THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY

REFERENCE

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL, THEOLOGICAL and ECCLESIASTICAL LITERATURE

Pensieri, Batista - Pestle

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

Pensieri, Batista,

an Italian engraver who flourished in the latter part of the 16th century, was a native of Parma, and is usually called *Baptista Parmensis,* from his signature. Zani calls his name *Battista Pensieri da Parmna,* and says that he was a designer, engraver, and a seller of books and prints, and gives four inscriptions from his prints (see Spooner). Pensieri resided chiefly at Rome, where he engraved several plates for various masters, and others from his own designs, executed in a style resembling that of Cornelius Cort. Among these are the following: *The Virgin and Infant appearing to St. John* (after Baroccio, Baptista Parmensis fec. 1588): — The *Baptism of Christ* (Baptista Parmensis): — *The Chastity of St. Joseph* (1593): — *The Crucifixions* (in two sheets, Baptista Parmensis fornis. 1584).

Pensio

i.e. the enjoyment or use of a part of the fruits of a benefice without service, was formerly a very common occurrence in the Church of Rome, and is even now occasionally enjoyed in the Church of England. *SEE SINECURE*. At present in the Romish Church the *pensio* is accorded only to priests *de emeritu.*

Titulis pensionis is the name of the secured income to a priest without regard as to its source.

Penso, Joseph

also called DE LA VEGA, a Jewish merchant of Spain, is noted for his literary labors as poet, moral philosopher, and orator. He was born about 1650 at Espejo, in Cordova; and lived afterwards at Livorno, Amsterdam, and Antwerp, at which last place he probably died. He belongs to the last Spanish Jews who cultivated Spanish poetry in a foreign land. He wrote, hw,2æqTæiy r ęsæį, "the Prisoners of Hope," an allegorical drama (Amsterd. 1673): — µyNæiw sDeP,e, "Orchard of Lilies." In both these dramas Penso shows the assiduity of Satan in deluding man from the worship of God, and the many snares he lays in his way to entrap him; but Providence frustrates all Satan's diabolic devices, and righteousness obtains at last the sway over him: — *La Rosa, Panegyrica sacra,* a panegyric poem in praise of the Mosaic law (ibid. 1683): — The *Life of Adam,* in Spanish (ibid. 1683): — *Sermon funebre,* a funeral oration in Spanish on the death of his mother, printed together with a funeral oration

on the death of his father (ibid. 1683): — *Discurso Academico moral y sanyrado*, etc. (ibid. 1683): — *Discursos academicos, morales, rhetoricos, y sangrados que recito en lafiorida Acadamia de los Floridos*, etc. (ibid. 1685). See Furst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3:75; Gratz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, 10:198; 13; Kavserling, *Sephardim*, p. 316 sq.; *Bibliothekjiudischer Kanzelredner*, vol. i, Beilage, p. 17; Margoliouth, *Modern Judaism investigated*, p. 246; Delitzsch, *Zur Geschichte der jidischen Poesie*, p. 77, 160, 174; De Rossi, *Dizionario storico degli autori Ebrei*, p. 326 (Germ. transl. by Hamburger); Etheridge, *Introduction to Hebrew Literature*, p. 389; Wolf, *Bibl. Hebr.* 1:555; 3:417; 4:851. (B. P.)

Pentacle of Solomon

a five-angled figure, composed of two triangles interlaced; the legendary seal or sigil of Solomon, carved on an emerald, by which he ruled the gins or daemons, representing the five fingers of the hand of Omnipotence. David's shield had six angles.

Pen'tateuch

the collective title commonly given to the first five books of the O.T. In the present article we treat this important section of Scripture as a whole, in the light of modern criticism and discussion, reserving its component books for their separate heads. See Moses.

I. *The Name.* — The above is the Greek name given to the books commonly called the Five Books of Moses (ἡ πεντάτευχος sc. βιβλος; Pentateuchus sc. liber; the fivefold book; from τοῦχος, which, meaning originally "vessel, instrument," etc., came in Alexandrine Greek to mean "book"). In the time of Ezra and Nehemiah it was called "the Law of Moses" (<15706>Ezra 7:6); or "the book of the Law of Moses" (<16801>Nehemiah 8:1); or simply "the book of Moses" (<15618>Ezra 6:18; <16130>Nehemiah 13:1; <14254>2 Chronicles 25:4; 35:12). This was beyond all reasonable doubt our existing Pentateuch. The book which was discovered in the Temple in the reign of Josiah, and which is entitled (<14344>2 Chronicles 34:14) the book of the Law of Jehovah by the hand of Moses," was substantially, it would seem, the same volume. In <14340>2 Chronicles 34:30 it is styled "the book of the Covenant," and so also in <12202>2 Kings 23:2, 21, while in <12208>2 Kings 22:8 Hilkiah says, I have found "the book of the Law." Still earlier, in the reign of Jehoshaphat, we find a "book of the Law of Jehovah" in use (<14709>2 Chronicles 17:9). This was probably the earliest designation, for a "book of

the Law” is mentioned in Deuteronomy (31:26), though it is questionable whether the name as there used refers to the whole Pentateuch or only to Deuteronomy. The modern Jews usually call the whole by the name of *Torah* (hrwoT), i.e. “the Law,” or *Torath Mosheh* (hvm trwoT), “the Law of Moses.” The rabbinical title is hrwoT hiyvmj hVmj, “the five fifths of the Law.” In the preface to the Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach, it is called “the Law,” which is also a usual name for it in the New Testament (<401205>Matthew 12:5; 22:36, 40; <421026>Luke 10:26; <430805>John 8:5, 17). Sometimes the name of Moses stands briefly for the whole work ascribed to him (<422427>Luke 24:27). Finally, the whole Old Testament is sometimes called *a potiori parte,* “the Law” (<400518>Matthew 5:18; <421617>Luke 16:17; <430749>John 7:49; 10:34; 12:34). In <431525>John 15:25; <450319>Romans 3:19, words from the Psalms, and in <461421>1 Corinthians 14:21, from Isaiah, are quoted as words of the Law. *SEE LAW*.

II. *Present Form*. — The division of the whole work into five parts has by some writers been supposed to be original. Others (as Leusden, Havernick, and Lengerke), with more probability, think that the division was made by the Greek translators. For the titles of the several books are not of Hebrew, but of Greek origin. The Hebrew names are merely taken from the first words of each book, and in the first instance only designated particular *sections* and not whole books. The MSS. of the Pentateuch form a single roll or volume, and are divided not into books, but into the larger and smaller sections called *Parshiyoth* and *Sedarim.* Besides this, the Jews distribute all the laws in the Pentateuch under the two heads of affirmative and negative precepts. Of the former they reckon 248; because, according to the anatomy of the rabbins, so many are the parts of the human body; of the latter they make 365, which is the number of days in the year, and also the number of veins in the human body. Accordingly the Jews are bound to the observance of 613 precepts; and in order that these precepts may be perpetually kept in mind, they are wont to carry a piece of cloth foursquare, at the four corners of which they have fringes consisting of eight threads apiece, fastened in five knots. These fringes are called tyxyx, a word which in numbers denotes 600: add to this the eight threads and the five knots, and we get the 613 precepts. The five knots denote the five books of Moses. (See Bab. Talmud. *Maccoth,* sect. 3; Maimon. *Pref. to Jad Hachazakah;* Leusden, *Philol.* p. 33.) Both Philo (*de Abraham.* ad init.) and Josephus (c. *Apion.* 1:8) recognize the division now current. Vaihinger supposes that the symbolical meaning of the number five led to

its adoption; for ten is the symbol of completion or perfection, as we see in the ten commandments (and so in Genesis we have ten “n generations”), and therefore five is a number which, as it were, confesses imperfection and prophesies completion. The Law is not perfect without the Prophets, for the Prophets are in a special sense the bearers of the Promise; and it is the Promise which completes the Law. This is questionable. There can be no doubt, however, that this division of the Pentateuch influenced the arrangement of the Psalter in five books. The same may be said of the five Megilloth of the Hagiographa (Canticles, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, and Esther), which in many Hebrew Bibles are placed immediately after the Pentateuch. In some Jewish writers, however, there are found statements indicating that the Pentateuch was formerly divided into seven portions (comp. Jarchi, *ad Proverb.* 9: 1; *ibique* Breithaupt). In the Jewish canon the Pentateuch is kept somewhat distinct from the other sacred books of the Old Testament, because, considered with reference to its contents, it is the book of books of the ancient covenant. It is the basis of the religion of the Old Testament, and of the whole theocratical life. *SEE OLD TESTAMENT*.

For the several names and contents of the five books we refer to the articles on each book, where questions affecting their integrity and genuineness separately are also discussed.

III. *Unity of the Pentateuch.* —

1. This is evinced in its general scope and contents. With a view to this point, we need only briefly observe here that this work, beginning with the record of creation and the history of the primitive world, passes on to deal more especially with the early history of the Jewish family. It gives at length the personal history of the three great fathers of the family; it then describes how the family grew into a nation in Egypt, tells us of its oppression and deliverance, of its forty years’ wandering in the wilderness, of the giving of the law, with all its enactments both civil and religious, of the construction of the tabernacle, of the numbering of the people, of the rights and duties of the priesthood, as well as of many important events which befell them before their entrance into the Land of Canaan, and finally concludes with Moses’s last discourses and his death. The unity of the work in its existing form is now generally recognised. It is not a mere collection of loose fragments carelessly put together at different times, but bears evident traces of design and purpose in its composition. Even those

who discover different authors in the earlier books, and who deny that Deuteronomy was written by Moses, are still of opinion that the work in its present form is a connected whole, and was at least reduced to its present shape by a single reviser or editor (see Ewald, *Geschichte,* 1:170; Stfahelin, *Kritische Unters.* p. 1).

The question has also been raised whether the book of Joshua does not, properly speaking, constitute an integral portion of this work. To this question Ewald (*Geschichte,* 1:175), Knobel (*Genesis,* Vorbem. § 1, 2), Lengerke (*Kenaan,* 83), and Stahelin (*Kritische Unlters.* p. 91) give a reply in the affirmative. They seem to have been led to do so, partly because they imagine that the two documents, the Elohistic and the Jehovistic, which characterize the earlier books of the Pentateuch, may still be traced, like two streams, the waters of which never wholly mingle though they flow in the same channel, running on through the book of Joshua; and partly because the same work which contains the promise of the land (Genesis 15) must contain also — so they argue — the fulfillment of the promise. But such grounds are far too arbitrary and uncertain to support the hypothesis which rests upon them. All that seems probable is that the book of Joshua received a final revision at the hands of Ezra, or some earlier prophet, at the same time with the books of the law. The fact that the Samaritans, who it is well known did not possess the other books of Scripture, have besides the Pentateuch a book of Joshua (see *Chronicon Samaritanum,* etc., ed. Juynboll, Lugd. Bat. 1848), indicates no doubt an early association of the one with the other, but is no proof that they originally constituted one work, but rather the contrary. Otherwise the Samaritans would naturally have adopted the canonical recension of Joshua. We may therefore regard the five books of Moses as one separate and complete work.

2. More particularly, the order which pervades the book manifests its unity, although this is not, indeed, tediously formal or monotonous.

(1.) Chiefly its *chronological* order, the simplest of all, and such as might be expected to be predominant in a book which is in a large measure historical. This characteristic is obvious in respect to the position of the two books of Genesis and Deuteronomy at the beginning and the end; the former serving as an introduction, and the latter as a recapitulation. In like manner the story of the family of Abraham expands, when we come to Exodus, into that of the people of Israel: first, enslaved Israel attains to

redemption, and next redeemed Israel is consecrated to the service of its Lord, who meets his people, delivers his law of life to them, and instructs them to set up his tabernacle in the midst of them. The book of Leviticus contains scarcely any history, and is occupied with the rules for the service of God in this tabernacle: it is the code for the spiritual life of Israel as the congregation of the Lord code published almost at once, and in a form substantially complete. The fourth book, that of Numbers, resumes the thread of the history, and conducts the redeemed and consecrated and organized host from Mount Sinai through the wilderness to the Land of Promise; including further legislation, of which they stood in need if they were to take a suitable place among the kingdoms of the world.

(2.) Yet obviously this book is not a dry series of annals, in which the chronological order is alone observable; still less is it the mere leaves of a journal in which the narrative of the three middle books was written down at the dates of the several occurrences, and left unchanged in all time coming. Whatever may have been written down in the form of a journal at the first (of which we have possibly an instance in Numbers 33), would be revised, extended, abbreviated, and rearranged by the author, ere it came from his hands a finished history. Therefore we find a *systematic* order, according to the internal or logical connection of the parts, even in the purely narrative portions. Thus Genesis 38 furnishes the account of transactions in the family of Judah which cannot but have stretched over a long course of time, of years apparently, including the greater part of the time that Joseph was alone in Egypt, and which very probably extended back to a date considerably earlier than that at which his captivity began: the entire series of events, however, being recorded in this one chapter, with a twofold advantage — that of being itself more distinctly set before us, and that of not interrupting the thread of Joseph's history in Egypt. Sometimes indeed we may be unable to determine whether the order in which events are narrated is the order of time or that of logical sequence; an uncertainty which meets us in other portions of sacred history, as well as outside of the Bible. But it is not surprising that this logical order predominates in the legislation; though even here the chronological order is by no means uncommon, because the laws sprang, to a considerable extent, out of the circumstances in which the people were placed from time to time. This peculiarity has given rise to repetitions, enlargements, rearrangements, and even in a limited degree to modifications, of earlier enactments, of which we have an instructive example in the varied order in

which the parts of the tabernacle and its furniture are mentioned, first in the directions given to Moses in the mount, and, secondly, in the narrative of its actual construction.

(3.) A third principle of arrangement is the *rhetorical,* of which the instances are fewer. Indeed it is very much confined to Deuteronomy, in which Moses appears as the great prophet of Israel. It was a corollary from the plan of these discourses that Moses should present the topics in the form likeliest to tell upon the audience to whom he was giving a parting address; that he should group incidents and laws according to certain affinities or contrasts for the purpose of effect; that he should pass over some subjects in entire silence, should touch upon others lightly, and on another class still should enlarge at some length; and that he should often present them under peculiar aspects, in forms somewhat different from those in which we should have seen them if we had known them only from the earlier books. Yet such variety, subordinate in its amount, and existing for a special purpose, is in reality an additional proof of the unity of the Pentateuch, and of the comprehensiveness of the plan on which it has been written.

IV. *Authority and Date of Composition.* — This is preeminently the subject which calls for discussion here, as it has been largely disputed. The reply we give is the old and common one, namely, by Moses, during the wandering in the wilderness. We shall endeavor to state plainly and fairly the views and reasons both for and against it.

1. *History of the Controversy.* —

(1.) *Adverse Writers.* — At different times suspicions have been entertained that the Pentateuch as we now have it is not the Pentateuch of the earliest age, and that the work must have undergone various modifications and additions before it assumed its present shape.

So early as the 2d century we find the author of the *Clementine Homilies* calling in question the authenticity of the Mosaic writings. According to him the Law was only given orally by Moses to the seventy elders, and not consigned to writing till after his death; it subsequently underwent many changes, was corrupted more and more by means of the false prophets, and was especially filled with erroneous anthropomorphic conceptions of God, and unworthy representations of the characters of the patriarchs (*Hom.* 2:38, 43; 3:4, 47; Neander. *Gnost. Systeme,* p. 380). A statement of this

kind, unsupported, and coming from a heretical, and therefore suspicious source, may seem of little moment; it is however remarkable, so far as it indicates an early tendency to cast off the received traditions respecting the books of Scripture; while at the same time it is evident that this was done cautiously, because such an opinion respecting the Pentateuch was said to be for the advanced Christian only, and not for the simple and unlearned.

Jerome, there can be little doubt, had seen some difficulty in supposing the Pentateuch to be altogether, in its present form, the work of Moses; for he observes (*contra Helvid.*): “Sive Mosen dicere volueris auctorem Pentateuchi sive Esram ejusdem instauratorem operis,” with reference apparently to the Jewish tradition on the subject. Aben-Ezra († 1167), in his *Comment.* on <05001>Deuteronomy 1:1, threw out some doubts as to the Mosaic authorship of certain passages, such as <01206>Genesis 12:6; <05310>Deuteronomy 3:10, 11; 31:9, which he either explained as later interpolations, or left as mysteries which it was beyond his power to unravel. But for centuries the Pentateuch was generally received in the Church without question as written by Moses. In the year 1651, however, we find Hobbes writing: “Videtur Pentateuchus potius de Mose quam a Mose scriptus” (*Leviathan, c.* 33). Spinoza (*Tract. Theol.-Polit.* c. 8, 9, published in 1679) set himself boldly to controvert the received authorship of the Pentateuch. He alleged against it (1) later names of places, as <01414>Genesis 14:14 comp. with <07129>Judges 18:29; (2) the continuation of the history beyond the days of Moses, <02635>Exodus 16:35 comp. with <06512>Joshua 5:12; (3) the statement in <01631>Genesis 36:31, “before there reigned any king over the children of Israel.” Spinoza maintained that Moses issued his commands to the elders, that by them they were written down and communicated to the people, and that later they were collected and assigned to suitable passages in Moses’s life. He considered that the Pentateuch was indebted to Ezra for the form in which it now appears. Other writers began to think that the book of Genesis was composed of written documents earlier than the time of Moses. So Vitringa (*Observ. Sacr.* 1:3), Le Clerc (*De Script. Pentateuchi, §* 11), and R. Simon (*Hist. critique du V. T.* lib. i, c. 7, Rotterdam, 1685). According to the last of these writers, Genesis was composed of earlier documents, the laws of the Pentateuch were the work of Moses, and the greater portion of the history was written by the public scribe who is mentioned in the book. Le Clerc supposed that the priest who, according to <12727>2 Kings 17:27, was sent to instruct the Samaritan colonists, was the author of the Pentateuch.

It was not till the middle of the last century, however, that the question as to the authorship of the Pentateuch was handled with anything like a bold criticism. The first attempt was made by a layman, whose studies we might have supposed would scarcely have led him to such an investigation. In the year 1753 there appeared at Brussels a work entitled *Conjectures sur les memoires originaux, dont ii paroit que Moyse s'est servi pour composer le livre de Genese.* It was written in his 69th year by Astruc, doctor and professor of medicine in the Royal College at Paris, and court physician to Louis XIV. His critical eye had observed that throughout the book of Genesis, and as far as the 6th chapter of Exodus, traces were to be found of two original documents, each characterized by a distinct use of the names of God; the one by the name Elohim, and the other by the name Jehovah. Besides these two principal documents, he supposed Moses to have made use of ten others in the composition of the earlier part of his work. Astruc was followed by several German writers on the path which he had traced; by Jerusalem, in his *Letters on the Mosaic Writings and Philosophy;* by Schultens, in his *Dissertatio qua disquiritur, unde Moses res in libro Geneseos descriptas didicerit;* and with considerable learning and critical acumen by Ilgen (*Urkunden des Jerusalemischen Tempelarchivs,* 1er Theil, Halle, 1798) and Eichhorn (*Einleitulng in d. A. T.*).

But this "documentary hypothesis," as it is called, was too conservative and too rational for some critics. Vater, in his *Commentar uber den Pentateuch* (1815), and A. T. Hartmann. in his *Linguist. Einl. in d. Stud. der Buicher des A. Test.* (1818), maintained that the Pentateuch consisted merely of a number of fragments loosely strung together without order or design. The former supposed a collection of laws, made in the times of David and Solomon, to have been the foundation of the whole: that this was the book discovered in the reign of Josiah, and that its fragments were afterwards incorporated in Deuteronomy. All the rest, consisting of fragments of history and of laws written at different periods up to this time, were, according to him, collected and shaped into their present form between the times of Josiah and the Babylonian exile. Hartmann also brings down the date of the existing Pentateuch as late as the exile. This has been called the "fragmentary hypothesis." Both of these have now been superseded by the "supplementary hypothesis," which has been adopted with various modifications by De Wette, Bleek, Stahelin, Tuch, Lengerke, Hupfeld, Knobel, Bunsen, Kurtz, Delitzsch, Schultz, Vaihinger, and others.

They all alike recognize two documents in the Pentateuch. They suppose the narrative of the Elohlst, the more ancient writer, to have been the foundation of the work, and that the Jehovist, or later writer, making use of this document, added to and commented upon it, sometimes transcribing portions of it intact, and sometimes incorporating the substance of it into his own work.

Yet though thus agreeing in the main, they differ widely in the application of the theory. Thus, for instance, De Wette distinguishes between the Elohist and the Jehovist in the first four books, and attributes Deuteronomy to a different writer altogether (*Einl. ins A. T. §* 150 sq.). So also Lengerke, though with some differences of detail in the portions he assigns to the two editors. The last places the Elohist in the time of Solomon, and the Jehovistic editor in that of Hezekiah; whereas Tuch puts the first under Saul, and the second under Solomon. Stahelin, on the other hand, declares for the identity of the Deuteronomist and the Jehovist, and supposes the last to have written in the reign of Saul, and the Elohist in the time of the Judges. Hupfeld (*Die Quellen der Genesis*) finds, in Genesis at least, traces of three authors, an earlier and a later Elohist, as well as the Jehovist. He is peculiar in regarding the Jehovistic portion as an altogether original document, written in entire independence, and without the knowledge even of the Elohistic record. A later editor or compiler, he thinks, found the two books, and threw them into one. Vaihinger (in Herzog's *Encyklopadie*) is also of opinion that portions of three original documents are to be found in the first four books, to which he adds some fragments of the 32d and 34th chanters of Deuteronomy. The fifth book, according to him, is by a different and much later writer. The pre-Elohist he supposes to have flourished about 1200 B.C., the Elohist some 200 years later, the Jehovist in the first half of the 8th century B.C., and the Deuteronomist in the reign of Hezekiah.

Delitzsch agrees with the writers above mentioned in recognising two distinct documents as the basis of the Pentateuch, especially in its earlier portions; but he entirely severs himself from them in maintaining that Deuteronomy is the work of Moses. His theory is this: the kernel or first foundation of the Pentateuch is to be found in the Book of the Covenant (Exodus 19-24), which was written by Moses himself, and afterwards incorporated into the body of the Pentateuch, where it at present stands. The rest of the laws given in the wilderness, till the people reached the plains of Ioab, were communicated orally by Moses and taken down by the

priests, whose business it was thus to provide for their preservation (Deuteronomy 17:11, comp. 24:8; 33:10; Leviticus 10:11, comp. 15:31). Inasmuch as Deuteronomy does not pre-suppose the existence in writing of the entire earlier legislation, but on the contrary recapitulates it with the greatest freedom, we are not obliged to assume that the proper codification of the law took place during the forty years' wandering in the desert. This was done, however, shortly after the occupation of the land of Canaan. On that sacred soil was the first definite portion of the history of Israel written; and the writing of the history itself necessitated a full and complete account of the Mosaic legislation. A man, such as Eleazar the son of Aaron, the priest (see Numbers 26:1; 31:21), wrote the great work beginning with the first words of Genesis, including in it the Book of the Covenant, and perhaps gave only a short notice of the last discourses of Moses, because Moses had written them down with his own hand. A second — who may have been Joshua (see especially Deuteronomy 32:44; Joshua 24:26; and comp. on the other hand 1 Samuel 10:25), who was a prophet, and spake as a prophet, or one of the elders on whom Moses's spirit rested (Numbers 11:25), and many of whom survived Joshua (Joshua 24:31) — completed the work, taking Deuteronomy, which Moses had written, for his model, and incorporating it into his own book. Somewhat in this manner arose the *Torah* (or Pentateuch), each narrator further availing himself when he thought proper of other written documents.

Such is the theory of Delitzsch, which is in many respects worthy of consideration, and which has been adopted in the main by Kurtz (*Gesch. d. A. B.* i, § 20, and ii, § 99, 6), who formerly was opposed to the theory of different documents, and sided rather with Hengstenberg and the critics of the extreme conservative school. There is this difference, however, that Kurtz objects to the view that Deuteronomy existed before the other books, and believes that the rest of the Pentateuch was committed to writing before, not after, the occupation of the Holy Land. Finally, Schultz, in his recent work on Deuteronomy, recognises two original documents in the Pentateuch, the Elohistic being the base and groundwork of the whole, but contends that the Jehovistic portions of the first four books, as well as Deuteronomy, except the concluding portion, were written by Moses. Thus he agrees with Delitzsch and Kurtz in admitting two documents and the Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy, and with Stahelin in identifying the Deuteronomist with the Jehovist.

One other theory has, however, to be stated before we pass on. The author of it stands quite alone, and it is not likely that he will ever find any disciple bold enough to adopt his theory: even his great admirer Bunsen forsakes him here. But it is due to Ewald's great and deserved reputation as a scholar, and to his uncommon critical sagacity, briefly to state what that theory is. He distinguishes, then, seven different authors in the great Book of Origins or Primitive History (comprising the Pentateuch and Joshua). The oldest historical work, of which but a very few fragments remain, is the Book of the Wars of Jehovah. Then follows a biography of Moses, of which also but small portions have been preserved. The third and fourth documents are much more perfect: these consist of the Book of the Covenant, which was written in the time of Samson, and the Book of Origins, which was written by a priest in the time of Solomon. Then comes, in the fifth place, the third historian of the primitive times, or the first prophetic narrator, a subject of the northern kingdom in the days of Elijah or Joel. The sixth document is the work of the fourth historian of primitive times, or the second prophetic narrator, who lived between 800 and 750. Lastly comes the fifth historian, or third prophetic narrator, who flourished not long after Joel, and who collected and reduced into one corpus the various works of his predecessors. The real purposes of the history, both in its prophetical and its legal aspects, began now to be discerned. Some steps were taken in this direction by an unknown writer at the beginning of the 7th century B.C.; and then in a far more comprehensive manner by the Deuteronomist, who flourished in the time of Manasseh, and lived in Egypt. In the time of Jeremiah appeared the poet who wrote the Blessing of Moses, as it is given in Deuteronomy. A somewhat later editor incorporated the originally independent work of the Deuteronomist, and the lesser additions of his two colleagues, with the history as left by the fifth narrator, and thus the whole was finally completed. "Such," says Ewald (and his words, seriously meant, read like delicate irony), "were the strange fortunes which this great work underwent before it reached its present form."

(2.) *Writers in favor of the Mosaic Authorship of the Pentateuch.* — On the other side, however, stands an array of names certainly not less distinguished for learning, who maintain not only that there is a unity of design in the Pentateuch — which is granted by many of those before mentioned-but who contend that this unity of design can only be explained on the supposition of a single author, and that this author could have been

none other than Moses. This is the ground taken by Hengstenberg, Havernick, Drechsler, Ranke, Welte, and Keil. The first mentioned of these writers has no doubt done admirable service in reconciling and removing very many of the alleged discrepancies and contradictions in the Pentateuch: but his zeal carries him in some instances to attempt a defense, the very ingenuity of which betrays how unsatisfactory it is; and his effort to explain the use of the divine names, by showing that the writer had a special design in the use of the one or the other, is often in the last degree arbitrary. Drechsler, in his work on the *Unity and Genuineness of Genesis* (1838), fares no better, though his remarks are the more valuable because in many cases they coincide, quite independently, with those of Hengstenberg. Later, however, Drechsler modified his view, and supposed that the several uses of the divine names were owing to a didactic purpose on the part of the writer, according as his object was to show a particular relation of God to the world, whether as Elohim or as Jehovah. Hence he argued that, while different streams flowed through the Pentateuch, they were not from two different fountain-heads, but varied according to the motive which influenced the writer, and according to the fundamental thought in particular sections; and on this ground, too, he explained the characteristic phraseology which distinguishes such sections. Ranke's work (*Untersuchungen uber den Pentateuch*) is a valuable contribution to the exegesis of the Pentateuch. He is especially successful in establishing the inward unity of the work, and in showing how inseparably the several portions, legal, genealogical, and historical, are interwoven together. Kurtz (in his *Einheit der Genesis* [1846], and in the first edition of his first volume of the *Geschichte des Alten Bundes*) followed on the same side; but he has since abandoned the attempt to explain the use of the divine names. on the principle of the different meanings which they bear, and has espoused the theory of two distinct documents. Keil, also, though he does not despair of the solution of the problem, confesses (*Luther. Zeitschr.* [1851-2] p. 235) that "all attempts as yet made, notwithstanding the acumen which has been brought to bear to explain the interchange of the divine names in Genesis on the ground of the different meanings which they possess, must be pronounced a failure." Ebrard (*Das Alter des Jehova-Namens*) and Tiele (*Stud. und Krit.* 1852-1) make nearly the same admission. It is not fair, however, to require the advocates of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch to explain positively the reasons which impelled him to the peculiar use of these names. The causes of such a selection are often inscrutable, even to the writer himself. A sufficient

reason is perhaps given in the supposition that Moses made use of documents written by different persons which contained those peculiarities. The want of uniformity observable in the same section in this respect shows that it is due to a twofold influence. It must be borne in mind that this peculiar distinction in the use of the sacred names is mostly confined to the book of Genesis (q.v.).

2. *Direct Testimony of the Book to its own A uthorship and Date of Composition. —*

(1.) Of this character is (2174)Exodus 17:14, “And the Lord said unto Moses, Write this for a memorial in a book, and rehearse it in the ears of Joshua; for I will utterly put out the remembrance of Amalek from under heaven:” a statement which becomes the more pointed if we read, as we have little hesitation in doing, not “in a book,” but “in *the* book” (rpSB). This passage shows that the account to be inserted was intended to form a portion of a more extensive work, with which the reader is supposed to be acquainted. It also proves that Moses, at an early period of his public career, was filled with the idea of leaving to his people a written memorial of the divine guidance, and that he fully understood the close and necessary connection of an authoritative law with a written code, or ^wrkz. At any rate, the direct testimony to the fact that particular passages were written by Moses is of vast importance as a presumption that other passages were written by him also, although the contrary assertion has often been put forward: nay, many passages may be inferred *a fortiori* to have come from his pen. Or, where the inference might be unsafe, as in the instance now given, it is because of the extraordinary emphasis of the testimony in such a passage; not merely that the doom of Amalek was written by Moses in the book of the Lord for Israel, but also its being so expressly recorded that it was written. See also (2404)Exodus 24:4-7; (4601)Numbers 33:1, 2; (5718)Deuteronomy 17:18, 19 (a remarkable passage); 28-30, which repeatedly mention the *written* blessings and curses; (5701)Deuteronomy 27:1-13, a command to “write all the words of this law” on plastered stones, preparatory to the solemn reading of the blessings and the curses beside the altar which was to be erected when the people took possession of the center of the Promised Land (comp. the account of the fulfillment, (6080)Joshua 8:30-35). The most remarkable passage, however, is at (5309)Deuteronomy 31:9: “And Moses wrote this law, and delivered it to the priests the sons of Levi, which bare the ark of the covenant of the Lord,

and unto all the elders of Israel," and charged these ecclesiastical and civil heads of the community to read it to the assembled congregation of Israel during the eight days of the Feast of Tabernacles, on the occasion when it was most largely attended in the seventh year, the year of rest. Further (ver. 24-27): "And it came to pass when Moses had made an end of writing the words of this law in a book, until they were finished, that Moses commanded the Levites, which bare the ark of the covenant of the Lord, saying, Take this book of the law, and put it in [or rather at] the side of the ark of the covenant of the Lord your God; that it may be there for a witness against thee. For I know thy rebellion and thy stiff neck: behold, while I am yet alive with you this day, ye have been rebellious against the Lord; and how much more after my death?" It has often been said that no assertion could be more explicit, or made in more solemn circumstances, or with additions more calculated for discovering and demonstrating its falsehood unless the truth had been notorious. With this mass of evidence we must connect the warnings against adding to what Moses commanded, or taking from it (<05D402>Deuteronomy 4:2; 12:32); the circumstantial statement as to the discourses being addressed by Moses to the people (<05D101>Deuteronomy 1:1-5); and along with these opening words of Deuteronomy, the closing words of Numbers (<041613>Numbers 36:13), as also the last words of Leviticus (<032734>Leviticus 27:34; also 25:1; 26:46). If all these statements are not to be set aside as an idle dream or a tissue of deliberate falsehoods, the very least which can be inferred from them is that the Pentateuch (at all events the part of it from the time when the people came to covenant with God at Mount Sinai) is from one writer; that the divine legislation was in the first place given from that mount, the substance or essence of which was concluded in the book of Leviticus; that there were appendices to this, recorded in the book of Numbers, on to the time when Israel stood upon the eastern bank of the Jordan, ready to cross over upon Jericho; and that there was a very solemn renewal of the covenant on the part of the generation which had grown up in the wilderness, to whom, in the book of Deuteronomy, Moses repeated much of the legislation and addressed his parting counsels. It may be made a question whether the hand of a later writer, who finished the Pentateuch, is perceptible from <053124>Deuteronomy 31:24 (comp. 33:1, and ch. 34), or whether the words in <053124>Deuteronomy 31:24-30 are still the words of Moses. In the former case we have two witnesses, viz. Moses himself, and the continuator of the Pentateuch; in the latter case, which seems to us the more likely, we have the testimony of Moses alone.

It is true that the above passages do not define the limits of the book, nor prove its absolute identity with the existing copies of the Pentateuch. But other evidences will be found to supply this proof. We have already the fact that a book was written by Moses under the immediate authority of God, and that this book was intended to be of perpetual obligation. Now, supposing that the scriptural testimony of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch had ended here, although we shall see this is not the case, yet, even so, no moral doubt could exist that this design was carried into effect, and that the books thus preserved were substantially identical with those which have come down to us. For at this period the Jewish people suddenly take their place amid the settled nations of the world, and enter upon that grand and mysterious national life which has continued till our own day. It will not be denied by any that this race was distinguished from all others by many peculiar characteristics. Some of their national habits exhibited affinity in various points of detail with the surrounding polytheism amid which they dwelt; but their whole system was sharply separated, alike by the grandeur of its religious monotheism and by its complex social and civil organization, from that of all other nations. Their code of laws was penetrating enough to affix its indelible peculiarities on the race who lived under them, and to endow it with a force and elevation, a perpetuity of national life, and a world-wide influence, to which no parallel can be found in history, Such an effect would itself prove the existence of a cause as permanent as itself, for the precise ritual and ceremonial enactments of the system could never have been maintained without an authorized code of directions. When we inquire into the nature of that peculiar polity to which it is to be attributed, we find it in the books of Moses. The Pentateuch contains a system which explains the national life of the Jewish race, and which, in its turn, is equally explained by it. As we know, on the one side, that the Pentateuch was reduced by Moses to a written form, and, on the other side, that the phenomena of national Jewish life can only be explained by the influence of a positive written code, it is impossible not to put the two facts together, and identify the Mosaic books of the law with the code of subsequent times. In other words, the permanence of the effect proves the permanence of the cause. The subsequent history of the Jewish race would have sufficed to prove that the Mosaic code must have existed in a permanent form from that period till the present, even if no positive external proofs of the fact had existed.

From the passages adduced above it is apparent, indeed, that the most numerous and direct testimonies occur in Deuteronomy; and the opinion has had learned advocates that these testimonies are to be restricted to this one book, which is therefore admitted to be from the pen of Moses, whereas it is alleged that there is no clear evidence as to the authorship of the other four. But he who takes up this position in good faith is likely soon to discover that Deuteronomy presupposes the existence of the others, and the general knowledge of their contents, by its incidental reference to subjects which are intelligible only when we turn to the fuller accounts given in these books: for example, the dispersion and settlement of the nations by the hand of God; the call of Abraham, that in his seed the families of the earth might be blessed; the patriarchal history generally, and the result of it, the sojourn of the children of Israel in Egypt; the destruction of Sodom and the neighboring cities; the relationship of the Edomites, Moabites, and Ammonites to Israel; the laws in reference to leprosy; the entire rules for the sacrificial services; the consecration of Aaron's family, and of the whole tribe of Levi in a wider sense, to these services; and the method of their support; and the laws on the subject of murder and manslaughter. Besides, the age of generalizations, such as we find in Deuteronomy, must be preceded by the age of particular enactments. Hence there are scarcely any who have intelligently believed that Deuteronomy is the work of Moses, who have not come to feel the necessity of acknowledging him to be (substantially at least) the author of the entire Pentateuch.

(2.) Pressed by these arguments, some of the sceptical critics have resorted to the opposite conclusion that the book of Deuteronomy itself, in which these striking testimonies are so largely found, is likewise not the production of Moses. It is of importance therefore to consider this question separately.

All allow that the Book of the Covenant in Exodus, perhaps a great part of Leviticus, and some part of Numbers were written by Israel's greatest leader and prophet. But Deuteronomy, it is alleged, is in style and purpose so utterly unlike the genuine writings of Moses that it is quite impossible to believe that he is the author. But how, then, set aside the express testimony of the book itself? How explain the fact that Moses is there said to have written all the words of this law, to have consigned it to the custody of the priests, and to have charged the Levites sedulously to preserve it by the side of the ark? Only by the bold assertion that the fiction was invented by

a later writer, who chose to personate the great Lawgiver in order to give the more color of consistency to his work! The author first feigns the name of Moses that he may gain the greater consideration under the shadow of his name, and then proceeds to re-enact, but in a broader and more spiritual manner, and with true prophetic inspiration, the chief portions of the earlier legislation. But such a hypothesis is devoid of all probability. For what writer in later times would ever have presumed, unless he were equal to Moses, to correct or supplement the Law of Moses? And if he were equal to Moses, why borrow his name (as Ewald supposes the Deuteronomist to have done) in order to lend greater weight and sanction to his book? The truth is, those who make such a supposition import modern ideas into ancient writings. They forget that what might be allowable in a modern writer of fiction would not have been tolerated in one who claimed to have a divine commission, who came forward as a prophet to rebuke and to reform the people. Which would be more weighty to win their obedience, “Thus saith Jehovah,” or “Moses wrote all these words?” It has been argued indeed that in thus assuming a feigned character the writer does no more than is done by the author of Ecclesiastes. He in like manner takes the name of Solomon that he may gain a better hearing for his words of wisdom. But the cases are not parallel. The Preacher only pretends to give an old man’s view of life, as seen by one who had had a large experience and no common reputation for wisdom. Deuteronomy claims to be a law imposed on the highest authority, and demanding implicit obedience. The first is a record of the struggles, disappointments, and victory of a human heart. The last is an absolute rule of life, to which nothing may be added, and from which nothing may be taken (4:2; 31:1).

But, besides the fact that Deuteronomy claims to have been written by Moses, there is other evidence which establishes the great antiquity of the book.

(a) It is remarkable for its allusions to Egypt, which are just what would be expected supposing Moses to have been the author. It is a significant fact that Ewald, who will have it that Deuteronomy was written in the reign of Manasseh, is obliged to make his supposed author live in Egypt, in order to account plausibly for the acquaintance with Egyptian customs which is discernible in the book. Without insisting upon it that in such passages as Deuteronomy 4:15-18, or 6:8, and 11:18-20 (comp. Exodus 13:16), where the command is given to wear the law after the fashion of an amulet,

or Deuteronomy 27:1-8, where writing on stones covered with plaster is mentioned, are probable references to Egyptian customs, we may point to more certain examples. In Deuteronomy 20:5 there is an allusion to Egyptian regulations in time of war; in Deuteronomy 25:2, to the Egyptian bastinado; in Deuteronomy 11:10, to the Egyptian mode of irrigation. The references which Delitzsch sees in Deuteronomy 22:5 to the custom of the Egyptian priests to hold solemn processions in the masks of different deities, and in Deuteronomy 8:9 to Egyptian mining operations, are by no means so certain. Again, among the curses threatened are the sicknesses of Egypt (Deuteronomy 28:60; comp. 7:15). According to Deuteronomy 28:68, Egypt is the type of all the oppressors of Israel: "Remember that thou wast a slave in the land of Egypt," is an expression which is several times made use of as a motive in enforcing the obligations of the book (5:15; 24:18, 22; see the same appeal in Leviticus 19:34, a passage occurring in the remarkable section Leviticus 17-20, which has so much affinity with Deuteronomy). Lastly, references to the sojourning in Egypt are numerous: "We were Pharaoh's bondmen in Egypt," etc. (Leviticus 6:21-23; see also Leviticus 7:8, 18; 11:3); and these occur even in the laws, as in the law of the king (Leviticus 17:16), which would be very extraordinary if the book had only been written in the time of Manasseh.

(b) The phraseology of the book, and the archaisms found in it, stamp it as of the same age with the rest of the Pentateuch. The form awh, instead of ayh, for the feminine of the pronoun (which occurs in all 195 times in the Pentateuch), is found thirty-six times in Deuteronomy. Nowhere do we meet with ayh in this book, though in the rest of the Pentateuch it occurs eleven times. In the same way, like the other books, Deuteronomy has r[ni of a maiden, instead of the feminine hr;[]ni, which is only used once (22:19). It has also the third pers. pret. yji, which in prose occurs only in the Pentateuch (Ewald, *Lehrbuch, §* 142 *b*). The demonstrative pronoun lae;(which, according to Ewald, § 183 *a*, is characteristic of the Pentateuch) occurs in Deuteronomy 4:42; 7:22; 19:11, and nowhere else out of the books of Moses, except in the late book, 1 Chronicles 20:8, and the Aramaic Ezra, 5:15. The use of the h *locale*, which is comparatively rare in later writings, is common to Deuteronomy with the other books of the Pentateuch; and so is the old and rare form of writing ^axm]Ta;and the termination of the future in ^YA. The last, according to

Konig (*A.-T. Stud.* 2 Heft), is more common in the Pentateuch than in any other book: it occurs fifty-eight times in Deuteronomy. Twice even in the preterite (<05083>Deuteronomy 8:3, 16) a like termination presents itself; on the peculiarity of which Ewald (§ 190 b, note) remarks, as being the original and fuller form. Other archaisms which are common to the whole five books are: the shortening of the Hiphil, taoi]l]i, 33; rveN]l]i, <052612>Deuteronomy 26:12, etc.; the use of arq hrq, "to meet;" the construction of the passive with hae of the object (for instance, 20:8); the interchange of the older bcK,(<051404>Deuteronomy 14:4) with the more usual cbK; the use of rWkz; (instead of rkz;), <051616>Deuteronomy 16:16; 20:13, a form which disappears altogether after the Pentateuch; many ancient words, such as bybae; µWqy] rgiv](ygv, <021312>Exodus 13:12). Among these are some which occur besides only in the book of Joshua, or else in very late writers, like Ezekiel, who, as is always the case in the decay of a language, studiously imitated the oldest forms; some which are found afterwards only in poetry, as µypale}a}(7:13; 28:4, etc.) and µytme], so common in Deuteronomy. Again, this book has a number of words which have an archaic character. Such are, vme]j},(for the later lG;mi), an,f, (instead of lsi); the old Canaanitish twor T]v][i^aXhi, "offspring of the flocks;" ^Wrvy], which as a name of Israel is borrowed, <234402>Isaiah 44:2; ^yhae(1:41), "to act rashly," tyKse]hi, "to be silent;" qynæE]h, (15:14), "to give," lit. "to put like a collar on the neck;" rMeE]it]hæ,"to play the lord;" hwd]mi, "sickness."

(c) A fondness for the use of figures is another peculiarity of Deuteronomy. See <052901>29:17. Deuteronomy 18; 28:13, 44; 1:31, 44; 8:5; 28:29, 49. Of similar comparisons there are but few (Delitzsch says but three) in the other books. The results are most surprising when we compare Deuteronomy with the Book of the Covenant (Exodus 19-24) on the one hand, and with Psalm 90 (which is said to be Mosaic) on the other. To cite but one example: the images of devouring fire and of the bearing on eagles' wings occur only in the Book of the Covenant and in Deuteronomy. Comp. <022417>Exodus 24:17 with <050424>Deuteronomy 4:24; 9:3; and <021904>Exodus 19:4 with <052211>Deuteronomy 22:11. So again, not to mention numberless undesigned coincidences between Psalm 90 and the book of Deuteronomy, especially chap. 32, we need only here cite the phrase µydey; hceE]mi(Psalm 90, 17), "work of the hands," as descriptive of human action generally,

which runs through the whole of Deuteronomy 2:7; 14:29; 16:15; 24:19; 28:12; 30:9. The same close affinity, both as to matter and style, exists between the section to which we have already referred in Leviticus (chap. 17-20, so manifestly different from the rest of that book), the Book of the Covenant (Exodus 19-24), and Deuteronomy.

(d) In addition to all this, and very much more might be said — for a whole harvest has been gleaned on this field by Schultz in the Introduction to his work on Deuteronomy — in addition to all these peculiarities which are arguments for the Mosaic authorship of the book, we have here, too, the evidence strong and clear from post-Mosaic times and writings. The attempt, by a wrong interpretation of 2 Kings 22 and 2 Chronicles 34, to bring down Deuteronomy as low as the time of Manasseh fails utterly. A century earlier the Jewish prophets borrow their words and their thoughts from Deuteronomy. Amos shows how intimate his acquaintance was with Deuteronomy by such passages as Deuteronomy 2:9; 4:11; 9:7, whose matter and form are both colored by those of that book. Hosea, who is richer than Amos in these references to the past, while full of allusions to the whole law (Hosea 6:7; 12:4, etc.; Hosea 13:9, 10), in one passage (Hosea 8:12) using the remarkable expression, “I have written to him the ten thousand things of my law,” manifestly includes Deuteronomy (comp. 11:8 with Deuteronomy 29:22), and in many places shows that that book was in his mind. Comp. 4:13 with Deuteronomy 12:2; 8:13 with Deuteronomy 28:68; 11:3 with Deuteronomy 1:31; 13:6 with Deuteronomy 8:11-14. Isaiah begins his prophecy with the words, “Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth,” taken from the mouth of Moses in Deuteronomy 32:1. In fact, echoes of the tones of Deuteronomy are heard throughout the solemn and majestic discourse with which his prophecy opens. (See Caspari, *Beitr age zur Eninl. in d. Buch Jesaia*, p. 203-210., The same may be said of Micah. In his protest against the apostasy of the nation from the covenant with Jehovah, he appeals to the mountains as the sure foundations of the earth, in like manner as Moses (Deuteronomy 32:1) to the heavens and the earth. The controversy of Jehovah with his people (Micah 6:3-5) is a compendium, as it were, of the history of the Pentateuch from Exodus onwards, while the expression tyBeµydbæ[; “slave-house” of Egypt, is taken from Deuteronomy 7:8; 13:5. In 6:8 there is no doubt an allusion to Deuteronomy 10:12, and the threatenings of 6:13-16 remind us of Deuteronomy 28 as well as of Leviticus 26. Since, then, not only Jeremiah

and Ezekiel, but Amos and Hosea, Isaiah and Micah speak in the words of Deuteronomy, as well as in words borrowed from other portions of the Pentateuch, we see at once how untenable is the theory of those who, like Ewald, maintain that Deuteronomy was composed during the reign of Manasseh, or, as Vaihinger does, during that of Hezekiah.

(e) But, in truth, the book speaks for itself. No imitator could have written in such a strain. We scarcely need the express testimony of the work to its own authorship. But, having it, we find all the internal evidence conspiring to show that it came from Moses. Those magnificent discourses, the grand roll of which can be heard and felt even in a translation, came warm from the heart and fresh from the lips of Israel's lawgiver. They are the outpourings of a solicitude which is nothing less than parental. It is the father uttering his dying advice to his children, no less than the prophet counseling and admonishing his people. What book can vie with it either in majesty or in tenderness? What words ever bore more surely the stamp of genuineness? If Deuteronomy be only the production of some timorous reformer, who, conscious of his own weakness, tried to borrow dignity and weight from the name of Moses, then assuredly all arguments drawn from internal evidence for the composition of any work are utterly useless. We can never tell whether an author is wearing the mask of another, or whether it is he himself who speaks to us. In spite, therefore, of the dogmatism of modern critics, we declare unhesitatingly for the Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy. *SEE DEUTERONOMY*.

3. *Testimony of other Witnesses to the Author. —*

(1.) *Our Lord and his Apostles*. — Their language is such that the hypothesis of the Pentateuch not being the work of Moses must create a very painful feeling in the mind of every true and simple-hearted follower of Christ. Comp. <40150>Matthew 15:1-9 and <41070>Mark 7:1-13, where the fifth commandment and the law which sentenced to death the man who cursed his parents are ascribed indifferently *to God* and *to Moses,* and are put in opposition to the *commandments of men* which had grown up by a course of traditions. In <42224>Matthew 22:24 we read of the Sadducees attempting to puzzle our Lord about the resurrection: "Master, *Moses said,"* etc., or as it is in Mark and Luke, "*Moses wrote* unto us," referring to the law in <052505>Deuteronomy 25:5-10. Jesus answered them, "Ye do err, not knowing the *Scriptures,* nor the power of God... But as touching the resurrection of the dead. have ye not *read* that which was *spoken unto you by God,*

saying," etc.; or as in Mark, "Have ye not *read in the book of Moses;"* or as in Luke, "That the dead are raised, *even Moses showed* at the bush, when he calleth the Lord," etc.; all three quoting from <02306>Exodus 3:6. Again, in <40904>Matthew 19:4, 5, in answer to the Pharisees who tempted him on the subject of divorce, our Lord said to them, "Have ye not *read,* that he which made them at the beginning, made them male and female, *and said,"* etc., quoting <01024>Genesis 2:24. Upon this they asked him, *"Why did Moses then commanded* to give a writing of divorcement, and to put her away?" referring to <05401>Deuteronomy 24:1. He replied, "*Moses,* because of the hardness of your hearts, *suffered* you to put away your wives." The language is not less distinct in the parallel passage (<41002>Mark 10:2-9). There is also the testimony of the risen Savior to *the written law of Moses* as distinguished from the other Scriptures, namely, the Prophets and the Psalms (<42427>Luke 24:27, 44, 45). Without insisting on others of less distinctness (such as <42223>Luke 2:23, 24; <43817>John 8:17; <44737>Acts 7:37, 44; 15:21; <45105>Romans 10:5,19; <46909>1 Corinthians 9:9; <58805>Hebrews 8:5), we ask particular attention to two statements by our Lord. In <42629>Luke 16:29, 31, "They have *Moses and the prophets, let them hear them. ....* If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead." Without even the slight intervention of a parable, our Lord said (<43546>John 5:46, 47), "Had ye believed *Moses,* ye would have believed me; for he *wrote* of me. But if ye believe not *his writings,* how shall ye believe *my words?* "In illustration of our Lord's argument, and as a last testimony to Moses by the apostles, we quote the confession of Paul to king Agrippa (<44622>Acts 26:22), "Having therefore obtained help of God, I continue unto this (lay, witnessing both to small and great, saying *none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say* should come;" and his earlier confession to Felix (24:14), "After the manner which they call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers, *believing all things which are written in the law and the prophets."* These two statements by Paul make it plain that what he meant by the writings of Moses was the written law as received among the Jews of his day, and not any shorter work, such as critics have imagined to be the genuine work of Moses and the germ which expanded into our present Pentateuch; a hypothesis which is also contradicted by the fact that the quotations of our Lord and his apostles are as freely made from the portions which the critics ascribe with greatest confidence to later writers as from the other portions which they concede to be more ancient.

In reference to these testimonies we observe,

(a) the habitual reply has indeed been that it was not the business of our Lord and his apostles to teach Biblical criticism. But the rejoinder of Witsius is as satisfactory as ever, though the precise matter in debate has somewhat shifted since his time. “Certainly Christ and his apostles were not teachers of criticism, such as those men demand that they themselves shall be considered, who at the present day claim as their own the realm of literature in every branch of knowledge whatsoever: yet they were teachers of the truth, and they did not permit themselves to be imposed upon by the ignorance of the masses or by the astuteness of the ruling class. They certainly did not come into the world to foster vulgar errors and to protect them by their authority, and to spread them, not among the Jews alone, but also far and wide among the nations who depended exclusively upon them.”

(b) A fairer reply has been that the name “the law of *Moses,*” or the expression “*Moses* wrote,” etc., implies no more than “the psalms of *David,*” “*David* said,” etc.; and that if the latter class of phrases may be used without affirming the entire psalter to be David’s own composition, or without decisively attributing to David the particular psalm which is quoted, we are justified in taking the former class of phrases equally in an indeterminate sense. It is probably in this way that a man’s mind most readily finds relief when critical objections disturb his faith in the composition of the Pentateuch by Moses. and at the same time he holds fast his faith in Scripture as a whole; and it is well that there are such halting-places where one may rest in a downward course, and from which he may start in the hope of recovering himself. But we cannot concede that the phrases are really parallel. Were there no other difference, there is plainly a broad distinction between a collection of devotional poetry, which may be partly or wholly anonymous without injury to its character and usefulness, and the authoritative history of the commencement of Israel’s national existence, of its covenant relation to God, and of its constitution and laws as a state; for this is a document whose value is intimately connected with the age and circumstances of its author.

(2.) *The Rest of the Old-Testament Scriptures.* — These were in existence centuries before these testimonies of Jesus and his apostles, and they contain copious evidence that the Pentateuch was written at the time of Moses, and by himself or under his directions. Beyond all doubt there are

numerous most striking references both in the prophets and in the books of Kings to passages which are found in our present Pentateuch. One thing is certain, that the theory of men like Von Bohlen, Vatke, and others, who suppose the Pentateuch to have been written in the times of the latest kings, is utterly absurd. It is established in the most convincing manner that the legal portions of the Pentateuch already existed in writing before the separation of the two kingdoms. Even as regards the historical portions, there are often in the later books almost verbal coincidences of expression, which render it more than probable that these also existed in writing. All this has been argued with much learning, the most indefatigable research, and in some instances with great success, by Hengstenberg in his *Authentie des Pentateuchs.* We will satisfy ourselves by pointing out some of the most striking passages in which the coincidences between the later books and the Pentateuch (omitting Deuteronomy here) appear.

(a) Beginning with the historical books, the references to the law of Moses as a written work of supreme authority in Israel are particularly numerous and distinct in the book of Joshua, as might be expected in the history of the personal friend of Moses, and the close attendant upon him, to whom, by divine direction, Moses intrusted the completion of the work of conquering the Promised Land, and settling the people in it, and establishing among them the worship and the laws of God. The evidence is so abundant and indubitable that the only resource of our opponents has been an allegation, without any evidence, that the book of Joshua is comparatively of very recent origin, written perhaps after the Exile, or at least not long before it; an allegation which has been somewhat modified by others, but only to make it more arbitrary and improbable, when they pronounce it to be a *sixth* book of that history of the original of the Hebrew nation which has come down to us under the name of the *five* books of Moses, with certain ancient elements in it, yet wrought up to its present form only in a very late age, much as they imagine the Pentateuch to have been. The book of Judges has been said to want such clear evidence to the Pentateuch; if so, the reason must be sought, partly in the greater distance from it in point of time, and still more in its nature, as a series of sketches of the defections of the people and the chastisements which followed in order to lead them to repentance. Yet the entire work is meant to bring the conduct and condition of the people to the test of the law of God, as the known and acknowledged standard of duty: the opening account of the criminal neglect which left so many remnants of Canaanites

in the midst of the tribes of Israel is meaningless except on the supposition that the law of Moses and the transactions of Joshua are already known; and some parts of it, such as the histories of Gideon and of Samson, abound in admitted references both to the facts of the Pentateuch and to its language. Nay, the cases of, grossest divergence from the law of Moses which it records are no proof that this law was unknown, or destitute of authority, at the time its author lived, as has been rashly asserted: on the contrary, they carry evidence within themselves that they were sinful; because they were the acts of men whose whole conduct was vile and disorderly, or because it is noticed that they drew down divine judgments on those who were concerned in perpetrating them. The succeeding historical books of Ruth, Samuel, and Kings present similar evidence. In the books of Kings we have references as follows: <111202>1 Kings 20:42 to <032729>Leviticus 27:29; 21:3 to <032523>Leviticus 25:23, <043608>Numbers 36:8; 21:10 to <043450>Numbers 35:30 (comp. <051706>Deuteronomy 17:6, 7; 19:15); 22:17 to <042716>Numbers 27:16, 11; <120301>2 Kings 3:20 to <022938>Exodus 29:38, etc.; 4:1 to <032559>Leviticus 25:39, etc.; 5:27 to <020406>Exodus 4:6, <041210>Numbers 12:10; 6:18 to <011911>Genesis 19:11; 6:28 to <032629>Leviticus 26:29; 7:2, 19 to <011074>Genesis 7:14; 7:3 to <031346>Leviticus 13:46 (comp. <040503>Numbers 5:3).

(b) Especially remarkable is the testimony arising from the existence of the line of prophets in Israel; men who spoke in the style of the law of Moses, and used its language, and enforced and applied its lessons, without any civil support, often in opposition to the habits of the people and the wishes of the government; not without suffering persecution occasionally, yet without one word being uttered against the authority of the prophetic office and their abstract right to prophesy in the name of Jehovah and in support of his law. In Joel, who prophesied only in the kingdom of Judah; in Amos, who prophesied in both kingdoms; and in Hosea, whose ministry was confined to Israel, we find references which imply the existence of a written code of laws. The following comparison of passages may satisfy us on this point: <290202>Joel 2:2 with <020104>Exodus 10:14; 2:3 with <010208>Genesis 2:8, 9 (comp. 13:10); 2:17 with <041413>Numbers 14:13; 2:20 with <020109>Exodus 10:19; 3:1 [2:28, E.V.] with <010662>Genesis 6:12; 2:13 with <023406>Exodus 34:6; 4 [3], 18 with <042501>Numbers 25:1. — Again, <300202>Amos 2:2 with <042128>Numbers 21:28; 2:7 with <022306>Exodus 23:6, <032003>Leviticus 20:3; 2:8 with <022225>Exodus 22:25, etc.; 2:9 with <041332>Numbers 13:32, etc.; 3:7 with <011817>Genesis 18:17; 4:4 with <032403>Leviticus 24:3, and <051428>Deuteronomy 14:28, 26:12; v. 12 with <043531>Numbers 35:31 (comp. <022306>Exodus 23:6 and <300207>Amos 2:7; 5:17 with

(12012)Exodus 12:12; - 5:21, etc., with (4035)Numbers 29:35, (3236)Leviticus 23:36; 6:1 with (4017)Numbers 1:17; 6:6 with (1037)Genesis 37:25 (this is probably the reference: Hengstenberg's is wrong); 6:8 with (3609)Leviticus 26:19; 6:14 with (4048)Numbers 34:8; 8:6 with (2102)Exodus 21:2, (3259)Leviticus 25:39; 9:13 with (3603)Leviticus 26:3-5 (comp. (2038)Exodus 3:8). — Again, (2002)Hosea 1:2 with (3205)Leviticus 20:5-7; 2:1 [i. 10] with (1227)Genesis 22:17, 32:12; 2:2 [i. 11] with (2010)Exodus 1:10; 3:2 with (2232)Exodus 21:32; 4:8 with (3167)Leviticus 6:17, etc., and 7:1, etc.; 4:10 with (3626)Leviticus 26:26; 4:17 with (2319)Exodus 32:9, 10; 5:6 with (2009)Exodus 10:9; 6:2 with (1178)Genesis 17:18; 7:8 with (2342)Exodus 34:12-16; 12:6 [A.V. 5] with (2035)Exodus 3:15; 12:10 [9] with (3238)Leviticus 23:43; 12:15 [14] with (1095)Genesis 9:5. This fact is the more worthy of consideration, inasmuch as these prophets were to be found actively at work, not merely in the kingdom of Judah, in which the process of elaborating the Pentateuch is imagined to have been carried on, but also in the kingdom of the ten tribes, in which the true spirit of the theocracy was confessedly at a very low ebb. Those of the prophets who have left their writings as a portion of Scripture have furnished references to facts and phrases in the books of Moses, sometimes longer and more direct, sometimes briefer and more incidental, but so various and multiplied that it has been found necessary to frame the hypothesis that the prophetic writings were the originals out of which our present Pentateuch was formed: a supposition in itself sufficiently unnatural, and, if it were admitted, still forcing us back upon the question, What, then, was the foundation of divine authority, as acknowledged by the people of Israel, on which the prophetic office rested, and to which the prophets in their teaching appealed?

(c) A strong support is also furnished by two books of Scripture which are of a very different nature from any that have yet been noticed — the books of Psalms and of Proverbs: the one dealing with the devotional feelings, the other with the practical life of the people of Israel, and both often naming the law, and continually referring to it, or tacitly assuming that it was known and reverenced.

(d) It is unnecessary to speak of the testimony of books written after the return from Babylon, as Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles: a testimony which is admitted to be so full and explicit that there is no way of destroying its force, or of even materially diminishing its value, unless by affirming boldly that these are such late writings that they are he authorities

upon the question; as in fact the history given in the books of Chronicles is often pronounced incorrect and untrustworthy.

(e) But now if, as appears from the examination of all the extant Jewish literature, the Pentateuch existed as a canonical book; if; moreover, it was a book so well known that its words had become household words among the people; and if the prophets could appeal to it as a recognized and well-known document — how comes it to pass that in the reign of Josiah, one of the latest kings, its existence as a canonical book seems to have been almost forgotten? Yet such was evidently the fact. The circumstances, as narrated in <14814>2 Chronicles 34:14, etc., were these: In the eighteenth year of his reign, the king, who had already taken active measures for the suppression of idolatry, determined to execute the necessary repairs of the Temple, which had become seriously dilapidated, and to restore the worship of Jehovah in its purity. He accordingly directed Hilkiah the highpriest to take charge of the moneys that were contributed for this purpose. During the progress of the work, Hilkiah, who was busy in the Temple, came upon a copy of the book of the Law — which must have long lain neglected and forgotten — and told Shaphan the scribe of his discovery. The effect produced by this was very remarkable. The king, to whom Shaphan read the words of the book, was filled with consternation when he learned for the first time how far the nation had departed from the law of Jehovah. He sent Hilkiah and others to consult the prophetess Huldah, who only confirmed his fears. The consequence was that he held a solemn assembly in the house of the Lord, and read in their ears all the words of the book of the covenant that was found in the house of the Lord." How are we to explain this surprise and alarm in the mind of Josiah, betraying as it does such utter ignorance of the book of the Law, and of the severity of its threatenings, except on the supposition that as a written document it had well-nigh perished? This must have been the case, and it is not so extraordinary a fact, perhaps, as it appears at first sight. It is quite true that in the reign of Jehoshaphat pains had been taken to make the nation at large acquainted with the law. That monarch not only instituted "teaching priests," but we are told that as they went about the country they had the book of the Law with them. But that was 300 years before a period equal to that between the days of Luther and our own; and in such an interval great changes must have taken place. It is true that in the reign of Ahaz the prophet Isaiah directed the people, who in their hopeless infatuation were seeking counsel of ventriloquists and necromancers, to

turn “to the law and to the testimony;” and Hezekiah, who succeeded Ahaz, had no doubt reigned in the spirit of the prophet’s advice. But the next monarch was guilty of outrageous wickedness, and filled Jerusalem with idols. How great a desolation might one wicked prince effect, especially during a lengthened reign! To this we must add that at no time, in all probability, were there many copies of the law existing in writing. It was probably then the custom, as it still is in the East, to trust largely to the memory for its transmission. Just as at this day in Egypt persons are to be found, even illiterate in other respects, who can repeat the whole Koran by heart, and as some modern Jews are able to recite the whole of the five books of Moses, so it probably was then: the law, for the great bulk of the nation, was orally preserved and inculcated. (See Mr. Grove’s very interesting paper on Nablus and the Samaritans in *Vacation Tourists,* 1861. Speaking of the service of the *yom kippur* in the Samaritan synagogue, he says that the recitation of the Pentateuch was continued through the night, “without even the feeble lamp which on every other night of the year but this burns in front of the holy books. The two priests and a few of the people know the whole of the Torah by heart” [p. 346].) The ritual would easily be perpetuated by the mere force of observance, though much of it doubtless became perverted, and some part of it perhaps obsolete, through the neglect of the priests. Still it is against the perfunctory and lifeless manner of their worship, not against their total neglect, that the burning words of the prophets are directed. The command of Moses, which laid upon the king the obligation of making a copy of the law for himself, had of course long been disregarded. Here and there, perhaps, only some prophet or righteous man possessed a copy of the sacred book. The bulk of the nation were without it. Nor was there any reason why copies should be brought under the notice of the king. We may understand this by a parallel case. How easy it would have been in England, before the invention of printing, for a similar circumstance to have happened. How many copies, do we suppose, of the Scriptures were made? Such as did exist would be in the hands of a few learned men, or more probably in the libraries of monasteries. Even after a translation, like Wickliffe’s, had been made, the people as a whole would know nothing whatever of the Bible; and yet they were a Christian people, and were in some measure at least instructed out of the Scriptures, though the volume itself could scarcely ever have been seen. Even the monarch, unless he happened to be a man of learning or piety, would remain in the same ignorance as his subjects. Whatever knowledge there was of the Bible and of religion would be kept alive

chiefly by means of the liturgies used in public worship. So it was in Judah. The oral transmission of the law and the living testimony, of the prophets had superseded the written document, till at last it had become so scarce as to be almost unknown. But the hand of God so ordered it that when king and people were both zealous for reformation, and ripest for the reception of the truth, the written document itself was brought to light.

If this direct verbal testimony had been absent, the entire structure of the scriptural books from Joshua to Malachi would have necessitated the same conclusion. These books never could have been written in their existing form, unless by men familiarly conversant with the Pentateuch. Thence are derived the ultimate principles which underlie the whole. They are united to it by a mass of reference so complex, intricate, and minute, as to constitute a study in itself. The grand monotheism which pervades the whole, the overruling Providence which is everywhere thrown into the foreground; the national election of the Jew, and his relation to his forefathers in the perpetual covenant sealed between God and them, would all be inexplicable without this reference to the transactions of the past. Throughout the prophetical books especially the tone of thought and feeling, the language employed, the illustrations used, the accents of blended reproach, warning, and promise, the allusions to the past, and the predictions of the future, would be unintelligible to the student if the Pentateuch were not in his possession to interpret them. This is as true, and perhaps more forcibly evident in regard to the N.T. and the teaching of our Lord and his apostles than it is in the O.T. and in the language of the prophets. The Pentateuch is the thread of gold which runs, now latent, now prominent, throughout the whole body of the Scriptures. Retain it in its place, and the whole is united by a consistent purpose from end to end; take it away, and all the rest of revelation becomes a mass of inextricable confusion. The recognition of this bearing of the authority of the Pentateuch on the authority of the other scriptural books is most necessary. For the purpose, however, of succinctly stating the positive argument in favor of the authorship and divine authority of the five books of Moses, it is sufficient to trace the line of testimony down to the time of Malachi, for here we find that firm footing in the acknowledged facts of profane history which enables us to close every avenue against the objections of unbelief.

To take the facts of the books subsequent to the Pentateuch, and reduce them to anything like consistency, on the supposition that the Pentateuch itself is mythical, framing a connected and credible story out of them, is a

task which baffles all human ingenuity. The only alternative appears to be to make a clean sweep of the history altogether; but this is no sooner proposed to the mind than both the past and the present lift up their protest against it. The past forbids it, because at many points the history of the Jew has come into contact with the history of the other great nations of antiquity, and to destroy the one would involve the destruction of the other likewise; for modern research has conclusively proved the harmony of sacred history with profane in a very considerable number of instances. The Mosaic authorship is expressly affirmed by Hecataeus, Manetho, Lysimachus, Tacitus, Juvenal, and Longinus. In regard to the Pentateuch itself, the Mosaic cosmogony, the scriptural account of the deluge, and the dispersion of mankind at Babel receive confirmation from Berosus the Chaldaean; the ethnological list in Genesis is strongly corroborated by the Babylonian monuments; the account of the exodus, by the distorted narrative of Manetho the Egyptian. Coming to later times, the Jewish conquest of Canaan is confirmed by an ancient Phoenician inscription noticed by three old writers; David's conquest of Syria by two heathen writers of repute; the history of his relations with Hiram, king of Tyre. by Herodotus, Dius, and Menander. Similar points of contact occur all down the history, till, in the period of the captivity, we emerge from the darkness of prehistoric times to the period of authentic history (see Rawlinson's *Bamnpton Lectures* and *Ancient Monarchies*). If the Jewish history be all fabulous. what becomes of the profane? and how is it that the ancient Babylonian monuments, now yielding their precious stores of information to the diligence of modern inquiry, corroborate in so many points the statements of the sacred books. The two branches of history, the sacred and the profane, are so interwoven that the denial of the one must involve likewise the denial of the other. Say that the past history of the Jew before the times of the Ptolemies is a myth altogether, and the history of the Egyptian, the Babylonian, and the Assyrian must become at least equally apocryphal. Acknowledge the history to be true, and the truth of the history involves the divine authority of the Pentateuch which records it.

But the argument is at least equally strong when we trace the line of proof upward from the time of the Ptolemies, in regard to the existence of the Jewish Scriptures, as in regard to the facts of Jewish history. The still extant Septuagint proves the existence of the O.-T. Scriptures in their completed form at this date, and that they were universally received by the Jewish race as the authoritative and divinely inspired compositions of the

authors to whom they are ascribed. The Pentateuch, for instance, was implicitly received as being the work of Moses, and as supplying the divinely ordained platform on which the whole superstructure of Jewish polity and religion had been reared, and as the authoritative record of it. To cast a doubt on its genuineness and sacred authority would have been esteemed blasphemy. The case is strengthened by the position held by the Pentateuch as the most ancient of their writings, and as underlying, so to speak, all the rest. For they were accepted not only as existing from former times, but as the first of a long series of sacred books, united by a regular historical sequence with each other, and all of them received from the tradition of the preceding times. The supposition, therefore, that the Pentateuch is unhistorical does not end with the destruction of the sacred authority of the Mosaic books, but destroys the authority of all the rest of the O.-T. Scriptures likewise; for all these without exception are founded on the authority of the Pentateuch, and the historic reality of the events recorded in it. If this is denied, either the later books must be considered part of the same imposture as that which produced the Pentateuch in its connected form; or their authors must have knowingly endorsed and availed themselves of this imposture; or, lastly, they must ignorantly have received human and imaginary compositions as veritable and divinely inspired history.

The enormous difficulty of even conceiving the possibility of a fraud under such circumstances is increased by the wide dispersion of the Jewish race, and the mighty separation which had divided the original people into two jealous if not hostile nations. If one portion of the dispersed had been disposed to acquiesce in the fraud, or, in the depth of their superstitious ignorance, had been induced to accept a religious romance composed by some member of the college of the prophets as the ancient Scriptures of their nation, still it is inconceivable that all the communities of Jews established in the different cities of the known world could have been brought to the same conclusion. Or if the exclusive and intense spirit of nationality by which they were actuated, and which becomes on this supposition itself an effect without a cause, can be believed to have accomplished even this result, it still remains to be conceived how the Samaritan people could have been induced to adopt the same belief, instead of indignantly protesting, as a people so sensitively jealous would inevitably have done, against what must have been either an enormous folly or a criminal imposture. Yet an independent Samaritan version of the

Pentateuch carries the evidence for the national acceptance of the Mosaic writings as high as the times of Solomon and David, within little more than 400 years of the conquest of Canaan. Every theory hitherto suggested to explain the existence of the Jewish Scriptures, and the profound veneration entertained for them during all periods by the historic Jew, bristles with difficulties which contradict every experience of human history and every known principle of human conduct.

(3.) Proof of the early composition of the Pentateuch exists in the fact that the *Samaritans had their own copies of it,* not differing very materially from those possessed by the Jews, except in a few passages which had probably been purposely tampered with and altered; such, for instance, as ‹0124›Exodus 12:40; ‹0527›Deuteronomy 27:5. The Samaritans, it would seem, must have derived their book of the Law from the ten tribes, whose land they occupied; on the other hand, it is out of the question to suppose that the ten tribes would be willing to accept religious books from the two, unless these were already in general circulation and of long-established authority. Hence the conclusion seems to be irresistible that the Pentateuch must have existed in its present form before the separation of Israel from Judah; the only part of the O.T. which was the common heritage of both. There is not indeed any historical notice of a rupture between the Jews and Samaritans prior to the return from Babylon, except so far as the schismatic calf-worship, and the mongrel character of the inhabitants introduced by the Assyrian conquerors, would naturally produce it; and there are traces of a religious association, more or less close, during the later period of the Hebrew monarchy; but the notable fact that none of the prophetical writings were admitted by the Samaritans strongly argues that their copy dates from a very early period. This view is confirmed by the fact that it is written in the ancient character, which certainly was not in use after the Exile. The only objection of any considerable weight to this conclusion is the fact that it agrees remarkably with the existing Hebrew Pentateuch, and that, too, in those passages which are manifestly interpolations and corrections as late as the time of Ezra. Hence many incline to the view of Prideaux (*Connect.* bk. vi, ch. iii) that the Samaritan Pentateuch was in fact a transcript of Ezra’s revised copy. The same view is virtually adopted by Gesenius (*De Pent. Sam.* p. 8, 9). *SEE SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH*.

(4.) *The unvarying conviction of the Jews, and of the Christian Church also,* has been that the Pentateuch, substantially as we have it now, and

without any alterations beyond what are conceded to be admissible in all books which have been handed down from remote antiquity, is the writing of Moses. As we have seen above, until near the end of last century the universality of this conviction may be pronounced absolute; the alleged exceptions are so trifling or so dubious that the mere mention of them, as they have been carefully hunted out, gives us an impression of the strength of the traditional belief such as we might not otherwise have had. The case of some obscure early heretical sects among so-called Christians would scarcely be to the point, even if it could be established: but really they do not seem to have denied that Moses was the author of the book; their denial had reference to its divine origin and authority. The first distinct adverse statement was made by Carlstadt, the Reformer with whom Luther was associated for a time, but from whom he was compelled to separate on account of his rashness and want of good sense. Carlstadt admitted that Moses had received the law from God, and that he communicated it to the people; but he doubted whether the words and the thread of discourse in the Pentateuch did not proceed from some later writer, though he rejected the notion that Ezra was the writer. Masius, a learned Roman Catholic, whose commentary on Joshua was published in 1574, after his death, held that at least there was rearrangement and supplementing by Ezra or some other inspired person. These two Christian writers perhaps had a predecessor among the Jewish rabbins, the learned Aben-Ezra, of Toledo, who lived probably A.D. 1095-1168; he hinted his opinion that a few passages had not come from the hand of Moses, and he notices the similar opinion, as to one passage, of another rabbin in the 11th century, a man, however, who is otherwise wholly unknown to us. Finally, about the end of the 17th and beginning of the 18th century, there were a few theologianis, both Romanist and Reformed — Pevrerius, Richard Simon, Van Dale, and Le Clerc — who adopted the opinion, more or less decidedly, that Ezra was the author of the Pentateuch. The last of these, an eminent man among the Dutch Arminianls, is by far the best known of the whole number; and he professed himself convinced by subsequent discussions that he had been in error, and in his commentary on the Pentateuch retracted his opinion.

4. *Confirmation of the Mosaic Authorship*. — Of this confirmatory evidence we offer the following specimens, in addition to the considerations urged above to prove the *unity* of the entire five books.

(1.) *Internal indications* occur that the Pentateuch does belong to the age of Moses. —

(a.) *References to matters somewhat earlier than his own time,* which he might well have opportunities of knowing, and which might be expected to attract the interest of the generation of Israelites who came out of Egypt and entered Canaan, while they would less probably have been incorporated into his history by a writer of a much later period. Such are the details in Genesis xiv of the wars between the four kings of the East and the five kings of Sodom, etc.; the peculiar list of nations in Canaan during the earlier part of Abraham's sojourn (<01159>Genesis 15:19-21), differing very considerably from the ordinary list of these nations in the age of Moses, several centuries later; the designation of Abraham's original home as "Ur of the Chaldees" (<01131>Genesis 11:31), though really in Mesopotamia (<44702>Acts 7:2), in the mountains of which country it seems that the Chaldees were settled at a remote period, whereas later Jewish history represents them as settled much farther south, in the plains of Babylonia; the curious notices scattered throughout <05101>Deuteronomy 2 of the old nations in and around Canaan, who had been dispossessed by the Philistines, the Edomites, the Moabites, and the Ammonites — notices well fitted, and we believe intended, to encourage Israel in rooting out their enemies the Canaanites with the promised special help of God, although the higher criticism has induced its votaries to pronounce them ill-judged interpolations.

(b.) *The record of particulars respecting the origin of the people that have every token of verisimilitude,* at once from the simplicity with which they are related, and from the absence of features which characterize the fabulous accounts of early things by the Greeks and others.

(c.) *The prominence given to many events, and the minuteness and vividness of the descriptions, such as are common in the narratives of eye-witnesses and men personally engaged in the transactions;* with which may be associated the evidence of intimate (yet not obtruded) acquaintance with both Egypt and the wilderness.

(d.) *Confirmatory evidence may be found in many of the laws which were applicable to the Israelites only while in motion through the wilderness, or while gathered close together in the camp;* as indeed "the camp" is very frequently mentioned in the course of these laws, for instance in <03346>Leviticus 13:46; 14:8; 16:26; 17:3; <04103>Numbers 5:3. So also the commands are many a time laid, not upon the priests as a body, but upon Aaron personally, or upon "Aaron and his sons." To this may be added

what has already been said of certain slight modifications of laws in Deuteronomy, which were natural with the progress of events during the forty years; compare also <BIBLE>Deuteronomy 14 and Leviticus 11, Leviticus alone mentioning the permission to eat the locusts, which would be common in the wilderness, etc.

(e.) Add to this *the antique forms of words and expressions which are generally conceded to occur throughout the Pentateuch.* This is no doubt a kind of argument which must be handled with care and moderation; and it has been employed very frequently, and been pushed to a most extravagant length, by many Continental scholars in support of views which they have really adopted on other grounds. But three things may be asserted very confidently, and they are sufficiently plain to be appreciated by the mere English reader, although he is not in circumstances to verify them. First, that there are many traces of very early simple language in the Pentateuch, as the habitual use of aWh for "he" and "she," r[ni for "young man" and "young woman," without the distinction of gender invariably found in the rest of the Old Testament. Secondly, that the differences of the Elohistic and the Jehovistic and the Deuteronomic vocabulary (to use the barbarous words descriptive of peculiar notions which have been introduced into this controversy) are reduced to extremely narrow limits by such a competent scholar as Delitzsch, whose peculiar theory leads him to occupy an intermediate or neutral place in these discussions. Thirdly, that a difference is at once plainly discernible when we pass from the vocabulary of the Pentateuch to that of the books generally reckoned nearest to it in point of age — namely, Joshua and Judges.

(2.) *If we deny that Moses was the author of this book, it is impossible to fix with satisfaction on any later age for the date of composition.* — This will be evident on a slight examination of the various dates proposed.

(a.) The inclination is very strong to fix the date of the composition of Deuteronomy, as well as the final arrangement of the other four books, somewhere perhaps in the reign of Hezekiah — the character of whose administration, however, is inconsistent with the admission of religious novelties (emphatically in the rule of faith), since he was bent upon removing all the abuses which had crept into the institutions of Moses; or in the reign of his profligate son Manasseh, although the heathenish party in Judah were at the time so completely in the ascendant that their opponents were at their mercy, and they are thought to have subjected the

prophets of Jehovah to bloody persecution; or perhaps in the reign of Josiah, when the corruption was still deeper and more widespread, and when so distinguished a prophet as Jeremiah was impotent to stem the tide of evil. It may be asserted very confidently that no one of these reigns was more favorable for interpolating or annexing a new section of the law of Moses than the age of the Reformation would have been for adding another epistle to the New Testament. Any of these dates is ridiculously ill-suited for the composition in Deuteronomy of those consecutive chapters (6, 7, 8) which are filled with warnings against worldliness in consequence of peacefully possessing the land, and an improper toleration of the doomed nations of Canaan, and pride in victories achieved and wealth enjoyed.

(b.) Or shall we assume an earlier date, the period of the first and best times of the kingdom, before the death of Jehoshaphat, which is generally regarded by the critics as a time of prophetic activity in composing the early history of the nation? The Pentateuch, however, cannot well have been composed later than the schism in religion, and the rise of two hostile kingdoms, after the death of Solomon; for it uniformly supposes Israel to be in an undivided condition, both civilly and ecclesiastically. There is never a hint of the existence of such a division; nay, after that division had taken place many of the laws must have met with impediments in their execution. Again, had the book been composed later than the date of the schism, the ten tribes would have protested, and justly too, against such laws as bore hard upon them; while at the same time we are warranted in inferring from the strong language in the acknowledged writings of the prophets, that, had they been the writers of the legislation, its language would have been found to be distinct and pointed against the schism. Similar remarks may be made upon the historical portions of the Pentateuch. A prophetic historian in the kingdom of Judah would have been likely to identify more distinctly than is done “the land of Moriah,” where Abraham was ready to offer Isaac, with “Mount Moriah,” where the Temple was built; and he would have been likely to assign less religious prominence in the patriarchal and early national history to Shechem, the scene of the revolt and the seat of Jeroboam’s government. Nor could we expect him to say nothing in praise of Levi, in Jacob’s dying blessing; nor in the blessing of Moses, while mentioning Levi, to give so slight a blessing to Judah in comparison with that given to Ephraim and Manasseh.

(c.) Nor yet is the earlier age of David and Solomon satisfactory as the assumed date of this composition. If the Pentateuch had been a recent work, of the age of these kings, it would have been wholly thrown aside by Jeroboam, who must have found inconvenience and positive danger from it; and in casting it away he would have easily and naturally represented himself as a reformer of religion, delivering the people from one of the yokes of bondage which the house of David had been imposing on them, and restoring to them their primitive civil liberty and religious simplicity, according to the genuine institutions of Moses. Instead of this, it is evident that from the first Jeroboam was condemned and resisted by the prophets and the priests and the Levites, and generally by multitudes of the people, whose hearts were reverent towards the acknowledged and established law of God. The entire law of the kingdom (Deuteronomy 17), which has been represented as furnishing evidence of late authorship, is on the contrary a witness to a much earlier date of composition. In the days of David and Solomon there would have been no need to forbid the appointment of a foreigner to the throne, since it was established in this family of the tribe of Judah, and this with divine sanctions and promises of perpetuity; while the language in which the multiplication of horses and wives and silver and gold is prohibited would have needed to be very different to suit that age. The oft-repeated command to extirpate the Canaanites, and not to let them dwell in the midst of Israel (so far from being a production of the age of David and Solomon), was no longer applicable, after it had been neglected for so many centuries: in their totally altered circumstances the remains of these nations appear to have become converts to the worship of Jehovah, and in some sense members of the congregation of Israel; and a fearful curse fell upon Saul and his bloody house on account of his zeal in exterminating the Gibeonites.

(d.) If we are thus driven back to a period indefinitely anterior to the time of David, there is no other age than that of Moses himself at which we can rest with reason or satisfaction. There is no one whose name could be suggested as the author, with any degree of probability, during the disturbed period of the judges, in the course of which religion was rather retrograding, and the revivals of it were very far from favoring new legislation. *SEE JUDGES*. Samuel has indeed been named, and there is no doubt of the eminent position which he occupied at the crisis in which the Hebrew republic passed into a monarchy; still there is no evidence that he was competent to write the Pentateuch. Besides there are two special

objections: his closeness to the age of David and Solomon, than which the book seems much more ancient; and the necessity of supposing a known and acknowledged law of God in Israel as the basis on which all his labors rested, and the rule of life and worship to which it was his aim to bring the people back.

(e.) There are not wanting traces which point to the patriarchal age as the time in which the writer of the Pentateuch lived. A writer subsequent to the time at which "the laws of Moses" (rightly or wrongly so called) had taken hold of the national mind, would have been little likely to represent their ancestor Abraham as marrying his sister, half-sister though she might be; and Jacob as setting up his pillar and anointing it. The primitive age of the writer is evinced by his entire silence on the subject of temples for the worship of false gods, as well as of any house for Jehovah. It may be doubted. too, whether a later legislator would have spoken of priests in Israel prior to the institution of Aaron's priesthood, and of young men of the children of Israel offering the sacrifices, under the direction of Moses, at the establishment of the covenant in Sinai (Exodus 19:24; 24:5).

(f.) Moreover, that "law of Moses" was very burdensome in its ritual, in respect to both trouble and expense and no one could have introduced it, thereby in fact accomplishing an unparalleled social revolution, if he had not had the support of overwhelming authority as the recognized messenger of Jehovah. Nor, when once established. could that legislation have been altered throughout successive ages by numberless nameless authors such as the critics have discovered.

(g.) The prophetic passages, those of Moses himself, and those of Balaam, have puzzled the critics when attempting to fix a later date for them.

(h.) A most tempting subject for any one who wishes to turn upon the critics is *the irreconcilable diversity of the hypotheses which they have framed,* in spite of every imaginable advantage enjoyed by them — learning, leisure, mutual concert, and entire absence of any belief in the need of evidence for their endless suppositions. We noticed, at an early part of our argument, that there is a fundamental difference among them: much the greater number believing, as we do, that Deuteronomy was composed later than the other four books, while a small minority, comprising some distinguished scholars, invert the relation of the two parts, assigning the higher antiquity to Deuteronomy, and considering the legislation in the preceding books to be developed from it. By both schools

"the Deuteronomist" is regarded as a different person from "the Elohist" and "the Jehovist" (or the older and younger Elohistic and Jehovistic writers, according to those critics who make each of these names represent a class rather than an individual), to whom is assigned the composition of almost the whole of the first four books and a small portion of history towards the close of the fifth. It would occupy too much space to reckon up the variety of opinions as to the number of these imaginary authors and the ages in which they respectively flourished: those who wish to see this practice of making hypotheses in its most extravagant and self-sufficient form may find it in the commencement of Ewald's *History of the People of Israel.* We wish, however, to remind our readers that these varieties in the hypotheses are not to be overlooked, as if they were *mere differences of detail.* To us, on the contrary, they appear to be *essential or fatal defects* in these critical schemes; for when Moses has been denied to be the author, there is nothing on which to depend except critical sagacity; and since this critical sagacity not unfrequently contradicts itself, and is ever contradicting the sagacity of some other critic quite as much to be respected as the one we are studying at the time, it furnishes convincing evidence that it is itself an unsafe guide. The critics allege, indeed, that their testimony agrees in many points; and this is true, so long as they confine themselves to generalities, because they start from the same false principles, as to miracles, prophecy, etc. They do also agree in a great many particulars; but this is not wonderful, considering how they read one another's productions, compare them, and dovetail their statements together, altering and amending as often as they are charged with error or confusion, by one another or by those who adhere to the old opinion. We do not blame them for this procedure; but it makes their agreement, so far as it goes, of very little worth as concurrent testimony.

(i.) There are gaps in "the fundamental document" which need to be filled up; and there are references in it to the so-called later or supplementary matter, which we therefore believe to be a composition as early as the other which they pronounce to be alone the original. The individual proofs of this assertion we cannot here adduce; and indeed, as often as instances are given, some new critic starts up to make a different arrangement of the original and the supplementary matter which escapes from the objection charged upon the scheme of his predecessor — a process which is not so difficult after all, as nothing more is required than his own unsupported assertion.

It is to be remembered, however, that a person may hold the common opinion that Moses wrote the Pentateuch, and yet along with this may also hold (rightly or wrongly) *that there are extents in it which are not from the hand of Moses, but which have come to be incorporated with it by accidents to which all very ancient books are liable.* Thus there are various ways of dealing with near half a dozen difficulties, such as the mention of Dan, or of the district called Havoth-jair "unto this day," or the testimony to the surpassing meekness of Moses, or the geographical and antiquarian statements in Deuteronomy 2. If the mind of any. one remains unsatisfied with the explanations offered, he has it in his power to cut the knot which he is not able to untie. He may say that the general and direct evidence, on account of which he believes Moses to be the author of the Pentateuch, is overwhelming; and in regard to these few incidental passages which puzzle him, he may incline to consider them glosses or explanations thrown in by some copyist or annotator, whether authorized or not, and he can imagine these removed without any serious alteration in the book, as it reverts precisely to the form in which he conceives it to have come from Moses. That unauthorized copyists might make such changes is a notion for which parallels more or less satisfactory can be adduced; yet it might be preferable to think of an editor whose annotations or alterations were authoritative, and such an editor Ezra is supposed to have been by many who follow old Jewish traditions. How far the influence of such an editor might alter the work is a matter for those to settle who embrace this opinion; certainly it ought not to be supposed to extend far, or they run the risk of virtually injuring their faith in Moses as the author. On the other hand, of course, those who adhere most strenuously to the old opinion deny that they are committed by their views to the absurdity of believing that Moses wrote the account of his own death and burial. There is a tradition in the Talmud that Joshua wrote the last eight verses of Deuteronomy; although it is now more commonly supposed that the work of Moses ends at ch. 31:23 (or even earlier, at verse 8; Baumgarten says at ch. 30:20), and that Joshua, or whoever recorded these closing details, inserted the song and the blessing of Moses, along with the accounts of his final charge, his view of the Promised Land, his death, etc.

5. *Objections against the Mosaic Authorship*. — These have been numerous and vehemently urged, especially by rationalists, as we might expect from the importance of the subject. On the opposite side, these critical doubts respecting the authenticity of the Pentateuch have produced

in modern times several works in defense of its genuineness; such as Kanne's *Biblische Untersuchungen* (1820, 2 vols.); the observations by Jahn, Rosenmüller, and Bleek; Ranke's *Untersuchungen uber den Pentateuch* (2 vols.); Hengstenberg's *Beitr agqe zur Einleitung* (vols. ii and iii); Havernick's *Einleitung in daas Alte Testament* (vol. i); Drechsler's *Ueber die Einheit und Authentie der Genesis;* Kinig's *Alt-testamentliche Studien* (No. ii); Sack's *Apologetik,* etc. From the most recent of these we extract the following, as presenting a condensed view of the argument (see RawlinSoLn's *Historical Evidence,* p. 51 sq.). As above stated the ancient, positive, and uniform tradition of the Jews assigned the authorship of the Pentateuch, with the exception of the last chapter of Deuteronomy, to Moses (see Horne's *Introd.* 1:51-56; Graves, *Lectures;* Stuart, *O.T. Canon,* p. 42); and this tradition is *prima facie* evidence of the fact, such at least as throws the burden of proof upon those who call it in question. It is an admitted rule of all sound criticism that books are to be regarded as proceeding from the writers whose names they bear, unless very strong reasons indeed can be adduced to the contrary (comp. Gladstone, *Homer,* 1:3, 4). In the present instance, the reasons which have been urged are weak and puerile in the extreme; they rest in part on misconception of the meaning of passages (e.g. De Wette, *Einl. §* 147, with regard to  which means as well "this side" as "the other side" of Jordan; Buxtorf, *Lex.* p. 527); in part upon interpolations into the original text, which are sometimes very palpable (e.g. Genesis 36:31-39; Exodus 16:35, 36; and perhaps Deuteronomy 2:14; comp. Fritzsche, *Prufung,* p. 135). Mainly, however, they have their source in arbitrary and unproved hypotheses: as that a contemporary writer would not have introduced an account of miracles (De Wette, *Einl. §* 145); that the culture indicated by the book is beyond that of the age of Moses (*ibid.* § 163); that if Moses had written the book, he would not have spoken of himself in the third person (Hartmann, *Forschungen,* p. 545; Norton, *Genuineness,* 2, 444; comp. Spinoza, *Tractatus Theo.-Pol.* p. 154); that he would have given a fuller and more complete account of his own history (De Wette, § 167); and that he would not have applied to himself terms of praise and expressions of honor (Hartmann, *l.c.;* comp. Spinoza, *l.c.*). It is enough to observe of these objections that they are such as might equally be urged against the genuineness of Paul's epistles (which is allowed even by Strauss, *Leben Jesu,* 1:60) — against that of the works of Homer, Chaucer, and indeed of all writers in advance of their age — against Caesar's Commentaries and Xenophon's Expedition of Cyrus — against

the Acts of the Apostles (which even Strauss allows may be the work of Luke, *Leben Jesu,* 1:60), and against the Gospel of John. For Paul relates contemporary miracles; Homer and Chaucer exhibit a culture and a tone which, but for them, we should have supposed unattainable in their age; Caesar and Xenophon write throughout in the third person; Luke omits all account of his own doings at Philippi; and John applies to himself the most honorable of all titles, "the disciple whom Jesus loved" (comp. John 13:23; 14:26). In fact *a priori* conceptions as to how an author of a certain time and country would write, what he would or would not say, or how he would express himself, are among the weakest of all presumptions, and must be regarded as outweighed by a very small amount of positive testimony to authorship. Moreover, for an argument of this sort to have any force at all, it is necessary that we should possess, from other sources besides the author who is judged, a tolerably complete knowledge of the age to which he is assigned, and a fair acquaintance with the literature of his period. In the case of Moses, our knowledge of the age is exceedingly limited, while of the literature we have scarcely any knowledge at all, beyond that which is furnished by the sacred records next in succession — the books of Joshua and Judges with (perhaps) that of Job — and these are so far from supporting the notion that such a work as the Pentateuch could not be produced in the time of Moses that they actually presuppose the contrary by constantly appealing to it or as being evidently based upon it. We propose to examine these objections here in detail, as they relate more or less to all the books of the Pentateuch. For other difficulties, see each book in its place.

We mention here one objection of a general character. The history of the art of writing among the Hebrews has often been appealed to in order to disprove the authenticity of the Pentateuch. It is true that in our days no critic of good repute for learning ventures any longer to assert that the art of writing was invented subsequent to the Mosaical age (Ewald, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel,* p. 64 sq.); but it is questioned whether the Hebrews were acquainted with that art. Such a doubt proceeds from erroneous ideas concerning the condition of this people, and concerning the civilization necessarily imparted to them in Egypt. The reality of this civilization is proved by indubitable testimony. It is said that a work of such extent as the Pentateuch was beyond the means of the primitive modes of writing then existing. But various testimonies, not merely in the Pentateuch itself, but also derived from other sources, from the period

immediately subsequent to that of Moses, prove that a knowledge of the art of writing was widely diffused among the Hebrews (comp. Judges 8:14).

If there were any knowledge of this art, its application would entirely depend upon the particular circumstances of a given period. Some writers seem to entertain the opinion that the materials for writing were yet, in the days of Moses, too clumsy for the execution of larger works. This opinion is refuted by the fact that the Hebrews became acquainted, just in the Mosaical period, with the use of very good materials for writing, such as papyrus, byssus, parchment, etc. (comp. Herodotus, v. 58). There are, indeed, mentioned in the Pentateuch some more solid materials for writing, such as tables of stone (Exodus 24:12; 31:18; 34:1, etc.); but this does not prove that in those days nothing was written except upon stone. Stone was employed, on account of its durability, for specific purposes. *SEE WRITING*.

The arguments on which the authorship of the Pentateuch is denied to Moses are, it will be perceived, wholly of an *internal* character (except that noticed above, and the one drawn from 2 Chronicles 34:14 sq.). They have varied considerably with the taste and the information of those who urged them. There are some which were advanced very confidently a generation ago, but now are scarcely mentioned. But of those which have been urged with greatest confidence and plausibility, and still continue to be so, we believe the following to be the chief:

(1.) *The supernatural character of much of the book* — namely, the miracles and prophecies occurring abundantly in the history. This really is the great objection, even in many minds which have not been fully aware that it was so; and they have therefore been propping up their opinion with other arguments, that would never have had much of even apparent solidity and strength if they had been destitute of this foundation. But this objection need not be discussed in this article, for it concerns the entire Bible. *SEE MIRACLE*; *SEE PROPHECY*.

(2.) *The alleged inaccuracies and impossibilities in the history, even apart from the miracles with which it is interspersed.* This is a line of argument which has in general been found very difficult to manage; and in connection with which, therefore, there has not been very much attempted by learned and cautious writers. It has, however, recently attained to a temporary prominence and importance by the writings of bishop Colenso. The

particular instances are not of a nature which really requires much consideration, though the most important may be briefly noticed.

(a.) The vast increase of Jacob's descendants in Egypt, and the difficulty as to the proportion between the whole number of them and that of the first-born. On these and some other matters, *SEE NUMBERS*.

(b.) The chronological difficulty that the census was not taken till the second month of the second year of the Exodus, while yet the tabernacle is represented as having been finished a month sooner, and the silver used in its construction as having been obtained by a poll-tax of half a shekel on occasion of the census being taken. In this there is nothing very puzzling; for it is evident that before the formal and exact census, in the course of which all the names were written down, there was a preliminary enumeration of the people, by which a close approximation was made to their number; and if the payment of the poll-tax did not take place earlier or was not superseded as unnecessary on account of the superabundance of voluntary offerings, which the people needed to be restrained from bringing, there could be no difficulty in finding those who would advance the money in the certainty of speedy repayment.

(c.) The other chronological difficulty, that such a multitude of events are crowded into the short space between the death of Aaron on the first day of the fifth month of the last year of the wandering and the delivery of the prophetic message in Deuteronomy on the first day of the eleventh month. A calm examination, however, will show that they are not so crowded as has been supposed. Yet no doubt there was a marvelous concentration of interest and hastening of the course of Providence during those six months of grace and power manifested on behalf of the young faithful generation of Israelites who were to enjoy the blessings of their redemption from the house of bondage and to take possession of the Land of Promise. In like manner our Lord hints that events may be crowded and carried forward with marvelous rapidity when the glory of the latter day is to be ushered in, and when he is to come again (Matthew 24:22).

(d.) The difficulties connected with the extent to which the sacrifices and other Levitical institutions were set up and kept up ill the wilderness. But the very letter of the law many a time shows that these institutions were not meant to be set up till the people entered the Land of Promise; and at other times the intention is at least doubtful. The difficulties are unspeakably diminished When we take into account the sin of the people in

refusing to go forward after the report of the unbelieving spies, and the semi-excommunication or suspension from Church privileges for the rest of the forty years under which in consequence they were laid (comp. ◁Joshua 5:4-9).

(e.) The blank in the narrative for the thirty-eight years during which that unbelieving generation were dying out; so that the suspicion has been expressed that this space of time is fabulous, and that either vastly less than forty years elapsed between the Exodus and the conquest of Ganaan, or else that the most of that period was spent, not in the desert properly so called, but on the eastern side of the Jordan, in a protracted struggle with the kingdoms of Sihon and Og. Without giving attention to this fancy, we confine ourselves to the blank of thirty-eight years in the history, which we regard without any of the surprise and suspicion which the critics have exhibited. Had the Pentateuch been an ordinary history, it might have had much to tell of these thirty-eight years, and of the manner in which the Israelites contrived to spend the time and to support themselves; but since it is a theocratic history, an account of the progress in the kingdom of God and in the manifestation of his way of mercy to his people, a blank occurs, because there was little or nothing to tell during these years of suspended privileges. Such periods of protracted silence occur also in the history of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and remarkably in the four hundred and thirty years of the sojourn in Egypt. If we go beyond the Pentateuch, we believe that the same explanation is to be given of the silence in reference to the period after the end of Joshua's administration, the long periods between those critical times in which the Lord raised up judges to save his people, the seventy years of captivity in Babylon, the eighty years or thereabouts between Zerubbabel and Ezra, and the four hundred years between the Old-Testament Scriptures and the New.

(f.) The assumed difficulties of supporting so large a multitude in the desert, and of their setting out so suddenly and moving so rapidly, the impossibility of their entire mass assembling at the Tabernacle-door (as is incorrectly alleged to be the meaning of numerous passages), and kindred arithmetical objections, we here pass over, as they have been repeatedly and amply refuted, and many of them are noticed elsewhere in this *Cyclopaedia.*

(3.) There is one striking fact lying on the face of the record-the only important fact, as we believe, to which advocates for the disintegration of

the Pentateuch can point as seeming to favor their views of a plurality of authors; and that is the fact, above referred to, which Astruc noticed so clearly — *the use of two names for the Divine Being*, ELOHIM and JEHOVAH, in the Authorized Version usually "God" and "LORD." Astruc's theory of composition was very coarse and mechanical, that there were two documents, known by the barbarous titles of the Elohistic and the Jehovistic documents respectively, by two writers who confined themselves each to one of these names; and that from these two narratives and ten documents of small comparative importance the book of Genesis was strung together by Moses. Enormous labor, great stores of learning, and unbridled fancy have altered Astruc's theory over and over again, in order to elaborate some satisfactory hypothesis by which to account for the existence of our present Pentateuch; but no fact of essential importance has been added; and no proof has been furnished of the truth of his assumption that the use of these two names of God is due to the existence of two different authors. The only circumstance that can even appear to be a proof of this assumption is a text, of which, accordingly, abundant use has been made in this controversy (Exodus 6:2, 3):, "And God spake unto Moses, and said unto him, I [am] Jehovah: and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by [the name of] God Almighty; but by my name Jehovah was I not known to them." The opinion is of some antiquity, though it first obtained prominence and currency through the labors of these critics, that according to this statement the very vocable Jehovah was unknown until the revelation made of it to Moses; and the older interpreters who held this opinion supposed further that, whenever the name Jehovah had been used in earlier passages, this was done merely by anticipation — a supposition which may be unnecessary, yet which is by no means very strange or unnatural. But the explanation given for near a century by one class of writers is that this text comes from the pen of the Elohist, and expresses his belief; and that where the name occurs in earlier passages, these have not been written by him, but by another author, who did not notice or did not recognize this distinction in the divine names. This explanation, however unsupported by evidence, is at least perfectly intelligible, if we adopt the exploded hypothesis of independent historians, each with his own document, and perhaps each ignorant of the document composed by the other; but it raises some curious questions in relation to the final editor who could patch together such incongruous materials, questions all the more troublesome according to the fashionable hypothesis of supplementers. Bishop Colenso, indeed, like some others, speaks very

candidly of the Jehovist writing as he did, "*without perceiving*, or at least without FEELING VERY STRONGLY [his own capitals] the contradiction thereby imported into the narrative; "of which procedure he gives two parallel instances in the Jehovistic additions the Elohistic accounts of the creation and of the flood. But in these two cases the contradiction has not been perceived to this hour by many who have examined the matter as carefully as they could (and this with the advantage of having the alleged discovery pointed out to them), and whose capacities for judging are as fair as those of their neighbors, and whose conviction it is that no contradiction exists except in the imagination of these critics; whereas, in the case of the habitual use of the name Jehovah, in the age of the patriarchs, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, the assertion that this name was kept a secret till that age was over, the man who combined these two things in one narrative, without seeing the flat contradiction which he introduced into it, must have been destitute of reason and commonsense. On other occasions these critics are ready enough to affirm that the later writer (or writers) suppressed and altered portions of the original document, in order the better to fit his own story into it; and they allege that his operation has been achieved so neatly that most people have never suspected it, nor can detect it for themselves even after the sagacity of the critics has discovered it and pointed it out. But in this particular instance these critics insist on so interpreting a text, which is especially prominent and important as giving the account of the revelation of this name Jehovah from God and its introduction into use among men, that it shall be a contradiction in terms to a multitude of passages which the editor or supplementer had indulged himself by inserting amid the comparatively brief original details. The truth is given in the common old interpretation of (2062)Exodus 6:2, 3, that not the syllables, but the signification of the name JEHOVAH *SEE JEHOVAH* (q.v.), as the independent, unchangeable fulfiller of his promises to the patriarchs, was revealed to Moses at the bush. It is true that these merely *natural* perfections would fail to inspire right feelings towards God, if they were to be contemplated as in a state of separation from *moral* perfections. But the two classes of attributes are inseparable in actual reality, and probably were never even conceived of by the, Hebrew mind as separable, if we judge from the line of argument in the closing chapters of Job. Certainly (2306)Exodus 34:6, 7 makes an express claim for the inclusion of moral perfection, as well as omnipotence and unchangeableness, in the signification of the name Jehovah — "Jehovah, Jehovah El, merciful and gracious, longsuffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping

mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin, and that will by no means clear [the guilty]; visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, and upon the children's children, unto the third and to the fourth [generation]." The concluding words of this *proclamation of the name Jehovah,* by him to whom it belongs, make the truth apparent that the name Jehovah could not come out in its full and true meaning except through many successive generations, and therefore could not be properly known to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, but became known to their descendants as they observed the unchanging course of his special providence towards Israel. Once more, it must never be forgotten that God Almighty and Jehovah are not names sharply *opposed* to one another, much less diametrically so, as is necessarily assumed in the interpretation of Exodus 6:3 which we have been controverting; on the contrary, *so far as it goes,* God Almighty is *identical with* or *included under* Jehovah, giving the meaning of it incompletely, as the Almighty God, yet failing to bring into view that he is unchangeable besides. Nevertheless, it is only by its incompleteness that El Shaddai differs from Jehovah; there is no antagonism between them, there is a mere difference of degree. The children of Israel were now to think of their God as Jehovah, almighty, and also unchangeable, as he was manifesting himself to be; whereas it was his almightiness alone of which their fathers had had experience. In the age of those patriarchs, therefore, and considering the imperfect view which they could have of him, so far from El Shaddai and Jehovah being opposing titles, they were practically one and the same; precisely as a cube appears to be merely a square when we take notice of its length and breadth, but cannot observe its thickness. To bring this out is to lay bare the real source of many critical misconceptions about the text which has been so greatly misused, and about the patriarchal history. Accordingly the identity of these two names in the patriarchal times is explicitly enough asserted in Genesis 17:1, "And when Abram was ninety years old and nine, *Jehovah* appeared to Abram, and said unto him, I am *El Shaddai,* walk before me, and be thou perfect." The critics concede that this text belongs to the fundamental document, as they call it; and since it makes their interpretation of Exodus 6:3 impossible, and in fact dashes to pieces their hypothesis of a distinction of writers according to the use of the one divine name or the other, they have been driven to make a purely conjectural alteration of the text, and to read Elohim instead of Jehovah. This is a desperate expedient, which involves the confession that the facts of the case are fatal to their hypotheses, and that the editor or

supplementer must be supposed to have made an intentional change of the divine name, which they detect and correct, as they restore the original word Elohim. How desperate the resource is may be understood the better when we recollect that they make the Jehovist or the editor such a simpleton as to be unaware that ⁰²⁰⁰³Exodus 6:3 pours contempt upon all his previous interpolations; and yet they imagine him so wary or cunning here as to strike out the original word Elohim in order to make the better piece of patchwork by substituting his favorite title Jehovah. The text, as it stands, is conclusive evidence that in the days of Abraham El Shaddai was identical with Jehovah so far as the signification of this latter word had then been unfolded; that is, there was then no difference in the subjective apprehension of the meaning of the two names.: But the objective significance of Jehovah was always deeper and fuller; and at the time of the mission of Moses they came to be distinguished in the apprehension of the church, for the element of unchangeableness was seen to be involved in the name Jehovah. From the time of the worship of the golden calf, and of the gracious pardon granted to the people at the intercession of Moses, to whom a new revelation of the name and character of the covenant God was vouchsafed, the moral characteristics of the name Jehovah came out more prominently still, as in ⁰²³⁴⁶Exodus 34:6, 7, already quoted. Yet it is only in the times of the New Testament that its full .meaning has been unfolded (that is, as fully as it can be in this world), in connection with the person and work of him who is Jehovah Tsidkenu, “the LORD our Righteousness;” who said of himself, “Before Abraham was, I am;” and who in the epistle to the Hebrew Christians has this nane applied to him and explained of him, that he is Jehovah, who in the beginning laid the foundation of heaven and earth, and who shall continue the same when they shall be folded together like a garment, the Savior who has offered one sacrifice for sins forever, Jesus Christ, the same yesterday and to-day and forever.

Undoubtedly, as we have intimated above, there are questions more easily asked than answered in relation to the use of these two names, Jehovah and Elohim, in the history previous to the time of Moses. Possibly those who uphold the common belief that Moses wrote the whole of it have passed over these difficulties too lightly, or have spoken too confidently of having fully explained them; if so, their fault has really been that they have attempted more than they were under any obligation to attempt. Elohim and Jehovah have their differences, yet vastly more numerous and

important are their points of agreement; and it may be too much to assert that, *whenever* they were used, there was retained a consideration of their distinctive meanings. This much, however, we may affirm with perfect confidence-and in doing so we go beyond any requirement which can fairly be made by those who differ from us in this discussion — to *a considerable extent* it is very easy to show in Genesis, as well as in the later books of Scripture, that these two divine names are employed with an intentional discrimination — Elohim expressing more generally the Deity, and Jehovah expressing God in covenant with Israel, possessed of every perfection, and using it for the good of his people, as his character is manifested in their history. If so, the use of the one or the other name is no proof at all of a difference of authorship. We may moreover assert that the hypothesis of the modern critics entirely breaks down as to this text (Exodus 6:3), the solitary passage in which they can even profess to find countenance given to their views; and owing to the importance which they cannot but attach to it, we have examined it at considerable length, in order to show that it is in fact opposed to them as soon as it is rightly interpreted. Moreover, when they press this argument in favor of different writers in the Pentateuch, on account of the different names for the Divine Being, they will find that they need to account for a great deal more than the use of the two words *Jehovah* and *Elohim.* There is also *El,* which Knobel, commenting on this text, reckons an intermediate title; and there is the occasional use of *Elohim with a plural verb,* as to which Gesenius and others have coarsely suggested that it may be an indication of polytheism left in the syntax of the language; there is also the variation of the *presence or the absence of the article with Ei'ohimn;* and there is the use of another divine title, *Adonai.* He who reads the history of Balaam, and observes the use of the three names *Elohim, El,* and *Jehovah,* will find difficulty in believing that these are not intentionally varied by the same writer; as indeed the critics in general do not hesitate to ascribe the entire section to the Jehovist. He who notices how *Jacob* and *Israel* are used in the closing chapters of Genesis to denote the same individual will probably hesitate to assert that a difference of names for a person, be he man or God, ought to be accounted for by the difference of authorship. This has certainly been affirmed to some extent by Colenso; but his statement will perhaps not meet with more support from those who agree with him in his leading principles than his other statement that Jehovah was a name invented about the age of Samuel and David. We have already noticed that the interpretation of Exodus 6:3, to which the critical school are

committed, assumes that the word Jehovah was till then unknown; whereas there is varied evidence for its earlier existence. Vaihinger indeed makes the further concession that in the original document, "as is confessed by almost all," the name Jehovah is employed by Jacob a few times (Genesis 28:21; 32:10; 49:18). *SEE GOD*.

(4.) Yet the admission that the name Jehovah was not unknown before the age of Moses, and the consequent impossibility of making the different divine names a proof of diversity of authorship. and of drawing confirmation of this opinion from Exodus 6:3, are not felt by the critical school at the present day to be so damaging as they would have been felt by their predecessors, or as they will generally be felt by those who take an impartial view of the arguments. *For the tendency now is to rest more upon an alleged difference of style and thought, which is discovered by comparing the fundamental document uith the additions.* This line of reasoning necessitates a considerable amount of acquaintance with the language, and also of patient drudgery, even to understand its meaning, and to estimate its value, however roughly; it is therefore impossible to discuss it within our limits here. We have no hesitation, however, in expressing our opinion that it is excessively wearisome in the process, and so vague in the results that these are likely to be estimated very much in conformity with the previous inclinations of the investigator. One of the so-called critical commentaries may present long lists of words peculiar to the different authors; but the imposing array of evidence is collected by a vicious reasoning in a circle. The existence of different authors is inferred from the existence of different sets of words and phrases; but in order to arrive at the grouping of these words and phrases into different sets, the continuous narrative needs to be cut up in the most minute and fantastic manner among different authors. It is a mere assumption, and antecedently improbable in a high degree, that a chapter in Genesis or Exodus is a patchwork of authorship such as modern criticism pronounces it to be; but if we are to believe this on the evidence of the differences in the language and composition of the different parts, we need something more than the assertions of the critics to make us believe that these parts really are different; for all the time they appear to uninitiated readers to be one consecutive and homogeneous piece of writing. It is impossible for the critics to establish any clear *usus loquendi* without tearing the book often into shreds, and pronouncing passages, and single verses, and clauses of verses, and individual words to be interpolations or alterations; a process

which insures its own condemnation. In fact, if there were no other difficulty, he who has attempted the humble task of following the statements of the critics on the subject must have been often brought to a stand-still by their disagreement as to the several writers to whom their respective gifts of sagacity lead them to ascribe the individual passages. On the other hand, there is abundant evidence of diversity of language in passages which they are pretty well agreed in ascribing to the same author, as well as of remarkable similarity of language in writings which they generally attribute to different authors.

In this argument from style in general, as in the previous one from the use of the divine names in particular, we have no object to gain by pressing our reply to the uttermost, and, as some might think, unduly. We might grant that there are traces of a difference of style, and yet deny that this fact is any evidence whatever of difference of authorship; and we should be supported in our denial by the common experience and opinion of men respecting parallel cases in literature, where no theological bias comes in to warp their judgment. The language of Deuteronomy furnishes by far the best case for the critics, although in it (as above detailed) we see many traces of the author of the rest of the Pentateuch; but there are certain peculiarities which we have no difficulty ill attributing to the oratorical character of the book. If anything of the same kind call be established as to certain classes of passages in the first four books, in their genealogical and legislative portions respectively, or in passages involving prophetic announcements, etc., no allegation is simpler or fairer than that the style is intentionally varied with the change of subject; in fact, many of the words paraded in lists of differences of style are naturally or even unavoidably connected with the subjects treated in only a few places. If there were *evidence from some other quarter* that these passages proceeded from certain different authors, modern criticism could then make use of the peculiar language with propriety in confirmation of its disintegrating hypotheses; but to do so at present is to indulge in the vicious reasoning in a circle of which we have already spoken, or to fall into another great logical vice, by begging the question, in affirming that difference of subject-matter is evidence of difference of authorship. In short, we call admit the existence of differences of style and language only within limits so narrow that they appear as nothing in comparison with the exaggerated estimate that is often given of them. In so far as comparatively trifling differences do exist, while we are ready to suggest reasons in the subject-matter (or even

in external circumstances as the use of “Sinai” or “Horeb”) which may often explain them, we feel and acknowledge no incumbent duty to do so. For we hold it to be the indefeasible right of every author to change his style and language under the influence of motives which may be inappreciable to his readers; and we hold that this right is exercised by every author in proportion to the strength and freshness of his own individual mind, or of the mind of the age and nation to which he belongs, the variety and compass of the work with which he is engaged, the wealth of the language which he uses, or the culture he has received, and the demand of the human spirit that occasionally changes shall occur, for no other reason than to give it rest from the monotony of a mechanical uniformity.

Before leaving the consideration of this argument, it may be right to notice how it combines in itself so many great fallacies; for it involves also a mistake as to the point which is to be proved. The critics profess to prove that Moses is not the writer of the Pentateuch; and, on their own showing, the evidence of this fact is that there are in it traces of different authors. But this is nothing to the purpose, unless they also prove that these authors were subsequent to the time of Moses. So learned and cautious and orthodox a theologian as Vitringa long ago gave expression to the opinion that Moses may probably have made use of written documents prepared by the patriarchs and safely handed down among the Israelites, till he arose to collect and arrange and supplement them; but if we shrink from asserting that written instruction was given to the patriarchal Church, we must all the more exalt the strength and value of primeval tradition-tradition upon the very subjects which are handled in the book of Genesis. There is, then, no difficulty whatever in maintaining that, before the time of Moses, there existed a body of instruction as to the dealings of God with men, which was known and preserved ill the family that had been called to the knowledge of his grace; and the language of that instruction must have assumed a certain fixity of form, whether we affirm or deny that it was written out and laid up in the repositories of the patriarchs. When Moses began to write the Pentateuch, there was already, therefore, a religious and historical phraseology. Grant everything that the critics imagine they have established, and their original document might be nothing more than the pre-Mosaic writing or tradition; while the editor or supplementer might be Moses himself: or if there be traces of several hands and several styles, nevertheless, as Astruc himself believed, these may be no more than traces

of the different (but not contradictory or untrustworthy) rills of patriarchal tradition, which he was guided to collect into one channel, and send down to posterity in the clear, continuous, consistent stream of the narrative in Genesis. The influence of these varieties of style might tell upon him still as he continued his labors in the composition of the other books. This is all a supposition; but it is a supposition vastly more modest and credible than that of the modern disintegrating criticism; and it admits everything which that criticism can even profess to have established by the most microscopic study of the language, and the most merciless vivisection of the subject of its experiments.

(5.) *An objection to the unity of the authorship has been drawn from the repetitions which occur in the book;* for it is said that these are a sure mark of at least two authors, whose accounts have been thrown into one. This objection presented a more formidable aspect as long as the hypothesis was in favor according to which there were two independent and continuous histories, the Elohistic and the Jehovistic, afterwards combined: the occurrence of double narratives gives an air of plausibility to this supposition. But as soon as we recollect that this hypothesis has been generally abandoned for another, according to which there is only one original continuous history, subsequently interpolated, the objection loses any *prima facie* verisimilitude that it ever possessed: for why should an editor burden and disfigure the clear narrative as it lay before him, by interpolating accounts which had the look of repetitions, unless the events did really occur a second time? The attempt to assign one of these double accounts to the Elohist and the other to the Jehovist breaks down from time to time by the confession of the critics themselves. Here we introduce a remark in explanation of one or two passages in which a repeated account is given of the same event: this repetition in fill, instead of a mere reference which we might prefer to make, is of a piece with the simple and uninvolved style of thought which characterizes the very structure of the Hebrew language. In cases where our Western languages would express a complex proposition by a compound sentence, in which the subordinate members are introduced and kept in their true pilce by means of relative pronouns and conjunctions, the Hebrew uses simple sentences, and unites his statements by his favorite conjunction “and,” to which translators assign a great variety of meanings, according to the exigencies of the moment. By this method, however, his gain in simplicity is counterbalanced by a loss of terseness; since he has often to repeat at length what might have been

noticed only incidentally and by an allusion. This mode of dealing with sentences is extended to paragraphs, and has given rise to the occurrence of titles prefixed to sections, and of repeated statements, which misled the earlier disintegrating critics into the belief that here they had evidence of fragments which were afterwards brought together with little care or judgment; whereas their successors have thrown aside the hypothesis of fragments, having become more wary by experience. The clearest case of such repetition is the Elohistic account of creation (Genesis 1:1-2:3), and the Jehovistic account (Genesis 2:4-25). But it is surely plain enough that the second is an incomplete account, implying that the general comprehensive narrative had gone before; and throwing in additional information of a particular kind in reference to the creation of *man,* the creature formed in God's image and placed under his moral government, as briefly stated in the first chapter, but now stated more fully in this introduction to the history of redemption, which throws the account of the creation of other beings more into the background.

Besides, it is an entirely erroneous philosophy which prompts men to find fault with the unity or truthfulness of a history because it contains narratives bearing a resemblance to one another. Such repetitions (if this be the correct designation of these narratives) are recorded in all histories of individuals and communities; indeed otherwise experience would not be the great means of disciplining and training mankind. To take no wider range, instances of such repetition, certainly not less remarkable than anything in the books of Moses, occur in other parts of the Bible, including the life of our Lord; and they cannot be escaped, unless by a universally destructive criticism.

Occasionally the charge is put differently in this way: instead of the allegation that there are two varying reports of one transaction, which have been erroneously understood of two different events, *it is alleged that two accounts occur of what is confessedly the same matter, and that these accounts are varying or even contradictory;* and the explanation given of these alleged contradictions is that they proceed from two different authors. The instances are obtained sometimes by comparing the first four books of Moses among themselves, and sometimes by comparing them with Deuteronomy.

(a.) Those of the former class, *contradictions within the compass of the first four books,* are of little importance, and demand no lengthened

consideration in this condensed statement. Such are the two accounts of creation, to which we have had occasion to refer as illustrating the different aspects of a narrative according as logical connection or the chronological principle of arrangement predominates; the names of Esau's wives. *SEE AHOLIBAMAH*. A favorite instance is the account in ⁂Exodus 33:7-11 of the tabernacle of the congregation which Moses was to pitch "without the camp, afar off from the camp," whereas the ordinary accounts place the tabernacle inside the camp, at its very center. But there really is no serious difficulty in the way of accepting the common explanation that this was a preliminary tabernacle, used till the regular tabernacle was constructed, and placed outside the camp at the time when the people were saved by the special intercession of Moses, when on the point of being destroyed for the sin of the golden calf: an opinion which has been slightly modified by those who think it was the private tent of Moses which received this honor at the time when he had declined the Lord's offer to make of him a great nation n the ruin of apostate Israel. Yet the simplest view would be to take ver. 5-11 as one speech of the Lord to Moses, the whole being in the Hebrew in the future or unfinished tense; except that ver. 6 parenthetically relates, in the perfect tense, how the people humbled themselves according to the opening part of the Lord's directions, whereas the rest of these directions may never have been carried out after the intercession of Moses was completed.

(b.) Passing to the other class of alleged contradictions, *in which the four earlier books are placed on the one side and Deuteronomy on the other*, as if it belonged to a later age than the latest of them, and betrayed certain differences of belief and sentiment, it deserves to be noticed that a great deal used to be said of the *historical* contradictions; whereas the wisest of the destructive critics now concede that nothing can be made of these, especially when the oratorical nature of Deuteronomy is considered, and weight is assigned to the form which narratives would assume in a discourse whose object was exhortation. The only cases which require consideration are those in which the laws as laid down in Deuteronomy are said to be different from some in the three preceding books. We admit willingly that there are modifications, within certain comparatively narrow limits, and easily enough explained by recollecting that forty years elapsed between the covenanting in Horeb and that in the land of Moab (⁂Deuteronomy 29:1 [28:69 in Hebrew]); the latter also taking into consideration the new circumstances of the people when they should be

settled in their own land. The chief instance of this is the permission to the people to eat flesh anywhere throughout the land of Canaan, if only they took care to pour out the blood upon the earth (Deuteronomy 12:15, 16, 20-25), for the previous law upon the subject in Leviticus 17 became physically impracticable as soon as the people ceased to live together in the camp. In connection with this there is the account of the priests' share of the sacrifices (Deuteronomy 18:3), which differs from the account in Leviticus and Numbers of the parts of sacrifices which were assigned to the priests. But this statement of "the priests' dues from the people," is in addition to "the offerings of the Lord made by fire," which have already been mentioned at ver. 1; it is a plausible conjecture that these additional dues were assigned to them on purpose to indemnify them for losses sustained by the repeal of the law in Leviticus 17, and in fact there seems to be a reference to this particular statute in Deuteronomy in the account of the evil conduct of Eli's sons in 1 Samuel 2:13-16. There is also another class of cases in which the alleged contradiction is probably the result of our ignorance, and can be at least hypothetically met and removed. A good example of this is the difficulty alleged to exist in Deuteronomy 15:19, 20, as if it gave to the people at large the right to eat the firstlings of their flocks and herds in holy feasts, whereas the earlier legislation had given these firstlings to the priests (Numbers 18:15-18); for it is plain that the author of Deuteronomy did not contemplate any contradiction of the divine lot in this arrangement, to which he had made repeated allusion already (Deuteronomy 12:6, 17; 14:22, 23). But, in point of fact, nothing is simpler than to understand the law in Deuteronomy as addressed to the collective Israelites as if they were a single individual, in "*thou* shalt sanctify . . *thou* shalt eat," etc., leaving the priests and the rest of the people to adjust their respective duties and privileges by the well-known directions of the law in Numbers; and along with this to remember that the earlier law naturally suggests that the priests should make a sacred feast of the first-born animals given to them, at which feast none could more reasonably be expected to be guests than the persons to whom these animals had belonged.

The most important allegation of contradiction between the legislation in the middle books and that in Deuteronomy has reference to the three great orders in the theocracy — the prophetic, the priestly, and the kingly. The first and last must be passed over almost in silence. It is enough to say that the law of the kingdom in Deuteronomy 17 need not surprise any one who

observes that the king is represented as the mere viceroy of Jehovah, himself the true and everlasting King of Israel, according to <02:15:18>Exodus 15:18; <04:23:21>Numbers 23:21; and who recollects the promises that kings should spring from the loins of the patriarchs Abraham and Jacob (<01:17:16>Genesis 17:16; 35:11), and along with this the notice that kings had not yet arisen in Israel although they did exist in Edom (<01:36:31>Genesis 36:31). But certain passages, already considered in so far as they refer to the privileges of the priests, are brought into connection with others in such a way as to suggest the inference that a vast revolution had taken place in the position of the priests and Levites before the time when the author of Deuteronomy published his work, in which his object was to prop up the tottering institutions of his country. The two orders of priests and Levites had come to be confused, the Levites having been all admitted to priestly functions; and the tithes having been seldom paid, they had sunk into poverty, and the scheme of this writer was to compound the matter by securing to them a certain share in these tithes, which were henceforth to be spent in religious feasts at the Temple, where the Levites should have a place along with the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow. This representation must be characterized as a mass of unsupported suppositions. That the Levites might often be poor is probable enough, but there is no appearance of general starvation, such as would have been their condition if their chief support had been this share in the sacred feasts. There is no need to puzzle ourselves about the tithe which was spent at these feasts (<05:12:6>Deuteronomy 12:6, 7, 11, 17-19, and especially 14:22-29 and 26:12-15), which plainly was quite distinct from the other tithe given to the tribe of Levi as a compensation for having no share in the territorial allotment of Canaan (<04:18:20>Numbers 18:2032). This is rightly expressed in the apocryphal book of Tobit (Tobit 1:6, 7), though in the original it is still more distinct than in our A.V.: “But I alone went often to Jerusalem at the feasts, as it was ordained to all the people of Israel by an everlasting decree, having the first-fruits and tenths of increase, with that which was first shorn; and them gave I at the altar to the priests the children of Aaron. The first tenth part of all increase I gave to the sons of Aaron, who ministered at Jerusalem; another tenth part I sold away, and went and spent it every year at Jerusalem.” This hypothesis of a radical change in the position of the priests and Levites, at that late age to which the composition of Deuteronomy is assigned, has been supposed to be supported by two expressions — “the priests the Levites” (<05:18:01>Deuteronomy 18:1), or “the priests the sons of Levi”

(<5205>Deuteronomy 21:5), as if it established the conclusion that all the Levites were represented in this book as performing priestly functions. But; "the priests the Levites" would be a proof of this only if it meant "the priestly Levites," which it does not; its only fair interpretation is "the Levitical priests." Yet it is true that the offices of the Levites and of the priests did come very close to one another, the ministry of the altar being the sole exclusive prerogative of the latter. Hence it is no wonder that in Deuteronomy, which is, comparatively speaking, the people's book of the law, it is the points of agreement which are noted rather than the points of difference; especially since none of the regulations as to sacrifices are given anywhere in the book. The close connection of the priests and the rest of the Levites is taken for granted throughout the whole law, as in the first dedication of the entire tribe, on occasion of the worship of the golden calf (<2225>Exodus 32:25-29), and this representation of them in united privileges or duties continues through the book of Joshua (in which the critics are forced to imagine absurdly that the same confusion of the two orders appears, see <0603>Joshua 3:3) down to the arguments in <3101>Malachi 2:1-9 and in <5801>Hebrews 7. Where, as in the earlier books of the law "the sons of *Aaron"* are mentioned very naturally, while he was living and they were literally his sons; after his death, and as a new generation of priests was growing up, it was equally natural to alter the expression into in "the priests the sons of *Levi,"* or "the *Levitical* priests." This name was peculiarly appropriate after the revolt of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram: it reminded the Levites of their high honor as God's servants, although the service of the altar was restricted to a single family among them (see <0407>Numbers 16:7-10; 17:3-9 [ver. 18-24, Hebrews]); and it summoned the whole congregation of Israel to give honor in spiritual things to this tribe which had so few political advantages, and whose fortunes had undergone a marvelous revolution since the time when Jacob pronounced a curse upon them. *SEE LEVI* and *SEE LEVITE*.

(6.) *It is alleged that in the Pentateuch there are distinct traces of any age later than that of Moses;* and certainly, if this can be established, it follows either that Moses did not write the book, or else that it has been interpolated.

(a.) *There are certain geographical names,* particularly Bethel and Hebron, *which are supposed not to have been in use till the Israelites took possession of the land,* and so displaced the ancient names Luz and Kirjatharba. But there is no real difficulty in such cases, nor in another, for

which *SEE HORMAH*. The only truly difficult case is that of Dan (<01414>Genesis 14:14, comp. <07029>Judges 18:29). Even of this several plausible solutions can be offered, and there is another mode of dealing with it to which we have adverted. *SEE DAN*.

(b.) *There are sentences which are said to bear evidence that they were not written by Moses.* There are but one or two of these that lend much plausibility to this argument; and deferring what may be said of them, if this be true, till we revert to the case of Dan just noticed, we reply at present that we see no serious difficulty in the way of attributing them to the pen of Moses. It is written (<02165>Exodus 16:35), "And the children of Israel did eat manna forty years, until they came to a land inhabited: they did eat manna until they came unto the borders of the land of Canaan." There is no reason why Moses should not have written all this, except on the unwarrantable and erroneous assumption that we make the middle books of the Pentateuch a kind of journal written at the time when each event occurred, and not even remodeled before the work was finished. Just as little do we see difficulty in attributing to Moses himself the observation (<04203>Numbers 12:3), "Now the man Moses was very meek, above all the men which were upon the face of the earth." It is no more a difficulty than that David should plead his righteousness and integrity as he often does; or Paul speak of his not being a whit behind the very chiefest apostles, and of his laboring more abundantly than all of them; or that John should habitually name himself "the disciple whom Jesus loved," or "the beloved disciple." Such language is due to the fact that the "holy men of old," who "spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," thought so little of themselves when they were writing, that they were equally ready to tell the defects of their own character and the graces bestowed on them by God, when it was fitting that such a statement should be made. In this particular case there was such a fitness, as well to show plainly how unreasonable the conduct of the brother and sister of Moses was, as to give point to the statement that Jehovah himself suddenly interposed to vindicate his faithful and honored servant, who might probably never have spoken in his own vindication.

(c.) *A phrase has been thought to betray a more recent date than the age of Moses, when something is said to have occurred the results of which continue "unto this day."* But this is a phrase which by no means necessarily indicates any great length of time; which indicates occasionally a pretty short time, so far as we can infer from the probabilities of the case; and which sometimes *must* be understood of a short time, as in <06625>Joshua

6:25 (for it is frequent in Joshua as well as in the Pentateuch, and the same inference has been drawn in regard to both these books), “And Joshua saved Rahab the harlot alive, and her father’s household, and all that she had; and she dwelleth in Israel even unto this day.” In fairness we mention one passage which may occasion serious difficulty to some minds, and we know of no other; it is <05314>Deuteronomy 3:14: “Jair the son of Manasseh took all the country of Argob unto the coasts of Geshuri and Maachathi, and called them after his own name, Bashan-havoth-jair, unto this day.” Yet even in this case, referring to an interval of no more than a few months, we ought to recollect how difficult it is to change the name of an entire district; if Jair succeeded in this at first, securing for the first six months both his position in the land and his new name for it by way of a memorial of himself, there was less risk of the name being subsequently lost. In general, as well as in reference to this particular case, we ought to take into account the marvelous revolution — religious, social, and political — which was involved in the transition occurring at the end of the life and administration of Moses, from the patriarchal period of wandering to that of Israel settled in the Land of Promise; and though a few months might be all that separated two events in point of time, yet within that little period were compressed transactions more remarkable and important than are often witnessed in whole ages of common history. At such a turning-point in the history of the Church and people of Israel, it does not surprise us that Moses should use the expression that events occurred and changes were ushered in which continued “unto this day.”

(d.) *The quotation from “the book of the wars of the Lord”* (<042114>Numbers 21:14, 15), *and others apparently of a similar kind in the same chapter, are thought to be incredible in a contemporary history*, though natural enough in a writing of a later age, when these snatches of song might become valuable as the testimony of eye-witnesses. But there is no evidence of the assumption that it was the historian’s object to secure corroboration of his statements. While there is no obligation lying on us to assign the reason why these snatches of hymns appear where they do, the supposition is natural enough that Moses incorporated them in his history as specimens of the new spiritual life which had been wakened in the young generation of Israelites, and as evidences that God had indeed visited them with his grace, and was fitting them to take up the mission which had fallen from the unworthy hands of those who, in <021501>Exodus 15, “sang his praise,” but “soon forgat his works” (<19A612>Psalm 106:12, 13; comp. the

anticipations, <012514>Exodus 15:14-16, with the fulfillments, <042121>Numbers 21:21-35; 22:2-4, etc.).

(e.) *It is scarcely worth while to dwell upon certain incidental expressions which have been said to betray the hand of a later writer.* Such are, that "the Canaanite was then (za) in the land" (<011206>Genesis 12:6; comp. 13:7); and Joseph's words, "I was stolen away out of the land of the Hebrews" (<014015>Genesis 40:15). We select one case on account of its seeming greater strength. In <031828>Leviticus 18:28 the Israelites are warned to avoid the practices by which the land of Canaan had already been polluted, "that the land spue not you out also, when ye defile it, as it spued out the nations that were before you;" from which it is inferred that this was not written till after the Canaanites had been exterminated. But in truth the Hebrew language is very poorly furnished with tenses. Had this speech been in Latin, and had the future perfect been used — "that the land may not spue you out, in your defiling it, as it shall have spued out the nations that were before you" — a translation of it into Hebrew could not have been better expressed than in the present words of the Hebrew Bible. This really future meaning we take to be the meaning of the passage. Yet if the literal past time is insisted on by any one, there are two explanations, either of which is easy enough: either the sentence received its present form of expression as Moses revised his work, after the people of Sihon and Og had been destroyed; or else the very repulsiveness of the metaphorical language was meant to teach that the strength of the Canaanites was only apparent, that the land had already vomited them forth, and that they lay upon its surface as a loathsome incumbrance which must now be removed by Israel.

(7.) *Scientific Objections.* — Many who are able to explain to their satisfaction most of the above difficulties, are still troubled by others of a different class resting on alleged contradictions between the language of the Mosaic books and the facts of science. For instance, the Adamic creation is declared to contradict the conclusions of geology, inasmuch as the period required for bringing the crust of the earth into its existing condition must have included countless centuries, and not a brief period of six days. In the same way it is first argued that the scriptural narrative involves a universal deluge, and then, this meaning being assumed, that such a deluge, with all its accompanying circumstances, as recorded in Genesis, cannot have taken place without a miracle wholly stupendous. A third objection is grounded on the chronology of the Bible, and on the asserted fact that the duration of man upon the earth has extended to a

period at least exceeding four or five times the 6000 years allotted to him in the Pentateuch. A fourth objection is directed against the descent of all mankind from a single pair, and their primary migrations as recorded by Moses. It assumes that the physical peculiarities distinguishing the various races of the world are the results of a difference in species, not of a variety caused by the influence of climatic, physical, and social circumstances. There are many other minor objections of a more frivolous character, such as that which insists on fixing upon the word "firmament," in ⁰¹⁰¹⁶Genesis 1:6, the sense of a permanent solid vault, and then pointing out the opposition in which such an idea stands to astronomical science; or such as the objection against the language of Joshua (⁰⁶¹²Joshua 10:12), which is sufficiently answered by reference to the language of any modern almanac, and by the observation that if the ancient Scriptures had been written in the terminology of science, they would have been simply unintelligible to the generation to which they were first given. But these captious difficulties are of little weight compared to the four objections mentioned above, all of which touch questions of the gravest importance. In addition to those general elements of error which We shall proceed to point out as belonging in common to all the modern objections urged against the Pentateuch, there are some considerations bearing specially upon this scientific class of difficulties to which it is necessary briefly to call attention.

(a.) In regard to theories of the creation and the deluge, it is necessary to distinguish with the utmost possible precision between the language of Scripture and any private interpretations of it. When the question is propounded whether the six days of the Adamic creation were literal days of one revolution of the globe, or were successive periods of time; when it is asked whether the deluge was partial or universal, the particular opinion which each man may form must not be fastened on the scriptural language, as if it were its necessary and only admissible interpretation. It must be acknowledged that opinions on either side are equally consistent with a devout acceptance of the inspired Word. Experience teaches the necessity of this caution; for the lessons of geology have compelled us to separate between the creation and the beginning of ⁰¹⁰¹⁰Genesis 1:1, and the Adamic creation of the later verses, and to allow the existence of untold periods between them. Now that we are accustomed to this, we find that the change of interpretation has not put any dishonor on the text, and we must feel that what has happened in regard to one verse may happen in regard to others. Modern science has undoubtedly proved the pre-existence of

immense geological periods; but we are quite able to reconcile them with the scriptural narrative. *SEE CREATION*.

(b.) The same observation applies to the question of the deluge, and however these questions may be finally solved, the apologist for the Pentateuch must stand by the text of Scripture, and, whether he believes in a partial deluge or a universal deluge, must not confuse the infallible text with his own fallible interpretation of it. *SEE DELUGE*.

(c.) Lastly, the state of the controversy relative to the antiquity of man and the origin of races illustrates with peculiar force the crude and incomplete state of all scientific investigation on these subjects, and the consequent rashness of all conclusions drawn from them unfavorable to the authority of the Pentateuch. For the rationalistic attack is urged from two contrary directions, and is supported by arguments directly contradictory to each other. On the one side we are told that the distinctive physical peculiarities of different human races are so deep, so irremovable, that they must be considered to indicate diversity of species, and not simply varieties of one species; that no climatic and social influences call explain them; that consequently the races of men must have been created distinct, and the scriptural narrative which asserts the common descent of all mankind must be unworthy of credit. *SEE PREADAMITES*. On the other side, the very fact of an intelligent creation is called into question, on the ground that there are in the world no distinctions of fixed species, but only variations so mutable that all existing differences are the mere result of natural causes. The inevitable conclusion from such premises is that all forms of life whatever are self-developed out of one common primal form, and the idea of creation becomes superfluous, for the original monad can scarcely be considered as less self-developed than all the forms which have sprung from it. That such is the natural tendency of Mr. Darwin’s theory of the origin of species we have a most impartial witness. “This theory, when fully enunciated, founds the pedigree of living nature upon the most elementary form of vitalized matter. One step farther would carry us back, without greater violence to probability, to inorganic rudiments, and then we should be called upon to recognize in ourselves, and in the exquisite elaborations of the animal and vegetable kingdoms, the ultimate results of mere material forces, left free to follow their own unaided tendencies” (Sir W. Armstrong at the British Association at Newcastle, 1863). On the one side we are called to believe in the evidence of fixed species; and on the other side to believe in their non-existence. We are asked to believe that all living beings

whatever, including man himself, have descended from original monads, and at the same time to believe that the races of mankind cannot have descended from a common parentage. The two arguments are totally irreconcilable and till something like congruity can be introduced into our scientific theories, it is premature even to suggest their possible contradiction to the inspired authority of the Pentateuch. *SEE SPECIES, ORIGIN OF*.

(8.) *Alleged Moral Incongruities in the Pentateuch.* This class of objections is so indefinite in its nature as to make explanation and refutation, in the brief space of an article, equally difficult. They are all founded on the sufficiency of the human consciousness to pass a verdict on the propriety or impropriety of certain acts ascribed to God in the Pentateuch. The form they take is, however, more subtle than this. Certain acts imputed to God are contrary to the ideal which the human mind frames of the Deity; therefore it is argued that God cannot have done them, and consequently the books which attribute them to him cannot declare the truth, cannot be divinely inspired. The ideal God in the human consciousness is made the standard whereby revelation is measured. For instance, it is argued that the destruction of the Canaanitish nations by the sword of Israel under express command was a cruel deed, at which the human mind revolts, and which it is impossible to believe that God could have done. Objections of the same kind are urged against the Mosaic law, both against its positive enactments, as in the case of slavery, and against the minute and apparently trivial character of many of its details; and then, in support of these allegations, a contrast is drawn between the spirit of the Mosaic code and the spirit of the Gospels and epistles. It will be enough for the present purpose to reply that these objections rest almost entirely, and derive any force they may appear to have, from a misapprehension of the facts of the case, and an erroneous estimate of the Mosaic code on the one side, and of the Christian dispensation upon the other. A candid examination of the whole narrative shows that the destruction of the Canaanitish nations was purely a judicial act, wherein God was the judge and the people of Israel the authorized and divinely appointed executioners. It will be found that the utmost care was taken to present the whole transaction in this specific aspect, and that this act of judicial severity stood in the sharpest possible contrast to the general tenor of the Mosaic law, which was tolerant, gentle, and singularly beneficent both in spirit and in. its positive provisions. Looking at the Pentateuch, we find in

it the same law of love which we find in the Gospels; and looking at the Gospel, we find in God the same attribute of punitive justice which stands conspicuous in the law. The argument may be carried farther, for the analogy between God's character and dealings in providence and his dealings in grace, as contained in the book of revelation, is close and exact in the highest degree. On this whole question Bp. Butler's immortal *Analogy* may safely be referred to. *SEE CANAANITE*.

Into the details of these various objections — critical, historical, scientific, and moral — this article will not farther enter, partly from considerations of space, partly because many of them will be found treated in other articles of this *Cyclopaedia.* The student is referred, for their more formal refutation, to the almost voluminous literature which the controversy of the last few years has called into existence. With reference to the special form they have assumed in the *Critical Examination of the Pentateuch,* by Dr. Colenso, bishop of Natal, every information will be found in recent publications. The general questions of scholarship will be found ably handled in the *Examination* of Dr. Colenso's work, issued by the late lamented Dr. M'Caul. Reference may also be usefully made to *Colenso's Defections Examined* (Lond. 1863), by Dr. Benisch, a Jewish doctor. For the numerical calculations, the student should refer to the *Exodus of Israel* (Lond. 1863), by Rev. P. R. Birks, in which the are submitted to a searching examination. For questions of topography, a smaller work, entitled *The Pentateuch and the Gospel* (Lond. 1865), by Prof. Porter, of Belfast, the well-known author of *Five Years in Damascus,* Murray's *Hand-book of Syria,* etc., will be found full of valuable information.

V. *Literature*. — Some of this has been cited above; and much of the remainder is contained in general *introductions* or *commentaries* on the whole of the O.T., or on the several books of Moses. We mention here only the critical and exegetical works on the whole Pentateuch separately. De Bafiolas, vWrPe (Mantua, 1476-80, fol., and later); Aben-Ezra, rv;hi rps; (Naples, 1488, fol., and often later in various formns and combinations); Fostat R. C.], *Commentanus* [includ. other books] (Hisp. 1491, etc., 4to); Sal. Jizchaki (Rashi), hrwTohi vWrPe (Salonica, 1515, fol., and very often since [last ed. Berlin, 1867]; in Latin, by Breithaupt, Gotha, 1713, 4to; in German, by Haymann, Bonn, 1833, 8vo; by Dukes, Prague, 1838, 8vo); Bechor-Schor, vWrPe (Constant. 1520, fol.); Aboab, vWrPe (ibid. 1525, 4to; Ven. 1548; Cracow, 1587; Wilmend. 1713, fol.);

D'Illescas, µ[ìoyr e]aæ (Constant. 1540, 4to, and since); Achai, twOT l]a,v] rp,se (ed. Chaffi, Ven. 1546; ed. Berlin, Dyckerfurt, 1786, fol.); Jehudah ben-Isaac, [bir]aiW]µyraæ][,(ed. Jechiel ben-Jekuthiel, Venice, 1547, 4to); Oleaster [R. C.], *Commentarius* (Olyssop. 1556, etc., fol.); Elijah of Mantua, µynij[erwa (Cremona, 1557, 8vo); Bresch, vmWj (ibid. 1560, fol., and later); Ferus [R. C.], *Enarrationes* (Colon. 1572-4, 2 vols. 8vo); Abrabanel, hrwOT hi vWrPe (Ven. 1579, 1604, fol.; ed. Van Bashuysen, Hanau, 1710, fol.; also Amst. 1768-71, 4 vols. 4to); Arvivo, laetwOmWjn]Ti (Salonica, 1583, fol.); Galesinus [R. C.], *Commentarius* (Romans 1587, 4to); Alscheich, hv,m trwOT (Constant. 159-, fol., and often later); Chytraeus, *Narrationes* (Vitemb. 1590, fol.; also in *Opp*. i); Capponus [R. C.], *Commentarius* (Ven. 1590, fol.); Junius, *Explicationes* (L. B. 1594, 1602; Genev. 1609, 5 vols. 4to); Marbach, *Hypomnemata* (Argent. 1597, 2 vols. 4to); Pelargus, *Comnmentaria* (Lips. 1598-1609, 5 vols. 4*to*)*; Aretius,-Commentarii* (Bern 1602 8vo); Mos. Albelda, hv,m vrD; (Ven. 1603, fol.); Abigdors, vWrPe (Cracow, 1604, 4to); Heerbrand, *Commentarius* (Tubing. 1609, fol.); Ainsworth, *Annotations* [includ. Psalm and Cant.] (Lond. 1612-23, 6 vols. 4to, and later; also in Dutch, Leoward. 1690, fol.); Leyser, µyYæje µyMæi raB] (Venice, 1614; Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1707, fol.); Schick, qj,xy]æt [ìyrz] (Prague, 1615, 4to); A Lapide, *In Pentateuchum* (Antw. 1616, 4to); Drusius, *Commentarius* [on difficult passages] (Franeck. 1617, 4to); Marius [R. C.], *Comnmentarius* (Colon. 1621, fol.); Bonfrere [R. C.], *Commentarius* (Antw. 1625, fol.); Cromm [R. C.], *Illustrationes* (Lovan. 1629, 1630, 2 vols. 4to); Alstedt, *Adnotationes* (Herb. 1631, 1640, 8vo); Jansenius [R. C.], *Commentarius* (Lovan. 1639, 1641, 1644; Par. 1649, 1661, 4to); Heilpron, ˆwOYxæt bij]ai (Loblin, 1639, fol.); Polno, hrwOT rwa (ibid. 1642, 4to); Walther, *Spongia Mosaica* (Norib. 1642, 4to); Novarinus [R. C.], *Notce* (Veron. 1646, 2 vols. fol.); Amato, bwOFhi ˆm,v, (Venice, 1657, fol.); Varenius, *Decades* (Rost. 1659-75, 4 vols. 4to); Cregut, *Revelator Arcanorum* (Genev. 1666, 4to); Osiander, *Commentarius* (Tubing. 1676-8, 5 vols. fol.); Aboab [Israelite], *Parafrasis* (Amst. 1681, fol.); Ising, *Exrercitationes* (Regroin. 1683, 4to); Von der Hardt, *Ephemerides Philologicce* (Helmst. 1693, 8vo; 1696, 4to); Kidder, *Commentary* (Lond. 1694, 4to); Loria, hrwOThi vWrPe (Herbon, 1694, 8vo); Calvoer, *Gloria Mosis* (Gosl. 1696, 4to); Sterring, *Animadversiones* (Leovard. 1696; L. B. 1721, 4to); Athar, µyYæjhi rwa

(Venice, 17-, 4to, and often); Dupin, *Notce* (Par. 1702, 2 vols. 8vo); Frassen [R. C.], *Disquisitiones* (ibid. 1705, 4to); Meir (Rashbam), hrwTthi l[ivWrPe (Berl. 1705, 2 vols. 4to; Amst. 1760, 2 vols. 4to); Gensburg, ˆwox r;[biv]ylæTpjhi (Hamb. 3708, fol.); Tomaschov, vWrPe (Venice, 1710, fol.); Chefez, tbv,j}ni tkæl,m] (ibid. 1710, fol.); Engelschall, *Betracht. aus d.f. B. Mosis* (Dresd. 1712, 2 vols. 8vo); Helvig [R. C.], *Qucestiones* (Colossians 1713, fol.); Marck, *Analysis Exegetica* (L. B. 1713, 4to); Zarfati, vbD]ãWx (Amst. 1718, fol.); Bender, *Auslegung* (F. ad M. 1721, 4to); Israel ben-Isaac, tpiysæ}µymæke j} (ed. Brod, Offenb. 1722, 8vo; ed. Spetz, ibid. 1802, 4to); Landsberger, µynWmæE rmeov (Offenb. 1724, 4to); Abulefia, µyYæji/[e (Smyrna, 1726, fol.) also jqil,ãsewo (ibid. 1731, 4to); A. Cattenburgh [R. C.], *Syntagma* (Amst. 1737, 4to); Jameson, *E*: — *position* (Lond. 1748, fol.); Ostrob, rve a;µynæBæmæËWrB; (Zolk.. 1749, fol.); Alexander-Susskind, dBi tpn,x]mæ (ibid. 1757, fol.); Tismenitz, lLej æ tyBe (Fr. ad 0. 1760, 4to); Jacob ben-Pesach, bwq[y}i[riz, (Fiirth, 1765, 4to); Robertson, *Clavis* (Edinb. 1770, 8vo); Bate, *Notes* [includ. other books] (Lond. 1773, 4to); Moldenhauer, *Commentarius* (Quedlinb. 1774-5, 2 vols. 4to); Nacho mani, ˆwom]væ[riz, (Mantua, 1778, fol.); Mendelssohn, *Auslegung* (Berl. 1780-3, 5 vols. 8vo); Dathe, *Note* (Hal, 1781, 1792, 8vo); Jehudah ben-Eliezer, tjn]mæhadWhy], also Nicola, vWrPe (ed. Nunez-Vaez, Leghorn, 1783, fol.); Di Trani, vmWjhiyqeWMnæ (ed. Asulai, Leghorn, 1792, fol.); Marsh, *Authenticity of Pentateuch* (Lond. 1792, 8vo); Gaab, *Erklar.* (Tub. 1796, 8vo); Wittmann, *Annotationes* (Regensb. 1796, 8vo); Jones, *Authenticity of Pentateuch* (Lond. 1797, 8vo); Zebi, ybæ]dm,j, (Fiirth, 1798, 4to); Solestein, *Erakl'r.* (Berl. 1800, 8vo); Asulai, µymWdq] ljni (Leghorn, 1800, 4to); Faber, *Horce Mosaicce* (Lond. 1801, 1818, 2 vols. 8vo); Vater, *Commentar*; Jacob ben-A , vWrPe (ed. liBr, Zolk. 1806, 4to; ed. Rosenthal, Hanov. 1838, 4to); Griesinger, *Ueb. d. Pentateuch* (Stuttg. 1806, 8vo); Schrenzel, µydæm]µ[eo (Lemb. 1807, 1859, 4to); Morison, *Introductory Key* (Perth, 1810, 8vo); Meyer, *Apologie d. Pentat.* (Sulzb. 1811, 8vo); Kelle, *Wurdigung d. Mos. Schrift.* (Freib. 1811 sq., 3 vols. 8vo); also *Anmerk.* (ibid. 1817-21, 2 vols. 8vo); Neumann, *Ansicht d. Pentat.* (Bresl. 1812, 4to); Fritzsche, *Aechtheit d. Pentat.* (Leipz. 1814, 8vo); Aharon hal-Levi, µyvWD jæ, etc. (Leghorn, 1815, fol.); Herbst, *De Pentat. auctore et editore* (Elvee, 1817, 8vo); Calvo, hvpd;j}hjn]mæ

(Rodelh. 1818, 8vo); Heiden., heim, µymyi[erwam]vmWj (ibid. 1818-21, 8vo); Venusi, *Uebersetz.* (Prag. 1820, 4to); Aharon ben-Elia, hrwTrtp, (ed. Kosegarten, Jena, 1824, 4to); Horwitz, twpr;µynBe;(Ostrob. 1824, 8vo); Pfister, *Betracht.* (Wurzb. 1828, 8vo); Hagel, *Apologie d. Moses* (Sulzb. 1828, 8vo); Schumann, *Notce* (vol. i, Lips. 1829, 8vo); Hartmann, *Plan d. funf B. Mosis* (Rost. 1831, 8vo); Heinemann [Israelite], *Commentar* (Berlin, 1831-3, 5 vols. 8vo); Blunt, *Principles of the Mos. Writings* (Lond. 1833, 8vo); Wittman, *Pentat. Mosis* (Lat. and Ger. Landsb. 1834, 8vo); Ranke, *Unters. iib. d. Pentat.* (Erlang. 1834-40, 2 vols. 8vo); Stahelin, *Unters. ub. d. Pentat.* (in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1835, p. 461 sq.); Hengstenberg, *Authentie d. Pent.* (Berl. 1836-9, 2 vols. 8vo; tr. Edinb. 1847, 2 vols. 8vo); also *Die Biicher Mosis* (Berl. 1841, 8vo; tr. Edinb. 1845, 8vo); Thistlethwaite, *Sermons* (Lond. 1837-8, 4 vols. 12mo); Landauer. *Form d. Pentat.* (Stattg. 1838, 8vo); Meklenburg, *Ctommeniarius* (Lips. 1839, 8vo); Caunter, *Poetry of the Pentat.* (Lond. 1839, 2 vols. 8vo); Arnheim [Israelite], *Anmerk.* (Glogau, 1839-41, 5 vols.; ibid. 1842, 7 vols. 8vo); Bertheau, *Die sieben Gruppen,* etc. (Gott. 1840, 8vo); Herxheimer [Israelite], *Erklar.* (Berl. 1841,1850,1865, 8vo); Thiersch, *De Pentat. versione Alex.* (Berol. 1841, 8vo); Thornton, *Lectures* (Lond. 1843, 8vo); Kurtz, *Einleit. in d. Pentat.* (Leipz. 1844, 8vo); Baumgarten, *Commentar* (Kiel, 1844, 2 vols. 8vo); Von Gerlach, *Commentary* (from the Germ. Edinb. 1846, 8vo); Graves, *Lectures* (Lond. 1846, 8vo); Homberg, µrwTkhi(Vienna, 1846-9, 8vo); *Havernick, Introduction* (from the German, Edinb. 1850, 8vo); Weiss [Israelite], *Investigation of the Pentat.* (Dundee, 1850, 8vo); Hamilton, *Defence of the Pentat.* (Lond. 1851; N. Y. 1852, 8vo); Sorensen, *Inhalt u. Alter d. Pentat.* (pt. i, Kiel, 1851, 8vo); Sanguinetti, hlyfi hvdj}(Leghorn, 1853, fol.); Riehm, *Gesetzgebung Mosis* (Leips. 1854. 8vo); Macdonald, *Introduction to the Pent.* (Edinb. 1861, 2 vols. 8vo); E. Wilna [IsraeliteJ, *Commentarius* (ed. Fischel, Berl. 1862, 8vo); Mosar, hm;[Di(Berl. 1862, 8vo); Wogue, *Traduction et Notes* (Par. 1862 sq., 5 vols. 8vo); Bartlett, *Character and Authorship of the Pentat.* (in the *Bibliotheca Sacra,* Apr. and July, 1863, July and Oct. 1864); De Solla, *Vocabulary of the Pent.* (Lond. 1865, 8vo); Hirsch, *Erlaut.* (vol. i and ii, F. ad M. 1867 sq. 8vo); Smith (W. J. D.), *Authorship, etc., of the Pentateuch* (vol. i, Lond. 1868, 8vo); Norton, *The Pentateuch in relation of Jewish and Christian Dispensations* (Lond. 1870, 8vo); Margoliouth, *Poetry ofthe Pentateuch* (ibid. 1871, 8vo). See also Rawlinson's refutation (in *Aids to Faith,* a reply

to the *Essays and Reviews,* repub. N. Y. 1852, Essay 6) of the rationalistic attacks upon the Pentateuch by Bunsen and others. Bishop Colenso's *Pentateuch and Joshua Examined* (Lond. 1852, 8vo) was answered by numerous books and reviews (see a list in Low's *Publisher's Circular*, Jan. 15, 1863). *SEE COMMENTARY*.

Pen'tecost

(Πεντηκοστή, *scil.* ἡμέρα), the second of the three great annual festivals on which all the males were required to appear before the Lord in the national sanctuary, the other two being the feasts of Passover and Tabernacles. It fell in due course on the sixth day of Sivan, and its rites, according to the Law, were restricted to a single day. The most important passages relating to it are <02316>Exodus 23:16; <032315>Leviticus 23:15-22; <042826>Numbers 28:26-31; <051609>Deuteronomy 16:9-12; The following article treats of its observance from a Scriptural as well as Talmudical point of view. *SEE FESTIVAL*.

I. *Name and its Signification.* —

1. This festival is called, twø[bVh gji ἑορτὴ ἑβδομάδων, *solemnitas hebdomadorum, the Festival of Weeks* (<023422>Exodus 34:22; <051610>Deuteronomy 16:10, 16; <140813>2 Chronicles 8:13), because it was celebrated seven complete weeks, or fifty days, after the Passover (<032315>Leviticus 23:15, 16).

2. For this reason it is also called in the Jewish writings μwøy μyVæmij}h gji, *the feast of the fifty days* (comp. Joseph. *War,* 2:3, 1), whence ἡμέρα τῆς Πεντηκοστῆς (Joseph. *Ant.* 3:10, 6; Tob. 2:1; 2 Macc. 12:32; <440201>Acts 2:1; 20:16; <461608>1 Corinthians 16:8), the Latin *Pentecoste,* and our appellation Pentecost.

3. ryxæQ;h gji, *the festival of the harvest* (<02316>Exodus 23:16), because it concluded the harvest of the later grains.

4. μyrWKBæh" μwøy ἡμέρα τῶν νέων, *dies prinitivorum*, "the day of first-fruits" (<042826>Numbers 28:26), because the first loaves made from the new corn were then offered on the altar (<032317>Leviticus 23:17), for which reason Philo (*Opp.* 2:294) calls it ἑορτὴ πρωτογεννημάτων.

5. It is also denominated in the postcanonical Jewish writings t r x,[}h;gji, *the festival of conclusion* (or *assembly*), i.e. of the Passover, or simply t r x,[}(comp. πεντηκοστή, ἣν Ἑβραῖοι Ἀσαρθά [—=a t r x [, Chaldee] καλοῦσι, σημαίνει δὲ τοῦτο πεντηκοστήν, Joseph. *Ant.* 3:10, 6; Mishna, *Bikkurim*, 1:3, 7, 10; *Rosh Ha-Shana*, 1:2; *Chagiga*, 2:4), because it completed what the Passover commenced; and 6, Wn t e wT ˆTmi ˆmz] *the time of the giving of our law*, because the Jews believe that on this day the revelation of the Decalogue took place.

II. *The Time at which this Festival was celebrated.* — The time fixed for the celebration of Pentecost is the fiftieth day reckoning from *"the morrow after the Sabbath"* (t BVhi t rij Mm;) of the Passover (<03231>Leviticus 23:11, 15, 16.) The precise meaning, however, of the word t b v in this connection, which determines the date for celebrating this festival, has been matter of dispute from time immemorial. The Boethusians (µysw ayb) and the Sadducees in the time of the second Temple (Mishna, *Menachoth*, 10:3), and the Karaites since the 8th century of the Christian era (comp. Jehudah Hedessi, *Eshkol Ha-Kopher*, Alphab. p. 221-224; *ibid.* p. 85 b), took thv in its literal and ordinary sense as denoting *the seventh day of the week*, or *the Sabbath of creation*), and maintained that the omer was offered on the day following that weekly Sabbath which might happen to fall within the seven days of the Passover, so that Pentecost would always be on the first day of the week. But against this it is urged

(a.) that <06511>Joshua 5:11, where j sph t r j mm is used for thçh t r hmm, shows that thç in <03231>Leviticus 23:11 denotes the first day of Passover, which was to be a day of rest.

(b.) The definite article in thçh in <03231>Leviticus 23:11 refers to one of the preceding festival days.

(c.) The expression thç is also used for the Day of Atonement (<03232>Leviticus 23:32), and the abstract ˆw t b ç is applied to the first and eighth days of Tabernacles (ver. 39) and the Feast of Trumpets (23:24), as well as to *week* (23:15; 25:8); hence this use of σάββατον in the N.T. (<41162>Mark 16:2, 9; <42182>Luke 18:12).

(d.) According to <3315>Leviticus 23:15 the seventh week, at the end of which Pentecost is to be celebrated, is to be reckoned from this Sabbath. Now, if this Sabbath were not fixed, but could happen on any one of the seven Passover days, possibly on the fifth or sixth day of the festival, the Passover would in ,the course of time be displaced from the fundamental position which it occupies in the order of the annual festivals.

(e.) The Sabbatic idea which underlies all the festivals, and which is scrupulously observed in all of them, shows that the reckoning could not have been left to the fifth or sixth day of the festival, but must have fixedly begun on the 16th of Nisan. Thus, each Sabbath comes after *six even periods*: 1. the Sabbath of days, after six days; 2. the Sabbath of months, after six months; 3. the Sabbath of years, after six years; 4. the Sabbath of Sabbatic years, after six Sabbatic years; 5. the Sabbath of festivals = the Day of Atonement, after six festivals, *SEE JUBILEE, THE YEAR OF*; hence the Sabbath of weeks, i.e. Pentecost, must also be at the end of six common weeks after Passover, which could be obtained only by reckoning from the 16th of Nisan, as this alone yields *six common* weeks; for the first week during which the counting goes on belongs to the feast of Passover, and is *not common.*

(f.) The Sept. (ἡ ἐοπαύριον τῆς πρώτης), Josephus (τῇ δευτέρᾳ τῶν ἀζύμων ἡμέρᾳ, *Ant.* 3:10, 5, 6), Philo (*Opp.* 2:294), Onkelos (abf amwy r t bm), and the synagogue have understood it in this way, and most Christian commentators espouse the traditional interpretation. *SEE SABBATH.* Still more objectionable is the hypothesis of Hitzig (*Ostern und Pfingsten,* Heidelberg, 1837), defended by Hupfeld (*De primit. et vera festorum ap. Hebraeos ratione,* 2:3 sq.), and Knobel (*Die Bacher Exodus und Leviticus,* Leipsic, 1857, p. 544), that the sacred or festival year of the Hebrews always began on the Sabbath, so that the 7th (i.e. the first day of Passover), the 14th (i.e. the last day of the festival), and the 21st of Nisan, were always Sabbath days; and that the omer was offered on the 22d day of the month, which was "the morrow after the Sabbath" terminating the festival, and from which the fifty days were reckoned (Hitzig, Hupfield), or that the omer was offered on the 8th of the month, which was also "the morrow after the Sabbath," thus preventing it from being *post festum* (Knobel). It will be seen that this hypothesis, in order to obtain Sabbaths for the 14th and 21st days of the month as the beginning and termination of Passover, is always obliged to make the religious new year begin on a

Sabbath day, and hence has to assume a stereotyped form of the Jewish year, which as a rule terminated with an incomplete week. Now this assumption —

1. Is utterly at variance with the unsettled state of the Jewish calendar, which was constantly regulated by the appearance of the disk of the new moon, *SEE NEW MOON, DAY OF THE*;

2. It rudely disturbs the weekly division, which is based upon the works of creation, and which the Jews regarded with the utmost sanctity; and

3. It is inconceivable that the Mosaic law, which, as we have seen, regarded the Sabbatic division of time as so peculiarly sacred that it made it the basis of the whole cycle of festivals, would adopt a plan for fixing the time for celebrating the Passover whereby the last week of almost every expiring year is to be cut short, and the hebdomadal cycle, as well as the celebration of the Sabbath, interrupted (comp. Keil, *On* ‹0231› *Leviticus* 23:11).

It is therefore argued that the Jews, who during the second Temple kept Pentecost fifty days after the 16th of Nisan, rightly interpreted the injunction contained in ‹0231› Leviticus 23:15-22. The fiftieth day, or the feast of Pentecost, according to the Jewish canons, may fall on the 5th, 6th, or 7th of Sivan (ˆwys), the third month of the year from the new moon of May to the new moon of June (*Rosh Ha-Shana,* 6 *b*; *Sabbath,* 87 *b*). The fifty days formally included the period of grain-harvest, commencing with the offering of the first sheaf of the barley-harvest in the Passover, and ending with that of the first two loaves which were made front the wheat-harvest, at this festival. It was the offering of these two loaves which was the distinguishing rite of the day of Pentecost. *SEE WAVE-OFFERING*.

III. *The Manner in which this Festival was Celebrated.* — Not to confound the practices which obtained in the course of time, and which were called forth by the ever-shifting circumstances of the Jewish nation, we shall divide the description of the manner in which this festival was and still is celebrated into three sections.

1. *The Pentateuchal Ordinances*. — The Mosaic enactments about the manner in which this festival is to be celebrated are as follows: On the day of Pentecost there is to be a holy convocation; no manner of work is to be done on this festival (‹0231› Leviticus 23:21: ‹0428› Numbers 28:26); all the able-

bodied male members of the congregation, who are not legally precluded from it are to appear in the place of the national sanctuary, as on the Passover and Tabernacles (<022314>Exodus 23:14, 17; 34:23), where “a new meat-offering” (hjnm hçdj) of the new Palestine crop (<032316>Leviticus 23:16; <042826>Numbers 28:26; <051610>Deuteronomy 16:10), consisting of two unleavened loaves, made respectively of the tenth of an ephah (=about 3.5 quarts) of the finest wheaten flour (<023418>Exodus 34:18; <032317>Leviticus 23:17), is to be offered before the Lord as firstlings (µyrwkb, <023417>Exodus 34:17), whence this festival derived its name, *the day of firstlings* (µyrwkb µwy, <042826>Numbers 28:26).

In the above prescription, the phrase “Out of your habitations,” µkytbçwmm (<032317>Leviticus 23:17), has been explained by the Jewish canons, which obtained during the time of the second Temple, as an ellipsis for µkytwbçwm /ram (<041502>Numbers 15:2), *the land of your habitations, i*.e. *Palestine* (*Menachoth*, 77 *b*, with Mishna, *Menachoth*, 8:1); hence the rendering of Jonathan *b*. — Uzziel’s reputed Chaldee paraphrase, rtam ˆykynbtwm, the Sept. ἀπὸ τῆς κατοικίας ὑμῶν, *from your habitation,* in the singular referring to Palestine; the remark ofRashi, /ral hxwjm aly µkytbçwmm, *from where your habitations are, but not from any part outside the land,* i.e. *of Israel;* Rashban (ad loc.) and Maimnonides (*lad Ha - Chezaka, tilchoth Tamidin U-Mosaphin*, 8:2), who rightly distinguish between µkytbçwmm as here used, and µkytbçwm lkb (<021220>Exodus 12:20; 35:3; <030317>Leviticus 3:17; 7:26; 23:3, 14, 21; <043529>Numbers 35:29), the former referring to injunctions which are binding in the land of Canaan, and the latter to commandments to be observed in every place, or wherever the Jews might reside; comp. Rashban on <032316>Leviticus 23:16. The rendering of the Vulgate (*ex omnibus habitaculis vestris*), therefore which is followed by Luther (*aus alien eueren Wohnungen*), inserting lkb, is most arbitrary and unjustifiable. Inadmissible, too, is the opinion of Calvin, Osiander, George (*Die altenjiud. Feste,* p. 130, 273), etc., that *two loaves* were brought out of every house, or at least out of every town, based upon the plural µkytbçwmm*;* or the view of Vaihinger (in Herzog’s *Real-Encyklopdie,* s.v. Pfingstfest, p. 479) and Keil (on <032317>Leviticus 23:17), that the plural µkytbçm is used in a singular sense, i.e. *from one of your habitations* (comp. <010804>Genesis 8:4; <071207>Judges 12:7; <160602>Nehemiah 6:2; <211001>Ecclesiastes

10:1); and denotes that the two loaves are to be offered from the habitations of the Israelites, and not from those prepared for the sanctuary or from its treasury.

With the two loaves were to be offered as a burnt offering seven lambs of the first year and without blemish, one young bullock, and two lambs, with the usual meat and drink offerings; while a goat is to be offered as a sin-offering, and two lambs of the first year are to be offered as a thanksgiving or peace offering (<23>Leviticus 23:18-20). The peace-offering, consisting of the two lambs with the two firstling loaves, are to be waved before the Lord by the priests. These are to be additions to the two loaves, and must not be confounded with the proper festival sacrifice appointed for Pentecost. which is given in <04>Numbers 28:27, and which is to be a burnt-offering, consisting of two bullocks, one ram, and seven lambs. That these two passages are not contradictory, as is maintained by Knobel (*Comment. on* <03>*Leviticus* 23:15-22), Vaihinger (in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.* s.v. Pfingstfest, p. 480), and others, but refer to two distinct sacrifices, viz. one to accompany the wave-loaves (µjlh l[, <23>Leviticus 23:18), and the other the properly appointed sacrifice for the festival (<04>Numbers 28:27), is evident from the context and design of the enactments in the respective passages, as well as from the practice of the Jews in the Temple, where both prescriptions were obeyed. Hence Josephus (*Ant.* 3:10, 6), in summing up the number of animal sacrifices on this festival, says that there were fourteen lambs, three young bullocks, and three goats; the number *two,* instead of three goats, being manifestly a transcriber's error, as Vaihinger himself admits. When Vaihinger characterizes this statement of Josephus "as one of the many exegetical and historical blunders of the Jewish historian," and maintains that it does not follow from *Menachoth,* 4:2, we can only say that — 1. Josephus simply describes what he himself saw in the Temple, and what every ancient Jewish document on the same subject declares; 2. The third section of the very Mishna (*Menachoth,* 4:3) which Vaihinger quotes distinctly declares, "The kind of sacrifice prescribed in <04>Numbers 28:27 was offered in the wilderness, and the kind of sacrifice enjoined in <23>Leviticus 23:18 was not offered in the wilderness; but when they [i.e. the Israelites] entered the Promised Land they sacrificed both kinds; "see also the Gemara on this Mishna (*Babylon Menachoth,* 45 *b*), where the reasons are given more largely than in the Mishna why the former kind of sacrifice was not offered in the wilderness; and 3. Maimonides, who also summarizes the ancient canons on these two

kinds of sacrifices for Pentecost, shows beyond the shadow of a doubt how these enactments were carried out in the second Temple. He says: “On the fiftieth day, counting from the offering of the omer, is the feast of Pentecost and Azereth (ת ר ע ת). Now on this day additional sacrifices are offered, like the additional ones for new moon, *SEE NEW MOON, THE FEAST OF*, consisting of two bullocks, one ram, and seven lambs, ail of them being burnt-offerings, and of a goat as sin-offering. These are sacrifices ordered in (04826)Numbers 28:26, 27, 30, and they constitute the addition for the day. Besides this addition, however, a new meat-offering of two loaves is also brought, and with the loaves are offered one bullock, two rams, and seven lambs, all burnt-offerings; a goat for a sin-offering, and two lambs for a peace-offering. These are the sacrifices ordered in (03218)Leviticus 23:18. Hence the sacrifice on this day exceeds the two daily sacrifices by three bullocks, three rams, fourteen lambs (all these twenty animals being a burnt-offering); two goats for a sin-offering, which are eaten; and two lambs for a peace-offering, which are not eaten” (*lad la-Chezaka, Hilchoth Tamidin U-Mosaphin,* 8:1).

Besides the two loaves with their accompanying sacrifices, and the special festival sacrifices which were offered for the whole nation, each individual who came to the sanctuary was expected to bring, on this festival, as on Passover and the feast of Tabernacles, a free-will offering according to his circumstances ((05160)Deuteronomy 16:10-12), a portion of which was given to the priests and Levites, and the rest was eaten by the respective families, who invited the poor and strangers to share it. It would seem that the character of this festival partook of a more free and hospitable liberality than that of the Passover, which was rather of the kind that belongs to the mere family gathering. In this respect it resembled the feast of Tabernacles. The Levite, the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow were to be brought within its influence ((05161)Deuteronomy 16:11, 14). The mention of the gleanings to be left in the fields at harvest for “‘the poor and the stranger,” in connection with Pentecost, may perhaps have a bearing on the liberality which belonged to the festival ((03222)Leviticus 23:22). At Pentecost (as at the Passover) the people were to be reminded of their bondage in Egypt, and they were especially admonished of their obligation to keep the divine law ((05162)Deuteronomy 16:12).

2. *The Post-exilian Observance of this Festival*. — More minute is the information in the non-canonical documents about the preparation of the sacrifices and the observance of this festival in and before the time of

Christ. The pilgrims went up to Jerusalem the day previous to the commencement of the festival, when they prepared everything necessary for its solemn observance; and the approach of the holy convocation was proclaimed in the evening by blasts of the trumpets. The altar of the burnt-sacrifice was cleansed in the first night-watch of the preparation-day, and the gates of the Temple, as well as those of the inner court, were opened immediately after midnight for the convenience of the priests, who resided in the city, and for the people, who filled the court before the cock crew, to have their burnt-sacrifices and thanksgiving offerings duly examined by the priests. When the time of sacrifice arrived, the daily morning sacrifice was first offered, then the festival sacrifices prescribed in Numbers 28:26, 27, 30, while the Levites were chanting *the Great Hallel* (q.v.), in which the people joined; whereupon the congregation solemnly and heartily thanked God for the successful harvest, and the loaves of the new corn, with the accompanying sacrifices prescribed in Leviticus 23:18, were offered to the Lord. The two loaves for the wave-offering were prepared in the following manner: "Three *seahs* of new wheat were brought into the court of the Temple; they were beaten and trodden like all meat-offerings, and ground into flour, two omers of which were sifted through twelve sieves, and the remainder was redeemed and eaten by any one. The two omers of flour, of which the two loaves were made, were respectively obtained from a seah and a half... kneaded separately and baked separately. Like all meat-offerings, they were kneaded and prepared outside, but baked inside the Temple, and did not set aside the festival, much less the Sabbath, so that they were baked on the day preceding the festival. Hence, if the preparation-day (bwf µwy br[) happened to be on a Sabbath, the loaves were baked on Friday (br[hbç), and eaten on the third day after they were baked, which was the feast day." They were leavened loaves according to the declaration of the law, and made as follows: "The leaven was fetched from some other place, put into the omer, the omer filled with flour, which was leavened with the said leaven. The length of each loaf was seven hand-breadths; the breadth, four hand-breadths; and the height, four fingers" (Maimonides, *lad Ha-Chezaka, Hilchoth Tamidin U-Mosaphin*, 8:3-10, with Mishna, *Menachoth*, 6:6, 7; 11:2; 4:9). The two loaves thus prepared were then offered as wave-offerings, with two lambs, constituting the peace-offering, in the following manner: "The two lambs were brought into the Temple and waved together by the priest while yet alive, as it is written, 'And he shall wave them... a wave-offering' (Leviticus 23:20); but if he waved each one separately, it was also valid, whereupon they

were slain and flayed. The priest then took the breast and the shoulder of each one (comp. <03730>Leviticus 7:30, 32), laid them down by the side of the two loaves, put both his hands under them, and waved them all together as if they were one, towards the east side — the place of all wave offering — doing it forwards and backwards, up and down; but it was also valid if he waved each separately. Hereupon he burned the fat of the two lambs, and the remainder of the flesh was eaten by the priests. As to the two loaves, the high-priest took one of them, and the second was divided among all the officiating priests (twrmçmh), and both of them were eaten up within the same day and half the following night, just as the flesh of the most holy things" (Maimonides, *lad Ita-Chezaka, Hilchoth Tamidin U-Mosaphin,* 8:11. See Mishna, *Menachoth,* v. 6; Joseph. *Ant.* 3:10, 6; *War,* 6:5, 3). After the prescribed daily sacrifice, the festival and the harvest sacrifice were offered for the whole nation. Each individual brought the free-will offering, which formed the cheerful and hospitable meal of the family, and to which the Levite, the widow, the orphan, the poor, and the stranger were invited. The festival in a minor degree continued for a whole week, during which time those who did not offer on the first day repaired their defects or negligence (*Rosh Ha-Shana,* 4 *b*). The offering of the first fruits also began at this time (Mishna, *Bikkurim,* 1:7, 10); and it was for this reason, as well as for the joyous semi-festival days which followed the day of Holy Convocation, that we find so large a concourse of Jews attending Pentecost (<440201>Acts 2; Joseph. *Ant.* 14:13, 14; 17:10, 2; *far,* 2:3, 1).

No occasional offering of first-fruits could be made in the Temple before Pentecost (*Bikkurim,* 1:3, 6). Hence probably the two loaves were designated "the first of the first-fruits" (<022319>Exodus 23:19), although the offering of the omer had preceded them. The proper time for offering first-fruits was the interval between Pentecost and Tabernacles (*Bikk.* 1:6, 10; comp. <022316>Exodus 23:16). *SEE FIRST-FRUITS.*

The connection between the omer and the two loaves of Pentecost appears never to have been lost sight of. The former was called by Philo, προεότριος ἑτέρας ἑορτῆς μείζονος (*De Sept. §* 21, v. 25; comp. *De Decem Orac.* 4:302, ed. Tauch.). He elsewhere mentions the festival of Pentecost with the same marked respect. He speaks of a peculiar feast kept by the Therapeutse as προεόρτιος μεγίστης ἑορτῆς *sc.* Πεντηκοστῆς (*De Vit. Contemp.* v. 334). The interval between the Passover and Pentecost was evidently regarded as a religious season. The custom has probably been handed down from ancient times, which is observed by the

modern Jews, of keeping a regular computation of the fifty days by a formal observance, beginning with a short prayer on the evening of the day of the omer, and continued on each succeeding day by a solemn declaration of its number in the succession, at evening prayer, while the members of the family are standing with respectful attention (Buxtorf, *Syn. Jud.* 20, p. 440). According to the most generally received interpretation of the word δευτερόπρωτος (<4061>Luke 6:1), the period was marked by a regularly designated succession of Sabbaths, similar to the several successions of Sundays in our own calendar. It is assumed that the day of the omer was called δεύτερα (in the Sept., <0231>Leviticus 23:11, ἡ ἐπαύριον τῆς πρώτης). The Sabbath which came next after it was termed δευτερόπρωτον*;* the second, δευτεροδεύτερον*;* the third, δευτεροτριτον*;* and so onwards till Pentecost. This explanation was first proposed by Scaliger (*De Emend. Temp.* lib. 6, p. 527), and has been adopted by Frischmuth, Petavius, Casaubon, Lightfoot, Godwyn, Carpzov, and many others.

3. *The Observance of this Festival to the Present Day.* — This festival, like all the feasts and fasts ordained or sanctioned in the Old Test., is annually and sacredly kept by the Jews to the present day on the 6th and 7th of Sivan, i.e. between the second half of May and the first half of June. Thus, although, according to the law, the observance of Pentecost lasted but a single day, the Jews in foreign countries, since the Captivity, have prolonged it to two days. They have treated the feast of Trumpets in the same way. The alteration appears to have been made to meet the possibility of an error in calculating the true day (Lightfoot, *Exercit. Heb.* <4401>Acts 2:1; Reland, *Antig.* 4:4, 5; Selden, *De Ann. Civ.* c. vii). It is said by Bartenora and Maimonides that, while the Temple was standing, though the religious rites were confined to the day, the festivities and the bringing in of gifts continued through seven days (Notes to *Chagiga*, 2:4). As above noted, in accordance with the injunction in <0231>Leviticus 23:15,16, the Jews regularly count every evening the fifty days from the second day of Passover until Pentecost, and they recite a prayer over it, which is given in the article PASSOVER *SEE PASSOVER* . As the counting (hryps) of these fifty days, on the first of which the sickle was brought out for cutting the corn, and on the last of which it was laid up again because the harvest was entirely finished, is not only a connecting link between Passover and Pentecost, but may be regarded as preparatory for the feast of Pentecost, we must notice the events and practices connected therewith. Owing to a

fearful plague which broke out on the second day of Passover or the first of Omer, and which, after raging thirty-two days, and carrying off between Gabath and Antiparos no less than 24,000 disciples of the celebrated R. Akiba, suddenly ceased on the 18th of Jiar, the second month, i.e. the thirty-third of Omer (*Babylon Jebamoth,* 62 b; *Midrash Bereshith Rabba,* Seder hrç yyj, sec. 61, p. 134, ed. Stettin, 1863), it was ordained that, in memory of this calamity, three days are to be kept as a time of mourning, during which no marriage is to take place, no enjoyments and pleasures are to be indulged in, nor even is the beard to be removed (*Orach Chajim, Hilchoth Pesach,* sec. 493); and that the thirty-third of Omer, on which the epidemic disappeared, is to be kept as a holiday, especially among the students, for which reason it is called the scholars' feast. The reason which R. Jochanan ben-Nori assigns for regarding this period as a time of mourning — i.e. that the wicked are punished in hell in these days, and that judgment is passed on the produce of the land — is simply a modern cabalistic form given to an ancient usage.

The three days preceding the festival, on which, as we shall see hereafter, the Jews commemorate the giving of the law on Sinai, are called (ymy 8tçlç hlbgh) *the three days of separation and sanctification,* because the Lord commanded Moses to set bounds around the mountain, and that the people should sanctify themselves three days prior to the giving of the law (<2912>Exodus 19:12, 14, 23). On the preparation day (tw[rbç br[) the synagogues and the private houses are adorned with flowers and odoriferous herbs; the male members of the community purify themselves by immersion and confession of sins, put on their festive garments, and resort to the synagogue, where, after the evening prayer (byr[m), the hallowed nature of the festival is proclaimed by the cantor in the blessing pronounced over a cup of wine (çwdyq), which is also done by every head of the family at home before the evening repast. After supper both the learned and the illiterate are either to go again into the synagogue or to congregate in private houses and read all night:

(a) The first three and the last three verses of every book in the Hebrew Scriptures, but some portions have to be read entire;

(b) the first and last Mishna of every tractate in the Talmud;

(c) the beginning and end of the book *Jezirah;*

(d) passages from the Sohar;

(e) the 613 commandments into which the Mosaic law is divided, *SEE SCHOOL*; and

(f) the Song of Songs.

The whole must be recited in thirteen divisions, so that the prayer *Kadish* (çydq) might be said between each division, and the letters of the word dja (the unity in the Deity) = 4+8+1 -13, be obtained (comp. *Magen Abraham, Orach Chajim*, sec. 494). The reason for this watching all night, given by R. Abraham, the author of the *Magen Abraham*, is as follows: When God was about to reveal his law to Israel, he had to wake them up from their sleep. Hence, to remove the sin of that sleep, the Jews are now to wake all night (comp. Brick, *Rabbinische Ceremonial gebrduche* [Breslau, 1837], p. 8-22, and the ritual for this night, entitled lyl ^wqyt tw[wbç). In the general festival service of the morning special prayers are inserted for this day, which set forth the glory of the Lawgiver and Israel, the glory of the Lord in creating the universe, etc., and in which the Decalogue is interwoven, the great Hallel is recited, <02901>Exodus 19:1, 20:26 is read as the lesson from the law, <04825>Numbers 18:26-31 as *Maphtir*, and <26101>Ezekiel 1:1-28, 3:12, as the lesson from the prophets, *SEE HAPHTARAH*; whereupon the *Musajh* is offered, and the priests, after having their hands washed by the Levites, pronounce chantingly the benediction (<04623>Numbers 6:23-27) on the congregation, who receive it with their heads covered by the fringed wrapper. *SEE FRINGE*. On the second evening they again resort to the synagogue, use the ritual for the festivals, in which are again inserted special prayers for this occasion, being chiefly on the greatness of God and the giving of the law and the Decalogue; the sanctification of the festival (çwdyq) is again pronounced, both by the praelector in the synagogue and the heads of families at home; and prayers different from those of the first day, also celebrating the giving of the law, are intermingled with the ordinary festival prayers; the Hallel is recited, as well as the book of Ruth; <05159>Deuteronomy 15:19-16:17, with <04826>Numbers 28:26-31 is read as the lesson from the law; Habbakuk 2:20-3:19, as the lesson from the prophets; the prayer is offered for depaited relatives; the *Musaph Ritual* is recited; the priests pronounce the benediction as on the former day; and the festival concludes after the afternoon service, as soon as the stars appear or darkness sets in. It must

be remarked that milk and honey form an essential part of the meals during this festival, which is of a particularly joyous character, to symbolize "the honey and milk which are under the tongue" of the spouse (<20411>Song of Solomon 4:11), by virtue of the law which the bridegroom gave her.

The less educated of the modern Jews regard the fifty days with strange superstition, and, it would seem, are always impatient for them to come to an end. During their continuance they have a dread of sudden death, of the effect of malaria, and of the influence of evil spirits over children. They relate with gross exaggeration the above-mentioned case of a great mortality which, during the first twenty-three days of the period, befell the pupils of Akiba, the great Mishnical doctor of the second century, at Jaffa. They do not ride, or drive, or go on the water, unless they are impelled by absolute necessity. They are careful not to whistle in the evening, lest it should bring ill-luck. They scrupulously put off marriages till Pentecost (Stauben, *La Vie Juive en Alsace* [Paris, 1860], p. 124; Mills, *British Jews*, p. 207).

IV. *Origin and Import of this Festival.* — There is no clear notice in the Scriptures of any historical significance belonging to Pentecost. Yet, looking simply at the text of the Bible, there can be little doubt that Pentecost owes its origin entirely and exclusively to the harvest which terminated at this time. It is to be expected that, in common with other nations of antiquity who celebrated the ingathering of the corn by offering to the Deity, among other firstling offerings, the fine flour of wheat as θαλύσιος ἄρτος (Eustath. *Ad Iliad.* 9:530; Athen. 3:80; Theocrit. 7:3), the Jews, as an agricultural people, would thankfully acknowledge the goodness of God in giving them the fruits of the earth, by offering to the Bountiful Giver of all good things the first-fruits of their harvest. That this was primarily the origin and import of Pentecost is most unquestionably indicated by its very names, e.g. *the festival of* (ryxqh) *the cut-off corn*, i.e. end of the harvest (<022316>Exodus 23:16), which commenced on the morrow of the Passover, when the sickle was first brought into the field (<051609>Deuteronomy 16:9); and so intimately connected are the beginning of the harvest at Passover with the termination of it at this festival, that Pentecost was actually denominated, during the time of the second Temple, and is called in the Jewish literature to the present day, trx[, *the conclusion*, or, jsp lç trx[, *the termination of Passover*. To the same effect is the name tw[wbçh gj, *the festival of weeks*, which, as Bahr

rightly remarks, would be a very strange and enigmatical designation of a festival, simply because of the intervening time between it and a preceding festival, if it did not stand in a fixed and essential relationship to this intervening time, and if in its nature it did not belong thereto, since the weeks themselves have nothing which could be the subject of a religious festival, except the harvest that took place in these weeks (*Symbolik*, 2:647). Being the culmination of Passover, and agrarian in its character, the pre-Mosaic celebration of this festival among the Jews will hardly be questioned; for it will not be supposed that the patriarchs, who in common with other nations were devoted to agriculture, would yet be behind these nations in not celebrating the harvest festival, to acknowledge the goodness of God in giving them the fruits of the earth, which obtained among the heathen nations to the remotest times. Indeed, the Book of Jubilees, as will be seen in the sequel, actually ascribes a pre-Mosaic existence to it. In incorporating this festival into the cycle of the canonical feasts, the Mosaic legislation, as usual, divested it of all idolatrous rites, consecrated it in an especial manner to him who filleth us with the finest of wheat (<19E714>Psalm 147:14), by enjoining the Hebrews to impart liberally to the needy from that which they have been permitted to reap, and to remember that they themselves were once needy and oppressed in Egypt, and were now in the possession of liberty and of the bounties of Providence (<05L611>Deuteronomy 16:11, 12). The Mosaic code, moreover, constituted it a member of the Hebrew family of festivals, by putting Pentecost on the sacred basis of seven, which, as we have seen, underlies the whole organism of the feasts.

But though the canonical Scriptures speak of Pentecost as simply a harvest festival, yet the non-canonical documents show, beyond the shadow of a doubt, that the Jews, at least as early as the days of Christ, connected with it, and commemorated on the 6th of Sivan, the third month, the giving of the Decalogue. It is made out from <02L901>Exodus 19 that the law was delivered on the fiftieth day after the deliverance from Egypt (Selden, *De Jur. Nat. et Gent.* 3:11). It has been conjectured that a connection between the event and the festival may possibly be hinted at in the reference to the observance of the law in <05L612>Deuteronomy 16:12. But neither Philo nor Josephus has a word on the subject. Philo expressly states that it was at the feast of Trumpets that the giving of the law was commemorated (*De Sept.* c. 22). *SEE TRUMPETS, FEAST OF*. There is, however, a tradition of a custom which Schottgen supposes to be at least as ancient as the apostolic times, that the night before Pentecost was a time especially appropriated

for thanking God for the gift of the law (*Hor. Hebr.* ad Act. 2:1). The Talmud declares that "the rabbins propounded that the Decalogue was given to Israel on the 6th of Sivan" (*Sabbath,* 86 b), and this is deduced from Exodus 19, for, according to tradition, Moses ascended the mountain on the 2d of Sivan, the third month (Exodus 19:1-3); received the answer of the people on the 3d (ver. 7); reascended the mountain on the 4th (ver. 8); commanded the people to sanctify themselves three days, which were the 4th, 5th, and 6th (vers. 12, 14, 23); and on the third of these three days of sanctification, which was the sixth day of the month, delivered the Decalogue to them (vers. 10, 11, 15, 16). This is the unanimous voice of Jewish tradition. It is given in the *Mechilta* on Exodus 19 (p. 83-90, ed. Wilna, 1844, *SEE MIDRASH*); in the Chaldee paraphrase of Jonathan ben-Uzziel, which renders yçylçh µwyb yhyw (Exodus 19:16) by atyçb hatylt amwyb hwhw ajryb, *and it came to pass on the third day, on the sixth of the month,* i.e. Sivan; by Rashi (*Comment. on* *Exodus* 19:1-16); and by Maimonides, who remarks: "Pentecost is the day on which the law was given, and in order to magnify this day, the days are counted from the first festival (i.e. Passover) to it, just as one who is expecting the most faithful of his friends is accustomed to count the days and hours of his arrival; for this is the reason of counting the omer from the day of our Exodus from Egypt to the day of the giving of the law, which was the ultimate object of the exodus, as it is said, I bare you on eagles' wings, and brought you unto myself.' And because this great manifestation did not last more than one day, therefore we annually commemorate it only one day" (*More Nebochim,* 3:43). To this effect is R. Jehudah (born circa 1086), in his celebrated work *Cusari,* 3:10; Nachmanides (born about 1195), in his commentary on the Pentateuch (Exodus 19:1-25; Leviticus 23:17), and all the Jewish commentators, as well as the ritual for this festival. Even Abrabanel, who denies that the primary object in the institution of this festival was to celebrate the gift of the law, most emphatically declares that the Decalogue was given on Mount Sinai on Pentecost, as may be seen from the following remark: "The law was not given with a design to this festival, so that it should commemorate the gift of the law, since the festival was not instituted to commemorate the giving of the law; as our divine law and the prophecy are their own witnesses, and did not require a day to be sanctified to commemorate them; but the design of the feast of weeks was to commence the wheat harvest. For just as the feast of Tabernacles was intended to finish the ingathering of the produce, so the festival of weeks

was intended to begin the harvest, as it was the will of the Lord that at the commencement of the ingathering of the fruits which are the food of man, the first of which is the wheat, and which began to be cut on the feast of weeks, a festival should be celebrated to render praise to him who giveth food to all flesh; and that another festival should be celebrated at the end of the ingathering of the fruits. Still, there is no doubt that the law was given on the day of the feast of weeks, although this festival was not instituted to commemorate it" (*Commentary on the Pentateuch*, Parshath rwma, p. 211 a, ed. Hanau, 1710). Those early fathers who were best acquainted with the Jewish tradition testify to the same thing, that the law was given on Pentecost, and that the Jews commemorate the event on this festival. It was therefore on this day, when the apostles, in common with their Jewish brethren, were assembled to commemorate the anniversary of the giving of the law from Sinai, and were engaged in the study of Holy Writ, in accordance with the custom of the day, that the Holy Spirit descended upon them, and sent them forth to proclaim "the wonderful works of God," as revealed in the Gospel (44001Acts 2). Thus, St. Jerome tells us, "Supputemus numerum, et inveniemus quinquagesimo die egressionis Israel ex *A*Egypto in vertice montis Sinay legem datam. Unde et Pentecostes celebratur solemnitas, et postea evangelii sacramentum in Spiritus Sancti descensione completur" (*Epist. ad Fabiolam,* 12; in *Opp.* 1:1074, ed. Par. 1609). Similarly St. Augustine, "Pentecosten etiaim, id est, a passione et resurrectione Domini, quinquagesimum diem celebramus, quo nobis Sanctum Spiritum Paracletum quem promiserat misit; quod futurum etiam per Judaeorum pascha significatum est, cum quinquagesimo die post celebrationem ovis occisee, Moyses digito Dei scriptam legem accepit in monte" (*Contra Faustzum,* lib. 33, c. 12). Comp. also De Lyra, *Comment. on Leviticus* 23; Bishop Patrick *on Erod.* 19. It is very curious that the apocryphal Book of Jubilees, which was written in the first century before Christ, *SEE JUBILEES, BOOK OF*, should connect this festival, which was celebrated on the third month, with the third month of Noah's leaving the ark, and maintain that it was ordained to be celebrated in this month, to renew annually the covenant which God made with this patriarch not to destroy the world again by a flood (ch. 6:57 sq.). Such an opinion would hardly have been hazarded by a Jew if it had not. been believed by many of his co-religionists that this festival had a pre-Mosaic existence. Since the destruction of Jerusalem, and the impossibility of giving prominence to that part of the festival which bears on the Palestinian harvest, the Jews have almost entirely made Pentecost to commemorate the giving of the law, and

the only references they make in the ritual to the harvest, which was the primary object of its institution, is in the reading of the book of Ruth, wherein the harvest is described.

If the feast of Pentecost stood without an organic connection with any other rites, we should have no certain warrant in the Old Testament for regarding it as more than the divinely appointed solemn thanksgiving for the yearly supply of the most useful sort of food. Every reference to its meaning seems to bear immediately upon the completion of the grain harvest. It might have been a Gentile festival, having no proper reference to the election of the chosen race. It might have taken a place in the religion of any people who merely felt that it is God who gives rain from heaven and fruitful seasons, and who fills our hearts with food and gladness (<44147>Acts 14:17). But it was, as we have seen, essentially linked to the Passover — that festival which, above all others, expressed the fact of a race chosen and separated from other nations. It was not an insulated day. It stood as the culminating point of the Pentecostal season. If the offering of the omer was a supplication for the divine blessing on the harvest which was just commencing, and the offering of the two loaves was a thanksgiving for its completion, each rite was brought into a higher significance in consequence of the omer forming an integral part of the Passover. It was thus set forth that He who had delivered his people from Egypt, who had raised them from the condition of slaves to that of free men in immediate covenant with himself, was the same that was sustaining them with bread from year to year. The inspired teacher declared to God's chosen one, "He maketh peace in thy borders, he filleth thee with the finest of the wheat" (<19714>Psalm 147:14). If we thus regard the day of Pentecost as the solemn termination of the consecrated period, intended, as the seasons came round, to teach this lesson to the people, we may see the fitness of the name by which the Jews have mostly called it, t r x, [} *the concluding assembly.*

As the two loaves were leavened, they could not be offered on the altar, like the unleavened sacrificial bread. Abrabanel (*in* <03230>Leviticus 23) has proposed a reason for their being leavened which seems hardly to admit of a doubt. He thinks that they were intended to represent the best produce of the earth in' the actual condition in which it ministers to the support of human life. Thus they express, in the most significant manner, what is evidently the idea of the festival.

We need not suppose that the grain harvest in the Holy Land was in all years precisely completed between the Passover and Pentecost. The period of seven weeks was evidently appointed in conformity with the Sabbatical number, which so frequently recurs in the arrangements of the Mosaic law. *SEE FEASTS*; *SEE JUBILEE*. Hence, probably, the prevailing use of the name, "The Feast of Weeks," which might always have suggested the close religious connection in which the festival stood to the Passover.

It is not surprising that, without any direct authority in the O.T., the coincidence of the day on which the festival was observed with that on which the law appears to have been given to Moses, should have strongly impressed the minds of Christians in the early ages of the Church. The divine Providence had ordained that the Holy Spirit should come down in a special manner, to give spiritual life and unity to the Church, on that very same day in the year on which the law had been bestowed on the children of Israel which gave to them national life and unity. They must have seen that, as the possession of the law had completed the deliverance of the Hebrew race wrought by the hand of Moses, so the gift of the Spirit perfected the work of Christ in the establishment of his kingdom upon earth.

It may have been on this account that Pentecost was the last Jewish festival (so far as we know) which the apostle Paul was anxious to observe (<44016>Acts 20:16; <46608>1 Corinthians 16:8), and that Whitsuntide came to be the first annual festival instituted in the Christian Church (Hessey, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 88, 96). It was rightly regarded as the Church's birthday, and the Pentecostal season, the period between it and Easter, bearing as it does such a clear analogy to the fifty days of the old law, thus became the ordinary time for the baptism of converts (Tertullian, *De Bapt.* c. 19; Jerome, *in* <38148>*Zechariah* 14:8). *SEE PENTECOSTAL EFFUSION*.

V. *Literature.* — Mishna, *Menachoth* and *Bikkurim;* Joseph. *Ant.* 14:13, 4; 17:12. 2; *War*, 2:3, 1; faimonides, *Iad Ha-Chezaka, Hilchoth Tamidin U-Mosaphin*, c. 8; Abrabanel, *Commentary on the Pentateuch*, p. 211 (ed. Hanau, 1710); Meyer, *De Fest. Heb.* 2:13; Bahr, *Symbolik des Mosaischen Cultus*, 2:619 sq., 645 sq.; Diedricli, in Ersch and Gruber's *Encyklopadie*, s.v. Pfingsten, sec. iii, vol. xx, p. 418-431; *The Jewish Ritual called Derach Ha-Chajim* (Vienna, 1859), p. 253 b, sq.; *The Ritual for the Cycle of Festivals*, entitled (rwzjm) *Machsor on* (tw[wbç) *the Festival of Weeks;* Carpzov, *App. Crit.* 3:5; Reland, *Antiq.* 4:4; Lightfoot, *Temple*

Service, sec. 3; *Exercit. in Act.* 2:1; Spencer, *De Leg. Heb.* I, 9:2; III, 8:2; Hupfeld, *De Fest. Heb.* ii; Iken, *De Duobus Panibus Pentecost.* (Brem. 1729); Drusius, *Notoe Majores in* (0235)*Leviticus* 23:15, 21 (*Crit. Sac.*)*;* Otho, *Lex. Rab.* s.v. Festa; Buxtorf, *Synagogal. Judenthum,* c. 20. *SEE FESTIVAL*.

Pentecostal Effusion Of The Holy Spirit

(as recorded in Acts 2). The commencement of the Christian Church on the day of Pentecost, preceded as it was by our Lord's ascension,. attached a peculiar interest to this season, and eventually led to its being set apart for the commemoration of these great events. It was not, however, established as one of the great festivals until the 4th century. The combination of two events (the Ascension and the descent of the Holy Ghost) in one festival has a parallel in the original Jewish feast, which is held to have included the feast of first-fruits and of the delivering of the law ((0236)Exodus 23:16; (0234)Leviticus 23:14-21; (0426)Numbers 28:26). Indeed, this festival in some respects bears a close analogy to the Jewish one; and is evidently little more than a modification of it. The converts of that day, on which the Holy Ghost descended, were the *first- fruits* of the Spirit. Jerome (*Ad Fabium, §* 7) elegantly contrasts this with the giving of the law on Mount Sinai: "Utraque facta est quinquagesimo die a Paschate; illo, in Sina; haec, in Sion. Ibi terrae motu contremuit mons; hic, domus apostolorum. Ibi, inter flaruinas igniumn et micantia.fulgura, turbo ventorum, et fragor tonitruorum personuit; hic, cum ignearum visione linguarum sonitus pariter de ccelo, tanquam spiritus vehementis adversit. Ibi, clangor, buccinae, legis verba perstrepuit; hie, tuba evangelica apostolorum ore inltonlllit." This festival became one of the three great festivals (Tertullian, *De Baptist.* c. 19: Jerome, in *Zach.* 14:8); and it derives its name of Whitsunday, not from baptism, but from a corruption of the name *Pentecost,* through the German *Pfingsten.*

In the early Christian Church the entire period between Easter and Pentecost was named from the latter (Tertullian, *De Idol.* c. 14; *De Bapti*. c. 19; *Can. Ap.* c. 37; *Can. Ant.* c. 30; Cyril. Hieros. *Ad Const.*). The feast was observed as the festival of the Holy Spirit (Greg. Naz. *De Pent. Hom.* c. 44) at a very early date, allusion being made to it by Tertullian, as shown above, and by Orien (*Contra Cels* e. [ed. Cantab. 1677], viii, p. 392). All public games were interdicted by Theodosius the Younger during the Pentecostal as during the Paschal solemnity (*Cod. Theod.* 15:5, "De

Spectac.”). During these weeks the Acts of the Apostles were read, as being most suitable for the period during which the risen Lord appeared to pis disciples in the body “by many infallible proofs.” Fasting was intermitted (*Const. Ap.* v. 33), and the pravers of the Church were offered, not in a kneeling position, but erect (*Concil. Nic.* can. 20), as symbolizing the jubilant attitude of the Church during her Lord’s passage from the grave to the glory. The entire octave was celebrated in early days, and followed by a week of fasting (*Const. Ap.* v. 33). The feast was restricted to three days by papal decree, A.D. 745.

Doubts have been cast on the common interpretation of Acts 2:1, according to which the Holy Ghost was given to the apostles on the day of Pentecost. Lightfoot contends that the passage ἐν τῷ συμπληροῦσθαι τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς Πεντηκοστῆς means, *when the day of Pentecost had passed,* and considers that this rendering is countenanced by the words of the Vulgate, “cum complerentur dies Pentecostes.” He supposes that Pentecost fell that year on the Sabbath, and that it was on the ensuing Lord’s day that ησαν ἅπαντες ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό (*Exercit. in Act., ii.* 1). Hitzig, on the other hand (*Ostern un Pfingsten,* Heidelberg, 1837), would render the words, “As the day of Pentecost was approaching its fulfillment.” Neander has replied to the latter, and has maintained the common interpretation (*Planting of the Christian Church* 1:5, Bohn’s ed.).

The question on what day of the week this Pentecost fell must of course be determined by the mode in which the doubt is solved regarding the day on which the Last Supper was eaten. *SEE PASSOVER*. If it were the last Paschal supper, on the 14th of Nisan, and the Sabbath during which our Lord lay in the grave was the day of the omer, Pentecost must have followed on the Sabbath. But if the supper were eaten on the 13th, and he was crucified on the 14th, the Sunday of the Resurrection must have been the day of the omer, and Pentecost must have occurred on the first day of the week.

For monographs on this subject, see Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, p. 72, 120. *SEE BAPTISM OF FIRE*.

Pentecostals

a contribution or oblation made by every house or family to the cathedral church at Pentecost, in consideration of a general absolution then pronounced. The Pentecostals are sometimes called Whitsun-farthings.

Pentecostarion

one of the service-books of the Greek Church, containing the office of the Church from Easter-day till the eighth day after Pentecost, which they called the Sunday of All-Saints.

Penton, Stephen

an English clergyman and educator, was born in the first half of the 17th century, and was educated at Oxford University. In 1675 he became principal of St. Edmund Hall, Oxford; afterwards rector of Glympton. He died near the close of the 17th century. He published *Apparatus ad theo. logiam, in usum Academiarnum*: (1) Generalis; (2) Specialis (Lond. 1688, 8vo). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* vol. ii, s.v.

Pentz (Pencz Or Pens), Georg,

a celebrated German painter and engraver, was born at Nuremberg about 1500. He was first the pupil of Albrecht Durer, and afterwards went to Italy, and studied the works of Raffaelle at Rome, probably after the death of that great master. Pentz died about 1560. Little is known of his works as a painter. A few of them are in the Imperial Gallery at Vienna, and these are greatly admired. His prints are numerous and highly esteemed. His drawing is correct, and there is none of that stiffness and formality which characterize the productions of his contemporaries. While in Italy he engraved, in conjunction with Marc' Antonio, several plates after the works of Raffaelle. The Bible subjects from his own designs are: Two small prints, *Job Tempted* and *Esther before Ahauerus;* two, *Judith in the Tent of Holofernes* and *Judith with his Head;* two, *the Judgment of Solomon* and *Solomon's Idolatry;* two, *Lot and his Dautghters* and *Susanna and the Elders;* four of the *History of Joseph* (1544); seven of the *History of Tobit* (1543), considered among his best; two of the *Merciful Samaritan* and the *Conversion of St. Paul* (1545); *The Four Evangelists.* The seven works of Mercy are circular; twenty-five plates of the life and miracles of Christ are very fine.

Penu'el

In the place of this name, *SEE PENIEL*. The name Penuel (Heb. *Penuel'*, לאנפ*face of God;* Sept. Φανουήλ) occurs also as the name of two men.

1. First named of two sons of Hur, son of Judah. He was the father of Gedor (1304 1 Chronicles 4:4). B.C. post 1658.

2. Last named of eleven sons of Shashak, son of Beriah; a man of the tribe of Benjamin who dwelt in the city of Jerusalem (1385 1 Chronicles 8:25). B.C, post 1612.

Pe'or

(Heb. *Peor i',* r / [P] *cleft,* always with the art. when speaking of the mountain, but without it of the idol; Sept. Φογώρ), the name of a hill and of a heathen deity; perhaps also of a town.

1. A mountain on the plateau of Moab, to the top of which Balak led Balaam that he might see the whole host of Israel and curse them (0228 Numbers 23:28). It appears to have been one of the ancient high places of Moab dedicated to the service of Baal (0241 Numbers 22:41; 23:13, 27). Its position is described as "looking to the face of Jeshimon;" that is, the wilderness on either side of the Dead Sea. *SEE DESERT*. If it were in sight of the Arabah of Moab, on the east bank of the Jordan, where the Israelites were then encamped, it must have been one of those peaks on the western brow of the plateau which are seen between Heshbon and the banks of the Arnon (comp. Josephus, *Ant.* 4:6,4). Two other incidental notices of the sacred writers tend to fix its position. There can be little doubt that it was connected with the town of Beth-Peor, which is described as "over against" the site of the Israelitish camp (0329 Deuteronomy 3:29; comp. 34:6). *SEE BETH-PEOR*. Josephus says it was sixty stadia distant from the camp (*Ant.* 4:6, 4); Eusebius states that it lay above Livias (the ancient Beth-aran), six miles distant from it, and opposite Jericho; and Jerome mentions Mount Phogor as situated between Livias and Heshbon (*Onomast.* s.v. Fogor and Araboth Moab). It would seem, therefore, that this mountain was one of those peaks on the south side of Wady Heshbon commanding the Jordan valley. A place named *Fuichatr*(*h* is mentioned in the list of towns south of Es-Salt in the appendix to the first edition of Dr. Robinson's *Bib. Res.* (vol. iii, Append. p. 169), and this is placed by Van de Velde at the head of the Wady Eshteh, eight miles north-east of Hesban. Professor Paine, however, recently contends that it is one of the summits of the present Jebel Neba. *SEE PISGAH*.

2. “The matter of Peor” (8p rbd) mentioned in <04258>Numbers 25:18, and 31:16; and the “iniquity of Peor” (8p ˆy[), spoken of by Joshua (<06217>Joshua 22:17), refer to the Midianitish deity Baal-peor, and not to the mountain. By following the counsels of Balaam, the Midianites seduced the Israelites to take part in their worship, and the licentious revels by which it appears to have been accompanied; and thus they brought upon them the divine vengeance (<04316>Numbers 31:16; 25:1 sq.). The temple or shrine of Baal-peor probably stood on the top of the mountain; and the town of Beth-peor may have been situated at its base. Gesenius (*Thesaur.* p. 1119 a) gives it as his opinion that Baal-peor derived its name from the mountain, not the mountain from him. *SEE BAAL-PEOR*.

3. A Peor, under its Greek garb of Φαγώρ, appears among the eleven names added by the Sept. to the list of the allotment to Judah, between Bethlehem and Aitan (Etham). It was known to Eusebius and Jerome, and is mentioned by the latter in his translation of the *Onomasticon* as *Phaoa.* It probably still exists under the name of *Beit Faghur* or *Kirbet Faghur,* five miles south-west of Bethlehem, barely a mile to the left of the road from Hebron (Reland, *Palaest.* p. 643; Robinson, *Bib. Res.* 3:275; Tobler, *Dritte Wanderung,* p. 92).

Pepin

is the name of several distinguished members of the Carlovingian line of French kings. The first of them in order was PEPIN THE OLD, or “Pepin de Landen,” who flourished in the first half of the 7th century. The only one, however, whose history concerns us especially here is the third of the Pepins, whose name was PEPIN LE BREF, i.e. “Pepin the Short,” and who was really the first king of France. He was the younger son of Charles Martel, who, on the death of his father in 741, received Neustria and Burgundy; Austrasia, Thuringia, and Suabia being the heritage of his elder brother Carloman. Aquitaine was nominally a part of Pepin’s dominions, though really independent under its own duke, whom Pepin made several ineffectual attempts to subdue. The farce of governing the country in the name and as the chief minister, or, as he was called, “Mayor of the Palace,” of the Merovingian sovereign, which had begun under Pepin of Heristal, was still kept up, though Pepin was eagerly longing for an opportunity to assume the crown, but the opportune moment did not come until 747, when Carloman bade adieu to power, and retired into a convent, leaving his government to his sons. Pepin immediately dispossessed them. After

crushing a rebellion of Saxons and Bavarians, Pepin determined to effectually establish his royal power by dispossessing the Merovingian dynasty of even the semblance of authority, and of originating in person a new royal dynasty. To gain his point he flattered the clergy, then the most influential body in France; and as they had been despoiled by Charles Martel for the behoof of his warriors, a moderate degree of kindness and generosity on the part of Pepin contrasted him so favorably with his father that the clergy at once became his partisans. So did the pope (Zacharias), who felt the importance of securing the aid of the powerful Frankish chief against the Lombards, who were then masters of Italy, and to stop the progress of the Saacens, who now spread as far as the south of France. He therefore released the Franks from their oath of fidelity to Childeric, the Merovingian monarch; which intelligence, when brought to Pepin, at once caused him to complete the dethronement of Childeric by having his long hair shaved off, which was an essential characteristic of royalty with the Merovingian kings, and to confine him in a monastery, where he died in 755, and had himself elected king by the assembly of estates at Soissons, and consecrated by the bishop of Mayence in March, 752. In 754 the pope himself (Stephen II) appeared for Pepin, and gave his sanction to the election and consecration; and, in order to give further effect to Pepin's authority, consecrated him anew to his high dignity in the church of St. Denis at Paris. Apparently the action had significance only for Pepin's subjects. It soon proved, however, that these solemn ceremonies had put the crown under great obligations to the Church, or, better, the papacy; and that, though at this time the pope came to favor the king, and to ask for help to maintain his temporal sovereignty, the day came when the clergy claimed to have secured political rank in the state by Pepin's coronation at their hands. *SEE INVESTITURES*; *SEE TEMPORAL POWER OF THE POPE*. Pepin accompanied the pontiff to Italy at the head of a large army, to establish firmly, in turn, the papal authority. He waged war against Astolphus, the Lombard king, obliged him to raise the siege of Rome, and not only compelled him to. abandon all pretensions to the city and the exarchate of Ravenna, but took from a him several cities which had formerly belonged to the, Greeks, and handed them over to the pope. Another expedition was rendered necessary in A.D. 755 by the revolt of Astolphus, who was again subdued by the champion of the Church. He also obtained a signals victory over the Saracens, reunited Aquitaine to his kingdom, and waged successful war against the German princes. Pepin le Bref died in the year 768, and was succeeded by his son Charlemagne. It is

admitted by late historians that this change of dynasty was coincident with the elevation of the eastern Franks, whose fresher energy, guided by the chiefs of the Pepin family, enabled them to push upward to the seat of government, and take the place of their feebler kindred. *SEE FRANCE* and *SEE LOMBARDS* for the necessary literature for a correct understanding of the establishment of the Gallic nation.

Pepin (Or Pepyn), Martin

a Flemish painter, was born at Antwerp in 1574, as appears from an inscription on his portrait hereafter mentioned. It is not known under whom he studied at home. After having learned the principles of the art, he went to Italy, where he is said to have so distinguished himself by his grandeur of composition, correctness of design, and vigorous tone of coloring, that Rubens himself regarded Pepin with jealousy, and dreaded his return to Antwerp, fearing his reputation would suffer: from such rivalship. Pepin, however, did not interfere with Rubens, for he resided most of his life at Rome. In Italy Pepin failed to secure much fame. In the church of the hospital at Antwerp are two of his works, which are highly extolled; they are altarpieces, with folding doors, in the style of some of the old Flemish masters; the center picture of one represents the *Baptism of St. Augustine*, and the laterals on the doors that saint giving alms to the poor and curing the sick; the other is a similar work, representing *St. Elizabeth giving Alms* to a group of miserable objects who are struggling to approach her. His portrait, by Vandyck, in the private collection of the king of Holland, is described by C. J. Niewvenhuyt (in his *Catalogue*), who saw several of Pepin's pictures, and says that his talents were but second rate, that his first manner partook of the school of Otho Venius, but that the works he executed in Italy are in a more elevated style. Pepin died at Rome in 1641.

Peploe, Samuel, D.D.

an English divine, flourished in the beginning of the 18th century. He was for a time warden of Manchester. — In 1726 he was made bishop of Chester. He died about 1752. He published, *A Sermon on* 1 Kings 18:21 (1716, 8vo): — *God's peculiar Care in the Preservation of our Religion and Liberties; a Sermon on* 1 Samuel 12:7 (1716, 8vo): *Sermon*, Matthew 25:40 (1730, 4to): — *Sermon*, Matthew 10:34 (1733, 4to): — *Popish Idolatry a strong Reason why all Protestants*

should zealously suppose the present Rebellion; A Sermon on <46104>1 Corinthians 10:14 (1745, 4to).

Pepusch, Joh(an)n Christopher,

one of the greatest theoretical musicians of modern times, a contemporary and associate of Handel, was born in 1667 at Berlin, where his father was then minister of a Protestant congregation. At the early age of fourteen he attracted the ndtice of the court, and was given a lucrative position, which he held until his thirtieth year. — The tyranny of his royal master, Frederick I inclined Pepusch to quit the country and seek employment abroad. He visited Holland, but after a year's tarry went over to England. He reached London in 1700, and was engaged as musician at Drury Lane Theatre, where it is thought he assisted in adapting the operas which were performed there. In his private studies he devoted himself principally to the music of the ancients, especially that of the Greeks, which he regarded as far superior to anything that the moderns were capable of producing. In 1710 he was one of the founders of the *Academy of Ancient Music,* which existed until 1790. In 1712 he, together with Handel, was engaged by the duke of Chandos (Pope's Timon) to compose for the chapel at Cannons. In 1713 the University of Oxford admitted him to the degree of doctor in music. In 1724 he was persuaded by Dr. Berkeley to join in the scheme for establishing a college in the Bermudas; but as the ship was wrecked the project was precipitately abandoned. At the instance of Gay and Rich, he undertook, in 1730, to compose and adapt the music for the "Beggar's Opera." In 1731 appeared his *Treatise on Harmony,* which long continued a standard work, and is still studied by artists of the first order. In 1737 he was chosen organist for the Charter-House. Having written a paper on the ancient genera, which was read before the Royal Society, and published in the Philosophical Transactions. in the year 1746, he soon afterwards was elected a fellow of the Royal Society. He died in 1752.

Pepuzians

is a name sometimes given to the *Montanists* (q.v.), because Montanus is said to have taught that a place called Pepuza, in Phrygia, was the chosen spot at which the millennial reign of Christ was destined to begin.

Pera (Or Bursa)

is the name of a four-cornered case for the keeping of the corporale, and is of the same material and color as the altar-dress. The oil for the anointing of the sick and the host were carried by the priests in the pera, hung about the neck.

Peraccini, Guiseppe

called *Il Mirandolese,* an Italian painter, was born at Mirandola in the year 1672. According to Crespi, he studied under Marc' Antonio, Franceschini, whose style, he adopted. He executed some works for the churches at Bologna. He must not be confounded with Pietro Paltronieri. called *Mirandolese dello prospettiva.* He died in 1754.

Peraea

(Περαία, from πέραν, *beyond*), a name given to a portion of the country beyond Jordan, or on the east side of that river, the ancient possession of the two tribes of Reuben and Gad. According to Josephus (*War*, 3:3, 3), it was bounded on the west by Jordan, east by Philadelphia, north by Pella, and south by the castle of Machaerus. The country was fruitful, abounding with pines, olive-trees, palm-trees, and other plants, which grew in the fields in great abundance; it was well watered with springs and torrents from the mountains. It corresponds in an enlarged sense to *"the region round about Jordan"* (ἡ περίχωρος τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, <400305>Matthew 3:5; <420303>Luke 3:3; the earlier rKKæ of <011310>Genesis 13:10). *SEE PALESTINE*. The events connected with this region mentioned in the O.T. are noticed under the articles *SEE GILEAD* and *SEE BASHAN*. It would seem to have been partially visited by our Lord (<431014>John 10:14). *SEE BETHABARA*.

Peraeans

were the followers of Euphrates of Pera, in Cicilia, who is said to have believed that there are in the Trinity three Fathers, three Sons, and three Holy Ghosts. It has been alleged that in opposition to this class of heretics was framed the clause in the Athanasian creed which says, "So there is one Father, not three Fathers; one Son, not three Sons; one Holy Ghost, not three Holy Ghosts."

Peraga, Bonaventura De

an Italian cardinal, was born June 12, 1332, in Padua. He entered the Order of St. Augustine while very young, went to study in Paris, and there taught theology. He was a friend of Petrarch, and it was he who pronounced his funeral oration (1374). Three years later he was elected general of his order (1377), When schism entered the Church, Bonaventura declared himself for Urban VI, who rewarded him by giving him a cardinal's hat (1378). His zeal for the court of Rome proved fatal to him: he was killed while passing over the bridge St. Angelo to go to the Vatican, and Francois de Carrara, tyrant, of Padua, is suspected of ordering the deed. But no historian has yet given a proof of this crime, and we are ignorant of the precise date of the year in which it was committed, though it was supposed to be about 1390. The cardinal is none the less made a martyr to the faith, and the continuators of the *Actes des Saints* have admitted him into their vast collection (vol. 11, June 10). He had composed commentaries on the epistles of St. John and St. James, lives of saints, sermons, etc. See Petrarque, *Rerum senilium,* lib. xi, ep. 25; Scardeoni, *Antiq. Patav.* lib. ii; J. Pamphile, *Bibl. Augustiniana;* Tommasini, *Fibl. Patavina,* p. 75; Tiraboschi, *Storiln della letter. Ital. v.* 139-141.

Perah

SEE MOLE.

Perambulation

is the term applied to the English practice of *walking round* a parish in order to ascertain its boundaries. This perambulation was, and still is, usually performed on *Ascension day* (q.v.). Dr. Hooke says: "Perambulations for ascertaining the boundaries of parishes are to be made by the minister, churchwardens, and parishioners, by going round the same once a year, in or about Ascension week. The parishioners may justify going over any man's land in their perambulations according to usage; and, it is said, may abate all nuisances in their way." There is a small homily, constituting the fourth part of the "Homily for Rogation Week," which is appointed to be read on the above occasion. Perambulation is now known as *beating the parish bounds,* as the marks are struck with a stick.

This ancient custom had a twofold object. It was designed to supplicate the divine blessing on the fruits of the earth, and to preserve in all classes of

the community a correct knowledge of and due respect for the bounds of parochial and individual property. It appears to have been derived from a still older custom among the ancient Romans. called Terminalia, and Ambarvalia, which were festivals in honor of the god Terminus and the goddess Ceres. On its becoming a Christian custom the heathen rites and ceremonies were of course discarded, and those of Christianity substituted. It was appointed to be observed on one of the Rogation (q.v.) days, which were the three days next before Ascension day. "Before the Reformation, parochial perambulations were conducted with great ceremony. The lord of the manor, with a large banner, priests in surplices and with crosses, and other persons with hand-bells, banners, and staves, followed by most of the parishioners, walked in procession round the parish, stopping at crosses, forming crosses on the ground, 'saying or singing gospels to the corn,' and allowing 'drinkings and good cheer' (Grindal's *Remains,* p. 141, 241, and note; Whitgift's *Workz,* 3:266, 267; Tindal's *Works,* 3:62, 234, Parker Society's edition), which was remarkable, as the Rogation days were appointed fasts. From the different practices observed on the occasion the custom received the various names *of processioning, rogationing, perambulating, and ganging the boundaries;* and the week in which it was observed was called *Rogation week; Cross week,* because crosses were borne in the processions; and *Grass week,* because the Rogation days being fasts, vegetables formed the chief portion of diet. At the Reformation, the ceremonies and practices deemed objectionable were abolished, and only 'the useful and harmless part of the custom retained.' Yet its observance was considered so desirable that a homily was prepared for the occasion, and injunctions were issued requiring that for 'the perambulation of the circuits of parishes the people should once in the year, at the time accustomed, with the rector, vicar, or curate, and the substantial men of the parish, walk about the parishes, as they were accustomed, and at their return to the church make their common prayer. And the curate, in their said common perambulations, was at certain convenient places to admonish the people to give thanks to God (while beholding of his benefits), and for the increase and abundance of his fruits upon the face of the earth, with the saying of the 103d Psalm. At which time also the said minister was required to inculcate these, or such like sentences: Cursed be he which translateth the bounds and doles of his neighbor; or such other order of prayers as should be lawfully appointed' (Burns, *Ecclesiastical Law,* 3:61; Grindal, *Remains,* p. 168). Those engaged in the processions usually had refreshments provided for them at certain parts of the parish, which, from

the extent of the circuit of some parishes, was necessary; yet the cost of such refreshment was not to be defrayed by the parish, nor could such refreshment be claimed as a custom from any particular house or family. But small annuities were often bequeathed to provide such refreshments. In the parish of Edgcott, Buckinghamshire, there was about an acre of land, let at £3 a year, called 'Gang Monday Land,' which was left to the parish officers to provide cakes and beer for those who took part in the annual perambulation of the parish. To this day questions of disputed boundary between parishes are invariably settled by the evidence afforded by these perambulations; for in such questions immemorial custom is conclusive. And so far are they recognized in law that the parishioners on such occasions are entitled to trespass on lands, and even to enter private houses if these stand on the boundary line. In Scotland, where the parochial principle has never been developed as in England, there seem to be few traces of a similar practice. But as between neighboring landowners, a brieve of perambulation is the technical remedy for setting right a dispute as to boundaries or marches; and perambulating or 'riding' the bounds of boroughs is a common practice. The necessity or determination to perambulate along the old track often occasioned curious incidents. If a canal had been cut through the boundary of a parish, it was deemed necessary that some of the parishioners should pass through the water. Where a river formed part of the boundary line, the procession either passed along it in boats, or some of the party stripped and swam along it, or boys were thrown into it at customary places. If a house had been erected on the boundary line, the procession claimed the right to pass through it. A house in Buckinghamshire, still existing, has an oven passing over the boundary line. It was customary in the perambulations to put a boy into this recess to preserve the integrity of the boundary line. At various parts of the parish boundaries, two or three of the village boys were 'bumped' — that is, a certain part of the person was swung against a stone wall, a tree, a post, or any other hard object which happened to be near the parish boundary. This, it will scarcely be doubted, was an effectual method of recording the boundaries in the memory of these *battering-rams*, and of those who witnessed this curious mode of registration. The custom of perambulating parishes continued in some parts of the kingdom to a late period, but the religious portion of it was generally, if not universally, omitted. The custom has, however, of late years been revived in its integrity in many parishes."

Peranda, Santo

an Italian painter, was born at Venice in 1566. According to Ridolfi, he first studied under the younger Palma, and afterwards with Leonardo Corona, of Murano. In his first performance he followed the prompt and hasty manner of Palma; but he afterwards went to Rome, where, by diligently studying the antique and the works of the great masters, he formed a style of his own, more finished and correct. On his return to Venice he improved his coloring by contemplating the works of Titian, Tintoretto, and Veronese, so that he became as accomplished in coloring as he was before in design. He executed many works for the churches and public edifices, and was employed in decorating the ducal palaces at Venice, Mirandola, and Modena with various subjects from history. "His usual manner," says Lanzi, "very much resembles Palma, while in the large histories which he produced at Venice and Mirandola he appears in a more practical character of his own. Yet he was of a more slow and reflective turn, and more studious of art — qualities which, in the decline of age, led him to adopt a very delicate and labored manner. He was not ambitious of equalling his contemporaries in the number of his works, but his aim was to surpass them in correctness; nor did he anywhere succeed better in his object than in his *Christ taken down from the Cross,* in the church of San Procolo at Venice." He had several disciples, among whom was Matteo Ponzone. He died at Venice in 1638.

Per Anniilum et Bacilum

were those bishoprics given by handing over *the ring and* staff.

Perard-Castel, Francis,

a French canonist, was born at Vire in 1647. Admitted to the bar in Paris, he entered into a business relating to benefices, under the direction of his uncle, banker to the court of Rome, to whom he soon succeeded. He afterwards became a lawyer to the grand council, and, exhausted by labor and too close application, he died at Paris in 1687. We have of his works, *Paraphase sur le Commentaire de Dumoulin ad Regulas Cancellarice* (Paris, 1683 or 1685, *fol.*): — *Remarques sur les Definitions du droit Cunonique* (de Desmaisons) (ibid. 1700, fol.), "a work which is of more value," says Camus, "than the *Definitions* themselves;" the first edition, without notes, is 1668, 4to; the second, 1674, 3 small vols. 4to: — *Nouveau recueil de plusieurs questions notables sur les matieres*

benficiales (ibid. 1689, 2 vols. fol.): — *Traite sommaire de Vusage et de la pratique de la coup de Rome pour l'expedition des signatures et provisions des benefices de France* (ibid. 1717, 2 vols. 12mo), with remarks by Guill. Nover. Some authors believe that the latter work is by Castel, uncle of Perard, who may have corrected it. See Denys-Simon, *Biblioth. Hist. des Auteurs de Droit;* Camus, *Biblioth. d'un Avocat;* Richard et Simon, *Biblioth. sacree.*

Peratae

were a very obscure Gnostic sect, related to the *Ophit* (q.v.). They are first named by Clement of Alexandria, and definitely described, i.e. in some detail, by Hippolytus (*Refut.* v. 124). The latter was followed by Theodoret, but no new information about them was added by him (*Haeret. fab.* 1:17). This sect appears to have been called Peratae, or *Peratici,* in the first instance, from the country to which they belonged, Eubcea, i.e. the land beyond (πέραν) the continent, as Peraea was the district beyond Jordan; and this is the only fact stated about them by Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* 7:17, ad fin.). But they afterwards gave another meaning to the name, that of "Transcendentalists" (Περᾶσαι), because, through their knowledge of the divine mysteries, they were qualified to "proceed through the pass beyond destruction." Hippolytus says they originated with Euphrates the Peratic and Celbes the Carystian (the latter being also called Ademes and Acembes the Carystian both by Hippolytus and Theodoret), but no particulars are given about either.

The Peratae appear to have been a local sect, and their peculiar γνῶσις was a recondite philosophy founded on theories associated with the constellations of astronomers, and on serpent-worship. Hippolytus says that they and their doctrine had been very little known until he described them, and that the latter were so intricate that it was difficult to give a compendious notion of them. But, after stating many details of their strange system, he goes on to sum it up in the following terms, which make it evident that their system was only a modification of the general Ophitic notions. They held that the universe is Father, Son, and Matter, each of the three having endless capacities in itself; intermediate between Matter and the Father sits the Son — the Logos, the Serpent — always being in motion towards the unmoving Father and towards moving Matter. At one time the Son is turned towards the Father, and receives powers into his own person; at another time he takes up these powers, and turns towards

Matter. Then Matter, devoid of attribute, and being unfashioned, molds itself into forms from the Son, which the Son molded from the Father. They believed, further, in a Demiurge, who works destruction and death, and that men could be saved from his power only through the Son, who is the Serpent. In addition to this fundamental corruption of Christianity, the Peratee had also many secret mysteries, which Hippolytus says could not be mentioned by him on account of their profanity (*Philosoph.* v. 7-13; 10:6). See Baxmann, in Illgen's *Zeitschr. f. historische Theologie,* 1860; Taylor, *Hippolytus,* p. 84; Ueberweg, *Hist. of Philos.* 1:280-285.

Perault

(or, better, Peyraud), Guillaume, a French prelate, was born about 1190 in Peyraud, a village of Vivarais, then in the diocese of Viennia, now in the department of Ardeche. Doctor of the University of Paris, Guillaume entered quite young the Order of St. Dominic, and soon acquired a general esteem by the purity of his manners, by his doctrines, and by his talents in the pulpit. Philip of Savoy, who, without having received orders, was elected in 1246 archbishop of Lyons, chose him for suffragan bishop, and Guillaume, clothed with a title *in partibus,* performed episcopal duties in the diocese for more than ten years, which has led into error Leandro Alberti, Altamura, and Severt, who have placed him among the archbishops of Lyons. Perault died at Lyons in 1255. We have of his works, *Summa de vitiis et virtu. tibus,* of which the last edition (Paris, 1663, 4to) is a work much praised by Gerson: — *Commentarium de Re. gula Sancti Benedicti* (1500, 8vo); printed without name of place, year, or printer, and attributed in a MS. to William of Poitiers: — a treatise, *De eruditione religiosorum;* often printed at Paris, Lyons, and elsewhere, and which appeared under the name of Imbert, general of the Dominicans: — a collection of sermons *De di. versis et de efstis,* of which more than twelve editions have been published; the last at Orleans, 1674, 8vo: — a treatise, *De eruditione Principium,* printed for the first time at Rome, 1570, 8vo. A treatise entitled *Virtutum vitiorumque exempla* has been wrongly attributed to Guillaume Perault; it is by Nicholas de Hanappes, patriarch of Jerusalem. See Echard, *Scriptor. ordin. Prcedicat.* 1:132; Touron, *hommes illust. de l'ordre de Saint Dominique; Gallia Christ.* vol. 5.

Perault, Raimond

a French cardinal, was born May 28, 1435, at Surgeres (Saintonge). The son of poor artisans, he was first a school-teacher in his own village, then at La Rochelle, and, thanks to some benefactors, he entered as burser the College of Navarre, in Paris. Received as doctor, and appointed prior of Saint-Gilles at Surgeres, he went to Rome, and rendered himself useful to popes Paul II, Sextus IV, and Innocent VIII. The latter sent him in 1487 to Germany to collect the alms designed for the expenses of the war against the Turks, and, although this nunciatory had not gained for himself much honor, Raimond was nevertheless rewarded for his travels and labors by the bishopric of Gurck, in Carinthia. Alexander VI made him a cardinal in September, 1493, on the recommendation of king Charles VIII, and it was he who, in the name of this prince, signed at Rome, Sept. 6, 1494, the act of donation or cession of the empire of Constantinople, made to France by Andreas Paleologus, prince of Roumania, sole heir of the empire. His favorable inclinations towards France, his native land, appeared particularly on the occasion of the war of Naples, when he raised his voice to complain of the intrigues and the odious conduct of Alexander VI on the subject of prince Zizim, son of Mohammed II. Cardinal Perault obtained in 1513 the bishopric of Saintes, where he never resided, and was appointed by Julius II legate of the patrimony of St. Peter. The favor which he enjoyed with the different popes excited jealousy against him; also, certain authors have treated him very ill; others, on the contrary, have bestowed the greatest praises upon his probity and manners. He died at Viterbo, Sept. 5, 1505. He has left, among others, works entitled *De dignitate sacerdotali super omnes reges*: — *De Actis suis Lubeci et in Dania Epistole*: — different *Harangues.* See *Gallia Christiana,* vol. ii; Huguee du Teurs, *Le Clerge de France,* vol. ii; Aubery, *Hist, des Cardin.;* Berthier, *Hist. de l'Eglise Gallic.* vol. xvii; Briand, *Hist. de l'Eglise Santone et Aunisienne,* vol. ii.

Per'azim, Mount

[some *Pera'zim],* MOUNT (Heb. *Har Peratsim',* µyxæPÅr hi *mountain of clefis;* Sept. ὄρος ἀσεβῶν [apparently by mistake for µy[ær]; Vulg. *Mons division'im*), a place mentioned by the prophet Isaiah, in warning the Israelites of the divine vengeance about to come upon the nation, with which they did not seem sufficiently impressed, referring to instances of God's wrath exhibited in their past history in these words: "The Lord shall rise up as in *Mount Perazim,* he shall be wroth as in the valley of Gibeon"

(<23821>Isaiah 28:21). The commentators almost unanimously take his reference to be to David's victories at Baal-perazim and Gibeon (Gesenius, Strachey), or to the former of these on the one hand, and Joshua's slaughter of the Canaanites at Gibeon and Beth-horon on the other (Eichhorn, Rosenmüller, Michaelis). Hendewerk thinks reference is made to "the breach of Uzzah" (hz[/rp, *Perez-Uzzah*) described in <10606>2 Samuel 6:6-8 (*Die Deutero-Jesaiaschen Weissag.* ad loc.); but that narrative contains no mention of any mount. Ewald supposes the prophet may allude to the slaughter of the Canaanites at Gibeon by Joshua (*Die Propheten,* ad loc.); though in another place he distinctly states that Mount Perazim is the same place which is called Baal-perazim (*Geschichte des Volkes Israel,* 3:187, note 3). Isaiah in this passage doubtless alludes to David's conquest of the Philistines. "And David came to Baal-perazim, and smote them there, and said, The Lord hath broken forth (/rp) upon mine enemies before me, as the breach of waters (µym /rpk). Therefore he called the name of that place Baal-perazim" (µyxrp l[b, <10520>2 Samuel 5:20). The play upon the word is characteristic. It seems probable, as Ewald states (*l.c.*), that there was a high-place of Baal upon the top of the mount, and hence the name Baal-perazim. *SEE BAAL*. This view is confirmed by the fact that in the second clause of the passage Isaiah mentions another instance of divine wrath in the valley of Gibeon, and in 1 Chronicles 14 the historian connects with the victory at Baal-perazim a second victory of David over the Philistines, in which it is said "they smote the host of the Philistines from *Gibeon* even to Gazer" (ver. 16). The exact locality of Mount Perazim is unknown, but it must have been some of the heights on the borders of the valley of Rephaim (<13409>1 Chronicles 14:9; <10518>2 Samuel 5:18), and consequently not far distant from Jerusalem. In the account of Josephus (*Ant.* 7:4, 1), David's victory assumes much larger proportions than in Samuel and Chronicles. The attack is made not by the Philistines only, but by "all Syria and Phoenicia, with many other warlike nations besides." He places the scene of the encounter in the "groves of weeping," as if alluding to the Baca of <19401>Psalm 84. *SEE BAAL-PERAZIM*.

Perception

This word refers to our reception of knowledge through the senses, an operation which to the common understanding seems simple enough; but, viewed philosophically, is attended with much difficulty. Perception,

considered as a source of knowledge, refers exclusively to the outer, or the object world — the world of extended matter and its properties. The names for the act of knowing one's own mind — the feelings and thoughts of the individual are self-consciousness and self-introspection. The word "consciousness" is sometimes improperly limited to this signification. Locke used the term "reflection" for the same meaning; but this is ambiguous, and is now disused. All our knowledge is thus said (by those that deny innate ideas) to spring from two sources — perception and self-consciousness.

Sir William Hamilton (*Intel. Pow.* essay i, ch. i) notices the following meanings *of perception,* as applied to different faculties, acts, and objects

1. *Perceptio,* in its primary philosophical signification, as in the mouths of Cicero and Quintilian, is vaguely equivalent to comprehension, notion, cognition in general.

2. An apprehension, a becoming aware of, consciousness. *Perception* the Cartesians really identified with *idea,* and allowed them only a logical distinction; the same representative act being called idea, inasmuch as we regard it as a representation; and perception, inasmuch as we regard it as a consciousness of such representation.

3. Perception is limited to the apprehension of sense alone. This limitation was first formally imposed by Reid, and thereafter by Kant.

4. A still more restricted meaning, through the authority of Reid, is *perception* (proper), in contrast to *sensation* (proper). He defines sensitive perception simply as that act of consciousness whereby we apprehend in our body,

> **(a)** certain special affections, whereof, as an *animated* organism, it is contingently susceptible; and
>
> **(b)** those *general relations of extension* under which, as a *material* organism, it necessarily exists.

Of these perceptions, the former, which is thus conversant about a *subject object,* is *sensation proper;* the latter, which is thus conversant about an *object-object,* is *perception proper.*

Two great disputes connect themselves with perception, both raised into their full prominence in the philosophical world by bishop Berkeley. The

first is the origin of our judgments of the distances and real magnitudes of visible bodies. In opposition to the common opinion on this subject, Berkeley maintained that these were learned by experience, and not known by the mere act of vision. The second question relates to the grounds we have for asserting the existence of an external and material world, which, in the view of Berkeley, was bound up with the other. Inasmuch as perception is a mental act, and knowledge is something contained in a mind, what reason have we for believing in the existence of objects apart from our minds? or what is the mode of existence of the so-called external world? The following sentences show in what manner Berkeley opened up the question: "That neither our thoughts nor passions nor ideas, formed by the imagination, exist without the mind, is what everybody will allow; and it seems no less evident that the various sensations or ideas imprinted on the sense, however blended or combined together (i.e. whatever objects they compose), cannot exist otherwise than in a mind perceiving them. I think an intuitive knowledge may be obtained of this by any one that shall attend to what is meant by the term *exist* when applied to sensible things. The table I write on I say exists — i.e. I see and feel it; and if I were out of my study, I should say it existed, meaning thereby that if I was in my study I might perceive it, or that some other spirit actually does perceive it. There was an odor i.e. it was smelled; there was a sound — that is to say, it was heard; a color or figure, and it was perceived by sight or touch. This is all I can understand by these and the like expressions. For as to what is said of the absolute existence of unthinking things, without any relation to their being perceived, that seems perfectly unintelligible. Their *esse* is *percipi*, nor is it possible they should have any existence out of the minds or thinking things which perceive them." *SEE BERKELEY*. This doctrine of Berkeley, amounting, it was said, to a denial of the existence of a material world (which is far from a correct view of it), was followed up by Hume, who, on similar reasoning, denied the existence of mind, and resolved the universe into a mere flow of ideas and impressions without any subject to be impressed, acknowledging, nevertheless, that he felt himself unable, practically, to acquiesce in his own unanswerable arguments. There was obviously some great mistake in a mode of reasoning that brought about a dead-lock of this description; and hence it has been the work of *metaphysical* philosophy since that time to endeavor to put the perception of the world on an admissible footing. Dr. Reid reclaimed against Berkeley and Hume by appealing to common-sense, or unreasoning instinct, as a sufficient foundation for our belief in the

existence of a world apart from our own minds. Sir William Hamilton has expounded the same view with greater clearness and precision. He considers that our consciousness tells us at once that in the act of perceiving there is both *a perceiving subject-self,* or the mind — and an *external reality,* in relation with sense, as the *object perceived.* "Of the existence of both these things," he says, "I am convinced; because I am conscious of knowing each of them, not mediately in something else, *as represented,* but immediately in itself, *as existing.* Of their mutual dependence I am no less convinced, because each is apprehended equally and at once, in the same indivisible energy, the one not preceding or determining, the other not following or determined; and because each is apprehended out of and in direct contrast to the other" (*Works,* p. 747). Much as Hamilton has labored to elucidate this doctrine in all its bearings, it has not been universally accepted as satisfactory. Many believe that he has regarded as an ultimate fact of our constitution what admits of being still further resolved, and has mistaken an acquisition of the mature mind for a primitive or instinctive revelation. Professor Ferrier, in his *Institutes of Metaphysics,* has gone through the question with extraordinary minuteness and elaboration. His main position is the inseparability of the subject and the object in perception (a position also maintained by Hamilton in the above extract), which is not reconcilable with the common assumption as to the independent existence of matter. Indeed, he reduces the received dogma of the existence of matter *per se* to a self-contradiction, and builds up a system in strict conformity with the correlation, or necessary connection, of the mind perceiving with the object perceived. He thus approaches nearer to Berkeley than to Hamilton or to Reid. See Porter, *Intellect;* Ueberweg, *Hist. of Philos.; South. Rev.* Oct. 1873, art. 8, *Westm. Rev.* Jan. 1873, p. 119.

Perceval, Alfred P.

an English divine of some distinction, was born near the opening of this century, and was educated at Oxford, where he became fellow of All-Soul's College. After taking holy orders, he was in 1824 made rector of East Horsley, and finally chaplain to the queen. He died in 1853. He published, *Reasons why I an not a Member of the Bible Society* (Lond. 1830, 8vo): — *The Roman Schism Illustrated from the Records of the Catholic Church* (Lond. 1836, 8*vo*): — *Historical Notices concerning some of the Peculiar Tenets of the Church of Rome* (new ed. Lond. 1837, 12mo): — Sermons, *preached chiefly at the Chapel Royal, St. James's*

(Lond. 1839, 8vo): — An *Apologyfor the Doctrine of Apostolical Succession, with an Appendix on the English Orders* (Lond. 1841, 2d ed. sm. 8vo): —*A Collection of Papers connected with the Theological Movement of* 1833 (Lond. 1842, 8vo): — *Results of an Ecclesiastical Tour in Holland and Northern Germany* (Lond. 1846, 12mo): — *Plain Lectures on the Epistle to the Ephesians* (Lond. 1846).

Percival, Thomas

an English physician, eminent as a writer on philosophic and general social topics, was born at Warrington, in Lancashire, in 1740. After studying at Edinburgh and Leyden, he settled at Manchester, and there founded a literary and philosophical society, of which he was chosen president. He devoted a considerable portion of his time during the later period of his life to the study of moral philosophy, and he published several popular works on this subject. In his religious tenets he was a strict dissenter from the Church of England, but was very temperate and unobtrusive in his opinions. He died, universally respected by the inhabitants of Manchester, August 30, 1804. Dr. Percival's earlier medical and philosophical papers were collected and published in one volume (Lond. 1767, 8vo). To this two other volumes were afterwards added, one in 1773, and the other in 1778. These essays went through several editions, and acquired for the author considerable reputation. Besides the *Essays*, we may mention some: — *Moral and Literary Dissertations* (Warrington, 1784, 8*vo*): — *A Father's Instructions, consisting of Moral Tales, Fables, and Reflections, designed to Promote the Love of Virtue* (Lond. 1788, 8vo). All his works were collected and published together after his death by his son, in four vols. 8vo (Lond. 1807). To this edition is prefixed a memoir of his life and writings, and a selection from his literary correspondence.

Percligia

a Turkish visionary, who excited a commotion in Natolia, and was put to death, declaring himself an apostle of God, in 1418.

Perclose

a railing or other enclosure separating a tomb or chapel from the rest of a church.

Percoto, Gian-Maria,

an Italian missionary, was born at Udine in 1729. A member of the Congregation of the Paulists, he was appointed bishop of Maxula. Charged with the direction of the missions in India, he made numerous proselytes in Pegu and Ava. He translated into Burmese several books of the fathers of the Church, and composed a Latin-Burmese dictionary and grammar. We owe to him the translation into Italian of several Jainas; very curious, on the history of India. The manuscripts are deposited in the library of the Propaganda of Rome. Percoto died at Ava in 1776. See A. Griffini, *Vie de Percoto* (Udine, 1782, 4to); *Lefttes edifiantes et curieuses des missions etrang.* vol. 17.

Percy, Thomas

D.D., a noted English scholar, and a prelate of the Irish Church, was the son of a grocer at Bridgenorth, in Shropshire, where he was born, April 13. 1728. He affected to be considered of the noble house of Percy, or it has been affected for him; but his better and surer honor is that he was the maker of his own fortunes, and by his valuable writings and the honorable discharge of his episcopal duties reared for himself a high and permanent reputation. He was educated at Christ Church, Oxford, and early in life obtained the vicarage of Easton Mauduit, on which he resided, and the rectory of Wilby. In 1769 he became chaplain to the king; in 1778 dean of Carlisle; and in 1782 was elevated to the bishopric of Dromore, in Ireland. Long before this he had begun his literary career by the publication of what purports to be a translation from the Chinese of a novel, together with other matters connected with the poetry and literature of that people. This is a translation by him from a Portuguese manuscript. It was soon followed by another work, entitled *Miscellaneous Pieces relating to the Chinese*. He next published translations from the Icelandic of five pieces of Runic poetry. These appeared in 1761, 1762, and 1763. In 1764 he published *A New Version of Solomon's Song, with a Commentary and Notes* — an elegant version and useful commentary, in which the Song of Songs is considered chiefly as a celebration of the earthly loves of Solomon: the book has become exceedingly scarce. In 1765 he published a *Key to the New Testament*, which has been reprinted several times. In the same year, 1765, appeared the work by which he is, however, best known, and which is indeed one of the most elegant and pleasing works in the whole range of English literature, to which he gave the title of *Reliques of Ancient English*

Poetry. It contains some of the best of the old English ballads, many very beautiful lyrical pieces by the poets of the Elizabethan period and the age immediately succeeding, a few extracts from the larger writings of the poets of those periods, and a few lyrical pieces by modern writers. Each piece is well illustrated. It has been many times reprinted. From the time of this publication dates the revival of a genuine feeling for true poetry among the English people. To Percy himself it secured the successive promotions which he enjoyed in the Church. In 1770 he printed the *Northumberland Household Book,* and a poem, the subject of which is connected with the history of the Percy family, called *The Hermit of Warkworth.* In the same year appeared his translation, with notes, of *The Northern Antiquities,* by M. Mallet. The assistance which he gave to other authors is often acknowledged by them, and especially by Mr. Nichols, in several of his works. When Percy became a bishop he thought it his duty to devote himself entirely to his diocese. He resided from that time almost constantly at the palace of Dromore, where he lived greatly respected and beloved. After a life in the main prosperous and happy, he tasted of some of the afflictions of mortality. In 1782 he lost an only son. His eyesight failed him, and he became at length totally blind. He died at the palace of Dromore September 30, 1811. The memory of bishop Percy has been honored by the foundation of a literary association called the *Percy Society.*

Percy, William

D.D., a somewhat noted Episcopal clergyman, was born in Warwickshire, England, in 1744; was educated at Edmund Hall, Oxford, and after having taken holy orders in 1767, filled a number of ecclesiastical posts in the Church of England until 1816, when he came to America, and was made rector of St. Paul's Church, Radcliffeborough, South Carolina. In 1819 he returned to England, and died at London. He published, *An Apology for the Episcopal Church,* in a series of letters on the nature, ground, and foundation of the Episcopacy: — The *Clergyman's and People's Remembrancer.* See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit,* vol. Episcopalians, p. 293-96.

Perdiccas

(Περδίκκας) flourished as a prothonotary at Ephesus in the 14th century (1347), and is the author of a poem which was inserted in a compilation of Allatius, entitled Συμμικτά (published at Amsterdam in 1653). The subject

is the miraculous events connected with Christ's history, principally those of which Jerusalem was the theater. But besides Jerusalem, he visits Bethany, Bethpage, and Bethlehem. In this poem (which consists of 260 verses of that kind termed *politici*) he writes as if from personal inspection, but, if this were really the case, he is wanting in clearness and distinctness of delineation. While some of the details are curious, his geography is singularly inaccurate. Thus he places Galilee on the northern skirts of the Mount of Olives. If we may trust a conjecture hazarded by Fabricius, he attended a synod held at Constantinople A.D. 1347, at which were present two of the same name, Theodorus and Georgius Perdiccas (Allatius, *l.c.*; Fabricius, *Biblioth. Graeca,* 4:663; 8:99).

Perdition

This word is never used in the Old Testament and but rarely in the New, but the idea which it conveys runs through the whole of Scripture. Various Hebrew words, and especially the word dbà; "to destroy," are translated by the Greek words ἀπώλεια and ὄλεθρος, and the primary meaning in most cases is *waste,* loss, disappearance, or physical dissolution; sometimes, however, the meaning appears to be sorrow, shame, or degradation.

I. Let us examine in what sense *nations and cities* have been subjected to perdition. God it. the ruler of the nations of the world, and if they provoke him to anger they are threatened with destruction. Thus God determines to destroy man (<01067>Genesis 6:7) for his wickedness, and only Noah and his family are saved. Sodom and the neighboring cities are destroyed (Genesis 19), and only Lot and his daughters are permitted to escape. In these cases apparently supernatural means are taken for carrying out God's purpose, but in other cases man is made the instrument of destruction, as in the case of the Canaanitish nations. Sometimes the prevalent idea is the desolation of the country when the people have left it (<26614>Ezekiel 6:14; <24803>Jeremiah 48:3). Often it has reference to great national calamities and reverses (Obadiah 13; <17006>Esther 8:6; <23711>Isaiah 47:11); and occasionally it expresses the extinction of a single family (<11334>1 Kings 13:34). Sometimes the nations who have been thus "destroyed" rise up again, and sometimes they seem to come to an end altogether.

II. We now pass to the case of *individuals;* and here we have to distinguish several kinds of destruction or perdition.

1. There is *present perdition,* or the lost state of the soul until it partakes of a present salvation. The Son of Man came to seek that which was lost (<42190>Luke 19:10). The idea here presented is that of a soul which has fallen from its high estate and has become a wreck, but it is capable of renovation and restoration by the power of Jesus Christ; and the idea is well illustrated by the story of the son who "was lost and is found," and by the parables of the lost sheep and the lost piece of money.

2. Temporal calamity and death are often included under the term destruction (<20127>Proverbs 1:27; 11:10; <46922>Romans 9:22; and perhaps <46518>1 Corinthians 15:18). But when we read of the destruction coming on the wicked (<19520>Psalm 145:20), and that they are "reserved unto the day of destruction" (<18213>Job 21:30), we perceive that there must be a third meaning given to the word before us. We read in four passages of "Hades and destruction," as if this involved something beyond death (<18306>Job 26:6; 28:22; <20152>Proverbs 15:12; 27:20). We find that some are to be destroyed "forever" (<19505>Psalm 52:5); he read of him who after death can "destroy both soul and body in hell" (<40028>Matthew 10:28), and that men may gain the whole world and lose their own souls, and he rejected or cast away. We find that there is a broad road leading to destruction and trod by many, which however may be avoided; this cannot be *mere* physical death, for no man can avoid *that.* It must thereto e be something beyond death, and must be the end of a misspent existence, and so we read of some that their "end is destruction" (<50319>Philippians 3:19), and that while some men are σωζόμενοι, or in the way to be saved, others are ἀπολλύμενοι, or in the way to be destroyed (<46018>1 Corinthians 1:18; <47215>2 Corinthians 2:15; 4:3). The author of this final destruction is God (<59412>James 4:12); whereas the two kinds of perdition previously named seem connected with the power of Satan, who is called Abaddon or Apollyon. Final destruction is the alternative to salvation, and appears to be especially set forth in the New Testament as the lot of those who deliberately reject or recede from the Gospel (<50128>Philippians 1:28; <58039>Hebrews 10:39; 2 Peter 2), and it will be awarded in the time of judgment (<61307>2 Peter 3:7).

III. Taking it then as proved that perdition is the final destiny of certain persons, it remains for us to consider the passages which give us hints as to the nature of this terrible judgment. First, is it *annihilation?* The word which looks most like annihilation in the Old Testament is hhL;B; "nothingness," and its cognate forms, used by the prophet Ezekiel with

reference to Rabbath-ammon, Tyre, and other cities (Ezekiel 25:7; 26:21; 27:36; 28:19). Yet even in these extreme cases the exact and philosophical meaning of the word can hardly be pressed. For in truth the nature of destruction will vary according to the nature of the object to be destroyed, and it is not necessarily that utter extinction to which we give the name “annihilation,” if indeed there be such a thing. There is a *physical* destruction, to which the material buildings of great cities were doomed, as Tyre and Jerusalem; but in all such cases there are ruins, or stones, or fragments enough left, to show that the idea intended to be conveyed is that of a wreck rather than that of non-existence. There is a *corporate* destruction of nationalities and of families, yet even from these ruins there have been some that have escaped, and who have been merged into other nations. There is *individual* destruction — death and something more — and no doubt in these cases the man thus destroyed is in one sense no longer the same man, with the same powers and faculties which he had before his final doom came upon him, yet there may be sufficient remaining to him to enable him still to preserve an identity and to recognize the justice of his doom. The only passage in the New Testament which at all favors the idea of annihilation or absolute extinction is Revelation 20:14, where we are told that “death and hades were cast into the lake of fire.” Now it might be argued that we cannot suppose that death and hades suffered eternal punishment, and that as being “cast into the lake” means extinction in their case, so it is to be understood in the case of the reprobate. But the argument cuts both ways, for as death and hades are here personified, so their end is personified; but as they are not really persons, so their end will not really be the same as the end of personal human beings who would not come unto Christ that they might have life. Whether annihilation is a conceivable idea in relation to a being in whom God has breathed the breath of life we cannot tell; nor do we know whether it would be a just recompense for the rejection of Christ as Lord and Savior; but we may rest assured that if it were in accordance with God’s character and design it would have been so ordered.

Proceeding with our investigation, we note that perdition is set forth in the New Testament as involving the final ruin of the spirit. This may be inferred from 1 Corinthians 5:5, where we are told that the spirit may be saved hereafter at the cost of the destruction of the flesh here, which implies that otherwise the spirit would be unsaved or lost. Again, St. Paul tells us that perdition is the drowning of the soul, following from the love

of money or erroneous belief (<54609>1 Timothy 6:9), and St. Peter uses the word in reference to the fate of Simon Magus, who was in the bond of iniquity (<44820>Acts 8:20). In two passages which bring the subject before us (<52503>1 Thessalonians 5:3; <53109>2 Thessalonians 1:9), the primary reference is to the fate of the enemies of Christ who shall be destroyed at his coming — an event which seems to be portrayed in figurative language at the end of <66901>Revelation 19. Perhaps we are not warranted in drawing any direct inference as to the fate of all the ungodly from these passages. But in whatever light we regard them, they evidently form part of the great revelation of God's wrath against sin, which we find fully confirmed by the words of our Lord himself. For if we take the one word Gehenna, the scene or abode of perdition (<40128>Matthew 10:28), as used by Christ, we gather that it is to be the fate of the angry and revengeful (<40522>Matthew 5:22), of the carnal (ver. 29, 30), of hypocrites and persecutors (<42333>Matthew 23:33); and from several of the parables we see that punishments described in almost similar terms are to be inflicted upon faithless and unprofitable members of Christ's Church. Perdition is described as "the second death" in <66208>Revelation 21:8, and a terrible list is given setting forth the real character of those who shall share it; and this list is almost the same as that which St. Paul set before his Galatian converts more than once, as marking the characteristics of those who are finally excluded from the kingdom of God (<48519>Galatians 5:19-21; comp. <46609>1 Corinthians 6:9,10).

Another idea connected with perdition is that of corruption. The body of the saint is sown in corruption, but it springs up and the harvest is incorruption. But it is not so with those who are treasuring up wrath against the day of wrath. Their harvest is corruption — ten times more corruptible than that which takes place at the first death (<48608>Galatians 6:8). St. Peter tells us of some who have turned from the truth that they have become "servants of corruption," and in that state they enter the world to come (<61219>2 Peter 2:19). If we try to comprehend the nature of final spiritual corruption, we find it impossible to say more than that it implies the utmost degradation and loathsomeness of which the human spirit is capable, and that it probably will be wrought out by natural laws in God's spiritual kingdom, as in the case with physical corruption now.

Gathering up into one view a few other solemn statements about the ruin of the unbelieving, which we find in Scripture — and apart from Scripture we know absolutely nothing of the matter, as we know neither the nature

nor the results of sin — we see that there are persons who "die in their sins" (<40824>John 8:24), who "have no forgiveness" (<401231>Matthew 12:31), "God's wrath abideth on them" (<40336>John 3:36), they rise to "the resurrection of damnation" (<40629>John 6:29), they "depart" from Christ (<40723>Matthew 7:23), "into outer darkness" (<40812>Matthew 8:12), and into a "furnace of fire" (<41350>Matthew 13:50). There they reap the fruit of their actions done here, being accursed and utterly degraded. We know nothing about the nature of their sufferings, and we have no right to indulge in exaggerated and glowing descriptions of their future misery. All such attempts are based upon the supposition that their physical constitution will be the same then as now. But this is a most unsafe hypothesis. Physical pain now depends on the exquisite sensitiveness of the nervous system, which is devised for man's benefit. Man *suffers* more than other animals because he has perverted his nature which was constituted for him to *enjoy* more. The accursed will "rise with their bodies," but the constitution of those bodies may be far less sensitive. They are described as "carcasses" in <23624>Isaiah 66:24, and the word (דֶּגֶר) literally means that which is faint or exhausted, and so excludes the idea of strong nervous sensibility. They are in "outer darkness" — this seems to shut them out from spiritual and physical light and knowledge. They are "bound hand and foot," which appears to exclude the idea of any physical activity. In fact their punishment should be represented as the extreme of degradation rather than the height of suffering, though it is true that they suffer the bitterness of remorse, described as "weeping and gnashing of teeth," and that "the smoke of their torment" will be a lasting memorial of God's wrath against man's pride and ingratitude. Though we know so little about perdition, one thing is clear, that not a gleam of hope is given in Scripture to those on whom this awful sentence shall be pronounced. Their condition is represented as one from which there can be no recovery. It is sometimes argued that God's threats are eternally conditional, and that the destiny of no man even in the world to come is hopeless. Attempts have been made to defend this hypothesis by reference to God's temporal threatenings, the accomplishment of which has been modified by the repentance of the persons threatened. But before this idea can be entertained it must be shown, first, that the finally lost are even capable of repentance or of any good thought; secondly, that God will set a way of return-another sacrifice for sin — before them; thirdly, that any indications can be found in Scripture that any or all of those who shall be cast into Gehenna shall be restored to favor; and, lastly, those passages must be explained, or

explained away, which reveal the perdition of the lost as *eternal. SEE PUNISHMENT*.

Perdition, Son Of

(ὑιὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας). It was common among the Jews to express a man's character by calling him "the son of" some abstract quality. Thus we read in the New Testament of the sons of the kingdom, the sons of light, the sons of God, the sons of the devil, the sons of this age, the sons of disobedience, the sons of thunder; the children (τέκνα) of wisdom, of the promise, of wrath, of obedience, of a curse. So in the Sept. we read of a son of death (<091230>1 Samuel 20:30), a son of strength (<101328>2 Samuel 13:28), sons of the captivity, a son of a hundred years, sons of the bow (<250313>Lamentations 3:13), sons of wisdom (Sir. 4:12); children of unrighteousness (<281009>Hosea 10:9), and children of perdition (<235704>Isaiah 57:4). By this last expression we understand that perdition marks both the character and destiny of the persons spoken of. Our Lord calls Judas Iscariot "the son of perdition," and refers to his end as the fulfillment of Scripture (<431712>John 17:12). The best commentary on this statement is that afforded by St. Peter (<440120>Acts 1:20), who refers directly to <196901>Psalm 69 as predicting the fate of the betrayer of the Lord. *SEE BEN-*.

But it may be gathered from <530203>2 Thessalonians 2:3, that another son of perdition is to be revealed, and he is identified as the Man of Sin, the great opponent of the Christian religion, who shall set himself up in the place of God. He is afterwards called "the lawless one," and his miraculous impostures are described, but he is to be destroyed at Christ's appearing. He appears to be the final incarnation of irreligion, and his character is drawn in the book of Revelation as the great deceiver and tormenter of nations, who, after becoming the instrument of the destruction of the mystic Babylon, aims at universal despotism, forbids all worship of the true God, and defies the power of Christ; but he is to be destroyed and cast into the lake of fire. The terms in which this "son of perdition" is described seem to imply that he will be a real person; but arguing from the very figurative character of prophecy many writers have been led to an opposite conclusion. *SEE ANTICHRIST*.

Perdoite

an ancient Slavonic deity worshipped by mariners and fishermen, who believed that he presided over the sea.

Pere

SEE ASS.

Pere la Chaise

SEE LA CHAISE.

Pered

SEE MULE.

Pereda, Antonio,

an eminent Spanish painter, was born at Valladolid in 1599. He studied under Pedro de has Cuevas, and showed so much ability that he was taken under the protection of Don Francisco de Texada, who sent him to Madrid, where he had an opportunity of studying the works of the great masters in the royal collections. At the age of eighteen he produced a picture of the *Immaculate Conception,* in which the Virgin appeared on a throne of clouds, supported by angels, executed so admirably that no one could believe it the work of so young an artist. The reputation he acquired by this performance induced the due de Olivarez, who had the direction of the works going on in the palace of the Retiro, to employ him, and place him among the artists of the highest rank. Pere da performed his part to the satisfaction of his patron, and was munificently rewarded. He acquired great reputation, and is said to have executed many works for the churches at Madrid, Toledo, Alcala, Cuenca, and Valladolid. He also painted much for individuals, and no collection was considered complete without a specimen of Pereda. It is also said he was a universal artist — painting history, familiar life, vases, tapestry, musical instruments, and other objects of still life. His pictures were well designed, his drawing correct, and his coloring rich and glowing, in the Venetian style, with an admirable impasto. Few of his works are known to be extant at the present day. There are two in the Royal Gallery at Madrid, one of which represents *St. Jerome Meditating on the Last Judgment;* one of *Christ asleep on the Cross,* with flowers and skulls, in the collection of marshal Soult; one of *St. Anthony and Christ,* in the Esterhazy Gallery in Vienna, and three or four in the gallery at Munich. Pereda died at Madrid in 1699.

Perefixe, Hardouin Beaumont De

a noted French prelate, was born in 1605. After having finished his education, he attracted the notice of cardinal Richelieu, who became his protector. Perefixe obtained the high office of tutor to Louis XIV in 1644. Four years later his services to the court received recognition by his promotion to the bishopric of Rodez. He became a member of the French Academy in 1654, and was appointed archbishop of Paris in 1662. In this last responsible position he enforced among the Jansenists compliance with the formulary of pope Alexander VII. He died in 1670. Perefixe was a man of great scholarship, and possessed remarkable talents. He was born to rule and to teach. Unfortunately, however, he was more of a politician than an ecclesiastic, and did everything rather to please hisking than to honor his God. He was truly a timeserver. In the Jansenistic controversy he had it in his power to influence the king favorably, but he failed to embrace the opportunity, and was obliged to obey when he might have led. *SEE PAVILLON*; *SEE PORT-ROYAL*. His Life of Henry IV is considered a classical work (*Histoire du Roy Henry le Grand* [Amst. 1661, 12mo]). An English translation was published (Lond. 1663, 8vo; also 1672 and 1785). See Jervis, *History of the Church of France*, 1:454 sq., 461 sq.; D'Avrigny, *Memoires Chronol.* 2:444 sq. (J. H. W.)

Peregrini Da Cesena, Or Pellegrini Da Cesio

an Italian goldsmith, engraver, and worker in *niello,* flourished in the latter part of the 15th and first part of the 16th centuries. He is one of those artists about whom and whose works there is very little known with certainty. Bartsch gives a descriptive account of ten prints by him (*Peintre-Graveur*, tom. 13). Duchesne discovered Peregrini's name on some admirable works by him in *niello,* which he describes (*Essai sur les Nielles*). Ottley describes ten prints which he supposes to be by this artist. Nagler, from these and various other authorities, gives a list of sixty-four pieces which he attributes to him, among them the following:

1. *Abraham loading an ass for his journey to Mt. Moriah;*
2. *Abraham, Isaac, and two servants on their way to the Mount;*
3. *Abraham and Isaac on the Mount,* the servants sitting below;
4. *Abraham with a knife and torch, Isaac bearing a bundle of wood;*
5. *Abraham, about to immolate Isaac, is prevented by an Angel*: the head of a ram is seen at the right-hand corner;

6. *David conquering Goliath*: a very fine plate;
7. *Judith with the head of Holiness in her left hand;*
8. *The Holy Virgin with the Infant on a throne, attended* by *St. Paul and St. Francis d'Assisi;*
9. *The Baptism of Christ*: in the foreground, to the right and left, are St. Stephen and St. Francis;
10. *The Resurrection of Christ*:
11. *The Annunciation,* in two small medallions;
12. *John the Baptist with the Cross,* on which is a medallion with the Lamb, and the words "Ecce Agnus;"
13. *St. Sebastian standing by a Tree,* his hands tied above his head;
14. *St. Jerome kneeling before a Crucifix,* the lion behind him;
15. *St. Roch*: on the right hand the first person of the Trinity is blessing him;
16. *St. Margaret seated on a large winged Dragon,* holding in one hand a cornucopia, and in the other a cake. Bartsch calls this subject *Providence.*

Peregrino, Bonaventura

(originally SERACH YOM TOB, or SALOMO NAVARRA), a convert from Judaism, was born about 1643 at Casale, not far from the famous Spanish monastery at Montferrat. He was baptized at Bologna Jan. 18, 1665, on which occasion he took the name under which he was afterwards known. According to the spirit of his age, Peregrino endeavored to demonstrate the mysteries of Christianity from the letters of the Old Testament according to the rules of the Cabala (q.v.), and wrote in Italian *Pretioso Giqjello sopra ii nome di Dio Tetragrammaton,* which, however, has never been published. See Wolf, *Bibl. Hebr.* 1:360 sq.; 3:247; Kalkar, *Israel u. die Kirche,* p. 80.

Peregrinus, Proteus

a cynic philosopher, who was a native of Parium on the Hellespont, and flourished in the reign of the Antonines. After a youth spent in debauchery and crime, he visited Palestine, where he embraced Christianity, and by dint of hypocrisy attained to some authority in the Church. In order to gratify his morbid appetite for notoriety, he contrived to be imprisoned; but the Roman governor, perceiving the object, disappointed Peregrinus by setting him free. He now assumed the cynic garb and returned to his native town,

where, to obliterate the memory of his crimes, he divided his inheritance among the populace. He again set out on his travels, relying on the Christians for his support; but being discovered profaning the ceremony of the Lord's Supper, he was excommunicated. He then went to Egypt, where in the garb of a mendicant cynic he made himself notorious by the open perpetration of the most disgusting obscenity. Thence he proceeded to Rome, and endeavored to attract attention by his ribaldry and abuse, for which he was expelled by the *praefectus urbis.* His next visit was to Elis, where he tried to incite the people against the Romans. Having exhausted all the methods of making himself conspicuous, he at length resolved to procure himself an immortal name by submitting to voluntary death, in imitation of Hercules. He went to the Olympian games, and in the presence of a vast concourse of spectators raised a funeral pile, and there carried his mad resolution into effect, in the 236th Olympiad, A.D. 165. The Parians raised a statue to his memory, which was reputed to be oracular (Anaxagoras, quoted by Valois, *Ad. Anmm. Marcell.*). Lucian, who knew Peregrinus in his youth, and who was present at his strange self-immolation, has perhaps overcharged the narrative of his life (Lucian, *De Morate Peregrini,* Amm. Marcell. 29:1; Philostratus, *Vit. Sophist.* 2:13; Gellius, *Noct. Aft.* 12:11; Eusebius, *Chron.* 01. p. 236). See Brucker, *Historia Critica Philosophiae* (see Index); Enlfield, *History of Philosophy,* p. 356, 357.

Pereira, Antonio, De Ficueiredo

a learned Portuguese litterateur, was born Feb. 14, 1725, in the borough of Macao. After having completed his studies in the college of the Jesuits at Villa-Vicosa, he refused to remain among them, and, as he had a taste for Inusic, he accepted the situation of organist in the monastery of the Holy Cross at Coimbra. Several months later he took the religious habit in the Congregation of the Oratorio of Lisbon (1744), and was afterwards employed to teach grammar (1752), rhetoric (1755), and theology (1761). The publication of his first articles upon the teaching of the Latin and Portuguese languages, written with much clearness, drew upon him passionate attacks on the part of the Jesuits, who were then the elementary instructors. Then the differences arose between the court of Rome and Portugal, his great reputation induced the marquis de Pombal to intrust to him the care of opposing the ultramontane doctrines, and he proved with great superiority, in his *Tentativa Theologica,* that the bishops have the right to grant all dispensations, and to provide for all the wants of the

national Church without the aid of the holy chair. This discussion, which attracted towards Pereira as many praises as invectives, procured for him the employments of deputy to the tribunal of censure (1768), and of interpreting secretary to the minister of war (1769). Obliged to live in the world, he left the dress of the Oratorio, and aided, with all the activity and penetration with which he was gifted, the prime minister in his plans of reform. About 1774 he became a member of the Royal Academy of Lisbon, which conferred upon him in 1792 the title of dean. "He attained," says a writer, "great favor, which his talents doubtless merited; yet he was careful to preserve it by the most pompous praises lavished either upon the king or his minister. His vast erudition rendered his conversation as agreeable as instructive. In his career his manners have been above reproach; but sensible people, while admiring his talents, could never pardon him for the forgetfulness of his first vows, his animosity towards the same monks who had been his first teachers, and his too great condescension to the court. He died at Lisbon Aug. 14, 1797. He composed a very large number of theological theses and writings, dissertations and memoirs, the enumeration of which would occupy too much space. Below are his principal works: *Exercicios da lingua Latina e Portugueza* (Lisb. 1751, 8vo), in Latin and Portuguese: — *Novo methodo de grammatica Latina* (ibid. 1752-1753, 8vo, pt. ii), followed by a *Defensa* (1754), under the name of Francisco Sanches: — *Apparato critico para a correcaao do Diccionario intitulado Prosodia"* (ibid. 1755, 4to): — *Breve Diccionario da Latinidade pura e impura* (ibid. 1760, 8*vo*): — *Rerum Lusitanarum ephemerides usque ad Jesuitarum expulsionem* (ibid. 1761, 4to), translated into Portuguese in 1766: — *Principios da historia ecclesiastica em forma de dialogo* (ibid. 1765, 2 vols. 8vo); the author promised two other volumes, which were never printed: — *Doctrina veteris Ecclesiae de suprema regun etiam in clericos potestate* (ibid. 1765, fol.); these famous theses, printed in the *Collectio thesium* (1768, 1774, 8vo), have been translated into French, *Traite du pouvoir des eveq-s* (Par. 1772, 8*vo*): — *Tentativa Theologica* (ibid. 1766, 1,69, 4to), translated into Latin by the author (1769), into French, Italian, German, and Spanish, and followed by an *Appendix* (1768, 4to): — *Demonstratio Theologica* (ibid. 1769, 4to): — *Deductio Chronologica et Analytica* (ibid. 1771): — *Testamento Novo e Velho em Portuguez* (ibid. 1778, 1790, 23 vols. 8vo); this translation, accompanied by notes, prefaces, and various readings, was reprinted in 1794 for the third time, 4to size: — *Compendio das epocas*, etc. (ibid. 1782, 8*vo*): — *Eogios dos r ys de Portugal* (ibid. 1785, 4to). See *Summario da Bibl.*

Lusitana, vol. i; Figaniere, *Bibliogroaca hist. Portlgueza; Le Monziteur univ.* ann. 12; *English Review*, 8:106, 113.

Pereira, Bento

(1), a learned Spaniard, was born at Valencia in 1535. Admitted into the Society of Jesus in 1552, he finished his studies in Sicily and at Rome, and rendered himself very skillful in the sciences and philosophy, which he taught with honor. He died at Rome March 6, 1616. His principal writings are, *Physicorum lib. xv* (Rome, 1562, 4to) — *Commentariae in Danielem* (ibid. 1586, 4to): — *Commentaria in Gene, sim* (ibid. 1589-1598, 4 vols. 4*to*): — *De magia et dimvi natione astrologica* (Ingolstadt, 1591, 8*vo*): — *Selectae disputationes in sacram Scripturam* (ibid. 1601-1610, 5 vols. 4to). All these works have frequently been reprinted. See Fabricius, *Hist. Bibl.* 1:265; Grasse, *Literat.* 3:832 sq.; Simon, *Hist. Crit. du Vieux Test.* p. 423.

Pereira, Bento

(2), a Portuguese Jesuit, was born in 1605 at Borba, in Alemtejo. He taught belleslettres at Evora, and published several works of poetry, of morals, and of theology. He died in 1681. We quote of his works, *Prosodia* (Evora, 1634, fol.), in Latin, Spanish, and Portuguese, several editions: *Thesaurus linguae Lusitanae* (ibid. 1643, *fol.*): — *Promptuarium theologicum* (ibid. 1671-1676, 2 vols. fol.). See Possevin, *Apparatus sacer;* Sotwel, *De Script. Soc. Jesu;* Antonio, *Bibl. Hispana Nova.*

Peremayanoftschins

(i.e. *Re-Anointers*), is the name of a Russian sect which separated from the Russo-Greek Church about the year 1770 at Vetka. They agree in almost every respect with the *Starobredsi*, or "Old Ceremonialists," except that they re-anoint those who join them with their holy chrism. They also re-ordain those popes or priests who secede to them from the Establishment. The Peremayanoftschins are really a branch of the Popoftschins (q.v.).

Peres

SEE EAGLE.

Pe’resh

(Heb. *id.* vrP, *excrement;* Sept. Φαρές), the first named of the two sons of Machir the Manassite by his wife Maachah (1Ch 7:16). 1 Chronicles 7:16). B.C. cir. 1658.

Pereyra, Abraham Israel

a Jewish litterateur of some note, was of Portuguese origin, but born in Amsterdam, where he flourished in the middle of the 17th century. He was one of the students of the rablinical college of that city, and was highly esteemed ,for his literary talents;. He wrote in Spanish, *Espejo della Vanidad del Mundo,* “the Mirror of Worldly Vanity” (Amsterd. 1671): — *La Certezza del Camino,* “the Sure Path” (ibid. 1666), an ethical work in twelve sections, treating, 1, on divine Providence; 2, on the vanity of the world; 3, on love and fear of God; 4, on vices and virtues; 5, on recompense and punishment, etc. See Furst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3:77; Lindo, *Hist. of the Jews in Spain and Portugal,* p. 369; Gratz, *Gesch. d. Juden,* 10:227; De Castro, *Biblioteca Espanola,* 1:595; De Rossi, *Dizionario storico degli autori Ebrei, p.* 259 (Germ. transl. by Hamburger); Wolf, *Bibl. Hebr.* 3:59; Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenth. u. s. Sekten,* 3:233, 238. (B.P.)

Pereyra, Diego

a Portuguese painter, was born about the year 1570. Very little is known concerning his life. He died in the year 1640, in the house of a nobleman where he spent his last days. Pereyra had a rare talent for painting conflagration and infernal scenes. He often painted the *Burning of Troy* and the *Overthrow of Sodom,* but in each case in a different manner. He excelled in painting pictures of fruit and flowers; also rural scenes illuminated by the radiance of torches or the lightning’s flash. His landscapes are painted in a spirited style, ornamented with small figures in excellent taste.

Pereyra, Manuel

a Portuguese sculptor, was born in 1614. He settled at Madrid, where he attained great distinction, and is regarded as one of the ablest artists that Portugal has produced. He was commissioned to execute a great-number of works. His masterpiece is a large statue of the *Savior* in the church of the Rosario at Madrid. It is said that in his old age, having become blind,

he made the model of a statue of *St. John,* and directed its execution. This statue is one of his finest works. He died in 1667.

Pe'rez

(¹³⁷⁰1 Chronicles 27:3). *SEE PHAREZ.*

Perez

a name common to many Jewish literati, of whom we mention the following:

1. BEN-ELIJA, also called *Raph* (ãâr, also ãârhm), a pupil of R. Jechiel of Paris, lived at Corbeil, and died about 1300. He wrote many Tosafoth or additamenta to the Talmud, viz. to the treatises Beza, Nazir, Nedarim, Sanhedrim, Maccoth, and Meila, reprinted in the editions of the Talmud. He also wrote additamenta to the treatise Baba Kama (amq abb), which was published, according to a recension of one of his pupils, by Abr. Venano (Livorno, 1819). His Tosafoth to Zebachim (µyjbz]m) is reprinted in Pietosi's jmzm hrpk (ibid. 1810). See Furst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3:77; Zunz, *Zur Geschichte u. Literatur,* p. 38, 41, 46, 52, 59, 119, 193, 205, 565. (B.P.)

2. BEN-ISAAC HA-COHEN, a jurist of high repute, a great cabalist, and a celebrated physician, was born about 1241 at Gerona. He wrote a highly esteemed work, tWhlah;tk,r,[]mi, "the Dispositions of the Divinity," which treats in fifteen sections of the system of Cabala. It was first planted at Ferrara in 1558, and often since; lastly at Zolkiew in 1779. See Furst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3:77; De Rossi, *Dizimonrio storico deenli autori Ebrei, p* 260 (Germ. transl. by Hamburger); LindoI *Hist. of the Jews in Spain and Portugal,* p. 81; Zunz, *Z r Geschichle u. Literatur,* p. 480. (B. P.)

3. JEHUDA LEON BEN-JOSEPH, who lived at the beginning of the 18th century, was rabbi at Venice and Amsterdam. He wrote, µyrbdh trç[, the Decalogue, in a poetical Aramaico-Arabic paraphrase, etc. (Amsterdam, 1737): — *Fundamento solilo,* a compendium of Jewish theology, which treats, in twelve chapters, of the fundamental principles of the Jewish religion — God, cosmology, faith, legislature, the thirteen articles of faith, asceticism, ethics, providence, etc.; it was written in Spanish, and published in 1729: — µymjr yryç, mystical and cabalistic

treatises (Venice, 1716): — ˆwodb;l j rP, excerpts of discourses delivered at Venice, which bear upon the Pentateuch (Berlin, 1712). See Furst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3:77 sq.; De Rossi, *Dizionario storico degli autori Ebrei,* p. 259 sq. (Germ. transl. by Hamburger); Jocher, *Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon,* s.v.; Wolf, *Bibl. Hebr.* 3:315 sq. (B. P.)

Perez

one of the first Portuguese missionaries in Cochin China, was born about 1665. He joined the French missionaries, and was charged by the bishop of Berynthe to go to Bengarin and Jonsalam to make conversions. He arrived about 1671. and from those places wrote letters to the prelate who had sent him, in which were found interesting observations upon the country and its inhabitants. He died towards the close of the 17th century. See *Relation des Missions des eveques Francais,* p. 70.

Perez, Father Andre

a Spanish theologian and romance writer, a native of the kingdom of Leon, lived in the early part of the 17th century. He entered the Dominican Order, and attained to the dignity of superior of the convent of the Dominicans in Madrid. His *Sermons* and his *Vie de St. Raymond de I'enafort* are forgotten, but inquiries are still made, from motives of curiosity, after his romance of *La Picara Justina,* which he published under the pseudonym of Francois Ubeda, Toledan (Medina-del-Campo, 1605, 4to). It is a weak imitation of *Guzman de Alfarache,* destitute of invention, and written in an affected style. It is remarkable only for some licentious incidents, strange enough for the superior of a convent. The best edition is that of Mayans y Siscar (Madrid, 1735, 4to). See Richard, *Scriptores ordinis Preedicaforum;* Ticknor, *History of Spanish Literature,* 3:61.

Perez, Andres

a Spanish painter, was born at Seville in 1660. He painted historical subjects; also flower-pieces, in which he was more successful. Among his principal works are three on sacred subjects in the sanctuary of S. Lucia at Seville, signed "Andres Perez, 1707;" and in the sacristy of the Capuchins of the same city is a picture by him of the *Last Judgment,* dated 1713. He died in 1727.

Perez, Antonio

a learned Spanish prelate, was born in 1559 at Saint-Dominica of Silos. He belonged to the Benedictine Order, which chose him for vicar-general, and he helped to revive among his brethren a taste for learning. He occupied successively the bishoprics of Urgel, Lerida, and Tarragona.. He died at Madrid May 1, 1637. His principal works are, *Apuntamientos quadragesimales* (Barcelona, 1608,. 3 vols. 4to): — *Pentateuchum fidei* (Madrid, 1620, fol.); some passages relative to the authority of the pope caused the work to be *tacitly* suppressed, and it has; become very rare: — Commentaria *in regulam S. Benedicti* (Lyons, 1624, 2 vols. 4to). See N. Antonioi, *Bibloth. Hispana Nova;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 39:580; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, 12:942.

Perez, Bartolome

a distinguished Spanish painter, was born at Madrid in 1634. He studied in the school of Don Juan de Arellano, and attained great excellence in flower painting. His pictures of this kind are composed in a tasteful and delicate style, with a brilliancy and harmony of coloring deserving of high praise. He also succeeded in the figure, following the style of Don Juan de Carreno. There were many of his pieces at the Retiro, which were subsequently removed to the Rosario; and one of his best productions is mentioned, which combines his talents in both branches of the art, representing *St. Rosa of Lima kneeling before the Virgin and infant Jesus, with two Angels, one of whom is crowning the Savior, while the other is presenting him with a vase of flowers.* Perez was also distinguished for the excellence of his theatrical decorations. The duke of Monteleone commissioned him to paint a grand ceiling in fresco in his place at Madrid, but while occupied upon it he unfortunately fell from the scaffold and was killed, in 1693.

Perez, Francisco, De Pineda,

a Spanish painter who flourished at Seville about 1660. He studied under Murillo, and followed his style with considerable success. Among other works, he painted several pictures for the churches and convents at Seville, which show that he was an able disciple of that great master. Perez was a member of the society of professors who established the Academy of Fine Arts at Seville.

Pe’rez-Uzza

(Heb. *Pe’rets Uzza’*, עֻזָּא פֶּרֶץ, 1 Chronicles 13:11), or Pe’rez-Uz’zah (Heb. *Pe’rets UzzoAh’*. עֻזָּה פֶּרֶץ, *breach of Uzzah*, 2 Samuel 6:8; Sept. Διασκοπὴ Ὀζ), the name which David conferred on the threshing-floor of Nachon, or Chidon, in commemoration of the sudden death of Uzzah: “And David was wroth because Jehovah had broken this breach on Uzzah, and he called the place ‘Uzzah’s breaking’ unto this day.” The word *perez* was a favorite with David on such occasions. He employed it to commemorate his having “broken up” the Philistine force in the valley of Rephaim (2 Samuel 5:20). *SEE BAALPERA-ZIM*. He also used it in a subsequent reference to Uzzah’s destruction in 1 Chronicles 15:13. It is remarkable that the statement of the continued existence of the name should be found not only in Samuel and Chronicles, but also in Josephus, who says (*Ant.* 7:4, 2), as if from his own observation, “the place where he died is even now (ἔτι νῦν) called ‘the cleaving of Oza.”’ About a mile and a half or two miles from the site of Kirjath-jearim, on the hill immediately above Chesla, the ancient Chesalon, on the road thence towards Jerusalem, is a small village still called *Khirbet el- Uz*, or “the ruins of Uzzah.” It is given by Prof. Robinson among the names of places west of Jerusalem as *Khirbet el-Lauz*, or, as it should be written, *Khirbet el-Auz.* This seems to be Perez-Uzzah. The position, on the road to Jerusalem, near the site of Obed-edom’s house, and not far from the site of Kirjath-jearim, all correspond. David, Ibeing afraid, it is said, to proceed with the ark towards Jerusalem, “carried it aside into the house of Obed-edom the Gittite.” It seems therefore that the house of Obed-edom must have been near or in the immediate neighborhood of Perez-Uzzah. *SEE OBEDEDOM*.

Perfecti

(*Perfect*) is the name assumed by the stricter Cathari (q.v.) of the 12th and 13th centuries. Rainerius, who had himself been a Catharist, and who speaks of a census of the sect taken by themselves, says that there were only 4000 of these, although the “Credentes,” or general body of the Catharists, were innumerable. These “perfect” Catharists were analogous to the Manichbean “elect,” professing to live an extremely strict life, in imitation of Christ and his apostles. From among them were taken their bishops, “Filius major,” “Filius minor,” and deacon, some of whom were brought up from their childhood on a rigid fish and vegetable diet. The

Perfecti also called themselves *Consolati and Boni Homines.* See Reiner, *Contr. Waldens.* in *Bibl. Max.* 25:266, 269.

Perfection

(*Lat. perfectum,* "made out," complete) is applied to that which wants nothing. According to some, it is divided into *physical* or *natural,* whereby a thing has all its powers and faculties; *moral,* or an eminent degree of goodness and piety; and *metaphysical* or transcendent in the possession of all the essential attributes or parts necessary to the integrity of a substance; or, in general, it is that whereby a thing has or is provided with everything belonging to its nature. Perfection is *relative* or *absolute.* A being possessed of all the qualities belonging to its species in the highest degree may be called *perfect* in a *relative sense.* But *absolute perfection* can only be ascribed to the Supreme Being. We have the idea of a Being infinitely *perfect* — and from this Descartes reasoned that such a Being really exists.

The PERFECTIONS OF GOD are those qualities which he has communicated to his rational creatures, and which are in him in an *infinitely perfect* degree. They have been distinguished as *natural* and *moral* — the former belonging to Deity as the great first cause such as independent and necessary existence — the latter as manifested in the creation and government of the universe — such as goodness, justice, etc. But they are all natural in the sense of being essential. It has been proposed to call the former *attributes* and the latter *perfections.* But this distinctive use of the terms has not prevailed; indeed it is not well founded. In God there are nothing but *attributes — because* in him everything is absolute and involved in the substance and unity of a perfect being. *SEE ATTRIBUTES.*

Perfection, Christian.

The word "perfect," in the moral sense, is usually the translation of the Heb. µT; and the Greek τέλειος, which both essentially mean *complete.* The term perfection, says Witsius, is not always used in the same sense in the Scriptures.

1. There is a perfection of *sincerity,* whereby a man serves God without hypocrisy (<18101>Job 1:1; <23803>Isaiah 38:3).

2. There is a perfection of parts, *subjeciive* with respect to the whole man (<52323>1 Thessalonians 5:23), and *objective* with respect to the whole law,

when all the duties prescribed by God are observed (<19911928>Psalm 119:128; <42106>Luke 1:6).

3. There is a *comparative* perfection ascribed to those who are advanced in knowledge, faith, and sanctification, in comparison of those who are still infants and untaught († <43213>John 2:13; <46206>1 Corinthians 2:6; <50315>Philippians 3:15).

4. There is an *evangelical* perfection. The righteousness of Christ being imputed to the believer, it is complete in him, and accepted of God as perfect through Christ (<51210>Colossians 2:10; <49527>Ephesians 5:27; <47521>2 Corinthians 5:21).

5. There is also a perfection of *degrees, by* which a person performs all the commands of God, with the full exertion of all his powers, Without the least defect. This is what the law of God requires, but what the saints cannot attain to in this life, though we willingly allow them all the other kinds above mentioned (<45724>Romans 7:24; <50312>Philippians 3:12; <62108>1 John 1:8) (Witsius, (*Economic Fiderum Dei*, lib. iii, cap. 12, § 124). The ancient worthies, in the simplicity of their faith, were “perfect in their generation” (<01609>Genesis 6:9; <18101>Job 1:1); “they followed the Lord fully” (<04424>Numbers 14:24). As the term “perfect” is frequently applied to different individuals in the Scriptures, and the possession of the character so frequently enjoined, there can be no doubt, among those who know the Scriptures and the power of God, that *perfection,* in the scriptural sense of the term, ought to be an object of more anxious solicitude among Christians than it usually is (<01701>Genesis 17:1; <42640>Luke 6:40; <58601>Hebrews 6:1). We are exhorted to acquire the perfection of Christianity both in theory and practice. We are to be thoroughly instructed and experienced in divine principles; to be adults and not children in Christian knowledge (<46206>1 Corinthians 2:6; 14:20; <47139>2 Corinthians 13:9; <49413>Ephesians 4:13; <50315>Philippians 3:15; <58514>Hebrews 5:14). We are to press onward to the attainment of the perfection of Christian life by submission to the reign of the Holy Spirit, which brings the entire man into complete subjection to the divine will (<45812>Romans 8:12). In this sense the faithful may be said to “stand perfect and complete in all the will of God” (<51210>Colossians 2:10; 4:12). The Savior says to his disciples, “Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect” (<40548>Matthew 5:48). Not that we can ever attain to an *equality;* but taking him as the *only* pattern of perfection, we can advance towards a *consimilarity*. Just as it is said in the

parallel passage, "Be ye therefore merciful, as your Father also is merciful" (Luke 6:40), so we are to be holy in the same *manner*, though in the same *degree* it is utterly impossible, as we are but finite creatures, while he is the Infinite and Eternal. As creatures, we cannot reach any state that precludes the possibility of further improvement; inasmuch as we may love God supremely, yet that love may become stronger, and that delight increase forever. The perfection of a Christian, considered in relation to that of his heavenly Father, may be likened to one of those mathematical lines that may draw nearer and nearer to another for all eternity, still remaining as infinite in their mutual distance as they are endless in their mutual approach, and everlasting in their asymptotic relation to one another. Our continual advancement towards him may be illustrated by the recurring decimal fraction. Though we add figure after figure, in a continuing and never-ending series, and every additional figure brings it nearer to a certain value, yet there is no possibility of its ever reaching that value. So the happy and the holy may continue to grow more like God, without the most distant possibility of attaining his glorious perfections. Nay, he may grow more like God throughout eternity, and throughout eternity remain at an infinite distance from the absolutely perfect object which he thus increasingly resembles (Philippians 3:12-16). See Bates, *Works,* p. 557, etc.; Burgh, *Dignity of Human Nature;* Doddridge, *Lectures,* lect. 181; Channing, *Works;* Irving, *Orations and Arguments; Engl. Rev.* 2:20; *Presb. Theol. Rev.* Oct. 1868; *Christ. Examiner* (1874), p. 183; *Brit. and For. Ev. Rev.* July, 1876; *Meth. Quar. Rev.* Oct. 1874. *SEE SANCTIFICATION*.

That such perfection is attainable in this life is held by the Franciscans, Jesuits, and Molinists in the Church of Rome, but is denied by the Dominicans and Jansenists. In advocating the doctrine, its Roman Catholic supporters generally rest much on the distinction between *mortal* and *venial* sins. *SEE SIN*. "*Christian Perfection*" is pre-eminently a doctrine of Methodists of nearly all classes. It is not a perfection of *justification,* but a perfection of *sanctification;* which John Wesley, in a sermon on Christian perfection, from the text Hebrews 6:1, "Let us go on to perfection," earnestly contends for as attainable in this life by believers, by arguments founded chiefly on the commandments and promises of Scripture concerning sanctification; guarding his doctrine, however, by saying that it is neither an *angelic* nor an *Adamic* perfection, and does not exclude ignorance and error of judgment with consequent wrong affections, such as

"needless fear or ill-grounded hope, unreasonable love or unreasonable aversion." He admits, also, that even in this sense it is a rare attainment, but asserts that "several persons have enjoyed this blessing, without interruption, for many years, several enjoy it at this day, and not a few have enjoyed it unto their death, as they have declared with their latest breath, calmly witnessing that God had saved them from all sin, till their spirit returned to God." Paul and John he deemed sufficient authorities for the use of an epithet which he knew, however, would be liable to the cavils of criticism. The Christian world had also largely recognized the term in the writings of Clemens Alexandrinus, Macarius, Kempis, Fenelon, Lucas, and other writers, Papal and Protestant. Besides incessant allusions to the doctrine in his general writings, Wesley has left an elaborate treatise on it. Fletcher of Madeley, an example as well as an authority of the doctrine, published an essay on it, proving it to be scriptural as well as sanctioned by the best theological writers. Wesley's theory of the doctrine is precise and intelligible, though often distorted into perplexing difficulties by both its advocates and opponents. As above observed, he taught not absolute, nor angelic, nor Adamic, but "Christian perfection." Each sphere of being has its own normal limits; God alone has absolute perfection; the angels have a perfection of their own above that of humanity, at least of the humanity of our sphere; unfallen man, represented by Adam, occupied a peculiar sphere in the divine economy, with its own relations to the divine government, its own "perfection," called by Wesley Adamic perfection; fallen, but regenerated man, has also his peculiar sphere as a subject of the mediatorial economy, and the highest practicable virtue (whatever it may be) in that sphere is its "perfection." is Christian perfection. Admitting such a theory of perfection, the most important question has respect to its practical limit. When can it be said of a Christian man that he is thus perfect? Wesley taught that perfect Christians "'are not free from ignorance, no, nor from mistake. We are no more to expect any man to be infallible than to be omniscient... From infirmities none are perfectly freed till their spirits return to God; neither can we expect, till then, to be wholly freed from temptation; for 'the servant is not above his Master.' Neither in this sense is there any absolute perfection on earth. There is no perfection of degrees, none which does not admit of a continual increase. . . The proposition which I will hold is this: 'Any person may be cleansed from all sinful tempers, and yet need the atoning blood.' For what? for 'negligences and ignorances;' for both words and actions (as well as omissions), which are, in a sense, transgressions of the perfect law. And I believe no one is clear

of these till he lays down this corruptible body." Perfection, as defined by Wesley, is not then perfection according to the absolute moral law: it is perfection according to the special remedial economy introduced by the Atonement, in which the heart, being sanctified, fulfills the law by love (Romans 12:8,10), and its involuntary imperfections are provided for, by that economy, without the imputation of guilt, as in the case of infancy and all irresponsible persons. The only question, then, can be, Is it possible for good men so to love God that all their conduct, inward and outward, shall be swayed by love? that even their involuntary defects shall be swayed by it? Is there such a thing as the inspired writer calls the "perfect love" which "casteth out fear?" (1 John 4:18). Wesley believed that there is; that it is the privilege of all saints; and that it is to be attained by faith. "I want you to be *all love,"* he wrote. "This is the perfection I believe and teach; and this perfection is consistent with a thousand nervous disorders, which that highstrained perfection is not. Indeed, my judgment is that (in this case particularly) to overdo is to undo; and that to set perfection too high is the most effectual way of driving it out of the world." "Man," he says, "in his present state, can no more attain Adamic than angelic perfection. The perfection of which man is capable, while he dwells in a corruptible body, is the complying with that kind command, in 'My son, give me thy heart!' It is loving the Lord his God with all his heart, and with all his soul, and with all his mind." Such is his much misrepresented doctrine of Christian perfection. Wesley taught that this sanctification is usually gradual, but may be instantaneous (Stevens, *Centenary of Methodism* p. 133). See Wesley, *Plain Account of Christian Perfection;* Fletcher, *Christian Perfection;* Merritt, *Christian's Manual;* Peck, *Scripture Doctrine of Christian Perfection;* Foster, *Christian Purity. SEE METHODISM*.

Perfectionism

This doctrine is often confounded with two others, from which, however, it is philosophically distinguishable. One of these is the doctrine of the simplicity of moral action, the most powerful advocate of which is the theological school at Oberlin, Ohio. According to this theory, it is impossible that sin and virtue should co-exist in the human heart at the same time; all moral action is single and indivisible; the soul is either wholly consecrated to Christ, or it has none of his spirit. These two states may alternate: the man may be a Christian at one moment and a sinner the next, but he cannot be at any one moment a sinful or imperfect Christian. The

advocates of this view, however, deny that any one can claim to be a perfect Christian under this theory, because he does not remember any conscious failure, since “even present failure is not always a matter of distinct consciousness, and the past belongs to memory, and not to consciousness.” *SEE OBERLIN THEOLOGY*.

The other view, which is sometimes confounded with perfectionism, is that entitled by its advocates the doctrine of “perfect sanctification,” or sometimes the “higher life.” This is, in brief, the doctrine that Jesus Christ is a present Savior from sin; that he is able to keep those that trust in him from falling into any sin whatever; and that if the soul trusted him completely it would be preserved from all deliberate sin, and its unintentional wrong-doing — errors rather than sins — would not be imputed to it. It is true that some of the advocates of this view claim to have so lived in the presence of Christ as to have been for weeks and months unconscious of any sin; but more generally those who hold this view of the present redeeming power of Christ, while they insist that it is possible to live so near to him as to be kept by him “without sin,” also confess that they occasionally fail to keep up a complete and undeviating trust in Christ, and so do, in fact, in some degree, temporarily fall away from that condition in which they maintain it to be their privilege to walk. It should be added that this doctrine of the “higher life” is one of experience rather than philosophy, and it is difficult to afford a clear and concise definition of it that will be free from every objection, or intelligible to those of an unspiritual state of mind. *SEE PERFECTION, CHRISTIAN*.

Perfectionists

a controversial term, applied in an odious sense to those who lay claim to absolute Christian perfection, or maintain its possibility. They may be divided into several classes, as they rest their claims on different grounds.

1. There are the advocates of *imputed* perfection. These are perfect, not in their own righteousness, but in the imputed righteousness of Christ. The individual who fancies himself in possession of all Christ’s righteousness holds usually, not only that he does not, but that he *cannot* sin. What would be sin in others is no sin in him. But moral character is not transferable property. It adheres to its possessor, and to him alone, and can never become the character of any other being. *SEE IMPUTATION*.

2. The second class are those who claim what they call an *evangelical* perfection. They do not profess to obey perfectly the divine law, or think that this is at all necessary. The moral law has been superseded by the law of faith. To this theory it is sufficient to reply that the moral law as not been superseded or annulled, but is in full force now throughout the universe. Our Savior came to vindicate and honor the law, not to annul it. *SEE ANTINOMIANS*.

3. The third class are those who profess to fulfill perfectly the law of God. They admit that the moral law — the great law of love — stands in unabated force; that it is binding on themselves; and insist that they can and *do* completely fulfill it. This they claim in such an absolute sense as to imply *perfect sinlessness,* and to require no further need of penitence and forgiveness. This view is not held by any one sect, nor confined to any one denomination; but is avowed more or less distinctly by some persons in different churches, chiefly in the Methodist and the Congregational denominations, though not accepted by the great body of believers in any of them. Such views have occasionally characterized mystical individuals in every age, *SEE MYSTICS*, and are also held, under some modification or other, by several bodies of communists in this country. See *Theol. Rev.* 1:554; *Meth. Quar. Rev.* 1841, p. 307; 1848, p. 293. *SEE LAW (MORAL)*.

Perfume

(rFqæ, *kitter,* tr,fq], *ketoreth*). The strong and offensive exhalations of animal bodies in a hot climate must be regarded as the original cause of the high value (<202709>Proverbs 27:9) ascribed to perfumery, and its generally extended use (*SEE ANOINT*; *SEE OIL*; and comp. Plut. *De Iside,* ch. 80), although luxury and self-indulgence had much to do with its extension and refinement. It is still customary in the Orient, as it was of old, to perfume thoroughly not only rooms, clothing, etc. (comp. <220306>Song of Solomon 3:6), but in the houses of chief persons to sprinkle perfumes on the persons of guests, at their arrival or departure (comp. Maundl ell, *Trav.* p. 40 sq.; Harmer, *Obs.* 2:83 sq.; Rosenmüller, *Morgenland,* 4:157). On anointing the beard, *SEE BEARD*. Perfumed fans were carried (Curt. 8:9, 23) before princes; and at their public entry into cities altars of incense were erected on the streets (Herodian, 4:8, 19; Rosenmüller, *Morgenland,* 4:195). Such attestation of honor and means of enjoyment were at an early period transferred also to the gods, in the belief that they inhaled with pleasure the odors offered them (<053310>Deuteronomy 33:10), and this burning of incense is

hence very often alluded to among the ceremonies of heathen religions (<111108>1 Kings 11:8; <122217>2 Kings 22:17; 23:5; <240116>Jeremiah 1:16; 7:9; 44:3 sq.; <281213>Hosea 2:13; 11:2; <236503>Isaiah 65:3; <142514>2 Chronicles 25:14; 28:3; <261613>Ezekiel 6:13; 23:41; 1 Maccabees 2:15. Comp. *Iliad,* 6:269 sq.; Virg. *AEn.* 1:420 sq.; Ovid, *Fasti,* 1:839 sq.; 2:573; Aristoph. *Vesp.* 94 sq.; Lucian, *Jup. Tranced.* 45; Pliny, 13:1). Some deities were worshipped with no other offerings than incense and perfumes (Buhr, *Symbol.* 1:478), but their use was also included in the instituted worship of Jehovah (<053310>Deuteronomy 33:10), for the Israelites were required to add sacred incense to many of their sacrifices, which was burned with them on the altar (<030201>Leviticus 2:1 sq.; 16:6, 15); and daily, morning and evening, in trimming and lighting their lamps, an especial incense-offering was made upon its own separate altar over against the ark of the covenant (<022627>Exodus 40:27; 30:7 sq. Comp. <420109>Luke 1:9). No doubt the incense was useful in destroying the damp vapors in the confined space of the sanctuary, as well as the exhalations from the animals burned as sacrifices (Rosenmüller on <022307>Exodus 30:7), but the purpose of the incense seems to have been religious. Thus the seer of the Apocalypse represents the angel in the heavenly sanctuary as burning incense after the type of the earthly. But it does not follow, because incense and prayer are often united (<240116>Jeremiah 1:16; <19E102>Psalm 141:2; Bahr's other citations are irrelevant), that in the Jewish sanctuary the incense-offering had sensualized prayer (comp. Hofmann, *Weissag.* 1:144 sq.). Still less can we adopt Bihr's view (*Symbol.* 1:462 sq.) that incense is a symbol of God's name invoked in prayer. Besides the ingredients of this incense enumerated in <022308>Exodus 30:38, the Talmud adds seven other components, and hence calls the whole *the eleven orders* (djaˆynmms rç[, *Midrash Shir Hashir,* 12:4; 21:3; and R. Abr. ben-David, *Comm. de svffitu ex Shilte Hangibor.* in Ugolini *Thesaur.* xi). According to the Talmud, half a pound of this incense was to be burned morning and evening (Gem. *Shebuoth,* 10:2. See esp. Lightfoot, *Her. Hebr.* p. 715). Exaggerated accounts are given as to the distance from Jerusalem at which the incense could be smelled (Mishna, *Tamid,* 3:8). The most important incense-offering was that which the highpriest made before the ark of the covenant on the great day of atonement (<031612>Leviticus 16:12 sq.). The management of the daily incense in the second Temple is detailed in the Mishna (*Tamid,* 5, 6). One priest carried incense in a vessel (ãK), another burning coals from the altar of burnt-offering in a golden *censer* (q.v.), and, passing into the holy place, the latter scattered the coals upon the altar of incense, and the former spread the incense upon them (*Tamid,*

1:2 sq.). These priestly duties, like the others of the office (<09128>1 Samuel 2:28; <14618>2 Chronicles 26:18), were daily distributed by lot (comp. <42109>Luke 1:9). But, according to the Mishna (*Tamid,* 5:2; *Yoma,* 2:4), those priests who had once performed the office were afterwards shut out from the lot, on the ground that, as the Gemara says that this duty enriches with divine blessings (<05330>Deuteronomy 33:10 sq.), this advantage might thus be as widely distributed as possible. (On these later Jewish superstitions, see G. Michaelis, *Observat. Sacr.* p. 71 sq.) It is possible that the distinction which this office gave the priest, bringing him into the nearest relation with the Deity of all the duties of the sanctuary, rendered such an arrangement proper. Perhaps also the belief that the special revelations of God would be made first to the priest thus officiating, may have contributed to cause this duty to be equally divided. (Comp. Joseph. *Ant.* 13:10, 3; <42011>Luke 1:11, and Wetstein, *ad loc.*) During the burning of incense in the sanctuary the people stood praying in the court (<42010>Luke 1:10), and, after the fulfillment of his office, they received from the priest his blessing (Reland, *Antiq. Sacr.* 2:5, 5). The burning of incense to the honor of Jehovah out of the national sanctuary, on high places, or in cities, was accounted illegal after David's time (<11033>1 Kings 3:3; 22:44; <12203>2 Kings 12:3; 15:4; 16:4. Comp. <14212>2 Chronicles 32:12; 1 Maccabees 1:58). In the idolatries of the ten tribes of Israel, arranged by Jeroboam, the rning of incense found a place (<11301>1 Kings 13:1; <12711>2 Kings 17:11). See Carpzov, *Appar.* p. 275 sq.; Braun. *Selecta Sacr.* p. 225 sq.; Schlichter, *De suffitu sacr. Hebr.* (Hal. 1754). *SEE INCENSE*.

In secular life also, as above observed, the free use of perfumes was peculiarly grateful to the Orientals (<20709>Proverbs 27:9), whose olfactory nerves are more than usually sensitive to the offensive smells engendered by the heat of their climate (Burckhardt, *Travels,* 2:85). The Hebrews manufactured their perfumes chiefly from spices imported from Arabia, though to a certain extent also from aromatic plants growing in their own country. *SEE SPICES*. The modes in which they applied them were various: occasionally a bunch of the plant itself was worn about the person as a nosegay, or enclosed in a bag (<22013>Song of Solomon 1:13); or the plant was reduced to a powder and used in the way of fumigation (<22306>Song of Solomon 3:6); or, again, the aromatic qualities were extracted by some process of boiling, and were then mixed with oil, so as to be applied to the person in the way of ointment (<43203>John 12:3); or, lastly, the scent was carried about in smelling-bottles (vpNhiyTB; *houses of the soul*)

suspended from the girdle (Isaiah 3:20). Perfumes entered largely into the Temple service, in the two forms of incense and ointment (Exodus 30:22 38). Nor were they less used in private life: not only were they applied to the person, but to garments (Psalm 45:8; Song of Solomon 4:11), and to articles of furniture, such as beds (Proverbs 7:17). On the arrival of a guest the same compliments were probably paid in ancient as in modern times; the rooms were fumigated; the person of the guest was sprinkled with rose-water; and then the incense was applied to his face and beard (Daniel 2:46; Lane, *Mod. Eg* 2:14). When a royal rersonage went abroad in his litter, attendants threw up "pillars of smoke" about his path (Song of Solomon 3:6). Nor is it improbable that "other practices, such as scenting the breath by chewing frankincense (Lane, 1:246), and the skiny washing in rosewater (Burckhardt, 1:52), were also adopted in early times. The use of perfumes was omitted in times of mourning, whence the allusion in Isaiah 3:24, "Instead of sweet smell there shall be stink." The preparation of perfumes in the form either of ointment or incense was a recognized profession (רקח A.V. *apothecary*) among the Jews (Exodus 30:25, 35; Ecclesiastes 10:1). *SEE OINTMENT*.

Per'ga

Picture for Perga 1

(Πέργη), an ancient and important city of Pamphylia, in Asia Minor, situated on the river Cestrus, at a distance of sixty stadia from its mouth (Strab. 14:667; Cic. *Verr.* 1:20; Plin. v. 26; Mela, 1:14; Ptol. v. 5, § 7). It was celebrated in antiquity for the worship of Artemis (Diaina), whose temple stood on a hill outside the town, and in whose honor annual festivals were celebrated (Callim. *Hymn. in Dian.* 187; Scylax, p. 39; Dion. Per. 854). The goddess and the temple are represented on the coins of Perga. Alexander the Great occupied Perga with a part of his army after quitting Phasaelis, between which two towns the road is described as long and difficult (Arrian, *Anab.* 1:26; comp. Polyb. v. 72; 22:25; Livy, 38:37). The Cestrus was navigable to Perga, and St. Paul landed here on his voyage from Paphos (Acts 13:13). He visited the city a second time on his return from the interior of Pamphylia, and preached the Gospel there (Acts 14:25). Perga was originally the capital of Pamphylia; but when that province was divided into two, Side became the chief town of the first, and Perga of the second Pamphylia. In the ecclesiastical notices, and in

Hierocles (p. 679), Perga appears as the metropolis of Pamphylia (Stephlen of Byzant. s.v.; Eckhel, *Docir. Num.* 1:3, p. 12). There are still extensive remains of Perga at a spot called by the Turks *Eski-Kilesi* (Leake, *Asia Minor,* p. 182; Fellows, *Asia Minor,* p. 190; Texier, *Asie Minere,* pl. 19; Conybeare and Howson, *St. Paul,* 1:160). *SEE PAMPHYLIA.*

Picture for Perga 2

Per'gamos

properly PERGAMUS (Πέργαμος), or PERGAMUM (Πέργαμον, as usually in classical writers), a town of the Great Mysia, the capital of a kingdom of the same name, and afterwards of the Roman province of Asia Propria. It was an ancient city, in a most beautiful district of Teuthrania, in Asia Minor, north of the river Caicus. Near the point where the city was located, two other rivers, the Selinus and Cetius, emptied themselves into the Caicus; the Selinus flowed through the city itself, while the Cetius washed its walls (Strab. 13:619; Plin. v. 33; Pausan. 6:16, § 1; Livy, 37:18). Its distance from the sea was one hundred and twenty stadia, but communication with the sea was effected by the navigable river Caicus. The name was originally given to a remarkable hill, presenting a conical appearance when viewed from the plain. The local legends attached a sacred character to this place. Upon it the Cabiri were said to have been witnesses of the birth of Zeus, and the whole of .the land belonging to the city of the same name which afterwards grew up around the original Pergamos appertained to these deities. The city itself, which is first mentioned by Xenophon (*Anab.* 7:8, § 8), was originally a fortress of considerable natural strength, being situated on the summit of the hill, round the foot of which there were at that time no houses. Sublsequently, however, a city arose at the foot of the hill, and the latter then became the Acropolis. We have no further information as to the foundation of the original town on the hill, but the Pergamenians believed themselves to be the descendants of Arcadians who had migrated to Asia under the leadership of the Heraclid Telephus (Pausan. 1:4, § 5). 1 hey derived the name of their town from Pergamus, a son of Pyrrhus, who was believed to have arrived there with his mother Andromache, and, after a successful combat with Arius, the ruler of Teuthrania, to have established himself there (Pausan. 1:11, § 2). Another tradition stated that Asclepius, with a colony from Epidaurus, proceeded to Pergamos. At all events, the place seems to have been inhabited by many Greeks at the time when Xenophon

visited it. Still, however, Pergamos remained a place of not much importance until the time of Lysimachus, one of the generals of Alexander the Great. The sacred character of the locality, combined with its natural strength, seems to have made it. like some others of the ancient temples, a bank for chiefs who desired to accumulate a large amount of specie. Hence this lysimachus chose Pergamos as a place of security for the reception and preservation of his treasures, which amounted to 9000 talents. The care and superintendence of this treasure in as entrusted to Philetrerus of Tium, a eunuch from his infancy, and a person in whom Lysimachus placed the greatest confidence. For a time Philetaerus answered the expectations of Lysimachus, but having been ill-treated by Arsinoe, the wife of his master, he withdrew his allegiance, and declared himself independent. B.C. 283. As Lysimachus was prevented by domestic calamities from punishing the offender, Philetuerus remained in undisturbed possession of the town and treasures for twenty years, contriving by dexterous management to maintain peace with his neighbors. He transmitted his principality to a nephew of the name of Eumenes, who increased the territory he had inherited, and even gained a victory over Antiochus, the son of Seleucus, in the neighborhood of Sardis. After a reign of twenty-two years, from B.C. 263 to 241, he was succeeded by his cousin Attalus, who, after a great victory over the Galatians, assumed the title of king, and distinguished himself by his great talents and sound policy (Strabo, 13:623, 624; Polyb. 18:21; Livy, 33:21). He espoused the interests of Rome against Philip of Macedonia, and in conjunction with the Rhodian fleet rendered important service to the Romans. It was mainly this Attalus that amassed the wealth for which his name became proverbial. He died at an advanced age, in B.C. 197, and was succeeded by his son Eumenes II, from B.C. 197 to 159. He continued his father’s friendship for the Romans, and assisted them against Antiochus the Great and Perseus of Macedonia. After the defeat of Antiochus, the Romans rewarded his services by giving him all the countries in Asia Minor west of Mount Taurus. Pergamos, the territory of which had hitherto not extended beyond the gulfs of Elea and Adramyttium, now became a large and powerful kingdom (Strabo, *l.c.*; Livy, 38:39). Eumenes II was nearly killed at Delphi by assassins said to have been hired by Perseus; yet at a later period he favored the cause of the Macedonian king, and thereby incurred the ill-will of the Romans. Pergamos was mainly indebted to Eumenes II for its embellishment and extension. He was a liberal patron of the arts and sciences; he decorated the temple of Zeus Nicephorus, which had been built by Attalus outside the

city, with walks and plantations, and erected himself many other public buildings; but the greatest monument of his liberality was the great library which he founded, and which yielded only to that of Alexandria in extent and value (Strabo, *l.c.*; Athen. 1:3). He was succeeded by his son Attalus II; but the government was carried on by the late king's brother, Attalus, surnamed Philadelphus, from B.C. 159 to 138. During this period the Pergamenians again assisted the Romans against the pseudo-Philip. Attalus also defeated Diegylus, king of the Thracian Cseni, and overthrew Prusias of Bithynia. On his death, his ward and nephew, Attalus III. surnamed Philometer, undertook the reins of government, from B.C. 138 to 133, and on his death bequeathed his kingdom to the Romans. Soon after Aristonicus, a natural son of Eumenes II, revolted, and claimed the kingdom of Pergamos for himself; but in B.C. 130 he was vanquished and taken prisoner, and the kingdom of Pergamios became a Roman province under the name of Asia (Strabo, 14:646.) The city of Pergamos, however, continued to flourish and prosper under the Roman dominion, so that Pliny (*l.c.*) could still call it "longe clarissimum Asiae Pergamum:" it remained the center of jurisdiction for the district, and of commerce, as all the main roads of Western Asia converged there. Pergamos was one of the seven churches mentioned in the book of Revelation (2:12). Under the Byzantine emperors the greatness and prosperity of the city declined; but it still exists under the name of *Bergamo,* and presents to the visitor numerous ruins and extensive remains of its ancient magnificence. It lies on the north bank of the Caicus, at the base and on the declivity of two high and steep mountains, on one of which now stands a dilapidated castle. A wall facing the south-east of the Acropolis, of hewn granite, is at least one hundred feet deep, and engrafted into the rock; above it a course of large instructions form a spacious area, upon which once rose a temple unlivalled in sublimity of situation, being visible from the vast plain and the AEgean Sea. The ruins of this temple show that it was built in the noblest style. Besides this, there are ruins of an ancient temple of *A*Esculapius, which, like the Nicephorion, was outside the city (Tacit. *Ann.* 3:63; Pausan. 13, § 2); of 4 royal palace, which was surrounded by a wall, and connected with the Caicus by an aqueduct; of a prytaneum, a theater, a gymnasium, a stadium, an amphitheatre, and other public buildings. All these remains attest the unusual splendor of the ancient city, and all travelers speak with admiration of their stupendous greatness. The numerous coins which we possess of Pergamos attest that Olympian games were celebrated there; a vase found there represents a torchrace on horseback; and Pliny (10:25)

relates that public cock-fights took place there every year. Pergamos was celebrated for the manufacture of ointments (Athen. 15:689), pottery (Pliny, 35:46), and parchment, which derives its name (charta Perzamena) from the city. The library of Pergamos, which is said to have consisted of no less than 200,000 volumes, remained at Pergamnos after the kingdom of the Attali had lost its independence, until Antony removed it to Egypt, and presented it to queen Cleopatra. (Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* 3:2' Plutarch, *Anton.*). The valuable tapestries, called in Latin *aulva,* from having dorned the hall of king Attis, were also wrought in this town. Even now it is a place of considerable importance containing a population estimated at 14,000, of whom about 3000 are Greeks, 300, Armenians, and the rest Turks (*Macfarlane's Visit*). The writer just cited says, "The approach to this ancient and decaved city was as impressive as well might be. After crossing the Caicus, I saw, looking over three vast tumuli, or sepulchral barrows, similar to those of the plains of Troy, the present Turkish city, with its tall minarets and taller cypresses, situated on the lower declivities and at the foot of the Acropolis, whose bold gray brow was crowned by the rugged walls of a barbarous castle, the usurper of the site of a magnificent Greek temple." The town consists for the most part of small and mean wooden houses, among which appear the remains of early Christian churches, showing "like large fortresses amid vast barracks of wood." None of these churches have any scriptural or apocalyptic interest connected with them, having been erected "several centuries after the ministry of the apostles, and when Christianity was not a humble and despised creed, but the adopted religion of an immense empire." The pagan temples have fared worse than these Christian churches. "The fanes of Jupiter and Diana, of *A*Esculapius and Venus, are prostrate in the dust; and where they have not been carried away by the Turks, to cut up into tombstones or to pound into mortar, the Corinthian and Ionic columns, the splendid capitals, the cornices and pediments, all in the highest ornament, are thrown into unsightly heaps."

Picture for Pergamos 1

As above noted, in Pergamos was one of the seven churches of Asia, to which the Apocalypse is addressed. This church is commended for its fidelity and firmness in the midst of persecutions, and in a city so eminently addicted to idolatry. "I know," it is said, "thy works and *where thou dwellest, even where Satan's seat is"* (Revelation 2:13). Now there was at Pergamos a celebrated and much frequented temple of *A*Esculapius, who

probably there, as in other places, was worshipped; n the form of a living serpent, fed in the temple, and considered as its divinity. Hence *A*Esculapius was called the god of Pergamos, and on the coins struck by the town *A*Esculapius often appears with a rod encircled by a serpent (Berger, *Thesaur.* 1:492). As the sacred writer mentions the great dragon and the old serpent. (<661209>Revelation 12:9), there is reason to conclude that when he says in the above passage that the Church of Pergamos dwelt "where Satan's seat is," he alludes in the worship of the serpent as there practiced. The great wealth which accrued to Eumenes II from his large accession of territory he employed in laying out a magnificent residential city, and adorning it with temples and other public buildings. His passion, and that of his successor, for literature and the fine arts, led them to form a library which rivaled that of Alexandria; and the impulse given to the art of preparing sheepskins for the purpose of transcription, to gratify the taste of the royal *dilettanti,* has left its record in the name *parchment.* Eumenes's successor, Attalus II, is said to have bid six hundred thousand sestercs for a picture by the painter Aristides, at the sale of the plunder of Corinth; and by so doing to have attracted the attention of the Roman general Mummius to it, who sent it off at once to Rome, where no foreign artist's work had then been seen. For another picture by the same artist he paid one hundred talents. But the great glory of the city was the so-called Nicephorium, a grove of extreme beauty, laid out as a thank-offering, for a victory over Antiochus, in which was an assemblage of temples, probably of all the deities, Zeus, Athena, Apollo, *A*Esculapius, Dionysus, and Aphrodite. The temple of the last was of a most elaborate character. Its facade was perhaps inlaid after the manner *of pietradura* work; for Philip of Macedonia, who was repulsed in an attempt to surprise Pergamos during the reign of Attalus I , vented his spite in cutting down the trees of the grove, and not only destroying the Aphrodisium, but injuring the stones in such a way as to prevent their being used again. At the conclusion of peace it was made a special stipulation that this damage should be made good. The immense wealth which was directly or indirectly derived from the legacy of his dominions by Attalus III to the Romans contributed perhaps even more than the spoils of Carthage and Corinth to the demoralization of Roman statesmen. The sumptuousness of the Attalic princes had raised Pergamos to the rank of the first city in Asia as regards splendor, and Pliny speaks of it as without a rival in the province. Its prominence, however, was not that of a commercial town, like Ephesus or Corinth, but arose from its peculiar features. It was a solt of union of a pagan cathedral city, a university town,

and a royal residence, embellished during a succession of years by kings who all had a passion for expenditure and ample means of gratifying it. Two smaller streams, which flowed from the north, embracing the town between them, and then fell into the Caicus, afforded ample means of storing water, without which, in those latitudes, ornamental cultivation (or indeed cultivation of any kind) is out of the question. The larger of these streams — the *Bergama-tchai*, or Cetius of antiquity — has a fall of more than 150 feet between the hills to the north of Pergamos and its junction with the Caicus, and it brings down a very considerable body of water. Both the Nicephorium, which has been spoken of above, and the Grove of *A*Esculapius, which became yet more celebrated in the time of the Roman empire, doubtless owed their existence to the means of irrigation thus available; and furnished the appliances for those licentious rituals of pagan antiquity which flourished wherever there were groves and hill-altars. Under the Attalic kings, Pergamos became a city of temples, devoted to a sensuous worship; and being in its origin, according to pagan notions, a sacred place, might not unnaturally be viewed by Jews and Jewish Christians as one "where was the throne of Satan" (ὅπου ὁ θρόνος τοῦ Σατανᾶ, Revelation 2:13). After the extinction of its independence, the sacred character of Pergamos seems to have been put even more prominently forward. Coins and inscriptions constantly describe the Pergamenes as νεωκόροι or νεωκόροι πρῶτοι τῆς Ἀσίας. This title always indicates the duty of maintaining a religious worship of some kind (which indeed naturally goes together with the usufruct of religious property). What the deities were to which the title has reference especially it is difficult to say. In the time of Martial, however, *A*Esculapius had acquired so much prominence that he is called *Pergameus deus.* His grove was recognized by the Roman senate in the reign of Tiberius as possessing the rights of sanctuary. Pausanias, too, in the course of his work, refers more than once to the Esculapian ritual at Pergamos as a sort of standard. From the circumstance of this notoriety of the Pergamene *A*Esculapius, from the title Σωτήρ being given to him, from the *serpent* (which Judaical Christians would regard as a symbol of evil) being his characteristic emblem, and from the fact that the medical practice of antiquity included charms and incantations among its agencies, it has been supposed that the expressions ὁ θρόνος τοῦ Σατανᾶ οπου ὁ Σατανᾶς κατοικεῖ have an especial reference to this one pagan deity, and not to the whole city as a sort of focus of idolatrous worship. But although undoubtedly the *A*Esculapius worship of Pergamos was the most famous, and in later times

became continually more predominant from the fact of its being combined with an excellent medical school (which among others produced the celebrated Galen), yet an inscription of the time of Marcus Antoninus distinctly puts Zeus, Athena, Dionysus, and *A*Esculapius in a coordinate rank, as all being special tutelary deities of Pergamos. It seems unlikely, therefore, that the expressions above quoted should be so interpreted as to isolate one of them from the rest. It may be added that the charge against a portion of the Pergamene Church that some among them were of the school of Balaam, whose policy was "to put a stumbling-block before the children of Israel, by inducing them φαγεῖν εἰδωλύθυτα καὶ πορνεῦσαι (Revelation 2:14), is in both its particulars very inappropriate to the *A*Esculapian ritual. It points rather to the Dionysus and Aphrodite worship; and the sin of the Nicolaitans, which is condemned, seems to have consisted in a participation in this, arising out of a social amalgamation of themselves with the native population. Now, from the time of the war with Antiochus at least, it is certain that there was a considerable Jewish population in Pergamene territory. The decree of the Pergamenes quoted by Josephus (*Ant.* 14:10, 22) seems to indicate that the Jews had farmed the tolls in some of the harbors of their territory, and likewise were holders of land. They are, in accordance with the expressed desire of the Roman senate, allowed to levy port-dues upon all vessels except those belonging to king Ptolemy. The growth of a large and wealthy class naturally leads to its obtaining a share in political rights, and the only bar to the admission of Jews to privileges of citizenship in Pergamos would be their unwillingness to take any part in the religious ceremonies, which were an essential part of every relation of life in pagan times. The more lax, however, might regard such a proceeding as a purely formal act of civil obedience, and reconcile themselves to it as Naaman did to "bowing himself in the house of Rimmon" when in attendance upon his sovereign. It is perhaps worth noticing, with reference to this point, that a Pergamene inscription published by Bockh mentions by *two* names (*licostratus*, who is also called *Tryppho*) an individual who served the office of gymnasiarch. Of these two names, the latter, a foreign one, is likely to have been borne by him among some special body to which he belonged, and the former to have been adopted when, by accepting the position of an official, he merged himself in the general Greek population.

Picture for Pergamos 2

See Smith, *Dict. of Class. Geog.* s.v.; Spon and Wheler, *Voy.* 1:260, etc.; Choiseul-Gouffier, *Voyage Pittoresque,* 2:25, etc.; Arundell, *Seven Churches,* p. 281, etc.; Dallaway, *Constantinople, Ancient and Modern,* p. 303; Leake, *Asia Minor,* p. 266; Fellows, *Asia Minor,* p. 34, etc.; Richter, *Wall'fihrten,* p. 488, etc.; Eckhel, *Doctr.* *Numbers* 4:448; Capelle, *Commentat. de Regibus et Antiquit. Pergamen is* (Amst. 1842, 8vo); Rosenmiiller, *Bibl. Geog.* 3:13 17: Macfarlane, *Visit to the Seven Apocalyptic Churches,* 1832; Schubert, *Reise ins Morgenland; Missionary Herald* for 1839, p. 228 230; Bockh, *Inscript.* Nos. 3538, 3550, 3553; Philostratus, *De Vit. Soph.* p. 45, 106; Tchihatcheff, *Asie Mineure,* p. 230. *SEE MYSIA*.

Pergamos, Council Of,

was held at that place in 152 (?) against the Colarbasians.

Pergolese, Giovanni Battista

was an eminent musician of the Neapolitan school. Evidence regarding the date and place of his birth is conflicting; probably the correct account is that of the Marchese di Villarosa, his latest biographer, who states that he was born at Jesi, near Ancona, on Jan. 3, 1710. In 1717 he was admitted into the Conservatorio dei Poveri di Gesu Cristo at Naples, where he studied the violin under Domenico di Matteis, and musical composition under Gaetano Greco and Durante. Under the conviction that melody and taste were sacrificed to learning by most of the masters of his time, he abandoned the style of Scurlatti and Greco for that of Vinci and Hasse. His first great work was the oratorio of *San Cug'ielo d'Aquitania,* composed in 1731. In that and the following year appeared his operas of *La Serva Padrona, II Prigionicr Superbo,* and *Lo Frate Innamorato;* in 1734, *Ad)iano in Siria; in* 1735, *II Flaminio* and *L'Olimpiade.* In 1734 lhe received the appointment of *maestro di capella* of the church of Loretto. In consequence of delicate health he removed to Pozzuoli, where he composed the cantata of *Orfeo,* and his pathetic *Stubat Mater.* He died there of consumption in 1736. Besides the above-mentioned works, Pergolese composed a number of pieces for the Church, which were better appreciated during his lifetime than his secular compositions, also a violin concerto, and thirty trios for violin, violoncello, and harpsichord. His

works are all characterized by sweetness and freedom of style. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Pergolesi

SEE PERGOLESE.

Pergubrios

an ancient Slavonian deity who was believed to preside over the fruits. An annual festival was celebrated in his honor on the 22d of March.

Peri

(*Fairy*), according to the mythical lore of the East, a being begotten by fallen spirits, which spends its life in all imaginable delights, is immortal, but is forever excluded from the joys of Paradise. It takes an intermediate place between angels and demons and is either male or female. So far from there being only female Peris, as is supposed by some, and these the wives of the Devs, the Peris live, on the contrary, in constant warfare with these Devs. Otherwise they are of the most innocuous character to mankind, and, exactly as the fairies, with whom our own popular mythology has made us familiar, are, when female, of surpassing beauty. One of the finest compliments to be paid to a Persian lady is to speak of her as *Perizadeh* (born of a Peri; Greek, *Parisatis*). They belong to the great family of genii, or *Jin*: a belief in whom is enjoined in the Koran, and for whose conversion, as well as for that of man, Mohammed was sent (comp. Koran, ch. 55, 72, and 74).

Periamma

a cross of gold that hung from the neck, and was a distinctive ornament of a bishop’s dress. *SEE BISHOP*.

Periammata

SEE PHYLACTERY.

Peribolaeon

SEE PALLIUM.

Peribolon

(περίβολον), the outer enclosure of ancient Christian churches, being the utmost bounds allowed for refuge or sanctuary. *SEE ASYLUM*.

Peribolos

SEE PERIBOLON.

Pericopae

the lessons or divisions of Scripture read in the early Church, after the style of the Jewish *par 'shioth.* It is doubtful when the custom originated, but the necessity of it pleads for its antiquity.

Peri'da

(Nehemiah 7:57). *SEE PERUDA*.

Perier, Marguerite

a French inmate of Port Royal, noted for a pretended miraculous cure upon her person, which has been the subject of much controversy in the Church, was the daughter of M. Perier, magistrate at Clermont, and niece of Blaise and Jacqueline Pascal. She was born about 1645. When about eight years old she was afflicted with fistula lachrymalis in the left eye, and the disease was of so virulent a character that when she had attained the age of eleven years the bones of the nose and palate had become carious. Medical treatment proved unavailing; and as the child grew worse it was decided, as a last resource, to apply the cautenry, though with little hope of success. She was at this time a pupil in the convent of Port-Royal at Paris. The sisterhood just then received from a priest named La Poterie a reliquary containing what claimed to be a portion of the crown of thorns which pierced the head of the Redeemer. This was carried in procession to the altar of the convent chapel on March 24, 1656, being Friday of the third week in Lent. The nuns, in turn, kissed the sacred relic; and when the pensionnaires approached for the same purpose, their governess, sister Flavia, desired Mademoiselle Perier to commend herself to God, and apply the reliquary to the diseased eye. She did so, and is claimed to have been conscious of a complete and instantaneous cure. The occurrence was mentioned in the convent next day, but was not generally known till a week afterwards, When the surgeon, M. Dalence, called to see his patient, such

was the change in her appearance that it was only after a most minute and careful examination that he was convinced of her identity and of the reality of the cure, which he declared unaccountable on any other than supernatural grounds. The news spreading through the city, the queen dispatched her own surgeon to Port-Royal to verify the facts. He and other medical witnesses attested the genuineness of the cure, and pronounced it beyond the operation of natural causes. Their testimony was confirmed by the ecclesiastical authorities; and the grand vicars published a formal recognition of the truth of the miracle. Solemn thanksgivings were offered in the church at Port-Royal, and the holy thorn was presented to the convent, where it was exposed every Friday for the veneration of the faithful. 'This miracle was considered important from the bearing which it had on the Jansenistic controversy then agitating the Romish Church, being thought to be a special indication of God's favor to and his direct interference in behalf of the persecuted Jansenists (q.v.). Demoiselle Marguerite Perier died in 1733. Of course Protestants refuse to give credence to the cure as of miraculous order, and would account for it on psychological principles as the best interpretation of the case. *SEE MIRACLES, ECCLESIASTICAL*.

Perignon, Pierre

a French Benedictine, was born about 1640 at Sainte-Menehould. He belonged to the congregation of Sainte-Vannes. In his capacity of procurator of the abbey of Hautvilliers, he was charged with the care of the vineyards. Gifted with an extreme delicacy of taste, he could distinguish, without ever mistaking, between the grapes coming from the different growths of Champagne. He rendered a great service to this province by showing how. to combine the different kinds to give to its wine that delicacy and strength which have since gained it such a great reputation. But, far. from keeping for himself or for his convent the secret of its manufacture, he was eager to divulge it in his *Memoires sur la maniere de choisir les plantes de viqgne convenables au sol, sur la faupon de les provigner, de les tailler, de melansger les raisins, d'en fiire la cueillette et de gouverner les vins.* The author was a learned man and of austere manners. He died Sept. 14, 1715, at Hautvilliers, near Epernay. See *Histoire de la Congreg. de Sainte Vatnnes.*

Period

a term used in chronology in the same sense as *Cycle* (q.v.), to denote an interval of time after which the astronomical phenomena to which it refers recur in the same order. It is also employed to signify a cycle of cycles. Various periods have been invented by astronomers, but we can only notice a few of the most important. *SEE EPOCH*.

1. The Chaldaeans invented the *Chaldaic Period*, or *Period of Eclipses*, from observing that, after a certain number of revolutions of the moon around the earth, her eclipses recurred in the same order and of the same magnitude. This period consists of 223 lunations, or 6798.28 days, and corresponds almost exactly to a complete revolution of the moon's node.

2. The Egyptians made use of the *Dog-star, Syriacal*, or *Sothic Period*, as it is variously called, to compare their civil year of 365 days with the true or Julian year of 365.25 days. The period consequently consisted of 1460 Julian years, corresponding to 1461 Egyptian years, after the lapse of which the dates in both reckonings coincided. By comparing the solar and lunar years, Meton, an Athenian, invented (B.C. 432) a lunar period of 6940 days, called from him the *Metonic Cycle*, also the *Lunar Cycle*. About a century afterwards the cycle of Meton was discovered to be an insufficient approximation to the truth, and as he had made the solar year too long by about death of a day. at the end of 4 Metonic cycles the solar reckoning was in advance of the lunar by about 1 day 6 hours. To remedy this, a new period, called the *Calippic Period*, was invented by Calippus, and consisted of 4 Metonic cycles less by 1 day, or 27,759 days. But as this period still gave a difference of 6 hours between the solar and lunar reckonings, it was improved by Hipparchus, who invented the *Hipparchic Period* of 4 Calippic periods less by 1 day, or 111,035 days, or about 304 Julian years, which is an exceedingly close approximation, being only 61 minutes too long, when measured by the tropical year; and too short by an almost inappreciable quantity, when measured by the *Synodic Month.*

3. The *period of the Heliacal* or *Solar Cycle*, after which the same day of the month falls upon the same day of the week, consists of 28 Julian years. If the year had regularly consisted of 365 days, that is, one day more than an exact number of weeks, it is evident that at the end of seven years the days of the month and week would again correspond; but the introduction of an intercalary day into every fourth year causes this coincidence to recur

at irregular periods of 6, 11, 6, and 5 years successively. However, by choosing a period such as will preserve the leap-years in the same relative position to the other years, and at the same time consist of an exact number of weeks (both of which objects are effected by using the number 28, which is the least common multiple of 4 and 7), we insure the *regular* recurrence of the coincidence between the days of the week and of the month. The solar cycle is supposed to have been invented about the time of the Council of Nice (A.D. 325), but it is arranged so that the first year of the first cycle corresponds to B.C. 9. In calculating the position of any year in the solar cycle, care must be taken to allow for the omission of the intercalary day at the beginning of each century, and its insertion in the first year of every fourth century.

4. The *Julian Period* is a cycle of cycles, and consists of 7980 (= 28 x 19 x 15) years, after the lapse of which the solar cycle, lunar cycle, and the Indiction (q.v.) commence together. The period of its commencement has been arranged so that it will expire at the same time as the other three periods from which it has been derived. The year 4713 B.C. is taken as the first year of the first period, consequently A.D. 1 was the 4714th.

Periodentae

a name given to itinerating or visiting presbyters decreed by the Council of Laodicea, A.D. 360, to supersede the *Chorepiscopi* (q.v.) in the country villages.

Perion, Joachim

a learned Frenchman, was born about 1499 at Cormery (Touraine). In 1517 he took the religious habit of the Benedictines in the abbey of Cormery; came to Paris in 1527, and was there received as doctor of theology in 1542. He sometimes gave himself the *honorary* title of interpreter to the king. He possessed the talents for it, if he did not do the work; for he made the study of ancient languages the occupation of his whole life. He professed a superstitious admiration for Cicero, and he regarded Aristotle as the oracle of the school; he also delivered against Ramus, who did not share in his fondness, three harangues full of invectives. Perion died at Cormery in 1559; or, according to Dom Liron, in 1561. We have of his works, *De fabularum, ludorum, theatrorum antiqua consuetudine* (Paris, 1540, 4*to*): — *Topicorum theologicorum lib. ii* (ibid. 1549, 8vo); he supports the Catholic doctrine by well-chosen extracts from

Scripture and from the fathers: — *De vitis et rebus yestis apostolorum* (ibid. 1551, 16mo), translated into French in 1552: — *De vita rebusque gestis J. C., Maricn Virgin's, et Johannis Basptistoe* (ibid. 1553, 16mo): — *De oigine linguae Gallicae et ejus cum Graecat cognatione dialogorum lib. iv* (ibid. 1555, 8vo); this treatise, divided into four parts, falls below criticism, but is not so bad as La Monnoye pretends, and contains some curious particulars: — *De sanctorum virorum qui patriarchce ab ecclesia appellantur rebus gestis ac vitis* (ibid. 1555, 4to), translated into French: — *De magistraibus Romanonrum ac Graecorum* (ibid. 1560, 4to), and in the *Antiq. Gr.* of Gronovius. The numerous Latin versions of Domn Perion are more elegant than faithful, and derive their principal merit from the time in which they appeared. We cite only those from Aristotle (1540-59, 7 vols.); from the *Traite des Heresies* of John of Damascus (1548, fol.); from the (*Euvres* of Saint Justin (1554, fol.), and from Saint Denis the Areopagite (1556, fol.), etc. See Scevole de Sainte-Marthe, *Elogia*, lib. i; Teissier, *Eloges;* Hilarion de Coste, *Vie de Francois Le Picard*, p. 335; La Monnoye, *Notes sur "la Biblioth. de La Croix du Mainze;" Essais de Litterature*, Nov. 1702; Niceron, — *Memoires*, vol. 36.

Peripatetic Philosophy

SEE PERIPATETICS.

Peripatetics

was the name of a sect of philosophers at Athens who were the disciples of Aristotle. It is doubtful whether they received this name from the place where they were taught, called *Peripaton,* in the Lyceum, or because they received the philosopher's lectures as they *walked* (περιπατοῦντες). The Peripatetics acknowledged the dignity of human nature, and placed their *summum bonum* not in the pleasures of passive sensation, but in the due exercise of the moral and intellectual faculties. The habit of this exercise, when guided by reason, constituted the highest excellence of man. The philosopher contended that our own happiness chiefly depends upon ourselves; and while he did not require in his followers that self-command to which others pretended, lie allowed a moderate degree of perturbation as becoming human nature; and he considered a certain sensibility of passion quite necessary, as by resentment we are enabled to repel injuries, and the smart which past calamities have inflicted renders us careful to

avoid the repetition. See Philo Judaeus, *Opera*, 4:423 sq.; Lewes, *Hist. of Philos.* vol. ii; Ueberweg, *Hist. of Philos.* 1:180 sq.; Grote, *Life of Aristotle*. *SEE ARISTOTLE*.

Perirrhanteria

(περιῤῥαντήρια), fonts placed at the entrance of the ancient heathen temples, that those who entered the sanctuary to pray or to offer sacrifice might first purify themselves.

Perisin (Persinus) Or Perrisim, Jacques

a French engraver, was born, according to Nagler, in 1530. In concert with Jean Tortorel, he designed and engraved, partly on wood and partly on copper, a set of twenty-four large prints to illustrate a History of the Wars of the Huguenots, 1559 to 1570. This book is exceedingly rare. The copper plates are etched in a coarse and incorrect style; the wooden cuts are executed with more attention. When Perisin and Tortorel engraved in concert, they marked their prints with the second monogram. When Perisin engraved alone, he used the first monogram. Malpe attributes to the latter a series of Tritons and marine monsters, small pieces lengthways, marked with his monogram reversed.

Peristerion

(περιστερή, a dove), the place over the altar where hung the silver dove, the emblem of the Holy Ghost. *SEE DOVE*.

Peristia

a name for the victims sacrificed in a lustration among the ancient heathens.

Peristiarch

the officiating priest in a lustration or purification among the ancient Greeks, when they wished to purify the place where a public assembly was held. He received this name because he went before the lustral victims as they were carried around the boundary of the place. *SEE LUSTRATION*.

Peristyle

(περίστυλον) is the name applied to a court, square, or cloister, in Greek and Roman buildings, with a colonnade around it; also the colonnade itself

surrounding such a space. In mediaeval Latin it is called the *Quadraporticus*, and was the usual arrangement in Italy in front of the churches as well as in front of houses. The nearest approach to it in England is the *Cloister* (q.v.).

Peritzol

SEE FARISSOL.

Perizonius

(the Latinized form of *Voolrbrook*), JAMES, a learned Dutch scholar, was born at Dam, in Holland, in 1651. He studied at Deventer, and afterwards at Utrecht, under the learned Graevius, and was successively made master of the Latin school at Delft, and professor of eloquence and history at Franeker. In 1693 he was appointed professor of eloquence, history, and Greek at Leyden, where he died in 1715. He was a man of extensive erudition, great application, and sound judgment. He edited several of the classics, and greatly enriched the classical lore of his age. He also published *Origines Babylonicae et Egypticae* (Leyden, 1711, 2 vols. 8vo), a work in which he treats of the Egyptian chronology and antiquities. Of course ore recent researches have wholly superseded his writings in this line, but his industry should not be ignored. Other works of his worthy of notice here are the treatise *De mnoate Judae et verbo* ἀπάγχεσθαι, etc. (1702): — *De origine, significatione, et usu vocum Prcetoris et Prcetorii, veroque sensu loci ad* ⁵⁰¹¹³*Philippians* 1:13 (1687). See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Per'izzite

(Heb. *Perizzi'*, yZæpe] always in the sing. and with the article; Sept. Φερεζαῖος, in Ezra Φερεσθεί), a Canaanitish tribe, already known in the time of Abraham, inhabiting a mountainous region (⁰¹³⁰⁷Genesis 13:7; comp. 15:20), which they eventually yielded to Ephraim and Judah (⁰⁶¹⁰³Joshua 11:3; 17:15; ⁰⁷⁰⁰⁴Judges 1:4, 5). They were kindred to the Canaanites strictly so called (⁰²²²³Exodus 23:23; ⁰⁷⁰⁰⁴Judges 1:45): sometimes Canaanites and Perizzites are put for all the other tribes of Canaan (⁰¹³⁰⁷Genesis 13:7; 34:30); while in other places the Perizzites are enumerated with various other tribes of the same stock (⁰¹⁵²⁰Genesis 15:20; ⁰²³⁰⁸Exodus 3:8, 17; ⁰⁵⁷⁰⁷Deuteronomy 7:1, etc.). They are not named in the catalogue of Genesis 10; so that their origin, like that of other small tribes,

such as the Avites, and the similarly named Gerizzites, is left in obscurity. They are continually mentioned in the formula so frequently occurring to express the Promised Land (<011520>Genesis 15:20; <020308>Exodus 3:8, 17; 23:23; 33:2; 34:11; <050701>Deuteronomy 7:1; 20:17; <060310>Joshua 3:10; 9:1; 24:11; <070305>Judges 3:5; <150901>Ezra 9:1; <160908>Nehemiah 9:8). They appear, however, with somewhat greater distinctness on several occasions. On Abram's first entrance into the land it is said to have been occupied by "the Canaanite and the Perizzite" (<011307>Genesis 13:7). As the separation of Abram and Lot, there recorded, took place at Bethel, we may infer that the Perizzites were then in that vicinity. Jacob also, after the massacre of the Shechemites, uses the same expression, complaining that his sons had "made him to stink among the inhabitants of the land, among the Canaanite and the Perizzite" (<013430>Genesis 34:30). This seems to locate the Perizzites near Shechem. So also in the detailed records of the conquest given in the opening of the book of Judges (evidently from a distinct source from those in Joshua), Judah and Simeon are said to have found their territory occupied by "the Canaanite and the Perizzite" (<070104>Judges 1:4, 5), with Bezek (a place not yet discovered, but apparently not far from Jerusalem, and hence probably on the south-western boundary of Ephraim) as their stronghold, and Adoni-bezek their most noted chief. Thus too a late tradition, preserved in 2 Esdras 1:21, mentions only "the Canaanites, the Pheresites,-and the Philistines," as the original ten ants of the country. The notice just cited from the. book of Judges locates them in the southern part of the Holy Land. Another independent and equally remarkable fragment of the history of the conquest seems to speak of them as occupying, with the Rephaim, or giants, the "forest country" on the western flanks of Mount Carmel (<061715>Joshua 17:15-18). Here again the Canaanites only are named with them. As a tribe of mountaineers, they are enumerated in company with the Amorites, Hittites, and Jebusites in <061103>Joshua 11:3; 12:8; and they are catalogued among the remnants of the old population whom Solomon reduced to bondage, both in <110920>1 Kings 9:20 and <140807>2 Chronicles 8:7. Not only had they not been exterminated, but they even intermarried with the Israelites (<070305>Judges 3:5, 6; <150901>Ezra 9:1). By Josephus the Perizzites do not appear to be mentioned.

The signification of the name is not by any means clear. It possibly meant *rustics,* dwellers in open, unwalled villages, which are denoted by a similar word (twzrP] <263811>Ezekiel 38:11; <170919>Esther 9:19). So also *Copher hap-perazi,* A.V. "country villages" (<090618>1 Samuel 6:18); *Arey hap-perazi,*

"unwalled towns" (Deuteronomy 3:5). In both these passages the Sept. understands the Perizzites to be alluded to, and translates accordingly. In Joshua 16:10 it adds the Perizzites to the Canaanites as inhabitants of Gezer. Ewald (*Geschichte,* 1:317) inclines to believe that they were the same people with the Hittites. But against this there is the fact that both they and the Hittites appear in the same lists; and that not only in mere general formulas, but in the records of the conquest, as above. Redslob has examined the whole of these names with some care (in his *Attestam. Namen den Israeliten-Staaten,* Hamb. 1846), and his conclusion (p. 103) is that, while the *Chavvofh* were villages of tribes engaged in the care of cattle, the *Perazoth* were inhabited by peasants engaged in agriculture, like the *Fellahs* of the Arabs. This view, however, although acquiesced in by Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 1120; Hengstenberg, *Beitrdge,* p. 186; Keil, on *Joshua* 3:10; and Kalisch, on *Genesis13,* appears to be opposed to the Biblical narrative, which everywhere classes them as a distinct branch of the Canaanites (see Reland, *Palaest.* p. 139; Kurtz, in Rudelloch's *Zeitschr.* 1845, 3:53; *Jour. Sac. Lit.* Oct. 1853, p. 166). *SEE CANAANITE*.

Perjury

is the willful taking of an oath in order to tell or to confirm anything known to be false. This is evidently a very heinous crime, as it is treating the Almighty with irreverence; denying, or at least disregarding his omniscience; profaning his name, and violating truth. By the Mosaic law, perjury was strictly prohibited as a most heinous sin against God; to whom the punishment of it is left, and who in Exodus 20:7 expressly promises that he will inflict it, without ordaining the infliction of any punishment by the temporal magistrate; except only in the case of a man falsely charging another with a crime, in which case the false witness was liable to the same punishment which would have been inflicted on the accused party if he had been found guilty; but this not, indeed, as the punishment of perjury against God, but of false testimony. Perjury, therefore (rq;v,t [bv;, "false swearing"), was prohibited by the Hebrews in a religious point of view (Exodus 20:7; Leviticus 19:12; comp. Matthew 7:33; Zechariah 8:17), but in the law only two sorts of perjury are noticed: 1, false testimony in judicial proceedings; 2, a false assurance, confirmed by an oath, that one has not received or found a piece of property in question (Leviticus 5:1; 6:2 sq.; Proverbs 29:24). A sin-offering is provided

for both (comp. Plaut. *Rud.* 5:3, 21), and in the latter case satisfaction for the injury, with increase (comp. Hebenstreit, *De sacrifcio a perjuro ojnendo,* Lips. 1739). Among the ancient Romans, also, the punishment of perjury was left with the gods (Cic. *Leg.* 2:9), and no official public notice was taken of the perjured man, save by the censor (Genesis 7:18; comp. Cic. *Off.* 3:31; Rein, *Rom. Criminalrecht,* p. 795 sq.). On the contrary, the Talmud not only notices the subject at greater length, but ordains more severe penalties for perjury: scourging and full reparation when any serious injury has been done (Mishna, *Maccoth,* 2:3 sq.; *Shebuoth,* 8:3). It also determines in special cases the value of the sin-offering to be presented (*Shebuoth,* 4:2; v. 1; comp. further Zenge and Stemler, *De jurejur. sec. discipl. Hebr.* p. 57 sq.). *SEE OATH*.

Perjury

in Christian law is. the crime committed by one who, when affirming anything by oath, makes statements which he knows to be false. This is, from the Biblical standpoint, a double crime, including both falsehood and profanity; and in a social point of view it is one of the gravest offenses against human law. It has always been esteemed a very detestable thing, and those who have been proved guilty of it have been looked upon as the pests of society. In order to make the giving of the false evidence liable to punishment under the civil law, it must have been not only false to the knowledge of the witness but the matter must have been material to the issue raised. If the falsehood occurred as to some trifling or immaterial fact, no crime is committed. Moreover, it is necessary, in proving the crime, that at least two persons should be able to testify to the falsehood of the matter, so that there might be a majority of oaths on the matter — there being then two oaths to one. But this rule is satisfied though both witnesses do not testify to one point. The perjury must also have taken place before some court or tribunal which had power to administer the oath. *SEE OATH*. Though in some courts affirmations are allowed instead of oaths, yet the punishment for false affirmation is made precisely the same as for false swearing. The punishment for perjury was, before the Conquest, sometimes death or cutting out the tongue; but latterly it was confined to fine and imprisonment, and at present the latter is the only punishment, with the addition of hard labor. The crime of subornation of perjury, i.e. the persuading or procuring a person to give false evidence, is also punishable as a distinct offense.

Perkins, Justin

D.D., a celebrated American missionary, labored among the Nestorians of Persia, and has not unaptly been called the "Apostle of Persia." He was born at West Springfield, Mass., March 12, 1805. He passed his youth on 'his father's farm, and when ready for higher studies went to Amherst College, where he graduated in 1829. He studied theology at Andover, and after graduation there became a tutor at Amherst. In the year 1827 that erratic adventurer, Dr. Joseph Wolf, made a flying visit to the Nestorians while traveling in Persia. His mention of them met the eye of Dr. Anderson, secretary of the American Board, and he conceived the idea of sending a mission to that extraordinary people. Justin Perkins and wife were selected as the proper persons for this field, and they set out from Boston Sept. 21, 1833. Reaching Constantinople Dec. 21, without the knowledge of a word of the language, they were welcomed by Messrs. Goodell, Dwight. and Schauffler, but recently established there. In the spring of the following year, Perkins and his wife proceeded towards their final destination. They reached the city of Tabruz Aug. 23, 1834. There Mrs. Perkins stopped, while Mr. Perkins went on farther to Urumiah, where the mission was at once established, with the assistance of Mrs. Perkins, and Dr. and Mrs. Grant, who joined them in the fall of 1835. Then followed the great labors of his life; schools for boys and schools for girls were established which have grown into noble seminaries of learning. Besides those that may be called higher seminaries, some seventy primary schools have been established, 3000 Scripture readers have, been educated in them, and an army trained up to preach the Gospel to their countrymen. Perkins's greatest work, however, was his translation of the Scriptures into the Nestorian dialect of the Syrian. In 1841 the doctor came home to visit his friends, and to stir up an interest in this missionary enterprise. He was accompanied by Mar Yohannan, the Nestorian bishop, and the two awakened a thrilling enthusiasm wherever they went. Dr. Perkins took back with him the sainted Stoddard (q.v.), and other missionaries, and from that time faithfully and most successfully prosecuted his work, until the fall of 1869, when he came home exhausted, and on the last day of the year he yielded up his spirit into the hands of his Lord, who doubtless said to him, "Well done, good and faithful servant." Dr. Perkins published in this country, *Residence of Eight Years in Persia* (Andover, 1843, 8vo), reviewed in *Christian Examiner,* 34:100; *Christian Review,* 8:138: — *Missionary Life in Persia* (Boston, 1861). He was also a contributor to the

Bibliotheca Sacra, and to the *Journal* of the "American Oriental Society." See Anderson, *Oriental Missions; The Observer,* N. Y. Jan. 13, 1870; Drake, *Dict. Amer. Biog. s.v.*

Perkins, Nathan

(1), D.D., a Congregational minister, was born May 12, 1748, in Lisbon, Conn. He graduated at the College of New Jersey in 1770, and was ordained pastor at West Hartford Oct. 14, 1772, where he labored until his death, Jan. 18, 1838. He published *Four Letters, showing the History and Origin of the Anabaptists* (1793): — *Tweny-four Discourses on some of the Important and Interesting Truths, Duties, and Institutions of the Gospel, and the generatl Excellency of the Christian Religion; calcrlnated for the People of God of every Communion, particularly for the Benefit of Pious Families, and the Instruction of all in the Things which concern their Salvation* (1795, 8vo); and several occasional sermons. See Sprague, *Annals,* 2:1.

Perkins, Nathan

(2), son of the preceding, was born in 1772, and was educated at Yale College, where he graduated in 1795. He was then minister of the Second Congregational Church, Amherst, from 1810 to his death, March, 1842.

Perkins, Thomas

a minister of the Free-will Baptist denomination, was born in Haverhill, Mass., Feb. 22, 1783. His family removed to New Hampton, N. H., when he was thirteen years of age, and there he ever afterwards lived. At seventeen he was converted, and united with the first Free-will Baptist Church in New Hampton, then but recently organized. By the advice both of lay brethren and the ministry, he held public meetings in 1808, and, after repeated urgings, consented to receive license. He was set apart to the work of the ministry, by the imposition of hands, in February, 1816, and immediately devoted himself to preaching the Word, and building up the churches of his denomination, which was then new; and the Macedonian cry, which he so often heard at that day, incited him to the utmost activity and faithfulness in the cause of the Master. He preached, baptized, attended funerals, and performed other pastoral duties in some twenty towns in the vicinity of New Hampton. His own words are, "I have preached nearly every Sabbath for more than fifty years, and have traveled

thousands of miles on business to which I had been appointed by the quarterly and yearly meetings; yet I never had a salary, neither have I received half-day wages, besides the use of my horse and carriage. And yet the Lord has blessed me abundantly, both temporally and spiritually, so that I do not regret any sacrifice I have made for the cause." Though he depended largely upon his own resources for the support of himself and family, he was ever ready to help the various causes of benevolence. He attended nearly all the quarterly and annual sessions of the Free-will Baptists in New Hampshire for sixty-five years. He was six times chosen a member of the American Free-will Baptist General Conference, and for twelve years was one of the corporators of the Printing Establishment. Nor did he serve the Church alone. He always had more or less probate business on his hands, defending the rights of the widow and orphan. He also represented his town in the legislature of his state eleven consecutive years. Honest in business, far-seeing in judgment, kind and judicious in counsel, he was consulted with confidence, and his opinion was received as just and safe. It is difficult to describe his sermons, for their completeness allowed of no peculiar characteristics. They were studied, but not written — logical, compact, and vigorous. He may have been called a doctrinal preacher, though he gave no undue prominence to any dogma, and was practical as well. When he rose to speak, his portly form, large head, and open countenance were imposing, and the hearer felt himself in the presence of a *man* before a word was spoken. If such was his life, what need be said of his death? It was what might have been expected-peaceful, resigned, trustfully waiting the will of the Lord. January 18, 1876, the summons came, and the venerable man, the faithful servant of God, was taken to his rest. See *Free-will Baptist Quar.* v. 120 sq. (W. H. W.)

Perkins, Col. Thomas Handasyd

an American merchant, noted for his philanthropic labors, was born in Boston Dec. 15, 1764. He began his commercial life in partnership with his elder brother James, who was a resident of St. Domingo when the insurrection of the blacks occurred, and was compelled to flee for his life. In 1789 he went as supercargo to Batavia and Canton, and obtained a thorough acquaintance with the Oriental trade. The brothers afterwards embarked in the trade to the north-west coast, Canton, and Calcutta, in which they acquired great wealth. Soon after the death of James, in 1822, Colossians Perkins retired from active business. The Perkins family gave over $60,000 to the Boston Athenaeum. He took a prominent part in the

erection of the Bunker-hill Monument, and gave his estate in Pearl Street, valued at $40,000, for the use of the Asylum for the Blind. He was also in 1827 the projector of the Quincy Railway, the first in the United States. Subsequently he was much interested in urging forward the completion of the Washington Monument; and was also the largest contributor to the Mercantile Library Association. For many years he represented Boston in both branches of the state legislature. See Drake, *Dict. of* Amer. *Biog.* s.v. Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* s.v.

Perkins, William

(1), an eminent divine of the Church of England, noted as one of the best exponents of Calvinism, was born at Warton, in Warwickshire England, in 1558. He was educated in Christ College, Cambridge. In his early life he gave proofs of great genius and philosophic research, but in his habits was exceedingly wild and profligate. After his conversion he was distinguished for his tender sympathy and skill in opening the human heart, so that he became the instrument of salvation to many. At the age of twenty-four he was chosen fellow of Christ College, and obtained high reputation as a tutor. He finally entered into holy orders, and began his ministry by preaching to the prisoners in Cambtridge Jail, where in all his efforts he displayed a mind admirably adapted to his station. So far was he from considering his field of effort circumscribed that he improved every opportunity to do good. On one occasion, perceiving a young man who was about to ascend the ladder to be executed exceedingly distressed, he endeavored to console him, but to no effect. He then said, “Man, what is the matter with thee? art thou afraid of death?” “Ah! no,” said the malefactor; “but of a worse thing.” “Then come down,” said Mr. Perkins, “and thou shalt see what the grace of God can do to strengthen thee.” Mr. Perkins then took him by the hand, and, kneeling down with him at the foot of the ladder, so fervently acknowledged sin, its aggravations, and its terrible desert, that the poor culprit burst into tears of contrition. He then proceeded to set forth the Lord Jesus Christ as the Savior of every believing penitent, which he was enabled to do with such success that the poor creature continued indeed to shed tears; but they were now tears of love, gratitude, and joy, flowing from a persuasion that his sins were canceled by the Savior’s blood. He afterwards ascended the ladder with composure, while the spectators lifted up their hands and praised God for such a glorious display of his sovereign grace. About 1585 Perkins was chosen rector of St. Andrew’s parish, in Cambridge, and in this position he

remained until his death in 1602. As a preacher Perkins was very greatly admired. While his discourses were suited to the capacity of the common people, the pious scholar could not but appreciate them. They were said to be “all law and all gospel,” so well did he unite the characters of a Boanerges and a Barnabas. He was an able casuist, and was resorted to by afflicted consciences far and near. Bishop Hall says of Perkins that “he excelled in distinct judgment, a rare dexterity in clearing the obscure subtleties of the schools, and an easy explication of perplexed subjects.” “The science of morals, according to Mosheim, or rather of casuistry, which Calvin had left in a rude and imperfect state, is confessed to have been first reduced into some kind of form, and explained with some accuracy and precision, by Perkins” (Hallam, *Lit. Hist. of Europe,* 1:161; see also 2:508). He was the author of *Expositions of the Creed;* of the *Lord’s Prayer;* of chap. 1-5, (completed by Rodolfe Cudworthe) of the *Epistle to the Galatians;* of *St. Matthew 5-7;* of *Romans1-3*: — *Commentary on Hebrews and Cases of Conscience;* and many doctrinal. practical, and controversial treatises. Several of his works were translated into Latin, French, Dutch, and Spanish; and their popularity at home is evinced by the number of collective editions of them, each in 3 vols. fol., issued shortly after his death, between 1605 and 1635. We notice, *Works newly corrected according to his own Copies* (Lond. 3 vols. fol.: 1:1616; 2:1617; 3:1618). The last dates which we find are 1626, 1631, and 1635. *Opera,* Latin (Geneva, 1611). It is not a little remarkable that, in this day of the exhumation of so much buried theology, Perkins’s works have not been republished. Yet few writers have been more commended. “The works of Perkins,” says Orme, “are distinguished for their piety, learning, extensive knowledge of the Scriptures, and strong Calvinistic argumentation... . They were highly esteemed by Job Orton, though he was far from being a thorough Calvinist himself” (*Bibl. Bib.* s.v.). Orton says of him: “Perkins’s works are judicious, clear, full of matter and a deep Christian experience. I could wish ministers, especially young ones, would read him, as they would find large materials for composition.” “For his time,” says Dr. E. Williams, “his style is remarkably pure and neat: he had a clear head, and excelled in defining and analyzing subjects. His method is highly Calvinistic; but he carried the idea of reprobation too far... His commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians is equally sound as Luther’s, but more methodical and comprehensive.” “His works,” says Bickersteth, “have been too much undervalued; they are learned, spiritual, Calvinistic,

and practical; . . . holy and evangelical" (*Christian Student*, ed. 1844, p. 414, 444).

Perkins, William

(2), a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Goochland County, Va., Aug. 2, 1800, and, in his own words, was "born again" Aug. 30, 1825. He was licensed to preach in 1828, serving the Church in a local relation with great acceptability for twenty-five years. He was ordained deacon, March 3, 1833, at Petersburg, Va., by bishop Hedding; ordained elder, Oct. 6, 1839, at Fayette, Mo., by bishop Morris. At the session of 1853 he entered the itinerancy as a member of the Missouri Conference, and continued in this connection until he ceased at once to work and live, Jan. 31, 1871. He filled various appointments on districts, stations, and circuits until the fall of 1870, when he was superannuated. "Brother Perkins, as a preacher, was too well known to require panegyric. He was able and faithful — a man of culture and extensive research, which, however, he never obtruded in his pulpit ministrations. There he was the simple, earnest 'messenger of God,' whose trumpet gave no uncertain sound. He was a gifted and useful minister of the New Testament, delighting and glorying in the cross of Christ. All the time during his last illness he was in a very happy frame of mind, exhorting all his friends to increased faithfulness in the service of God" (*Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the M. E. Church, South,* 1871, p. 606, 607).

Perl, Joseph

a Jewish savant, was born about 1773. He holds a prominent position in Jewish history and literature as propagator of the modern school system among the Jews in Austro-Galicia. He gave time and money for the foundation of a higher school for the Jews at Tarnopol, which afterwards became famous, and of which he was the president until his death, Oct. 1, 1839. He not only aimed at a correction of the educational and school system, but also fought against the Chasidaic obscurantism, which tried to suppress every new movement that aimed at the amelioration of the condition of the Jews. For this purpose he wrote, ˆyrymf hlgm, 151 epistles written after the fashion of the *Epistolae obscurorum virorum* (Vienna, 1819): — µyqsbx yrbd, against the Chasidimn and their rabbins (ibid. 1830): — qydx ˆjwb, a kind of criticism of his *Epistolae*, also against the Chasidim (ibid. 1838). See Ftirst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3:78; Gratz,

Geschichte der Juden, 11:487 sq.; Jost, *Geschichte des Judenthums und seiner Sekten,* 3:185, 343; Mannheimer, *Leichenrede* (Vienna, 1840); Rappaport, in *Kerem Chemed,* 4:45-57; 5:163 sq.; Busch, *Jahrbuch,* 1846, 1847; Zunz, *Monatstage* (Engl. transi. by Rev. B. Pick, in *Jewish Messenger,* New York, 1874). (B. P.)

Perla, Francesco

a painter of Mantua, supposed by Volta to have studied under Giulio Romano. There were two fine frescos in the dome of the chapel of S. Lorenzo in that city attributed to him. Little besides is known of this artist. He flourished about the middle of the 16th century.

Permaneder, Michael, D.D.,

a Roman Catholic divine, was born at Munich in the year 1794. In 1818 he was ordained to holy orders. In the following year he was appointed teacher at the pro-gymnasium; in 1822, professor at the gymnasium. In 1834 he was appointed to fill the chair of canon law and Church history at the lyceum in Freising, which position he held until the year 1847, when he was called to Munich for the same work. He suddenly died at Regensburg, Oct. 10, 1862. Of his writings we mention, *Handbuch des gemeingiiltigen katholischen Kirchenrechts* (3d ed. Landshut, 1856; 4th ed. 1865): — *Bibliotheca patristica,* 2 vols.; vol. 1 contains a *Patrologia generalis,* and the second, which is unfinished, the beginning of a *Patrologia specialis.* See *Literarischer Handweiser fur daq katholische Deutschland,* 1862, p. 235, 282; 1865, p. 77. (B. P.)

Pernoctalians

(*watching all night*) is a term that represents what was long a custom with the more pious Christians, especially before the greater festivals. *SEE VIGIL*.

Perola, Juan And Francisco,

two brothers, Spanish painters, sculptors, and architects, were natives of Almagro, and flourished about 1600. They visited Italy, studied under Michael Angelo, and finished their artistic education in Spain under Gasparo Becerra. After leaving that master they gained considerable distinction, and were commissioned by the marquis de Santa Cluz to erect his palace at Vico. Of their works in sculpture, the *Biographie Universelle*

mentions the busts decorating the above-mentioned palace, and the mausoleum of the marquis of Santa Cruz in the church of the Franciscans at Vico. They also painted the grand altar-piece in the same church, and, in concert with Mohedano, they painted several frescos in the sanctuary of Cordova and the convent of Seville.

There was an architect named ESTEBAN PEROLA, a native of Almagro, and contemporary with the preceding. He designed and probably erected the convent of S. Francisco at Seville, commenced in 1623.

Peroni, Giuseppe,

an Italian painter, born at Parma about 1700. According to the Abate Affo, he first studied under Felice Torelli at Bologna; next with Donati Creti; and afterwards went to Rome, where he became the pupil of Agostino Masucci. According to Lanzi, he designed much in the style of Carlo Maratti, but his coloring partakes largely of the verds and other false coloring of Conca and Giaquinto, who were then very popular at Rome. Such are his pictures of *St. Philip,* in the church of S. Satiro at Milan, and the *Conception,* in the possession of the Padri dell' Oratorio at Turin. Lanzi says, also, that his best works are his frescos in the church of S. Antonio Abate at Parma, which rank him among the good painters of his age. There he also painted an altar-piece of the *Crucifixion,* in competition with Pompeo Battoni. He executed several other works for the churches of his native city; adorned its academy, and wrought much for the collections. He died at Parma in 1776, at an advanced age. Lanzi calls him the Abate Giuseppe Peroni, a title probably conferring some favor upon him.

Perotti, Nicolas,

an Italian prelate and philologist, was born at Sassoferrato, in Umbria, in 1430. He became professor in the University of Bologna, where he was educated. His translation of the first five books of Polybius, the only ones then known, recommended him to the protection of pope Nicolas V. Shortly after he went to Rome, and was appointed apostolic vicar. In 1458 he obtained the archbishopric of Siponto or Manfredonia; but he continued to reside at Rome. The duties of governor of Umbria, to which he was appointed in 1465, and those of governor of Perugia in 1474, did not cause him to neglect literary labors. He died Dec. 13, 1480. Perotti was one of the contributors to the Renaissance. His principal works, very useful in the 15th century and now quite curious, are a Latin Grammar, *Rudimenta*

Grammatices (Rome, 1473, fol.), and a commentary upon Martial, which forms a kind of argumentative Lexicon of the Latin language, *Cornucopia, sive Commentaria linguae Latinae* (Venice, 1489, 1499, 1513, 1526, fol.). We have also a treatise from Perotti, *De Generibus Metrorum* (ibid. 1497, 4to), and an edition of the *Historia Nafturalis* of Pliny. The works of Perotti are counted among the most ancient monuments of printing. Some fables from Phedra were published after one of his manuscripts, and critics have even regarded him as the author of the whole collection which bears the name of this poet; but it is a hypothesis without probability, and favored by none of the mediocre Latin verses which remain of Perotti. See Paul Jove, *Elogia;* Niceron, *Memoires,* vol. 9; Bayle, *Dictionaire;* Tiraboschi, *Storia de la Letteratura Italiana,* 6:11, 408; Apostolo Zeno, *Dissertaz. Tossiane,* vol. i; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale,* 39, 623.

Peroxino, Giovanni

a Piedmontese painter who flourished about 1517. According to DellaValle, he was a good artist; and Lanzi says “he was well known for the pictures he left in the church of the Conventuals at Alba.”

Perpendicular

Picture for Perpendicular

STYLE, the name given to the style of Gothic architecture in England which succeeded the Decorated style. It prevailed from about the end of the 14th century to the middle of the 16th century, and was thus contemporary with the Flamboyant style in France. These styles have much in common, but they derive their names from the features peculiar to each. Thus the Flamboyant is distinguished by the flowing lines of its tracery; while the Perpendicular is remarkable for its stiff and rectilinear lines. The lines of the window-tracery are chiefly vertical, and the mullions are frequently crossed by horizontal bars. The moldings are usually thin and hard. The same feeling pervades the other features of the style; the buttresses, piers, towers, etc., are all drawn up and attenuated, and present in their shallow recesses and meager lines a great contrast to the deep shadows and bold moldings of the earlier styles. The art of masonry was well understood during the Perpendicular period, and the vaulting was admirably built. Fan-tracery vaulting is peculiar to this style, and is almost invariably covered with paneling, which was also much used, the walls being frequently almost entirely covered with it. The depressed or four-center arch is another of its

peculiar features. This arch, over doorways, has the moldings generally arranged in a square form over the arch, with spandrels containing shields, quatrefoils, etc. The arches are often two-centered, but as frequently four-centered; at the commencement of the style, of good elevation, but subsequently much flattened; in small openings ogee arches are very often used, and a few rare examples of elliptical arches are to be found. The *Roofs* of this style are often made ornamental, and have the whole of the framing exposed to view. Many of them are of very high pitch, and have a magnificent effect, the spaces between the timbers being filled with tracery, and the beams arched, molded, and ornamented in various ways; and sometimes pendants, figures of angels, and other carvings ale introduced. These roofs are among the peculiar and beautiful features of the architecture of England. The largest roof of this kind is that of Westminster Hall, erected in the reign of Richard II.

The Perpendicular style may be said to have been introduced about the middle of the 14th century in some parts of England, as at Gloucester and Windsor; but the Decorated and Perpendicular styles overlapped each other for a long period, some districts retaining the older style much longer than others. The following are some of the chief dated examples:

York Cathedral-Choir, 1372-1403.
Warwick, St. Mary's-Choir, 1370-1391.
Lynn, Norfolk-Chapel of St. Nicholas, 1371-1379.
Selby Abbey, Yorkshire, 1375.
Winchester Cathedral-West front, 1360-1366.
Canterbury Cathedral-Nave and western transepts, 1378-1411.
Oxford-New College, 1380-1386.
Howden, Yorkshire-Chapter-house and tower, 1389 1407.
Saltwood Castle, Kent-Gate-house, 1381-1396.
Gloucester Cathedral-Cloi.ters, 1381-1412.
Winchester College, 1387-1393.
Winchester Cathedral — Nave, 1394-1410.
Westminister Hall-Roof, 1397-1399.
Maidstone-College and Church, 1395.

In the 15th century the Perpendicular is the general style of England for churches, houses, castles, barns, cottages, and buildings of every kind. The universities of Oxford and Cambridge owe many of their colleges to this

period, and there we find vestiges of the style still lingering when in other places it had been lost.

Perpent-Stone

Picture for Perpent Stone

(Fr. *Perpeigne*), an architectural term, designates a large stone reaching through a wall so as to appear on both sides of it; the same as what is now usually called a *bonder*, bond-stone, or through, except that these are often used in rough-walling, while the term perpent-stone appears to have been applied to squared stones, or ashlar; bonders also do not always reach through a wail. The term is still used in some districts; in Gloucestershire, ashlar thick enough to reach entirely through a wall, and show a fair face on both sides, is called *Parping ashlar*. This name may perhaps also have been sometimes given to a corbel. The term *Perpent-wall* would signify a wall built of perpent ashlar. Also a pier, buttress, or other support projecting from a wall to sustain a beam, roof, etc. In Lincoln Cathedral the dwarf walls separating the chapels in the transepts are also called perpeyn-walls, although actually they do not sustain a roof.

Perpetua

ST., a Christian martyr who suffered at Carthage, under the persecution of Severus, at the beginning of the 3d century. She was a lady of high rank, and at the time when she was accused about twenty-two years of age. In her martyrdom she afforded an illustrious example of Christian fortitude. She was married, and had an infant son; she was the favorite child of a pagan father, who importuned her to turn from the Christian faith, and to whom her constancy appeared but absurd obstinacy; every entreaty, every threat was employed; she encountered the terrors of a crowded court, in which certain conviction awaited her; she was scourged and imprisoned; the tenderest feelings of filial and maternal love were appealed to; but in vain. “God’s will must be done,” was her language, and she remained immovable. Nor was she less firm in the final scene, when in a crowded amphitheater, together with Felicitas, she was thrown to a mad or wild cow. By this attack she was stunned; but the fatal stroke was left, in the spoliarium — a place where the wounded were dispatched — to an unskillful gladiator, whose trembling hand she herself, with a martyr’s courage, guided to her throat. Felicitas suffered with her. (One scene from her life represented in modern art is her farewell to her infant child. There

are, however, many incidents in her story which would be most interesting subjects for the artist, that as yet remain without representation. In her pictures a cow stands by her side or near her. She is commemorated in the Roman Catholic Church March 7. See Butler, *Lives of the Saints;* Hagenbach, *Kirchengesch. der ersten drei Johrhunderte,* ch. 12; Alzog, *Kirchengesch.* 1:139; Fox, *Book of Martyrs,* p. 23; Bohringer, *Kirchengesch.* 1:43; Ruinart, in the *Act. Martyr.* and the *Act. SS.* of the Bollandists; Schaff, *Church Hist.* vol. 1; Jortin, *Remarks,* 1:352.

Perpetual Curate

a title of the incumbent of a church, chapel, or district, which is within the boundaries of a rectory or vicarage.

Perpetual Cure

a form of ecclesiastical benefice which grew out of the abuse of lay impropriation (q.v.), the impropriator appointing a clergyman to discharge the spiritual functions of which he himself was not capable. The substituted clergyman, in ordinary cases, is appointed by the bishop, and called a vicar; the impropriator appoints the clergyman who is called a perpetual curate. The perpetual curate enters on his office without induction or institution, and requires only the bishop's license. Perpetual cures are also created by the erection and endowment of a chapel subject to the -principal church of a parish. Such cures, however, are not benefices unless endowed out of the fund called Queen Anne's Bounty. Churches so endowed are, by 2 and 3 Vict. c. 49, recognized as benefices. The district churches which have been erected under several recent acts are made perpetual cures, and their incumbents are corporations.

Perpetual Virginity Of Mary

the mother of Christ is a doctrine held by some branches of the Christian Church. As the being who was conceived in the womb of the blessed Virgin Mary was of divine origin, and as her virginity had been maintained for the purpose of that miraculous conception, it is thought to be unreasonable and irreverent to imagine that children conceived in sin were afterwards tenants of that sacred tabernacle. The Church fathers were the first to affirm that the mother of Jesus the Christ was not only a virgin at the time he was born but ever afterwards, and this belief was not called in question in the first ages. A denial of the virginity of the Blessed Virgin

Mary at the time of her conception had indeed been made by the Corinthians and Ebionites, who, in the 1st and 2d centuries, asserted that Jesus was the son of Joseph and Mary by natural generation; but no doubt of her perpetual virginity was expressed by any who believed that Christ was born of a virgin (<23 7 14>Isaiah 7:14; <42 1 27>Luke 1:27) until the 4th century. It was then, after Apollinaris had denied the Blessed Virgin to be the real mother of the Word Incarnate, that some were led on to the denial of her perpetual virginity. These were called Antidicomarians, and their heresy gave rise to another, that of the Collyridians, who made the Blessed Virgin the object of an idolatrous worship, consisting in the offering of little cakes (*collyrides*), which were afterwards eaten as sacrificial food. -Epiphanius. in his treatise against heresies, severely condemned these two extremes. He denounced those who denied Christ's mother to be ever virgin, as adversaries of Mary, who deprived her of "honor due;" while he insisted that, according to the essential principles of Christianity, worship was due to the Trinity alone. Jerome wrote a tract against Helvidius, who maintained the view of the Antidicomarians; and this tract contains the most of the arguments that have been brought by bishop Pearson and other divines in support of the perpetual virginity of the Blessed Virgin. Helvidius denied it on the ground of the words of the evangelist Matthew, that Joseph "knew her not till she had brought forth her first-born son" (<40 1 25>Matthew 1:25); as if it implied that he knew her afterwards, and that a first-born son inferred a second-born. Jerome answered the first objection by citing other instances in which no such inference can be drawn from similar language (<01 27 15>Genesis 27:15; <05 25 6>Deuteronomy 25:6; <09 15 5>1 Samuel 15:35; <10 6 23>2 Samuel 6:23; <40 28 20>Matthew 28:20). But none of these passages are in point, Bengel, who treats the matter as an open question, says, "ἕως οὗ, non sequitur ergo post." The word "first-born," on which the Antidicomarians laid so much stress, does not occur in the Vatican MS., but, if its genuineness be admitted, the difficulty has been met by the supposition that Christ is called the first-born, not with reference to any that succeeded, but for the following reasons: 1. Because there were special rites attending the birth of a first-born son. These were not delayed until a second was born, but performed at once. The law was, "Sanctify unto me all the first-born: whatsoever openeth the womb among the children of Israel, both of man and of beast, it is mine" (<02 13 2>Exodus 13:2). Joseph and Mary, in obedience to this law, brought our Savior to Jerusalem "to present him to the Lord; as it is written in the law of the Lord: Every male that openeth the womb shall be called holy to the Lord"

(<40222>Luke 2:22, 23). “First-born” is therefore equivalent to “one that openeth the womb.” Bishop Pearson says, “the Scripture notion of priority excludeth an antecedent, but inferreth not a consequent; it suffereth none to have gone before, but concludeth not anv to follow after” (*Creed,* 1:214. See also Hooker, *Ecl. Pol.* bk. 5, ch. 45, sec. 2; Jerome, *contra Helvid.* 2:7; Augustine, *Haer.* 84, 8. 24; Whitby and BishopWordsworth, ad loc.). 2. The *First-born* was one of the titles of Jesus. In its classical sense, πρωτοτόκος (thus accentuated) never means the first-born, but has an active signification in relation to the mother who for the first time bears a child (*Iliad,* 17:5); but in Holy Scripture it is used in the Sept., with a different accentuation, πρωτότοκος, to signify (*a*) sometimes the first-born, (*b*) sometimes the privileges which belong to the elder son, and also (*c*) as a title of the Messiah. (*a*) In the first sense it is used in <01279>Genesis 27:19; 48:18; <02229>Exodus 12:29; <04815>Numbers 18:15, etc. (*b*) There are other passages in which it is used metaphorically to express peculiar honor and dignity: “Israel is my son, even my first-born” (<02422>Exodus 4:22); “Ephraim is my first-born” (<24809>Jeremiah 31:9). This is also a Hebrew use which has been rendered by the translator of the A.V. “first-born” in <23430>Isaiah 14:30, where “the first-born of the poor” means *very poor;* and <18813>Job 18:13, where “the first-born of death” means *the most terrible form of death.* (c) It is used as a title of the Savior, without reference to priority of birth, in <19927>Psalm 89:27. In the New Testament our Lord is called πρωτότοκος ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς, “the first-born among many brethren” (<45829>Romans 8:29), πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως, “the first-born of every creature,” signifying the dominion which he has received who is made Head over all things. Πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν (<51018>Colossians 1:18; <66105>Revelation 1:5) means not simply the first who was raised, for that Christ was not, but he who hath power over death, and whose resurrection is an earnest of that of all his people: Hence it is argued that the word πρωτότοκος, in Matthew’s Gospel, may be nothing more than a synonym of Christ. He was the “first-born” because he was the Second Adam, the Perfect Man, the Restorer and Redeemer of his brethren, the Lord of the Church, and the Heir of all things. The metaphor was borrowed from the dominion which the first-born exercised over his brethren, but when the word is compared with other passages in which it occurs it avails nothing for Helvidius’s argument against the perpetual virginity of the Blessed Virgin Mary. But this philological argument is evidently inconclusive as applied to the passage in question, where the ord

"first-born" is not used thus generally, nor as a title, but is explicitly limited to the fact of parturition. *SEE FIRSTBORN*.

Another argument of the Antidicomarians was drawn from the mention made of the brethren of our Lord (<4012 46>Matthew 12:46; <4807 5>John 7:5), from which they inferred that these brethren were the children of our Lord's mother by her marriage with Joseph; but

(1) these brethren may have been the children of Joseph by a former wife. There is an old tradition preserved by Epiphanius and followed by Hilary, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Cyril, Euthymius, Theophylact, OEcumenius, and Nicephorus that Joseph had four sons and two daughters by a former wife named Escha. (See Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.* 2:1; Pearson, *On the Creed*, 2:140). Jerome was the first to confute this opinion, alleging that it rested only on a statement contained in an apocryphal writing.

(2) It was held by Jerome, Augustine, and generally by the later commentators, that the brethren are not strictly the brethren but the cousins o our Lord, in which sense the term is frequently used in Holy Scripture (<0130 8>Genesis 13:8; 29:12; <0300 4>Leviticus 10:4). Helvidius argued that there was proof from Scripture of James and John being notioxly the brethren of our Lord, but the sons of the Blessed Virgin Mary. Among the women at the cross were Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of Jamies and Moses. The sister Mary; he thought, was none other than the mother of our Lord, because she was found early at the sepulcher with Mary Magdalene and Salome, and it was improbable that any one should have greater care for the body of her son than his mother. The answer to this is clearly shown by bishop Pearson: "We read in St. <4819 25>John 19:25, that 'there stood by the cross of Jesus his mother, and his mother's sister, Mary the wife of Cleophas, and Mary Magdalene.' In the rest of the evangelists we find at the same place 'Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of James and Joses,' and again at the sepulcher, 'Mary Magdalene and the other Mary;' wherefore that other Mary, by the conjunction of these testimonies, appeareth to be Mary the wife of Cleophas and the mother of James and Joses; and consequently James and Joses, the brethren of our Lord, were not the sons of Mary his mother, but of the other Mary, and therefore called his brethren, according to the language of the Jews, because that the other Mary was the sister of his mother" (Pearson, *On the Creed*, 1:217). A fragment of Papias, respecting the relationship of Christ's brethren, has

been printed by Dr. Routh (*Relig. Sacr.* 1:16), in which he distinguishes four Marys, as follows:

(1.) Mary the mother of Jesus;

(2.) Mary the wife of Cleophas or Alphaeus, who was the mother of James the bishop and apostle, and of Simon and Thaddaeus, and a certain Joseph;

(3.) Mary Salome, the wife of Zebedee, the mother of John the Evangelist and James (<40 27 56>Matthew 27:56; <41 15 40>Mark 15:40; 16:1);

(4.) Mary Magdalene. These four are found in the Gospels. James and Judas and Joseph were the sons of the maternal aunt of Jesus. Mary the mother of James the Less and Joseph, wife of Alphueus, was sister of Mary the Lord's mother, whom John calls "of Cleophas" (ἡ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ, 19:25), either from her father or her family, or from some other cause. Mary is called Salome either from her husband or her residence. Her, too, some call "of Cleophas," because she had had two husbands. *SEE BRETHREN OF OUR LORD*.

In the Greek Church the Blessed Virgin has always been called ἀεὶ πάρθενος. This term was used by St. Athanasius. She was so called at the Council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451), and in the Confession of Faith published by Justin II in the 6th century. If the gate of the sanctuary in the prophet Ezekiel be understood of the Blessed Virgin — "This gate shall be shut, it shall not be opened, and no man shall enter in by it; because the Lord God of Israel hath entered by it, therefore it shall be shut" (<26 44 02>Ezekiel 44:2) — the perpetual virginity of the Blessed Virgin will appear necessary to that honor which belongs to her Divine Son, as well as to that which, for his sake, the Church has always accorded to her. But the inconclusiveness of this argument is obvious. *SEE MARIOLATRY*; *SEE MARY*.

Perpignan, Council Of

was convened Nov. 1, 1408, by pope Benedict XIII in the city of Perpignan, in the Eastern Pyrenees, and then belonging to the kingdom of Navarre, whither this rival pope had been obliged to retire from Avignon after the withdrawal of French support. This council was intended to anticipate the action of the council to meet shortly after at Pisa (in 1409). in order to terminate the long-continued schism of the Church. The Council of Perpignan was attended only by a few French and Spanish ecclesiastics, and they quitted the council when they found Benedict stubbornly refusing

to resign the pontifical honors. No action was taken by the council worthy of notice. *SEE BENEDICT XIII* (*a*).

Perrache, MICHEL,

a French sculptor, was born at Lyons in 1685. At the age of sixteen he visited Italy for improvement, and also went to Flanders, where he executed a number of sculptures for a church at Malines, and was honored with the freedom of the city. In 1717 he returned to France and settled at Lyons, where he practiced the art for many years, and executed a variety of sculptures for the churches and gardens. He died in 1750.

Perrault, Nicolas

a French theologian, was born in Paris about 1611. Having been received doctor of the Sorbonne in 1652, he was one of the seventy doctors excluded with Arnauid on the charge of Jansenism, Jan. 31, 1656. Perrault died at Paris in 1661. He published only, *La Morale des Jesuifes, extraitesfidelemem ae leurs livres imprims ares ec l'approbation et permission des superieurs de leur Compagnie* (Mons, 1667, 4to, and 1669, 3 vols. 16mo): — three *Lettres* to Dr. Hasle against signing the *Formulary,* printed with the responses of the latter in a collection of pieces upon the *Formulary,* the bulls and constitutions of the popes. See Moreri, *Diet. Hlist.* s.v.; Niceron, *Mem.* vol. 33, S. V;

Perrenot De Granvelle, Antoine De,

a noted French cardinal, was born at Besan- on, Aug. 20, 1517; studied at the universities of Paris, Padua, and Lonvain, and at twenty-three became bishop of Arras. Having exhibited great executive talent at the Council of Trent, he was made counselor of state, and upon the death of his father, Nicolas Perrenot, the prime-minister of Charles V, was himself elevated to that position. He soon acquired much distinction, and became known all over the Continent. After the accession of Philip II, Perrenot continued in the premiership, but at the same time received recognition for his valuable services to the Church by being made in 1560 archbishop of Malines, and in 1561 a cardinal. In 1565 he was called to Rome to assist the conclave in the election of pope Pius V. In 1570 he was instrumental in effecting a treaty against the Turks, which so benefited Naples that he was named viceroy of that territory. In 1584 he was elected archbishop of Besadion, and he thereupon resigned the see of Malines. He died at Madrid Sept. 21,

1586. Cardinal Perrenot was one of the most eminent men of his time. He was marvelously successful in all that he undertook. In the State and in the Church he exhibited the same aptitude and power, and developed his plans to perfection. Besides, he was a good man, and sought not to gratify a selfish ambition, but to labor for his fellows and the religious faith he himself honestly avowed. He was a general favorite among his contemporaries, as is evinced by the many works that were dedicated to him by his many friends and progress. Cardinal Perrenot was too busy to write many books; but his letters, which have been collected in 33 vols., with memoir, are much valued for the light they throw of the history of Charles V and on the beautiful character of the cardinal himself. See Courchetet, *Hist. du Card. Perrenot de Granvelle* (Par. 1761); Robertson, *Hist. of Charles V;* Prescott, *Hist. of Philippians II;* Schiller, *Gesch. d. Niederlande,* vol. i, pt. ii, ch. i.

Perrier, Francois

a French painter, was born at Macon, Burgundy, about 1590. His father was a goldsmith, and instructed him in the elements of design, but was unwilling that he should become a painter. Opposed in his wishes, young Perrier left his native place, and, being without means of a livelihood, he became the conductor of a blind mendicant who was traveling to Italy, and in this way succeeded in reaching Rome. On arriving there he was employed by a picture-dealer to copy several paintings, and some of his copies were shown to Lanfranco, who encouraged him to persevere and admitted him to his school. After several years' residence at Rome, Perrier returned to France and passed some time at Lyons, where he painted the *Decollation of St. John,* a *Holy Family,* and other works for the cloister of the Carthusians. Not content with a provincial field for the exercise of his abilities, Perrier vent to Paris, and associating himself with Vouet, was employed by him to paint from his design the chapel of the chateau de Chilly. Meeting with little encouragement, he revisited Italy in 1635, and applied himself to engraving the principal antique statues and bassreliefs, also a number of plates after the Italian masters. After the death of Simon Vouet he returned to Paris in 1645, and was commissioned to paint the walls of the Hotel de la Vrilliere (now the Bank of France). His pictures evince great warmth of imagination, but the design is often incorrect, the airs of his heads lack elegance and dignity, and his coloring is the dark. Perrier was a member of the Academy, and died at Paris, according to D'Argenville, in 1650. There are a number of etchings by him, incorrectly

and negligently designed, and executed in a slight, hasty style, usually marked *Paria,* or with his monogram. Among them are the following: A set of one hundred prints from antique statues, published at Rome; a set of fifty taken from the ancient bass-reliefs; ten plates of the *Angels* in the Farnesina, after Raffaelle; two plates of the *Assembly of the Gods,* and the *Marriage of Cupid and Psyche,* from the paintings by Raffaelle in the Farnesina; the *Communion of St. Jerome,* after Agos. Caracci; the *Flight into Egypt,* after Agos. Caracci; the *Nativity,* after S. Vouet, and the *Portrait of Simon Foet.* Among subjects from his own designs are, the *Holy Family, with St. John playing with a Lamb;* the *Crucifixion* (inscribed Franciscus Perrier, Burgundy, pinx. et scul.); *St. Roch curing the People* (*afflicted with the Plague;* the *Body of St. Sebastian supported by two Saints.* See Spooner, *Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts,* 2:677.

Perrier, Guillaume

a painter and engraver, nephew and scholar of the preceding, flourished about the middle of the 17th century, and died in 1655. His works are executed in the style of his uncle. Among his principal pictures are those in the sacristy of the Minims at Lyons, where he had taken refuge, having killed his antagonist in a duel. There are a few etchings by him in the style of Francois Perrier, among which are an emblematic subject, the *Portrait of Lazarus Messonier,* the *Death of the Magdalen,* and the *holy Family.*

Perrimezzi, Giuseppe-Maria

a learned Italian prelate, was born Dec. 17, 1670, at Paula, Calabria. He joined the Order of the Minims, and acquired, by his preaching and his writings, a considerable reputation. He became successively provincial of his order and a member of the Holy Office and of the Congregation of the Index. In 1707 he was made bishop of Scala and Ravello, whence he was transferred in 1714 to the diocese of Oppida. He received from pope Benedict XIII, who honored him with particular esteem, the title of archbishop of Bostra *in partibus,* and then fixed his residence at Rome. He died in that city in 1740. We have thirty works of his, among which the following are worthy of notice: *Panegirici* (Rome, 1702-3, and Naples, 1722. 4 vols. 12mo): — *Vita di S. Francisci de Paula* (Rome, 1707, 2 vols. 4*to*): — *T'ita di Niccolo di Longobardi* (ibid. 1713, 4to): — *Raggionamenti pastorali* (Naples, 1713-21, 6 vols. 4*to*): — *Decisioni academiche degl' Infecnundi* (ibid. 1719, 2 vols. 12mno): — 1n *sacram de*

Deo scientiam disserf. selectce (ibid. 17301733, 8 vols. fol.): — Vita *del Antonio Torres* (ibid. 1733, 4to). See Tipaldoi, *Biogr. degli Italiani illustri,* vol. viii.

Perrincheif, Richard

a noted English divine, was born near the opening of the 17th century, and was educated at Cambridge University. He was made prebend of Westminster in 1664, prebend of London in 1667, and archdeacon of Huntingdonl in 1670. He died in 1673. He published, *Sermon* (Lond. 1666, 4to): — *Discourse on Toleration* (1667, 4*to*): — *Indulgence not justified,* against Dr. John Owen's *Peace Offering;* and two works of a semi-political character, evincing hatred of the Puritans and decided leaning towards the cause of king Charles I. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. und Amer. Authors, s.v.*

Perrine, Matthew La Rue, D.D.

a Presbyterian minister, was born at Freehold. Monmouth County, N. J, May 4 1777. He entered the College of New Jersey in 1794, graduated in 1797, and was licensed to preach by the Presbytery of New Brunswick Sept. 18,1799. In May, 1800, he was appointed a missionary; on June 24 following he was ordained as an evangelist, and on June 15, 1802, he was installed pastor of the Church at what was then called Bottle Hill, but is now Madison, N. J. After some other changes he was finally installed pastor of the Spring Street Church, New York City, Oct. 31, 1811, which situation he filled until July 26, 1820, when the connection was dissolved at his request. In 1821 he was elected professor of ecclesiastical history and Church polity in the theological seminary at Auburn, and filled that station until his death, Feb. 11, 1836, acting also for two years as professor of theology, and frequently preaching in the chapel of the seminary and in the churches of the neighborhood. Dr. Perrine published, *Letters concerning the Plan of Salvation* (N. Y. 1816): — *Sermon before a Female Missionary Society in New York* (1817): — and an *Abstract of Biblical Geography* (Auburn, 1835). See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit,* 4:237 sq.

Perron, Jacques Davy Du

an eminent Roman Catholic prelate, distinguished for his learning and influence, was descended from ancient and noble families on both sides.

His parents, having been educated in the principles of Calvin, retired to Geneva; and settled afterwards in the canton of Berne, where he was born, Nov. 25, 1556. His father, who was a man of learning, instructed him till he was ten years of age, and taught him mathematics and Latin. Young Perron seems afterwards to have built upon this foundation by himself; for, while his parents were tossed about from place to place by civil wars and persecutions, he applied himself entirely to study. He learned Greek and philosophy, beginning the latter study with the logic of Aristotle, thence passing to the orators and poets; and afterwards applied himself to the study of the Hebrew language, which he attained so perfectly that he read without points, and lectured on it to the ministers. In the reign of Henry III, after the Pacification with the Huguenots, his parents returned to France, and shortly after young Du Perron was (in 1576) introduced to the king, as a prodigy of pal is and learning. His controversial talents were very great, so that none dared dispute with him, although he made many challenges to those who would have been glad to attack him. At the breaking up of the states he came to Paris, and mounted the chair in the habit of a cavalier, in the grand hall of the Augustines, where he held public conferences upon the sciences. He set himself afterwards to read the "Sum" of St. Thomas Aquinas, and cultivated a strict friendship with Philip Desportes, abbot of Tiron, who put him into his own place of reader to Henry III. Perron is said to have lost the favor of this prince in the following manner: One day, while the king was at dinner, he made an admirable discourse against atheists; with which the king was well pleased, and commended him much for having proved the being of a God by arguments so solid. But Perron, whose spirit of policy had not vet got the better of his passion for shining or showing his parts, replied, that "if his majesty would vouchsafe him audience, he would prove the contrary by arguments as solid;" which so offended the king that he forbade him to come into his presence. Perron recovered himself, however, from this fall. The reading of St. Thomas had engaged him in the study of the fathers. and made him particularly acquainted with Augustine's writings, so that he devoted himself wholly to divinity-, and resolved to abjure Protestantismm. Having discovered, or rather pretended to discover, many false quotations and weak reasonings in Du Plessis-Mornay's *Treatise upon the Church,* he instructed himself thoroughly in controverted points, and made his abjuration. He now labored for the conversion of others, even before embracing any ecclesiastical function, which occurred in 1577. By these arts and his uncommon abilities he acquired great influence, and was

selected to pronounce the funeral oration of Mary queen of Scots in 1587. Some time after he wrote, by order of the king, *A Compassion of Moral and Theological Virtues;* and two *Discourses,* one upon the *soul,* the other upon *self-knowledge,* which he pronounced before that prince. After the murder of Henry III he retired to the house of cardinal de Bourbon, and labored more vigorously than ever in the conversion of the Reformed. He brought a great number of them back to the Church, among whom was Henry Spondanus, afterwards bishop of Pamiez; as this prelate acknowledges, in his dedication to cardinal Du Perron of his "Abridgment of Baronius's Annals." This conversion was followed by several others; and among them he claimed the agency in the conversion of Henry IV, before whom he had held at Nantes a famous dispute with four ministers, which resulted in his appointment to the bishopric of Evreux, that he might be capable of sitting in a conference which the king convened for religious matters. Perron attended with the other prelates at St. Denis, and is supposed to have contributed more than any other person to the conversion of that great prince. After this, Perron was sent with Mr. D'Ossat to Rome, to negotiate Henry's reconciliation to the holy see; which at length he effected, to the satisfaction of the king, but not of his subjects-that part of them at least who were zealous for Gallican liberties, and thought the dignity of their king compromised upon this occasion (see Jervis, 1:203 sq.). Du Perron stayed a whole year at Rome, was there consecrated to his holy office by cardinal De Joyeuse, archbishop of Rouen, Dec. 27, 1595, and then returned to France; where, by such kind of services as have already been mentioned, he advanced himself to the highest dignities. He wrote and preached and disputed against the Reformed; particularly against Du Plessis-Mornay, with whom he had a public conference in 1600, in the presence of the king, at Fontainebleau. (See for an account, Jervis, 1:218 sq.) The king resolved to make him grand almoner of France, to give him the archbishopric of Sens, and wrote to Clement VIII to obtain for him the dignity of a cardinal, which that pope conferred on him, in 1604, with singular marks of esteem. The indisposition of Clement made the king resolve to send the French cardinals to Rome; where Du Perron was no sooner arrived than he was employed by the pope in the congregations. He had a great share in the elections of Leo X and Paul V. He became a most devoted advocate of the ultramontane doctrine and a powerful champion of papal interests. In the many anxious questions which arose Du Perron's decisions always carried great weight. Thus he assisted in the congregations upon the subject of

Grace, and the disputes which were agitated between the Jesuits and the Molinists; and it was principally upon his advice that the pope resolved to determine nothing with respect to these questions. He was sent a third time to Rome, to accommodate the differences between Paul V and the republic of Venice; but his health not permitting him to stay long, he was recalled to France. After the murder of Henry IV, which happened in 1610, Du Perron devoted himself entirely to the court and see of Rome, and prevented any action in France which might, displease it or hurt its interests. He rendered useless the *arrst* of the Parliament of Paris against the book of cardinal Bellarmine; and favored the infallibility of the pope, and his superiority over a council, in a thesis maintained in 1611 before the nuncio. He afterwards held a provincial assembly, in which he condemned Richer's book "concerning ecclesiastical and civil authority:" and, being at the assembly of Blois, he made a harangue to prove that they ought not to decide questions of faith. He was one of the presidents of the assembly of the clergy which was held at Roan in 1615; and made harangues to the king at the opening and closing of that assembly, which were much applauded. This was the last shining action of his life; for after this he retired to his house -at Bagnolet, and employed himself wholly in revising and putting the last hand to his works. He set up a printing-house there, that he might have them published correctly; in order to do which he revised every sheet himself. He died at Paris Sept. 5, 1618. Cardinal Du Perron was a man of great abilities; had a lively and penetrating wit, and a special talent for making his views appear reasonable. He delivered himself upon all occasions with great clearness, dignity, and eloquence. He had a prodigious memory, and had studied much. He was very well versed in antiquity, both ecclesiastical and profane; and had read much in the fathers, councils, and ecclesiastical historians, of which he knew how to make the best use against his adversaries. He was very powerful in dispute, so that the ablest ministers were afraid of him; and he always confounded those who had the courage to engage with him. He was warmly attached to the see of Rome, and strenuous in defending its rights and prerogatives; and therefore it cannot be wondered at that his name has never been held in high honor among those of his countrymen who have been accustomed to stand up for Gallican liberties.

The works of Du Perron, the greatest part of which had been printed separately in his lifetime, were collected after his death, and printed at Paris (1620 and 1622) in 3 vols. folio. The first volume contains his great

Treatise upon the Eucharist, against that of Du Plessis-Mornay. The second, his *Reply to the Answer of the King of Great Britain,* which originated as follows: James I of England sent to Henry IV of France a book, which he had written himself, concerning differences in religion. Henry put it into the hands of Du Perron's brother. who informed his majesty, from what the cardinal had observed to him, that there were many passages in that book in which the king of England seemed to come near the Catholics; and that it might be proper to send some able person, with a view of bringing him entirely over. Henry, taking the advice of his prelates in this affair, caused it to be proposed to the king of England whether or not he would take it in good part to have the cardinal Du Perron sent to him? who returned for answer that he should be well pleased to confer with him, but for reasons of state could not do it. Isaac Casaubon, however, a moderate person among the Reformed, who had had several conferences with Du Perron about religion, and who seemed much inclined to a reunion, was prevailed on to take a voyage into England; where he spoke advantageously of Du Perron to the king, and presented some pieces of poetry to him, which the cardinal had put into his hands. The king received them kindly, and expressed much esteem for the author; which Casaubon noticing to Du Perron, he returned a letter of civility and thanks to his Britannic majesty; in which he told him that, except the sole title of Catholic, he could find nothing wanting in his majesty that was necessary to make a most perfect and accomplished prince." The king replied that, "believing all things which the ancients had unanimously thought necessary to salvation, the title of Catholic could not be denied him." Casaubon having sent this answer to Du Perron, he made a reply to it in a letter, dated July 15, 1611, in which he sets forth the reasons that obliged him to refuse the name of Catholic to his Britannic majesty. Casaubon answered in the name of the kin, to all the articles of his letter; to which the cardinal made a reply, which constitutes the bulk of the second volume of his works. The third contains his miscellaneous pieces; among which are, *Acts of the Conference held at Fontainebleu against Du Plessis-Mornay;* moral and religious pieces in prose and verse, orations, dissertations, translations, and letters. A fourth volume of his embassies and negotiations was collected by Caesar de Ligni, his secretary, and printed at Paris in 1623, folio; but these have not done him much honor, as they do not show that profound reach and insight into things with which he is usually credited. There were also published afterwards, under his name, *Perroniana,* which, like most of the *ana,* is a collection of puerilities and impertinences. See

Jervis, *Ch. Hist. of France,* 1:203, 216 sq., 219 sq., 279; Ranke, *History of the Papacy in the* 16*th and* 17*th Centuries,* vol. i (see Index in vol. ii); *Gen. Biogr. Dict.* s.v.; Dupin, *Bibliotheque des Auteurs soclis*. — 17*th Siecle,* s.v.

Perrone, Cardinal.

SEE PERRON.

Perrone, Giovanni

a noted Italian Jesuit, one of the ablest of modern Romanist theologians, was born in 1794, in Chieri, Piedmont. After studying in the college of his native city, he finished his theological course in the University of Turin, where he was finally received doctor. At the age of twenty-one he went to Rome, and entered the Society of Jesus. After one year of novitiate, he was sent to Orvieto to teach dogmatic and moral theology to the students of the society, to whom were added the pupils of the Germanic college. Being ordained priest, he taught in the Roman college, and was appointed, in 1830, rector of the college of Ferrara, from whence he was recalled, in 1838, to resume the teaching of theology in the Roman college. In 1848, at the time of the Roman revolution, he went to England for safety, and only returned to Rome in 1850. Three years afterwards he was made rector of all the Roman colleges. Father Perrone, who, with father Passaglia, is counted among the greatest theologians of Italy, thereafter took his seat in the congregation of bishops and regulars, and in the provincial councils, and was charged with the revision of the books of the Eastern churches. He was also counselor to the Propaganda, and the Ritual committee, etc. Indeed, Perrone was in scientific and literary relations with the most distinguished savans of Europe. He died at Rome in 1875. His works amount to more than sixty, and have been translated into Latin, French, German, English, and Armenian. The principal are, *Proelectiones theologiam* (Rome, 1835, 9 vols. 8vo). .This work has had more than twenty-five editions, and the different treatises of which it is composed have been translated into French and German. An abridged edition of it was made (ibid. 1845, 4 vols. 8vo), and was followed by seventeen *others*: — *Synopsis historiae theologiae cum philosophia comnparatae* (ibid. 1845, 8vo): — *De immaculato B. V. Marice concepta, an dogmatico de crto deJiniripossit* (ibid. 1847, 8vo); several editions in German, French, and *Dutch*: — *Analyse et Considerations sur* 1 *t Symbolique de Moehler*

(ibid. 1836, 8vo): — *II Hermesianismo* (ibid. 1838, 8vo); translated into French and Latin: — *Analyse et Reflexions sur I'Histoire d'Innocent III*, by Fred. Hurter (ibid. 1840, 8vo): — *II Protestantismo* (ibid. 1853, 3 vols. 8vo); translated into French by the abbe A. C. Peltier (Paris, 1854, 3 vols. 8vo). See F. Ed. Chassay, *Notice sur la Vie et les Ecrits du R. P. Perrone*, at the beginning of the last work quoted.

Perronet, Charles

a Wesleyan preacher in the days of the founder of Methodism, and one of the companions of the Wesleys, was born about 1720 at Shoreham, England, where his father was then vicar. He was educated at Oxford University, and was untended for the ministry in the Church Establishment. But becoming interested in the Wesleyan movement, like his brother Edward and his father, Charles accompanied Charles Wesley in 1747 to Dublin, and traveled for more than half a year over Ireland. This was his initiation into the itinerant ministry, and he became a most efficient helper in the Wesleyan cause. When Charles Perronet joined the Conference we have been unable to determine. His name does not appear in the appointments or minutes even as late as 1753, but as many of Wesley's assistants did not join the itinerant ranks, it is possible that Perronet simply labored as the opportunity opened. In 1755, at the twelfth Conference, e.g., there were present 63 preachers, who are subdivided into three classes; the first is a list of 34 names, beginning with John and Charles Wesley, headed "Our present itinerants are." The second is a list of 12 names, headed "half itinerants; "the third contains 14 names, who are called "our chief local preachers." "These half itinerants," says Smith (*Life of Wesley*, p. 288), "were unquestionably men who gave themselves up to travel under Wesley's direction." Charles Perronet must have belonged to this class. Aug. 12. 1776, we find the death of Charles Perronet recorded, and he is spoken of as an itinerant Methodist preacher of "more than twenty years' faithful service." "He was a living and a dying witness of the blessed doctrine he always defended entire sanctification. 'God,' he said shortly before his death, 'has purged me from all my dross; all is done away. I am all love.'" See *Arminian Mag.* 1871, 529; Stevens, *Hist. of Methodism*, 2:260.

was the son of Vincent Perronet (q.v.), and for some time the associate of the Wesleys. In Charles Wesley's diary he appears under the affectionate nickname of "Ned." In college Perronet figured as one of the poetic trio beside John and Charles Wesley. In 1746 he traveled with Charles Wesley in the north of England, and was then initiated into the persecutions and other trials of an itinerant preacher's life in early Methodism. Stevens says that "Perronet showed good courage, and sometimes intercepted blows and missiles aimed at Wesley by receiving them himself." In 1748, at the fifth Annual Conference, we find Perronet's name recorded as an itinerant member. Shortly after, however, he ceased to travel with the Wesleyans, having taken exception to Wesley's adherence to the Church. He was for a while employed by lady Huntingdon, and preached successfully at Norwich, Canterbury, and other places, but from her views of the Church he also differed so widely that he quitted her connection likewise, and became the pastor of a Church of Dissenters at Canterbury. He died in 1792. His last words were, "Glory to God in the height of his divinity; glory to God in the depth of his humanity; glory to God in his all-sufficiency! Into his hands I commit my spirit." He was the author of an anonymous poem called the *Mitre*, one of the most cutting satires on the National Establishment that has ever been written. It was suppressed, after it was in print, by the influence of John Wesley, it is thought, though he himself in later life said, "For forty years I have been in doubts concerning that question, ' What obedience is due to heathenish priests and mitred infidels?'" Charles Wesley was shocked at the poem, and declared it to be lacking in wit and of insufferable dullness, but his feeling as a churchman may have dimmed his sight as a critic. Perronet, however, it must be acknowledged, is severe, even though it be considered that in his day there was much to provoke his satirical genius. He wrote also several small poems, chiefly on sacred subjects, and hymns, published by request of his friends, and entitled *Occasional Verses, Moral and Sacred, published for the Instruction and Amusement of the candidly Serious and Religious* (1785). But that which has given him his place in the memory and gratitude of the Christian world is his hymn entitled *The Coronation*, beginning, "All Hail the power of Jesus' name." This hymn was in some measure the product of the times in which Perronet lived. They were times made memorable by the wonderful victories gained for the Gospel of Jesus

Christ. See Stevens, *Hist. of Methodism* (see Index in vol. 3); Christopher, *Epworth Singers,* ch. 9.

Perronet, Vincent

an English divine of the 18th century, noted for his association with the Wesleys, and the service he rendered to Methodism in the days of its first establishment, was born of Swiss-French parentage about 1700. He was educated at Oxford University. After taking holy orders, he was given the parish of Sandwich, Kent, where he remained about nine years, when he was presented to the vicarage of Shoreham. While in this position, two of his sons (Charles and Edward), who were students at Oxford, became intimately associated with the Wesleys, their classmates. Thus the vicar of Shoreham himself conceived a lively interest in the Oxford movement, and when in 1746 John Wesley met vicar Perronet, he found in him a true friend, a warm admirer, and a most confidential counselor. Charles Wesley called him the "archbishop of Methodism." He welcomed the traveling evangelists into his own church; though his parishioners mobbed them. When Charles Wesley first appeared in his pulpit, they "roared, stamped, blasphemed, rang the bells, and turned the church into a bear-garden." Their hostility was subdued, however, and when John Wesley arrived, soon after, he preached without interruption. Perronet adopted their strongest views of personal religion, and wrote several pamphlets in defense of Methodism, and even went so far in his enthusiasm as to send forth this declaration: "I make no doubt that Methodism is designed by Providence to introduce the approaching millennium." Wesley dedicated to him the *Plain Account of the People called Methodists.* For nearly forty years the vicarage of Shoreham was a frequent and endeared refuge to both the great leaders, and the Shoreham church virtually a Methodist chapel; Vicar Perronet died May 9, 1785. He was a man of saintly piety, and "was entitled on various accounts," says a Calvinistic Methodist authority, "to a conspicuous place among the brightest ornaments of the Christian Church in the last century" (*Life and Times of the Countess of Huntingdon,* 1:387). He published *A Vindication of John Locke from the Charge of giving Encouragement to Scepticism* (Lond. 1736, 8vo): — A *Second Vindication* (1738, 8vo): — *Some Enquiries chiefly relating to Spiritual Beings* (Lond. 1740, 8vo): — *An Affectionate Address to the People called Quakers* (ibid. 1747, 8vo), and his defences of Methodism (1740-53). See Jackson, *Centenary of Methodism,* ch. v; *Wesleyan Mag.* 1858, p. 484; Stevens, *Hist. of Methodism,* 1:25 sq.; 2:259 sq.

Perrot, Charles

a Protestant minister, was born in 1541. He was the son of a counselor in the Parliament of Paris, but embraced the Reformed doctrines and retired to Geneva, where he was provided with a place as pastor in 1567. Besides, he ably fulfilled the duties of rector of the academy and professor of theology. What rendered him especially commendable was the courage with which he preached religious tolerance. He died in Geneva Oct. 15, 1608. He became suspected by the theologians of the Calvinistic school, who persuaded the council to forbid the printing of the works which he had composed, among others the treatises *De la Foi* and *De extremis in Ecclesia Vitandis.*

Perrot, John

a preacher of the Society of the Friends, noted as a schismatic, flourished in the 17th century. He was an associate of George Fox for a while, but differing from that good man, Perrot, with a number of followers, branched off into an independent relation. He was an eccentric man, and inaugurated many impracticable measures. Thus, e.g., he went to Rome "to convert the pope," and was imprisoned by the Inquisition at Rome. While in confinement he wrote *Epistles to the Romans,* of which Southey says, "This book is the most frantic I ever saw." See *Southy's Life and Corresp.* ch. 9.

Perrot, Paul

Sieur de La Salle, nephew of Charles Perrot, was a writer who flourished in the 16th century. He was educated at Oxford, and published several works which testify to his great piety. Of these we mention, *La Gigautomachie, ou Combat de tous les Arts et Sciences* (Middleburg, 1593, 8*vo*): — *Tableaux sacres* (Frankf. 1594, 8vo), extracts from the Old Testament in verse: — and *Le Trsor de Salomon, enz Quatrains et Sonnets* (Rotterdam, 1594, 12mo). According to Bayle, he had worked upon the famous *Catholicon d'Espnagne.* One of his sons was the translator, Nicolas Perrot. See Bayle, *Diet. Hist. et Crit.;* Patru, *Vie de Perrot d'Ablancourt,* in his (*Euvres;* Senebier, *Hist. Litter. de Geneve;* Haag, *La France Protestante.*

Perry, Benjamin Franklin

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born of pious parentage in Talbot Co., Ga., Feb. 13, 1836. He was early converted, and dedicated himself to the service of God. In 1853 he became a student at Emory College, Va., where he graduated in 1855, taking the first honor of his class, and about that time he was licensed to preach. In 1856 he received his first appointment 2. The Texas Conference. In 1861 he filled the Austin Station with great credit to himself. At the outbreak of the civil war he determined, after removing his family to Alabama, where they would be better cared for, to enter the Southern army as chaplain. He thus spent the eventful years of 1862 and 1863, sharing the hardships of the Vicksburg siege. Having resigned his chaplaincy, he was appointed, in 1864, a missionary to Johnson's army. In 1865, after the close of the war, he returned to the itinerant ranks; was transferred to the Montgomery Conference, and stationed at Lowndesboro, the appointment of which he held at the time of his death. He was also for two years in charge of the Female College. His health began to decline about June 1, 1868. He refused to rest, though it was manifest that he was overtaxing his strength. About the last of July he was compelled to desist. He died Sept. 23, 1868. In his last hours he was exultant in Christ's atonement. See *Minutes of the Annual Conf. of the M. E. Church, South,* p. 229, 230.

Perry, Gardner Braman

D.D., a Presbyterian divine, was born in Norton, Mass., Aug. 9, 1783. He received a very careful academical training, and entered Brown University in the fall of 1800; after two years' study he left, and entered Union College, Schenectady, N.T., where he graduated in 1804. After teaching for one year as principal of Ballston Academy, N. Y., in 1806 he was elected tutor in Union College, where he remained three years. Here he studied theology under Rev. Dr. Nott, and, taking charge of an educational institution at Kingston, N. Y., he resumed teaching, which he continued five years. In the mean time he was licensed, in March, 1812, by Albany Presbytery. In 1814 he was ordained pastor of the Second Congregational Church at Groveland, Mass., where he remained as pastor for forty-five years. Though pastor of a Congregational Church, he was a member of the Presbytery. He was one of the original members of Newburyport Presbytery, preached the sermon at its organization in October, 1826, and was a commissioner from that Presbytery to the General Assembly in 1834.

After the dissolution of Newburyport Presbytery he joined Londonderry Presbytery, which he represented in the Assembly in 1849. This relation existed until his death, Dec. 16, 1859. Dr. Perry was a Christian gentleman of the highest refinement and taste.. His vast stores of general information rendered him a conversationalist of a high order. He was interested in all public movements, an earnest advocate of the temperance reformation, and ever zealous in the cause of education. He published a *History of the Town of Bradford;* also a number of sermons. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac,* 1861, p. 105. (J. L. S.)

Perry, James H.

D.D., a noted minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Ulster Co., N. Y., in 1811. His education commenced at an early age, and he made rapid progress in his studies until he was prepared to enter as a cadet at the Military Academy at West Point. Becoming strongly interested in the cause of Texan independence, he resigned his position in the academy in the third year of his connection with it, and, accepting the appointment of colonel in the service of Texas, proceeded to raise a regiment in New York, and then embarked and reached Texas in time to participate in the battle of San Jacinto, which resulted in the defeat of Santa Anna and the establishment of Texan independence. Upon his return from Texas he settled with his family in Newburgh, N. Y. By invitation of his sister, a member of the Methodist Episcopal Church, he was induced to attend a love-feast, where the strange but consoling truths of experimental religion excited his attention. At an early moment he disclosed his feelings to the Rev. Seymour Landon, then pastor of the Church. The result was his profession of religion, and he united with the Church on probation. Shortly after he felt called of God to the work of the holy ministry. In 1838 he joined the New York Conference, and was appointed to Burlington and Bristol Circuit, Connecticut During his ministry, which lasted without interruption from 1838 to the year of his death, he filled many of the first appointments in the New York and New York East Conferences. He was a delegate to the General Conference of 1856. ‘ Shortly after the breaking out of the late civil war, Dr. Perry, believing it to be his duty to give his country the benefit of his military experience, accepted the command of the Forty-eighth Regiment of New York Volunteers. He was ordered to Annapolis, from whence he embarked for the South, and rendered eminent services to the United States army. After the fall of Pulaski he was put in command, and in this fort he died of apoplexy, June 18,1863. As a

preacher Dr. Perry "was calm and impressive. He kept constantly in view the great ends of preachingthe conversion of sinners and the building up of believers in the faith. In debate he was dexterous and cogent, No matter what might be the topic of controversy, ht was an able advocate and a formidable opponent. His ability as a logician and his tact as a debater made him naturally a leader upon the floor of Conference. His brethren who adopted his views of Church administration relied unhesitatingly upon his sagacity, and followed his suggestions with confidence. His well-known kindness of disposition subjected him to constant calls to appear as an advocate in behalf of parties who were, or were likely to be, brought under Conference censure. The services rendered by him at such times were purely disinterested. In his attachments Dr. Perry was firm and constant. He grappled his friends to him with 'hooks of steel.' His character was so positive that he was incapable of indifference; he liked or disliked decidedly, and with all the force of a strong nature. His ministry was fruitful of good." See *Minutes of Conf.* 1863, p. 65, 66; Smith, *Memoirs of N. Y. and N. Y. East Conf. p.* 256-262; Appleton, *Annual Cyclop.* 1863.

Perry, Joseph

a Congregational minister, was born about 1733, and was educated at Harvard College, class of 1752. He entered the holy ministry, and became minister of East Windsor, Conn., where he died in 1783. He published, *Sersmon on the Death of R Wolcott* (1763): — *Sermon on the Death of N. Hooker* (1771): — *Election Sermon* (1775).

Perry, Solomon C.

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in what is now called East Attleborough, Mass., May 27, 1807. His parents were members of the Congregational Church, and exceedingly rigid in their theological creed and strict in their morals. His early education was such as a New Eng. land rural neighborhood and the times afforded. He passed his youth mostly with his father on the farm. When quite a young man he was awakened to the dangers of an unregenerated state, and, encouraged by an uncle who was a Methodist preacher, began to attend Methodist meetings. To do this, however, he had to travel seven miles, there being no Methodist church within that distance from his father's house. It was while making this journey on a certain occasion that he was converted. Soon after he felt called of God to preach, and attached himself as a student to

the Wilbraham Academy, then under the care of the late Dr. Fisk. At the termination of his preparatory course he entered, a year in advance, Brown University, under the presidency of Dr. Wayland. After his graduation he taught at Swinburn's Academy, a very flourishing institution at the time, in the village of White Plains, N. Y. He was licensed as a local preacher. He joined the New York Conference in 1838, and his successive fields of labor were, for the years 1838, 1839, Yonkers; 1840, Durham and Middlefield; 1841, Stratford and Bridgeport; 1842, Bridgeport; 1843, Bushwick; 1844, 1845, Peekskill; 1846, 1847, New York, Twenty-seventh Street; 1848, 1849. Yonkers and Kingsbridge; 1850, 1851, New York, Fiftieth Street; 1852, Red Hook; 1853, 1854, Salisbury; 1855, 1856, Yorkville; 1857, 1858. Tremont; 1859, Washington Heights. In the year 1830 he was made supernumerary, and in 1861 he was superannuated, in which relation he continued until the time of his death, March 6, 1872. "Mr. Perry was a sound theologian, an excellent preacher, an earnest Christian, and in every sense a safe, conservative man. The transparency and purity of his character were singular and distinctive. In his death the ministry has lost one of its most faithful laborers, the Church has been deprived of the presence and influence of one who was devoted to her interests, and whose uniform consistency and integrity reflected upon her the greatest credit; and the fragrance of his good name and exemplary life will ever be grateful to our memories and yield us unceasing satisfaction" (*N. Y. Christian Advocate*, May 23, 1872).

Perse, William

an English divine, flourished in the second half of the 17th century. He was educated at Cambridge University, and was made fellow of his alma mater, the King's College, Cambridge. After taking holy orders he was presented to the living of Malton and the rectory of Hesterton, Yorkshire. He published *Sermon on* ⁴²²⁰*Acts* 22:3, which he preached to the Eaton scholars (Lond. 1682, 4to).

Persecution

is any pain or affliction which a person designedly inflicts upon another. In its variability it is threefold:

(1.) *Mental*, when the spirit of a man rises up and malignantly opposes another;

(2.) *Verbal,* when men give hard words and deal in uncharitable censures;

(3.) *Actual* or *open* by the hand; such as the dragging of innocent persons before the civil tribunal.

In its more restricted sense, *persecution for conscience' sake* concerns us here only in so far as it has occurred within the Church, or the Church has been the guilty, party. The Church of Christ, in her *purity,* knows nothing of *intolerance,* and therefore can *never* be guilty of persecution. Indeed, the unlawfulness of persecution for conscience' sake, under the New-Testament dispensation, must appear plain to every one that possesses the least degree of Christian thought or feeling, "To banish, imprison, plunder, starve, hang, and burn men for religion," says the shrewd Jortin, "is not the Gospel of Christ; it is the Gospel of the devil. Where persecution begins, Christianity ends. Christ never used anything that looked like force or violence except once; and that was to drive bad men out of the Temple, and not to drive them in." Yet would we not overlook that true religion is essentially aggressive and intolerant of error, inasmuch as it "earnestly contends for the faith," and therefore abhors indifferentism and syncretism, believing that their true source is not faith and charity, but the very opposite of these, Laodicean lukewarmness and tacit infidelity. Toleration of error on the part of the Church would render useless God's revelation of truth, would make God the abettor of error — would either destroy the Church as a society of believers, or contradict the divine order which establishes it as the way of salvation. But the Church as such uses only *spiritual* weapons — the earnestness of entreaty, the force of prayer, the terrors of conscience, the powers of the Gospel. Its punishments, too, are entirely spiritual censures, and the different degrees of excommunication. This is shown from the nature of religion in general and the spirit of Christianity in particular; from the constitution of the Church as a spiritual body; from the tenor of Scripture, which explains the compulsion of ⁴²Luke 14:23 as being spiritual compulsion only; from Paul's language to Timothy, as ⁵⁴2 Timothy 2:24, etc. (see Samuel Clarke's *Sermons against Persecution for Religion,* Serm. 1, p. 659), and from the fathers (see Bp. Taylor's *Liberty of Prophesying, §* 14). For these very reasons, however, all *temporal* penalties inflicted by the Church as a spiritual body must be classed as persecution; for such penalties can be meted out only by a power either usurped or wrongfully given. The Church, being a spiritual society, has no power over the physical, i.e. the body. Its capital punishment is

deliverance to Satan. It may impose penance, it may enjoin restitution. it may arbitrate, but these sentences it can enforce only by *spiritual* inducements. Coercive jurisdiction it has none; and if any such jurisdiction be assigned it, it becomes so far a minister of the civil authority which makes the assignation; and so far it leaves its own sphere and becomes a temporal power. Temporal pains and penalties belong only to the temporal power, which moves in the external sphere of overt acts, and does not deal with the will and conscience. The cause of this is that, inasmuch as Almighty God has put man's life into man's keeping, and entrusted him with goods, the society which is to have power over life and goods is not formed without man's concurrence. The Church, on the other hand, is not formed by man's consultation, nor can it be modified at man's pleasure. Man joins it by voluntary submission, without any power of altering its constitution. The Church, therefore, has no power over life and goods; for the power over these which God has once given he will not take away. The concurrence of men in the formation of civil society is properly considered by holding up the ideal of a social contract, a contract perpetually forming and modifying, as the mind of a nation expresses itself in law; and such ordinances of man are ratified by God's providence, which has worked also in their formation. Whence it is said, "Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake." Such compact, then, according to the religious state of those who make it, may be (1) a complete identity of the members of the Church and State; (2) or an established and preferred Church, with toleration in different degrees for other religious bodies (Jeremy Taylor, e.g., advocated toleration for all those who accept the Apostles' Creed); (3) or complete equality of all religious bodies. Any one of these positions the Church of Christ may hold. In any case it ought to retain distinctly its proper position as a society of divine institution in the world, but not of the world. Especially it ought not to usurp in the name of religion the powers and aims of the state law. There cannot be a greater mistake in statesmanship than to confound the temporal and spiritual estates and jurisdictions. The Church as a spiritual body has nothing to do with the state. It continues its own course, neither intruding into the sphere of the state nor refusing to aid the state, but ever rejecting an alliance with the state. *SEE CHURCH AND STATE*. It is from dogmatism invested with political power, and authorized to use that power for the inculcation of its dogmas, that persecution is sure to spring, aye, really springs. The first community based on freedom of conscience was the Roman Catholic colony of Maryland; yet Roman Catholicism in Maryland was as dogmatic

as in Spain. The great consequence from the principles we have tried to establish is that the temporal penalties spoken of can be inflicted only for overt acts. The compact of society does not profess to touch the mind. It leaves the will and conscience to the divine institution of the Church.. Consequently for matters of opinion, for belief privately held, there can be no temporal penalty at all. The temporal penalty is outside the power of the Church; the private belief is outside the supervision of the state. We may therefore define persecution thus: the infliction of temporal penalties by the spirituality as the spirituality, or by the civil power for other than overt acts. Roger Williams has the honor of being the first in modern times who took the right ground in regard to liberty of conscience. It was he who, in 1642, cleared the subject from the subtleties of a thousand years of darkness, and held up to Christian abhorrence in all its forms the "Bloody Tenet" (as he justly called it) of persecution for conscience' sake. John Owen, John Milton, John Locke, and a host of later writers have followed in, his steps. "Persecution for conscience' sake," says Dr. Doddridge, "is every way inconsistent; because,

1. It is founded on an absurd supposition that one man has a right to judge for another in matters of religion.

2. It is evidently opposite to that fundamental principle' of morality that we should do to others as we could reasonably desire they should do to us.

3. It is by no means calculated to answer the end which its patrons profess to intend by it.

4. It evidently tends to produce a great deal of mischief and confusion in the world.

5. The Christian religion must, humanly speaking, be not only obstructed, but destroyed, should persecuting principles universally prevail.

6. Persecution is so far from being required or encouraged by the Gospel, that it is most directly contrary to many of its precepts, and indeed to the whole of it." *SEE RELIGIOUS LIBERTY*; *SEE TOLERATION*.

Romanism has alone stood out in the Christian Church supplying an interpretation of the Scriptures which Protestantism has as steadfastly discarded. Popes and Church councils have repeatedly declared the extermination of heretics a duty, and pronounced execrable and damnable all opinions to the contrary; so much so that there is no doctrine whatever

more absolutely asserted by the Church officially than this; and the moderate nominal Romanist who allows himself to dissent from it might just as well set his individual judgment against that of the Church upon any other article of its creed. The liberal Protestant must be told that the very central and fundamental conception of the Roman Catholic system must produce, as its natural and inevitable consequence, wherever it is dominant, those three great objects of sacerdotal ambition in the Middle Ages — persecution of recusants at home, propagation of the faith by force abroad, and the supremacy of the religious over the civil power. If these objects are but partially attainable in our modern world, it is because the principle itself has lost its power over the minds of men; half the world is anti-Catholic, and multitudes, who are Roman Catholics by birth and education, and who, in their indifference, are satisfied with the forms of the religion they have inherited, have never really imbibed its spirit. The doctrine of the Papacy is this: God has entrusted the salvation of mankind to the Church that is, to the clerical order. This salvation is essentially effected by the administration of the sacraments. The spiritual dominion exercised by the Church extends by right over the whole world; every human creature belongs to it as much as he belongs to the civil society of which he is born a member, without any choice of his own, both the one and the other being established of God. Lastly, the great mission of the Church is to make this right a fact, by bringing the entire race to obedience to their spiritual advisers, and to the habitual use of the sacraments, and by obtaining from all local civil governments entire freedom of action for the universal spiritual government. A bad logician may admit this theory, and deny its consequences; but no man can embrace it from the heart, and prize it as the great divine appointment for the everlasting weal of mankind, without approving its consequences, and desiring practically to follow them out. Why scruple at converting barbarians by the sword? The method has been successful; whole populations have thus been brought within reach of sacramental grace; and if the hearts of a first generation are-too obdurate to profit by it, their descendants will. Why shudder at the fearful punishment of heretics? They are rebels, rebels against the highest and holiest authority: we must, cut off the diseased member for the good of the whole body: we must punish those that would poison souls. Why be astonished at the assumption of a priest’s superiority over the kings of the earth? Is he not a nearer representative of God, the possessor of a higher order of authority, addressing itself to the deepest powers and susceptibilities of our nature? The king, as well as the peasant, in all his

conduct comes under the cognizance of the authorized interpreter of the divine will. “The king of England,” wrote Innocent III to Philip Augustus, “thy brother *in* the faith, complains that thou hast sinned against him: he has given thee warning; he has taken as witnesses great lords, in order to re-establish peace; and when that failed, he has accused thee to the Church. The Church has sought to employ paternal love, and not the severity of a judge. She has entreated thee to conclude a peace, or, at least, a truce; and if thou wilt not hear the Church, must thou not be to us as a pagan and a publican? “It is impossible to adopt the conception of the Church and its agency supposed in the pope’s reasoning, and not admit that his conclusion is just and scriptural. An expression constantly recurring in Innocent’s letters is that of “the liberty of the Church:” in its use he was not always wrong; for the pretensions of the spiritual power produced reprisals and usurpations on the part of the temporal; but the phrase generally meant that the civil power was to walk out of the Church’s way whenever they came into conflict. And so it ought to do, if it were true that the Creator of heaven and earth had founded the sacerdotal body, and given it the mission to take men and save them, as children are carried out of a burning house, with a merely passive cooperation of their own. The priest’ does not want to be king; but he claims the right to reign over the king, which is the surest way of reigning; and, from his point of view, the great business of the secular arm — the reason for which it exists — is the repression of heresy. It is an *arm*, and no more. Here are two systems in presence of each other. On the one, man belongs to himself, that he may give himself to God; the Church is the society formed by those who have freely given themselves to God; individual piety thus logically, even when not chronologically, preceding collective life; the knowledge of God in Jesus Christ being the introduction to the Church, and the ordinances of the latter being means of grace, the blessing of which depends upon the recipient’s moral state and personal relation to God. On the other system, man belongs to the sacerdotal order, and the services of the Church are the only introduction to Jesus Christ: she is the nursing mother of his members, receiving them into her bosom before they are conscious of it, and feeding them with ordinances, the blessing of which is independent of the recipient’s moral experiences. It is evident that conceptions so utterly at, variance must make their opposition felt throughout the whole series of ecclesiastical relations, in the character of their proselytism, in their manner of dealing with the impenitent, in their attitude toward the heretic or the heathen. As has already been said, religious indifference may make the

merely nominal Catholic tolerant, but the real Romanist must persecute wherever he has the power; he must interpret after the letter that favorite text of the Dominicans, “Compel them to come in.” That is no misrepresentation which makes him say to his adversaries, “When you are the stronger, you ought to tolerate me; for it is your duty to tolerate truth. But when I am the stronger, I shall persecute you; for it is my duty to persecute error.” What are Rome’s doings in Spain and Italy at the present moment? Let the Romish hierarchy become dominant in some distant island at the antipodes, away from all foreign influences and all excuse of political interest, and it will immediately exhibit its inevitable tendencies. In 1840 the inhabitants of the largest of the Marquesas, at the instigation of their priests, expelled from the island the minority that had become Protestant. An infallible Church can persecute with a good conscience; for the infallibility of an authority implies its resistless evidence, so that it cannot be resisted without guilt, nor can it ever be mistaken in its blows. This is so true that it is avowed by the most consistent ultramontane organs of England and the Continent, by the *Tablet*, and more unreservedly still by the *Universe.* Nay, the zeal of the Anglo-Catholic might shame many a lukewarm Romanist; for one of the symptoms of a thorough appropriation of the sacramental system among recreant Protestants is a cordial approbation of the use of the sword against the Albigenses and their fellows, who dared to mar the unity of the Church. The late dean Hurter retained the presidency of the Protestant clergy L, Schaffhausen for many years after he wrote his Life of Innocent III; yet in that work he boldly advocates the propagation of Christianity by force, and. notwithstanding some hypocritical reserves, can hardly be said to conceal his sympathy with the crusaders of Simon de Montfort and the inquisitors of the Middle Ages. We have an authoritative declaration of Romish doctrine in the bull of Pius VI, A.D. 1794, which condemns the reforming Synod of Ricci, bishop of Pistoia. The synod had affirmed, “Abusum fore auctoritatis ecclesise transferendo illam ultra limites doctrinne ac morum, et eam extendendo ad res exteriores, et per vim exigendo id quod pendet a persuasione et corde, turn etiamn multo minus ad eamr pertinere, exigere per vim exteriorem subjectionem suis decretis;” and this proposition is declared heretical so far as by the Indeterminate words “extendendo ad res exteriores” denenoted an abuse of Church power; and “Qua parte insinuat, ecclesiam non habere auctoritatem subjectionis suis decretis exigendse aliter quam per media quae pendent a persuasione-quatenus intendat ecclesiam; non habere collatam sibi a Deo potestatem, non solum dirigendi per consilia et

suasiones, sed etiam jubendi per leges, ac devios contumacesque exteriore judicio ac salubribus poenis coercendi atque cogendi" (ex Bened. XIV in brevi *Ad Assiduas,* anni 1755; comp. *Damnatio Synodi Pistoiensis,* art. iv, v, in the Appendix to *Canones Conc. Trident.* Tauchnitz ed. p. 298). By this determination of two popes must be interpreted the oath taken by a bishop upon consecration: "Haereticos, schismaticos, et rebelles eidem Domino nostro vel successoribus praedictis, pro posse persequar et impugnabo" (*Pontificale Ronm.*). The claim from the Church of the power of temporal punishment is distinct. The union of civil sovereignty over the Papal States with the ecclesiastical primacy makes such a claim more natural to the head of the Romish Church; but as the history of the Papal States does not recommend such a union of the temporal and civil powers, so neither does the history of the Romish obedience recommend a transfer of coercive jurisdiction from the civil to the ecclesiastical tribunals. That there is no such power divinely given to the Church we have endeavored to show. See Elliott, *Romanism;* Milman, *Lat. Christianity;* Leakey, *Hist. of Europ. Morals,* and his *Hist. of Rationalism,* 1:74, 156, 331, 350, and esp. 2:11, 99; Thompson, *Papacy and the Civil Power* (see Index); Riddle, *Persecutions of the Papacy* (Lond. 1859, 2 vols. 8vo). *SEE ROMANISM*.

Persecutions Of Christians.

The persecution of Christians dates from the day when Jesus Christ appeared among men to preach the glad tidings of redemption from sin and salvation eternal. The very earliest sufferings of the Church of Christ and its Head are subjects of New-Testament history. It is clear that these earliest sufferings Christians endured from the Jews. But the persecutions were of no great severity so long as the Jews were the persecutors. When, however, the Roman authorities assumed the exercise of the state's sovereignty persecution took a more terrible form, and there were then inaugurated a series of measures intended to compel the rising community of Christians to renounce their new creed, and to conform to the established religion of the empire. In later times persecutions of heretics and dissenters have been not uncommon on the part of certain Christian bodies, especially the Romish and Anglican churches.

I. *Pagan Persecutions*. — These are called *the ten persecutions* in ecclesiastical history, and designate certain periods of special severity. The Christian community were at all times regarded with suspicion and dislike in the Roman empire — the constitution of Rome not only being essentially

intolerant of those new religions which, like the Christian, were directly aggressive against the established religion of the state, but being particularly hostile to private associations and private assemblages for worship, such: as those which every Christian congregation by its very nature presented; and thus there are very few periods during the first three centuries in which it can be said that the Church enjoyed everywhere a complete immunity from persecution. But the name is given particularly to certain periods when either new enactments were passed against Christianity, or the existing ones were enforced with unusual rigor. The notion of *ten* such periods is commonly accepted almost as a historical axiom; and it is not generally known that this precise determination of the number is comparatively recent. In the 4th century no settled theory of the number of persecutions seems to have been adopted. Lactantius reckons up but six; Eusebius does not state what the number was, but his narrative supplies data for nine. Sulpicius Severus, in the 5th century, is the first who expressly states the number as *ten;* but he only enumerates nine in detail, and in completing the number to ten, he adds the general persecution which, at the coming of Antichrist, is to precede the end of the world. The fixing of ten as the number seems to have originated in a mystic allusion to the ten horns of the beast in the Apocalypse ([6672]Revelation 17:12). It need hardly be said, however, that this is only a question of words, the diversity of enumeration arising from the different notions attached by the several historians to the designation *general.* If taken quite strictly to comprise the entire Roman empire, the number must fall below ten; if used more loosely of local persecutions, the number might be very largely increased. The ten persecutions commonly regarded as general are the following:

(1.) The persecution under Nero, A.D. 64, when that emperor, having set fire to the city of Rome, threw the odium of that execrable action on the Christians. First, those were apprehended who openly avowed themselves to be of that sect; then by them were discovered an immense multitude, all of whom were convicted. Their death and tortures were aggravated by cruel derision and sport; for they were either covered with the skins of wild beasts, and torn in pieces by devouring dogs, or fastened to crosses, and wrapped up in combustible garments, that, when the daylight failed, they might, like torches, serve to dispel the darkness of the night. For this tragical spectacle Nero lent his own gardens, and exhibited at the same time the public diversions of the circus; sometimes driving a chariot in person, and sometimes standing as a spectator, while the shrieks of

women, burning to ashes, supplied music for his ears. *SEE NERONIAN PERSECUTIONS*.

(2.) The second general persecution was under Domitian. From the death of Nero to the reign of Domitian the Christians remained unmolested and daily increasing; but towards the close of the 1st century they were again involved in all the horrors of persecution. In this persecution many eminent Christians suffered; but the death of Domitian soon delivered them from this calamity. In the year 95 40,000 were supposed to have suffered martyrdom.

(3.) The third began in the third year of Trajan, in the year 100. Many things contributed towards it: as the laws of the empire, the emperor's zeal for his religion and aversion to Christianity, and the prejudices of the pagans, supported by falsehoods and calumnies against the Christians. Under the plausible pretense of their holding illegal meetings and societies, they were severely persecuted by the governors and other officers; in which persecution great numbers fell by the rage of popular tumult, as well as by laws and processes. This persecution continued several years, with different degrees of severity, in many parts of the empire, and was so much the more afflicting because the Christians generally suffered under the notion of malefactors and traitors, and under an emperor famed for his singular justice and moderation. The most noted martyr in this persecution was Ignatius of Antioch, although some name also Clement, bishop of Rome. After some time the fury of this persecution was abated, but did not cease during the whole reign of Trajan. In the eighth year of his successor, Adrian, it broke out with new rage. This is by some called the fourth general persecution, but is more commonly considered as a revival or continuance of the third.

(4.) This persecution took place under Antoninus the philosopher; and at different places, with several intermissions and different degrees of severity, it continued the greater part of his reign. Antoninus himself has been much excused as to this persecution. As the character of the virtuous Trajan, however, is sullied by the martyrdom of Ignatius, so the reign of the philosophic Marcus is forever disgraced by the sacrifice of the venerable Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, the friend and companion of St. John. A few days previous to his death, he is said to have dreamed that his pillow was on fire. When urged by the proconsul to renounce Christ, he replied, "Fourscore and six years have I served him, and he has never done

me an injury: can I blaspheme my King and my Savior?" Several miracles are reported to have happened at his death. The flames, as if unwilling to injure his sacred person, are said to have arched over his head; and it is added that at length, being dispatched with a sword, a dove flew out of the wound, and that from the pile proceeded a most fragrant smell. It is obvious that the arching of the flames might be an accidental effect, which the enthusiastic veneration of his disciples might convert into a miracle; and as to the story of the dove, etc., Eusebius himself apparently did not credit it, since he has omitted it in his narrative of the transaction. Among many other victims of persecution in this philosophic reign we must also record that of the excellent and learned Justin. But it was at Lyons and Vienne, in Gaul, that the most shocking scenes were acted. Among many nameless sufferers, history has preserved from oblivion Pothinus, the respectable bishop of Lyons, who was then more than ninety years of age; Sanctus, a deacon of Vienne; Attalus, a native of Pergamus; Maturus, and Alexander; some of whom were devoured by wild beasts, and some of them tortured in an iron chair made red hot. Some females also, and particularly Biblias and Blandina, reflected honor both upon their sex and religion by their constancy and courage.

(5.) A considerable part of the reign of Severus proved so far favorable to the Christians that no additions were made to the severe edicts already in force against them. For this lenity they were probably indebted to Proculus, a Christian, who, in a very extraordinary manner, cured the emperor of a dangerous distemper by the application of oil. But this degree of peace, precarious as it was, and frequently interrupted by the partial execution of severe laws, was terminated by an edict, A.D. 197, which prohibited every subject of the empire, under severe penalties, from embracing the Jewish or Christian faith. This law appears, upon a first view, designed merely to impede the further progress of Christianity; but it incited the magistracy to enforce the laws of former emperors, which were still existing, against the Christians; and during seven years they were exposed to a rigorous persecution in Palestine, Egypt, the rest of Africa, Italy, Gaul, and other parts. In this persecution Leonidas, the father of Origen, and Irenseus, bishop of Lyons, suffered martyrdom. On this occasion Tertullian composed his "Apology." The violence of pagan intolerance was most severely felt in Egypt, and particularly at Alexandria.

(6.) The next persecution began with the reign of the emperor Maximinus, A.D. 235, and seems to have arisen from that prince's hatred of his

predecessor, Alexander, in whose family many Christians had found shelter and patronage. Though this persecution was very severe in some places, yet we have the names of only a few martyrs. Origen at this time was very industrious in supporting the Christians under these fiery trials.

(7.) The most dreadful persecution that ever had been known in the Church occurred during the short reign of Decius, the Christians being exposed to greater calamities than any they had hitherto suffered. It has been said, and with some probability, that the Christians were involved in this persecution by their attachment to the family of the emperor Philip. Considerable numbers were publicly destroyed; several purchased safety by bribes or secured it by flight; and many deserted from the faith, and consented to burn incense on the altars of the gods. The city of Alexandria, the great theater of persecution, had even anticipated the edicts of the emperor, and had put to death a number of innocent persons, among home were some women. The imperial edict for persecuting the Christians was published A.D. 249; and shortly after Fabianus, bishop of Rome, with a — number of his followers, was put to death. The venerable bishops of Jerusalem and Antioch died in prison the most cruel tortures were employed, and the numbers that perished are by all parties confessed to have been very considerable.

(8.) The emperor Valerian, in the fourth year of his reign, A.D. 257, listening to the suggestions of Macrinus, a magician of Egypt, was prevailed upon to persecute the Christians, on pretense that by their wicked and execrable charms they hindered the prosperity of the emperor. Macrinus advised him to perform many impious rites, sacrifices, and incantations; to cut the throats of infants, etc.; and edicts were published in all places against the Christians, who were exposed without protection to the common rage. We have the names of several martyrs, among whom were the famous St. Laurence, archdeacon of Rome, and the great St. Cyprian, bishop of Carthage.

(9.) A persecution took place under the emperor Aurelian, A.D. 274; but it was so small and inconsiderable that it gave little interruption to the peace of the Church.

(10.) The last general persecution of the Christians began in the nineteenth year of the emperor Diocletian, A.D. 303. The most violent promoters of it were Hierocles the philosopher, who wrote against the Christian religion, and Galerius, whom Diocletian had declared Caesar. This latter was

excited not only by his own cruelty and superstition, but likewise by his mother, who was a zealous pagan. Diocletian, contrary to his inclination, was prevailed upon to authorize the persecution by his edicts. Accordingly it began in the city of Nicomedia, whence it spread into other cities and provinces, and became at last universal. Great numbers of Christians suffered the severest tortures in this persecution, though the accounts given of it by succeeding historians are probably exaggerated. There are, however, sufficient well-authenticated facts to assure us amply of the cruel and intolerant disposition of the professors of pagan philosophy. The human imagination was, indeed, almost exhausted in inventing a variety of tortures. Some were impaled alive; some had their limbs broken, and in that condition were left to expire. Some were roasted by slow fires; and some suspended by their feet with their heads downward, and, a fire being placed under them, were suffocated by the smoke. Some had melted lead poured down their throats, and the flesh of some was torn off with shells, and others had splinters of reeds thrust under the nails of their fingers and toes. The few who were not capitally punished had their limbs and their features mutilated. It would be endless to enumerate the victims of superstition. The bishops of Nicomedia, of Tyre, of Sidon, of Emesa, several matrons and virgins of the purest character, and an immense number of plebeians, arrived at immortality through the flames of martyrdom. At last it pleased God that the emperor Constantine, who himself afterwards became a Christian, openly declared for the Christians, and published the first law in favor of them. The death of Maximin, emperor of the East, soon after put a period to all their troubles; and this was the great epoch when Christianity triumphantly got possession of the thrones of princes.

Picture for Persecutions 1

In this dreadful persecution, which lasted ten years, houses filled with Christians were set on fire, and numbers of them were tied together with ropes and thrown into the sea. It is related that 17,000 were slain in the space of one month, aid that during the continuance of this persecution, in the province of Egypt alone, no less than 144,000 Christians died by the violence of their persecutors, besides 700,000 that died through the fatigues of banishment or the public works to which they were condemned. The time fixed for the exterminating edicts, as they are called, was the Feast of Terminalia in the year 302, which historians remark was to put an end to Christianity. So complete was supposed to be the extirpation of the

sect, that coins were struck and inscriptions set up recording the fact that the Christian superstition was now utterly exterminated, and the worship of the gods restored by Diocletian, who assumed the name of Jupiter; and Maximian, who took that of Hercules. In the annexed coin, from the collection of the Louvre at Paris, the obverse represents the head of the emperor Diocletian crowned with laurel, and his shoulders covered with a robe, with the legend *Diocletianus Perpetuis Felix Augustus,* "Diocletian, perpetual, happy, august." On the reverse is Jupiter holding in his raised hand a thunderbolt, and trampling a kneeling figure with serpent-like feet, having the legend *Jovi Fulgeratori,* "To Jupiter the thunderer." The prostrate figure designates Christianity, and the figure of Jupiter brandishing his thunderbolt is taken probably from Ovid's description, "Quo centimanum dejecerat igne Typhcea;" he is dashing down the Christians with the same fire as he hurled upon the Titans, who had equally but vainly tried to dispossess him of heaven. The figure of this coin is very remarkable, and has a resemblance so strong as to identify it with the Abrasax on the Gnostic gems, with serpent-like feet, supposed to be the God of the Christians. We see him here disarmed of his weapons, the very being which the Christians were supposed to adore, and this single sect and its impure idol bringing persecution on the whole of the Christian Church. In the exergue is *Pecunia Romae,* "The money of Rome." A coin similar to that of Diocletian was struck by his colleague, Maximilian, to commemorate an event in which he also had acted a distinguished part. In the following coin the obverse represents the naked bust of the emperor crowned with laurel, having the legend *Maximianus Perpetuus Augustu.,* 'Maximian, perpetual, august." On the reverse is the figure of Jupiter Tonans, in nearly the same attitude, and with the same legend as the former, but having his head covered. In the prostrate figure the serpentine part of the legs is not distinct, and it has on the whole more of a human form. It may be conjectured that Diocletian wished to represent only the depraved and corrupt sectarians of which his figure is the emblem; and that his more atrocious colleague, careless of distinction, exhibited the genius of Christianity under any form as equally the object of his persecution. This, the most dreadful of all the heathen persecutions, was happily also the last; and the time shortly arrived when Christianity became the public religion of the Roman empire. Constantine was converted A.D. 312, and, according to ecclesiastical writers, his conversion was effected, like that of St. Paul, by a sensible miracle, while he was performing a journey on a public road. He immediately afterwards adopted the cross as his ensign, and formed on the

spot the celebrated labarum or Christian standard, which was ever afterwards substituted for the Roman eagle. This, as Eusebius describes it, was a spear crossed by an arrow, on which was suspended a velum having inscribed on it the monogram formed by the Greek letters X and P, the initials of the name of Christ. *SEE LABARUM*. The coin below represents on the obverse the naked bust of the emperor crowned with a laurel wreath, and surrounded with the leg. end *Flavius Valerius Constanitnus Per. petuus Felix Augustus,* "Flavius Valerius Constantine, perpetual, happy, august." On the reverse is the whole-length figure of the emperor in armor, covered with a helmet, standing on the prow of a galley (a ship was the common emblem of the state among the Romnans. See the ode of Horace, *O Navis*)*;* in his right hand he holds a globe, surmounted by a rayed phoenix, the adopted emblem of his family, to intimate the renovation of the empire; in his left is the labarum, inscribed with the monogram; behind is the angel of victory, directing his course; around is the appropriate legend, *Feli Temporum Reparatio,* "The happy reformation of the times." In the exergue is *Pecunia Tereveromrum,* "The money of Treves." For monographs on these pagan persecutions, see Volbeding, *Index Progammaturn,* p. 96 sq.

Picture for Persecutions 2

Picture for Persecutions 3

II. *Christian Persecutions*. — The guilt of persecution has, however, been attached to professing Christians. Had men been guided solely by the spirit and the precepts of the Gospel, the conduct of its blessed Author, and the writings and example of his immediate disciples, we might have boldly affirmed that among Christians there could be no tendency to encroach upon freedom of discussion, and no approach to persecution. The Gospel, in every page of it, inculcates tenderness and mercy; it exhibits the most unwearied indulgence to the frailties and errors of men; and it represents charity as the badge of those who in sincerity profess it. In Paul's description of this grace (1 Corinthians 13) he has drawn a picture of mutual forbearance and kindness and toleration, upon which it is scarcely possible to dwell without being raised superior to every contracted sentiment, and glowing with the most diffusive benevolence. In the churches which he planted he had often to counteract the efforts of teachers who had labored to subvert the foundation which he had laid, to misrepresent his motives, and to inculcate doctrines which, through the

inspiration that was imparted to him, he discerned to proceed from the most perverted views, and to be inconsistent with the great designs of the Gospel. These teachers he strenuously and conscientiously opposed; he endeavored to show the great importance of those to whom he wrote being on their guard against them; and he evinced the most ardent zeal in resisting their insidious purposes; but he never, in the most distant manner, insinuated that they should be persecuted, adhering always to the maxim which he had laid down, that the weapons of a Christian warfare are not carnal but spiritual. He does, indeed, sometimes speak of heretics; and he even exhorts that, after expostulation with him, a heretic should be rejected, and not acknowledged to be a member of the Church to which he had once belonged. But that precept of the apostle has no reference to the persecution which it has sometimes been conceived to sanction, and which has generally been directed against men quite sincere in their belief, however erroneous they may be esteemed.

Upon a subject thus enforced by precept and example, it is not to be supposed that the first converts, deriving their notions of Christianity immediately from our Lord or his apostles, could have any opinion different in theory, at least, from that which has been now established. Accordingly we find that the primitive fathers, although in many respects they erred, unequivocally express themselves in favor of the most ample liberty as to religious sentiment, and highly disapprove of every attempt to control it. Passages from many of these writers might be quoted to establish that this was almost the universal sentiment till the age of Constantine. Lactantius in particular has, with great force and beauty, delivered his opinion against persecution: “There is no need of compulsion and violence, because religion cannot be forced; and men must be made willing, not by stripes, but by arguments. Slaughter and piety are quite opposite to each other; nor can truth consist with violence, or justice with cruelty. They are convinced that nothing is more excellent than religion, and therefore think that it ought to be defended with force; but they are mistaken, both in the nature of religion, and in proper methods to support it; for religion is to be defended, not by murder, but by persuasion; not by cruelty, but by patience; not by wickedness, but by faith. If you attempt to defend religion by blood, and torments, and evil, this is not to defend, but to violate and pollute it; for there is nothing that should be more free than the choice of religion, in which, if consent be wanting, it becomes entirely void and ineffectual.”

The general conduct of Christians during the first three centuries was in conformity with the admirable maxims now quoted. Eusebius has recorded that Polycarp, after in vain endeavoring to persuade Anicetus, who was bishop of Rome, to embrace his opinion as to some point with respect to which they differed, gave him, notwithstanding, the kiss of peace, while Anicetus communicated with the martyr; and Irenseus mentions that although Polycarp was much offended with the Gnostic heretics, who abounded in his days, he converted numbers of them, not by the application of constraint or violence, but by the facts and arguments which he calmly submitted for their consideration. It must be admitted, however, that even during the second century some traces of persecution are to be found. Victor, one of the early pontiffs, because the Asiatic bishops differed from him about the rule for the observance of Easter, excommunicated them as guilty of heresy; and he acted in the same manner towards a person who held what he considered as erroneous notions respecting the Trinity. This stretch of authority was, indeed, reprobated by the generality of Christians, and remonstrances against it were accordingly presented. There was, however, in this proceeding of Victor too clear a proof that the Church was beginning to deviate from the perfect charity by which it had been adorned, and too sure an indication that the example of one who held so high an office, when it was in harmony with the corruption or with the worst passions of our nature, would be extensively followed. But still there was in the excommunication rashly pronounced by the pope merely an exertion of ecclesiastical power, not interfering with the personal security, with the property, or with the lives of those against whom it was directed; and we may, notwithstanding this slight exception, consider the first three centuries as marked by the candor and the benevolence implied in the charity which judgeth not, and thinketh no evil.

It was after Christianity had been established as the religion of the empire, and after wealth and honor had been conferred on its ministers, that the monstrous evil of persecution acquired gigantic strength, and threw its blasting influence over the religion of the Gospel. The causes of this are apparent. Men exalted in the scale of society were eager to extend the power which had been entrusted to them; and they sought to do so by exacting from the people acquiescence in the peculiar interpretations of tenets and doctrines which they chose to publish as articles of faith. The moment that this was attempted the foundation was laid for the most inflexible intolerance; because reluctance to submit was no longer regarded

solely as a matter of conscience, but as interfering with the interest and the dominion of the ruling party. It was therefore proceeded against with all the eagerness which men so unequivocally display when the temporal blessings that gratify their ambition or add to their comfort are attempted to be wrested from them. To other dictates than those of the Word of God the members of the Church now listened; and opinions were viewed, not in reference to that Word, but to the; effect which they might produce upon the worldly advancement or prosperity of those by whom they were avowed. From the era, then, of the conversion of Constantine we may date, if not altogether the introduction, at least the decisive influence of persecution.

III. *Roman Catholic Persecution.* — Numerous were the persecutions of different sects from Constantine's time to the Reformation; but when the famous Martin Luther arose, and opposed the errors and ambition of the Church of Rome, and the sentiments of this good man began to spread, the pope and his clergy joined all their forces to hinder their progress. A general council of the clergy was called: this was the famous Council of Trent, which was held for near eighteen successive years, for the purpose of establishing popery in greater splendor and preventing the Reformation. The friends of the Reformation were anathematized and excommunicated, and the life of Luther was often in danger, though at last he died on the bed of peace. From time to time innumerable schemes were suggested to overthrow the Reformed Church, and wars were set on foot for the same purpose. The Invincible Armada, as it was vainly called, had the same end in view. The Inquisition, which was established in the 12th century against the Waldenses, *SEE INQUISITION*, was now more effectually set to work. Terrible persecutions were carried on in various parts of Germany, and even in Bohemia, which continued about thirty years, and the blood of the saints was said to flow like rivers of water. The countries of Poland, Lithuania, and Hungary were in a similar manner deluged with Protestant blood.

1. *Holland.* — In the Low Countries, for many years, the most amazing cruelties were exercised under the merciless and unrelenting hands of the Spaniards, to whom the inhabitants of that part of the world were then in subjection. Father Paul observes that these Belgic martyrs were 50,000; but Grotius and others observe that there were 100,000 who suffered by the hand of the executioner. Herein, however, Satan and his agents failed of their purpose; for in the issue a great part of the Netherlands shook off the

Spanish yoke, and erected themselves into a separate and independent state, which has ever since been considered as one of the principal Protestant countries.

2. *France.* — No country, perhaps, has ever produced more martyrs than this. After many cruelties had been exercised against the Protestants, there was a most violent persecution of them in the year 1572, in the reign of Charles IX. Many of the principal Protestants were invited to Paris, under a solemn oath of safety, upon occasion of the marriage of the king of Navarre with the French king's sister. The queen-dowager of Navarre, however, a zealous Protestant, was poisoned by a pair of gloves before the marriage was solemnized. Coligni, admiral of France, was basely murdered in his own house, and then thrown out of the window to gratify the malice of the duke of Guise: his head was afterwards cut off; and sent to the king and queen-mother; and his body, after a thousand indignities offered to it, was hung by the feet on a gibbet. After this the murderers ravaged the whole city of Paris, and butchered, in three days, above ten thousand lords, gentlemen, presidents, and people of all ranks. A horrible scene of things, says Thuanus, when the very streets and passages resounded with the noise of those that met together for murder and plunder; the groans of those who were dying, and the shrieks of such as were just going to be butchered, were everywhere heard; the bodies of the slain were thrown out of the windows; the courts and chambers of the houses were filled with them; the dead bodies of others were dragged through the streets; their blood ran through the channels in such plenty that torrents seemed to empty themselves in the neighboring river: in a word, an innumerable multitude of men, women with child, maidens, and children were all involved in one common destruction; and the gates and entrances of the king's palace were all besmeared with their blood. From the city of Paris the massacre spread throughout the whole kingdom. In the city of Meaux they threw above two hundred into jail; and after they had ravished and killed a great number of women, and plundered the houses of the Protestants, they executed their fury on those they had imprisoned; and calling them one by one, they were killed, as Thuanus expresses, like sheep in a market. In Orleans they murdered above five hundred men, women, and children, and enriched themselves with the spoil. The same cruelties were practiced at Angers, Troyes, Bourges, La Charite. and especially at Lyons, where they inhumanly destroyed above eight hundred Protestants-children hanging on their parents' necks, and parents embracing their children; putting ropes

about the necks of some, dragging them through the streets, and throwing them, mangled, torn, and half dead, into the river. According to Thuanus, above thirty thousand Protestants were destroyed in this massacre, or, as others affirm, above one hundred thousand. But what aggravates these scenes with still greater wantonness and cruelty was the manner in which the news was received at Rome. When the letters of the pope's legate were read in the assembly of the cardinals, by which he assured the pope that all was transacted by the express will and(command of the king, it was immediately decreed that the pope should march with his cardinals to the church of St. Mark, and in the most solemn manner give thanks to God for so great a blessing conferred on the see of Rome and the Christian world; and that, on the Monday after, solemn mass should be celebrated in the church of Minerva, at which the pope, Gregory XIII, and cardinals were present; and that a jubilee should be published throughout the whole Christian world, and the cause of it declared to be to return thanks to God for the extirpation of the enemies of the truth and Church in France. In the evening the cannon of St. Angelo were fired to testify the public joy; the whole city was illuminated with bonfires; and no one sign of rejoicing was omitted that was usually made for the greatest victories obtained in favor of the Roman Church. *SEE BARTHOLOMEWS DAY*.

But all these persecutions were far exceeded in cruelty by those which took place in the time of Louis XIV. It cannot be pleasant to any man's feelings, who has the least humanity, to recite these dreadful scenes of horror, cruelty, and devastation; but to show what superstition, bigotry, and fanaticism are capable of producing, and for the purpose of holding up the spirit of persecution to contempt, we shall here give as concise a detail as possible. The troopers, soldiers, and dragoons went into the Protestants' houses, where they marred and defaced their household stuff; broke the looking-glasses and other utensils; threw about them corn and wine; sold what they could not destroy; and thus, in four or five days, the Protestants were stripper of above a million of money. But this was not the worst: they turned the dining-rooms of gentlemen into stables for horses, and treated the owners of the houses where they quartered with the greatest cruelty, lashing them about, not suffering them to eat or drink. When they saw the blood and sweat run down their faces they sluiced them with water, and, putting over their heads kettle-drums turned upside down, they made a continual din upon them, till these unhappy creatures lost their sense. At Negreplisse, a town near Montauban, they hung up Isaac Favin, a

Protestant citizen of that place, by his arm-pits, and tormented him a whole night by pinching and tearing off his flesh with pincers. They made a great fire round about a boy twelve years old, who, with hands and eyes lifted up to heaven, cried out, “My God, help me!” and when they found the youth resolved to die rather than renounce his religion, they snatched him from the fire just as he was on the point of being burned. In several places the soldiers applied red-hot irons to the hands and feet of men and the breasts of women. At Nantes they hung up several women and maids by their feet, and others by their arm-pits, and thus exposed them to public view stark-naked. They bound suckling mothers to posts, and let their sucking infants lie languishing in their sight for several days and nights, crying and gasping for life. Some they bound before a great fire, and being half-roasted let them go — a punishment worse than death. Amid a thousand hideous cries, they hung up men and women by the hair, and some by their feet, on hooks in chimneys, and smoked them with wisps of wet hay till they were suffocated. They tied some under the arms with ropes, and plunged them again and again into wells; they bound others, put them to the torture. and with a funnel filled them with wine till the fumes of it took away their reason, when they made them say they consented to be Catholics. They stripped them naked, and, after a thousand indignities, stuck them with pins and needles from head to foot. In some places they tied fathers and husbands to bed-posts, and before their eyes ravished their wives and daughters with impunity They blew up men and women with bellows till they burst them. If any, to escape these barbarities, endeavored to save themselves by flight, they pursued them into the fields and woods, where they shot at them like wild beasts, and prohibited them from departing the kingdom (a cruelty never practiced by Nero or Diocletian) upon pain of confiscation of effects, the galleys, the lash, and perpetual imprisonment. With these scenes of desolation and horror the popish clergy feasted their eyes, and made only matter of laughter and sport of them.

3. *England* has also been the seat of much persecution. Though Wickliffe, the first Reformer, died peacefully in his bed, yet such was the malice and spirit of persecuting Rome that his bones were ordered to be dug up and cast upon a dunghill. The remains of this excellent man were accordingly dug out of the grave, where they had lain undisturbed forty-four years. His bones were burned, and the ashes cast into an adjoining brook. In the reign of Henry VIII, Bilney, Bayman, and many other Reformers, were burned; but when queen Mary came to the throne the most severe persecutions

took place. Hooper and Rogers were burned in a slow fire. Saunders was cruelly tormented a long time at the stake before he expired. Taylor was put into a barrel of pitch, and fire set to it. Eight illustrious persons, among whom was Ferrar, bishop of St. David's, were sought out, and burned by the infamous Bonner, in a few days. Sixty-seven persons were this year, A. D. 1555, burned, among whom were the famous Protestants Bradford, Ridley, Latimer, and Philpot. In the following year, 1556, eighty-five persons were burned. Women suffered; and one, in the flames, which burst her womb, being near her time of delivery, a child fell from her into the fire, which being snatched out by some of the observers more humane than the rest. the magistrate ordered the babe to be again thrown into the fire and burned. Thus; even the unborn child was burned for heresy! O God, what is human nature when left to itself! Alas, dispositions ferocious as infernal then reign and usurp the heart of man I The queen erected a commission court, which was followed by the destruction of near eighty more. Upon the whole, the number of those who suffered death for the reformed religion in this reign were no less than 277 persons; of whom were five bishops, twenty-one clergymen, eight gentlemen, eighty-four tradesmen, one hundred husbandmen, laborers, and servants, fifty-five women, and four children. Besides these, there were fifty-four more under prosecution, seven of whom were whipped, and sixteen perished in prison.

Nor was the reign of Elizabeth free from this persecuting spirit. If any one refused to consent to the least ceremony in worship, he was cast into prison, where many of the most excellent men in the land perished. Two Protestant Anabaptists were burned, and many banished. She also, it is said, put two Brownists to death; and though her whole reign was distinguished for its political prosperity, yet it is evident that she did not understand the rights of conscience; for it is said that more sanguinary laws were made in her reign than in any of her predecessors', and her hands were stained with the blood of both Papists and Puritans. James I succeeded Elizabeth: he published a proclamation commanding h Protestants to conform strictly, and without any exception, to all the rites and ceremonies of the Church of England. Above five hundred clergymen were immediately silenced or degraded for not complying. Some were excommunicated, and some banished the country. The Dissenters were distressed, censured, and fined in the Star Chamber. Two persons were burned for heresy, one at Smithfield and the other at Lichfield. Worn out with endless vexations and unceasing persecutions, many retired into

Holland, and from thence to America. It is stated by a judicious historian that. in this and some following reigns, 22,000 persons were banished from England by persecution to America. In Charles I's time arose the persecuting Laud, who was the occasion of distress to numbers. Dr. Leighton, for writing a book against the hierarchy, was sentenced to a fine of £10,000, perpetual imprisonment, and whipping. He was whipped, and then he was placed in the pillory; one of his ears was cut off; one side of his nose slit; he was branded on the cheek with a red-hot iron with the letters S. S.; whipped a second time, and placed in the pillory. A fortnight afterwards, his sores being yet uncured, he had the other ear cut off, the other side of his nose slit, and the other cheek branded. He continued in prison till the Long Parliament set him at liberty. About four years afterwards William Prynne, a barrister, for a book he wrote against the *sports* on the Lord's day, was deprived from practicing at Lincoln's Inn, degraded from his degree at Oxford, set in the pillory, had his ears cut off, imprisoned for life, and fined £5000.

Nor were the Presbyterians, when their government came to be established in England, free from the charge of persecution. In 1645 an ordinance was published subjecting all who preached or wrote against the Presbyterian directory for public worship to a fine not exceeding £50; and imprisonment for a year, for the third offense, for using the Episcopal book of Common Prayer even in a private family. In the following year the Presbyterians applied to Parliament, pressing them to enforce *uniformity* in religion, and to extirpate popery, prelacy, heresy, schism, etc., but their petition was rejected; yet in 1648 the Parliament, ruled by them, published an ordinance against heresy, and determined that any person who maintained, published, or defended the following errors should suffer death. These errors were: 1. Denying the being of a God. 2. Denying his omnipresence, omniscience, etc. 3. Denying the Trinity in any way. 4. Denying that Christ had two natures. 5. Denying the resurrection, the atonement, the Scriptures. In Charles II's reign the Act of Uniformity passed, by which two thousand clergymen were deprived of their benefices. Then followed the Conventicle Act and the Oxford Act, under which, it is said, eight thousand persons were imprisoned and reduced to want, and many to the grave. In this reign, also, the Quakers were much persecuted, and numbers of them imprisoned. Thus we see how England has bled under the hands of bigotry and persecution; nor was toleration enjoyed until William III came to the throne, who showed himself a warm friend to the rights of conscience. The

accession of the present royal family was auspicious to religious liberty; and as their majesties have always befriended toleration, the spirit of persecution has long been curbed.

4. *Ireland* has likewise been drenched with the blood of the Protestants, forty or fifty thousand of whom were cruelly murdered in a few days in different parts of the kingdom in the reign of Charles I. It began Oct. 23,1641. Having secured the principal gentlemen, and seized their effects, they murdered the common people in cold blood, forcing many thousands to fly from their houses and settlements naked into the bogs and woods, where they perished with hunger and cold. Some they whipped to death, others they stripped naked, and exposed to shame, and then drove them, like herds of swine, to perish in the mountains: many hundreds were drowned in rivers, some had their throats cut, others were dismembered. With some the execrable villains made themselves sport, trying who could hack the deepest into an Englishman's flesh; wives and young virgins were abused in the presence of their nearest relations; nay, they taught their children to strip and kill the children of the English, and dash out their brains against the stones. Thus many thousands were massacred in a few days, without distinction of age, sex, or quality, before they suspected their danger, or had time to provide for their defense.

5. *Scotland, Spain, etc.* — Besides the above-mentioned persecutions, there have been several others carried on in different parts of the world. Scotland, for many years together, was the scene of cruelty and bloodshed, till it was delivered by the monarch at the Revolution. Spain, Italy, and the valley of Piedmont, and other places, have been the seats of much persecution. Popery, we see, has had the greatest hand in this mischievous work. It has to answer, also, for the lives of millions of Jews, Mohammedans, and barbarians. When the Moors conquered Spain in the eighth century, they allowed the Christians the free exercise of their religion; but in the fifteenth century, when the Moors were overcome, and Ferdinand subdued the Moriscoes, the descendants of the above Moors, many thousands were forced to be baptized, or were burned, massacred, or banished, and their children sold for slaves; besides innumerable Jews who shared the same cruelties, chiefly by means of the infernal courts of the Inquisition. A worse slaughter, if possible, was made among the natives of Spanish America, where fifteen millions are said to have been sacrificed to the genius of popery in about forty years. It has been computed that fifty millions of Protestants have at different times been the victims of the

persecutions of the papists, and put to death for, their religious opinions. Well, therefore, might the inspired penman say, that at mystic Babylon's destruction "was found in her the blood of prophets, of saints and of all that was slain upon the earth" (Revelation 18:24).

See Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* 1:156 sq.; Elliott,: *Romanism;* Milman, *Hist. of Lat. Christ.;* Leckey, *Hist. of Rat.; European Mora's;* Littell, *Living Age,* Aug. 11, 1855, .p. 330 sq.; *Edinb. Rev.* 63:38 sq.; *Zeitschrift fur hist. Theol.* 1861; *North British Rev.* 34:271; Limborch, *Introduction* to his *History of the Inquisition;* D'Enarolles, *Memoirs of the Persecutions of the Protestants in France;* Robinson, *History of Persecution;* Lockman, *Hist. of Popish Persecution;* Clark, *Looking glass for Persecutors;* Doddridge, *Sermon on Persecution;* Jortin, *ibid.* vol. iv, ser. 9; Fox, *Martyrs;* Wodrow, *Hist. of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland;* Neale, *History of the Puritans, and of New England; Hist. of the Bohemian Persecutions;* Roger Williams, *Bloody Tenet;* Backus, *Hist. of New England;* Bancroft, *Hist. of the United States,* vol. 1.

Persephone

was the name of the. Grecian goddess who ruled over the infernal regions. By the Romans she was called *Proserpina.* She was the daughter of Zeus (Jupiter) and Demeter (Ceres). In Attica she was therefore called Κόρη, i.e. the *Daughter.* By Homer she was styled the wife of Hades (Pluto), and the queen of the lower world, and of the realms inhabited by the souls of the dead. Hence she is called *Juno Inferna, Averna,* and *Stygia.* She is said to have been the mother of the Eumenides, Erinyes, or Furies. Hesiod mentions a story of her having been carried off by Pluto, and of the search of Demeter instituted for her (laughter all over the earth by torch-light, until at length she found her in the realms below. An arrangement was now made that Persephone should spend a third of the year with Pluto, and two thirds with the gods above. She was generally worshipped along with Demeter, and temples in her honor are found at Corinth, Megara, Sparta, and at Locri, in the South of Italy. In art she is represented as grave and severe, as would become the queen of the lower world.

Persep'olis

Picture for Persepolis

(Περσέπολις; *Persepolis*). This city is mentioned only once in the Bible, namely, in 2 Macc. 9:2, where it is said that Antiochus Epiphanes "entered [a city] called Persepolis, and went about to rob the temple and to hold the city; "but the inhabitants defending themselves, Antiochus was ignominiously put to flight. Persepolis was the capital of Persia at the time of the invasion of Alexander the Great, who, as is well known, wantonly burned it, as has been supposed at the suggestion of the courtesan Thais, to revenge the taking of Athens by Xerxes, but this story probably rests on the sole authority of Cleitarchus (Cleitarch. *ap. Athen.* 13, p. 576 e; Diod. Sic. 17:71, 2, 3; 72, 6; Plutarch, *in Alex.* 38 Quint. Curt. v. 7, 3). According to some authors, the whole city, as well as the magnificent palace, suffered in the general conflagration (Diod. Sic. *l. c.;* Arrian, 3:18, 11; Pliny, *H. N.* 6:26); but according to others it was only the palace (τὸ βασίλειον) that was destroyed (Strabo, xv, p. 730; Plutarch, *in Alex.* 38). Quintus Curtius (v. 7, 5) mentions that the palace was built with a great quantity of cedar, which increased the ardor of the flames. It is probable that the temples, which were of stone, escaped. That it could have been entirely destroyed seems hardly credible, for not only was it existing in the time of Antigonus, king of Asia (B.C. 306), who visited the palace himself (Diod. Sic. 19:46, 6), but at the same period Peucestas and Eumenes, formerly generals of Alexander, and now antagonists of Antigonus, both visited Persepolis, and the latter moved his camp there and; held it as the seat of government (προῆγον τῆς Περσίδος εἰς Περσέπολιν τὸ βασίλειον, Diod. Sic. 19:21, 2; 22, 1). From this it would appear that the city itself was called τὸ βασίλειον. Moreover, at the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, as recorded above (2 Maccabees 9:2), it seems to have still been a repository of treasure; and Ptolemy (*Geog.* 6:44; 8:5, 13) mentions it as existing in his time. The extensive ruins now remaining would prove that it must either have been rebuilt or not totally destroyed by Alexander. It does not seem to have long survived the blow inflicted upon it by Alexander; for after the time of Antiochus Epiphanes it disappears altogether from history as an inhabited place. Persepolis has been considered by many as identical with *Pasargadae* (Niebuhr, *Lect. on Ant. Hist.* 1:115; Ousely, *Travels,* 2:6, 18), and in one passage of an ancient author there is some obscurity (Arrian, 3:18, 11), but the two cities are

afterwards distinguished (7:1, 1). All other ancient authors, however, carefully distinguish the position of the two cities (Strabo, 15, p. 729; Pliny, 6:26; Ptol. 6:4), and it is now ascertained that the ruins of these two cities are more than forty miles apart. Persepolis was situated on the plains of *Merdusht,* near the junction of two streams, the Araxes (Bendamir) and the Medus (Pulwan), while Pasargadee was about forty-nine miles from Persepolis on the plain of *Murghab,* where even now exist the ruins of the tomb of Cyrus (Arrian, 6:29). The ruins of Persepolis, which are very extensive, bear the name *of Chehel Minar,* or "Forty Pillars," the remains of the palaces built by Darius, son of Hystaspes, and his son Xerxes. The city seems to have stood at the foot of the rock on which these ruins are placed. Three groups are chiefly distinguishable in the vast ruins existing on the spot. First, the Chehel Minar (Forty Pillars), with the Mountain of the Tombs (Rachmed), also called Takht-i-Jamshid, or the structure of Jamshid, after some fabulous ancient king, popularly supposed to be the founder of Persepolis. The next in order is Naksh-i-Rustam, to the north-west, with its tombs; and the last, the building called the Haram of Jamshid. The most important is the first group, situated on a vast terrace of cyclopean masonry at the foot of a lofty mountain-range. The extent of this terrace is about 1500 feet from north to south, and about 800 from east to west, and it was, according to Diodorus Siculus, once surrounded by a triple wall of 16, 32, and 60 cubits respectively in height, for the threefold purpose of giving strength, inspiring awe, and defense. The whole internal area is further divided into three terraces-the lowest towards the south; the central being 800 feet square, and rising 45 feet above the plain; and the third, the northern, about 550 feet long, and 35 feet high. No traces of structures are to be found on the lowest platform; on the northern, only the so-called "Propyleea" of Xerxes; but the central platform seems to have been occupied by the foremost structures, which again, however, do not all appear to have stood on the same level. There are distinguished here the so-called "Great Hall of Xerxes" (called Chehel Minar, by way of eminence), the Palace of Xerxes, and the Palace of Darius, towering one above the other in successive elevations from the ground. The stone used for the buildings is darkgray marble, cut into gigantic square blocks, and in many cases exquisitely polished. The ascent from the plain to the great northern platform is formed by two double flights, the steps of which are nearly 22 feet wide, 83 inches high, and 15 inches in the tread, so that several travelers have been able to ascend them on horseback. What are called the Propylaea of Xerxes on this platform are two masses of stone-

work, which probably formed an entrance-gateway for foot-passengers, paved with gigantic slabs of polished marble. Portals, still standing, bear figures of animals 15 feet high, closely resembling the Assyrian bulls of Nineveh. The building itself, conjectured to have been a hall 82 feet square, is, according to the cuneiform inscriptions, as interpreted by Rawlinson, the work of Xerxes. An expanse of 162 feet divides this platform from the central one, still bearing many of those columns of the Hall of Xerxes from which the ruins have taken their name. The staircase leading up to the Chehel Minar, or Forty Pillars, is, if possible, still more magnificent than the first; and the walls are more superbly decorated with sculptures, representing colossal warriors with spears, gigantic bulls, combats with wild beasts, processions, and the like; while broken capitals, shafts, pillars, and countless fragments of buildings, with cuneiform inscriptions, cover the whole vast space of this platform, 350 feet from north to south, and 380 from east to west. The Great Hall of Xerxes, perhaps the largest and most magnificent structure the world has ever seen, is computed to have been a rectangle of about 300 X 350 feet, and to have consequently covered 105,000 square feet, or 2.5 acres. The pillars were arranged in four divisions, consisting of a center group six deep every way, and an advanced body of twelve in two ranks, the same number flanking the center. Fifteen columns are all that now remain of the number. Their form is very beautiful. Their height is 60 feet, the circumference of the shaft 16, the length from the capital to the torus, 44 feet. The shaft is finely fluted in 52 divisions: at its lower extremity begin a cincture and a torus, the first two inches in depth, and the latter one foot, from whence devolves the pedestal, shaped like the cup and leaves of the pendent lotus, the capitals having been surmounted by the double semi-bull. Behind the Hall of Xerxes was the so-called Hall of Hundred Columns, to the south of which are indications of another structure, which Fergusson terms the Central Edifice. Next along the west front stood the Palace of Darius, and to the south the Palace, of Xerxes, measuring about 86 feet square, similarly decorated, and of similar grand proportions. For a further and more minute description, see Le Bruyn, *Voy. au Levant,* 4:301; Chardin, 2:140; Niebuhr, *Reise in Arabien,* etc., 2:121; Sir R. K. Porter, *Travels,* 1:576; Heeren, *Asiatic Nations,* 1:91; Rich, *Residence in Kurdistan,* 2:218-222; Fergusson, *Palaces of Nineveh and Persepolis Restored,* p. 89; Vaux, *Nineveh and Persepolis,* p. 360; Ussher, *A Journey from London to Persepolis,* p. 532, etc. Persepolis is about four miles from Istakhr, the earliest occurrence of which name appears on a coin of the Mohammedan

conquerors of Persia, struck at this place A.H. 94 =A.D. 712; and as, according to Mr. Fergusson, "Pasargadae had been the royal residence of the Achaemenidne *[*βασίλειον ἀρχαῖον, Strabo, 15:3, 7], so Persepolis became the new town when Darius removed to Istakhr — the latter having been, in all ages subsequent, *the* city *par excellence"* (Fergusson, p. 92; Vaux, *Nin. and Pers.* p. 397, 401). It is curious that, while Herodotus and other ancient writers mention Susa, Babylon, and Ecbatana, no contemporary author mentions Persepolis; and moreover they "mark the portions of the year which the Persian monarchs used to spend at their several residences in such a manner as to leave no portion of the year vacant for Persepolis" (Heeren, *Asiatic Nations,* 1:92). Atheneus (*Deipnosoph.* 12:513, F), however, says that the Persian kings resided at Persepolis during the autumn of each year; but statements of other writers (Xenoph. *Cyrop.* 8:6, 22; Plutarch, *De Exil.* 12:10) leave this uncertain. Notwithstanding, it cannot be doubted that it was a royal residence, and. as Strabo (xv, p. 729) states, after Susa, the richest city of the Persians. *SEE PERSIA*.

It is, however, to be observed that the expedition of Antiochus Epiphanes to Persia is very differently related in 1 Maccabees 6:1, 2. It is there stated that Antiochus, "having heard say that Elymais, in the country of Persia, was a city (ὅτι ἐστιν Ἐλυμα ἵς ἐν τῇ Περσίδι πόλις; ὅτι ἐστιν ἐν Ἐλυμὲς ἐν τῇ Περσιδι πόλις, *Cod. Alex.*) greatly renowned for riches, silver, and gold, and that there was in it a very rich temple, wherein were coverings of gold, and breastplates and shields, which Alexander, son of Philip, the Macedonian king, who reigned first among the Grecians, had left there, came and sought to take the city and to spoil it," but was defeated in the attempt. This account is strictly followed by Josephus (*Ant.* 12:9, 1), who adds that it was the temple of Diana against which the expedition was made — a fact also recorded by Polybius (31:11), but by Appiain (*Syr.* 66) stated to have been the temple of Venus. These statements receive some confirmation from the temple of the goddess "Nanaea" being mentioned as visited by Antiochus (2 Maccabees 1:13-15). Nanaea has been identified with both Artemis and Aphrodite, and is evidently the Ἀναῖτις of Strabo (15, p. 532), the *numnen patriunm* of the Persians. Medes, and Armenians. (For an account of this deity, see Norris, in *Roy. As. Soc.* 15:161; Rawlinson, *Herod.* 1:634.) *SEE NANAEA*. It is quite evident that there is an error in the Maccabees and in Josephus, in both of which Elymais is called "a city," for all historians and geographers

call it a province (Smith, *Dict. of Class. Biog.* s.v. Elymais), and it is even so particularized in the *Cod. Alex.;* and Strabo especially (16, p. 744), who mentions three temples-of Belus, Minerva, and Diana, called Azara-does not place them in the city of Elymais, but at different places in the country of the Elymaeans. It was the temple of Belus that was attacked by Antiochus the Great in B.C. 187, when he was killed by the people, who rose in its defense (Strabo, *l.c.* 16:1, 18; Diod. Sic. 29:15; comp. 28:3; Justin, 32, ch. 2), against the opinion of Aurelius Victor (*De Viris Illust.* 54), who says he was slain by his attendants during the carousals. Taking the following facts into consideration —

1. That Persepolis, according to the account of most historians, was utterly destroyed, and all the treasures carried away;

2. that the expedition of Antiochus Epiphanes thereto is only recorded in the 2d Maccabees;

3. that Antiochus's father had already made an attack on the temple of Elymais, which was perhaps a judgment, for the, soon to do the same;

4. that the expedition to Elymais and to its temple — the deity of which is named — is not only mentioned in the 1st and 2d Maccabees, but is also recorded by Polybius and Appian — it seems more probable that it was against an *Elynocean* temple that Antiochus Epiphanes directed his attack, an opinion that has been already advanced by Grimm (*Kurzgef. exeg. Handb. zu den Apokr.*). See Rawlinson, *Anc. Monarchies,* 4:237 sq.; *North Amer. Rev.* 1836, p. 7. *SEE ANTIOCHUS EPIPHANES.*

Perseus

Picture for Perseus

the name of a Grecian character in mythology, was the son of Zeus and Danae, and grandson of Acrisius. Acrisius had been warned by an oracle that he should be killed by the hand of the son of Danae, so he shut her up in a brazen tower. Zeus visited her there in the form of a shower of gold, and became the father of Perseus. Hence his is called *Aurigena.* When Acrisius discovered the birth of the boy, he put both him and his mother into a chest and cast it into the sea, but Zeus carried it ashore at Seriphos (and there Perseus was brought up), one of the Cyclades, where Polydectes reigned, who, wishing to get rid of him to be free in his approaches to Danae, with whom he had become enamored, sent Perseus, when yet a

youth, to bring the head of the Gorgon Medusa, on the pretense that he wanted to present it as a bridal gift to Hippodaania. Perseus set forth under the protection of Athena and Hermes, the former of whom gave him a mirror, by which he could see the monster without looking at her (for that would have changed him into stone); the latter, a sickle; while the nymphs provided him with winged sandals, and a helmet of hades, or invisible cap. After numerous wonderful adventures, he reached the abode of Medunsa, who dwelt near Tartessus, on the coast of the ocean, and succeeded in cutting off her head, which he put into a bag and carried off. On his return he visited Ethiopia, where he liberated and married Andromeda, by whom he subsequently had a numerous family, and arrived at Seriphos in time to rescue his mother from the annoyance of the too ardent addresses of Polydectes, whom, along with some of his companions, he changed into stone. After this he went to Argos, from which Acrisius fled to Thessaly, but Perseus followed him in disguise, hoping to persuade him to return. While taking part in the games there, he threw the discus in such a way that Acrisius was killed by it, without Perseus's intention. Then Perseus assumed the vacant throne. Perseus was worshipped as a hero in various parts of Greece, and according to Herodotus in Egypt too. In ancient works of art the figure of Perseus much resembles that of Hermes. See Vollmer, *Mythologisches Worterbuch,* s.v.; Mrs. Clement, *Sacred and Legendary Art and Mythol.* p. 478, 479.

Per'seus

(Περσεύς, the name originally of a mythological Greek character, Vulg. *Perses*), the eldest (illegitimate or supposititious?) son of Philip V and last king of Macedonia. After his father's death (B.C. 179) he continued the preparations for the renewal of the war with Rome, which was seen to be inevitable. The war, which broke out in B.C. 171, was at first ably sustained by Perseus; but in 168 he was defeated by L. *A*Emilius Paullus at Pydna, and shortly afterwards surrendered with his family to his conquerors. He graced the triumph of Paullus, and died in honorable retirement at Alba. The defeat of Perseus put an end to the independence of Macedonia, and extended even to Syria the terror of the Roman name (1 Maccabees 8:5).

Perseverance

is the continuance in any design, state, opinion, or course of action. In theological science the *perseverance of the saints* is a doctrine so named, which teaches that those who are truly converted by the Holy Spirit shall never finally and totally fall from grace, but shall *hold out to the end* and be saved. This doctrine has afforded considerable matter for controversy between the Calvinists and Arminians, the former maintaining this doctrine of Final Perseverance, the latter denying it. We shall briefly state the arguments of the Calvinists and the objections made by the Arminians.

The advocates of the doctrine of Final Perseverance found their belief upon the decree of God, whereby he has predestinated the elect to grace and glory; inferring that therefore they will certainly persevere;. and arguing that their perseverance is a part of their election, for God has decreed to keep such persons that they should not fall. (The Bible passage very generally quoted to prove the perseverance of the saints, in connection with foreordination, unconditional election, etc., is Romans 8:28-30.) It is thus; stated in the Westminster Assembly's Confession of Faith: "They whom God hath accepted in his beloved, effectually called and sanctified by his Spirit, canneither totally nor finally fall away from the state of grace; but shall certainly persevere therein to the: end, and be eternally saved." According to the Calvinistic theory of regeneration, the soul is chosen by God from eternity, its conversion and regeneration are-wholly the work of the Holy Spirit, and the work, having been begun by God for his own good pleasure, will not and cannot be abandoned by him. Or, to quote, again the words of the Westminster Assembly's Confession of Faith, "This perseverance of the saints depends not upon their own free-will, but upon the immutability of the decree of election, flowing 'from the free and unchangeable love of God the Father: upon the efficacy of the merit and intercession of Jesus Christ; the abiding of the Spirit, and of the seed of God within them; and the nature of the covenant of grace-from all which ariseth also the certainty and infallibility thereof." "The perfections of God," says Buck, "are a strong argument to prove this doctrine.

(1.) God, as a Being possessed of infinite love, faithfulness, wisdom, and power, can hardly be supposed to suffer any of his people finally to fall into perdition. This would be a reflection on his attributes, which are all pledged for their good, as a father of his family. His love to his people is unchangeable, and therefore they cannot be the objects of it at one time

and not at another (<430131>John 13:1; <360317>Zephaniah 3:17; <243103>Jeremiah 31:3). His faithfulness to them and to his promise is not founded upon their merit, but upon his own will and goodness; this, therefore, cannot be violated (<390306>Malachi 3:6; <042319>Numbers 23:19). his wisdom foresees every obstacle in the way, and is capable of removing it, and directing them into the right path. It would be a reflection on his wisdom, after choosing a right end, not to choose right means in accomplishing the same (<240106>Jeremiah 10:6, 7). His power is insuperable, and is absolutely and perpetually displayed in their preservation and protection (<600105>1 Peter 1:5).

(2.) Another proof of this doctrine is their union to Christ, and what he has done for them. They are said to be chosen in him (<490104>Ephesians 1:4), united to him (<490123>Ephesians 1:23), the purchase of his death (<450834>Romans 8:34; <560214>Titus 2:14), the objects of his intercession (<450510>Romans 5:10; 8:34; <620201>1 John 2:1, 2). Now if there be a possibility of their finally falling, then this choice, this union, his death and intercession, may all be in vain, and rendered abortive; an idea as derogatory to the divine glory, and as dishonorable to Jesus Christ, as possibly can be.

(3.) It is proven also from the work of the Spirit, which is to communicate grace and strength equal to the day (<500106>Philippians 1:6; <470121>2 Corinthians 1:21, 22). If, indeed, divine grace were dependent on the will of man, if by his own power he had brought himself into a state of grace, then it might follow that he might relapse into an opposite state when that power at any time was weakened; but as the perseverance of the saints is not produced by any native principles in themselves, but by the agency of the Holy Spirit, enlightening, confirming, and establishing them, of course they must persevere, or otherwise it would be a reflection on this Divine Agent (<450809>Romans 8:9; Corinthians 6:11; <430414>John 4:14; 16:14).

(4.) Lastly, the declarations and promises of Scripture are very numerous in favor of this doctrine (<181709>Job 17:9; <199414>Psalm 94:14; <243240>Jeremiah 32:40; <431028>John 10:28; 17:12; <460108>1 Corinthians 1:8, 9; <600105>1 Peter 1:5; <200418>Proverbs 4:18), all of which could not be true, if this doctrine were false."

According to the Arminian theology, on the other hand, the Spirit of God is equally ready and willing to act upon all hearts; its efficacy over some rather than others depends solely upon their own free-will in choosing Christ, and yielding to the influence of the Spirit; hence, if they thereafter choose again to reject Christ, and steel themselves against the continuing influences of the Holy Spirit, they can do so, in which case they are said to

have fallen from grace. This possibility of the final apostasy of the saints, Arminians assert on the authority of <scripRef passage="Hebrews 6:4" />, as well as of the many warnings against falling away which the Scriptures contain (<scripRef passage="Ezekiel 7:20; 18:24" />; <scripRef passage="Hebrews 6:3, 6" />; <scripRef passage="Psalm 135:3-5" />), and inasmuch as it is foretold as a future event that some should fall away (<scripRef passage="Matthew 24:12, 13" />; <scripRef passage="John 15:6" />; <scripRef passage="Matthew 13:20, 21" />), and that many have in fact fallen away, as David, Solomon, Peter, Alexander, Hymenaeus, etc. This last point has become of so much importance in the controversy that those who hold to the doctrine of the final perseverance of the saints maintain that they may temporarily fall away into sin, and suffer loss by their inconsistency and backsliding, and also that those cases in which seeming Christians abandon their Christian profession and hope altogether, are explained by the declaration that the conversion in such cases was a spurious one. The Calvinists go even so far as to claim that "the difference between Arminian and Calvinist on this subject, though very considerable, is less, practically, *than* has sometimes been supposed, since both agree that one *may* give all the external evidences of having commenced a Christian life, and yet fall away and be finally lost. The real difference between them is that the Arminians hold that in such a case the professor of religion was really a Christian, but lost his religion by turning his lack upon Christ; while the Calvinist holds that the appearances were deceitful, and the professed Christian was never really a child of God" (Dr. Lyman Abbott); or, as Mr. Edwards says of *all* apostates, "They had no root, no oil in their vessels." To this mode of arguing the question Arminians take decided exception, since the fact that professed saints do not persevere does not prove that all real ones will do so. More properly expressed, the Calvinistic proposition stands thus: *"Professed saints do not persevere. Therefore all real saints will persevere."* The exposure of the hypocrite the Arminian denies to be proof that the real saint cannot apostatize, and though David and Peter were finally restored, it does riot prove that either had grace in his heart at the time of his fall. "To assert this," says Nash, "in the case of David, is to assert that a murderer and an adulterer hath eternal life abiding in him; and to assert it in the case of Peter, is to assert that a person may be in a state of grace and yet profanely deny Christ." Besides, this doctrine absolutely places the Christian higher than Adam stood in his primeval state. *SEE PERFECTION*. Even in his first trial Adam could fall. According to Calvinism, the Christian has reached a point where he can no more be liable to fall from God. It also removes the decision of a question from its proper jurisdiction — the final

judgment — and places it at the point of conversion. It teaches that when a person becomes truly converted he is absolutely *assured* of eternal life, and of course his meetness for heaven is prospectively settled, and therefore, granting the conversion to be gen*uine,* the judgment-day becomes a farce. But the most common objection raised by the Arminians is that the doctrine of final perseverance makes men careless concerning virtue and holiness, and supersedes the use of means and renders exhortation unnecessary. Its advocates, however, reply that this objection is not valid against them, "the true doctrine of Perseverance of Saints being one of perseverance in holiness and giving no encouragement to a confidence of final salvation which is not; connected with a present and even an increasing holiness," or, as Abbott puts it: "Both Calvinist and Arminian agree in urging all professed Christians to exercise diligence in making their calling and election sure, the one that they be not deceived, the other that they lose not what they have gained." The Church of England, without pronouncing any authoritative opinion on this question, declares in the 16th Article that "after we have received the Holy Ghost, we *may* depart from grace given, and fall into sin; and by the grace of God *may* rise again." "To our own safety our own sedulitv is required," is the sentiment of Hooker, in his sermon on *The Certainty and Perpetuity of Faith in the Elect.* See Beza, *Principles;* Whitby and Gill, *On the Five Points;* Calvin, *Institutes,* bk. 3, ch. 23; Williston, *Harmony of Divine Truth* (art. on Persev.); Cole, *Sovereignty of God;* Booth, *Reign of Grace;* Doddridge, *Lectures,* lect. 179; Turretin, *Comp. Theology,* loc. 14, p. 156; Witsius, *OEconomia;* lib. iii, ch. 13; Topladyt, *Works,* v. 476; Ridgley, *Body of Divinity,* qu. 79; Wesley, *Works,* 6:50; Fletcher, *Works;* Watson, *Institutes;* Hall, *Help to Zion's; Travellers;* Newton, *Works;* Edwards, *Works,* 3:509-532; Dwight, *Theology,* serm. 87; Fuller, *Works;* Goodwin, *Works, p.* 238, 280; Cunningham, *Hist. Theol.* 1:355 sq.; 2:490 sq.; Hodge, *Doctrinal Theology* (see Index); Whately, *St. Paul* (essay 4); Browne, *Expos. of the XXXIX Articles; Brit. and For. Ev. Rev.* 35:222; *Christian Remembr.* Jan. 1856, p. 158; *Christian Journal,* vol. 8; Nevin, in *Mercersb. Rev.* 1857, p. 73, 197; Griffin, *Park Street Lectures;* Scott, *Synod of Dort,* p. 220; Olivers, *Perseverance;* Nash, *Perseverance.*

Persia

Picture for Persia 1

(Heb. *Paras'*, סרפ; native *Fars*, thought to be either from the Zend *Pars*, "'pure" or "splendid," or from *Farash* [ורפ], "a horse," that animal being abundant there; Sept. Περσίς; Vulg. *Perses*), the name of one of the interior countries of Hither Asia, varying greatly in application according to time and circumstances. The following account of it embraces the ancient and the modern information, with a special view to Biblical illustration. *SEE PERSIAN*.

I. *Extent and Physical Features.* — The name is used in two or three senses geographically and historically.

1. "Persia" was strictly the name of a tract of no very large dimensions on the Persian Gulf, which is still known as *Fars*, or *Farsistin*, a corruption of the ancient appellation. This tract was bounded on the west by Susiana *or* Elam, on the north by Media, on the south by the Persian Gulf, and on the east by Carmania, the modern Kerman. It was, speaking generally, an and and unproductive region (Herod. 9:122; Arrian, *Exp.* — *Alex.* v. 4; Plato, *Leg.* iii, p. 695, A); but contained some districts of considerable fertility. The worst part of the country was that towards the south, on the borders of the gulf, which has a climate and soil like Arabia, being sandy and almost without streams, subject to pestilential winds, and in many places covered with particles of salt. Above this miserable region is a tract very far superior to it, consisting of rocky mountains — the continuation of Zagros — among which are found a good many fertile valleys and plains, especially towards the north, in the vicinity of Shiraz. Here is an important stream, the Bendamir, which, flowing through the beautiful valley of Merdasht and by the ruins of Persepolis, is then separated into numerous channels for the purpose of irrigation, and, after fertilizing a large tract of country (the district of Kurjan), ends its course in the salt lake of Baktigan. Vines, oranges, and lemons are produced abundantly in this region; and the wine of Shiraz is celebrated throughout Asia. Farther north an and country again succeeds, the outskirts of the Great Desert, which extends from Kerman to Mazenderan, and from Kashan to Lake Zerrah.

Ptolemy(*Geogr.* 6:4) divides Persia into a number of provinces, among which the most important are Paraetacene on the north, which was

sometimes reckoned to Media (Herod. 1:101; Steph. Byz. ad voc Παραίτακα), and Mardyenl on the south coast, the country of the Mardi. The chief towns were Pasargadae, the ancient, and Persepolis, the later capital. Pasargadve was situated near the modern village of Murgaub, 42 miles nearly due north of Persepolis, and appears to have been the capital till the time of Darius, who chose the far more beautiful site in the valley of the Bendamir, where the Chehel Minar, or "Forty Pillars," still stand. *SEE PERPSEPOLIS*. Among other cities of less importance were Paraetaca and Gabne in the mountain country, and Taoce upon the coast. See Strab. 15:3, § 1-8; Pliny, *H. N.* 6:25, 26; Ptolem. *Geogr.* 6:4; Kinneir, *Persian Empire,* p. 54-80 Malcolm, *Hist. of Persia,* 1:2; Ker Porter, *Travels,* 1:458, etc.; Rich, *Journey from Bushire to Persepolis,* etc.

2. While the district of Fars is the true original Persia, the name is more commonly applied, both in Scripture and by profane authors, to the entire tract which came by degrees to be included within the limits of the Persian empire. This empire extended at one time from India on the east to Egypt and Thrace upon the west, and included, besides portions of Europe and Africa, the whole of Western Asia between the Black Sea, the Caucasus, the Caspian, and the Jaxartes upon the north, the Arabian desert, the Persian Gulf, and the Indian Ocean upon the south. According to Herodotus (3:89), it was divided into twenty governments, or satrapies; but from the inscriptions it would rather appear that the number varied at different times, and when the empire was most flourishing considerably exceeded twenty. In the inscription upon his tomb at Naksh-i-Rustam, Darius mentions no fewer than thirty countries as subject to him besides Persia Proper. These are — Media, Susiana, Parthia, Aria, Bactria, Sogdiana, Chorasmia, Zarangia, Arachosia, Sattagydia, Gandaria, India, Scythia, Babylonia, Assyria, Arabia, Egypt, Armenia, Cappadocia, Saparda, Ionia, (European) Scythia, the islands (of the *A*Egean), the country of the Scodrae, (European) lonia, the lands of the Tacabri, the Budians, the Cushites or Ethiopians, the Mardians, and the Colchians.

The name "Persia" is not found in the older records of the Bible, but after the Babylonian period it occurs frequently (2 Chronicles 36:20, 22; Ezra 4:5 sq.; 6:14 sq.; Esther 1:3; 8:10; 1 Maccabees 1:1), meaning the great Persian kingdom founded by Cyrus. The only passage in Scripture where Persia designates the tract which has been called above "Persia Proper" is Ezekiel 38:5. *SEE ELAM*.

3. *Modern Persia* or "*Iran*" is bounded on the north by the great plain of Khiva, the Caspian Sea, and the Trans-Caucasian provinces of Russia; on the east by Bokhara, Afghanistan, and Beloochistan; on the south by the Strait of Ormuz and the Persian Gulf; and on the west by the Shat-el-Arab and Asiatic Turkey. It contains about 545,000 square miles, and consists for the most part of a great table-land or elevated plateau, which in the center and on the east side is almost a dead level; but on the north, west, and south is covered with a broad belt of mountain-region, here and there interspersed with tracts of desert and small fertile plains. The mountain-system of Persia has its root in the north-west corner of the kingdom, and is a continuation of the Taurus, Armenian, and Caucasian chains. The Taurus chain enters Persia a little to the north-east of Lake Van and then turns in a southeasterly direction, ramifying into numerous parallel chains, which traverse the west and south of the country, covering it for a width of from 100 to 330 miles. At its south-eastern extremity this chin joins the Jebel-Abad, which runs eastward through the center of the province of Kerman, and forms the southern boundary of the plateau. The range is generally limestone, and, like all other mountains of the same character, presents many caves and grottos. The province of Azerbijan, in the north-west, is almost wholly mountainous. — On the east side of Azerbijan, a spur of the Caucasus, separated from it, however, by the valley of the Kur and Araxes, runs southwards at some little distance from and parallel to the shore of the Caspian, at the south-west corner of which it becomes more elevated, and as the majestic range of the Elburz takes an easterly direction, following the line of the Caspian coast at a distance varying from 12 to 60 miles. On reaching Astrabad it divides into three great parallel ranges of somewhat inferior elevation, which pursue first an east, and then a south-east direction, joining the Paropamisus in Afghanistan. Many of the hills in the Elburz are covered with perpetual snow; and the highest peak, Mount Demavend, is more than 20,000 feet above the sea. The Persian mountains are mostly of a primitive character; granite, porphyry, feldspar, and mountain limestone enter largely into their composition; they also, in great part, exhibit indications of volcanic action-Demavend itself being evidently an extinct volcano; and the destructive earthquakes which are still of frequent occurrence in the north and north-west of Persia indicate the presence of subterranean fires. The Elburz on the north, the Zagros on the west, the Kerman mountains on the south, and Afghanistan on the east, are the boundaries of the Persian plateau, which ranges from 2000 to 5000 feet above sea-level, the lowest portion being the Great Salt Desert, in the

north-west of Khorassan, which has 2000 feet of elevation above the sea; while the average elevation of the whole plateau above the sea is about 3700 feet. The lower level, out of which the upland rises, is called the Dushtistan, or "Level Country," and stretches along the coast of the Persian Gulf and the Gulf of Ormuz, south of the Bakhtiyari and Kerman ranges, and also along the Caspian Sea, between it and the Elhurz. The aspect of the plateau, diversified as it is for the most part with hills and valleys, mountains and plains, is, contrary to what might naturally be expected, dreary and forbidding. The interior mountains are everywhere bare and, unrelieved by trees or shrubs, and present the appearance of huge masses of gray rock piled one on the other, or starting in abrupt ridges from the level plain. The plains are equally unattractive; and those which are not deserts consist either of gravel which has been washed down from the mountain slopes or accumulated into deep and extensive beds during some former revolution of nature, or of a hard, dry clay. To render such a country fertile requires the presence of abundant water; but, unfortunately for Persia, nature has been remarkably sparing in this respect. The whole of the east and center of the country is entirely destitute of rivers; the country south of the Kerman mountains is very meagerly supplied, the rivers, such as they are, being almost wholly confined to the western and the Caspian provinces.

Almost the whole of Khorassan, the north half of Kerman, the east of Irak-Ajemi, which form the great central plain, and detached portions of all the other provinces, with the exception of those on the Caspian Sea, forming more than three fourths of the surface of Persia, are desert. In some parts of this waste the surface is dry, and produces a scanty herbage of saline plants; in other parts it is covered with salt marshes, or with a dry, hard, salt crust, sometimes of considerable thickness, which glitters and flashes in the sunlight, forcing the traveler on these inhospitable wastes to wear a shade to protect his eyes; but by far the greater portion of this region consists of sand, sometimes so light and impalpable as to be shifted thither and thither by the slightest breeze. This great central desert contains a few oases, but none of great extent. The largest of the salt deserts of Persia is the "Dasht Beyad," commonly known as the Great Salt Desert of Khorassan, which lies in the north-west of that province, and is 400 miles in length by 250 miles in breadth. Some parts of Persia, however, are of exceeding fertility and beauty; the immense valleys, some of them 100 miles in length, between the various ranges of the Kerman mountains,

abound with the rarest and most valuable vegetable productions; great portions of the provinces of Fars, Khuzistan, Ardelan, and Azerbijan have been lavishly endowed by nature with the most luxuriant vegetation; while the Caspian provinces, and the southern slopes of the Elburz, are as beautiful as wood, water, and a fine climate can make them — the mountain-sides being clothed with trees and shrubs, and the plains studded with nature's choicest products.

The climate is necessarily very varied. What the Younger Cyrus is reported to have said to Xenophon regarding the climate, "that people perish with cold at the one extremity, while they are suffocated with heat at the other," is literally true. Persia may be considered to possess three climate — that of the southern Dushtistan, of the elevated plateau, and of the Caspian provinces. In the Dushtistan, the autumnal heats are excessive, those of summer more tolerable, while in winter and spring the climate is delightful. The cold is never intense, and snow seldom falls on the southern slope of the Kerman range. The rains are not heavy, and occur in winter and spring. The district is extremely healthy. On the plateau, the climate of Fars is temperate, and as we proceed northwards, the climate improves, attaining its greatest perfection about Ispahan. Here the winters and summers are equally mild, and the regularity of the seasons appears remarkable to a stranger. To the north and north-west of this the winters are severe; and in Kurdistan, the greater part of Azerbijan, and the region of the Elburz, the climate is quite alpine. The desert region of the center and east, and the country on its border, suffer most oppressive heat during summer and piercing cold in winter. The Caspian provinces, from their general depression below the sea-level, are exposed to a degree of heat in summer almost equal to that of the West Indies, and their winters are mild. Rains, however, are frequent and heavy, *and* many tracts of low country are marshy and extremely unhealthy. With the exception of the Caspian provinces, the atmosphere of Persia is remarkable above that of all other countries for its dryness and purity, a fact frequently proved by exposing pieces of polished iron to the action of the air, and finding whether or not they rust.

II. *Inhabitants*. —

1. *Classification of the Population.* Herodotus tells us that the Persians were divided into ten tribes, of which three were noble, three agricultural, and four nomadic. The noble tribes were the Pasargadee, who dwelt,

probably, in the capital and its immediate neighborhood; the Maraphians, who are perhaps represented by the modern *Mafi, a* Persian tribe which prides itself on its antiquity; and the Maspians, of whom nothing more is known. The three tribes engaged in agriculture were called the Panthialaeans, the Derusiaeans, and the Germanians, or (according to the true orthography) the Carmanians. These last were either the actual inhabitants of Kerman, or settlers of the same race, who remained in Persia while their fellow-tribesmen occupied the adjoining region. The nomadic tribes are said to have been the Dahi, who appear in Scripture as the "Dehavites" (comp. Ezra 4:9), the Mardi, mountaineere famous for their thievish habits (Steph. Byz.), together with the Sagartians and the Derbices or Dropici, colonists from the regions east of the Caspian. The royal race of the Achaemenidae was a phratry or clan of the Pasargadse (Herod. 1:126); to which it is probable that most of the noble houses likewise belonged. Little is heard of the Maraphians, and nothing of the Maspians, in history; it is therefore evident that their nobility was very inferior to that of the leading tribe.

The modern population of Persia is naturally divisible into two classes, the settled and the nomad. The settled population are chiefly Tajiks, the descendants of the ancient Persian race, with an intermixture of foreign blood — Turkish, Tartar, Arab, Armenian, or Georgian. To this class belong the agriculturists, merchants, artisans, etc. From having long been a subject race, they have to a large extent lost their natural independence and manliness of character, and acquired, instead, habits of dishonesty, servility, and cunning. The Tajiks are Mohammedans of the Shiite sect, with the exception of the few remaining Parsees (q.v.) or Guebres who are found in Kerman and Fars, and still retain their purity of race and religious faith. The nomad or pastoral tribes, or eylats (*Qyl*, a clan), are of four distinct races — Tulkomans, Kurds, Luurs, and Arabs. Their organization is very similar to that which formerly subsisted among the Highland clans of Scotland, with the exception that the former are nomad, while the latter inhabited a fixed locality. Each tribe is ruled by its hereditary chief (*ujak*), and under him by the heads of the cadet branches (*tirehs*) of his family. Of the four races, the Turkoman is by far the most numerous, and forms at the present day the ruling race in Persia. The Kurds are few in number, the greater part of their country and race being hinder the sway of Turkey. The Arabs are also few in number, and at the present day can hardly be distinguished from the Persians, having adopted both their manners and

language. The Luurs are of nearly pure Persian blood. The nomad races, especially the Turkomans, profess the Sunni creed; they are distinguished from the Tajiks by their courage, manliness, and independence of character; but they are inveterate robbers, and since their entrance into the country in the 10th century it has continually been distracted by civil wars and revolutions. The whole population of Persia is estimated in round numbers at 10,000,000, of whom 3,000,000 are nomads (200,000 of these being Arabs). Classed according to their religious belief, they stand thus: 7,500,000 are Shiites; 500,000 are unorthodox Shiites; 1,500,000 are Sunnites; while the remaining 500,000 are made up of Christians of all denominations (including 200 000 Armenians, 100,000 Nestorians), along with Jews, Guebres, etc.

Picture for Persia 2

2. *Character and Customs*. — The government of Persia was despotic, though there seems to have been a council of state, composed perhaps of the seven princes who "see the king's face" (<150714>Ezra 7:14; <170114>Esther 1:14). These, after the time of Cyrus, may have been the six magnates or their representatives ("his well-wishers," as he names them) who conspired with Darius against the pseudo-Smerdis, along with a prince of the royal house. The sovereign often administered judgment promptly and personally, though he was approached with tedious and stately formalities, as if in some sense he was an impersonation of Ormuzl. The council might speak faithfully, as did Artabanus to Xerxes; or they might be as compliant as when they told the same monarch that, though there was no law permitting him to marry his sister, there was a law allowing him to do as he pleased. The Spartan embassy refused to do the required homage to Xerxes, as in their opinion it amounted to religious worship. In Plutarch (*Themist.* 27) reference is made to the king, who was to be worshipped ώς εἰκόνα θεοῦ, "as the image of God," and Curtius tells us how much Alexander coveted this deification (8:5, 11). The seven princes of the empire, seem to have been regarded also as representing the seven *amshashpands* who stand before the throne of Ormuzd. The sculptures at Persepolis tell the same story, and the Visparad directs prayer to to be offered "to the ruler of the country" (Spiegel, *Eridn*, p. 74). The satraps appointed by Darius are called in Hebrew µynæP]r]Dåv]j]iâa}, in Greek σατράπης. in old Persian, as on the inscriptions, *khshatrapai* — *the* X in the Hebrew form being usually inserted before the Persian *khsh.* A district

or smaller portion of country was put under a hjP, or prefect (Est 3:12; Ezr 8:36), the word being allied to the familiar term *pacha.* This name is applied to the Persian governor west of the Euphrates (Neh 2:7, 9; 3:7); also to the governor of Judaea, as Zerubbabel (Hag 1:1; 2:2; and Neh 5:14; 12:26). Another term given to a Jewish prefect is "the Tirshatha," applied to Nehemiah (Neh 8:9; comp. Ezr 2:63; Neh 7:65). The title probably means, as Gesenius says, "your serenity," or, as we have it, "most dread sovereign." The royal scribes kept a regular journal of judicial procedure, and these "chronicles" were deposited in the chief cities. Thus in Ezra we read of the "house of the rolls," in which search was made, by command of Darius, for a copy of the decree of Cyrus concerning the Jews and Jerusalem, and the "record" was found in the palace at Achmetha (Ezr 6:1). In Esther occurs also this incident (Est 6:1, 2): "On that night could not the king sleep; and he commanded to bring the book of records of the chronicles; and they were read before the king. And it was found written that Mordecai had told of Bigthana and Teresh, two of the king's chamberlains, the keepers of the door, who sought to lay hand on the king Ahasuerus" (see also Est 10:2). When the enemies of Daniel were afraid that the king might relent towards a favorite, they pressed upon him this constitutional maxim, "Sign the writing, that it be not changed, according to the law of the Medes and Persians, which altereth not." As the king solemnly admitted the maxim, he was again pressed with it: "Know, O king, that the law of the Medes and Persians is, that no decree or statute which the king establisheth may be changed" (Dan 6:15). We are not to infer from such language that a royal decree was in every sense irrevocable, or beyond the power of modification or repeal. But the words imply that edicts could not be capriciously altered, and that the despot was bound and regulated by past decisions and precedents. The book of Esther shows, moreover, how a decree, though it could not be reversed, might easily be neutralized. The Jews marked out for assassination got warrant to defend themselves, and to become assassins in turn (Est 8, 9). The satrapian form of administration necessitated the employment of posts and means of conveyance. A vivid picture of such an organization — scribes, translators, and couriers — is given in Est 8:9, 10. The system is described by Herodotus (8:98). "Nothing mortal," he says, "travels so fast." Relays of men and horses were stationed at due distances, and license was given to the couriers to press men, horses, and ships into their service. This service was called ἀγγαρήϊον — a Tatar

word meaning “work without pay.” Rawlinson, however, suggests other derivations. The verb αγγαρεύω came to signify to press into service like a Persian ἄγγαρος; and Persian domination brought the wood into Palestine. Compare ⁴⁰⁰⁵⁴Matthew 5:41; ⁴¹¹⁵²Mark 15:21, where the verb is rendered in the first instance “compel thee to go,” and in the second is applied to the soldiers forcing Simon to carry Christ’s cross. The Persian revenues were raised partly in money and partly in kind. The queen’s wardrobe and toilet were provided for by certain districts, and they were named according to the article which they were taxed to furnish — one being called the Queen’s Veil and another the Queen’s Girdle. The court, according to Ctesias, consisted of an immense retinue. The only water which the king drank was that of the Choaspes; the salt on his table was imported from Africa, and the wine from Syria. Athenneus (4) depicts at length the royal etiquette and extravagance, such as we have it in the first chapter of Esther. The surveillance of the harem was committed to eunuchs, and the seraglio was often the real governing power. The residences of the monarchs of Persia (who called themselves “king of kings; “see Gesen. *Jesa.* 1:392; comp. Berfey, *Pers. Keilinschr.* p. 54, 57, 62) were various. Pasargada, with its royal tombs was most ancient. Persepolis rose not very far from it, and became a treasure-city. After the overthrow of the Babylonian kingdom, Cyrus, while preserving a regard for the more ancient cities of the empire, seems to have thought Babylon a more suitable place for the metropolis of Asia; but as it might not be politic, if it were possible, to make a strange place the center of his kingdom, he founded a new city. Susa, where he was still on Persian ground, and yet not far distant from Babylon. There was also Ecbatana, the Median capital. These several royal abodes seem to have been occupied by the later monarchs, according to the season of the year.

Picture for Persia 3

Among the people there were minute distinctions of rank and formal salutations. When two persons of equal station met, they kissed on the lips; if one was of slightly lower rank, the kiss was on the cheek; and where the difference was great, the inferior prostrated himself on the ground. They drank wine in large quantities, and often under its influence formally deliberated on public affairs. Polygamy was freely practiced. No one was put to death for a first offense, but ferocity was often shown to captives or rebels. Darius himself says of Phraortes, “I cut off his nose and his ears. He was chained at my door; all the kingdom beheld him; afterwards I crucified

him” (Inscription at Behistun, col. 3). The severity of masters towards slaves was wisely restrained (Herod. 1:133, etc.). The Persian youth were taught three things — ἱππεύειν, καὶ τοξεύειν, καὶ ἀληθίζεσθαι — “to ride, to shoot, and to speak truth” (Herod. 1:136). The Persians had made no small progress in the fine arts, especially in architecture, as the ruins of Persepolis testify. These stately and imposing ruins stand on a leveled platform, raised above several terraces — the ascent being by a stair, or double flight of steps the grandest in the world, and yet so gradual in its rise that the traveler may ride up on horseback. The stones are of dark gray marble, often exquisitely polished. Colossal bulls guarded the front of the portals, and the sculptures are not unlike those of Assyria. The space on the upper platform stretches north and south 350 feet, and east and west 380 feet, and is now covered with broken capitais, shafts, etc.; of beautiful workmanship. The pillars are arranged in four divisions — a central group six deep every way, an advanced body of twelve in two ranks, and the same number flanking the center (Sir R. K. Porter). The principal apartments are adorned with sculptures and bass-reliefs, such as the king on his throne and his courtiers around him, with processions of warriors, captives, and bearers of tribute. These sculptures, many of them of the period of Darius and Xerxes, verify the descriptions of Herodotus and Xenophon. The royal pleasure-gardens and hunting-grounds were named sDœÞ¡ in Greek παράδεισος. The original term is an old Eastern one, and it is vain to seek for a Greek derivation. The kings were passionately fond of hunting, and, as exhibited on the rock sculptures, seem to have followed the pastime in a truly Easter manner. The soldiers were armed with bows and short spears, and protected with small helmets on their heads, and steel-scaled tunics on their bodies. In war they fought bravely, but without discipline, generally gaining their victories by the vigor of their first attack; if they were strenuously resisted, they soon flagged; and if they suffered a repulse, all order was at once lost, and the retreat speedily became a rout. The old Persian dress-tight and close-fitting-was superseded under Cyrus by the more flowing Median vestments; and on the Persepolitan monuments the Persians appear “in long robes, with their hair floating behind.”

Picture for Persia 4

The Persians were a people of lively and impressible minds, brave and impetuous in war, witty, passionate, for Orientals truthful, not without

some spirit of generosity, and of more intellectual capacity than the generality of Asiatics. Their faults were vanity, impulsiveness, a want of perseverance and solidity, and an almost slavish spirit of sycophancy and sevility towards their lords. In the times anterior to Cyrus they were noted for the simplicity of their habits, which offered a strong contrast to the luxuriousness of the Medes; but from the date of the Median overthrow this simplicity began to decline; and it was not very long before their manners became as soft and efeminate as those of any of the conquered peoples.

Picture for Persia 5

3. *Language*. — The spoken language of the ancient Persians was closely akin to the Sanscrit, or ancient language of India (see Schultz, *Handbuch der Persischen Sprache,* Elbing, 1863, 8vo). We find it in its earliest stage in the Zendavesta — the sacred book of the whole Aryan race, where, however, it is corrupted by a large admixture of later forms. The inscriptions of the Achaemenian kings give us the language in its second stage, and, being free from these later additions, are of the greatest importance towards determining what was primitive, and what more recent in this type of speech. The earliest form of the written characters was the cuneiform (q.v.). Modern Persian is a degenerate representative, being a motley idiom largely impregnated with Arabic; still, however, both in its grammar and its vocabulary, it is mainly Aryan; and, historically, it must be regarded as the continuation of the ancient tongue, just as Italian is of Latin, and modern of ancient Greek (see Adelung, *Mithridat.* 1:255 sq.; Frank. *De Persidis Lingua et Genio* [Norimb. 1809]; Wahl, *Gesch. d. Morgenland. Sprache u. Literatur, p.* 129 sq.; Lassen, in the *Zeitschrift f die Kunde des Morgenlandes,* VI, 3:488 sq.).

Picture for Persia 6

4. *Religion*. — The religion which the Persians brought with them into Persia Proper seems to have been of a very simple character, differing from natural religion in little, except that it was deeply tainted with dualism. Like the other Aryans, the Persians worshipped one Supreme God, whom they called *Aura-mazda* (Oromasdes) — a term signifying (as is believed) "the Great Giver of Life." From Oromasdes came all blessings — "he gave the earth, he gave the heavens, he gave mankind, he gave life to mankind" (Inscriptions, *passin*) — he settled the Persian kings upon their thrones,

strengthened them, established them, and granted them victory over all their enemies. The royal inscriptions rarely mention any other god. Occasionally, however, they indicate a slight and modified polytheism. Oromasdes is "the chief of the gods," so that there are other gods besides him; and the highest of these is evidently Mithra (q.v.), who is sometimes invoked to protect the monarch, and is beyond a doubt identical with "the sun." To the worship of the sun as Mithra was probably attached, as in India, the worship of the moon, under the name of Homa, as the third greatest god. Entirely separate from these — their active resister and antagonist — was *Ahriman* (Arimanius), "the Death-dealing" — the powerful, and (probably) self-existing Evil Spirit, from whom war, disease, frost, hail, poverty, sin, death, and all other evils, had their origin. Ahriman was Satan, carried to an extreme — believed to have an existence of his own, and a real power of resisting and deifying God. Ahriman could create spirits, and as the beneficent Auramazda had surrounded himself with good angels, who were the ministers of his mercies towards mankind, so Ahriman had surrounded himself with evil spirits, to carry out his malevolent purposes. Worship was confined to Auramazda and his good spirits; Ahriman and his daemons were not worshipped. but only hated and feared. *SEE ORMUZD*.

The character of the original Persian worship was simple. They were not destitute of temples, as Herodotus asserts (Herod. 1:131; comp. *Beh. Inscr.* col. 1, par. 14, § 5); but they had probably few altars, and certainly no images. Neither do they appear to have had any priests. Processions were formed, and religious chants were sung in the temples, consisting of prayer and praise intermixed, whereby the favor of Auramazda and his good spirits was supposed to be secured to the worshippers. Beyond this it does not appear that they had any religious ceremonies. Sacrifices, apparently, were nusunal, though thank-offerings may have been made in the temples. *SEE PARSEES*.

From the first entrance of the Persians, as immigrants, into their new territory, they were probably brought into contact with a form of religion very different from their own Magianism, the religion of the Scythic or Turanian population of Western Asia, had long been dominant over the greater portion of the region lying between Mesopotamia and India. The essence of this religion was worship of the elements more especially of the subtlest of all, fire. It was an ancient and imposing system, guarded by the venerable hierarchy of the Magi, boasting its fire-altars where from time

immemorial the sacred flame had burned without intermission, and claiming to some extent mysterions and miraculous powers. The simplicity of the Aryan religion was speedily corrupted by its contact with this powerful rival, which presented special attractions to a rude and credulous people. There was a short struggle for pre-eminence, after which the rival systems came to terms. Dualism was retained, together with the names of Auramazda and Ahriman, and the special worship of the sun and moon under the appellations of Mithra and Homa; but to this was superadded the worship of the elements and the whole ceremonial of Magianism, including the divination to which the Magian priesthood made pretense. The worship of other deities, as Tanata or Anaitis, was a still later addition to the religion, which grew more complicated as time went on, but which always maintained as its leading and most essential element that dualistic principle whereon it was originally based. *SEE MAGI*.

III. *History*. — In remote antiquity it would appear that the Persians dwelt in the region east of the Caspian, or possibly in a tract still nearer India. The first Fargard of the Vendidad seems to describe their wanderings in these countries, and shows the general line of their progress to have been from east to west, down the course of the Oxus, and then, along the southern shores of the Caspian Sea, to Rhages and Media. It is impossible to determine the period of these movements; but there can be no doubt that they were anterior to B.C. 880 at which time the Assyrian kings seem for the first time to have come in contact with Aryan tribes east of Mount Zagros. Probably the Persians accompanied the Medes in their migration from Khorassan, and, after the latter people took possession of the tract extending from the river Kur to Ispahan, proceeded still farther south, and occupied the region between Media and the Persian Gulf. It is uncertain whether they are to be identified with the Bartsu or Partsu of the Assyrian monuments. If so, we may say that from the middle of the 9th to the middle of the 8th century B.C. they occupied South-eastern Armenia, but by the end of the 8th century had removed into the country which thenceforth went by their name. The leader of this last migration would seem to have been a certain Acheemenes. who was recognized as king of the newly occupied territory, and founded the famous dynasty of the Achaemenide-, about B.C. 700. Very little is known of the history of Persia between this date and the accession of Cyrus the Great, near a century and a half later. The crown appears to have descended in a right line through four princes-Teispes, Cambyses I, Cyrus I, and Carmbyses II, who was the

father of Cyrus the Conqueror Telspes must have been a prince of some repute, for his daughter Atossa married Pharnaces, king of the distant Cappadocians (Diod. Sic. ap. Phot. *Bibliothec.* p. 1158). Later, however, the Persians found themselves unable to resist the growing strength of Media, and became tributary to that power about B.C. 630, or a little earlier. The line of native kings was continued on the throne, and the internal administration was probably untouched; but external independence was altogether lost until the revolt under Cyrus.

Of the circumstances under which this revolt took place we have no certain knowledge. The stories told by Herodotus (1:108-129) and Nicolas of Damascus (*Fr.* 66) are internally improbable; and they are also at variance with the monuments, which prove Cyrus to have been the son of a Persian *king. SEE CYRUS*. We must therefore discard them, and be content to know that after about seventy or eighty years of subjection, the Persians revolted from the Medes, engaged in a bloody struggle with them, and finally succeeded, not only in establishing their independence, but in changing places with their masters, and becoming the ruling people. The probable date of the revolt is B.C. 558. Its success, by transferring to Persia the dominion previously in the possession of the Medes, placed her at the head of an empire the bounds of which were the Halys upon the west, the Euxine upon the north, Babylonia upon the south, and upon the east the salt desert of Iran. As usual in the East, this success led on to others' Craesus, the Lydian monarch, who had united most of Asia Minor under his sway, venturing to attack the newly risen power, in the hope that it was not vet firmly established, was first repulsed, and afterwards defeated and made prisoner, by Cyrus, who took his capital, and added the Lydian empire to his dominions. This conquest was followed closely by the submission of the Greek settlements on the Asiatic coast, and by the reduction of Caria, Caunus, and Lycia. The empire was soon afterwards extended greatly towards the north-east and east. Cyrus rapidly overran the flat countries beyond the Caspian, planting a city. which he called after himself (Arrian, *Exp. Alex.* 4:3), on the Jaxartes (Jihfn); after which he seems to have pushed his conquests still farther to the east, adding to his dominions the districts of Herat, Cabul, Candahar, Seistan, and Beloochistan, which were thenceforth included in the empire (see Ctesias, *Pers. Exc. §* 5 et sq.; and comp. Pliny, *H. N.* 6:23). In B.C. 539 or 538 Babylon was attacked, and after a stout defense fell before his irresistible bands. *SEE BABYLON*. This victory first brought the Persians into contact

with the Jews. The conquerors found in Babylon an oppressed racelike themselves abhorrers of idols — and professors of a religion in which to a great extent they could sympathize. This race, which the Babylonian monarchs had torn violently from their native land and settled in the vicinity of Babylon, Cyrus determined to restore to their own country; which he did by the remarkable edict recorded in the first chapter of Ezra (<15102>Ezra 1:2-4). Thus commenced that friendly connection between the Jews and Persians which prophecy had already foreshadowed (<23408>Isaiah 44:28; 45:1-4), and which forms so remarkable a feature in the Jewish history. After the conquest of Babylon, and the consequent extension of his empire to the borders of Egypt, Cyrus might have been expected to carry out the design which he is said to have entertained (Herod. 1:153) of an expedition against Egypt. Some danger, however, seems to have threatened the north-eastern provinces, in consequence of which his purpose was changed; and he proceeded against the Massagetse or the Derbices, engaged them, but was defeated and slain. He reigned, according to Herodotus, twenty-nine years.

Under his son and successor, Cambyses III, the conquest of Egypt took place (B.C. 525), and the Persian dominions were extended southward to Elephantinb and westward to Euesperidse on the North-African coast. This prince appears to be the Ahasuerus of Ezra (4:6), who was asked to alter Cyrusn's policy towards the Jews, but (apparently) declined all interference. We have in Herodotus (bk. 3) a very complete account of his \warlike expeditions, which at first resulted in the successes above mentioned, but were afterwards unsuccessful, and even disastrous. One army perished in an attempt to reach the temple of Ammon, while another was reduced to the last straits in an expedition against Ethiopia. Perhaps it was in consequence of these misfortunes that, in the absence of Cambyses with the army, a conspiracy was formed against him at court, and a Magian priest, Gomates (Gaumata) by name, professing to be Smerdis (Bardiya), the son of Cyrus, whom his brother Cambyses had put to death secretly, obtained quiet possession of the throne. Cambyses was in Syria when news reached him of this bold attempt; and there is reason to believe that, seized with a sudden disgust, and despairing of the recovery of his crown. he fled to the last resort of the unfortunate, and ended his life by suicide (*Behistun Inscription*, col. 1, par. 11, § 10). His reign had lasted seven years and five months.

Gomates the Magian found himself thus, without a struggle, master of Persia (B.C. 522). His situation, however, was one of great danger and delicacy. There is reason to believe that he owed his elevation to his fellow-religionists, whose object in placing him upon the throne was to secure the triumph of Magianism over the dualism of the Persians. It was necessary for him therefore to accomplish a religious revolution, which was sure to be distasteful to the Persians, while at the same time he had to keep up the deception on which his claim to the crown was professedly based, and to prevent any suspicion arising that he was not Smerdis, the son of Cyrus. To combine these two aims was difficult; and it would seem that Gomates soon discarded the latter, and entered on a course which must have soon caused his subjects to feel that their ruler was not only no Achaemenian, but no Persian. He destroyed the national temples, substituting for them the fire-altars and abolished the religious chants and other sacred ceremonies of the Oromasdians. He reversed the policy of Cyrus with respect to the Jews, and forbade by an edict the farther building of the Temple (Ezra 4:17-22). *SEE ATAXERXES*. He courted the favor of the subject nations generally by a remission of tribute for three years, and an exemption during the same space from forced military service (Herod. 3:67). Towards the Persians he was haughty and distant, keeping them as much as possible aloof from his person, and seldom showing himself beyond the walls of his palace. Such conduct made him very unpopular with the proud people which held the first place among his subjects, and the suspicion that he was a mere pretender having after some months ripened into certainty, a revolt broke out, headed by Darius, the son of Hystaspes, a prince of the blood-royal, which in a short time was crowned with complete success. Gomates quitted his capital, and, having thrown himself into a fort in Media, was pursued, attacked, and slain. Darius then, as the chief of the conspiracy, and after his father the next heir to the throne, was at once acknowledged king. The reign of Gomates lasted seven months.

The first efforts of Darius were directed to the re-establishment of the Oromasdian religion in all its purity. He “rebuilt the temples which Gomates the Magian had destroyed, and restored to the people the religious chants and the worship of which Gomates the Magian had deprived them” (*Beh. Inscr.* col. 1, par. 14). Appealed to in his second year by the Jews, Who wished to resume the construction of their Temple, he not only allowed them, confirming the decree of Cyrus, but assisted the

work by grants from his own revenues, whereby the Jews were able to complete the Temple as early as his sixth year (Ezra 6:1-15). During the first part of the reign of Darius the tranquillity of the empire was disturbed by numerous revolts. The provinces regretted the loss of those exemptions which they had obtained from the weakness of the Pseudo-Smerdis, and hoped to shake off the yoke of the new prince before he could grasp firmly the reins of government. The first revolt was that of Babylon, where a native, claiming to be Nebuchadnezzar, the son of Nabonadius, was made king; but Darius speedily crushed this revolt and executed the pretender. Shortly afterwards a far more extensive rebellion broke out. A Mede, named Phraortes, came forward, and; announcing himself to be "Xathrites, of the race of Cyaxares," assumed the royal title. Media, Armenia, and Assyria immediately acknowledged him — the Median soldiers at the Persian court revolted to him — Parthia and Hyrcania after a little while declared in his favor — while in Sagartia another pretender, making a similar claim of descent from Cyaxares, induced the Sagartians to revolt; and in Margiana, Arachotia, and even Persia Proper, there were insurrections against the authority of the new king. His courage and activity, however, seconded by the valor of his Persian troops and the fidelity of some satraps, carried him successfully through these and other similar difficulties; and the result was that, after five or six years of struggle, he became as firmly seated on his throne as any previous monarch. His talents as an administrator were upon this brought into play. He divided the whole empire into satrapies, and organized that somewhat complicated system of government on which they were henceforth administered (Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, 2:555-568). He built himself a magnificent palace at Persepolis, and another at Susa. *SEE PERSEPOLIS*; *SEE SHUSHAN*. He also applied himself, like his predecessors, to the extension of the empire; conducted an expedition into European Scythia, from which he returned without disgrace; conquered Thrace, Pneonia, and Macedonia towards the west, and a large portion of India on the east, besides (apparently) bringing into subjection a number of petty nations (see the Naksh-i-Rustam Inscription). On the whole he must be pronounced, next to Cyrus, the greatest of the Persian monarchs. The latter part of his reign was, however, clouded by reverses. The disaster of Mardonius at Mount Athos was followed shortly by the defeat of Datis at Marathon; and, before any attempt could be made to avenge the blow, Egypt rose in revolt (B.C. 486), massacred its Persian garrison, and declared itself independent. In the palace at the same time there was dissension; and

when, after a reign of thirty-six years, the fourth Persian monarch died (B.C. 485), leaving his throne to a young prince of strong and ungoverned passions, it was evident that the empire had reached its highest point of greatness, and was already verging towards its decline.

Xerxes, the eldest son of Darius by Atossa, daughter of Cyrus, and the first son born to Darius after he mounted the throne, seems to have obtained the crown in part by the favor of his father, over whom Atossa exercised a strong influence, in part by right, as the eldest male descendant of Cyrus, the founder of the empire. His first act was to reduce Egypt to subjection (B.C. 484), after which he began at once to make preparations for his invasion of Greece. It is probable that he was the Ahasuerus of Esther. *SEE AHASUERUS*. The great feast held in Shushan, the palace, in the third year of his reign, and the repudiation of Vashti, fall into the period preceding the Grecian expedition, while it is probable that he kept open house for the "princes of the provinces, of who would from time to time visit the court, in order to report the state of their preparations for the war. The marriage with Esther, in the seventh year of his reign, falls into the year immediately following his flight from Greece, when he undoubtedly returned to Susa, relinquishing warlike enterprises, and henceforth devoting himself to the pleasures of the seraglio. It is unnecessary to give an account of the well-known expedition against Greece, which ended so disastrously for the invaders. Persia was taught by the defeats of Salamis and Platsea the danger of encountering the Greeks on their side of the *A*Egean, while she learned at Mycale the retaliation which she had to expect on her own shores at the hands of her infuriated enemies. For a while some vague idea of another invasion seems to have been entertained by the court; but discreeter counsels prevailed, and, relinquishing all aggressive designs, Persia, from this point in her history, stood upon the defensive, and only sought to maintain her own territories intact, without anywhere trenching upon her neighbors. During the rest of the reign of Xerxes, and during part of that of his son and successor, Artaxerxes, she continued at war with the Greeks, who destroyed her fleets, plundered her coasts and stirred up revolt in her provinces; but at last, in B.C. 449, a peace was concluded between the two powers, who then continued on terms of amity for half a century.

A conspiracy in the seraglio having carried off Xerxes (B.C. 465), Artaxerxes his son, called by the Greeks Μακρόχειρ, or "the Long-Handed," succeeded him, after an interval of seven months, during which

the conspirator Artabanus occupied the throne. This Artaxerxes, who reigned forty years, is beyond a doubt the king of that name who stood in such a friendly relation towards Ezra (Ezra 7:11-28) and Nehemiah (Nehemiah 2:1-9, etc.). *SEE ARTAXERXES*. His character, as drawn by Ctesias, is mild but weak; and under his rule the disorders of the empire seem to have increased rapidly. An insurrection in Bactria, headed by his brother Hystaspes, was with difficulty put down in the first year of his reign (B.C. 464), after which a revolt broke out in Egypt, headed by Inarus the Libyan and Amyrtaeus the Egyptian, who, receiving the support of an Athenian fleet, maintained themselves for six years (B.C. 460-455) against the whole power of Persia, but were at last overcome by Megabyzus, satrap of Syria. This powerful and haughty noble soon afterwards (B.C. 447), on occasion of a difference with the court, himself became a rebel, and entered into a contest with his sovereign, which at once betrayed and increased the weakness of the empire. Artaxerxes is the last of the Persian kings who had any special connection with the Jews, and the last but one mentioned in Scripture. His successors were Xerxes II, Sogdianus, Darius Nothus, Artaxerxes Mnemon, Artaxerxes Ochus, and Darius Codomannus. These monarchs reigned from B.C. 424 to B.C. 330. None were of much capacity; and during their reigns the decline of the empire was scarcely arrested for a day, unless it were by Ochus, who reconquered Egypt, and gave some other signs of vigor. Had the younger Cyrus succeeded in his attempt, the regeneration of Persia was perhaps possible. After his failure the seraglio grew at once more powerful and more cruel. Eunuchs and women governed the kings, and dispensed the favors of the crown, or wielded its terrors, as their interests or passions moved them. Patriotism and loyalty were alike dead, and the empire must have fallen many years before it did had not the Persians early learned to turn the swords of the Greeks against one another, and at the same time raised the character of their own armies by the employment on a large scale of Greek mercenaries. The collapse of the empire under the attack of Alexander is well known, and requires no description here. On the division of Alexander’s dominions among his generals, Persia fell to the Seleucidae, under whom it continued till after the death of Antiochus Epiphanes, when the conquering Parthians advanced their frontier to the Euphrates, and the Persians came to be included among their subject tribes (B.C. 164). Still their nationality was not obliterated. In A.D. 226, three hundred and ninety years after their subjection to the Parthians, and five hundred and fifty-six years after the

loss of their independence, the Persians shook off the yoke of their oppressors, and once more became a nation.

The Sassanian kings raised Persia to a height of power and prosperity such as it never before attained, and more than once emperilled the existence of the Eastern empire. The last king was driven from the throne by the Arabs (A.D. 636), who now began to extend their dominion in all directions; and from this. period may be dated the gradual change of character in the native Persian race, for they have been from this time constantly subject to the domination of alien races. During the reigns of Omar (the first of the Arab rulers of Persia), Othman, All, and the Ommiades (634-750), Persia was regarded as an outlying province of the empire, and was ruled by deputy governors; but after the accession of the Abbaside dynasty (A.D. 750), Bagdad became the capital, and Khorassan the favorite province of the early and more energetic rulers of this race, and Persia consequently came to be considered as the center and nucleus of the caliphate. But the rule of the caliphs soon became merely nominal, and ambitious governors, or other aspiring individuals, established independent principalities in various parts of the country. Many of these dynasties were transitory, others lasted for centuries, and created extensive and powerful empires. The chief were the Taherites (820-872), a Turkish dynasty, in Khorassan; the Soffarides (Persian, 869-903), in Seistan, Fars, Irak, and Mazanderan; the Samani, in Transoxiana, Khorassan, and Seistan; the Dilemi (Persian, 933-1056), in Western Persia; and the Ghiznevides, in Eastern Persia. These dynasties supplanted each other, and were finally rooted out by the Seljuks, whose dominion extended from the Hellespont to Afghanistan. A branch of this dynasty, which ruled in Khorezm (now Khiva), gradually acquired the greater part of Persia, driving out the Ghiznevides and their successors, the Ghurides; but they, along with the numerous petty dynasties which had established themselves in the south-western provinces, were all swept away by the Mongols (q.v.) under Genghis-Khan and his grandson Hulaku-Khan, the latter of whom founded a new dynasty, the Perso-Mongol (1253-1335). This race, becoming effeminate, was supplanted by the Eylkhanians in 1335, but an irruption of the Tartars of Turkestan under Timur again freed Persia from the petty dynasties which misruled it. After the death of Timur’s son and successor, shall Rokh, the Turkomans took possession of the western part of the country, which, however, they rather preyed upon than governed; while the eastern portion was divided and subdivided among Timir’s descendants, till, at the close of

the 15th century, they were swept away by the Uzbeksi who joined the whole of Eastern Persia to their newly founded khanate of Khiva. A new dynasty now arose (1500) in Western Persia, the first prince of which (Ismail, the descendant of a long line of devotees and saints, the objects of the highest reverence throughout Western Persia), having become the leader of a number of Turkish tribes who were attached by strong ties of gratitude to his family, overthrew the power of the Turkomans, and seized Azerbijan, which was the seat of their power. Ismail rapidly subdued the western provinces, and in 1511 took Khorassan and Balkh from the Usbeks; but in 1514 he had to encounter a much more formidable enemy — to wit, the mighty Selim (q.v.), the sultan of Turkey, whose zeal for conquest was further inflamed by religious animosity against the Shiites, or "Sectaries," as the followers of Ismail were termed. The Persians were totally defeated in a battle on the frontiers; but Selim reaped no benefit from his victory, and, after his retreat, Ismail attacked and subdued Georgia. The Persians dwell with rapture on the character of this monarch, whom they deem not only to be the restorer of Persia to a prosperous condition, and the founder of a great dynasty, but the establisher of the faith in which they glory as the national religion. His son Tamasp (1523-1576), a prudent and spirited ruler, repeatedly drove out the predatory Uzbeks from Khorassan, sustained without loss a war with the Turks, and assisted Homayun, the son of Baber, to regain the throne of Delhi. After a considerable period of internal revolution, during which the Turks and Uzbeks attacked the empire without hinderance, shall Abbas I the Great (1585-1628) ascended the throne, restored internal tranquillity, and repelled the invasions of the Uzbeks and Turks. In 1605 he inflicted on the Turks such a terrible defeat as kept them quiet during the rest of his reign, and enabled him to recover the whole of Kurdistan, Mosul, and Diarbekir, which had for a long time been separated from Persia; and, in the east, Candahar was taken from the Great Mogul. Abbas's government was strict, but just and equitable; roads, bridges, caravansaries, and other conveniences for trade were constructed at immense expense, and the improvement and ornamentation of the towns were not neglected. Ispahan more than doubled its population during his reign. His tolerance was remarkable, considering both the opinions of his ancestors and subjects; for he encouraged the Armenian Christians to settle in the country, well knowing that their peaceable and industrious habits would help to advance the prosperity of his kingdom. His successors, shall Sufi (1628-1641), shall Abbas II (1641-1666), and shall Soliman (1666-1694), were

undistinguished by any remarkable talents, but the former two were sensible and judicious rulers, and advanced the prosperity of their subjects. During the reign of sultan Hussein (1694-1722), a weak and bigoted fool, priests and slaves were elevated to the most important and responsible offices of the empire, and all who rejected the tenets of the Shiites were persecuted. The consequence was a general discontent, of which the Afghans took advantage by declaring their independence, and seizing Candahar (1709). Their able leader, Mir Vais, died in 1715; but his successors were worthy of him, and one of them, Mahmud, invaded Persia (1722), defeated Hussein's armies, and besieged the king in Ispahan, till the inhabitants were reduced to the extremity of distress. Hussein then abdicated the throne in favor of his conqueror, who, on his accession, immediately devoted his energies to alleviate the distresses and gain the confidence of his new subjects, in both of which objects he thoroughly succeeded. Becoming insane, he was deposed in 1725 by his brother Ashraf (1725-1729); but the atrocious tyranny of the latter was speedily put an end to by the celebrated Nadir Shah, who first raised Tamasp (1729 1732) and his son Abbas II (1732-1736), of the Suffavean race, to the throne, and then, on some frivolous pretext, deposed him, and seized the scepter (1736-1747). But on his death: anarchy again returned; the country was horribly devastated by the rival claimants to the throne; Afghanistan and Beloochistan finally separated from Persia, and the country was split up into a number of small independent states until 1755, when a Kurd, named Kerim Khan (17551779), abolished this state of affairs, re-established peace and unity in Western Persia, and by his wisdom, justice, and warlike talents acquired the esteem of his subjects and the respect of neighboring states. After the usual contests for the succession, accompanied with the usual barbarities and devastations, Kerim was succeeded in 1784 by Ali-Murad, Jaafar, and Luft-Ali, during whose reigns Mazanderan became independent under Aga-Mohammed, a Turkoman eunuch of the Kajar race, who repeatedly defeated the royal armies, and ended by depriving Luft-Ali of his crown (1795). The great eunuch-king (as he is frequently called), who founded the present dynasty, on his accession announced his intention of restoring the kingdom as it had been established by Kerim Khan, and accordingly invaded Khorassan and Georgia, subduing the former country almost without effort. The Georgians besought the aid of Russia; but the Persian monarch, with terrible promptitude, poured his army like a torrent into the country, and devastated it with fire and sword; his conquest was, however, hardly

completed, when he was assassinated, May 14, 1797. His nephew, Futteh-Ali (1797-1834), after numerous conflicts, fully established his authority, and completely subdued the rebellious tribes in Khorassan. but the great commotions in Western Europe produced for him bitter fruits. He was dragged into a war with Russia soon after his accession, and, by a treaty concluded in 1791, surrendered to that power Derbend and several districts on the Kur. In 1802 Georgia was declared to be .a Russian province. War with Russia was recommenced by Persia, at the instigation of France; and, after two years of conflicts disastrous to the Persians, the treaty of Gulistan (Oct. 12, 1813) gave to Russia all the Persian possessions to the north of Armenia, and the right of navigation in the Caspian Sea. In 1826 a third war, equally unfortunate for Persia, was commenced with the same power, and cost Persia the remainder of its possessions in Armenia, with Erivan, and a sum of 18,000,000 rubles for the expenses of the war. The severity exercised in procuring this sum by taxation so exasperated the people that they rose in insurrection (Oct. 12, 1829), and murdered the Russian ambassador, his wife, and almost all who belonged to or were connected with the Russian legation. The most humiliating concessions to Russia, and the punishment by mutilation of 1500 of the rioters, alone averted war. The death of the crown prince, Abbas-Mirza, in 1833, seemed to give the final blow to the declining fortunes of Persia, for he was the only man who seriously attempted to raise his country from the state of abasement into which it had fallen. By the assistance of Russia and Britain, Mohammed Shah (1834-1848), the son of Abbas-Mirza, obtained the crown, but the rebellions of his uncles, and the rivalry of Russia and Britain (the former being generally successful) at the Persian court, hastened the demoralization of the country. Mohammed was compelled to grant (1846) to Russia the privilege of building ships of war at Resht and Astrabad, and to agree to surrender all Russian deserters, and Persia became thus more and more dependent on its powerful neighbor. Nazir-uddin succeeded to the throne on his father’s death in 1848; and the new government announced energetic reforms, reduction of imposts, etc., but limited itself to these fine promises, and on the contrary, augmented the taxes, suffered the roads, bridges, and other public works to go to ruin, squandered the public money, and summarily disposed of all who protested against their acts. In October, 1856, the Persians took Herat, a town for the permanent possession of which they had striven for a long series of years; and having thus violated the terms of a treaty with Britain, war was declared against them, and a British army was landed on the coast of the gulf, which, under

generals Outram and Havelock, repeatedly defeated the Persians, and compelled them to restore Herat (July, 1857). Since that time treaties of commerce have been concluded with the leading European powers; and Russia, Great Britain, Turkey, France, and Italy have consuls in the chief towns, and, with the exception of Italy, are represented by ministers at the court of Teheran.

IV. *Literature*. — The sources of information regarding the ancient Persian history are:

1. The Jewish, to be elicited chiefly from the books of Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther, of which something has been said.

2. Grecian writers. Of these, Ctesias availed himself of the Persian annals, but we have only extracts from his work in Photins. Herodotus appears also to have consulted the native sources of Persian history. Xenophon presents us with the fullest materials, namely, in his *Anabasis,* his "*Hellenica,* and especially in his *Cyropaedia,* which is an imaginary picture of a perfect prince, according to Oriental' conceptions, drawn in the person of Cyrus the elder. Some of the points in which the classical authorities disagree may be found set forth in Eichhorn, *Gesch. der A. Welt,* 1:82, 83. A representation of the Persian history, according to Oriental authorities, may be found in the *Hallische Allgemeine Welfgeschichte,* pt. 4. (See also Becker, *Weltgeschichte,* 1:638 sq.) A very diligent compilation is that of Brissonilus, *De Regno Persarum,* 1591. Consult especially Heeren, *Ideen,* 1:1; his *Handbuch der G. d. S. Alterth.* 1:102; and H. Brochner, *Um det jodiske Folks Tilstand i den Persiske Periode* (Copenhagen, 1845). A full and valuable list of the older authorities in Persian affairs may be seen in the *Bibliotheca Historica* of Meusellius, vol. i, pt. ii, p. 28 sq. See also Malcolm, *History of Persia from the Earliest Ages to the Present Times* (Lond. 1816, 2 vols. 4to); and Sir H. Rawlinson's "Memoir on the Cuneiform Inscriptions of Ancient Persia," published in the *Journal of the Asiatic Society,* vol. 10 and 11: Polak, *Persien, dus Land und seine Bewohner* (Leips. 1865 sq., 2 vols. 8vo); Friedlainder, *De veteribus Persarumr regibus* (Hal. 1862, 8vo); Hutchinson, *Two Years in Persia* (Lond. 1874, 2 vols.); Markham, *History of Persia* (ibid. 1874). The most complete as well as recent survey of ancient Persia is given in Rawlinson's *Ancient Monarchies,* vol. iii (new edition, Lond. 1871). *SEE ELAM*; *SEE MEDIA*.

Per'sian

(Heb. *Parsi',* ysæP; Sept. Περσής; Vulg. *Perses*), the name of the people who inhabited the country called above "Persia Proper," and who thence conquered a mighty empire. There is reason to believe that the Persians were of the same race as the Medes, both being branches of the great Aryan stock, which under various names established their sway over the whole tract between Mesopotamia and Burmah. The native form of the name is *Parsa,* which the Hebrew ysæPi fairly represents, and which remains but little changed in the modern ' Parsee." It is conjectured to signify "the Tigers." *SEE PERSIA*.

Persian Christians

That the Gospel was early planted in Persia we have the most unequivocal evidence in the terrible persecution of Christians which began there in A.D. 330, whereby, in forty years, about 250 of the clergy and 16,000 others, of both sexes, were martyred in the cause of Christ, though many of them have been considered as heretics by the Church of Rome, being of the Nestorian and Jacobite communions. In the 7th century they fell under the scourge of Mohammedan tyranny and persecution, whereby many were driven to seek a refuge in India, particularly on the coasts of Travancore, while the great mass of the population apostatized to Mohammed; a circumstance that Mr. Yeates very naturally attributes to their not having the Scriptures in their own language till very recently.

In the middle of the last century a version of the Gospels was made by order of Nadir Shah, who, when it was read to him, treated it with contempt and ridicule; but since the commencement of the present century the Rev. H. Martyn has translated the whole New Testament. It was completed in the year in which he died (1812), and has been presented to the king of Persia by the British ambassador, and favorably received. Notwithstanding both persecution and apostasy, the number of Christians in Persia is said to be still very considerable, and to comprise Georgians, Armenians, Nestorians, Jacobites, and Romish Christians. "The number of these (Persian) Christians amounts to about 10,000. They have an archbishop and three bishops. The former resides at Mosul; one of the bishops at Chosrabad; another at Meredin, and the third at Diarbekir. By the Mohammedans they are called *Nazarenes,* and *Syrians* by the Arabs; but among themselves: *Ebrians,* or *Beni Israel,* which name denotes their

relation to the ancient Jewish Christian Church, as does also their present language. being very like the Hebrew. They have no connection whatever with either Greek or Roman churches. They hold the doctrine of the Trinity in Unity; and declare Jesus Christ to be 'the way, the truth, and the life,' and that through him alone they are delivered from the wrath to come, and are made heirs of eternal life. They acknowledge only the two sacraments, but both in the full sense and import of the Protestant Church. They have at Chosrabad a large church, nearly of the size and appearance of the Scotch kirk at Madras, which is a fine building. Through fear of the Mohammedans, who insult and oppress them, they assemble for divine worship between the hours of five and seven on Sunday mornings. and in the evenings between six and eight. There are also daily services at the same hours. The women and men sit on opposite sides of the church." Of the native *Mohammedan* inhabitants we shall only remark that they are *Shiites* (q.v.) of the sect of Ali, and have among them some remains of the ancient Magi, with a sect of modern infidels called *Sufis* (q.v.). See Buchanan, *Researches,* p. 167-176; Yeates, *Indian Church History,* p. 40-47; *Life of the Rev. H. Martyn; London Missionary Register,* 1822, p. 45; 1823, p. 25.

Persian Versions

At an early period there seems to have existed a translation of the Old Testament in the Persian language. There is no doubt that, like the Chaldee, such a version was prepared for use in the synagogue and in the education of the people. From the Talmud (*Sota,* 49 b) we know at least that the Persian language along with the holy language "is mentioned as a vernacular." Chrysostom (*Homil.* 2, in Joann.) and the Syrian bishop Theodoret (in his *De curandis Graecorumn affect.* 1:5) speak of such a version, and according to Maimonides the Pentateuch was translated into Persia long before Mohammed (Zunz, *Die gottesd. Vortr. d. Juden,* p. 9). But the Persian translation of the Pentateuch which has come down to us, and which was printed at first at Constantinople in 1546, and then in the fourth part of the *London Polyglot* (the Hebrew character having been used in the former case and the Persian in the latter), is of later origin. This is particularly apparent from the name *Babel* being rendered *Bagdad* (Genesis 10:10) — a proof that it owes its origin to a period at least later than the 8th century (for Bagdad was built in the year 762 [145 of the Hegira]). According to the inscriptions in the Constantinopolitan edition, this translation was made by R. Jacob ben-Joseph Tawus. A question has

been raised whether the formula wjwn [8nA^d[, *he reposes in Paradise*, refers to Tawus's father or Tawus himself. Furst, who inclined to the latter view, made Tawus flourish in the 13th century, while Lorsbach, Zunz, Kohut, and Munk, inclining to the former view, put the age of the author in the 16th century. On this point the latter thus expresses himself in his *Notice sur Rabbi Sanadia Gaon*, p. 64: "Il suffit de jeter un seul coup-d'ceil sur la version de Rabbi Yacob pour se convaincre qu'un tel langue Persan ne pent surmonter a une epoque oui la langue Persane se parlait et s'ecrivait encore avec beaucoup de purete, et oh les mots Arabes n'y abondaient pas encore... Si je ne me trompe, Rabbi Yacob est un ecrivain tres-moderne, et ii me semble mmme resulter des termes dont se sert a son egard l'editeur du Pelntateuque de Constantinople, que c'etait, un contemporain, et que sa version etait, dis l'origine, destinee a cette edition du Pentateuque." It may now be regarded as settled that the author of this version did not live in the 9th century (Rosenmüller), nor in the 13th century (Furst, Ginsburg), but in the 16th (Zunz, Lorsbach, Kohut, Munk), and that he was born between 1510 and 1514 (?). As to the name of the author there is a diversity of opinion, inasmuch as some take it for a proper noun (*tawus* means *peacock* in Persic), others for an adjective: Tusensis, ex urbe Persica Tus (where a celebrated Jewish school flourished). We are inclined to the former view. As to the version itself, Tawus rendered slavishly the Hebrew text. He uses euphemisms, and avoids anthropomorphisms and anthropopathies; sometimes he follows the Targums, often Saadia's Arabic version and Kimchi's and Aben-Ezra's commentaries, and sometimes he leaves the Hebrew untranslated (as in Genesis 7:11; 12:6. 8; 16:14; 22:14; 28:3; 1, 11; Exodus 3:14; 17:7; Numbers 21:28; 34:4, 16; Deuteronomy 3:10; 4:4; 32:51). On the whole, this version is of little critical value.

Besides the Pentateuch, there is also a Persian version of the Prophets and Hagiographa. as well as of the Apocrypha, in the Paris library. Thus *Catal. imprime M.S. Hebr.* No. 34 contains the version of Genesis and Exodus, with the Hebrew original after each verse. No. 35 contains the version of Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy, in a similar manner. No. 40 contains Job and Lamentations, as well as a Persian elegy, or hnyq, for the 9th of Ab, bewailing the destruction of the Temple (comp. *Taanith*, 3:488 a). No. 44 contains Isaiah and Jeremiah in Hebrew characters. No. 45 Daniel, as well as an apocryphal history of this prophet (the latter published in Hebrew characters, with a German transl. by H. Zotenberg, in Merx's

Archiv fur wissenschaltfliche Erfbrsschung des Alten Testaments, I, 385 sq. [Halle, 1869]). No. 46, written in the year 1469, also contains Daniel, with various readings of older MS., *Fond de St. Germ.-des-Pres.* No. 224 contains the book of Esther with the Hebrew original, as well as a Rabbinical Calendar in Persian, completed in 1290, and extending to 1522. No. 236 contains a version of the Apocrypha in Hebrew characters, written in 1600; the book of Tobit is different from the common Greek text; Judith and Bel and the Dragon agree with the Vulgate, while the book of Maccabees is simply the *Megillath Antiochus,* swkwyfna tlgm, Hebrew and Persian. *SEE MACCABEES, BOOKS OF*. A direct version from the Hebrew of Solomon's writings existing in Parisian MSS. was discovered by Hassler (comp. *Studien und Kritiken* for 1829, p. 469 sq.). The Imperial Public Library at St. Petersburg, which of late has bought the collection of Hebrew MSS. of the famous Karaite Abr. Firkowiez and of the Odessa Society, has also some MSS. with a Persian version. Thus Harkavy and Strack in their *Cactalog* describe No. 139 as a Persian version of the Minor Prophets, containing ³⁰¹⁰¹Micah 1:13 to ³⁰³⁰²Malachi 3:2. No. 140, the Haphtaroth in Hebrew, with the Persian version. The Hebrew has the vowels and accents; the Persian has no vowels, and is written in Persian (Arabic) letters. No. 141, Pentateuch with Persian version. The Hebrew text has the vowels. which often differ from our present system. The Persian version, which is written in smaller letters, and which follows, verse by verse, the original, differs very much from that published in the *London Polyglot* (vol. iv). No. 142, Job with the Persian (¹⁸³¹⁴Job 23:14-29:24; 41:23-42 *a*); of the Hebrew, only the initial words of each verse are given (with vowels, but without accents.) On these manuscripts, comp. Harkavy and Strack, *Catalog der Hebrdischen Bibelhanld. schriften in St. Petersburg* (St. Petersburg and Leips. 1875), p. 165 sq.

There are two Persian versions of the Gospels, one of which is printed in the *London Polyglot* from a MS. belonging to Pococke, written in the year 1341. Its source is the *Peshito,* as internal evidence abundantly shows. It was published in Latin by Bode (Helmstadt, 1751). The other version was made from the original Greek. Wheloc, professor of Arabic in the University of Cambridge, began to print it with a Latin translation which was afterwards edited by Pierson (Lond. 165257). In our century, translations were published by the Bible Society, by Colebroke (Calcutta, 1805), by Martyn, *The New Testament, Translated on the Greek into Persian* (Lond. 1821).

On the Old-Testament versions, comp. Rosenmüller, *De versione Pentateuchi Persica* (Leips. 1813); Lorsbach, *Jenaer All. Lit.-Zeitung*, 1816, No. 58; Bernstein, in Berthold's *Krit. Journ.* vol. v, p. 21; Zunz, inl Geiger's *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift* (1839), 4:391; Fiirst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3:453; Gratz, *Gesch. d. Juden* (Leips. 1866), 10:34 sq.; Hatvernick, *Introd. to the O.T.* p. 350 sq.; Keil, *Iutro d.* 2:281; Simon, *Histoire critique*, p. 307; De Rossi, *Dizionarion delli trtori Ebreei*, p. 309 sq. (Germ. transl. by Hamburger); Munk, *Version Persasne,* in Cohen's Bibl (Paris, 1834), 9:134, etc., who institutes a comparison between the printed text of the Persian version and that of the MS., and gives an elaborate account of the MSS., as well as specimens of the translation of Lamentations (reprinted in his *Notice sur Rabbi Saadia Gaon et sa version Arabe d'Is'ie, et sur une version Persane, manuscrite de la Bibliotheque royaele* [Paris, 1838]), p. 62-87; but especially the latest work on Tawus's Pentateuch by Dr. A. Kohut, *Kritische Belt uchtufng der Persischen Pentateuch- Uebersetzung des Jacob ben-Joseph Tavus, unter stetiger Riicksichtnahme auf die altesten Bibelversionen* (Heidelb. and Leips. 1871), and Geiger's notice of this work in his *Jidische Zeitschrift fur Wissenschaft und Leben* (1872), 10:103 sq. (B. P.)

Per'sis

(Περσίς, fem. of Περσικός, *Persian*, so used by *A*Eschylus, *Pers.* 151, 281, and often), a female Christian at Rome, whom Paul salutes (Romans 16:12). A.D. 55. The apostle commends her with special affection on account of some work which she had performed with singular diligence (see Origen, ad loc.).

Person

SEE PERSONALITY.

Personality

The word *person* is derived from the Latin "persona," originally a term of the theater, and signifying the *mask* worn of old by actors. Hence it signified a dramatic character, and in Cicero a personage; in Suetonius an individual, as also in law Latin. Tertullian seems to use the word in its original sense, where he says "Personae Dei, Christus Dominus," for he immediately interprets the words by the apostle's expression, "Qui est imago Dei" — i.e. Christ is the eternal manifestation of the Deity (*Adv.*

Marc. v, ii); he uses it also in its conventional meaning, "personam nominis," the personage to whom the name attaches (*ibid.* 4:14); but elsewhere he applies the word in its true ecclesiastical sense of an intelligent individual Being, "Videmus duplicem statum non confusum sed conjunctum in una persona Deum et hominemn Jesum" (*Adv. Proef*: 28 Similarly the adverb "personaliter" means with him relative individuality in contrast with absolute being: "Hunc substantialiter quidem αἰῶνα τελειον appellant; personaliter vero πρὸ ἀρχήν et, τὴν ἀρχήν — i.e. the first absolutely, the second in antecedent relation with every after-emanation. It is important to ascertain the meaning of ecclesiastical Latin terms in Tertullian, for when he wrote the language of the Church at Rome was Greek; and the Latinity of the Western Church, as well as the barbarisms of its version of Scripture, were imported shortly afterwards from Africa. "Persona" in Latin bore the same relation to "substantia" as ὑπόστασις to οὐσία in Greek theology; but ὑπόστασις in the sense of person was etymologically equivalent for the very different theological idea of "substantia" in Latin; hence arose the confusion that has been noticed under the article HYPOSTASIS *SEE HYPOSTASIS* . Hilary first coined the term "essentia," to convey the meaning of οὐσία*;* "novo quiden? nomine," as says Augustine, "quo usi non slunt veteres Latini auctores, sed jam nostris terimporibus usitato, ne deesset etiam linguae nostrae quod Grseci appellant οὐσιάν" (*Civ. Dei,* 12:2), and "persona" was retained as the equivalent for ὑποστασις.

The meaning of "person" in theology is as Locke has defined it in metaphysics: "A person is a thinking, intelligent being, that has reason and reflection, and can consider itself as itself, the same thinking thing in different times and places." There must be a continuous intelligence and a continuous identity, as well as individuality. The memorable axiom of Descartes, "Cogito, ergo sum." may be applied not only to the reality of thinking substance, but also to the true personality of that intelligent being. "I am a conscious being, therefore in that consciousness I have a personal existence." But "personality," as applied to the divine substance, involves a contradiction that defines in this direction, as Dr. Mansel has observed, the limits of human thought (*Limits of Religious Thought,* p. 59). We are compelled to apply to the Absolute our own insufficient human terms of finite relation. The idea of personality must always involve limitation; one person is invested with acqidents that another has not. Yet God, as the designer and creator of the universe, must have a personal existence; as

Paley has well stated it, “The marks of design are too strong to be gotten over, and design must have had a designer; that designer must have been a person. That person is God.” But how is substance thus affected with personality? Analogy in such a matter cannot lead us through the difficulty, for God is one, and such a test is an impossibility for want of any true means of comparison. Yet thus much may be said: So far as it reaches, analogy shows that the personality of the Deity is very possible; for if beings of another world could watch the growing results of human civilization, without having the power of tracing out the individual efforts that produce it, they would find themselves in a somewhat similar difficulty. Humanity, they might reason, is certainly an intelligent substance; but substance is something vague and undetermined; yet the intelligence that is developing all terrestrial works must be the result of personal design and personal skill: therefore this world-wide humanity must have a definite, personal substance. Adam, in the first instance, was that personal substance. Christ in the end shall recapitulate (Irenaeus) all humanity in himself, we know not how. Therefore in some way that is a present mystery, but of certain future solution, God may be Substance that is All-wise and Absolute, and personality may attach to his being, limiting the Unlimited, and defining the Indefinite (*ibid.* p. 56-59). In the mean time the idea of personality is mixed up intimately with all man’s highest and noblest notions of the Deity (*ibid.* p. 57, 240), neither is it possible to form the faintest possible conception of a non-personal God. The religious idea revolts against the negation, which, in fact, would be its annihilation. The sense of personal individual responsibility to a personal God and Father of all would pass away, and a “caput mortuum” of pantheism would be all that would remain — an illusive Maya for the present, a hopeless Nirvana for the future. Next, with respect to a plurality of persons in the Deity, Hooker excellently defines the properties that determine this phase of the divine nature; and his generalization may serve to impress upon the mind the impossibility of expressing the mutual relations of three hypostases in one substance by any adequate term that human language can supply. That which transcends thought can never find expression by the tongue. The personality of the Father and Holy Spirit is affected by nothing without the divine nature; the personality of the Son has been modified since the incarnation by taking the manhood into God; and a second definition by Locke exactly covers this modification; “Person,” he says, “belongs only to intelligent agents, capable of a law and happiness and misery,” all of which accidents of personality pertain to Christ, though not to the person of the

Son of (God as pre-existing eternally in the Word. *SEE HYPOSTATICAL UNION*; *SEE SUBSTANCE*.

"We attribute *personality,"* says Ahrens (*Cours de Theologie,* 2:272) "to every being which exists, not solely for others, but which is in the relation of unity with itself in existing, or for itself. Thus we refuse *personality* to a mineral or a stone, because these things exist for others, but not for themselves. An animal, on the contrary, which exists for itself, and stands in relation to itself, possesses a degree of *personality*. But man exists for himself in all his essence, in a manner more intimate and more extensive; that which he is, he is for himself, he has consciousness of it. But God alone exists for himself in a manner infinite and absolute. God is entirely in relation to himself; for there are no beings out of him to whom he could have relation. His whole essence is for himself, and this relation is altogether internal; and it is this intimate and entire relation of God to himself in all his essence which constitutes the divine *personality."* It should be observed, however, that personality implies limitation. "Infinite personality," therefore, would be a contradiction in terms. The term "person," as applied to the Godhead, is not used in its ordinary sense, as denoting a separate being, but represents the Latin *persona* or the Greek *hypostasis,* which means that which stands under or is the subject of certain attributes or properties. Three persons are not thus three parts of one God, nor are they three Gods; nor yet are Father, Son, and Spirit only three names, but distinct hypostases with characteristic attributes. In modern times, especially in Germany, and through a prevalent philosophical mysticism, opinions are propagated about the person of Christ which are quite opposed to the doctrines of all the orthodox and evangelical confessions. The second article of the Church of England, and the eighth of the *Westminster Confession,* express the general view. So does the *Quicunque vult* of the Liturgy. But the modern theory teaches a different dogma, thus: Martensen and Ebrard seem to adopt a view very similar to that of Beron in the early ages, who held that the Logos assumed the form of a man, that is, subjected himself to the limitations of humanity. The infinite became finite, the eternal and omnipresent imposed on himself the limitations of time and space; God became man. The statement of Ebrard is, "The eternal Son of God, by a free act of self-limitation, determined to assume the existenceform of a center of human life, so that he acted as such from the conception onward, and having assumed this form, he fashioned for himself a body," etc. According to this view there

are not two natures in Christ, in the established sense of the word nature, but only two forms of existence, a prior and posterior form of one and the same nature. The most common mode of presenting the doctrine is to say that the Logos assumed our fallen humanity. But by this, we are told, is not to be understood that he assumed an individual body and soul, so that he became *a* man, but that he assumed generic humanity, so that he became *the* man. By generic humanity is to be understood a life-power, that peculiar law of life, corporeal and incorporeal, which develops itself outwardly as a body and inwardly as a soul. The Son, therefore, became incarnate in humanity, in that objective reality, entity, or substance in which all human lives are one. Thus, too, Olshausen, in his comment on <40114>John 1:14, says, "It could not be said that the Word was made man, which would imply that the Redeemer was a man by the side of other men, whereas, being the second Adam, he represented the totality of human nature in his exalted comprehensive personality." To the same effect he says, in his remarks on <45515>Romans 5:15, "If Christ were a man among other men, it would be impossible to conceive how his suffering and obedience could have an essential influence on mankind: he could then only operate as an example. But he is to be regarded, even apart from his divine nature, as *the* man, i.e. as realizing the absolute idea of humanity, and including it potentially in himself spiritually as Adam did corporeally." To this point archdeacon Wilberforce devotes the third chapter of his book on *The incarnation,* and represents the whole value of Christ's work as depending upon it. If this be denied he says, "the doctrines of atonement and sanctification, though confessed in words, become a mere empty phraseology." In fine, Dr. Nevin, in his *Mystical Presence,* p. 210, says, "The Word became flesh; not a single *man* only, as one among many; *but flesh,* or humanity, in its universal conception. How else could he be the principle of a general life, the origin of a *new* order of existence for the human *world* as such? How else could the value of his mediatorial work be made over to us in a real way by a true imputation, and not a legal fiction only? "The hypostatic union, on these hypotheses, is the assumption on the part of the eternal Son of God, not simply or primarily of a true body and a reasonable soul, as the Church has always held, but of humanity as a generic life, of our fallen humanity, of that entity or substance in which all human lives are one. The effect of this union is that humanity is taken into divinity: it is exalted into a true divine life. The life of Christ is one, and it may be designated as divine or as human. On this point, more than any other, its advocates are specially full and earnest. Schleiermacher ignores

all essential difference between God and humanity, holding that they differ in our conception, and functionally, but are essentially one. Dorner, also, the historian of the doctrine concerning Christ's person, avows that the Church view of two distinct substances in the same person involves endless contradictions, and that no true Christoloy can be framed which does not proceed on the assumption of the essential unity of God and man; while Ullmann makes this essential oneness between the divine and human the fundamental idea of Christianity.

The term *person,* when applied to Deity, is certainly used in a sense somewhat different from that in which we apply it to one another; but when it is considered that the Greek words' ὑπόστασις and πρόσωπον, to which it answers, are, in the New Testament applied to the Father and Son (<580103>Hebrews 1:3; <470406>2 Corinthians 4:6), and that the personal pronouns are used by our Lord (John- 14:26), it can hardly be condemned as unscriptural and improper. There have been warm debates between the Greek and Latin churches about the words *hypostasis* and *persona*: the Latin, concluding that the word *hypostasis* signified substance or essence, thought that to assert that there were three divine *hypostases* was to say that there were three Gods. On the other hand, the Greek Church thought that the word *person* did not sufficiently guard against the Sabellian notion of the same individual Being sustaining three relations. Thus each part of the Church was ready to brand the other with heresy, till, by a free and mutual conference in a synod at Alexandria, A.D. 362, they made it appear that it was a mere contention about the grammatical sense of a word; and then it was allowed by men of moderation on both sides that either of the two words might be indifferently used., See Beza, *Principles of the Christian Religion;* Owen, *On the Spirit; Marci Medulla,* 1:5, § 3; Ridgley, *Divinity,* qu. 11; Hurrion, *On the Spirit,* p. 140; Doddridge, *Lectures,* lec. 159; Gill, *On the Trinity,* p. 93; Watts, *Works,* v. 48, 208; Gill, *Body of Divinity* (8vo), 1:205; Edwards, *History of Redemption,* p. 51, note; *Horoe Sol.* 2:20; Stuart, *Letters to Charming;* Keith, Norton, and Winslow, *On the Trinity;* Knapp, *Theology,* p. 325; *Bibliotheca Sacra,* Feb. 1844, p. 159; Oct. 1850, p. 696; July, 1867, p. 570*; New Englander,* July, 1875, art. iii; *Stud. u. Kritiken,* 1838, 1847. Older monographs on the subject are cited by Volbeding, *Index Programmatum,* p. 82. *SEE TRINITY*.

Personati

an ecclesiastical term, which does not occur earlier than the 11th century, came into use after tie time of Alexander III, and designates (1) Persons, canons holding office with precedence in chapter and choir after dignitaries, either by institution or custom. A dignitary was also a person because his person was honored, and he was a person constituted in dignity. The “quatuor personae” were the four internal dignitaries. Until recently the dignitaries were called the parsons at Hereford. (2) Stipendiary clerks or chaplains perpetually resident in a cathedral or collegiate church, like the chantry priests of St. William at York and the rectors of choir at Beverley, holding offices for life. At Grenoble, Sens, Aries, and Nevers they had the responsibility of the ordinary choral services.

Personatus

SEE PERSONATI.

Persuasion

the act of influencing the judgment and passions by arguments or motives. It is different from conviction. Conviction affects the understanding only; persuasion the will and practice. It is more extensively used than conviction, which last is founded on demonstration, natural or supernatural. But all things of which we may be persuaded are not capable of demonstration. Eloquence is but the art of persuasion. See Blair, *Rhetoric;* Maury, *Principles of Eloquence; Pulpit Orator.*

Perth Articles Of.

SEE ARTICLES.

Perth Councils Of

(*Concilium Perthusanum*), held at the Scottish city so named.

I. The first was held in 1202 or 1203, by cardinal John Salerno, Roman legate in Scotland; in which certain regulations relating to the reform of the clergy were drawn up. The council lasted three days, but two only of the canons are known:

1. That they who had received orders on Sunday should be removed from the service of the altar.

2. That every Saturday from 12 o'clock be kept as a day of rest, by abstaining from work; the holy day to continue till Monday morning.

See Skinner, 1:280. Labbe, *Conc.* 11:24.

II. Another council was held at Perth in 1212. William Malvoisin, bishop of St. Andrew's, Walter, bishop of Glasgow, and others were present. The pope's instructions for preaching the Crusade were published; upon which, says the author of the *Scoti-chronicon,* great numbers of all ranks of clergy throughout Scotland, regulars as well as seculars, took the cross, but very few of the rich or great men of the kingdom. See Skinner, *Works,* 1:280; Wilkins, *Conc.* 1:532; Collier, *Eccles. Hist;* Landon, *Man. of Councils,* s.v.

Perthes, Friedrich Christoph

an eminent German publisher, distinguished not only in his professional capacity, but for his sincere piety and ardent patriotism, was born at Rudolstadt April 21, 1772. In his fifteenth year he was apprenticed to a Leipsic bookseller, with whom he remained six years, devoting much of his leisure time to the acquisition of knowledge. In 1793 he passed into the establishment of Hoffmann, the Hamburg bookseller; and in 1796 started business on his own account; and, by his keen and wide appreciation of the public wants, his untiring diligence, and his honorable reputation, he ultimately made it the most extensive of the kind in modern Germany. During the first few years or so of his Hamburg apprenticeship, his more intimate friends had been either Kantian or skeptical in their opinions, and Perthes, who was not distinguished for either learning or speculative talent, had learned to think with his friends; but a friendship which he subsequently formed with Jacobi (q.v.), and the Holstein poet and humorist, Matthias Claudius, led him to a more serious view of Christianity, and he became one of the noblest types of German orthodox piety, leading a life whose influence is impressed on many distinguished minds of his country to this day. The iron rule of the French in Northern Germany, and the prohibition of intercourse with England, nearly ruined trade, yet Perthes, even in this great crisis of affairs, found ways and means to extend his. He endeavored to enlist the intellect of Germany on the side of patriotism, and in 1810 started the *National-Muselum,* with contributions from Jean Paul Friedrich Richter, count Stolberg, Claudius, Fouque, Heeren, Sartorius, Schlegel, Gorres, Arndt, and other eminent men. Its success was far beyond Perthes's expectations, and encouraged

him to continue his patriotic activity, until Hamburg's incorporation with the French empire put a temporary stricture upon his activity. He Subsequently took a prominent part in forcing the French garrison to evacuate Hamburg, March 12, 1813; and on its re-occupation by the French, he was one of the ten Hamburgers who were specially excepted from pardon. After peace had been restored to Europe, he steadily devoted himself to the extension of his business, and to the consolidation of the sentiment of German national unity, as far as that could be accomplished by literature and speech. In 1822 he removed to Gotha, transferring his Hamburg business to his partner, Besser. Here he laid himself out mainly for the publication of great historical and theological works. His subsequent correspondence with literary, political, and theological notabilities — such as Niebuhr (one of his dearest friends), Neander, Schleiermacher, Lucke, Nitszch, Tholuck, Schelling, and Umbreit — is extremely interesting, and throws a rich light upon the recent inner life of Germany. He died May 18, 1843. — Chambers. See *Friedrich Perthes' Leben* (12th edit. 1853, 3 vols. 8vo), written by his second son, Clemens Theodor Pertles, professor of law at Bonn, and translated into English anonymously in Edinburgh (1857, 2 vols. 8vo); Me*moirs of Frederick Perthes, or Literary, Religious, and Political Life in Germany from* 1789-1843; Baur, *Religious Life in Germany* (transl. by Jane Sturge, Lond. 1870, 2 vols. 12mo), 2:132-178.

Pertusati, Francesco

Count, an ascetic Italian author, was born in Milan May 9,1741. The son of a senator of Milan, he was educated among the Jesuits, for some time wore their habit, and never ceased to be attached to them. He divided his leisure between the education of his children and the direction of works of charity. His devotion to the religious and absolutist party exposed him to persecution: arrested in 1796, on the invasion of the French, and conducted to Nice, he was obliged, in 1799, to seek refuge in Venice. He died at Milan May 22, 1823. His works are very numerous, and all translated from the French into Italian. See Beraldi, *Memorie di religione* (Modena, 1823); 'Rudoni,' *Cenni sulla vita e sugli scritti del F. Pertusati* (Milan, 1823, 8vo).

Peru

an important maritime republic of South America, bounded on the north by Ecuador, on the west by the Pacific, on the south and south-east by Bolivia, and on the east by Brazil, in lat. 3° 25’-21° 30’ S., and in long. 68°-81° 20’ W., has an area estimated at upwards of 500,000 square miles, and a population of 2,630,000. The coast-line is about 1660 miles in length. The shores are in general rocky and steep, and, owing to the comparative unfrequency of bays and inlets along the coast, the harbors are few and unimportant. Those of Callao (the port of Lima) and Payta afford the most secure anchorage. The country is highly interesting from a historical and antiquarian point of view.

I. *Islands.*— The islands on the Peruvian coast, although valuable, are extremely few in number and small in extent. In the north are the Lobos (i.e. *Seal*) Islands, forming a group of three, and so called from the seals which frequent them. On their eastern and more Sheltered sides they are covered with guano, and the quantity on the whole group is stated at 4,000,000 tons. The Chincha Islands, famous as the source of Peruvian guano, also form a group of three. Each island presents, on the eastern side, a wall of precipitous rock, with rocky pinnacles in the center, and with a general slope towards the western shore. The cavities and inequalities of the surface are filled with guano, and this material covers the western slopes of the islands to within a few feet of the water’s edge. There is no vegetation. At the present rate of consumption, the guano will last until the year 1883. The island of San Lorenzo forms the harbor of Callao. The grand physical feature of Peru, and the source of all its mineral wealth, is the great mountain system of the Andes.

II. *Surface, Soil, and Climute*. — The surface of Peru is divided into three distinct and well-defined tracts or belts, the climates of which are of every variety from torrid heat to arctic cold, and the productions of which range from the stunted herbage of the high mountainslopes to the oranges and citrons, the sugar-canes and cottons, of the luxuriant tropical valleys.

a. The *Coast* is a narrow strip of sandy desert between the base of the Western Cordillera and the sea, and extending along the whole length of the country. This tract, varying in breadth from thirty to sixty miles, slopes to the shore with an uneven surface, marked by and ridges from the Cordillera, and with a rapid descent. It is for the most part a barren waste

of sand, traversed, however, by numerous valleys of astonishing fertility, most of which are watered by streams that have their sources high on the slopes of the Cordillera. Many of the streams are dry during the greater part of the year.

b. The *Sierra* embraces all the mountainous region between the western base of the maritime Cordillera and the eastern base of the Andes, or the Eastern Cordillera. These ranges are, in this country, about 100 miles apart on an average, and have been estimated to cover an area of 200,000 square miles. Transverse branches connect the one range with the other, and high plateaus, fertile plains, and deep tropical valleys lie between the lofty outer barriers. The following are the most striking and distinctive physical features of the Sierra, beginning from the south:

1. The plain of Titicaca, partly in Peru and partly in Bolivia, is enclosed between the two main ridges of the Andes, and is said to have an area of 30,000 miles — greater than that of Ireland. In its center is the great Lake Titicaca, 115 miles long, from 30 to 60 miles broad, from 70 to 180 feet deep, and 400 miles in circumference.

2. The mountain-chains which girdle the plain of Titicaca trend towards the north-west, and form what is called the Knot of Cuzco. The Knot comprises six minor mountain-chains, and has an area thrice larger than that of Switzerland. Here the valleys enjoy an Indian climate, and are rich in tropical productions; to the north and east of the Knot extend luxuriant tropical forests, while the numberless mountain-slopes are covered with waving crops of wheat, barley, and other cereals, and with potatoes; and higher up extend pasture-lands, where the vicuina and alpaca feed.

3. The valley of the Apurimac, 30 miles in average breadth, and extending north-west for about 300 miles. This valley is the most populous region of Peru.

4. From Cuzco proceed two chains towards the north-west; they unite again in the Knot of Pasco. This Knot contains the table-land of Bombon, 12,800 feet above sea-level; as well as other tablelands at a height of 14,000 feet, the highest in the Andes; otherwise, however, the physical features of the country resemble those of the vicinity of Cuzco.

5. The vale of the river Maranfon, which is upwards of 300 miles in length, is narrow, deep, and nearer the equator than any other valley of the Sierra,

and consequently it is the hottest portion of this region; and its vegetation is thoroughly tropical in character. The conformation of the surface of the Sierra is of the most wonderful description. The soil of the Sierra is of great variety; but wherever it is cultivated it is productive.

c. The *Montana,* forming two thirds of the entire area of the country, stretches away for hundreds of leagues eastward from the Andes to the confines of Brazil. On the north it is bounded by the Amazon, on the south by Bolivia. It consists of vast impenetrable forests and alluvial plains. is rich in all the productions of tropical latitudes, is of inexhaustible fertility, and teems with animal and vegetable life. Among the products which are yielded here in spontaneous abundance are the inestimable Peruvian bark, India-rubber, gum-copal, vanilla, indigo, copaiba, balsam, cinnamon, sarsaparilla, ipecacuanha, vegetable wax, etc. On the western fringe of the Montafia, where there are still a few settlements, tobacco, sugar, coffee, cotton, and chocolate are cultivated with complete success.

The *hydrography* of Peru may be said to be divided into three systems-those of Lake Titicaca, the Pacific, and the Amazon. All the great rivers of Peru are tributaries of the Amazon.

III. *Productions, Exports and Imports, Revenue, etc.* — The wealth and resources of Peru consist, not in manufactures, but entirely in mineral, vegetable, and animal products. As no statistics are taken in the country, it is impossible to give the quantity and value of the productions, and of the exports and imports, even approximately. Of the precious metals, in which Peru abounds, the production has greatly fallen off; and this country, which once stood in the same relation to Spain that Australia does to Great Britain, now contributes little to the metallic wealth of the world. The immense stores of gold and silver found here by the Spanish invaders represented the accumulation of centuries, and that among a people who used the precious metals only for the purposes of ornamentation. The Andes mines have gold, silver, copper, lead, bismuth, etc., and in the Montana gold is said to exist in abundance in veins and in pools on the margins of rivers. Although so rich in the precious metals, Peru produces comparatively little specie, which is to be accounted fortchiefly by the unscientific and improvident manner in which the mining operations are carried on. It can hardly be said that Peruvian coinage exists, inasmuch as that in circulation is from the mint of Bolivia. In addition to the precious metals and guano, another important article of national wealth is nitrate of

soda, which is found in immense quantities in the province of Tarapaca. This substance, which is a powerful fertilizer, is calculated to cover, in this province alone, an area of fifty square leagues, and the quantity has been estimated at sixty-three million tons. Great quantities of borax are also found. The working of this valuable substance, however, is interdicted by government, which has made a monopoly of it, as it has of the guano.

The vegetable productions are of every variety, embracing all the products both of temperate and tropical climes. The European cereals and vegetables are grown with perfect success, together with maize, rice, pumpkins, tobacco, coffee, sugar-cane, cotton, etc. Fruits of the most delicious flavor are grown in endless variety. Cotton, for which the soil and climate are admirably adapted, is now produced here in gradually increasing quantity. The land suited to the cultivation of this plant is of immense extent, and the quality of the cotton grown is excellent. The animals comprise those of Europe, together with the hama and its allied species; but although Peru produces much excellent wool, almost the whole of the woolen fabrics used as clothing by the Indians is imported.

IV. *Ancient Civilization and History*. — Peru, the origin of whose name is unknown, is now passing through its third historical nera, and is manifesting its third phase of civilization. The present sera may be said to date from the conquest of the country by the Spaniards in the early part of the 16th century; the middle aera embraces the rule of the Incas; and the earliest sera, about which exceedingly little is known, is that prencarial period, of unknown duration during which a nation or nations living in large cities flourished in the country, and had a civilization, a language, and a religion different, and perhaps in some cases even more advanced than those of the Incas who succeeded them, and overran their territories. Whence these pre-Incarial nations came, and to what branch of the human family they belonged, still remain unanswered questions. Their existence, however, is clearly attested by the architectural remains, sculptures, carvings, etc., which they have left behind them. Ruins of edifices constructed both before the advent of the Incas and contemporary with and independently of them, are found everywhere throughout the country. For further information regarding pre-incarial times and races, see Bollaert, *Antiquities, Ethnology, etc., of South America* (Lond. 1860), p. 111 sq.; Hutchinson, *Two Years in Peru, with Explorations of its Antiquities* (*ibid.* 1874, 2 vols. 8vo); Brinton, *Myths of the New World* (N. Y. 1877, revised ed.).

Regarding the origin of the Incas, nothing definite can be said. We have no authorities on the subject save the traditions of the Indians, and these, besides being outrageously fabulous in character, are also conflicting. It appears, however, from all the traditions, that Manco, the first Inca, first appeared on the shores of Lake Titicaca, with his wife Mama Oello. He announced that he and his wife were children of the Sun, and were sent by the glorious Inti (the Sun) to instruct the simple tribes. He is said to have carried with him a golden wedge, or, as it is sometimes called, a wand. Wherever this wedge, on being struck upon the ground, should sink into the earth, and disappear forever, there it was decreed Manco should build his capital. Marching northward, he came to the plain of Cuzco, where the wedge disappeared. Here he founded the city of Cuzco, became the first Inca (a name said to be derived from the Peruvian word for the Sun), and founded the Peruvian race, properly so called. Mannco, or Manco Capac (i.e. Manco the Ruler), instructed the men in agriculture and the arts, gave them a comparatively pure religion, an and a social and national organization; while his wife, Mama Oello, who is also represented as being his sister, taught the women to sew, to spin, and to weave. Thus the Inca was not only ruler of his people, but also the father and the high-priest. The territory held by Manco Capac was small, extending about ninety miles from east to west, and about eighty miles from north to south. After introducing laws among his people, and bringing them into regularly organized communities, “he ascended to his father, the Sun.” The year generally assigned as that of his. death, after a reign of forty years, is 1062. The progress of the Peruvians was at first so slow as to be almost imperceptible. Gradually, however, by their wise and temperate policy, they won over the neighboring tribes, who readily appreciated the benefits of a powerful and fostering government. Little is clearly ascertained regarding the early history of the Peruvian kingdom, and the lists given of its early sovereigns are by no means to be trusted. They invented no alphabet, and therefore could keep no written record of their affairs, so that almost all we know of their early history is derived from the traditions of the people, collected by the early Spaniards. Memoranda were indeed kept by the Peruvians, and, it is said, even full historical records, by means of the *quipu,* a twisted woolen cord, upon which other smaller cords of different colors were tied.” Of these cross threads, the color, the length, the number of knots upon them, and the distance of one from another, all had their significance; but after the invasion of the Spaniards, when the whole Peruvian system of government and civilization underwent

dislocation, the art of reading the quipus seems either to have been lost or was effectually concealed. Thus it is that we have no exact knowledge of Peruvian history farther back man abruot on century before the coming of the Spaniards. In 1453 Tutpac Inca Yupanqui, the eleventh Inca, according to the list given by Garcilasso de la Vega, greatly enlarged his already widespread dominions. He led his armies southward, crossed into Chili, marched over the terrible desert of Atacama, and penetrating as far south as the river Maule (lat. 36° S.), fixed there the southern boundary of Peru. Returning, he crossed the Chilian Andes by a pass of unequaled danger and difficulty, and at length regained his capital, which he entered in triumph. While thus engaged, his son, the young Huayna Capac, heir to the fame as well as the throne of his father, had marched northward to the Amazon, crossed that barrier, and conquered the kingdom of Quito. In 1475 Huayna Capac ascended the throne, and under him the empire of the Incas attained to its greatest extent and the height of its glory. His sway extended from the equatorial valleys of the Amazon to the temperate plains of Chili, and from the sandy shores of the Pacific to the marshy sources of the Paraguay. Order and civilization accompanied conquest among the Peruvians, and each tribe that was vanquished found itself under a careful paternal government, which provided for it, and fostered it in every way.

The early *government* of Peru was a pure but a mild despotism. The Inca, as the representative of the Sun, was the head of the priesthood, and presided at the great religious festivals. He imposed taxes, made laws, and was the source of all dignity and power. He wore a peculiar head-dress, of which the tasseled fringe, with two feathers placed upright in it, was the proper insignia of royalty. Of the nobility, all those descended by the male line from the founder of the monarchy shared, in common with the ruling monarch, the sacred name of Inca. They wore a peculiar dress, enjoyed special privileges, and lived at court; but none of them could enter the presence of the Inca except with bare feet, and bearing a burden on the shoulders, in token of allegiance and homage. They formed, however, the real strength of the empire, and, being superior to the other races in intellectual power, they were the fountain whence flowed that civilization and social organization which gave Peru a position above every other state of South America. Prior to the arrival of the Spaniards Peru contained a population of 30,000,000 — twelve times greater than it is at the present day. Money was unknown among the Peruvians. They were ma nation of

workers, but they wrought as the members of one family, labor being enforced on all for the benefit of all.

The *national policy* of the Peruvians had its imperfections and drawbacks, and though capable of unlimited extension, it was not capable of advancement. It was in the last degree conservative, and was of such a nature that the introduction of reform in any vital particular must have overturned the whole constitution. Nevertheless the wants of the people were few, and these were satisfied. Their labor was not more than they could easily perform, and it was pleasantly diversified with frequent holidays and festivals. They lived contentedly and securely under a government strong enough to protect them; and a sufficiency of the necessaries of life was obtained by every individual. Still in the valleys of the Cordilleras and on the plain of Cuzco maybe heard numberless songs, in which the Peruvian mourns the happy days of peace, security, and comfort enjoyed by his ancestors. Further, they revered and loved their monarch, and considered it r pleasure to serve him. With subjects of such a temper and inclination, the Incas might direct the entire energies of the nation as they chose; and it is thus that they were able to construct those gigantic public works which would have been wonderful even had they been performed with the assistance of European machinery and appliances.

The Peruvian system of *agriculture* was brought to its highest perfection only by the prodigious labor of several centuries. Not only was the fertile soil cultivated with the utmost care, but the sandy wastes of the coasts, unvisited by any rains, and but scantily watered by brooks, were rendered productive by means of an artificial system of irrigation, the most stupendous, perhaps, that the world has ever seen. Where the mountain-slopes were too steep to admit of cultivation, terraces were cut, soil was accumulated on them, and the level surfaces converted into a species of hanging gardens. Large flocks of lamas were grazed on the plateaus: while the more hardy vicunias and alpacas roamed the tipper heights in freedom, to be driven together, however, at stated periods, to be shorn or killed. The wool yielded by these animals, and the cotton grown in the plains and valleys, were woven into fabrics equally remarkable for fineness of texture and brilliancy of color.

The character of the *architecture* of the Peruvians has already been referred to. The edifices of Incarial times are oblong in shape and cyclopean in construction. The materials used were granite, porphyry, and

other varieties of stone; but in the more rainless regions sun-dried bricks were also much used. The walls were most frequently built of stones of irregular size, but cut with such accuracy, and fitting into each other so closely at the sides, that neither knife nor needle can be inserted in the seams. Though the buildings were not, as a rule, more than from twelve to fourteen feet high, they were characterized by simplicity, symmetry, and solidity. The Peruvian architects did not indulge much in external decoration, but the interior of all the great edifices was extremely rich in ornament. In the royal palaces and temples the most ordinary utensils were of silver and gold; the walls were thickly studded with plates and bosses of the same metals: and exquisite imitations of human and other figures, and also of plants, fashioned with perfect accuracy in gold and silver, were always seen in the houses of the great. Hidden among the metallic foliage, or creeping among the roots, were many brilliantly colored birds, serpents, lizards, etc., made chiefly of precious stones; while in the gardens, interspersed among the natural plants and flowers, were imitations of them, in gold and silver, of such truth and beauty as to rival nature. The temple of the Sun at Cuzco, called *Coricancha*, or "Place of Gold," was the most magnificent edifice in the empire. On the western wall, and opposite the eastern portal, was a splendid representation of the Sun, the god of the nation. It consisted of a human face in gold, with innumerable golden rays emanating from it in every direction; and when the early beams of the morning sun fell upon this brilliant golden disk, they were reflected from it as from a mirror, and again reflected throughout the whole temple by the numberless plates, cornices, bands, and images of gold, until the temple seemed to glow with a sunshine more intense than that of nature.

The *religion* of the Peruvians, in the later ages of the empire, was far in advance of that of most abarbarous nations. They believed in a Great Spirit, the Creator of the universe, who, being a spirit, could not be represented by any image or symbol, nor be made to dwell in a temple made with hands. They also believed in the existence of the soul hereafter, and in the resurrection of the body. The after-life they considered to be a condition of ease and tranquillity for the good, and of continual wearisome labor, extending over ages, for the wicked. But while they believed in the Creator of the world, they also believed in other deities, who were of subordinate rank to the Great Spirit. Of these secondary gods the Sun was the chief. They reverenced the Sun as the source of their royal dynasty, and

everywhere throughout the land altars smoked with offerings burned in his worship.

V. *Modern History and Characteristics*. — About the year 1516, and ten years before the death of Huayna Capac, the first white man had landed on the western shoes of South America; but it was not till the year 1532 that Pizarro, at the head of a small band of Spanish adventurers, actually invaded Peru. On his death-bed the great Inca expressed a wish that the kingdom of Quito should pass to Atahualpa, one of his sons by a princess of Quito whom lie had received among his concubines, and that all his other territories should fall to his son Huascar, the heir to the crown, and who, according to the custom of the fncas, should have inherited all its dependencies. Between these two princes quarrels, resulting in war, arose; and when Pizarro entered Peru he found the country occupied by two rival factions, a circumstance of which he took full advantage. Atahualpa had completely defeated the forces of his brother, had taken Huascar prisoner, and was now stationed at Caxamalca, on the eastern side of the Andes, whither, with a force of 177 men, of whom 27 were cavalry, the dauntless Spanish leader, in September, 1532, set out to meet him. Atahualpa was captured by the Spaniards, and subsequently put to death. Shortly after the execution of the Inca at Caxamalca, the adventurers set out for Cuzco. Their strength had recently been increased by reinforcements, and they now numbered nearly 500 men, of whom about a third were cavalry. They entered the Peruvian capital Nov. 15, 1533, having in the course of their progress towards the city of the Incas had many sharp and sometimes serious encounters with the Indians, in all of which, however, their armor, artillery, and cavalry gave them the advantage. At Cuzco they obtained a vast amount of gold, the one object for which the conquest of Peru was undertaken. As at Caxamalca, the articles of gold were for the most part melted down into ingots, and divided among the band. Their sudden wealth, however, did many of them little good, as it afforded them the means of gambling, and many of them, rich at night, found themselves again pennils adventurers in the morning. One cavalier having obtained the splendid golden image of the Sun as his share of the booty, lost it in play in a single night. After stripping the palaces and temples of their treasures, Pizarro placed Manco, a son of the great Huayna Capac, on the throne of the Incas. Leaving a garrison in the capital, he then marched west to the sea-coast, with the intention of building a town, from which he could the more easily repel invasion from without, and which should be the future

capital of the kingdom. Choosing the banks of the river Rimac, he founded, about six miles from its mouth, the *Cinda de los Reyes,* "City of the Kings." Subsequently its name was changed into Lima, the modified form of the name of the river on which it was placed. But the progress of a higher civilization thus begun was interrupted by an event which overturned the plans of the general, and entailed the severest sufferings on many of his followers. The Inca Manco, insulted on every hand, and in the most contemptuous manner, by the proud Castilian soldiers effected his escape, and headed a formidable rising of the natives. Gathering round Cuzco in immense numbers, the natives laid siege to the city, and set it on fire. An Indian force also invested Xauxa, and another detachment threatened Lima. The siege of Cuzco was maintained for five months, after which time the Peruvians were commanded by their Inca to retire to their farms, and cultivate the soil, that the country might be saved from famine. The advantages, many though unimportant, which the Inca gained in the course of this siege were his last triumphs. He afterwards retired to the mountains, where he was massacred by a party of Spaniards. More formidable, however, to Pizarro than any rising of the natives was the quarrel between himself and Almagro, a soldier of generous disposition, but of fiery temper, who, after Pizarro, held the highest rank among the conquerors. The condition of the country was now in every sense deplorable. The natives, astonished not more by the appearance of cavalry than by the flash, the sound, and the deadly execution of artillery, had succumbed to forces which they had no means of successfully encountering. Meantime the Almagro faction had not died out with }he death of its leader, and they still cherished schemes of vengeance against the Pizarros. It was resolved to assassinate the general as he returned from mass on Sunday, June 26, 1541. Hearing of the conspiracy, but attaching little importance to the information, Pizarro nevertheless deemed it prudent not to go to mass that day. His house was assaulted by the conspirators, who, murdering his servants, broke in upon the great leader, overwhelmed him by numbers, and killed him. The son of Almagro then proclaimed himself governor, but was soon defeated in battle, and put to death. In 1542 a council was called at Valladolid, at the instigation of the ecclesiastic Las Casas, who felt shocked and humiliated at the excesses committed on the natives. The result of this council was that a code of laws was framed for Peru, according to one clause of which the Indians who had been enslaved by the Spaniards were virtually declared free men. It was also enacted that the Indians were not to be forced to labor in unhealthy

localities, and that in whatever cases they were desired to work they were to be fairly paid. These and similar clauses enraged the adventurers. Biasco Nufiez Vela, sent from Spain to enforce the new laws, rendered himself unpopular, and was seized and thrown into prison. He had come from Spain accompanied by an “audience” of four, who now undertook the government. Gonzalo Pizarro (the last in Peru of the family of that name), who had been elected captain-general, now marched threateningly upon Lima. He was too powerful to withstand, and the audience received him in a friendly manner, and, after the administration of oaths, elected him governor as well as captain-general of the country. The career of this adventurer was cut short by Pedro de la Gasca, who, invested with the powers of the sovereign, arrived from Spain, collected a large army, and pursued Pizarro, who was eventually taken and executed.

A series of petty quarrels, and the tiresome story of the substitution of one ruling functionary for another, make up a great part of the subsequent history. The country became one of the four vice-royalties of Spanish America, and the Spanish authority was fully established and administered by successive viceroys. The province of Quito was separated from Peru in 1718; and in 1788 considerable territories in the south were detached, and formed into the government of Buenos Ayres. At the outbreak of the War of Independence in South America, the Spanish government, besides having much declined in internal strength, was distracted with the dissensions of a regency, and torn by civil war; nevertheless in 1820 the Spanish viceroy had an army of 23,000 men in Peru, and all the large towns were completely in the hands of Spanish officials. Peru was the last of the Spanish South American possessions to set up the standard of independence. In August, 1820, a rebel army, under general San Martin, one of the liberators of Chili, sailed for Peru, and after a number of successes both on sea and land, in which the patriots were most effectively assisted by English volunteers, the independence of the country was proclaimed, July 28,1821, and San Martin, assumed the protectorate of the young republic. From this date to the year 1860. twenty-one rulers, under various titles, held sway. For the first twenty-four years of its existence as an independent Republic the country was distracted and devastated by wars and revolutions. In 1845 Don Ramon Castilla was elected president; and under his firm and sagacious guidance the country enjoyed an unwonted measure of peace, and became regularly organized. Commerce began to be developed, and important public works were undertaken. The

term of his presidency ended in 1851, in which year general Rufino Jose Echenique was elected president. The country, however, was discontented with his government, and Castilla, after raising an insurrection in the south, again found himself in 1855 at the head of affairs. Slavery, which, although abolished by the charter of independence, still existed, was put an end to by a decree dated October, 1854. In August, 1863, a quarrel had taken place at the estate of Talambo, in the north, between some Basque emigrants and the natives, in which several of the disputants were killed or wounded. Taking advantage of this occurrence, the Spanish government sent out a "special commissioner" in the spring of 1864, who delivered a memorandum to the Peruvian minister, complaining of injuries sustained by the Spaniards, and accompanied by a letter threatening prompt and energetic reprisals should Spain be insulted or her flag disgraced. The "commissioner" left Lima on April 12, the day on which his memorandum and letter were delivered; and on the 14th a Spanish squadron, under admiral Pinzon, who had been joined by the "commissioner," took forcible possession of the Chincha Islands, the principal source of the revenue of Peru. This complication provoked disturbances, not only in Peru, but in all the ancient Spanish states of South America. In January, 1865, peace was concluded by the payment of sixty million seals to Spain as war indemnity; but the Peruvians rebelled against this concession of their president, Pezet, and in November he was retired, a provisional government established, and war measures inaugurated against Spain by forcible seizure of the Chincha Islands. An alliance was agreed upon between Peru and Chili, Ecuador, and Bolivia, and war declared by these allies in January, 1866; but only a month later all hostilities ceased. In 1867 the Peruvians adopted a new and mire liberal constitution. Yet frequent revolutionary measures have thus far failed to give perfect quiet to the country. Thus as late as 1872 an attempt was made, to take the life of the head of the government by a powder-plot.

The *government* of Peru is republican, and elects its president for a term of six years. He is assisted by a Senate, consisting of two members from each province, and a House of Representatives, of whom there is one member for every 20,000 inhabitants. The ministers, together with senators chosen by the congress, form the cabinet. The country is divided into 11 departments, and two provinces with the constitution of departments; and the departments are subdivided into provinces, the provinces into districts, and the districts into parishes. The army consists of 13,000 men, and the

navy of 22 vessels, carving 88 guns. Of the whole population, 240,000 are whites, 300,000 Mestizos, 40,000 Negroes, and 1,620,000 Indians.

The general *religion* of Peru is that of the conquerors of the country, the Spaniards — the Roman Catholic, which is besides especially favored and protected by the constitution. Roman Catholic missionaries labored among the early settlers from Spain as well as among the natives, especially among the Antes, but towards the close of the 17th century the Indians turned against the missionaries and destroyed the missions. The republic is divided into the archbishopric of Lima. founded in 1541, and the seven episcopal sees of Chachapoyas, Truxillo, Ayacucho, Cuzco, Arequipa, Huanuco, and Puno (the last two were founded in 1861). The clergy are numerous, but uneducated and badly supported. The number of convents, once astonishingly large, was reduced in 1863 to 130. Public instruction is principally in the hands of the clergy. The people's schools are in a very inferior condition. Of the higher institutions, the first are the five universities at Lima, Truxillo, Ayacucho, Cuzco, and Puno, but they have only a nominal existence. Of more importance are the *colegios*, or technical schools, of which, in 1860, there were 30 public and 38 private ones. Of all these, 17 are for females. The clergy are educated in seminaries. There are a few Jews and some Protestants, but their number is not definitely known. See Hill, *Travels in Peru and Mexico* (Lond. 1860); Grandidier, *Voyage dans l'Amerique du Sad* (Paris, 1861); Soldan, *Geografia del Peru* (ibid. 1862); Tschudi, *Reisen* in *Sudmerika* (Leips. 1861); Wappaeus, *Peru, Bolivia, and Chili* (ibid. 1871); Fuentes, *Lima, Esquisses historiques, statistiques, administratives, commerciales;* Hutchinson, *Two Years in Peru* (Lond. 1874, 2 vols. 8vo); Prescott, *Hist. of the Conquest of Peru; Harper's Monthly,* vol. 7.

Perucci, Orasio

an Italian painter of Reggio, was born in 1548. According to Tiraboschi, he was a good artist, executed some works for the churches of his native city, and painted much for the collections. Lanzi says there remain various pictures by him in private houses, and an altar-piece in the church of S. Giovanni at Reggio; and, judging from his style, he thinks he was a pupil of Lelio, Orsi. He died in 1624.

Peru'dah

(Heb. *Perudah'*, adWrP] *core;* Sept. Φαδουρά (*;;* Ezra 2:55. In Nehemiah 7:57 the name is written *Peridah'*, adyrP] Sept. Φαρειδά vr. *r.* Φεριδά), one of "Solomon's servants," whose posterity returned from the exile. B.C. ante 536.

Perugia, Giovanni Niccolo da

an Italian painter, was born at Perugia, according to Pascoli about 1478. He was probably a scholar of Pietro Perugino. Lanzi says, He was a good colorist, and therefore was willingly received by Pietro to assist him in his works, however inferior to that artist in design and perspective. His works are recognized in the Capella del Cambio near, the celebrated Sala of Perugino. where be painted *John the Baptist.* In the church of S. Tommaso is his picture of that saint about to touch the wounds of the Savior, and, with the exception of a sameness of the heads, it possesses much of the character of Perugino." He died in 1544.

Perugia, Mariano da

an Italian painter, who, according to Mariotti, was a reputable artist, and executed some works for the churches at Perugia and Ancona. There are notices of him from 1547 to 1576. That writer commends an altar-piece by him in the church of S. Domenico at Perugia, and another picture by him in the church of S. Agostino at Ancona. He was also called *Mariano di Ser Eusterio.*

Perugia, Sinabaldo da

an Italian painter, was a native of Perugia. He is highly commended by Mariotti, who flourished in the first part of the 16th century. There are notices of him from the years 1505 to 1528. Lanzi says, "He must be esteemed an excellent painter from his works in his native place, and still more from those in the cathedral at Gabbio, where he painted a fine picture in the year 1505, and a gonfalon still more beautiful, which would rank him among the first artists of the ancient school."

Perugino, Domenico

an Italian painter, was a native of Perugia, and, according to Baglioni, flourished in the latter part of the 16th and the first part of the 17th

centuries. Lanzi says he painted small wood scenes, or landscapes, and that he is scarcely known at Perugia; though it is believed that one of his pictures remains in the church of S. Angelo Magno at Ascoli. His name also occurs at Siena, and he is mentioned by authors as the master of Antiveanto Grammatica.

Perugino, Lello

an old Italian painter, who was a native of Perugia, decorated, in conjunction with Ugolino Orvietano and other artists, the cathedral of Orvieto in 1321.

Perueino, Pietro Vanuoci

a celebrated Italian painter, was born of very humble parentage at Citta della Pieve, in Umbria, about 1446, but as he established himself in the neighboring and more important city of Perugia, he is commonly called *II Perugino.* It is generally thought that he studied under AndreaVerocchio at Florence. He executed numerous excellent works in various cities. particularly in Florence, Siena, Pavia, Naples, Bologna, Rome. and Perugia. Sixtus IV employed him in the Cappella Sistina; and his fresco of *Christ giving the Keys to Peter* is by far the best of those painted on the side-walls of that chapel, Perugino also, along with other contemporary painters, decorated the stanze of the Vatican; and his works there are the only frescos that were spared when Raffaelle was commissioned to substitute his own works for those formerly painted on the walls and ceilings. The fact of his having had Raffaelle for his pupil has no doubt in one way increased the reputation of Perugino, but it has also in some degree tended to lessen it, as in many of his best productions the work of Raffaelle is confidently pointed out by connoisseurs, and, indeed, many important pictures at one time acknowledged as Perugino’s are now ascribed to his great pupil. His high standing as a painter, however, is established by many admirable works, in which no hand superior to his own could have operated; and, with the exception, perhaps, of Francia, who in some respects is esteemed his equal, he is now acknowledged as the ablest of the masters of that section of the early Italian school in which religious feeling is expressed with great tenderness, in pictures remarkable for delicate execution. Perugino’s works are also distinguished by rich and warm coloring. One of his most celebrated paintings, *The Bewailing of Christ,* is now in the Pitti gallery at Florence. An excellent example of his

work may be studied in the collection of the National Gallery, London (No. 288), *The Virgin adoring the Infant Christ.* In the New York Historical Society theme is a painting of his, *The Adoration of the Infant Jesus,* and in Yale College there is one on *The Baptism of Christ.* Perugino's reputation was high, when the introduction of the cinquecento style, by Leonardo and Michael Angelo, tended to throw into the shade the art of the earlier masters. Disputes ran high between the leaders of the old and new styles, and Michael Angelo is said to have spoken contemptuously of Perugino's powers. This, of course, has biased Vasari's opinion in his estimate of the opponent of his idol, but Perugino's reputation is nevertheless great, and his works are much esteemed. Raffaelle was about twelve years of age when he was entered as a pupil with Perugino, who was then (1495) engaged on the frescos in the Sala del Cambia (the Exchange) at Perugia. Perugino died at Castello di Fontignano, near Perugia, in 1524. See Spooner, *Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts,* s.v. *Lond. Rev.* 1854, pt. 2:256.

Perunatele

a goddess among the ancient Lithuanians, who was at once the mother and wife of Perun.

Peruvian Architecture

Although the buildings of Peru were erected probably about the 12th century A.D., they possess an extraordinary likeness to those of the Pelasgi in Europe. This resemblance in style must be accidental, arising probably from the circumstance that both nations used bronze tools, and were unacquainted with iron. The Peruvian walls are built with large polygonal blocks of stone, exactly like what we call "cyclopean masonry." The jambs of the doorways slope inwards, like those of Etruscan tombs, and have similar lintels. The walls of Cuzco are good examples of this style. It is further remarkable that these walls are built with re-entering angles, like the fortifications which were adopted in Europe only after the invention of gunpowder. *SEE PERU.*

Peruzzi, Baldassare

an eminent Italian painter and architect, was born at Accajano, near Siena, Tuscany, Jan. 15, 1480. He was the child of poor parents, but by dint of persevering effort he succeeded in obtaining a knowledge of painting from

some unknown master in his native city, and afterwards pursued his studies in Rome. While there he formed an intimacy with Raffaelle, for whom he had the most ardent admiration. He attained great eminence at Rome, and received patronage from many of the nobility, and also from pope Alexander VI. In perspective and architecture — on which subject he left several MSS. — he especially distinguished himself; and was even preferred to Bramante, under whom he is said to have studied. Indeed, his work in this branch of art was so skillfully done, and so closely imitated bass-reliefs and real architecture, that the most perfect illusions were produced; and it is said that his perspectives in the arches of the ceiling at the Farnese palace, representing the *History of Perseus* and other mythological subjects embellished with bass-reliefs, were so admirably executed that Titian himself was deceived by them, and was only convinced of his error by observing the works from other points of view. He was employed in designing and ornamenting numerous churches, palaces, and chapels, all of which were masterpieces, the Palazzo Massimo being considered one of the most original and tasteful edifices in Rome. He was architect of St. Peter's, at Rome, being employed for that work by pope Leo X, with a salary of two hundred and fifty crowns per annum. His frescos were marvels of beauty, and evinced remarkable talent. He also achieved great excellence in grotesques, a style of painting which affords unlimited scope for the play of the imagination. With the ability to comprehend its principles, he combined rare judgment and good taste, exhibiting surprising skill in the arrangement and adaptation of figures as devices emblematic of stories which they surrounded. It is said too that he engraved on wood, and that he wrote a treatise on the *Antiquities of Rome*, and a *Commentary on Vitruvius*, which he purposed to illustrate with wood-engravings. His oil-paintings are rare, but among those mentioned are the *Adoration of the Magi*, in the National Gallery at London; *Charity*, in the Museum at Berlin; and a piece containing half-length figures of the Virgin, St. John, and St. Jerome. Critics are unanimous in commendation of his grandeur of conception, purity of design, and nobleness of execution; and Lanzi says of him, "If other artists surpassed him in the vastness of their works, they never did in excellence." He always remained poor, being too modest to push his way among rivals; and, though patronized by the nobility, he received a merely nominal compensation for his best works. Pursued during his life by misfortune, he died — poisoned by a rival — in the prime of his manhood, in 1536. Artists of every class assisted at his obsequies, and he was buried in the Pantheon by the side of Raffaelle. The

greatness of his talent was recognized after his death; and posterity pays its just tribute to his wonderful genius. Among his other works were *The Judgment of Paris; The Sibyl announcing to Augustus the Birth of Christ;* and several pieces representing Bible history, among which were three events in the history of Jonah. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale,* 39:675; Spooner, *Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts,* 2:679.

Peruzzini, Cav. Giovanni

an Italian painter of Pesaro or Ancona, was born in 1629. Canon Lazzarini asserts that both Domenico and Giovanni Peruzzini were natives of Pesaro, and that they transferred their services to Ancona, their adopted, country. Giovanni studied under Simone Cantarini; acquired distinction, and painted several pictures for the churches at Ancona, Bologna, and other places. He was invited to the court of Turin, where he executed several works both in oil and in fresco, so much to the satisfaction of his protector that he made him knight of the Order of St. Maurice. He possessed a lively imagination, ready invention, and facility of execution. He formed a style of his own, founded on those of Cantarini, the Caracci, and Guido. He was vain of his facility, as appears on one of his lunettes of the portico de' Servi at Bologna, on which he inscribed, *Opus* 24 *Hor. Eq. Jo. P.* (the work of twenty-four hours, by Gio. Peruzzini, knight), which caused many sarcastic remarks from his brother artists. His best works are finished with more care. The principal at Anlcona are the *Decollation of St. John,* at Spedale, and *St. Teresa,* at the Carmelitani; at Bologna, *The Descent of the Holy Ghost,* in the church of SS. Vitale and Agricola, and an altarpiece of *St. Cecilia* in the church dedicated to that saint. Lanzi says, "In his picture of St. Teresa are traces of Baroccio's manner; that of the 'Beheading of St. John' is extremely beautiful, and there he appears a scholar of the Bolognese." He afterwards took to a wandering life, and painted in various churches and theaters, if not with much study, yet with tolerable correctness, a knowledge of perspective, and with a certain facility, grace, and spirit which delight the eye. His paintings are dispersed through various places in the Picenum, even as far as Ascoli, where are a number of his works. There are also some of his works at Rome and Milan. He died at Milan in 1694. See Spooner, *Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts,* 2:681.

Peruzzini, Domenico

an Italian engraver, was born at Pesaro or Ancona; flourished, according to the dates in the prints attributed to him, from 1640 to 1661. He is supposed to have been the elder brother of Gio. Peruzzini, and, like him, to have studied under Simone Cantarini. Lanzi says that in a MS. at Pesaro it is mentioned that Domenico was a native of that city, and a scholar of Pandolfi. There is much confusion and contradiction about both artists, and still more uncertainty about Domenico. The list of prints given below were formerly attributed to Domenico Piola; but Bartsch repudiates the idea, and adduces several cogent reasons for transferring them to Domenico Peruzzini. They are etched in a masterly style, resembling those of Cantarini. It would seem that both brothers were natives of Pesaro, but preferred to be called after Ancona, the place of their adoption. The following are the prints attributed to him by Bartsch:

1. *The Holy Virgin* (half length) *with the Infant Jesus* (1661);

2. *The Virgin seated, with the Infant on her Knees* (1661);

3. *Christ tempted by the Devil,* in the form of an old man (1642);

4. *Christ bearing his Cross,* with other figures half length;

5. *The Holy Family and Saints* (1661). The figures in this print are half length. Heineken, in his *Dictionnaire des Artistes,* attributed this print to Gio. Dom. Cerrini, known under the name of II Cavaliere Perugino.

6. *St. Anthony of Padua praying,* and the infant Jesus appearing to him in a cloud supported by three cherubim. This print has been erroneously attributed to D. Cresti.

7. *The Assassination,* a man in his shirt on a bed assailed by three soldiers, one of whom thrusts a lance into his body (1640); 8-11. Landscapes; 12. *St. Jerome doing Penance in the Desert.* The letters D. P. F. are on a plant to the right. Bartsch, however, considers it doubtful whether it belongs to Domenico Peruzzini, as there is a sensible difference in the style from that of others.

Per Viam

a technical title of certain forms of ecclesiastical election.

1. PER VIAM COMPROMISSI (*by way of conmpromise*) was an election of a superior by the sworn delegates of a convent, who retired into a secret chamber, and, after invocation of the Holy Ghost, named the person on whom their choice had fallen.

2. PER VIAM SPIRITUS SANCTI (*by way of the Holy Spirit*) was a unanimous election by the whole convent, as if by divine inspiration.

3. PER VIAM SCRUTINII (*by way of scrutiny*) was when each monk voted singly in the chapter-house, in the presence of the bishop.

Pesachim

SEE TALMUD.

Pesari, Giovanni Battista

an Italian painter, flourished at Modena about 1650. Tiraboschi says that he was either a pupil of Guido, or made that master' his example. Lanzi says he resembles Guido very closely in his picture of the Madonna in the church of S. Paolo at Modena, and in other works. He afterwards went to Venice, where he died, in the flower of life.

Pesaro, Aaron di Of Italy

a celebrated rabbi of the 16th century, undertook and accomplished the hereulean task of furnishing a sort of concordance to every passage of Scripture quoted or commented upon in the *Babylonian Talmud*, and called it after his own name, ˆrh}ai twdlw]T, "the Offering of Aaron." It was first published at Freiburg and Basle in 1581, in folio. Of such importance did the great Buxtorf consider the work that he published the whole of it as an Appendix to the first edition of his Chaldaic, Talmudical, and Rabbinical Lexicon, in 1639, with the following Latin paraphrase of its title-page: "Index locupletissimus omnium locorum in toto Talmudico opere de sacris Bibliis eompraehensorum, summo studio et fidelitate collectus" (which, however, is not reprinted in the new edition of Buxtorf's Lexicon by Fischer, Leipsic, 1869-1874). In 1590 an enlarged edition, including references to the Zohar, Baal Akeda, or Isaac Arama's philosophical work, entitled qjx]yæ tdiqe[}, and Ikkarim of Joseph Albo, was published at Vienna. Between sixty and seventy years afterwards the then famous rabbi Jacob Sasportas, whom subsequent Hebrew writers described as "most distinguished in the law and crowned with humility," a

native of Oran, in North Africa-who was successively chief rabbi of the Sephardim congregations at Leghorn, Hamburg, and Amsterdam-supplemented the work of Pesaro by a concordance of the passages of Scripture quoted and treated in the *Jerusalem Talmud.* This supplement the author called after his own name, bq[y twdlwt, "the Offering of Jacob." The twofold work, as a whole, was first published at Amsterdam in 1652, then at Berlin in 1705. The Rev. Dr. Margoliouth, of London, has recently announced an English translation. with editorial annotations and illustrations, in two volumes, of both Pesaro's and Sasportas's work. See Furst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3:79; De Rossi, *Dizionario storico degli autori Ebrei,* p. 262 (Germ. transl. by Hamburger); Wolf, *Bibl. Hebr.* 1:128 sq.; 3:80 sq. (B. P.)

Pesaro, Jechiel

(also called PISAURENSIS JECHIEL), OF FLORENCE, a Jewish convert to Christianity, is noted as a philosopher, physician, and theologian. Having for some time heard the sermons of the inquisitor Dionysius Costacciario, he repaired to Rome to renounce Judaism. Pope Gregory XIII, who then held the Papal See, was present at the speech Pesaro made before a numerous assembly in 1582, and received him, as he descended from the chair, with the words, "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." Soon after Pesaro was baptized by this pontiff, and became a preacher. Some of his sermons which he preached before and against the Jews at Florence were printed in the Italian language in 1585. See Furst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3:79; Wolf, *Bibl. Hebr.* 1:576; Bartolocci, *Bibl. Rabb.* 4:584; Adams, *Hist. of the Jews,* 2:79 (Boston, 1812); Basnage, *Histoire des Juifs,* p. 726 (Taylor's transl.); Kalkar, *Israel u. d. Kirche,* p. 71 (Hamb. 1869); Pick, *Evangelical Review* (Gettysburg, 1876), p. 367. (B. P.)

Pesaro, Niccolo Trometto, Or Niccolo Da

an Italian painter of the 16th century, and a native of Pesaro, studied under Zuccaro, whose style he at first followed closely. He executed some works for the churches at Rome, the principal of which are the *Nativity,* in the Basilica; a *Pieta,* in S. Francesca; the *Nativity* and the *Circumcision,* in S. Maria da Aracaeli. Lanzi says his best piece is the *Last Supper,* in the church of the Sacrament at Pesaro. "It is a picture so well conceived and harmonized, and so rich in pictorial effect, that Lazzarini has descanted upon it in his lectures as one of the finest works in that city." It is said that

Baroccio regarded this artist with esteem, and Baglioni commends him for his earlier works. He afterwards fell into a mannered, insipid style, which injured his reputation and fortune. He died at Rome in the pontificate of Paul V, aged seventy years.

Pescia, Mariano Da

an Italian painter, was a native of Pescia. His real name was *Mariano Gratiadei*, He was born about 1520, and was a scholar of Ridolfo Ghirlandaio (not, as is said, of Domenico G., who died about 1493), whom he assisted in many of his works. He also painted some pictures from his own compositions, of which the principal are an altar-piece in the Capella della Signoria, in the Palazzo Vecchio at Florence, and a picture of *the Virgin and the Infant Jesus, with St. Elizabeth and St. John*, in the Florentine gallery. It is agreed by all that Pescia died young, but the time of his birth and death is variously stated. Zani says he died in 1520; others that he was born in 1520 or 1525, and died at Florence in 1550. See Spooner, *Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts*, 2:682.

Pesello, Francesco

an Italian painter of the Florentine school, was born in the year 1380. He studied with Filippo Lippi, and was a good imitator of his style. There is a fine picture by him of the *Epiphany* in the ducal gallery. He died in the year 1457.

Pesheth

SEE FLAX.

Peshito, Or Rather Peshitto

(Syr., as generally supposed, simple," "faithful," sc. Version, or the "explained," i.e. translated, Bible), is the name given to the authorized Syriac Version of the Old and the greater part of the New Testament. This version holds among the Syrian Christians the same place as the Vulgate in the Roman and the "Authorized Version" in the English Church. Many are the traditions about its origin. Thus the translation of the Old Testament is supposed to date from the time of Solomon and Hiram; or to have been done by Asa the priest; or, again, that it belongs to the time of the apostle Thaddseus (Adaeus), and Abgar, the king of Osrhoene, in the 1st century after Christ. To the same period is also supposed to belong the translation

of the New Testament, which is ascribed to Achaeus, a disciple of Thaddseus, the first Edessian bishop and martyr. Recent investigation has not as yet come to any nearer result than to place the latter vaguely in the 2d, and the former in the 3d century, and to make Judaic-Christians the authors of both. Ephraem Syrus (q.v.), who wrote in the 4th century, certainly speaks of the Peshito as *Our* Version, and thus early finds it necessary to explain some of its terms, which had become obsolete. Five books of the New Testament (the Apocalypse and four of the Epistles) are wanting in all the MSS., having probably not yet formed part of the canon when the translation was made. The version of the Old Testament was made direct from the Hebrew, and by men imbued with the Palestinian mode of explanation. It is extremely faithful, and astonishingly free from any of those paraphrastic tendencies which pervade more or less all the Targums or Aramaic versions. Its renderings are mostly very happy, and coincide in many places with those of the Septuagint — a circumstance which has given rise to the supposition that the latter itself had been drawn upon. Its use for the Old Testament is more of an exegetical, for the New Testament more of a critical, nature. Anything like an edition of the Peshito worthy of its name is still as much a desideratum as is a critical edition of the Septuagint or the Targums, and consequently investigators have as vet been unable to come to anything but very hazy conclusions respecting some very important questions connected with it. The *editio princeps* of the New Testament part dates Vienna, 1555; that of the Old Testament is contained in the Paris Polygglot of 1645. *SEE SYRIAC VERSIONS*.

Pesne, Jean

a French engraver, was born at Rouen in 1623. It is not known under whom he studied, but he went to Paris, where he acquired distinction by the excellence of his works. His execution is not dexterous nor picturesque, but his outline is correct, and he rendered with remarkable fidelity the precise character of the different painters whose works he engraved, which makes his prints interesting and valuable to the collector. Dumesnil mentions 166 prints by him, the best of which are those he engraved after Niccolo Poussin. He died about 1700. The following are his most esteemed prints:

(1) subjects after Poussin — *Esther before Ahasuerus; the Adoration of the Shepherds; the Dead Christ, with the Virgin and St. John; the Entombing; the Death of Ananias; the Holy Family; the Vision of St.*

Paul; the Triumph of Galatea; the Testament of Eudamidas, one of his best prints; *the Seven Sacraments* is in seven plates of two sheets each.

(2) *The Holy Family* (after Raffaelle). See Spooner, *Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts,* 2:682.

Pessimism

the opposite of *Optimism* (q.v.), is the doctrine that the universe is the worst possible, or the worst conceivable. This is the broadest form in which the doctrine can be stated or held. In a non-limited application it might be defined as the doctrine that *human existence,* in its conditions and its destiny, is only an evil. *SEE EVIL* and *SEE ORIGIN OF EVIL*. Popularly applied, pessimism might be defined as the doctrine that the evil outweighs the good in the universe at large or in the condition of man.

The term is of recent coinage, and has only become current — in its philosophical or popular meaning — within the last twenty years, chiefly through the influence of Arthur Schopenhauer (q.v.) and Eduard von Hartmann. The very recent introduction of the term indicates, if it does not prove, that the doctrine itself as a formal theory is of recent origin. It is true that all literatures and all philosophies abound in complaints and meditations and proposed remedies having respect to the evils of human existence, and the apparent defects in the constitution or the workings of the universe. But these theories and complaints and remedies all presuppose that some good reason can be given, or some valuable end suggested, as the explanation or the compensation for the evil which is accounted for or bemoaned. None of the ancient philosophies or theologies are avowedly and consistently pessimistic except that of Buddhism, which formally teaches that all the present forms of existence are only evil, and that the only good conceivable is in Nirvana. What this may be is not so clear as might be desired: whether the termination of conscious and sentient existence, or the actual cessation of all forms of active desire and hope, which work conflict or disappointment.

With the exception named, all the older philosophies and theologies are in theory optimistic, so far as they all resolve the existence of physical evil into some permanent or preponderating good, under the conduct of one supreme Deity or reason, or many subordinate deities, who in some way were supposed to bring greater good out of abounding evil. Even the theory of Lucretius cannot be said to be pessimistic. The temper in which

the great thinkers and the leading philosophers of antiquity regarded the economies of the universe and the ordering of human affairs varies with the greater or less hopefulness of the times in which they wrote, and the clearness and firmness with which they held to faith in divine guidance and the divine goodness. It is worthy of observation that the universe and the condition of man never seemed darker nor more hopeless, in the judgment of reflecting and sympathizing thinkers, than a little before and after Christianity made its appearance in the world, offering the solutions and the comforts which it brought as pre-eminently a religion of contentment, thankfulness, and hope.

But with all the consolation and hope which Christianity afforded to man, it did not put to rest all speculation and misgiving in respect to the mystery of evil. Indeed, it is no more than the truth to say that Christianity brought special difficulties of its own, which, according to some interpretations made of its teachings, have seemed to darken the mystery of evil, and to complicate the explanation of its existence. It is no part of our duty to recite the theories of Christian philosophy in respect to the existence of physical and moral evil. It is enough that we call attention to the fact that their theories are in form or in fact optimistic. They all find the explanation of evil in some greater and superabounding good, of which this evil in its infliction or permission is the condition or the means. They all recognize the existence of a wise and benevolent Ruler of the universe, who from seeming evil is ever educing good, and whose wisdom and goodness will be amply justified when the reasons of his administration are fully understood. In theory and in fact, no theistic theory of the universe can be conceived of as pessimistic.

With the denial of theism, pessimism is possible, but not necessary. Spinoza seems to be an optimist when he asserts that finite evil and good are only relative conceptions; that what seems to be evil is the necessary manifestation or outworking of the universal substance. Logically considered, his argument is not valid, for, in order to make it such, it must be assumed or proved that the existence of the universal substance or God is itself a good. The philosophy of Hegel found in the necessary evolution of the absolute a place for every form of evil as a necessary stage in the process by which the idea at last comes to self-consciousness in man, and thus marks the steps of its advancement or evolution in the history of each individual, and in the progress of the race. But in order to justify the occurrence of these transient evils, this development of the lower into the

higher must be assumed to be good. Pessimism is by no means excluded by this theory of Hegel, except by the assumption that an outcome of preponderating evil in the universe would be unreasonable, and unreason is evil only, and cannot be actual. But this solution only illustrates a fundamental weakness or limitation of the system itself in its conceptions of good and evil.

Schopenhauer makes the two elements or factors of the universe to be will — i.e. force and thought; i.e. *Vorstellung;* conceiving, however, of neither nor of both as implying a personal God. He does, indeed, make the force which is blind when it begins to work to come at the end of its operations to a consciousness of itself and of its work; but the discovery which it makes of both is anything rather than satisfactory. As soon as the blind will comes to the clear knowledge of the unsatisfactory character of its work, it recoils with horror, and strives for self-annihilation. Schopenhauer gives his reasons for holding that all life is only suffering: 1. The constitution of the human individual; 2. The nature of enjoyment; 3. The consequents of possession and gratification; 4. The relation of man to the external world; 5. The aimless operation of history. From these data he concludes that the universe is the worst possible, arguing that if it were a shade worse it could not possibly exist. The only transitory happiness which man can find or should value are the passionless pleasures of science and art. These have as little as possible of the elements of feeling and impulse, and therefore are liable to the least possible alloy.

Hartmann contends that the universe as a whole is uncontrolled by design. Each part is adapted to every other, but no design controls the whole. This he argues from the unsatisfactory results of the universe, with which he contends no reasonable being could possibly be content, and therefore the universe as a whole is neither reasonable nor good. In proof, he cites

(1) The law of nervous exhaustion;

(2) The pleasure found in relief from pain does not usually outweigh the pain;

(3) The most of our pleasures are unobtrusive; the contrary is true of pains;

(4) All gratifications are usually brief, while sufferings are enduring.

The remedy which Hartmann proposes is to elevate and strengthen the will to a passionless indifference to existence and its evils, and a passionless enjoyment of its blessings. *SEE STOICISM*.

The affinity of these philosophical theories with the hypotheses of blind evolutionism and the survival of the fittest, as taught by many modern expounders of natural history, is too obvious to need exposition. The moment we abandon the position that design controls the universe, and that the tendency of its forces and movements authorizes us to believe in the goodness of a personal God, it is impossible to set aside the reasonings which lead to the hopeless and repulsive conclusions of pessimism. In literature pessimism is nearly allied to *nihilism*, or that faithless and hopeless view of life's duties and life's activities which is the result of the overstimulated and the overindulged curiosity and tastes that characterize most of our modern life. Indeed, it is in this practical form only that pessimism is likely to be current or dangerous. There are comparatively few men who will be attracted by this doctrine as an abstract theory of the universe. Its assumptions are too remote and doubtful, and the deductions are too attenuated. But there are multitudes in this our own cultivated age who have found life so empty, and the gratification of passion so unsatisfying, and even the pursuit of art and literature so unrewarding, as to be ready to accept the conclusion that the universe is badly ordered, and human existence is only vanity and vexation of spirit. Theoretic pessimism is, on the one hand, compatible with the grossest debauchery, the most shameless self-seeking, and the most cruel oppression; and on the other with stoic indifference for one's personal sufferings, and passionless unsympathy for the sorrows of others. No influence can be more unfriendly to individual or national character than the absence of faith in God and man which such n theory implies or engenders. No heroism nor self-sacrifice nor self-culture in its highest forms can flourish in a community of educated men who have persuaded themselves that their life is a burden, that the universe is false to its promises, and that their very nature is necessarily in conflict with the impulses and hopes which impel it to action. Neither art nor literature nor philosophy can escape the blight which pessimism, as a philosophy of the universe or a theory of life, must of necessity bring upon all that is noble and aspiring in man and his achievements. See Huber, *Der Pessimismus* (Munich, 1876); Volkelt, *Das Unbewusste und der Pessimismus*: *Studien zur modernen Geistesbewegung* (Berlin, 1873); Taubert, *Der Pessimismus und seine Gegner;* Von

Hartmann, *Ist der pessimistische Monismus trostlos? Gesammeltephil. Abhandlungen* (Berlin, 1872); Pfleiderer, *Der Pessimismus* (Berlin, 1875); Christlieb, *Infidelity*, v. 40; Ueberweg, *Hist. of Philosophy* (see Index); *Christian Quar.* April, 1874, p. 284-88; *North Amer. Rev.* July, 1873, art. 2.

Pessos

a small black stone which held the place of a statue in the temple of *Cybele*, the great goddess of the Phrygians. It was probably an aerolite, having been represented as falling from heaven.

Pestalozzi, Johann Heinrich

the father of modern educational ideas, or, as he has been aptly called, "the schoolmaster of the human race," was one of the greatest philanthropists of the world. He was born at Zurich, Switzerland, Jan. 12, 1746. His father, a physician, died when Pestalozzi was about six years old; but his mother, with the assistance of some relatives, procured him a good education. He studied divinity, but soon tired of it, and turned aside to fit himself for the profession of law; but, instead of entering either the clerical or legal ranks, he married, at the age of twenty-three, the daughter of a merchant of Zurich, purchased a small landed property which he named Neuhof, and went to reside upon it and cultivate it. Why this man of scholarly tastes and pious life should so suddenly turn his attention to farming was a mystery to many of his friends. But Pestalozzi himself had a far-reaching purpose in this step. The reading of Rousseau's *Emile* had drawn his attention to the subject of education. He had long noticed the degraded and unhappy condition of the laboring classes, the great mass of the population, and he was seeking — led by motives of Christian benevolence and sympathy — to provide means best suited to promote their elevation. He finally became convinced that by means of a sound education a remedy might be found for the many evils by which society was infected. He regarded their ignorance as the principal cause of their misery, and thought that by a proper and advantageous use of their political rights they could be raised from the state of stupidity and brutality into which they had sunk, and given devoted hearts and manly intellects. He proposed to effect this result not simply by instruction, but by a judicious blending of industrial, intellectual, and moral training. He rightly saw that it was not enough to impart instruction to children, but that their *moral* nature should be particularly cared for, and

habits of activity instilled into them through agricultural and industrial labors. To his way of thinking, the great drawback on the side of industry was the weakening of the natural affections and the development of the mercantile spirit, without having the moral resources and consolations afforded by rural occupations. For this reason he preferred to withdraw to a farm, there to gather about him the children of the poor, and to foster in the. coming men and women the taste for domestic life and the sentiment of human dignity. He began in 1775 to carry his views into practice by turning his farm into a farm-school for instructing the children of the poorer classes of the vicinity in industrial pursuits, as well as in reading and writing. He was, however, unsuccessful in his operations. and at the end of two years his school was broken up, and he became involved in debt. In order to relieve himself from his encumbrances, and to procure the means of subsistence, he produced his popular novel of *Lienhardt und Gertrud* (Basle, 1781, 4 vols.), in which, under guise of depicting actual peasant life, he sought to show the neglected condition of the peasantry, and how by better teaching they might be improved both morally and physically. It was read with general interest, and the Agricultural Society of Berne awarded him for it a gold medal, which, however, his necessities compelled him at once to sell. It was followed by *Christoph und Else* (Zurich, 1782). During 1782-83 he edited a periodical entitled *Das Schweizer-Blatt* furi *das Volk*, which was collected in 2 vols. and published as *Nachnforschungen uber den Gang der Natur in der Eintwickelung des Menschengeschlechts* (Zurich, 1797). He wrote also other works of less importance. Not until 1798 did Pestalozzi's opportunity come again to test his theories by practice. In this year he established, with the assistance of the Swiss Directory, a school for orphan children in a convent which had belonged to the Ursuline nuns at Stanlz, in the canton of Unterwalden. Stanz had been sacked by a French army, and the children were such as were left without protectors to wander about the country. In the bare and deserted convent he had, without assistance and without books. to teach about eighty children of from four to ten years of age. He was thus driven by necessity to set the elder and better-taught children to teach the younger and more ignorant; — and thus struck out the monitorial or mutual-instruction system of teaching which, just about the same time, Lancaster was under somewhat similar circumstances led to adopt in England. In less than a year Pestalozzi's benevolent labors were suddenly interrupted by the Austrians, who converted his orphan-house into a military hospital. But the feasibility of his theory had become so evident that he could no longer be

discouraged or turned back by any obstacle. He promptly removed to Burgdorf, eleven miles north-east from Berne, and there founded another school of a somewhat higher grade, and produced his educational works, *Wie Gertrud uhre Kinder lehrt* (Berne, 1801): — *Buch der Mitter* (ibid. 1803), and some others. In 1802 the people of the canton of Berne sent him as their deputy to an educational conference summoned by Bonaparte, then first consul, at Paris. His establishment at Burgdorf was prosperous, became celebrated. and was resorted to from all parts of Europe by persons interested in education; some came for instruction, others for inspection. In 1804 he removed his establishment to Munichen-Buchsee near Hofwol, in order to operate in conjunction with Fellenberg. who had a similar establishment at the latter place; but the two educational reformers disagreed, and in the same year Pestalozzi removed to Yverdun, in the canton of Vaud, where the government appropriated to his use an unoccupied castle. This establishment became even more prosperous and more. celebrated than the one at Burgdorf, and had a still greater number of pupils and of visitors. Unfortunately dissensions arose among the teachers, in which Pestalozzi himself became implicated, and thus the latter years of his life were embittered. The number of pupils rapidly diminished, the establishment became a losing concern, and Pestalozzi was again involved in debt, which the proceeds of the completed edition of his works, *Pestalozzi's Sammtliche Werke* (Stuttgard and Tubingen, 1819-26, 15 vols.), hardly sufficed to liquidate. (This edition was the result of a subscription got up in 1818 for the publication of his works, the names of the emperor of Russia, the king of Prussia, and the king of Bavaria standing at the head of the list.) In 1825 Pestalozzi retired from his laborious duties to Neuhof, where his grandson resided. Here he wrote his *Schwanengesang* (1826), and *Mieine Lebensschicksale als Vorsteher mneiner Erziehungsanstaltene in Burgdoif und Iferten* (ibid.), in which he recounts his disappointments in a most desponding mood. He died Feb. 17,1827, at Brugg, in the canton of Aargau, and over his grave a monument was erected by a grateful generation, which, though it had always failed to reward him as he deserved in life, yet failed not to honor him when his work was done.

The great idea which lay at the basis of Pestalozzi's method of intellectual instruction was. that nothing should be treated of except in a concrete way. Objects themselves became in his hands the subject of lessons tending to the development of the observing and reasoning powers — not lessons

about objects. His special attention was directed to the *moral* and *religious* TRAINING of the children, as distinct from their mere INSTRUCTION; and here, too, graduation and a regard to the nature and susceptibilities of children were conspicuous features of his system.. His aim was to impart to the school the character of an educating family, into which the ease and pleasure of home should be introduced Without books and without apparatus, he directed his attention to those natural elements which are found in the mind of every child. He taught numbers instead of figures; living sounds, instead of dead characters; deeds of faith and love, instead of abstruse creeds; substance instead of shadow; realities instead of signs. Whatever may be thought of his system as a whole, the present generation cannot afford to ignore its great indebtedness to Pestalozzi for the fresher thoughts and experiments which his plans suggested. What Rousseau (q.v.) attempted with a simulated pupil was realized, though with modifications, by Pestalozzi upon real men; and that which was already existing in scattered ideas was collected by him into a focus. Besides. it is the great distinction of Pestalozzi to be among the first benefactors of the poor-the first to claim for their squalid children the full advantage of all that is impressive in art and beautiful in nature-the first to share his bread with them, and to dwell among them as a poor man himself, in order, as he expressed it, that he might "teach those harassed with poverty to live as men."

It now remains for us to notice more distinctly Pestalozzi's relation to Christianity, and especially to Protestantism. It was the practice in his day and country to teach the child the Catechism, and forget altogether the deeper lesson of real faith and true love. As one has aptly put it, the Christianity of Pestalozzi's generation was a lazy Christianity of memory and form," or, as Pestalozzi himself was accustomed to designate it, "a paper-science." Pestalozzi took issue with such a course. He was a Protestant, in whom the essence of Christianity took the place of the form, and in whom the spirit preponderated over the letter. True, he put revealed religion as auxiliary to natural religion, and only instructed his pupils in the latter when the former had been mastered; but whatever may be thought of the method, it is certain that Pestalozzi was a firm believer in the salvation of the world by Christianity. The humble man shrank from professions; he found that he might cause his pupils to stumble if they looked to him for a pattern, and we do not wonder that in the midst of his trials with the world he is led to cry out, "I do not think that there are many men naturally fitted

to be Christians;" and in shame and confusion confesses that he does not really think himself a Christian, because he does not find himself endowed with a capacity to arrive at religious excellence by the conquest of himself. His life will bear the closest scrutiny, and if ever there has been a striving after perfection, Pestalozzi sought for it in Christianity. In the hour of death his hope for salvation was in his Savior. See Krisi, *Pestalozzi*: *his Life, Work, and Influence* (Cincinnati. 1870); and the article in Kiddle and Schem's (*Encyclop. of Education,* p. 693-95; also Hagenbach, *Ch. Hist. of the* 18*th and* 19*th Centuries,* 2:154 sq.; Hurst, *Rationalism,* p. 188 sq.

Pestilence

is the invariable rendering in the A.V. (except in Exodus 9:3, "murrain," and in Hosea 13:14, "plagues") of the Heb. רֶבֶד, *deber* (Sept. usually θάνατος), which originally seems to mean simply *destruction*, but is regularly applied to that common Oriental epidemic *the plague* (q.v.). The same term is also used in the Hebrew Scriptures for all epidemic or contagious diseases (Leviticus 26:25). The writers everywhere attribute it either to the agency of God himself or of that legate or angel whom they denominate מלאך, *malak;* hence the Sept. renders the word רבד, *deber*, or pestilence, in Psalm 91:6, by δαιμόνιον μεσήμβρινον, "the daemon of noonday," and Jonathan also renders the same word in the Chaldee Targum (Habakkuk 3:5) by the Chaldee word אל, angel or messenger. The prophets usually connect together sword, pestilence, and famine, being three of the most grievous inflictions of the Almighty upon a guilty people (2 Samuel 24:19). In the N.T. the term rendered "pestilence" is λοιμός (Matthew 24:7; Luke 21:11; "pestilent fellow," Acts 24:5). *SEE DISEASE*.

Pestle

Picture for Pestle

(עלי, *eli*, so called either as being *round* or *lifted up*), the instrument used for triturating in a mortar (Proverbs 27:22). It is supposed, from the above passage, not that the wheat was pounded to meal instead of being ground, but that it was pounded to be separated from the husk. The Jews very probably used wheat in the same manner as rice is now used in the East, that is, boiled up in *pillaus* variously prepared, which required that it should, like rice, be previously disengaged from the husk. *SEE MORTAR*.

END OF VOL. VII.