliensians, but afterwards styled by the schoolmen Semi-Pelagians. They adopted the Synergistic theory of

regeneration. They said that the efficacy of grace depended on the manner in which it was received by man. This form of doctrine became dominant in the Church of Rome. Augustinianism had but few to defend it. It was as a system of doctrine almost forgotten, till at the time of the Reformation it once more rose to new life, and was embodied in the theology of Luther and Calvin. The Council of Trent gave full sanction in its canons to the doctrine of Pelagius on the subjects of sin and of regeneration. This is evident from the expositions given to these canons by such divines as Bellarmine. The Tridentine theologians vigorously maintain the Synergistic theory of regeneration, and as vigorously condemn the Monergistic theory taught by Augustine, and entering as an essential part into the theology of the Reformation.

IV. *Analysis of Pelagianism.* — Much importance attaches to the forms which the Pelagian controversy assumed when it appeared for the first time on the field of Church history. What are called the “doctrines of divine grace,” although always forming an essential part in the system of truth which pervaded and gave life to the Christian Church, had never been the subject of controversy, and, consequently, had never been stated with any definiteness or precision of form till the time of Pelagius. The controversy, as at first conducted, while it cannot be said to have been exhausted, was carried on with so much skill, both on the one side and on the other, that scarcely anything new in the form of argument can be adduced. In the writings of Augustine, the great defender of the catholic truth of that age, there is found such a vast store of arguments, both philosophical and scriptural, in support of the cardinal doctrines of divine grace, that modern controversialists find little else remaining for them than to gather and present them anew. They are as valid now as when first exhibited in opposition to the ingenious and plausible reasonings of Pelagius and his immediate followers, Coelestius and Julian of Eclanum.

The fathers before Augustine, in making reference to the doctrine involved in the controversy, certainly do not always use language which is sufficiently explicit, or which may not be interpreted as giving countenance to Pelagianism; yet the manner in which they quote the Scripture, and the whole tone and tendency of their teachings, sufficiently demonstrate that they held substantially the same doctrines that Augustine afterwards fully developed into a system. Augustine quotes the fathers that preceded him as agreeing with him in his doctrinal views. The principal discussions of the fathers of the earlier centuries were with Gnosticism in its various

manifestations. This led them to magnify unduly the power of man's free will. At this point the divergence in the direction of what afterwards was known in history as Pelagianism first made its appearance. The roots of that system may indeed, in this respect, be found in the ambiguous and frequently inconsistent language of the earlier fathers when speaking of man's possessing a freedom of will — a power of will in the direction of that which is good. They said more than they were warranted, more than consistency with the other truths they maintained required, in affirming that man had a power to obey God. They failed to give due weight and importance to the influences of human depravity on the human will; and thus, while acknowledging that depravity, they attributed a power to the human will in the doing of good which it does not possess. They moreover confounded morality with evangelical holiness. A power to perform outward duties which belong to the sphere of morality is not to be confounded with a power to perform the duties which belong to the sphere of evangelical holiness — the relation we bear to God. Thus it was that, while in the main they held the doctrines of human depravity and of salvation by grace, they at the same time spoke of them with much indefiniteness, so that a Pelagian will not have much difficulty in persuading himself that the germs of his system are to be found in the writings of the fathers.

A scientific exhibition of the system of Pelagianism must rest on its primary or central principle, and must trace the connection of its several parts with that principle. Theologians are not at one as to what this fundamental principle in reality is. Starting from the circumstance that Augustine, in his first anti-Pelagian work, *De peccatorum meritis et remissione*, combats the opinion that physical death is purely natural, and that the first man would have died even though he had not sinned, Jansen and Garnier have maintained that this doctrine is the root of the whole system of Pelagius, out of which all its parts have sprung. Wiggers begins his development of the system with the doctrine of infant baptism, because that doctrine, though not the first, was one of the first about which the controversy arose. Another theologian of our own time, Julius Muller, finds the ground-principle of the Pelagian heresy in a superficial apprehension of sin — in the want of a true, heartfelt knowledge of sin. Such a defective knowledge must rest on a superficial knowledge of holiness which God demands of us, and which Christ, the living law, shows us in the mirror of his own life. The existence of sin, with its dominion in the soul, is the

fundamental supposition of Christianity, and its subjective recognition is the condition of its pardon; therefore error as to the' inner being and operation of in must result in a false doctrine of the saving grace of Christ. But since the chief and most general contrast does not lie between sin and holiness, but between nature and grace, it is plain, argues Worter, that we must look for the proper root and fountain-head of all Pelagian doctrine elsewhere. To know properly the principle on which Pelagianism rests, we must inquire thoroughly into the history of its dogmas as they develop themselves in the 4th and in the early part of the 5th centuries. This will lead us to inquire into the relation of cosmology, or, rather, of anthropology, to soteriology, or into the question of the transition from creation to salvation, as Cyril of Alexandria has already briefly but distinctly indicated when, in expounding ^{<24818>}Isaiah 43:18; ^{<4111>}1 Corinthians 5:17; and ^{<6215>}Revelation 21:5, he has advanced the problem whether the salvation in Christ is not to be considered as a new creation of the not altogether unscathed, but yet not altogether destroyed human nature, or as a restoration of man despoiled by the fall of his original perfection. Apollinarism and the Antiochean school, though in other respects very much separated from each other, teach with one voice that the creation of man was imperfect and incomplete, and they define salvation through Christ as a second creation, coming after and completing the first. Salvation, say they, is the finishing of creation, and on that account is necessary. But such an opinion as this is altogether a perversion of Christianity. It stands ill direct opposition to the true Christian conception of God, which admits of no defective creation, but demands one every way perfect and complete. Besides this, if the first man sinned in consequence of the defective nature with which he was created, it could not be properly sin, which is the action of a free will. Pelagianism, on the other hand, maintains the precise opposite doctrine in asserting that man was in his original creation perfect, and did not need emendation. Julian of Eclanum, who sought to carry back the Pelagian doctrines in general, and to rest them on those principles which lay at the foundation of the system, taught in his argument against Augustine that in acknowledging the doctrine of original sin, i.e. of a moral pollution extending to the personal will of the individual through Adam's sin, we are led to the conclusion that as a Savior God comes into contradiction with himself as a Creator, since by salvation he would make better what by creation was made good and perfect; and that now, since human nature remains the same as it was when

originally created by God, viz. good and perfect, there can be no such thing spoken of as a positive deterioration or injury of it.

If we accept this view of Pelagianism, which maintains the creation of man as originally perfect, it stands rightly in opposition to Apollinarism and the Antiochean school. But holding the perfection of human nature in such a sense as to exclude all idea of moral injury, it falls into the opposite error of overestimating it, so that for it salvation has only an accidental importance, and too great an independence is attributed to man. Though the Pelagian builds the chief doctrines of his system on the doctrine of the original perfection of human nature, yet, in a just development of Pelagianism, which stands in antagonism to the whole doctrines of anthropology, we regard the freedom of the will as forming the fundamental conception or principle on which the whole depends. We begin, therefore, our representation of Pelagianism with the doctrine of the freedom of the will, because the doctrine of sin is conditioned upon it, and the doctrine of grace depends upon both.

The doctrine of Augustine, and of all the Reformed confessions, at least those of the Calvinistic type, is, that in the direction of holiness, or of spiritual good, the will of man is in entire bondage; that man has no freedom to do anything really good before God; no natural power, even in the faintest degree, to love and serve God. This they rested on the doctrine of the entire depravity of human nature. For if it is true that man is totally depraved, it must follow as a consequence that the will is in a state of bondage to evil; and also, that efficacious divine grace is necessary to deliver him from this bondage, and to create a will to that which is good. But while denying the freedom of the will to this extent, i.e. to that which is good, they did not mean to affirm that man had ceased to be a responsible agent, or that he had lost the natural power of willing or of choosing; or that when he chose evil, he was acted upon by a power outside or apart from himself which necessitated his willing or choosing in one direction rather than in another; but simply and solely that, in point of fact, man does always choose that which is sinful, and will certainly and invariably continue to choose it till he is made the subject of renewing grace. His continually willing that which is evil is the result of the depravity which taints his whole nature; but in so choosing evil, he acts spontaneously — he only does that which he chooses to do.

The doctrine of Pelagius stood in antagonism to this view of the state of man's will. His primary position is that moral freedom — the power to choose right or wrong — the “*possibilitas utriusque partis*,” as he defined it — can never by any means be lost or impaired, that man must always and unchangeably stand in the same relation to good and evil. He argues in his *Epistola and Demetriadem*, c. 8. that if we would not place both good and evil in the region of physical necessities, but in that of moral freedom, man must possess an equal relation to both, and be able equally to choose, and to act upon his choice in both directions. “Neque vero nos ita defendimus naturae bonum, ut eam dicamus malum non facere posse, quam utique boni et mali capacem etiam profiteamur, sed ab hac eam tantummodo injuria vindicamus. ne ejus vitio ad malum videamur impelli, qui nec bonum sine voluntate faciamus, nec malum.” The sin is not man's, he reasons, if it is necessary. Much more, if it is his, it is free: and if it is free, then he can avoid it. Now if the will is free, he continues, ever ready to do one of both, then it follows that it is able to do both, i.e. to sin or to avoid sinning. In his Confession of Faith, sent to Innocent the pope, Pelagius says, “Liberum sic confitemur arbitrium, ut dicamus nos semper Dei indigere auxilio; et tam illos errare qui cum Manicheis dicunt hominem peccatum vitare non posse, quam illos qui cum Joviniano asserunt hominem non posse peccare; uterque enim tollit libertatem arbitrii. Nos vero dicimus, hominem semper et peccare et non peccare posse, ut semper nos liberi confitemur esse arbitrii.” He places the freedom that appertains to the will in an abstract indifference to good and evil. “Neque enim aliter spontaneum habere poterat bonum, nisi aequae etiam malum habere potuisset.” In like manner Julian also thus defines what he means by the freedom of the will: “Libertas igitur arbitrii possibilitas est vel admittendi vel vitandi peccati, expers cogentis necessitatis, quae in suo utpote jure habet utrum surgentium partem sequatur, i.e. vel ardua asperaque virtutum vel demersa et palustria voluptatum.” The freedom of the will, he says, is nothing else than the “propulatrix necessitatum;” so that no one is either good or bad in any other way than by his choosing freely to be that which he is. Freedom is, he says, the “possibilitas peccandi et non peccandi;” and as such is the “facultas in quod voluerat latus suo pte insistendi arbitrato.” In answering his arguments, Augustine thus states Julian's doctrine: “Libram tuam conaris ex utraque parte per aequalia momenta suspendere, ut voluntas quantum est ad malum, tantum etiam sit ad bonum libera.”

In the conflict to which the publication of such opinions gave rise, Augustine took, as might be expected, the foremost place. He strenuously maintained, and this was his great doctrine — the doctrine which he was peculiarly honored to develop—that there is a distinction between nature and grace; and that grace is always and only, the efficient cause of all that is truly good in men; yea, even in holy angels, beings who have never sinned, all their goodness and holiness they owe to grace alone, sustaining and confirming grace, though not, as in man's case, renewing and sanctifying. He affirmed that it was impossible for any one to occupy that position of absolute indifference to good and evil which Pelagius declared was the essence of freedom; but that, on the contrary, as an intelligent, active moral agent, man must possess a positive character; that is, he must either be determined towards that which is good or towards that which is evil. He affirmed that man must have some moral bent or bias of his mind; that he must be either inclined towards God or away from him, and this before, in actual outer life, there is any manifestation of such a bias.

According to the anthropology of the Western Church, the will of man was always regarded as in a state of determination or decision either towards good or evil. The Eastern anthropology, on the other hand, presented the will of man as intrinsically and essentially in a state of equilibrium, a state of indecision, having a determination neither to good nor to evil.

According to the teaching of the former, freedom is self-determination, the acting from motives that are within ourselves — the not being compelled to act by a foreign power without us. All that is needed to the freedom of the will is that it be self-moved; that is, be uncompelled in all the choice it makes. According to the teaching of the latter, the Eastern or Greek anthropology, the freedom of the will consists in its being in a state of indecision, indifference — the *possibilitas utriusque partis*;" its having the power of choosing either of two contrasts—the power of choosing differently from what it actually does choose.

In speaking of the *sinfulness of man* there are two questions which must be carefully distinguished: 1. The question of his depravity or sinfulness, or inherent ungodliness of character; and, 2. The question of his guilt (*reatus*), or liability to punishment. In the Reformed Confession the two doctrines are kept distinct.* The guilt of Adam's first sin is regarded as an actual part of the guilt which rests upon all his posterity. Adam and his descendants are regarded as being so identified that the guilt which rested upon him rests upon them also. The inherent

depravity of man's nature is to be regarded as the penal consequence of this guilt. But in the time of the Pelagian controversy, as conducted between Augustine and his opponents, the question was, Does man come into the world in a state of innate depravity? and not, Does he come into the world with a sentence of guilt resting upon him? Hence, while the development given by Augustine to the doctrine of grace, in certain directions, has been of permanent and essential service to the Church, there was in it this defect, that he did not fully apprehend the doctrine of man's inherited guilt. He did not deal with that question as apart from the doctrine of inherited corruption; and hence also his views of the doctrine of justification, as being deliverance from this guilt, were defective. He was in this way led, not into the question of the provision that was necessary for securing pardon and acceptance to man, but into the provision necessary for his deliverance from corruption; or into the doctrine of a change of nature in conversion and regeneration.

If the will is only free when it is in a state of equilibrium — a state of indifference to either good or evil having the same power in the one direction as in the other; if no tendency pre-exists in the will, determining it either towards right or wrong, then sin is exclusively an *act*, and has no existence apart from that *act*. † The *act* of sin does not change the nature of man, it only exposes him to punishment for the act itself. Taking up this position, Pelagius and his followers reasoned that man does not bring with him into the world any proneness or tendency to sin — that he has not a sinful and depraved disposition. Sin is only something actual and personal, they affirmed, and cannot be of the character of a taint spreading over the nature and defiling it. This was one of their cardinal principles: “Omne bonum ac malum quo vel laudabiles vel vituperabiles sumus non nobiscum oritur sed agitur a nobis.” Julian, who was the ablest and most systematic defender of Pelagianism, thus defines what sin is, and whence it arises, according to his theory: “Constat esse peccatum. Quaerimus quid sit; utrum corpus aliquod sit quod ex multis compositum vlideatur an singulare quiddam, sicut unum aliquod elementum vel per cogitationem a reliquorum communione purgatum. Porro nihil horum est. Quid est igitur? Appetitus liberae voluntatis quonem prohibet justitia; vel ut definitione utamur priore: Voluntas faciendi quod justitia vetat, et unde liberim est

abstinere.” Again Julian says, “If it is asked, Whence arises the first sinful will in man? I answer, A motu animi cogente nullo.”

What is the true relation of man to God? Is he in the condition of one who needs redemption, who needs a divine power to act upon him, so as to raise him morally and spiritually from misery and ruin? This is the prominent question in the controversy as conducted between Pelagius and Augustine. The former asserted that human nature has continued in all its spiritual and moral capacities to be the same as it was when it emanated originally from the Creator — that till men individually, by the exercise of free will, chose that which was evil, they continued in the same sinless, innocent condition in which Adam was before he sinned. The Pelagians did not deny that Adam’s fall did affect his posterity, but they held that it was only by setting them a bad example. Augustine held that a sinful nature had descended from Adam to all his posterity, and that, as a consequence, they were all under the bondage of evil, from which a divine power was needed to rescue them. Men come, said the Pelagians, into the world in a state of primitive purity. It has no taint of corruption about it, so that men may live on through a long life, may have so lived — in a state of perfect holiness, such as Abel, Isaac, and Jacob, etc. Yet the influence of example they regarded as such that in general man was deteriorated, yea, that that deterioration was going on and continually increasing. Such deterioration they looked upon, however, as only *accidental*, and as not essentially and necessarily belonging to man. Man they regarded as possessing perfect power to resist this deteriorating influence if he so willed it, and to grow up by the natural development of the faculties in the possession of which he was created into the character of perfect innocence before God. In order to this development there needed no divine power or influence whatever.

On the subject of *grace*, the Pelagians altogether denied that there was need for, or that God did at all exercise, any power upon man so as to determine the bent of his will. Maintaining the theory of the freedom of the will we have already described, they admitted no divine influence that conflicted with it. They did, indeed, speak of “grace” as bestowed upon man, but by the word they did not mean the “*gratia proeveniens*” or “*preparans*,” the divine influences going before and producing by an irresistible power the first motions of the soul towards goodness, but only the outward revelation made by God to man in the Scriptures, and also those moral and spiritual powers bestowed upon him at his creation. The idea of a divine power influencing man’s inner nature, and bending his will,

and determining the action of his mind, they altogether rejected. There was in the Pelagian system no place at all for the doctrine of a divine life being imparted to man through the redemption of Christ, and by the power of his Holy Spirit. They did not, indeed, deny to Christ the title of Redeemer, but the idea they attached to that word was simply that of one who, by his teaching and his life, gave a perfect example — “*exacta justitiae norma*” — which, by our giving heed to it, will enoble and elevate our nature to a position higher than that originally belonging to it by creation. As Adam gave a bad example to his posterity, so Christ gave a good example, and in this consists his excellence as the Redeemer of man. Christ, by his whole life on earth, and by his sufferings and death, and by the communication he made as the Teacher sent from God, supplied valuable motives which ought to induce men to greater efforts to resist temptation, and to imitate his example in a holy life; and beyond this there was in their system no room for anything else for the Redeemer to do.

V. Literature. — Voss, *Hist. Controversiarum Pelagianorum* (Lugd. Batav. 1618, 4to); Noris, *Hist. Pelag.* (Lovan, 1702, fol.); Tillemont, *Memoires Eccles.*; Schrockh, *Kirchengeschichte*, vol. xiv; Neander, *Kirchengeschichte*, vol. ii; Schonleemann, *Bibl. Patrum Latinorum*, vol. ii; Bahr, *Geschichte der rom. Literatur*, suppl. vol. pt. ii; *Versuch einer pragm. Darstellung des Augustinismus und Pelagianismus nach ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung*, by G. F. Wiggers, professor of theology (Rostock, Hamburg, 1833). The first part of this work was first published in 1821. It was translated into English by Prof. Emerson, of Andover, and published in 1840. The second part deals with the semi-Pelagian controversy down to the time of the second Synod of Orange. Worter, *Der Pelagianismus nach seinem Ursprunge und seiner Lehre, (ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Dogmas von der Gnade und Freiheit)*, (Freiburg, 1866), is properly, the second volume of the author's *History of Pelagianism*, the first of which was published a few years previously under the title of *Geschichte der christlichen Lehre über das Verhältniss von Gnade und Freiheit bis auf Augustinus*. See also *Theological Essays* from the *Princeton Rev.* first series; *Brit. and For. Evang. Rev.* 1867; Cunningham, *Historical Theology* (Edinb. 1864), vol. i; Shedd, *Hist. of Christian Doctrine*; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines.* (W. G. E.)

*The Dutch Remonstrants, however and as it seems to us justly, objected to the Calvinistic Confessions that they did *not* keep these

two questions sufficiently distinct. The *guilt*, and with it the penalty, of Adam's sin was made to rest upon his posterity, and not his *depravity* simply. The confusion has arisen from not duly observing that depravity is properly predicable only of the moral affections, while guilt is the result of personal volition alone. Hence, although man's moral nature is wholly depraved, his will is nevertheless free, so long as his affections are not held to exercise a necessarily dominant control over his determinations. For it makes but little difference as to his freedom, whether constraint comes *ab extra* or *ab intra*, if in either case it is equally absolute. Depravity is inherited, guilt is not. — ED.

† The writer here uses "sin" in an ambiguous sense. Strictly speaking sin is simply an *act* of transgression (~~trans~~ 1 John 3:4); but this implies *sinfulness*, which is a moral disposition. — ED.

Pelagius

a very noted ecclesiastical character of the 5th century, whose origin and early history is much obscured, was the exponent of a heretical theory concerning the dogma of original sin (q.v.) and the necessity of divine grace. His contemporaries applied to him the title *of Brito*, from which it has been concluded that he was a British monk. His real name is said to have been *Morgan* (*Marigena*), which was translated into *Pelagius*; (*πελάγιος*). About the year 400 he went to Rome, when he began to teach the system of doctrine with which his name is generally associated. The chief events of his history are noticed under the article PELAGIANISM *SEE PELAGIANISM* (q.v.). The time and circumstances of his death are unknown. He was the author of the following works: *Expositionum in Epistolas Pauli libri xic*. These commentaries, consisting of brief, simple explanatory notes on all the Epistles of Paul, with the exception of that to the Hebrews, were at first attributed to Gelasius, bishop of Rome; they afterwards found a place among the MSS. of Jerome. They are printed in the Benedictine edition of that father's works, and also in that of Vallarsi. Quotations made from them by Augustine led Marius Mercator and others to the conclusion that they were the work of Pelagius, although they have come down to us in a somewhat mutilated form, as the editors of Jerome's works regarded it as their duty to expunge from them every passage which seemed to them to savor of heresy (see Garnier's ed. of Mercator, *App. ad Diss.* 6:367): — *Epistola ad Demetriadem*: a letter addressed to a Roman

lady of distinction. Like the other works of Pelagius, this also was assigned to Jerome, and is found in the best editions of his works. Its real authorship was ascertained from the quotations made by Augustine in his *De Gratia Christi*. It was published separately by Semler in 1775: — *Libellus Fidei ad Innocentium Papam*. This also had a place among Jerome's works, and its real authorship was only discovered by quotations in Augustine's *De Gratia Christi*: — *Epistola ad Celantiam Matronens de Ratione die vivendi*, found among Jerome's correspondence, numbered 148, in Vallarsi's ed. of his works. Erasmus assigned it to Paulinus of Nola, and Vallarsi to Sulpicius Severus; but Semler has shown from its style and tone that it was the work of Pelagius. The following fragments of works are also found: **Εὐλογιῶν Liber**, designated by Gennadius as *Eulogiarum pro actuali conversatione ex divinis scripturis Liber*; by Honorius as *Pro actuali vita Liber*. It was a collection of Scripture texts, arranged and illustrated after the manner of the *Testimonia* of Cyprian (see Jerome, *Dialog. advers. Pelag.* lib. i; Augustine, *C. duas Pelagianorum*, op. 4:8; *De Gestis Pelagii*, comp. Garnier, *Ad M. Mercat. Append. ad Diss. vi*): — *De natura Liber*, to which Augustine's *De natura et Gratia* was a reply: — *Liber ad viduam consolatorius atque exhortatorius* (see Jerome, *Dialog. adv. Pelag.* lib. iii; Augustine, *De Gestis Pelag.* c. 6): — *Epistola ad Augustinum* (see *De Gestis Pelag.* c. 26): — *Epistola ad Augustinum secunda* (see *De Gestis Pelag.* c. 30). See Augustinus, *De Gest. Pelag.* ch. 30; Voss, *Hist. Controv. Pelag.* (Lug. 1618); Tillemont, *Memoires Ecclesiast.*; Schrockh, *Kirchengeschichte*, vol. 2; and the literature quoted in the art. PELAGIANISM *SEE PELAGIANISM* .

Pelagius

ST., an Eastern ecclesiastic, flourished in the second half of the 4th century. He was made bishop of his paternal city, Laodicea, notwithstanding that he was a married man, because he abstained on religious grounds from all sexual connection. He was one of the leaders of the orthodoxy, and in their struggles with the Arians took part at the synods of Antioch (A.D. 361) and Tyana (367). He was banished to Arabia by the emperor Valens in 370, but was permitted to return in a few years, and was present at the Council of Constantinople in 381, and was one of its most honored attendant bishops.

Pelagius I

pope of Rome, succeeded Virgilius in the see of Rome (A.D. 555). Like his predecessor, he was involved in dogmatic controversy with most of the Western bishops concerning certain theological tenets condemned by the Council of Constantinople, and known in controversial history by the name of the Three Chapters. Pelagius was supported in his views by the emperor Justinian, who was fond of interfering in theological disputations. He died in 560, and was succeeded by John III (see Norris, *De Synodo Quinta*). Sixteen of his Epistles are in the *Concilia*, tom. 5.

Pelagius II

succeeded Benedict I as pope of Rome in 579. He was likewise embroiled in disputes concerning the Three Chapters above mentioned. In the mean time a council which assembled at Constantinople bestowed on the patriarch of that city the title of oecumenic, or “universal” bishop, at which Pelagius was greatly offended. He died at Rome in 590, and was succeeded by Gregory I. Ten of his Epistles and six Decrees are extant in the *Concilia*, tom. 5.

Pelagius, Alvarus

a noted Spanish Franciscan, flourished in the first half of the 14th century. He was a scholar of Duns Scotus, and first became grand penitentiary of pope John XXII (1316-34), and later bishop of Silves, in Algarve. He is noted especially as the defender of extreme Ultramontanism by his *De planctu ecclesiae* (Ulm, 1474; Lyons, 1570; Venice, 1560). He regarded the power of the pope as limitless, and not even bound by the laws he might himself have given. Everything is subject to the pontiff, of course all councils included, even the oecumenical. The tribunal of Christ and of the pope on earth are one. Pelagius’s work belongs to the classical documents of the curialistic system of the Middle Ages. See Schwab. *Johannes Gerson* (Wurzburg, 1855).

Pelai’ah

[some *Pelai’ah*] (Heb. *Pelayah’ hyal P*)[and briefly *hyl P*] Neh.], distinguished of *Jah*, i.e. Jehovah; Sept. Φαλαΐας, Φαλαΐα, Φελεΐα, etc.), the name of two Jews.

1. A Levite who aided Ezra in instructing the people (^{<1687>}Nehemiah 8:7). B.C. 445. He afterwards joined in the covenant with Nehemiah (^{<1600>}Nehemiah 10:10).
2. Son of Elioenai and a descendant of David (^{<1383>}1 Chronicles 3:24). B.C. post 400.

Pelali'ah

(Heb. *Pelalyah'*, **hyf] P**] *judged of Jah*, i.e. Jehovah; Sept. Φαλαλία), son of Amzi, a priest, and father of Jeroham (^{<1612>}Nehemiah 11:12). B.C. ante 445.

Pelati'ah

(Heb. *Pelatyah'*, **hyf] P**] *delivered of Jehovah*; also in the prolonged form *Pelatyau 'hu*, **Whyf] P**] ^{<1510>}Ezekiel 11:1,13; Sept. Φαλετία, Φαλεττία, Nehemiah Φαλτία, in Ezekiel Φαλτίας), the name of four Jews.

1. Son of Ishi, of the tribe of Simeon, and one of the captains of the five hundred men who made a successful attack on the Amalekites in Mount Seir, in the reign of Hezekiah (^{<1342>}1 Chronicles 4:42). B.C. cir. 700.
2. The son of Benaiah, and one of the princes of the people against whom Ezekiel was directed to utter the words of doom recorded in ^{<1516>}Ezekiel 11:5-12. The prophet in spirit saw him stand at the east gate of the Temple, and, as he spoke, the same vision showed him Pelatiah's sudden death (^{<1510>}Ezekiel 11:1,13). B.C. cir. 592.
3. The first named of two (three) sons of Hananiah, among the descendants of David (^{<1321>}1 Chronicles 3:21). B.C. post 536.
4. One of the heads of the people who joined in the covenant with Nehemiah (^{<1602>}Nehemiah 10:22). B.C. cir. 440.

Pelayo

a noted mediaeval royal character, and a convert to Christianity, is said to have been the first Christian king in Spain after the conquest of that country by the Arabs. Contemporary historians make no mention of him, but this may be accounted for on the ground of the insignificant size of his kingdom, which comprised only the mountainous district of Asturias. He is

said to have been a scion of the royal Visigothic line, and to have retired before the conquering Arabs to the mountains of Asturias, where he maintained himself against the armies which were sent to attack him, defeating them in various pitched battles, and in numberless minor engagements. One of his most famous exploits was the destruction of a large army sent against him by Tarik, near Cangas-de-Onis. His men were posted on the heights bounding the valley through which the Arabs were to pass, and, waiting till the enemy had become involved in the defile, at a given signal overwhelmed them with enormous masses of rock. This great success caused Pelayo to be recognized as sovereign by the surrounding districts, and the Christians flocked to him from all parts of Spain. He was much engaged in contests with the Arabs, but nevertheless found time to reanimate agriculture, superintend the reconstruction of churches, and the establishment of a civil administration. He died in 737. Such is the account given us by later historians, who trace from him the genealogy of the royal family of Spain.

Pelbart, Oswald

a Hungarian Franciscan monk, noted for his learning and as a pulpit orator, flourished near the opening of the 16th century at Temesvar. We possess the following works of his, which are mostly homiletical, and have passed through numerous editions: *Ponzerium sermonuo in de tempore* (Norimb. 1483, fol. et al.): — *Pomoerium sermonum de sanctis* (Hagenov. 1475, 1498, 1501, 2 vols. fol.): — *Quadragesimale triplex de pœnitentia, de vitiis, de pœceptis Decalogi* (ibid. 1475. fol. et al.): — *Stellarium coronce gloriosissime Virginis seu Ponzcwriunz sermonun de b. Virgine* (Argentín. 1496, fol. et al.): — *Expositio compendiosa sensum litteralens et mysticum complexens libri Psalmorum, scilicet Psalterium, liber Hynnorum, liber soliloquiorum regii Prophete, item Expositio Canticorum V. T., Canticorum N.T., Symboli Athenasii, Hymni universalis creature* (ibid. 1487, fol. et al.): — *Aurei rosarii Theologicæ ad sententiarum IV libros parformitor quadripartiti libri IV* (Hagenov. 1504, et al.). See Wadding, *Annal. O. Min.* a. 1483 and *Script. O. M.* p. 274; Czwingger, *Ungar. litt.* p. 301; Fabricius. *Bibl. med. et inf. Lat.* v. 224, s.v. Pelbartus.

Pe'leg

(Heb. *id.* **gl P**, division; Sept. **Φαλέγ** v. r. **Φαλέκ**, **Φαλέχ**; Josephus, **Φάλεκος**, *Ant.* 1:6, 5), the son of Eber, and father of Reu (⁴¹¹¹⁶Genesis

11:16-19). B.C. 24152176. He was the elder brother of Joktan, and the fourth in descent from Shem. This name is said to have been given him “because in his days was the earth divided” (^{<11025>}Genesis 10:25; ^{<11019>}1 Chronicles 1:19). This notice is usually thought to refer, not to the general dispersion of the human family subsequently to the Deluge, but to a division of the family of Eber himself, the younger branch of whom (the Joktanids) migrated into southern Arabia, while the elder remained in Mesopotamia. The name *Phaliga* occurs for a town at the junction of the Chaboras with the Euphrates; but the late date of the author who mentions the name (Isidorus of Charax) prevents any great stress being laid upon it. The separation of the Joktanids from the stock whence the Hebrews sprang finds a place in the Mosaic table, as marking an epoch in the age immediately succeeding the Deluge. According to others, however, the name indicates a mere earthquake, or at most an actual division of the earth in some geological convulsion, in which islands and continents were separated and formed by volcanic agency, and followed by extensive emigrations (^{<11019>}Genesis 9:19; 10:32; ^{<11018>}Deuteronomy 32:8, 9). Peleg is called *Phalec* (Φαλέκ) in the New Test. (^{<11035>}Luke 3:35). *SEE DISPERSION OF NATIONS.*

Pe’let

(Heb. *id.* פִּלְעַת, *deliverance*; Sept. Φαλέτ, Φαλλέτ, v. r. Φαλέκ and Ἰωφαλλέτ), the name of two Jews. *SEE BETH-PALET.*

1. The fourth named of the six sons of Jahdai, of the family of Caleb the Hezronite (^{<11017>}1 Chronicles 2:47). B.C. post 1612.
2. “Son” of Azmaveth (q.v.), and brother of Jeziel, one of David’s Benjamite captains at Ziklag (^{<11018>}1 Chronicles 12:3). B.C. cir. 1055.

Pe’leth

(Heb. *id.* תִּלְפַת, *swiftness*; Sept. Φαλέθ v. r. θαλέθ), the name of two Jews.

1. The father of On, of the tribe of Reuben, who joined Dathan and Abiram in their rebellion (^{<11011>}Numbers 16:1). B.C. ante 1657. “Josephus (*Ant.* 4:2, 2), omitting all mention of On, calls Peleth (Φαλαοῦς, apparently identifying him with PHALLU, the son of Reuben. In the Sept. Peleth is

made the son of Reuben, as in the Sam. text and version, and one Heb. MS. supports this rendering.”

2. Son of Jonathan, and a descendant of Jerahmeel through Onam, his son by Atarah, being apparently the fifth in descent from Hezron, grandson of Judah (^{<123>}1 Chronicles 2:33). B.C. cir. 1618.

Pel'ethite

[most *Pe'lethite*] (Heb. *Pelethi'*, *ytæp*] Sept. *Φελετό, Φελεθί*; but ^{<1817>}1 Chronicles 18:17, *Φαλλεθθί*), a class of persons mentioned only in the phrase *ytækhīytæp[h]* rendered in the A.V. “the Cherethites and the Pelethites.” These two collectives designate a force that was evidently David’s body-guard. Their names have been supposed either to indicate their duties or to be Gentile nouns. Gesenius renders them “executioners and runners.” comparing the *μυκῶν κῆ* “executioners and runners” of a later time (^{<2104>}2 Kings 11:4, 19); and the unused roots *trK*; and *tl P*; of both of which we shall speak later, admit this sense. In favor of this view, the supposed parallel phrase, and the duties in which these guards were employed, may be cited. On the other hand, the Sept. and Vulg. retain their names untranslated; and the Syriac and Targ. Jon. translate them differently from the rendering above and from each other. In one place, moreover, the Gittites are mentioned with the Cherethites and Pelethites among David’s troops (^{<1518>}2 Samuel 15:18); and elsewhere we read of the Cherethim, who bear the same name in the plural, either as a Philistine tribe or as Philistines themselves (^{<1014>}1 Samuel 30:14; ^{<2516>}Ezekiel 25:16; ^{<4118>}Zephaniah 2:5). Gesenius objects that David’s bodyguard would scarcely have been chosen from a nation so hateful to the Israelites as the Philistines. But it must be remembered that David in his later years may have distrusted his Israelitish soldiers, and relied on the Philistine troops, some of whom, with Ittai the Gittite, who was evidently a Philistine, and not an Israelite from Gath, *SEE ITTAI*, were faithful to him at the time of Absalom’s rebellion. He also argues that it is improbable that two synonymous appellations should be thus used together; but this is on the assumption that both names signify Philistines, whereas they may designate Philistine tribes. (See *Thesaur.* p. 719, 1107.)

The Egyptian monuments throw a fresh light upon this subject. From them we find that kings of the 19th and 20th dynasties had in their service mercenaries of a nation called *Shayretana*, which Rameses III conquered,

under the name “*Shayretana* of the Sea.” This king fought a naval battle with the *Shayretana* of the Sea, in alliance with the *Tokknari*, who were evidently, from their physical characteristics, a kindred people to them, and to the *Pelesatu*, or Philistines, also conquered by him. The *Tokkari* and the *Pelesatu* both wear a peculiar dress. We thus learn that there were two peoples of the Mediterranean kindred to the Philistines, one of which supplied mercenaries to the Egyptian kings of the 19th and 20th dynasties. The name *Shayretana*, of which the first letter was also pronounced *Kh*, is almost letter for letter the same as the Hebrew Cherethim; and since the *Shayretana* were evidently cognate to the Philistines, their identity with the Cherethim cannot be doubted. But if the Cherethim supplied mercenaries to the Egyptian kings in the 12th century B.C., according to our reckoning, it cannot be doubted that the same name in the designation of David’s body-guard denotes the same people or tribe. The Egyptian *Shap’etana* of the Sea are probably the Cretans. The Pelethites, who, as already remarked, are not mentioned except with the Cherethites, have not yet been similarly traced in Egyptian geography, and it is rash to suppose their name to be the same as that of the Philistines, $y\text{t}\text{æ}\text{p}[\text{æ}]$ for $y\text{T}\text{æ}\text{p}[\text{æ}]$ for, as Gesenius remarks, this contraction is not possible in the Shemitic languages. The similarity, however, of the two names would favor the idea which is suggested by the mention together of the Cherethites and Pelethites, that the latter were of the Philistine stock as well as the former. As to the etymology of the names, both may be connected with the migration of the Philistines. As already noticed, the former has been derived from the root trK ; “he cut, cut off, destroyed;” in Niphal, “he was cut off from his country, driven into exile, or expelled,” so that we might as well read “exiles” as “executioners.” The latter, from tl P ; an unused root. the Arab. *palata*, “he escaped, fled,” both being cognate to fl P ; “he was smooth,” thence “he slipped away, escaped, and caused to escape,” where the rendering “the fugitives” is at least as admissible as “the runners.” If we compare these two names so rendered with the Gentile name of the Philistine nation itself, $y\text{T}\text{æ}\text{p}[\text{æ}]$ “a wanderer, stranger,” from the unused root vl P ; he wandered or emigrated,” these previous inferences seem to become irresistible. The appropriateness of the names of these tribes to the duties of David’s body-guard would then be accidental, though it does not seem unlikely that they should have given rise to the adoption in later times of other appellations for the royal body-guard, definitely signifying “executioners and runners.” If, however, $y\text{t}\text{æ}\text{p}[\text{æ}]\text{h}|\text{y}\text{t}\text{æ}\text{h}|\text{i}$ meant nothing

but executioners and runners, it is difficult to explain the change to ⲙⲗⲁⲥⲏⲱⲣⲉⲕⲏ *SEE CHERETHITE*.

Peli'as

(Πεδίας v. r. Παιδείας; *Vulg. Pelias*), a corrupt form (1 Esdras 9:34) of the name of BEDEIAH (^{<1508>}Ezra 10:35).

Pelican

Picture for Pelican

(ⲧⲁⲓⲕ; *kaath*'y Syriac, *kaka*; Arabic and Talmuds, *kuk* and *kik*; Sept. ⲡⲉⲗⲉⲕⲁⲛ, ^{<6118>}Leviticus 11:18; ⲕⲁⲧⲁⲣⲣⲁⲕⲏⲧⲉⲥ, ^{<6147>}Deuteronomy 14:17; ⲥⲧⲉⲛⲁⲓⲙⲟⲥ, Psalm cii. 6; ⲟⲩⲛⲉⲟⲛ, ^{<2341>}Isaiah 34:11; ⲕⲁⲙⲁⲓⲕⲉⲟⲛ, ^{<3124>}Zephaniah 2:14; *Vulg. pelican, onocrotalus*). Among the unclean birds mention is made of the *kadth* (^{<6118>}Leviticus 11:18; ^{<6147>}Deuteronomy 14:17). The suppliant Psalmist compares his condition to “a *kadth* in the wilderness” (^{<1026>}Psalm 102:6). As a mark of the desolation that was to come upon Edom, it is said that “the *kadth* and the bittern should possess it” (^{<2341>}Isaiah 34:11). The same words are spoken of Nineveh (^{<3124>}Zephaniah 2:14). In these two last places the A.V. has “; cormorant” in the text, and “pelican” in the margin. The expression “pelican of the wilderness” has, with no good reason, been supposed by some to prove that the *kadth* cannot be denoted by this bird. Shaw (*Trav.* 2:303, 8vo ed.) says “the pelican must of necessity starve in the desert,” as it is essentially a water bird. In answer to this objection, it will be enough to observe that the term *midbar* (“wilderness”) is by no means restricted to barren sandy spots destitute of water. “The idea,” says Prof. Stanley, “is that of a wide open space, with or without actual pasture; the country of the nomads, as distinguished from that of the agricultural and settled people” (*Sin. and Pal.* p. 486). As a matter of fact, however, the pelican, after having filled its pouch with fish and mollusks, often does retire miles inland away from water, to some spot where it consumes the contents of its pouch. Pelicans (*Pelecanus onocrotalus*) are often seen associated in large flocks; at other times single individuals may be observed sitting in lonely and pensive silence on the ledge of some rock a few feet above the surface of the water (see Kitto, *Pict. Bib.* on Psalm cii. 6). It is not quite clear what is the particular point in the nature or character of the pelican with which the Psalmist compares his pitiable condition. Some have supposed that it

consists in the loud cry of the bird: compare “the voice of my sighing” (ver. 5). We are inclined to believe that reference is made to its general aspect as it sits in apparent melancholy mood, with its bill resting on its breast. Oedmann’s opinion that the *Pelicanis graculus*, the shag cormorant (*Verm. Samml.* 3:57), and Bochart’s, that the “bittern” is intended, are unsupported by any good evidence. Neither is there sufficient ground to infer from the above passage any peculiar capability in the genus to occupy remote solitudes; for they live on fish, and generally nestle in reedy abodes; and man, in all regions, equally desirous to possess food, water, and verdure, occupies the same localities for the same reasons. Perhaps the Psalmist refers to one isolated by circumstances from the usual haunts of these birds, and casually nestling among rocks, Where water, and consequently food, begins to fail in the dry season, as is commonly the case eastward of the Jordan — such a supposition offering an image of misery and desolation forcibly applicable to the context (see Thomson, *Land and Book*, 1:403). The best authorities are therefore in favor of the pelican being the bird denoted by *kaath*. The etymology of the name, from a word meaning “to vomit,” leads also to the same conclusion, for it doubtless has reference to the habit which this bird has of pressing its under mandible against its breast, in order to assist it to disgorge the contents of its capacious pouch for its young. This is, with good reason, supposed to be the origin of the fable about the pelican feeding its young with its own blood, the red nail on the upper mandible serving to complete the delusion.

Pelicans are chiefly tropical birds, equal or superior in bulk to the common swan. They are partially gregarious; and though some always remain in their favorite subsolar regions. most of them migrate in the northern hemisphere with the northern spring, occupy Syria, the lakes and rivers of temperate Asia, and extend westward into Europe, up the Danube into Hungary, and northward to some rivers of Southern Russia. They likewise frequent salt-water marshes and the shallows of harbors, but seldom alight on the open sea, though they are said to dart down upon fish from a considerable height. Notwithstanding their perfect development of the natatorial structure, they are good flyers, and the form of their feet does not interfere with their perching on trees, in which habit they are somewhat peculiar among swimming birds. They are all remarkable for voracity. The skin which extends from the throat between the rami of the lower mandible is extensible, and this structure attains its highest point of development in the true pelicans, in which the distended pouch is capable of holding ten

quarts of water. The use of this membrane is that of a reservoir for the temporary retention of the fishes that are captured; enabling the bird to dispose of the superfluous quantity for its own future consumption or for its sitting mate and young. The face of the pelican is naked; the bill, long, broad, and flat, is terminated by a strong, crooked, and crimson-colored nail, which, when fish is pressed out of the pouch, and the bird is at rest, is seen reposing upon the crop, and then may be fancied to represent an ensanguined spot. This, as above observed, may have occasioned the fabulous tale which represents the bird as wounding her own bared breast to revive its young brood; for that part of the bag which is visible then appears like a naked breast, all the feathers of the body being white or slightly tinged with rose color, except the great quills, which are black. The feet have all the toes united by broad membranes, and are of a nearly orange color. *Pelecanus onocrotalus*, the species here noticed, is the most widely spread of the genus, being supposed to be identical at the Cape of Good Hope and in India, as well as in Western Asia. It is very distinctly represented in ancient Egyptian paintings, where the birds are seen in numbers congregated among reeds, and the natives collecting basketfuls of their eggs. They still frequent the marshes of the Delta of the Nile, and the islands of the river high up the country, and resort to the lakes of Palestine, excepting the Dead Sea. The *Pelecanus onocrotalus* (common pelican) and the *Pelecanus crispus* are often observed in Palestine, Egypt, etc. Of the latter Mfr. Tristram noticed an immense flock swimming out to sea within sight of Mount Carmel (*Ibis*, 1:37).

PELICAN, in *Christian symbolism*. , A figure of this bird “vulning herself” — that is, feeding her young with her own blood — was common in old churches, the allusion being emblematic of our redemption through the sufferings of Christ. The pelican often surmounts the cross. A brass pelican was employed as a lectern prior to the use of the eagle. *SEE EAGLE; SEE LECTERN.*

Pelisson

SEE PELLISSON.

Pell, John

a learned divine, and mathematician, who settled at Breda as professor of philosophy and mathematics, and was a great correspondent of Cavendish, was born at Southwick, in Sussex, in 1610, and died in 1685. Besides the

works published by him, his MSS. and letters in the British Museum occupy nearly forty folio volumes.

Pell

W. E., a clergyman of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born near the beginning of the 19th century. He was for many years a member of the North Carolina Conference; but, his health failing, he was obliged to relinquish traveling, whereupon he turned his attention to journalism, and subsequently became one of the editors of the Raleigh *Sentinel*. He was an advocate of Southern rights. He died at Raleigh, N. C., Nov. 11, 1870. See Appleton, *Amer. Cyclop.* 10:581.

Pella

(Gr. Πέλλα), a city of Palestine, and one of the towns of the Decapolis in Peraea, being the most northerly place in the latter district (Pliny, v. 16, 18; Josephus, *War*, 3:3, 3; comp. Ptolemy, v. 15, 23, and Stephanus, s.v.). It was also called *Butis* (ἡ Βούτις). The place is not named in the Bible, but the district of "Decapolis," or *ten cities*, of which Pella was one, is mentioned in ^{<4025>}Matthew 4:25; ^{<4050>}Mark 5:20; 7:31. That district must have extended round to the south-east as well as to the east and north-east of the Sea of Galilee. Gerasa, Gadara, and Hippos, three cities of the Decapolis, lay to the south-east of that sea, and Pella is mentioned with these by Josephus (*War*, 2:18, 1). Pella must therefore have been somewhere in that direction. Eusebius and Jerome say that it was six miles from Jabesh-Gilead, on the road over the mountains from Gerasa to Bethshan, and twenty-one miles north of Amathus, now Amateh, near the junction of the Zerka or Jabbok with the Jordan. The name of Jabesh is still retained in Wady Yabes, or the valley of Jabesh, which comes down from Jebel Ajliin, or the mountains of Northern Gilead, in a south-westerly direction, and enters the Ghor, or the plain of the Jordan, about eight or ten miles below the latitude of Bethshan. Jabesh-Gilead no doubt lay somewhere within or upon that valley. The only ancient site with ruins within that valley, and on the old road from Bethshan to Gerasa, is one called Ed-Deir, on a height, on the south side of Wady Yabes, a little to the south of Kefr-Abil-Arbel of Jerome, and Arbela of Eusebius, in the borders of Pella. This, i.e. Ed-Deir, is supposed to be the site of Jabesh-Gilead (see Robinson, *Lat. Bible Res.* p. 319; Van de Velde, *Palest.* 2:352). In early times a convent possibly stood on the site of Jabesh-Gilead, or a convent

may have been the last building that remained; hence probably the name of Ed-Deir, or “the convent,” called perhaps at first “the convent of Jabesh-Gilead,” and afterwards simply “the convent,” meaning the convent of Yabes or Jabesh. About two hours or six miles from Ed-Deir, on the old road to Bethshan, and about twenty-one miles north of Amateh, on an elevated plateau in the side of the mountains of Gilead, immediately above the plain of the Jordan. and about 1000 feet above the level of that plain, almost directly opposite to, or to the east of Bethshan, and immediately above Sukuit, or ancient Succoth, in the plain below, is an ancient site with extensive ruins, called *Tubukat Fahel*, or *Tubukat Felah*, as Dr. Thomson’s Arab guide called it, who insisted upon this being the true name (*Land and Book*, 2:176). This no doubt is Pella. The Arabs pronounce it *Fella*, or *Felah*, as they have no *p* in their language. and use for *b* for *p*. The place is described by Porter as a low flat *tell*, in a nook among higher hills, having around it on the north, west, and south a narrow plain, with a ravine on its south side intersecting the plain. The *tell* and a part of the plain are covered with ruins-veritable remains of an ancient and important city. Columns of the Doric, Ionic, and Corinthian orders were observed by Irby and Mangles in 1818. Portions of the walls are still standing, and the line of streets is here and there traceable. Among the ruins are the remains of an ancient Christian church. The plain stands out like a *terrace* in the side of the mountains; hence its modern name, “the Terrace of Pella” (Porter, *Handbook*, p. 318).

The origin of Pella, like that of Gerasa, is not known. But it is said that some Macedonian veterans from the armies of Alexander the Great settled there under the Seleucidae, and named their new home after Pella of Macedon. *Fahel*, or *Felah*, however, may be the form of an earlier Arabic or Hebrew name, which the Greeks converted into Pella. The place was taken by Antiochus the Great, in the year B.C. 218 (Polyb. v. 70, 12). It was afterwards destroyed by the Jews under Alexander Jannasus, because the inhabitants refused to conform to the Jewish rites and customs (Josephus, *Ant.* 13:15, 4). It was built again, however, and afterwards taken by Pompey, who restored it to its former inhabitants (*Ant.* 14:4, 4); and it finally became the head or capital of a toparchy or district. But what makes Pella specially interesting is the fact that it formed the refuge and home of the Christians of Jerusalem during the siege and destruction of that city by the Romans (see Baier, *De Christianorum migratione in Pellam*, Jen. 1694). The disciples had been directed by their divine Master

to “flee into the mountains” (Matthew 24:16), and to this place in the mountains of Gilead, we are told, they retired (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* 3:5). If the name of the place be of Hebrew origin, its meaning would be, *hidden, secret, wonderful, severed, set apart, escape or deliverance*, and a very suitable description would it be, as if it had been providentially intended by anticipation, of the *hiding-place* of the Lord’s people, where his *hidden ones* dwelt in the *secret* place of the Most High, and were safe until the calamities of those times were passed; where the *secret* of the Lord was with them that feared him, and his dealings with them so *wonderful*; where he *severed* between his servants and the rest of the nation, and *set apart* the godly for himself; and where they that *escaped* out of Jacob, the remnant that was to inherit his holy mountains. found *deliverance*. The view of the surrounding country from the place is very charming, and the waters of Pella are celebrated. In the ravine on the south side of the city or *tell* is a large and beautiful fountain, which sends forth a fine, clear, and copious stream down the valley called Wady Mafiz, or the valley of the banana or plalntain, now full of tamarisks and oleanders, into the plain of the Jordan. The fountain is of such copiousness as to show it at once to be the famous fountain of Pella spoken of by ancient authors. In the early ages of Christianity, Pella became an episcopal city, but it seems to have been destroyed at or immediately after the conquest of Syria by the Saracens (Reland, *Palaest.* p. 924 sq.). See Schumacher, *Pella* (Lond. 1888).

Pellegrini, Andrea

a Milanese painter, who flourished in the last part of the 16th century, is commended by Lomazzo. Pellegrini executed some works for the churches, particularly the choir of S. Girolamo.

Pellegrini, Felice

an Italian painter, was born at Perugia in 1567. He studied under Federigo Baroccio, under whose able instruction he became a correct and skillful designer. He was invited to Rome by pope Clement VIII to assist ill the works going on in the Vatican. On his return to his native city he executed some good works for the churches. He died in 1630.

Pellegrini, Francesco

an Italian painter mentioned by Baretti, flourished about 1740 at Ferrara, and had studied under Giovanni Battista Cozza. Pellegrini executed a number of works for the churches of Ferrara, among which is a picture of the *Last Supper*, in S. Paolo; and another of *St. Bernardo*, in the cathedral.

Pellegrini, Girolamo

an Italian painter, flourished at Rome, according to Zanetti, in 1674. None of his works are mentioned at Rome, but he was employed at Venice, where he executed several frescos on a large scale for the churches. which Lanzi says indicate a painter sufficiently elevated, though not very select, varied, or spirited in his forms.

Pelleprat, Pierre

a French missionary, was born in 1606 at Bordeaux. Admitted to the Society of Jesus, he taught philosophy and theology in several colleges of the order. At Paris his talents in the pulpit soon gained him a reputation. In 1639 he embarked for the missions, and, after having visited several houses of the society, went to Mexico, where he sojourned eleven years. He died April 21, 1667, at La Puebla de los Angeles (Mexico). We have of his works, *Prolusiones oratorio* (Paris, 1644, 8vo), a collection of discourses: — *Relation des Missionas des Jisuites dans les iles et dtns la terre ferme de l'Aqnrique meridionale* (ibid. 1655, 8vo): — *Introduction a la langue des Galibis, sauvages de l'Amerique mnridicnale* (ibid. 1655, 8vo), a rare work. See Sottwell, *Bibl. scriptor. Soc. Jesu*; Brunet, *Manuel du libr.*; A. et A. de Backer, *Biblioth. descriv. de la Compagnie de Jesus*, 3^e serie.

Pellerwoinen

the god of plants among the Finns.

Pellew, George, D.D.,

dean of Norwich and rector of Chart, was born in Cornwall, England, in 1793. He was a son of admiral Sir Edward Pellew, G.C.B. He was educated at Eton and at Corpus Christi College, Oxford; received holy orders in 1817; became in 1823 dean of Norwich; and later, in 1829, rector of Chart. His death took place at Great Chart, Kent, Oct. 13, 1866. He was an accomplished scholar, and published among other works *The Life of*

Lord Sidmouth, and several volumes of *Sermons*. See Appleton's *Amer. Cyclop.* 6:599.

Pellican, Konrad Kirsner,

a noted German divine of the Reformation period, was born at Ruff bach, in the Rhenish province of Alsatia, in 1478. He was kept at school in his native place until he was fifteen years old, when his parents, who were poor, sent him to an uncle at Heidelberg to study there. But in 1493 he was deprived of all help, and he entered the Order of Cordeliers. Some time after he returned to Heidelberg, and thence went to Tubingen, where his success in study commanded great admiration. His proficiency in Hebrew was indeed surprising. He was a great favorite of the learned Franciscan — general Paul(us) Scriptoris, and while traveling found a companion in the converted Jew Pffersheim, who presented him with a copy of the Hebrew prophets Isaiah, Ezekiel, and the minor ones. Although he had never studied Hebrew, he yet, by the aid of Reuchlin's rules on Hebrew conjugations simply, applied himself to its acquisition with such zeal that by the end of three months he had finished reading it, selected the roots, and arranged them in the form of a concordance. In the last-named work, however, he had the help of a Jew from Spain, Matthaus Adriani. In the year 1501 Pellican was ordained presbyter. In that year he lost his parents, and on the occasion he transcribed the seven penitential psalms in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin. to which he subjoined many appropriate prayers. The year following he received the degree of D.D. at Basle, and was made divinity lecturer at the Minorite convent. About this time he assisted in the preparation of Augustine's works for the press. In 1517 he went to Rome on business for his order, and was in that city impressed with the corrupt condition of the papacy, just as Luther had been, whose reformatory steps Pellican could therefore most heartily approve. Returning to Basle, he assumed again, in 1519, the guardianship of his Franciscan cloister there. In 1522 he became acquainted with OEcolampadius, and was soon suspected of reformatory tendencies. Thus in this very year, at a chapter of the order in Leonberg, in Suabia, and at another in Basle, he was constantly inquired about and watched by one Satzger, the provincial of the order. But as the senate of Basle interceded in Pellican's behalf, no measures of censure were put in force against him. Shortly after he was, together with OEcolampadius, made lecturer in divinity, and as he dared to expound the Scriptures and to adopt reformatory measures, he was sorely persecuted and maligned, as were all Reformers. So long as he had

remained a friar he had been universally esteemed for his learning and integrity; but when it pleased God to convince him of the errors and absurdities of the papal Church, and he began publicly to expose them, he was directly made the object of its hate and persecution. In 1526, having at the request of Zwingli gone to Zurich for the purpose of hearing the lectures of Leo Judat on Hebrew, he there renounced popery, and was soon after married. A little while later he was by Zwingli's interest made a professor of Greek and Hebrew at Zurich, and he evinced his fitness for the position by the publication of an edition of the Hebrew Bible, with the comments of Aben-Ezra and R. Salamon (1527). In his first lectures on the 15th chapter of Exodus, he thanked God who had brought him out of the Egyptian and papistic captivity, helped him to pass the Red Sea, and sing the song of Miriam with joy — "Sing ye to the Lord, for he has triumphed gloriously." He diligently applied himself also to the study of the Turkish language, that he might be useful to some who had become his neighbors, by efforts for their conversion to the Christian faith. During the thirty years that he was professor at Zurich, he was universally admired for his extensive learning and unwearied labors. He died in 1556, and was succeeded in his position by the illustrious Peter Martyr. His works consist principally of lectures and annotations upon the Scriptures, translations from the Greek, Latin, Hebrew, and Chaldee; also an exposition of several books of the Old and New Testaments, together with a translation from Ludovicus Vives, designed to convince the Jews of the truth of Christianity. His most important publications are, *Psalterium Davidis ad Hebraicam veritatem interpretatum, cum scholiis brevissimis* (Strasburg, 1527, 8vo); the Zurich edition of 1532, in 8vo, is more carefully prepared and more complete: — *Commentarii Bibliorum cum vulgata editione, sed ad Hebraicam lectionem accurate emendata* (Zurich, 1531-36, 5 vols. fol.). Richard Simon says of this work: "He keeps to the literal sense, and does not lose sight of the words of his text. Though well read in rabbinical authors, he seeks more to be useful to his readers than to display his rabbinical lore. He considers it safest to borrow nothing from the Jews but grammatical observations." The characteristics of Pellican were sincerity, candor, uprightness, and humility, rendering him eminent in public life, and in private most amiable. See, besides the chronicle of his life which he has himself written, Fabricius, *Oratio hist. de vita Pellicani* (1608); Hess, *Pellican's Jugendesichte* (1795); Hottinger, *Altes u. Neues aus der Gelehrtenwelt*; Merle d'Aubigne, *Hist. of the Ref. in Switzerland*; Adam, *Vita theol. German.* 1:126 sq.; Hagenbach, *Vater u. Begründer der ref.*

Kirche; Ersch u. Gruber, *Allgemeine Encyclopadie*; Middleton, *Evangel. Biogr.* 2:60.

Pellicia, Alexius Aurelius,

an Italian theologian of note, was born at Naples in 1744, and was educated at the high school of his native place. When only twenty-one years old, and shortly after graduation, he translated Tillemont's *Life of Christ* into Italian, and enriched it with learned notes. Two years later he was teacher of liturgy at the Conference, and at twenty-seven was appointed professor of ethics and archaeology at his alma mater. A year later he wrote a dissertation on the obligation of the Church to the State. This was followed by other learned dissertations; but his chef d'aevre is *De Christianae ecclesie primae, mediae, et novissimae tatis politia libri iv* (Naples, 1777, 3 vols. 8vo; new ed. by Ritter [Colossians 1829], with add. by Brown, in 1838), which is one of the best archaeological works written by Romanists. He died in 1823.

Pelling, Edward, D.D.,

an English divine, flourished in the second half of the 17th century. He was a graduate of Cambridge University, and was vicar of St. Helen's, London, in 1674; rector of St. Martin's, Ludgate, in 1678; canon of Westminster in 1683, and subsequently rector of Petworth. He died about the opening of the 18th century. He published *A Discourse, philosophical and practical, on the Existence of God* (Lond. 1696-1705, 2 pts. 8vo), and many occasional *Sermons* (1679-1703). some of which were in opposition to the doctrines of the Church of Rome. See Watts, *Bibl. Brit.* s.v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Pellini, Andrea

an Italian painter, was born at Cremona probably near the opening of the 16th century. Very little is known of his personal history. He is supposed to have been a scholar of Bernardino Campi. Lanzi says that "Pellini, though unknown in his native city Cremona, is celebrated at Milan for his *Descent from the Cross*, in the church of S. Eustorgio." This is a grand composition, correctly designed and well colored, dated 1595.

Pellini, Marc' Antonio

an Italian painter, was born, according to Orandi, at Pavia in 1664. He first studied under Tommaso Gatti at Pavia, and afterwards visited Bologna and Venice for improvement. He executed a few works for the churches in his native city, but did not rise above mediocrity. He died in 1760.

Pellisson-Fontanier, Paul

a noted French character of the reign of king Louis XIV, a renegade from the Huguenots, and the principal government agent for the conversion scheme of the Protestants through *bribery*, was born at Beziers in 1624. He was deprived of his father at an early age, and was educated by his mother in the principles of the Reformed Church. His family had for a long time been distinguished in the profession of the law, and to that profession he was also destined. He studied successively at Castres, Montauban, and Toulouse, and acquired an intimate knowledge of the best classical writers, and of French, Spanish, and Italian literature. To the study of civil law and jurisprudence he especially devoted himself; the fruits of this shortly afterwards appeared in a paraphrase of the Institutes of Justinian, which was published at Paris in 1645. He commenced his legal career with considerable success at Castres, but it was soon interrupted by a most severe attack of small-pox, which permanently affected his sight, and so disfigured him that he was compelled to abandon the practice of his profession. He retired into the country, and devoted himself to general literature. In 1652 he settled in Paris, where his writings had already made him advantageously known. The French Academy, in acknowledgment of the services he had rendered it by writing its history (the work perhaps by which he is best known), decreed that he should be appointed a member of it on the first vacancy that should occur, and that in the mean time he should be permitted to attend their sittings: to enhance the honor, they further decided that a similar privilege should on no consideration be granted in future to any man of letters. The same year Pellisson purchased the office of secretary to the king; and in 1657 he was appointed first clerk to the minister of finances. In this employment, where vast sums of money passed through his hands, he maintained his reputation for integrity, while his increased means enabled him to render pecuniary services to the distressed men of letters in the capital. His services were rewarded with the appointment, in 1660, to the office of state counselor. The following year, when the minister was found guilty of defalcation, Pellisson, as the

supposed confidant of the minister. was imprisoned in the Bastille. He remained upwards of four years in captivity. During this imprisonment he composed three memoirs in behalf of Fouquet, which have been reckoned the finest models of that species of writing in the French language. They became however the plea for additional severity towards Pellisson. In order to increase the rigor of his confinement, he was deprived of the use of ink and paper, the want of which compelled him to have recourse to divers ingenious expedients, such as writing on the margin of his books with the lead of the casements. The persevering influence of his friends was at length successful in restoring him to liberty; and he was even received into favor by a king whose characteristic was seldom to forgive any opposition to his despotic will. The sufferings Pellisson had undergone at the Bastille were compensated by a pension and the appointment of historiographer to the king. In 1670 he abjured Protestantism for the Roman Catholic faith. This change, followed soon after by his entrance into holy orders, enabled Louis XIV to bestow upon him the abbacy of Gimont and the priory of St. Orens, a benefice of considerable value in the diocese of Auch. However, he is favorably distinguished from most proselytes by the lenient and tolerant disposition which he evinced towards those who disagreed with him in opinion, and, when high in royal favor, he publicly disapproved and opposed by his influence and writings the violent measures which were employed by the king's command to bring his Protestant subjects within the pale of the Roman Church. He persuaded his royal master to empower him to use money as he might see fit for the conversion of the Huguenots; and, as the king consented, Pellisson became the advocate of the policy of bribing the Nonconformists into the Church's fold. He communicated with the bishops, and placed in their hands sums of money, with instructions to employ them in indemnifying persons who might abjure heresy for any loss they sustained, or might imagine they sustained, by taking that step. Of course the plan worked well, for there are always many whom gold will tempt. and it is not at all surprising that Madame de Maintenon could write in 1683, "M. Pellisson works wonders... He may not be so learned as M. Bossuet, but he is more persuasive. One could never have ventured to hope that all these conversions would have been obtained so *easily*" (sic). "I can well believe," she writes in another place, "that all these conversions are not equally sincere; but God has numberless ways of recalling, heretics to himself. At all events, their children will be Catholics. If the parents are hypocrites, their outward submission at least brings them so much nearer to the truth; they bear the signs of it in common with the faithful. Pray God

to enlighten them all; the king has nothing nearer to his heart” (*Lettres et Memoires de Mme. de Maintenon*, 8:90). In 1671, on the occasion of the reception of the archbishop of Paris as member of the Academy, he delivered a panegyric on Louis XIV, which was translated into the Latin, English, Spanish, Portuguese, Italian, and even Arabic languages. In 1673, having incurred the displeasure of Madame de Montespan, he was deprived of his office of royal historiographer; but, at the special request of Louis, he continued to write the life of the king, and for that purpose accompanied him in several of his campaigns. Nearly every succeeding year of Pellisson’s life was marked by some instance of royal favor. His death took place at Versailles in February, 1693. The fact of his not receiving the sacrament in his last moments has been explained by the Roman Catholic writers to be owing to the suddenness of his death; by Protestants to his unwillingness to sanction, by a solemn act of hypocrisy, a conversion which they allege to be insincere. The arguments on both sides will be found impartially stated by Bayle (art. “Pellisson”). It may reasonably be supposed that Pellisson was never truly won over to the Church of Rome, and that he professed conversion for selfish purposes. His efforts to win over Protestants was only to give them advantages of which he saw them deprived, and to avoid persecution. He corresponded with Leibnitz regarding the question of religious toleration, and laid down his views in *Reflexions sur les differences en matiere de Religion*— (1686). See Weiss, *Histoire des Refugies Protestants de France* (Paris, 1863, 12mo), p. 65 sq., especially p. 78; Jervis, *Hist. of the Church of France*, 2:63 sq.; Smiles, *Hist. of the Huguenots after the Revocation* (see Index).

Pelloma

an ancient Roman deity, was believed to ward off the attacks of the enemy.

Pelloutier, Simon

a French historian, was born at Leipsic, Germany, Oct. 27, 1694. His father, a merchant established at Lyons, had been driven from France by the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. Aided by an excellent memory and a strong desire to educate himself, he studied at Halle, at Berlin, and Geneva. Admitted to the evangelical ministry, he served the French churches of Buchholtz (1715), of Madgeburg (1719), and of Berlin (1725), where he was the colleague of Lentant. In 1743 he was elected member of the Academy of Sciences at Berlin, and was chosen for its librarian in 1745. He

died at Berlin Oct. 3, 1757. His principal work is, *Histoire des Celtes et particulièrement des Gaulois et des Germains depuis les temps fabuleux jusqu'à la prise de Roze par les Gaulois* (La Haye, 1740-1750, 2 vols. 12mo). This edition is full of faults; Chiniac de la Bastide has given a second, revised and enlarged after the MSS. of the author (Paris, 1771, 2 vols. 4to, or 8 vols. 12mo), which was translated into German by Purmann (Frankfort, 1777-1784, 3 vols. 8vo). "This work," says the *Journal des Savants*, "is very curious and agreeable in many respects; it is full of an extremely varied erudition. The author, not satisfied with proving what he advances, always accompanies his proofs with judicious reflections, from which he afterwards draws very extended conclusions, calculated to throw light upon the history and antiquities of all the different peoples of Europe." The editor has added to the *Histoire des Celtes* several dissertations by Pelloutier; among others the *Discours sur les Galates*, which gained for him in 1742 a prize from the French Academy of Inscriptions. See Brucker, *Pinacotheca*, dec. 3, No. 9; Formey, *Eloges*; Haag, *La France Protestante*.

Pelon

SEE PELONITE. (below)

Pel'onite

(Heb. with the art. *hap-Peloni'*, **יְהוֹנָתָן** as if from a place or man *Pelon*. otherwise unknown; Sept. n **ὁ Φελωνί** v. r. **ὁ Φαλλωνί**, ^{<13127>}1 Chronicles 11:27; **ὁ Φελλωνί**, ^{<13136>}1 Chronicles 11:36; **ὁ ἐκ Φαλλοῦς**, ^{<13710>}1 Chronicles 27:10; Vulg. *Phalonites*, *Phelonites*, *Phallonites*). Two of David's mighty men, Helez and Ahijah, are called Pelonites (^{<13127>}1 Chronicles 11:27, 36). From ^{<13710>}1 Chronicles 27:10 it appears that the former was of the tribe of Ephraim, and "Pelonite" would therefore be an appellation derived from his place of birth or residence. But in the Targum of rabbi Joseph it is evidently regarded as a patronymic, and is rendered in the last-mentioned passage "of the seed of Pelan." In the list of ^{<1021>}2 Samuel 23 Helez is called (ver. 26) "the Paltite," that is, as Bertheau (on ^{<13110>}1 Chronicles 11) conjectures, of Beth-Palet, or Beth-Phelet, in the south of Judah. But it seems probable that "Pelonite" is the correct reading. SEE *PALTITE*. "Ahijah the Pelonite" appears in ^{<10234>}2 Samuel 23:34 as "Eliam the son of Ahithophel the Gilonite," of which the former is a corruption; "Ahijah" forming the first part of "Ahithophel," and

“Pelonite” and “Gilonite” differing only by **p** and **g** - If we follow the Sept. of 1 Chronicles 27, the place from which Helez took his name would be of the form Phallu, but there is no trace of it elsewhere, and the Sept. must have had a differently pointed text. In Heb. **yn&P]** *peloni*, as an appellative, corresponds to the Greek **ὁ δεινα**, “such a one:” it still exists in Arabic and in the Spanish *Don Fulano*, Mr. So-and-so.

Pelopeia

a festival observed by the people of Elis in honor of Pelops. It was kept in imitation of Hercules, who sacrificed to Pelops in a trench, as it was usual, when the manes and the infernal gods were the objects of worship.

Pelops

in Greek mythology, the grandson of Zeus and the son of Tantalus, was slain by his father, and served up at an entertainment which he gave to the gods, in order to test their omniscience. They were not deceived, and would not touch the horrible food; but Ceres, being absorbed with grief for the loss of her daughter, ate part of a shoulder without observing. The gods then commanded the members to be thrown into a caldron, out of which Clotho brought the boy again alive, and the want of the shoulder was supplied by an ivory one. According to the legend most general in later times, Pelops was a Phrygian, who, being driven by hos from Sipylos. came with great treasures to the peninsula which derived from him the name of Peloponnesus, married Hippodamia, obtained her father’s kingdom by conquering him in a chariot-race, and became the father of Atreus, Thyestes, and other sons. But in what appear to be the oldest traditions. he is represented as a Greek, and not as a foreigner. He was said to have revived the Olympic games, and was particularly honored at Olympia.

Peloria

a festival observed by the Thessalians in commemoration of the news which they received by one *Pelorius* that the mountains of Tempe had been separated by an earthquake, and that the waters of the lake which lay there stagnated had found a passage into the Alpheus, and left behind a vast, pleasant, and most delightful plain, etc.

Pelt, Anton Friedrich Ludwig

a German theologian, was born at Regensburg June 28, 1799, and was educated first at Btickeburg and Altona, and then at the universities in Jena. Kiel, and Berlin. At the last named high school he became "Privatdocent" in 1826, in 1829 was made extraordinary professor at Greifswalde, and in 1835 regular professor at Kiel. After the subjugation of Schleswick-Holstein by the Danes, Pelt was dismissed, and he was made university professor at Greifswalde, and given the living of Kemnitz, near by. He died in 1861. His principal work is *Theologische CEncyklopadie als System in Zusammenhanrge mnit der Geschichte der theol. Wissenschaft u. uhrer einzelnen Zweige* (Hamb. and Gotha, 1843). Besides, he published, *Conmentar zu den Thessalonischen Briefen* (1829): — *Der Kanmpf Clas dem Glauben* (1837), a reply to Strauss; and, with Rheinwald, *Homiliarium patristicunt* (Berl. 1829, 4 Nos.), which, unfortunately, was never completed. He also founded in Kiel in 1838 the periodical *Mitarbeiten*.

Pelte

(Lat. *Peltanus*), THEODORE ANTOINE DE, a Belgian theologian, was born in 1552 at Pelte, a department of Liege. He assumed the dress of a Jesuit, and taught Greek and Hebrew at Ingolstadt, then theology at Augsburg. He died in that city May 2, 1584. Besides different treatises of controversy, we have of his works. *Paraphrasis et scholia in Proverbia S.lomnonis* (Antw. 1606, 4to); and he translated from the Greek into Latin *Coticilii Ephesinii prinmi acta* (Ingolstadt, 1576, eol.): — *Gracorumn xviii Patrum- homiliae in prcecipua festa* (ibid. 1579, 8ro): — the *Commentaires* of Andre of Caesarea, of Victor of Antioch, etc. See Foppens, *Bibl. Belgica*; Kobold, *Lexicon*.

Pelton, Samuel

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Montgomery, Orange County, N.Y., March 25, 1776. He received his education in a classical school at Montgomery, studied theology privately, was licensed by Hudson Presbytery, and ordained by the same in 1816 as pastor of the Church at Hempstead, N.Y., and subsequently of the Church in Haverstraw, N.J. He died July 10, 1864. Mr. Pelton was a man of strong mind, a ready preacher, and a good pastor. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1866, p. 160.

Pelusiotae

(from *πηλός*, *mud*), a name applied by the *Origenists* in the 3d century to the orthodox Christians, denoting that they were earthly, sensual, carnally minded men, because they differed from them in their apprehension of spiritual and heavenly bodies.

Pelvert, Bon-Francois Riviere

(called *the abbi*), a French theologian, was born Aug. 5, 1714. He was a member of a community of clergymen formed in the parish of Saint-Germain-l'Auxerrois, and was admitted to orders by Bossuet, bishop of Troyes, who procured him, besides several benefices, a theological chair in his seminary. Dismissed by bishop Poncet de la Riviere, he retired to the community of Saint-Josse at Paris, and in 1763 assisted at the Council of Utrecht. His refusal to adhere to the formulary prevented him from performing any ecclesiastical duty. He died in Paris Jan. 18, 1781. His principal writings are, *Dissertations sur l'approbation necessaire pour administrer le sacrement de penitence* (1755, 12mo): — five *Lettres sur la distinction de la religion naturelle et de la religion revelee* (1769-70, 2 vols. 12mo): — six *Lettres on l'on examine la doctrine de quelques ecrivains modernes celntre les incredules* (1776, 2 vols. 12mo); directed against the Jesuits Delamare, Floris, Paulian, and Nonnotte: — *Dissertation sur la sacrifice de la messe* (1779, 12mo), which drew him into a sharp controversy with Plowden, and were followed by a *Defense* (1781, 3 vols. 12mo): — *Exposition et Comparaison de la doctrine des anciens e dedes nouveaux philosophes* (1787, 2 vols. 12mo), in which the necessity of revelation is established. Abbe Pelvert edited the treatise *De Gratia* of the abbe Gourlin (1781, 3 vols. 4to), and left a large number of manuscripts. See Frere, *Biblioy. Normande*, vol. ii; Feller et Weiss, *Biog. Univ.* s.v.

Pelvicula Amularum

is a term applied to the metal stands for the *cruets* (q.v.).

Pemberton, Ebenezer

(1), a Congregational minister, was born about 1661, and was educated at Harvard University, where, after graduation, he taught for a while. Aug. 28, 1700, he became pastor of the Boston "Old South Church," and

remained in that place until his death, Feb. 13, 1717. He published a number of *Sermons*, three prefatory *Epistles*, etc. (1710-19; published collectively in 1727, 8vo). His *Election Sermon* of 1710 was highly esteemed. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 1:250.

Pemberton, Ebenezer

(2), a Congregational minister, son of the preceding, was born in 1704, in Boston. He graduated at Harvard College in 1721; served for some time as chaplain at Castle William, and in 1727 became pastor of the Presbyterian Church in New York, where he labored until 1753, when he resigned, and was installed pastor of the Middle Street Church, Boston, March 6, 1754, and there remained until it was closed by the Revolution in 1775. Though one of the most popular preachers of his time, his friendship for governor Hutchinson, one of his flock, caused an imputation of disloyalty, and created difficulties in the Church. He died in Boston Sept. 15, 1777. He published, *Sermons on several Subjects, preached in the Presbyterian Church in New York* (1738): — *Dudleian Lecture* (1766): — *Salvation by Grace through Faith; Eight Sermons preached at Boston* (1774); and a few occasional *Sermons* (1731-71). See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 1:336.

Pemberton, Israel

(1), a Quaker preacher of great usefulness, was the son of Phineas Pemberton, one of the early settlers of Pennsylvania, and was born in Bucks County of that state in 1684. He was apprenticed to a merchant in Philadelphia, and subsequently became one of the most considerable merchants of that city. He took an active part in the public affairs of the province, and was for nineteen years a member of the General Assembly. Having been trained religiously, he sustained through life an unblemished character by his justice, integrity, and uprightness. He was endowed with a peculiar sweetness of disposition, which rendered his company agreeable and instructive. He also devoted himself to the ministration of the truth, and approved himself a faithful elder, manifesting by his meekness and humility that, having submitted himself to the discipline of the cross, he was qualified to counsel others in the way of holiness. While attending the funeral of an acquaintance, he was seized with a fit, supposed to be apoplexy, and expired in about an hour, Jan. 19, 1754. See Janney, *Hist. of Friends*, 3:334.

Pemberton, Israel

(2), a Quaker philanthropist, was brother of James and John, and grandson of Phineas, who came over with Penn, and settled near the Falls of Delaware. ISRAEL, his grandson, a man of eloquence and liberality, devoted the latter part of his life to acts of benevolence, especially to the Indians. He died at Philadelphia in 1779, aged 63 years.

Pemberton, John

a devoted Quaker preacher, a native of Philadelphia, and brother of the preceding, was born Nov. 27, 1727. John was early interested in the Gospel labors of his society, and traveled much both in this country and in Europe in the service of his divine Master. His first visit to Europe was in company with John Churchman, in the year 1750; his second was undertaken in 1782, and occupied him until 1789. His return to his relatives and friends after so long an absence was exceedingly gratifying to them all; but this pleasure was abated by the early discovery that he came home under a burdened mind, from an apprehension that his duty was not fully performed, which occasioned so great distress and conflict as sometimes to affect his bodily health. In his disposition he was modest; yet when his duty led him among the great and distinguished, his manner was plain, solid, and dignified. To the different ranks of sober people he was open and communicative. To the poor he addressed himself with great tenderness and condescension, and might indeed be said to have been the poor man's confiding counselor and friend. Like his Lord and Master, he went about continually doing good. He embarked for Amsterdam in the spring of 1794, and on his arrival in that city engaged in religious labors which occupied him some weeks. He then proceeded towards Pymont, in Westphalia, Germany, where there was a monthly meeting of Friends. At Bielefeld he was taken ill with a fever; yet he recovered sufficiently to travel, and reached Pymont early in the ninth month. He remained in that vicinity about four months, being in very poor health, yet most of the time occupied in religious labors. He died Jan. 31, 1795. See Janney, *History of Friends*, 4:80.

Pemble, William

a learned Calvinistic English divine, was born in 1591; educated at Magdalene College, Oxford; removed to Magdalene Hall in 1613, and there became a noted divinity reader and tutor. He appears to have been a

good Hebrew scholar, and employed his learning very advantageously in explanations of obscure passages of Scripture, and thorough expositions of the first nine chapters of Zechariah and the book of Ecclesiastes. He was a famous preacher, a good orator, an excellent scholar, and an ornament to society. He died in 1623. His works were published at London in one vol. fol. (1635; 4th ed. Oxford, 1659), and embrace: *Vindiciae Fidei, or a Treatise of Justification by Faith; A Treatise of the Providence of God; Salomon's Recantation and Repentance, or the Book of Ecclesiastes explained; The Period of the Persian Mhonarchy, wherein sundry Places!of Ezra, Nehemiah, and Daniel are clenared; A short and sweet Exposition upon the first Nine, Chapters of Zecharie; Sermon on* ~~4659~~1 Corinthians 15:19, 20; *Introduction to the worthy Receiving of the Lord's Supper; Five godly and profitable Sermons; A Summe of Moral Philosophy.* See Wood, *Athenae Oxon.*; Bickersteth, *Christian Student*; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliogr.* s.v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* s.v.

Pembroke, Anne

Countess of, a noted English lady philanthropist. was the daughter and sole heir of George Clifford, earl of Cumberland. She was born at Skipton Castle, in Craven, in 1589. To endowments naturally of a high order she added all those accomplishments which her high rank and extensive wealth brought within her reach. According to bishop Rainbow, "she could discourse with virtuosos, travelers, scholars, merchants, divines, statesmen, and good housewives in any kind." But she preferred "the study of those noble Berceans, and those honorable women who searched the Scriptures daily; with Mary, she chose the better part of hearing the doctrine of Christ." She was twice married: her first husband was Richard, earl of Dorset; her second, Philip, earl of Pembroke and Montgomery. She survived the latter forty-five years, during which time she employed herself in a constant series of good works, extensive charities, and generosity to learned men; also in erecting sacred edifices, a noble hospital, and many other stately buildings, both for the honor of her family and for the public good. While she was exemplary in her own religious observances, she was careful also that none of her servants should be remiss or negligent in that respect. In her intercourse with others she was condescending, and ever strove to obliterate from their minds any consciousness of inferiority. She died in 1674.

Pen

(**f** [*et*, ^{<1802>}Job 19:24; ^{<1951>}Psalms 45:1; ^{<2408>}Jeremiah 8:8; 17:1; and **frj** , *cheret*, ^{<2301>}Isaiah 8:1) properly means a *style* or *reed*. The instruments with which characters were formed in the writing of the ancients varied with the materials to be written upon. The proper pen was made of *reed*, *calamus*, hence a *reed pen* (^{<2404>}Jeremiah 36:4; 3 John, 13). This was perhaps the most ancient pen for writing on soft materials; and it is still used by the Turks, Syrians, Persians, Abyssinians, Arabs, and other Orientals, as their languages could not be written without difficulty with pens made like ours from quills. Upon tablets of wax a metallic pen or *stylus* was employed. In engraving- upon hard substances, such as stone, wood, or metallic plates, “an iron pen,” or graver of iron or copper, was employed (^{<1802>}Job 19:24). **SEE INK; SEE REED; SEE WRITING.** From the size and general appearance of some of the ancient reeds, as preserved in pictures found at Herculaneum, we may perceive how easily the same word (**fbç**, *shebet*) might denote the scepter or badge of authority belonging to the chief of a tribe, and also a pen for writing with. For although the two instruments are sufficiently distinct among us, yet, where a long rod of cane, or reed perhaps, was (like a general’s truncheon. or baton, in modern days) the ensign of command, and a lesser rod of the same nature was formed into a pen and used as such, they had considerable resemblance. This may account for the phraseology and parallelism in ^{<1754>}Judges 5:14:

***“Out of Machir came down governors (legislators);
Out of Zebulun they that hold the shebet of writers.”***

The ancients also used styles to write on tablets covered with wax. The Psalmist says (^{<1951>}Psalms 45:1), “My tongue is the pen of a ready writer.” The Hebrew signifies rather a style, which was a kind of bodkin, made of iron, brass, or bone, sharp at one end, the other formed like a little spoon, or spatula. The sharp end was used for writing letters, the other end expunged them. The writer could put out or correct what he disliked, and yet no erasure appear, and he could write anew as often as he pleased on the same place. On this is founded that advice of Horace, of often turning the style, and blotting out, “a Sape stylum vertas iterum, quae digna legi sint scripturus.” Scripture alludes to the same custom (^{<1213>}2 Kings 21:13), “I will blot out Jerusalem as men blot out writing from their writing tablets.” I will turn the tablets, and draw the style over the wax, till nothing appear-not the least trace. Isaiah (^{<2301>}Isaiah 8:1) received orders from the

Lord to write in a great roll of parchment, with the style of a man, what should be dictated to him. It is asked, What is meant by this style of a man? It could not be one of these styles of metal; they were not used for writing on parchment. It is probable that the style of a man signifies a manner of writing which is easy, simple, natural, and intelligible. For generally the prophets expressed themselves in a parabolical, enigmatical, and obscure style. Here God intended that Isaiah should not speak as the prophets, but as other men used to do. Jeremiah says (²⁴⁸⁸Jeremiah 8:8) the style of the doctors of the law is a style of error; it writes nothing but lies. Literally, "The pen of the scribes is in vain." They have promised you peace, but behold war. He says, "The sin of Judah is written with a pen of iron and with the point of a diamond. It is graven upon the table of their heart," or engraven on their heart, as on writing tablets. The Hebrew says, a graver of *shamir*.

Penal Laws

are statutes enacted for the secular punishment of those who are supposed to be in religious error. Thus the laws against Nonconformists in England were as follows:

1. An act for well governing and regulating corporations, 13 Car. II, c. 1. By this act all who bore office in any city, corporation, town, or borough were required to take the oaths and subscribe the declaration therein mentioned, and to receive the sacrament of the Lord's Supper according to the rites of the Church of England. This turned the dissenters out of the government of all corporations.

2. The Act of Uniformity, 14 Car. II, c. 4. By it all parsons, vicars, and ministers, who enjoyed any preferment in the Church, were obliged to declare their unfeigned assent and consent to everything contained in the *Book of Common Prayer*, etc., or be *ipso facto* deprived; and all schoolmasters and teachers were prohibited from teaching youth without license from the archbishop or bishop, under pain of three months' imprisonment.

3. An act to prevent and suppress seditious conventicles, 16 Car. II, c. 4, in which it was declared unlawful to be present at any meeting for religious worship, except according to the usage of the Church of England, where five besides the family should be assembled. The first and second offenses were made subject to a certain fine, or three months' imprisonment on

conviction before a justice of the peace on the oath of a single witness; and the third offense, on conviction at the sessions, or before the justices of assize, was punishable by transportation for seven years.

4. An act for restraining Nonconformists from inhabiting in corporations, 17 Car. II, c. 2. By it all dissenting ministers who would not take an oath therein specified against the lawfulness of taking up arms against the king on any pretense whatsoever, and that they would never attempt any alteration of government in Church and State, were banished five miles from all corporation towns, and subject to a fine of £40 in case they should preach in any conventicle.

5. Another act to prevent and suppress seditious conventicles, 22 Car. II, c. 5. Any persons who taught in such conventicles were subject to a penalty of £'20 for the first, and £40 for every subsequent offense; and any person who permitted such a conventicle to be held in his house was liable to a fine of £20; and justices of peace were empowered to break open doors where they were informed such conventicles were held, and take the offenders into custody. **6.** An act for preventing dangers which might happen from popish recusants, commonly called the Test Act, whereby every person was incapacitated from holding a place of trust under the government, without taking the sacrament according to the rites of the Church of England."

It may be added that in Scotland, about 1568, it was enacted that every examinable girl or stripling must communicate in the parish church or pay a fine. In 1600 and in 1641 fines were imposed on all non-communicants above fifteen years of age. Dr. Lee prints a portion of a session record, in which occurs the following: "Megget, spous to Thomas Clark, in Rosline, and Helen Denholme, spous to James Clerk, yr, for not communicating at this last communion, confess it, and credit them never to omit the said occasion, and payet 10s. Aug. 22. — Two men in Roslin, for not communicating, were penitent, and payed everie ane of them 4s. 6d." Severe laws were enacted against papists or trafficking priests, and again, against all who would not conform to prelacy in the days of the Stuarts. Ministers were banished and forbidden to preach, and torture from the thumbkin and boot in many cases was resorted to. Protestant penal laws against papists are as bad in principle as popish penal laws against Protestants. As late as 1700, in Scotland, a statute was sanctioned by king William to the following effect: It re-enacts a great number of the old acts

which make the hearing of mass a capital offense, imposes fines and imprisonment upon every man who should harbor papists, or sell them books, or remove their children out of the country without the authority of the presbytery. It then goes on to state at great length:

- 1.** That every one who shall seize a popish priest in the country shall receive a reward from government: and if the priest shall attempt to conceal his profession, he shall be banished; and if he should return, be put to death.
- 2.** If any person whatever shall be found in a place where there are any of the vestments or images used in popish worship, and refuse to purge himself of popery, he shall be banished, with certificate of death if he should return.
- 3.** That the children of papists shall be taken from them by their Protestant relations.
- 4.** No papist shall purchase land; and should he do so, and the seller come to the knowledge of the fact, he shall retain both the price and the land, and the papist shall have no redress.
- 5.** That no papist, above fifteen years of age, shall inherit any property left to him by another; and when he comes to fifteen years of age, if he does not then become a Protestant, it shall be again taken from him.
- 6.** That it shall not be in the power of any papist to sell and dispone any heritable property whatever.
- 7.** That no money can be left to any Roman Catholic institution.
- 8.** That if any person apostatize from Protestantism to Romanism, he shall forfeit his estate to his next Protestant heir.
- 9.** That no papist can be a curator, a factor, a schoolmaster, a teacher of any kind whatever.
- 10.** That no Protestant shall keep a domestic servant who is a papist.
- 11.** The presbytery of the bounds has power to apply the oath of purgation, which was as solemn and inquisitorial as man could frame it.

When will men learn that the forcible repression of opinion is not the way to change it? When it was proposed to alter some of those last penal laws.

Scotland rose in terrible uproar, and the first attempt had to be abandoned. Those who enjoyed freedom themselves would not allow it to others; those who had smarted under popery made it smart in turn, for they had not learned the lesson of toleration. *SEE TOLERATION.*

Penalosa, Juan De

a Spanish historical painter, was born at Baeza in 1581. He was one of the ablest scholars of Pablo de Cespedes at Cordova, and assiduously imitated his style. He painted some works for the churches, but more for the convents. His picture of *St. Barbe*, at the cathedral of Cordova, is said to be a magnificent performance, executed entirely in the style of his master. Penalosa died in 1636.

Penalties Of The Mosaic Law.

In this the controlling principle was the simple and natural, and therefore in early times general, one of recompense or revenge (Wachsmuth, *Hellen. Altersth.* 2:118), the *lex talionis* (see Rothmaier, *Jus Talionis*, Jen. 1700; comp. Polyb. v. 9, 6), which was directed even against beasts (^{<0213>}Exodus 21:23 sq., 28; ^{<0347>}Leviticus 24:17 sq.; ^{<0596>}Deuteronomy 19:16 sq.; comp. ^{<0005>}Genesis 9:5; ^{<1219>}1 Kings 21:19), and the kindred notion of compensation for private trespasses (^{<0236>}Exodus 21:36; 22:1, 3; ^{<0116>}2 Samuel 12:6). The design of deterring men from wrong by terror was held in view (^{<0573>}Deuteronomy 17:13; 19:20; 21:21); but this should not (with Michaelis, *Mos. Recht*, v. 6 sq.; and Kleinschrod, *Peinl. Recht*, 2:138) be pressed too far, although it cannot be (with Welker, *Letzte Griinde*, p. 292) wholly denied. This principle of revenge is found also in the ancient legislation of the Greeks, Romans, and Egyptians (on the last, see esp. Diod. Sic. 1:75). The particular penalties among the Israelites consisted in death, stripes, imprisonment, and in the payment of sums of money, which were either fixed by the law (^{<0219>}Deuteronomy 22:19,29), or left to the determination of the injured party (^{<0212>}Exodus 21:22), or took the place of certain personal penalties (ver. 29 sq.), for the redemption of which in this way provision had been made. The penalty of banishment does not appear in the Mosaic law; for the phrase "cut off from among his people" cannot be thus understood, *SEE EXECUTION*; nor is such a punishment at all in the spirit of the theocratic law. The accidental killing of a man led to temporary exile, but within a free city of the Holy Land itself. All these penalties bear an unmistakable air of mildness, in view of the crimes against

which they are denounced and the character of the people, and especially when compared with those inflicted by other ancient nations (e.g. the Egyptians, Diod. Sic. 1:77). Nor did they bring infamy upon the criminal, for punishments involving social and civil degradation were unknown to the Mosaic law. They were also free from torture; nor was this admitted even in the case of an inquisition until the time of the Herods (Josephus, *Ant.* 16:8, 4; 10, 3; 17:4, 1). Josephus, indeed (*Apion*, 2:30), speaks of the Mosaic penalties as more severe than those inflicted among other nations. But this is merely comparative. The freedom of the Mosaic laws from torture will appear the more to its honor if we remember that the most civilized nations have only begun to refrain from it, and to punish the worst criminals with simple death, in very recent time (Abegg, *Lehrb. d. Straffrechstwissensch.* p. 187). The pardoning power, with which the administration of justice is associated in modern states, accords with this character of punishment; but prescription, in the criminal law (*praescriptio criminis*), corresponds merely to the ancient right of blood-revenge. Of a gradation of penalties, increasing with each repetition of the offense, the Mosaic law knows nothing (comp. Abegg, *Op. cit.* p. 230), but it appears in the criminal jurisprudence of the later Jews (Mishna, *Sanhedr.* 9:5). The expiation by children of the offenses of their parents is nowhere ordered in the law, although it was usual among other ancient nations (Cicero, *Ad Brnut.* 15). On the contrary, ^{<1246>}Deuteronomy 24:16 directly opposes this practice (comp. ^{<1246>}2 Kings 14:6; ^{<1254>}2 Chronicles 25:4). But in ^{<1172>}Joshua 7:24 some understand that the whole family were sharers in the guilt. (But **SEE ACHAN**. Keil's remarks on the passage are childish.) It may be seen from ^{<1316>}2 Kings 9:26 that lawless tyranny sometimes punished children with the father; but the children in the case of Naboth were heirs, and Ahab's main design could not be fulfilled while they remained alive (1 Kings 21). 'The punishment of whole nations at the will of an individual (see ^{<1716>}Esther 3:6) is a work of Oriental despotism, of which examples have been witnessed even in modern times (Arvieux, 1:391 sq.). The only exception was the case of the children of insolvent debtors, who were made bondmen by hard-hearted creditors (^{<1241>}2 Kings 4:1; ^{<1185>}Matthew 18:25). The threat in ^{<1216>}Exodus 20:5 has nothing to do with civil jurisprudence (see Wegner's *Interpretatio* of the passage, Viteb. 1790).

There remains for examination the vexed question, which has an important bearing on the determination of the date of the crucifixion, whether the criminal trials and executions of the Jewish authorities could take place on

the Sabbath and high feast-days. There can be no doubt, in the nature of the case, that offenders could be arrested on these days, and that it was done appears from ^{<417>}John 7:32; ^{<418>}Acts 12:3. But it cannot be shown from the Mishna (*Sanhedr.* 88. 1) that sessions of the Sanhedrim were held on such days. *SEE PASSOVER*. They certainly were not then usual (*Mishna, Join Tob*, v. 2); and even on the preceding day they were avoided, if possible, lest in any way they should be held over into the Sabbath. It appears also from ^{<419>}Acts 12:4 that condemnation, where possible, was postponed until after the festivals. But that executions were held during the feast cannot be doubted (*Mishna, Sanhedr.* 11:4; comp. ^{<572>}Deuteronomy 17:12, 13). Yet we cannot suppose that the Sabbath, or a feast-day which was regarded as a Sabbath, could be chosen for such a purpose (see esp. Bleek, *Beitr. zur Evangelienkritik*, p. 140 sq.). *SEE PUNISHMENT*.

Penance

(Lat. *penitentia*) is the outward profession of sorrow, as *repentance* (q.v.) is the principle and inward feeling of sorrow for sin. The word is used in a *negative* and a *positive* sense. In a negative sense penance is manifested in the neglect of ordinary attention to dress, to the care of the person, to the use of food. In a positive sense the word is used to designate the performance of some *acts* of ecclesiastical discipline, enjoined or authoritatively imposed either as a punishment for offenses by which the party has exposed himself to the censures of that ecclesiastical body called the Church, or as an expression of his penitence. For the sake of affording a historical treatment of the subject, we shall first consider the views and practices of the early Christian Church. (A pretty full account is given by Bingham. *Origines Ecclesiae*, and a more concise one by Coleman, *Ancient Christianity Exemplified*, and upon these we shall mainly depend in the first part of this article.)

Penance

in the Christian Church, is an initiation of the discipline of the Jewish synagogue, or, rather, it is a continuation of the same institution. Excommunication in the Christian Church is essentially the same as expulsion from the synagogue of the Jews; and the penances of the offender, required for his restoration to his former condition, were not materially different in the Jewish and Christian churches. The principal

point of distinction consisted in this, that the sentence of excommunication affected the civil relations of the offender under the Jewish economy; but in the Christian Church it affected only his relations to that body. Neither the spirit of the primitive institutions of the Church, nor its situation, or constitution in the first three centuries, was at all compatible with the intermingling or confounding of civil and religious privileges or penalties. The act of excommunication was at first an exclusion of the offender from the Lord's Supper and from the *agapae*. The term itself implies separation from the communion. The practice was derived from the injunction of the apostle (^{<481>}1 Corinthians 5:11): "With such a one no not to eat." From the context, and from ^{<480>}1 Corinthians 10:16-18; 11:20-34, it clearly appears that the apostle refers, not to common meals and the ordinary intercourse of life, but to these religious festivals. Examples of penitence or repentance occur in the Old Testament; neither are there wanting instances, not merely of individuals, but of a whole city or people, performing acts of penitence-fasting, mourning, etc. (Nehemiah 9 and Jonah 3). But these acts of humiliation were essentially different, in their relations to individuals, from Christian penance. We have, however, in the New Testament an instance of the excommunication of an offending member, and of his restoration to the fellowship of the Church by penance, agreeably to the authority of Paul (^{<481>}1 Corinthians 5:1-8; ^{<485>}2 Corinthians 2:511). This sentence of exclusion from the Church was pronounced *by the assembled body*, and in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. By this sentence the offender was separated from the people of the Lord, with whom he had been joined by baptism, and was reduced to his former condition as a heathen man, subject to the power of Satan and of evil spirits. This is perhaps, the true import of delivering such a one up to Satan. A similar act of excommunication is described briefly in ^{<481>}1 Corinthians 16:32: "If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be anathema maranatha." The **μαρὰν ἄθά** corresponds in sense with the Hebrew **מַרְיָ**, and denotes a thing devoted to utter destruction. It is only the SyroChaldaic **hta anrm** expressed in the Greek character, and means, "The Lord cometh." The whole sentence implies that the Church leaves the subject of it to the Lord, who cometh to execute judgment upon him. All that the apostle requires of the Corinthians is that they should exclude him from their communion and fellowship, so that he should no longer be regarded as one of their body. He pronounces no further judgment upon the offender, but leaves him to the judgment of God. "What have I to do to judge them that are without?" (ver. 12), i.e. those who are not Christians, to which class the excommunicated person

would belong. “Do not ye judge them that are within?” i.e. full members of the Church. But them that are without God judgeth; or, rather, *will judge*, κρινεῖ, as the reading should be. It appears from ~~2~~2 Corinthians 2:1-11, that the Church had not restored such to the privileges of communion, but was willing to do so, and that the apostle very gladly authorized the measure. It is important to remark that in the primitive Church penance related only to such as had been excluded from the communion of the Church. Its immediate object was, not the forgiveness of the offender by the Lord God, but his reconciliation with the Church. It could, therefore, relate only to open and scandalous offenses. *De occultis non judicat ecclesia* — the Church takes no cognizance of secret sins — was an ancient maxim of the Church. The early fathers say expressly that the Church offers pardon only for offenses committed against her. The forgiveness of all sin she refers to God himself. “Omnia autem,” says Cyprian (*Ep.* 55), “remissimus Deo omnipotenti, in clujus potestate sunt omnia reservata.” Such are the concurring sentiments of most of the early writers on this subject. It was reserved for a later age to confound these important distinctions, and to arrogate to the Church the prerogative of forgiving sins. The readmission of penitents into the Church was the subject of frequent controversy with the early fathers and ancient religious sects. Some contended that those who had once been excluded from the Church for their crimes ought never again to be received to her fellowship and communion. But the Church generally was disposed to exercise a more charitable and forgiving spirit. During the severe persecutions which the Christians suffered in the early ages of the Gospel, many, through fear of tortures and death, apostatized from the faith. It frequently happened, after the danger was past, that these persons were desirous of returning to communion with the Church; but they were not readmitted to communion until they had made a public confession of their offense. In this manner confession began to be a part of ecclesiastical discipline; and being thus, in the first instance, applied to a crime of a public nature, it was afterwards extended to private sin. *SEE CONFESSION*. Besides the shame of public confession, the offending party was compelled to submit to public reproof, to acts of penance, to exclusion from the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, and to the temporary suspension of all the privileges of a Christian. *SEE PENITENTS*.

During the 4th and 5th centuries numerous councils were held for regulating the nature and duration of ecclesiastical censures, and for

settling the degree of discretionary power to be vested in bishops for the purpose of relaxing and shortening them, according to the circumstances of the case. As public confession was soon found to be attended with many inconveniences, offenders were permitted to confess their sins privately, either to the bishops themselves or to priests deputed by them to hear such confessions. When the punishment, which was still public, though the sin remained secret, was finished, the penitent was formally received into the Church by prayer and imposition of hands. In the 5th century public penance was submitted to with difficulty and reluctance; and it was thought expedient to allow penance, in certain cases, to be performed in monasteries, or in some private place, before a small select number of persons. This private penance was gradually extended to more and more cases; and before the end of the 7th century the practice of public penance for private sins was entirely abolished. Strenuous opposition was made to this at first, but the laxer custom prevailed. About the end of the 8th century penance began to be commuted: in the room of the ancient severities, prayers, masses, and alms were substituted; and in process of time the clergy of the Romish Church gained such an ascendancy over the minds of the people as to persuade them that it was their duty to confess all their sins, however private or heinous, to the priests, who had power to prescribe the conditions of absolution (q.v.).

The nature and origin of *private penance* is a subject of controversy between Roman Catholics and Protestants; the former contending that it had existed from the first, and that it held the same place even in the ages of public penance for *secret sins* which the public penance did for public offenses. At all events, from the date of the cessation of the public discipline, it has existed universally in the Roman Church. (See below.) According to Protestants, penance has no countenance whatever from Scripture, and is contrary to some of the most essential principles of the Christian religion; particularly to the doctrine of justification by faith in Jesus Christ alone, on the ground of his complete or “finished” work; penance being, in fact, founded on a doctrine of at least supplementary atonement by the works or sufferings of man — the sinner himself. The outward expressions of humiliation, sorrow, and repentance common under the Jewish dispensation, are regarded as very consistent with the character of that dispensation, in which so many symbols were employed. It is also held that the self-inflicted austerities, as fasting, sackcloth and ashes, etc., of Jewish and earliest Christian times, had for their sole

purpose the *mortification* of unholy lusts and sinful passions, in the people of God; or the expression of sorrow for sin, so that others beholding might be warned of its evil and restrained from it; all which is perfectly consistent with the principles of Christianity, if kept within the bounds of moderation and discretion. But penance in any other view, as a *personal exercise*, is utterly rejected. Arguments founded on the meaning of the two Greek words *μετανοέω* and *μεταμέλομαι*, both translated in our English version *repent*, are much urged by many Roman Catholic controversialists, the former being represented as equivalent to the English *do penance*; but this is condemned by Protestants as inconsistent with the very use of the words in the New Testament itself. That penance began, as a practice, very early in the Christian Church, is not only admitted by Protestants, but is alleged in proof of the very early growth of those corruptions which finally developed themselves in the doctrines and practices of the Roman Catholic Church, and of which Protestants also hold that there are plain intimations in the New Testament, not only prophetic, but showing the development of their germs to have already begun during the age of the apostles.

In the Romish Church penance is affirmed to be “truly and properly a sacrament, instituted by Christ our Lord, for the benefit of the faithful, to reconcile them to God as often as they shall fall into sin after baptism” (*Council of Trent*, sess. 14, can. i). To receive this sacrament three things are necessary: *first*, sorrow for sins committed, along with a purpose to commit them no more; *secondly*, an entire confession of all the sins committed; *thirdly*, the performance of the penance enjoined by the confessor. By penance, as ordinarily employed, at least in Protestant literature, is meant not the entire sacrament, but *the satisfaction or the doing of the penance imposed by the priest after confession*. According to Roman theology, by the atonement of Christ and the absolution of the confessor only the eternal punishment of sin is remitted. Where the penitent has intense contrition the temporal punishment is also remitted. But ordinarily the temporal penalties remain to be suffered either in this life or in purgatory. “Whoever,” says the Council of Trent, “shall affirm that the entire punishment is always remitted by God, together with the fault, and therefore that penitents need no other satisfaction than faith, whereby they apprehend Christ who has made satisfaction for them, let him be accursed.” Penance, accordingly, is imposed upon the sinner, not only to atone for the punishment due, but also to cure the bad effects left by sin. If penance be not performed in this life, the penalties remain to be suffered in purgatory

(q.v.), unless they are remitted by indulgence (q.v.). Besides fasting, alms, abstinence, which are the general conditions of penance in the Romish Church, there are others of a more particular kind, such as the repeating of a certain number of Ave Marias, paternosters, and credos, the wearing of hair shirts, self-flagellation, etc. The acts of the penitent are stated to be the matter, as it were (*quasi materia*), of this sacrament, the form of which resides in the words of absolution (*Ibid.* sess. 14, cap. 3). The following is the manner in which public penance is inflicted in the Romish Church, according to Gratian (*Decret.* pars i, Dist. 1, c. 64, p. 290, Paris, 1612):

“On the first day of Lent the penitents present themselves before the bishop, clad in sackcloth, with naked feet, and eyes cast down on the ground. This was to be done in the presence of the principal clergy of the diocese, by whom the penitents were introduced into the church, where the bishop, weeping, and the rest of the clergy repeated the seven penitential psalms. Then, rising from prayers, they threw ashes upon the penitents, and covered their heads with sackcloth, declaring to them, with mournful sighs, that as Adam was ejected from Paradise, so must they be turned out of the Church. The bishop then commanded the officers to turn them out of the church doors; and all the clergy followed after, repeating the curse pronounced upon Adam: ‘In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread’ (~~GEN~~ Genesis 3:19). A similar penance was inflicted upon them the next time the sacrament was administered, which was the Sunday following. All this was done to the end that the penitents, observing in how great a disorder the Church was by reason of their crimes, should not lightly esteem of penance.”

In the Roman Catholic so-called Douai version of the Scriptures the term *penance* is generally substituted for *repentance*. Thus, e.g. “Except ye repent,” etc., is rendered “Except ye *do penance*;” and in ~~AMP~~ Matthew 2:2 we have not n” Repent,” but “Do *penance*, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand;” and again in ~~AMP~~ Mark 1:4: “John was in the desert baptizing and preaching the baptism of *penance* for the remission of sins.” **SEE REPENTANCE.**

Dens, in his *System of Divinity*, divides penances into three classes: vindictive, medicinal or curative, and preservative. All satisfactory works he regards as included under the three kinds—prayer, fasting, and alms. “The following,” says this Romish divine, “can be enjoined under the head of prayer once, or oftener, either for many days or weeks, namely:

1. To say five paternosters and five Ave Marias, in memory of the five wounds of Christ, either with bended knees or outstretched arms, or before a crucifix.
2. To recite the rosary, or Litanies of the blessed Virgin Mary, or of the saints. etc.
3. To read the psalm *Miserere*, or the seven penitential psalms.
4. To hear mass, or praises. or preaching.
5. To read a chapter in Thomas a Kempis.
6. To visit churches, to pray before the tabernacle.
7. At stated hours, in the morning, evening, during the day, or as often as they hear the sound of the clock, to renew orally or in the heart ejaculatory prayers, acts of contrition or charity, such as 'I love thee, O Lord, above all things;' 'I detest all my sins: I am resolved to sin no more;' 'O Jesus, crucified for me, have mercy on me,' etc
8. At an appointed day to confess again, or, at any rate, to return to the confessor. To fasting may be referred whatever pertains to the mortification of the body, so that a perfect or partial fast can be enjoined.
 - (1) Let him fast (*feria sexta*) on the sixth holy day, or oftener.
 - (2) Let him fast only to the middle of the day.
 - (3) Let him not drink before noon, or in the afternoon, unless at dinner or supper, though he may be thirsty; let him abstain from wine and from *cerevisia forti*.
 - (4) Let him eat less, and take in the evening only half the quantity.
 - (5) Let him rise earlier from bed; let him kneel frequently and for a long period; let him suffer cold, observe silence for a certain time, and abstain from sports and recreations, etc.

To alms is referred whatever may be expended for the benefit of our neighbor. (1) To give money, clothes, food, etc. (2) To furnish personal assistance, to wait on the sick, to pray for the conversion of

sinner, etc., and other works of mercy, whether corporeal or spiritual.”

As we have just seen, the Church of Rome affirms “penance” to be a “sacrament,” instituted by Christ himself, and secret “confession” to be one of its constituent parts, instituted by the divine law; and she anathematizes those who contradict her: the Church of England denies “penance” to be a sacrament of the Gospel, affirms it to have “grown of the corrupt following of the apostles,” and “not to have” the proper “nature of a sacrament,” as “not having any visible sign or ceremony ordained by God,” and of course denies the ‘ sacramental character of “confession.” The Church of Rome pronounces that, by the divine law, “all persons” must confess their sins to the priest: the Church of England limits her provisions for confession to “sick persons.” The Church of Rome pronounces that all persons are “bound” to confess; the Church of England directs that the sick “be moved” to make confession. The Church of Rome insists upon a confession of “all sins whatsoever;” the Church of England recommends “a special confession of sins.” if the sick person “feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter.” The Church of Rome represents penance as instituted for reconciling penitents to God “as often as they fall into sin after baptism,” and imposes confession “once a year;” the Church of England advises it on a peculiar occasion. The purpose of the Church of England in so advising it evidently is the special relief of a troubled conscience; whereas the Church of Rome pronounces it to be “necessary to forgiveness of sin and to salvation;” and denounces with an anathema “any one who shall say that confession is only useful for the instruction and consolation of the penitent.” Penance, then, according to the ecclesiastical law of England, is a punishment affecting the body of the delinquent, by which he is obliged to give a public satisfaction to the Church for the scandal he has given by his example. Instead of the ancient discipline practiced against offenders, the United Church of England and Ireland at present contents herself with an office “called a commination. or denouncing of God’s anger and judgments against sinners,” which is annually read on Ash-Wednesday after the morning service. In case of incest or of incontinency, the offending party is usually enjoined to do a public penance in the cathedral or parish church, or in the public market, barelegged and bareheaded, in a white sheet, and to make an open confession of his crime in a prescribed form of words. This penance is augmented or moderated according to the quality of the fault and the

discretion of the judge. In smaller faults and scandals a public satisfaction or penance, as the judge of the ecclesiastical court shall decree, is to be made before the minister, churchwardens, or some of the parishioners, respect being had to the quality and circumstances of the offense; as in the case of defamation or laying violent hands on a minister, or the like. As these censures may be modified by the judge's discretion, so also they may be totally altered by the commutation of penance, by the oblation of a sum of money for pious uses, which shall be accepted as a satisfaction of public penance. Anciently such commutation money was to be applied to the use of the Church, in the same manner as fines, in cases of civil punishment, are converted to the use of the public (Burn, *Eccles. Law*, 3:77, 80. See also Collier, *Eccles. Hist.* bk. iv).

In the discipline of all the other Protestant churches penance is now unknown. The nearest approach to the Roman Catholic polity on the subject was that in use among the English Puritans of the 17th century, and more particularly in the Church of Scotland during that and the succeeding century, when it was common "to make satisfaction publicly on the Stool of Repentance" (q.v.). As far back even as 1576 we find in the records of the General Assembly this enactment:

"The kirk ordaynes sic persones as are convict of incest or adulterie, and hes not stubbornly contemnit the admonitions of the kirk, nor sufferit the sentence of excommunication for their offenses, shall make publict repentance in sackcloth, at their own kirks, bareheaded and barefooted, three severall dayes of preaching, and after the said third day to be receavit in the societie of the kirk in their owne cloathes. The uthers that hes been excommunicat for their offenses shall present themselves, bareheaded and barefooted, sax preaching dayes, and the last, after sermone, to be receavit in their owne cloathes, as said is. Give they be excommunicat for their offenses, they shall stand bareheaded at the kirk doore, every preaching day, betwixt the assemblies, secluded from prayers before and after sermnone, and then enter in the kirk, and sit in the publick place bareheaded all the tyme of the sermons, and depart before the latter prayer. The uthers that are not excommunicat shall be placeit in the publick place where they may be knawne from the rest of the people, bareheaded, the tyme of the sermones, the minister remembering them in his prayer in the tyme after preaching; all the saids persons to bring their ministers' testimonialls to the next assembly of their behavior in the meantyme, according to the act made thereupon be the kirk in the 2d sessione, halden

July 7, 1569.” “No superintendent nor commissioner, with advyce of any particular kirk of their jurisdictione, may dispense with the extreamitie of sackcloath prescryvit be the acts of generall discipline for any pecuniall soume *ad pios usus*.”

These laws were impartially executed: peers and peeresses, as the earl and countess of Argyle, earl and countess of Arran — Arran being at the time prime minister — were laid under public censure. Felons were subjected to such discipline, and then executed.

It does not seem to have occurred to the Reformers or their more immediate successors in the Protestant churches that their system of discipline, with its public rebukes and enforced humiliations of various kinds — as the wearing of a sackcloth robe, and sitting on a particular seat in church — was liable to be interpreted in a sense very different from that of a mere expression of sorrow for sin; but. the belief is now very general among the most zealous adherents of their doctrinal opinions that in all this they adopted practices incongruous with their creed, and in harmony rather with that of the Church of Rome. Nor do they seem to have perceived that Church discipline (q.v.), in its proper sense, as relating to ecclesiastical rights and privileges, is wholly distinct from the imposition of penalties by churches or Church courts. Penitential humiliations, imposed by ecclesiastical authority, are now no more in favor where Church discipline is most strict than where the utmost laxity prevails. The commutation of penalties deemed shameful, for a fine to the poor of the parish, was an abuse once prevalent in Scotland, but never sanctioned by the higher ecclesiastical authorities.

See, besides Bingham and Coleman, Riddle, *Christian Antiquities*; Elliott, *Delineation of Romanism*; Killen, *Ancient Church*, p. 491 sq.; Siegel, *Christl. Alterthumer*, 1:192 and 286; Calvin, *Institutes*; Marshall, *Penitential Discipline*, p. 101 sq. (in Anglo-Catholic Library); *Jahrbf. deutsch. Theol.* 8:91 (1868); 2:355 sq.; Cramp, *Text-Book of Popery*; Willet, *Synop. Panpism*; Haag, *Histoire des Dogmes Chretiennes*; Hagenbach, *fist. of Doctrines*; Barnum, *Romanism*; *Theol. Rev.* v. 427; (*London Quarterly Review*, Jan. 1868 (Amer. edition), p. 55; and especially *Die Bussordnungen der abenzdlandischen Kirche*, by Dr. F. W. H. Wasserschleben (Halle, 1851, 8vo, 726 pp.). After a historical introduction, showing a most thorough survey of the whole subject in its original sources, all the penitentials and canons relating to penance in the

British, Irish, Anglo-Saxon, Frankish, and Spanish churches are given at length. It is a repertory, in fact, of penitential law—not in abstracts, but in a reprint of the original documents themselves.

Penates were certain inferior deities among the Romans, who presided over houses and the domestic affairs of families, and were called *Penates* because they were generally placed in the innermost and most secret parts of the house, “*in penitissima cedium parte, quod,*” as Cicero says, “*penitus insident.*” The place where they stood was afterwards called *penetralia*, and they themselves received the name of *Penetrales*. It was in the option of every master of a family to choose his Penates, and therefore Jupiter, and some of the superior gods, are often invoked as patrons of domestic affairs. According to some, the Penates were divided into four classes; the first comprehended all the celestial, the second the sea gods, the third the gods of hell, and the last all such heroes as had received divine honors after death. The Penates were originally the manes of the dead, but when superstition had taught mankind to pay uncommon reverence to the statues and images of their deceased friends, their attention was soon exchanged for regular worship, and they were admitted by their votaries to share immortality and power over the world, with Jupiter or Minerva. The statues of the Penates were generally made of wax, ivory, silver, or earth, according to the affluence of the worshipper, and the only offerings they received were wine, incense, fruits, and sometimes the sacrifice of lambs, sheep, goats, etc. In the early ages of Rome human sacrifices were offered to them; but Brutus, who expelled the Tarquins, abolished this unnatural custom. When offerings were made to them, their statues were crowned with garlands, poppies, or garlic; and, besides the monthly day that was set apart for their worship, their festivals were celebrated during the Saturnalia. Some have confounded the Lares and the Penates, but they were different.

Pendant

Picture for Pendant

(Lat. *pendens*, hanging) is a term common in architecture to designate

(1) a hanging ornament which was much used in the Gothic style, particularly in late perpendicular work, on ceilings, roofs, etc. On stone vaulting they are frequently made very large, and are generally enriched with moldings and carvings. Good specimens are to be seen in Henry VII’s

Chapel, Westminster; the Divinity School, Oxford; St. Lawrence, Evesham, etc. In open timber roofs pendants are frequently placed under the ends of the hammer-beams, and in other parts where the construction will allow of them. About the period of the expiration of Gothic architecture, and for some time afterwards, pendants were often used on plaster ceilings, occasionally of considerable size, though usually small.

(2) This name was also formerly used for the *spandrels* very frequently found in Gothic roofs under the ends of the tie-beams, which are sustained at the bottom by corbels or other supports projecting from the walls. In this position it is usually called a *Pendant-post*.

Pendentive

Picture for Pendentive 1

Picture for Pendentive 2

is an architectural term used to designate the portion of a groined ceiling supported by one pillar or impost, and bounded by the apex of the longitudinal and transverse vaults; in Gothic ceilings of this kind the ribs of the vaults descend from the apex to the impost of each pendentive, where they become united. It also denotes the portion of a domical vault which descends into the corner of an angular building when a ceiling of this description is placed over a straight-sided area; pendentives of this kind are common in Byzantine architecture, but not in Gothic.

Pendlebury, Henry

a Nonconformist divine, was born near ,the beginning of the 17th century. He was a minister at Holcomb, Lancashire, in 1651, and was ejected for nonconformity in 1662. He died in 1695. His works are, *Transubstantiation*: — *Barren Figtree*: — *The Books Opened*, on ^{Gen 12}Revelation 20:12: — *Invisible Realities*, etc., containing an account of his life: — *Sacrificium Missaticum, Mysterium Iniquitatis*, on the mass, with the author's life (Lond. 1768, 8vo). See Allibone, *Dictionary of British and American Authors*, 2:1549.

Peneius

a river-god among the ancient Thessalians, said to be the son of Oceanus and Tethys.

Penensus, F.

an engraver, probably an Italian, by whom there are some spirited etchings of devout subjects after Italian masters and from his own designs, marked with his name, among which are the *Holy Family*, with St. Catharine and an angel in the air, after Parmiggiano, and the *Marriage of St. Catharine*, from his own design. There is a fine expression in his heads, but he was negligent and incorrect in designing the extremities.

Penetralis

a surname applied to the different Roman divinities who occupied the penetralia or inner parts of a house. These deities were Jupiter, Vesta, and the Penates.

Penfield, Thomas

an American Christian philanthropist, was born at Savannah, Georgia. He died in 1834. His benefactions laid the foundation of the Mercer Institute, Green County, Georgia. Another monument of his charity is the Penfield Mariner's church, in Savannah, erected at a cost of eight thousand dollars. He also left a large property to other Christian charities, such as education, foreign and domestic missions, etc.

Peni'el

(Heb. *Penil'*, [אֵלֶּיךָ] *face of God*; Samar. [אֵלֶּיךָ]; Sept. εἰδος θεοῦ; Vulg. *Phanuel*, and so also the Peshito), the name which Jacob gave to the place in which he had wrestled with God: "He called the name of the place 'Face of El,' for I have seen Elohim face to face" ([אֵלֶּיךָ] Genesis 32:30). With that singular correspondence between the two parts of this narrative which has already been noticed under MAHANAIM, there is apparently an allusion to the bestowal of the name in 33:10, where Jacob says to Esau, "I have seen thy face as one sees the face of Elohim." In 32:31, and the other passages in which the name occurs, its form is changed to PENUEL ([אֵלֶּיךָ] *Penuel'*, apparently of the same signification). On this change the lexicographers throw no light. It is perhaps not impossible that Penuel was the original form of the name, and that the slight change to Peniel was made by Jacob or by the historian to suit his allusion to the circumstance under which the patriarch first saw it. The Samaritan Pentateuch has *Penuel* in all. The promontory of the Ras-el-Shukah. on the coast of Syria

above Beirfit, was formerly called Theouprosopon, probably a translation of Peniel, or, its Phoenician equivalent. The scene of Jacob's vision was evidently some spot on the north bank of the Jabbok, between that torrent and Succoth (comp. 32:22 with 33:17). This is in exact agreement with the terms of its next occurrence. It does not appear that there was any town or village upon the spot at the time of this wondrous event; but it was probably then marked by some rude cairn or stone to serve as a record of the divine presence. We hear no more of it for five hundred years. After the defeat of the Midianites in the valley of Jezreel, Gideon pursued them to their home in the eastern district. On reaching the fords of the Jordan at Succoth, he asked the people of that city to supply food to his fainting followers; they refused, "and he *went up thence to Penuel*, and spake unto them likewise" (^{<4088>}Judges 8:8). He probably ascended from the valley of the Jordan through the glen of the Jabbok, which falls into the Jordan a few miles below Succoth. This would bring him direct to the site of Peniel, on which a city appears to have been built in the interval. It was natural, and in accordance with Eastern custom, that a holy place such as Penuel should become the nucleus of a town. In the time of Gideon there was a *tower* (l dgm) at Peniel, which Gideon destroyed on his return from the conquest of the Midianites. It would seem too that the city was then completely depopulated (ver. 17). It may have remained a ruin till the days of Jeroboam, of whom we read that after taking up his abode in Shechem, he "went out from thence, and built Penuel" (^{<4125>}1 Kings 12:25). This was done, no doubt, on account of its commanding the fords of Succoth and the road from the east of Jordan to his capital city of Shechem, and also, perhaps, as being an ancient sanctuary. We hear no more of Peniel in Scripture. Josephus merely repeats the Scripture notices (*Ant.* 1:20, 2; 8:8, 4), as do Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast.* s.v. Fanuel). They do not appear to have known the exact site; and, indeed, Jerome represents the Penuel of Jacob, Gideon, and Jeroboam as distinct places.

Penington, Isaac

a distinguished and zealous preacher of the Society of Friends, was born in 1617. He was the son of Sir Isaac Penington, lord mayor of London; was married in 1648 to Mary Springett, widow of Sir William Springett, and mother of the wife of William Penn. Except when traveling in the discharge of his religious engagements, he resided on his estate, the Grange, at Chalfont, Buckinghamshire. From 1661 to 1670 he suffered imprisonment

for conscience' sake no less than six times. As this victim of persecution was a man of a remarkably meek and quiet spirit, though courageous in matters of religious principle, it is not unlikely that his republican parentage had some share in stimulating the unsleeping vigilance of the civil authorities. It is an interesting series of facts that Thomas Ellwood was domestic Latin tutor to Isaac Penington's children; that it was through the good offices of Penington and Dr. Paget that the amiable tutor obtained the honorable post of reader to John Milton; and that it was to Ellwood's suggestion that the world owes the inception of *Paradise Regained*. Penington died in 1679; at Goodnestone Court, Kent, and was buried at Jordans, in the county of Bucks, where his remains repose by those of William Penn. Of his numerous writings, which amount to more than eighty (principally expositions of his theological dogmas), a collection was published: *The Works of the Long Mournful and Sorely Distressed Isaac Penington*, etc. (1681, fol.). Among his productions are, *Light or Darokness, Displaying or Hiding Itself* (Lond. 1650, 4to): — *A Word for the Common Weal* (1650, 4to): — *The Fundamental Right, Safety, and Liberty of the People, briefly Asserted* (1651, 4to): — *Divine Essays* (1654, 4to): — *The Root of Popery Struck at* (1660, 4to): — *The Holy Truth and People Defended* (1672, 4to): — *His Testimony Concerning Church Government and Liberty of Conscience* (1681,4to). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* 2:1549; Thomas, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.; Webb, *The Penns and Peningtons of the 17th Century* (Lond. 1867).

Penington, John

eldest son of Isaac Penington, was born in Bucks County, England, in 1655. He died at Goodnestone Court, Kent; in 1710. He deserves consideration here as the defender of his father's theological views, in whose behalf he published two tracts, *Complaint* (1681): *Exceptions against W. Rogers's Strictures on Isaac Penington's Writings* (1695): — *Certificates on Behalf of S. Jennings* (1695), and five tracts (1695-97) in defense of the Quakers, in answer to the publications of George Keith (q.v.).

Penini, Jedaja, Ben-Abraham Bedrashi

a Hebrew poet of much celebrity, and a writer of great originality and research, was born at Barcelona, in Spain, in 1280, and died about 1340. He is the author of a few poetical compositions, which are more esteemed

for the ingenuity and studied labor of which they bear the marks than for any intrinsic poetical merit. For instance, in one of these poems every word begins with the letter M. He has a better right to the title of “Orator” given him by his brethren, while Christian writers have compared him to Seneca, Lactantius, and Cicero. He owes this honor to his celebrated work entitled **מלך תנין** (*Bechinath Olam*), “Examination of the World,” a discourse or letter concerning the vanity of all earthly things, and the seeking of the kingdom of God. The learned Philip Aquinas, an Israelite converted to Christianity in the 17th century, wrote a French translation of *itn*, *L’Examen du Monde* (Paris, 1629). Great praise has been bestowed on the work itself, and the way in which it is treated by its French translator, as well as by Buxtorf, who speaks of it as of “*liber insignis tam quoad res, quam quoad verba, ut eloquentissimus habeatur, quisquis styllum ejus imitatur.*” It was also translated into German by different translators, and into English in 1806, and lately in the *Hebrew Review*, edited by M. I. Raphall (Lond. 1835), 1:135 sq. Being a great advocate of philosophical studies, Penini vehemently opposed the sentence of excommunication pronounced by Ibn-Adereth, which forbade the study of philosophical works (excepting medicine) before the age of twenty-five years, and addressed a letter to him **תול חיי חבב תל** “Defence of the Study of Philosophy.” He also wrote, **בחזי וול** “the Wedge of Gold,” annotations on the Talmudic exposition of the Psalms (Midrash Tehillim): — An elucidation of Ibn-Ezra’s “Exposition on the Pentateuch” — The above-mentioned poem, a prayer in verse, every line commencing with the letter **m**, entitled **ממתי תבתי** translated into Latin by H. Prache (Leips. 1662), and into German by D. Ottenrosser (q.v.), Furth (1808), and B. W. Prerau (Vienna, 1803): — A commentary on the Psalms: — Compendium of the canons of Avicenna: — Annotations on the Talmudic treatises Midrash Rabboth, Tanchum, and Siphre: — Treatise on the intellect and imagination: — “The Selection of Pearls,” a collection of didactic sayings from the Greek and Arabic sages, since translated from the Arabic by rabbi Judah Ibn-Tibbon (q.v.). He is also said to have composed a work of some extent on the game of chess, under the title of **מלך המלך** “the Royal Delight.” See Furst, *Bibl. Judaica*, 3:71 sq.; De Rossi, *Dizionario storico degli autori Ebrei* (Ger. transl. by Hamburger), p. 257 sq.; Wolf, *Bibl. Tiebr.* 3:291; Gratz, *Gesch. der Juden* (Leips. 1873), 7:260 sq.; Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenth. u. s. Sekten*, 3:29; Zunz, *Zur Geschichte u. Literatur* (Berlin, 1845), p. 467 sq.; id. *Literaturgeschichte der synagogalen Poesie*

(ibid. 1865), p. 498; Lindo, *History of the Jews in Spain and Portugal* p. 112 sq.; Finn, *Sephardim*, p. 302 sq.; Da Costa, *Israel and the Gentiles*, p. 302 sq.; Etheridge, *Introduction to Hebrew Literature*, p. 266; Ginsburg, *Commentary on Ecclesiastes*, p. 61, where a few pieces of the *Bechinath Olam* are translated (Lond. 1861); Delitzsch, *Zur Gesch. de jüdischen Poesie* (Leips. 1836), p. 348; Cassel, *Leitfaden für jud. Geschichte und Literatur* (Berlin, 1872), p. 70. (B. P.)

Peninim

SEE RUBY.

Penin'nah

(Heb. *Peninnah'*, חַנְנִיָּה *coral*; Sept. Φεννώνα), one of the two wives of Elkanah, the father of Samuel, of whom we only know that she bore children to her husband, and was not very generous in her bearing towards the other wife, Hannah (¹Samuel 1:2). B.C. cir. 1125.

Penitence

(Gr. μετανοία; Lat. *penitentia*) is the older word for repentance (q.v.) used by the Vulgate, but replaced by *resipiscentia*, μεταμελεία, when the penitential scheme of the Latin Church was developed; for *poenitentia* then became restricted to the *act* of repentance, i.e. the performance of the penances of the confessional. SEE PENANCE. Penitence is an enduring and penal condition; for there is an evident etymological connection between *peana* and *punio*, both having their common origin ποινή, a “fine,” or “weregeld,” for blood. The old form, in fact, of *punio* was *pyenio*, and is so written by Cicero, “Cum multi inimicos mortuos poeniantur” (Tusc. 1:44, and MSS. in Mil. 31; also, Aul. Gell. VII, 3:54). Thus *moerus*, whence *pomrriunm*, for *murus*, from μοῖρα (quasi “allotment boundary”), *maenio* for *munio*; *paniceus* and *puniceus*, *paenicus* and *punicus*. “Poenitere” is explained as “pnoenam tenere” by the ancient author of the treatise *De vera et falsa Penitentia*, in the works of Augustine, with direct reference to *punio*. “Poenitere enim est poenam tenere, ut semper puniat in se ulciscendo quod commisit peccando. Poena enim proprie dicitur laesio quae punit et vindicat quod quisque commisit” (c. xix). Isidore of Seville gives the same definition, “A punitione poenitentia nomen accepit, quasi punitentia, cum ipse homo punit poenitendo quod male admisit;” which is followed by the schools:”

Pcenitentia quasi punitentia” (Hugo a S. Vict. *De Myst. Eccl.c.* iii.). Scotus slightly varies the definition, “quasi poenae tenentia.” Hence the idea of penitence involves a lasting remorse for sin — “yea, what revenge,” as St. Paul expresses it; and in this it is distinguished from the initiative repentance that leads to conversion and baptism. Thus *penitence* may be said to be a correlative term of *repentance*, as *renovation* is of *regeneration*.

Penitence is also used for a discipline or punishment attending repentance, more usually called *penance*. It also gives title to several religious orders, consisting either of converted debauchees and reformed prostitutes, or of persons who devote themselves to the office of reclaiming them. **SEE PENITENTS.**

Penitential

(*Codex Pmenitentialis*) is an ecclesiastical book in the Romish Church which contains everything relating to the imposition of *penance* (q.v.) and the reconciliation of penitents (q.v.). It appoints the time and manner of penance to be regularly imposed for every sin, and forms of prayer that are to be used for the receiving of those who entered upon penance, and reconciling penitents by solemn absolution; a method chiefly introduced in the time of the degeneracy of the Church. There are various penitentials, as the Roman Penitential, and the Penitentials of Bede, and of Theodore of Tarsus, archbishop of Canterbury, etc.

Penitential Priests

officers appointed in many ancient churches, when private confession was introduced, for the purpose of hearing confessions and imposing penances. The office originated in the time of the Decian persecution, and was abolished by Nectarins, bishop of Constantinople. The example of Nectarius was followed by all the bishops of the East, but the office was continued in the Western churches, chiefly at Rome. The Council of Lateran, A.D. 1215, ordered all bishops to have a penitentiary; and such a dignitary is still connected with most Romish cathedrals, whose duties, however, are quite different from those of the original penitentiary.

Penitential Psalms

These are usually reckoned seven. They are so called because they are regarded as specially expressive of sorrow for sin, and accepted by

Christian devotion as forms of prayer suitable for the repentant sinner. They are Psalms 6, 32, 39, 51, 102, 130, and 143 according to the A.V., which correspond with 6, 31, 37, 50, 101, 129, and 142 of the Vulgate. These Psalms have been set apart from a very early period, and are referred to as such by Origen (*Hom. ii in Leviticum*). Pope Innocent III ordered that they should be recited in Lent. They have a special place in the Roman Breviary, and more than one of the popes attached an indulgence to the recital of them. The most deeply penitential, and the most frequent in use, both public and private, is the 51st Psalm, or the *Miserere* (50th in the Vulgate.)

Penitentiary

is a word which has been variously applied.

(I.) In the early Christian Church it designated certain presbyters or priests, appointed in every church to receive the private confessions of the people; not in prejudice to the public discipline, nor with the power of granting absolution before any penance was performed, but in order to facilitate public discipline, by acquainting the people what sins were to be expiated by public penance, and to appoint private penance for such private crimes as were not proper to be publicly censured (Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* bk. 18, ch. 3). The office of general confessor, or penitentiary priest, in a diocese, mentioned by Sozomen and Socrates, was abrogated in the East by Nectarius of Constantinople in the reign of the emperor Theodosius. It subsists, however, to this day in the Romish Church, where the penitentiaries are of various rank and dignity. Thus there are,

- 1.** The cardinal grand penitentiary, who presides over the tribunal of the penitentiaries at Rome; and
- 2.** Penitentiary priests, established for the hearing of confessions in the three patriarchal churches at Rome, viz. those of the Vatican, the Lateran, and of Santa Maria Maggiore.
- 3.** Penitentiary priests, established in the cathedral churches for the purpose of absolving cases reserved to the bishops of the several dioceses. The Council of Trent (sess. 24, c. 8) decreed that every bishop should establish in his cathedral church a penitentiary, who must be either a master, a doctor, or a licentiate in theology or in the canon law, and of the age of forty years.

(II.) The term is applied among Protestants to such houses as have been established for the reception and reformation of females who have been seduced from the path of virtue. Of penitentiaries, in this sense, there are 63 in Great Britain and Ireland, capable of receiving 2657 inmates, besides numerous small private “Homes.” The single condition of admission to most of the institutions is “penitence,” a desire and endeavor to return to a virtuous life. The inmates remain in the strictest seclusion for periods varying from a few months to two years, the average time being about a year; they then return to their friends, or to situations provided for them. It is an invariable rule not to dismiss any one without seeing that she is provided with the means of honest subsistence. During their seclusion they are employed in needlework, washing, and housework. The ages at which they are received vary from fourteen to forty. In the metropolis there are 19 institutions, accommodating 1155 women; in other towns of England, 34 institutions, accommodating 1116; and in the chief towns of Scotland and Ireland, 10 institutions, with accommodation for 386. One third of the provincial and one half of the metropolitan establishments have been created in the last ten years. The oldest institution in existence is the London Magdalen Hospital, opened in 1758; the next, that of Dublin, 1767; Edinburgh follows in 1797; and none of the others date earlier than the present century. The results of these penitentiaries, as far as they can be ascertained, are excellent. During the last one hundred years, 8983 women have passed through the London Magdalen. This most important and useful institution is supported by voluntary contributions, patronized by royalty, and conducted on truly Christian principles, by means of which numbers of miserable outcasts have not only been recovered to the proprieties of moral conduct, but have given satisfactory evidence of genuine conversion to God.

(III.) In the United States the name, having been adopted by the Quakers of Pennsylvania in 1786, when they caused the legislature of that state to abolish the punishments of death, mutilation, and the whip, and to substitute solitary confinement as a reformatory process, is applied to all those prisons which are constructed on reformatory principles, whether the convicts be men or women. The happiest results have flowed from the efforts of the Prison Discipline Society directed to this point. *SEE PRISON REFORM.*

Penitents

(I) is a name for those members of the Church who, having offended the laws of God or the ecclesiastical canons, seek reconciliation. Penance (q.v.), in the primitive Church, as Coleman, from Augusti, remarks, was wholly a voluntary act on the part of those who were subject to it. The Church not only would not enforce it, but refused even to urge or invite any to submit to the penitential discipline. It was to be sought as a favor, not inflicted as a penalty. The offending party had, however, no authority or permission to prescribe his own duties as a penitent. When once he had resolved to seek the forgiveness and reconciliation of the Church, it was exclusively the prerogative of that body to prescribe the conditions on which this was to be effected. No one could even be received as a candidate for penance without permission first obtained of the bishop or presiding elder. The period of penitential probation differed in different times and places, but in general was graduated according to the enormity of the sin, some going so far in their rigor, *SEE NOVATIAN*, as, contrary to the clearly expressed sense of the Church, to carry it even beyond the grave. In the earlier ages much depended upon the spirit of each particular Church or country; but about the 4th century the public penitential discipline assumed a settled form, which, especially as established in the Greek Church, is so curious that it deserves to be briefly described. Sinners of the classes already referred to had their names enrolled, and were (in some churches, after having made a preliminary confession to a priest appointed for the purpose) admitted, with a blessing and other ceremonial, by the bishop to the rank of penitents. This enrollment appears to have commonly taken place on the first day of Lent.

The penitents so enrolled were divided into four distinct classes, called by the Greeks *προσκλαίοντες*, *ἀκροώμενοι*, *ὑποπίπτοντες*, and *συνιστάμενοι*; and by the *Latins flentes*, *audientes*, *substrati*, and *consistentes* — that is, the mourners or weepers, hearers, kneelers, and co-standers. The duties required of penitents consisted essentially in the following particulars:

1. Penitents of the first three classes were required to kneel in worship, while the faithful were permitted to stand.
2. All were required to make known their penitential sorrow by an open and public confession of their sin. This confession was to be made, not

before the bishop or the priesthood, but in the presence of the whole Church, with sighs and tears and lamentations. These expressions of grief they were to renew and continue so long as they remained in the first or lowest class of penitents, entreating at the same time in their behalf the prayers and intercessions of the faithful. Some idea of the nature of these demonstrations of penitence may be formed from a record of them contained in the works of Cyprian. Almost all the canons lay much stress upon the sighs and tears accompanying these effusions.

- 3.** Throughout the whole term of penance all expressions of joy were to be restrained, and all ornaments of dress to be laid aside. The penitents were required, literally, to wear sackcloth, and to cover their heads with ashes. Nor were these acts of humiliation restricted to Ash-Wednesday merely, when especially they were required.
- 4.** The men were obliged to cut short their hair, and to shave their beards, in token of sorrow. The women were to appear with disheveled hair, and wearing a peculiar kind of veil.
- 5.** During the whole term of penance, bathing, feasting, and sensual gratifications, allowable at other times, were prohibited.

Penitents

Picture for Penitents

(II). There are in the Roman Catholic Church several orders or *fraternities* (as they are called) *of penitents*, of both sexes. These are secular societies, who have their rules, statutes, and churches, and make public processions under their particular crosses or banners. Of these is said there more than a hundred, the most considerable of which are as follows:

- 1.** The White Penitents, of whom there several different bodies at Rome, the most ancient having been constituted in 1264 by Gonfalon, in the church of San major, in imitation of which four others were established in the church of Ara-Coeli. The habit of these penitents is a kind of white sackcloth, and on the shoulder is circle, in the middle of which is a red and white cross.
- 2.** Black Penitents, the most considerable of which are the Brethren of Mercy, were instituted in 1488 by some Florentines, in order to attend criminals during their imprisonment and at the time of their death. On the

day of execution they walk in procession before them, singing the seven penitential psalms and the litanies; and after they are dead they take them down from the gibbet and bury them. These penitents wear black sackcloth, and hence they are sometimes called *Friars of the Sack*. There are others whose business it is to bury such persons as are found dead in the streets: these wear a death's head on one side of their habit.

3. There are also blue, gray, red, green, and violet penitents, all whom are remarkable for little else besides the different colors of their habits.

4. Penitents or converts of the name of Jesus are a congregation of religious at Seville, in Spain, consisting of women who have led a licentious life. This monastery, founded in 1550, is divided into three quarters: one for professed religious, another for novices, and a third for those who are under correction. When these last give signs of a real repentance, they are removed into the quarter of the novices, where, if they do not behave themselves well, they are remanded to their correction. They observe the rule of St. Augustine.

5. Penitents of Orvieto are an order of nuns instituted by Antonio Simoncelli, a gentleman of Orvieto, in Italy. The monastery he built was at first designed for the reception of poor girls abandoned by their parents, and in danger of losing their virtue. In 1662 it was changed into a monastery, for the reception of such as, having abandoned themselves to impurity, were willing to reform and consecrate themselves to God by solemn vows. Their rule is that of the Carmelites.

6. The Order of Penitents of St. Magdalen was established about the year 1272, by one Bernard, a citizen of Marseilles, who devoted himself to the work of converting the courtesans of that city. Bernard was seconded by several others, who, forming a kind of society, were at length erected into a religious order by pope Nicholas III, under the rule of St. Augustine. Gesney says they also made a religious order of the penitents, or women whom they converted, giving them the same rules and observances which they themselves kept.

7. The Congregation of Penitents of St. Magdalen of Paris. By virtue of a brief of, pope Alexander, Simon, bishop of Paris, in 1497, drew them up a body of statutes, and gave them the rule of St. Augustine.

See *Hist. du Clerge seculier et regulier*, 1:361 sq.; 2:386; iii; 135, 249.
SEE MAGDALEN, RELIGIOUS ORDER OF.

Penknife

(*rpSbir [IT]* *tdar has-sopher*, ^{<462>}Jeremiah 36:23). The translation of this phrase by “penknife,” is substantially correct, but a more literal rendering, “the scrivener’s knife,” would have been preferable; this was used to sharpen the point of the writing-reed. **SEE KNIFE; SEE WRITING.**

Penn, Abram

M.D., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in the county of Patrick, Va., in the year 1803. In early life he studied medicine, but while he was absent at Philadelphia, attending lectures, his wife died, which was the cause of his awakening. He at once began to seek Christ, gave up the study of medicine, and returned home. Two years after he offered himself to the Virginia Conference, and was received on trial in 1825. He rose rapidly as a minister, and from his reception until broken down by disease he exhibited constancy, zeal, and a uniformity and depth of piety seldom manifested. He was eminently successful as a preacher, and enjoyed a popularity almost unbounded. His talents were not of the highest order, yet he possessed a clear, vigorous, and comprehensive mind, well stored with valuable information. With a graceful diction, rich imagination, and great zeal and earnestness of manner, he took a high position among the ministers of the Church. He was a devoted son of Methodism, an unflinching advocate of her doctrines and rights, of her polity and discipline. The leading feature of his character was a dauntless, straightforward honesty that needed no disguise for itself, and was impatient of dissimulation and disguise in other men. Yet there was in Dr. Penn a fountain of geniality that made his society peculiarly agreeable, and secured him the ardent attachment of many warm and admiring friends. He suffered much in the later years of his life with a most distressing affection of the heart. Many times it brought him to the very gates of death, but he would rally again, and go on in the path of duty and toil. At length disease gained the mastery, and peacefully, joyfully, he resigned his soul into the hands of his Creator. A life pious, devoted, and useful was crowned by a death calm, peaceful, triumphant. See Bennett, *Methodism in Virginia* (Richmond, 1871, 12mo), p. 731 sq.

Penn, Granville

youngest son of the Hon. Thomas Penn (son of the founder of Pennsylvania) by lady Juliana Fermor, fourth daughter of Thomas, first earl of Pomfret, was born in 1761. He was for some time an assistant chief clerk in the War Department, for which he received a pension of £550, and succeeded to the family estates upon the death of his brother, John Penn, LL.D. Granville Penn has conferred an inestimable service on the Church by his learned and valuable contributions (extending over a period of about thirty years) to theological literature. He died in 1844. We quote of his works: *Critical Remarks on* ~~23718~~ *Isaiah 7:18* (Lond. 1799, 4to): — *Remarks on the Eastern Origination of Mankind, and of the Arts of Cultivated Life* (1799, 4to): — *Three Copies of his Greek Version of the inscription on the Stoner fom Egypt [Rosetta, etc.]* (1802, 8vo): — *Observations in Illustration of Virgil's Fourth Eclogue* (1810, 8vo): — *A Christian's Survey of all the Principal Events and Periods of the World* (2d ed. 1812, 8vo): — *The Bioscope, or the Dial of Life Explained* (1814, sm. 8vo): — *The Prophecy of Ezekiel concerning Gog, etc.* (1814, 8vo): — *Original Lines and Translations* (1815, 8vo): — *Institutes of Christian Perfection of Macarius, translated from the Greek* (1816, sm. 8vo; 2d ed. 1828, 12mo): — *An Examination of the Primary Argument of the Iliad* (1821, 8vo): — *A Comparative Estimate of the Mineral and Mosaical Geologies* (1822, 8vo; suppl. 1823, 8vo; 2d ed. [of the whole] revised and enlarged with relation to the latest publications on Geology, 1825, 2 vols. 8vo; again, 1844, 2 vols. in one, 8vo): — *Memorials of the Professional Life and Times of Sir William Penn, knight, etc., 1644-1670* (1833, 2 vols. 8vo): — *The Book of the New Covenant of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ; being a Critical Revision of the Text and Translation of the English Version of the New Testament, with the aid of most ancient Manuscripts unknown to the Age in which that Version was put forth by Authority* (1836, 8vo): — *Annotations to the Book of the New Covenant, etc.* (1837, 8vo): — *Supplemental Annotations to the Book of the New Covenant, with a Brief Exposure of the Strictures of the Theological Reviewer for July* (1837, 1838, 8vo). See *Lond. Lit. Gaz.* Jan. 28, 1837; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* 2:1550.

Penn, James

was a theologian who flourished in the 18th century, first as under grammar-master of Christ Church Hospital, and afterwards as vicar of

Clavering-cum-Langley, Essex. He published several works on theology, but there is not much valuable interpretation of the Scriptures, and far too large a portion of controversial spirit. We quote of his works: *Various Tracts* (Lond. 1756, 8vo), theological: — *Various Tracts* (1762, 8vo), theological: — *Three Sermons* (1769, 8vo): — *Sermons and Tracts* (1777, 8vo), He also published a number of occasional sermons, etc. See Orme, *Bibl. Bib.*; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* 2:1551.

Penn, John

an English divine, was born in 1743. He flourished as vicar of Roughton, Norfolk, and subsequently of Beccles, where he died in 1814. He published *Sermons on Various Subjects* (1792, 2 vols. 8vo). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* 2:1551.

Penn, William

conspicuous as a leader of a Christian sect, philanthropist, founder and legislator of a colony which has expanded into the second state of the American Union, was born in London, England, Oct. 14, 1644. He was the son of Sir William Penn, a gentleman of Welsh descent, who, first as a captain, then as an admiral in the British navy, by several victories at sea and the capture of Jamaica, greatly contributed towards the English maritime ascendancy over the Dutch, and stood in high favor with court and country. His mother, Margaret, was the daughter of John Jasper, a Rotterdam merchant, an amiable, sensible woman. Young William was started to a careful education befitting his rank at the school of Chigwell, Essex, and, duly prepared, in his fifteenth year entered the college of Christ's Church, Oxford. He is described as from his earliest youth remarkable for an amiable disposition, docility, and uncommon aptitude, beauty in person, and altogether a harmonious development of faculties—physical, intellectual, and moral. He advanced rapidly in his studies, and cultivated the acquaintance of those classmates who were most distinguished for learning and good conduct; among their number was John Locke (q.v.). Enjoying excellent health and strength, he engaged also and delighted in athletic exercises — sports of the leisure hours — such as fencing, shooting, boating. On the whole, he bade fair to make a career to distinction such as his ambitious father had in view, and most auspicious circumstances made easy to realize. This prospect, however, was suddenly changed in an unexpected manner, and the youth thrown into a train of

thoughts much at variance with the usual pursuit of honor and glory. With other students, he attended a meeting of the society then lately formed by the agitation of George Fox (q.v.). The speaker on this occasion was Thomas Lee, who had formerly belonged to the university. His discourse made a deep impression on Penn, reviving certain religious ideas which, as he confessed, had seriously occupied his mind when he was only twelve years old. Some of his classmates were equally affected. In consequence they ceased to attend the worship of the Established (Episcopal) Church, as running into ritualism and formality, and held conventicles of their own, where they exhorted and prayed and discussed theological topics. Reprimanded and fined for "nonconformity," they nevertheless persisted in their proceedings; they went even farther. When the students were enjoined to wear again the surplice, which had been abolished since the Reformation, they (the conventiclors) not only refused compliance with the royal order, but fell upon those who appeared in the hateful popish garment. Hence the severest punishment which the college authorities could inflict was pronounced against the refractory pupils. Among those thus expelled from the college was Penn. The feelings of the admiral can easily be imagined. William's reception at home was not the most cordial. Highly incensed at the views and actions of his son, on whom he otherwise doted, he first tried remonstrances, then threats, at last even bodily chastisement, to induce a change of sentiment and conduct; but in vain. He concluded by sternly interdicting the paternal roof. Young William, although strongly attached to his father, who was hotheaded and hasty, but kindly at heart, bore it gently, yet remained firm in his purpose and faith. After a while, by the intercession of lady Penn, the admiral relented so far as to allow William to return home, and finally sent the youth traveling (1662) into France and Italy, in the hope that acquaintance with the world might divert and alter his mind. During this tour, furnished with letters of introduction and his own prepossessing exterior, he was well received in the brilliant circles of Paris and at the court of Louis XIV. In Saumur he enjoyed the intercourse of a prominent Protestant divine, Moses Amyrault, and devoted a couple of months to becoming familiar with theological matters. He spent about two years on the Continent, as it seemed to good advantage and the satisfaction of his father, who recalled him, when he had gone as far as Turin, to take charge of his affairs while he was absent at sea. To prevent any relapse into his former oddities, it was deemed proper to keep him busy, and, as the best preparation both for family and state affairs, he was entered at Lincoln's Inn to study law. This curriculum was

soon interrupted by the plague which broke out in the metropolis. To remove him out of danger, he was dispatched to Ireland, where in the county of Cork the admiral owned large estates. With letters to the viceroy, the duke of Ormond, who was an intimate friend of the admiral, William was a welcome guest at the gay vice-regal court. During this visit he had a special opportunity of ingratiating himself, and still more rising in estimation. When at Carrick-Fergus a mutiny broke out among the troops. Young Penn volunteered his services, under the command of the viceroy's son, to assist in reducing them to obedience, and by his coolness and courage displayed in the affair earned general praise. Elated by this success, he resolved to choose the profession of arms as his way to fame and fortune; and so enraptured was he with that idea that he had his picture painted in military dress, said to be the only one for which he ever sat. Unexpectedly and strangely, the admiral, even disregarding the duke's (Ormond's) congratulation about his son's bravery, etc., disapproved of this step, and ordered him to superintend the management of his Irish possessions. Reluctantly but promptly he obeyed. While so engaged business called him to the city of Cork. There he met again the Quaker preacher who had made so strong an impression on him in Oxford. His old convictions revived. He attended Lee's meetings, and finally professed publicly adherence to his doctrines. Ere long (1667) he had to share also their lot of persecution. He was, with eighteen others of the sect convened for nonconformity worship, arrested and imprisoned. A letter which he immediately addressed to the earl of Orrery, lord president of Munster, showing the injustice of the proceeding, and advocating general religious toleration, soon effected his own release. This was probably the first time he touched the keynote of his life, which subsequently resounded frequently and in many variations in his words and actions. Great was the chagrin of the parent when the news of this new conversion reached him — a reverse of all his fond hopes and aspirations. William was immediately called home. Could it be true? A fine young gentleman of twenty-three, polished and courtly in address, distinguished for sprightly wit and profound erudition, admired for martial courage, with honors and wealth ready to fall to him almost at the asking, consorting with the despised people nicknamed Quakers — self-styled Friends — followers of a ranting, enthusiastic cobbler! It was even so. Young Penn, looking more to the merits of the underlying truth than to external appearances, modestly avowed his principles; and while expressing his sincere desire to obey his father in everything that did not conflict with his duty to God, he declared

he could not abandon his religion. his duty to his heavenly Father being paramount to all other considerations. The admiral, so used to command, descended to resort with his beloved son to expostulation, argument, persuasion, entreaty; yea, he even proposed a compromise-to overlook the rest of his opinions provided he would agree to uncover his head before his majesty the king, the duke of York, and himself, acknowledging them as his superiors. Yet even this trifling request William refused to entertain, after having implored by prayer God's help and illumination. A second banishment from home ensued, throwing him on the hospitality of friends and the clandestine supplies of money from a tender-hearted mother, since he, with all his accomplishments, had no certain profession to fall back upon for support. But in spite of all the adverse surrounding circumstances, and the sad feelings of a sensitive heart, he continued with his whole soul to work in the holy cause he had embraced by deed, word, and writing. We may here observe it was principally Penn, ill connection with Robert Barclay, George Keith, and Samuel Fisher, who tempered the rude and irregular utterances of George Fox, and reduced them to a system of doctrine and discipline, the main features of which are still preserved as the rules of the Society of the Friends. The first essay published by Penn, under the title *Truth Exalted*, was addressed to lay and clericals, to the king and the people, exhorting all to examine into the foundation of their faith, etc. On account of a succeeding publication, *The Sandy Foundation Shaken*, he had to undergo an imprisonment in the Tower (1668-69). It was declared heretical, as, among other things, it attempted to refute "that the Godhead existed in three separate persons." During this incarceration, when it was reported to him that the bishop of London had threatened, "Penn must either recant or die in it," he said, "Then the prison shall be my grave before I will budge a jot: my conscience I owe to no mortal man:" and in this expected martyrdom he wrote one of his most popular treatises, *No Cross, no Crown*; followed shortly after by another, *Innocency with her Open Face*, in which he acknowledged Christ's divinity. This latter pamphlet gave somewhat better satisfaction to the clergy, and the intercession of the duke of York with the king effected, after nearly nine months' confinement, his liberation. But in August, 1669, he was again arrested for preaching in the open street before the Friends' meeting-house, which was shut, and kept closed against them by a guard of soldiers. On the occasion of this trial before mayor (of London), recorder, and aldermen, he made a most manly defense, not only of his own case, but of the liberties of the English people so greatly involved in this case, and won

from the jury an honest verdict of acquittal. The magistrate turned now in anger against the jury, and fined the members, and imprisoned them until the fine should be paid. An appeal, however, pronounced this absurd sentence, which would render the jurors only tools of the judge, illegal. Penn and Mead were fined for contempt of court, because they had kept their heads covered. The admiral settled this matter, although his son protested. About this time a reconciliation took place between father and son. The admiral's health had been of late fast declining, and he learned to see earthly things, however splendid, in a more sober light. William, too, had gained greatly in his esteem by the firm and able stand he had made in the last trial. Without being a Simeon, he could easily foresee the thorny paths, the persecutions and dangers, which such a character would have to encounter, and with paternal solicitude he made to the king and to the duke of York the dying request that they might extend to his son their protection. The promise was graciously given, and in after-years truly complied with on their side, and duly and gratefully appreciated by him on whom it was conferred. He remained at his father's bedside, watching him with tender assiduity until he breathed his last, and had even the gratification to hear from the lips of the dying man, "Let nothing in the world tempt you to wrong your conscience," etc.. a confirmation of what William had contended for. Admiral Penn died Sept. 16, 1670, and left William property yielding all annual revenue of £1500 (\$7500), and a claim of £16,000 (\$80,000) on the government, due for services and money advanced to the crown. Shortly after this event he was again committed by the lieutenant of the Tower rather arbitrarily to the loathsome prison of Newgate for addressing a meeting on the street on religious subjects, and refusing to take the oath of the Oxford Act, which, according to his view, applied only to persons in orders addressing unlawful assemblies. He employed during this term of six months his pen busily in support of his principles and in defense of his society. Among the treatises issued from this dungeon stands pre-eminent for ability, learning, and charity, *The Great Cause of Liberty of Conscience once more briefly Debated and Defended by the Authority of Reason, Scripture, and Antiquity*. After the expiration of his imprisonment he visited the Continent on a religious mission, and traveled through Holland and some parts of Germany. After his return to England (1672) he married the daughter of Sir William Springett, of Darling, Sussex, and then connected with the Quakers by her mother, who had become the wife of Isaac Pennington (q.v.). His domestic relations and the attention required for the management of his extensive

private affairs did not abate his zeal in behalf of what he deemed true religion. He engaged either in controversies or in exposing the hardships to which his society was subjected by oppressive and unequal laws. He also wrote during this period a treatise *On Oaths*, and another on the *Necessity of Religious Toleration*, in which he ventured to maintain that the civil affairs of all governments may be peaceably transacted under the different liveries or trims of religion. "So far from a government being weakened or endangered by a variety of religious sentiments," he writes, "it is, on the contrary, strengthened by them, provided that all are equally tolerated; for it prevents combinations against the government."

In 1677 he undertook with Fox and Barclay another journey to Holland and Germany, to make converts no less than to smooth the way of the persecuted. In the former country he preached with great acceptance; but in the latter empire, although the countess-palatine Elizabeth, granddaughter of James I, favored his intentions, he found less appreciation, perhaps because less understood or less needed, the Peace of Westphalia, ending the Thirty-years' War, having at least partially settled the principle of religious tolerance. On his return he was called upon to defend his cause before a committee of the Commons, Parliament inclining to severer measures against people who differed so much in their habits. and demanded liberty of faith and conscience for all, even Roman Catholics. For the last ten years continually harassed, he now conceived a plan by which he might escape further trials and troubles, and realize his ideal of Christianity, viz., by founding a commonwealth after his own model in the transatlantic territories of Great Britain. By his transcendent abilities, his efforts, not to mention the sacrifices and personal sufferings in behalf of the sect, his honesty, his wealth and rank, overshadowing influence, and his beneficence, he had become, without seeking the position, their head and leader, and was consulted also in other not strictly religious matters. Thus it came to pass that he was appealed to in difficulties and disputes that had arisen between two Friends, Edward Byllinge and John Fenwick, so-called proprietors of lands in New Jersey. William Penn as referee carefully examined the matter, and made his award. Fenwick refused to comply. Finally, however, by Penn's good offices the dispute was adjusted. Byllinge, who afterwards became embarrassed, wished to transfer his interest in the territory to his creditors, but in order to make the property more available entreated Penn to act as assignee. Penn became thereby (1675) instrumental in the settlement of

New Jersey, with a constitution of equitable rights. In this way engaged in colonizing West New Jersey, and subsequently as a purchaser also of the eastern part of that province, he acquired a knowledge of the adjoining region. This promised to be a place of refuge and security, where the distressed Friends and others might enjoy civil and religious liberty. He applied to king Charles II, the friend and patron of his father, and, "after many waitings, watchings, solicitings, and disputes in council," obtained the grant of a tract of land in payment of the governmental debt above mentioned. The patent bears the date of March 4, 1681, and comprised lands on the Delaware River, including also settlements previously made by Sweden and Holland with 2000 inhabitants, to whom a royal proclamation was issued April 2, 1681. The new province, against his own wish, for he wanted it called New Wales or Sylvania, was named by the king, as he pleased to pretend; in memory of admiral Penn, Pennsylvania. Penn himself says of this grant:" It is a clear and just thing; and my God, that has given it me through many difficulties, will, I believe, bless and make it the seed of a nation. I shall have a tender care to the government that it will be well laid at first." He forthwith (July 11, 1681) published an account of his acquisition, and invited purchasers at the rate of forty shillings a hundred acres, subject to a quit-rent of one shilling per annum forever. The next object of colonization was to establish an asylum for the Quakers, who were still persecuted, to form a people whose morals would correspond with the purity of the faith they professed, and to demonstrate that the use of arms was unnecessary for the protection of society. The propagation of his religious views, however, was a secondary consideration; his form of government he was anxious to submit to the test of reality and experience in general. Soon after preliminary arrangements had been made, three ships, with numerous emigrants of his own persuasion from England and Wales, were dispatched the *Amity* and *John and Sarah* to sail from London, the *Factor* from Bristol. The expedition was under the control of colonel William Markham, Penn's relative, as his deputy, joined with others as commissioners authorized to confer with the aborigines on the purchase of land (for he considered the royal patent invalid as to them), and to conclude a treaty of amity. He instructed his agents to bear themselves with candor, justice, and humanity, and addressed to the Indians a letter of the same sentiments, sent presents to the chiefs, and merchandise to pay for the land bargained for. In the following year (1682) Penn himself, leaving his wife and children in England, crossed the ocean, to settle the affairs of the new colony. On Dec. 14, 1682, he held a grand

council with the sachems and their people, assembled in great numbers, trusting himself, with his European train, unarmed among the wild sons of the forest. The savages, at a sign from their head sachem, throwing bows and arrows to the ground, seated themselves in a semicircle around their chiefs. The locality chosen was then called Shackamaxon; it bears now the name of Kensington, a suburb of the present Philadelphia; a gigantic elm, with its widespreading branches, formed the main spot of their gathering (the tree was blown over in 1810, when it was, by its annual growth-rings, ascertained to have been two hundred and eighty-three years old, consequently one hundred and fifty-five at the time). The place is now marked by a marble monument. We have no space here to detail the tenets of the principal party interested, *SEE FOX; SEE FRIENDS; SEE QUAKERS*, but we cannot withhold an account of this transaction as a memorable manifestation of their Christianlike policy and practice, which, if followed consistently, would have saved millions of lives and treasure, and crowned Christian colonists with the renown of true missionaries of the Gospel of Peace. Penn addressed them by interpreter substantially as follows: The Great Spirit who rules the heavens and the earth, the Father of all men, bore witness to the sincerity of his wishes to dwell with them in peace and friendship, and to serve them with all his power. Himself and followers had met them unarmed, because their religion forbade the use of hostile weapons against their fellowcreatures. They came not to injure others—that was offensive to the Great Spirit; but to do good, in which he delighted. Having met in the broad way of truth and benevolence, they ought to disdain deception, and to regulate their conduct by candor, fraternity, and love.” Unrolling the parchment, he explained the articles of the treaty and the terms of purchase. “By these,” he continued, “they were protected in their lawful pursuits even in the lands they had sold. Their right to improve their plantations, and means to secure subsistence, would be in all respects similar to those of the English. Should unfortunately disputes arise between the two peoples, they should be adjusted by arbitrators composed of equal numbers of Indians and Englishmen.” From the merchandise before him he then paid for the land to their satisfaction, and made them besides many presents. The sums which he spent for the purchase of all land on this and other occasions is computed at £6000 (\$30,000). Laying the roll of parchment upon the ground, he bade them observe it as a sign “that the land should be thenceforth common to both peoples.” “He would not,” he added, “like the people of Maryland, call them his children or his brethren; for some parents chastised their children

too severely, and brethren could disagree. Nor would he compare their friendship to a chain, which the rain might rust. But they would consider them as of one flesh and blood with the Christians, and the same as if one body was divided in two parts." Taking up the parchment, he presented it to the chief sachem, and desired that it might be carefully preserved for three generations, that their children might know what had passed, as if he remained to repeat it." The Indians in return made long and stately speeches, the gist and end of which was that they pledged themselves to live in love with William Penn and his children as long as the sun and moon would endure. This transaction is one of the brightest pages in American history, and has been honorably noticed even by the sarcastic Voltaire in these words: "This was the only treaty between these people (the natives) and the Christians which was not ratified by an oath, and which was never broken." For the space of more than seventy years, as long as the Quakers retained supremacy in the government of Pennsylvania, the peace and amity then solemnly promised never was violated, nor was the blood of a single Quaker shed by the Indians. It is significant that the place thus sanctified, near the junction of the Delaware and Schuylkill Rivers, and selected for the capital of his province, has become the largest inland city of the continent, the cradle of the American republic, and the center of the late Centennial celebration. A few months after Penn bought the site from the Swedes, who had already erected a church there, and designed a map, according to which it was regularly laid out.

In the political construction of the new country, as proprietor empowered to enact laws with the assent of the freemen, he availed himself of this right in a manner which ranks him with Moses, Lycurgus, and Solon, without incurring their faults. His laws, although not exempt from error, are surely in advance of all similar works of his age, even Locke's plan of government adopted by lord Baltimore not excepted. His code is dated April 25, 1682, and was drawn up before he embarked. His friend, Algernon Sidney, was consulted in framing it. Of the twenty-four chapters of this document we will mention only a few of the more striking features:

1. "Almighty God being only Lord of conscience, Father of lights, and the author as well as the object of all divine knowledge, faith, and worship, who can only enlighten the mind and convince the understanding of people in reference to his sovereignty over the soul of mankind, therefore be it enacted, that no person now or hereafter living in the province, who shall confess one Almighty to be the creator and upholder and ruler of the

world, and who professes himself or herself obliged in conscience to live peaceably and justly under civil government, shall in any wise be molested or prejudiced for his or her conscientious persuasion or practice; nor shall he or she at any time be compelled to frequent or maintain any religions worship, place, or ministry contrary to his or her mind, but shall freely and fully enjoy his or her liberty in that respect without any interruption or reflection; and if any person shall abuse or deride any other for his or her different persuasion or practice in religion, such shall be looked upon as a disturber of the peace, and be punished accordingly.”

2. Yet only professed Christians were admitted to office, and of them such only as paid taxes; the purity of election was guarded by penalties against bribery, other corruption and frauds nowadays so frequently resorted to probably being then unknown and not thought of. Besides these he made very wise enactments.

3. The law of primogeniture, still to this day in force in England, was abolished; all members of a family should enjoy an equal share of inheritance.

4. Every one, rich or poor, was to learn a useful trade or occupation, the poor to live on it, the rich to have a resort, if they should become poor.

5. Even to malefactors his clemency extended; all penalties to have a tendency rather to improve than to punish the criminal. He substituted for about two hundred offenses which were at that time capitally punished in England some milder penalty. Only murder and treason were punishable by death.

In March, 1683, he held in the infant settlement the second assembly, and, waiving some more of his proprietary privileges, amended “the frame of government,” so that almost in all but the name Pennsylvania was rendered a representative democracy; and to his dying day he declared that if the people needed anything more to make them happy he would readily grant it. Says a modern writer: “In the early constitutions of Pennsylvania is to be found the distinct annunciation of every great principle, the germ, if not the development, of every valuable improvement in government or legislation which has been introduced into the political systems of more modern epochs.” After having settled the provincial administration (five commissioners, with Lloyd as president during his absence), he returned in August, 1684, to England on account of his domestic affairs, and the

prospect that, by his influence on king Charles II, he could give better protection to the increasing sect of the Quakers. In 1685 Charles II was succeeded on the throne by his brother, the duke of York, as James II. In accordance with the pledge given to the admiral on his death-bed, the new king bestowed on the son the same friendship he had on the deceased. Penn, therefore, failed not to attend the royal court, and tried to use as heretofore his influence for good. But these frequent visits at Whitehall were misconstrued, and the most invidious and ridiculous slanders were put in circulation. He was accused of being a Catholic, a disguised Jesuit, corresponding with the pope and trafficking with pardons to convicted criminals. All the actions which in the eyes of zealots might give color to these criminations may be easily explained by the radical principles of equal rights and tolerance to all denominations openly avowed by Penn, and by the promptings of broad humanity to redress or alleviate grievances of any kind so natural to his character. The facts are that, mainly through his influence on the monarch, in 1686 a proclamation was issued which, with a number of other Dissenters, set fourteen hundred imprisoned Quakers at liberty; and in 1687 another declaration for liberty of conscience to all, unrestricted by any test and penalties. When, under a liberal construction of this Nonconformity Act, the king filled offices with Catholics, and committed himself to other reactionary measures, the Whig party prevailed in Parliament (1688), and declared James, who left England, to have forfeited the crown, and installed William of Orange and Mary as rulers of the realm. Now a still graver offense, that of high-treason, was laid on Penn: the charge that, out of attachment to the fallen royalty, he was accomplice to a plot calculated to overthrow the newly chosen regime and restore the self-exiled James to the throne. The indictment rests mainly on the statement of the head conspirator Preston, who, convicted of the crime and condemned to death, naming among others also Penn as implicated, tried to postpone or avert his own execution. Fuller, the principal witness against him, was by Parliament afterwards branded as an impostor. The impeachment is too outrageous. That Penn, the man of common-sense, the apostle of peace and good-will, who had forbidden the use of carnal weapons, an exemplar of frankness, enjoying under the Reform more toleration than ever, should invite a hostile (French) invasion and civil war for the uncertain caprice of a bigoted and licentious king! (For a detailed refutation we refer the reader to Dixon.) In answer to these calumnies, to which, with other still more serious charges, even Macaulay gives credence in his *History of England*, Penn published (1688) a letter of which the

following is an extract: “It is fit that I contradict them as particularly as they accuse me. I say then, solemnly, I am so far from having been bred at St. Omer’s, and received orders at Rome, that I never was at either place; nor do I know anybody there; nor had I ever any correspondence with anybody in these places. And as for officiating in the king’s chapel, or any other, it is so ridiculous, as well as untrue, that, besides that nobody can do it but a priest, I have been married to a woman of some condition above sixteen years, which no priest can be by any dispensation whatever. I have not so much as looked into any chapel of the Roman religion, and consequently not the king’s, though a common curiosity warrants it daily to people of all persuasions. And, once for all, I do say I am a Protestant Dissenter, and to that degree such that I challenge the most celebrated Protestant of the English Church, or any other on that head, be he layman or clergyman, in public or private. For I would have such people know it is not impossible for a true Protestant Dissenter to be dutiful, thankful, and serviceable to the king, though he (the king) be of the Roman Catholic communion. We hold not our property or protection from him by our persuasion, and therefore his persuasion should not be the measure of our allegiance.” Another attempt to fasten a disreputable transaction on Penn is the charge that he was an agent of the queen in extorting or collecting a penalty from the parents of certain girls who, under the lead of their schoolmistress, tendered colors to the rebellious Monmouth when passing Taunton; and who were for this act imprisoned on the charge of high-treason. The imputation against Penn rests on a letter dated Feb. 13, 1685-6, by secretary Sunderland, addressed to “Mr. Penn,” who, in company with Walden, should manage the affair. The penalty demanded was £7000, which her gracious majesty donated to her maids of honor. In reply: 1. It nowhere appears that William Penn was meant — to one George Penn the business would have been more congenial; 2. It is not proved that either William or George or any Penn accepted the commission; 3. It is a fact, substantiated by the contemporary Oldmixon, that one Brent, a popish lawyer, and Crane as his deputy, were engaged, and executed the collection, much to their own benefit, so that the maids of honor received only one third part of the imposed fine. Equally groundless is the insinuation that he interfered in the affair of Magdalen College to the injury of the Protestant faculty. He tried to mediate and save it, if possible, even by a compromise, which was construed by his enemies as trying to induce the president (Hough) to commit simony. His only fault was that he could not prevail over the king, who, bent on his purpose, by a royal order

transferred the institution to the Jesuits despite all remonstrances. But as credence to these calumnies, fostered probably by High Churchmen, was accorded by the government, an order for his arrest was finally issued (1690). Penn, absent to attend the funeral of his master, George Fox, when learning of it, to escape the blind fury of his powerful enemies, first concealed himself in London, and then by the way of Shoreham passed over into France, and once only had a secret interview with Algernon Sidney, in which he with more than his usual earnestness protested his innocence. In December, 1693, after the passion had subsided, he appeared again in England, and stood trial before the royal privy council, and was honorably acquitted. Meanwhile he had suffered greatly, not only in person, but also in property. Just before his intended arrest (1690) he had prepared a new expedition of five hundred colonists, and was on the eve of sailing. All the expenses of the outfit were lost, and in 1692 he was deprived of his supreme rights in Pennsylvania, and the province administered by royal governors until 1694, when he was reinstated as proprietor. In 1696 he married a second time, taking for his wife Hannah Callowhill. In 1699 he embarked with his family for his territories, with the intent of permanently residing there. He stayed only two years. The English ministry had presented to the House of Lords a bill to subject all the proprietary governments to the perfect control and authority of the crown. Penn's friends succeeded in postponing its discussion. His return and presence prevented it from being passed. The remaining period of his life he spent in England, employing tongue and pen in the service of civil and religious liberty; maintaining an active correspondence with his representatives and agents in his American province, for which he had an anxious care. The succession of queen Anne, the Protestant daughter of the Catholicizing James II, procured for him a certain favor and patronage at court, but he rarely availed himself of this advantage. The losses and great expenses incurred during the last years caused him financial embarrassments- a heavy burden and a source of chagrin, as the provincial assembly, to which he applied for relief, ungratefully refused to come to his aid. He was obliged to contract a mortgage of £66,000 on his transatlantic territories. In 1712 he himself proposed to the English government to sell his right and title to them; but before the business was closed, overcome by labors and cares, he had three consecutive attacks of apoplexy, the last of which deprived him almost entirely of memory; but his cheerful and benevolent disposition and the amenity of his conversation were apparent to the last. He died at his country-seat of Rushcombe, Buckinghamshire,

July 30, 1718. -His remains were buried near the Friends' meeting house at Jordans. The plain recital of his doings is his best eulogy.

Besides the treatises already named, Penn wrote and published the following, which are all controversial: *A seasonable Caveat against Popery* (1670): — *Truth rescued from Imposture* (1671): — *The Spirit of Truth Vindicated* (1672): — *Quakerism a New Nickname for Old Christianity* (1673): — *England's Present Interest Considered* (1674). His collected writings, with a biography, were published in 1726 at London, and in 1782 in 4 vols. See Marsillac, *Vie de Guillaume Penn* (Paris, 1791); Clarkson, *Miemoirs of the Private and Public Life of William Penn* (Lond. 1813, 2 vols.; new ed. 1849, with a preface by W. E. Forster, which deserves particular attention as containing a refutation of some of the calumnies started against him by Macaulay); Hepworth Dixon, *William Penn, a Historic Biography from New Sources* (2d ed. Lond. 1853); Paget, *Inquiry into the Evidence of the Charges brought by Lord Macaulay against William Penn* (Edinb. 1858); Janney, *Life of Penn* (Philad. 1852). See also Ranke, *Englische Geschichte*, vol. v; Weingarten, *Revolutions-Kirchen Englands* (Leips. 1868), p. 405-421; Janney, *Hist. of the Friends*, vol. iii; Skeats, *Hist. of the Free Churches of England*, p. 81, 82, 153, 315; Neal, *Hist. of the Puritans*; Stoughton, *Eccles. Hist. of England*, vol. i and ii; Marsden, *Hist. of the Churches and Sects of Christendon*. For a full account of Penn's writings, and of those relating to him, see especially Joseph Smith's *Catalogue of Friends' Books*, 2:282-326; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, 2:1551-1553. See also the excellent article in Thomas, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.; *Quarterly Review of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*, April, 1863, art. ii; *Christian Review*, 17:555; *Westminster Review*, October, 1850; Littell's *Living Age*, March 28, 1846, art. vii.

Penna, Francois-Horace della

an Italian missionary, was born in 1680 at Macerata, States of the Church. Having entered the Order of the Capuchins while young, he was in 1719 appointed chief of a mission destined to evangelize Thibet, and went to Lassa with twelve of his brethren. After several years of apostolic labors, Della Penna, seeing his mission reduced to only three monks, returned to Rome in 1735 to ask for new reinforcements, and upon his recital the Congregation of the Propaganda associated with him nine other Capuchins, with whom he departed in 1738, loaded with presents, and bearing two pontifical briefs for the king of Thibet and the grand lama. They arrived in

Thibet in 1741, and commenced their preaching; and it was upon the instruction- furnished by Della Penna that the Congregation of the Propaganda published in Italian *Relation of the Commencement of the Present State of the Kingdom of Thibet and its Neighbors* (Rome, 1742, 4to). It is not necessary to take literally the recital of the conversions that Della Penna pretends to have made; what he relates in this respect must be accepted only as an inventory. He died July 20, 1747, in Patan, Nepaul. We owe to this missionary, who had studied Thibetan under a doctor at Lassa, several manuscript fragments, by which father Giorgi has profited in the publication of his *Alphabetum Tibetanurn* (1742, 4to). It is also from the designs of Della Penna that the Thibetan characters of the Propaganda have been engraved. See *Lettres edif. et cur. ecrites des Missions etrangeres*; Remusat, *Recherches Tartares*, 1:344.

Penna, Lorenzo

an Italian organist, was born at Bologna in 1613. He entered the Order of Carmelites at Mantua, taught theology, and became chapelmaster of the church of his order at Parma. His reputation as an organist and didactic writer appears to have been great. He died Oct. 20, 1693. Besides his *Messes* and his *Psaumes concertos*, which have had several editions, we have of his works, *Li primi labori musicali* (Bologna, 1656-79, 3 pts. 4to), a treatise reprinted five times, and containing some good things; and *Direttorio del canto fermno* (Modena, 1689, 4to). See Orlandi, *Scrittori Bolognesi*; Fetis, *Biog. univ. des Musiciens*.

Pennacchi, Pietro Maria,

a painter of Trevigi, who, according to Zanetti, flourished at Venice about 1520. He painted some works for the churches at Venice and Murano, which Lanzi says are more excellent in color than design.

Pennafiel, Council Of

(*Concilium Penafelense*), was held, April 1, 1302, by Gonsalvo of Toledo and his suffragans. Fifteen articles were published, tending to repress those abuses which are noticed in the councils of this age, viz. incontinence among the clergy, usury, etc. Among other things, it was enacted, by canon 12, that in every church the "Salve Regina" should be sung after compline. By canon 8, that the priests should make with their own hands the bread to be consecrated at the Eucharist, or cause it to be made by other

ecclesiastics in their own presence. By canon 7, that tithe should be paid of all lawful property, thereby to recognize the universal sovereignty of God. See Labbe, *Concilia*, 11:2444.

Pennaforte, Raymond Of,

a celebrated ecclesiastical character of the 13th century, was born at Barcelona, and was educated at the university of his native place from 1204 to 1219. He then went to Bologna, and there taught for some time. Ere he had left home he had been vicar-general of his native place. On his return he entered the Dominican Order, then but recently founded. By request of his superiors he wrote *Summa casuum poenitentiae*. In 1230 pope Gregory IX called him to Rome, and made him his chaplain and confessor. His holiness also entrusted him with a collection of the papal decisions not given by Gratian, and they were published under the title *Decretalium Gregorii IX compilatio*. In 1235 he was elevated to the archbishopric of Tarragona, but he refused the honor, and retired to his convent. In 1238 he was, however, obliged to accept the honor of a general of his order. But though he accepted the office, he finally resigned it, and devoted himself to the conversion of Moors and Jews, and to his studies. He died Jan. 6, 1275. Pope Clement VIII enrolled him among the saints, and he is commemorated Jan. 20. See Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, Jan. 20, vol. i.

Penney, Joseph

D.D., a Presbyterian divine, was born in Ireland in 1790. He graduated at the university in Dublin, emigrated to the United States, and in April, 1822, was settled as pastor over the First Presbyterian Church, Rochester, N.Y.; in 1832 he removed to Northampton, Mass., and subsequently became president of Hamilton College, N.Y. But he soon again exchanged the rostrum for the pulpit, and became pastor of the Church at Nyack, N.Y. In 1839 he removed to Grand Rapids, Mich., and afterwards preached at Pontiac, Mich. He died March 20, 1860. Dr. Penney's life was laborious and useful; he was greatly beloved wherever he was located. He was the author of a work on *Education*, and published a number of fugitive theological articles in periodicals. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1861, p. 105; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, v, vol. i, . v. (J. L. S.)

Penney, Nicholas

a French engraver of the last century, has left some plates treating of devout subjects from his own designs, executed with the graver in a very neat style, but without much effect, among which is one of the Virgin appearing to St. Bartholomew. They are marked "N. Penney fecit."

Penni, Giovanni Francesco

an eminent Italian painter, was born at Florence in 1488, and received the name of *Il Farttorne*, or the Steward, from his having been entrusted with the management of the domestic affairs of Raffaelle. He was, however, also one of his principal assistants, and probably bore the surname *Il Fattore* because he was also Raffaelle's *apprentice*. He was first employed in the decoration of the *Loggie* of the Vatican, where he executed the histories of Abraham and Isaac in such an admirable manner that Raffaelle made him one of his heirs. Dr. Waagen is of opinion that Penni executed many parts of the cartoons at Hampton Court, especially those of the *Death of Ananias*, *St. Paul and Barnabas at Lystra*, and *St. Paul Preaching at Athens*. Of Penni's own works no frescos and very few oil-paintings remain. His characteristics are said to have been facility of invention, graceful execution, and singular felicity in landscape. After the death of Raffaelle, Penni went to Naples, where he died in 1528. Kugler and Passavant attribute to Penni the celebrated *Madonna del Passeggio* in the Bridgewater collection, usually believed to be Raffaelle's.

Penni, Luca

another Italian artist and brother of the preceding, was born at Florence about the year 1500. Orlando says that Luca also studied in the school of Raffaelle. According to Vasari, Luca united himself to Plierino del Vaga, and worked with him in the churches at Lucca, Genoa, and other cities; he afterwards accompanied Rosso into France, and ultimately passed into England, where he was employed for some time by Henry VIII. On his return to Italy he is said to have quitted painting for engraving. There are quite a number of prints attributed to him, mostly after the works of Rosso and Primaticcio. Among them are the following: *Susanna and the Elders*; *Abraham sacrificing Isaac*, after Primaticcio; *The Marriage of St. Catharine*, ditto.

Pennington, J. W. C.

D.D., a Presbyterian minister (colored), was born in 1800. He was born a slave but escaped from his condition of servitude at the age of twenty-one years, and found his way to New York, where he was assisted in his studies for the ministry by the Presbyterian Church, under the care of Dr. Cox. He was subsequently settled at Hartford, and later over the Shiloh Presbyterian Church, New York. He received the degree of D.D. from the University of Heidelberg, Germany. For two or three years previous to his death he labored with great zeal and success among the freedmen in Florida. He died at Jacksonville Oct. 22, 1870.

Pennington, Montagu

an English divine of some celebrity, was born about 1763, and was educated at Trinity College, Oxford, where he took his M.A. in 1784. He was vicar of Northbourne and Shoulden, and perpetual curate of St. George's Chapel, Deal. He was also a magistrate for Kent and the Cinque Ports. He died April 15, 1849. He published *Redemption, or a View of the Rise and Progress of Christianity* (1811); and, besides several minor literary labors, prepared a memoir of his aunt, Mrs. Elizabeth Carter, the poetess, and published it with a collection of her poems, essays, etc. (Lond. 1807, 4to; 1808, 2 vols. 8vo). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* s.v.

Pennington, Thomas

a brother of the preceding, also an English clergyman, was born about 1770, and was educated under his very learned aunt. After taking holy orders, bishop Porteus, who was the friend of Mrs. Carter, presented Thomas Pennington with the rectory of Thorley, Herts. He became also chaplain to Lord Ellenborough. He died about 1850. His publications are of little interest now.

Pennone, Rocco

a distinguished Lombard architect, flourished at Genoa in the 16th century. Milizia does not mention his instructor, but he warmly commends Pennone's abilities, as evinced in the enlargement of the government palace at Genoa, particularly in the arrangement of a grand portico, flanked by two courts, which, although differing in size, satisfy the eye by their perfect

symmetry. These courts are surrounded by two orders of galleries, the first supported by Doric and the second by Ionic columns. Among the other works of Pennone is a part of the *church of St. Sacramento*, which he completed after the designs of Galeazzo Alessi.

Penny

Picture for Penny

In the A.V., in several passages of the New Test., “penny,” either alone or in the compound “pennyworth,” occurs as the rendering of the Greek **δηνάριον**, a transfer of the name of the Roman *denarius* (^{<4083>}Matthew 18:28; 20:2, 9,13; 22:19; ^{<4067>}Mark 6:37; 12:15; 14:5; ^{<4074>}Luke 7:41; 10:35; 20:24; ^{<4067>}John 6:7; 12:5; ^{<4066>}Revelation 6:6). It took its name from its being first equal to *ten* “n asses,” a number afterwards increased to sixteen. The earliest specimens are of about the commencement of the 2d century B.C. From this time it was the principal silver coin of the commonwealth. It continued to hold the same position under the empire until long after the close of the New-Testament canon. In the time of Augustus eighty-four denarii were struck from the pound of silver, which would make the standard weight about 60 grains. This Nero reduced by striking ninety-six from the pound, which would give a standard weight of about 52 grains, results confirmed by the coins of the periods, which are, however, not exactly true to the standard. The drachm of the Attic talent, which from the reign of Alexander until the Roman domination was the most important Greek standard, had, by gradual reduction, become equal: to the denarius of Augnstus, so that the two coins came to be regarded as identical. Under the same emperor the Roman coin superseded the Greek, and many of the few cities which yet struck silver money took for it the form and general character of the denarius, and of its half, the quinarius. In Palestine in the New-Test. period, we learn from numismatic evidence, that denarii must have mainly formed the silver currency. It is therefore probable that in the New Test, by (**δραχμή** and **ἀργύριον**, both rendered in the A.V. “piece of silver,” we are to understand the denarius. *SEE DRACHMA*. The **δίδραχμον** of the tribute (^{<4072>}Matthew 17:24) was probably in the time of our Savior not a current coin, like the **στατήρ** mentioned in the same passage (ver. 27). *SEE MONEY*. From the parable of the laborers in the vineyard it would seem that a denarius was then the ordinary pay for a day’s labor (^{<4010>}Matthew 20:2, 4, 7, 9, 10, 13). The term *denarius aureus* (Pliny 34:17; 37:3) is probably a corrupt designation for the *aureus*

(*nunzmus*); in the New Test. the denarius proper is always intended. See Smith, *Dict. of Class. Antiq.* s.v. Denarius. The earlier silver denarii were struck by the authority of distinguished families, and bear portraits and designs illustrative of Roman history; these are called *consular* denarii. After the time of Julius Caesar they present us with a series almost unbroken of the emperors, together with many of their wives, sons, daughters, and occasionally of their fathers, sisters, and brothers also. The consular denarius bore on one side a head of Rome, and X or a star, to denote the value in *asses*, and a chariot with either two or four horses; but afterwards the reverse bore the figures of Castor and Pollux, and sometimes a Victory in a chariot of two or four horses. At a later date the busts of different deities were given on the obverse; and these were finally superseded by the heads of the Caesars. The reverses varied, and some of them are very curious. The name continued to be applied to a silver piece as late as the time of the earlier Byzantines. The states that arose from the ruins of the Roman empire imitated the coinage of the imperial mints, and in general called their principal silver coin the denarius, whence the French name *denier* and the Italian *denaro*. The chief Anglo-Saxon coin, and for a long period the only one corresponded to the denarius of the Continent. It continued to be current under the Normans, Plantagenets, and Tudors, though latterly little used. It is called penny, denarius, or denier, which explains the employment of the first word in the A.V. See Arnold. *De denario Petri* (Alt. 1769); Dorschaeus, *Denarius Vespertinus* (Rost. 1657).
SEE DENARIUS.

Penny Weddings

(or PENNY BRIDALS) is the name of a peculiar festive marriage ceremonial which was common in Scotland until the middle of the 17th century. At these penny weddings the invited guests made contributions in money (seldom more than one shilling each), to pay the general expenses, and leave over a small sum, which would assist the newly married pair in furnishing their dwelling. This practice, now disused, as leading to “profane minstreling and promiscuous dancing,” was denounced by an Act of the General Assembly of the Kirk in 1645, as well as by numerous acts of presbyteries and kirk-sessions about the same period. The act reads as follows:

“The assembly, considering that many persons do invite to these penny weddings excessive numbers, arono, whom there frequently

falls out drunkenness and uncleanness, for preventing whereof, by their act Feb. 13, 1645, they ordain presbyteries to take special care for restraining the abuses ordinarily committed at these occasions, as they shall think fit, and to take a strict account of the obedience of every session to their orders thereanent, and that at their visitation of parishes within their boulds; which act is ratified March 8, 1701. By the 12th session assembly, 1706, presbyteries are to apply to magistrates for executing the laws relating to penny bridals, and the commission, upon application from them, are to apply to the government for obliging the judges who refuse to execute their office in that matter. By the 14th act Parl. 3 Car. II, it is ordained that at marriages, besides the married persons, their parents, brothers, and sisters, and the family wherein they live, there shall not be present above four friends on either side. If there shall be any greater number of persons at penny weddings within a town, or two miles thereof, that the master of the house shall be fined in the sum of 500 merks.”

Penry (Or Penri Or Ap Henry), John

a Puritan divine, better known under the names of *Martin MarPrelate* and *Martin Priest*, was a native of Wales, and was born in 1559. He was educated at Peter House, Cambridge, whence he removed to Oxford, where he took his degree of master, and then entered into holy orders. In the controversy between the Puritans and the hierarchy he waged a fierce war against the Establishment, and was accused and condemned for holding seditious opinions and libelling the queen (Elizabeth). He was executed like a felon in 1593, leaving a widow with four young children to bemoan their loss. He was charged with the authorship of the *Mar-Prelate Tracts*, but he disapproved of the project, and their spirit and their style are so unlike his that his apologists deny his having had anything to do with them. During his trial he advocated the principles which he believed necessary for adoption by the English Church, viz. (1) that the Church as an institution of Christianity should be governed only by the laws of its divine founder; (2) that the offices derived from the Romish hierarchy were unscriptural and antichristian. There is little doubt that Penry’s conscientious hostility to prelacy and Church authority made him obnoxious to the ruling party, and brought him to a premature and violent death. He seems to have had less of that spirit of rancor and insubordination than the majority of his co-thinkers. Especially in his last

moments did the spirit of the man rise to the solemn circumstances of his fate, and he died, if not precisely for the cause, yet with much of the devoted spirit of a martyr. See Waddington, *John Penry, the Pilgrim Martyr* (Lond. 1854, 8vo); Stoughton, *Spiritual Heroes*, p. 52 sq.; Coleman, *The English Confessors after the Ref.* p. 117 sq., 297 sq.; Price, *Hist. of Nonconformity*, vol. i; Soames, *Elizabethan Religious History*, p. 427 sq.; Collier, *Eccles. Hist.*; Neal, *Hist. of the Puritans*; (Lond.) *Gentleman's Magazine*, 1854, 1:511; Bacon, *Genesis of the New England Churches*; and the article as well as the references in Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* ii, s.v.

Pensaben, Fra Marco, And Fra Marco Maraveia,

his assistant, two old painters of the Order of the Dominicans at Venice, flourished in the first half of the 16th century. Pensaben was born at Venice in 1486, Of his parents and boyhood nothing is known. The earliest account takes his back to 1510, when he was a priest at the Dominican convent of Sts. Paul and John in Venice, having only a short time previous to this taken the Dominican habit. In the capitular acts of 1514 he is called sub-prior, and in those of 1524 head sacristan. Lanzi says Pensaben was an artist of singular merit, wholly unknown in the history of art till Frederici discovered some documents relating to him in the convent of the Dominicans at Trevigi, whither he had been invited from Venice. "In this style, partaking of the ancient and modern taste, is a large picture of St. Nicholas in a church of the Dominicans at Trevigi, in which the cupola, the columns, and the perspective, with a throne, on which is seated the Virgin with the infant Jesus, surrounded by saints standing, the steps ornamented by a harping seraph, all discover the composition of Bellini. It was painted by P. Marco Pensaben, assisted by P. Marco Maraveia, both Dominican priests engaged for this purpose from Venice." Nothing further is known of their works. Pensaben died in 1530.