THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY

REFERENCE

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL, THEOLOGICAL and ECCLESIASTICAL LITERATURE

Petach - Philippine Islands

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

Petach

SEE PETHACH.

Petachia(s), Moses Ben-Jacob

a learned rabbi who flourished towards the latter half of the 12th century (Regensburg), is the author of the µlwO[h;bWBsæ, also called hy;j]t'P] ri bWBsæ, in which he relates his travels, made between 1075 and 1090 through Poland, Russia, Tartary, Syria, Mesopotamia, ancient Syria, Persia, etc., and wherein he describes the manners and usages of his co-religionists. It was first printed at Prague (1595), and reprinted by Wagenseil, entitled *Itinerarium cum versione Wagenseilii,* in his *Sex exercitationes varii argumenti* (Altorf, 1687; Zolkiew, 1792). It has been translated into French, with notes, by E. Carmoly, *Tour de Monde de Petachia de Ratisbonne, traduit en Francais et accompagne du texte et des notes historiques, geographiques, et litteraires* (Paris, 1831); into German by D. Ottensosser, with a Hebrew commentary (Furth, 1844); into English by Dr. A. Benisch. See First *Bibl. Jud.* 3:79 sq.; Wolf, *Bibl. Hebr.* 1:888; 3:956; Basnage, *Histoire d s Juifs,* page 655 (Taylor's English transl.); Gratz, *Gesch. der Juden,* 6:259, 424; Zunz, *Zir Geschichte u. Literatur,* page 166; the same author in Asher's edition of Tudela's *Itinerary,* volume 2, No. 40, 43, 44, 47; Etheridge, *Introd. to Hebr. Lit.* page 214; Da Costa, *Israel and the Gentiles,* page 187. (B.P.)

Petani

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

Petavel, Alfred F.

a Swiss Protestant clergyman of note, was born near the close of the last century. He studied at the university in Berlin, and was the first recipient from that high school of the doctorate in philosophy. He was greatly instrumental in the establishment of the Swiss Missionary Society, and subsequently took no inconsiderable share in the doings of the Evangelical Alliance. The principal work, however, to which he devoted his best time, his talents, his energies, and his whole heart, was to bring the Jewish people into a more intimate personal contact with the Christians, and it is especially in this respect that his influence has extended beyond his little

country. He was a zealous member of the Universal Israelitish Alliance and of the Evangelical Alliance. He did not, at first, impress one as a pastor, a missionary, an apostle, a father of the Church, but rather as one of those individials described in the book of Genesis, who walked with God, who communed with him, like a patriarch or a seer. He died at the age of eighty. The addresses which he delivered were collected under the title of *Discourses on Education.* His *Daughter of Zion,* his *Letter to the Synagogues of France,* and many other writings, will always remain as imperishable records of the zeal which animated him for the re-establishment of the Jews as a people.

Petavius, Dionysius

(also called DENIS PETAU), one of the most celebrated of French scholars, and iifluential in the councils of the Jesuits, to whose order he belonged, was born at Orleans Aug. 21, 1583. His father, who was a man of learning, seeing strong parts and a genius for letters in his son, took all possible means to improve them to the utmost. He used to tell his son that he ought to qualify himself so as to be able to attack and confound "the giant of the Allophylae;" meaning the redoubtable Joseph Scaliger, whose abilities and learning were supposed to have done such service to the Reformed. Young Petavius seems to have entered into his father's views; for he studied very intensely, and afterwards levelled much of his erudition against Scaliger. He joined the study of mathematics with that of belles-lettres; and then applied himself to a course in philosophy, which he began in the College of Orleans, and finished at Paris. After this he maintained theses in Greek and in Latin, which he is said to have understood as well as his native language, the French. In maturer years he had free access to the king's library, which he often visited in order to consult Latin and Greek manuscripts. Among other advantages which accompanied his literary pursuits was the friendship of Isaac Casaubon, whom Henry IV called to Paris in 1600. It was at his instigation that Petavius, young as he was, undertook an edition of *The Works of Synesius;* that is, to correct the Greek from the manuscripts, to translate that part which yet remained to be translated into Latin, and to write notes upon the whole. He was but nineteen when he was made professor of philosophy in the University of Bourges; and spent the two following years in studying the ancient philosophers and mathematicians. In 1604, when Morel, professor of Greek at Paris, published *The Works of Chrysostom,* some part of Petavius's labors on Synesius was added to them. (From the title of this

work we learn that he then Latinized his name *Poetus,* which he afterwards changed into *Petavius.* His own edition of *The Works of Syneius* did not appear till 1612.) He entered the Society of the Jesuits in 1605, and did great honor to it afterwards by his vast and profound erudition. He became zealous for the Roman Catholic Church; and there was no way of serving it more agreeable to his humor than by criticising and abusing its adversaries. Scaliger was the person he was most bitter against; but he did not spare his friend Casaubon whenever he came in his way. There is no occasion to enter into detail about a man whose whole life was spent in reading and writing books, and in performing the several offices of his order. The history of a learned man is the history of his works; and by far the greater part of Petavius's writings were to support popish doctrines and discipline. But it must be confessed that in order to perform his task well he made himself a universal scholar. He died at Paris December 11, 1652. In 1633 he published an excellent work entitled *Rationale Temporum;* it is an abridgment of universal history, from the earliest times down to 1632, digested in chronological order, and supported all the way by references to proper authorities. It went through several editions; many additions and improvements have been made to it, both by Petavius himself, and by Perizonius and others after his death; and Le Clerc published an abridgment of it as far down as to 800, under the title of *Compendium Historiae Universalis,* in 1697 (12mo). Petavius's chef-d'oeuvre is his "*Opus de Theologicis Dogmatibus,* nunc primum septem voluminibus comprehensum, in meliorem ordinem redactum, auctoris ipsius vita, ac libris quibusdam numquam in hoc opere editis locupletatum, Francisci Antonii Zachariae ex eadem Societate Jesu extensium principum Bibliothecae Praefecti dissertationibus, ac notis uberrimis illustratum" (Ven. 1757, 7 volumes, fol.). It is full of choice erudition, but unfortunately his death cut it short, and it lacks completeness. Besides other services, Petavius deserves to be acknowledged as the first theologian who brought into proper relations history and dogmatics. Muratori regards him as the restorer of dogmatic theology. In the opinion of Gassendus *(Vit. Pereschii)* Petavius was the most consummate scholar the Jesuits ever had; and indeed we cannot suppose him to have been inferior to the first scholars of any order, while we consider him waging war, as he did frequently with success, against Scaliger, Salmasius, and other like chiefs in the republic of letters. His judgnent, as may easily be conceived, was inferior to his learning; and his controversial writings are full of that sourness and spleen which appears so manifest in all the prints of his countenance. Bayle has

observed that Petavius did the Socinians great service, though unawares and against his intentions. The Jesuit's original design, in the second volume of his *Dogmata Theologica,* was to represent ingenuously the doctrine of the first three centuries. Having no particular system to defend, he did not carefully state the opinions of the fathers, but only gave a general account of them. By this means he unawares led the public to believe that the fathers entertained false and absurd notions concerning the mystery of the Three Persons; and, against his intentions, furnished arguments and authorities to the Antitrinitarians. When made aware df this, and being willing to prevent the evil consequences which he had not foreseen, he wrote his Preface, in which he labored solely to assert the orthodoxy of the fathers, and thus was forced to contradict what he had advanced in the *Dogmata.* (Comp. Bull, *On the Trinity.)* See Werner, *Geschichte der apologet. und polem. Literatur,* volume 4; idem, *Geschichte der katholischen Theologie* (Munich, 1866); Dupin, *Nouvelle Bibliotheque des Auteurs ecclesiastiques,* s.v.; Simon, *Hist. crit. des principaux Commentateurs;* Alzog, *Kirchengeschichte,* 2:435; *Christian Remembrancer,* 55:484. (J.H.W.)

Pe'ter

(Πέτρος, *a rock,* for the Aram. apyK), originally SIMON *SEE SIMON* (see below), the leader among the personal disciples of Christ, and afterwards the special apostle to the Jews. We shall treat this important character first in the light of definite information from the New Testament and early Church historians, and disputed questions under a subsequent head, relegating many minor details to separate articles elsewhere.

I. *Authentic History.* —

1. *His Early Life.* — The Scripture notices on this point are few, but not unimportant, and enable us to form some estimate of the circumstances under which the apostle's character was formed, and how he was prepared for his great work. Peter was the son of a man named Jonas (<401617>Matthew 16:17; <430142>John 1:43; 21:16), and was brought up in his father's occupation, a fisherman on the sea of Tiberias. The occupation was of course an humble one, but not, as is often assumed, mean or servile, or incompatible with some degree of mental culture. His family were probably in easy circumstances (see below). He and his brother Andrew were partners of John and James, the sons of Zebedee, who had hired seirvants; and from

various indications in the sacred narrative we are led to the conclusion that their social position brought them into contact with men of education. In fact the trade of fishermen, supplying some of the important cities on the coasts of that inland lake, may have been tolerably remunerative, while all the necessaries of life were cheap and abundant in the singularly rich and fertile district where the apostle resided. He did not live, as a mere laboring man, in a hut by the sea-side, but first at Bethsaida, and afterwards in a house at Capernaum belonging to himself or his mother-in-law, which must have been rather a large one, since he received in it not only our Lord and his fellow-disciples, but multitudes who were attracted by the miracles and preaching of Jesus. It is certain that when he left all to follow Christ, he made what he regarded, and what seems to have been admitted by his Master, as being a considerable sacrifice (<40>1927>Matthew 19:27). The habits of such a life were by no means unfavorable to the development of a vigorous, earnest, and practical character, such as he displayed in after-years. The labors, the privations, and the perils of an existence passed in great part upon the waters of that beautiful but stormy lake, the long and anxious watching through the nights, were calculated to test and increase his natural powers, his fortitude, energy, and perseverance. In the city he must have been brought into contact with men engaged in traffic, with soldiers and foreigners, and may have thus acquired somewhat of the flexibility and geniality of temperament all but indispensable to the attainment of such personal influence as he exercised in after-life. It is not probable that he and his brother were wholly uneducated. The Jews regarded instruction as a necessity, and legal enactments enforced the attendance of youths in schools maintained by the community. *SEE EDUCATION*. The statement in <40>1913>Acts 4:13, that "the council perceived they (i.e., Peter and John) were unlearned and ignorant men," is not incompatible with this assumption. The translation of the passage in the A.V. is rather exaggerated, the word rendered "unlearned" *(*ἰδιῶται *)* being nearly equivalent to "laymen," i.e., men of ordinary education, as contrasted with those who were specially trained in the schools of the rabbins. A man might be thoroughly conversant with the Scriptures, and yet he considered ignorant and unlearned by the rabbins, among whom the opinion was already prevalent that "the letter of Scripture was the mere shell, an earthen vessel containing heavenly treasures, which could only be discovered by those who had been taught to search for the hidden cabalistic meaning." Peter and his kinsmen were probably taught to read .the Scriptures in childhood. The history of their country, especially of the

great events of early days, must have been familiar to them as attendants at the synagogue, and their attention was there directed to those portions of Holy Writ from which the Jews derived their anticipations of the Messiah.

The language of the apostles was of course the form of Aramaic spoken in Northern Palestine, a sort of *patois*, partly Hebrew, but more nearly allied to the Syriac. Hebrew, even in its debased form, was then spoken only by men of learning, the leaders of the Pharisees and Scribes. The men of Galilee were, however, noted for rough and inaccurate language, and especially for vulgarities of pronunciation (40 26 73Matthew 26:73). It is doubtful whether our apostle was acquainted with Greek in early life. It is certain, however, that there was more intercourse with foreigners in Galilee than in any district of Palestine, and Greek appears to have been a common, if not the principal, medium of communication. Within a few years after his call Peter seems to have conversed fluently in Greek with Cornelius, at least there is no intimation that an interpreter was employed, while it is highly improbable that Cornelius, a Roman soldier, should have used the language of Palestine. The style of both of Peter's epistles indicates a considerable knowledge of Greek; it is pure and accurate, and in grammatical structure equal to that of Paul. That may, however, be accounted foi' by the fact, for which there is very ancient authority, that Peter employed an interpreter in the composition of his epistles, if not in his ordinary intercourse with foreigners. There are no traces of acquaintance with Greek authors, or of the influence of Greek literature upon his mind, such as we find in Paul. nor could we expect it in a person of his station, even had Greek been his mother-tongue. It is on the whole probable that he had some rudimental knowledge of Greek in early life, which may have afterwards been extended when the need was felt, but not more than would enable him to discourse intelligibly on practical and devotional subjects. That he was an affectionate husband, married in early life to a wife who accompanied him in his apostolic journeys, are facts inferred from Scripture, while very ancient traditions, recorded by Clement of Alexandria (whose connection with the Church founded by Mark gives a peculiar value to his testimony), and by other early but less trustworthy writers, inform us that her name was Perpetua, that she bore a daughter, and perhaps other children, and suffered martyrdom. (See below.)

2. *As a Disciple merely*. — It is uncertain at what age Peter was called by our Lord. The general impression of the fathers is that he was an old man at the date of hlis death, A.D. 64, but this need not imply that he was much

older than our Lord. He was probably between thirty and forty years of age at the date of his first call, A.D. 26. That call was preceded by a special preparation. He and his brother Andrew, together with their partners, James and John, the sons of Zebedee, were disciples of John the Baptist (<40135>John 1:35). They were in attendance upon him when they were first called to the service of Christ. From the circumstances of that call, which are recorded with graphic minuteness by St. John, we learn some important facts touching their state of mind and the personal character of our apostle. Two disciples, one named by the evangelist Andrew, the other in all probability St. John himself, were standing with the Baptist at Bethany on the Jordan, when he pointed out Jesus as he walked, and said, Behold the Lamb of God! that is, the antitype of the victims whose blood (as all true Israelites, and they more distinctly under the teaching of John, believed) prefigured the atonement for sin. The two at once followed Jesus, and upon his invitation abode with him that day. Andrew then went to his brother Simon, and said to him, We have found the Messias, the Anointed One, of whom they had read in the prophets. Simon went at once, and when Jesus looked on him he said, "Thou art *Simon the son of Jona;* thou shalt be called *Cephas."* The change of name is of course deeply significant. As son of Jona (a name of doubtful meaning, according to Lampe equivalent to *Johmnan* or *John,* i.e., *grace of the Lord;* according to Lange, who has some striking but fanciful observations, signifying *dove)* he bore as a disciple the name Simon, i.e., hearer; but as an apostle, one of the twelve on whom the Church was to be erected, he was hereafter *(*κληθήσῃ*)* to be called Rock or Stone. It seems a natural impression that the words refer primarily to the original character of Simon: that our Lord saw in him a man firm, steadfast, not to be overthrown, though severely tried; and such was generally the view taken by the fathers. But it is perhaps a deeper and truer inference that Jesus thus describes Simon, not as what he was, but as what he would become under his influence — a man with predispositions and capabilities not unfitted for the office he was to hold, but one whose permanence and stability would depend upon union with the living Rock. Thus we may expect to find Simon, as the natural man, at once rough, stubborn, and mutable, whereas Peter, identified with the Rock, will remain firm and immovable to the end. (See below.)

This first call led to no immediate change in Peter's external position. He and his fellow-disciples looked henceforth upon our Lord as their teacher, but were not commanded to follow him as regular disciples. There were

several grades of disciples among the Jews, from the occasional hearer to the follower who gave up all other pursuits in order to serve a master. At the time a recognition of his Person and office sufficed. They returned to Capernaum, where they pursued their usual business, waiting for a further intimation of his will.

The second call is recorded by the other three evangelists. It took place on the Sea of Galilee near Capernaum, where the four disciples, Peter and Andrew, James and John, were fishing, A.D. 27. Peter and Andrew were first called. Our Lord then entered Simon Peter's boat, and addressed the multitude on the shore; after the conclusion of the discourse he wrought the miracle by which he foreshadowed the success of the apostles in the new but analogous occupation which was to be theirs — that of fishers of men. The call of James and John followed. From that time the four were certainly enrolled formally among his disciples, and although as yet invested with no official character, accompanied him in his journeys, those especially in the north of Palestine.

Immediately after that call our Lord went to the house of Peter, where he wrought the miracle of healing on Peter's wife's mother, a miracle succeeded by other manifestations of divine power which produced a deep impression upon the people. Some time was passed afterwards in attendance upon our Lord's public ministrations in Galilee, Decapolis, Peraea, and Judaea — though at intervals the disciples returned to their own city, and were witnesses of many miracles, of the call of Levi, and of their Master's reception of outcasts, whom they in common with their zealous but prejudiced countrymen had despised and shunned. It was a period of training, of mental and spiritual discipline preparatory to their admission to the higher office to which they were destined. Even then Peter received some marks of distinction. He was selected, together with the two sons of Zebedee, to witness the raising of Jarius's daughter.

The special designation of Peter and his eleven fellow-disciples took place some time afterwards, when they were set apart as our Lord's immediate attendants, and as his delegates to go forth wherever he might send them, as apostles, announcers of his kingdom, gifted with supernatural powers as credentials of their supernatural mission (see <40:10:2-4>Matthew 10:2-4; <41:03:13-19>Mark 3:13-19, the most detailed account; <42:06:13>Luke 6:13). They appear then first to have formally received the name of Apostles, and from that time Simon bore publicly, and as it would seem all but exclusively, the name Peter,

which had hitherto been used rather as a characteristic appellation than as a proper name.

From this time there can be no doubt that Peter held the first place among the apostles, to whatever cause his precedence is to be attributed. There was certainly much in his character which marked him as a representative man; both in his strength and in his weakness, in his excellences and his defects he exemplified the changes which the natural man undergoes in the gradual transformation into the spiritual man under the personal influence of the Savior. The precedence did not depend upon priority of call, or it would have devolved upon his brother Andrew, or that other disciple who first followed Jesus. It seems scarcely probable that it depended upon seniority, even supposing, which is a mere conjecture, that he was older than his fellow-disciples. The special designation by Christ alone accounts in a satisfactory way for the facts that he is named first in every list of the apostles, is generally addressed by our Lord as their representative, and on the most solemn occasions speaks in their name. Thus when the first great secession took place in consequence of the offence given by our Lord's mystic discourse at Capernaum (see <4066>John 6:66-69), "Jesus said unto the twelve, Will ye also go away? Then Simon Peter answered him, Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life: and we believe and are sure that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God." Thus again at Caesarea Philippi, soon after the return of the twelve from their first missionary tour, Peter (speaking as before in the name of the twelve, though, as appears from our Lord's words, with a peculiar distinctness of personal conviction) repeated that declaration, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." The confirmation of our apostle in his special position in the Church, his identification with the rock on which that Church is founded, the ratification of the powers and duties attached to the apostolic office, and the promise of permanence to the Church, followed as a reward of that confession. The early Church regarded Peter generally, and most especially on this occasion, as the representative of the apostolic body — a very distinct theory from that which makes him their head or governor in Christ's stead. Even in the time of Cyprian, when connection with the bishop of Rome as Peter's successor for the first time was held to be indispensable, no powers of jurisdiction or supremacy were supposed to be attached to the admitted precedency of rank. *Primus inter pares* Peter held no distinct office, and certainly never claimed any powers which did not belong equally to all his fellow-apostles. (See below.)

This great triumph of Peter, however, brought other points of his character into strong relief. The distinction which he then received, and it may be his consciousness of ability, energy, zeal, and absolute devotion to Christ's person, seem to have developed a natural tendency to rashness and forwardness bordering upon presumption. On this occasion the exhibition of such feelings brought upon him the strongest reproof ever addressed to a disciple by our Lord. In his affection and self-confidence Peter ventured to reject as impossible the announcement of the sufferings and humiliation which Jesus predicted; and he heard the sharp words — "Get thee behind me, Satan, thou art an offence unto me — for thou savorest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men." That was Peter's first fall; a very ominous one: not a rock, but a stumbling-stone; not a defender, but an antagonist and deadly enemy of the faith, when the spiritual should give place to the lower nature in dealing with the things of God. It is remarkable that on other occasions when Peter signalized his faith and devotion he displayed at the time, or immediately afterwards, a more than usual deficiency in spiritual discernment and consistency. Thus a few days after that fall he was selected together with John and James to witness the transfiguration of Christ, but the words which he then uttered prove that he was completely bewildered, and unable at the time to comprehend the meaning of the transaction. Thus again, when his zeal and courage prompted him to leave the ship and walk on the water to go to Jesus (<401429>Matthew 14:29), a sudden failure of faith withdrew the sustaining power; he was about to sink when he was at once reproved and saved by his Master. Such traits, which occur not unfrequently, prepare us for his last great fall, as well as for his conduct after the resurrection, when his natural gifts were perfected and his deficiencies supplied by "the power from on high." We find a mixture of zeal and weakness in his conduct when called upon to pay tribute-money for himself and his Lord, but faith had the upper hand, and was rewarded by a significant miracle (<401724>Matthew 17:24-27). The question which about the same time Peter asked our Lord as to the extent to which forgiveness of sins should be carried, indicated a great advance in spirituality from the Jewish standpoint, while it showed how far as vet he and his fellow-disciples were from understanding the true principle of Christian love (<401821>Matthew 18:21). We find a similar blending of opposite qualities in the declaration recorded by the synoptical evangelists (<401927>Matthew 19:27; <411028>Mark 10:28; <421728>Luke 17:28), "Lo, we have left all and followed thee." It certainly bespeaks a consciousness of sincerity, a spirit of self-devotion and selfsacrifice, though

it conveys an impression of something like ambition; but in that instance the good undoubtedly predominated, as is shown by our Lord's answer. He does not reprove Peter, who spoke, as usual, in the name of the twelve but takes the opportunity of uttering the strongest prediction touching the future dignity and paramount authority of the apostles, a prediction recorded by Matthew only.

Towards the close of our Lord's ministry (A.D. 29) Peter's characteristics become especially prominent. Together with his brother and the two sons of Zebedee he listened to the last awful predictions and warnings delivered to the disciples in reference to the second advent (<401403>Matthew 24:3; <411303>Mark 13:3, who alone mentions these names; <422107>Luke 21:7). At the last supper Peter seems to have been particularly earnest in the request that the traitor might be pointed out, expressing of course a general feeling, to which some inward consciousness of infirmity may have added force. After the supper his words drew out the meaning of the significant, almost sacramental act of our Lord in washing his disciples' feet — an occasion on which we find the same mixture of goodness and frailty, humility and deep affection, with a certain taint of self-will, which was at once hushed into submissive reverence by the voice of Jesus. Then too it was that he made those repeated protestations of unalterable fidelity, so soon to be falsified by his miserable fall. That event is. however, of such critical import in its bearings upon the character and position of the apostle, that it cannot be dismissed without a careful, if not an exhaustive discussion. Judas had left the guest-chamber when Peter put the question, Lord, whither goest thou? words which modern theologians generally represent as savoring of idle curiosity or presumption, but in which the early fathers (as Chrysostom and Augustine) recognised the utterance of love and devotion. The answer was a promise that Peter should follow his Master, but accompanied with an intimation of present unfitness in the disciple. Then came the first protestation, which elicited the sharp and stern rebuke, and distinct prediction of Peter's denial (<431336>John 13:36-38). From comparing this account with those of the other evangelists (<401633>Matthew 26:33-35; <411429>Mark 14:29-31; <422233>Luke 22:33, 34), it seems evident that with some diversity of circumstances both the protestation and warning were thrice repeated. The tempter was to sift all the disciples, our apostle's faith was to be preserved from failing by the special intercession of Christ, he being thus singled out either as the representative of the whole body, or, as seems more probable, because his character was one which had special

need of supernatural aid. Mark, as usual, records two points which enhance the force of the warning and the guilt of Peter, viz. that the cock would crow twice, and that after such warning he repeated his protestation with greater vehemence. Chrysostom, who judges the apostle with fairness and candor, attributes this vehemence to his great love, and more particularly to the delight which he felt when assured that he was not the traitor, yet not without a certain admixture of forwardness and ambition such as had previously been shown in the dispute for pre-eminence. The fiery trial soon came. After the agony of Gethsemane, when the three, Peter, James, and John, were, as on former occasions, selected to be with our Lord, the only witnesses of his passion, where also all three had alike failed to prepare themselves by prayer and watching, the arrest of Jesus took place. Peter did not shrink from the danger. In the same spirit which had dictated his promise he drew his sword, alone against the armed throng, and wounded the servant *(*τὸν δοῦλον, not a servant) of the highpriest, probably the leader of the band. When this bold but unauthorized attempt at rescue was reproved, he did not yet forsake his Master, but followed him with John into the focus of danger, the house of the highpriest. There he sat in the outer hall. He must have been in a state of utter confusion: his faith, which from first to last was bound up with hope, his special characteristic, was for the time powerless against temptation. The danger found him unarmed. Thrice, each time with greater vehemence, the last time with blasphemous asseveration, he denied his Master. The triumph of Satan seemed complete. Yet it is evident that it was an obscuration of faith, not an extinction. It needed but a glance of his Lord's eye to bring him to himself. His repentance was instantaneous and effectual. The light in which he himself regarded his conduct is clearly shown by the terms in which it is related by Mark, who in some sense may be regarded as his reporter. The inferences are weighty as regards his personal character, which represents more completely perhaps than any in the New Testament the weakness of the natural and the strength of the spiritual man — still more weighty as bearing upon his relations to the apostolic body, and the claims resting upon the assumption that he stood to them in the place of Christ.

On the morning of the resurrection we have proof that Peter, though humbled, was not crushed by his fall. He and John were the first to visit the sepulchre; he was the first who entered it. We are told by Luke (in words still used by the Eastern Church as the first salutation on Easter Sunday) and by Paul that Christ appeared to him first among the apostles — he who

most needed the comfort was the first who received it, and with it, as may be assumed, an assurance of forgiveness. It is observable, however, that on that occasion he is called by his original name, Simon, not Peter; the higher designation was not restored until he had been publicly reinstituted, so to speak, by his Master. That reinstitution took place at the Sea of Galilee (John 21), an event of the very highest import. We have there indications of his best natural qualities, practical good sense, promptness, and energy; slower than John to recognise their Lord, Peter was the first to reach him: he brought the net to land. The thrice-repeated question of Christ, referring doubtless to the three protestations and denials, was thrice met by answers full of love and faith, and utterly devoid of his hitherto characteristic failing, presumption, of which not a trace is to be discerned in his later history. He then received the formal commission to feed Christ's sheep; not certainly as one endued with exclusive or paramount authority, or as distinguished from his fellow-disciples, whose fall had been marked by far less aggravating circumstances; rather as one who had forfeited his place, and could not resume it without such an authorization. Then followed the prediction of his martyrdom, in which he was to find the fulfilment of his request to be permitted to follow the Lord.

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

3. *Apostolical Career*. — The first part of the Acts of the Apostles is occupied by the record of transactions in nearly all of which Peter stands forth as the recognised leader of the apostles; it being, however, equally clear that he neither exercises nor claims any authority apart from them, much less over them. In the first chapter it is Peter who points out to the disciples (as in all his discourses and writings drawing his arguments from prophecy) the necessity of supplying the place of Judas. He states the qualifications of an apostle, but takes no special part in the election. The candidates are selected by the disciples, while the decision is left to the searcher of hearts. The extent and limits of Peter's primacy might be inferred with tolerable aco curacy from this transaction alone. To have one

spokesman, or foreman, seems to accord with the spirit of order and humility which ruled the Church, while the assumption of power or supremacy would be incompatible with the express command of Christ (see <4023 10>Matthew 23:10). In the second chapter again, Peter is the most prominent person in the greatest event after the resurrection, when on the day of Pentecost the Church was first invested with the plentitude of gifts and powers. Then Peter, not speaking in his own name, but with the eleven (see verse 14), explained the meaning of the miraculous gifts, and showed the fulfilment of prophecies (accepted at that time by all Hebrews as Messianic) both in the outpouring of the Holy Ghost and in the resurrection and death of our Lord. This discourse, which bears all the marks of Peter's individuality, both of character and doctrinal views, ends with an appeal of remarkable boldness. It is the model upon which the apologetic discourses of the primitive Christians were generally constructed. The conversion and baptism of three thousand persons,who continued steadfast in the apostle's doctrine and fellowship, attested the power of the Spirit which spake by Peter on that occasion.

The first miracle after Pentecost was wrought by Peter (Acts 3); and John was joined with him in that, as in most important acts of his ministry; but it was Peter who took the cripple by the hand, and bade him "In the name of Jesus of Nazareth rise up and walk," and when the people ran together to Solomon's porch, where the apostles, following their Master's example, were wont to teach, Peter was the speaker: he convinces the people of their sin, warns them of their danger, points out the fulfilment of prophecy, and the special objects for which God sent his Son first to the children of the old covenant. This speech is at once strikingly characteristic of Peter and a proof of the fundamental harmony between his teaching and the more developed and systematic doctrines of Paul; differing in form, to an extent utterly incompatible with the theory of Baur and Schwegler touching the object of the writer of the Acts; identical in spirit, as issuing from the same source. The boldness of the two apostles, of Peter more especially as the spokesman, when "filled with the Holy Ghost" he confronted the full assembly headed by Annas and Caiaphas, produced a deep impression upon those cruel and unscrupulous hypocrites: an impression enhanced by the fact that the words came from comparatively ignorant and unlearned men. The words spoken by both apostles, when commanded not to speak at all nor teach in the name of Jesus, have ever since been the watchwords of martyrs (4:19, 20).

This first miracle of healing was soon followed by the first miracle of judgment. The first open and deliberate sin against the Holy Ghost — a sin combining amnbition, fraud, hypocrisy, and blasphemy — was visited by death, sudden and awful as under the old dispensatioln Peter was the minister in that transaction. As he had first opened the gate to penitents (<44 2 37>Acts 2:37, 38), he now closed it to hypocrites. The act stands alone, without a precedent or parallel in the Gospel; but Peter acted simply as an instrument, not pronouncing the sentence, but denouncing the sin, and that in the name of his fellow-apostles and of the Holy Ghost. Penalties similar in kind, though far different in degree, were inflicted or commanded on various occasions bv Paul. Peter appears, perhaps in consequence of that act, to have become the object of a reverence bordering, as it would seem, on superstition (<44 5 15>Acts 5:15), while the namerous miracles of healing wrought about the same time, showing the true character of the power dwelling in the apostles, gave occasion to the second persecution. Peter then came in contact with the noblest and most interesting character among the Jews, the learned and liberal tutor of Paul, Gamaliel, whose caution, gentleness, and dispassionate candor stand out in strong relief contrasted with his colleagues, but make a faint impression compared with the steadfast and uncompromisiing principles of the apostles, who, after undergoing an illegal scourging, went forth rejoicing that they were counted worthy to suffer shame for the name of Jesus. Peter is not specially named in connection with the appointment of deacons, an important step in the organization of the Church; but when the Gospel was first preached beyond the precincts of Judaea, he and John were at once sent by the apostles to confirm the converts at Samaria, a very important statement at this critical point, proving clearly his subordination to the whole body, of which he was the most active and able member.

Up to this time it may be said that the apostles had one great work, viz. to convince the Jews that Jesus was the Messiah; in that work Peter was the master builder, the whole structure rested upon the doctrines of which he was the principal teacher; hitherto no words but his are specially recorded by the writer of the Acts. Henceforth he remains prominent, but not exclusively prominent, among the propagators of the Gospel. At Samaria he and John established the precedent for the most important rite not expressly enjoined in Holy Writ, viz. confirmation, which the Western Church lhas always held to belong exclusively to the functions of bishops as successors to the ordinary powers of the apostolate. Then also Peter

was confronted with Simon Magus, the first teacher of heresy. *SEE SIMON MAGUS*. As in the case of Ananias he had denounced the first sin against holiness, so in this case he first declared the penalty due to the sin called after Simon's name. About three years later (comp. <4009>Acts 9:26 and <4001>Galatians 1:17, 18) we have two accounts of the first meeting of Peter and Paul. In the Acts it is stated generally that Saul was at first distrusted by the disciples, and received by the apostles upon the recommendation of Barnabas. From the Galatians we learn that Paul went to Jerusalem especially to see Peter; that he abode with him fifteen days, and that James was the only other apostle present at the time. It is important to note that this account, which, while it establishes the independence of Paul, marks the position of Peter as the most eminent of the apostles, rests not on the authority of the writer of the Acts, but on that of Paul — as if it were intended to obyiate all possible misconceptions touching the mutual relations of the apostles of the Hebrews and the Gentiles. This interview was preceded by other events marking Peter's position — a general apostolical tour of visitation to the churches hitherto established (διερχόμενον δεὰ πάντων, <4002>Acts 9:32), in the course of which two great miracles were wrought on AEneas and Tabitha, and in connection with which the most signal transaction after the day of Pentecost is recorded, the baptism of Cornelius. A.D. 32. That was the crown and consummation ef Peter's ministry. Peter, who had first preached the resurrection to the Jews, baptized the first converts, confirmed the first Samaritans, now, without the advice or cooperation of any of his colleagues, under direct communication from heaven, first threw down the barrier which separated proselytes of the gate from Israelites, thus establishing principles which in their gradual application and full development issued in the complete fusion of the Gentile and Hebrew elements in the Church. The narrative of this event, which stands alone in minute circumstantiality of incidents and accumulation of supernatural agency, is twice recorded by Luke. The chief points to be noted are, first, the pecaliar fitness of Cornelius, both as a representative of Roman force and nationality, and as a devout and liberal worshipper, to be a recipient of such privileges; and, secondly, the state of the apostle's own mind. Whatever may have been his hopes or fears touching the heathen, the idea had certainly not yet crossed him that they could become Christians without first becoming Jews. As a loyal and believing Hebrew, he could not contemplate the removal of Gentile disqualifications without a distinct assurance that the enactments of the law which concerned them were

abrogated by the divine Legislator. The vision could not therefore have been the product of a subjective impression. It was, strictly speaking, objective, presented to his mind by an external influence. Yet the will of the apostle was not controlled, it was simply enlightened. The intimation in the state of trance did not at once overcome his reluctance. It was not until his consciousness was fully restored, and he had well considered the meaning of the vision, that he learned that the distinction of cleanness and uncleanness in outward things belonged to a temporary dispensation. It was no mere acquiescence in a positive command, but the development of a spirit full of generous impulses, which found utterance in the words spoken by Peter on that occasion — both in the presence of Cornelius, and afterwards at Jerusalem. His conduct gave great offence to all his countrymen (<44112>Acts 11:2), and it needed all his authority, corroborated bv a special manifestation of the Holy Ghost, to induce his fellowapostles to recognise the propriety of this great act, in which both he and they saw an earnest of the admission of Gentiles into the Church on the single condition of spiritual repentance. The establishment of a Church, in great part of Gentile origin, at Antioch, and the mission of Barnabas, between whose family and Peter there were the bonds of near intimacy, set the seal upon the work thus inaugurated by Peter.

This transaction was followed, after an interval of several years, by the imprisonment of our apostle. A.D. 44. Herod Agrippa, having first tested the state of feeling at Jerusalem by the execution of James, one of the most eminent apostles, arrested Peter. The hatred which at that time first showed itself as a popular feeling may most probably be attributed chiefly to the offence given by Peter's conduct towards Cornelius. His miraculous deliverance marks the close of this second great period of his ministry. The special work assigned to him was completed. He had founded the Church, opened its gates to Jews and Gentiles, and distinctly laid down the conditions of admission. From that time we have no continuous history of Peter. It is quite clear that he retained his rank as the chief apostle, equally so that he neither exercised nor claimed any right to control their proceedings. At Jerusalem the government of the Church devolved upon James the brother of our Lord. In other places Peter seems to have confined his ministrations to his countrymen — as apostle of the circumcision. He left Jerusalem, but it is not said where he went. Certainly not to Rome, where there are no traces of his presence before the last years of his life; he probably remained in Judaea, visiting and confirming the

churches; some old but not trustworthy traditions represent him as preaching in Caesarea and other cities on the western coast of Palestine; three years later we find him once more at Jerusalem when the apostles and elders came together to consider the question whether converts should be circumcised. Peter took the lead in that discussion, and urged with remarkable cogency the principles settled in the case of Cornelius. Purifying faith and saving grace (Acts 15:9 and 11) remove all distinctions between believers. His arguments, adopted and enforced by James, decided that question at once and forever. It is, however, to be remarked that on that occasion he exercised no one power which Romanists hold to be inalienably attached to the chair of Peter. He did not preside at the meeting; he neither summoned nor dismissed it; he neither collected the suffrages nor pronounced the decision. It is a disputed point whether the meeting between Paul and Peter of which we have an account in the Galatians (2:1-10) took place at this time. The great majority of critics believe that it did, but this hypothesis has serious difficulties. Lange *(Das apostolische Zeitalter,* 2:378) fixes the date about three years after the council. Wieseler has a long excursus to show that it must have occurred after Paul's second apostolic journey. He gives some weighty reasons, but wholly fails in the attempt to account for the presence of Barnabas, a fatal objection to his theory. (See *Der Brief an die Galater, Excursus,* page 579.) On the other side are Theodoret, Pearson, Eichhorn, Olshausen, Meyer, Neander, Howson, Schaff, etc. The only point of real importance was certainly determined before the apostles separated, the work of converting the Gentiles being henceforth specially intrusted to Paul and Barnabas, while the charge of preaching to the circumcision was assigned to the elder apostles, and more particularly to Peter (Galatians 2:7-9). This arrangement cannot, however, have been an exclusive one. Paul always addressed himself first to the Jews in every city; Peter and his colleagues undoubtedly admitted and sought to make converts among the Gentiles. It may have been in full force only when the old and new apostles resided in the same city. Such at least was the case at Antioch, where Peter went soon afterwards. There the painful collision took place between the two apostles; the most remarkable, and, in its bearings upon controversies at critical periods, one of the most important events in the history of the Church. Peter at first applied the principles which he had lately defended, carrying with him the whole apostolic body, and on his arrival at Antioch ate with the Gentiles thus showing that he believed all ceremonial distinctions to be abolished by the Gospel — in that he went far beyond the

strict letter of the injunctions issued by the council. That step was marked and condemned by certain members of the Church of Jerusalem sent by James. It appeared to them one thing to recognise Gentiles as fellow-Christians, another to admit them to social intercourse, whereby ceremonial defilement would be contracted under the law to which all the apostles, Barnabas and Paul included, acknowledged allegiance. Peter, as the apostle of the circumcision fearing to give offence to those who were his special charge, at once gave up the point, suppressed or disguised his feelings, and separated himself not from communion, but from social intercourse with the Gentiles. Paul, as the apostle of the Gentiles, saw clearly the consequences likely to ensue, and could ill brook the misapplication of a rule often laid down in his own writings concerning compliance with the prejudices of weak brethren. He held that Peter was infringing a great principle, withstood him to the face, and, using the same arguments which Peter had urged at the council, pronounced his conduct to be indefensible. The statement that Peter compelled the Gentiles to Judaize probably means, not that he enjoined circumcision, but that his conduct, if persevered in, would have that effect, since they would naturally take any steps which might remove the barriers to familiar intercourse with the first apostles of Christ. Peter was wrong, but it was an error of judgment: an act contrary to his own feelings and wishes, in reference to those whom he looked upon as representing the mind of the Church; that he was actuated by selfishness, national pride, or any remains of superstition, is neither asserted nor implied in the strong censure of Paul. Nor, much as we must admire the earnestness and wisdom of Paul, whose clear and vigorous intellect was in this case stimulated by anxiety for his own special charge, the Gentile Church, should we overlook Peter's singular humility in submitting to public reproof from one so much his junior, or his magnanimity both in adopting Paul's conclusions (as we must infer that he did from the absence of all trace of continued resistance) and in remaining on terms of brotherly communion (as is testified by his own written words) to the end of his life (<60510>1 Peter 5:10; <61315>2 Peter 3:15, 16). *SEE PAUL*.

From this time until the date of his Epistles we have no distinct notices in Scripture of Peter's abode or work. The silence may be accounted for by the fact that from that time the great work of propagating the Gospel was committed to the marvellous energies of Paul. Peter was probably employed for the most part in building up and completing the organization

of Christian communities in Palestine and the adjoining districts. There is, however, strong reason to believe that he visited Corinth at an early period; this seems to be implied in several passages of Paul's first epistle to that Church, and it is a natural inference from the statements of Clement of Rome *(First Epistle to the Corinthians,* c. 4). The fact is positively asserted by Dionysius, bishop of Corinth (A.D. 180 at the latest), a man of excellent judgment, who was not likely to be misinformed, nor to make such an assertion lightly in an epistle addressed to the bishop and Church of Rome. The reference to collision between parties who claimed Peter, Apollos, Paul, and even Christ for their chiefs, involves no opposition between the apostles themselves, such as the fabulous Clementines and modern infidelity assume. The name of Peter as founder, or joint founder, is not associated with any local Church save those of Corinth, Antioch, and Rome, by early ecclesiastical tradition. That of Alexandria may have been established by Mark after Peter's death. That Peter preached the Gospel in the countries of Asia mentioned in his First Epistle appears from Origen's own words *(*κεκηρυκέναι ἔοικεν*)* to be a mere conjecture (Origen, ap. Euseb. 3:1, adopted by Epiphanius, *Haer.* 27, and Jerome, *Catal.* c. 1), not in itself improbable, but of little weight in the absence of all positive evidence, and of all personal reminiscences in the Epistle itself. From that Epistle, however, it is to be inferred that towards the end of his life Peter either visited or resided for some time at Babylon, which at that time, and for some hundreds of years afterwards, was a chief seat of Jewish culture. This of course depends upon the assumption, which on the whole seems most probable, that the word Babylon is not used as a mystic designation of Rome, but as a proper name, and that not of an obscure city in Egypt, but of the ancient capital of the East. There were many inducements for such a choice of abode. The Jewish families formed there a separate community; they were rich, prosperous, and had established settlements in many districts of Asia Minor. Their language, probably a mixture of Hebrew and Nabathaean, must have borne a near affinity to the Galileean dialect. They were on far more familiar terms with their heathen neighbors than in other countries, while their intercourse with Judaea was carried on without intermission. Christianity certainly made considerable progress at an early time in that and the adjoining districts; the great Christian schools at Edessa and Nisibis probably owed their origin to the influence of Peter; the general tone of the writers of that school is what is now commonly designated as Petrine. It is no unreasonable supposition that the establishment of Christianity in those districts may have been specially

connected with the residence of Peter at Babylon. At that time there must have been some communication between the two great apostles, Peter and Paul, thus stationed at the two extremities of the Christian world. Mark, who was certainly employed about that time by Paul, was with Peter when he wrote the Epistle. Silvanus, Paul's chosen companion, was the bearer, probably the amanuensis of Peter's Epistle — not improlably sent to Peter from Rome, and charged by him to deliver that epistle, written to support Paul's authority, to the churches founded by that apostle on his return. *SEE PETER, EPISTLES OF.*

More important in its bearings upon later controversies is the question of Peter's connection with Rome. It may be considered as a settled point that he did not visit Rome before the last year of his life. Too much stress may perhaps be laid on the fact that there is no notice of Peter's labors or presence in that city in the Epistle to the Romans; but that negative evidence is not counterbalanced by any statement of undoubted antiquity. The date given by Eusebius rests upon a miscalculation, and is irreconcilable with the notices of Peter in the Acts of the Apostles. He gives A.D. 42 in the *Chronicon* (i.e., in the Armenian text), and says that Peter remained at Rome twenty years. In this he is followed by Jerome, *Catal.* c. 1 (who gives twenty-five years), and by most Roman Catholic writers. Protestant critics, with scarcely one exception, are unanimous upon this point, and Roman controversialists are far from being agreed in their attempts to remove the difficulty. The most ingenious effort is that of Windischmann *(Vindicae Petrinae,* page 112 sq.). He assumes that Peter went to Rome immediately after his deliverance from prison (Acts 12), i.e., A.D. 44, and left in consequence of the Claudian persecution between A.D. 49 and 51. (See below.)

The fact, however, of Peter's martyrdom at Rome rests upon very different grounds. The evidence for it is complete, while there is a total absence of any contrary statement in the writings of the early fathers. We have in the first place the certainty of his martyrdom in our Lord's own prediction (⁴John 21:18, 19). Clement of Rome, writing before the end of the first century, speaks of it, but does not mention the *place,* that being of course well known to his readers. Ignatius, in the undoubtedly genuine Epistle to the Romans (ch. iv), speaks of Peter in terms which imply a special connection with their Church. Other early notices of less weight coincide with this, as that of Papias (Euseb. 2:15), and the apocryphal *Prcedicatio Petri,* quoted by Cyprian. In the second century, Dionysius of Corinth, in

the Epistle to Soter, bishop of Rome (ap. Euseb. *H.E.* 2:25), states, as a fact universally known, and accounting for the intimate relations between Corinth and Rome, that Peter and Paul both taught in Italy, and suffered martyrdom about the same time. Irenaeus, who was connected with the apostle John, being a disciple of Polycarp, a hearer of that apostle, and thoroughly conversant with Roman matters, bears distinct witness to Peter's presence at Rome *(Adv. Her.* 3:1 and 3). It is incredible that he should have been misinformed. In the next century there is the testimony of Caius, the liberal and learned Roman presbyter (who speaks of Peter's tomb in the Vatican), that of Origen, Tertullian, and of the ante- and post-Nicene fathers, without a single exception. In short, the churches most nearly connected with Rome, and those least affected by its influence, which was as yet but inconsiderable in the East, concur in the statement that Peter was a joint founder of that Church, and suffered death in that city. What the early fathers do not assert, and indeed implicitly deny, is that Peter was the sole founder or resident head of that Church, or that the See of Rome derived from him any claim to supremacy: at the utmost they place him on a footing of equality with Paul. That fact is sufficient for all purposes of fair controversy. The denial of the statements resting on such evidence seems almost to indicate an uneasy consciousness, truly remarkable in those who believe that they have, and who in fact really have, irrefragable grounds for rejecting the pretensions of the papacy. Coteler has collected a large number of passages from the early fathers, in which the name of Paul *precedes* that of Peter *(Pat. Apost.* 1:414; see also Valesius, Euseb. *H.E.* 3:21). Fabricius observes that this is the general usage of the Greek fathers. It is also to be remarked that when the fathers of the 4th and 5th centuries — for instance, Chrysostom and Augustin — use the words οÅπόστολος, or *Apestolus,* they mean Paul, not Peter — a very weighty fact.

The time and manner of the apostle's martyrdom are, less certain. The early writers imply,or distinctly state, that he suffered at or about the same time (Dionysius, κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν καιρόν*)* with Paul, and in the Neronian persecution. All agree that he was crucified, a point sufficiently determined by our Lord's prophecy. Origen (ap. Euseb. 3:1), who could easily ascertain the fstct, and, though fanciful in speculation, is not inaccurate in his. torical matters, says that at his own mrequest he was crucified κατὰ κεφάλης; probably meaning *by the head,* and not, as generally understood, *with his head downwards.* (See below.) This statement was generally

received by Christian antiquity; nor does it seem inconsistent with the fervent temperament and deep humility of the apostle to have chosen such a death — one, moreover, not unlikely to have been inflicted in mockery by the instruments of Nero's wanton and ingenious cruelty. The legend found in St. Ambrose is interesting. and may have some foundation in fact. When the persecution began, the Christians at Rome, anxious to preserve their great teacher, persuaded him to flee, a course which they had scriptural warrant to recommend and he to follow; but at the gate he met our Lord. "Lord, whither goest thou?" asked the apostle. "I go to Rome," was the answer, "there once more to be crucified." Peter well understood the meaning of those words, returned at once and was crucified. See Tillemont, *Mem.* 1:187, 555. He shows that the account of Ambrose (which is not to be found in the Bened. edit.) is contrary to the apocryphal legend. Later writers rather value it as reflecting upon Peter's want of courage or constancy. That Peter, like all good men. valued his life and suffered reluctantly, may be inferred from our Lord's words (John 21); but his flight is more in harmony with the principles of a Christian than wilful exposure to persecution. Origen refers to the words then said to have been spoken by our Lord, but quotes an apocryphal work *(On St. John,* tom. 2).

Thus closes the apostle's life. Some additional facts, not perhaps unimportant, may be accepted on early testimony. From Paul's words it may be inferred with certainty that he did not give up the ties of family life when he forsook his temporal calling. His wife accompanied him in his wanderings. Clement of Alexandria, a writer well informed in matters of ecclesiastical interest, and thoroughly trustworthy, says *(Strom.* 3, page 448) that "Peter and Philip had children, and that both took about their wives, who acted as their coadjutors in ministering to women at their own homes; by their means the doctrine of the Lord penetrated without scandal into the privacy of women's apartments." Peter's wife is believed, on the same authority, to have suffered martyrdom, and to have been supported in the hour of trial by her husband's exhortation. Some critics believe that she is referred to in the salutation at the end of the First Epistle of Peter. The apostle is said to have employed interpreters. Basilides, an early Gnostic, professed to have derived his system from Glaucias. one of these interpreters. This shows at least the impression that the apostle did not understand Greek, or did not speak it with fluency. Of far more importance is the statement that St. Mark wrote his Gospel under the teaching of Peter, or that he embodied in that Gospel the substance of our apostle's

oral instructions. This statement rests upon such an amount of external evidence, and is corroborated by so many internal indications, that they would scarcely be questioned in the absence of a strong theological bias. (Papias and Clem. Alex., referred to by Eusebius, *H.E.* 2:15; Tertullian, *c. Marc.* 4, c. 5; Irenseus, 3:1; 4:9. Petavius [on Epiphanius, page 428] observes that Papias derived his information from John the Presbyter. For other passages, see Fabricius *[Bibl. Gr.* 3:132]. The slight discrepancy between Eusebius and Papias indicates independent sources of information.) The fact is doubly important, in its bearings upon the Gospel, and upon the character of our apostle. Chrysostom, who is followed by the most judicious commentators, seems first to have drawn attention to the fact that in AMark's Gospel every defect in Peter's character and conduct is brought out clearly, without the slighest extenuation, while many noble acts and peculiar marks of favor are either omitted or stated with far less force than by ally other evangelist. Indications of Peter's influenlce, even in Mark's style, mu, h less pure than that of Luie, are traced by modern criticism (Gieseler, quoted by Davidson).

II. *Discussion of Particular Points*. — We subjoin a closer examination of certain special questions touched upon in the above history.

1. *Peter's Name*. — His original appellation *Cephas* (Κηφᾶς) occurs in the following passages: <43042>John 1:42; <46012>1 Corinthians 1:12; 3:22; 9:1; 15:5; <48209>Galatians 2:9; 1:18; 2:10, 14 (the last three according to the text of Lachmann and Tischendorf). Cephas is the Chaldee word *Keyphia*, אפיכא itself a corruption of or derivation from the Hebrew *Keph*, כֵּף"a rock," a rare word, found only in <18306>Job 30:6 and <24029>Jeremiah 4:29. It must have been the word actually pronounced by our Lord in <40163>Matthew 16:18, and on subsequent occasions when the apostle was addressed by him or other Hebrews by his new name. By it he was known to the Corinthian Christians. In the ancient Syriac version of the N.T. (Peshito), it is uniformly found where the Greek has Πέτρος. When we consider that our Lord and the apostles spoke Chaldee, and that therefore (as already remarked) the apostle must always have been addressed as Cephas, it is certainly remarkable that throughout the Gospels, no less than ninety-seven times, with one exception only, the name should be given in the Greek form, which was of later introduction, and unintelligible to Hebrews, though intelligible to the far wider Gentile world among which the Gospel was about to begin its course. Even in Mark, where more Chaldee words

and phrases are retained than in all the other Gospels put together, this is the case. It is as if in our English Bibles the name were uniformly given,not Peter, but Rock; and it suggests that the meaning contained in the appellation is of more vital importance, and intended to be more carefully seized at each recurrence, than we are apt to recollect. The commencement of the change from the Chaldee name to its Greek synonym is well marked in the interchange of the two in <480107>Galatians 2:7, 8, 9 (Stanley, *Apostolic Age,* page 116). The apostle in his companionship with Christ, and up to the time of the Lord's ascension, seems to have borne the name of *Simon;* at least he is always so called by Jesus himself (<401725>Matthew 17:25; <411437>Mark 14:37; <422231>Luke 22:31; <432115>John 21:15), and apparently also by the disciples (<422434>Luke 24:34; <441514>Acts 15:14). But after the extension of the apostolic circle and its relations (comp. <441005>Acts 10:5,18), the apostle began to be known, in order to distinguish him from others called Simon, as *Simnon Peter;* the name of *Peter,* which had at first been given him as a special mark of esteem, being added, as that of a father often was in other cases; and, in the course of time, it seems that the latter name superseded the former. Hence the evangelists call the apostle Peter oftener than Simon Peter. As to the epistles of Paul, he is always called Cephas in 1 Corinthians, but in the other epistles often Peter. As above suggested, the appellation thus bestowed seems to have had reference to the disciple individually and personally. Attaching himself to Christ, he would partake of that blessed spiritual influence whereby he would be enabled, in spite of the vacillations of his naturally impulsive character, to hold with persevering grasp the faith he now embraced. He would become rooted and grounded in the truth, and not be carried away to destruction by the various winds of false doctrine and the crafty assaults of Satan. The name imposed was continually to remind him of what he ought to be as a follower of Christ. Compare Wieseler, *Chronologie des Apostolischen Zeitalters,* page 581.

2. *Peter's Domestic Circumstances*. — Of the family and connections of our apostle we know but little. His father is named in the Gospel history, and his mother's name seems to have been Joanna (see Coteler, *Ad Const. Apostol.* 2:63). It appears from John 21 that he did not entirely give up his occupation as a fisherman on his entrance into the body of Christ's disciples. <420438>Luke 4:38 and <460905>1 Corinthians 9:5 seem to show that he was married, and so the Church fathers often affirm (comp. Coteler, ad Clem. *Recogn.* 7:25; Grabe, *Ad Spicil. Patr.* § 1, page 330). But the tradition of

the name of his wife varies between Concordia and Perpetua (see Meyer, *De Petri Conjugio*, Viteb. 1684). It is said that she suffered martyrdom before Peter (Clem. Alex. *Stromn, 7:*p. 312). Some affirm that he left children *(ibid.* 3, page 192; Euseb. 3, 30), among whom a daughter, Petronilla, is named (comp. *Acta Sanct.* 30; Mai, 7:420 sq.). More recently Ranch *(Neues krit. Journ. f. Theol. 8:*401) strives to find a son of Peter mentioned in <60153>1 Peter 5:13, and Neander *(Pflanz.* 2:520) follows him, supposing that the "elected together with you" (the word *church* in the English version is not in the original) refers to the wife of the apostle.. The personal appearance of Peter at the time of his martyrdom is described in Malalae *Chronogr.* 10, page 256, in an absurd passage, of which the sense appears to be this: He was an old man, two thirds of a century old; bald in front, knob-haired *(?*κονδόθριξ*)*, with gray hair and beard; of clear complexion, somewhat pale, with dark eyes, a large beard, long nose, joined eyebrows, upright in posture; intelligent, impulsive, and timid. Comp. the description in Niceph. *H.E.* 2:37, page 165; and Faggini, *De Rom. P. Itin. Exerc.* 20, page 453 sq.

3. *Peter's Prominence as an Apostle*. — From such rassages as <40170>Matthew 17:1; <41091>Mark 9:1; 14:33, there can be no doubt that Peter was among the most beloved of Christ's disciples; and his eminence among the apostles depended partly on the fact that he had been one of the first of them, and partly on his own peculiar traits. Sometimes he speaks in the name of the twelve (<401927>Matthew 19:27; <422241>Luke 12:41). Sometimes he answers when questions are addressed to them all (<401616>Matthew 16:16; <410829>Mark 8:29); sometimes Jesus addresses him in the place of all (<402640>Matthew 26:40). But that he passed, out of the circle of the apostles, as their representative, cannot be certainly inferred from <401724>Matthew 17:24, even if it be supposable in itself. This position of Peter becomes more decided after the ascension of Jesus, and perhaps in consequence of the saying in <432115>John 21:15 sq. Peter now becomes the organ of the company of apostles (<440215>Acts 2:15; 2:14 sq.; 4:8 sq.; 5:27 sq.), his word is decisive (<441507>Acts 15:7 sq.), and he is named with "the other apostles" (<440237>Acts 2:37; 5:29. Comp. Chrysost. on John, *Horn.* 88, page 525). The early Protestant polemic divines should not have blinded themselves to this observation. (See Baumgarten, *Polem.* 3:370 sq.) The case is a natural one, when we compare Peter's character with that of the other apostles, and contributes nothing at all to fixing the primacy in him, after the view of the Roman Church. It may even be granted that the custom of looking upon

Peter as the chief of the apostles was the cause of his always having the first place in the company of apostles in the Church traditions. The old account that Peter alone of the apostles was baptized by Jesus himself agrees well with this view. (Comp. Coteler, *Ad Herm. Past.* 3:16.)

As to the meaning of the passage <4016>Matthew 16:18, there is much dispute. The accounts which have been given of the precise import of this declaration may be summed up under these heads:

(1.) That our Lord spoke of himself, and not of Peter, as the rock on which the Church was to be founded. This interpretation expresses a great truth, but it is irreconcilable with the context, and could scarcely have occurred to an unbiassed reader, and certainly does not give the primary and literal meaning of our Lord's words. It has been defended, however, by candid and learned critics, as Glass and Dathe.

(2.) That our Lord addresses Peter as the type or representative of the Church, in his capacity of chief disciple. This is Augustine's view, and it was widely adopted in the early Church. It is hardly borne out by the context, and seems to involve a false metaphor. The Church would in that case be founded on itself in its type.

(3.) That the rock was not the person of Peter, but his confession of faith. This rests on much better authority, and is supported by stronger arguments. Our Lord's question was put to the disciples generally. Although the answer came through the mouth of Peter, always ready to be the spokesman, it did not the less express the belief of the whole body.

So in other passages (noted below) the apostles generally, not Peter by himself, are spoken of as foundations of the Church. Every one will acknowledge that Christ, as before suggested, is pre-eminently the *first* foundation, THE Rock, on which every true disciple, on which Peter himself, must be built. It was by his faithful confession that he showed he was upon the rock. He was then Peter indeed, exhibiting that personal characteristic in the view of which Christ had long before given him the name. Such an interpretation may seem to accord best with our Lord's address, "Thou art Peter" — the firm maintainer of essential truth, a truth by the faithful grasping of which men become Christ's real disciples, living stones of his Church (<4703>John 17:3; <5009>Romans 10:9; <4621>1 Corinthians 3:11). Thus it was not the personal rock Peter, but the material rock of Gospel truth, the adherence to which was the test of discipleship. This

view, that it was Peter's confession on which Christ would build his Church, has been held by many able expositors. For instance, Hilary says, "Super hanc igitur confessionis petram ecclesiae sedificatio est" *(De Trin.* lib. 6:36, *Op.* [Par. 1693], col. 903; comp. lib. 2, 23, col. 800). See also Cyril of Alexandria *(De Sanct. Trin.* dial. 4, *Op.* [Lut. 1638], tom. 5, parsi, page 507); Chrysostom *(In Matthew* hom. 54, *Op.* [Par. 1718-38], 7:548); and the writer under the name of Nyssen *(Test. de Advent. Dom. adv. Jud.* in Greg. Nyssen. *Op.* [Par. 1638], 2:162). Yet it seems to have been originally suggested as an explanation, rather than an interpretation, which it certainly is not in a literal sense.

(4.) That Peter himself was the rock on which the Church would be built, as the representative of the apostles, as professing in their name the true faith, and as intrusted specially with the duty of preaching it, and thereby laying the foundation of the Church. Many learned and candid Protestant divines have acquiesced in this view (e.g. Pearson, Hammond, Bengel, Rosenmfller, Schleusner, Kuinol, Bloomfield, etc.). It is borne out by the facts that Peter on the day of Pentecost, and during the whole period of the establishment of the Church, was the chief agent in all the work of the ministry, in preaching, in admitting both Jews and Gentiles, and laying down the ternls of communion. This view is wholly incompatible with the Roman theory, which makes him the representative of Christ, not personally, but in virtue of an office essential to the permanent existence and authority of the Church. Passaglia, the latest and ablest controversialist, takes more pains to refute this than any other view; but wholly without success: it is clear that Peter did not retain, even admitting that he did at first hold, any primacy of rank after completing his own special work; that he never exercised any authority over or independently of the other apostles; that he certainly did not transmit whatever position he ever held to any of his colleagues after his decease. At Jerusalem, even during his residence there, the chief authority rested with St. James; nor is there any trace of a central power or jurisdiction for centuries after the foundation of the Church. The same arguments, *mutatis mutandis,* apply to the keys. The promise was literally fulfilled when Peter preached at Pentecost, admitted the first converts to baptism, confirmed the Samaritans, and received Cornelius, the representative of the Gentiles, into the Church. Whatever privileges may have belonged to him personally died with him. The authority required for the permanent government of the

Church was believed by the fathers to be deposited in the episcopate, as representing the apostolic body, and succeeding to its claims. *SEE ROCK*.

The passage is connected with another in the claims of the papacy, namely, "Unto thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven," etc. (<40169>Matthew 16:19). The force of both these passages is greatly impaired for the purpose for which Catholics produce them, by the circumstance that whatever of power or authority they may be supposed to confer upon Peter must be regarded as shared by him with the other apostles, inasmuch as to them also are ascribed in other passages the same qualities and powers which are promised to Peter in those under consideration. If by the former of these passages we are to understand that the Church is built upon Peter, the apostle Paul informs us that it is not on him *alone* that it is built, but upon *all* the apostles (<490220>Ephesians 2:20); and in the book of Revelation we are told that on the twelve foundations of the New Jerusalem (the Christian Church) are inscribed "the names of the *twelve apostles of the Lamb"* (<442114>Acts 21:14). As for the declaration in the latter of these passages, it was in all its essential parts repeated by our Lord to the other disciples immediately before his passion, as announcing a privilege which, as his apostles, they were to possess in common (<401818>Matthew 18:18; <432023>John 20:23). It is, moreover, uncertain in what sense our Lord used the language in question. In both cases his words are metaphorical; and nothing can be more unsafe than to build a theological dogma upon language of which the meaning is not clear, and to which, from the earliest ages, different interpretations have been affixed. Finally, even granting the correctness of the interpretation which Catholics put upon these verses, it will not bear out the conclusion they would deduce from them, inasmuch as the judicial supremacy of Peter over the other apostles does not necessarily follow from his possessing authority over the Church. On the other side, it is certain that there is no instance on record of the apostle's having ever claimed or exercised this supposed power; but, on the contrary, he is more than once represented as submitting to an exercise of power upon the part of others, as when, for instance, he went forth as a messenger from the apostles assembled in Jerusalem to the Christians in Samaria (<440814>Acts 8:14), and when he received a rebuke from Paul, as already noticed. This circumstance is so fatal, indeed, to the pretensions which have been urged in favor of his supremacy over the other apostles, that from a very early age attempts have been made to set aside its force by the hypothesis that it is not of Peter the apostle, but of

another person of the same name, that Paul speaks in the passage referred to (Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* 1:13). This hypothesis, however, is so plainly contradicted by the words of Paul, who explicitly ascribes apostleship to the Peter of whom he writes, that it is astonishing how it could have been admitted even by the most blinded zealot (verses 8, 9). While, however, it is pretty well established that Peter enjoyed no judicial supremacy over the other apostles, it would, perhaps, be going too far to affirm that no dignity or primacy whatsoever was conceded to him on the part of his brethren. His superiority in point of age, his distinguished personal excellence, his reputation and success as a teacher of Christianity, and the prominent part which he had ever taken in his Master's affairs, both before his death and after his ascension, firnished sufficient grounds for his being raised to a position of respect and of moral influence in the Church and among his brother apostles. To this some countenance is given by the circumstances that he is called "the first" (πρῶτος) by Matthew (<4010>Matthew 10:2), and this apparently not merely as a numerical, but as an honorary distinction; that when the apostles are mentioned as a body, it is frequently by the phrase "Peter and the eleven," or "Peter and the rest of the apostles," or something similar; and that when Paul went up to Jerusalem by divine revelation, it was to Peter particularly that the visit was paid. These circumstances, taken in connection with the prevalent voice of Christian antiquity, would seem to authorize the opinion that Peter occupied some such position as that of προεστώς, or president in the apostolical college, but without any power or authority of a judicial kind over his brother apostles (Campbell, *Eccles. Hist.* lect. 5 and 12; Barrow, *ubi sup.*, etc.; Eichhorn, *Einleit.* 3:599; Hug, *Introd.* page 635, Fordick's transl.; Home, *Introd.* 4:432; Lardner, *Works*, volume 4, 5, 6, ed. 1788; Cave, *Antiquitates Apostolcae*, etc.). *SEE PRIMACY*.

4. *Peter's Character*. — However difficult it might be to present a complete sketch of the apostle's temper of mind, there is no dispute as to some of the leading features; devotion to his Master's person (<4B137>John 13:37), which even led him into extravagance (<4B139>John 13:9), and an energetic disposition, which showed itself sometimes as resolution, sometimes as boldness (<4014>Matthew 14:29), and temper (<4B18>John 18:10). His temperament was choleric, and he easily passed from one extreme to another (<4B138>John 13:8. For a parallel between Peter and John, see Chrysost. *in Johan.* hom. 67:522). But how could such a man fall into a repeated denial of his Lord? This will always remain a difficult

psychological problem; but it is not necessary on this account to refer to Satan's power (Olshausen, *Bibl. Comment.* 2:482 sq.). When Jesus predicted to Peter his coming fall, the apostle may have thought only of a formal inquiry; and the arrest of Christ drove from his mind all recollection of Christ's warning words. The first denial was the hasty repulse of a troublesome and curious question. Peter thought it not worth while to converse with a girl at such a moment, when all his thoughts were taken up with the fate of his Master; and his repulse would be the more resolute, the more he wished to avoid being driven by the curious and pressing crowd out of the vicinity of the beloved Savior. The second and third questions compelled him still to deny, unless he would confess or leave the place; but the nearness of the Lord held him fast. Besides they are the questions only of curious servants, and he is in danger, if he acknowledges his Lord, of becoming himself the butt of ridicule to the coarse multitude, and thus of failing in his purpose. Thus again and again, with increasing hesitation, he utters his denial. Now the cock-crowing reminds him of his Master's warning, and now at length he reflects that a denial, even before such unauthorized inquiries, is yet really a denial. In this view some think that Peter's thoughts were continually on his Master. and that possibly the fear of personal danger had no part in influencing his course. The expression *fall* of Peter, often used, is in any case rather strong. For various views of this occurrence, see Luther, *on John 18;* Niemeyer, *Charakter,* 1:586 sq.; Rau, *Praeterita ad narration. Evang. de summa P. temeritate* (Erlangen, 1781); Paulus, *Comment.* 3:647 sq.; Henneberg, *Leidensgesch.* page 159 sq.; *Miscellen eines Landpredigers* (Glogau, 1799), page 3 sq.; Greiling, *Leben Jesu,* page 381 sq.; Rudolph, in Winer's *Zeitschr. f. wissensch. Theol.* i, 109 sq.; and Bellarmine, *Controv. de Benit.* 2:16; Martin, *Diss. de Petri Denegatione* (Monaster, 1835).

5. *Paul's Dispute with Peter.* — With reference to the occurrence mentioned in Galatians 2:11**,** from which some have inferred that Peter was not wholly free from the servile fear of men, we may remark that the case is altogether different from the preceding, and has much to do with the apostle's dogmatic convictions. It is known that the admission of the heathen to the Church was strange to Peter at first, and that he could only be induced to preach to them by a miraculous vision (Acts 10:10; 11:4 sq.). Then he was the first to baptize heathen, and announced in unmistakable language that the yoke of the Mosaic law must not be placed on the Gentile converts (Acts 15:7 sq.). But it is quite supposable that

he was still anxious for Christianity to be first firmly rooted among the Jews, and thus he seems after this occurrence to have turned his preaching exclusively to the Jews (comp. <480107>Galatians 2:7), his first epistle also being intended only for Jewish readers. The affair at Antioch (<480212>Galatians 2:12) seems to show that he still wavered somewhat in the conviction expressed in <441507>Acts 15:7 sq.; if, indeed, as appears to be the case, it was later than the latter. For even if Peter found it necessary to respect the prejudices of the party of James, still the necessity of firmness and consistency cannot be denied; although, on the other hand, we must not confound Peter's position with that of Paul. It is known (comp. Euseb. 1:12, 1) that in the early Church many referred the entire statement to another Cephas, one of the seventy disciples, who afterwards became bishop of Iconium, and nearly all the Catholic interpreters adopt this expedient. See Molkenbuhr, *Quod Cephas* <480211>*Galatians* 2:11 *non sit Petrus Ap.* (Monaster, 1803). See against this view Deyling, *Observatt.* 2:520 sq. On another view of the church fathers, see Neander, *Pflanz.* 1:292, note. It appears from the fact that at Corinth a party of Judaizing Christians called themselves by his name, that Peter was afterwards recognised as head of this class, in distinction from the Pauline Christians.

6. As to the time of Peter's journey to Rome, the Church fathers do not quite agree. Eusebius says in his *Chron.* (1:42) that Peter went to Rome in the second year of Claudius Caesar, after founding the first Church in Antioch; and Jerome, in his version, adds that he remained there twenty-five years, preaching the Gospel, and acting as bishop of the city (comp. also Jerome, *Script. Eccl.* page 1). Yet this statement appears very doubtful, for three reasons:

(1) Because, although we learn from <441217>Acts 12:17 that Peter left Jerusalem for a time after the death of James the elder, yet he certainly cannot have left Palestine before the events recorded in Acts 15.

(2) Because the mention of the origin of the Church in Antioch, connected by the fathers with Peter's journey to Rome, cannot easily be reconciled with <441119>Acts 11:19 sq.

(3) Because, if Peter had been bishop in Rome when Paul wrote his Epistle to the Romans, and afterwards when he was prisoner in Rome, we should expect the former to contain words of greeting to Peter, and the epistles written from Rome similar messages from Peter; the more as these epistles are very rich in such messages; but nothing of the kind appears. We may

wll doubt, too, whether, if Peter had been bishop or even founder of the Roman Church, Paul's principles and method (see <45150>Romans 15:20, 23 sq.; 28:2; <47106>2 Corinthians 10:16) would have allowed him to write this epistle to Rome at all. Eusebius seems to have drawn his account from Clemens Alexandrinus and Eusebius (Euseb. *H.E.* 2:15), the former of whom quoted from a remark of Justin Martyr *(Apol.* 2:69), which rests upon an accidental error of language; this father referring to Simon the Magician an inscription which belonged to the SabineRomish deity Semo (Hug, *Einleit.* 2:69 sq.; Credner, *Einleit.* 1:529 sq. Comp. Schulrich, *De Simonis M. fatis Roman.* Misen. 1844). Now Peter had once publicly rebuked this Simon (<44818>Acts 8:18 sq.); this fact, connected with the inscription, gave rise to the story of Peter's residence in Rome under Claudius, in whose reign the inscription originated. After this detection of the occasion which produced the record in Eusebius, it is truly wonderful that Bertholdt *(Einleit.* 5:2685) should defend the account, and found a critical conjecture upon it. Further, the Armenian Chronicle of. Eusebius refers this statement to the third year of Caius Caligula.

But the account found in Irenaeus *(Haer.* 3:1) differs materially from that above noticed. He tells us that Peter and Paul were in Rome, and there founded a Church in company; and Eusebius (2:25, in a quotation from Dionysius, bishop of Corinth) adds that they suffered martyrdom together (Peter being crucified, according to Origen, in Euseb. 3:1; Niceph. 2:36). Eusebius in his Chronicle places their martyrdom, according to his reckoning of twenty-five years for Peter's episcopacy, in the fourteenth year of Nero's reign, which extended from the middle of October, A.D. 67, to the same time in A.D. 68. This joint martyrdom of Paul and Peter (without however any special mention of the manner of Peter's crucifixion, comp. Neander, *Pflanz.* 2:514) is also mentioned by Tertullian *(Praescript. Hceret.* 36) and Lactantius *(Mort. Persec.* 2; *Institut. Div.* 4:21). The graves of both apostles were pointed out in Rome as early as the close of the second century (Euseb. 2:25). Yet the whole story rests ultimately on the testimony of Dionysius alone, who must have died about A.D. 176. (The passages in Clemens Romanus, to 1 Corinthians 5, and Ignatius, *to the Romans,* 5, settle nothing.) Thus, on the one hand, we are not at liberty to reject all doubt as to the truth of this account with Bertholdt *(loc. cit.)* as hypercritical, or with Gieseler *(Ch. Hist.* 1:92 sq. 3d ed.) as partisan polemics; nor, on the other, can we suppose it to have sprung from the interpretation of <60513>1 Peter 5:13, where at an early day *Babylon* was

understood to stand for Rome (Euseb. 15:2; Niceph. *H.E.* 2:15. Comp. Baur, page 215). The genetic development of the whole story attempted by Baur (in the Tubingen *Zeitschrift. f. Theol.* 1831, 4:162 sq. Comp. his *Paulus,* page 214 sq., 671 sq.) deserves close attention. But compare Neander, *Pflanz.* 2:519 sq.; and further against any visit to Rome by Peter, see M. Velenus, *Lib. quo Petrum Romam non venisse asseritur* (1520); Vedelius, *De tempore utriusque Episcopatus Petri* (Geneva, 1624); Spanheim, *De facta profectione Petri Ap. in erbem Rom.* (Lug. Bat. 1679; also in his *Opera,* 2:331 sq.); also an anonymous writer in the *Biblioth. fur theol. Sckrifikunde,* volume 4, No. 1 (extract in the *Leipz. Lit. Zeit.* 1808, No. 130); Mayerhoff, *Einl. in d. Petrin. Schriften,* page 73 sq.; Reiche, *Erklar. des Briefes an d. Rimer,* 1:39 sq.; Von Ammon, *Fortbild.* 4:322 sq.; Ellendorf, *Ist Petrus in Rom. u. Bischof d. Rim. Kirche gewesen?* (Darmstadt, 1841; translated in the *Bibliotheca Sacra,* July 1858; January 1859; answered by Binterim, Disseldorf, 1842). On the other side of the question, the older writings are enumerated by Fabricius, *Lux Evang.* page 97 sq. The usual arguments of the Catholics are given by Bellarmine, *Controv. de Rom. Pontif.* lib. 2. But the chief work on that side is still that of Cortesius, *De Romano itinere gestisque princip. Apostol.* lib. 2 (Venice, 1573; revised by Constaltinus, Rom. 1770). Comp. esp. Foggini, *De Romano Petri itinere,* etc. (Flor. 1741). On the same side in general, though with many modifications, are the following later writers: Mynster, *Kleine theol. Schrifien,* page 141 sq., who holds that Peter was in Rome twice. See *contra,* Baur, *Op. cit.* page 181 sq.; Herbst, in the *Tubinger Kathol. theol. Quartalschr.* 1820, 4:1, who places Peter in Rome at least during the last years of Nero's reign, though but for a short time. See, however, Baur, *Op. cit.* page 161 sq.; Olshausen, *Studien u. Krit.* 1838, page 940 sq., in answer to Baur; Stenglein, in the *Tubinger Quartalschr.* 1840, 2d and 3d parts, who makes Peter to have visited Rome in the second year of Claudius; to have been driven away by the well-known edict of that emperor; and at length to have returned under Nero. Comp. also Iaiden, *De itinere P. Romano* (Prag. 1761), and Windischmann, *Vindiciae Petri* (Ratisb. 1836). It is not in the least necessary for those who oppose the Romish Church, which makes Peter first bishop of Rome (see Van Til, *De Petro Romer martyre non pontficae* [Lug. Bat. 1710]), and grounds on this the primacy of the pope (Matthaeucci, *Opus dogmat. adversus Hetherodox* [sic !], page 212 sq.; Bel. larmine, *Controv. de Rom. Pontif.* 2:3, and elsewhere), to be influenced in the question of Peter's journey by these views, inasmuch as this primacy, when all the historical evidences

claimed are allowed, remains, in spite of every effort to defend it, without foundation (Butschang, *Untersuch. der Vorzyge des Ap. P.* [Hamb, 1788]; Baumgarten, *Polem.* 3:370 sq.; Paulus, in *Sophroniz.* 3:131 sq.). The first intimation that Peter had a share in founding the Roman Church, and that he spent twenty-five years there as bishop, appears in Eusebius *(Chron.* ad secund. ann. Claud.) and Jerome *(Script. Eccl.* 1); while Eusebius *(H.E.* 3:2) tells us that after the martyrdom of Peter and Paul, Linus was made the first bishop of the Church of the Romans; a most remarkable statement, if Peter had been bishop before him (comp. 3:4). Epiphanius (27:6) even calls Paul the bishop *(ἐπίσκοπος)* of Christianity in Rome.

7. *Mode of Peter's Death.* — The tradition of this apostle's being crucified with his head downwards is probably to be relegated to the regions of the fabulous. Tertullian, who is the first to mention Peter's crucifixion, says simply *(De Praeser. Haeres.* 36), "Petrus passioni Dominicae adaequatur;" which would rather lead to the conclusion that he was crucified in the usual way, as our Lord was. The next witness is Origen, whose words are, ἀνεσκολοπίσθη κατὰ κεφάλης οὕτως αὐτὸς ἀξιώσας παθεῖν (ap. Euseb. *H.E.* 3:1); and these are generally cited as intimating the peculiarity traditionally ascribed to the mode of Peter's crucifixion. But do the words really intimate this? Allowing that the verb may mean "was crucified," can κατὰ κεφάλης mean "with the head downwards?" No instance, we believe, can be adduced which would justify such a translation. The combination κατὰ κεφάλης occurs both in classical and Biblical Greek (see Plato, *Rep.* 3:398; Plut. *Apoph. de Scipione Jun.* 13; <4114B>Mark 14:3; <4610A>1 Corinthians 11:4), but in every case it means "upon the head" (comp. κατὰ κόῤῥης πατάξαι, Lucian, *Gall. c.* 30, and κατὰ κόῤῥης παίειν, *Catapl. c.* 12). According to analogy, therefore, Origen's words should mean that the apostle was impaled, or fastened to the cross upon, i.e., by, the head. When Eusebius has to mention the crucifying of martyrs with the head downwards, he says distinctly οἱ δὲ ἀνάπαλιν κατωκάρα προσηλωθέντες *(H.E.* 8:8). It is probably to a misunderstanding of Origen's words that this story is to be traced and it is curious to see how it grows as it advances. First, we have Origen's vague and doubtful statement above quoted; then we have Eusebius's more precise statement: Πέτρος κατὰ κεφάλης σταυροῦται *(Dem. Ev.* 3:116, c.); and at length, in the hands of Jerome, it expands into "Affixus cruci martyrio coronatus est capite ad terram verso et in sublime pedibus elevatis, asserens se indignum

qui sic crucifigeretur ut Dominus suns" *(Catal. Script. Eccles.* 1). *SEE CRUCIFY*.

8. *Spurious Writings attributed to Peter*. — Some apocryphal works of very early date obtained currency in the Church as containing the substance of the apostle's teaching. The fragments which remain are not of much importance, but they demand a brief notice. *SEE APOCRYPHA*.

(1.) The *Preaching (*κήρυγμα*)* or *Doctrine (*διδαχή*) of Peter,* probably identical with a work called the *Preaching of Paul,* or of *Paul and Peter,* quoted by Lactantius, may have contained some traces of the apostle's teaching, if, as Grabe, Ziegler, and others supposed, it was published soon after his death. The passages, however, quoted by Clement of Alexandria are for the most part wholly unlike Peter's mode of treating doctrinal or practical subjects. Rufinus and Jerome allude to a work: which they call "Judicium Petri;" for which Cave accounts by a happy conjecture, adopted by Nitzsche Mayerhoff, Reuss, and Schliemann, that Rufinus found καμα for κήρυγμα, and read κρίμα. Epiphanius also names Περιοδοι Πετρου as a book among the Ebionites *(Haeres.* 30:15). It is probably only a different name for the foregoing (Schwegler, *Nach-apost. Zetalt.* 2:30). *SEE GOSPELS, SPURIOUS.*

(2.) Another work, called the *Revelation of Peter (*ἀποκάλυψις Πέτρου), was held in much esteem for centuries. It was commented on by Clement of Alexandria, quoted by Theodotus in the *Eclogae,* named together with the Revelation of John in the Fragment on the Canon published by Muratori (but with the remark, "Quam quidam ex nostris legi in Ecclesia nolunt"), and according to Sozomen *(Hist. Eccles.* 7:19) was read once a year in some churches of Palestine. It is said, but not on good authority, to have been preserved among the Coptic Christians. Eusebius looked on it as spurious, but not of heretical origin. From the fragments and notices it appears to have consisted chiefly of denunciations against the Jews, and predictions of the fall of Jerusalem, and to have been of a wild, fanatical character. The most complete account of this curious work is given by Liicke in his general introduction to the Revelation of John, page 47. *SEE REVELATIONS, SPURIOUS.*

There are traces in ancient writers of a few other writings attributed to the apostle Peter, but they seem to have wholly perished (see Smith, *Dict. of Class. Biog.* 3:221 sq.). *SEE ACTS, SPURIOUS*.

The legends of the Clementiles are wholly devoid of historical worth; but from those fictions, originating with an obscure and heretical sect, have been derived some of the most mischievous speculations of modern rationalists, especially as regards the assumed antagonism between St. Paul and the earlier apostles. It is important to observe, however, that in none of these spurious documents, which belong undoubtedly to the first two centuries, are there any indications that our apostle was regarded as in any peculiar sense connected with the Church or see of Rome, or that he exercised or claimed any authority over the apostolic body of which he was the recognised leader or representative (Schliemann, *Die Clementinen nebst den verwandten Schriften,* 1814). *SEE CLEMENTINES.*

Among other legends which have come down to us concerning Peter is that relating to his contention at Rome with Simon Magus. This seems to have no better foundation than a misunderstanding of an inscription on the part of Justin Martyr *(Apol.* 1:26). *SEE SIMON MAOTS.*

III. *Literature.* — In addition to the works copiously cited above, we may here name the following on this apostle personally, reserving for the following articles those on his writings specially. Blunt, *Lectures on the Hist. of Peter* (Lond. 1833, 1860. 2 volumes, 12mo); Thompson, *Life-Work of Peter the Apostle* (ibid. 1870, 8vo); Green, *Peter's Life and Letters* (ibid. 1873, 8vo); Morich, *Leben und Lehre Petri* (Braunsch. 1873, 8vo). Among the old monographs we may name Mever, *Nut Christus Petrum baptizaverit* (Leips. 1672); Walch, *De Claudo a Petro sanato* (Jen. 1755); and on his denials of his Master, those cited by Volbeding, *Index Programmatum.* page 58; and in Hase, *Lebenz Jes.,* page 202; also the *Jour. of Sac. Lit.* July 1862; on his dispute with Paul, Volbeding, page 85. *SEE APOSTLE.*

Peter, First Epistle Of,

the first of the seven Catholic Epistles of the N.T. In the following account of both epistles of Peter we pass over many particulars which will be found discussed elsewhere. *SEE PETER.*

I. *Genuineness and Canonicity.* — This epistle found an early place in the canon by universal consent, ranking among the ὁμολογούμενα, or those generally received. The other epistle, by calling itself δευτέρα, refers to it as an earlier document (2 Peter 3:1). Polycarp, in his Epistle to the Philippians, often uses it, quoting many clauses, and some whole verses, as

1 Peter 1:13, 21, in 1 Peter 2; 3:9, in 1 Peter 5; 2:11, in 1 Peter 4:7, in chapter 6; and 1 Peter 2:21-24, in chapter 8, etc. It is to be observed, however, that in no case does this father refer to Peter by name, but he simply cites the places as from some document of acknowledged authority; so that Eusebius notes it as characteristic of his epistle that Polycarp used those citations from the First Epistle of Peter as μαρτυρίαι *(Hist. Eccles.* 4:14). The same lhistorian relates of Papias that in his Λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξηγήσεις he in a similar way used μαρτυρίαι from this epistle *(Hist. Eccles.* 3:39). Irenoeus quotes it expressly and by name, with the common formula, "Et Petrus ait" *(Haeres.* 4:9, 2), citing 1 Peter 1:8; using the same quotation similarly introduced in *ibid.* 5:7, 2; and again, " Et propter hoc Petrus ait," citing 1 Pet. ii, 16; *ibid.* 4:16, . . Other quotations, without mention of the apostle's name, may be found, *ibid.* 3:16, 9, and 4:20, 2, etc. Quotations abound in Clement of Alexandria, headed with ὁ Πέτρος λέγει, or φησὶν ὁ Πέτρος. These occur both in his *Stromata* and *Pcedag.,* and need not be specified. Quotations are abundant also in Origen, certifying the authorship by the words παρὰ τῷ Πετρῶ*;* and, according to Eusebius, he calls this epistle μιαν ἐπιστολὴν ὁμογουμένην (Euseb. *Hist. Eccles*. 6:25). The quotations in Origen's works need not be dwelt upon. In the letter of the churches of Vienne and Lyons, A.D. 177, there is distinct use made of 1 Peter 5:60 Theophilus of Antioch, A.D. 181, quotes these terms of 1 Peter 4:3 — ἀθεμίταις εἰδωλολατρείαις. Tertullian's testimony is quite as distinct. In the short tract *Scorpiace* this epistle is quoted nine times, the preface in one place being" Petrus quidem ad Ponticos" *(Scorp.* c. 12), quoting 1 Peter 2:20. Eusebius himself says of it, Πέτρου . . . ἀνωμολόγηται *(Hist. Eccles.* 3”25). It is also found in the Peshito, which admitted only three of the catholic epistles. See Mayerhoff, *Einleitung in die Petrin. Schriften,* page 139, etc.

In the canon published by Muratori this epistle is not found. In this fragment occurs the clause, "Apocalypses etiam Johannis et Petri tantum recipimus." Wieseler, laying stress on *etiam,* would bring out this meaning- in addition to the epistles of Peter and John, we also receive their Revelations; or also of Peter we receive as much as of John, two epistles and an apocalypse. But the interpretation is not admissible. Rather with Bleek may the omission be ascribed to the fragmentary character of the document *(Einleit. in das N.T.* page 643; Hilgenfeld, *Der Canon and die Kritik des N.T.* [Halle, 1833], page 43). Other modes of reading and

explaining the obscure sentence have been proposed. Hug alters the punctuation, "Apocalypsis etiam Johannis. Et Petri tantum recipimus;" certainly the *tantum* gives some plausibility to the emendation. Believing that the barbarous Latin is but a version from the Greek, he thus restores the original, καὶ Πέτρου μόνον παραδεχόμεθα, and then asks μόνον to be changed into μονήν — an alteration which of course brings out the conclusion wanted *(Einleit.* § I). Guericke's effort is not more satisfactory. Thiersch, with more violence, changes *tantum* into *unam epistolam*, and *quam quidem* in the following clause into *alteram quidem*. This document, so imperfect in form and barbarous in style, is probably indeed a translation from the Greek, and it can have no authority against decided and general testimony (see the canon in Routh's *Reliquiae Sacrat,* 1:396, edited with notes from Freindaller's *Commentatio* [Lond. 1862]). Nor is it of any importance whether the words of Leontius imply that this epistle was repudiated by Theodore of Mopsuestia, and if the Paulicians rejected it, Petrus Siculus gives the true reason — they were *"pessime adversus illun affecti*" — personal prejudice being implied in their very name *(Hist. Manich.* page 17).

The internal evidence is equally complete. The author calls himself the apostle Peter (1 Peter 1:1), and the whole character of the epistle shows that it proceeds from a writer who possessed great authority among those whom he addresses. The writer describes himself as "an elder," and "a witness of Christ's sufferings" (1 Peter 5:1). The vehemence and energy of the style are altogether appropriate to the warmth and zeal of Peter's character, and every succeeding critic, who has entered into its spirit, has felt impressed with the truth of the observation of Erasmus, "that this epistle is full of apostolical dignity and authority, and worthy of the prince of the apostles."

In later times the genuineness of the epistle has been impugned, as by Cludius in his *Uransichten des Christenthums,* page 296 (Altona, 1808). He imagined the author to have been a Jewish Christian of Asia Minor, and his general objection was that the similarity in doctrine and style to Paul was too great to warrent the belief of independent authorship. His objections were exposed and answered by Augusti (in a program, Jena, 1808) and by Bertholdt *(Eirdeit.* volume 6, § 667). Eichhorn, however, took up the theory of Cludius so far as to maintain that as to material Peter is the author, but that Mark is the actual writer. De Wette also throws out similar objections, hinting that the author may have been a follower of Paul

who had been brought into close attendance upon Peter. The question has been thoroughly discussed by Hug, Ewald, Bertholdt, Weiss, and other critics. The most striking resemblances are perhaps <60103>1 Peter 1:3 with <49103>Ephesians 1:3; 2:18 with <49605>Ephesians 6:5; 3:1 with <49522>Ephesians 5:22; and 5:5 with <49521>Ephesians 5:21; but allusions nearly as distinct are found to the other Pauline epistles (comp. especially <60213>1 Peter 2:13 with <54102>1 Timothy 2:2-4; <60101>1 Peter 1:1 with <49104>Ephesians 1:4-7; 1:14 with <45212>Romans 12:2; 2:1 with <51308>Colossians 3:8 and <45201>Romans 12:1; 2:6-10 with <45932>Romans 9:32; 2:13 with <45301>Romans 13:1-4; 2:16 with <48513>Galatians 5:13; 3:9 with <45217>Romans 12:17; 4:9 with <50414>Philippians 2:14; 4:10 with <45206>Romans 12:6, etc.; 5:1 with <45818>Romans 8:18; 5:8 with <52506>1 Thessalonians 5:6; 5:14 with <46160>1 Corinthians 16:20). While, however, there is a similarity between the thoughts and style of Peter and Paul, there is at the same time a marked individuality, and there are also many special characteristics in this first epistle.

First, as proof of its genuineness, there is a peculiar and natural similarity between this epistle and the speeches of Peter as given in the Acts of the Apostles. Not to mention similarity in mould of doctrine and array of facts, there is resemblance in style. Thus <44530>Acts 5:30, 10:39, <60224>1 Peter 2:24, in the allusion to the crucifixion and the use of ξύλον, the tree or cross; <44232>Acts 2:32, 3:15, <60501>1 Peter 5:1, in the peculiar use of μάρτυς; <44318>Acts 3:18, 10:43, <60110>1 Peter 1:10, in the special connection of the old prophets with Christ and his work; <44042>Acts 10:42, <60405>1 Peter 4:5, in the striking phrase "judge quick and dead;" <44316>Acts 3:16, <60121>1 Peter 1:21, in the clauses ἡ πίστις ἡ δι᾽αὐτοῦ-τοὺς δι᾽ αὐτοῦ πιστούς; and in the mode of quotation (<44402>Acts 4:2; <60107>1 Peter 2:7). Certain favorite terms occur also — ἀναστροφή, and ἀγαθοποιεῖν with its cognates and opposites. There are over fifty words peculiar to Peter in this brief document, nearly all of them compounds, as if in his profound anxiety to express his thoughts as he felt them, he had employed the first, and to him at the moment the fittest terms which occurred. He has such phrases as ἐλπὶς ζῶσα, <60103>1 Peter 1:3; συνείδησις θεοῦ, <60219>1 Peter 2:19; ὀσφύες διανοίας, 1:13; φίλημα ἀγάπης, <60514>1 Peter 5:14. The nouns δόξαι, <60111>1 Peter 1:11, and ἀρεταί, <60209>1 Peter 2:9, occur in the plural. He uses εἰς before a personal accusative no less than four times in the first chapter. The article is often separated from its noun, 3:2, 3, 19; 4:2, 5, 8. 12. Peter has also a greater proneness than Paul to repetition-to reproduce the same idea in somewhat similar terms — as if he had felt it needless to search for a mere change of

words when a similar thought was waiting for immediate utterance (comp. 1 Peter 1:6-9 with 1 Peter 4:12, 13; 1 Peter 2:12 with 1 Peter 3:16, 4:4; 4:7 with 1 Peter 5:8). There are also in the epistle distinct and original thoughts-special exhibitions of the great facts and truths of the Gospel which the apostle looked at from his own point of view, and applied as he deemed best to a practical purpose. Thus the visit of Christ "to the spirits in prison" (1 Peter 3:19); the typical connection of the Deluge with baptism; the desire of the old prophets to study and know the times and the blessings of the Gospel — are not only Petrine in form, but are solitary statements in Scripture. Thus, too, the apostle brings out into peculiar relief regeneration by the "Word of God," the "royal priesthood" of believers, and the qualities of the future "inheritance," etc.

Again, in phrases and ideas which in the main are similar to those of Paul, there is in Peter usually some mark of difference. Where there might have been sameness, the result of imitation, there is only similarity, the token of original thought. For example, Paul says (Romans 6:10, 11), ζῆν τῷ θεῷ; Peter says (1 Peter 2:24), ζῆν τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ. The former writes (Romans 6:2), ἀποθνήσκειν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ; the latter (1 Peter 2:24), ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ἀπογίνεσθαι. Besides, as Bruckner remarks, the representation in these last clauses is differentdeath to sin in the passage from Romans being the result of union with the sufferings and death of Christ, while in Peter it is the result of Christ's doing away sin (De Wette, *Erkldarung*, ed. Bruckner, page 9). So, too, the common contrast in Paul is σάρξ and πνεῦμα, but in Peter πνεῦμα and ψυχή ;ἐκλογή) is connected in Paul with χάρις, or it stands absolutely; but in Peter it is joined to πρόγνωσις; government is with the first τοῦ θεοῦ διαταγή (Romans 13:2); but with the second it is ἀνθρωπίνη κτίσις (1 Peter 2:13); the expression with the one is καινὸς ἄνθρωπος (Ephesians 4:24); but with the other ὁ κρυπτὸς ἄνθρωπος (1 Peter 3:4): what is called ἀφορμή in Galatians 5:13 is named ἐπικάλυμμα in 1 Peter 2:16, etc. Now, not to insist longer on this similarity with variance, it may be remarked that for many of the terms employed by them, both apostles had a common source in the Septuagint. The words found there and already hallowed by religious use were free to both of them, and their acquaintance with the Sept. must have tended to produce some resemblance in their own style. Among such terms are ἀγνωσία, ἀσωτία, εὔσπλαγχνος, καταλαλία, ὑπερέχειν, φρουρεῖν, χορηγεῖν (comp. Mayerhoff, *Histor.-Krit. Einleitung in d. Petrin. Schriften*, page 107 sq.).

That two apostles, in teaching the same system of divine truth, should agree in many of their representations. and even in their words, is not to be wondered at, since the terminology must soon have acquired a definite form, and certain expressions must have become current through constant usage. But in cases where such similarity between Peter and Paul occurs, there is ever a difference of view or of connection; and though both may refer to ideas so common as are named by ὑπακοή, δόξα or κληρονομία, there is always something to show Peter's independent use of the terms. One with his "beloved brother Paul" in the general view of the truth, he has something peculiar to himself in the introduction and illustration of it. The Petrine type is as distinct as the Pauline — it bears its own unmistakable style and character. The Galilean fisherman has an individuality quite as recognizable as the pupil of Gamaliel.

Once more, to show how baseless is the objection drawn from Peter's supposed dependence on Paul, it may be added that similarity in some cases may be traced between Peter and John. In many respects Paul and John are utterly unlike, yet Peter occasionally resembles both. though it is not surmised that he was an imitator of the beloved disciple. Such accidental resemblance to two styles of thought so unlike in themselves is surely proof of his independence of both, for he stands midway; as it were, between the objectivity of Paul and the subjectivity of John; inclining sometimes to the one side and sometimes to the other, and occasionally combining both peculiarities of thought. Thus one may compare <60122>1 Peter 1:22 with <62303>1 John 3:3 in the use of ἁγνίζω; <60123>1 Peter 1:23 with <62309>1 John 3:9 in the similar use of σπορᾶς and σπέρμα, denoting the vital germ out of which regeneration springs; <60502>1 Peter 5:2 with <431016>John 10:16 in the use of ποιμήν; <60318>1 Peter 3:18 and <620107>1 John 3:7 in the application of the epithet δίκαιος to Christ; <60318>1 Peter 3:18, <430129>John 1:29, in calling him ἀμνός. Such similarities only prove independent authorship. In the resemblances to James, which are sometimes adduced, the chief similarity consists in the use of Old-Test. quotations. Thus compare <60106>1 Peter 1:6, 7 with <590102>James 1:2, 3; 1:24 with <590110>James 1:10; 2:1 with <590121>James 1:21; 2:5 with <590406>James 4:6, 10; 4:8 with <590520>James 5:20; and 5:5 with <590406>James 4:6. What, then, do these more frequent resemblances to Paul, and the fewer to John and James, prove? Not, with De Wette, the dependence of Peter on Paul; nor, with Weiss, the dependence of Paul on Peter *(Der Petrin. Lehrbegriff* page 374); but that Peter, in teaching similar truths, occasionally employs similar terms; while the surrounding illustration is so

various and significant that such similarity can be called neither tame reiteration nor unconscious reminiscence. With much that is common in creed, there is more that is distinctive in utterance, originating in difference of spiritual temperament, or moulded by the adaptation of truth to the inner or outer condition of the churches for whom this epistle was designed.

On the other hand, the harmony of such teaching with that of Paul is sufficiently obvious. Peter, indeed, dwells more frequently than Paul upon the future manifestation of Christ, upon which he bases nearly all his exhortations to patience, self-control, and the discharge of all Christian duties. Yet there is not a shadow of opposition here; the topic is not neglected by Paul, nor does Peter omit the Pauline argument from Christ's sufferings; still what the Germans call the eschatological element predominates over all others. The apostle's mind is full of one thought, the realization of Messianic hopes. While Paul dwells with most earnestness upon justification by our Lord's death and merits, and concentrates his energies upon the Christian's present struggles, Peter fixes his eye constantly upon the future coming of Christ, the fulfilment of prophecy, the manifestation of the promised kingdom. In this he is the true representative of Israel, moved by those feelings which were best calculated to enable him to do his work as the apostle of the circumcision. Of the three Christian graces, hope is his special theme. He dwells much on good works, but not so much because he sees in them necessary results of faith, or the complement of faith, or outward manifestations of the spirit of love, aspects most prominent in Paul, James, and John, as because he holds them to be tests of the soundness and stability of a faith which rests on the fact of the resurrection, and is directed to the future in the developed form of hope.

But while Peter thus shows himself a genuine Israelite, his teaching, like that of Paul, is directly opposed to Judaizing tendencies. He belongs to the school, or, to speak more correctly, is the leader of the school, which at once vindicates the unity of the Law and the Gospel, and puts the superiority of the latter on its true basis, that of spiritual development. All his practical injunctions are drawn from Christian, not Jewish principles, from the precepts, example, life, death, resurrection, and fiuture coming of Christ. The apostle of the circumcision says not a word in this epistle of the perpetual obligation, the dignity, or even the bearings of the Mosaic law. He is full of the Old Testament; his style and thoughts are charged with its imagery, but he contemplates and applies its teaching in the light of the

Gospel; he regards the privileges and glory of the ancient people of God entirely in their spiritual development in the Church of Christ. Only one who had been brought up as a Jew could have had his spirit so impregnated with these thoughts; only one who had been thoroughly emancipated by the Spirit of Christ could have risen so completely above the prejudices of his age and country. This is a point of great importance, showing how utterly opposed the teaching of the original apostles, whom Peter certainly represents, was to that Judaistic narrowness which speculative rationalism has imputed to all the early followers of Christ, with the exception of Paul. There are in fact more traces of what are called Judaizing views, more of sympathy with national hopes, not to say prejudices, in the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians, than in this work. In this we see the Jew who has been born again, and exclianged what Peter himself calls the unbearable yoke of the law for the liberty which is in Christ. At the same time it must be admitted that our apostle is far from tracing his principles to their origin, and from drawing out their consequences with the vigor, spiritual discernment, internal sequence of reasoning, and systematic completeness which are characteristic of Paul. A few great facts, broad solid principles on which faith and hope may rest securely, with a spirit; of patience, confidence, and love, suffice for his unspeculative mind. To him objective truth was the main thing; subjective struggles between the intellect and spiritual consciousness, such as we find in Paul, and the intuitions of a spirit absorbed in contemplation like that of John, though not by any means alien to Peter, were in him wholly subordinated to the practical tendencies of a simple and energetic character. It has been observed with truth that both in tone and in form the teaching of Peter bears a peculiarly strong resemblance to that of our Lord, in discourses bearing directly upon practical duties. The great value of the epistle to believers consists in this resemblance; they feel themselves in the hands of a safe guide, of one who will help them to trace the hand of their Master in both dispensations, and to confirm and expand their faith.

But apart from the style and language of the epistle, objections have been brought against it by Schwegler, who alleges the want of special occasion for writing it, and the consequent generality of the contents *(Das Nach-apostol. Zeitalt.* 2:7). The reply is that the epistle bears upon its front such a purpose as well suits the vocation of an apostle. Nor is there in it, as we have seen, that want of individuality which Schwegler next alleges. It bears upon it the stamp of its author's fervent spirit; nor does its use of Old-Test.

imagery and allusions belie his functions as the apostle of the circumcision (Wiesinger, *Einl.* page 21). If there be the want of close connection of thought, as Schwegler also asserts, is not this want of logical sequence and symmetry quite in keeping with the antecedents of him who had been trained in no school of human learning? Nor is it any real difficulty to say that Peter in the East could not have become acquainted with the later epistles of Paul. For in various ways Peter might have known Paul's epistles; and granting that there is a resemblance to some of the earlier of them, there is little or none to the latest of them. Schwegler holds that the epistle alludes to the persecution under Nero, during which Peter suffered, and that therefore his writing it at Babylon is inconsistent with his martyrdom at the same period at Rome. The objection, however, takes for granted what is denied. It is a sufficient reply to say that the persecution referred to was not, or may not have been, the Neronian persecution, and that the apostle was not put to death at the supposed period of Nero's reign. There is not in the epistle any direct allusion to actual persecution; the ἀπολογία (3:15) is not a formal answer to a public accusation, for it is to be given to every one asking it (Huther, *Kritisch-exegetisches Handbuch fiber den* 1. *Brief des Petrus, Einleit.* page 27). The epistle in all its leading features is in unison with what it professes to be an earnest and practical letter from one whose heart was set on the well-being of the churches, one who may have read many of Paul's letters and thanked God for them, and who, in addressing the churches himself, clothes his thoughts in language the readiest and most natural to him, without any timid selection or refusal of words and phrases which others may have used before him.

II. *Place and Time.* — The place is indicated in 5:13, in the clause ἀζεπάζεται ὑμᾶς ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτή. Babylon is named as the place where the apostle was when he wrote the epistle, as he sends this salutation from it, on the part of a woman, as Mayerhoff, Neander, Alford, and others suppose; or on the part of a Church, as is the opinion of the majority. It is remarkable, however, that from early times Babylon has here been taken to signify Rome. This opinion is ascribed by Eusebius on report to Papias and Clement of Alexandria *(Hist. Eccles.* 2:15). Jerome and (Ecumenius also held it. In later times it has been espoused by Grotius, Cave, Lardner, Hengstenberg,Windischmann,Wiesinger, Baur, Thiersch, Schott *(Der 1. Brief Pet. erklart,* page 346, Erlangen, 1861), and Hofmann *(Schriftb.* 1:201). But why discover a mystical sense in a name set down as

the place of writing an epistle? There is no more reason for doing this than for assigning a like significance to the geographical names in 1:1. How could his readers discover the Church at Rome to be meant by ἡ συνεκλεκτή in Babylon? And if Babylon do signify a hostile spiritual power, as in the Apocalypse (18:21), then it is strange that Catholic critics as a body should adopt such a meaning here, and admit by implication the ascription of this character to their spiritual metropolis. Dr. Brown, of Edinburgh, puts a somewhat parallel case — "Our own city is sometimes called Athens from its situation, and from its being a seat of learning; but it would not do to argue that a letter came from Edinburgh because it is dated from Athens" *(Expository Discourses on 1st Peter,* 1:548).

Some, again, think that Babylon may mean a place of that name in Egypt. Of this opinion are Le Clerc, Mill, Pearson, Pott, Burton, Greswell, and Hug. Strabo *(Geog.* 17:1, 30) calls it not a town, but a strong fortress built by refugees from Babylon, and a garrison for one of the three legions guarding Egypt. The opinion that this small encampment is the Babylon of our epistle has certainly little plausibility. It is equally strange to suppose it to be Ctesiphon or Seleucis; and stranger still to imagine that Babylon represents Jerusalem, as is maintained by Cappellus, Spanheim, Hardouin, and Semler. The natural interpretation is to take Babylon as the name of the well-known city. We have indeed no record of any missionary journey of Peter into Chaldaea, for but little of Peter's later life is given us in the New Test. But we know that many Jews inhabited Babylon — (οὐ γὰρ ὀλίγοι μυριάδες, according to Josephus — and was not such a spot, to a great extent a Jewish colony or settlement, likely to attract the apostle of the circumcision? Lardner's principal argument, that the terms of the injunction to loyal obedience (2:13, 14) imply that Peter was within the bounds of the Roman empire, proves nothing; for as Davidson remarks — "The phrase 'the king,' in a letter written by a person in one country to a person in another, may mean the king either of the person writing, or of him to whom the letter is written." Granting that the Parthian empire had its own government, he is writing to persons in other provinces under Roman jurisdiction, and he enjoins them to obey the emperor as supreme, and the various governors sent by him for purposes of local administration. Moreover as has often been observed, the countries of the persons addressed in the epistle (1 Peter 1:1) are enumerated in the order in which a person writing from Babylon would naturally arrange them, beginning with those lying nearest to him, and passing in circuit to those in

the west and the south, at the greatest distance from him. The natural meaning of the designation Babylon is held by Erasmus, Calvin, Beza, Lightfoot, Wieseler, Mayerhoff, Bengel, De Wette, Bleek, and perhaps the majority of modern critics.

But if Peter wrote from Babylon on the Euphrates, at what period was the epistle written? The epistle itself contains no materials for fixing a precise date. It does not by its allusions clearly point to the Neronian persecution; it rather speaks of evil and danger suffered now, but with more in prospect. Suffering was endured and was also impending, and yet those who lived a quiet and blameless life might escape it, though certainly trials for righteousness' sake are implied and virtually predicted. About the year 60 the dark elements of Nero's character began to develop themselves, and *after* this epoch the epistle was written. The churches addressed in it were mostly planted by Paul, and it is therefore thought by some that Paul must have been deceased ere Peter would find it his duty to address them. Paul was plt to death about A.D. 64; but such a date would be too late for our epistle, as time would not, on such a hypothesis, be left for the apostle's going to Rome, according to old tradition, and for his martyrdom in that city. It may be admitted that Peter would not have intruded into Paul's sphere had Paul been free to write to or labor in the provinces specified. Still it may be supposed that Paul may have withdrawn to some more distant field of labor, or may have been suffering imprisonment at Rome. Davidson places the date in 63; Alford between 63 and 67. If the Mark of 5:13 be he of whom Paul speaks as being with him in Rome (<51040>Colossians 4:10), then we know that he was purposing an immediate journey to Asia Minor; and we learn from <55041>2 Timothy 4:11 that he had not returned when this last of Paul's epistles was written. It is surely not impossible for him to have gone in this interval to Peter at Babylon; and as he must have personally known the churches addressed by Peter, his salutation was naturally included by the apostle. Silvanus, by whom the epistle was sent-if the same with the Silvanus mentioned in the greetings <52001>1 Thessalonians 1:1; <53001>2 Thessalonians 1:1 seems to have left Paul before the epistles to Corinth were written. He may have in some way become connected with Peter, and, as the Silas of the Acts, he was acquainted with many of the churches to whom this epistle was sent. The terms "a faithful brother as I suppose" *(the faithful brother as I reckon)* do not imply any doubt of his character, but are only an additional recommendation to one whose

companionship with Paul must have been known in the provinces enumerated by Peter.

But Schwegler ascribes the epistle to a later periodto the age of Trajan; and of course denies its apostolic authorship *(Nach-apostol. Zeitalter*, 2:22). The argulments, however, for so late a date are very inconclusive. He first of all assumes that its language does not tally with the facts of the Neronian persecution, and that the tone is unimpassioned — that Christians were charged with definite crime under Nero — that his persecution did not extend beyond Rome — that it was tumultuary, and not, as this epistle supposes, conducted by regular processes, and that the general condition of believers in Asia Minor, as depicted in the epistle, suits the age of Trajan better than that of Nero. The reply is obvious — that the tranquillity of tone in this epistle would be remarkable under any persecution, for it is that of calm, heroic endurance, which trusts in an unseen arm, and has hopes undimmed by death; that the persecution of Christians simply for the name which they bore was not an irrational ferocity peculiar to Trajan's time; that in the provinces Christians were always exposed to popular fury and irregular magisterial condemnation; that there is no allusion to judicial trial in the epistle, for the word ἀπολογία does not imply it; and that the sufferings of Christians in Asia Minor as referred to or predicted do not agree with the recorded facts in Pliny's letter, for according to it they were by a formal investigation and sentence doomed to death (Huther, *Einleit.* page 28). The persecutions referred to in this epistle are rather such as Christians have always to encounter in heathen countries from an ignorant mob easily stirred to violence, and where the civil power, though inclined to toleration in theory, is yet swayed by strong prejudices, and prone, from position and policy, to favor and protect the dominant superstition.

Supposing this epistle to have been written at Babylon, it is a probable conjecture that Silvanus, by whom it was transmitted to those churches, had joined Petei after a tour of visitation, either in pursuance of instructions from Paul, then a prisoner at Rome, or in the capacity of a minister of high authority in the Church, and that his account of the condition of the Christians in those districts determined the apostle to write the epistle. From the absence of personal salutations, and other indications, it may perhaps be inferred that Peter had not hitherto visited the churches; but it is certain that he was thoroughly acquainted both with their external circumstances and spiritual state. It is clear that Silvanus is not regarded by Peter as one of his own coadjutors, but as one whose personal character he

had sufficient opportunity of appreciating (<60512>1 Peter 5:12). Such a testimonial as the apostle gives to the soundness of his faith would of course have the greatest weight with the Asiatic Christians, to whom the epistle appears to have been specially, though not exclusively addressed. The assumption that Silvanus was employed in the composition of the epistle is not borne out by the expression "by Silvanus I have written unto you," such words, according to ancient usage, applying rather to the bearer than to the writer or.amanuensis. Still it is highly probable that Silvanus, considering his rank, character, and special connection with those churches, and with their great apostle and founder, would be consulted by Peter throughout, and that they would together read the epistles of Paul, especially those addressed to the churches in those districts: thus, partly with direct intention, partly it may be unconsciously, a Pauline coloring, amounting in passages to something like a studied imitation of Paul's representations of Christian truth, may have been introduced into the epistle. It has been observed above, *SEE PETER* that there is good reason to suppose that Peter was in the habit of employing an interpreter; nor is there anything inconsistent with his position or character in the supposition that Silvanus, perhaps also Mark, may have assisted him in giving expression to the thoughts suggested to him by the Holy Spirit. We have thus, at any rate, a not unsatisfactory solution of the difficulty arising from correspondences both of style and modes of thought in the writings of two apostles who differed so widely in gifts and acquirements.

III. *Persons for whom the Epistle was intended.* — It was addressed to the churches of Asia Minor, which had for the most part been founded by Paul and his companions. From some expressions in the epistle many have thought that it was meant for Jewish Christians. The words of the salutation *are* — ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμοις διασπορᾶς Πόντου, etc. — "to the elect strangers of the dispersion," etc. Viewed by themselves the words seem to refer to *Jews* — διασπορά being often employed to designate Jews living out of Palestine. This opinion is held by many of the fathers, as Eusebius, Jerome, and Theophylact, and by Erasmus, Calvin, Beza, Grotius, Bengel, Hug, and Pott. A modification of this extreme view is maintained by Gerhard. Wolf, Jachmann, and Weiss, viz. that Jewish converts were chiefly regarded in the mass of Gentile believers. The arguments of Weiss need not be repeated, and they are well met by Huther *(Einleit.* page 21). But there are many things in the epistle quite irreconcilable with the idea of its being meant either solely or principally

for Jewish believers. He tells his readers that "sufficient lies the past for them to have wrought out the will of time Gentiles — as indeed ye walked in lasciviousness, wine-bibbing, revellings, drinking-bouts, and forbidden idolatries" — sins all of them, and the last particularly, which specially characterized the heathen world. Similarly does he speak (1 Peter 1:14) of "former lusts in your ignorance;" (1 Peter 3:6), of Sarah, "whose daughters ye have become" — ἐγενήθητε — they being not so by birth or blood. In 1 Peter 2:9, 10, they are said to be "called out of darkness," to have been "in time past not a people, but now the people of God." The last words, referring originally to Israel, had already been applied by Paul to Gentile believers in Romans 9:25. The term διασπορά may be used in a spiritual sense, and such a use is war. ranted by other clauses of the epistle — 1 Peter 1:17, " the time of your sojourning;" 1 Peter 2:11, "strangers and pilgrims." Peter, whose prepossessions had been so Jewish, and whose soul moved so much in the sphere of Jewish ideas from his very function as the apostle of the circumcision, instinctively employs national terms in that new and enlarged spiritual meaning which, through their connection with Christianity, they had come to bear. Besides, the history of the origin of these churches in Asia Minor shows that they were composed to a large extent of Gentile believers. Many of them may have been proselytes, though, as Wieseler has shown, it is wrong in Michaelis, Credner, and Neudecker to apply to such exclusively the terms in the address of this epistle. Nor is it at all a likely thing that Peter should have selected one portion of these churches and written alone or mainly to them. The provinces (1 Peter 1:1) included the churches in Galatia which are not named in Acts, as Ancyra and Pessinus, and the other communities in Iconium, Lystra, the Pisidian Antioch, Miletus, Colosse, Laodicea, Philadelphia, Thyatira, Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamus, Troas, etc. (Steiger, *Einleit.* sec. 6). That the persons addressed in the epistle were Gentiles is the view of Augustine, Luther, Wetstein, Steiger, Brickner, Mayerhoff,Wiesinger, Neander, Reuss, Schaff, and Huther. Reuss (page 133) takes πάροικοι and παρεπίδημοι as μywg, Israelites by faith, not by ceremonial observance. See also Weiss, *Der Petrinische Lehrbegriff,* page 28, n. 2.

IV. *Design, Contents, and Characteristics.* — The objects of the epistle, as deduced from its contents, coincide with the above assumptions. They were:

1. To comfort and strengthen the Christians in a season of severe trial.

2. To enforce the practical and spiritual duties involved in their calling.

3. To warn them against special temptations attached to their position.

4. To remove all doubt as to the soundness and completeness of the religious system which they had already received.

Such an attestation was especially needed by the Hebrew Christians, who were wont to appeal from Paul's authority to that of the elder apostles, and above all to that of Peter. The last, which is perhaps the very principal object, is kept in view throughout the epistle, and is distinctly stated (<60512>1 Peter 5:12).

These objects may come out more clearly in a brief analysis. The epistle begins with salutations and a general description of Christians (<60101>1 Peter 1:1, 2), followed by a statement of their present privileges and future inheritance (verses 3-5); the bearings of that statement upon their conduct under persecution (verses 6-9); reference, according to the apostle's wont, to prophecies concerning both the sufferings of Christ and the salvation of his people (verses 10-12); and exhortations based upon those promises to earnestness, sobriety, hope, obedience, and holiness, as results of knowledge of redemption, of atonement by the blood of Jesus, and of the resurrection, and as proofs of spiritual regeneration by the Word of God. Peculiar stress is laid upon the cardinal graces of faith, hope, and brotherly love, each connected with and resting upon the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel (verses 13-25). Abstinence from the spiritual sins most directly opposed to those graces is then enforced (<60201>1 Peter 2:1); spiritual growth is represented as dependent upon the nourishment supplied by the same Word which was the instrument of regeneration (verses 2, 3); and then, by a change of metaphor, Christians are represented as a spiritual house, collectively and individually as living stones, and royal priests, elect, and brought out of darkness into light (verses 4-10). This portion of the epistle is singularly rich in thought and expression, and bears the peculiar impress of the apostle's mind, in which Judaism is spiritualized, and finds its full development in Christ. From this condition of Christians, and more directly from the fact that they are thus separated from the world, pilgrims and sojourners, Peter deduces an entire system of practical and relative duties, self-control, care of reputation, especially for the sake of Gentiles; submission to all constituted authorities; obligations of slaves, urged with

remarkable earnestness, and founded upon the example of Christ and his atoning death (verses 11-25); and duties of wives and husbands (1 Peter 3:1-7). Then generally all Christian graces are commended, those which pertain to Christian brotherhood, and those which are especially needed in times of persecution, gentleness, forbearance, and submission to injury (verses 8-17): all the precepts being based on imitation of Christ, with warnings from the history of the. deluge, and with special reference to the baptismal covenant. In the following chapter (1 Peter 4:1, 2) the analogy between the death of Christ and spiritual mortification, a topic much dwelt upon by Paul, is urged with special reference to the sins committed by Christians before conversion, and habitual to the Gentiles. The doctrine of a future judgment is inculcated, both with reference to their heathen persecutors as a motive for endurance, mind to their own conduct as an incentive to sobriety, watchfulness, fervent charity, liberality in all external acts of kindness, and diligent discharge of all spiritual duties, with a view to the glory of God through Jesus Christ (verses 3-11). This epistle appears at the first draught to have terminated here with the doxology, but the thought of the fiery trial to which the Christians were exposed stirs the apostle's heart, and suggests additional exhortations. Christians are taught to rejoice in partaking of Christ's sufferings, being thereby assured of sharing his glory, which even in this life rests upon them, and is especially manifested in their innocence and endurance of persecution: judgment must come first to cleanse the house of God, then to reach the disobedient: suffering according to the will of God, they may commit their souls to him in welldoing as unto a faithful Creator. Faith and hope are equally conspicuous in these exhortations. The apostle then (1 Peter 5:1-4) addresses the presbyters of the churches, warning them as one of their own body, as a witness *(parve)* of Christ's sufferings, and partaker of future glory, against negligence, covetousness, and love of power; the younger members he exhorts to submission and humility, and concludes this part with a warning against their spiritual enemy, and a solemn and most beautiful prayer to the God of all grace. Lastly, he mentions Silvanus with special commendation, and states very distinctly what we have seen reason to believe was a principal object of the epistle, viz. that the principles inculcated by their former teachers were sound, the true grace of God, to which they are exhorted to adhere. A salutation from the Church in Babylon and from Mark, with a parting benediction, closes the epistle.

A few characteristic features may be more distinctly looked at. The churches addressed were in trialssuch trials as the spirit of that age must necessarily have brought upon them (<60317>1 Peter 3:17; 4:12-19). Those trials originated to some extent in their separation from the heathen amusements and dissoluteness in which they had mingled prior to their conversion (<60404>1 Peter 4:4, 5). They are exhorted to bear suffering patiently, and ever to remember the example, and endure in the spirit, of the Suffering One — the Righteous One who had suffered for them. While affliction would come upon them in the present time, they are ever encouraged to look Nith joyous anticipation to the future. Peter indeed might be called the apostle of hope. Doctrine and consolation alike assume this form. The "inheritance" is future, but its heirs are begotten to a "living hope" (<60103>1 Peter 1:3, 4). Their tried faith is found unto glory "at the appearance of Jesus Christ" (<60107>1 Peter 1:7). The *"end"* of their faith is "salvation" (<60109>1 Peter 1:9), and they are to "hope to the end for the grace to be brought at the revelation of Jesus Christ" (<60113>1 Peter 1:13). Their ruling emotion is therefore "the hope that is in them" (<60315>1 Peter 3:15); so much lying over in reserve for them in the future, their time here is only a "sojourning" (<60117>1 Peter 1:17); they were merely "strangers and pilgrims" (<60211>1 Peter 2:11); nay, "the end of all things is at hand" (<60407>1 Peter 4:7). Suffering was now, but joy was to come when his "glory shall be revealed" (<60501>1 Peter 5:1). In Christ's own experience as Prototype suffering led to glory (<60111>1 Peter 1:11; 4:13); the same connection the apostle applies to himself, and to faithful ministers (<60501>1 Peter 5:1-4). There are also allusions to Christ's words, or, rather, reminiscences of them mingle with the apostle's thoughts. Comp. 1 Peter 1: 4 with <402534>Matthew 25:34; 1:8 with <432029>John 20:29; 1:10 with <422404>Luke 10:24; 1:13 with <422235>Luke 12:35; 2:12 with <400516>Matthew 5:16; 3;13-15 with <400516>Matthew 5:16, 10:28; 5:6 with Matthew 33:12, etc.

There were apparently some tendencies in those churches that required reproof — some temptations against which they needed to be warned, as "former lusts," "fleshly lusts" (<60114>1 Peter 1:14, 11); dark and envious feelings (<60201>1 Peter 2:1; 3:8, 9); love of adornment on the part of women (<60303>1 Peter 3:3); and ambition and worldliness on the part of Christian teachers (<60501>1 Peter 5:1-4). God's gracious and tender relationship to his people was a special feature of the old covenant, and Peter reproduces it under the new in its closer and more spiritual aspects (<60209>1 Peter 2:9, 10; 4:17; 5:2). The old economy is neither eulogized nor disparaged, and no

remark is made on its abolition, the reasons of it, or the good to the world springing out of it. The disturbing question of its relation to Gentile believers is not even glanced at. In the apostle's view it had passed away by its development into another and grander system, one with it in spirit, and at the same time the realization of its oracles and types. His mind is saturated with O.-T. imagery and allusions, but they are freely applied to the spiritual Israel, which, having always existed within the theocracy, had now burst the national barriers, and was to be found in all the believing communities, whatever their lineage or country. To him the Jewish economy was neither supplanted by a rival faith nor superseded by a sudden revolution; Israel had only put off its ceremonial, the badge of its immaturity and servitude, and now rejoiced in freedom and predicted blessing. What was said of the typical Israel may now be asserted with deeper truth of the spiritual Israel. But the change is neither argued from premises laid down nor vindicated against Jews or Judaizers, and the results of the new condition are not held up as matter of formal congratulation; they are only seized and put forward as recognized grounds of joy, patience, and hope. The Redeemer stood out to Jewish hope as the Messiah; so Peter rejoices in that appellation, calling him usually Jesus Christ, and often simply Christ (1 Peter 1:11; 2:21; 3:16-18; 4:1, 13, 14); and it is remarkable that in nearly all those places the simple name Christ is used in connection with his sufferings, to the idea of which the Jewish mind had been so hostile. The centre of the apostle's theology is the Redeemer, the medium of all spiritual blessing. The relation of his expiatory work to sinners is described by ὑπέρ (1 Peter 2:12; 3:18); or it is said he bore our sins — τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἀνήνεγκεν; or died περὶ δ μαρτιῶν. "The sprinkling of blood" and the "Lamb without spot" were the fulfilment of the old economy, and the grace and salvation now enjoyed were familiar to the prophets (1 Peter 1:10). Christ who suffered is now in glory, and is still keeping and blessing his people.

In fine, the object, as told by the author (1 Peter 5:12), is essentially twofold. "I have written briefly, exhorting" *(παρακαλῶν);* and the epistle is hortatory-not didactic or polemical; "and testifying *(ἐπιμαρτυρῶν)* that this is the true grace of God wherein ye stand." The true grace of God — ἀληθὴς χάρις — could not be doctrine imparted through the apostle's personal teaching. Some of the fathers, indeed, affirm that Peter visited the provinces specified in this epistle. Origen gives it as a probable conjecture; and Eusebius says that the countries in which Peter preached the doctrine

of Christ appear from his own writings, and may be seen from this epistle. The assertion has thus no basis, save in the idea that Peter must have preached in the churches to which he sent an epistle. Jerome repeats the statement, and Epiphanius, as his wont is, intensifies it; but it has no foundation. Nay, the apostle, by a change of person, distinguishes himself from "them that have preached the Gospel unto you" (1 Peter 1:12). So that the "true grace" in which those churches stood was the Gospel which they had heard from others, and especially from Paul, by whom so many of them had been founded. The epistle, then, becomes a voucher for the genuineness of the Gospel preached in Asia Minor by the apostle of the uncircumcision. Not that, as Schwegler supposes, it attempts to mediate between James and Paul; for it proclaims the same truths, touching the peculiar aspects common to the two, without any dilution of Paul's distinctive forms, or any modification of Peter's as given in his oral addresses — both being in inner harmony, and differing only in mode of presentation, caused by mental diversity, or suggested by the peculiar circumstances, tendencies, or dangers of the churches which were warned or addressed.

V. *Style*. — The epistle is characterized by its fervor. The soul of the writer stamped its image on his thoughts and words — ὁ πανταχοῦ θερμός is the eulogy of Chrysostom. The epistle bears his living impress in his profound emotions, earnest convictions, and zealous thoroughness. He was never languid or half-hearted in what he said or did, though the old impulsiveness is chastened; and the fire which often flashed up so suddenly is more equable and tranquil in its glow. He is vivid without vehemence, and hurries on without impetuosity or abruptness. The epistle is throughout hortative, doctrine and quotation being introduced as forming the basis or warrant, or as showing the necessity and value of practical counsel or warning. There is in it little that is local or temporary; it is suited to the Church of all lands and ages; for believers are always in the present time "strangers and sojourners," with their gaze fixed on the future, exposed to trial and borne through by hope. The apostle infuses himself into the epistle, portrays the emotions which swayed and cheered him, as he reveals his own experience, which had been shaped by his past and present fellowship with a suffering and glorified Lord. What he unfolds or describes never stands apart as a theme by itself to be wrought out and argued; nor is it lifted as if to a lofty eminence that it may be admired from afar; but all is kept within familiar grasp, and inwrought into the relations,

duties, and dangers of everyday Christian existence. The truths brought forward are treated not in themselves, but in their immediate bearing on duty, trial, and hope; are handled quite in the way which one would describe air and food in their essential connection with life.

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

V. *Commentaries*. — The following are special exegetical helps on *both* epistles: Didymus Alexandrinus, *In Ep. Petri* (in *Bibl. Max Patr.* 5; and Galland. *Bibl. Patr.* 6); Bede, *Expositio* (in *Opp.* 5); Luther, *A uslegung* (1st Ep., Vitemb. 1523, 4to — with 2d En. ibid. 1524. 4to and 8vo, and later; also in Lat. and Germ. eds. of his works; in English, Lond. 1581, 4to); Bibliander, *Commentarii* (Basil. 1536, 8vo); Laurence, *Scholia* (Amst. 1540; Genev. 1669, 4to); Foleng, *Commentaria* [includ. James and 1 John] (Lugd. 1555, 8vo); Weller, *Enarratio* (Leips. 1557, 8vo); Sehlecker, *Commentaria* (Jen. 1567, 8vo); Feuardent, *Commentarius* (Par. 1600, 8vo) Winckelmain, *Commentarius* (Giess. 1608, 8vo); Turnemann, *Meditationes* (Frankf. 1625, 4to); Ames, *Explicatio* (Amst. 1635, 1643, 8vo; in English, Lond. 1641, 8vo); Byfield, *Sermons* [on 1-3] (Lond. 1637, fol.); Gerhard, *Commentarius* (ed. fil. Jen. 1641, 4to, and later); Nisbet, *Exposition* (Edinb. 1658, 8vo); Goltz, *Verklaringe* (Amst. 1689, 1690, 1721, 2 vols. 4to); Antonio, *Verklaringe* (Amst. 1693-7, 2 volumes, 4to; also in Germ., Brem. 1700, fol.); Anon, *Untersuchung* (Amsterd. 1702, 8vo); Lange, *Exegesis* (Halle, 1712, 4to, and later); Streso, *Meditationes* (Amst. 1717, 4to); Boyson, *Erklar.* (Halle, 1775, 8vo); Schirmer, *Erklar.* (Bresl. and Leips. 1778, 4to); Semler, *Paraphrasis* [includ. Jude] (Hal. 1783-4, 2 volumes, 8vo); Baumgirtel, *Anmerk.* (Leips. 1788, 8vo); Morus,

Praelectiones [includ. James], ed. Douat (Leips. 1794, 8vo); Hottinger, *Commentaria* [includ. 1 Pet.] (Leips. 1815, 8vo); Eisenschmid, *Erldut.* (Ronneb. 1824, 8vo); Mayerhoff, *Einleitung* (Hamb. 1835, 8vo); Windischmann (Rom. Cath.), *Vindiciae* (Ratisb. 1836, 8vo); Schlichthorst, *Entwickelung* (Stuttg. 1836 sq., 2 parts, 8vo); Demarest, *Exposition* (N.Y. 1851-65, 2 volumes, 8vo); Wiesinger, *Erkldr.* [includ. Jude] (Konigsb. 1856-62, 2 volumes, 8vo); Besser, *Ausleg.* (2d ed. Halle, 1857, 12mo); Schott, *Erklar.* [includ. Jude] (Erlang. 1861-3, 2 volumes, 8vo); Lillie, *Lectures* (Lond. and New York, 1869, 8vo). There are also articles on the authorship of the two epistles by Ranch, in Winer's *Krif. Journ.* 1828, page 385 sq.; by Seyler, in the *Theol. Stud. u. Krif.* 1832, page 44 sq.; by Bleek, *ibid.* 1836, page 1021 sq.; by J.Q.,in Kitto's *Journ. of Sac. Lit.*, January and July 1861; by Baur, in the *Theol. Jahrb.* 1856, page 193 sq.; by Weiss, *ibid.* 1865, page 619; and 1865, page 255. *SEE EPISTLE.*

The following are on the *first* epistle exclusively. Hessels, *Commentarius* (Lovan. 1568, 8vo); Schotan, *Commentarius* (Franek. 1644, 4to); Rogers, *Exposition:* (Lond. 1650. fol.); Leighton, *Commentary* (Lond. 1693, 2 vols. 8vo, and later); Van Alphen, *Terklar.* (Utr. 1734, 4to); Klemm, *Anacrisis* (Tub. 1748, 4to); Walther, *Erklar.* (Hanov. 1750, 4to); Moldenhauer, *Erklar.* Hamb. n. d. 8vo); Hensler, *Commentar* (Sulzb. 1813, 8vo); Steiger, *Ausleg.* (Berlin, 1832, 8vo; in English, Edinb. 1836, 2 volumes, 8vo); Lecoultre, *Prem. Ep. de P.* (Genev. 1839, 8vo); Brown, *Discourses* (2d ed. Edinb. 1849, 2 vols. 8vo, ibid. 1866, 3 volumes, 8vo, N.Y. 1850, 8vo); Kohlbrugge, *Predigten* [on chapter 2 and 3] (Leips. 1850, 8vo; in English, Lond. 1854, 8vo). *SEE COMMENTARY.*

Peter, Second Epistle Of

follows immediately the other, but it presents questions of far greater difficulty than the former. *SEE ANTILEGOMENA.*

I. *Canonical Authority.* — The genuineness of this second epistle has long been disputed, though its author calls himself "Simon Peter," δοῦλος καὶ ἀπόστολος, "a servant and an apostle of Jesus Christ."

1. *History of Opinion.* — It is hard to say whether the alleged quotations from it by the fathers are really quotations, or are only, on the one hand, allusions to the O.T., or, on the other, the employment of such phrases as had grown into familiar Christian commonplaces. Thus Clement of Rome, in his First Epistle to the Corinthians (chapter 7), says of Noah, ἐκήρυξε

μετάνοιαν, and of those who obeyed him, ἐσώθησαν, language not unlike 2 Peter 2:5; but the words can scarcely be called a quotation. The allusion in the same epistle to Lot (chapter 11) is of a similar nature, and cannot warrant the allegation of any proof from it. A third instance is usually taken from chapter 23, in which Clement says, "Miserable are the double-minded," a seeming reminiscence of James 1:5; but he adds, "We are grown old, and none of those things have happened to us" *(γεγηράκαμεν καὶ οὐδὲν ἡμῖν τούτων συμβεβηκεν)*, as if in alluision to 2 Peter 3:4. The appeal to Hermas is as doubtful; in lib. 1, *Vis.* 3:7, the words *reliquerunt viam veram* have a slight resemblance to 2 Peter 2:15; in another place (2 Peter 1:4:3) the clause *qui effugistis sceculum hoc* is not a citation of ἀποφυγόντες τὰ μιάσματα τοῦ κοσμοῦ, 2 Peter 2:20. Justin Martyr says, "A day with the Lord is as a thousand years" *(Dialog. cumn Tryph.* cap. 81; *Opera,* 2:278, ed. Otto, Jene, 1843), but the clause may as well be taken from Psalm 90:4 as from 2 Peter 3:8. Similar statements occur twice in Irenaeus, and have probably a similar origin, as citations from the O.T. The epistle is not quoted by Tertullian, the Alexandrian Clement, nor Cyprian, who speaks only of one epistle. A passage in Hippolytus *(De Antichristo,* 2), in asserting of the prophets that they did not speak "by their own power" *(*ἐξ ἰδίας δυνάμεως*)*, but uttered things which God had revealed, appears to be a paraphrase of 2 Peter 1:21. Another statement made by Theophilus *(Ad Autolycum,* lib. 2, page 87), in which he describes the prophets as πνευματοφόροι πνεύματος ἁγίου, is not unlike 2 Peter 1:20, ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι. Theophilus again describes the word shining as a lamp in a house — φαίνων σπερ λύχνος ἐν οἰκήματι*;* but the figure is different from that in 2 Peter 1:19, ὡς λύχνῳ φαίνοντι ἐν αὐχμηρῷ τόπῳ — "as a light shining in a dark place." Clement of Alexandria commented, we are told by Eusebius and Cassiodorus, on all the canonical Scriptures, Eusebius specifying among them "Jude and the other Catholic epistles" — καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς καθολικὰς ἐπιστολάς *(Hist. Eccles.* 6:14). But a second statement of Cassiodorus mentions expressly the first epistle of Peter, as if the second had been excluded, and adds, "1 and 2 John and James," thereby also excluding Jude, which Eusebius, however, had distinctly named *(De Institut.* cap. 8). The testimony of Origen is no less liable to doubt, for it seems to vary. In the translation of Rufinnus, who certainly was not a literal versionist, we find the epistle at least three times referred to, one of them being the assertion, " Petrus enim duabus epistolarum suarum personat tubis" *(Hom.* 4, on Joshua). In *Hom.* 4 on

Leviticus, ⁶⁰¹⁰⁴2 Peter 1:4 is quoted, and in *Hom. xiii* on Numbers, ⁶⁰¹⁰⁶2 Peter 2:16 is quoted. Somewhat in opposition to this, Origen, in his extant works in Greek, speaks of the first epistle as ἐν τῇ καθολικῇ ἐπ.; nay, as quoted by Eusebius *(Hist. Eccles.* 6:25), he adds that "Peter left one acknowledged epistle," adding ἔστω δὲ καὶ δευτέραν ἀμφιβάλλεται γάρ. This is not a formal denial of its genuineness, but is tantamount to it. Nor can the words of Firmilian be trusted in their Latin version. Yet in his letter to Cyprian he seems to allude to 2 Peter, and the warnings in it against heretics (Cypriani *Opera,* page 126, ed. Paris, 1836). In a Latin translation of a commentary of Didymus on the epistle it is called *falsata, non in canone.* Now *falsare,* according to Du Fresne in his *Glossar. med. et infim. Latinitat.,* does not mean to interpolate, but to pronounce spurious. Eusebius has placed this epistle among the ἀντιλεγόμενα *(Hist. Eccles.* 3:25), and more fully he declares, "That called his second epistle we have been told has not been received, οὐκ ἐνδιάθετον*;* but yet appearing to many to be useful it has been diligently studied with the other Scriptures." Jerome says explicitly, "Scripsit duas epistolas . . . quarum secunda a plerisque ejus esse negatur;" adding as the reason, "propter styli cum priore dissonantiam," and ascribing this difference to a change of amanuensis, *diversis interpretibus (De Script. Eccles.* cap. 1, epist. 120, ad Hedib. cap. 11). Methodius of Tyre makes two distinct allusions to a peculiar portion of the epistle (3:6, 7, 12, 13), the conflagration and purification of the world (Epiphan. *Haeres.* 64:31, tom. 1, pars post. page 298, ed. Oehler, 1860). Westcott *(On the Canon,* page 57) points out a reference in the martyrdom of Ignatius, in which (cap. ii) the father is compared to "a divine lamp illuminating the hearts of the faithful by his exposition of the Holy Scriptures" (⁶⁰¹⁰⁹2 Peter 1:19). The epistle is not found in the Peshito, though the Philoxenian versioa has it, and Ephrem Syrus accepted it. The canon of Muratori has it not, and Theodore of Mopsuestia rejected it. But it was received by Athanasius, Philastrius, Cyril, Rufinus, and Augustine. Gregory of Nazianzum, in his *Carmen* 33, refers to the seven catholic epistles. It was adopted by the Council of Laodicea, 367, and by the Council of Carthage, 397. From that period till the Reformation it was acknowledged by the Church. Not to refer to other quotations often given, it may suffice to say that, though the epistle was doubted, it usually had a place in the canon; that the objections against it were not historical, but critical in nature. and had their origin apparently among the Alexandrian scholars; and that in one case at least, that of Cosmas Indicopleustes, doctrinal prepossessions led to its rejection,

Gregory, at the end of the 6th century, seems to allude to others whose hostility to it had a similar origin, adding, "Si ejusdem epistolse verba pensare voluissent, longe aliter sentire potuerant." (See Olshausen, *Opuscula,* where the citations are given at length.) The old doubts about the epistle were revived at the time of the Reformation, and not a few modern critics question or deny its genuineness. In earlier times strong disbelief was expressed by Calvin, Erasmus, Grotius, and Salmasius. Scaliger, Semler, Credner, De Wette, Neander, and Mayerhoff deny its Petrine origin. Pott, Windischmann, Dalll, Qaussen, and Bonnet, on the other hand, make light of many objections to it. But the proofs adduced on its behalf by Dietlein *(Die* 2. *Ep. Petri,* 1851) are many of them unsatisfactory, the result of a dextrous and unscrupulous ingenuity on behalf of a foregone conclusion. Yet amid early doubts and modern objections we are inclined to accept this epistle, and to agree with the verdict of the early churches, which were not without the means of ample investigation, and to whom satisfactory credentials must have been presented.

The objections, as Jerome remarks, were based on difference of style, and we admit that there is ground for suspicion on the point. Still no doubter or impugner who placed the epistle among the ἀντιλεγόμενα gives any historical ground for his hostility. No one of old is ever brought forward as having denied it in his own name, or in the name of any early Church, to be Peter's. If the apostolic fathers do not quote it, it can only be inferred either that it was not in universal circulation, or that they had no occasion to make any use of it. We observe that it was not likely to be quoted frequently; it was addressed to a portion of the Church not at that time much in intercourse with the rest of Christendom: the documents of the primitive Church are far too scanty to give weight to the argument (generally a questionable one) from omission. Their silence would not warrant the assertion that the epistle was not in the canon during their period, and for half a century afterwards. The earliest impugners never speak of it as a book recently admitted into the canon, or admitted on insufficient evidence or authority. One objection of this nature would have been palpable and decisive. The silence of the fathers is accounted for more easily than its admission into the canon after the question as to its genuineness had been raised. It is not conceivable that it should have been received without positive attestation from the churches to which it was first addressed. We know that the autographs of apostolic writings were

preserved with care. It may be added that there appears to be no probable motive for a forgery. Neither personal ambition nor ecclesiastical pretensions are in any way forwarded by the epistle. There is nothing in it that an apostle might not have written, nothing that comes into direct conflict with Peter's modes of thought, either as recorded in the Acts or as found in the first epistle. No little circumstantial evidence can be adduced in its favor, and its early appearance in the callon is an element of proof which can it easily be turned aside.

The doubts as to its genuineness appear to have originated with the critics of Alexandria, where, nevertheless, the epistle itself was formally recognised at a very early period. Those doubts, however, were not quite so strong as they are now generally represented. The three greatest names of that school may be quoted on either side. On the one hand there were evidently external credentials, without which it could never have obtained circulation; on the other, strong subjective impressions, to which these critics attached scarcely less weight than some modern inquirers. They rested entirely, so far as can be ascertained, on the difference of style. The opinions of modern commentators may be summed up under three heads. Many, as we have seen, reject the epistle altogether as spurious, supposing it to have been directed against forms of Gnosticism prevalent in the early part of the 2d century. A few consider that the first and last chapters were written by Peter or under his dictation, but that the second chapter was interpolated. So far, however, is either of these views from representing the general results of the latest investigations, that a majority of names, including nearly all the writers of Germany opposed to Rationalism, who in point of learning and ability are at least upon a par with their opponents, may be quoted in support of the genuineness and authenticity of this epistle. The statement that all critics of eminence and impartiality concur in rejecting it is simply untrue, unless it be admitted that a belief in the reality of objective revelation is incompatible with critical impartiality, that belief being the only common point between the numerous defenders of the canonicity of this document. If it were a question now to be decided for the first time upon the external or internal evidences still accessible, it may be admitted that it would be far more difficult to maintain this than any other document in the New Testament; but the judgment of the early Church is not to be reversed without far stronger arguments than have been adduced, more especially as the epistle is entirely free from objections which might be brought, with more show of reason, against others now all but

universally received: it inculcates no new doctrine, bears on no controversies of post-apostolical origin, supports no hierarchical innovations, but is simple, earnest. devout, and eminently practical, full of the characteristic graces of the apostle, who, as we believe, bequeathed this last proof of faith and hope to the Church. Olshausen's deliberate conclusion is —

> **"1.** That our epistle, as far as we can ascertain from history, was used by the Church, and was generally read, along with the other catholic epistles;
>
> **2.** There were those who denied that Peter was the author of this epistle, but they were influenced particularly by critical and, perhaps, by doctrinal reasons;
>
> **3.** That there were historical considerations which led them to assail our epistle is not probable; certainly it cannot be demonstrated. *History, then, avails scarcely anything in overthrowing the authority of our epistle" (Integr. and Authent. of Second Epistle of Peter,* transl. in *Amer. Bibl. Repos.* July 1836, pages 123-131).

2. *Internal Evidence.* — There are points of similarity in style between it and the first epistle. The salutation in both epistles is the same, and there are peculiar words common to both, though found also in other parts of the N.T. Both epistles refer to ancient prophecy (<61016>1 Peter 1:16; <61020>2 Peter 1:20, 21); both use ἀρετή as applicable to God (<61209>1 Peter 2:9; <61003>2 Peter 1:3), and both have ἀπόθεσις (<60321>1 Peter 3:21; <61014>2 Peter 1:14), which occurs nowhere else in the N.T.; ἀναστροφή is a favorite term (<60115>1 Peter 1:15, 17, 18; 2:12; 3:1, 2, 16; <61207>2 Peter 2:7-18; 3:11); the verb ἐποπτεύειν in <60212>1 Peter 2:12; 3:20, corresponds to the noun ἐπόπτης (<61016>2 Peter 1:16) ; the peculiar collocation ἄσπιλος καὶ ἄμωμος (<60119>1 Peter 1:19) has an echo of itself (<61213>2 Peter 2:13; 3:14); πέπαυται ἁμαρτίας (<60401>1 Peter 4:1) is not unlike ἀκαταπαύστους ἁμαρτίας, etc. (<61214>2 Peter 2:14). We have also, as in the first epistle, the intervention of several words between the article and its substantive (<61004>2 Peter 1:4; 2:7; 3:2). The frequent use of ἐν in a qualifying clause is common to both epis. ties (<61004>2 Peter 1:4; 2:3; 3:10). The recurrence of similar terms marks the second epistle, but it is not without all parallel in the first. Thus <61003>2 Peter 1:3, 4, δεδωρημένης, δεδώρηται; <61207>2 Peter 2:7, 8, δίκαιος, three times; <61212>2 Peter 2:12, φθοράν ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ

καταφθαρήσονται. So, too, in <61301>1 Peter 3:1, 2, ἀναστροφῆς, ἀναστροφή; and <61217>2 Peter 2:17, τιμήσατε, τιμᾶτε, etc. Then too, as in the first epistle, there are resemblances to the speeches of Peter as given in the Acts. Comp. ἡμέρα κυρίου (<61310>2 Peter 3:10) with <44220>Acts 2:20 — the phrase occurring elsewhere only in <52524>1 Thessalonians 5:24; λαχοῦσιν (<61101>2 Peter 1:1) with ἔλαχε (<44117>Acts 1:17); εὐσεβείαν (<61106>2 Peter 1:6) with <44312>Acts 3:12; and εὐσεβεῖς (2:9) with <44102>Acts 10:2-7: κολαζομένους (ib.) with <44421>Acts 4:21-an account which Peter probably furnished. We have likewise an apparent characteristic in the double genitives (<61302>2 Peter 3:2; <44532>Acts 5:32).

It is also to be borne in mind that the epistle asserts itself to have been written by the apostle Peter, and distinctly identifies its writer with the author of the first epistle — "This epistle now, a second, I write unto you, in both which I stir up" — averring also to some extent identity of purpose. It is not anonymous, like the epistle to the Hebrews, but definitely claims as its author Peter the apostle. Nay, the writer affirms that he was an eye-witness of the transfiguration, and heard "the voice from the excellent glory." He uses, moreover, two terms in speaking of that event which belong to the account of it in the Gospels; comp. <61013>2 Peter 1:13, σκηνώματι, with his own words σκηνὰς τρεῖς; also in 15, ἔξοδον, in reference to his own death-the same word being employed to denote Christ's death, τὴν ἔξοδον αὐτοῦ, this being the theme of conversation on the part of Moses and Elias (<42931>Luke 9:31). Ullmann supposes the reference in the words δίκαιον δὲ ἡγοῦμαι διεγειρειν (1:13) to be to Mark's Gospel said to have been composed on Peter's authority; but the allusion seems to be to the paragraph immediately under his hand. It would have been a profane and daring imposture for any one to personate an apostle, and deliver to the churches a letter in his name, with so marked a reference to one of the most memorable circumstances and glories in the apostle's life. A forgery so glaring could make no pretence to inspiration to be a product of the Spirit of Truth. The inspiration of the epistle is thus bound up with the question of its authorship, so that if it is not the work of Peter it must be rejected altogether from the canon. The opinion of critics of what is called the liberal school, including all shades from Liucke to Baur, has been decidedly unfavorable, and that opinion has been — adopted by some able writers in England. There are, however, very strong reasons why this verdict should be reconsidered. No one ground on which it rests is unassailable. The rejection of this book affects the authority of

the whole canon, which, in the opinion of one of the keenest and least scrupulous critics (Reuss) of modern Germany, is free from any other error. It is not a question as to the possible authorship of a work like that of the Hebrews, which does not bear the writer's name. The Church, which for more than fourteen centuries has received it, has either been imposed upon by what must in that case be regarded as a satanic device, or derived from it spiritual instruction of the highest importance. If received, it bears attestation to some of the most important facts in our Lord's history, casts light upon the feelings of the apostolic body in relation to the elder Church and to each other, and, while it confirms many doctrines generally inculcated, is the chief, if not the only, voucher for eschatological views touching the destruction of the framework of creation, which from an early period have been prevalent in the Church.

3. *Objections*. — There are serious difficulties, however, in the way of its reception; and these are usually said to be difference of style, difference of doctrine, and the marked correspondence of portions of the epistle with that of Jude. Yet Gaussen makes the astounding statement — "The two epistles when carefully compared reveal more points of agreement than difference," but he has not taken the trouble of noting them *(On the Canon*, page 359). The employment of ὡς is different in the second epistle from the first. There, though it occurs otherwise, it is generally employed in comparisons, and its frequency makes it a characteristic of the style; but it occurs much more rarely in the second epistle, and usually, though not always, with a different meaning and purpose. The use of ἀλλά after a negative clause and introducing a positive one is common in the first epistle, and but rare in the second. There are many ἅπαξ λεγόμενα in the second epistle. The first and second epistles differ also in the use of Χριστός. In the first epistle X. stands in the majority of instances without the article and by itself, either simply I. X. or X. I.; but in the second epistle it has usually some predicate attached to it (<610101>2 Peter 1:1, 2, 8; 2:14-16). The name θεός occurs nearly forty times in the first epistle, but only seven times in the second. Again, κύριος is applied to Christ only once in the first epistle (<600103>1 Peter 1:3), but in the second epistle it is a common adjunct to other names of the Savior. In the first epistle it means the Father in all cases but one (<600203>1 Peter 2:3), but in the second epistle it denotes the Son, in harmony with Peter's own declaration (<440236>Acts 2:36; 10:36). The epithet σωτήρ, so often applied to Christ in the second epistle, is not found in the first. The second coming of our Lord is also expressed differently in

the two epistles. ἀποκάλυψις, or its verb, being used in the first epistle (<60105>1 Peter 1:5, 7, 13; 4:13; 5:1); or it is called τὸ τέλος πάντων (<60407>1 Peter 5:7); or χρόνοι ἔσχατοι (<60120>1 Peter 1:20). But in the second epistle it is called ἡμέρα κρίσεως (<61009>2 Peter 2:9), παρουσία (<61304>2 Peter 3:4), ἡμέρα κυρίου (<61310>2 Peter 3:10), ἡμέρα θεοῦ (<61312>2 Peter 3:12). These are certainly marked diversities, and it is difficult to offer a satisfactory explanation of them. It may, however, be replied that with the sacred writers the divine names are not used, as with us, without any prominent or distinctive application. In the first epistle the Redeemer's names are his common ones, the familiar ones in the mouths of all believers — for the writer brings into prominence the oneness of believers with him in suffering and glory; with him still as Jesus wearing his human name and his human nature with all its sympathies; or as the Christ who, as the Father's servant, obeyed, suffered, and was crowned, the Spirit that anointed him still being "the unction from the Holy One" to all his people. In the second epistle the writer has in view persons who are heretics, rebellious, dissolute, false teachers; and in warning them his mind naturally looks to the authority and lordship of the Savior, which it was so awful to contemn and so vain to oppose. If the last day be set in different colors in the two epistles, the difference may be accounted for on the same principle: for to those suffering under trial it shines afar as the hope that sustains them, but to those who are perverse it presents itself as the time of reckoning which should alarm them into believing submission.

The aspects under which the Gospel is represented in this second epistle differ from those in the first. The writer lays stress on ἐπίγνωσις, or γνῶσις (<61002>2 Peter 1:2, 3, 5, 8; 2:20, 11; 3:18). In this epistle the Gospel is generally Χριστοῦ δύναμις καὶ παρουσία (<61016>2 Peter 1:16), ὁδὸς τῆς δικαιοσύνης (<61021>2 Peter 2:21), ἁγία ἐντολή, etc.; whereas the first epistle throws into prominence ἐλπίς, σωτηρία, ῥαντισμὸς αἵματος I. X., χάρις (<61010>2 Peter 1:10) ἀλήθεια (<61002>2 Peter 1:22), λόγος (2:8), πιστις, etc. The reason may be ventured that the persons addressed in the second epistle were in danger of being tempted into error; and that a definite and progressive knowledge of Christianity was the safeguard against those loose speculations which were floating around them. On this account, too, we have admonition suggested and pointed by their perilous circumstances, "to make their calling and election sure" (<61010>2 Peter 1:10; 3:14); nay, the purpose of the epistle seems to be given in <61317>2 Peter 3:17: "Ye therefore, beloved, knowing beforehand, take heed lest, being led

away with the error of the lawless, ye fall away from your own steadfastness; but grow in grace, and in the knowledge of oul Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." The ἐπίγνωσις is the grand theme of counsel and the real prophylactic presented, for it embodies itself in that δικαιοσύνη on the possession of which so much depends, as is seen in the allusions to Noah and Lot, and to the want of which are traced in contrast the judgment of the flood and the fate of Sodom, the selfish character of Balaam, and the dark and deceitful ways and works of the false teachers.

There is also a characteristic difference in the mode of quotation from the O.T. Quotations are abundant in the first epistle, either formally introduced by διότι γέγραπται (<600116>1 Peter 1:16), or by διότι περιέχει ἐν τῇ γραφῇ (1:6), or are woven into the discourse without any prefatory statement, as if writer and readers were equally familiar with them (<610102>2 Peter 1:24; 2:3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 22, 24, 25; 3:9, 10, 11, 15). But in the second epistle quotations are unfrequent, though we have <199004>Psalm 90:4 in 3:8, and <236517>Isaiah 65:17 in <610313>2 Peter 3:13. Of a different kind are the allusions to Noah and the flood, to Lot and Sodom, and to Balaam. But we may still explain that the modes of handling and applying the O.T. may differ according to the purpose which any writer has in view. In a longer and fuller epistle there may be quotations at length, but in a shorter one only apposite allusions to facts and incidents. The objection would have been stronger if in an epistle ascribing itself to Peter there had been no use made of the O.T. at all; but a third of this epistle consists of references to the O.T. or to warnings drawn from it.

The peculiar similarity of a large portion of this epistle to that of Jude has often been commented on. The second chapter and a portion of the third are so like Jude that the resemblance cannot be accidental, for it is found in words as well as in thoughts. It has been conjectured by some that both borrowed from a common source. Bishop Sherlock supposed that this source was some ancient Hebrew author who had portrayed the false teachers, Jude having used the epistle of Peter as well as this old authority *(Use and Intent of Prophecy,* Dissert. 1:200, Lond. 1725). Herder and Hasse, holding this theory, conjecture the document common to both writers to be the Zendavesta. This opinion has no foundation, and relieves us of no difficulty. Others imagine that Jude followed Peter, and several reasons have been alleged in favor of this opinion by Mill, Michaelis, Storr, Dahl, Wordsworth, Thiersch, Hleydenreich, Hengstenberg, and Gaussen. Their general argument is that Peter predicts what Jude describes as

actually existing (Jude 18), and that Jude refers to prophecies which are found only in Peter. But it is really doubtful if both epistles refer to the same class of errorists. Those described by Peter are rather speculators, though their immoral practices are also noted, while those branded by Jude are specially marked as libertines and sensualists, whose life has perverted and undermined their creed. Others again hold that Peter took from Jude; such is the view of Hug, Eichhorn, Credner, Neander, Mayerhoff, De Wette, Guericke, and Bleek. One argument of no small force is that the style of Jude is the simpler and briefer, and Peter's the more ornate and amplified; that Jude's is more pointed and Peter's more indefinite; and that some allusions in Peter are so vague that they can be understood only by a comparison with Jude (comp. 2 Peter 2:4 with Jude 1:6; 2 Peter 2:11 with Jude 1:9). Thus Peter says, generally, "Angels bring not railing accusations;" Jude gives the special instance, Michael and Satan. Peter speaks of the "angels that sinned;" Jude says more precisely, they "kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation." Olshausen and Augusti in part think that the similarity may be accounted for by a previous correspondence between the writers; that Jude may have described to Peter the character and practices of the false teachers, and that Peter, relying on the truthfulness of the statement, made his own use of it without hesitation when he had occasion to refer to the same or a similar class of pernicious subverters of truth and purity. This hypothesis is scarcely probable, and it is more likely that Peter had read the epistle of Jude, and reproduced in his own epistle and in his own way its distinctive clauses, which must have deeply impressed him, but with such differences at the same time as show that he was no mere copyist. Is it unworthy of an apostle to use another writing divinely authorized, and can Peter's appropriation of so much of Jude's language be stigmatized, as by Reuss, as "a palpable plagiarism?" Thus Jude uses the phrase “clouds without water," but Peter "wells without water," this figure being more suited to his immediate purpose. The σπιλάδες of Jude 12 was from reminiscence of sound before Peter's mind, but it is changed of purpose into σπῖλοι; and Jude's phrase ἐν ταῖς ἀγάπαις ὑμῶν becomes in the same connection in Peter ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις αὐτῶν. 2 Peter 2:17 shows a like similarity and difference compared with Jude 1:13. The claim of originality thus lies on the side of Jude, while original thinking characterizes Peter's use of Jude's terser and minuter diction. There is no ground for Bertholdt's suggestion to reject the second chapter as spurious; or for Ullmann's, to refer both second and third chapters to a post-apostolic period; or for Lange to brand as spurious

the whole of the second chapter with the last two verses of the first chapter, and the first ten verses of the third-that is, from the first τοῦτο πρῶτον γινώσκοντες to the other; or for Bunsen to receive only the first twelve verses and the concluding doxology (Bertholdt, *Einleit. in d. N.T.* volume 6; Ullmann, *Der zweite Brief Petri;* Lange, *Apostol. Zeitalter,* 1:152; and in Herzog's *Eincyklop.* s.v.; Bunsen, *Ignatius von Antiochien.* page 175).

Other more specific objections against the epistle may be briefly alluded to. According to Mayerhoff *(Einleit.* page 187), the writer in 2 Peter 3:2 separates himself from the apostles; Bleek *(Einleit.* page 576) and others supposing that he intended to characterize himself as an apostle, and having before him the somewhat parallel expression of Jude, he so far altered it, but in the alteration has failed to give lucid utterance to his purpose. The phrase, with the double genitive καὶ τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν ἐντολῆς τοῦ κυρίου, naturally means, "and the commandment of the Lord given by your apostles." The pronoun ὑμῶν is the best-sustained reading, and the English version does violence to the position of the words. As Olshausen and Windischmann have shown, the use of ὑμῶν does not exclude Peter, even though it be rendered "the commandments of your apostles of the Lord Jesus." In fact, it neither denies nor affirms his apostleship; though if ἡμῶν had been employed, and the phrase rendered "our apostles," the conclusion against its genuineness would certainly have some weight. But this objection that the writer excludes himself from the apostles neutralizes another, to wit, that the writer betrays too great anxiety to show himself as the apostle Peter. He could not certainly do both in the same document without stultifying himself. Does not the apostle Paul when it serves his object use pointedly the first person singular, refer to himself, and assert his apostolic office as Peter does in 2 Peter 1:12, 13, 14, 15? The use of the name Συμεών;Λ in 2 Peter 1:1 can neither tell for the genuineness, as Dietlein supposes, nor against it, as Mayerhoff argues. The reference in 2 Peter 3:1 to a former epistle is not for the purpose of identifying himself with the author of that epistle, but naturally comes in as a proof of his anxiety for his readers that they should bear in memory the lessons already imparted to them.

It is said that the first epistle was addressed to a particular circle of churches (1 Peter 1:1), while the second was to Christians in general (2 Peter 1:1), yet it assumed (2 Peter 3:1) that the readers were in both cases the same, the confusion being increased by the fact that in

chapter 2 Peter 1:16 the writer speaks as if he had been their personal instructor, whereas in 2 Peter 3:15 he treats them as the disciples of Paul. But we may well suppose that the first epistle, directed to a large enough circle at first, must soon have taken its place as a general epistle. The inspired penmen knew well that, though there was a paiticular occasion for their writing and special counsels to be given, yet their teachings were to be for the guidance of the whole Church. Hence we sometimes find them directing that their letters should be read beyond the first community to which they came (Colossians 4:16; 1 Thessalonians 5:27). Peter miight therefore properly write a second time to Christians without express limitation of country, and still regard his readers as those whom he had admonished before. It is not necessary to suppose that by his expression in 2 Peter 1:16 he means personal instruction: the reference was to what he had said in his former letter. We must consider too the circumstances under which he wrote at all. There was a spurious kind of wisdom corrupting the Church (Colossians 2:8, 16-23). Jewish traditions had their influence; and sensual indulgence was sure to follow. Paul, who had carefully watched the churches he had planted, had been long a prisoner, and was thus withdrawn from active superintendence of them. Very fitting therefore it was that Peter, the apostle of the circumcision, should write as he did at first, to confirm the doctrine learned of Paul, and to inculcate the holy principles and unblemished conduct which could alone fortify believers against impending persecution. Yet he anticipates in the first letter a further declension, and a greater necessity for faithful resistance of error (1 Peter 4:1-4). Now we know that the evil did increase; and Paul in the pastoral epistles speaks of serious depravation of doctrine, and more open lawlessness of conduct (1 Timothy 1:19, 20; 4:1; 2 Timothy 2:17, 18; 3:1-7). The second epistle of Peter was called for, then, to check the progress of false teaching and of unbecoming conduct: it takes up the matter at a point historically later than the first; but it handles the same topics, and so is a proper supplement to it. Thus, as Schott says (page 162), "That which presented itself in the first epistle we see also in the second; the same uncertainty respecting the gospel-standing of Gentile Christians, and the gospel-teaching of Paul (2 Peter 1:1, 10, 12; 3:2, 15, etc.); the same questionings about the revelation of Christ, the resurrection of the body, and the final judgment (2 Peter 1:4, etc., 11, 12, etc., 16, etc.; 2 Peter 2:9; 3:2, 8, etc., 10, etc., 18); the same tendency to relax in the work of Christian sanctification (2 Peter 1:5-12, etc.; 2 Peter 3:11, etc., 14, 17)." Other noteworthy traces he believes he

can detect of a relationship between the two. Some of these are a debased state of religious knowledge grounded on Jewish writings alien from the true teaching of Scripture, and an affected spirituality which fostered sensual indulgence. Evidence that such evils existed at the time of writing may be found more clearly in the second, more faintly, but yet noticeably, in the first epistle.

Three arguments have been adduced to prove that the epistle must belong to post-apostolic times.

(1.) It is alleged that the doubts about Christ's second coming, referred to in 2 Peter 3:3, 4, could not have arisen in apostolic times, when the belief in it was so firm and glowing; and a period of some length must have elapsed ere it could be said that the "fathers had fallen asleep." But the scoffers referred to were probably Gnostics who never believed that event, or at all events spiritualized the truth of it away; and after one generation had passed they might use the language imputed to them; or "the fathers" may, denote the Jewish patriarchs, since whose decease uniformity had characterized all the processes and laws of nature. The Gnostic spiritualism which treated the resurrection as past early troubled the Church, and its disciples might cast ridicule on the faith and hopes of others in the challenge which Peter quotes.

(2.) It is said that the allusion to Paul's epistles indicates a late date, as it supposes them to be collected in part at least, and calls them by the sacred name of *ypacoal* (2 Peter 3:15, 16). But surely it may be granted that towards the close of Peter's life several epistles of Paul may have been brought together and placed in point of authority on the same level as the O.T.; and that other documents also — τὰς λοιπὰς γραφάς — already occupied a similar place. Whatever exegesis be adopted, this is the general result. The writings of Paul, so well known to the readers of this epistle, are mentioned not as a completed whole; the phrase ἐν πάσαις, etc., is not to be taken absolutely, but relatively, as if denoting "in all his epistles which he writes." The "things" referred to as discussed in these epistles (περὶ τούτων*)* are not their general contents, but the coming of our Lord and the end of the world, and in these discussions "are some things hard to be understood." The allusion certainly presupposes a late age, and the writer, as he informs us, was very near his death. The date of Peter's death is not precisely known, and the common traditions concerning it may therefore be modified. As Alford says, a later date than the usual one may

be assigned to it. 3. Again, it is held, as by Neander, that the epithet "holy mount," as applied to the hill of transfiguration, indicates a late period, for Zion only was so designated; and Mayerhoff affirms that the epithet suits Mount Zion alone. But the scene on which the glory of Jesus had been so displayed might many years afterwards be well called "holy" by one who was an eyewitness, when he referred to it as a proof and symbol of "the power and coming of the Lord Jesus."

Still, while a partial reply may be given to objections based on difference of style and of doctrinal representation, it must in honesty be added that these differences are not all of them wholly accounted for. The style and matter, as a whole, are so unlike the first epistle, that one has considerable difficulty in ascribing both epistles to the same author. While there is similarity in some words or phrases, the spirit, tone, and manner of the whole epistle are widely diverse. Minute criticism may discover ἅπαξ λεγόμενα, and arrange them in proof parallel to similar usage in the first epistle; but such minutiae do not hide the general dissimilitude. It may be argued, and the argument is not without weight, that a forger would have imitated the salient peculiarities of the first epistle. No one of ordinary critical discernment would have failed to attempt the reproduction of its characteristic features of style and thought. But the absence of such studied likeness is surely in favor of the genuineness. It may be added also that, as there are in the first epistle statements so peculiar to it as to be found nowhere else, the same specialty in what seems to be undesigned coincidence marks the second epistle in the declarations of its third chapter. It would have been difficult in the second century to impose on the churches a second epistle forged in Peter's name, and so unlike in many points to his first. A direct imitation of his style might have deceived some of the churches by its obvious features of similitude, but the case is widely different when a writing so obviously unlike the first epistle won its way into circulation unchallenged in its origin and history, and was not doubted save at length by scholars and mainly on critical grounds. Why did not Origen and others tell us of the time of its first appearance, and how and by whom it was placed in the canon? Possibly on such points they were ignorant, or at least they knew nothing that warranted suspicion. Still the difference of manner between the two epistles remains, and perhaps one might account for it, as Jerome has hinted and Calvin has supposed, by the supposition that Peter dictated the epistle in Aramaic, and that the amanuensis was left to express the thoughts in his own forms and phrases.

Difference of condition and purpose may account for difference of topic, and the change of style may be ascribed to the Greek copyist and translator. If, moreover, we admit that some time intervened between the composition of the two works; that in writing the first the apostle was aided by Silvanus, and in the second by another, perhaps Mark; that the circumstances of the churches addressed by him were considerably changed, and that the second was written in greater haste, not to speak of a possible decay of faculties, the differences may be regarded as insufficient to justify more than hesitation in admitting its genuineness. The authenticity of the epistle has been maintained more or less decidedly by Michaelis, Nitzsche, Flatt, Augusti, Storr, Dahl, Hug, Heydenreich, Lardner, Windischmann, Guericke, Thiersch, Stier, Dietlein, Hofmann, Luthardt, Bruckner, and Olshausen. Feilmoser and Davidson incline to the same side. These are great names; yet, though we agree with their opinion, we cannot venture to say, with Bonnet, that "of all the books of the N.T. which have been controverted at certain times, there is not one whose authenticity is so certain as that of the second epistle of Peter" *(Nouv. Test.*, Introd., 2:701, Geneve, 1852).

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

The persons for whom the epistle is intended are "those who have obtained like precious faith with us;" and 2 Peter 3:1 identifies them with those addressed in the first epistle. It is objected that this epistle asserts that Peter had taught them in person — such not being the case with those addressed in the first epistle. But the phrase adduced — ἐγνωρίσαμεν ὑμῖν (2 Peter 1:16), "we made known unto you" — seems to refer not to oral discourse, but to various portions of the first epistle in which the coming and glory of Christ are dwelt on. The object of the epistle is to warn against "false teachers," “bringing in damnable heresies," "denying the Lord that bought them," holding a peculiar daemonology — covetous, sensual, and imperious apostates, the victims and propagators of Antinomian delusion. Probably they taught some early form of Gnostic error, which,

denying the Lord's humanity and atoning death, ridiculed his second advent in man's nature, set aside the authority of law, and by this effrontery justified itself in licentious impurity. The false teachers were like the "false prophets," perhaps claiming divine basis for their teachings, and therefore the more able to shake the faith of others, and seduce them into perilous apostasy. Thus, in brief, as the writer himself describes it (<GIOB17>2 Peter 3:17), his object is, first, warning, or to caution his readers against seduction: "Beware lest ye also, being led away with the error of the wicked, fall from your own steadfastness'" προγιγνώσκοντες — "as ye know those things beforehand," that is, from his descriptive accounts; and, secondly, counsel, or to urge on them, — as the best of all antidotes to apostasy, to "grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." For this χάρις and γνῶσις would fortify them and make them invincible against those assaults which so often succeeded with the unwary who fell in their heedlessness, the graceless who trusted in their own strength, and the ignorant or half-informed, so liable from their partial knowledge to be imposed upon by any system that dealt in novel speculations, professed to unfold mysteries, or give license and warrant for lawless practices. The supposition of Grotius, that it was written in the reign of Trajan against the Carpocratians, and by Simeon, bishop of Jerusalem, is without any probability, as Bertholdt has more than sufficiently shown. The arguments of Schwegler for its place as Rome, its date the end of the second century, and its purpose as an effort to conciliate Petrine and Pauline theological differences, are answered conclusively by Huther.

III. The *contents* of the epistle seem quite in accordance with its asserted origin. The customary opening salutation is followed by an enumeration of Christian blessings and exhortation to Christian duties, with special reference to the maintenance of the truth which had already been communicated to the Church (<GIOIOI>2 Peter 1:1-13). Referring then to his approaching death, the apostle assigns as grounds of assurance for believers his own personal testimony as an eye-witness of the transfiguration, and the sure word of prophecy, that is the testimony of the Holy Ghost (14-21). The danger of being misled by false prophets is dwelt upon with great earnestness throughout the second chapter; their covetousness and gross sensuality, combined with pretences to spiritualism, in short all the permanent and fundamental characteristics of Antinomianism, are described; while the overthrow of all opponents of Christian truth is predicted (<GIOIOI>2 Peter 2:1-29) in connection with

prophecies touching the second advent of Christ, the destruction of the world by fire, and the promise of new heavens and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness. After an exhortation to attend to Paul's teaching, in accordance with the less explicit admonition in the previous epistle, and an emphatic warning, the epistle closes with the customary ascription of glory to our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

IV. *Commentaries*. — Exegetical helps on the whole of this epistle exclusively are the following: Simson, *Commentary* (Lond. 1632, 4to); Adams, *Commentary* (ibid. 1633, fol.); Smith, *Commentaries* (ibid. 1690, 4to); Deurhof, *Erklaringe* (Amst. 1713, 4to); Nitzsche, *Vindicatio* (Lips. 1785, 8vo); Flatt, *Defensio* (Tub. 1806, 8vo); Dahl, *De* αὐθεντίᾳ, etc. [includ. Jude] (Rost. 1807, 4to); Richter, *De Origine,* etc. [includ. Jude] (Vit. 1810, 8vo); Ullmann, *Auslegung* (Lips. 1322, 8vo); Olshausen, *De Integ. et Authent.* etc. (Regiom. 1822-3, 4to; in English in the *Bibl. Repos.* July and October 1863); Picot, *Recherches,* etc. (Genev. 1829, 8vo); Moutier, *Authentie,* etc. [includ. Jude] (Strasb. 1829, 8vo); Delille, *Authentie,* etc. (ibid. 1835, 8vo); Magnus, *id.* (ibid. 1835, 8vo); Heydenreich, *Aechtheit,* etc. (Herb. 1837, 8vo); Audemars, *La 2d Ep. de P.* (Genev. 1838, 8vo); Daumas, *Introduction critique* (Strasb. 1845. 8vo); Brown, *Discourses* [on chapter 2 (Edinb. 1856, 8vo); Smith, *Lectures* (Lond. 1878, 8vo). *SEE PETER, FIRST EPISTLE OF.*

Peter OF Alcantara, St.

was born in the place after which he is surnamed in 1499, studied at the university in Salamanca. and when sixteen years old became a Franciscan monk. In 1519 he became prior at Badajoz, and in 1524 priest. For several years he lived in retirement, but in 1538 he was made general-superior of his order in Estremadura. In 1555 he founded, with the consent of pope Julius III, a separate reformed congregation, called the *Observantists* (q.v.), and assisted St. Theresa in her reforms of the Carmelites. He died in 1562, and was canonized in 1569. His work *De oratione et meditatione* was long and widely circulated. The *De animi pace seu tranquillitate* is not genuine. According to the legend, Peter walked on the sea by faith. In a picture in the Munich gallery, he not only walks himself, but a lay brother goes with him, whom Peter seems to encourage by pointing to heaven. See *Acta Sanctorum,* volume 8.

the first of that name in the list of bishops, and noted for the part he took against the Meletian schism, was born in the 3d century. He was placed over the see of Alexandria after the death of Theonas, which occurred April 9, 300. Peter had not occupied the position quite three years when the persecution commenced by the emperor Diocletian, and continued by his successors, broke out in 304. Peter was obliged to hide himself, and fled from one place to another, as we learn from a discourse said to have been delivered by him in prison, in which he states that he found shelter at different times in Mesopotamia, in Phoenicia, in Palestine, and in various islands. Cave conjectures that he was imprisoned during the reign of Diocletian or Maximian Galerius, but, if so, Peter must have obtained his release before the schism in the Egyptian churches. In 306 he assembled a council, which passed upon the misdemeanors of Meletius, bishop of Lycopolis. This prelate, in publishing calumnies against Peter and his council, finally created a schism in the Church of Alexandria, which lasted 150 years. Peter was obliged to seek his safety in flight. In the ninth year of the persecution he was, suddenly and contrary to all expectation, again arrested by order of Maximin Daza, and, without any distinct charge be. ing brought against him, was beheaded November 25, 311. Eusebius speaks with the highest admiration of his piety and his attainments in sacred literature, and he is revered as a saint and martyr both in the Eastern and Western churches. His memory is now celebrated by the Latin and Greek churches on the 26th, except in Russia, where the more ancient computation, which placed it on the 25th, is still followed. Peter wrote several works, of which there are very scanty remains:

(1.) *Sermo de Paenitentia: —*

(2.) *Sermo in Sanctum Pascha.* These discourses are not extant in their original form, but fifteen canons relating to the lapsi, or those who in time of persecution had fallen away — fourteen of them from the *Sermo de Poenitentia* (λόγος περὶ μετανοίας), the fifteenth from the *Sermo in Sanctum Pascha* — are contained in all the *Canonumn Collectiones.* They were published in a Latin version in the *Micropresbyticon* (Basle, 1550); in the *Orthodoxographa* of Heroldus (ibid. 1555), and of Grynaeus (ibid. 1569); in the first and second editions of De la Bigne's *Bibliotheca Patrum* (Paris, 1575 and 1589), and in the Cologne edition (1618). They are given

also in the *Concilia*. It is only in some MSS. and editions that the separate source of the fifteenth canon is pointed out: —

(3.) *Liber de Divinitate s. Deitate.* There is a citation from this treatise in the *Acta Concilii Ephesini;* it occurs in the *Actio prima,* and a part of it is again cited in the *Defensio Cyrilli,* which is given in the sequel of the *Acta:* —

(4.) *Homilia de Adventu Salvatoris s. Christi. A* short citation from this occurs in the Latin version of the work of Leontius of Byzantium, *Contra Nestorianos et Eutychianos,* lib. 1: —

(5, 6.) Two fragments, one described, *Ex primo Sermone, de eo quod nec praeexistit Anima, nec cum peccasset propterea in Corpus missa est,* the other as *Ex Mystagogia quam fecit ad Ecclesiam cum Martyrii Coronam suscepturus esset,* are cited by the emperor Justinian in his *Epistola ad Mennam CPolitanum adversus Origenem,* given in the *Acta Concilia CPolitani II s. OEcunenici V (Concilia,* volume 5, col. 652, ed. Labbe; volume 3 col. 256, 257, ed. Hardouin). Another fragment of the same discourse is contained in the compilation *Leontii et Joannis Rerum Sacrarum lib. 2,* published by Mai in the above-cited *Collectio,* 7:85: —

(7.) *Epistola S. Petri Episcopi ad Ecclesiam Alexandrinam,* noticing some irregular proceedings of the schismatic Meletius. This letter, which is very short, was published in a Latin version by Scipio Maffei in the third volume of his *Observazione Letterarie* (Veronae, 1737-40, 6 volumes, 12mo): —

(8.) *Doctrina.* A fragment of this work is cited by Leontius and Joannes. and was published by Mai (ibid. page 96). The published fragments of Peter's works, with few exceptions, are given in the fourth volume of Galland's *Bibliotheca Patrum,* page 91, etc. See Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* 7:32; 8:13; 9:6, cum notis Valesii; Athanasius, *Apolog, contra Arianos,* c. 59; Epiphanius, 1.c.; *Concilia,* 1.c.: Cave, *Hist. Litt.* ad ann. 301, 1:160 (Oxford ed. 1740-43) Tillemont, *Memoires,* 5:436, etc.; Fabricius, *Biblioth Graec.* 9:316, etc.; Ceillier, *Hist. des Auteurs sacres e ecclesiastiques,* 4:17 sq.; Dupin, *Bibliotheque des Auteurs eccles.;* Galland, *Biblioth. Patrum,* proleg. ad volume 4, c. 6. — Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* 3:219. Comp. Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale,* 40:138; Dorner, *Christologie,* 1:810; Hefele, *Conciliengesch.* 1:327 sq.; Schaff, *Church Hist.* volume 1.

Peter Of Alexandria (2)

another patriarch of that see, was born near the beginning of the 4th century, during the life of Athanasius, whom he for many years accompanied, sharing his variable fortunes, as presbyter of the Church at Alexandria. He was designated by Athanasius as his successor, and upon the death of that celebrated Church father (A.D. 373) was appointed to the place, to the great satisfaction of the orthodox among the people, and with the approval of the neighboring bishops. The Arians, however, who had, either from fear or reverence, conceded quiet possession to Athanasius, were by no means disposed to acquiesce in the appointment of an orthodox successor; and Peter was at once deposed and imprisoned. Making his escape, he fled to Rome, where he was kindly received by pope Damasus I, leaving his Arian competitor, Lucius, in possession of the Church of Alexandria. After five years' absence, Peter returned with letters from the pope confirming his title to the see, and regained possession of the church by favor of the people, who deposed Lucius, and forced him to flee to Constantinople. Peter enjoyed the highest esteem of his contemporaries, but survived his restoration only a short time. He died February 14, 381, and was succeeded by his brother Timothy. Valesius speaks of him as the abettor of Maximus the Cynic in his usurpation of the see of Constantinople in place of St. Gregory (Nazianzen), but this is scarcely probable, since Gregory himself eulogizes him. Theodoret ascribes this act to Timothy. Of the writings of Peter, parts of two letters have been preserved to us by Theodoret and Facundus; the first giving an account of the persecutions and acts of violence perpetrated by Lucius and the Arians; the second, *Epistola ad Episcopos et Presbyteros atque Diacones pro vera Fide in exsilio constitutes, s. ad Episcopos, Presbyteros, atque Diacones qui sub Valente Imperatorae Diocaesaream fuerant exules missi.* See Ceillier, *Hist. des Auteurs sacres et eccles.* 8:464 sq.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale,* 40:138; Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* 3:220.

Peter Of Amiens

SEE PETER THE HERMIT.

Peter (Pierre) Of St. Andre

(known also as *Jean Antoine Rampalle),* a French ecclesiastic, was born in 1624 at L'Isle (comte Venaissin). After having taken in 1640 the garb of the barefoot Carmelites under the name of *Pier re de St. Andre,* he taught

philosophy and theology; became about 1667 general definitor of his order, and died at Rome, in the exercise of these duties, November 29, 1671. Although he left only some odes in praise of St. Theresa, father Cosmo de Villiers claims that he had so much facility in Latin poetry that he was regarded as a second Baptiste Mantouan. We have of his works, *Historia generalis Fratrum Miscalceatorum ord. de Monte-Carmelo* (Rome, 1668-1671, 2 volumes, fol.); this history is the continuation of that undertaken by father Isidore de St. Joseph, who died in 1666: — *Le Religieux dans la Solitude* (Lyons, 1668, 12mo): — *La Vie du B. Jean de la Croix* (Aix, 1675, 8vo). He has translated into French the *Voyage a l'Orient* (1659, 8vo), and the *Vie du Pere Dominique de Jesus-Marie,* two works of Esprit Julien, as well as the *Madeleine penitente et convertie,* and the *Alexis* of father Brignole-Sale. A *Traite de la Physionomie naturelle* and two sacred tragedies are also attributed to him, which, in all probability, are by an homonymous poet, Antoine Rampalle, known by a verse from the *A rt Poetique* of Boileau (chapter 4, verse 35). See De Villiers, *Biblioth. Carmelitana,* 2:545; Achard, *Dict. Hist. de la Provence;* Barjavel, *Biog. du Vancluse,* 2:295.-Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale,* 40:198.

Peter Of Anolo

a Swiss theologian of the 15th century, flourished at Basle as doctor and professor of canon law. He wrote about 1460, *Libellus de Caesarum Monarchia ad Fridericum,* etc. (under the title *De Imperio Romano,* edited by Faber, Strasburg, 1603; Nuremb. 1657). The work takes the ground that the German empire is the continuance of the Roman imperium (a view in very recent times espoused by Freeman in his *Comparative Politics).* All princes are subordinate to the emperor; the emperor is the subordinate of the pope, who has received his authority from God.

Peter Of Antioch (1)

SEE PETER FULLO.

Peter Of Antioch (2)

the third patriarch of that name in the current tables of the occupants of that see, which commence with the apostle Peter, was born near the beginning of the 11th century. Contemporary with Michael Cerularius, patriarch of Constantinople, and Leo of Achridia, he united with them in hostility to the Latin Church. According to Cave, Peter bitterly inveighed

against the lives and doctrines of the Latin clergy, and especially against the addition of the word *Jilioque* to the creed; while, according to Le Quien, he preserved a more impartial tone, and showed everywhere "a disposition averse to schism." Peter obtained the patriarchate in the year 1053, and in the same year he sent synodical letters to the patriarchs of Alexandria, Jertusalem, and Constantinople, and to pope Leo IX, signifying his accession. Cave states that he sent to the pope "a profession of his faith," but it is probable that he has applied this term to the synodical letter, of which a Latin version appears among the letters of Leo IX. Le Quien, who had in his possession the Greek text of these synodical letters, complains of the great discrepancy between the Greek text and the Latin version. Two letters of Peter appear in Greek. with a Latin version, in the *Monumenta Ecclesiae Graecae* of Cotelerius (2:112, 145). The first is entitled *Epistola ad Doeminicum Gradensem,* and is an answer to Dominicus Gradensis s. Venetus, patriarch of Venice or Aquileia, whose letter, in the collection of Gotelerius, precedes that of Peter; the second is addressed to Michael Cerularius *(Epistola ad Michaelem Cerularium),* and is preceded by a letter of Michael to Peter, to which it is the answer. A considerable part of this letter had previously been published by Leo Allatius, in his *De Consensu Ecclesiarum Orient. et Occident.* lib. 3, c. 12, § 4. There is extant in MS. at Vienna another letter of Peter, *Petri Epistola ad Joannem Tranensem in Apulia Episcopum,* relating to the matters in dispute between the Eastern and Western churches. See Cave, *Hist. Litt.* ad ann. 1040, 2:132; Oudin, *Comment. de Scriptorib. et Scriptis Eccles.* 2:605; Lambec, *Comment. de Biblioth. Caesaraea;* Le Quien, *Oriens Christian.* 2:754.

Peter (Pierre) Of Baume

(Lat. *Petrus de Palma),* general of the Dominicans, was born at Baume (county of Bourgogne) in the latter part of the 13th century. Having early embraced the rule of St. Dominic, he was sent in 1321 to Paris, and there gave public lessons upon the *Livre des Sentences* of Pierre Lombard. In 1343 he was elected general of his order by a unanimity of votes. He died in Paris March 1, 1345. He wrote *Postillae in quatuor Evangelia,* some copies of which are preserved at Basle and at Tours, and two *Lettres Encycliques,* which have not been printed. See Quetif et Echard, *Script. ord. Praedic.* 1:614. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale,* 40:198.

Peter (Pierre), Son Of Bechin

was a French historian, who died in the 12th century. It is supposed that he was canon of St. Martin of Tours. He left a *Chaonique,* which begins with the creation of the world and ends with 1137. For ancient times, it is a compilation from Eusebius, from St. Jerome, Isidore of Seville, Gregory of Tours; for modern times, from Frddegaire, St. Odon, etc. However, some passages from this *Chronique,* relative to St. Martin of Tours, to the abbey of Cormery, and to the counts of Anjou, are not without interest. It has never been published elitire. Short fragments of it may be found in the *Recueil* of Duchesne (3:365-372), and in that of Bouquet (3:5, 6:8:10:11:12); but M. Salmon has recently published the best part of it in his *Chroniques de Touraine,* after three MSS., one from the Imperial Library, two from the Vatican. See *Hist. Litt. de la France,* 12:80; 13:57; Andre Salmon, *Notices sur les Chroniques de Touraine.* — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale,* 40:191.

Peter Bernardinus

an Italian reformer, the intimate companion of Savonarola, was a Florentine by birth and of humble descent. He was attracted by the teaching of the great Italian reformer, and after the execution of Savonarola frequently met his followers secretly, and encouraged them in steadfastness to the faith. He finally became a leader among the Italian reformed, and as such forbade all participation in the sacraments of the Church of Rome, favored communistic life, diligence in prayer, and simplicity in dress. Pursued by the Church and by the State, he fled with all his family to the home of count Picus de Mirandola, but on the way he was captured and, after a hasty trial, was condemned to be burned.

Peter Of Blois (Petrus Blesensis)

so called from the place of his birth, a learned ecclesiastical writer, flourished in the 12th century. He studied at Paris, Bologna, and Oxford, and there was so interested in scholastic pursuits that he became a student of John of Salisbury. In 1167 he was appointed the teacher and secretary of young king William II of Sicily. Fear of assassination, prompted by jealousy of his success, made him leave Italy, and he remained for a while in France. In 1168 he was invited to England by Henry II; was nominated archdeacon of Bath, and afterwards became chancellor of Canterbury and archdeacon of London. For the space of fourteen years he was one of the

most influential men in England, both as a politician and a churchman. He died in 1200. He is said to have first used the word transubstantiation. His letters are very interesting; they are admired for their elegance and perspicuity of language. Besides, Peter of Blois deserves to be pointed out as one of those ecclesiastics of the Middle Ages who dared to speak out against the abuses in school, Church, and State. He complains bitterly of the superficial ways of the clergy, who were then the educators of the world. He reproaches those who moot questions respecting time and space, and the nature of universals *(universalia),* before they had learned the elements of science. These charlatans strove after high things, and neglected the doctrines of salvation. Peter of Blois's writings have been collected under the title, *Opera omnia, nunc prinum in Anglia ope codicum manuscriptorum editionumque optinzarum,* edidit J.A. Giles, LL.D. (4 volumes, 8vo). See Wright, *Biog. Brit. Litter.* 2:366 sq.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliogr.* volume 2, s.v.; Baur, *Dogmengesch.;* Hardwick, *Ch. Hist. of the Middle Ages;* Neander, *Hist. of Christian Dogmas.* (J.H.W.)

Peter Of Bruys (Pierre de Brois)

a French ecclesiastic of the 12th century, is noted as the representative of those anti-hierarchical tendencies which so generally prevailed in Southern France. He was a priest, but resigned his orders, preferring to become a leader of the people against the corruptions of the Church, about 1104. Peter of Clugny, whose pastoral epistles to the bishops of the south of France are the principal source of information concerning Peter of Bruys, reproaches him with heretical opinions; and, although the account of an enemy is always to be read with suspicion, the high and disinterested character of the abbot of Clugny gives more than ordinary value to his narrative. The time of the composition of the preface to the refutation (the body of which was of early date) was shortly after the death of De Bruys, which took place about A.D. 1125. At this time, the author tells us, the heresy had been flourishing for twenty years. Peter of Bruys seems to have rejected infant baptism, because he felt that baptism without faith was of no avail, and with Abelard he rebaptized adults. He also rejected all public divine service, for God, he argued, "ante altare vel ante stabulum invocatus" — is heard as well in the inn as in the church. The crosses he would burn, and not honor, for that is a reproach to the sufferings of the Saviour. Peter of Bruys even maintained that the Supper was not instituted by Christ as a rite of perpetual observation; that he only once distributed his body and blood among his disciples. This expression is obscure:

perhaps he meant to say that Christ had observed this rite once for all. He also rejected the mass and sacrifices for the dead. He found many followers, known as the *Petrobrusians* (q.v.). Peter of Bruys was burned at St. Gilles on Still Friday, in 1124, in the Arelatensia diocese, by a mob, in an emeute caused by his preaching, and probably instigated by the Romish ecclesiastics. See Gieseler, *Kirchengesch.* volume 2, part 2, page 536; Engelhardt, *Dogmengesch.* volume 2, chapter 3, page 51 sq.; Munscher, *Dogmengesch.* (edit. by Cohn), page 209, 210. (J.H.W.)

Peter Of Cellxe (Petrus Cellensis)

a French prelate of some note, flourished in the second half of the 12th century. He was abbot at Moutier la Celle from 1150; in 1162 he filled a like office at St. Remis, near Rheims; and in 1181 was made bishop of Chartres. He died in 1183. Peter of Cellae left mystical interpretations of the Scriptures, and letters to the popes and bishops and many princes, who highly esteemed him. He had reformatory ideas, and did not hesitate to express them. His works have been collected and published several timnes. One edition is by Sirmond (Par. 1613; Ven. 1728).

Peter (Pierre) Of Chartres

a French ecclesiastic who flourished in the first half of the 10th century, died about 1039. The authors of the *Histoire Litteraire de la France* attribute to him several works. We mention only *Manuale Ecclesiasticum, Manuale de Mysteriis Eoclesiae,* and *Speculunm Ecclesie.* This last treatise, which offers us curious details upon the origin or meaning of liturgical usages, is unpublished; but we indicate three manuscript copies in the Imperial Library of Saint-Victor, under the numbers 513, 724, 923. Number 923 has one chapter more than the other two. Jean Garet, canon of Louvain, Gesner, Possevin, and after them the authors of the *Histoire Litteraire,* designate also among the works of our chancellor a *Paraphrase of the Psalms,* likewise unpublished. There is, finally, in the library of Molht-Saint-Michel, *Glossae in Job, secundum Petrum, cancellarium Carnuteisem.* See Gesner, *Bibl. Universalis,* page 669; Possevin, *Apparatus,* 2:246; *Hist. Litt. de la France,* 7:341. — Hoefer, *Nouv, Biog. Generale,* 40:184.

Peter Chrysolanus

an Italian prelate, was born in the latter part of the 11th century. He was raised to the archbishopric of Milan in 1110, having previously held some less important see. He was sent by pope Paschal II on a mission to the emperor Alexius I Comnenus, and engaged eagerly in the controversy on the procession of the Holy Spirit. His principal work is, *Ad Imperatorem Dominum Alexium Conzenum Oratio,* etc., designed to prove the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son as well as from the Father, published in the *Graecia Orthodoxa* of Allatius, 1:379, etc. (Rome, 1 652, 4to), and given in a Latin version by Baronius, *Annal. Eccles.* ad ann. 1116, volume 8, etc.

Peter Chrysologus, St.

an Italian prelate, was born at Imola, in the northern part of Italy, towards the close of the 4th century. He was educated by Cornelius, a bishop, and received ordination as deacon from the same prelate. In 433 he was consecrated archbishop of Rav:enna by pope Sixtus III, who knew all his merit. He labored to reform several abuses which had been introduced into his diocese, and to extirpate the remnants of pagan superstition. In A.D. 448 St. Germain d'Auxerre having come to Ravenna, Peter received him with marks of the most profound veneration. Shortly afterwards the heresiarch Eutyches wrote to him complainiqg of the condemnation passed on him by Flavianus of Constantinople, and Peter replied to him in June, 449, expressing his grief to see that the disputes upon the mystery of the incarnation were not ended. He died December 2, 450. His zeal for the instruction of his flock is shown by one hundred and seventy-six *Sermones,* collected in 708 by Felix, archbishop of Ravenna, under the title, *Divi Petri Chrysologi archiepiscopi Ravennatis, viri eruditissimi atque sanctissimi, insigne et pervetustum opus Homiliarum nunc primum in lucem editum* (Par. 1544, 12mo), which have frequently been reprinted. They appear in the seventh volume of the Lyons edition of the *Bibliotheca Patrum* (1677, fol.): — *Epistola Petri Ravennatis Episcopi ad Eutychem Abbatem.* This letter was published by Gerard Vossius in the original Greek, with a Latin version, at the end of the works of Gregory Thaumaturgus (Mayence, 1604, 4to). It is reprinted in the *Concilia* (volume 4, col. 36, ed. Labbe; volume 2, col. 21, ed. Hardouin). See Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* 3:222; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale,* 40:138.

Peter Collivacinus

(also called *Morra),* an ecclesiastical character of the 13th century, flourished as teacher of canonical law at Bologna; was then secretary to Innocent III, by whose order he collected the decretals of that pope during the first eleven years of his reign, and published them in 1210 by the help of the so-called *Compilatio Romana* of Bernhard of Compostella. This collection was approved by the University of Bologna, and received the name *Compilatio tertia.* (The socalled *Compilatio secunda* is younger, but contains older material. See Richter, *Kirchenrecht, §* 74.) Later, Peter was cardinal legate, and as such labored to restore order to the Church of South France, in his day so greatly broken up by the wars of the Albigenses (q.v.).

Peter The Deacon (1)

flourished near the beginning of the 6th century. In the controversy excited by the monks whom ecclesiastical writers call *Scythae,* who came from the diocese of Torni, on the south bank of the Danube, Peter took a prominent part. He had accompanied the delegates sent to Rome by the monks, and while in the Eternal City united with his colleagues in addressing to Fulgentius, and the other African bishops who were then in exile in Sardinia, a work entitled *De Incarnatione et Gratia Domini nostri Jesu Christi Liber.* To this Fulgentius and his companions replied in another treatise on the same subject. The work of Peter, which is in Latin, was published in the *Monumenta SS. Patrum Orthodoxographa* of Grynaeus (Basle, 1569), and has been reprinted in various editions of the *Bibliotheca Patrum.* It is in the ninth volume of the Lyons edition of Galland (Ven. 1776, fol.).

Peter The Deacon (2)

a learned Benedictine of Monte-Cassino, of a Roman patrician family, was born about the close of the 11th century, in the reign of Alexius I Comnenus. In the *Jus Graeco-Romanum* of Leunclavius (lib. 6:395-397) are given *Interrogationes quas solvit reverendissimus Chartularius, Dominus Petrus. idemque Diaconus Majoris Ecclesiae* (sc. of St. Sophia at Constantinople), A.M. 6600=A.D. 1092. We learn from this title when the author lived, and that he held the offices described. He seems to have been admitted into the Benedictine Order at the very early age of fifteen. In a controversy of his convent with pope Innocent II, he defended the

monastic interests to great advantage before the emperor Lothaire in 1138, while he was in South Italy. So well pleased was the emperor with Peter that he was made chartularius and chaplain of the Roman realm. Later he was intrusted by pope Alexander with the management of the convent of Monte-Cassino, where he died after the middle of the 12th century. The following of his writings are instructive for the contemporaneous history of the Church, *De vita et obitu Justorum Coenobii Casinensis: — Lib. illustrium virorum Casinensis Archisterii: — Lib. de locis sanctis: — and De Novissinis temporibus.* There are, or were, extant in MS. in the king's library at Paris, *Petrus Diaconus et Philosophus de Cyclo et Indictione,* and *Petri Diaconi et Philosophi Tractatus de Sole, Luna, et Sideribus* (Codd. CMXXIX, No. 7, and MMMLXXXV), but whether this Petrus Diaconus is the canonist is not clear.-Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* 3:223; Potthast, *Bibl. Med. AEvi,* page 490; Fabricius, *Bib. Graeca,* 11:334 sq.; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* 2:161.

Peter The Dominican

SEE PETER MARTYR.

Peter (Pierre) OF Dresden

a German reformer, was born at Dresden in the latter part of the 14th century. Driven from that city for having spread the doctrines of the Vaudois, Pierre sought refuge in Prague, where, in order to subsist, he opened a small school for children. Some time after he attracted to himself one of his friends called Jacobel, with whom he published his opinions. Pierre inveighed especially against the communion in one kind. "To his influence." says Gillett, "is to be attributed in large measure the origin of that discussion in respect to the communion of the cup which almost revolutionized Bohemia, and brought down upon it the energies of crusading Christendom." He was evidently a man of superior talent, and one who possessed great power over the minds of others. At Prague, among the thousands congregated at its university, he had large opportunity for insinuating his peculiar views. The very fact that he was instrumental in shaping the enlarged views of Jacobel suffices to rescue his name and memory from oblivion. He afterwards united with the Hussites against the primacy of the pope, and propagated their ideas upon the nature of the Church. To establish his doctrines he wrote several works now completely forgotten. He died at Prague in 1440. See Eneas Sylvius,

Bohemr. chapter 5; Bonfinius, *Hist. Bohem.;* Moreri, *Dict. Hist.;* Jocher, *Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon;* Gillett, *Huss and the Hussites,* 1:38, 483, 519. (J.H.W.)

Peter Of Edessa

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

Peter (St.) Exorcista and Marcellinus

(It. *SS. Pietro e Marcellino),* two Romish saints always represented together, flourished during the last persecutions under Diocletian, about the opening of the 4th century. Their religious convictions, openly avowed, brought them to jail, and it so happened that even there they were sorely tried. Their jailer, Artemius, had a daughter, Paulina, who was sick. Peter promised to restore her to health if Artemius would believe in God. Then the jailer ridiculed him, saying, "If I put thee into the deepest dungeon, and load thee with heavier chains, will thy God then deliver thee?" To this Peter replied that it mattered little to God whether he believed or not, but that Christ might be glorified he desired that it should be done. And it was so; and in the night Peter and Marcellinus, dressed in shining white garments, came to Artemius in his own chamber. Then he believed, and was baptized with all his family, and three hundred others. When they were to die, it was ordered that the executioner should take them to a forest three miles from Rome, in order that the Christians should not know of their burial-place. So when they were come to a solitary place, and the executioner pointed it out as the spot where they were to die, they themselves cleared a space and dug their grave, and died encouraging each other. In the paintings of the churches they are represented in priestly habits bearing palms. They are commemorated by the Romish Church on June 2.

Peter Fullo

(also called *Cnapheus,* i.e., the Fuller), a patriarch of Antioch, was born near the commencement of the 5th century. He was abbot of a monastery at or near Constantinople, but various accusations (including heresy) being

made against him, he fled to Antioch, accompanying Zeno, son-in-law of the emperor Leo I, who was sent thither. Peter appears to have held the doctrine of the Monophysites, the controversy concerning which was at that time agitating the entire Eastern Church. On his arrival at Antioch, the patriarchate of which city was held by Martyrius, a supporter of the Council of Chalcedon, he determined to attempt the usurpation of that office, engaging Zeno and a number of those who favored the Monophysite doctrine in the enterprise. Great tumult and confusion ensued, one cause of which was that Peter added to the sacred hymn called the *Trisagion* the words "who wast crucified for us" — which constituted one of the tests of the Monophysites — and anathematized all who did not sanction the alteration. Martyrius, unable to maintain order, went to Constantinople, where he was kindly received by Leo I, through whose influence he hoped to be able, on his return to Antioch, to quell the disturbance. Failing in this, and disgusted with his failure, he abdicated the patriarchate, which was immediately assumed by Peter. Leo, however, at the instigation of Gennadius, patriarch of Constantinople, promptly expelled the intruder, in whose place Julian was elected, with general approval. Peter was banished to Upper Egypt, but, contriving to escape from his exile, he returned to Constantinople and obtained refuge in a monastery, where he remained until the revolt of Basiliscus against Zeno, having bound himself by oath to abstain from exciting further troubles. The revolt succeeding, and Zeno being driven from Constantinople, Basiliscus exerted himself to gain the Monophysites, and issued an encyclical letter to the various prelates of the Church, anathematizing the decrees of the Synod of Chalcedon. Peter gave formal assent to this letter, and was immediately restored to the patriarchate of Antioch (A.D. 476). Julian soon after died of grief, and Peter, resuming authority, restored the obnoxious clause "who wast crucified for us;" and by repeating his anathemas excited fresh tumults, which resulted in plunder and murder. Zeno, however, recovering the imperial power, a synod was assembled and Peter was deposed, chiefly through the agency of one of his own partisans, John Codonatus, whom he had made a bishop. He was banished to Pityus, from whence he escaped, and, going to Euchaita, obtained refuge in the church of St. Theodore. After a period of nine years, during which time numerous changes had been made in the patriarchate, the Monophysites, again in the ascendant, persuaded Zeno to consent to the restoration of Peter upon his signing the emperor's "Henoticon," or decree for the unity of the Church. This event is placed by Theophanes in A.D. 485. The Western Church, which had

maintained its allegiance to the Council of Chalcedon, assembled in council at Rome, and hurled its anathemas at Peter, but to no purpose. Protected by Zeno and the strength of his party, he retained the patriarchate during the remainder of his life. Theophanes charges him with various offences against ecclesiastical rule, and with many acts of oppression after his restoration; which charges are, unfortunately, corroborated by the previous character of the man. One of the latest manifestations of his ambition was the attempt to add the island of Cyprus to his patriarchate. He was succeeded by Palladius, a presbyter of Seleucia. His death is variously stated to have occurred in A.D. 488, 490, 491.

Peter The Hermit

an ecclesiastical character of the 11th century, is of very little significance except as the monks of the Church of Rome have given him importance by crediting him with the movement of the Christian Church against the Saracens, known as the First Crusade, for which the credit is by most competent critics awarded to pope Urban II. Von Sybel, in his *Geschichte des ersten Kreuzzuges* (Dusseldorf, 1841), examines the history of the first crusaders, and in consequence of a most searching review of all the records pronounces Peter of Amiens an apocryphal character, and his reputed efforts for the first crusade the invention of Greek legendaries of the 12th century. Even William of Tyre, who is the principal source of the history of the Crusades of all the Middle-Age historians, knows (in his *Belli sacri historiae* about 1188) of Peter of Amiens only that he is a *persona contemptibilis*, whose fate was that of the other crusaders. The Jesuit OEltreman has made the life of Peter of Amiens the subject of a sacred romance, which is often mistaken for history. The whole scheme is intended to wrest the honor of the first Crusade from the papacy and to give it to the monks.

According to these questionable sources, Peter the Hermit was a native of Amiens, where he was born about the middle of the 11th century. He was educated first at Paris, and afterwards in Italy, and then became a soldier. After serving in Flanders without much distinction, he retired from the army, married, and had several children; but on the death of his wife he became religious, and exhausted, without satisfying the cravings of his religious zeal, all the ordinary excitements — the studies, the austerities and mortifications, the fasts and prayers — of a devout life. Still yearning for more powerful emotions, he retired into the solitude of the strictest and

severest cloister. Not even content with this life of a recluse, he ultimately became a hermit. But even this failed to satisfy him, and he would not rest contented with himself until lie had projected a pilgrimage to the Holy Land. For this he set out about 1093. On his visit to the East he saw with a bleeding heart that the Holy Sepulchre was in the hands of the infidel, and beheld the oppressed condition of the Christian residents or pilgrims under the Moslem rule: "his blood turned to fire," and the hermit made his vow that with the help of God these things should cease. In an interview with the patriarch Simeon he declared that the natives of the West should take up arms in the Christian cause. On his return to the West he spoke so earnestly on the subject to pope Urban II that the pontiff warmly adopted his views, and, however selfish may have been the promptings of his zeal in the cause-he foreseeing probably that, whatever might be the result to the warriors of the cross, his own power would thenceforth rest on more solid foundationsUrban eagerly bestowed his blessing on the fervent enthusiast, and commissioned him to preach throughout the West an armed confederation of Christians for the deliverance of the Holy City. Mean in figure and diminutive in stature, and gifted only with an eloquence that was as rude as it was ready, his deficiencies were more than made up by the earnestness which gave even to the glance of his eye a force more powerful than speech. His enthusiasm lent him a power which no external advantages of form could have commanded. He was filled with a fire which would not stay, and the horrors which were burnt in upon his soul were those which would most surely stir the conscience and rouse the wrath of his hearers. His fiery appeals carried everything before them. "He traversed Italy," writes the historian of Latin Christianity, "crossed the Alps, from province to province, from city to city. He rode on a mule, with a crucifix in his hand, his head and feet bare: his dress was a long robe, girt with a cord, and a hermit's cloak of the coarsest stuff. He preached in the pulpits, on the roads, in the marketplaces. His eloquence was that which stirs the heart of the people, for it came from his own — brief, figurative, full of bold apostrophes; it was mingled with his own tears, with his own groans; he beat his breast: the contagion spread throughout his audience. His preaching appealed to every passion — to valor and shame, to indignation and pity, to the pride of the warrior, to the compassion of the man, the religion of the Christian, to the love of the brethren, to the hatred of the unbeliever aggravated by his insulting tyranny, to reverence for the Redeemer and the saints, to the desire of expiating sin, to the hope of eternal life." The results are well known as among those moral marvels of

enthusiasm of which history presents occasional examples. All France especially was stirred from its very depths; and just at the time when the enthusiasm of that country had been enkindled to its full fervor, it received a sacredness and an authority from the decree of a council held at Clermont, in which Urban himself was present, and in which his celebrated harangue was but the signal for the outpouring, through all Western Christendom, of the same chivalrous emotions by which France had been borne away under the rude eloquence of the Hermit. To understand this success, we must take into account the poverty of the masses, and the alluring prospect of a residence in Eastern lands, the scenes of which were painted in glowing colors by the apostle of the holy war. Thousands of outcasts had always been ready to follow the princes in their marauding expeditions or political wars, and how much more in a war which enlisted the highest sympathies of their nature in its behalf, which received the sanction of the ministers of religion, and was regarded as the will of God! For the details of the expedition, We must refer to the article CRUSADES *SEE CRUSADES*, our sole present concern being with the personal history of Peter. Of the enormous but undisciplined army which assembled from all parts of Europe, one portion was committed to his conduct; the other being under the command of a far more skilful leader, Walter (q.v.) the Penniless. Peter, mounted upon an ass, with his coarse woollen mantle and his rude sandals, placed himself at the head of his followers. On the march through Hungary they became involved in hostilities with the Hungarians, and suffered a severe defeat at Semlin, whence they proceeded with much difficulty to Constantinople. There the emperor Alexius, filled with dismay at the want of discipline which they exhibited, was but too happy to give them supplies for their onward march; and near Nice they encountered the army of the sultan Soliman, from whom they suffered a terrible defeat. Peter accompanied the subsequent expedition under Godfrey; but worn out by the delays and difficulties of the siege of Antioch, he was about to withdraw from the expedition, and was only retained in it by the influence of the other leaders, who foresaw the worst results from his departure. Accordingly he had a share, although not marked by any signal distinction, in the siege and capture of the Holy City in 1099, and the closing incident of his history as a crusader was an address to the victorious army delivered on the Mount of Olives. He returned to Europe, and founded a monastery at Huy, in the diocese of Liege, where he died, July 7, 1115. The movement which had been inaugurated continued to agitate Europe for nearly two centuries, and its general effect upon the march of civilization

may well be pronounced incalculable. See Milman, *Hist. of Lat. Christianity*, 4:25 sq.; Cox, *The Crusades* (N.Y. 1874, 18mo), page 26 sq.; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, chapter 33.

Peter The Lombard

SEE LOMBARD, PETER.

Peter (Pierre) Of Maillezais

a French chronicler of the 11th century, was, according to Dom Rivet, a man of talent, of merit, and learning. He embraced the monastic rule in the early part of the 11th century, and flourished uinder Goderanne, abbd of Maillezais, in Bas-Poitou. We have an interesting article of his upon the history of his time, particularly that of the counts de Poitiers and the abbe' of Maillezais. Father Labbd has comprised it *(Malleacense Chronicon)* in the monuments that he collected for the history of Aquitaine. What concerns the *translation of Saint Riomer* has been detached from it and published again by Mabillon and the Bollandists. See *Hist. Litt. de la Friance*, 5:599. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 40:187.

Peter (St.) Martyr (1)

Picture for Peter Martyr

a Roman Catholic saint of the Dominican order, is greatly beloved in the Romish fold, and in his own order ranks next to the fbunder himself. He was born at Verona about 1205. His parents were Catharists, but Peter early became orthodox in sentiment, and sought his education at the conventual schools of the Church. At the age of fifteen he united with the order by the persuasion of Dominic. He soon became a public character by reason of his piety and oratorical power. He turned against his own sect. and so severely persecuted the Catharists that he was universally regarded as intolerant. When the Inquisition needed an uncompromising head, Peter was made its general by approval of pope Honorius III. His high-handed disposal of the lives and property of people under him made him a general object of hatred. Two Veronian noblemen whom he had accused, and whose property was confiscated, resolved to be revenged on him. They hired assassins, who watched that they might kill him in a forest where they knew he would pass unaccompanied save by a single monk. When he appeared one of the murderers struck him down with an axe. They then pursued and killed his attendant. When they returned to Peter he was

reciting the Apostles' Creed, or, as others say, was writing it on the ground with his blood, when the assassins completed their cruel work. This event occurred on April 28, A.D. 1252. In the various paintings of this saint he is represented in the habit of his order, and bears the crucifix and palm. His more peculiar attribute is either the axe stuck in his head or a gash from which the blood trickles. Fra Bartolomeo painted the head of his beloved Jerome Savonarola as St. Peter Martyr. He is also known as *St. Peter of Verona.* (J.H.W.)

Peter (St.) Martyr (2)

a Romish saint of the 15th century, was born at Arena in 1455, and was probably educated at the university in Salamanca, where he taught for many years with great success. He had a part in the wars against the Moors, and in 1505 took holy orders. As prior of Granada lie was frequently employed in very important missions by queen Isabella the Catholic. His travels in diplomatic interests he described in *De legatione Babylonica.* He died in 1525. His *Epistola de rebus Hispanicis* was published at Alcala in 1530, and at Amsterdam in 1670.

Peter, Mauritius

SEE PETER THE VENERABLE.

Peter Mogilas

SEE MOGILAS.

Peter Mongus

a Monophysite, flourished as patriarch of Alexandria in the 5th century. Liberatus gives him also the surname of *the Stammerer*. He was ordained deacon by Dioscorus, successor of Cyril, who held the patriarchate for seven years (A.D. 444-451). Peter was the ready participator in the violences of Dioscorus, and earnestly embraced his cause when he was deposed by the Council of Chalcedon, withdrawing from the communion of the successor of Dioscorus, Proterius, who supported the cause of the council, and uniting in the opposition raised by Timothy LElurus and others. Peter was consequently sentenced, apparently by Proterius, to deposition and excommunication. Whether he was banished, as well as Timothy AElurus, is not clear, but he seems to have accompanied Timothy to Alexandria, and to have been his chief supporter when, after the death of

the emperor Marcian, he returned, and either murdered Proterius or excited the tumults that led to his death, A.D. 457. Timothy AElurus was immediately raised to the patriarchate by his partisans, but was shortly after banished by the emperor Leo I, the Thracian, who had succeeded Marcian. Peter also was obliged to flee. Another Timothy, surnamed Salofaciolus, a supporter of the Council of Chalcedon, was appointed to succeed Proterius in the patriarchate. When, in the following reign of Zeno, or rather during the short usurpation of Basiliscus, Timothy AElurus was recalled from exile (A.D. 475), and was sent from Constantinople to Alexandria to re-occupy that see, he was joined by Peter and his party, and with their support drove out his competitor Salofaciolus, who took refuge in a monastery at Canopus. On the downfall of Basiliscus and the restoration of Zeno, Timothy AElurus was allowed, through the emperor's compassion for his great age, to retain his see; but when on his death (A.D. 477) the Monophysite bishops of Egypt, without waiting for the emperor's directions, elected Peter (who had previously obtained the rank of archdeacon) as his successor, the emperor's indignation was so far aroused that he determined to put the new prelate to death. His anger, however, somewhat abated, and Peter was allowed to live, but was deprived of the patriarchate, to which Timothy Salofaciolus was restored. On the death of Salofaciolus, which occurred soon after, John of Tabenna, surnamed Talaia, was appointed to succeed him; but he was very shortly deposed by order of Zeno, on some account not clearly ascertained, and Peter Mongus was unexpectedly recalled from Euchaita in Pontus, whither he had been banished, and was (A.D. 482) restored to his see. His restoration appears to have been part of the policy of Zeno to unite, if possible, all parties; a policy which Peter, whose age and misfortunes appear to have abated the fierceness of his party spirit, was ready to adopt. He consequently subscribed the Henoticon of the emperor, and readmitted the Proterian party to communion on their doing the same. John of Tabenna had meanwhile fled to Rome, where the pope, Simplicius, who, with the Western Church, steadily supported the Council of Chalcedon, embraced his cause, and wrote to the emperor in his behalf. Felix II or III, who succeeded Simplicius (A.D. 483), was equally zealous on the same side. Peter had some difficulty in maintaining his position. In order to recover the favor of his Monophysite friends, whom his subservience to Zeno's policy had alienated, he anathematized the Council of Chalcedon; and then, to avert the displeasure of Acacius of Constantinople and of the court, to whose temporizing course this decisive step was adverse, he denied that he

had done so. Evagrius has preserved the letter he wrote to Acacius on this occasion, which is the only writing of Peter now extant. By this tergiversation he preserved his see, and was enabled to brave the repeated anathemas of the Western Church. When, however, to recover the attachment of the Monophysites, he again anathematized the Council of Chalcedon, and Euphemius, the newly elected patriarch of Constantinople, forsaking the policy of his predecessors, took part with the Western Church against him, his difficulties became more serious. What result this combination against him might have produced cannot now be known; death removed him from the scene of strife A.D. 490, shortly before the death of Zeno. He was succeeded in the see of Alexandria by another Monophysite, Athanasius II. See Cave, *Hist. Litt.* 1:455; Fabricius, *Bibl. Graeca,* 11:336; Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus,* volume 2, col. 416, etc.; Tillemont, *Memoires Ecclesiastiques,* volume 16.

Peter (Pierre), archbishop Of Narbonne

the son of Ameli, was born in the last half of the 12th century. He was at first clerk of Saint-Nazaire of Beziers; canon, chamberlain, grand archdeacon of Narbonne; then elected archbishop in the month of March, 1226. The extermination of the Albigenses having ended the war so long prosecuted against these people, Peter used all his efforts to pacify his diocese. But observing the method practiced in his time, he seized, according to that custom, all the goods which had belonged to the heretics, made all the inhabitants of Narbonne take oath to massacre any one who should dare in the future to separate himself from the Roman orthodoxy, and in order to watch over, discover, and point out all the dissenters, introduced in 1231 into the city of Narbonne the St. Dominican friars. But the Albigenses were conquered, not subdued. An occasion having offered in 1234, the inhabitants rose in insurrection, and drove out their archbishop. Vainly he excommunicated them. In order to return to his metropolis, after about a year's exile, Peter was obliged to descend to conditions. The insurgents imposed upon him, among others, that of expelling from their city the Brother Preachers, and under his eyes, for greater safety, they invaded the convent of these brothers and put them to flight. Peter dared not recall them. Yet he was a prelate energetic in his designs, courageous in his conduct, who had the tem, perament of a man of arms, and who oftener faced perils than turned his back upon them. In 1238 he made a campaign against the Moors with Jayme I, king of Aragon, and, according to the *Chronique* of Albaric, he took an active part in the

battles fought under the walls of Valence. The following year he raised other troops, and at their head went to drive from Carcassonne Raymond de Tancarvel and some other lords in revolt against the king of France. He was less fortunate in his attempt against Aimeric; the latter drove him from Narbonne in 1242. Finally, in 1243, we see the archbishop Peter making the siege of the chateau of Montsegur, and taking it from the heretics. This was the last exploit of this belligerent prelate. He died at Narbonne May 20, 1245. See *Gallia Christiana,* volume 6, col. 65; *Hist. Litt. de la France,* 18:331; Vaissette, *Hist. du Languedoc,* 3:352; Alberic, *Chronicon,* ad ann. 1239; Gulielmus de Podio, *Hist. bellor. adversus Albigenses, c.* 39, 40 sq. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale,* 40:195.

Peter Of Nicomedia

an Eastern ecclesiastic, was born in the early part of the 7th century. He was one of the prelates who, with certain deacons and monks, had to clear themselves in the third Constantinopolitan, or sixth oecumenical, council (A.D. 680), from the suspicion of holding the Monothelite heresy, by oath and solemn written confessions of their belief in the orthodox doctrine of two wills in Christ. The confessions were of considerable length, and all exactly alike, and are given in the original Greek with a considerable hiatus; but completely iin a Latin version in the *Acta Concilii CPolitani III, Actio 10.;* or, according to one of the Latin versions of the *A cta* given by Hartiouin, in *Actio 9.* See *Concilia,* volume 6, col. 784, 842, ed. Labbd; volume 3, col. 1202, 1248, 1537, 1561, ed. Hardouin; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* ad ann. 680, 1:595.

Peter (St.) Nolasco

Picture for Peter Nolasco

(Sp. *San Pedro Nolasco), a* Romish saint, noted as the founder of "the Order of Our Lady of Mercy," flourished in the first half of the 13th century. He was the son of a noble of Languedoc, and became a convert of St, John de Matha. He was much cultivated, and greatly esteemed for his learning and application, and was made a tutor of the young king James of Aragon. As the needs of the crusaders called for help from various directions, Peter brought about the formation of the order above referred to. At first it was military, and consisted of knights and gentlemen. The king himself was placed at the head, and his arms served as a device or badge. Soon, however, the order became very popular, and extended itself

on all sides. Peter Nolasco was the superior, and spent his life in expeditions to the provinces under the Moors, from which he brought back hundreds of redeemed captives. In time the order changed its character from that of a military to that of a religious institution, and as such exerted a wide influence. Peter himself, when he was old, was taken from his cell by angels, so the legend goes, and borne to and from the altar, where he received the holy Eucharist. In the paintings of the saints he is represented as old, with a white habit, and the shield of king James on his breast. His death is said to have occurred January 15, 1258. (J.H.W.)

Peter The Patrician (1)

was a Byzantine historian of the 6th century. He was born at Thessalonica, in the province of Macedonia, then included in the prefecture of Illyricum. He settled at Constantinople, where he acquired distinction as a rhetor or advocate, a profession for which his cultivated mind, agreeable address, and natural powers of persuasion were admirably adapted. These qualifications pointed him out to the discernment of the emperor Justinian I as suited for diplomatic life, and he was sent by him (A.D. 534) as ambassador to Amalasuntha, regent of the kingdom of the Ostrogoths. Before arriving in Italy Peter learned the death of the young king Athalaric, the marriage of Amalasuntha and Theodotus, one of the principal chiefs of the Ostrogoths, their exaltation to the throne of Italy, and of their subsequent dissensions and the imprisonment of Amalasuntha. Peter then received instructions to vindicate the cause of the imprisoned queen; but his arrival at Ravenna was speedily followed by the murder of Amalasuntha. Procopius charges Peter with instigating Theodotus to commit the murder; being secretly commissioned to do so by the jealousy of Theodora, Justinian's wife, who held out to him as an inducement to comply with her desire the hope of great advancement. Whether he was an abettor to the crime or not, Peter, in conformity to the orders of Justinian, demanded reparation for it, and declared war against Theodotus. The latter, terrified, commissioned him to convey to Justinian the most humble propositions of peace, and even, if necessary, the offer of his abdication. The last offer only was accepted; but when Peter returned to communicate the will of the emperor to Theodotus, the latter was not disposed to accept it. The king of the Ostrogoths even violated the law of nations by imprisoning the Byzantine ambassadors. Peter and his colleague remained in captivity until Belisarius, by detaining some Ostrogothic ambassadors, compelled Vitiges, who had succeeded Theodotus, to release him about the

end of A.D. 538. On his return Peter received, as Procopius intimates, by Theodora's interest, and as a reward for his participation in procuring Amalasuntha's death, the high appointment of *magister officiorum,* but incurred general odium by the part he had acted. He exercised his authority with the most unbridled rapacity; for although he was, according to Procopius, naturally of a mild temper, and by no means insolent, he was at the same time the most dishonest of all mankind, κλεπτίστατος δὲ ανθρώπων ἁπάντων**.** Several years afterwards (about A.D. 550) Peter, who retained his post of *magister offciorum,* and had in addition acquired the dignity of patrician, was sent by Justinian to negotiate a peace with Chosroes I, king of Persia. Some negotiations with pope Vigilius (552), and a new mission into Persia (562), are the last events known of the career of Peter the Patrician. He died soon after his return from Persia, leaving one son, who succeeded him in his office of *magister officiorum.* According to Suidas, Peter composed two works, *Historiae* and *De Statu Reipublicae*. The *Historiae* began with Augustus, or rather with the second triumvirate, and continued to a period a little later than the time of Constaptine the Great. Considerable portions of it are preserved in the *Excerpta de Legationibus,* made by order of the emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus. The treatise *De Statu Reipublicae* is lost, although Mai thinks he recognises it in *De Republica,* from which he has deciphered and published long passages in his *Scriptorum Veterum Nova Collectio.* Authentic fragments from the treatise of Peter are found in the *De Caeremoniis Aulae Byzantinae* of Constantine Porphyrogenitus. Peter the Patrician has given a relation of his negotiations with Chosroes, which is quoted by Menander. All the remains of this historian are given in the Bonn edition of the *Excerpta de Legationibus.* See Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Graeca,* 6:135; 7:538; 8:33; Reiske, *Praefatio,* c. 2, to the *De Caeremoniis* of Constantine Porphyrogenitus; Niebuhr, *De Historicis quorum Reliquiae hoc Volumine continentur,* in the *Excerpta de Legat.* ed. of Bonn; Mai, *De Fragmentis Politicis Petri Magistri,* in the *Script. Veterum Nova Collec.* 2:571 sq.; Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* 3:226; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale,* 40:182.

Peter The Patrician (2)

was a Greek saint who lived early in the 9th century. He had fought in the battle (A.D. 811) against the Bulgarians in which the emperor Nicephorus I was defeated and slain. A life of Peter, taken from the *Meencea* of the Greeks, is given in the original Greek, with a Latin version, and a

Commentariolus Prcevius by Joannes Pinius, in the *Acta Sanctorum* (July), 1:289, 290.

Peter The Patrician (3)

a Greek, different from the foregoing, and belonging to a somewhat later period. He presented to the emperor Leo VI Sapiens, who began to reign A.D. 886, a copy of Theodoret's *Curatio Graecarum Adfectionum,* to which he prefixed an *Epigramma,* which is printed at length by Lambecius ill his *Commentarius de Biblioth. Caesaraea.*

Peter (Pierre) Of Poitiers

was a modern Latin poet, who died after 1141. All that we learn of his life is that, having made a profession of the rule of St. Benedict in a monastery of Aquitaine, he was chosen by Peter the Venerable as secretary, and accompanied him first to Clugny, in 1134, then to Spain in 1141. His principal works are poems in elegiac verse, which, for verses of the 12th century, lack neither fluency nor elegance. Yet Peter the Venerable surpasses even the limit of hyperbole when he compares these verses with those of Horace and Virgil. The poems of Peter of Poitiers have been collected by the editors of the *Biblioth. de Cluni.* We find in the same collection, among the letters of Peter the Venerable, three letters written to this abbe by his secretary. A fourth letter from Peter of Poitiers to Peter the Venerable, published by Martene in his *Amplissima Collectio* (2:11), contains this curious information, that Peter of Poitiers, being in Spain, contributed some part to the translation of the Koran demanded by the abbe of Clugny. See *Hist. Litt. de la France,* 12:349. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale,* 40:187.

Peter Regulato (St.)

a mediaeval saint, appears in the later Italian and Spanish paintings of the Franciscans, to whose order he belonged. He is noted in ecclesiastical annals for his "sublime gift of prayer." He died March 30, 1456.

Peter Of Remigius

also known as *Petrus Cellensis,* flourished in the fourth quarter of the 12th century as abbot of St. Remigius, and afterwards as bishop of Chartres. He published his *Opera,* containing *Sermones, Liber depanibus, Mosaici tabernaculi mystica et moralis expositio, De conscientia, De disciplina*

claustrali, Epistolarum libri 9 (in *Bibl. Max. Patr.* 23:636), *Tractatus de disciplina claustrali* (D'Achery, *Spicil.* 1:452), *Epistolarum libri 9* (Sirmondi *Opera Varia*, 3:659).

Peter Of Sebaste

an Eastern prelate, was born at Caesarea, in Cappadocia. before A.D. 349. He was the youngest of the ten children of Basil and Emmelia, who numbered among their children those eminent fathers of the Church, Basil the Great and Gregory of Nyssa. Peter's early education was conducted by his sister, St. Macrina, who, in the emphatic phrase of Gregory of Nyssa. "was everything to him — father, teacher, attendant, and mother." The quickness of the boy enabled him readily to acquire anything to which his attention was directed; but his education appears to have been conducted on a very narrow system, profane learning being disregarded. If, however, his literary culture was thus narrowed, his morals were preserved pure; and if he fell short of his more eminent brothers in variety of attainments, he equalled them in holiness of life. The place of his education appears to have been a nunnery at Annesi, or Annesa, on the river Iris, in Pontus, established by his mother and sister; and with them, or in the monastery which his brother Basil had established on the other side of the river, much of his life was passed. In a season of scarcity (A.D. 367, 368 ?), such was his benevolent exertion to provide for the destitute, that they flocked to him from all parts, and gave to the thinly peopled neighborhood in which he resided the appearance of a populous town. His mother's death appears to have occurred about the time of Basil's elevation to the bishopric of the Cappadocian Caesarea, about A.D. 370; soon after which, apparently, Peter received from Basil ordination to the office of presbyter, probably of the Church of Csesarea; for Basil appears to have employed his brother as his confidential agent in some affairs. A passage of Theodoret *(H.E.* 4:30) shows that he took an active part in the struggle carried on during the reign of Valens by the bishops of the orthodox party against Arianism. It was probably after the death both of Basil and Macrina, about the year 380, as Tillemont judges, that Peter was raised to the bishopric of Sebaste (now Siwas), in the Lesser Armenia. His elevation preceded the second general council, that of Constantinople, A.D. 380-381, in which he took part. In what year he died is not known, but it was probably after A.D. 391, and certainly before the death of his brother, Gregory of Nyssa (who survived till A.D. 394, or later), for Gregory was present at Sebaste at the first celebration of his brother's memory, i.e., the anniversary of his death,

which occurred in hot weather, and therefore could not have been in January or March, where the martyrologies place it. The only extant writing of Peter is a letter prefixed to the *Contra Eunomium Libri* of Gregory of Nyssa, and published with the works of that father. It is entitled *Sancti Patris nostri Petri Episcopi Sebasteni ad S. Gregorium Nyssenum suum Epistola.* Peter does not appear to have been ambitious of authorship, and probably felt the disqualification arising from his restricted education. Some of the works of his brother Gregory were, however, written at his desire, such as the above-mentioned treatises against Eunomius and the *Expicatio Apologetica in Hexaemeron.* The *De Hominis Opificio is* also addressed to him by Gregory, who, both in this treatise and in the *Explicatio in Hexaemeron,* speaks of him in the highest terms. See Greg. Nyssen. *De Vita S. Macrinae;* Basil, *Maritimis Episcopis Epistola,* 203, ed. Bened.; Tillemont, *Mimoires,* 9:572, Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus,* volume 1, col. 424; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* ad ann. 370, 1:246.

Peter (Pierre),prior of St. John Of Sens

was born in the latter part of the 11th century. In 1111, Stephen, provost of the church of Sens, having resolved to restore the ancient monastery of Saint-Jean, called to it some regular canons, and confided the government of this house to our Peter. The authors of the *Gallia Christiana* give the highest praise to the knowledge and piety of this prior. He died after 1144. We have several of his *Letters,* published by Du Saussay in his *Annales de l'Eglise d'Orlians,* and by Severt, in his *Chronique des Archeveques de Lyon.* Peter is, besides, considered the author of several letters of kings, princes, and bishops, who had required, in delicate affairs, the aid of his experienced pen. See *Gallia Christ.* 12, col. 195; *Hist. Litt. de la France,* 12:230. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale,* 40:188.

Peter The Sicilian

an Italian prelate, was born in Sicily near the beginning of the 9th century. In order to escape the persecution of the Saracens, who ruled in Sicily, he went to Byzantium in 830, and there spent a large part of his life. He gained the friendship of the emperor Basil, and the princes Constantine and Leo, his sons, who provided him with ecclesiastical benefices. He was sent by the emperor to Tabrica, in the district or on the frontier of Melitene, near the Euphrates, to negotiate an exchange of Christian prisoners, apparently with the chiefs of the Paulicians, a purpose which, after a

residence of nine months, he effected. We have of his works, *Petri Siculi, humillimi Argirorum Episcopi, Funebris Oratio in B. Athanasium, Methones Episcopum.*

It is given in the Latin version of the Jesuit Franciscus Blanditius, in the *Acta Sanctorum* of the Bollandists (January), 2:1125, *etc.*: — *Petri Siculi Historia de vana et stolida Manichaeorum Haeresi tanquam Archiepiscopo Bulgarorum nuncupata.* This account of the Paulicians was translated into Latin, and published by Matthaeus Raderus (Ingoldstadt, 1604, 4to), and has been reprinted in various editions of the *Bibliotheca Patrum.*

There was another bishop of Argos of the name of Peter, author of *Eulogium Cosniae et Damiana SS. Anargyrorum in Asia s. Oratio in sanctos et gloriosos Anargyros et Thaumaturgos Cosnum et Damianum,* which has never been printed. — Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* 3:222; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale,* 40:183.

Peter The Singer (Pierre le Chanteur)

a French theologian, was born in Beauvoisis near the beginning of the 12th century. The place of his birth is strongly controverted, and certain authors assert that he was born in Paris or Rheims. It is probable that, educated by the care of Henry of France, brother of the king Louis le Jeune, and bishop of Beauvais in 1149, he followed him to Rheims when he was raised to that seat in 1162. Peter went afterwards to Paris, where he taught theology, and became grand chorister of the cathedral, a dignity which gained him the surname under which he was known (1184). Elected in 1191 bishop of Tournay, he saw his election broken for want of form, and was in 1196 called to the episcopal seat of Paris, but without being more fortunate this time. He was supplanted by Eudes de Sully. The pope charged him to preach the crusade in France; but Peter, weakened by disease, confided this care to Foulques, cure of Neuilly-sur-Marne, his disciple, and died in the garb of a monk at Longpont, September 22, 1197, when he had just been elected dean of Rheims. Of his numerous writings a single one has been published under the title of *Verbum abbreviatum,* because it commences with these words (Mons, 1639, 4to). See *Hist. Litt.* 15:283-303; Muldrac, *Hist. de l'Abb. de Longpont;* Dupin, *Auteurs Eccles. du Treizieme Siecle.* — *Hoefer, Nouv, Biog.* [01409]*Genesis* 40:192.

Peter The Stammerer

SEE PETER MONGUS.

Peter (St.) Of Tarentaise

a French prelate, was born in 1102 at Saint-Maurier de l'Exile, diocese of Vienne. He was one of the first monks of the abbey founded in 1117 at Bonnevaux by Gui de Bourgogne, archbishop of Vienne. The abbe Jean, his superior, sent him in 1132 to found in Savoy the abbey of Tamie, which he governed for ten years, at the end of which he was called, by the advice of St. Bernard, to the bishopric of Tarentaise, now Moutiers (1142). After having worked thirteen years to repress grave disorders in this diocese, Peter went in 1155 to conceal himself in a monastery of his order in Germany, where he hoped to live unknown; but he was soon discovered, and constrained to return to his Church. He employed himself fortunately in extinguishing the war which had arisen between Humbert III, count of Savoy, and Alphonse Taillefer, son of Alphonse Jourdain, count of Toulouse; and, although a vassal of the emperor Frederick, he sustained the part of pope Alexander III without quarrelling with that prince. This pope brought him to Italy, where he acquired great influence, and employed him to negotiate peace between the young Henry, crowned king of England, and king Henry his father. Peter died May 3,1174, at Belleveaux, diocese of Besancon. The Church honors his memory May 8, Celestin III having canonized him in 1191. See Fontenay, *Hist. de l'Eglise Gallic.* volume 9; *Acta Sanctorum,* May; Baillet, *Vies des Saints,* 8 Mai; Lenain, *Hist. de Citeaux,* 2:83. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale,* 40:139.

Peter (Pierre) Tudebode

a French chronicler, was born at Civray (Poitou) near the beginning of the 11th century. Like so many other priests who engaged in the first crusade, he departed in 1096 with Hugues de Lusignan, lord of Civray; his two brothers, Herve and Arnaud, chevaliers *(optimi milites),* took the cross at the same time with himself, and were both killed in the East. Peter was present at the siege of Nice, and followed Bohemond when the crusaders were divided into three different bodies. He shared equally the fatigues that the long siege of Antioch cost the Christians, and assisted at the taking of Jerusalem. After that period no more mention is made of him. He died at the close of the year 1099. "The history of the first crusade which he has left," says Dom Rivet, "carries with it all the characteristics of an authentic,

true, and sincere writing. He had been present at almost all that he re.lates, and seems to have written it upon the spot. . . . Raimond d'Agiles has made use of it. There is found so much conformity between these two historians that one can scarcely believe that they did not comrmunicate their productions to each other." This narrative is given in a simple but rude style; it is divided into five books (1096-1099), and is entitled *Historia de Hierosolymitano itinere;* the most correct edition is that by Duchesne, in volume 4 of the *Historiens de France.* See *Hist. Litt. de la France,* 8:629-640. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale,* 40:187.

Peter The Venerable

also called *Mauritius,* a mediaeval character of note, was born in 1092 or 1094. He was educated at the Cistercian abbey at Soucilanges, and soon after the completion of his theological training was made prior of the convent at Vezelay, then at Domeine, and in 1122 abbot of Clugny. Petrus Venerabilis was more or less mixed with all the important ecclesiastical transactions of the 12th century. He took in the schism of 1130 the side of pope Innocent XI; and especially played a great part in the discussions between Bernard of Clairvaux and Abelard. His works, written with more ease than talent, have not yet been published in a collected form. He died, at Christmas, in 1157 (see *Bibl. Patr. Despont,* volume 22). His publications are, *Sermones* (in Martene et Durand, *Thesaur.* November 5, 1419): — *Nucleus de sacrificio missae* (Hittorpius, 1091): — *Libri ii adversus nefariam sectam Saracenorum* (in Martene et Durand, *Collectio,* 9:1120). His life was written by the monk Rudolph, his disciple: *Vita Petri Venerabilis, abbatis Cluniacensis (ibid.* 6:1187). See Hook, *Eccles. Biog. 8:*59; Schrockh, *Kirchengesch.* volume 27; Wilkins, *Peter der Ehrwurdige* (Leipsic, 1857). (J.H.W.)

Peterffi, Charley

a Hungarian Jesuit, was born towards the close of the 17th century. He was descended from a noble family. Admitted among the Jesuits in 1715, he taught belles-lettres at Tyrnau and philosophy at Vienna. He died August 10, 1746. He made himself known by a valuable collection, *Sacra concilia in regno Hungariae celebrata, ab a.* 1016 *usque ad a.* 1715 (Vienna, 1742, fol.), in which a good method and the variety of research are to be admired. See Feller, *Dict. Hist.* — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale,* 39:691.

Peter-Low, Christian

a convert from Judaism, flourished in the first half of the 18th century for several years as professor of Oriental languages at the University of Upsala. He wrote, in the Swedish language, *Speculum religionis Judaicae,* which, in fifty-eight chapters, treats of the Jewish festivals, rites, circumcision, dogmas, resurrection, etc. — Furst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3:80; Wolf, *Bibl. Hebr.* 4:966; *Niedersachsische Nachrichten* (Hamburg, 1731), page 666 sq.; and *Leipziger Gelehrte Zeitung* (Leips. 1731), page 884, where a full index to all the chapters is given. (B.P.)

Peter-pence

is the annual tribute of one penny from every Roman Catholic family, paid at Rome at a festival of the apostle Peter. It is offered to the Roman pontiff in reverence of the memory of St. Peter, of whom that bishop is believed to be the successor. From an early period the Roman see had been richly endowed; and although its first endowments were chiefly local, yet as early as the days of Gregory the Great large estates were held by the Roman bishops in Campania, in Calabria, and even in the island of Sicily. The first idea, however, of an annual tribute appears to have come from England, and is by some ascribed to Ina (A.D. 721), king of the West Saxons, who went as a pilgrim to Rome, and there founded a hospice for AngloSaxon pilgrims, to be maintained by an annual contribution from England; by others, to Offa and Ethelwulf, at least in the sense of their having extended it to the whole of the Saxon territory. But this seems very uncertain; and although the usage was certainly long anterior to the Norman conquest, Dr. Lingard is disposed not to place it earlier than the time of Alfred. The tribute consisted in the payment of a silver penny by every family possessing land or cattle of the yearly value of thirty pence, and was collected in the five weeks between St. Peter's and St. Paul's Day and August 1. In the time of king John, the total annual payment was £199 8s., contributed by the several dioceses in proportion, an account of which will be found in Lingard's *History of England,* 2:330. The tax called *Romescot,* with some variation, continued to be paid till the reign of Henry VIII, when it was abolished. Pope Gregory VII sought to establish the Peter-pence for France: and other partial or transient tributes are recorded from Denmark, Sweden, Norway, and Poland. This tribute, however, is quite different from the payments made annually to Rome by the kingdoms which were held to be feudatory to the Roman see — as Naples, Aragon, England

under the reign of John, and several other kingdoms, at least for a time." — Chambers. The pope having suffered a considerable diminution of his own revenue since the revolution of 1848, an effort has been made in several parts of Europe to revive this practice. In some countries it has been very successfully carried out, and the proceeds have been among the chief of the resources of Pius IX, as he has steadfastly refused to accept any support from the new kingdom of Italy, since his temporalities were merged in it. See Thompson, *Papal Power* (N.Y. 1877,1 2mo); Riddle, *lrist. of the Papacy;* Hefele, *Conciliengesch.* volume 5; Ranke, *Hist. of the Papacy in the 16th and 17th Centuries,* 1:21, 37, 230; Inett, *Ch. Hist. of England* (see Index).

Peter's (St.) Day

(June 29) is a festival observed in the Roman Catholic Church. Its origin has been traced back to the 3d century. In 348 Prudentius mentions that the pope celebrated the Holy Communion in both St. Peter's and St. Paul's churches at Rome on this festival, which in the 6th century was observed at Constantinople, and was kept, until the Reformation, associated with the name of St. Paul, whose conversion was not generally commemorated on Jan. 25 until the 12th century. Cathedra Sancti Petri is a commemoration virtually of SS. Peter and Paul, but its title is the Chair of St. Peter, wherein he first sat at Rome, January 18. On February 22 his chair at Antioch is commemorated.

Peters, Absalom, D.D.

a Congregational minister, was born at Wentworth, N.H., September 19, 1793, and was educated at Dartmouth College, class of 1816, and for the ministry at Princetoll Seminary, class of 1819. He was the son of general Absalom Peters, a descendant of William, of Boston, brother of the noted Hugh Peters. In 1819 he was made a missionary in Northern New York, but in the following year became pastor of the First Church, Bennington, Vermont, where he remained until December 14, 1825. After this he was successively secretary of the Home Missionary Society until 1837, and editor of the *Home Missionary and Pastor's Journal;* and in 1838 began to edit the *American Biblical Repository.* He was professor of pastoral theology and homiletics in the Union Theological Seminary, New York, from 1842 to 1844, and pastor of the First Church, Williamstown, Mass., from 1844 to 1857. Here he originated and edited the *American Eclectic*

and the *American Journal of Education,* which was afterwards merged in that of Dr. Henry Barnard. When past seventy he published a volume of poems. He died at New York May 18, 1869. During his long life he was never ill. He is the author of *A Plea for Voluntary Societies: — Sprinkling the Only Mode of Baptism, etc.*: — *Sermon against Horse-racing* (1822): — *Sacred Miusic* (1823): — *Colleges, Religious Institutions* (1851).

Peters, Charles

a learned English divine, was born in Cornwall near the close of the 17th century, and was educated at Exeter College, Oxford. On entering into orders he obtained the living of Boconoc. In 1727 he was made rector of St. Mabyn, Cornwall, where he died, at a very advanced age, in 1777. In his dissertation on the book of Job he displayed a deep knowledge of Hebrew, and great power of argument against Warburton. The work, which is valuable, is entitled *A critical Dissertation on the Book of Job, wherein the A ccount given of that Book by the Author of the Divine Legation of Moses demonstrated* [Warburton] *is particularly considered, the Antiquity of the Book vindicated, the great Text (19:*25) *explained, and a future State shown to have been the popular Belief of the ancient Jews* (2d ed. corrected, Lond. 1757, 8vo): — *An Appendix to the critical Dissertation on the Book of Job, giving a further Account of the Book of Ecclesiastes; to which is added a Reply to some Notes of the late D-n of B-, in his new Edition of the Divine Legation,* volume 2, part 2, *by the Author of the Critical Dissertation* (Lond. 1760). There are also extant *Sermons,* published from his MSS. by his nephew, Jon. Peters, M.A., vicar of St. Clement's, near Truro, Cornwall (Lond. 1776, 8vo). (J.H.W.)

Peters, Hugh

an English divine, who came to this country in the colonial days, and is noted both as a preacher and politician, was born at Fowey, Cornwall, England, in 1599. He was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge, where he graduated in 1622; then entered the ministry, and preached successfully at St. Sepulchre's, London, until he was silenced for nonconformity, and imprisoned. As soon as liberated he went to Rotterdam, and became pastor of the Independent Church in that place. In 1635 he resigned and sailed for New England, where he arrived October 6, and was installed December 21, 1636, pastor of the First Church, Salem, as successor to Roger Williams, whose doctrines he disclaimed and whose adherents he excommunicated.

He was also active in civil and mercantile affairs, suggesting coasting and foreign voyages, and the plan of the fisheries. In March 1638, he was appointed by the General Court to assist in collecting and revising the colonial laws, and having been chosen to "represent the sense of the colony upon the laws of excise and trade," he sailed for England August 3, 1641. He became in 1643 a preacher in the Parliamentary army, in which capacity he was present at the siege of Lynn and the capture of Bridgewater. For his services he was largely rewarded, and in 1653 was one of the committee of legal reform appointed by Parliament. In 1658 he was chaplain to the garrison at Dunkirk. After the Restoration Peters, being suspected of some complicity with the death of the king, was committed to the Tower, and indicted for high-treason October 13, 1660. He was:convicted and executed October 16, 1660. During his imprisonment he wrote several letters of advice to his daughter, subsequently (1717) published under the title of *A dying Father's last Legacy to an only Child.* His private character has been the subject of much discussion both in England and America. He as charged by his enemies with gross immorality, and the most bitter epithets were appliedtto him by bishops Burnet. Kennet, and others; but oflate years he has been estimated more favorably. He published also *God's Doings and Man's Duty, opened in a Sermon preached before the House of Commons, the Lord Mayor, and the Assembly of Divines* (1646): — *Peters's last Report of the English Wars, occasioned by the Importunity of a Friend pressing an Answer to some Queries* (1646): — A *Word for the Army and Two Words for the Kingdom, to Clear the One and Cure the Other, forced in much Plainness and Brevity from their faithful Servant, Hugh Peters* (1647): — *A Good Work for a Good Magistrate, or a Short Cut to a Great Quiet* (1651): — *Some Notes of a Sermon preached on the 14th of October,* 1660, *in the Prison of Newgate, after his Condemnation* (1660). See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit,* 1:70; Drake, *Dict. of Amer. Biogr.* s.v.

Peters, Richard, D.D.

a Protestant Episcopal clergyman of colonial days, was born at Liverpool, England, where he was educated as a clergyman of the Church of England, and came to Philadelphia in 1735. His services were soon engaged at Christ's Church, for which he was licensed by the bishop of London. — He shortly resigned, and then held an important Church agency, and also became secretary to a succession of governors. In May 1749, he became a member of the provincial council, butin 1762 he resigned all civil offices

and was made one of the ministers of the United Church; was afterwards chosen their rector, and in 1764 went to England to receive his license in due form. On his return he resumed his duties. He resigned in 1775, and died July 10, 1776. He published a *Sermon on Education* (1751). See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 5:88; Dorr, *Hist. of the Christ. Church*, volume 1.

Peters, Samuel Andrew, D.D., LL.D.

an eccentric Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was born at Hebron, Conn., November 20, 1735, and passed A.B. in Yale, 1757, when he went to England for ordination. He returned in 1759, and in 1762 took charge of the Church at Hebron, where he continued for many years. During the Revolution, being a Tory, he retired first to Boston, and soon sailed to England, as his imprudence and loyalty to the English cause made him very obnoxious. Of course his royal master rewarded his fidelity by a pension and a grant of confiscated lands. In 1781 he published a general history of Connecticut, which has been called "the most unscrupulous and malicious of lying narratives." Its narrations are independent of time, place, and probability. In 1794 he was chosen bishop of Vermont, but he was never consecrated. After being struck off the pension roll by William Pitt, he returned home in 1805, and spent his years in useless petitions to Congress for lands granted to Jonathan Carver, the Indian traveller. In 1817 he journeyed westward, and in 1818 returned to New York, where he lived in obscurity and poverty until his death, April 19, 1826. He is the "Parson Peter" of Trumbull's *M'Fingal*. Peters published, *A General History of Connecticut, by a Gentleman of the Province* (Lond. 1781): — *A Letter on the Possibility of Eternal Punishments*, etc. (ibid. 1785): — and *The History of Rev. Hugh Peters*, etc. (ibid. 1807). See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 5:191.

Peters, William

an English clergyman, who flourished in the latter part of the 18th century, distinguished himself especially as a painter. He was a man of wit, and possessed a lively imagination and great conversational powers, which made him a favorite. Having a passion for painting, he practiced it first as an amusement, and, by associating much with the eminent artists of the time, he greatly improved his manner, and produced many beautiful works which were greatly admired. He painted for the Shakespeare Gallery scenes

from that author's dramatic works; also several pictures for Macklin's Gallery, as the *Resurrection of a Pious Family; the Guardian Angels and the Spirit of a Child; the Cherubs,* etc., all of which were very popular. He executed many fancy subjects from his own imagination, which are pleasingly sentimental. He was much patronized by the nobility, and he sometimes painted subjects not strictly in accordance with just notions of propriety. His pictures are well composed, and his coloring rich and harmonious, with an admirable *impasto,* in which he imitated Reynolds. Many of his works were engraved by Bartolozzi, Thew, Simon, Smith, Marcuard, and others. He is generally called the Reverend W. Peters. The duke of Rutland was his chief patron, and presented him with a valuable living. The bishop of Lincoln gave him a prebendal stall in his cathedral. He died in 1814.

Petersen, Johann Wilhelm

a German writer noted for his theological studies, and his heresies in certain branches of Christian doctrine, was born July 1, 1649, at Osnabrick, was educated at Lubeck in the preparatory branches, and studied theology at the universities of Giessen, Rostock, Leipsic, Wittenberg, and Jena. He then lectured for a while at Giessen, preached at Lubeck, and finally accepted a professorship at the university in Rostock. He had written a poem satirizing the Jesuits; they in turn had made it so uncomfortable for him at Lubeck that he went to Rostock, but also here, and at Hanover later, they followed him with their opposition and invectives, and in 1678 he gladly accepted the superintendency of the churches at Eutin. In 1688 he became superintendent at Lineburg, but did not remain long, as differences sprang up between him and the pastors. In 1692 he was deposed, on the ground that he espoused chiliastic ideas. He now purchased a farm near Zerbst, and died in retirement, January 31, 1727. His last years were spent in the advocacy of chiliasticopietistic opinions, and he wrote much for that purpose. A list of all his writings is given in his autobiography (1717). This book is valuable, as it indicates the sources whence the pietism of Spener and Francke drew its strength. We must not be understood, however, to say that Spener's pietism depended on Petersen, but simply that Petersen and Spener had much in common, and that the former, by his influence and acceptance of pietistic views, strengthened Spener's hands. Petersen seems to have misapprehended Spener, and to have gone farther than he. Thus, for example, Petersen. misunderstanding Spener's doctrine concerning "better times to come",

SEE ESCHATOLOGY; *SEE SPENER*, and the realization of God's kingdom on earth, announced the speedy approach of the millennial reign, and, for the sake of accommodation, even adopted the final restoration theories of Origen (q.v.), with which he became acquainted, as he tells us, in the writings of the English fanatic Jane Leade (q.v.). His wife adopted these views also, and became a propagator of this heresy and the notion of a universal *apocatastasis.* But the doctrine, though it pleased many by limiting the eternity of punishment, and some who had almost strayed from the Church beyond hope of regaining their former hold on Christ and his Church, yet met with almost universal rejection, because it obliged its advocates to embrace a physical process of redemption, or at least one which was not brought about by the Word of Christ. A train of thought Which was the germ of the *Terministic* controversy of 1698-1710 might well lead farther. It had been usual so to identify the day of grace with the duration of earthly life as to allow no hope beyond it, and also to regard the term of grace as unexpired while life lasted. Though the original foundation of this opinion was a serious view of the importance of earthly life, it was yet capable of being made the basis of that levity which would delay repentance till the approach of death. To put a stop to this notion, Bose, with whom Rechenberg (q.v.) agreed, upheld the tenet that there is, even in this life, a peremptory termination of grace. This cannot depend upon so external a matter as time, but upon the inward maturity of the decision for or against Christ. Grace is taken from those who have repeatedly refused it, and the justification formerly pronounced is withdrawn. See, however, the art. GRACE *SEE GRACE* . To Petersen's adoption of a millennium and a universal restoration, he added, thirdly, faith in the continuation of supernatural inspiration. He was led to this step by a Miss Rosamunda Juliana Von Arnburg, who professed, after her seventh year, to see miraculous visions, especially during prayer, and to experience extraordinary divine revelations. Petersen was acquainted with her after 1691. He boasts that his house had been blessed by her presence as the house of Obed-Edom. He then busied himself with the matter, and composed a work in favor of the lady, in which he sought to establish the divine character of her revelations against all doubt. Besides, Petersen and his wife also claimed to be themselves favored with such illuminations and revelations, and they not unfrequently entertained their superstitious age with extraordinary experiences of a disorganized and infatuated brain. But notwithstanding all his peculiar views, and his too ready credulity, Petersen must be pronounced a noble and pious man. He wrote many hymns, some

of which are preserved in German collections to this day. Dippel (q.v.) and Edelmann joined Petersen, though they differed from him much on doctrinal points. See Hurst's Hagenbach, *Ch. Hist. 18th and 19th Cent.* 1:159 sq.; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines,* 2:370; Dorner, *Hist. of Protestant Theology,* 2:154; *Lebensbeschreibung* (1719). (J.H.W.)

Peterzano (or Preterazzano), Simone

an Italian painter, was, according to Lomazzo, a pupil of Titian, and flourished at Milan in 1591, where he executed some works for the churches, both in oil and fresco. Lanzi says: "On his *Pieta* in S. Fidela he inscribed himself 'litiani Discipulus;' and his close imitation seems to confirm the truth. He produced several works in fresco, particularly several histories of St. Paul in S. Barnaba. He there seems to have aimed at uniting the expression, the foreshortening, and the perspective of the Milanese to the rich coloring of Venetian artists, noble works if they were thoroughly correct, and if the author had been as excellent in fresco as in oil painting." There is a fine picture by this master of the *Assumption of the Virgin* in the Chiesa di Brera.

Pethach Debaray

(yrbDjtP) is the title of an excellent Hebrew grammar written in rabbinic char-, acters by an anonymous Spanish author, the first edition of which appeared at Naples in 1492, and not, as is generally believed, at Pesaro in 1507. Another edition, with additions, appeared at Constantinople in 1515, and the same, with corrections by Elias Levita (q.v.), at Venice in 1545. Of the first edition of this valuable grammar only two copies, one at the Vatican Library, and one at Parma, are extant. The *Pethach Debaray* has been edited with Ibn-Ezra's *Moynaim* (Venice, 1546), and together with Haja ben-Sherira's work on dreams, twmwlj ^wrtp (Constantinople, 1515, and often); and, lastly, with Moses Kimchi's (q.v.) grammatical work, *The Journey on the Paths of Knowledge,* t[dh ylybç !lhm. See De Rossi, *Dizionario storico degli autori Ebrei,* page 262 (Germ. transl. by Hamburger); Wolf. *Bibl. Hebr.* 2:1412 sq.: Steinschneider, *Bibliographisches Handbuch,* page 8, No. 75 sq. (Berlin, 1859). (B.P.)

Pethahi'ah

(Heb. *Pethachyah',* hy;j tPæ, *freed of Jehovah;* Sept. , Φεθεΐ́α, <151023>Ezra 10:23; Φεσσίας, <160905>Nehemiah 9:5; Φαθαΐ́α, 11:24; Φεθείας, <132416>1 Chronicles 24:16). The name of three men.

1. The head of the nineteenth course in David's division of the priests (<132416>1 Chronicles 24:16). B.C. cir. 1020.

2. A Levite, who put away an idolatrous wife at the injunction of Ezra (<151023>Ezra 10:23), and joined in the hymn of praise and the covenant with Nehemiah (<160905>Nehemiah 9:5). B.C. cir. 458.

3. A Hebrew, son of Meshezabeel, of the tribe of Judah, who acted as counsellor of Artaxerxes in matters concerning the Jews (<161124>Nehemiah 11:24). B.C. cir. 446.

Pe'thor

(Heb. *Pethor',* rwOtPæ, *opened;* Sept. (Φαθουρά ; but in <052306>Deuteronomy 23:6 Sept. omits), the name of a place in Mesopotamia, on the Euphrates, the native country of Balaam, to which Balak sent for him to come and curse Israel (<042205>Numbers 22:5; <052305>Deuteronomy 23:5). It is supposed to have been near Tiphsah, on the Euphrates, but this is altogether uncertain. *SEE BALAAM*. The name occurs in the cuneiform inscriptions (q.v.).

Peth-t'el

(Heb. *Pethuel',* laeWtP], *stamp* or *engraving of God;* but according to others, i.q. laeWtmæ, *Methuel',* i.e., *folk of God;* Sept. Βαθουήλ*),* the father of the prophet Joel (<290101>Joel 1:1). B.C. ante 800.

Petillianists

those who adhered to the party of *Petillian*, the Donatist bishop of Carthage, in his controversy with St. Augustine.

Petit, Samuel

a celebrated French scholar, was born at Nismes in 1594. He studied at Geneva with such success that at the age of seventeen he was admitted to the sacred ministry. Soon after he was raised to the professorship of theology, and of Greek and Hebrew, in that city. He died in 1645. He was

a man of vast and profound erudition. He published *Varies lectiones in S. Scripturam* (in the *Critici Sao* volume 8). His other works are, *Miscellaneorum libri 9: — Eclogae Chronologicae*: *— Diatribe de Jure, Principunm Edictis, etc.: — Diatribe de Dissidiorum Causis, Effectis et Remediis.*

Petit-Didier, Matthew

a learned French prelate of note, was born in Lorraine in 1659. He very early in life entered the Order of the Benedictines, and later became abbot of Senones, and finally bishop of Macra *(in partibus infidelium).* He died in 1728. He is the author of several valuable works, among them, *Traite theologique sur l'autorite et 'infallibilite des Papes* (Avign. 1726, sm. 8vo). This work, asserting the infallibility of the pope, has been attacked by various writers, Romanist as well as Protestant; especially by Lenfant at the end of his *Hist. of the Council of Constance.* He also published several critical, historical, and chronological dissertations on the Scriptures (1689-1728). His brother, Jean Joseph, who was a Jesuit, flourished from 1664 to 1756. See Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliogr.* s.v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* s.v.

Petition

according to Dr. Watts, is the fourth part of prayer, and includes a desire of deliverance from evil, and a request of good things to be bestowed. On both these accounts petitions are to be offered up to God, not only for ourselves, but for our fellow-creatures also. This part of prayer is frequently called *intercession. SEE PRAYER.*

Petitot, Jean

an eminent French painter in enamel, is noted especially as a Huguenot who spurned all efforts for his conversion, and, notwithstanding the personal intercession for his recall to Romanism on the part of king Louis XIV, died as he lived, a pious Protestant. Petitot was the son of a sculptor and architect, and was born at Geneva in 1607. Being designed for the trade of a jeweller, he was placed under the direction of Bordier, and in this occupation was engaged in the preparation of enamels for the jewelry business. He was so successful in the production of colors that he was advised by Bordier to attempt portraits. They conjointly made several trials, and though they still wanted many colors which they knew not how

to prepare for the fire, their attempts had great success. After some time they went to Italy, where they consulted the most eminent chemists. and made considerable progress in their art, but it was in England, whither they removed after a few years, that they perfected it. In London they became acquainted with Sir Theodore Mayern, first physician to Charles I, and an intelligent chemist, who had by his experiments discovered the principal colors proper to be used in enamel, and the means of vitrifying them, so that they surpassed the boasted enamelling of Venice and Limoges. Petitot was introduced by Mayern to the king, who retained him in his service and gave him apartments in Whitehall. He painted the portraits of Charles and the royal family several times, and copied many pictures, after Vandyck, which are considered his finest works. That painter greatly assisted him by his advice, and the king frequently went to see him paint. On the death of Charles, Petitot retired to France with the exiled family. He was greatly noticed by Charles II, who introduced him to Louis XIV. Louis appointed him his painter in enamel, and granted him a pension and apartments in the Louvre. He painted the French king many times, and, among a vast number of portraits, those of the queens Anne of Austria and Maria Theresa. He also occupied himself in making copies from the most celebrated pictures of Mignard and Lebrun. Petitot, dreading the effects of the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, solicited leave, but for a long time in vain, to return to Geneva. Finally the king, determined to save his painter, employed Bossuet to endeavor to convert him to Romanism; in this effort, however, that eloquent prelate was wholly unsuccessful. At length Louis permitted him to depart, and, leaving his wife and children in Paris, Petitot proceeded to his native place, where he was soon after joined by his family. Arrived now at eighty years of age, he was sought by such numbers of friends and admirers that he was forced to remove from Geneva, and retire to Vevay, a small town in the canton of Vaud, where he continued to labor till 1691, in which year, while painting a portrait of his wife, he was suddenly attacked by apoplexy, of which he died. For his works of art, see Spooner, *Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts,* s.v.

Petit-Pied, Nicolas (1)

a French canonist, was born in Paris December 24, 1627. He was made doctor of the Sorbonne in 1658, and counsellor-clerk in the Chatelet in 1662. He was provided shortly after with the curacy of Saint-Martial in Paris, united later to that of Saint-Pierre-des-Arcis, and finally became under-chorister and canon of the metropolitan church. In 1678, having

wished, as dean of the counsellors, to preside in the Chatelet in the absence of the lieutenants, he found a violent opposition among the lay-counsellors, who pretended that the clergy had not the right to preside and to *decaniser*. Upon the complaint of Petit-Pied, March 17, 1682, the authorities interposed a decree which gained for him the cause. The researches which he was obliged to make for the pursuit of this affair furnished him the occasion for composing an excellent *Trait' du droit et des prerogatives des ecclesiastiques dans l'administration de la justice seculiere* (Paris, 1705, 4to). See *Journ. des Savans*, 1705; Moreri. *Dict. Hist.; Descript. Hist. de l'Eglise de Paris.* — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 39:719.

Petit-Pied, Nicolas (2)

a French theologian, nephew of the preceding, was born in Paris August 4, 1665. After having finished with distinction his ecclesiastical studies, he was received doctor of the Sorbonne in 1692, and his reputation caused him to be chosen in 1701 to teach the Holy Scriptures in that celebrated school. Having signed, July 20, 1702, with thirty-nine other doctors, the famous *Cas de conscience*, which was condemned at Rome February 15, 1703, he would not retract, and was therefore exiled to Beaune and deprived of his pulpit. He hastened to join in Holland his friend Quesnel, and remained in that country until 1718, producing each year, for the support of Jansenism, new articles upon the formulary, upon respectful silence, and upon other analogous matters now forgotten. The bull *Unigenitus* found in him a formidable adversary: he fought it in pamphlets, in memoirs, and in more extended works. On his return to France, Petit-Pied passed some time at Troyes, and afterwards went to Paris, where, June 1 and 6, 1719, the faculty of theology and the Sorbonne established him again in his rights as doctor. On the 15th of the same month he was again exiled, and on the 21st a *lettre de cachet* ordered the cancelling of the conclusion of the faculty in his favor. Petit-Pied had established his home and a new kind of Protestant Church in the village of Asnibres, near Paris. There he made a trial of the regulations and all the liturgy practiced by the Jansenists in Holland. Renown published astonishing things of him; people hastened there in crowds from the capital, and Asnibres soon became another Charenton. Petit-Pied showed himself from that time a more obstinate appellant. M. de Lorraine, bishop of Bayeux, selected him shortly after for his theologian, but on the death of that prelate, June 9, 1728, he retired again to Holland, whence he returned only in 1734. His

zeal for Jansenism and the fertility of his pen were not inconsistent in this new exile; but from his return to Paris he led a more tranquil life, and contented himself with composing several works to defend the missal given to his diocese by Bossuet, bishop of Troyes. Petit-Pied died in Paris January 7, 1747. The list of all his works would be too long; Moreri mentions eighty-one. We quote of his works, *Examen theologique de l'instruction pastorale approuvee dans l'assemblee di clerge . . . pour l'acceptation de la bulle* (Paris, 1713, 3 volumes, 12mo): — *Examen des faussetes sur le culte Chinois avancees par le P. Jouvency* (ibid. 1714, 12mo): — and *Lettres touchant la matiere de l'usure, par rapport aux contrats des rentes rachetables des deux cotes* (Lille, 1731, 4to). He also labored upon the work of Legros, *Dogma Ecclesiae circa usuram expositum et vindicatum* (Utrecht, 1731, 4to). Sarcastic in his works, Petit-Pied was of a mild, sociable character. See *Dict. Hist. des Auteurs Eccles.* volume 3; *Journal de Dorsanne, Calendrier ecclesiastique* (ibid. 1757, 12mo); *Nouv. eccles.* passim; Moreri, *Dict. Hist.* — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 39:719.

Petosiris

*(*Πετόσιρις*)*, an Egyptian priest and astrologer, who is generally named along with Nechepsos, an Egyptian king. The two are said to be the founders of astrology, and of the art of casting nativities. Suidas states that Petosiris wrote on the right mode of worshipping the gods, astrological maxims, ἐκ τῶν ἱερῶν βιβλίων (which are often referred to in connection with astrology), and a work on the Egyptian mysteries. But we may infer from a statement made by Vetius Valens, of which the substance is given by Marsham *(Canon Chronicus* [ed. Lips. 1676], page 479), that Suidas assigns to Petosiris what others attributed partly to him and partly to Nechepsos. For his ῎Οργανον Ἀστρονομικόν, or ψῆφος σεληνισκή, containing astrological principles for predicting the event of diseases, and for his other writings, Fabricius *(Bibl. Graec.* 4:160) may be consulted. To the list given by him may be added a translation into Latin by Bede of the astrological letter of Petosiris to Nechepsos, entitled *De Divinatione Mortis et Vitce* (Bed. *Opera* [ed. Col. Agripp. 1612], 2:233, 234). His name, as connected with astrology, was in high repute early in Greece, and in Rome in her degenerate days. This we learn from the praises bestowed on him by Manetho (5:10), who, indeed, in the prologue to the first and fifth books of his *Apotelesmatica*, professes only to expand in Greek the prose rules of Petosiris and Nechepsos ("divini illi viri atque omni

admiratione digni"), and from the references of Pliny *(Hist. Nat.* 1:23; 7:49). But the best proof is the fact that, like our own Lilly, Petosiris became the common name for an astrologer, as we find in Aristophanes, quoted by Athenaeus (3:114, c) in the fortysixth epigram of Lucilius (Jacobs, *Anthol. Graec.* 3:38), whence we learn the quantity, and in Juvenal (6:580). Marsham has a full dissertation on Nechepsos and Petosiris in the work above quoted (pages 474-481).

Petra

(in the earlier Greek writers Πέτρα or ἡ Πέτρα, but in the later αἱ Πέτραι*)* was the capital of the Nabathaean Arabs in the land of Edom, and seems to have given name to the kingdom and region of *Arabia Petrcea.* As there is mention in the Old Testament of a stronghold which successively belonged to the Amorites (<070136>Judges 1:36), the Edomites (<121407>2 Kings 14:7), and the Moabites (<231601>Isaiah 16:1; comp. in Hebrews chapter 42: 11), and bore in Hebrew the name of [l is,e *Sela*, which has the same meaning as *Petra* in Greek, viz. "a rock," that circumstance has led to the conjecture that the Petra of the Nabathaeans had been the Sela of Edom. *SEE SELAH*. This latter name seems, however, to have passed away with the Hebrew rule over Edom, for no further trace of it is to be found; although it is still called Sela by Isaiah (16:1). These are all the certain notices of the place in Scripture. *Arce* is said by Josephus to have been a name of Petra *(Ant.* 4:4, 7); but probably we should read Ἀρκήμ for Ἀρκή (yet see *Amer. Bib. Rep.* for 1833, page 536, note). *SEE ARKITE*.

1. *History.* — The earliest notice of this place under the name Petra by the Greek writers is connected with the fact that Antigonus, one of Alexander's successors, sent two expeditions against the Nabathaeans in Petra (Diod. Sic. 19:94-98). The first of these, commanded by Athenaeus, and the second by Demetrius, changed the habits of the Nabathaeans, who had hitherto been essentially nomadic, and led them to engage in commerce. In this way, during the following centuries, they grew up into the kingdom of Arabia Petraea, occupying very nearly the same territory which was comprised within the limits of ancient Edom. In the first expedition, Athenseus took the city by surprise while the men were absent at a neighboring mart or fair, and carried off a large booty of silver and merchandise. But the Nabatheeans quickly pursued him to the number of 8000 men, and, falling upon his camp by night, destroyed the greater part of his army. Of the second expedition, under the comr mand of Demetrius,

the Nabathaeans had previous intelligence; and prepared themselves for an attack by driving their flocks into the deserts, and placing their wealth under the protection of a strong garrison in Petra; to which, according to Diodorus, there was but a single approach, and that made by hand. In this way they succeeded in baffling the whole design of Demetrius. For points of history not immediately connected with the city, *SEE EDOMITES*; *SEE NABATHAEANS*. Strabo, writing of the Nabathaeans in the time of Augustus, thus describes their capital: "The metropolis of the Nabathaeans is Petra, so called; for it lies in a place in other respects plain and level, but shut in by rocks round about, yet within having copious fountains for the supply of water and the irrigation of gardens. Beyond the enclosure the region is mostly a desert, especially towards Judaea" *(Geog. 16*, page 906). At this time the town had become a place of transit for the productions of the East, and was much resorted to by foreigners (Diod. Sic. 19:95; Strabo, 1.c.). Pliny more definitely describes Petra as situated in a valley less than two miles (Roman) in amplitude, surrounded by inaccessible mountains, with a stream flowing through it *(Hist. Nat.* 6:28). About the same period it is often named by Josephus as the capital of Arabia Petrsea *(War,* 1:6, 2; 13, 8; etc.). Petra was situated in the eastern part of Arabia Petraea, in the district called under the Christian emperors of Rome Palsestina Tertia *(Vet. Rom. Itin.* page 74, ed. Wessel; Malala, *Chronogr.* 16:400, ed. Bonn). According to the division of the ancient geographers, it lay in the northern district, Gebalene; while the modern ones place it in the southern portion, Esh-Sherah, the Mount Seir of the Bible. Petra was subdued by A. Cornelius Palma, a lieutenant of Trajan (Dion Cass. 58:14). Hadrian seems to have bestowed on it some advantage, which led the inhabitants to give his name to the city upon coins; several of these are still extant (Mionnet, *Med. Antiques*, 5:587; Eckhel, *Doctr. Num.* 2:503). It remained under the Roman dominion a considerable period, as we hear of the province of Arabia being enlarged by Septimius Severus, A.D. 195 (ibid. 75:1, 2; Eutrop. 8:18). It must have been during this period that those temples and mausoleums were made, the remains of which still arrest the attention of the traveller; for, though the predominant style of architecture is Egyptian, it is mixed with florid and overloaded Roman-Greek specimens, which are but slightly modified by the native artists. In the 4th century Petra is several times mentioned by Eusebins and Jerome; and in the Greek ecclesiastical Notitiae bf the 5th and 6th centuries it appears as the metropolitan see of the third Palestine (Reland, *Palaest.* pages 215, 217); the last named of the bishops is Theodorus, who was

present at the Council of Jerusalem in A.D. 536 *(Oriens Christ.* 3:725). From that time not the slightest notice of Petra is to be found in any quarter; and as no trace of it as an inhabited site is to be met with in the Arabian writers, the probability seems to be that it was destroyed in some unrecorded incursion of the desert hordes, and was afterwards left unpeopled. It is true that Petra occurs in the writers of the sera of the Crusades; but they applied this name to Kerak, and thus introduced a confusion as to the true Petra which is not even now entirely removed. It was not until the reports concerning the wonderful remains in *Wady Musa* had been verified by Burckhardt that the latter traveller first ventured to assume the identity of the site with that of the ancient capital of Arabia Petraea. He expresses this opinion in a letter dated at Cairo, Sept. 12, 1812, published in 1819, in the preface to his *Travels in Nubia;* but before its appearance the eminent geographer Carl Ritter had suggested the same conclusion on the strength of Seetzen's intimations *(Erdkunde,* 2:217). Burckhardt's view was more amply developed in his *Travels in Syria,* page 431, published in 1822, and received the high sanction of his editor, Col. Leake, who produces in support of it all the arguments which have since been relied upon, namely, the agreement of the ancient descriptions with this site, and their inapplicability to Kerak; the coincidence of the ancient specifications of the distances of Petra from the Elanitic gulf and from the Dead Sea, which all point to Wady Musa, and not to Kerak; that Josephus, Eusebius, and Jerome testify that the Mount Hor where Aaron died was in the vicinity of Petra; and that to this day the mountain which tradition and circumstances point out as the same still rears its lonely head above the vale of Wady Musa, while in all the district of Kerak there is not a single mountain which could in itself be regarded as Mount Hor; and even if there were, its position would be incompatible with the recorded journeyings of the Israelites (Leake's Preface to Burckhardt's *Travels in Syria,* pages 7-9; Robinson's *Palestine,* 2:576-579, 653-659).

Picture for Petra 1

2. *Description of the present Site.* — The ruined city lies in a narrow valley, surrounded by lofty and, for the most part, perfectly precipitous mountains. Those which form its southern limit are not so steep as to be impassable; and it is over these, or rather through them, along an abrupt and difficult ravine, that travellers from Sinai or Egypt usually wind their laborious way into the scene of magnificent desolation. The ancient and more interesting entrance is on the eastern side, through the deep narrow

gorge called the *Sik.* It is not easy to determine the precise limits of the ancient city, though the precipitous mountains by which the site is encompassed mark with perfect distinctness the boundaries beyond which it never could have extended. These natural barriers seem to have constituted the real limits of the city; and they give an extent of more than a mile in length, nearly from north to south, by a variable breadth of about half a mile. Several spurs from the surrounding mountains encroach upon this area; but, with inconsiderable exceptions, the whole is fit for building on. The sides of the valley are walled up by perpendicular rocks from four hundred to six or seven hundred feet high. The northern and southern barriers are neither so lofty nor so steep, and they both admit of the passage of camels. A great many small recesses or side valleys open into the principal one, thus enlarging as well as varying almost infinitely the outline. With only one or two exceptions, however, they have no outlet, but come to a speedy and abrupt termination among the overhanging cliffs, as precipitous as the natural bulwark that bounds the principal valley. Including these irregularities, the whole circumference of Petra may be four miles or more. The length of this irregular outline, though it gives no idea of the extent of the area within its embrace, is perhaps the best measure of the extent of the excavations.

The valley of Wady Musa, which leads to the ruins, in a general westerly direction, is about one hundred and fifty feet broad at its entrance, and is shut in by cliffs of red sandstone, which gradually increase from a height of forty or fifty feet to two hundred or two hundred and ntty feet. The valley gradually contracts till at one spot it becomes only twelve feet broad, and is so overlapped by the perpendicular cliffs that the light of day is almost excluded. This is the ravine or Sik of Wady uIsa, which extends, with many windings, for a good English mile. This valley contains a wonderful necropolis hewn in the rocky walls. The tombs, which adjoin or surmount one another, exhibit now a front with six Ionic columns, now with four slender pyramids, and by their mixture of Greek. Roman, and Oriental architecture remind the spectator of the remains found in the valley of Jehoshaphat near Jerusalem. The entrance of the ravine is spanned by a bold arch, perhaps a triumphal one, with finely sculptured niches evidently intended for statues. This, like the other remains of this extraordinary spot, is ascribed by the natives either to the Pharaohs or to the Jins, i.e., evil genii. Along the bottom Of the valley, in which it almost vanishes, winds the stream. In ancient times its bed seems to have been paved; and it

appears to have been, in many places at least, covered in, so that the street passed above it. In other wider portions of the ravine, especially where it opens out into the city, it was spanned by frequent bridges, its sides strengthened with stone walls or quays, and numerous small canals derived from it supplied the inhabitants with water. But now its banks are overspread with hyacinths, oleanders, and other shrubs, and the upper portions of it are overshadowed by lofty trees.

Picture for Petra 2

Opposite the termination of the Sik, or narrow part of the ravine, just where it turns at its junction with a second ravine-like but broader valley, stands the chief attraction of the whole place, the finest monument in fact in all Syria. This is the *Khuzneh* — well preserved, considering its age and site, and still exhibiting its delicate chiselled work, and all the freshness and beauty of its coloring. Like all the other wonders of the place, it is carved out of the face of the perpendicular cliff, which here rises about 150 feet high. It has two rows of six columns over one another (one of the lower ones has fallen), with statues between, surmounted by capitals and a sculptured pediment, the latter divided by a little round temple crowned with an urn. The Arabs imagine that this urn contained treasure *(khuzneh,* hence the name of the entire structure), which they ascribe to Pharaoh. The interior does not correspond with the magnificence of the fa9ade, being a plain, lofty hall, with a chamber adjoining each of its three sides. It was either a mausoleum or, more probably, a temple.

From this spot the cliffs on both sides of the valley are pierced with numerous excavations, the chambers of which are usually small, though the fronts are occasionally of some size and magnificence; scarcely two, however, are exactly alike. After a gentle curve the valley expands still more, and here on its left side lies the theatre, entirely hewn out of the rock. Its diameter at the bottom is one hundred and twenty feet, and it has thirty-three rows of seats, capable of accommodating three thousand spectators. Strangely enough, it is entirely surrounded by tombs. One of the more northerly of these is inscribed with the name of Q. Praefectus Florentinus, probably the governor of Arabia Petraea under Hadrian or Antoninus Pius. Another has a Greek inscription not yet deciphered. Travellers are agreed that these excavations, some of the most striking of which are in time cliff directly opposite the theater, were mostly tombs, though some think they may originally have served as dwellings. Indeed

several of them have loculi sunk in the floor as if for burialplaces. A few were doubtless temples for the worship of Baal, but subsequently converted into Christian churches. They extend all along the eastern cliffs.

Picture for Petra 3

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

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

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

On an eminence south of this is a single column (obscenely called *Zab Farun,* i.e., hasta virilis Pharaonis) connected with the foundation walls of a temple, whose pillars lie scattered around in broken fragments, some of

them five feet in diameter. Twelve of these, whose pedestals still remain in their places, adorned either side of this stately edifice. There were also four columns in front and six in the rear of the temple. They are prostrate on the ground, and Dr. Olin counted thirty-seven massive frusta of which one of them was composed.

Still farther south are other piles of ruins — columns and hewn stones — parts, no doubt, of important public buildings. The same traveller counted not less than fourteen similar heaps of ruins, having columns and fragments of columns intermingled with blocks of stone, in this part of the site of ancient Petra. They indicate the great wealth and magnificence of this ancient capital, as well as its unparalleled calamities. These sumptuous edifices occupied what may be called the central parts of Petra. A large surface on the north side of the river is covered with substructions which probably belonged to private habitations. An extensive region still farther north retains no vestiges of the buildings which once covered it. Public wealth was lavished on palaces and temples, while the houses of the common people were slightly and meanly built, of such materials as a few years, or at most a few centuries, were sufficient to dissolve.

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

Laborde and Linant also thought that they traced the outline of a naumachia or theater for sea-fights, which would be flooded from cisterns in which the water of the torrents in the wet season had been reserved — a

remarkable proof, if the hypothesis be correct, of the copiousness of the water-supply, if properly husbanded, and a confirmation of what we are told of the exuberant fertility of the region, and its contrast to the barren Arabah on its immediate west (Robinson, 2:169). Stanley *(Syr. and Pal.* Page 95) leaves little doubt that Petra was the seat of a primeval sanctuary, which he fixes at the spot now called the "Deir" or "Convent," and with which fact the choice of the site of Aaron's tomb may, he thinks, have been connected (page 96). As regards the question of its identity with Kadesh, *SEE KADESH*; and, for the general subject, see Ritter, 14:69, 997 sq.

Picture for Petra 4

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

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

The attention of travellers has, however, been chiefly engaged by the above-noted excavations, which, having more successfully resisted the ravages of time, constitute at present the great and peculiar attraction of the place. These excavations, whether formed for temples, tombs, or the dwellings of living men, surprise the visitor by their incredible number and extent. They not only occupy the front of the entire mountain by which the valley is encompassed, but of the numerous ravines and recesses which radiate on all sides from this enclosed area. They exist, too, in great numbers in the precipitous rocks which shoot out from the principal mountains into the southern, and still more into the northern part of the site, and they are seen along all the approaches to the place, which, in the days of its prosperity, were perhaps the suburbs of the overpeopled valley. Some of the most peculiar are found in the valley above the entrance of the

Sik. Were these excavations, instead of following all the sinuosities of the mountain and its nurerous gorges, ranged in regular order, they probably would form a street not less than five or six miles in length. They are often seen rising one above another in the face of the cliff, and convenient steps, now much worn, cut in the rock, lead in all directions through the fissures and along the sides of the mountains, to the various tombs that occupy these lofty positions. Some of them are apparently not less than from two hundred to three or four hundred feet above the level of the valley. Conspicuous situations, visible from below, were generally chosen; but sometimes the opposite taste prevailed, and the most secluded cliffs, fronting towards some dark ravine, and quite hidden from the gaze of the multitude, were preferred. The flights of steps, all cut in the solid rock, are almost innumerable, and they ascend to great heights, as well as in all directions. Sometimes the connection with the city is interrupted, and one sees in a gorge, or upon the face of a cliff, fifty or a hundred feet above him, a long series of steps rising from the edge of an inaccessible precipice. The action of winter torrents and other agencies have worn the easy ascent into a channel for the waters, and thus interrupted the communication.

Picture for Petra 5

The situations of these excavations are not more various than their forms and dimensions. Mere niches are sometimes cut in the face of the rock, of little depth and of various sizes and forms, of which it is difficult to conjecture the object, unless they had some connection with votive offerings and religious rites. Bv far the largest number of excavations were manifestly designed as places for the interment of the dead; and thus exhibit a variety in form and size, of interior arrangement and external decorations, adapted to the different fortunes of their occupants, and conformable to the prevailing tastes of the times in which thev were made. There are many tombs consisting of a single chamber, ten, fifteen, or twenty feet square by ten or twelve in height, containing a recess in the wall large enough to receive one or a few deposits; sometimes on a level with the floor, at others one or two feet above it, and not unfrequently near the ceiling, at the height of eight or ten feet. Occasionally, as above mentioned, oblong pits or graves are sunk in the recesses, or in the floor of the principal apartment.

Some of these are of considerable depth, but they are mostly choked with stones and rubbish, so that it is impossible to ascertain it. In these plebeian

tombs there is commonly a door of small dimensions, and an absence of all architectural decorations; in some of larger dimensions there are several recesses occupying two or three sides of the apartment. These seem to have been formed for family tombs. Besides these unadorned habitations of the humble dead, there is a vast number of excavations enriched with various architectural ornaments. To these unique and sumptuous monuments of the taste of one of the most ancient races of men with whom history has made us acquainted, Petra is indebted for its great and peculiar attractions. This ornamental architecture is wholly confined to the front, while the interior is quite plain and destitute of all decoration. Pass the threshold, and nothing is seen but perpendicular walls, bearing the marks of the chisel, without mouldings, columns, or any species of ornament. But the exteriors of these primitive and even rude apartments exhibit some of the most beautiful and imposing results of ancient taste and skill which have remained to our times. The front of the mountain is wrought into favades of splendid temples, rivalling in their aspect and symmetry the most celebrated monuments of Grecian art. Columns .of various orders, graceful pediments, broad, rich entablatures, and sometimes statuary, all hewn out of the solid rock, and still forming part of the native mass, transform the base of the mountain into a vast splendid pile of architecture, while the overhanging cliffs, towering above in shapes as rugged and wild as any on which the eye ever rested, form the most striking and curious of contrasts. In most instances it is impossible to assign these beautiful fagades to any particular style of architecture. Many of the columns resemble those of the Corinthian order; but they deviate so far, both in their forms and ornaments, from this elegant model, that it would be impossible to rank them in the class. A few are Doric, which are precisely those that have suffered most from the ravages of time, and are probably very ancient.

But nothing contributes so much to the almost magical effect of some of these monuments as the rich and various colors of the rock out of which, or more properly in which, they are formed. The mountains that encompass the vale of Petra are of sandstone, of which red is the predominant hue. Their surface is a good deal burned and faded by the elements, and is of a dull brick color, and most of the sandstone formations in this vicinity, as well as a number of the excavations of Petra, exhibit nothing remarkable in their coloring which does not belong to the same species of rock throughout a considerable region of Arabia Petraea. Many of them, however, are adorned with such a profusion of the most lovely and brilliant

colors as it is scarcely possible to describe. Red, purple, yellow, azure or sky-blue, black and white, are seen in the same mass distinctly in successive layers, or blended so as to form every shade and huc of which they are capable — as brilliant and as soft as they ever appear in flowers, or in the plumage of birds, or in the sky when illuminated by the most glorious sunset. The red perpetually shades into pale, or deep rose or flesh color, and again approaches the hue of the lilac or violet. The white, which is often as pure as snow, is occasionally just dashed with blue or red. The blue is usually the pale azure of the clear sky or of the ocean, but sometimes has the deep and peculiar shade of the clouds in summer when agitated by a tempest. Yellow is an epithet often applied to sand and sandstone. The yellow of the rocks of Petra is as bright as that of saffron. It is more easy to imagine than to describe the effect of tall, graceful columns exhibiting these exquisite colors in their succession of regular horizontal strata. They are displayed to still greater advantage in the walls and ceilings of some of the excavations where there is a slight dip in the strata.

See Irby and Mangles, *Travels,* chapter 8; Robinson, *Bibl. Research.* 2:512 sq.; Laborde, *Voyage* (Par. 1830-33), page 55 sq. (this work is chiefly valued for its engravings); Bartlett, *Forty Days in the Desert,* page 126 sq.; Roberts, *Sketches* (Lond. 1842-48), volume 3; Olin, *Travels,* 2:1 sq.; Palmer, *Desert of the Exodus,* page 366 sq.; Ridgaway, *The Lord's Land,* page 139 sq.; Porter, in Murray's *Handbook for Sinai and Pal.* page 81 sq.; Badecker, *Palastina und Syrien,* page 304 sq. *SEE IDUMEA.*

Petra, Vicenzo

an Italian cardinal, was born at Naples November 13, 1662. He occupied at the court of Rome several considerable positions, and was created cardinal in 1724, then bishop of Praeneste. He enjoyed great influence with popes Innocent XII and Benedict XIII, who often consulted him upon grave affairs. He died at Rome March 24, 1747. He published *De sacra Poenitentiara Apostolica* (Rome, 1712, 4to), and *Commentaria ad Constitutiones Apostolicas* (Ven. 1729, 4 volumes, fol.). See *Nomini illustri del Regno di Napoli.* — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale,* 39:730.

Petrarch (Ital. Petrarca), Francesco

Picture for Petrarch

one of the most celebrated of Italian writers of prose and poetry, deserves a place here because he was for many years a devout and consistent ecclesiastic, and exerted a farreaching ilfluence on the classical culture of Italy in the later mediaeval period known as the Renaissance (q.v.). Petrarch was born at Arezzo, in Tuscany, July 20, 1304. His father, a Florentine notary, had been exiled two years before, in the same disturbance which drove out the poet Dante; and he soon left Italy for Avignon, where the papal court then resided. The son was educated in this French city washed by the Rhone, and at Montpellier, and then sent to study law at Bologna. Though Petrarch certainly loved the lEneid more than the Pandects, and copied ancient manuscripts more willingly than law papers, yet the subsequent course of his public life proves that he did not neglect professional pursuits, and that he prepared himself for being a useful man of business. Returning to, Avignon soon after he became of age, he found himself ia possession of a small inheritance, and indulged for some years in an aLternation of classical studies and political composition, with such gayety (sombre, perhaps, but not the more pure on that account) as the clerical court offered. In the year 1327 he conceived an attachment to an Avignonese lady, young but already married. Some slight obscurity still hangs over his relation to this lady, but it is almost certain that she was no less a paragon of virtue than of loveliness. He met her on April 6, 1327, in the church of St. Clara in Avignon, and at once and forever fell deeply in love with her. The lady was then nineteen, and had been married for two years to a gentleman of Avignon, named Hugues de Sade. For ten years Petrarch lived near her in the papal city, and frequently met her at church, in society, at festivities, etc. He sang her beauty and his love, under the name of his "Laura," in those sonnets whose mellifluous conceits ravished the ears of his contemporaries, and have not yet ceased to charm. The lady, whoever she was, knew how to keep Petrarch at a respectful distance, and for using the only opportunity he had of avowing his love in her presence she so severely reproved him that he never repeated the offence. About 1338 he retired for two or three years to dwell in the beautiful valley of Vaucluse, near Avignon. He himself said that his withdrawal to the retreat which he immortalized was caused by no reason more sentimental or poetic than his disgust with the licentiousness of the papal court, and the disappointment of the hopes of preferment which the pope had held out to

him. Long before this time Petrarch's talents and accomplishments had procured for him not only distinguished patronage, but frequent and active employment. A most brilliant honor awaited him at Rome in 1341, where, on Easter-day, he was crowned in the Capitol with the laurel-wreath of the poet. The ceremonies which marked this coronation were a grotesque medley of pagan and Christian repreo sentations. Petrarch was, however, as ardent a scholar as he was a poet; and throughout his whole life he was occupied in the collection of Latin MSS., even copying some with his own hand. To obtain these, he travelled frequently throughout France, Germany, Italy and Spain. In 1353 Petrarch returned to Italy, and soon became the trusted counsellor and diplomatic agent of several of his country's rulers. He was sent on missions at home and abroad. He finally settled at Milan, where he spent ten years, and lived for a season also at Parma, Mantua, Padua, Verona, Venice, and Rome. Though he had never entered holy orders, he was rewardqd for his faithful services to the state by ecclesiastic benefices in the north of Italy. He might have risen to positions of great influence and rich returns if he had chosen, but he preferred the quiet life of a recluse. In 1370 Petrarch removed to Arquh, a little village prettily situated among the Euganean hills, where he spent his closing years in hard scholarly work, much annoyed by visitors, troubled with, epileptic fits, not over rich, but serene in heart, and displaying in his life and correspondence a rational; and beautiful piety. He died July 18, 1374. Petrarch was not only far beyond his age in learningvbut had risen above many of its prejudices and superstitions. He despised astrology, and the childish medicine of his times; but, on the other hand, he had no liking for the conceited scepticism of the mediaeval savans; and in his *De sui ipsius et multorum aliorum Ignorantia* he sharply attacked the irreligious speculations of those who had acquired a shallow, free-thinking habit from the study of the Arabico-Aristotelian school of writers, such as Averroes. Petrarch's Latin works were the first in modern times in which the language was classically written. The principal are his *Epistolae*, consisting of letters to his numerous friends and acquaintances, and which rank as the best of his prose works: *De Vitis Virorum Illustrium: — De Remedis utriusque Fortunae: — De Vita Solitaria: — Rerum Memorandarum libri 4: — De Contemptu Mundi*, etc. Besides his prose epistles, he wrote numerous epistles in Latin verse, eclogues, and an epic poem called *Africa*, on the subject of the Second Punic War. It was this last production which obtained for him the laurel-wreath at Rome. Petrarch, whose life was thus active, is immortal in history by reason of more claims than one. He is

placed as one of the most celebrated of poets in right of his "Rime," that is, verses in the modern Italian tongue of which he was one of the earliest cultivators and refiners. Celebrating in these his visionary love, he modelled the Italian sonnet, and gave to it, and to other forms of lyrical poetry, not only an admirable polish of diction and melody,.but a delicacy of poetic feeling which has hardly ever been equalled, and a play of rich fancy which, if it often degenerates into false wit, is as often delightfully and purely beautiful. But though Petrarch's sonnets and canzoni and "triumphs" could all be forgotten, he would still be honored as one of the benefactors of European civilization. No oaie but Boccaccio shares with him the glory of having been the chief restorer of classical learning. His greatest merit lay in his having recalled attention to the higher and more correct classical authors; in his having been an enthusiastic and successful agent in reviving the study of the Greek tongue, and in his having been, in his travels and otherwise, an indefatigable collector and preserver of ancient manuscripts. To his care we owe copies of several classical works which, but for him, would, in all likelihood, have perished. Collective editions of his whole works have been repeatedly published (Basle, 1495, 1554, and 1581 sq.). His life has employed many writers, among whom may be mentioned Bellutello, Beccadelli, Tomasini, De la Bastie, De Sades, Tirabosehi, Baldelli, Ugo Foscolo, Campbell, and Geiger. In July 1874, a Petrarch festival' was held at Padua, and a statue of the great poet by Ceccon was erected. The eulogy on this occasion was pronounced by Alcardi, in the *aula magna* of the university. See, besides the complete biographies, Longfellow, *Poets and Poetry of Europe;* Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Romnan Empire.* chapter 70; Preseott, *Miscellanies,* page 616; *For. Qu. Rev.* July 1843; *Contemp. Rev.* July 1874; *Revue des Deux Mondes,* July 15, 1874; Ueberweg, *Hist. of Phil.* 2:7, 8, 462; *Revue Chretienne,* 1869, page 143.

Petrazzi, Astolfo

a painter of Siena, was born about 1590. He studied successively under Francesco Vanni, the younger Salimbeni, and Pietro Somi. He acquired distinction, and executed many works for the churches and public edifices of his native city, as well as for the private collections. He also opened an academy there, which was much frequented by the artists of Siena, and honored by the attendance of Borgognone, who stopped some months with Petrazzi before he proceeded to Rome. Lanzi says that Petrazzi seemed to have adhered more to the manner of Vanni than any other master. He

frequently aims at pleasing, and not unfrequently chose his models from the schools of Upper Italy. His *Marriage Feast at Cana* brings Paul the Veronese strongly to our recollection. Petrazzi's *Communion of St. Jerome,* at the Agostiniani, is painted much after the manner of Caracci. Petrazzi excelled in painting children, and his pictures are generally adorned with choirs of angels. His cabinet pictures are ingeniously composed, and have a lively and pleasing effect. His pictures of the *Four Seasons,* at Volte. a seat of the noble family of Chigi, are admired for the playfulness and elegance of the groups of Cupids introduced. He died in 1663.

Petreius (Lat. for Peeters), Theodorus

a learned Dutchman, was born April 17, 1567, at Kempen (OverIssel). After having been received as master of arts in Cologne, he entered the Carthusian convent of that city (1587), and was prior of Dulmen, in the bishopric of Mulnster; in this capacity he twice assisted at the general chapter of his order. His taste for study led him to employ the time left him from the duties of his profession in composing or translating different works for the defence of the Catholic faith. He died at Cologne April 20, 1640. We quote from him, *Confessio Gregoriana* (Cologne, 1596 or 1605, 12mo); in the same manner he made similar compilations for the collection of passages extracted from Tertullian and St. Cyprian (1603), from Leo the Great (1614), and from St. Bernard (1607): — *Bibliotheca Cartusiana* (ibid. 1609, 12mo); Moroti greatly profited from this in preparing his *Theatrumn S. Cartusiensis ord.* (ibid. 1680, fol.): — *Chronologia, tam Romanorum pontificum quam imperatorum, historica* (ibid. 1626, 4to): — *Catalogus haereticorum* (ibid. 1629, 4to); not very exact. He translated into Latin two theological works from fathers Coster and Jean David, and he edited the *Opera omnia* of St. Bruno (ibid. 1640, 3 volumes, fol.). See Niceron, *Memoires,* volume 40; Paquot, *Memoires,* volume 2. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale,* 39:752.

Petreolo, Andrea

a painter of Venzone, who, according to Renaldis, was employed in the cathedral of his native city about 1586, where he "decorated the panels of the organ with very beautiful histories of S. Geronimo and S. Eustachio, together with the parable of the wise and foolish virgins, surrounded with fine architecture."

Petri (Lat. for Peeters), Barthelemi

a Belgian theologian, was born about 1547 at Op-Linter, near Tirlemont. After having taught philosophy for ten years at Louvain, in order to escape the miseries of war he was obliged to retire to Douai (1580), where he was provided with a canonicate and a theological chair. A zealous Thomist, he bequeathed all his wealth to the Dominicans. He died at Douai February 26, 1630. 'His works are mostly scholastic, with some ecclesiastical history borrowed from Baronius; the most carefully written are a commentary upon the Acts of the Apostles (Douai, 1622, 4to), and some *Praeceptiones logicae* (ibid. 1625, 12tno). He prepared a good edition of the *Summa* of St. Thomas (ibid. 1614, fol.), and published the commentaries of Estius upon the epistles of St. Paul and St. John (ibid. 1614-1616, 2 volumes, fol.). See Foppeus, *Bibl. Belgica;* Paquot, *Memoires*, volume 8. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale,* 39:757.

Petri, Laurent

one of the three principal Swedish Reformers. a brother of the following, was born at OErebro in 1499. After having followed at Wittenberg the teaching of Luther and Melancthon, on his return to Sweden he spread the principles of Reform in that country. Appointed by Gustavus Vasa professor of theology in the University of Upsala, of which he became rector in 1527, he was elevated in 1531 to the archiepiscopal chair of that city. He then undertook, with the aid of his brother Olaus and of Laurent Andrea, a Swedish translation of the Bible, based principally upon Luther's version, which was printed in 1541: it is known under the name of *Gustavus's Bible*, and it has contributed greatly to the development of the Swedish language. Sent in 1534 as ambassador to the czar of Russia, he held, in the presence of that prince, a conference upot religion with the patriarch of the Russian Church; the discussion took place in Greek; but the interpreter em ployed by the czar to translate into Russian the word of the interlocutors often did not understand the abstract terms used by Petri, and then told what passed through his head, until one of the assistants, who understood Russian and Greek, disclosed the fraud by bursts of laughter. Petri, during the rest of his life, was occupied in consolidating Lutheranism in his own country, and in organizing the new Church, of which he was one of the principal founders. He was very beneficent. and distinguished himself advantageously over his brother by his conciliatory spirit, which did not

prevent him from addressing to Eric XIV, in 1567, a severe reprimand on the subject of the murder of the Sture.

Petri died in 1573. We have of his works. *Verae ac justae rationes quare regnum Sueciae Christierno captivo, Daniae olim regi ac ejus heredibus nihil debeat* (Stockholm, 1547, 4to): — *Postille sur les Evangiles* (ibid. 1555, 1641, 8vo): — *Refutatio D. Beurei pertinens ad articulum de Cona Domini* (Upsala, 1563): — *Discipline de l'Eglise Suedoise* (Stockholm, 1571, 4to); a work which, by a decision of the Diet of 1572, obtained the force of law: — *Sermons sur la Passion* (ibid. 1573, 8vo): — several other *Sermons,* and liturgic, polemical, and dogmatical works. See Schinmeier, *Lebensbeschreibung der drei Schwedischen Reformatoren, Andrea, Olaus und Laurent Petri* (Lubeck, 1783, 4to); Hallman, *Lefvernes beskrifing ofver Olaus och Lars Petri; Biographisk-Lexikon;* Alaux, *La Suede sous Gustave Wasa* (Paris, 1861).Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale,* 39:755. Comp. Fisher, *Hist. of the Ref.* page 176 sq.; Gieseler, *Eccles. Hist.* 4:276.

Petri, Olaus-Phase

a Swedish theologian, was born at OErebro, in 1497: the son of a blacksmith, he received his early education among the Carmelites of his native town, together with his brother Laurent, with whom he attended the University of Wittenberg, where they embraced the doctrines of Luther. On their return to Sweden, in 1519, they began, after having as by a miracle escaped from the executioners of Christian II, to propagate the ideas of the Reformer. Appointed in 1523 rector of the school of Strengnas, Olauis won to his opinions the archdeacon Laurent Andrea, and, through the mediation of the latter, Gustavus Vasa appointed Peter preacher at Stockholm. In his sermons and in divers conferences he attacked the old religion with an increasing ardor. The first among all Protestant ecclesiastics in Sweden, he was publicly married in 1525. After having assisted at the Diet of Vesteras in 1527, where he had a dispute upon religion with the professor of Upsala, Pierre Galle, whom Gmlstavus declared to have been conquered, he entered more and more into the favor of the king, who consulted him upon the most important affairs, and finally appointed him his chancellor. In 1539 Petri, tired of business, exchanged his duties for those of first pastor of the capital. The following year he was condemned to death for not having revealed, in 1536, the conspiracy formed against the life of the king by some citizens of the Han'seatic villages, one of whom had confessed to him. He purchased his pardon for a

large sum. Three years after the king reinstated him in his office of pastor, and he kept it until his death, which occurred at Stockholm in 1552. He joined to quite extensive and varied learning great activity and a captivating eloquence, but he never spared his adversary, and often degenerated into abuse of a bold and rash character. He may be called the Luther of Sweden, while his brother Laurent, milder and more moderate, was the Melancthon. We have of Petri's works, in Swedish, treatises on *Marriage of Ecclesiastics* (Stockholm, 1524, 1528, 4to): — the *Difference between the Evangelical Faith and the Roman* (ibid. 1527, 1605, 4to): — on the *Duties of the Clergy and the Laity* (ibid. 1528, 4to): — on the *Inconveniences of the Monastic Life* (ibid. 1528, 4to): — *Postills on all the Evangelists* (ibid. 1530): — *Introduction to Sacred Scripture* (ibid. 1538. 4to): — some *Sermons, Odes* that are still sung in Sweden, and several other theological writings. Petri has left in manuscript some *Memoirs* upon the history of his country, which remained unpublished because Gustavus found them written with too much independence; one copy of which, preserved in the Royal Library of Paris, has been analyzed by Keralio in the *Notices et Extraits des Manuscrits*, volume 1. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 39:754. See also the references under the preceding article.

Petri, Pietro de'

an Italian painter, was born in Premia, a district of Novara, in 1671. He studied under Carlo Maratti at Rome, and painted some works for the ehurches in that metropolis. Lanzi says he formed a style of his own by engrafting on that of Maratti a portion of the manner of Cortona. He did not. however, obtain the reputation which his merits deserved, on account of his infirm health and extreme modesty. His best works are a picture of *The Crucifixion*, in the church of SS. Vincento c Anastasio, and some frescos in the tribune of S. Clemente. He was called at Rome *de' Pietri.* Orlandi calls him a Roman, others a Spaniard, but Latnzi says he was a native of Premia. He died at Rome in 1716, in the prime of life. There are a few etchings heretofore attributed to him, but Bartsch gives them to another artist of the same name.

Petrobrusians

The sect of the Petrobrusians, or. as they are commonly but.less correctly called, *Petrobussians*, was the earliest of the anti-sacerdotal communities

which the profound discontent inspired by the tyranny of Rome called into existence at the beginning of the 12th century. They were the followers of the eloquent Peter of Bruys, who about the year 1100 began to declaim against the corruptions of the Church and the vices of the clergy. He continued the battle for twenty years most successfully, especially in Languedoc and Provence, and made many converts to his own opinions. What these really were it is difficult to state here, as there is no record among his friends. From Peter of Clugny, who replied to Peter of Bruys, we gather that his principal doctrines — which, with one exception (his repugnance to the cross), were more ably extended by his more powerful. successor, Henry the Deacon — were, though somewhat rationalistic, yet upon the whole rather evangelical. At first the preaching of Peter seems to have been confined to the inculcation of a system of general morality; but time and impunity so favored him that he attacked the seeds of dogmatic errors "per xx fere annos sata et aucta quinque praecipue et venenata virgulta." The capital charges upon which he is arraigned are:

(1) He rejected infant baptism, alleging that no miraculous gifts were possible in that ceremony, which he declared to be wholly void when performed on the person of an irresponsible infant.

(2) He denied that any special sanctity resided in consecrated buildings; forbidding the erection of churches, and directing that such churches as did exist should be pulled down.

(3) In particular he objected to the worship of the cross, alleging that the accursed tree should be held in horror by all Christians as the instrument of the torture and death of the Redeemer.

(4) He denied all sort of real presence in the Eucharist. Whether or not he retained the office of the communion as a memorial rite is not known.

(5) He was bitterly opposed to prayers, oblations, alms, and other good deeds done on behalf of the dead. To these five capital tenets, which form the subject of the Clugniac abbot's refutation, must be added a total prohibition of chanting and all use of sacred music. Puritanical as some of these tenets seem, Peter of Bruys was no lover of asceticism. He inculcated marriage, even of priests, as a high religious usage. The deleterious effects which the Romanists claim to have come from his teachings are thus summed up by Peter of Clugny: “The people are rebaptized, churches profaned, altars overturned, crosses are burned, meat eaten openly on the

day of the Lord's passion, priests scourged, monks cast into dungeons, and by terror or torture constrained to marry." His followers continued until the end of the 13th century. See Milman, *AHistory of Latin Christianity,* 5:412; Hardwick, *Church Hist. of the M.A.;* Baaur, *Dogmengeschichte,* volume 2; Piper, *Monumental Theology,* § 140; Jortin, *Eccles. Rev.* 3:323; Alzog, *Kirchengeschichte,* 2:72; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctr.* (see Index). *SEE PETER OF BRUYS.*

Petrocorius, Paulinus

sometimes confounded with Paulinus of Nola (q.v.), was an Eastern ecclesiastic, and, according to his own reports, flourished in the Western empire in the 5th century. He was intimate with Perpetuus, who was bishop of Tours from A.D. 461 to 491, and whom he calls his patron. It was at the desire of Perpetuus that he put into verse the life of St. Martin of Tours; and in an epistle addressed to that prelate he humbly tells him, with an amusing reference to the history of Balaam, that, in giving him confidence to speak, he had repeated the miracle of opening the mouth of the ass. He afterwards supplied, at the desire of the bishop, some verses to be inscribed on the walls of the new church which Perpetuus finished about A.D. 473 (or, according to Oudin, A.D. 482), and to which the body of St. Martin was transferred. He sent with them some verses, *De Visitatione Nepotuli sui,* on occasion of the cure, supposed to be miraculous, which his grandson, and the young lady to whom he was married or betrothed, had experienced through the efficacy of a document, apparently the account of the miracles of St. Martin, written by the hand of the bishop. We gather that this poem was written when the author was old, from the circumstance of his having a grandson of marriageable age. Of the death of Paulinus we have no account. The works of Paulinus Petrocorius are, *De Vita S. Martini,* a poem in hexameter verse, divided into six books. It has not much poetical or other merit. The first three books are little else than a versified abridgment of the *De Beati Martini Vita Liber* of Sulpicius Severus; and the fourth and fifth comprehend the incidents mentioned in the *Dialogi II et III de Virtutibus Beati Martini* of the same author. The sixth book comprises a description of the miracles which had been wrought at the tomb of St. Martin under the eyes of Perpetuus, who had sent an account of them to Paulinus: — *De Visitatione Nepotuli sui,* a description of the miraculous cure of his grandson already mentioned, also written in hexameter verse: — *De Orantibus* (an inappropriate title, which should rather be *Orantibus* simply, or *Ad Orantes),* apparently a portion of the

hexameter verses designed to be inscribed on the walls of the new church built by Perpetuus: — *Perpetuo Episcopo Epistola.* This letter was sent to Perpetuus with the verses *De Visitatione* and *De Orantibus.* The works of Paulinus Petrocorius were first printed by Franciscus Juretus (Par. 1585). After the first publication of the works they were inserted in several collections of the Christian poets, and in some editions of the *Bibliotheca Patrum,* generally, however, under the name of Paulinus of Nola. In the Lyons edition of the *Bibliotheca Patrum* (1677, fol.), 6:297, etc., they are ascribed to their right author. They were again published by Christianus Daumius (Leips. 1686, 8vo), with ample notes of Juretus, Barthius, Gronovius, and Daumius. To the works of our Paulinus were subjoined in this edition the *Eucharisticon* of Paulinus the Penitent, or Paulinus of Pella, and the poem on Jonah and the Ninevites, ascribed to Tertullgan. See *Hist. Litteraire de la France,* 2:469, etc.; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* ad ann. 461 (Oxon. 17401743, fol.), 1:449; Fabricius, *Biblioth. Med. et Inf. Latinitat.* 5:206, ed. Mansi; Tillemont, *Memoires, 16:*404; Oudin, *De Scriptoribus et Scriptis Eccles.* volume 1, col. 1288, 1289.

Petro-Johannites

a name given to the partisans of *Peter John Olivi* (A.D. 1279-1297), a monk of Bezibres, the founder of the Fraticelli schism among the Franciscaus, and a disciple of the abbot Joachim. He followed in the steps of his master, and wrote a commentary on the Revelation, containing interpretations of a similar character to the prophecies of Joachim. From his birthplace he is called *Peter of Serignan,* and from his monastery *Petrus Biterrensis.* When pope Nicholas III issued a new interpretation of the rule of St. Francis (A.D. 1279), with the view of suppressing the fanaticism which was rising among the "spirituals" of that order, a party was formed to resist it under the leadership of Olivi, and this party of Petro-Johannites, or strict Franciscans, became after his death the party out of which the *Fraticelli* took their rise. See Wadding, *Annal. Min. Fratr.;* Oudin, *De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticum,* 3:584; Baluze, *Miscellan.* 1:213.

Petronilla, St.

a Romish saint, is reputed to have been the daughter of the apostle Peter, and to have been at Rome with him. As the presence of the apostle himself at the Eternal City is still questioned, we need hardly discuss the presence of his daughter in that place. She is reputed to have become deprived of the

use of her limbs by sickness. One dav when some of his disciples sat at dinner with the apostle, they asked why it was that when he healed others his own child remained helpless. Peter replied that it was good for her to be ill, but, that his power might be shown, he commanded her to rise and serve them. This she did, and when the dinner was over lay down helpless as before. Years after, when she had become perfected by suffering, she was made well in answer to her earnest prayers. Now Petronilla was very beautiful, and a young noble, Valerius Flaccus, desired to marry her. She was afraid to refuse him, and promised that if he returned in three days he should then carry her home. She then earnestly prayed to be delivered from this marriage, and when the lover came with his friends to celebrate the marriage he found her dead. Flaccus lamented sorely. The attendant nobles bore her to her grave, in which they placed her crowned with roses She is commemorated in the Roman Church May 31.

Petronius

the name of two Romans somewhat involved in Jewish history.

1. CAIUS PETRONIUS succeeded Aulius Gallus in the government of Egypt, and carried on a war in B.C. 22 against the Ethiopians, who had invaded Egypt under their queen Candace (q.v.). He was a friend of Herod, and sent corn to Judsea during a famine (Josephus, *Ant.* 15:9, 2).

2. PUBLIUS PETRONIIS was sent by Caligula to Syria as the successor of Vitellius (A.D. 40), in the capacity of governor, with orders to erect the emperor's statue in the Temple at Jerusalem; but at the intercession of the Jews he was prevailed upon to disobey the imperial command, and escaped punishment by the opportune death of the emperor (Josephus, *Ant.* 18:9, 2; *War,* 2:10).

Petronius (St.) Of Bologna

a Roman Catholic prelate sainted for his piety, flourished in the first half of the 5th century. He was a Roman by birth, and descended of a noble family. He early entered the service of the Church, and soon rose to positions of influence and distinction. He finally became bishop of Bologna, and distinguished himself by banishing the Arians from that city. He died A.D. 430. In the paintings of the Romish saints he is represented in episcopal robes, with mitre and crosier. He has a thick black beard in an ancient representation, but generally is without it. His attribute is a model

of Bologna, which he holds in his hand. His pictures are confined to Bologna; and there is in that city a beautifll church dedicated to his memory.

Petrus

SEE PETER.

Petrus Hispanus

SEE JOHN 20.

Pettengill, Erastus

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Newport, N.H., July 7, 1805; was converted in Orford in 1824, and was baptized by Reverend Nathan Howe and joined the Methodist Episcopal Church. He received license to preach in 1835, and labored that year on the Bethlehem charge under the direction of the presiding elder. He joined the New Hampshire Conference in 1836, and was stationed at Bristol. His subsequent appointments were as follows: in 1837, Androscoggin Mission; 1838, Stratford; 1839, Bethlehem; 1840-41, Lunenburgh, Vermont; 184243, St. Johnsbury; 1844-45, Barton; 1846, Newbury; 1847-48, Londonderry; 1849-50, Hartland; 1851-52, East Barnard; 1853-54, Norwich and Hartford; 1855, UnionVillage; 1856, Bellows Falls; 1857-58, Hardwick; 1859-60, Irasburgh; 1861, Corinth; 1862-63, Williams, town 1864-66, Union Village; 1867-68, Barnard. While laboring faithfully and with great acceptance on this last appointment he was stricken with a fatal disease, and after weeks of suffering, borne with great patience and Christian fortitude, he died March 8, 1869, relying upon the divine promise and trusting solely to the merits of Christ. See *Minutes of Am. Conf.* 1870.

Pettibone, Roswell

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Orwell, Vermont, August 26, 1796. He had limited facilities for an early education, entered Middlebury College in 1817, graduated in 1820, taught in the academy there in 1821, studied divinity with Dr. Hopkins, and was licensed by the Addison County Association in 1822. He commenced preaching in Hopkinton, St. Lawrence County, N.Y., in 1823, and was ordained July 22, 1824; here he labored with great acceptability and success till poor health induced him to seek a milder climate, and in September 1830, he went West, and preached

at Ann Harbor, Mich., through the winter, and in the spring received a unanimous call to take charge of the Church, but ill-health prevented his doing so. During 1831 he was invited to the Church in Evans' Mills, Jefferson County, N.Y., which he served with great fidelity and success until, in November 1837, he was called to Canton, St. Lawrence County, N.Y., and installed February 14, 1838. Here he labored until April 1, 1854, when he became chaplain of Clinton State Prison, where he died, August 15, 1854. Mr. Pettibone was pre-eminent in every relation and in. the discharge of every duty; in spirit and conduct a progressive conservative, and strongly attached to the Calvinistic doctrines of grace; very active in organizing different benevolent societies and churches in his own and sister counties. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1864, page 310. (J.L.S.)

Pettigrew, Charles

a prelate of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born about 1755, in Ireland, whence his father immigrated about 1770. The family was of Scottish origin, and possessed those marked characteristics of Scotch genius which have distinguished so many of the Presbyterian brethren who have come to this country from Scotland. In 1773 Pettigrew became a teacher at Edenton, but two years later he took holy orders, and was ordained pastor of the Protestant Episcopal Church at London. In May, 1794, at a convention held at Tarborough, he was elected bishop. He died at Bonaron, Lake Scuppernong, where he settled in 1774. Pettigrew took a leading part in founding tie University of North Carolina.

Petto (or Pepto), Samuel

an English Nonconformist divine, the date of whose birth is not known, fiourished near the close of the 17th century. He was educated for the Church Establishment at Catharine Hall, Cambridge, and afterwards became rector of Sancroft, in Suffolk. When the Act of Uniformity was passed in 1662 he was ejected from his living as a Nonconformist. Afterwards he became pastor in a Dissenting Church at Sudbury, where he passed the remainder of his life. He died probably about 1708, at an advanced age. His work entitled *The Revelation Unveiled* (1693) dealt with Scripture prophecies. The plan of the work was to inquire:

1. When many Scripture prophecies had their accomplishment.

2. What are now in process of fulfilment.

3. What are still to be fulfilled. His other works were, *The Difference between the Old and the New Covenant* (the preface of this work was written by Dr. Owen): — *The Voice of the Spirit: — Infant Baptism Appointed by Christ: — Scripture Catechism: — Narrative of the Wonderful and Extraordinary Fits of Thom. Ipatchel under the Influence of Witchcraft.*

Petty, John

an eminent minister of the Primitive Methodist Connection in England, was born in 1807, and died in 1868. His ability, piety, and devotedness won for him some of the most important and responsible positions in the connection. For seven years he was editor of the Primitive Methodist magazines, "and did good service in sustaining the efficiency and useful, ness of these periodicals throughout the connection." He was the author of several works having a large circulation, of which the most important was *The History of the Primitive Methodist Connection,* a work performed by request of the Conference, and with great thoroughness and ability. During the last three years of his life he was governor of Elmfield School, the principal educational establishment among the Primitive Methodists. In that position he was especially useful in moulding the character and promoting the scholarship of the students for the ministry. As a Christian, Mr. Petty aimed with strong faith and blessed success at eminent personal holiness. As a scholar, "his learning was varied, accurate, profound, sanctified." As a preacher, he evinced a deep insight into Christian life and experience, and his style combined elegant simplicity with intense earnestness. Among his last words were, "what boundless stores of fulness there are in Jesus." (G.C.J.)

Petursson, Hallgrimur

a noted psalmist, was born in Iceland in 1614. While Hallgrimur was yet a boy, his father was appointed chorister at the cathedral in Hole (the old northern episcopal residence in Iceland), having been called thither by bishop Gudbrand Thorlaksson, who is known as the first translator of the Bible into Icelandic, and as the real founder of Protestantism in Iceland. Hallgrimur got his elementary education in the school at Hole; but for some unknown reason he was expelled from this school, whereupon he, aided by some of his friends, went abroad, first to Gluckstad, in Sleswick, and later to Copenhagen. In Copenhagen he worked for a blacksmith until

Brynjolf Sveinsson (afterwards bishop of Skalholt, in Iceland), about the year 1632, got him a place in the school of Our Virgin. Here Hallgrimur made rapid progress, and in 1636 we find him studying the so-called "master's lesson." In the year 1627 Iceland was visited by Mohammedan pirates from Algeria, in the northern part of Africa, who at that time extended their tyrannical rule of the sea from the shores of the Mediterranean to the most western and northern islands of the Atlantic. A number of Icelanders were slain by them, while others were carrie'd away as slaves. By the interference of the Danish kinig, Christian IV, some of the prisoners who had not already perished in the land of the barbarians were ransomed, and in 1636 thirty-eight Icelanders were broughit from Algeria to Copenhagen, where they had to remain a few months until merchant-ships in the spring of 1637 could take them back to Iceland. While prisoners in Algeria they had imbibed various Mohammedan ideas, and hence it was thought necessary during their stay in Copenhagen to instruct them in the principles of Christianity; but, not understanding Danish, an Icelandic teacher had to be found for them. Hallgrimur Petursson was selected. Among those set free was a woman by name Gudrid, who had formerly been the wife of an Icelander in the Westmann Isles. Hallgrimur fell in love with this woman so much that when the people were sent back to Iceland in the spring, he left the school and returned home with his beloved. The ship which carried them landed at Keflavik, in the southern part of Iceland, and here Hallgrimur remained through the summer, doing the work of a common laborer for the Danes. Gudrid got a place to work on the farm Njardvik, not far from Keflavik, and here she gave birth to a son, whose father was Hallgrimur. Soon afterwards he married Gudrid, and lived for some time in the most abject poverty in a lonely cottage at Suderness, until the above-mentioned Brynjolf Sveinsson, who meanwhile had become bishop of Skalholt, persuaded him to enter the service of the Church, ordained him for the ministry, and gave him the poor parish of Hvalness, in Guldbringe Syssel. He entered the ministry in 1644, and remained in Hvalness until 1651, when he was removed to Saurbaer, in Borgarfjord. At Saurbaer he found some relief from his poverty until Aug. 15, 1662, when the parsonage and al its contents were consumed by fire. The people were all saved, however, excepting an old stranger, who had found his lodgings there for the night. Though Hallgrimur heretofore had suffered much abuse and ridicule, he now found that he also had some friends, who assisted him in rebuilding the parsonage and furnishing him with the necessaries of life. A few years later (1665) Hallgrimur first

noticed the symptoms of the disease (leprosy) which finally laid him on his death-bed. He performed his ministerial duties alone until 1667, when his illness made it. necessary to get an assistant. He was compelled to resign his position in 1669, moved to a neighboring farm, Kalastad, where he remained two years, and then moved to another farm close by, Ferstikla, where, amid constantly increasing sufferings, he at last found a welcome death, October 27, 1674, not having left his bed the last year of his life. He was buried near the entrance of the church at Saurbser. In 1821 a small monument was raised on the spot beneath which his bones rest. By his wife, who died in 1679, he had several children, but the most of them died very young. We have given this detailed account of this man's life because of the prominent position he holds in the religious history of Iceland. He was an eloquent preacher, a thoroughly classical writer, and one of the most gifted psalmists that ever lived. His religious poems give evidence of a Christian courage that reminds one of the martyrs during the first century after Christ. Hallgrimur Petursson's works are the following: (a) in prose1. *Diarium Christianum,* consisting of religious meditations for every day in the week: — 2. *A Christian's Soliloquy every Morning and Evening*: — *3. A Collection of Prayers: — 4. Commentaries on some of the Songs in the Sagas, especially in Olaf Tryggveson's Saga.* (b) In poetry — l. *Psalterium Passionale,* fifty psalms on the sufferings of Christ for singing at family devotions during lent, an unsurpassed masterpiece, whether we regard it from a poetical or Christian standpoint. This work has passed through twenty-seven large editions in Iceland, nnd is found in every Icelander's house. The funeral psalm found in this collection, and beginning "Allt einsog blomstrid eing," has found its way into many of the Continental languages, and the whole collection has twice been translated into Latin: — 2. A poetical treatment of the first and second books of Samuel, which he left unfinished, but which was completed by the ministers Sigurd Gislesson and Jon Eyulfsson: — 3. Some epicromantic poems (the so-called *rimur),* of which all ages of Icelandic literature have furnished a large number: — 4. Finally, we have from Hallgrimur Petursson a collection of all his psalms and poems that are not found in the above-named works, and of which the majority were not published until long after his death. This last collection is almost as great a favorite with the Icelandic people as the *Psalterium Passionale.* In it is found a cycle of Bible poems, morning and evening hymns, and other songs, but the best portion of it is a number of psalms, in which the poet has expressed his thoughts upon death and eternity. Some of them were composed on his death-bed. They bear

testimony to the fervent love of the Saviour wherein he lived and died. His beautiful funeral hymn, which he closes by greeting the angel of death welcome, cheerful in the consciousness that his Savior lives, has its heathen prototype in Ragnar Lodbrok's dying words: "The hours of life have glided by; I fall, but smiling shall I die." In Petursson's religious poetry the old heathen courage is regenerated into Christian life, and the pagan coldness has yielded to the genial warmth of a celestial faith. No man has exercised a greater influence upon the Christian character of the Icelandic people than Hallgrimur Petursson. — Jon Bjarnason, *Husbibliothek*, 2:98-103. (R.B.A.)

Petzelians or Poeschelians

a modern sect of a politico-religious character, who derived their name from a priest of Brennan, called Petzel or Poeschel. They held the natural and legal equality of all human beings, and maintained that they had a continual and inalienable property in the earth and its natural productions. Their enemies charged them with offering human sacrifices, particularly on Good Friday. They appear to have adopted the political principles of the Spenceans, and probably their infidelity. Congregations belonging to this sect are said to have existed in Upper Austria, but by the interference of the public authorities they have been dispersed. A similar sect seems to have taken start and spread somewhat in Switzerland, who are charged with the like enormities.

Peucer, Kaspar

a German theologian of the Reformation period, was born January 6, 1525, at Bautzen, and studied at the school in Goldberg and the University of Wittenberg, where he was the table and house companion of the Reformer Melancthon, who afterwards became his father-in-law. Well educated and remarkably talented, he became in 1545 a magister, in 1554 ordinary professor of mathematics, in 1560 professor of medicine. Some time after this he was introduced to the personal attention of the elector Augustus of Saxony;who was so pleased with Peucer that he put him in charge of the Saxon high school. Peucer, greatly interested in the theological controversies of his day, avowed *Philippism* (q.v.), and used his influence for its propagation in Saxony, and thus arrayed the strongly Lutheran elector against him. Peucer was imprisoned from 1575 until 1586. .e died September 25, 1602. He left a large number of medical, mathematical,

historical, theological, and philological writings. See Henke, *Kaspar Peucer u. Nic. Krell* (Barb. 1865); Calinich, *Kampf u. Untergang des Melancithonismus in Kursachsen* (Leips. 1866) ; also the art. *SEE CRYPTO-CALVINISTIC CONTROVERSY*.,

Peul'thai

(Heb. *Peullethay'*, ytLi][Pu], *my wages;* Sept. Φολλαθί), son of Obed-edom, the last named of eigh (<132605>1 Chronicles 26:5); he belonged to the family of Asapl of the tribe of Levi, and was one of the porters of th tabernacle in the reign of David. B.C. cir. 1020.

Peutinger, Konrad

a German writer noted for his lntiquarian labors, was born at Augsburg in 1465; studied in German and Italian universities, and was employed in his native city by the authorities of the place and by the emperor as counsellor. He was a manysidqd, educated man, and is celebrated not only as a writer, but also as a humanist, and was greatly interested in Luther when he first appeared against the Romanists. See Hagen, *Deutschland's literarische Zustande im Zeitalter der Reformation,* volume 1.

Pevernage, Andre

a Belgian writer, was born in 1541 at Courtray. At first music teacher in the collegiate church at Courtray, he abandoned this place to settle in Antwerp, where he passed the last ten or twelve years of his life in the capacity of simple musician of the cathedral. He established in his house weekly concerts, and there was heard the most beautiful music of the composers then in repute. He died at Antwerp July 30, 1589. We have of his works, *Cantiones sacrce* (Antwerp, 1574-1591, 5 parts, 4to); some masses, religious fragments, and a collection compiled from different authors under the title of *Harmonie celeste* (ibid. 1583, 1593, 4to). See Paquot, *Memoires.* — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale,* 39:776.

Pew

(anciently pue; Old Fr. *puy;* Dutch, *puye;* Lat. *podium,* "anything on which to lean;" *s'appuyer),* an enclosed seat in churches. The old French word *puie* meant a balcony, a gallery built on bulks or posts of timber; and it has been unnecessarily suggested that *pew* may only be a form of podium, a book-desk, or the crutch used by monks before sitting was permitted. In

the early days of the Anglo-Saxon and some of the Norman churches, a stone bench afforded the only sitting accommodation for members or visitors. In the year 1319 the people are spoken of as sitting on the ground or standing. At a later period the people introduced low, three-legged stools, and they were placed in no order in the church. Directly after the Norman conquest seats came in fashion. Church-seats were in use in England some time before the Reformation, as is proved by numerous examples still extant, the carving on some of which is as early as the Decorated Period, i.e., before A.D. 1400, and records as old as 1450 speak of such seats by the name of *pues.* They were originally plain fixed benches, all facing east, with partitions of wainscoting about three feet high.

Picture for Pew (1)

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

it was first introduced, the great majority of specimens that exist being of the Perpendicular style. *SEE STANDARD*.

Picture for Pew (2)

In England pews were assigned at first only to the patrons of churches. A canon made at Exeter, in 1287, rebukes quarrelling for a seat in church, and decrees that none shall claim a seat as his own except noblemen and the patrons. Gradually, however, the system of appropriation was extended to other inhabitants of the parish, to the injury of the poor, and the multiplication of disputes. The law of pews in England is briefly this: All church-seats are at the disposal of the bishop, and may be assigned by him either (1) directly by faculty to the holders of any property in the parish; or (2) through the churchwardens, whose duty it is, as officers under the bishop, to "seat the parishioners according to their degree." In the former case the right descends with the property, if the faculty can be shown, or immemorial occupation proved. In the latter, the right canl at any time be recalled, and lapses on the party ceasing to be a regular occupant of the seat. It appears that by common law every parishioner has a right to a seat in the church, and the churchwardens are bound to place each one as best they can. The practice of *letting* pews, except under the church-building acts, or special local acts of Parliament, and, much more, of *selling* them, has been declared illegal, except for the *chapels* of the Dissenters, who need the income of the pews for the payment of the pastor's salary. In Scotland pews in the parish churches are assigned by the heritors to the parishioners, who have accordingly the preferable claim on them; but when not so occupied they are legally open to all. As is well known, pews in dissenting churches are rented as a means of revenue to sustain general charges. In some parts of the United States pews in churches are a matter of annual competition, and bring large sums. Latterly in England there has been some discussion as to the injuriously exclusive character of the "pew system," and a disposition has been manifested to abolish pews altogether, and substitute movable seats available by all indiscriminately. Several pamphlets have appeared on the subject. The *Times* remarks that in dealing with this subject the first question is not the letting of pews, but the appropriation of seats. In most country churches the seats are more or less appropriated, but the pews are seldom rented. When we consider the matter from this point of view, does it not seem reasonable, as a matter of mere order and decency, that those who regularly attend a church should have their appropriated places within it? If the churches are thrown

completely open, they are thrown open not only to the parish, but to the whole world. In one of the best known of the London churches the incumbent lately complained from the pulpit that his parishioners could not obtain seats in the church which had been expressly built for them, and he announced his intention of altering the system. Another church, in Wells Street, which was especially built for the accommodation of a poor district, and in which all the seats are free, is usurped every Sunday by an aesthetic congregation of welldressed people, who come to enjoy the excellent performance of the choir. Such a result would always take place where the preacher was popular or the service attractive. Again, the existing churches would not hold more than a certain number of persons, and they are filled as it is. If more were invited to come, it would be only driving out the rich to make way for the poor, and then we should want another national association for preaching the Gospel to the rich, or, rather, we should see the rich building proprietary chapels for themselves, in which the seats would be appropriated as before. But does any one suppose that the poor would thus force their way into the churches, and dispossess their present occupants? Whether the seats are free or not, the result would be much the same. When the question of the appropriation of seats is decided. that of pew rents is comparatively simple. If the rich are to have a certain number of seats appropriated to them, what can be more natural and convenient than that they should pay a certain sum in respect of them? In the Roman Catholic churches on the Continent pews are seldom to be seen.

The *reading-pue,* first mentioned in the rubric of 1662, was the reader's stall in the chancel. It had two desks-one on the west for the Holy Bible, and the other for the Prayer-book facing eastwards, as in Hooker's Church at Drayton Beauchamp. In 1571 Grindel called it "the pulpit, where prayers are said." Calamy applies the word to designate an open-air pulpit. George Herbert made his pulpit and reading pue of equal height, so as to be of equal honor and estimation, and agree like brethren. See Walcott, *Sacred Archaeol.* s.v.; Chambers, *Cyclop.* s.v.; Parker, *Glossary of Architecture,* s.v.

Peyrere, Isaac

a French Protestant writer, was born at Bordeaux in 1592. He fitted himself for military and diplomatic service, and at one time served the prince of Conde, whom he pleased by the singularity of his humor. PeyrBre finally turned pious. He was at the time a Protestant. He claimed that it had

been revealed to him by St. Paul that Adam was not the first man created, and he undertook to prove his theory by publishing in Holland, in 1655, a book entitled *Prceadamitce, sive exercitatio super versibus* 12, 13, 14, *capitis xv Epistolae Pauli ad Romanos,* which work was consigned to the flames, and he himself imprisoned at Brussels. Upon recantation and the interference of the prince of Condd he was released, and went to Rome in 1655, where he published the reasons for his recantation, and abjured Calvinism and Praeadamitism before pope Alexander VII. He was not believed sincere by the people, and doubtless public opinion was just. The pontiff endeavored to detain him at Rome, but he finally returned to Paris, and again entered the service of the prince of Condd, acting as his librarian. He was not thought to be attached to any particular Church, notwithstanding that he had joined the Romanists. He, however, submitted to receive the sacrament. Some time after his return to Paris he retired to the "Seminaire des Vertus," where he died in 1676. He wrote, besides the abovementioned articles, works upon Greenland and Iceland; also one upon the *Restoration of the Jews,* etc.

Peyton, Yelverton T.

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Stafford County, Virginia, 1797; was converted in 1815; entered the Baltimore Conference in 1818; and after filling some of the most important stations in the Conference, died in Baltimore January 15, 1831. He was a devoted pastor, a faithful minister, and a very useful preacher. See *Minutes of Am. Conferences,* 2:118.

Pez, Bernard

a learned German Benedictine, was born in 1683 at Ips. He early entered the monastery of Molk. For several years he, with his brother Jerome, collected chronicles, charters, and other documents of the Middle Ages, in Austria, Bavaria, and other parts of Germany. After having spent some time in France, where he was associated with count Zinzendorf, he returned to his convent, whose library was confided to his care. He died March 27, 1735. We have of his works, *Acta et vita Wilburgis virginis cum notis* (Augsb. 1715, 4to): — *Bibliotheca Benedictino-Mauriana, seu de vitis et scriptis Patrum e congregatione S. Mauri* (ibid. 1716, 8vo): — *Thesaurus anecdotorum novissimus, seu Veterum monumentorum praecipue ecclesiasticorum collectio* (17211723, 5 volumes, fol.): —

Bibliotheca ascetica antiquo-nova (Ratisb. 1723-1740, 12 volumes, 8vo): — *Acta S. Truperti martyris* (Vienna, 1731, 4to): — some *Notes a l'Anonymus Mellicensis de scriptoribus ecclesiasticis*, published by Fabricius; several articles in different collections, etc. See Jocher, *Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon;* Kropf, *Biblioth. Mellicensis*. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 39:789.

Pez, Hieronymus

a learned German Benedictine, brother of the preceding, was born at Ips in 1685. After having taken the Benedictine habit in the monastery of Molk, he began, with his brother, the search for unpublished historical documents concealed in the archives and libraries of Austria and Bavaria. Placed later at the head of the library of his convent, he passed the last fifteen years of his life in the most profound retreat. He died October 14, 1762. We have of his works, *Acta S. Colomani, Scotice regis* (Krems, 1713, 4to): — *Scriptores rerum Austriacarum veteres, cum notis et observationibus* (Leips. 1720-1725, 2 volumes, fol.), followed by a third volume. published in 1745 at Ratisbon; a very precious collection: — *Historia S. Leopoldi, Austriae marchionis, id nominis 4, ex diplomatibus adornata* (Vienna, 1747, fol.). See Meusel, *Lexikon;* Schrockh, *Leben v. Pez* (in the *Leipziger Gelehrte Zeitung* for 1762, page 737). — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 39:789.

Pezel, Christoph

a German theologian, was born March 5, 1539, at Plauen; studied at Wittenberg; was then three years cantor in his native place, and in 1567 became court-preacher and professor of theology at Wittenberg. An ardent advocate of *Philippism* (q.v.), he was deposed after the condemnation of Crypto-Calvinism in 1574; in 1576 was sent out of the country; in 1577 went to Siegen, where he taught for a while, and then became pastor at Herborn. In 1580 he was called to Bremen as pastor, and in 1584 was made professor of theology at the newly founded *Gymnasium illustre*. .In 1589 he again assumed the pastorate, and became also superintendent, and as such contributed to the strengthening and development of Lutheranism. He died February 25, 1604. Besides theological controversial writings, and the so-called Wittenberg Catechism entitled *Catechesis continens explicationem decalogi, symboli, oratiolis dominicae, doctrinae de poenitentia et sacramentis* (Wittenberg, 1571), he wrote also *Mellificium*

Historicum, a muchused handbook of history, and edited Melancthon's letters to Hardenberg. (J.H.W.)

Pezron, Paul

a Roman Catholic monastic of much celebrity, was born at Heminebon, in Bretagne, in 1639. He embraced the monastic life in the Cistercian abbey de Prieres in 1661; was appointed master of the novices and sub-prior in 1672; sub-prior of the college of the Bernardins at Paris in 1677; vicar-general of his order in 1690, and obtained the abbey of Charmoye in 1697. He resigned it finally to give himself entirely to his studies, and became a doctor of the Sorbonne. He died in 1706. His most important publication is *L'antiquite des temps retablie et defendue, contre les Juifs et les nouveaux chronologistes* (Amst. 1687, 12mo). In this work the author maintains the authority of the Septuagint chronology against that of the Hebrew Bible. Pezron's book was extremely admired for the ingenuity and learning of it; yet created, as was natural, no small alarm among the religious. Martianay, a Benedictine, and Le Quien, a Dominican, wrote against this new system, and undertook the defence of the Hebrew text; Martianay with great zeal and heat, Le Quien with more judgment and knowledge. Pezron published *Defense de l'antiquite des temps* in 1691 (4to), which, like the work itself, abounded with curious and learned researches. Le Quien replied, but Martianay brought the affair into another court; and, in 1693, laid the books and principles of Pezron before M. de Harlai, archbishop of Paris. Harlai communicated the representation of this adversary to Pezron, who, finding no difficulty in supporting an opinion common to all the fathers before Jerome, rendered the accusation of no effect. Other works of his are, *Essai d'un Commentaire Litteral et Historique sur les Prophetes* (1693,12mo): — *L'Histoire Evangelique Confirmee par la Judaique et la Romaine* (1696, 2 volumes, 12mo): — *Antiquite de la Nation et de la Langue des Celtes* (1703, 12mo, etc.). See Niceron, *Memoires*, volume 1; *Dict. Hist. des Auteurs Eccles.* s.v.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliogr.* s.v.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Pfaff, Christoph Matthaus, D.D.

a German Protestant theologian, son of Johann Christoph Pfaff (q.v.), was born December 25, 1686, at Stuttgard. At the age of thirteen he was admitted to the university, and after having finished his theological studies, he received the means from the duke of Wurtemberg, in 1706, to go to

other universities to perfect himself in the knowledge of the Oriental tongues. He visited with this design several universities of Germany, Holland, and England. Upon his return to Stuttgard in 1709, he was employed to accompany the hereditary prince Charles-Alexandre to Italy, with whom he remained three years in Turin, occupied especially in copying from the libraries the unpublished fragments of ancient ecclesiastical authors. He afterwards went with the prince to Holland, where he spent two years, and to Paris, continuing his researches in the libraries, and placing himself in connection with the most renowned learned men. Appointed in 1716 professor of theology at Tubingen, he became in 1720 dean of the faculty and chancellor of the university; he also received several high ecclesiastical positions, and became among others, in 1727, abbe of Loch, which gave him the *entree* to the states of Wurtemberg. In 1724 he was gratified with the title of count-palatine, and was elected in 1731 member of the Academy of Berlin. In 1756 he became chancellor of the University of Giessen, dean of the faculty of theology, and general superintendent of the churches. Possessing extensive and varied knowledge, he carefully avoided the bitter tone of the theologians of his confession, and he even made, but without the least success, several attempts to unite the Lutheran and Calvinistic churches. He died at Giessen November 19, 1760. Pfaff's erudition was immense, and his works so numerous that they fill a whole sheet of the German bibliographies. Among his numerous works and dissertations we mention, *De genuinis Librorum Novi Testamenti lectionibus* (Amst. 1709, 8vo): — *Demonstrations solides de la virite de la Religion Protestante contre la Religion pretendue Catholique* (Tub. 1713, 1719): — *De Evangeliis sub Anastatio imperatore non corruptis* (Tubing. 1717, 4to); reprinted, with several other dissertations of Pfaff, in his *Prinistiae Tubingenses* (ibid. 1718, 4to): — *De liturgiis, missalibus, agendis et libris ecclesiasticis Ecclesice orientalis et occidentalis veteris et modernce* (ibid. 1718,4to): —*De origine juris ecclesiastici veraque ejus indole* (ibid. 1719, 1720, 1756, 4to): — *Dissertationes Anti-Boelianae tres* (ibid. 1719, 1720, 4to): —*Institutiones theologiae dogmaticae et moralis* (ibid. 1719, 8vo; Frankf. 1721, 8vo); one of the first theological works written in Germany in which the rationalistic tendency is recognised: — *Introductio in historiam theologiae litterariam* (ibid. 1720, 8vo; ibid. 1724-1726, 3 volumes, 4to): — *De variationibus ecclesiarum Protestantium, adversus Bossuetum* (ibid. 1720, 4to): — *Gesammelte Schriften so zur Vereinigung der protestirenden Kirchen abzielen* (Halle, 1723, 2 volumes, 4to); a collection of writings

tending to the reunion of the Protestant churches: — De *titulopatriarchee tecumenici* (Tubing. 1735, 4to): — *De ecclesia sanguinem non sitiente* (ibid. 1740, 4to): — *De sterconanistis medii cevi* (ibid. 1750, 4to): — *De aureolis virginum, doctorum et martyrum* (ibid. 1753, 4to). As an editor, Pfaff published *Epitome Institutionum divinarum Lactantii* (Paris, 1712, 8vo), first edition complete: — *S. Irenaei fragmenta anecdota* (La Haye, 1715, 8vo); a publication followed by a dispute with Scip. Maffei, who had cast some doubt upon the authenticity of these *fragments: — Ecclesiae evangelicae libri symbolici* (Tubingen, 1730, 8vo). Finally, Pfaff directed the publication of the new German translation of the Bible, which appeared at Tubingen (1729, fol.), a work on which, in connection with others, he actively labored. Pfaff was a learned man of the very first rank, but of doubtful moral character. He is the real founder of the so-called collegial system, which regards the Church as a *collegium:* as a corporation possessing corporate rights, the Church can make her own statutes and laws, and can insist upon their observance. The attitude of the state towards her is but incidental, or similar to the position it occupies with respect to any other association. The *magistratus politicus* does not belong to her; the Church consisting solely of teachers and taught. It is only by transference, by virtue of silent or express compact. that the magistracy can receive rights originally inherent in the Church. Results were, however, at first, and till after the commencement of the 19th century, in favor of the territorial system. The Bible known among the German Protestants as "the Bible of Tubingen" was published under Pfaff's direction in one folio volume in 1727. See Strieder, *Hessische Gelehrtengesch.;* Rathlef, *Gesch. jetztlebender Gelehrten,* part 1; Schrockh, *Unparteiische Kirchengesch.* 4:787; Sax, *Onomasticon,* 6:138, 648; Bauer, *Gallerie,* volume 5; Dbring, *Die Gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands,* volume 3, s.v.; Hirsching, *Handbuch;* Meusel, *Lexikon,* s.v.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale,* 39:794; comp. Hurst's Hagenbach, *Ch. Hist.. 18th and 19th Centuries,* 1:110 sq., 410; *Ebrard,Kirchen- u. Dogmengesch.* 4:131. (J.H.W.)

Pfaff, Johann Christoph

a German Lutheran theologian, was born at Pfullingen in 1631, and was educated at the university in Ttibingen, where he afterwards flourished as professor of theology. He was also for a time pastor at St. Leonhard's Church in Stuttgard. He died in 1720. He was the author of about forty works and exegetical and dogmatical dissertations, but none of them are of much value in our day. A list of them may be found in Winer's *Theol.*

Literatur, s.v. See also Bickh, *Gesch. der Universitat Tubingen;* Lepoin, *Leben der Gelehrten,* and *Bibliotheca Bremensis* (1720). (J.H.W.)

Pfauser (Phauser), Johann Sebastian

a German Roman Catholic divine, was born at Constance in 1520. He came by recommendation of the bishop of Trent to Vienna as court-preacher of emperor Ferdinand I, but was obliged to quit that place on account of his anti-Roman tendency. He was thereafter employed as confessor and preacher by the emperor's son, Maximilian, and all efforts to supplant him here were unsuccessful until the Bohemian crown question arose, and it became necessary for the court to have the favor of all Ultramontane prelates. In 1560 Pfauser became pastor at Lauingen. He died in 1569. To the last Maximilian kept up a friendly correspondence with this good man.

Pfefferkorn, Johann (originally Joseph)

a noted Jewish convert to Christianity, was born in Moravia in 1469. He embraced Christianity. and was publicly baptized at Cologne with his wife and children in 1506 when thirty-six years old. All the efforts of this man, who, with many faults, was certainly not wanting in merit, were early directed to the conversion of his brethren according to the flesh. The means he first made use of were highly laudable; for he treated them with gentleness, and even defended his former co-religionists against the calumny of their enemies. But fanatical and misguided, his zeal afterwards was less well advised when he began to forbid and condemn the reading of any Hebrew book excepting the Old Testament. With the aid of the Dominican monks, he prevailed on the emperor Maximilian to adopt his views, and in 1509 an edict was published which enjoined that all writings emanating from the Jews against the Christian religion, should be suppressed and condemned to the flames; this edict was soon succeeded by another, July 6, 1510, enjoining the destruction of every Hebrew book with the sole exception of the Old Testament. The execution of this edict was, however, suspended until the opinion of the electoral archbishop Uriel of Mayence had been obtained. By reason of this delay, Prof. John Reuchlin, whose opinion in this matter was sought for, was enabled to publish a voluminous treatise, in which he divided the Jewish works into seven different classes, and afterwards proved which of these classes might be considered dangerous or injurious to the Christian religion. Among the

books which he thinks in part harmless and in part useful, and even valuable to theology, and which he would in consequence preserve, were not only the commelltaries of Rashi, the Kimchis, lbn-Ezra, Gersonides, Nachmanides, etc., but the Talmud and the cabalistic book Sohar (q.v.). On the other hand, Reuchlin maintained that those only should be destroyed which contained blasphemies against Christ, such as the Nizzachon and roledoth Jeshu. He further pointed out the impossibility of suppressing books by an imperial decree which were dispersed in all parts of the world, and might easily be reprinted in other places. The contest soon grew warm between the adversaries of the books and their defenders; the former consisting of the Dominicans and their partisans, and the latter of all moderate and enlightened theologians. The affair was finally left by an appeal to pope Leo X. Hochstraaten, an inquisitor, and a man fulily qualified for that cruel office, repaired to Rome. supported with remonstrances from several princes to bias, with money to bribe, and menaces to intimidate. He even threatened the pope with rejecting his authority and separating from the Church, unless Reuchlin, and the Jews whom he defended, were condemned. But all his efforts were in vain, and he was obliged to return, mortified and disgraced. The victory which his opponent had gained exposed him to the enmity of the monkish party. But he informed them "he was persuaded that Martin Luther, who then began to make a figure in Germany, would find them so much employment that they would permit him to end his days in peace" (Villers *on the Reformation,* page 107). Soon, indeed (by reason apparently of the Reformation movement), an end was put to the whole dispute. When and where Pfefferkorn died is difficult to say. Of his works, which obtained such unenviable notoriety, we mention, *Der Judenspiegel,* or *Speculum adhortationis Judaicae ad Ckristum* (Nirnb. 1507): — *Die Judenbeichte,* or *Libellus de Judaica confessione sive Sabbate afflictionis cum figuris* (Colog. 1508): — *Das Osterbuch,* or *Narratio de ratione Pascha celebrandi inter Judaeos recepta* (Colog. and Augsb. 1509): — *Der Judenfeind,* or *Hostis Judaeorum* (ibid. 1509): — *In Lob und Ehren dem Kaiser Maximilian,* or *In laudem et honorem illustrissimi im7peratoris Maximiliani,* etc. (Colog. 1510): — *Ein Brief an Geistliche und Weltliche in Betreff des Kaiserlichen Mandats die judischen Schriften zu vertilgen*: — *Der Handspiegel,* against Reuchlin (Mayence, 1511): — *Der Brandspiegel* (ibid. 1513): — *Die Sturmglocke,* against Reuchlin (Cologne, 1514): — *Streitbiichlein wider Reuchlin u.s. Junger,* or *Defensio contra famtosas et criminales obscurorum verorums epistolas,*

dedicated to the pope and the college of cardinals (Cologne, 1516): — *Eine mitleidige Clag' gegen den unglaubigen Reuchlin* (1521). (Where the Latin title is given, the work was also translated into Latin.) Comp. First, *Bibl. Jud.* 3:82; Wolf, *Bibl. Hebr.* 1:985 sq.; 3:940 sq.; 4:956 sq.; Meiners, *Lebensbeschreibung der Manner aus den Zeiten der Wiederherstellung der Wissenschaften* (Zurich, 1795), 1:99 sq.; Meyerhoff, *Reuchlin u.s. Zeit; Erhard, Geschichte des Wiederaufbluhens der wissenschaftl. Bildung,* volume 2; Lamey, *Reuchlin u.s. Zeit;* Strauss, *Ulrich v. Hutten,* volume 1; Gratz, *Gesch. d. Juden,* 9:98. 101 sq., 103, 110 sq., 115 sq., 130 sq., 140, 142, 158 sq., 168 sq., 209, 211, 218, and Appendix, note 2, page 7 sq.; L. Geiger, *Das Studium der hebr. Sprache in Deutschland,* page 38 sq. (Breslau, 1870); Kalkar, *Israel u.d. Kirche,* page 90 sq.; Basnage, *Histoire des Juifs,* page 730 (Taylor's transl.); H. Adams, *Hist. of the Jews,* 2:47 sq. (Boston, 1812); Da Costa, *Israel and the Gentiles,* page 464 sq.; *Johannes Pfefferkorn,* in Geiger's *Zeitschrift fur Wissenschqft u. Leben* (1869), pages 293-309; *Aktenstucke zur Confiscation de judischen Schriften in Frantkfurt a. M. unter Kaiser Maximilian durch Pfejeirkorn's Angeberei,* in Frankel-Gratz's *Monatsschr.* (July 1875), page 289 sq.; Weyden, *Gesch. d. Juden in Koln am Rhein* (Cologne, 1867), page 259 sq.; Palmer, *Hist. of the Jewish Nation* (Lond. 1874), page 288. (B.P.)

Pfefferkorn, S. Michael M.

a German theologian, was born in the year 1646 at Iffta, near Eisenach, and was the son of a minister. Having received his preparatory education at Creutzburg and Gotha, he went to Jena, where in 1666 he was created magister. From Jena he went to Leipsic, and after having completed his studies, he was appointed professor at the Altenburg gymnasium. Having occupied several stations as anl educator, he was called in 1676 to the pastorate of Friemar, near Gotha. For fifty years he faithfully discharged his ministerial functions. He died March 3, 1732. Besides other works, he is the author of some very fine hymns, which found their way into our hymnbooks, as "Was frag' ich nach der Welt und allen ihren Schatzen" (Engl. transl. by Mills, "Can I this world esteem," in *Hymns from the German,* page 101). See Brickner, *Kirchen- und Schulenstaat im Herzogthum Gotha* (Gotha, 1760, 3 parts), 4:80-82; Koch, *Gesch. d. deutschen Kirchenliedes,* 4:63 sq. (B.P.)

Pfeiffer, Augustus, D.D.

a learned German Lutheran divine, noted as an Orientalist, was born at Lauenburg October 30, 1640, and was educated at Wittenberg. In 1673 he entered the ministry, and thereafter held several important pastorates. In 1681 he became archdeacon to the church of St. Thomas at Leipsic, in which city he also held a chair in theology at the university. In 1689 he was made superintendent of the churches at Lubeck, and died there January 11, 1698. Pfeiffer was one of the most skilful philologists of his time. He is said to have known seventy languages. His library was rich in Hebrew, Arabic, Coptic, Armenian, Persian, and Chinese MSS., and he left many learned writings. His philological works were all collected under the title *Opera omnia philologica* (Utrecht, 1704, 2 volumes, 4to). His other publications were, *Theologia Judaica atque Mohanmmedica* (Lips. 1687. 12mo): — *Antiquitates selectae, ab Ugolino notis illustratae* (in Ugolino, 4:1173): — *Exercitatio de Theraphim* (ibid. 23:549): — *Diatribe de poesa Hebr. recognita* (ibid. 31:899; transl. into Engl. by D.A. Taylor, with additions, in the *Bibl. Repos.* volumes 6-9): — *Manuductio nova etfacilis ad accentuationen,* etc. (Ugol. 31:927): — *Specimen de monzialibus Vet. Test.* (ibid. 32:657): — *Specimen de voce vexata* , h l s (ibid. 32:743): — *Specimen de Psalmis Graduum* (ibid. 32:675). See Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* s.v.; Rotermund's Suppl. to Jocher, *Gelehrten-Lexikon,* s.v. Pipping; *Memoriae theologorum,* s.v. (J.H.W.)

Pfeiffer, Christoph

a German divine, noted as a hymnologist, was born at Oels in the year 1689. For two years he was assistant-preacher at Dirsdorf, when he was called, March 28, 1719, by the duke H. Chr. von Landskron to the pastorate at Dittmansdorf, near Frankenstein, in the principality of Munsterburg. Having occupied this position for twenty-seven years, he was called to Stolz, where he spent the remainder of his life, and died December 23, 1758. His picture in the church there has the motto, "Mea Christus Portio," and the following epigraph: "Mors tua vita mea est, tuaque, O dulcissime Jesu, vulnera sunt animae Pharmaca certa meoe." Pfeiffer is the author of many hymns, several of which are found in our modern hymn-books. See Wezel, *Hymnop.* (Herrnstadt, 1728), 4:397 sq.; Koch, *Gesch. d. deutschen Kirchenliedes,* 5:742 sq. (B.P.)

Pfeiffer, Madame Ida

a German lady, whose maiden name was *Reige*, is noted as a traveller in the East, and as a valuable contributor to Palestinian topography. She was born in Vienna, October 15, 1797. From her very childhood she longed to see the world, and ever read with delight books of travel. In her girlhood she travelled to some extent with her parents, and subsequently with her husband. After the death of her husband and the maturity of her sons she determined to undertake a journey to Palestine, that she might have the ineffable delight of treading those spots which our Saviour had hallowed by his presence. With the accumulated wealth of twenty years, she left Vienna in March 1842. Her joulrney included Constantinople, Broussa, Beirut, Jaffa, Jerusalem, the river Jordan and the Dead Sea, Nazareth, Damascus, Balbec, the Libanus, Alexandria, Cairo, and the Desert to the Red Sea; then back by Malta, Sicily, Naples, Rome, etc., to Vienna, where she arrived in December of the same year. Upon her return she published anonymously the diary she had kept during her trip, under the title of *Reise einer Wienerin in das Heilige Land* (Journey of a Vienna Woman in the Holy Land). In 1845 Madame Pfeiffer visited Sweden, Norway, and Iceland. In 1846 she made her first journey round the world. In 1851 she made a second expedition, visiting the United States, and upon her return published an account of all her travels. But of all her descriptions those of the Holy Land are far more interesting than any of the others; owing doubtless to haying been less hurried then than while making her trips round the world. Throughout the whole of her arduous journeys Madame Pfeiffer displayed great courage, perseverance, and womanly tact. The mere fact of her having accomplished what no male traveller ever has done is conclusive evidence that she was possessed of great endurance and fortitude. She died October 27, 1858.

Pfeil, Christoph Carl Ludwig Von

a descendant of an old knightly family, was born January 20, 1712, at GrNlnstadt, not far from Worms. When ten years of age he was left an orphan, and his uncle, the Reverend Justus S. von Pfeil, of Magdeburg, took him into his house. Here he remained for six years, when, at the age of sixteen, he entered the University of Halle for the study of jurisprudence. In the year 1729 he went to Tubingen to continue there his studies, where he became a faithful follower of Christ. In 1732, at the age of twenty, he was appointed secretary of legation of the Wiirtemberg

government at Regensburg, and in 1737 he was appointed counsellor of law at Stuttgard. For thirty years he held the highest honors in Wiirtemberg, until, in the year 1763, he removed to Prussia, when Frederick the Great awarded to him new honors. Pfeil died March 28, 1776. He was a very pious man, and the different stages of his life are best marked in his poetical productions and hymns, which number about 940. Not all of his hymns have found their way into hymnbooks, especially as most of them are influenced by Zinzendorf and Bengel, whose ideas are more or less reproduced in them. T'hose, however, which are found in our hymn-books are really jewels of German hvmnology. A collection of his hymns has been published by the Reverend G. Knack, of Berlin (1850, 1853), under the title *Evangel. Herzensgesdage.* Besides his hymns, Pfeil left in MS. a rhymed translation of Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, the Lord's Prayer, the apostolic epistles, etc. See Teichmann's biography in the preface to his *Christl. Hausschatz* (Stuttgard, 1852); Merz, *Das Leben des christlichen Dichters und Ministers C.C.L. von Pfeil* (ibid. 1863); Koch, *Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes,* 5:176 sq. (B.P.)

Pfenninger, Johann Conrad

a German theologian, was born at Zurich, Switzerland, in 1747; studied theology at the university of his native place: in 1775 was made dean of the Orphans' Church, and later was appointed the successor of his friend Lavater (q.v.) in the pastorate, and was also made the dean of St. Peter's Church. He died in 1792. Pfenninger was a voluminous writer and much involved in controversy with the Rationalists, who then so very generally abounded in Germany. He was in close harmony with the theological views of Lavater, and with him attempted to give to his period a secure Christian impress, so as to lift Christianity from its Oriental vestments, and place it upon the ground of universal humanity. While the sceptics, and even Spalding among them, regarded modern Christianity rather as a purely comprehensible and abstract fact, and excluded every contribution of the imagination, Lavater and Pfenninger, like Klopstock (q.v.), thought it best to render aid by the Western imagination. They made Christianity not only accessible to the modern understanding, but to the modern feeling. Most valuable of all of Pfenninger's publications are his *Judische Briefe aus der Zeit Jesu v. Nazareth* (1783-92), which have been freely used by Stier in his *Words of Jesus* (transl. by Strong and Smith, N.Y. 3 volumes, 8vo). These Jewish letters furnish a sort of Christian romance, in which the men

and women of the time of Jesus write letters to each other, just as sentimental men and women of the last century would hlave written, and Christianity was thus modernized to make it attractive and plain to the masses, and relieve it of the Oriental garb it wears in the Bible. (J.H.W.)

Pflug, Julius

a German theologian, noted in the Reformation history of his country's Church, was born at Merseburg near the opening of the 16th century. He was the son of a nobleman, and a favorite of the emperor Charles V, who sent him in 1541 as one of the collocutors to the synod at Regensburg (q.v.), which resulted in the adoption of the Augsburg Interim (q.v.). Pflug was selected by the emperor as president of the approaching synod at Regensburg. About that time the chapter of the cathedral at Naumburg-Zeitz elected him bishop, but he was unable to assume his episcopal duties until after the battle at Muhlberg. In 1557 he presided at the Synod of Worms, and died in 1564. Pflug was a moderate Romanist, and though associated with Eck, shared none of his extravagant and extreme ideas. He earnestly desired peace, and though he may here and there have consented to measures rather equivocal and questionable, he probably sought only the peace and union of the Church. See Ranke, *Hist. of the Papacy*, 1:117 sq.; Planck, *Gesch. der protest. Theol.* volume 6; Alzog, *Kirchengesch.* 2:309 sq. (J.H.W.)

Pha'ath-Mo'ab

*(*Φαὰθ Μωάβ v.r. Φθαλεὶ Μωαβείς*)*, a Graecized form (1 Esdr. 5:11) of the Heb. name (Ezra 2:6; Nehemiah 7:11) PAHATH-MOAB *SEE PAHATH-MOAB* (q.v.).

Phac'areth

*(*Φακαρέθ v.r. Φαχαρέθ*)*, a corrupt Graecized form (1 Esdr. 5:34) of the Heb. name (Ezra 2:57; Nehemiah 7:59) POCHERETH *SEE POCHERETH* (q.v.).

Phaedo(n) Of Elis

a noted ancient Grecian philosopher, was a native of Elis, and of high birth. He was taken prisoner in his youth, and passed into the hands of an Athenian slave-dealer; and being of considerable personal beauty was compelled to prostitute himself. It was in the summer of B.C. 400 that

Phmedo was brought to Athens. A year would thus remain for his acquaintance with Socrates, to whom he attached himself. According to Diogenes Laertius he ran away from his master to Socrates, and was ransomed by one of the friends of the latter. Suidas says that he was accidentally present at a conversation with Socrates, and besought him to effect his liberation. Various accounts mentioned Alcibiades, Crito, or Cebes as the person who ransomed him. Cebes is stated to have been on terms of intimate friendship with Phaedo, and to have instructed him in philosophy. Phaedo was present at the death of Socrates, while he was still quite a youth. From the mention of his long hair it would seem that he was not eighteen years of age at the time, as at that age it was customary to cease wearing the hair long (Becker, *Charikles*, 2:382). That Phaedo was Mn terms of friendship with Plato appears likely from the mode in which he is introduced in the dialogue which takes its name from him. Other stories that were current in the schools spoke of their relation as being that of enmity rather than friendship. Several philosophers were ungenerous enough to reproach Phaedo with his previous condition, but LEschines named one of his dialogues after Phaedo. Phsedo appears to have lived in Athens some time after the death of Socrates. He then returned to Elis, where he became the founder of a school of philosophy, which appears to have resembled in tendency and character the Megaric school. Anchipylus and Moschus are mentioned among his disciples. He was succeeded by Pleistanus, after whom the Elean school was merged in the Eretrian.

Of the doctrines of Phaedo nothing is known, except as they made their appearance in the philosophy of Menedemus. Nothing can safely be inferred respecting them from the Phaedo of Plato. None of Phaedo's writings have come down to us. They were in the form of dialogues. There was some doubt in antiquity as to which were genuine, and which were not. Panaetius attempted a critical separation of the two classes, and the Ζώπυρος and the Σίμων were acknowledged to be genuine. Besides these, Diogenes Laertius (2:105) mentions as of doubtful authenticity the Νικίας, Μήδιος, Ἀντίμαχος ἤ πρεσβίται, and Σκυθικοὶ λογοι. In addition to these Suidas mentions the Σεμμίας, Ἀλκιβιάδης, and Κριτόλαος. It was probably from the Zopyrus that the incident alluded to by Cicero *(De Fato, 5; Tusc. Disp.* 4:37, § 80), Maximus Tyr. (31:3), and others, was derived. Seneca *(Ep.* 94, 41) has a translation of a short passage from one of his pieces. See Fabricius, *Bibl. Graec.* 2:717; Scholl, *Gesch. der Griech. Lit.* 1:475; Preller, in Ersch and Gruber's *Encyklopedie,*

s.v.; Preller, *Phaedons Lebensschicksale u. Schriften* in the *Rheinisches Museum fur Philosophie,* 1846, page 391 sq., now in his *Kleine Schriften,* ed. by R. Kohler.

Phadrus

an Epicurean philosopher, and contemporary of Cicero, became acquainted with the great orator in his youth at Rome, and during his residence in Athens (B.C. 80) Cicero renewed his acquaintance with him. Phaedrus was at that time an old man, and was president of the Epicurean school. He was also on terms of friendship with Velleius, whom Cicero introduces as the defender of the Epicurean tenets in the *De Nat. Deor.* (1:21, § 58). He occupied the position of head of the Epicurean school till B.C. 70, and was succeeded by Patron. Cicero *(Ad Att.* 13:39) mentions, according to the common reading, two treatises by Phaedrus, Φαίδρου περισσῶν et ῾Ελλάδος. The first title is corrected on MS. authority to Περί θεῶν. Some critics (as Petersen) suppose that only one treatise is spoken of, Περὶ θεῶν καὶ Παλλάδος. Others (among whom is Orelli, *Ononm. Tull.* s.v. PhIedrus) adopt the reading *et῾ Ελλάδος*, or, at least, suppose that two treatises are spoken of. An interesting fragment of the former work was discovered at Herculaneum in 1806, and was first published, though not recognised as the work of Phiedrus, in a work entitled *Herculanensia,* or *A rchceological and Philological Dissertations; containing a Manuscriptfound among the Ruins of Herculaneum* (Lond. 1810). A better edition was published by Petersen *(Phcedri Epicurei, vulgo Anonymi Herculanensis, de Nat. Deor. Fragm.* Hamb. 1833). Cicero was largely indebted to this work of Phaedrus for the materials of the first book of his *De Natura Deorusm.* Not only is the development of the Epicurean doctrine (c. 16, etc.) taken from it, but the erudite account of the doctrines of earlier philosophers put in the mouth of Velleius is a mere translation from Phaedrus. See Fabricius, *Bibl. Graec.* 3:608; Krische, *Forschungen auf dem Gebiete der alten Phil.* 1:27, etc.; Preller, in Ersch and Gruber's *Encykl. — Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* s.v.

Pheenolium

*(*Φαινόλιον*). SEE CHASUBL.*

Phaenomenon

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

Phaenos

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

Phagiphania

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

Phagophania

SEE PHAGIPHANIA.

Phagor

SEE PEOR.

Phai'sur

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

Phalaeus

SEE PHALEUS.

Phaldai'us

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

Phale'as

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

Pha'lec

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

Phallicism

or Phallic Worship. *SEE PHALLUS*.

Phal'lu

(Genesis 46:9). *SEE PALLU*.

Phallus

*(*φαλλός*, nmembrum virile)*, a representation of the male generative organ, as the symbol of the fertility of nature, was carried among the ancient Greeks in the processions of the *Dionysia*, and men disguised as women, called *Ithyphalloi*, followed immediately behind it. The phallus, which was called among the Romans *fascinum*, was often used by that people as an amulet hung around the necks of children to avert evil influences. The *Satyrica signa* of Pliny probably referred to the phallus, and he says that these were placed in gardens and on hearths to protect against the fascinations of the envious. From Pollux, also, we learn that smiths were accustomed to place figures of the phallus before their forges for the same purpose. This symbol, which disgusts us by its indecency, conveyed to the ancient heathens, as the Linga (q.v.) does to the modern Hindi's, a profound and sacred meaning. Diodorus Siculus, referring to the veneration in which the phallus was held among the Greeks, tells us that by this they would signify their gratitude to God for the populousness of their country. "It was an object of common worship throughout the nature-religion of the East, and was called by manifold names, such as *Linga*, *Joni*, *Pollear*, etc. Originally it had no other meaning than the allegorical one of that mysterious union between the male and female which throughout nature seems to be the sole condition of the continuation of the existence of animated beings; but at a later period, more particularly when

ancient Rome had become the hot-bed of all natural and unnatural vices, its worship became an intolerable nuisance, and was put down by the senate on account of the more than usual immorality to which it gave rise. Its origin has caused much speculation, but no certainty has been arrived at by investigators. The Phoenicians traced its introduction into their worship to Adonis, the Egyptians to Osiris, the Phrygians to Attys, the Greeks to Dionysus. The common myth concerning it was the story of some god deprived of his powers of generation — an allusion to the sun, which in autumn loses its fructifying influence. The procession in which it was carried about was called Phallagogia, or Periphallia, and a certain hymn was sung on that occasion, called the φαλλικὸν μέλος. The bearers of the phallus, which generally consisted of red leather, and was attached to an enormous pole, were the Phallophoroi. Phalli were on those occasions worn as ornaments around the neck, or attached to the body. Aristotle traces the origin of comedy to the ribaldry and the improvised jokes customary on these festivals. Phalli were often attached to statues, and of a prodigious size; sometimes they were even movable. At a procession of Ptolemy Philadelphus a phallus was carried about made of gold, and one hundred and twenty yards long. Before the temple of Venus at Hierapolis there stood two phalli, one hundred and eighty feet high, upon which a priest mounted annually, and remained there in prayer for seven days. The phallus was an attribute of Pan, Priapus, and to a certain extent also of Hermes" (Chambers). The believers in the development theory of course have a way of their own in accounting for the origin and progress of phallic worship. They teach that it is the most ancient and universal of the beliefs of the human race, and that it has prevailed among all known nations of antiquity, and has been handed down in both dead and living forms to the present day. They claim to see evidences of its existence not only in Egypt, Greece, and Rome, but also in Syria, Persia, Asia Minor, Italy, Spain, Germany, France, Ireland, and Scandinavia, among the mound-builders of North America, in Mexico, Central America, Peru, and Hayti, and in the islands of the Pacific Ocean, and in Africa. They ecen see its traces among the Jews, and in the use of certain symbols in Christianity. Thus, e.g., Westropp teaches: "The origin of the idea is coeval among primitive nations with that of the family, and rests in part upon the natural veneration of the father as the generator, the priest, and the ruler. Marriage derived much of its importance from a veneration of the principles at the foundation of the phallic worship. Its ceremony was attended with rites which marked their significance, and one of its symbols, the wedding-ring,

is employed at the present day. Circumcision was in its inception a purely phallic ordinance. Although the O.T. narrative relates that it was instituted as a covenant between Jehovah and Abraham, the rite had been practiced by the Egyptians and Phoenicians long before the birth of the Hebrew patriarch. Serpent symbolism was associated with the phallic emblems, but that there was an identity in their signification has not been clearly established. The serpent was used among most archaic nations as a symbol of wisdom and health, and yet its meaning often included the notion of life and an embodiment of the spirit." Mr. Wake, another essayist of the same school, treats the Mosaic account of the fall of man as a phallic legend, which was borrowed by the compiler of the Pentateuch from some foreign source, probably from the mysteries of Mithra, a Persian deity. The tree of the knowledge of good and evil he identifies with the figtree, which was highly venerated by many primitive peoples. Its leaves, it will be remembered, were sewed into aprons by Adam and Eve after their transgression. The *kerub* which guarded the tree of life is interpreted as a symbol of the Deity himself, in the form of the sacred bull of antiquity — a form under which the *kerub* is described by Ezekiel (chapter 1 and 10). The story of the Deluge is also regarded as a myth, with decided evidences of a phallic character. In many of the incidents interwoven into the history of the Hebrews, and in many of their religious observances, Mr. Wake discovers testimony of the influence of the phallic superstition. Abraham was a Chaldaean, and by tradition declared to have been learned in astronomy, and to have taught the science to the Phoenicians. "He had higher notions of the relation of man to the Divine than his ancestors," says the writer, but there was no fundamental difference between his religious faith and that of his Syrian neighbors. The Jewish patriarchs erected pillars and planted groves, both of which were customs connected with phallic worship. Throughout the rule of the judges, and especially after the establishment of the monarchy, the Hebrews were given to derelictions from the purer religion of their nation to the idolatrous practices of their neighbors, which involved worship ofphallicstatues and omphalic emblems in "high places." The religion of Baal, openly denounced by the prophets, was a sort of phallism, and was conducted with lewd and abominable ceremonies, which the Jews too often imitated. Mr. Wake even holds that the basis of Christianity is more purely phallic than that of any other religion. "In the recognition of God as the universal Father, the great Parent of mankind, there is a development of the fundamental idea of phallism. In the position assigned to Mary as the mother of God the

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

Phal'ti

(Heb. *Palti',* yfæPi; *my deliverance;* Sept. Φαλτί*),* the son of Laish of Gallim, to whom Saul gave Michal in marriage after his mad jealousy had driven David forth as an outlaw (<092544>1 Samuel 25:44). B.C. cir. 1061. In <100315>2 Samuel 3:15 he is called PHALTIEL. Ewald *(Gesch.* 3:129) suggests that this forced marriage was a piece of policy on the part of Saul to attach Phalti to his house. With the exception of this brief mention of his name, and the touching little episode in <100316>2 Samuel 3:16, nothing more is heard of Phalti. Michal is there restored to David. "Her husband went with her along weeping behind her to Bahurim," and there, in obedience to Abner's abrupt command, "Go, return," he turns and disappears from the scene. *SEE DAVID.*

There was another person of the same Heb. name (Numbers 13:9, A.V. "Palti" [q.v.]).

Phal'tiel

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

Phannias

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

Phantasiaets

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

Phantasiodocetae

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

Phanton OF PHLIUS

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

Phanu'el

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

Phar'acim

*(*Φαρακέμ v.r. Φαρακείμ*)*, a name mentioned in the Apocrypha (1 Esdr. 5:31) as that of a Hebrew whose "sons" returned among the servants of the

Temple from the captivity with Zerubbabel; but it does not occur in the parallel lists of Ezra and Nehemiah.

Pha'raoh

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

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

contemporaneously over Upper and Lower Egypt, the hawk occurs only in connection with one of them (id. 3:282).

Readers of Scripture will remark that Pharaoh often stands simply like a proper name (<01215>Genesis 12:15; 37:36; 40:2 sq.; 44:1 sq.; and so generally throughout the Pentateuch, and also in Song of Solomon i, 9; <23911>Isaiah 19:11; 30:2). "King of Egypt" is sometimes subjoined to it (<11301>1 Kings 3:1; <12707>2 Kings 17:7; 18:21); and sometimes also the more specific designation, or real proper name of the monarch is indicated, as Pharaoh Necho (<12333>2 Kings 23:33), Pharaoh Hophra (<24460>Jeremiah 44:30). Josephus *(Ant.* 8:6, 2) says that while every king of Egypt from Menes to the time of Solomon-took this title, no king of Egypt used it afterwards, and affirms the latter fact to be apparent from the sacred writings. This, however, is not quite correct. Several Egyptian kings were after the period in question called *by foreigners* Pharaoh, sometimes simply, sometimes in connection with a second name (<12821>2 Kings 18:21; 23:29); but the alteration from the time of Solomon which undoubtedly took place is remarkable, and probably points to an important change in the dynastic history of Egypt.

Some writers suppose Pharaoh to have been the name given in the Bible to the *native* kings of Egypt. There were, however, probably before Solomon's time several introductions of foreign dynasties, and some of them, if we accept the usual period ascribed to the rule of the Shepherds, of long duration; yet Scripture gives the title to all alike before this period, and Josephus states that all without exception assumed it. Wilkinson supposes that it was the title of such kings as had the sole direction of affairs while Egypt was an independent state, and that the title of "melek," or king, marked such as ruled conjointly with other kings of Egypt, or who governed as viceroys under a foreign ruler, as was the case after the Persian conquest (1:148, 179). This is very probably a satisfactory explanation for the long period down to the reign of Solomon. Most likely throughout it "Pharaoh" marks the monarch who ruled alone in Egypt, or over its inferior and tributary kings when there were such. This may seem intimated in the speech of one of them to Joseph: "I am Pharaoh, and without thee shall no man lift up his hand or foot in all the land of Egypt" (<01444>Genesis 41:44). Wilkinson's explanation, however, scarcely accounts for the period subsequent to the Pharaoh who gave his daughter to Solomon. Shishak, who seems to have succeeded him, was evidently the supreme ruler of Egypt, and not only independent of foreigners, but able to extend Egyptian power far beyond the limits of Egypt. A change of dynasty

seems here to have caused the change of title, and was probably more or less connected with such changes in after periods. The Persian monarchs finally, administering the affairs of Egypt through tributary native kings, took the title of Pharaoh as indicative of their sovereignty (Trevor, *Egypt*, page 331). With them this ancient name of royalty passed away forever.

The political position of the Pharaohs in Egypt is of great moment in understanding the history of that country. If it were the exclusive title of the supreme ruler, it marks the general unity of Egypt under a single monarch. If it were given indifferently to every king of Egypt at those times, which seem unquestionably to have recurred, and may have been of long duration and early date, when several kings ruled over various divisions of the country, the occurrence of the title does not necessarily mark the political unity of the land. According to the first view. for instance, the Pharaoh of Abraham or Joseph would be the supreme ruler of the whole of Egypt, with, it might happen, various dynasties of subordinate kings under him; according to the latter, he might be only king of a portion of Egypt, with other dynasties of equal rank ruling contemporaneously elsewhere. To us the former view appears the preferable one for many reasons. The unity of Egypt under a single supreme monarch is, we think, unquestionably the view according to which the Scriptures lead us to think *thatobreigners* regarded that country. Whatever may have been the internal administration of the government, into which Scripture does not enter at all, the general view given us of Egypt in the Bible is that of a country united under one monarch. The earliest apparent reference to a different state of things occurs in 2 Kings 7:6, where we read of "kings of Egypt," apparently of equal authority. Isaiah predicts great troubles arising probably from a similar dissolution of any central authority (ch. 19:3; Wilkinson, *Egypt.* 1:178; Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, 1:51, note 4, and 391). All ancient history with which we are acquainted (Herodotus, Diodorus, and Manetho) assumes the political unity of Egypt. The titles of the Pharaohs seem to establish it. They are always called on the monuments "Lords of Upper and Lower Egypt" (Wilkinson. 2:73; 2d ser. 1:261). This unity of Egypt from the earliest times is new generally acknowledged (Hengstenberg, *Egypt*, page 84). The power and greatness of Egypt from the remotest times point to such a unity. Its high civilization and peaceful internal condition are a similar indication. If divided into several independent kingdoms Egypt would have exhibited the same condition which all the petty states of antiquity did, in which every man was of

necessity a soldier (Hume, *Essays,* 2:11). Whereas in Egypt soldiers formed a different class from the rest of the community, never wore arms except in actual service, while private citizens at no time carried offensive weapons (Wilkinsoln 1:402). Indeed, it is impossible to imagine any country less suited by geographical configuration for divided rule than Egypt from the Cataracts to the sea. One level valley, only divided east and west by its river, shut in from the rest of the world by the Libvan and Arabian mountains and the Syrian deserts, it must of necessity form a single state.

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

1. *The Pharaoh of Abraham*. — The first mention of a Pharaoh in the Bible is on the occasion of Abram's visit to Egypt during a famine in Canaan (⁰¹²¹⁰Genesis 12:10). Which of the ancient kings of Egypt is to be understood by this Pharaoh it is perhaps impossible to determine with certainty. Wilkinson supposes him to have been *Apappus;* Africanus calls him *Ramnessemenes;* and some have taken him to be one of the Shepherd kings. We have, in truth, no materials in Scripture or elsewhere for fixing the name and place of this king in the dynasties of Egypt. In regard to the

date also of Abraham's intercourse with him there is great uncertainty. But as the investigation of the point would involve us in a discussion on the somewhat perplexed chronology of the earlier parts of Old-Test. history, and the still more perplexed chronology of ancient Egypt, we can here only touch upon it; but see for the refutation of extreme views on the part of the Egyptologists, Hengstenberg's *Egypt and the Books of Moses*, and Sir C. Lewis's *Astronomy of the Ancients.* At the time at which the patriarch went into Egypt, according to Hales's as well as Usher's chronology, it is generally held that the country, or at least Lower Egypt, was ruled by the Shepherd kings, of whom the first and most powerful line was the fifteenth dynasty, the undoubted territories of which would be first entered by one coming from the east. Manetho relates that Salatis, the head of this line, established at Avaris, perhaps the Zoan of the Bible, on the eastern frontier, what appears to have been a great permanent camp, at which he resided for part of each year. *SEE ZOAN*. It is noticeable that Sarah seems to have been taken to Pharaoh's house immediately after the coming of Abraham; and if this were not so, yet, on account of his flocks and herds, the patriarch could scarcely have gone beyond the part of the country which was always more or less occupied by nomad tribes. It is also possible that Pharaoh gave Abraham camels, for we read that Pharaoh "entreated Abram well for Sarah's sake: and he had sheep, and oxen. and he-asses, and men-servants, and maid-servants, and she-asses, and camels" (<01216>Genesis 12:16), where it appears that this property was the gift of Pharaoh, and the circumstance that the patriarch afterwards held an Egyptian bondwoman, Hagar, confirms the inference. If so, the present of camels would argue that this Pharaoh was a Shepherd king, for no evidence has been found in the sculptures, paintings, and inscriptions of Egypt that in the Pharaonic ages the camel was used, or even known there, and this omission can be best explained by the supposition that the animal was hateful to the Egyptians as of great value to their enemies the Shepherds. On the other hand, Abraham's possessions, especially the camels, may have been purchased by him from the nomnad tribes with the proceeds of Pharaoh's liberality, and the fact that Hagar was of this Arab race hardly consists with her having been reduced to bondage while they were in the ascendant. Indeed, it appears that the Shepherd kings (q.v.) were not on good terms with the Hebrews, as their interests were rival. The date at which Abraham visited Egypt (according to the chronology which we hold most probable) was about B.C. 2081, which would not accord with the time of Salatis, the head of the fifteenth dynasty, B.C.

2006, according to our reckoning, but rather with that of Binothris of the second (Thinitic) dynasty, and that of Othoes of the sixth (Memphitic) dynasty, as well as with that of Tancheres of the fifth (Elephantinitic) dynasty, but anterior to all the other dynasties.

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

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

shepherds was carefully and jealously respected by this king. The Israelites on coming into Egypt were by him located in the border-land (Hengstenberg, *Egypt*, page 42) of Goshen, where they would serve as a barrier against the shepherd-hating Egyptians (<01634>Genesis 46:34). We cannot suppose a Shepherd king to act thus. He would not thus consult a native prejudice hostile to his own dynasty, while his own Shepherd garrisons occupied the strongholds of Egypt. Again, Pharaoh's court and household, so far as we know them, were composed of native Egyptians. Such was Potiphar, the captain of the king's bodyguard, probably the most trusted officer of Pharaoh (<01901>Genesis 39:1); while the chief butler and baker of his court are the well-known officers of the native court of the Pharaohs (Trevor, page 256). The officials of Pharaoh's prime minister, Joseph, are also native Egyptians, whose feelings of caste towards foreigners were carefully consulted (<01432>Genesis 43:32; see Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, book 2, c. 41, note 9). In the midst of universal destitution, when all others were reduced to serfdom, and the lands of Egypt passed into the possession of Pharaoh, the property of the native Egyptian priests alone was religiously respected, and they received, without any return, an ample maintenance from Pharaoh's stores for themselves and their families (<01422>Genesis 47:22). When Pharaoh sought to bestow upon Joseph marks of the highest honor for his preservation of the country, one of these marks was the bestowal on him in marriage of Asenath, the daughter of Potipherah, priest of On or Heliopolis, who is thus distinguished as one of the highest and most honored personages in the land (<01445>Genesis 41:45). These considerations lead us to conclude that this Pharaoh was a native Egyptian, not a Shepherd king, and that he ruled after the expulsion of the Shepherds, or during their supremacy, while the memory of their tyranny was still vivid in the national mind. Rawlinson *(Herod.* Lk. 2, c. 108, note 2) seems to think that horses were unknown in Egypt till the time of Amosis (B.C. 1510), and would thus give a low date for this monarch, in whose time horses were in use for ordinary purposes as well as for war (<01417>Genesis 47:17). The testimony of Herodotus on which he comments seems, however, opposed to this view. According to the chronology which we adopt, the period of Joseph's deliverance from prison was B.C. 1883, which will fall, according to our view of the Egyptian dynasties, under the reign of Aphobis, the fourth king of the fifteenth (Shepherd) dynasty. But as the Shepherd kings do not seem to have been friendly to the Hebrews, and for the other reasons enumerated above, we presume that these foreigners were not at this time (if indeed they ever were) in possession of

the whole of Egypt. We therefore incline to identify the Pharaoh in question with one of the eighth (Memphitic) dynasty, whose names are unrecorded, but who were contemporaneous with the twelfth (Diospolitic) as well as with the fifteenth (Shepherd) dynasty. There is one indication in Scripture which seems to attribute a very considerable antiquity to this period. In Joseph's time the territory allocated to the Israelites was called Goshen (<01451>Genesis 45:10). In the time of Moses this ancient name appears to have been almost forgotten, and to have yielded to that of the land of Rameses (<01471>Genesis 47:11).

The religion of Egypt during the reign of this Pharaoh appears to have been far less corrupt than it subsequently presents itself in the tinme of Moses. The Scriptures give us several indications of this; and these of no indistinct kind. Thus Joseph speaks to his master's wife as if she recognised the same God th'at he did (<01399>Genesis 39:9). His language to the chief butler and baker in the prison conveys a similar idea (<01408>Genesis 40:8), as does his address to Pharaoh when called before him (<01416>Genesis 41:16-82). Pharaoh in his speech to his servants and to Joseph speaks of God precisely as Joseph had done, and as if he recognised but cne God (<01438>Genesis 41:38, 39). Joseph, without any fear of injurious consequences to himself, and as if it were no extraordinary thing, allows the identity of his religion with that of the sons of Jacob (<01418>Genesis 42:18). Joseph's steward, probably a native Egyptian, evidently recognises their God (<01423>Genesis 43:23). No doubt corruption had now been introduced into the pure religion derived from Noah. In the magicians and wise men (<01408>Genesis 41:8) of Egypt we see probably a caste who had already given a superstitious coloring to religion, introduced new rites of worship, and paved the way for a total declension from theism to gross polytheism. But this latter condition does not appear to have been reached in the time of Joseph. Symbolic worship, if now, as is most likely, in common use, had still to a very great extent left undestroyed the notion of one supreme God ruling over all the nations; nor have we reason to suppose that Potipherah, the father-in-law of Joseph, and priest of On, was an upholder of the idolatry of a later time. The sun, now introduced into Egyptian worship, was by him in all likelihood explained as the sign and symbol of deity, but not as partaking of deity itself. No doubt we see from this the danger of any alteration by man of the worship ordained by God, but at the same time the religion of Egypt may have been comparatively true and pure, though it had now introduced that symbolism which quickly degenerated into the

grossest idolatry the world has ever seen. Symbolic worship was now probably regarded as a high proof of religious wisdom (<45122>Romans 1:22); a short time proved it to be utter folly.

The government of Pharaoh seems to have been of an absolute kind (<01440>Genesis 41:40-43; see Wilkinson, 1:45). The supposition that at this time Egypt was governed by several independent dynasties seems inconsistent with the language and conduct of Pharaoh in making by his own mere will Joseph to be ruler "over all the land of Egypt," only inferior to himself throughout its whole extent. But this language is evidently that of courtly assumption, and may very naturally be applied only to that region over which he ruled. The evidence is very strong from the monuments and other sources that even under the Shepherd rule there were kings in other parts of Egypt largely if not wholly independent of them. The appointment of coregents decorated with royal titles is thought to have been characteristic of this dynasty (Trevor, *Egypt*, page 258). This Pharaoh's personal character seems to have been that of a wise and prudent monarch, anxious for the welfare of his people, and superior to popular prejudice against strangers. Wilkinson thinks he was pacific in his policy, and his conduct in receiving a blessing from the aged Jacob shows a humility of mind and a respect for worth which contrasts very favorably with the conduct of other despotic kings. The situation of his capital was near the land of Goshen (<01450>Genesis 45:10), and the civilization and flourishing condition of Egypt during his reign were very great (Wilkinson, 1:43). Whether he were the same monarch whom we find ruling Egypt at the time of Jacob's death, seventeen years subsequently to his removal into Goshen, has been differently viewed (<01004>Genesis 1:4). It has been thought by some that Joseph's using the intercession of Pharaoh's household to procure a favor from the king indicates a less intimate acquaintance than we should expect between him and that king who ruled at the time of the famine. But local customs, probably connected with the habits of Egyptian mourning, may account for this.without supposing a different king (Hengstenberg, *Egypt*, page 71).

3. *The Pharaoh of the First Persecution of the Israelites*. — The interval which elapsed between the Pharaoh of Joseph's time and the Pharaoh who commenced the persecution of Israel is much affected by opinion as to the length of the sojourn in Egypt. *SEE CHRONOLOGY*. According to our view, the interval between Jacob's removal into Egypt and the birth of Moses was a little over one hundred and thirty-five years. The unknown

quantity is the period from the commencement of the persecution to the birth of Moses. It was the same Pharaoh that began to afflict Israel who reigned when Moses was born (Acts 7:20), and the persecution must have continued a considerable time previous to allow for the events mentioned in the first chapter of Exodus. These included the building oftwo considerable cities and other labor, for which a period of several years seems to be required. The name and dynasty of this king have been differently given *(Jour. of Sac. Lit.* [new ser.] 1:491). Wilkinson supposes him to have been *Amosis* or *Ames,* the first of the eighteenth dynasty of Theban or Diospolitan kings, and supports his view of the change of dynasty at this time, and the accession of kings from the distant province of Thebes, from the scriptural account of him as" a new king that knew not Joseph"(1:47, 76). Lord Prudhoe, in an able paper given by Wilkinson (1:78), argues that the new king was *Rameses I,* who was also, according to him, the head of a new dynasty, and as such ignorant of the history of Joseph, while it was for Rameses II that the Israelites built the treasure cities. According to the fragment of Manetho preserved by Theophilus, the new king was *Tkthmosis* (Bunsen, *Egypt,* 1:655). He is very commonly supposed to have been the king who crushed the power of the Shepherds in Egypt. From a picture on the walls of a very interesting tomb of Roshere, "superintendent of the great buildings" to king Thothmes III, Trevor *(Egypt,* page 72) thinks it likely that it was during his dynasty, the eighteenth, that the oppression of Israel occurred, and that most likely Amosis, the first king, was the originator of it (page 275). Josephus *(Ant.* 2:9, 1) considers him to have been of a new family called to the throne; but Hengstenberg *(Egypt,* page 252) argues that the appellation of "new king," in the Bible, which is very often referred to in proof of a change of dynasty, indicates only a disregard of the services of Joseph, and a forgetfulness of the old affection that used to be entertained in Egypt and by its kings for the great preserver of their country. According to Manetho's story of the Exodus-a story so contradictory to historical truth as scarcely to be worthy of mention-the Israelites left Egypt in the reign of Meneptah, who was great-grandson of the first Rameses, and son and successor of the second. This king is held by some Egyptologists to have reigned about the time of the rabbinical date of the Exodus, which is virtually the same as that which has been supposed to be obtainable from the genealogies. There is, however, good reason to place these kings much later; in which case Rameses I would be the oppressor; but then the building of Rameses could not be placed in his reign without a disregard of Hebrew chronology. But

the argument that there is no earlier known king Rameses loses much of its weight when we bear in mind that one of the sons of Aahmes, head of the eighteenth dynasty, who reigned about two hundred years before Rameses I, bore the same name, besides that very many names of kings of the Shepherd period, perhaps of two whole dynasties, are unknown. Against this one fact, which is certainly not to be disregarded, we must weigh the general evidence of the history, which shows us a king apparently governing a part of Egypt, with subjects inferior to the Israelites, and fearing a war in the country. Like the Pharaoh of the Exodus, he seems to have dwelt in Lower Egypt, probably at Avaris. (When Moses went to see his people, and slew the Egyptian, he does not seem to have made any journey, and the burying in sand shows that the place was in a part of Egypt, like Goshen, encompassed by sandy deserts.) Compare this condition with the power of the kings of the latter part of the eighteenth and of the nineteenth dynasties: rulers of an empire, governing a united country from which the head of their line had driven the Shepherds. The view that this Pharaoh was of the beginning or middle of the eighteenth dynasty seems at first sight extremely probable, especially if it be supposed that the Pharaoh of Joseph was a Shepherd king. The expulsion of the Shepherds at the commencement of this dynasty would have naturally caused an immediate or gradual oppression of the Israelites. But it must be remembered that what we have just said of the power of some kings of this dynasty is almost as true of their predecessors. The silence of the historical monuments is also to be weighed, when we bear in mind how nuinerous the gaps are, and that we might expect many of the events of the oppression to be recorded even if the exodus were not noticed. If we assign this Pharaoh to the age before the eighteenth dynasty, which our view of Hebrew chronology would probably oblige us to do, we have still to determine whether he were a Shepherd or an Egyptian. If a Shepherd, he must have been of the sixteenth or the seventeenth dynasty; and that 'he was Egyptianized does not afford any argument against this supposition, since it appears that foreign kings, who can only be assigned to one of these two lines, had Egyptian names. In corroboration of this view we quote a remarkable passage that does not seem otherwise explicable: "My people went down aforetime into Egypt to sojourn there; and the Assyrian oppressed them without cause" (²⁵⁰⁴Isaiah 52:4): which may be compared with the allusions to the exodus in a predic tion of the same prophet respecting Assyria (10:24, 26). Our inference is strengthened by the discovery that kings bearing a name almost certainly an Egyptian

translation of an Assyrian or Babylonian regal title are among those apparently of the Shepherd age in the Turin Papyrus (Lepsius, *Konigsbuch*, Tafel 18:19:275, 285). According to our view of the Hebrew chronology, the birth of Moses occurred B.C. 1738. The scheme of Egyptian chronology which we have adopted places the beginning of the sixteenth (Shepherd) dynasty in B.C. 1755, and it would therefore be under the reign of one of the first kings of this dynasty, whose names are unknown, that the persecution of the Israelites began.

4. *The Pharaoh of Moses's Exile*. — It is often supposed that the Pharaoh who ruled Egypt at the birth of Moses is the same Pharaoh who ruled it when Moses fled into Midian (<01215>Exodus 2:15). There is nothing in the narrative of Scripture to lead us to this conclusion, though it may possibly have been the case. The probabilities, however, seem to point the other way. We have allowed about eight years of his reign to have elapsed prior to the birth of Moses, who at the period of flight was forty years of age (<40723>Acts 7:23). The monarch, therefore, if the same, must have reigned forty-eight years, which is an unusual length. (The entire 16th dynasty of thirty-two kings seems to have lasted but 112 years.) The jealousy also with which Moses was regarded by this Pharaoh seems to indicate that he did not stand towards him in the relation of his grandfather by adoption. The view is further confirmed by the intimation in <02419>Exodus 4:19, which seems to tell us that the Pharaoh who sought Moses's life lived nearly to the time of his return into Egypt, a period of forty years. If this were so, it is impossible for this king to have been the monarch who began the persecution of Israel. We prefer, therefore, to regard him as different, and as probably chosen by adoption, to continue the succession of a childless family. We would mace the year during his reign at the flight of Moses to have been B.C. 1698, and his attempt upon the life of the great lawgiver is the only event of his reign recorded in Scripture.

5. *The Pharaoh of the Exode*. — The Pharaoh in whose reign the deliverance of the Israelites was achieved would appear to have succeeded to the throne not very long before the return of Moses to Egypt after his forty years' sojourn in Midian (<02419>Exodus 4:19). His relationship to his predecessor is not told us, but he was probably of the same dynasty, and carried on the traditional policy of a grinding oppression of the Israelites. We do not read of any effort of his to re. duce the numbers of that nation: he seems rather to have looked on their numbers as an additional source of grandeur and power to Egypt by an enforced system of labor. The name of

this Pharaoh is very variously related. Wilkinson supposes him to have been *Thothmes III,* the fourth or fifth monarch, according to him, of the eighteenth dynasty of Theban or Diospolitan kings; while Manetho, according to Africanus, makes him to have been *Amos,* the first of that line of monarchs; and lord Prudhoe would have him to have been *Pthahmen,* the last of that dynasty (Wilkinson, *AEgypt.* 1:31, 41, 81). Ptolemy, the priest of Mendis, agrees in opinion with Manetho (Bunsen, *Egypt,* 1:90). Various reasons are given in the *Journal of Sacred Literature* (new ser. i, 490) for supposing him to have been *Sethos II.* Respecting the time of this king, we can only be sure that he was reigning for about a year or more before the exodus, which we place B.C. 1658.

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

Although we have already stated our reasons for abandoning the theory that places the exodus under the nineteenth dynasty, it may be well to notice an additional and conclusive argument for rejecting as unhistorical the tale preserved by Manetho, which makes *Meneptah,* the son of Rameses II, the Pharaoh in whose reign the Israelites left Egypt. This tale was commonly current in Egypt, but it must Le remarked that the historian

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

The idolatry of Egypt appears to have arrived at its height in the time of this monarch. We see evidences of a great difference between the religious system of this period and of the time of Joseph's Pharaoh. At both periods indeed we read of the "magician and wise men of Egypt," but it by no means follows that because the names are the same the part discharged by

them was identical in the two periods. Besides, we read in the later period (<020711>Exodus 7:11) of an order of men (sorcerers, µyp\æ]km) apparently unknown in the earlier. These men supported their authority and doctrine by claims to miraculous power (verse 11), whether we suppose them to have executed their feats merely by a skilful system of jugglery and sleight of hand, or, as many think, by diabolical aid. The authority of the God of Israel, acknowledged by the earlier Pharaoh, is by this king scornfully renounced, and a vast system of polytheism, embracing the famous worship of sacred animals, is firmly established as the religion of Egypt (5:2; 12:12; 8:26). This was the suitable time chosen by God, when a great monarch ruled over the greatest empire of its time, which had brought to full development the idolatry by it widely propagated, to read a lesson to the Gentile world on the feebleness of idols as compared to him.

Before speaking of the later Pharaohs we may mention a point of weight in reference to the identification of these earlier ones. The accounts of the campaigns of the Pharaohs of the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth dynasties have not been found to contain any reference to the Israelites. Hence it might be supposed that in their days, or at least during the greater part of the time, the Israelites were not yet in the Promised Land. There is, however, an almost equal silence as to the Canaanitish nations. The land itself, *Kanana* or *Kanaan*, is indeed mentioned as invaded, as well as those of *Kheta* and *Amar*, referring to the Hittites and Amorites; but the latter two must have been branches of those nations seated in the valley of the Orontes. A recently discovered record of Thothmes III, published by M. de Rouge in the *Revue Archeologique* (November 1861, page 344 sq.), contains many names of Canaanitish towns conquered by that king, but not one recognised as Israelitish. These Canaanitish names are, moreover, on the Israelitish borders, not in the heart of the country. It is interesting that a great battle is shown to have been won by this king at Megiddo. It seems probable that the Egyptians either abstained from attacking the Israelites from a recollection of the calamities of the exodus, or that they were on friendly terms. It is very remarkable that the Egyptians were granted privileges in the law (<052307>Deuteronomy 23:7), and that Shishak, the first king of Egypt after the exodus whom we know to have invaded the Hebrew territories, was of foreign extraction, if not actually a foreigner.

6. *Pharaoh, the Father-in-law of Mered.* — In the genealogies of the tribe of Judah, mention is made of the daughter of a Pharaoh married to an Israelite: "Bithiah, the daughter of Pharaoh, which Mered took" (<130418>1

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

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

David'a reign to its close, i.e., from about B.C. 1033 to B.C. 1013. His reign perhaps came to an end soon after David's death, as Solomon's father-in-law is thought to have been another Pharaoh. His treatment of Hadad, a bitter enemy of David, and with strong reason so, was certainly an unfriendly act towards the latter, but it does not seem to have been attended by any ulterior consequences. No war ensued between Egypt and Israel, and Pharaoh made no attempt to restore Hadad to the throne of Edom. When this latter, upon David's death, sought to return home, evidently with the intention of disturbing the reign of Solomon in its commencement, Pharaoh was apparently opposed to his return, very probably from a disinclination to favor any step which might involve him in unpleasant relations with the powerful kingdom of Israel, then at the height of its greatness. Probably in the first part of this account the fugitives took refuge in an Egyptian mining-station in the peninsula of Sinai, and so obtained guides to conduct them into Egypt. There they were received in accordance with the Egyptian policy, but with the especial favor that seems to have been shown about this time towards the eastern neighbors of the Pharaohs, which may reasonably be supposed to have led to the establishment of the twenty-second dynasty of foreign extraction. For the identification of this Pharaoh we have chronological indications, and the name of his wife. Unfortunately, however, the history of Egypt at this time is extremely obscure, neither the monuments nor Manetho giving us clear information as to the kings. It appears that towards the latter part of the twentieth dynasty the highpriests of Amen, the god of Thebes, gained great power, and at last supplanted the Rameses family, at least in Upper Egypt. At the same time a line of Tanitic kings, Manetho's twenty-first dynasty, seems to have ruled in Lower Egypt. The feeble twentieth dynasty was probably soon extinguished, but the priest-rulers and the Tanites appear to have reigned contemporaneously, until they were both succeeded by the Bubastites of the twenty-second dynasty, of whom Sheshonk I, the Shiskak of the Bible, was the first. The monuments have preserved the names of several of the highpriests, perhaps all, and probably of some of the Tanites; but it is a question whether Manetho's Tanitic line does not include some of the former, and we have no means of testing the accuracy of its numbers. It may be reasonably supposed that the Pharaoh or Pharaohs spoken of in the Bible as ruling in the time of David and Solomon were Tanites, as Tanis was nearest to the Israelitish territory. We have therefore to compare the chronological indications of Scripture with the list of this dynasty. Shishak must have begun to reign in the twenty-fifth year of Solomon (B.C. 989).

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

8. *Pharaoh, the Father-in-law of Solomon*. — In the narrative of the beginning of Solomon's reign, after the account of the deaths of Adonijah, Joab, and Shimei, and the deprivation of Abiathar, we read: "And the kingdom was established in the hand of Solomon. And Solomon made affinity with Pharaoh king of Egypt, and took Pharaoh's daughter, and brought her into the city of David, until he had made an end of building his own house, and the house of the Lord, and the wall of Jerusalem round about" (1Ki 2:46; 3:1). The events mentioned before the marriage belong altogether to the very commencement of Solomon's reign, excepting the matter of Shimei, which, extending through three years, is carried on to its completion. The mention that the queen was brought into the city of David while Solomon's house, and the Temple, and the citywall were building, shows that the marriage took place not later than the eleventh year of the king, when the Temple was finished, having been

commenced in the fourth year (1 Kings 6:1, 37, 38). It is also evident that this alliance was before Solomon's falling away into idolatry (1 Kings 3:3), of which the Egyptian queen does not seem to have been one of the causes. From this chronological indication it appears that the marriage must have taken place between about twenty-four and eleven years before Shishak's accession. It must be recollected that it seems certain that Solomon's father-in-law was not the Pharaoh who was reigning when Hadad left Egypt. Both Pharaohs, as already shown, cannot vet be identified in Manetho's list. *SEE PHARAOHS DAUGHTER.*

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

This Pharaoh we suppose to have reigned over all Egypt, but he does not appear to have had any possessions in Asia. The kingdom of Israel, we are told, stretched to the land of the Philistines and the border of Egypt (1 Kings 4:21), so that Egypt seems to have been strictly confined on the eastward by Philistia and Canaan. His expedition to and capture of Gezer was the capture of a city hitherto independent both of him and Solomon, and over which he retained no authority (1 Kings 9:15, 16). The kingdom of Israel was at this time of greater extent and power than that of Egypt, so that the alliance with Solomon would be courted by Pharaoh, and seems to have been productive of great commercial advantages both to Egypt and Israel (1 Kings 10:28, 29; 2 Chronicles 1:16, 17). It is the first direct intercourse of which we are with certainty informed between these two kingdoms since the time of the exodus. It is most likely that Pharaoh's daughter, married to Solomon in the opening of his reign, and when his zeal for Jehovah and his worship was at its height, was herself a convert to the faith of Solomon (1 Kings 3:1-3). He would scarcely at

this period of his life have married an idolatress. and in the Bithiah of an uncertain date we have already seen some evidence of the influence of true religion on the royal house of Pharaoh. Nor can we readily suppose that the Song of Solomon, emblematic of the union of Christ and his Church, was founded on any other than the marriage of Solomon with a daughter of the true faith. To what extent this good influence may have spread in the family of Pharaoh can be only matter of conjecture. If it had prevailed to any great extent it may have partly led to the change of dynasty which we have reason to believe took place in Egypt during the reign of Solomon. Any tendency towards truth, if it existed in the royal house, was not shared by the priesthood or people of Egypt, who were firmly wedded to their debased system of idolatry.

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

The next kings of Egypt mentioned in the Bible are Shishak, probably Zerah, and So. The first and second of these were of the twenty-second dynasty, if the identification of Zerah with Userken be accepted, and the third was doubtless one of the two Shebeks of the twenty-fifth dynasty, which was of Ethiopians. The twenty-second dynasty was a line of kings of foreign origin, who retained foreign names, and it is noticeable that Zerah is called a Cushite in the Bible (14492 Chronicles 14:9; comp. 16:8). Shebek was probably also a foreign name. The title “Pharaoh" is probably not once given to these kings in the Bible, because they were not Egyptians, and did not bear Egyptian names. The Shepherd kings, it must be remarked, adopted Egyptian names, and therefore some of the earlier sovereigns called Pharaohs in the Bible may be conjectured to have been Shepherds notwithstanding that they bear this title. *SEE SHISHAK*; *SEE SO*; *SEE ZERAH*.

9. *Pharaoh, the Opponent of Sennacherib*. — It is not at all certain that the name used for so many centuries for the supreme ruler of Egypt was

ever again correctly used *by itself* to designate a particular king of Egypt. The Pharaoh of whom we read in the reign of Hezekiah as the rival of the Assyrian Sennacherib (<12821>2 Kings 18:21; <23609>Isaiah 36:9), is, indeed, simply called Pharaoh, but this title is not given him by the sacred historian, but by the Assyrian general Rabshakeh. Pharaoh is still, indeed, used as the generic title of Egyptian rovalty (<23911>Isaiah 19:11), when no individlual king is intended, but when particular kings are meant the Scriptures join to Pharaoh a second title, as PharaohNecho, Pharaoh-Hophra. This may have been Josephus's reason for his statement *(Ant.* 8:6, 2) that after the father-in-law of Solomon no king of Egypt used this name. The Jewish historian was too well acquainted with Scripture not to have known of the title in connection with a second name, and he therefore meant probably that it was never again used by itself as the title of Egyptian royalty. The king of whom we are now speaking reigned in the fourteenth year of Hezekiah, i.e., about B.C. 713, and was the contemporary of Tirhakah king of Ethiopia, and of Sennacherib king of Assyria. This latter synchronism depends, however, on the correctness of the present Hebrew text, which some suppose to have been corrupted, and that it was Sargon and not Sennacherib who invaded Judaea in the fourteenth vear of IHezekiah *(Journ. of Sacr. Lit.* October 1858; January 1863). The comparison of Pharaoh in the above passages to a broken reed is remarkable, as the common hieroglyphics for" king," restricted to Egyptian sovereigns, *Su-ten,* strictly a title of the ruler of Upper Egypt, commence with a bent reed, which is an ideographic symbolical sign proper to this word, and is sometimes used alone without any phonetic complement. This Pharaoh can only be the *Sethos* whom Herodotus mentions as the opponent of Sennacherib, and who may reasonably be supposed to be the *Zet* of Manetho, the last king of his twenty-third dynasty. Tirhakah, as an Ethiopian, whether then ruling in Egypt or not, is, like So, apparently not called Pharaoh. *SEE TIRHAKAH*.

10. *Pharaoh-Necho.* — He was king of Egypt during the reigns of Josiah, Jehoahaz, and Jehoiakim, kings of Judah (<12229>2 Kings 23:29-34). We do not read of him in Scripture until the last year of Josiah's reign, B.C. 609. How long before this he may have been king of Egypt the. Bible gives us no help in ascertaining. It mentions him as still reigning in the fourth year of king Jehoiakim, i.e., B.C. 606 (<24602>Jeremiah 46:2), and from <12407>2 Kings 24:7 it seems probable that he continued to reign for a considerable time after this. In the Bible his name is written *Nek6,*wkn; and hkn; and in

hieroglyphics *Neku.* This king was of the Saitic twenty-sixth dynasty, of which Manetho makes him either the fifth ruler (Africanus) or the sixth (Eusebius). Herodotus calls him *Nekos,* and assigns to him a reign of sixteen years, which is confirmed by the monuments. According to this historian, he was the son of Psammetichus I; this the monuments do not corroborate. Dr. Brugsch says that he married Nit-Akert, Nitocris, daughter of Psammetichus I and queen Shepuntepet, who appears, like her mother, to have been the heiress of an Egyptian royal line, and supposes that he was the son of Psammetichus by another wife (see *Hist. d'Egypte,* page 252; comp. 248). If he married Nitocris, he may have been called by Herodotus by mistake the son of Psammetichus.

The father of Necho had already distinguished himself by the siege and capture from the Assyrians of the strong town of Ashdod, which had been taken from the Egyptians in the reign of Sargon (Herod. 2:157; <2301>Isaiah 20:1). In the decline of the Assyrian empire Egypt ventured once more beyond her eastern confines, and indulged in the hope of universal domination, Necho in the commencement of his reign prepared to carry out to completion his father's ambitious designs, and it was in this endeavor that he came into contact with the kingdom of Judah, and so finds a place in Scripture history. Claiming an oracle from the true God, he advanced an Egyptian army against the town of Carchemish on the Euphrates. then apparently under the dominion of the king of Assyria (<1452>2 Chronicles 35:21; <1239>2 Kings 23:29). There seems to be no doubt that Necho's claim to this oracle was sincere, and that he really thought himself commissioned to go to war with Assyria. How far this may indicate a true knowledge of God on Necho's part it is difficult to determine. Yet it can scarcely be understood as more than a conviction that the war was predestined, for it ended in the destruction of Necho's army and the curtailment of his empire. Josiah, however, influenced perhaps by an alliance with Assyria, or dreading the rising ambition of Egypt, disputed the march of Pharaoh's army. In vain the latter, evidently most unwilling to come into collision with Josiah, entreated him not to oppose him, and pleaded the oracle of him whom he would appear, in common with Josiah, to have recognised as the true God. At Megiddo (now Lejjun), a town not far from the coast-line of Palestine, so frequently the passage of great armies in the old wars of Asia, Josiah encountered the armies of Egypt, and his death on this occasion formed the sub. ject of lamentations among his people long after it took place. Without pausing upon his march, or returning back to attack

Jerusalem, Pharaoh seems to have passed on with all haste to accomplish his original design of capturing Carchemish, which commanded one of the ordinary fords of the Euphrates, and thus of meeting and conquering the king of Assyria in his own dominions. In this great expedition he was entirely success. ful. He took Carchemish, and retained possession of the countries between Egypt and the Euphrates until the rising power of Babylon under the great Nebuchadnezzar met and overthrew the Egyptian army four years afterwards at Carchemish, and forced them back into their own land. Returning from the Euphrates, he treated Judaea as a conquered country,. and exercised over it the same absolute authority which the Babylonians did immediately after him. Sending for Jehoahaz to Riblah in the land of Hamath, on the Orontes, a favorite camping-ground for the great armies of that period (Robinson, *Bibl. Res.* 3:545), he placed him there in bonds for a time after a brief reign of three months. This he seems to have done because he was not consulted in the choice of a king. On his farther march homeward, Necho entered as a conqueror into Jerusalem, placed the brother of Jehoahaz on the throne, and put the land to tribute. He then seems to have returned to Egypt, carrying with him the dethroned king of Judah, who died in the land of his captivity. The expedition of Necho, which Scripture describes as having been made against the king of Assyria, Josephus says was directed against the Medes and Babylonians, who had at this time, according to him, captured Nineveh *(Ant.* 10:5; see Rawlinson's *Herod.* 1:418. Herodotus mentions this battle, relating that Necho made war against the Syrians, and defeated them at Magdolus, after which he took Cadytis, "a large city of Syria" (2:159). There can be no reasonable doubt that Magdolus is Megiddo, and not the Egyptian town of that name, *SEE MIGDOL*, but the identification of Cadytis is difficult. It has been conjectured to be Jerusalem, and its name has been supposed to correspond to the ancient title, "the Holy," hçwdqh, but it is elsewhere mentioned by Herodotus as a great coast-town of Palestine near Egypt (3:5), and it has therefore been supposed to be Gaza. The difficulty that Gaza is not beyond Megiddo would perhaps be removed if Herodotus be thought to have confounded Megiddo with the Egyptian Magdolus, or we may understand the term "coast" here used in a wide sense. (See Sir Gardner Wilkindon's note to *Herod.* 2:159, ed. Rawlinson.) It seems possible that Cadytis is the Hittite city Ketesh, on the Orontes, which was the chief stronghold in Syria of those captured by the kings of the eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties. The Greek historian adds that Necho

dedicated the dress he wore on these occasions to Apollo at the temple of Branchidae (l.c.).

The power of Egypt under Necho at this period of his reign was very great. From the composition of the army which he led to Carchemish and left there in garrison (<2409>Jeremiah 46:9), we gather that Ethiopia and Libya were at this time a part of his dominions. Eastward of Egypt his power extended to the Great River, and the Lydians, if not his subjects, were in strict league with him. This was the period of the fall of Assyria, and Egypt for a time succeeded to its rule on the west of the Euphrates (Wilkinson, 1:157). This was that time of boasting in its military successes which Jeremiah describes in chapter 46, and he takes occasion from it to predict the approaching overthrow of Egypt. When this land "rose up like a flood, and he said, I will go up, and will cover the earth," the prophet in plain words spoke of approaching defeat in battle and utter humiliation as a nation. The power of Necho to the east of Egypt only lasted about four years. In the fourth year of Jehoiakim, Nebuchadnezzar, having conquered Nineveh, had leisure to turn his arms against Egypt. At Carchemish, which Necho had wrested from the Assyrians, the Babylonian army conquered that of Egypt. Whether Necho was present at this contest does not appear. Its issue was that he was driven out of Asia and came into it no more (<1247>2 Kings 24:7). It would seem to have been at a later period, however, that the utter humiliation of Egypt described by Jeremiah took place, though the battle of Carchemish was one of those decisive conflicts which changed for a period the history of the world. The strength of Necho's armies seems not to have lain in the native Egyptians, but in foreigners, whether subjects, allies, or mercenaries. They were Ethiopians, Libyans, and Lydians who fought with Nebuchadnezzar. Wilkinson places the death of Necho shortly before the captivity of Jehoiakim (1:167). It is not certain, however, that Jehoiakim was carried away captive by Nebuchadnezzar. The book of Kings makes no mention of such an occurrence. Josephus states that he was put to death at Jerusalem *(Ant.* 10:6, 3). The second book of Chronicles only says (<1466>2 Chronicles 36:6) that he was put into fetters for the purpose of being brought to Babylon. If Josephus's account is true, this purpose was not put into execution. Necho is famous in history for other besides his military exploits. The celebrated canal of Suez, according to Herodotus (2:158; see Wilkinson, 1:70), was completed by this king. He is also stated by this historian to have circumnavigated Africa, a performance the credibility of which is disputed by him for the very reason that makes it

to modern readers all but certainly true (Herod. 4:62; see Wilkinson, 1:160; Sir C. Lewis, *Astronomy of the Ancients,* page 317). *SEE NECHO*.

11. *Pharuoh-Hophra*. — This is the last of the Pharaohs of whom mention is made in the Bible. He is introduced to our notice in connection with the closing period of the Jewish monarchy, as attempting to ward off from God's people the judgments brought upon them for their sins at the hand of Nebuchadnezzar (<24307>Jeremiah 37:7). He was on the throne of Egypt in the ninth year of the reign of Zedekiah (<12501>2 Kings 25:1), i.e., about B.C. 590, continued to reign when Jerusalem had been taken by the Babylonians, B.C. 588, and was to continue reigning until a signal destruction should fall upon him, and he was to suffer the loss of life at the hand of his enemies (<24430>Jeremiah 44:30), a prediction fulfilled about five years subsequently in the invasion of Egypt by Nebuchadnezzar, about B.C. 582 (Josephus, *A* nt. 10:9, 7). He ascended the throne about B.C. 589, and reigned for a period of nineteen years; but Eusebius, according to Syncellus. makes his reign to have lasted twenty-five years (Bunsen, *Egypt,* 1:640).

This Pharaoh is generally considered to have been the *Apries* or *Vaphres* (in hieroglyphic *Wah-[p]rahah)* of whom an account is given in Herodotus and Diodorus (Wilkinson, 1:168; Lewis. *A stronomy of the Ancients,* page317). He was, according to the former historian, the son of Psammis, and the grandson of Pharaoh-Necho, and enjoyed a fortunate reign of twenty-five years (2:141). Wilkinson (1:179) is doubtful whether he is the same person as Psammetichus III. Bunsen considers him to have be(n the fourth king of the twenty-sixth dynasty *(Egypt,* 1:164). Of PharaohNecho we are told that after his defeat by Nebuchadnezzar he came forth out of Egypt no more; but Pharaoh-Hophra had recovered strength sufficient to enable him to meet the armies of Babvlon out of his own country. At the time we read of him in Scripture he was in intimate alliance with Zedekiah, and it was doubtless in great part owing to his reliance upon Egypt that the infatuated king of Judah ventured to enter upon that contest with Nebuchadnezzar which terminated in the famous captivity of seventy years in Babylon. The pride of this Pharaoh was excessive. Ezekiel (<26903>Ezekiel 29:3) compares him to a great dragon lying in the midst of his rivers, and saying, "My river is mine own, and I have made it for myself," much as his successful antagonist Nebuchadnezzar gloried in the contemplation of Babylon. Influenced by an opinion of Pharaoh's power, and stimulated in all likelihood by promises of aid, Zedekiah rebelled against the Babylonians, and drew on'that siege of Jerusalem which after two years resulted in its

capture (<12501>2 Kings 25:1-3). The narrative of this event in Kings is very concise, but the fuller accounts in Jeremiah bring before us a temporary suspension of the siege caused by the advance of Pharaoh-Hophra with an Egyptian army to relieve Zedekiah (<24705>Jeremiah 37:5-12). It is quite plain from Jeremiah that the siege was abandoned for a time and the Babylonian army withdrawn from Jerusalem, so as to allow free intercourse between the city and the surrounding country; but whether the Chaldaean army withdrew before the advancing army of Egypt or advanced against it is not agreed on. Josephus *(Ant.* 10:7, 3) expressly states that Nebuchadnezzar on hearing of the march of the Egyptians broke up from before Jerusalem, met the Egyptians on their advance, conquered them in battle, drove them out of Syria, and then returned to the siege of Jerusalem. Some, however, think that the Babylonians retreated from before the Egyptians, who on this occasion took Gaza, Sidon, and Tyre (Trevor, *Egypt,* page 321). Looking simply to the scriptural account, the case appears to stand thus: On hearing of the rebellion of Zedekiah, Nebuchadnezzar despatched a force against Jerusalem, but without accompanying it himself. This force was sufficient to shut up Zedekiah within the city, but was not able to meet the Egyptian army in the field. This is the partial siege which is spoken of in <24705>Jeremiah 37:5-11, in which nothing is said of Nebuchadnezzar's presence. On the approach of Pharaoh-Hophra the Chaldaean army, unequal to the conflict, retired before him, and he advanced unopposed. This was probably in the eighth year of Zedekiah. That Pharaoh came to Jerusalem we are not told. Probably on hearing of the raising of the siege he judged it unnecessary, and took the easier coast-line towards Syria (<24701>Jeremiah 47:1). Nebuchadnezzar, made aware of the retreat of his army, now advanced with his entire force (<24601>Jeremiah 39:1), laid siege to Jerusalem in the ninth year of Zedekiah, and took it in the eleventh year. That the Egyptians and Babylonians met on this occasion in battle is not stated in the Bible. We think it probable from <24707>Jeremiah 37:7, that on hearing of Nebuchadnezzar's approach with the entire army of Babylon, the Egyptians retired without a contest and left Jerusalem to its fate (see Rawlinson's *Herodotus,* 1:423). Pharaoh-Hophra continued to be king of Egypt after the overthrow of Zedekiah (<24430>Jeremiah 44:30), and he and his land were the refuge of those Jews who, contrary to God's command to remain in their own land ,after the general captivity, preferred a course of their own. They expected peace beneath the shadow of Egypt, trusting in the power of Pharaoh, who seems till then to have enjoyed great prosperity. But in this they were to be disappointed. Pharaoh was himself to be delivered

"into the hands of those who sought his life," of which Herodotus gives an account (2:169); at the very entry of Pharaoh's palace in Taphanes the Babylonian Nebuchadnezzar was to set his throne and spread his pavilion (<24430>Jeremiah 43:10); and henceforth Egypt was to descend in the scale of nations, and to become the meanest among kingdoms. Herodotus relates how he attacked Sidon. and fought a battle at sea with the king of Tyre, until at length an army which he had despatched to conquer Cyrene was routed, and the Egyptians, thinking he had purposely caused its overthrow to gain entire power, no doubt by substituting mercenaries for native troops, revolted, and set up Amasis as king. Apries, only supported by the Carian and Ionian mercenaries, was routed in a pitched battle. Herodotus remarks in narrating this, "It is said that Apries believed that there was not a god who could cast him down from his eminence, so firmly did he think that he had established himself in his kingdom." He was taken prisoner, and Amasis for a while treated him with kindness, but when the Egyptians blamed him, "he gave Apries over into the hands of his former subjects, to deal with as they chose. Then the Egyptians took him and strangled him" (Herod. 2:161-169). The Scripture passages, which entirely agree with the account Herodotus gives of the death of Apries, make it not improbable that the invasion of Nebuchadnezzar was the cause of that disaffection of his subjects which ended in the overthrow and death of this Pharaoh. The invasion is not spoken of by any trustworthy profane historian excepting Berosus (Cory, *Anc. Frag.* 2d ed. pages 37, 38), but the silence of Herodotus and others can no longer be a matter of surprise, as we now know from the Assyrian records in cuneiform of conquests of Egypt either unrecorded elsewhere or only mentioned by second-rate annalists. *SEE HOPIRA*.

Pharaoh-Hophra was succeeded by two independent monarchs, the first of whom, Amasis, had a very prosperous reign; but in the reign of his son, Psammetichus, or Psammenitus, according to the Greeks, the Persian invasion took place, when Egypt was reduced to insignificance, and the ancient title of Pharaoh was transferred from the kings of Egypt to their conquerors (Trevor, *Egypt*, page 331; Wilkinson, *Egypt.* 1:169-198); No subsequent Pharaoh is mentioned in Scripture, but there are predictions doubtless referring to the misfortunes of later princes until the second Persian conquest, when the prophecy "There shall be no more a prince of the land of Egypt" (<26013>Ezekiel 30:13) was fulfilled. *SEE EGYPT*.

Pharaoh's Daughter

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

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

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

3. A wife of Solomon, most probably daughter of a king of the twenty-first dynasty. She was married to Solomon early in his reign, and apparently treated with distinction. It has been supposed that the Song of Solomon was written on the occasion of this marriage and the idea is, we think,

sustained by sound criticism. She was at first brought into the city of David (1 Kings 3:1), and afterwards a house was built for her (1 Kings 7:8; 9:24), because Solomon would not have her dwell in the house of David, which had been rendered holy by the ark having been there (2 Chronicles 7:11). *SEE PHARAOH*, 8.

Pharaoh's Wife

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

Pharatho'ni

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

Pha'res

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

Pha'rez,

the name of two persons.

1. (Heb. *Pe'retz,* / r P, a *breach,* as explained Genesis 38:29; Sept. and N.T. Φαρές*;* A.V. "Perez," 1 Chronicles 27:3; "Phares," Matthew 1:3; Luke 3:33; 1 Esdr. 5:5), twin son with Zarah, or Zerah, of Judah by Tamar his daughter-in-law. B.C. cir. 1890. The circumstances of his birth are detailed in Genesis 38. Pharez seems to have kept the right of primogeniture over his brother, as, in the genealogical lists, his name comes first. The house also which he founded was far more numerous and illustrious than that of the Zarhites. Its remarkable fertility is alluded to in

<0804212>Ruth 4:12: "Let thy house be like the house of Pharez, whom Tamar bare unto Judah." Of Pharez's personal history or character nothing is known. We can only speak of him therefore as a demarch, and exhibit his genealogical relations. At the time of the sojourn in the wilderness "the families of the tribe of Judah were: of Shelah, the family of the Shelalites, or Shilonites; of Pharez, the family of the Pharzites; of Zerah, the family of the Zarhites. And the sons of Pharez were, of Hezron, the family of the Hezronites, of Hamul, the family of the Hamulites" (<042620>Numbers 26:20, 21). After the death therefore, of Er and Onan without children, Pharez occupied the rank of Judah's second son, and, moreover, from two of his sons sprang two new chief houses, those of the Hezronites and Hamulites. From Hezron's second son Ram, or Aram, sprang David and the kings of Judah, and eventually Jesus Christ. *SEE GENEALOGY OF JESUS CHRIST*. The house of Caleb was also incorporated into the house of Hezron, *SEE CALEB*, and so were reckoned among the descendants of Pharez. Another line of Pharez's descendants were reckoned as sons of Manasseh by the second marriage of Hezron with the daughter of Machir (<130221>1 Chronicles 2:21, 22). In the census of the house of Judah contained in 1 Chronicles 4, drawn up apparently in the reign of Hezekiah (<130441>1 Chronicles 4:41), the houses enumerated in verse 1 are Pharez, Hezron, Carmi, Hur, and Shobal. Of these all but Carmi (who was a Zarhite, <060701>Joshua 7:1) were descendants of Pharez. Hence it is not unlikely that, as is suggested in the margin of the A.V., "Carmi" is an error for "Chelubai." Some of the sons of Shelah are mentioned separately at verses 21, 22. *SEE PAHATH-MOAB*. In the reign of David the house of Pharez seems to have been eminently distinguished. The chief of all the captains of the host for the first month, Jashobeam, the son of Zabdiel (<132702>1 Chronicles 27:2, 3), so famous for his prowess (<131111>1 Chronicles 11:11), and called "the chief among the captains" (ibid. and <102308>2 Samuel 23:8), was of the sons of Perez, or Pharez. A considerable number of the other mighty men seem also, from their patronymic or gentile names, to have been of the same house, those, namely, who are called Bethlehemites, Paltites (<130233>1 Chronicles 2:33, 47), Tekoites, Netophathites, and Ithrites (<130253>1 Chronicles 2:53; 4:7). Zabad, the son of Ahlai, and Joab and his brothers, Abishai and Asahel, we know were Pharzites (<130231>1 Chronicles 2:31, 36, 54; 11:-41). The royal house itself was the head of the family. We have no means of assigning to their respective famiilies those members of the tribe of Judah who are incidentally mentioned after David's reign, as Adnah, the 'chief captain of Judah in Jehoshaphat's reign, and Jehohanan and Amasiah,

his companions (<14174>2 Chronicles 17:14-16); but that the family of Pharez continued to ithrive and multiply we may conclude from the numbers who returned from captivity. At Jerusalem alone 468 of the sons of Perez, with Athaiah, or Uthai, at itheir head, were dwelling in the days of Zerubbabel (<13904>1 Chronicles 9:4; <16104>Nehemiah 11:4-6), Zerubbabel himself of course being of the family (1 Esdr. 5:5). Of the lists of returned captives in Ezra 2, Nehemiah 7, Nehemiah's time, the following seem to have been of the sons of Pharez, judging as before from the names of their ancestors, or the towns to which they belonged: the children of Bani (<15210>Ezra 2:10; comp. <13904>1 Chronicles 9:4); of Bigvai (2:14; comp. <15184>Ezra 8:14); of Ater (2:16; conp. <13126>1 Chronicles 2:26, 54); of Jorah, or Hariph (2:18; <16724>Nehemiah 7:24; comp. <13151>1 Chronicles 2:51); of Bethlehem and Netophah (2:21, 22; comp. <13154>1 Chronicles 2:54); of Kirjatharim (2:25; comp. <13150>1 Chronicles 2:50, 53); of Harim (2:32; comp. <13408>1 Chronicles 4:8); and, judging from their position, many of the intermediate ones also (comp. also the lists in <15025>Ezra 10:25-43; <16104>Nehemiah 10:14-27). Of the builders of the wall named in Nehemiah 3 the following were of the house of Pharez: Zaccur, the son of Imri (verse 2, by comparison with <13904>1 Chronicles 9:4, and <15184>Ezra 8:14, where we ought, with many MSS., to read "Zaccur" for "Zabbud"); Zadok, the son of Baana (verse 4, by comparison with <10229>2 Samuel 23:29, where we find that Baanah was a Netophathite, which agrees with Zadok's place here next to the Tekoites, since Bethlehem, Netophah, and Tekoa are often in close juxtaposition, comp. <13154>1 Chronicles 2:54; 4:4, 5; <15221>Ezra 2:21, 22; <16726>Nehemiah 7:26, and the situation of the Netophathites close to Jerusalem, among the Benjamites, <16228>Nehemiah 12:28, 29, compared with the mixture of Benjamites with Pharzites and Zarhites in <16302>Nehemiah 3:2-7); the Tekoites (verses 5 and 27, comp. with <13224>1 Chronicles 2:24; 4:5); Jehoiada, the son of Paseah (verse 6, comp. with <13412>1 Chronicles 4:12, where Paseah, a Chelubite, is apparently descended from Ashur, the father of Tekoa); Rephaiah, the son of Hur (verse 9, comp. with <13220>1 Chronicles 2:20, 50; 4:4,12, Beth-Raphah); Hanun (verses 13 and 30), with the inhabitants of Zanoah (comp. with <13418>1 Chronicles 4:18); perhaps Malchiah, the son of Rechab (verse 14, comp. with <13255>1 Chronicles 2:55); Nehemiah, son of Azbuk, ruler of Beth-zur (verse 16, comp. with <13245>1 Chronicles 2:45); and perh. Baruch, son of Zabba, or Zaccai (verse 20), if for Zaccai we read Zaccur as the mention of "the *other,* or second, *piece,"* makes probable, as well as his proximity to Meremoth in this second piece, as Zaccur was to Meremoth in their first pieces (verses 2, 4).

2. (Sept. Φαρές v. r. Φόρος*)* A Graecized form (1 Esdr. 8:30) for the PAROSH *SEE PAROSH* (q.v.) of the Heb. text (<150803>Ezra 8:3).

Phari'ra

*(*ΦαρIρά v.r. ΦαρIδά*)*, a corrupt form (1 Esdr. 5:33) of the name PERIDA *SEE PERIDA* (q.v.) of the Heb. text (<160757>Nehemiah 7:57).

Phar'isee

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

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

together to keep the Mosaic laws of purity. As it was natural that all the students of the law would, as a matter of course, be the first to join this association, the appellation *Chaber,* rbej; *member, associate,* or vWrP; *Pharisee,* became synonymous with *student, disciple, lawyer, scribe,* while those who refused to unite to keep the laws were regarded as /reah;µ[i, *country people, common people, illiterates, irreligious.*

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

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

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

To understand these laws, which may seem trivial and arbitrary, as well as to see the extraordinary influence which they exercised upon the whole religious and social life of the Jewish nation in all its ramifications, the following facts must be borne in mind: The Mosaic law enjoins that besides the priestly heave-offering (hmWrT]) every Israelite is annually to give to the Levites a tithe of all the produce (<041821>Numbers 18:21-24), which the Jewish canons call *the first tithe (* rce[}mi ^wOar; *);* that *a second tithe (*ynæe rce[}mi*)*, as it is termed in the same canons, is to be taken annually from the produce to Jerusalem, either in kind or specie, and consumed by the owner in the metropolis in festive celebration (<051205>Deuteronomy 12:5-18), and that *every third year* this second tithe is to be given to the poor (<051428>Deuteronomy 14:28, 29), whence it is denominated *the poor tithe* *(* rce[}mi ynæ[e) in the ancient canons. Moreover, as each seventh year was a Sabbatic or fallow year, which yielded no harvest, it was fixed that in the first. second, fourth, and fifth years of the septennial cycle *the second tithe* is to be eaten by the owner in Jerusalem, while in the third and sixth years it is to be distributed among the poor, and be *the poor tithe.* When it is remembered that these tithal laws, which were originally enacted for Palestine, were in the post-exilian period extended to Egypt, Ammon,

Moab, and to every land in which the Jews had possessions, that they had more of a *religious* than civil import, that the portion of produce reserved as tithes was *holy*, that *the eating of holy things* was a deadly sin, and that the non-separation of the tithes rendered the whole produce unlawfuil, thus affecting every article of food, the paramount importance of the first condition which the Pharisees, who were the conservators of the divine law, exacted from the candidates for fellowship will readily be understood (comp. Mishna, *Bekoroth*, 30 *b*).

Of equal importance, and equally affecting the whole fabric of social and religious life, are the Mosaic laws upon the strength of which the second condition was exacted. These laws, which so rigidly enforce the eschewing of unclean food and defiling objects, even without the amplifications and expansion which obtained in the course of time, extend to and affect almost every actioi in public life and every movement in family intercourse. Thus not only are numbers of animals proscribed as food, but their very carcasses are branded as unclean, and he who touches them is temporarily de. filed, and pollutes every one and everything wherewith he comes in contact (<03502>Leviticus 5:2; 11). A man that has an issue not only defiles everything upon which he lies, sits, or which he touches, but his very spittle is polluting (<03501>Leviticus 15:1-13). The same is the case with a man who comes in contact with a corpse (<04914>Numbers 19:14-22), with a woman in menstruum and childbirth (<03201>Leviticus 12:1-8; 15:19-31), and with a husband after conjugal intercourse (<03518>Leviticus 15:18). Individuals thus defiled were forbidden to come into the sanctuary (<04920>Numbers 19:20), and were visited with the severe punishment of excision if they ate the flesh of peace-offering (<03720>Leviticus 7:20, 21). Now the slightest reflection upon the workings of these laws will show that thousands upon thousands were daily unclean according to the Mosaic institutions, that these thousands of unclean men and women legally defiled myriads of people and things by contact with them, either wittingly or unwittingly, and that it therefore became absolutely necessary for those who were conscientiously desirous of discharging their religious duties in a state of legal purity to adopt such precautionary measures as would preclude the possibility of violating these laws. Hence the Jewish canons ordained that since one does not know whether he has been defiled by contact with any unclean person or thing, every *Chaber* or member of the Pharisaic association is "to wash his hands before eating his ordinary food, second tithes, or the heave-offering; to immerse his whole body before he eats the portions of holy

sacrifices; and to bathe his whole body before touching the water absolving from sin, even if it is only his hands which are unclean. If one immersed himself for ordinary food, and designed it only for ordinary food, he could not eat second tithes; if he immersed for second tithes, and meant it only for second tithes, he could not eat of the heave-offering; if he immersed for the heave-offering, and meant by it the heave-offering, he was not allowed to eat the portions of the holy sacrifice; if he immersed for the holy sacrifice, and meant it for the holy sacrifice, he could not as vet touch the water absolving from sin; but he who immersed for the more important could share in the less important" (Mishna, *Chagigah,* 2:5, 6). This gave rise to four degrees of purity, and to four divisions in the Pharisaic associations, so that every *Chaber* or member belonged to that rank whose prescriptions of purity he practiced. Each degree of purity required a greater separation from the above-named Mosaic defilements. The impure subjects themselves were termed *the fathers of impurity,* that which was touched by them was designated *the first generation of impurity,* what was touched by this again was called *the second generation of impurity,* and so on. Now ordinary food, the first degree of holiness, became impure when touched by the second generation; heave-offering, the second degree of holiness, became defiled when touched by the third generation; the flesh of sacrifices, the third degree of holiness, when coming in contact with the fourth generation, and so on. These degrees of purity had even to be separated from each other, as the lower degree was impure in respect to the higher one. The same removal, both from defilement without and the different gradations within, was required of each member of the Pharisaic order corresponding to the degree to which he belonged. Hence "the garments of an /raḥ;µ[j *Antha-Aretz* ['man of earth,' or *a publican, a sinner,* as he is termed in the N.T., who neglected to pay the tithes and observe the laws of Mosaic purity], defile the Pharisee [i.e., him who lived according to the first degree of purity], the garments of a Pharisee defile those who eat of the heaveoffering [i.e., the second degree], the garments of those who eat the heave-offering defile those who eat the sacred sacrifices [i.e., the third degree], and the garments of those who eat the sacred sacrifices defile those who touch the water absolving from sin [i.e., the fourth degree]" (comp. Mishna, *Chagigah,* 2:7, with *Taharoth,* 7:5).

The above-mentioned two conditions exacted from candidates for membership of the Pharisaic association are thus expressed in the Mishna: "He who takes upon himself to be conscientious, tithes whatever he eats,

and whatever he sells, and whatever he buys, and does not become the guest of an *Amha-Aretz* [i.e., a non-Pharisee]; . . . and he who takes upon himself to become a member of the Pharisaic association must neither sell to an *Amha-Aretz* moist or dry fruit, nor buy of him moist fruit, nor become the guest of an *Amha-Aretz,* nor receive him as guest, in his garments, into his house" *(Demai,* 2:2, 3; comp. <40223>Matthew 23:23; <42172>Luke 17:12). It is in accordance with this regulation that Christ enjoins that an offender is to be regarded "as a heathen man and publican" (<40187>Matthew 18:17), that the apostle Paul commands "not to eat" with a sinner (<46511>1 Corinthians 5:11), and it is for this reason that Christ was upbraided by the Pharisees for associating and eating with publicans and sinners (<40909>Matthew 9:9-11; 11:19; <41026>Mark 2:16; <42530>Luke 5:30; 7:34), with the neglecters of tithes and the transgressors of the laws of purity, which was not only in violation of the then prevailing Pharisaic and national law, but contrary to the Mosaic enactments. But he came to teach that "not that which goeth into the mouth [i.e, untithed food or edibles handled by Levitically unclean persons] defileth a man, but that which cometh out of the mouth, this defileth a man" (<40511>Matthew 15:11); and that it is not outward washing but inward purity which is acceptable. For this reason "he sat down to meat with a Pharisee, and did not first wash before dinner" (<42137>Luke 11:37-40); which, as we have seen, was in contravention of the very first degree of purity among the association. It must, however, be remarked that the Jews were not peculiar in their laws of purity and defilement. Other nations of antiquity had similar statutes. Thus, among the ancient Indians, one who had an issue was obliged to bathe and pray to the sun *(Maunu,* 2:181); among the Hierapolytans in Syria every inmate of the house in which a death took place was thirty days unclean, and could not go to the temple during that time (Lucian, *De Syr. dea,* 53); the Greeks, too, were defiled by contact with a corpse, and could not resort to the temple (Theophrast. *Charact.* 16; Elurip. *Iphig. Taur.* 367; Diog. Laer. 8:33); both the Parsees and the Greeks regarded a woman in childbirth as unclean (Kleuker, *Zend-Avesta,* 3:222, 223; Eurip. *Iphig. Taur.* 367); and "no Egyptian would salute a Greek with a kiss, nor use a Greek knife, spits, caldrons, nor taste the meat of an ox which had been cut by a Greek knife. They drank out of bronze vessels, rinsing them perpetually. And if any one accidentally touched a pig he would plunge into the Nile without stopping to undress" (Herodot. 2:37, 41, 47).

III. *The Tenets and Practices of the Pharisees.* — To state the doctrines and statutes of the Pharisees is to give a history of orthodox Judaism; since Pharisaism was after the return from the Babylonian captivity, and is to the present day, the national faith of the orthodox Jews, developing itself with and adapting itself to the ever-shifting circumstances of the nation. *SEE RABBINISM*. Of the other two sects, viz. the Essenes and the Sadducees, the former represented simply an intensified form of Pharisaism, *SEE ESSENES*, while the latter were a very small minority. *SEE SADDUCEES*. The Pharisees, as the erudite Geiger has conclusively shown. were the democratic party, the true representatives of the people, whose high vocation they endeavored to develop by making them realize, both in their practices and lives, that "God has given to all alike the kingdom, priesthood, and holiness" (2 Macc. 2:17); in opposition to the small caste of the priestly aristocracy of Sadducees, who set the highest value upon their spiritual office, and who, by virtue of their hereditary rights, tried to arrogate everything to themselves, and manifested little sympathy with the people at large. Hence the Pharisaic enactments were such as to make the people realize that they were *a people of priests, a holy nation;* that by becoming a diligent student of'the law, and by preparing one's self for the office of a rabbi or teacher, every such person. though not literally of the priestly caste, may be a priest in spirit, and occupy quite as important and useful a position as if he were actually of the Aaronic order, and even arrange his mode of life according to the example of those who minister in holy things. Thus the very name rbj, ἑταιρία, which in olden times denotes *a priestly fraternity* (³⁰⁴¹⁷Hosea 4:17; 6:9), and was so used by the Jews on the Maccabaean coins (µydwhyh rbj), was adopted by the Pharisees for their lay association. Their social meals were invested with a solemn character to resemble the social meals of the priests, made up from the sacrifices in the Temple. If the priests took care that the sacrifices which they offered.up, and portions of which constituted their social meal, especially on the Sabbath and festivals, should be clean and without blemish, the Pharisees also took the utmost precaution that their meals should be free from the different degrees of defilement: they washed before partaking thereof, recited prayers before and after the repast, had a cup of blessing, and offered incense. It is only from this point of view that some of the differences between the Pharisees and the Sadducees can be explained; as, for instance, *the ideal connection of places* for Sabbatic purposes, called bwbwy[e, *mixture,* adopted by the former and rejected by the latter. In

consequence of the rigorous laws about the observance of the Sabbath (<2162>Exodus 16:29; <2417>Jeremiah 17:21, with <1631>Nehemiah 13:15, etc.), it was enacted that no Israelite is to walk on the Sabbath beyond a certain distance, called a Sabbath-day's journey, nor carry anything from one house to another. The Sadducees, or priestly party, who celebrated their meals on the Sabbath in different places, could go from one place to another, and carry to and fro anything they liked, because they regarded these meals as constituting part of their priestly and sacrificial service, which set aside the sanctity of the Sabbath. But the Pharisees, who made their Sabbatic repast resemble the priestly social meals, had to encounter difficulties arising from the rigorous Sabbatic laws. The distance which they had sometimes to walk to join a company in the social meal was more than a Sabbath-day's journey; the carrying from one place to another of the things requisite for the solemnities was contrary to the'enactments about the sanctity of the day. Hence they contrived the ideal connection of places (bwqy[), which was effected as follows: Before the Sabbath commenced (i.e. Friday afternoon), an article of food was deposited by each member in the court selected for the social gathering, so that it might thereby become the common place for all; the streets were made to form one large dwellingplace with different gates, by means of beams laid across on the tops of the houses, and doors or gates put in the front; and meals were put in a house at the end of the distance permitted to walk, in order to constitute it a domicile, and thus another Sabbath-day's journey could be undertaken from the first terminus. By this means the Pharisees could evade the law, and, like the priests, meet together in any place to celebrate their social meals on the Sabbath, and carry anything that was wanted for its sacred festival, as they had three common meals on the Sabbath (twdws çwlç). On the Friday eve the entrance of the Sabbath was greeted with a cup of wine, or the cup of blessing, over which every member recited benedictions (çwdyq), expressing the holiness of the day as well as the holiness of Israel; whom God sanctified to himself and made a people of priests, a royal nation; and then the sacred and social meal was eaten. The second meal was eaten on noon of the Sabbath, and the third began with the setting sun, and in the middle of it the Sabbath departed.

When lights were kindled a blessing was again pronounced over a cup of wine (hldbh), and burning incense was offered up to accompany the exit of the holy day, which was regarded as a departing friend. The paschal meal was the model for these social and sacred repasts. But the light in

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

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

Practicaliy, Josephus represents the Pharisees as leading a temperate life, renouncing both excessive riches and immoderate pleasure, and striving above all to acquire a knowledge of that law and to practice those precepts which would fit them for the life to come *(Ant.* 18:1, 3); the same may be seen from the following declaration of the Talmud: The more flesh on the body the more worms [when it is (lead], the more riches the more cares, the more wives the more witches, the more handmaids the more unchastity,

the more manservants the more robbery; but the more meditation in the divine law the better the life, the more schooling the more knowledge, the more counsel the more intelligence, the more benevolence the more satisfaction; he who acquires a good name acquires it for himself in this world, but he who acquires a knowledge of the divine law acquires for himself life in the world to come" *(Aboth,* 2:17). In aiding the people to realize their high vocation, and to prepare themselves for the kingdom of heaven by obedience to the divine law, the Pharisees endeavored to facilitate that obedience by putting a mild interpretation upon some of the rigorous Mosaic enactments, and to adapt them to ever-changing circumstances. Thus they explain the expression hl;be] *carcass,* in <030724>Leviticus 7:24, literally, and maintain that the statute in the verse in question only declares *the flesh* of an animal which was torn and died a natural death to be defiling by contact, but not the skin, bones, etc.; and that, except the human corpse and the dead bodies of a few reptiles in which the skin and flesh are to a certain extent identical, the skin and bones of all animals, whether clean and legally slaughtered for meat, or unclean and dying accidentally, do not defile, but may be made up into parchment, different utensils, etc. The haughty and aristocratic Sadducees, on the other hand, who stood on their priestly dignity, and cared little for the comforts of the people, took the term hl;be] in the unnatural sense of *an animal approaching the condition of becoming a carcass,* i.e., being so weak that it must soon expire, and maintained that an animal in such a condition may be slaughtered before it breathes its last; that its flesh must then be considered as a carcass, and is defiling, while the fat, skin, bones, etc., may be used for divers purposes *(Jerusalem Megilla,* 1:9; *Babylon Sabbath,* 108 *a*). It requires but little reflection to perceive how materially and divergently these different views must have affected the whole state of society, when it is remembered that according to the Sadducees the touching of any book written upon the parchment made from the skin of an unclean animal, or contact with one of the numerous utensils made from the leather, bones, veins, etc., of animals not Levitically clean and not legally slaughtered, imparted defilement. Again, the Pharisees, with a due regard for the interests of the people, and following the requirements of the time, explained *the right of retaliation,* "eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot," etc. (<022123>Exodus 21:23, etc.), as requiring pecuniary compensation, while the Sadducees took it literally *(Baba Kama,* 83 *b*; 84 *a, b; Megillath Taanith,* cap. 4, Tosephta). The same consideration for the spiritual and temporal well-being of the people led the

Pharisees to enact that in cases of danger, when the prescribed prayers cannot be offered, they are to offer a short prayer as follows: "Do thy will in heaven above, and give peace of mind to those who fear thee on earth, and whatsoever pleaseth thee do. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who hearest prayer!" *(Berakoth,* 29 *b*). What a striking resemblance between this and some parts of the Lord's prayer! It was this humane and pious care for the interests of the people that made the Pharisees so popular and beloved, and accounts for the remark of Josephus that they had such influence with the multitude that if they said anything, against a king or a high-priest they were at once believed *(Ant.* 13:10, 5).

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

a. In regard to a future state, Josephus presents the ideas of the Pharisees in such a light to his Greek readers that, whatever interpretation his ambiguous language might possibly admit, he obviously would have produced the impression on Greeks that the Pharisees believed in the transmigration of souls. Thus his statement respecting them is, "They say that every soul is imperishable, but that the souls of good men only pass over (or transmigrate) into another *body* — μεταβαίνειν εἰς ἕτερον σῶμα — while the souls of bad men are chastised by eternal punishment" (*War,* 2:8,14; comp. 3:8, 5; *Ant.* 18:1, 3; and Bottcher, *De Inferis,* page 519, 552). There are two passages in the Gospels which might. countenance this idea: one in <4014:2>Matthew 14:2, where Herod the tetrarch is represented as thinking that Jesus was John the Baptist risen from the dead (though a different color is given to Herod's thoughts in the corresponding passage, <4209:7>Luke 9:7-9); and another in <4302:2>John 9:2, where the question is put to Jesus whether the blind man himself had sinned, or his parents, that he. was born blind? Notwithstanding these passages, however, there does not appear to be sufficient reason for doubting that the Pharisees believed in a resurrection of the dead very much in the same sense as the early Christians. This is most in accordance with Paul's statement to the chief priests and council (<4423:6>Acts 23:6) that he was a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee, and that he was called in question for the hope and resurrection of the dead-a statement which would have been peculiarly disingenuous if the Pharisees had merely believed in the transmigration of souls; and it is likewise almost implied in Christ's teaching, which does not insist on the doctrine of a future life as anything

new, but assumes it as already adopted by his hearers, except by the Sadducees, although he condemns some unspiritual conceptions of its nature as erroneous (<402230>Matthew 22:30; <411225>Mark 12:25; <422034>Luke 20:34-36). On this head the Mishna is an illustration of the ideas in the Gospels, as distinguished from any mere transmigration of souls; and the peculiar phrase "the world to come," of which ὁ αἰὼν ὁ ἐρχόμενος was undoubtedly only the translation, frequently occurs in it (aBhi µlwø h; *Aboth,* 2:7; 4:16; comp. <411030>Mark 10:30; <421830>Luke 18:30). This phrase of Christians, which is anterior to Christianity, but which does not occur in the O.T., though fully justified by certain passages to be found in some of its latest books, is essentially different from Greek conceptions on the same subject; and generally, in contradistinction to the purely temporal blessings of the Mosaic legislation, the Christian ideas that this world is a state of probation, and that every one after death will have to render a strict account of his actions, were expressed by Pharisees in language which it is impossible to misunderstand: "This world may be likened to a court-yard in comparison of the world to come; therefore prepare thyself in the antechamber that thou mayest enter into the dining-room" *(Aboth,* 4:16). "Everything is given to man on security, and a net is spread over every living creature; the shop is open, and the merchant credits; the book is open, and the hand records; and whosoever chooses to borrow may come and borrow: for the collectors are continually going around daily, and obtain payment of man, whether with his consent or without it; and the judgment is true justice; and all are prepared for the feast" (3:16). "Those who are born are doomed to die, the dead to live, and the quick to be judged; to make us know, understand, and be informed that he is God; he is the Former, Creator, Intelligent Being, Judge, Witness, and suing party, and will judge thee hereafter. Blessed be he; for in his presence there is no unrighteousness, forgetfulness, respect of persons, nor acceptance of a bribe; for everything is his. Know also that everything is done according to the account, and let not thine evil imagination persuade thee that the grave is a place of refuge for thee: for against thy will wast thou formed. and against thy will wast thou born; and against thy will dost thou live, and against thy will wilt thou die; and against thy will must thou hereafter render an account, and receive judgment in the presence of the Supreme King of kings, the Holy God, blessed is he" (4:22). Still it must be borne in mind that the actions of which such a strict account was to be rendered were not merely those referred to by the spiritual prophets Isaiah and Micah (<230116>Isaiah 1:16, 17; <330608>Micah 6:8). nor even those enjoined in the

Pentateuch, but included those fabulously supposed to have been orally transmitted by Moses on Mount Sinai, and the whole body of the traditions of the elders. They included, in fact, all those ceremonial "works," against the efficacy of which, in the deliverance of the human soul, Paul so emphatically protested. *SEE RESURRECTION*.

b. In reference to the opinions of the Pharisees concerning *the freedom of the will,* a difficulty arises from the very prominent position which they occupy in the accounts of Josephus, whereas nothing vitally essential to the peculiar doctrines of the Pharisees seems to depend on those opinions, and some of his expressions are Greek, rather than Hebrew. "There were three sects of the Jews," he says, "which had different conceptions respecting human affairs, of which, one was called Pharisees. the second Sadducees, and the third Essenes. The Pharisees say that some things, and not all things, are. the work of fate; but that some things are in our own power to be and not to be. But the Essenes declare that fate rules all things, and that nothing happens to man except by its decree. The Sadducees, on the other hand, take away fate, holding that it is a thing of naught, and that human affairs do not depend upon it; but in their estimate all things are in the power of ourselves, as being ourselves the causes of our good things, and meeting with evils through our own inconsiderateness" *(Ant.* 18:1, 3; comp. *War,* 2:8, 14). On reading this passage, and the others which bear on the same subject in Josephus's works, the suspicion naturally arises that lie was biassed by a desire to make the Greeks believe that, like the Greeks, the Jews had philosophical sects among themselves. At any rate his words do not represent the opinions as they were really held by the three religious parties. We may feel certain that the influence *of fate* was not the point on which discussions respecting free-will turned, though there may have been differences as to the way in which the interposition of *God* in human affairs was to be regarded. Thus the ideas of the Essenes are likely to have been expressed in language approaching the words of Christ (Matthew 10:29, 30; 6:25, 34), and it is very difficult to believe that the Sadducees, who accepted the authority of the Pentateuch and other books of the O.T., excluded God, in their conception, from all influence on human actions. On the whole, in reference to this point, the opinion of Gratz *(Geschichte der Juden,* 3:509) seems not improbable, that the real difference between the Pharisees and Sadducees was at first practical and political. He conjectures that the wealthy and aristocratical Sadducees in their wars and negotiations with the Syrians entered into matters of policy and calculations of

prudence, while the zealous Pharisees, disdaining worldly wisdom, laid stress on doing what seemed right, and on leaving the event to God; and that this led to differences in formal theories anil metaphysical statements. The precise nature of those differences we do not certainly know, as no writing of a Sadducee on the subject has been preserved by the Jews, and on matters of this kind it is unsafe to trust unreservedly the statements of an adversary.

c. In reference to the spirit of *proselytism* among the Pharisees, there is indisputable authority for the statement that it prevailed to a very great extent at the time of Christ (<40235>Matthew 23:15); and attention is now called to it on account of its probable importance in having paved the way for the early diffusion of Christianity. The district of Palestine, which was long in proportion to its breadth, and which yet, from Dan to Beersheba, was only 160 Roman miles, or not quite 148 English miles long, and which is represented as having been civilized, wealthy, and populous 1000 years before Christ, would under any circumstances have been too small to continue maintaining the whole growing population of its children. But, through kidnapping (<29306>Joel 3:6), through leading into captivity by military incursions and victorious enemies (<12706>2 Kings 17:6; 18:11; 24:15; Amos 1:6, 9), through flight (<24404>Jeremiah 43:4-7), through commerce (Josephus, *Ant.* 20:2, 3), and probably through ordinary emigration, Jews at the time of Christ had become scattered over the fairest portions of the civilized world. On the day of Pentecost, that great festival on which the Jews suppose Moses to have brought the perfect law down from heaven *(Festival Prayers for Pentecost*, page 6), Jews are said to have been assembled with one accord in one place in Jerusalem, "from every region under heaven." Admitting that this was al Oriental hyperbole (comp. <43225>John 21:25), there must have been some foundation for it in fact; and the enumeration of the various countries from which Jews are said to have been present gives a vivid idea of the widely-spread existence of Jewish communities. Now it is not unlikely, though it cannot be *proved* from Josephus *(Ant.* 20:2, 3), that missions and organized attempts to produce conversions, although unknown to Greek philosophers, existed among the Pharisees (De Wette, *Exegetisches Handbuch,* <40235>Matthew 23:15). But, at any rate, the then existing regulations or customs of synagogues afforded facilities which do not exist now either in synagogues or Christian churches for presenting new views to a congregation (<44170>Acts 17:2; <42046>Luke 4:16). Under such auspices the proselytizing spirit of the Pharisees inevitably

stimulated a thirst for inquiry, and accustomed the Jews to theological controversies. Thus there existed precedents and favoring circumstances for efforts to make proselytes, when the greatest of all missionaries, a Jew by race, a Pharisee by education, a Greek by language, and a Roman citizen by birth, preaching the resurrection of Jesus to those who for the most part already believed in the resurrection of the dead, confronted the elaborate ritual-system of the written and oral law by a pure spiritual religion; and thus obtained the cooperation of many Jews themselves in breaking down every barrier between Jew, Pharisee, Greek, and Roman, and in endeavoring to unite all mankind by the brotherhood of a common Christianity. *SEE PROSELYTE*.

IV. *Origin, Development, Classes, and general Character of the Pharisees*. — The name does not occur either in the O.T. or in the Apocrypha; but it is usually considered that the Pharisees were essentially the same with the Assidweans (i.e., *chasidim* — godly men, saints) mentioned in 1 Macc. 2:42; 7:13-17; and in 2 Macc. 14:6. Those who admit the existence of Maccabsean Psalms find allusion to the Assideans in <19792>Psalm 79:2; 97:10; 132:9, 16; 149:9, where *chasidim* is translated "saints" in the A.V. (see Fiirst, *Handworter' buch*, 1:420 *b)*. After the return from the Babylonian captivity the priesthood formed the centre of the new religious life, and the pious in Israel who were anxious to practice the commandments of the Lord naturally attached themselves to the divinely - appointed and time-honored tribe of Levi. Besides the keeping pure from intermarriage with heathen, great and vital importance was attached to the setting aside of the soil and Temple taxes (<16033>Nehemiah 10:33, 36, etc.; Ecclus. 7:31; 45:20; Tobit 1:6; 5:13; Judith 11:13; 1 Macc. 3:49), to the due observance of the Sabbath (<16031>Nehemiah 10:31; 13:19), the three pilgrim festivals. viz. the Passover (<14803>2 Chronicles 30:35; <15769>Ezra 6:19-22), Pentecost (Tobit 2:1), and Tabernacles (<16814>Nehemiah 8:14), as well as the Sabbatic year (<16031>Nehemiah 10:31; 1 Macc. 6:49, 53), and to the abstinence from unclean food. He who allied himself to the national party with the solemn resolve to keep those ancestral laws divinely given to the nation was called "one who had separated himself unto them from the impurity of the country people" (<15621>Ezra 6:21), or "one who had separated himself for the law of the Lord from the country people" (<15901>Ezra 9:1; 10:11; <16092>Nehemiah 9:2; 10:28). Hence the phrase ˆmæ lDþ]æ, "separated from," obtained during this period *aparty* signification. This name became the standing appellation for those who had thus

separated themselves for the service of God, and continued to be the conservators of their ancestral religion, as may be seen from the taunt of the antinational party, who warned them to join the Greek party, telling them in the davs of the Maccabees that "since we have separated from them *(*ἐχωρίσθημεν ἀπ αὐτῶν, the translation of lDþh]æ) many evils have come upon us" (1 Macc. 1:11). Those who yielded to the temptation, and, relinquishing the national party, joined the antinational portion, were denominated (brç;t]hæ) *the mixed* (<150901>Ezra 9:1), or (br,[e) *the mixture* (<161303>Nehemiah 13:3). Hence the period before Alcimus was afterwards regarded as the *non-mixture (*ἀμιξία*)*, while his own was looked upon as *the mixture (*ἐπιμιξ, 2 Macc. 14:3, 38). Afterwards, when the priestly party, or the Sadducees, who were at first the centre of the national movement, assumed a haughty position, stood upon their sacerdotal dignity, cared little for the real spiritual and temporal wants of the people, but only sought their own aggrandizement and preservation, allying themselves for this purpose with foreign nations, and espousing antinational sentiments, the real national portion of the people united themselves more firmly than ever, independently of the priests, to keep the law, and to practice their ancestral customs; and it is this party whom the opposite section called by the Aramaic name ˆyvæwærP]- Φαρισαῖοι, instead of its original Hebrew equivalent µylDæbh]æ, *the separated* (<150621>Ezra 6:21; 9:1; 10:1; <160902>Nehemiah 9:2; 10:28).

In the time of queen Alexandra (q.v.) the Pharisees attained almost supreme power. By the appearance of piety and thorough knowledge of the law, which they well knew how to affect (so as even to pass for prophets, Josephus, *Ant.* 17:2, 4), the Pharisees at an early day secured the popular favor (Josephus, *Ant.* 13:10, 5; 13:15, 5; 18:1, 3; *War,* 1:5, 2; comp. <421143>Luke 11:43), and that of the women (Josephus, *Ant.* 17:2, 4, where, however, only the wives of king Herod are spoken of; but comp. Lightfoot. *Hor. Hebr.* page 230 sq.), and thereby acquired considerable political influence, which became very manifest even during the history of the Jewish dynasty (Josephus, *Ant.* 13:10, 6; 13:16, 2; *War,* 1:5, 2). This influence became greatly increased by the; extension of the Pharisees over the whole land (<420517>Luke 5:17), and the majority which they composed in the Sanhedrim (comp. <440534>Acts 5:34; 23:6 sq.). In political conflicts they generally followed democratic principles, and sometimes carried them to an extreme, trusting to their combined influence for success. (Their number reached more than six thousand under the Herods, Josephus, *Ant.* 17:2, 4.)

Many of them must have suffered death for political agitation (Josephus, *Ant.* 17:2, 4). In the time of Christ they were divided doctrinallv into several schools, among which those of Hillel and Shammai were most noted, the former being more moderate, the latter more strict, in their observances. Of the history of the Pharisees after the resurrection of Christ and the foundation of the Christian Church little need be said. Their opposition to the Gospel continued as eager as before, and, though they are seldom mentioned by name in the Acts of the Apostles, that opposition is frequently brought before us when "the council" is spoken of (<4404 15>Acts 4:15; 5:27; 6:12; 22:30; comp. <4423 6>Acts 23:6). That "council" is the Sanhedrim, and of the seventy-two doctors of which it was composed, the more influential part appears to have consisted of Pharisees. We see then the same spirit of enmity to Christian truth manifested by it as had been displayed during the life of the Redeemer; and the history of Paul before his conversion is only a more marked illustration than ordinary of the manner in which the whole body would have "persecuted the Church of God and wasted it." It is not to be imagined that this enmity would abate as the infant Church grew stronger. Everything that we know of human nature and religious bigotry leads to the opposite conclusion; and in the terrible fanaticism with which, when Titus besieged Jerusalem, the Jewish people rushed upon their fate, in the unflinching zeal which they displayed, in the desperate efforts which they made to avert the destruction which was "the wrath come upon them to the uttermost," and in the awful frenzy with which they sacrificed themselves amid their falling palaces and burning Temple, it is impossible not to recognise the last convulsive outburst of Pharisaic heroism and despair.

With the definitions and explanations of such an extensive and gorgeous ritual as that of the Mosaic law; with the application and adaptation thereof to all the vicissitudes of the commonwealth, with the different degrees of holiness and uncleanness attached to the performance or neglect of each precept and rite, with the diverse dispositions and idiosyncrasies of the multitude about the respective merits of outward observances and a corresponding inward feeling, the Pharisees would have been superhuman if they had escaped the extravagances which in the course of time have more or less developed themselves in the established religions based upon a more spiritual code and a less formal ritual. Thus the enactment that " the flesh of quadrupeds must not be cooked or in any way mixed with milk for food," deduced from injunctions in <0234 19>Exodus 23:19; 34:26;

(Deuteronomy 14:21; or the enactment about the compulsory recitation of the *Shema* twice a day," i.e., the declaration about the unity of the Deity (Deuteronomy 6:4-9), at a stated time; or the discussion on "the lighting of candles on the eve of the Sabbath," which is the duty of every Jew; or "the interdict to eat an egg which had been laid on any feast-day, whether such day was or was not the day after the Sabbath," has its parallel in other and later systems. The Christian Church, without any basis for it in the N.T., has at times employed a casuistry which may fairly compete with that of the Pharisees, who had to define an inspired code of minute rites and ceremonies. From Peter Lombard to Gabriel Biel the question was warmly discussed among all the Christian casuists, What is to be done with a mouse which has eaten of the consecrated wafer? The Established Church of England has deduced from the words "Let all things be done decently and according to order" (1 Corinthians 15:40) the petty regulation that "no man shall cover his head in the ohurch or chapel in the time of divine service, except lie have some infirmity, in which case let him wear a nightcap or coif" *(Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical,* 18); has enacted that "no minister, when he celcbrateth the communion, shall wittingly administer the same to any but to such as kneel under pain of suspension" *(ibid.* 27); that "upon Wednesdays and'Fridays weekly, though they be not holy-days, the minister, at the accustomed hours of service, shall resort to the church or chapel, and, warning being given to the people by tolling of a bell, shall say the litany prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer: *whereunto we wish every householder dwelling within half a mile of the church to come or send one at the least of his household* fit to join with the minister in prayers" (15); and that "no ecclesiastical person shall wear any coif or wrought nightcap, but only plain nightcaps of black silk, satin, or velvet; . . . in private houses and in their studies the said persons ecclesiastical may use any comely and scholar-like apparel, provided that it be not cut or pinkt; and that in public they go not in their doublet and hose, without coats or cassocks; and that they wear not any light-colored stockings" (74). This, however, only shows the tendency of all ritualism to degrade the human intellect by minute requisitions. That the multitudinous and detailed rites and ceremonies imposed by the Mosaic law, and amplified by the requirements of time, should have given rise among many Pharisees to formalism, outward religiousness, self-complacency, ostentation, superstition, and hypocrisy, was to be expected, judging from the general tendency of gorgeous ritualism in more modern days. A learned'Jew charges against them rather the holiness of works than

hypocritical holiness ("Werkheiligkeit, nicht Scheinheiligkeit," Herzfeld, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel,* 3:359). At any rate they must be regarded as having been some of the most intense *formalists* whom the world has ever seen; and, looking at the average standard of excellence among mankind, it is nearly certain that men whose lives were spent in the ceremonial observances of the Mishna would cherish feelings of selfcomplacency and spiritual pride not justified by intrinsic moral excellence. The supercilious contempt towards the poor publican, and towards the tender penitential love that bathed Christ's feet with tears, would be the natural result of such a system of life. We are therefore not surprised that our Savior saw these pernicious features in the ranks of Pharisaism, and that he found occasion to expose and to reprove most unsparingly their externalism (<40>Matthew 23:27; <42>Luke 7:39) and hypocrisy (<40>Matthew 23:13). But to conclude from this that all the Pharisees were either self-righteous and superstitious, or a set of hypocrites, is as unjust as it would be to brand every section in modern churches with the infirmities and extravagances of which individual members are guilty, and which are either denounced by their own more enlightened and spirituallvminded brethren, or exposed by the opposing sections. The language which the Pharisees themselves employed to denounce the proud, the formalists, the self-righteous, and the hypocrites in their own sect, is, to say the least, quite as strong as that which our Saviour used. In confirmation of this, we need only give the poignant Talmudic classification of the Pharisees. "There are seven kinds of Pharisees," says the Talmud:

"1. *The Shechemite Pharisee (*ymkç çwrp*),* who simply keeps the law for what he can profit thereby, just as Shechem submitted to the rite of circumcision that he might thereby obtain Dinah, the daughter of Jacob (<01>Genesis 34:19);

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

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

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

5. *The What-am-I-yet-to-do Pharisee* (ytbwj hm h[da çwrp), who, not knowing much about the law, as soon as he has done one thing, asks, 'What is my duty now? and I will do it' (comp. <41007>Mark 10:17-22);

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

7. *The Pharisee from Love (*hbham çwrp), who obeys the Lord because he loves him with all his heart" *(Babylon Sota,* 22 *b;* comp. *Jerusalem Berachoth,* cap. 9). It must also be admitted that it was among the Pharisees the glorious ideas were developed about the Messiah, the kingdom of heaven, the immortality of the soul, the world to come, etc. It was the Pharisees who, to some extent at least, trained such men as the immortal Hillel, "the just and devout Simeon, who waited for the consolation of Israel," and who, taking up the inlant Saviour into his arms, offered up thanks to God (<42025>Luke 2:25-35); Zacharias, "who was righteous before God" (<42006>Luke 1:6); Gamaliel, the teacher of Saul of Tarsus; Paul, the great apostle of the Gentiles, etc. Our Savior himself occupied Pharisaic ground, and used the arguments of the Pharisees in vindication of his conduct and doctrines. Thus, wien Jesus was charged by the Pharisees with allowing his disciples to break the Sabbath by plucking ears of corn in the field on this holy day, he quoted the very maxim of the Pharisees that "the Sabbath is made for man, and not man for the Sabbath" (<41027>Mark 2:27; comp. *Joma,* 85 *b);* and his proof is deduced according to the Pharisaic exegetical rule denominated hwç hrzn, *analogy.* When David was hungry, he ate of the priestly bread, and also gave some to those who were with him. Accordingly one who is hungry may satisfy his hunger with that which is otherwise only allowed to the priests. Now the priests perform all manner of work on the Sabbath without incurring the guilt of transgression; why, then, should one who is hungry not be allowed to do the same? (<40120>Matthew 12:1-7). We only add that the apostle Paul, who must have known all the denunciations of Christ against the Pharisees, never uttered a disrespectfll word against this sect, but, on the contrary. made it a matter of boast that he belonged to them (<44236>Acts 23:6; 26:5; <50305>Philippians 3:5). Yet candor must acknowledge that great moral

derelictions in practice often coexist with much that is beautiful in theory and the uncontradicted rebukes of our Saviour against the Pharisees of his time prove an enormous depravity on their part. He denounced them in the bitterest language; and in the sweeping charges of hypocrisy which he made against them as a class, he might even, at first sight, seem to have departed from that spirit of meekness, of gentleness in judging others, and of abstinence from the imputation of improper motives, which is one of the most characteristic and original charms of his own precepts. See <4015>Matthew 15:7, 8; 23:5,13-15, 23; <4107>Mark 7:6; <4214>Luke 11:42-44; and comp. <4107>Matthew 7:1-5; 11:29; 12:19, 20; <4068>Luke 6:28, 37-42. Indeed, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that his repeated denunciations of the Pharisees mainly exasperated them into taking measures for causing his death; so that in one sense he may be said to have shed his blood, and to have laid down his life in protesting against their practice and spirit. (See especially verses 53 and 54 in the 11th chapter of Luke, which follow immediately upon the narration of what he said while dining with a Pharisee.) Hence to understand the Pharisees is, by contrast, an aid towards understanding the spirit of unlcorrupted Christianity. This divergence is so wide and fundamental that we shall best apprehend the genius of *Phariseeism* by developing the contrast somewhat in detail (see Delitzsch, *Jesus und Hillel* [Erlangen, 1866]).

(1.) In relation to the O.T. dispensation, it was the Saviour's great effort to unfold the principles which had lain at the bottom of that dispensation, and, carrying them out to their legitimate conclusions, to "fulfil the law" (πληρῶσαι, <4057>Matthew 5:17, to " fulfil," not as too often supposed to mean, to "confirm"). But, in contrast to this, the Pharisees taught such a servile adherence to the letter of the law, that its remarkable character as a pointing forward to something higher than its letter was completely overlooked, and that its moral precepts, intended to elevate men, and to lead them on to the thought of a moral stage more glorious than that at which they then stood, were made rather the instruments of contracting and debasing their ideas of morality. Thus, strictly adheriig to the letter, "Thou shalt not kill," they regarded anger and all hasty passion as legitimate (<4021>Matthew 5:21, 22). Adhering with equal strictness to the words ' Thou shalt not commit adultery," all impure thoughts and deeds which fell short of this were considered by them to be allowable (<4027>Matthew 5:27, 28). And, once more, acquiescing in the letter, "Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a letter of

divorcement," they so interpreted the precept that, if only a letter of divorcement were given, a wife might be put away for any cause however trifling (<40531>Matthew 5:31, 32). Thus, the whole spirit of the O.T. dispensation was misunderstood by them. They did not see that it was adapted to a particular stage in the history of man; that its merit consisted, not in being perfect, but in being better than what would have existed without it; and that it contained in itself the pledge that it must one day yield, as a system, to the full evolution of those principles at which it aimed, and to which, from time to time, it gave expression. When accordingly He came, whose great effort it was to break through the letter, in order that lie might set free the spirit, which the circumstances of men had rendered it necessary to enclose and confine for a season, their hearts were steeled from the first against him, and they attacked him as a blasphemer against the God of Israel and his law.

(2.) While it was the aim of Jesus to call men to the law of God itself as the supreme guide of life, the Pharisees multiplied minute precepts and distinctions to such an extent, upon the pretence of maintaining it intact, that the whole life of the Israelite was hemmed in And burdened on every side by instructions so numerous and trifling that the law was almost, if not wholly, lost sight of. These "traditions," as they were called, had long been gradually accumulating. Their object may in the first instance have been a good one. The law had been given under circumstances very different from those in which the Jewish people found themselves more and more placed as the Christian aera approached. The relations of life had been far simpler; the influence exerted over Israel by neighboring nations less refined; while the national authorities, except in times when the worship of the true God was altogether thrown aside, had united in keeping all admixture of foreign elements at a distance. That was no longer possible, and it became almost necessary therefore to explain the application of the law to the changed and ever-changing condition of the people (comp. Dollinger, *Christenthum und Judenthum*, page 750). Commenting upon the law therefore was unavoidable: and many of the comments given were no doubt really what they were designed to be, "a fence to the law." But these "fences" too soon assumed, as indeed it was natural that they should, an importance superior to that of the law itself, while at the same time they were continually increasing in number, till at last a complete system of casuistry was formed, in which the most minute incidents of life were embraced, and which rendered the very conception of broad and general principles of duty an

impossibility. Of the trifling character of these regulations innumerable instances are to be found in the Mishna, but, as it is not quite clear that the Talmudical was the same as the Pharisaic theology, we omit these, and remind our readers only of some of those mentioned in the N.T. Such, then, were their washings before they would eat bread, and the special minuteness with which the forms of this washing were prescribed; their bathing when they returned from the market, their washing of cups and pots, brazen vessels, and couches (<41702>Mark 7:2-4); such were their fastings not only at the seasons which the law prescribed, but twice in the week (<42812>Luke 18:12) — on Thursday, when, according to their tradition, Moses had ascended Mount Sinai, and on Monday, when he had come down from it (Eisenmenger, *Entdecktes Judenthum*, 1:311); such were their tithings, not only of the property which the law provided should be tithed, but even of the most insignificant herbs — mint and anise and cummin (<40223>Matthew 23:23; comp. <42812>Luke 18:12); and such, finally, were those minute and vexatious extensions of the law of the Sabbath, which must have converted God's gracious ordinance of the Sabbath's rest into a burden and a pain (<40201>Matthew 12:1-13, <41301>Mark 3:1-6; <42310>Luke 13:10-17, etc.).

(3.) It was a leading aim of the Redeemer to teach men that true piety consisted not in forms, but in substance, not in outward observances, but in an inward spirit; not in small details, but in great rules of life. The whole system of Pharisaic piety led to exactly opposite conclusions. Under its influence "the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith," wera undervalued and neglected (<40223>Matthew 23:23; <42142>Luke 11:42), the idea of religion as that which should have its seat in the heart disappeared (<42138>Luke 11:3841); the most sacred obligations were evaded (<41071>Mark 7:11); vain and trifling questions took the place of serious inquiry into the great principles of duty (<40103>Matthew 19:3, etc.); and even the most solemn truths were handled as mere matters of curious speculation or means to entrap an adversary (<40225>Matthew 22:35, etc., <42720>Luke 17:20, etc.).

(4.) The lowliness of piety was, according to the teaching of Jesus, an inseparable concomitant of its reality, but the Pharisees sought mainly to attract the attention and to excite the admiration of men. They gave alms in the most ostentatious manner; they ofter prayed standing at the corners of the streets; they dis. figured their faces when they fasted (<40602>Matthew 6:2, 6, 16) To draw attention to their religious zeal they made broad their phylacteries and enlarged the borders of their garments (<40235>Matthew 23:5).

Blind to the true glory of ministering to others rather than being ministered to, they sought their glory in obtaining the chief seats in the synagogues, the first places at the tables to which they were invited, greetings of honor in the markets, and the title of Rabbi, Rabbi (<4023>Matthew 23:6; <4214>Luke 14:7). Indeed, the whole spirit of their religion was slummed up, not in confession of sin and humility, but in a proud self-righteousness at variance with any true conception of man's relation either to God or his fellow-creatures — “God, I thank thee that I am not as other men are, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even as this publican" (<4211>Luke 18:11).

(5.) It was a natural consequence of all this, that with such views of the principles and spirit of religion its practical graces should be overthrown, and it was so. Christ inculcated compassion for the degraded, helpftlness to the friendless, liberality to the poor, holiness of heart, universal love, a mind open to the truth. The Pharisees regarded the degraded classes of society as classes to be shunned, not to be won over to the right (<4079>Luke 7:39; 15:2; 18:11), and frowned from them such as the Redeemer would fain have gathered within his fold (<4049>John 7:49). Instead of having compassion on the friendless, they made them a prey (<4023>Matthew 23:13). With all their pretences to piety, they were in reality avaricious, sensual, and dissolute (<4025>Matthew 23:25; <4007>John 8:7). They looked with contempt upon every nation but their own (<4029>Luke 10:29). Finally, instead of endeavoring to fulfil the great end of the dispensation whose truths they professed to teach, and thus bringing men to the Hope of Israel, they devoted their energies to making converts to their own narrow views, who, with all the zeal of proselytes, were more exclusive and more bitterly opposed to the truth than they were themselves (<4015>Matthew 22:15).

In view of these facts, while acknowledging much that was just and commendable in their doctrines (<4023>Matthew 23:2, 3), we are compelled to acquiesce in that general judgment which has made the name of "Pharisee" a proverb of ecclesiastical reproach-a character too often reproduced under Christianity itself.

V. *Literature*. — Besides the Mishna, the Talmud, and the Midrashim, which embody the sentiments of the Pharisees, we refer to Brucker, *Hist. Crit. Philosophice,* 2:744-759; Milman, *Hist. of the Jews,* 2:71; Ewald, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel,* 4:415-419; Biedermann, *Pharisaer und Sadducaer* (Zur. 1854); Wellhausen, *Die Pharisaer und die Sadducaer* (Greifsw. 1874); and the *Jahrhundert des Heils,* page 5, etc., of Gfrorer,

who has insisted strongly on the importance of the Mishna, and has made great use of the Talmud generally. Grossmann has endeavored to present a harmony of the Jewish-Alexandrine doctrines with those of the Palestine Pharisees in his work, *De Pharis. Jud. Alexand.* (Hal. 1846), 2:4; but it is very improbable that the Pharisees of Palestine agreed with the Jewish philosophers of Alexandria in their principles, when the latter were adherents of Plato, and diligent students of Homer and Hesiod (Grossmann, *De Philos. Sadduc.* 3:8). See also the following works by modern learned Jews: Herzfeld, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel* (Nordhausen, 1857), 2:258, etc.; Jost, *Geschichte des Judenthums und seiner Secten* (Leipsic, 1857), 1:197, etc.; Gratz, *Geschichte der Juden* (2d ed. ibid. 1863), 3:72, etc., 454, etc.; and, above all, Geiger, *Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel* (Breslau, 1857), page 103, etc.; also in the *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenlandischen Gesellschaft* (Leipsic, 1862), 16:714, etc.; and in his *Judische Zeitschrift fur Wissenschaft und Leben* (Breslau, 1863), 2:11, etc.; and reprinted separately (Breslau, 1863). *SEE SECTS, JEWISH*.

Pharmacy

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

Pha'rosh

(Ezra 8:3). *SEE PAROSH*.

Phar'par

(Heb. *Panpar'*, rPir þ¡ *swift;* Sept. Φαρφάρ v.r. Φαρφαρά, Åφαρφά *;* Vulg. *Pharpar),* one of the two rivers of Damascus mentioned in the wellknown exclamation of Naaman, "Are not Abana and Pharpar, rivers of Damascus, better than all the waters of Israel?" (2 Kings 5:12). The name does not occur elsewhere in Scripture, nor is it found in ancient

classic authors. Eusebius and Jerome merely state that it is a river of Damascus *(Onomast.* s.v. Farfar). Plinv savs that "Damascus was a place fertilized by the river Chrysorrhoas, which is drawn off into its meadows and eagerly imbibed" (5:16); and Strabo says of this river that "it commences from the city and territory of Damascus, and is almost entirely drained by watercourses; for it supplies with water a large tract of country" (16:755). But none of these writers speak of any second river. Various opinions have been entertained regarding the Pharpar. Benjamin of Tudela states that, while the Abana runs through the city, the Pharpar runs between the gardens and the orchards in the outskirts *(Early Travels,* Bohn, page 90). He evidently refers to the two branches of the same river. The river *Barada* takes its rise in the upland plain of Zebdany, at the base ofthe loftiest peak of Anti-Lebanon. Its principal source is a fountain called Ain Barada. It cuts through the central chain in a sublime gorge, and flows in a deep wild glen down the eastern declivities. Its volume is more than doubled by a large fountain called Fijeh, which gushes from a cave in the side of the glen. The river leaves the mountains and enters the great plain of Damascus about three miles west of the city. The main stream flows though the city; but no fewer than seven large canals are taken from it at different elevations to irrigate the surrounding orchards and gardens. The largest of these is called *Na(hr Taula,* "the river Taura," and is probably that which Benjamin of Tudela identified with the Pharpar (1.c.). The Arabic version of the Bible reads *Taura* for *Pharpar* in 2 Kings 5:12; but the words of Naaman manifestly imply the existence of two distinct rivers. Some have supposed that because the Barada has two great fountains, Naaman alluded to these; and Dr. Wilson would identify the Barada with the Pharpar, and Ain Fijeh with the Abana *(Lands of the Bible,* 2:371, 373); but in reply we say that Naaman speaks of two "rivers," and not "fountains." *SEE ABANA.*

A short distance south of the city of Damascus flows the river *Awaj.* It has two principal sources — one high up on the eastern side of Hermon, just beneath the central peak; the other in a wild glen a few miles southward, near the romantic village of Beit Jann. The streams unite near Sasa, and the river flows eastward in a deep rocky channel, and falls into a lake, or rather large marsh, called Bahret Hijftneh, about four miles south of the lake into which the Barada falls. Although the Awaj is eight miles distant from the city, yet it flows across the whole plain of Damascus; and large ancient canals drawn from it irrigate the fields and gardens almost up to the walls.

The total length of the Awaj is nearly forty miles; and in volume it is about one fourth that of the Barada. The Barada and Awaj are the only rivers of any importance in the district of Damascus; and there can be little doubt that the former is the Abana, and the latter the Pharpar. The identity of the Awaj and Pharpar was suggested by Munro in 1833 *(Summer Ramble,* 2:54), and confirmed by Dr. Robinson *(Bibliotheca Sacra.* May 1849. page 371); but its sources, course, and the lake into which it falls, were first explored by Dr. Porter in the year 1852 *(ibid.* January 1854, and April 1854, page 329). He then heard, for the first time, the name *Barbar* applied to a glen on the east side of Hermon, which sends a small tributary to the Awaj; and it seems highly probable that we have in this name a relic of the ancient Pharpar. The Arabic may be regarded as equivalent to the Hebrew (see *Five Years in Damascus,* 1:299; *Biblioth. Sac.* 1.c. page 54). The mountain region round the sources of the river was occupied in a remote age by the warlike Maachathites (1 Chronicles 19:6, 7; Joshua 12:5). Subsequently it formed part of the tetrarchy of Abilene (Luke 3:1; Josephus, *Ant.* 19:5, 1). Farther down, the river Pharpar divided the territory of Damascus from Iturea (q.v.). The whole district through which the river flows is now called Wady el-Ajam, "the valley of the Persians ; the scenery is bare and mountainous, but some parts of it are extremely fertile, and it contains upwards of fifty villages, with ,a population of 18,000 souls (see *Jour. of Sac. Lit.* 1853; Ritter, *Pal. und Syr.* 4:132 sq.). *SEE DAMASCUS.*

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

Pharr, Walter Smiley

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Cabarras County, N.C., April 28, 1790. He was educated at Hampden Sidney College, Prince Edward County, Virginia; studied theology, under the care of Moses Hoge, D.D.; was licensed by Hanover Presbytery, and ordained by Concord Presbytery November 18, 1820. His first charge was Waxhaw Church, S.C., and he

subsequently preached for Prospect, Rama, and Mallard Creek churches, in North Carolina, all within the bounds of Concord Presbytery. He died December 27, 1866. Mr. Pharr was a sound theologian, a plain and successful preacher and pastor, much beloved and confided in by all who knew him. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. A lmanac*, 1867, page 450. (J.L.S.)

Phar'zite

(Heb. with the art. *hap-Partsi'*, yxær]Phi; Sept. ὁ Φαρεσί v.r. Φαρές*)*, the patronymic of a family among the Hebrews (<042620>Numbers 26:20), the descendants of Pharez (q.v.).

Phasaelis

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

Phase'ah

[some *Pha'seah]* (<160751>Nehemiah 7:51). *SEE PASEAH*.

Phase'lis

*(*Φασηλίς*)*, a town on the coast of Asia Minor, on the confines of Lycia and Pamphylia, and consequently ascribed by the ancient writers sometimes to one and sometimes to the other. It was one of the towns to which the Romans wrote commanding all Jewish exiles who had taken refuge there to be given up to Simon the high-priest (1 Macc. 15:23). Its commerce was considerable in the 6th century B.C., for in the reign of Amasis it was one of a number of Greek towns which carried on trade somewhat in the mranuer of the Hanseatic confederacy in the Middle Ages. They had a common temple, the Hellenium, at Naucratis, in Egypt, and nominated προστάται for the regulation of commercial questions and the decision of

disputes arising out of contracts, like the *preudhommes* of the Middle Ages, who presided over the courts of *piepoudre (pieds poudres,* peddlers) at the different staples. In later times Phaselis was distinguished as a resort of the Pamphylian and Cilician pirates. Its port was a convenient one to make, for the lofty mountain of Solyma (now Takhtalu), which backed it at a distance of only five miles, is nearly eight thousand feet in height, and constitutes an admirable landmark for a great distance. Phaselis itself stood on a rock of fifty or one hundred feet elevation above the sea, and was joined to the mainland by a low isthmus, in the middle of which was a lake, now a pestiferous marsh. On the eastern side of this were a closed port and a roadstead, and on the western a larger artificial harbor, formed by a mole run out into the sea. The remains of this may still be traced to a considerable extent below the surface of the water. The masonry of the pier which protected the small eastern port is nearly perfect. In this sheltered position the pirates could lie safely while they sold their booty, and also refit, the whole region having been anciently so thickly covered with wood as to give the name of *Pityusa* to the town. For a time the Phaselites confined their relations with the Pamphylians to the purposes just mentioned; but they subsequently joined the piratical league, and suffered in consequence the loss of their independence and their town lands in the war which was waged by the Roman consul Publius Servilius Isauricus in the years B.C. 77-75. But at the outset the Romans had to a great extent fostered the pirates, by the demand which sprang up for domestic slaves upon the change of manners brought about by the spoliation of Carthage and Corinth. It is said that at this time many thousand slaves were passed through Delos — which was the mart between Asia and Europe — in a single day; and the proverb grew up there, Ἔμπορε, κατάπλευσον: ἐξελοῦ πάντα πέπραται. But when the Cilicians had acquired such power and audacity as to sweep the seas as far as the Italian coast, and interrupt the supplies of corn, it became time to interfere, and the expedition of Servilius commenced the work which was afterwards completed by Pompey the Great (see Smith, *Dict. of Class. Geog.* s.v.).

It is in the interval between the growth of the Cilician piracy and the Servilian expedition that the incidents related in the First Book of Maccabees occurred. After naming Ptolemy, Demetrius (king of Syria), Attalus (king of Pergamus), Ariarathes (of Pontus), and Arsaces (of Parthia) as recipients of these missives, the author adds that the consul also

wrote: εἰς πάσας τὰς χώρας καὶ Σαμψάμῃ (Grotius conjectures Λαμψάκῳ, and one MS. has Μεσανίσσῃ) καὶ Σπαρτιάταις καὶ εἰς Δῆλον καὶ εἰς Μύνδον καὶ εἰς Σικυῶνα καὶ εἰς τὴν Καρίαν καὶ εἰς Σάμον καὶ εἰς τὴν Παμφυλίαν καὶ εἰς τὴν Λυκίαν καὶ εἰς Ἁλικαρνασσόν, καὶ εἰς Ῥόδον καὶ εἰς Φασηλίδα καὶ εἰς Κῶ καὶ εἰς Σίδην καὶ εἰς Ἄραδον καὶ εἰς Γόρτυναν καὶ Κνίδον, καὶ Κῶπρον καὶ Κυρήνην (1 Macc. 15:23). It will be observed that all the places named, with the exception of Cyprus and Cyrene, lie on the highway of marine traffic between Syria and Italy. The Jewish slaves, whether kidnapped by their own countrymen (<02116>Exodus 21:16), or obtained by raids (<12512>2 Kings 5:2), appear in early times to have been transmitted to the west coast of Asia Minor by this route (see <26713>Ezekiel 27:13; <29306>Joel 3:6).

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

Phas'iron

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

Phas'saron

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

Phe'be

SEE PHOEBE.

Phelan, William, D.D.

a somewhat noted Irish divine of the Protestant establishment, was born at Clonmel in 1789, and was educated at Trinity College, Dublin, where he was admitted sizar in 1806. In 1814 he was made second master of the endowed school of Derry; in 1817 he was elected fellow of his college, and

in 1819 Donellan lecturer. In 1824 he became rector of Killyman, Armagh, and in 1825 of Ardtrea. He died in 1830. His *Remains* were published, with a biographical memoir, by the bishop of Limerick (2d ed. Lond. 1832, 2 volumes, 8vo). See Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliogr.* s.v.

Phelet

SEE BETH-PHELET.

Phelipeaux, Jean

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

Phelonium

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

Phelps, Elizabeth Stuart

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

Phelps, Joseph T.

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

Phelps, Servis W.

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

Phelps, Thomas

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

Phelypeaux, Georges-Louis

a French prelate, was born in 1729 in the chateau d'Herbaut, diocese of Orleans. He entered holy orders, became commendatory abbe of the royal abbey of Thouronel, and was appointed in 1757 archbishop of Bourges, and in 1770 chancellor of the Order of the Holy Ghost. He distinguished himself as much by the activity of his pastoral zeal as by his inexhaustible beneficence. He founded several colleges in the principal cities of his diocese, instituted bureaus of charity, and succeeded in considerably diminishing mendicity. See Blin de Sainmore, *Eloge Hist. de G.-L.*

Phelypeaux (1778, 8vo); Fauchet, *Oraison Punebre de G.-L. Phelypeaux.* — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale,* 39:824.

Pheni'ce

[some *Phe'nice]:*

a. (Acts 27:12). *SEE PHOENIX*.
b. (Acts 11:19; 15:3). *SEE PHENICIA*.

Pheni'cia

SEE PHOENICIA.

Phenolion

SEE PHAENOLIUM.

Phenomenon

SEE PHENOMENON.

Pherecydes

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

Pher'esite

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

Phiala

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

Phibionita

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

Phi'chol

(Heb. *Pikol',* לכפ, of doubtful meaning [see below]; Sept. Φιχώλ v.r. Φικόλ; Josephus Φίκωλος*)*, the proper, or, more probably, the titular name of the commander of the troops of Abimelech, the Philistine king of Gerar in the patriarchal period. *SEE ABIMEILECH*. If the Abimelech of the time of Isaac was the son of the Abimelech of the time of Abraham, we may conclude that the Phichol who attended on the second Abimelech (<01212>Genesis 21:22) was the successor of the one who was present with the first at the interview with Abraham (<01226>Genesis 26:26). Josephus mentions him on the second occasion only. On the other hand the Sept. introduces Ahuzzath, Abimelech's other companion, on the first also. By Gesenius the name is treated as Hebrew, and as meaning the "m mouth of all." By Furst *(Heb. Lex.* s.v.) it is derived from a root לכפ; *to be strong.* But Hitzig *(Philistdaer, §* 57) refers it to the Sanscrit *pitshula,* a *tamarisk,* pointing out that Abraham had planted a tamarisk in Beersheba. and comparing the name with Elah, Berosus, Tappuach, and other names of persons and places signifying different kinds of trees; and with the name Φίγαλος, a village of Palestine (Josephus, *Ant.* 12:4, 2), and *(*Φιγαλία in Greece.

Stark *(Gaza,* etc. page 96) more cautiously avoids such speculations. The natural conclusion from these mere conjectures is that Phichol is a Philistine name, the derivation and meaning of which are lost to us.

Philadel'phia

[strictly *Philadelphi'a]* (Φιλαδέλφεια, *brotherly love),* one of the.seven cities of Asia Minor to which the admonitions in the Apocalypse were addressed (Revelation 1:11; 2:7). The town stood about twenty-five miles south-east from Sardis, in N. lat. 320 28', E. long. 280 30', in the plain of Hermus, about midway between the river of that name and the termination of Mount Tmolus. It was the second in Lydia (Ptolemy, 5:2; Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* 5:30), and was built by king Attalus Philadelphus from whom it took its name. In B.C. 133 the place passed, with the dominion in which it lay, to the Romans. The soil was extremely favorable to the growth of vines, celebrated by Virgil *(Georg.* 2:98) for the soundness of the wine they produced; and in all probability Philadelphia was built by Attalus as a mart for the great wine-producing region, extending for 500 stadia in length by 400 in breadth. Its coins have on them the head of Bacchus or a female Bacchant. Strabo compares the soil with that in the neighborhood of Catana, in Sicily; and modern travellers describe the appearance of the country as resembling a billowy sea of disintegrated lava, with here and there vast trap-dikes protruding. The original population of Philadelphia seems to have been Macedonian, and the national character to have been retained even in the time of Pliny. There was, however, as appears from Revelation 3:9, a synagogue of Hellenizing Jews there, as well as a Christian Church-a circumstance to be expected when we recollect that Antiochus the Great introduced into Phrygia 2000 families of Jews, removing them from Babylon and Mesopotamia, for the purpose of counteracting the seditious temper of the Phrygians; and that he gave them lands and provisions, and exempted them from taxes (Josephus, *Ant.* 12:3, 4). The locality continued to 'be subject to constant earthquakes, which in the time of Strabo (13:628) rendered even the town-walls of Philadelphia unsafe; but its inhabitants held pertinaciously to the spot, perhaps from the profit which naturally accrued to them from their city being the staple of the great wine-district. But the expense of reparation was constant, and hence perhaps the poverty of the members of the Christian Church *(*οἰδα. . . ὅτι μικρὰν ἔχεις δύναμιν, Revelation 3:8), who no doubt were a portion of the urban popullation, and heavily taxed for public purposes, as well as subject to private loss by the destruction of their own property.

Philadelphia was not of sufficient importance in the Roman times to have law-courts of its own, but belonged to a jurisdiction of which Sardis was the centre. It continued to be a place of importance and of strength down to the Byzantine age; and of all the towns in Asia Minor it withstood the Turks the longest. It was taken by Bajazet I in A.D. 1392. Furious at the resistance which he had met with, Bajazet put to death the defenders of the city, and many of the inhabitants besides (see G. Pachym. page 290; Mich. Due. page 70; Chalcond. page 33).

Philadelphia

Picture for Philadelphia

still exists as a Turkish town, under the name of *Allah-shehr*, "city of God," i.e., Hightown. The region around is highly volcanic, and, geologically speaking, belongs to the district of Phrygia Catacecaumene, on the western edge of which it lies. The situation of Philadelphia is highly picturesque, especially when viewed from the north-east, for it is principally built on four or five hills, extremely regular in figure, and having the appearance of truncated pyramids. At the back of these, which are all of nearly the same height, rise the lofty ridges of Tmolus; and though the country around is barren and desolate, the city itself is wanting neither in wood nor verdure. The climate of Philadelphia is pleasant and healthy. It is elevated 952 feet above the level of the sea, and is open to the salutary breezes from the Catacecaumene — a wild desert tract of highly volcanic country extending as far to the east as Peltae. This district is even vet famous for the growth of the vine, which delights in a light sandy soil; and, though incapable of extensive cultivation, has a few fertile oases. Close to Philadelphia the soil is rich, and fruits as well as corn are abundant. The Cogamos abounds in fresh-water turtle, which are considered delicacies, and highly prized accordingly. The revenues of the city depend on its corn, cotton, and tobacco. The cotton grows in small pods about the size of a medlar, and not unlike it in form. The town itself, although spacious, is miserably built and kept, the dwellings being remarkably mean, and the streets exceedingly filthy. Across the summits of the hill behind the town and the small valleys between them runs the town-wall, strengthened by circular and square towers, and forming also an extensive and long quadrangle in the plain below. The ancient walls are partly standing and partly in ruins; but it is easy to trace the circuit which they once enclosed, and within which are to be found innumerable fragments of pillars and

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

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

Philadelphians

or *"the Philadelphian Society,"* is the name of a sect which was founded in 1695, and claimed.to have for its object "the advancement of piety and divine philosophy." It originated with Jane Leade (q.v.) and John Pordage (q.v.). Another of the Philadelphians was the learned physician Francis Lee,who edited the "Theosophical Transactions" of the society. Another

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

Philalethes

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

Philanthropy

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

Christian philanthropy is universally admitted to be superior to that of any other ethical or religious system; and if we inquire what are the causes of

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

In the history of education philanthropy has acquired a special meaning. The influence exercised by Rousseau was not less great on education than on politics, and was as visible in the pedagogues of Germany and Switzerland as in the men of the French Revolution. It is to the brilliant and one-sided advocacy, by the author of *Emnile,* of a return to nature in social life and in the training of the young, that Basedow owed his novel and enthusiastic educationalism, which he put to the practical test in the institution which was opened under his auspices at Dessau in 1774, and which was called *Philanthropina.* Other establishments of the same kind were founded in different parts of Germany, but the only one which still survives is Salzmann's Institute at Schiepfenthal, near Gotha, opened in 1784. These philanthropina are of interest to us because they sought the religious and moral training of the young on an entirely original plan. Until the davs of these Philanthropists the Church had had the sole educational care of the rising generation, but these came forward to assume this responsibility, and to treat the child in a peculiar and altogether novel

manner. The religious fervor was to be developed like love for any given study, and, instead of influencing the heart. religion became an intellectual acquisition. As philanthropism agreed no less with the absolutism of Russia than with the liberty of Switzerland, so, in the general private devotional exercises, nothing should be done which would not be approved of by every worshipper of God, whether he were a Christian, Jew, Mohammedan, or a deist. In the temple of the Father of all, crowds of dissenting fellow-citizens will worship as brethren, and afterwards they will, with the same fraternal disposition, go, one to hear the holy mass, the other to pray with real brethren, 'Our Father,' the third to pray with real brethren, 'Father of us.' While the former education had viewed the minds of children as vessels into which a certain amount of knowledge and faith was to be infused, whether it was easy or difficult, philanthropism viewed these vessels as. the chief thilg, and the amount of knowledge as only secondary. In other words, knowledge was regarded merely as a means of training the human mind; and the aim was the natural development of all man's powers and faculties" (Kahnis, *Hist. of Germ. Prot.* page 47). See the *Quart. Rev.* Jan. 1875, art. 6; Blackie, *Hist. of Europ. Morals,* pages 236, 263; Wuttke, *Christian Ethics* (see Index in volume 7).

Philar'ches

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

Philaret

OF Moscow, a modern Russian prelate of much celebrity, was born of pious parentage at Kolouma in 1782. His lay name was *Vasili Drosdow.* He received his education in the Theological Seminary of Moscow. He commenced his public career as tutor of the Greek and Latin languages. His oratorical gifts being soon observed, he was appointed preacher in 1806 at the Sergian monastery of Troizka, and after having removed to St. Petersburg, entered the monastic life, in order to open to himself the higher avenues of the Church, which only the white clergy can enter. In 1810 he was translated to the Academy of Alexander Newskj as bachelor of

theological science; in 1811 he was made archimandrite, and in 1812 became rector of the St. Petersburg Theological Academy. In 1817 he was raised to the bishopric, and was appointed successively bishop of Twer, Iaroslaw, and Moscow. In the episcopal see of Moscow, to which he was appointed in 1821, he remained until his death, November 19, 1867. As the senior Russian prelate, the eminent orator and professor, the theologian justly renowned in the Christian world, the strict supporter of the Church, and the true statesman, Philaret, from his tenderest youth until the last day of his prolonged life, was animated by a burning and constant love for Russia. In the fulfilment of the mission which fell to his lot, he elevated himself by his spirit above the time, and did not allow himself to be captivated by any narrowness of mind. All that knew him know likewise that in the height of his intelligence he considered the relative importance of all the manifestations in the Christian world. whether within or without the orthodox Church. He would not permit the appellation of heretics to such of the Christian dissenters as had come into existence since the oecumenical councils, and consequently had not been condemned by them. He was exempt from fanaticism in his administrations, and yet he knew the limits and measures of that which stood below. His inexhaustible intellect, sound counsels, and thorough acquaintance with the religious and social life of the people made him the friend of the crowned heads of Russia; and he was by them selected as confidential adviser in all important questions ρconcerning the good of the empire. Alexander I even told him who was to be the successor to his throne before the future emperor knew of it. In the late Crimean war his words and sacrificing example revived a patriotic feeling throughout the land; and to him is ascribed the manifesto which led to the abolishment of the anti-Christian serfdom. For over twenty-five years he was not present at the Holy Synod, yet all important documents concerning spiritual affairs were submitted to him; and his vivid words called out sympathy with the poor co-religionists in the island of Crete. In 1813 Philaret received a decoration from the emperor Alexander I for his oratory. Sermons, lectures, etc., of his have been printed in large numbers and translated into foreign languages. The synodial printing establishment at Moscow alone printed 360 of his compositions to the number of 2,000,223 copies. Metropolitan Philaret was really one of the greatest scholars of his Church. Almost all the now living communicants of the orthodox Russo-Greek Church have learned its doctrines from the Catechism arranged by him. His greatest work is his *History of the Russian Church,* of which a German translation was brought out in 1872. This

history was really the first work of importance in Russian ecclesiastical annals. It was published from 1850 to 1859, and, by order of the Holv Synod, was introduced into the ecclesiastical seminaries (institutions ranking between the ecclesiastical schools and ecclesiastical academies). Within ten vears four editions were published. The author divides the history of the Russian Church into five periods: the first closes with the inroads of the Mongolians in 1237; the second embraces the time of the subjection of Russia by the Mongolians, 1238 to 1409; the third extends to the establishment of a patriarchate, 1587; the foumrth to the abolition of the patriarchate in 1719; the fifth comprises the administration of the Church of the Holy Synod. (The value of the German translation is considerably enhanced by an appendix containing Philaret's treatise on the *Liturgy of the Oriental Greek Church* and the *Catechism of the Orthodox Christian Doctrine.)* Philaret published, besides this history of the Russian Church, the following works: *A System of Christian Doctrines* (2 volumes): — *A Work on the Saints of Russia: — Cyril and Methodius, the Apostles of the Slavi: — The Liturgy of the Russian Church befbre the Invasion of the Mongolians: — A Work on the Church Fathers* (3 volumes, and an extract from it as a text-book): — *A Commentary to the Epistle to the Galatiauns: — An Outline of the Theological Literature of Russia* (2 volumes): — *Sermons, Homilies, and Addresses* (4 volumes), of which a detailed account is given by Otto in his *Russian Literature.* Of his personal appearance and kindness of heart dean Stanley makes mention in his *East. Ch. Lectures,* page 525. As a preacher, the dean describes Philaret as one of the first of the present Church of Russia, "whose striking manner renders his sermons impressive even to those who cannot follow the language." See *Meth. Qu. Rev.* July 1873. page 498 sq.; *Union Rev.* March, 1869; Appleton's *Annual Cyclop.* 1867, art. Moscow; *Theoloyisches Literaturblatt* (Bonn, 1873, January and April); *Zion's Herald* (Boston), April 2, 1868; Otto, *Russian Literature,* page 324 sq.: Dixon, *Free Russia,* page 29 sq. (J.H.W.)

Philaret, Theodorus Romanoff

third patriarch of Russia, a near relative by his mother of the last czar of the blood of Rurik, was born in the 16th century. This relationship caused him, in 1599, to be made a monk by Boris Godounof. Elevated in 1605 to the episcopal chair of Rostof by Dmitri, he was in 1610 sent on an embassy to Poland, where he was retained, against the law of nations, a prisoner for nine years. On his return to Moscow, in 1619, he found his son czar, who

appointed him, June 24, of this year, patriarch, and shared with him his sovereignty, so that all the ukases were given in their name, and in all solemnities each had a throne, one as high as the other. This interference of the patriarch in political affairs was fatal to Russia. Michael Romanoff had been called to the throne on the express condition of reigning with the colcurrence of the chamber of the *boyards* and of the states-general, which, from 1613 to 1619, had come to be regarded as a legislative assembly. Philaret exiled the most distinguished boyards, and reduced the states-general to a merely consultative relation. Into spiritual affairs he carried the same retrograde spirit. Without caring for the advice of Oriental patriarchs, he ordained, in 1620, that every member of a Christian confession who should embrace the Russian religion must be baptized again, a regulation which is still in force. He died at Moscow October 1, 1633. His pastoral epistles have been collected in the *A ncienne Bibliotheque Russe,* volume 16. See *Chronique de Nikon; Ilst. of'the Patriarch Philutrete* (in Russian) (Moscow, 1802, 8vo); Satiehtchefet Soloviеf, *History of Russia;* EugBne, *Diet. Hist.* s.v.; Philarbte, archi). of Kharkof, *Hist. de l'Eglise Russe;* Dolgoroukow, *La Verite sur la Russie,* chapter 6. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale,* 39:838.

Philaster

(PHILASTRIUS), a noted hberesiologist of the ancient Latin Church, flourished in the first quarter of the 4th century. He was probally a native of Italy, and came on the stage of theological activity when the Arian controversy was waxing hot, and he was soon interested in it as a most ardent orthodox presbyter seeking the conversion of strayed sheep of the flock. He travelled far and near, seeking everywhere the conversion of the Arians, both high and low. Thus, e.g., he went to Milan to convince bishop Auxentius of the error of his wavs. He was so well liked by the clergy that he was finally elected bishop of Brescia (Brixia), and as such took part in the Council of Aquileia in 361. He died July 18, 387. Philaster's greatest work is his *Liber de hceresibus* (in 156 chapters) (edited by Fabricius, Hamb. 1728; by Galland. *Bibliotheca,* 7:475-521; and by (Ehler in volume 1 of his *Corpus haereseolog.* pages 5-185). There is an affinity of Philaster with Epiphanins, but it is usually accounted for on the ground of the dependence of the former on the latter. This seems to have been the opinion of Augustine *(Epistola* 222 *ad Quodvultdeum).* But Lipsius derives both from a common older source, viz. the work of Hippolytus against thirty-two heresies, and explains the silence of Epiphanius (who mentions

Hippolytus only once) by the unsctupulousness of the authorship of the age, which had no hesitation in decking itself with borrowed plumes. Philaster was very liberal with the name of heresy, extending it to 156 systems. 28 before Christ, and 128 after. He includes peculiar opinions on all sorts of subjects: "Haeresis de stellis coelo affixis, haeresis de peccato Cain, haeresis de Psalterii inequalitate, haeresis de animalibus quatuor in prophetis, haeresis de Septuaginta interpretibus, hseresis de Melchisedech sacerdote, haeresis de uxoribus et concubinis Salomonis!" Philaster's writings first appeared in print at Basle in 1528, edited by Sichardus; they were reprinted in 1539 at Basle, and at other places. In 1677 they were inserted in the *Bibliotheca Patrum Maxima,* 5:701 sq. But the best edition is by Fabricius (Hamb. 1721), with a *Vita Philastri.* See Schrockh, *Kirchengesch.* 9:363-382; Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* 3:931 sq.; Alzog, *Patrologie, §* 63. (J.H.W.)

Phileas Of Thumite,

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

Phile'mon

*(*Φιλήμων, *affectionate),* a Christian to whom Paul addressed his epistle in behalf of Onesimus. A.D. 57. He was a native probably of Colosse, or at all events lived in that city when the apostle wrote to himi; first, because Onesimus was a Colossian (<5104>Colossians 4:9); and, secondly, because Archippus was a Colossian (verse 17), whom Paul associates with Philemon at the beginning of his letter (Philemon 1, 2). Wieseler *(Chronologic,* page 452) argues, indeed, from <5104>Colossians 4:17, that Archippus was a Laodicean; but the εἴπατε in that passage on which the poilnt turns refers evidently to the Colossians (of whom Archippus was one therefore), and not to the Church at Laodicea spoken of in the previous verse, as Wieseler inadvertently supposes. Theodoret *(Proaem. in Epist. ad Phil.)* states the ancient opinion in saying that Philemon was a citizen of Colossme, and that his house was pointed out there as late as the 5th century. The legendary history supplies nothing on which we can rely. It is

related that Philemon became bishop of Colossae *(Constit. Apost.* 7:46), and died as a martyr under Nero. From the title of" fellow-workman" (συνεργός) given him in the first verse, some (Michaelis, *Einleit.* 2:1274) make him a deacon, but without proof. But, according to Pseudo-Dorotheus, lie had been bishop in Gaza (see Witsius, *Mliscel. Leidens.* page 193 sq.). The Apphia mentioned in the epistle was nearly connected with Philemon, but whether or not she was his wife there are no means of determlining (comp. esp. Hofmann, *Introd. in Epist. ad Colos.* page 52 sq.; Bertholdt, *Einleit.* 6:3631 sq.). It is apparent from the letter to him that Philemon was a man of property and influence, since he is represented as the head of a numerous household, and as exercising an expensive liberality towards his friends and the poor in general. He was indebted to the apostle Pa!l as the medium of his personal participation in the Gospel. All interpreters agree in assigning that significance to σεαυτ ν μοι προσοφείλεις in Philemon 19. It is not certain under what circumstances they became known to each other. If Paul visited Colosse when he passed through Phrygia on his second missionary journey (<441606>Acts 16:6), it was undoubtedly there, and at that time, that Philemon heard the Gospel and attached himself to the Christian party. On the contrary, if Paul never visited that city in per son, as many critics infer from <510201>Colossians 2:1, then the best view is that he was converted during Paul's protracted stay at Ephesus (<441910>Acts 19:10), A.D. 51-54. That city was the religious and commercial capital of Western Asia Minor. The apostle labored there with such success that "all they who dwelt in Asia heard the word of the Lord Jesus." Phrygia was a neighboring province, and among the strangers who repaired to Ephesus, and had an opportunity to hear the preaching of Paul, may have been the Colossian Philemon. It is evident that on becoming a disciple, he gave no common proof of the sincerity and power of his faith. His character, as shadowed forth in the epistle to him, is one of the noblest which the sacred record makes known to us. He was full of faith and good works, was docile, confiding, grateful, was forgiving, sympathizing, charitable, and a man who on a question of simple justice needed only a hint of his duty to prompt him to go even beyond it *(*ὑπὲρ ὃ λέγω ποιήσεις*.)*. Anly one who studies the epistle will perceive that it ascribes to him these varied qualities; it bestows on him a measure of commendation which forms a striking contrast with the ordinary reserve of the sacred writers. It was through such believers that the primitive Christianity evinced its divine origin, and spread so rapidly among the nations. *SEE PAUL*.

Philemon, Epistile To.

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

I. *Authorship*. — That this epistle was written by the apostle Paul is the constant tradition of the ancient Church. It is expressly cited as such by Origen *(Homil.* 19 *in* <2018>Jeremiah 1:185, ed. Huet.); it is referred to as such by TertullianL *(Nov. Marc.* 5:21); and both Eusebius *(Hist. Eccles.* 3:25) and Jerome *(Prooem. in Ep. ad* Philemon. 4:442) attest its universal reception as suich in the Christian world. The latter, indeed, informs us that some in his day deemed it unworthy of a place in the canon, in consequence of its being occupied with subjects which, in their estimation, it did not become an apostle to write about, save as a mere private individual; but this he, at the same time, shows to be a mistake, and repudiates the legitimacy of such a standard for estimating the genuineness or authority of any book. That this epistle should not have been quoted by several of the fathers who have quoted largely from the other Pauline epistles (e.g. Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, and Cyprian), may be accounted for partly by the brevity of the epistle, and partly by their not having occasion to refer to the subjects of which it treats. We need not urge the expressions in Ignatius, cited as evidence of that apostolic father's knowledge and use of the epistle; though it is difficult to regard the similarity between them and the language in 5:20 as altogether accidental (see Kirchhofer, *Quoellensammlung*, page 205). The Canon of Muratori, which comes to us from the 2d century (Credner, *Geschichte des Kanons*, page 66), enumerates this as one of Paul's epistles. Tertullian says that Marcion admitted it into his collection. Sinope, in Pontus, the birthplace of Marcion, was not far from Colossse where Philemon lived, and the letter would find its way to the neighboring churches at an early period. It is so well attested historically, that, as De Wette says *(Einleitung ins Neue Testament),* its genuineness on that ground is beyond doubt.

Nor does the epistle itself offer anything to conflict with this decision. It is impossible to conceive of a composition more strongly marked within the same limits by those unstudied assonances of thought, sentiment, and expression, which indicate an author's hand, than this short epistle as compared with Paul's other productions. Paley has adduced the undesigned coincidences between this epistle and that to the Colossians with great

force, as evincing the authenticity of both *(Horae Paulinae,* c. 14); and Eichhorn has ingeniously shown how a person attempting, with the Epistle to the Colossians before him, to forge such an epistle as this in the name of Paul, would have been naturally led to a very different arrangement of the historical circumstances and persons from what we find in the epistle which is extant *(Einleit. ins N.T.* 3:302).

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

II. *Person Addressed*. — The epistle is inscribed to Philemon; and with him are joined Apphia (probably his wife), Archippus (his son or brother), and the Church which is in their house, though throughout the epistle it is Philemon alone who is addressed. Philemon was a personal friend and apparently a convert of the apostle (verses 13, 19); one who had exerted himself for the cause of the Gospel and the comfort of those who had embraced it (verses 2-7). His residence was probably at Colossae (comp.

(Colossians 4:9, 17); but whether he held any office in the Church there remains uncertain. In the *Apostolical Constitutions* (7:46) he is said to have been ordained bishop of the Church, but this is not sustained by any other testimony, and is expressly denied by the author of the commentary on St. Paul's epistles ascribed to Hilary. *SEE PHILEMON.*

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

III. *Time and Place of Writing.* — This is generally held to be one of the letters (the others are Ephesians, Colossians, Philippians, and Hebrews) which the apostle wrote during his first captivity at Rome. The arguments which show that he wrote the Epistle to the Colossians in *that city* and at *that period* involve the same conclusion in regard to this; for it is evident from Colossians 4:7, 9, as compared with the contents of this epistle, that Paul wrote the two letters at the same time, and forwarded them to their destination by the hands of Tychicus and Onesimus, who accompanied each other to Colossse. A few modern critics, as Schulz,

Schott, Bottger, Meyer, maintain that this letter and the others assigned usually to the first Roman captivity were written during the two years that Paul was imprisoned at Cesarea (Acts 23:35; 24:27). But this opinion, though supported by some plausible arguments, can be demonstrated with reasonable certainty to be incorrect. *SEE COLOSSIANS, EPISTLE TO THE.*

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

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

consents to receive them with the same gratitude and sense of obligation as if they were bestowed on himself. *SEE ONESIMUS.*

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

V. *Contents*. — The epistle commences with the apostle's usual salutation to those to whom he wrote; after which he affectionately alludes to the

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

VI. *Character*. — The Epistle to Philemon has one peculiar feature — its *aesthetical character* it may be termed — which distinguishes it from all the other epistles, and demands a special notice at our hands. It has been deservedly admired as a model of delicacy and skill in the department of composition to which it belongs. The writer had peculiar difficulties to overcome. He was the common friend of the parties at variance. He must conciliate a man who supposed that he had good reason to be offended. He must commend the offender, and yet neither deny nor aggravate the imputed fault. He must assert the new ideas of Christian.equality in the face of a system which hardly recognised the humanity of the enslaved. He could have placed the question on the ground of his own personal rights, and yet must waive them in order to secure an act of spontaneous kindness. His success must be a triumph of love, and nothing be demanded for the sake of the justice which could have claimed everything. He limits his request to a forgiveness of the alleged wrong, and a restoration to favor and the enjoyment of future sympathy and affection, and yet would so guard his words as to leave scope for all the generosity which benevolence might prompt towards one whose condition admitted of so much

alleviation. These are contrarieties not easy to harmonize; but Paul, it is confessed, has shown a degree of self-denial and a tact in dealing with them which, in being equal to the occasion, could hardly be greater. This letter, says Eichhorn, is a voucher for the apostle's urbanity, politeness, and knowledge of the world. His advocacy of Onesimus is of the most insinuating and persuasive character, and yet without the slightest perversion or concealment of any fact. The errors of Onesimus are admitted, as was necessary, lest the just indignation of his master against him should be roused anew; but they are alluded to in the most admirable manner: the good side of Onesimus is brought to view, but in such a way as to facilitate the friendly reception of him by his master, as a consequence of Christianity, to which he had, during his absence, been converted; and his future fidelity is vouched for by the noble principles of Christianity to which he had been converted. The apostle addresses Philemon on the softest side: who would wilfully refuse to an aged, a suffering, and an unjustly imprisoned friend a request? And such was he who thus pleaded for Onesimus. The person recommended is a Christian, a dear friend of the apostle's, and one who had personally served him: if Philemon will receive him kindly, it will afford the apostle a proof of his love, and yield him joy. What need, then, for long urgency? The apostle is certain that Philemon will, of his own accord, do even more than he is asked. More cogently and more courteously no man could plead *(Einleit. ins N.T.* 3:300).

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

VII. *Commentaries.* — The following are the special exegetical helps on this epistle: Jerome, *Conmmentarii* (in *Opp.* 7:741); also Pseudo-Hicron. *id.* (ibid. 11); Chrysostom, *Homiliae* (in *Opp.* 11:838; also ed. Raphelius, in the latter's *Annotationes,* 2); Alcuin, *Explanatio* (in *Opp.* I, 2); Calvin, *Commentarius* (in *Opp.;* also in English, by Pringle, in the latter's *Comment. on Tim.* and by Edwards, in the *Bib. Repos.* 1836) ; Brentz,

Commentarii (in *Opp.* 7); Pamelius, *Commentlriolus* (Rabani Mauri, *Opp.* 5); Major, *Enarratio* (Vitemb. 1565, 8vo); Danatus, *Commentarius* (Genev. 1579, 8vo); Hyperius, *Commentarius* [includ. Timothy and Titus] (Tigur. 1582, fol.); Feuardant (R.C.), *Commentarius* (Paris, 1588, 8vo); Rollock, *Commentarius* (Genev. 1602, 8vo)); Attersoll, *Commentary* (Lond. 1612, 1633, fol.); Gentilis, *Commentarius* (Norib. 1618, 4to); Dyke, *Exposition* (Lond. 1618, 4to; also in Dutch, in his *Wercke,* Amst. 1670, page 793); Rapine (R.C.), *Exposition* [French] (Par. 1632, 8vo); Jones, *Commentary* [includ. Heb.] (Lold. 1635, fol.); Himmel, *Commnentarius* (Jen. 1641, 4to); Vincent (l.c.), *Explicatio* (Par. 1647, 8vo); Crucius, *Verklaaring* (Harlem, 1649, 8vo); Habert (R.C.), *Expositio* [includ. Timothy and Titus] (Par. 1656, 8vo); Franckenstein, *Observationes* (Hal. 1657, 4to; Lips. 1665, 12mo); Taylor, *Commentarius* (Lond. 1659, fol.); Hummel, *Explanatio* (Tigur. 1670, fol.); Fecht, *Expositio* (Rost. 1696. 4to); Schmid, *Paraphrasis* (Hamb. 1704, 4to, and later); Smalridge, *Sermon* (in *Sermons,* Oxf. 1724, fol.); Lavater, *Predigt.* (St. Gall, 1785 sq., 2 volumes, 8vo); Klotzsch, *De occasione,* etc. (Viteb. 1792, 4to); Niemeyer, *Program.* (Hal. 1802, 4to); Wildschut, *De dictione,* etc. (Tr. ad Rh. 1809, 8vo); Buckminster, *Sermon* (in *Sermons,* Bost. 1815); Hagenbach, *Interpretatio* (Basil. 1829, 4to); Parry, *Exposition* (Lond. 1834, 12mo); Rothe, *Interpretatio* (Brem. 1844, 8vo); Koch, *Commentar* (Zur. 1846, 8vo); Kuhne, *Auslegung* (Leips. 1856, 8vo) ; Ellicott, *Commentary* (Lond. 1857, 8vo); Hackett, *Revised Translation* (Amer. Bible Union, 1860, 12mo); Bleek, *Vorlesungen* [includ. Ephesians and Colossians] (Berl. 1865, 8vo); Lightfoot, *Notes* [includ. Colossians] (Loud. 1875, 8vo). *SEE EPISTLE.*

Phile'tus

(Φίλητος, *beloved),* an apostate Christian, possibly a disciple of Hymenaeus, with whom he is associated in 2 Timothy 2:17, and who is named without him in an earlier epistle (1 Timothy 1:20). A.D. 58-64. Waterland *(Importance ofthe Doctrine of the Holy Trinity,* chapter 4, in his *Works,* 3:459) condenses in a few lines the substance of many dissertations which have been written concerning their opinions, and the sentence which was inflicted upon at least one of them. "They appear to have been persons who believed the Scriptures of the O.T., but misinterpreted them, allegorizing away the doctrine of the resurrection, and resolving it all into figure and metaphor. The delivering over unto Satan seems to have been a form of excommunication declaring the person reduced to the state of a

heathen; and in the apostolical age it was accompanied with supernatural or miraculous effects upon the bodies of the persons so delivered." Walch is of opinion that they were of Jewish origin; Hammond counnects them with the Gnostics; Vitringa (with less probability) with the Sadducees. They understood the resurrection to signify the knowledge and profession of the Christian religion, or regeneration and conversion, according to Walch, whose dissertation, *De Hymenaeo et Phileto,* in his *Miscellanuea Sacra,* 1744, pages 81-121, seems to exhaust the subject. Among writers who preceded him may be named Vitringa, *Observ. Sacr.* 4:9, pages 922-930; Buddoeus, *Ecclesia Apostolica,* 5:297-305. See also, on the heresy, Burton, *Bampton Lectures,* and dean Ellicott's notes on the pastoral epistles; and Potter on *Church Government,* chapter 5, with reference to the sentence. The names of Philetus and Hymenaeus occur separately among those of Caesar's household whose relics have been found in the Columbaria at Rome. *SEE HYMENAEUS.*

Phil'ip

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

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

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

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

book contains traces of the other account (13:23). *SEE ANTRIOCHUS (Epiphanes).*

Picture for Philip V of Macedon.

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

Philip

Picture for Philip coin of

(M. JULIUS PHILIPPUS), emperor of Rome, a native of Bostra, in Trachonitis, according to some authorities, after serving with distinction in the Roman armies, was promoted by the later Gordian to the command of the imperial guards after the death of Misitheus, A.D. 243. In the following year he accompanied Gordian in his expedition into Persia, where he contrived to excite a mutiny among the soldiers by complaining that the emperor was too young to lead an army in such a difficult undertaking. The mutineers obliged Gordian to acknowledge Philip as his colleague; and in a short time Philip, wishing to reign alone, caused Gordian to be murdered. In a letter to the senate he ascribed the death of Gordian to illness, and the senate acknowledged him as emperor. Having made peace with the Persians, he led the army back into Syria, and arrived at Antioch for the Easter solemnities. Eusebius, who with other Christian writers maintains that Philip was a Christian, states as a report that he went with his wife to attend the Christian worship at Antioch, but that Babila, bishop of that city,

refused to permit him to enter the church, as being guilty of murder, upon which Philip acknowledged his guilt, and placed himself in the ranks of the penitents. This circumstance is also stated by John Chrysostom. From Antioch Philip came to Rome, and the following year, 245, assumed the consulship with T.F. Titianus, and marched against the Carpi, who had invaded Moesia, and defeated them. In 247 Philip was again con. sul, with his son of the same name as himself, and their consulship was continued to the following year, when Philip celebrated with great splendor the thousandth anniversary of the building of Rome. An immense number of wild beasts were brought forth and slaughtered in the amphitheatre and circus. In the next year, under the consulship of Emilianus and Aquilinus, a revolt broke out among the legions on the Danube, who proclaimed emperor a centurion named Carvilius Marinus, whom, however, the soldiers killed shortly after. Philip, alarmed at the state of these provinces, sent thither Decius as commander, but Decius had no sooner arrived at his post than the soldiers proclaimed him emperor. Philip marched against Decius, leaving his son at Rome. The two armies met near Verona, where Philip was defeated and killed, as some say by his own troops. On the news reaching Rome, the praetorians killed his son also, and Decius was acknowledged emperor in 249. Eutropius states that both Philips, father and son, were numbered among the gods. It is doubtful whether Philip was really a Christian, but it seems certain, as stated by Eusebius and Dionysius of Alexandria, that under his reign the Christians enjoyed full toleration, and were allowed to preach publicly. Gregory of'Nyssa states that during that period all the inhabitants of Neo-Caesarea,in Pontus, embraced Christianity, overthrew the idols, and raised temples to the God of the Christians. It appears that Philip during his five years' reign governed with mildness and justice, and was generally popular.

Phil'ip The Apostle

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

1. *Authentic History.* — The Gospels contain comparatively scanty notices of this disciple. A.D. 25-28. He is mentioned as being of Bethsaida, the city of Andrew and Peter (<430144>John 1:44), and apparently was among the Galilaean peasants of that district who flocked to hear the preaching of the Baptist. The manner in which John speaks of him, the repetition by him of the selfsame words with which Andrew had brought to Peter the good

news that the Christ had at last appeared, all indicate a previous friendship with the sons of Jonah and of Zebedee, and a consequent participation in their Messianic hopes. The close union of the two in John vi and xii suggests that he may hlave owed to Andrew the first tidings that the hope had been fulfilled. The statement that Jesus *found* him (<430143>John 1:43) implies a previous seeking. To him first in the whole circle of the disciples were spoken the words so full of meaning, "Follow me" *(ibid.).* Philip was thus the fourth of the apostles who attached themselves to the person of Jesus — of those who "left all and followed him." As soon as he has learned to know his Master, he is eager to communicate his discovery to another who had also shared the same expectations. He speaks to Nathanael, probably on his arrival in Cana (see <432102>John 21:2; comp. Ewald, *Gesch.* 5:251), as if they had not seldom communed together of the intimations of a better time, of a divine kingdom, which they found in their sacred books. We may well believe that he, like his friend, was an "Israelite indeed in whom there was no guile." In the lists of the twelve apostles in the synoptic Gospels, his name is as uniformly at the head of the second group of four as the name of Peter is at that of the first (<400103>Matthew 10:3; <410318>Mark 3:18; <420614>Luke 6:14); and the facts recorded by John give the reason of this priority. In those lists again we find his name uniformly coupled with that of Bartholomew, and this has led to the hypothesis that the latter is identical with the Nathanael of <430145>John 1:45, the one being the personal name, the other, like Barjonah or Bartimaeus, a patronymic. Donaldson *(Jashmar,* page 9) looks on the two as brothers, but the precise mention of τὸν ἴδιον ἄδελφον) in 5:41, and its omission here, is, as Alford remarks (on <400103>Matthew 10:3), against this hypothesis.

Philip apparently was among the first company of disciples who were with the Lord at the commencement of his ministry, at the marriage of Cana, on his first appearance as a prophet in Jerusalem (John 2). When John was cast into prison, and the work of declaring the glad tidings of the kingdom required a new company of preachers, we may believe that he, like his companions and friends, received a new call to a more constant discipleship (<400418>Matthew 4:18-22). When the Twelve were specially set apart to their office, he was numbered among them. The first three Gospels tell us nothing more of him individually. John, with his characteristic fulness of personal reminiscences, records a few significant utterances. The earnest, simple-hearted faith which showed itself in his first conversion, required, it would seem, an education; one stage of this may be traced, according to

Clement of Alexandria *(Strom.* 3:25), in the history of Matthew 8:21. That Church father assumes that Philip was the disciple who urged the plea, "Suffer me first to go and bury my father," and who was reminded of a higher duty by the command, "Let the dead bury their. dead; follow thou me." When the Galilaean crowds had halted on their way to Jerusalem to hear the preaching of Jesus (John 6:5-9), and were faint with hunger, it was to Philip that the question was put, "Whence shall we buy bread that these may eat?" "And this he said," John adds, "to prove him, for he himself knew what he would do." The answer, "Two hundred pennyworth of bread is not sufficient for them that every one may take a little," shows how little he was prepared for the work of divine power that followed. It is noticeable that here, as in John 1, he appears in close connection with Andrew. Bengel and others suppose that this was because the charge of providing food had been committed to Philip, while Chrysostom and Theodore of Mopsuestia rather suppose it was because this apostle was weak in faith.

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

There is a connection not difficult to be traced between this fact and that which follows on the last recurrence of Philip's name in the history of the Gospels. The desire to see Jesus gave occasion to the utterance of words in which the Lord spoke more distinctly than ever of the presence of his Father with him, in the voice from heaven which manifested the Father's will (verse 28). The words appear to have sunk into the heart of at least one of the disciples, and he brooded over them. The strong cravings of a passionate but unenlightened faith led him to feel that one thing was vet wanting. They heard their Lord speak of his Father and their Father. He was going to his Father's house. They were to follow him there. But why should they not have even now a vision of the divine glory? It was part of the childlike simplicity of his nature that no reserve should hinder the

expression of the craving, "Lord, show us the Father, and it sufficeth us" (14:8). And the answer to that desire belonged also specially to him. He had all along been eager to lead others to *see* Jesus. He had been with him, looking on him from the very commencement of his ministry, and yet he had not known him. He had thought of the glory of the Father as consisting in something else than the Truth, Righteousness, Love that he had witnessed in the Son. "Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? He that hath seen me hath seen the Father; and how sayest thou, then, Show us the Father?" (<4814>John 14:9). No other fact connected with the name of Philip is recorded in the Gospels. The close relation in which we have seen him standing to the sons of Zebedee and Nathanael might lead us to think of him as one of the two unnamed disciples in the list of fishermen on the Sea of Tiberias who meet us in John 21. He is among the company of disciples at Jerusalem after the asdension (<4013>Acts 1:13) and on the day of Pentecost.

2. *Traditionary Notices.* — Besides the above all is uncertain and apocryphal. Philip is mentioned by Clement of Alexandria as having had a wife and children, and as having sanctioned the marriage of his daughters instead of binding them to vows of chastity *(Strom.* 3:52; Euseb. *H.E.* 3:30); and he is included in the list of those who had borne witness of Christ in their lives, but had not died what was commonly looked on as a martyr's death *(Strovm.* 4:73). There is nothing improbable in the statement that he preached the Gospel in Phrygia (Theodoret, *in Psalm* 116; Niceph. *H.E.* 2:36). Polycrates (in Euseb. *H.E.* 3:31), bishop of Ephesus, speaks of him as having fallen asleep in the Phrygian Hierapolis, as having had two daughters who had grown old unmarried, and a third, with special gifts of inspiration *(*ἐν Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι πολιτευσαμένη*)*, who had died at Ephesus. There seems, however, in this mention of the daughters of Philip, to be some confusion between the apostle and the evangelist. Eusebius in the same chapter quotes a passage from Caius, in which the four daughters of Philip, prophetesses, are mentioned as living with their father at Hierapolis, and as buried there with him, and himself connects this fact with <4421>Acts 21:8, as if they referred to one and the same person. Polycrates in like manner refers to him in the Easter Controversy, as an authority for the Quartodeciman practice (Euseb. *H.E.* 5:24). It is noticeable that even Augustine *(Serm.* 266) speaks with some uncertainty as to the distinctness of the two Philips.

Epiphanius (26:13) mentions a Gospel of Philip as in use among the Gnostics. *SEE GOSPELS, SPURIOUS*.The apocryphal *"Acta Pilippi"* are utterly wild and fantastic, and if there is any grain of truth in them, it is probably the bare fact that the apostle or the evangelist labored in Phrygia, and died at Hierapolis. He arrives in that city with his sister Mariamne and his friend Bartholomew. The wife of the proconsul is converted. The people are drawn away from the worship of a great serpent. The priests and the proconsul seize on the apostles and put them to the torture. John suddenly appears with words of counsel and encouragement. Philip, in spite of the warning of the Apostle of Love reminding him that he should return good for evil, curses the city, and the earth opens and swallows it up. Then his Lord appears and reproves him for his vindictive anger, and those who had descended to the abyss are raised out of it again. The tortures which Philip had suffered end in his death, but, as a punishment for his offence, he is to remain for forty days excluded from Paradise. After his death a vine springs ulp on the spot where his blood had fallen, and the juice of the grapes is used for the Eucharistic cup (Tischendorf, *Acta Apocrypha*, pages 75-94). The book which contains this narrative is apparently only the last chapter of a larger history, and it fixes the journey and the death as after the eighth year of Trajan. It is uncertain whether the other apocryphal fragment professing to give an account of his labors in Greece is part of the same work, but it is at least equally legendary. He arrives in Athens clothed, like the other apostles, as Christ had commanded, in an outer cloak and a linen tunic. Three hundred philosophers dispute with him. They find themselves baffled, and send for assistance to Ananias, the high-priest at Jerusalem. He puts on his pontifical robes, and goes to Athens at the head of five hundred warriors. They attempt to seize on the apostle, and are all smitten with blindness. The heavens open; the form of the Son of Man appears, and all the idols of Athens fall to the ground; and so on through a succession of marvels, ending with his remaining two years in the city, establishing a Church there, and then going to preach the Gospel in Parthia *(ibid.* pages 95-104).

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

In pictorial art Philip is represented as a man of middle age, scanty beard, and benevolent face. His attribute is a cross which varies in form — sometimes a small cross in his hand; again, a high cross in the form of a T,

or a staff with a small cross at the top. It has three significations: it may represent the power of the cross which he held before the dragon; or his martyrdom; or his mission as preacher of the cross of Christ. He is the patron-saint of Brabant and Luxembourg. His anniversary is May 1.

Phil'ip The Evangelist

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

The after-history of Philip warrants the belief, in any case, that his office was not simply that of the later Diaconate. It is no great presumption to think of him as contributing hardly less than Stephen to the great increase of disciples which followed on this fresh organization, as sharing in that wider, more expansive teaching which shows itself for the first time in the oration of the protomartyr, and in which he was the forerunner of Paul. We should expect the man who had been his companion and fellow-worker to go on with the work which he had left unfinished, and to break through the barriers of a simply national Judaism. So accordingly we find him in the next stage of his history. The persecution of which Saul was the leader must have stopped the "daily ministrations" of the Church. The teachers who had been most prominent were compelled to take to flight, and Philip

was among them. The cessation of one form of activity, however, only threw him forward into another. It is noticeable that the city of Samaria is the first scene of his activity (Acts 8). He is the precursor of Paul in his work, as Stephen had been in his teaching. It falls to his lot, rather than to that of an apostle, to take that first step in the victory over Jewish prejudice and the expansion of the Church, according to its Lord's command. As a preparation for that work there may have been the Messianic hopes which were cherished by the Samaritans no less than by the Jews (<40425>John 4:25), the recollection of the two days which had witnessed the presence there of Christ and his disciples (verse 40), even perhaps the craving for spiritual powers which had been roused by the strange influence of Simon the Sorcerer. The scene which brings the two into contact with each other, in which the magician has to acknowledge a power over nature greater than his own, is interesting rather as belonging to the life of the heresiarch than to that of the evangelist. *SEE SIMON MAGUS*. It suggests the inquiry whether we can trace through the distortions and perversions of the "hero of the romance of heresy," the influence of that phase of Christian truth which was likely to be presented by the preaching of the Hellenistic evangelist.

This step is followed by another. He is directed by an angel of the Lord to take the road that led down from Jerusalem to Gaza on the way to Egypt. *SEE GAZA*. A chariot passes by in which there is a man of another race, whose complexion or whose dress showed him to be a native of Ethiopia. From the time of Psammetichus there had been a large body of Jews settled in that region, and the eunuch or chamberlain at the court of Candace might easily have come across them and their sacred books, might have embraced their faith, and become by circumcision a proselyte of righteousness. He had been on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem. He may have heard there of the new sect. The history that follows is interesting as one of the few records in the N.T. of the process of individual conversion, and orie which we may believe Luke obtained, during his residence at Coesarea, from the evangelist himself. The devout proselyte reciting the prophecy which he does not understand — the evangelist-preacher running at full speed till he overtakes the chariot — the abrupt question — the simple-hearted answer — the unfolding, from the starting-point of the prophecy, of the glad tidings of Jesus — the craving for the means of admission to the blessing of fellowship with the new society — the simple baptism in the first stream or spring — the instantaneous, abrupt departure

of the missionary-preacher, as of one carried away by a divine impulse — these help us to represent to ourselves much of the life and work of that remote past. On the hypothesis which has just been suggested, we may think of it as being the incident to which the mind of Philip himself recurred with most satisfaction. A brief sentence tells us that he continued his work as a preacher at Azotus (Ashdod), and among the other cities which had formerly belonged to the Philistines, and, following the coast-line, came to Caesarea.

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

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

Phil'ip Herod

(Φίλιππος ʽ Ηηρώδης), a son of Herod the Great by Mariamune, the daughter of Simon the high-priest. He was the first husband of Herodias, who was taken from him by his brother Herod Antipas (<4014B>Matthew 14:3; Mark, 6:17; <4019>Luke 3:19). A.D. ante 25. Having been disinherited by his father, Philip appears to have lived a private life. He is called *Herod* by Josephus *(Ant.* 17:1, 2; 4, 2; 18:5. 1; *War,* 1:28, 4; 30, 7). *SEE HEROD*.

Phil'ip The Tetrarch

Picture for Philip theTetrarch

(Φίλιππος ὁ τετράρχης), tetrarch of Batanaea, Traclionitis, and Auranitis (<4001>Luke 3:1); the two latter appear to have been regarded by Luke as included in Ituraea. Philip was the son of Herod the Great by his wife Cleopatra, and own brother of Herod Antipas; at his death his tetrarchy was annexed to Syria. From him the city Caesarea Philippi took its name (Josephus, Ant. 17:1, 3; 11:4; 18:4,6; *War,* 1:28, 4; 2:6, 3). Philip ruled from B.C. 4 to A.D. 34. *SEE HEROD*.

Philip (St.) Benozzi (San Filippo Beniti, or Benizzi)

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

Philip Of Caesarea

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

Philip Of Gortyna

a Christian writer of the 2d century, flourished as bishop of the Church at Gortyna, in Crete, and was spoken of in the highest terms by Dionysius of Corinth in a letter to the Church at Gortyna and the other churches in Crete (apud Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* 4:23), as having inspired his flock with manly courage, apparently during the persecutions of Marcus Aurelius. Philip wrote a book against Marcion (q.v.), which was highly esteemed by the ancients, but is now lost; Trithemilus speaks of it as extant in his day, but

his exactness as to whether books were in existence or not is not great. He also states that Philip wrote *Ad Diversos Epistolce* and *Varii Tractatus,* but these are not mentioned by the ancients. See Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* 4:21, 23, 25; Jerome, *De tiris Illustr.* c. 30; Trithemius, *De Scriptor. Eccles.* c. 19; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* ad ann. 172 (ed. Oxford, 1740-1743), 1:74; Lardner, *Works* (see Index). — Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog.* s.v.

Philip Of Moscow

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

Philip (St.) Of Neri

SEE NERI, FILIPPO.

Philip Of Opus

Suidas (s.v. Φιλόσοφος) has this remarkable passage: "——, a philosopher who divided the *Leges* (s. *De Legibus)* of Plato into twelve books (for he is said to have added the thirteenth himself), and was a hearer of Socrates and of Plato himself; devoting himself to the contemplation of the heavens *(*σχολάσας τοῖς μετεώροις *')*. He lived in

the days of Philip of Macedon." Suidas then gives a long list of works written by Philip. It is evident that the passage as it stands in Suidas is imperfect, and that the name of the author of the numerous works which he mentions has been lost from the commencement of the passage. It appears, however, from the extract occupying its proper place in the Lexicon according to its present heading, that the defect existed in the source from which Suidas borrowed. Kuster, the editor of Suidas *(not. in loc.),* after long investigation, was enabled to supply the omission by comparing a passage in Diogenes Laertius (3:37), and to identify “the philosopher" of Suidas with Philip of the Locrian town of Opus, near the channel which separates Euboea from the mainland. The passage in Laertius is as follows: "Some say that Philip the Opuntian transcribed his (Plato's) work, *De Legibus,* which was written in wax (i.e., on wooden tablets covered with a coat of wax). They say also that the Ἐπινόμις (the thirteenth book of the *De Legibus)* is his," i.e., Philip's. The *Epinomiis,* whether written by Philip or by Plato, is usually included among the works of the latter. Diogenes Laertius elsewhere (3:46) enumerates Philip among the disciplesof Plato. See Fabricius, *Bibl. Graec.* 3:104.

Philip The Presbyter

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

Vallarsi, *Opera Hieron.* volume 3, col. 825, etc.; volume 11, col. 565, 566; Fabricius, *Biblioth. Med. et Infim. Latin.* 5:295, ed. Mansi.

Philip Of Side

*(*ὁ Σιδίτης or ὁ σιδέτης , or ὁ ἀπο Σίδης), a Christian writer of the first half of the 5th century, was born probably in the latter part df the 4th century. He was a native of Side, in Pamphylia, and according to his own account in the fragment published by Dodwell (see below), when Rhodon. who succeeded Didymus in charge of the catecheticai school of Alexandria, transferred that school to Side, Philip became one of his pupils. If we suppose Didymuns to have retained the charge of the school till his death, A.D). 396, at the advanced age of eighty-six, the removal of the school cannot have taken place long before the close of the century, and we may infer that Philip's birth could scarcely have been earlier than A.D. 380. He was a kinsman of Troilus of Side, the rhetorician, who was tutor to Socrates the ecclesiastical historian, and was indeed so eminent that Philip regarded his relationship to him as a subject of exultation (Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* 7:27). Having entered the Church, he was ordained deacon, and had much intercourse with Chrysostom; in the titles of some MSS. he is styled his Syncellus, or personal attendant, which makes it probable that he was, from the early part of his ecclesiastical career, connected with the Church at Constantinople. Liberatus *(Breviar.* c. 7) says he was ordained deacon by Chrysostom; but Socrates, when speaking of his intimacy with that eminent man, does not say he was ordained by him. Philip devoted himself to literary pursuits, and collected a large library. He cultivated the Asiatic or diffuse style of composition, and became a voluminous writer. At what period of his life his different works were produced is not known. His Ecclesiastical History was, as we shall see, written after his disappointment in obtaining the patriarchate; but as his being a candidate for that high office seems to imply some previous celebrity, it may be inferred that his work or works in reply to the emperor Julian's attacks on Christianity were written at an earlier period. On the death of Atticus, patriarch of Constantinople, A.D. 425, Philip, then a presbyter, apparently of the great Church of Constantinople, and Proelus, another presbyter, were proposed, each by his own partisans, as candidates for the vacant see; but the whole people were bent upon the election of Sisinnius, also a presbyter, though not of Constantinople, but of a Church in Elaea one of the suburbs (Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* 7:26). The statement of Socrates as to the unanimity of the popular wish leads to the inference that the supporters

of Philip and Proclus were among the clergy. Sisinnius was the successful candidate; and Philip, mortified at his defeat, made in his Ecclesiastical History such severe strictures on the election of his more fortunate rival that Socrates could not venture to transcribe his remarks; and has expressed his strong disapproval of his headstrong temper. On the death of Sisinnius (A.D. 428) the supporters of Philip were again desirous of his appointment, but the emperor, to prevent disturbances, determined that no ecclesiastic of Constantinople should succeed to the vacancy; and the ill-fated heresiarch Nestorius, from Antioch, was consequently chosen. After the deposition of Nestorius at the Council of Ephesus (A.D. 431), Philip was a third time candidate for the patriarchate, but was again unsuccessful. Nothing is known of him after this. It has been conjectured that he was dead before the next vacancy in the patriarchate, A.D. 434, when his old competitor Proclus was chosen. Certainly there is no notice that Philip was again a candidate; but the prompt decision of the emperor Theodosius in Proclus's favor prevented all competition, so that no inference can be drawn from Philip's quiescence.

Philip wrote, *Multa volumina contra Imperatorem Julianum Apostata* (Liberatus. *Breviar.* c. 7; comp. Socrat. *H.E.* 7:27). It is not clear from the expression of Liberatus, which we have given as the title, whether Philip wrote many works, or, as is more likely, one work in many parts, in reply to Julian: — Ἱστορία Χριστιανική, *Historia Christianae.* The work was very large, consisting of thirty-six Βίβλοι or Βιβλία, *Libri,* each subdivided into twenty-four τόμοι or λόγοι, i.e., sections. This voluminous work seems to have comprehended both sacred and ecclesiastical history, beginning from the creation, and coming down to Philip's own day, as appears by his record of the election of Sisinnius, already noticed. It appears to have been finished not very long after that event. Theophanes places its completion in A.M. 5922, Alex. aera =A.D. 430; which, according to him, was the year before the death of Sisinnius. That the work was completed before the death of Sisinnius is probable from the apparent silence of Philip as to his subsequent disappointments in obtaining the patriarchate; but as Sisinnius, accortding to a more exact chronology, died A.D. 428, we may conclude that the work was finished in or before that year, and, consequently, that the date assigned by Theophanes is rather too late. The style was verbose and wearisome, neither polished nor agreeable; and the matter such as to display ostentatiously the knowledge of the writer rather than to conduce to the

improvement of the reader. It was in fact, crammed with matter of every kind, relevant and irrelevant questions of geometry, astronomy, arithmetic, and music; descriptions of islands, mountains, and trees, rendered it cumbersome and unreadable. Chronological arrangement was disregarded. The work is lost, with the exception of three fragments. One of these, *De Scholae Catecheticae Alexandrines Successione,* on the succession of teachers in the catechetical school of Alexandria, was published from a MS. in the Bodleian Library at Oxford, by Dodwell, with his *Dissertationes in Irenaeun* (Oxf. 1689, 8vo), and has been repeatedly reprinted. It is given in the ninth volume of the *Bibliotheca Patrum* of Galland, page 401. Another fragment in the same MS., *De Constantino Maximiano, et Licinio Augustis,* was prepared for lpublication by Crusius, but has never, we believe, been actually published. The third fragment, τὰ γενόμενα ἐν Περσίδι μεταξὺ Χριστιανῶν ῾Ελλήρων τε καὶ Ἰουδαίων, *Act Disputationis de Christo, in Perside, inter Christianos, Gentiles, et Judceos habitse,* is (or was) in the Imperial Library at Vienna. Philip was present at the disputation. See Socrates, *H.E.* 7:26, 27, 29, 35; Liberatus, l.c.; Phot. *Bibl.* cod. 35; Theophan. *Chronog.* page 75, ed. Paris; page 60, ed. Venice; 1:135, ed. Bonn; Tillemont, *Hist. des Empereurs,* 6:130; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* ad ann. 418, 1:395; Oudin, *De Scriptoribus Eccles.* volume 1, col. 997; Fabricius, *Bibl. Graec.* 6:739, 747, 749; 7:418; 10:691; Galland, *Biblioth. Patrum,* volume 9, *Pol.* c. 11; Lambecius, *Commentar. de Biblioth. Caesaraea,* lib. s. volume 5, col. 289; volume 6, pars 2, col. 406, ed, Kollar.

Philip The Solitary

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

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

The work, in its complete state, consisted of five books; but most of the MSS. are mutilated or otherwise defective, and want the first book. Some

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

Biblioth. Caesarea, lib. s. volume 5. col. 7697, and 141, cod. 213, 214, 215, and 232, ed. Kollar; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* ad ann. 1095, 2:163; Oudin, *De Scriptor. Eccles.* volume 2, col. 851.

Philip Of The (Most Holy) Trinity

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

Philip, John, D.D.

a missionary to Africa, was born at Kirkcally, Fifeshire, Scotland, April 14, 1775. His father, who was teacher of an English school, gave him his elementary education; and his mother, who is described as "a woman of earnest and devoted piety," endeavored, with all the powerful insinuating influence of maternal persuasion, to imbue his infant mind with the fear of God and a reverence for his Word. Circumstances occasioned his removal while vet a boy to reside in the house of an uncle at Leven; and there his character rapidly developed itself in the leading features of intellectual and moral individuality that distinguished him through life. In his nineteenth year he removed to Dundee, where, having completed his term of apprenticeship to a linen-manufacturer, he relinquished that trade for the office of clerk in a factory, an office which; without regard to salary, he preferred, from the greater opportunities it afforded him for mental improvement. The Congregational minister with whose Church he connected himself conceived a strong attachment for him, and through his influence Philip was introduced to the theological college at Hoxton. After having completed the regular term of three years' study, he was licensed as a preacher and ordained in 1804. In the course of Providence he was led to visit Aberdeen, where his pulpit ministrations proved so useful that he received an invitation, which he accepted, to undertake the pastoral charge of a Congregational Church recently formed in that town. His heart had for many years been strongly set on the missionary work, when the London Missionary Society proposed to him to undertake the superintendence of their numerous missions in South Africa. The proposal, though at first strenuously opposed by his attached congregation, to whom he had then ministered for fourteen years, was at length accepted by both as the will of God, and in 1820 Dr. Philip sailed for Africa. He there assumed charge of the Church in Union Chapel, Cape Town, and for thirty years besides held the office of superintendent of the society's missions. By his labors in this

field he is principally known. But besides these direct evangelical labors, Dr. Philip made most persevering and successful efforts on behalf of the down-trodden tribes of South Africa. By his intercourse with the natives he obtained evidence of the disastrous effects of the prevailing: system, and ere long the strong arm of British power was stretched out for the defence of those who had so long been the white man's prey. These labors gained for him the title of "Liberator of Africa." Dr. Philip died in 1850, as became a. missionary, amid the people to whose spiritual and temporal welfare the energies of his life had been devoted. He published a work entitled *Researches in Africa*, which was received with great interest by the English government.

Philip, Rooert, D.D.

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

Introductory Essay to the Practical Works of the Reverend Richard Baxter (1838, 4 volumes). (J.H.W.)

Philipoftschins or Philiponians

SEE PHILIPPINS.

Philip'pi

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

1. *Apostolic Associations.* — St. Paul, when, on his first visit to Macedonia in company with Silas, he embarked at Troas, made a straight run to Samothrace, and from thence to Neapolis, which he reached on the second day (⁴⁴¹⁶¹Acts 16:11). The Philippi of Paul's day was situated in a plain, on the banks of a deep and rapid stream called Gangites (now Angista). The ancient walls followed the course of the stream for some distance; and in this section of the wall the site of a gate is seen, with the ruins of a bridge nearly opposite. In the narrative of Paul's visit it is said: "On the Sabbath *we went out of the gate by the river (*ἐξήλθομεν τῆς πύλης παρὰ ποταμόν*),*where a meeting for prayer was accustomed to be" (verse 13). It was doubtless by this gate they went out, and by the side of this river the prayer-meeting was held. As Philippi was a military colony, it is probable that the Jews had no synagogue, and were not permitted to hold their worship within the walls. Behind the city, on the north-east, rose lofty mountains; but on the opposite side a vast and rich plain stretched out, reaching on the south-west to the sea, and on the north-west far away among the ranges of Macedonia. On the south-east a rocky ridge, some sixteen hundred feet in height, separated the plain from the bay and town of Neapolis. Over it ran a paved road connecting Philippi with Neapolis. Though the distance between the two was nine miles, yet Neapolis was to Philippi what the Piroeus was to Athens; and hence Paul is said, when journeying from Greece to Syria, to have "sailed away from Philippi;" that is, from Neapolis, its port (20:6).

Philippi was in the province of Macedonia, while Neapolis was in Thrace. Paul, on his first journey, landed at the latter, and proceeded across the mountainroad to the former, which Luke calls "the first city of the division of Macedonia" *(πρώτη τῆς μερίδος τῆς Μακεδονίας πόλις,* <41612>Acts 16:12). The word πρώτη does not, as represented in the A.V., signify "chief." Thessalonica was the chief city of all Macedonia, and Amphipolis of that division *(μερίς)* of it in which Philippi was situated (see Wieseler, *Chron. des Apost. Zeit.* page 37). Πρώτη simply means that Philippi was the "first" city of Macedonia to which Paul came (Alford, *ad loc.;* Conybeare and Howson, *Life of St. Paul,* 1:311, note). In descending the mountain-path towards Philippi the apostle had before him a vast and beautiful panorama. The whole plain, with its green meadows, and clumps of trees, and wide reaches of marsh, and winding streams, lay at his feet; and away beyond it the dark ridges of Macedonia.

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

Paul visited Philippi twice more, once immediately after the disturbances which arose at Ephesus out of the jealousy of the manufacturers of silver shrines for Artemis. By this time the hostile relation in which the Christian doctrine necessarily stood to all purely ceremonial religions was perfectly manifest; and wherever its teachers appeared, popular tumults were to be expected, and the jealousy of the Roman authorities, who dreaded civil disorder above everything else, to be feared. It seems. not unlikely that the second visit of the apostle to Philippi was made specially with the view of

counteracting this particular danger. He appears to have remained in the city and surrounding country a considerable time (Acts 20:1, 2).

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

The Christian community at Philippi distinguished itself in liberality. On the apostle's first visit he was hospitably entertained by Lydia, and when he afterwards went to Thessalonica, where his reception appears to have been of a very mixed character, the Philippians sent him supplies more than once. and were the only Christian community that did so (Philippians 4:15). They also contributed readily to the collection made for the relief of the poor at Jerusalem, which Paul conveyed to them at his last visit (2 Corinthians 8:1-6). It would seem as if they sent further supplies to the apostle after his arrival at Rome. The necessity for these appears to have been urgent, and some delay to have taken place in collecting the requisite funds; so that Epaphroditus, who carried them, risked his life in the endeavor to make tup for lost time *(*μέχρι θανάτου ἤγγισεν παραβουλευσάμενος τῇ ψυχῇ, ἵνα ἀναπληρώσῃ τὸ ὑμῶν ὑστέρημα τῆς προς μὲ λειτουργίας, Philippians 2:30). The delay, however, seems to have somewhat stung the apostle at the time, who fancied his beloved flock had forgotten him (see 4:10-17). Epaphroditus fell ill with fever from his efforts, and nearly died. On recovering he became homesick, and wandering in mind *(*ἀδημονῶν*)* from the weakness which is the sequel of fever; and Paul although intending soon to send Timothy to the Philippian Church, thought it desirable to let Epaphroditus go without delay to them, who had already heard of his sickness. and carry with him the letter which is included in the canon — one which was written after the apostle's imprisonment at Rome had lasted a considerable time. Some domestic troubles connected with religion had already broken out in the community. Euodias and Svntyche, who appear to be husband and wife,

are exhorted to agree with one another in the matter of their common faith; and the former is implored to extend his sympathy to certain females (obviously familiar both to Paul and to him) who did good service to the apostle in his trials at Philippi, and who in some way or other appear to be the occasion of the disagreement between the pair. Possibly a claim on the part of these females to superior insight in spiritual matters may have caused some irritation; for the apostle immediately goes on to remind his readers that the peace of God is something superior to the highest intelligence *(*ὑπερέχουσα πάντα νοῦν*).*

It would seem, as Alford says, that the cruel treatment of the apostle at Philippi had combined with the charm of his personal fervor of affection to knit up a bond of more than ordinary love between him and the Philippian Church. They alone, of all churches, sent subsidies to relieve his temporal necessities" (<3010>Philippians 4:10, 15, 18; <4711>2 Corinthians 11:9; <5102>1 Thessalonians 2:2; Alford, Greek Test., *Prol.* 3:29). The apostle felt their kindness; and during his imprisonment at Rome wrote to them that epistle which is still in our canon. This epistle indicates that at that time some of the Christians there were in the custody of the military authorities as seditious persons, through some proceedings or other connected with their faith *(*ὑμῖν ἐχαρίσθη τὸ ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ, οὐ μόνον τὸ εἰς αὐτὸν πιστεύειν ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ πάσχειν: τὸν αὐτὸν ἀγῶνα ἔχνοτες οιον εἴδετε ἐν ἐμοὶ καὶ νῦν ἀκούετε ἐν ἐμοί, <3029>Philippians 1:29). The reports of the provincial magistrates to Rome would of course describe Paul's first visit to Philippi as the origin of the troubles there; and if this were believed, it would be put together with the charge against him by the Jews at Jerusalem which induced him to appeal to Caesar, and with the disturbances at Ephesus and elsewhere; and the general conclusion at which the government would arrive might not improbably be that he was a dangerous person and should be got rid of. This will explain the strong exhortation of the first eighteen verses of chapter 2, and the peculiar way in which it winds up. The Philippian Christians, who are at the same time suffering for their profession, are exhorted in the most earnest manner, not to firmness (as one might have expected), but to moderationi, to abstinence from all provocation and ostentation of their own sentiments *(*μηδὲν κατὰ ἐριθείαν μηδὲ κενοδοξίαν, verse 3), to humility, and consideration for the interests of others. They are to achieve their salvation with fear and trembling, and without quarrelling and disputing, in order to escape all blame from such charges, that is, as the Roman colonists would bring

against them. If with all this prudence and temperance in the profession of their faith, their religion is still made a penal offence, the apostle is well content to take the consequence — to precede them in martyrdom for it — to be the libation poured out upon them the victims (εἰ καὶ σπένδομαι ἐπὶ τῇ θυσίᾳ καὶ λειτουργίᾳ τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν χαίρω καὶ συγχαίρω πᾶσιν ὑμῖν, verse 17). Of course the Jewish formalists in Philippi were the parties most likely to misrepresent the conduct of the new converts; and hence (after a digression on the subject of Epaphroditus) the apostle reverts to cautions against *them*, such precisely as he had given before-consequently by word of mouth: "Beware of those dogs" — (for they will not be children at the table, but eat the crumbs underneath) — "those doers (and bad doers too) of the law-those flesh-manglers (for *circumcised* I won't call them, we being the true circumcision, etc.") (3:2, 3). Some of these enemies Paul found at Rome, who "*told the story* of Christ insincerely" *(*κατήγγειλαν οὐχ ἁγνῶς, 1:17) in the hope of increasing the severity of his imprisonment by exciting the jealousy of the court. These he opposes to such as *"preached* Christ" *(*ἐκήρυξαν*)* loyally, and consoles himself with the reflection that, at all events, the story circulated, whatever the motives of those who circulated it. See Walch, *Acta Pruli Philippensia* (Jen. 1726); Todd, *The Church at Philippi* (Lond. 1864). *SEE PHILIPPIANS, EPISTLE TO.*

2. *Ancient History*. — Strabo tells us that the old name of Philippi was *Krenides* (7:331); and Appian adds that it was so called from the number of "little fountains" *(*κρηνίδες*)* around the site. He also says that it had another name, *Datus;* but that Philip of Macedon, having taken it from the Thracians, made it a frontier fortress, and gave it his own name *(De Bell. Civ.* 4:105). Philip's city stood upon a hill, probably that seen a little to the south of the present ruins, which may have always formed the citadel, but was in all probability in its origin a factory of the Phoenicians, who were the first that worked the gold-mines in the mountains here, as iin the neighboring Thasos. Appian says that those were in a hill (λόφος) not far from Phiiippi, that the hill was sacred to Dionysus, and that the mines went by the name of "the sanctuary" (τὰ ἄσυλα*)*. But he shows himself quite ignorant of the locality, to the extent of believing the plain of Philippi to be open to the river Strymon, whereas the massive wall of Pangseus is really interposed..between them. In all probability the "hill of Dionysus" and the "sanctuary" are the temple of Dionysus high up the mountains among the Satrie, who preserved their independence against all invaders down to the

time of Herodotus at least. It is more likely that the gold-mines coveted by Philip were the same as those at *Scapte Hyle,* which was certainly in this immediate neighborhood. Before the great expedition of Xerxes, the Thasians had a number of settlements on the main, and this among the number, which produced them eighty talents a year as rent to the state. In the year B.C. 463 they ceded their possessions on the continent to the Athenians: but the colonists, 10,000 in number, who had settled on the Strymon and pushed their encroachments eastward as far as this point, were crushed by a simultaneous effort of the Thracian tribes (Thucydides, 1:100; 4:102; Herodotus, 9:75; Pausanias, 1:29, 4). From that time until the rise of the Macedonian power, the mines seem to have remained in the hands of native chiefs; but when the affairs of Southern Greece became thoroughly embroiled by the policy of Philip, the Thasians made an attempt to repossess themselves of this valuable territory, and sent a colony to the site, then going by the name of "the Springs" (Κρηνίδες). Philip, however, aware of the importance of the position, expelled them and founded Philippi, the last of all his creations. The mines at that time, as was not wonderfil under the circumstances, had become, almost insignificant in their produce; but their new owner contrived to extract more than a thousand talents a year from them, with which he minted the gold coinage called by his name. The proximity of the gold-mines was of course the origin ,of so large a city as Philippi, but the plain in which it lies is one of extraordinary fertility. The position too was on the main road from Rome to Asia, the Via Egnatia, which from Thessalonica to Constantinople followed the same course as the existing post-road. The usual course was to take ship at Brundisium and land at Dyrrachium, from whence a route led across Epirus to Thessalonica. Ignatius was carried to Italy by this route, when sent to Rome to be cast to wild beasts. See Strabo, *Fragnment.* lib. 7; Thucyd. 1:100; 4:102; Herod. 9:75; Diod. Sic. 16:3 sq.; Appian, *Bell. Civ.* 4:101 sq.; Pausan. 1:28, 4.

Picture for Philippi (1)

The famous battle of Philippi, in which the Roman republic was overthrown, was fought on this plain in the year B.C. 42 (Dio. Cass. 46; Appian, l.c.). In honor, and as a memorial of his great victory, Augustus made Philippi a Roman “colony," and its coins bear the legend *Colonia Augusta Jul. Philippensis* (Conybeare and Howson, 1:312). The emperor appears to have founded the new quarter in the plain along the banks of the Gangites. As a colony *(*κολωνία, Acts 16:12) it enjoyed peculiar

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

Picture for Philippi (2)

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

traders, "quorum cophinus foenumque supellex," as will appear from the parallel case of the Egerian fountain near Rome, of whose desecration Juvenal complains *(Sat.* 3:13). Lydia had an establishment in Philippi for the reception of the dyed goods which were imported from Thyatira and the neighboring towns of Asia, and were dispersed by means of packanimals among the mountain clans of the Haemus and Pangaeus, the agents being doubtless in many instances her own coreligionists. High tup in Haemus lay the tribe of the Satrae, where was the oracle of Dionysusnot the rustic deity of the Attic vinedressers, but the prophet-god of the Thracians *(*ὁ θρῃξὶ μάντις, Eurip. *Hecub.* 1267). The "damsel with the spirit of divination" (παιδίσκη ἔχουσα πνεῦμα πύθωνα*)* may probably be regarded as one of the hierodules of this establishment, hired by Philippian citizens, and frequenting the country-market to practice her art upon the villagers who brought produce for the consumption of the town. The fierce character of the mountaineers would render it imprudent to admit them within the wails of the city; just as in some of the towns of North Africa the Kabyles are not allowed to enter, butt have a market allotted to them outside the walls for the sale of the produce they bring. Over such an assemblage only a summary jurisdiction can be exercised; and hence the proprietors of the slave, when they considered themselves injured, and hurried Paul and Silas into the town, to the *agora* — the civic market where the magistrates *(*ἄρχοντες*)* sat — were at once turned over to the military authorities *(*στρατηγοί*),* and these, naturally assuming that a stranger frequenting the extra-mural market must be a Thracian mountaineer or an itinerant trader, proceeded to inflict upon the ostensible cause of a riot (the merits of which they would not attempt to understand) the usual treatment in such cases. The idea of the apostle possessing the Roman franchise, and consequently an exemption from corporal outrage, never occurred to the rough soldier who ordered him to be scourged; and the whole transaction seems to have passed so rapidly that he had no time to plead his citizenship, of which the military authorities first heard the next day. But the illegal treatment *(*ὕβοις*)* obviously made a deep impression on the mind of its victim, as is evident not only from his refusal to take his discharge from prison the next morning (<44167>Acts 16:37), but from a passage in the Epistle to the Church at Thessalonica (<52102>1 Thessalonians 2:2), in which he reminds them of the circumstances under which he first preached the Gospel to them *(*προπαθόντες καὶ ὑβρισθέντες, Καθώς οἴδατε, ἐν Φιλίπποις). Subsequently at Jerusalem, under parallel

circumstances of tumult, he warns the officer (to the great surprise of the latter) of his privilege (<442215>Acts 22:55).

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

Philip'pian

(Φιλιππήσιος), the patrial title of an inhabitant of PHILIPPI (<503415>Philippians 4:15).

Philippians, Epistle To The,

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

I. The canonical *authority,* Pauline *authorship, and integrity* of this epistle were unanimously acknowledged up to the end of the 18th century. Marcion (A.D. 140), in the earliest known canon. held common ground with the Church touching the authority of this epistle (Tertullian, *Adr. AMucirdon,* 4:5; 5:20): it appears in the Muratorian Fragment (Routh, *Reliquiae Sacrae,* 1:395); among the "acknowledged" books in Eusebius (*H.E.* 3:25); in the lists of the Council of Laodicea, A.D. 365, and the Synod of Hippo, 393; and in all subsequent lists, as well as in the Peslito and later versions. Even contemporary evidence may be claimed for it. Philippian Christians who had contributed to the collections for Paul's support at Rome, who had been eye and ear witnesses of the return of Epaphroditus and the first reading of Paul's epistle, may have been still alive at Philippi when Polycarp wrote (A.D. 107) his letter to them, in which (cl. 2, 3) he refers to Paul's epistle as a well-known distinction

belonging to the Philippian Church. It is quoted as Paul's by several of the early Church fathers (Irenaels, 4:18, § 4; Clem. Alex. *Paedag.* 1:6, § 52, and elsewhere; Tertullian. *Adv. Mar.* 5:20; *De Res. Carn.* chapter 23). A quotation from it (Philippians 2:6) is found in the Epistle of the Churches of Lyons and Vienne, A.D. 177 (Eusebius, *H.E.* 5:2). The testimonies of later writers are innumerable. *SEE CANON*.

It is only in very recent times that any doubt has been suggested as to the genuineness of this epistle. Sclrader *(Der Ap. Paulus,* 5:233) first insinuated that the passage Philippians 3:1-4:9 is an interpolation; but he adduces no reason for this but the purely gratuitous one that the connection between Philippians 2:30 and Philippians 4:10 is disturbed bv this intervening section, and that by the excision of this the epistle becomes "more rounded off, and more a genuine occasional letter" — as if any sound critic would reject a passage from an ancient author because in hfis opinion the author's composition would be improved thereby! Baur goes farther than this, and would reject the whole epistle as a Gnostic compositions of a later age *(Paulus,* page 458 sq.). But when he comes to point out "the Gnostic ideas and expressions" by which the epistle is marked, they will be found to exist only in his own imagination, and can only by a perverse ingenuity be forced upon the words of the apostle. Thus, in the statement that Christ ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ ειναι ἴσα θεῷ (Philippians 2:5, 6), Baur finds an allusion to the Gnostic aeon Sophia, in which "existed the outgoing desire with all power to penetrate into the essence of the supreme Father." But not only is this to give the apostle's words a meaning which they do not bear (for however we translate ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο, it evidently expresses an act in the past, not an aim tor the future), but it is manifest that the entire drift of the passage is not to set forth any speculative doctrine, but to adduce a moral inference. This is so manifest that even Baur himself admits it, and by so doing overturns his own position; for it is only on the supposition that what the apostle refers to is *a fact*, and not a mere speculative fancy, that any moral conclusion can be drawn from it. Equally futile is the attempt to find Docetism in the use of the term μορφή — a term used by the apostle in reference to the divine nature — or of the terms ὁμοίωμα, σχῆμα, and εὑρεθῆναι, all of which occur elsewhere in Paul's writings, and are here used to denote simply that Jesus Christ presented himself to the view of men actually as one of themselves (Linemann, *Pauli ad Phil. Ep. cont. Baurium defensa,* Gott.

1847; Bruckner, *Ep. ad Phil. Paulo auctori vindicata cont. Baur.* Lips. 1848). Baur was followed by Schwegler (1846), who argued from the phraseology of the epistle and other internal marks that it is the work not of Paul, but of some Gnostic forger in the 2d century. He too has been answered by Linemann (1847), Brickner (1848), and Resch (1850). 'Even if his inference were a fair consequence from Baur's premises, it would still be neutralized by the strong evidence in favor of Pauline authorship, which Palev *(Horae Paulinae,* chapter 7) has drawn from the epistle as it stands. The arguments of the Tubingen school are briefly stated in Reuss *(Gesch. d. N.T. §* 130-133), and at greater length in Wiesinger's *Commentary.* Most persons who read them will be disposed to concur in the opinion of dean Alford *(N.T.* 3:27, ed. 1856), who regards them as an instance of the insanity of hypercriticism. The canonical authority and the authorship of the epistle may be considered as unshaken.

A question has been raised as to whether the extant Epistle to the Philippians is the only one addressed by Paul to that Church. What has given rise to this question is the expression used by the apostle (3:1), τὰ αὐτὰ γράφειν ὑμῖν, κ.τ.λ., where the writing of the *same* things to them is supposed to refer to the identity of what he is now writing with what he had written in a previous letter. It has also been supposed that Polycarp knew of more than one epistle addressed by the apostle to the Philippians, from his using the plural (ὃς ἀπὼν ὑμῖν ἔγραψεν ἐπιστολάς) in reference to what he had written to them. To this, however, much weight cannot be attached, for there can be no doubt that the Greeks used ἐπιστολαί for a single letter, as the Latins used *litera* (see a multitude of examples in Stephans's *Thesaurus,* s.v.). That Polycarp knew of only one epistle of Paul to the Philippians has been supposed by some to be proved by the passage in the 11th chapter of his letter, preserved in the Latin version, where he says, "Ego autem nihil tale sensi in vobis vel audivi, in quibus laboravit beatlis Paulus qui estis in principio epistolae ejus," etc. But, as Meyver points out, "epistole" here is not the genitive singular, but the nominative plural; and the meaning is not "who are in the beginning of his epistle," which is hardly sense, but (with allusion to 2 Corinthians 3:1) "who are in the beginning [i.e., from the beginning of his preaching the Gospel among you — a common use of ἐν ἀρχῇ, which was the expression probably used by Polycarp] his epistle." It is going too far, however, to say that this passage has no bearing on this question; for if Meyer's construction be correct, it shows that Polycarp did use ἐπιστολαί

for a single epistle. Meyer, indeed, translates "who are his epistles;" but if the allusion is to 2 Corinthians 3:1, we must translate in the singular, the whole Church collectively being the epistle, and not each member an epistle. But though the testimony of Polycarp for a plurality of epistles may be set aside, it is less easy to set aside the testimony of the extant epistle itseli in the passage cited. To refer τὰ αὐτά to the preceding χαίρετε ἐν κυρίῳ seems somewhat difficult, for nowhere previously in this epistle has the apostle expressly enjoined on his readers χαίρειν ἐν κυρίῳ, and one does not see what on this hypothesis is the propriety of such expressions as ὀκνηρόν and ἀσφαλές; and to lay the stress on the γράφειν, as Wieseler proposes *(Chronologie des Ap. Zeit.* page 458), so as to make the apostle refer to some *verbal* message previously sent to the Philippians, the substance of which he was now about to put into *writing,* seems no less so; for not only does the epistle contain no allusion to any oral message, but in this case the writer would have said καὶ γράφειν. A large number of critics follow Pelagius in the explanation, "eadem repetere *que presens dixeram;"* but it may be doubted if so important a clause may be legitimately dragged in to complete the apostle's meaning, without any authority from the context. Hence many have concluded that the apostle alludes to some written communication previously sent by him to the Philippians (so Hahnlein, Flatt, Meyer, Bleek, Schenkel, etc.). But, besides the lack of all evidence of such lost epistles in general, the assumption here must be pronounced ill a high degree doubtful and precarious. Hence we conclude that τὰ αὐτὰ refers to the χαίρειν, which is the pervading thought of the epistle (1:4, 18; 2:17, etc.), and which seems to have been the more dwelt upon as the actual circumstances of the case might very naturally have suggested the contrary feeling (hence ὀκνηρόν). See Ellicott, *ad loc.* Ewald *(Sendschreiben des Ap. Paulus,* page 431) is of opinion that Paul sent several epistles to the Philippians; and he refers to the texts 2:12 and 3:18 as partly proving this. But some additional confirmation or explanation of this conjecture is requisite before it can be admitted as either probabre or necessary.

There is a break in the sense at the end of the second chapter of the epistle, which every careful reader must have observed. It is indeed quite natural that an epistle written amid exciting circumstances, personal dangers, and various distractions should bear in one place at least a mark of interruption. Le Moyne (1685) thought it was anciently divided into two parts. Heinrichs (1810), followed by Paulus (1817), has conjectured from this

abrupt recommencement that the two parts are two distinct epistles, of which the first, together with the conclusion of the epistle (4:21-23), was intended for public use in the Church, and the second exclusively for the apostle's special friends in Philippi. It is not easy to see what sufficient foundation exists for this theory, or what illustration of the meaning of the epistle could be derived from it. It has met with a distinct reply from Krause (1811 and 1818); and the integrity of the epistle has not been questioned by recent critics.

II. *Time and Place of Writing*. — The constant tradition that this epistle was written at Rome by Paul in his captivity was impugned first by Oeder (1732), who, disregarding the fact that the apostle was in prison (<50107>Philippians 1:7, 13, 14) when he wrote, imagined that he was at Corinth (see Wolfs *Cure Philologicae*, 4:168, 270); and then by Paulus (1799), Schulz (1829), Bottger (1837), and Rilliet (1841), in whose opinion the epistle was written during the apostle's confinement at Csesarea (<44223>Acts 24:23). But the references to the "palace" (praetorium, <44013>Acts 1:13), and to "Caesar's household" (<44022>Acts 4:22), seem to point to Rome rather than to Caesarea; and there is no reason whatever for supposing that the apostle felt in Ceesarea that extreme uncertainty of life connected with the approaching decision of his cause which he must have felt towards the end of his captivity at Rome, and which he expresses in this epistle (<50119>Philippians 1:19, 20; <50217>Philippians 2:17; 3:10); and, further, the dissemination of the Gospel described in <50112>Philippians 1:12-18 is not even hinted at in Luke's account of the Caesarean captivity, but is described by him as taking place at Rome (comp. <44223>Acts 24:23 with 28:30, 31). Even Reuss *(Gesch. d. N.T.* 1860), who assigns to Caesarea three of Paul's epistles which are generally considered to have been written at Rome, is decided in his conviction that the Epistle to the Philippians was written at Rome.

Assuming then that the epistle was written at Rome during the imprisonment mentioned in the last chapter of the Acts, it may be shown from a single fact that it could not have been written long before the end of the two years. The distress of the Philippians on account of Epaphroditus's sickness was known at Rome when the epistle was written; this implies four journeys, separated by some indefinite intervals, to or from Philippi and Rome, between the commencement of Paul's captivity and the writing of the epistle. The Philippians were informed of his imprisonment, and sent Epaphroditus; they were informed of their messenger's sickness, and sent

their message of condolence. Further, the absence of Luke's name from the salutations to a Church where he was well known implies that he was absent from Rome when the epistle was written: so does Paul's declaration (<505920>Philippians 2:20) that no one who remained with him felt an equal interest with Timothy in the welfare of the Philippians. By comparing the mention of Luke in <510414>Colossians 4:14 and <570124>Philemon 1:24 with the abrupt conclusion of his narrative in the Acts, we are led to the inference that he left Rome after those two epistles were written and before the end of the two years' captivity. Lastly, it is obvious from <500120>Philippians 1:20 that Pail. when he wrote, felt his position to be very critical, and we know that it became more precarious as the two years drew to a close. Assuming that Paul's acquittal and release took place in 58, we may date the Epistle to the Philippians early in that year.

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

1. *Paul's connection with Philippi* was of a peculiar character, which gave rise to the writing of this epistle. That city, important as a mart for the produce of the neighboring gold-mines, and as a Roman stronghold to check the rude Thracian mountaineers, was distinguished as the scene of the great battle fatal to Briutus and Cassiuls, B.C. 42. More than ninety years afterwards Paul entered its walls, accompanied by Silas, who had been with him since he started from Antioch, and by Timothy and Luke, whom he afterwards attached to himself; the former at Derbe. the latter quite recently at Troas. It may well be imagined that the patience of the zealous apostle had been tried by his mysterious repulse, first from Asia, then from Bithynia and Mysia, and that his expectations had been stirred up by the vision which hastened his departure with his new-found associate, Luke, from Troas. A swift passage brought him to the European shore at Neapolis, whence he took the road, about ten miles long, across the mountain ridge called Symbolum to Philippi (<441612>Acts 16:12). There, at a greater distance from Jerusalem than any apostle had yet penetrated, the long-restrained energy of Paul was again employed in laying the foundation of a Christian Church. Seeking first the lost sheep of the house of Israel, he went on a Sabbath-dav with the few Jews who resided in Philippi to their small Proseucha on the bank of the river Gangites. The missionaries sat down and spoke to the assembled women. One of them, Lydia, not born of the seed of Abraham, but a proselyte, whose name and occupation, as well as her birth, connect her with Asia, gave heed unto Paul, and she and her household were baptized, perhaps on the same Sabbath-day. Her house

became the residence of the missionaries. Many days they resorted to the Proseucha, and the result of their short sojourn in Philippi was the conversion of many persons (<44160>Acts 16:40), including at last their jailer and his household. Philippi was endeared to Paul, not only by the hospitality of Lydia, the deep sympathy of the converts. and the remarkable miracle which set a seal on his preaching, but also by the successful exercise of his missionary activity after a long suspense, and by the happy consequences of his undaunted endurance of ignominies which remained in his memory (<50130>Philippians 1:30) after a long interval. Leaving Timothy and Luke to watch over the infant Church, Paul and Silas went to Thessalonica (<52202>1 Thessalonians 2:2), whither they were followed by the alms of the Philippians (<50416>Philippians 4:16), and thence southwards. Timothy, having probably carried out similar directions to those which were given to Titus (1:5) in Crete, soon rejoined Paul. We know not whether Luke remained at Philippi. The next six years of his life are a blank in our records. At the end of that period he is found again (<44206>Acts 20:6) at Philippi.

After the lapse of five years, spent chiefly at Corinth and Ephesus, Paul, escaping from the incensed worshippers of the Ephesian Diana, passed through Macedonia, A.D. 54, on his way to Greece, accompanied by the Ephesians Tychicus and Trophimus, and probably visited Philippi for the second time, and was there joined by Timothy. His beloved Philippians, free, it seems, from the controversies which agitated other Christian churches, became still dearer to Paul on account of the solace which they afforded him when, emerging from a season of dejection (<47705>2 Corinthians 7:5), oppressed by weak bodily health, and anxious for the steadfastness of the churches which he had planted in Asia and Achaia, he wrote at Philippi his second Epistle to the Corinthians.

On returning from Greece, unable to take ship there on account of the Jewish plots against his life, he went through Macedonia, seeking a favorable port for embarking. After parting from his companions (<44204>Acts 20:4), he again found a refuge among his faithful Philippians, where he spent some days at Easter, A.D. 55, with Luke, who accompanied him when he sailed from Neapolis.

Finally, in his Roman captivity (A.D. 57), their care of him revived again. They sent Epaphroditus, bearing their alms for the apostle's support, and ready also to tender his personal service (<50225>Philippians 2:25). He stayed

some time at Rome, and while employed as the organ of communication between the imprisoned apostle and the Christians, and inquirers in and about Rome, he fell dangerously ill. When he was sufficiently recovered, Paul sent him back to the Philippians, to whom he was very dear, and with him our epistle. *SEE PHILIPPI*.

2. *The state of the Church at Rome* should be considered before entering on the study of the Epistle to the Philippians. Something is to be learned of its condition about A.D. 55 from the Epistle to the Romans, and more about A.D. 58 from Acts 28. Possibly the Gospel was planted there by some who themselves received the seed on the day of Pentecost (Acts ii, 10). The converts were drawn chiefly from Gentile proselytes to Judaism, partly also from Jews who were such by birth, with possibly a few converts direct from heathenism. In A.D. 55 this Church was already eminent for its faith and obedience: it was exposed to the machinations of schismatical teachers; and it included two conflicting parties, the one insisting more or less on observing the Jewish law in addition to faith in Christ as necessary to salvation, the other repudiating outward observances even to the extent of depriving their weak brethren of such as to them might be really edifying. We cannot gather from the Acts whether the whole Church of Rome had then accepted the teaching of Paul as conveyed in his epistle to them. But it is certain that when he had been two years in Rome, his oral teaching was partly rejected by a party which perhaps may have been connected with the former of those above mentioned. Paul's presence in Rome, the freedom of speech allowed to him, and the personal freedom of his fellow-laborers were the means of infusing fresh missionary activity into the Church (⁵⁰Philippians 1:12-14). It was in the work of Christ that Epaphroditus was worn out (⁵⁰Philippians 2:30). Messages and letters passed between the apostle and distant churches; and doubtless churches near to Rome, and both members of the Church and inquirers into the new faith at Rome addressed themselves to the apostle, and to those who were known to be in constant personal communication with him. Thus in his bondage he was a cause of the advancement of the Gospel. From his prison, as from a centre, light streamed into Caesar's household and far beyond (⁵⁰Philippians 4:22; 1:12-19). *SEE ROME*.

IV. *Efect of the Epistle*. — We have no account of the reception of this epistle by the Philippians. Except doubtful traditions that Erastus was their first bishop, and that he with Lydia and Parmenas was martyred in their city, nothing is recorded of them for the next fortynine years. But about

A.D. 107 Philippi was visited by Ignatius, who was conducted through Neapolis and Philippi, and across Macedonia, on his way to martyrdom at Rome. His visit was speedily followed by the arrival of a letter from Polycarp of Smyrna, which accompanied, in compliance with a characteristic request of the warm-hearted Philippians, a copy of all the letters of Ignatius that were in the possession of the Church of Smvrna. It is interesting to compare the Philippians of A.D. 58, as drawn by Paul, with their successors in A.D. 107 as drawn by the disciple of John. Steadfastness in the faith, and a joyful sympathy with sufferers for Christ's sake, seem to have distinguished them at both periods (<3001 05>Philippians 1:5, and Polyc. *Ep.* 1). The character of their religion was the same throughout, practical and emotional rather than speculative: in both epistles there are many practical suggestions, much interchange of feeling. and an absence of doctrinal discussion. The Old Testament is scarcely, if at all, quoted; as if the Philippian Christians had been gathered for the most part directly from the heathen. At each period false teachers were seeking, apparently in vain, an entrance into the Philippian Church, first Judaizing Christians, seemingly putting out of sight the resurrection and the judgment which afterwards the Gnosticizing Christians openly denied (Philippians 3, and Polyc. 6, 7). At both periods the same tendency to petty internal quarrels seems to prevail (<3001 27>Philippians 1:27; 2:14; 4:2; and Polyc. 2:4, 5:12). The student of ecclesiastical history will observe the faintly marked organization of bishops, deacons, and female coadjutors to which Paul refers (<3001 01>Philippians 1:1; 4:3), developed afterwards into broadly distinguished priests, deacons, widows, and virgins (Polyc. 4, 5, 6). Though the Macedonian churches in general were poor, at least as compared with commercial Corinth (<4708 02>2 Corinthians 8:2), yet their gold-mines probably exempted the Philippians from the common lot of their neighbors, and at first enabled them to be conspicuously liberal in alms-giving, and afterwards laid them open to strong warnings against the love of money (<3004 15>Philippians 4:15; <4708 03>2 Corinthians 8:3; and Polyc. 4, 6, 11).

Now though we cannot trace the immediate effect of Paul's epistle on the Philippians, yet no one can doubt that it contributed to form the character of their Church, as it was in the time of Polycarp. It is evident from Polycarp's epistle that the Church, by the grace of God and the guidance of the apostle, had passed through those trials of which Paul warned it, and had not gone back from the high degree of Christian attainments which it reached under Paul's oral and written teaching (Polyc. 1, 3, 9, 11). If it had

made no great advance in knowledge, still unsound teachers were kept at a distance from its members. Their sympathy with martyrs and confessors glowed with as warm a flame as ever, whether it was claimed by Ignatius or by Paul. They maintained their ground with meek firmness among the heathen, and still held forth the light of an exemplary though not a perfect Christian life.

V. *Scope and Contents of the Epistle*. — Paul's aim in writing is plainly this: while acknowledging the alms of the Philippians and the personal services of their messenger, to give them some information respecting his own condition, and some advice respecting theirs. Perhaps the intensity of his feelings and the distraction of his prison prevented the following out his plan with undeviating closeness. For the preparations for the departure of Epaphroditus, and the thought that he would soon arrive among the warm-hearted Philippians, filled Paul with recollections of them, and revived his old feelings towards those fellow-heirs of his hope of glory who were so deep in his heart (<50107>Philippians 1:7) and so often in his prayers (<50104>Philippians 1:4).

Full of gratitude for this work of friendly remembrance and regard, Paul addressed to the Church in Philippi this epistle, in which, besides expressing his thanks for their kindness, he pours out a flood of eloquence and pathetic exhortation, suggested partly by his own circumstances, and partly by what he had learned of their state as a Church. That state appears to have been on the whole very prosperous, as there is much commendation of the Philippians in the epistle, and no censure is expressed in any part of it either of the Church as a whole, or of any individuals connected with it. At the same time the apostle deemed it necessary to put them on their guard against the evil influences to which they were exposed from Judaizing teachers and false professors of Christianity. These cautions he interposes between the exhortations suggested by his own state, and by the news he had received concerning the Philippians, with which his epistle commences and with which it closes. We may thus divide the epistle into *three* parts. In the *first* of these (<50102>Philippians 1:2), after the usual salutation and an outpouring of warm-hearted affection towards the Philippian Church (<50101>Philippians 1:1-11), the apostle refers to his own condition as a prisoner at Rome; and, lest they should be cast down at the thought of the unmerited indignities he had been called upon to suffer, he assures them that these had turned out rather to the furtherance of that great cause on which his heart was set, and for which he was willing to live

and labor, though, as respected his personal feelings, he would rather depart and be with Christ, which he deemed to be “far better" (12-24). He then passes by an easy transition to a hortatory address to the Philippians, calling upon them to maintain steadfastly their profession, to cultivate humanity and brotherly love; to work out their own salvation with fear and trembling, and concluding by an appeal to their regard for his reputation as an apostle, which could not but be affected by their conduct, and a reference to his reason for sending to them Epaphroditus instead of Timothy, as he had originally designed (Philippians 1:25; 2:30). In part *second* he strenuously cautions them, as already observed, against Judaizing teachers, whom he stigmatizes as "dogs" (in reference, probably, to their impudent, snarling, and quarrelsome habits), "evil-workers," and "the concision;" by which latter term he means to intimate, as Theophylact remarks (ad loc.), that the circumcision in which the Jews so much gloried had now ceased to possess any spiritual significance, and was therefore no better than a useless mutilation of the person. On this theme he enlarges, making reference to his own standing as a Jew, and intimating that, if under the Christian dispensation Jewish descent and Jewish privileges were to go for anything, no one could have stronger claims on this ground than he; but at the same time declaring that however he had once valued these, he now counted them "all but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ" (Philippians 3:1-12). A reference to his own sanctified ambition to advance in the service of Christ leads him to exhort the Philippians to a similar spirit; from this he passes to caution tjaem against unnecessary contention, and against those who walk disorderly, concluding by reminding them of the glorious hopes which, as Christians, they entertained (verses 13-21). In the *third* part we have a series of admonitions to individual members of the Church at Philippi (Philippians 4:1-3), followed by some general exhortations to cheerfulness, moderation, prayer, and good conduct (verses 4-9); after which come a series of allusions to the apostle's circumstances and feelings, his thanks to the Philippians for their seasonable aid, and his concluding benedictions and salutations (verses 10-23).

VI. *Characteristic Features of the Epistle*. — Strangely full of joy and thanksgiving amid adversity, like the apostle's midnight hymn from the depth of his Philippian dungeon, this epistle went forth from his prison at Rome. In most other epistles he writes with a sustained effort to instruct, or with sorrow, or with indignation; he is striving to supply imperfect, or to

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

VII. *Commentaries*. — The following are the exegetical helps specially on this entire epistle; a few of the most important are indicated by an asterisk (*) prefixed: Vietorinus, *In Ep. ad Ph.* (in Mai, *Script. Vet.* III, 1:51; Pseudo-Hieronymus, *Commentarii* (in *Opp. [Suppos.],* 11:1011); Chrysostom, *Homiliae* (Gr. et Lat. in *Opp.* 11:208; also in Erasmi Opp. 8:319; in Engl. [including other epistles] in *Lib. of Fathers,* 14, Oxf. 1843, 8vo); Zwingli, *Annotationes* (Tigur. 1531, 4to; also in *Opp.* 4:504); Hoffmann, *Commentarius* (Basil. 1541,8vo); Brenz, *Explicatio* (Franc. 1548, 8vo; also in *Opp.* 7); Calvin, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* often; separately in Engl. by Becket, Lond. 1584, fol.; by Johnston [includ. Colossians], Edinb. 1842, 12mo; by Pringle [includ. Colossians and Thessalonians], Edinb. 1851, 8vo); Major, *Enarratio* [includ. Colossians and Thessalonians] (Vitemb. 1554, 1561, 8vo); Ridley, *Exposition* (in

Richmond's *Fathers*, 2); Weller, *Commentaries* [includ. Thessalonians] (Norib. 1561, 8vo); Salbont, *Commentarii* [includ. other epistles] (Antw. 1561, 8vo; also in *Opp.* Colossians Agr. 1568, fol.); Musculus, *Commentarius* [includ. Colossians, Thessalonians, and 1 Timothy] (Basil. 1565, 1578, 1595, fol.); Aretius, *Commentarii* [includ. Colossians and Thessalonians] (Morg. 1580, 8vo); Olevian, *Notae* [includ. Colossians] (Genesis 1580, 8vo); Steuart (Roman Cath.), *Commentarius* (Ingolst. 1595, 4to); Zanchius, *Commentarius* [includ. Colossians and Thessalonians] (Neost. 1595, fol.; also in *Opp.* 6); Weinrich, *Explicatio* (Lips. 1615, 4to); Airay, *Lectures* (Lond. 1618, 4to); Battus, *Commentarius* (Rost. 1627, 4to); Velasquez (Rom. Cath.), *Commentarii* (Lugd. 1628-32; Antw. 1637, 1651; Ven. 1646, 2 volumes, fol.); Schotan, *Commentaria* (Franeck. 1637, 4to); Crell, *Commentarius* (in *Opp.* 1:501); Meelfuhr, *Commentationes* (Altorf, 1641, 4to); Cocceius, *Commentarius* (in *Opp.* 5); Daille, *Exposition* (2d ed. Genesis 1659-60, 2 volumes, 8vo; in English by Sherman, Lond. 1841, 8vo); Scheid, *Disputationes* (Argent. 1668, 4to); Breithaupt, *Animadversiones* (Hol. 1693, 1703, 4to); Hazevoet, *Verklaaring* (Leyd. 1718, 4to); Van Til, *Verklaaring ([includ.* Romans] Harlem, 1721. 4to; in Lat. [includ. 1 Corinthians, Ephesians, and Colossians] Amst. 1726, 4to); Busching, *Introductio* (Hal. 1746, 4to) ; Storr. *Diss. exegetica* (Tub. 1783, 4to; also in *Opusc.* 1:301-67); Am Ende, *Annotationes* (fasc. 1, 2, Torg. 1789-92; Viteb. 1798-1803, 8vo); Paulus, *De tempore,* etc. (Jen. 1799, 4to); Lang, *Bearbeit.* (Nuremb. and Alt. 1800, 8vo); Krause, *An diversis hom. script.,* etc. (Regiom. 1811, 4to; also in *Opusc.* pages 1-22); Hoog, *De Philip. conditione* (L.B. 1825, 8vo); *Rheinwald, *Commentar* (Berl. 1827, 8vo); Acaster, *Lectures* (Lond. 1827, 8vo); Rettig, *Quaestiones* (Giess. 1831, 8vo); Schinz, *D. Christl. Gemeine zu Phil.* (Zur. 1833, 8vo); Eastburn, *Lectures* (N.Y. 1833, 8vo); Passavant, *Auslegung* (Basle, 1834, 8vo); Baynes, *Commentary* (Lond. 1834, 12mo); Matthies, *Erklad.* (Greifsw. 1835, 8vo); *Steiger, *Exegese* [includ. Colossians] (Par. 1837, 8vo); *Van Hengel, *Commentarius* (L.B. 1838, 8vo); Holemann, *Commentarii* (Lips. 1839, 8vo) ; Anon., *Erklar.* (Hanov. 1839, 8vo); Neat, *Discourses* (Lond. 1841, 8vo); Rilliet, *Commentaire* (Genesis and Par. 1841, 8vo); Hall, *Exposition* (Lond. 1843, 8vo); Neander, *Erlauf.* (Berl. 1849, 8vo; in Engl. by Mrs. Conant, N.Y. 1851, 12mo); Robertson, *Lectures* (Lond. 1849, 12mo); B. Crusius, *Commentar* (Jen. 1849, 8vo); Kohler, *Auslegung* (Kiel, 1855, 8vo); Toller, *Discourses* (Lond. 1855, 12mo); *Weiss, *Auslegung* (Berl. 1858, 8vo); *Ellicott, *Commentary* [includ. Colossians and Philemon] (Lond. 1858,

8vo); Jatho, *Erklar.* (Hildesh. 1858, 8vo); *Eadie, *Commentary* (Lond. 1858, 1861, 8vo); Shulte, *Commentary* (Lond. 1861, 8vo); Schenkel, *Erlaut.* [includ. Ephesians and Colossians] (Leipz. 1862, 8vo); Newland, *Catena* (Lond. 1862, 8vo); Vaughan, *Lectures* (2d ed. Lond. 1864, 8vo); Todd, *Expositions* (Lond. 1864, 8vo); *Lightfoot, *Commentary* (Lond. 1868, 1870, 8vo); Johnstone, *Lectures* (Lond. 1875, 8vo). *SEE EPISTLE*.

Philippine Islands

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

heat moderate, from December to May, when the temperature rapidly rises and becomes oppressive, except ibr a short time after a fall of rain. The fertility of the soil and the humid atmosphere produce a richness of vegetation which is nowhere surpassed. Blossoms and fruit hang together on the trees, and the cultivated fields yield a constant succession of crops. Immense forests spread over the Philippine Islands, clothing the mountains to their summits; ebony, iron-wood, cedar, sapanwood, gum-trees, etc., being laced together and garlanded by the bush-rope or palasan, which attains a length of several hundred feet. The variety of fruittrees is great, including the orange, citron, bread-fruit, mango, cocoa-nut, guava, tamarind, rose-apple, etc.; other important products of the vegetable kingdom being the banana, plantain, pine-apple, sugar-cane, cotton, tobacco, indigo, coffee, cocoa, cinnamon, vanilla, cassia, the areca-nut, ginger, pepper, etc., with rice, wheat, maize, and various other cereals. Gold is found in river-beds and detrital deposits, being used, in the form of dust, as the medium of exchange in Mindanao. Iron is plentiful, and fine coal-beds, from one to four feet thick, have been found. Copper has long been worked in Luzon. There are also limestone, a fine variegated marble, sulphur in unlimited quantity, quicksilver, vermilion, and saltpetre-the sulphur being found both native and in combination with copper, arsenic, and iron. Except the wild-cat, beasts of prey are unknown. There are oxen, buffaloes, sheep, goats, swine, harts, squirrels, and a great variety of monkeys. The jungles swarm with lizards, snakes, and other reptiles; the rivers and lakes with crocodiles. Huge spiders, tarantulas, white ants, mosquitoes, and locusts are plagues which form a set-off to the beautiful fireflies, the brilliant queen-beetle *(Elater noctilucus)*, the melody of myriads of birds, the turtle-doves, pheasants, birds-of-paradise, and many lovely species of paroquets, with which the forests are alive. "Hives of wild bees hang from the branches, and alongside of them are the nests of humming-birds dangling in the wind." The caverns along the shores are frequented by the swallow, whose edible nest is esteemed by the Chinese a rich delicacy. Some of them are also tenanted by multitudes of bats of immense size. Buffaloes are used for tillage and draught; a small horse for riding. Fowls are plentiful, and incredible numbers of ducks are artificially hatched. Fish is in great abundance and variety. Mother-omfpearl, coral, amber, and tortoise-shell are important articles of commerce. The principal exports are sugar, tobacco, cigars, indigo, Manilla hemp, coffee, rice, dyewoods, hides, gold-dust, and beeswax.

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

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

The Sooloo Islands have a population of 150,000; are governed by a sultan, whose capital is Sung, in 6° 1' N. lat., and 120° 55' 51" E. long., who also rules over the greatest part of Paragoa, the northern corner only being subject to Spain. Luzon has a population of 2,500,000, one fifth part being independent; the Bisaya Islands, 2,000,000, of whom three fourths are under Spanish rule. The population of Panay amounts to 750,000, and that of Zebu to 150,000. Of the numbers in Mindanao nothing is known; the

districts of Zamboanga, Misamis, and Caragan, with 100,000 inhabitants, being all that is subject to Spain. The greater part of the island is under the sultan of Mindanao, resident at Selanga, in 70 9' N. lat., and 1240 38' E. long., who, with his feudatory chiefs, can bring together an army of 100,000 men. He is on friendly terms with the Spaniards. Besides Manilla, there are very many large and important cities, especially in Luzon, Panay, and Zebu. The great centers of trade are Manilla, in Luzon, and Iloilo, in Panay. The Philippine Islands were discovered in 1521 by Magellan, who, after visiting Mindanao, sailed to Zebu, where, taking part with the king in a war, he was wounded, and died at Mactan April 26, 1521. Some years later the Spanish court sent an expedition under Villabos, who named the islands in honor of the prince of Asturias, afterwards Philip II. For some time the chief Spanish settlement was on Zebu; but in 1581 Manilla was built, and has since continued to be the seat of government. See Semper, *Die Philippinen u. ihre Bewohner* (Wurzb. 1869); and his *Reisen inm Archipel der Philippinen* (Leips. 1867-73, 8 volumes, 8vo); Earl, *Papuans*, chapter 7; *Academy*, August 15, 1873, page 311.