

THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY
REFERENCE

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL,
THEOLOGICAL and
ECCLESIASTICAL
LITERATURE

Philippins - Pilate, Pontius

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

Philippins

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

They are sometimes called *Bruleurs*, or *Tueurs*, from their tendency to suicide, which they consider meritorious, and which they accordingly court, sometimes burying themselves alive, sometimes starving themselves to death. Accusations of laxity of morals have been brought against them, of renouncing marriage, and living in spiritual brotherhood and sisterhood, the truth of which has never been clearly established; for when the empress Anne (A.D. 1730-1740) sent commissioners to inquire into the state of their monasteries, they shut themselves up, and burned themselves alive

within their own walls, rather than give any evidence on the subject. See Platon, *Greek Church* (see Index). (J.H.W.)

Philippists

is the name of that sect or party among the Lutherans who were the followers of Philip Melancthon. He had strenuously opposed the Ubiquists, who arose in his time; and the dispute growing still hotter after his death, the University of Wittenberg, who espoused Melancthon's opinion, were called by the Flacians, who attacked it, *Philippists*. They were strongest in that university, the opposite party controlling the University of Jena. The Philippists were in the end accused of being Calvinists at heart. and were much persecuted by the ultra-Lutheran party. See the different works on the *Rebrmnation* (q.v.), and the long treatise in Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie*, 11:537-546. **SEE ADIAPHORISTIC CONTROVERSY; SEE MELANCTHON.**

Philipps, Dirk

one of the most eminent co-laborers of Simon Menno (q.v.), was born in 1504 at Lenwarden, the capital of Friesland, of Romish parentage. He was carefully and piously reared, and had unusual educational facilities in his time. When the Anabaptists came to Friesland, Philipps, who was then a devoted Romanist, soon became interested in the new doctrines; and after his brother Ubbo, a common mechanic, had embraced the modern teachings and become a preacher, Dirk also found pleasure in them; forsook the Church of Rome, and was rebaptized. As a preacher of the new doctrines he was stationed at Appingadam (Groningen), and contented himself in that position until the Anabaptists advocated the extreme socialistic views. About the year 1534 or 1535 these two brothers came out boldly against the Munster ideas of the Anabaptists, and thus prepared the way for the revolution which Menno shortly after effected. After 1536 the brothers Philipps disappear, and are but little heard of. At the conference of the different Anabaptists held at Buckholt, in Westphalia, they do not seem to have been present. In 1543 we find them at Emden. After that we only meet Dirk now and then, but always in closest intimacy with Menno. Ubbo finally separated from both Dirk and Menno, and took a conciliatory position between the Protestants and Romanists. But Dirk remained true to Menno, and ever after is warmly commended by the great Dutch Reformer and founder of the Quakers of Holland. After the death of

Simon Menno, Dirk was more or less involved, and that unhappily, in the controversies which agitated the Dutch Anabaptists. In 1568 he was at Dantzic, but was so much sought after at home that the sixty-four-years-old man consented to return to Emden. He died there in 1568 or 1570. His many pamphleteering publications have been collected in his *Enchiridion*, or "Hand-book," among which there is an *Apology* or *Defence of the Anabaptists*; a treatise on *Christian Marriage*, etc. It is the universal testimony of Protestants and Romanists that Dirk Philipps was a very learned man, well versed in the classical languages, and a pulpit orator of the very highest order.

See Gent, *Anfang u. Fortgang der Streitigkeiten unter den Taujgesinnten*; Blaup. Ten Cate, *Gesch. der Taufyesinnten*. **SEE MENNONITES**, and the literature thereto appended. (J.H.W.)

Philipps, Ubbo

SEE PHILIPPS, DIRK.

Philippsohn, Moses

a noted Hebraist, was born May 9, 1775, in Sandersleben, a small town on the Wipper, and was destined for a rabbinate by his parents, who began to initiate him into Hebrew when he was scarcely four years of age. In 1787 he was sent to a rabbinic school at Halberstadt, where he was instructed in the Talmud and other branches of rabbinic literature. He then went to Brunswick, where he devoted himself to the study of the sciences generally, and in particular Hebrew philology, acquiring a most classical and charming style in Hebrew composition. In 1799, when only four-and-twenty, he was appointed master of the noted Jewish school at Dessau, where the celebrated historian Jost and the philosopher Mendelssohn, were educated. Here Philippsohn prosecuted more zealously than ever the study of Hebrew and the Hebrew Scriptures, and determined to continue, with the aid of his three colleagues, the great Bible work commenced by Mendelssohn (q.v.), selecting the minor prophets for their conjoint labor. Philippsohn undertook to translate and expound Hosea and Joel, being the two most difficult books of the twelve minor prophets; his colleague Wolf the translation and exposition of Obadiah, Micah, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah; his colleague Solomon undertook Haggai and Zechariah; while Neuman undertook Amos, Nahum, and Malachi; Jonah having already been published by Liwe (q.v.); and the whole was published under the title

hrwhf hj nm, *a Pure Offering*, at Dessau, in 1805. Three years later Philippsohn published a Hebrew Grammar and Chrestomathy, entitled hnyb ynbl ydwm, *Friend of Students* (Dessau. 1808; 2d improved ed. *ibid.* 1823); and a *Hebrew Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, with a translation by Wolf (*ibid.* 1808). He also wrote essays on various subjects connected with Hebrew, literature in the Hebrew periodical called *āsamh. The Gatherer*, and died April 20, 1814. See Steinschneider, *Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana*, col. 2099, and the interesting biographical sketch by Dr. Ph. Philippson, in his *Biographische Skizzen* (Leips. 1864); Jost, *Geschichte des Juden. und seiner Sekten* (see Index in volume 3).

Philips, Edward, M.A.

an English divine, was born near the middle of the 16th century. He was entered a student in Broadgate's Hall, now Pembroke College, in 1574; became preacher at St. Saviour's. Southwark, London, and died about 1603. He was a Calvinist, and esteemed "a person zealous of the truth of God, earnest in his calling, faithful in his message, powerful in his speech, careful of his flock, peaceable and blameless in his life, and comfortable and constant in his death." His published sermons are entitled, *Certaine Godly and Learned Sermons, Preached by that worthy Servant of Christ in St. Saviour's, in Southwark; and were taken by the pen of H. Yelverton, of Gray's Inn, Gentleman* (Lond. 1607, 4to).

Philips, Thomas

a Roman Catholic divine, was born of Protestant parentage at Ickford, in Buckinghamshire; received his education at St. Omer's, and there became a zealous Romanist. He entered into orders, and became a Jesuit, but quitted that society, and obtained a prebend in the collegiate church of Tongres, with a dispensation to reside in England. He was the author of *The Study of Sacred Literature Stated and Considered* (Lond. 1758, 8vo); and *The Life of Cardinal Pole* (Oxf. 1764-67, 2 volumes). He died at Liege in 1774. Philips was a man of eminent piety, and a writer of considerable ability.

Philip's (St.) And James's (St.) Day

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

Philis'tia

(Heb. *Pele'sheth*, תְּבֵלַשְׁתִּי *P]* signif. doubtful [see below]; Sept. ἀλλόφυλοι), the land of the Philistines, as it is usually styled in prose (^{<0213>}Genesis 21:32, 33; ^{<0137>}Exodus 13:17; ^{<0270>}1 Samuel 27:1, 7; 29:11; ^{<1021>}1 Kings 4:21; ^{<1102>}2 Kings 8:2, 3). This term is rendered in our version sometimes "Palestina," as in ^{<0154>}Exodus 15:14, and ^{<2342>}Isaiah 14:29, 31; and "Palestine" in ^{<2304>}Joel 3:4; but "Philistia" in ^{<0408>}Psalms 60:8; 87:4; and 108:9; and "Philistines" in ^{<0807>}Psalms 83:7. "Palestine" originally meant nothing but the district inhabited by the "Philistines," who are called by Josephus Παλαιστῖνοι, "Palaestines" (*Ant.* 5:1, 8). In fact the two words are the same, and the difference in their present form is but the result of gradual corruption. The form Philistia does not occur anywhere in the Sept. or Vulgate. In ^{<0154>}Exodus 15:14 this word (*Pelesheth*) is used along with Canaan, and as distinct from it; in ^{<2304>}Joel 3:4 its "coasts" are referred to (for it was a littoral territory), and are coupled with Tyre and Sidon as having sold into slavery the children of Judah and Jerusalem, and carried off silver and gold from the Temple; and in ^{<2342>}Isaiah 14:29-31 it is told not to congratulate itself on the death of Ahaz, who had smitten it. In ^{<0408>}Psalms 60:8; 83:7; 87:4; 108:9, it is classed among countries hostile to Israel. The word therefore uniformly in Scripture denotes the territory of the Philistines — though it came at length to signify in common speech the entire country — the Holy Land. Philistia is probably the country vaguely referred to by Herodotus as Συρία Παλαιστῖνα — for he describes it as lying on the sea-coast (7:89). The name is specially attached to Southern Syria by Strabo (16), Pomp. Mela (1:11), and Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* 5:12). The broader signification of the term arose by degrees. Josephus apparently uses it in both meanings (*Ant.* 1:6, 2. 4; 8:10, 3). Philo says of Palestine, ἡ τότε προσηγορεύετο Χαναναίων, and Jerome says, "Terra Judaea quae nunc appellatur Palaestina" (see Reland, *Palcest.* chapter 1, 7, 8). In the Talmud and the Arabic it likewise denotes the whole land of the Jews. **SEE PALESTINE.**

The name itself has given rise to various conjectures. Hitzig identifies the Philistines with **Πελασγοί**, and supposes the word, after the Sanscrit *Valaksha*, to denote the white races, as opposed to the Phoenician or dusky races (see Kenrick, *Phean.* pages 50, 52). Redslob makes it a transposition of the name of their country, **hl p̄y]** *Shephelah*, the low country (A.V. "valley" or "plain"). Knobel, Gesenius, Movers, and Roth take it from the root **vl P**; "to emigrate" — of which **Ἀλλόφυλοι** is supposed to be a translation. Furst substantially agrees with this etymology, from the same Heb. root, in the sense of *breaking through*, i.e., "wandering." Stark regards this Greek term as opposed to **ὁ μόφυλος**, "of the same race" (*Gaza*, page 67); and Von Lengerke looks upon it as a playful transposition of **Φυλιστιείμ**. **Ἀλλόφυλοι** seems, in later Greek, to denote a foreign race living in a country among its natives. Thus Polybius gives the name to the forces of Hannibal located in Gaul and Italy (3:61). The Sept. has in this way given it to a race that lived in a country which God had conferred in promise on the Hebrew people. The same name is for a like reason given to the population of Galilee (1 Macc. 5:15).

Philistia proper was a long and somewhat broad strip of land lying on the sea-coast, west of the hills of Ephraim and Judah, and stretching generally from Egypt to Phoenicia. The northern portion of this territory, from Joppa nearly as far as Ashkelon, was allotted to Dan; and the southern portion, from Ashkelon to the wilderness of Tih, and extending east to Beersheba, was assigned to Judah. In short, it comprised the southern coast and plain of Canaan, along the Mediterranean, hence called "the sea of the Philistines" (^{<1223>}Exodus 23:31), from Ekron to the border of Egypt; though at certain times the Philistines had also in possession large portions of the interior (^{<9107>}Psalm 60:7; 87:4; 108:10; ^{<9308>}1 Samuel 31:8; ^{<1157>}1 Kings 15:27; ^{<1307>}Psalm 83:7). The land of the Philistines partakes of the general desolation common to it with Judaea and other neighboring states. According to Volney, except the immediate environs of a few villages, the whole country is a desert abandoned to the Bedawin Arabs who feed their flocks on it (^{<3104>}Zephaniah 2:4-7). **SEE PHILISTINE.**

Philis'tim

(^{<1004>}Genesis 10:14). **SEE PHILISTINE.**

Philis'tine

(Heb. *Pelishti'*, פְּלִשְׁתִּים, gentile from פְּלִשְׁתִּי *Philistia*; Sept. ἀλλόφυλος, but sometimes Φυλιστιείμ for the plur., which is the usual form; A.V. once "Philistim," ^{<0104>}Genesis 10:14; Josephus, Παλαίστινοι, *Anf.* 5:1, 18), a race of aboriginal Canaanites inhabiting the land of Philistia (q.v.). The following article combines the Scripture information with that from other sources.

I. Early History. —

1. The *origin* of the Philistines is nowhere expressly stated in the Bible; but since the prophets describe them as "the Philistines from Caphtor" (^{<3007>}Amos 9:7), and "the remnant of the maritime district of Caphtor" (^{<2408>}Jeremiah 47:4), it is *prima facie* probable that they were the "Caphtorims which came out of Caphtor" who expelled the Avim from their territory and occupied it in their place (^{<8023>}Deuteronomy 2:23), and that these again were the Caphtorim mentioned in the Mosaic genealogical table among the descendants of Mizraim (^{<0104>}Genesis 10:14). But in establishing this conclusion certain difficulties present themselves: in the first place, it is observable that in ^{<0104>}Genesis 10:14 the Philistines are connected with the Casluhim rather than the Caphtorim. It has generally been assumed that the text has suffered a transposition, and that the parenthetical clause "out of whom came Philistim" ought to follow the words "and Caphtorim." This explanation is, however, inadmissible; for (1) there is no external evidence whatever of any variation in the text, either here or in the parallel passage in ^{<3012>}1 Chronicles 1:12; and (2) if the transposition were effected, the desired sense would -not be gained; for the words rendered in the A.V. "out of whom" (μὐνμαῖνα) really mean "whence," and denote a local movement rather than a genealogical descent, so that, as applied to the Caphtorim, they would merely indicate a sojourn of the Philistines in their land, and not the identity of the two races. The clause seems to have an appropriate meaning in its present position: it looks like an interpolation into the original document with the view of explaining when and where the name Philistine was first applied to the people whose proper appellation was Caphtorim. It is an etymological as well as a historical memorandum; for it is based on the meaning of the name Philistine (from the root פל *P*;=the Ethiopic *falasa*, "to migrate;" a term which is said to be still current in Abvssinia [Knobel. *Vilkert.* page

281], and which on the Egyptian monuments appears under the form of *Pulost* [Brugsch. *Hist. d'Egypt.* page 187]), viz. "emigrant," and is designed to account for the application of that name. But a second and more serious difficulty arises out of the language of the Philistines; for while the Caphtorim were Hamitic, the Philistine language is held to have been Shemitic. (Hitzig, in his *Urgeschichte d. Phil.*, however, maintains that the language is Indo-European, with a view to prove the Philistines to be Pelasgi. He is, we believe, singular in his view.) It has hence been inferred that the Philistines were in reality a Shemitic race, and that they derived the title of Caphtorim simply from a residence in Caphtor (Ewald, 1:331; Movers, *Phoniz.* 3:258), and it has been noticed in confirmation of this that their land is termed Canaan (^{<311E>}Zephaniah 2:5). But this seems to be inconsistent with the express assertion of the Bible that they were Caphtorim (^{<R123>}Deuteronomy 2:23), and not simply that they came from Caphtor; and the term Canaan is applied to their country, not ethnologically but etymologically, to describe the trading habits of the Philistines. The difficulty arising out of the question of language has been met by assuming either that the Caphtorim adopted the language of the conquered Avim (a not unusual circumstance where the conquered form the bulk of the population), or that they diverged from the Hamitic stock at a period when the distinctive features of Hamitism and Shemitism were yet in embryo. (See below.) A third objection to their Egyptian origin is raised from the application of the term "uncircumcised" to them (^{<197E>}1 Samuel 17:26; ^{<102>}2 Samuel 1:20), whereas the Egyptians were circumcised (Herod. 2:36). But this objection is answered by ^{<4125>}Jeremiah 9:25, 26, where the same term is in some sense applied to the Egyptians, however it may be reconciled with the statement of Herodotus. **SEE CAPHTOR**

There is additional evidence to the above that the Philistines belonged to the Shemitic family. The names of their cities and their proper names are of Shemitic origin. In their intercourse with the Israelites there are many intimations that the two used a common language. How is this, if they were immigrants in Palestine? This difficulty is removed by supposing that originally they were in Palestine, being a part of the great Shemitic family, went westward, under pressure from the wave of population which came down from the higher country to the sea-coast, but afterwards returned eastward, back from Crete to Palestine; so that in ^{<311E>}Amos 9:7 it is to be understood that God brought them up to Palestine, as he brought the Israelites out of Egypt-back to their home. This view the passage

undoubtedly admits; but we cannot agree with Movers in holding that it gives direct evidence in its favor, though his general position is probably correct, that the Philistines first quitted the mainland for the neighboring islands of the Mediterranean sea, and then, after a time, returned to their original home (Movers, pages 19, 29, 35). Greek writers, however, give evidence of a wide diffusion of the Shemitic race over the islands of the Mediterranean. Thucydides says (1:8) that most of the islands were inhabited by Carians and Phoenicians. Of Crete, Herodotus (1:173) declares that barbarians had, before Minos, formed the population of the island. There is evidence in Homer to the same effect (*Od.* 9:174; comp. Strabo, page 475). Many proofs offer themselves that, before the spread of the Hellenes, these islands were inhabited by Shemitic races. The worship observed in them at this time shows a Shemitic origin. The Shemitics gave place to the Hellenics—a change which dates from the time of Minos, who drove them out of the islands, giving the dominion to his son. The expelled population settled on the Asiatic coast. This evidence, derived from heathen sources, gives a representation which agrees with the scriptural account of the origin, the westerly wandering, and eastward return of the Philistines. But chronology creates a difficulty. Minos probably lived about the year B.C. 1300. According to the O.T. the Philistines were found in Palestine at an earlier period. In ^{<010>}Genesis 20:2; 26:1, we find a Philistine king of Gerar. But this king (and others) may have been so termed, not because he was of Philistine blood, but because he dwelt in the land which was afterwards called Philistia. There are other considerations which seem to show that Philistines did not occupy this country in the days of Abraham (consult Bertheau, page 196). It is, however, certain that the Philistines existed in Palestine in the time of Moses—as a brave and warlike people (^{<0137>}Exodus 13:17) — a fact which places them on the Asiatic continent long before Minos. This difficulty does not appear considerable to us. There may have been a return eastwards before the time of Minos, as well as one in his time; or he may have merely put the finishing stroke to a return commenced, from some cause or other — war, over-population, etc. — at a much earlier period. The information found in the Bible is easily understood on the showing that in the earliest ages tribes of the Shemitic race spread themselves over the West, and, becoming inhabitants of the islands, gave themselves to navigation. To these tribes the Philistines appear to have belonged, who, for what reason we know not, left Crete, and settled on the coast of Palestine.

Picture for Philistine (1)

2. The next question therefore that arises relates to *the early movements* of the Philistines. It has been very generally assumed of late years that Caphtor represents Crete, and that the Philistines migrated from that island, either directly or through Egypt, into Palestine. This hypothesis presupposes the Shemitic origin of the Philistines; for we believe that there are no traces of Hamitic settlements in Crete, and consequently the Biblical statement that Caphtorim was descended from Mizraim forms an *a priori* objection to the view. Moreover, the name Caphtor can only be identified with the Egyptian Cotptos. But the Cretan origin of the Philistines has been deduced, not so much from the name Caphtor, as from that of the Cherethites. This name in its Hebrew form (יְתֻרִים) bears a close resemblance to Crete, and is rendered Cretans in the Sept. A further link between the two terms has apparently been discovered in the term *yrkē kari*, which is applied to the royal guard (^{<2104>}2 Kings 11:4, 19), and which sounds like Carians. The latter of these arguments assumes that the Cherethites of David's guard were identical with the Cherethites of the Philistine plain, which appears in the highest degree improbable. *See CHERETHITE* With regard to the former argument, the mere coincidence of the names cannot pass for much without some corroborative testimony. The Bible furnishes none, for the name occurs but thrice (^{<080>}1 Samuel 30:4; ^{<2516>}Ezekiel 25:16; ^{<3016>}Zephaniah 2:5), and apparently applies to the occupants of the southern district; the testimony of the Sept. is invalidated by the fact that it is based upon the mere sound of the word (see ^{<3016>}Zephaniah 2:6, where *keroth* is also rendered Crete); and, lastly, we have to account for the introduction of the classical name of the island side by side with the Hebrew term Caphtor. A certain amount of testimony is indeed adduced in favor of a connection between Crete and Philistia; but, with the exception of the vague rumor, recorded but not adopted by Tacitus (*Hist.* 5:3), the evidence is confined to the town of Gaza, and even in this case is not wholly satisfactory. The town, according to Stephanus Byzantinus (s.v. Γάζα), was termed Minoa, as having been founded by Minos, and this tradition may be traced back to, and was perhaps founded on, an inscription on the coins of that city, containing the letters **MEINΩ**; but these coins are of no higher date than the 1st century B.C., and belong to a period when Gaza had attained a decided Greek character (Josephus, *War*, 2:6, 3). Again, the worship of the god Mame, and its identity with the Cretan Jove, are frequently mentioned by early writers (Movers, *Phoniz.*

1:662); but the name is Phoenician, being the *maran*, "lord," of ^{<4662>}1 Corinthians 16:22, and it seems more probable that Gaza and Crete derived the worship from a common source, Phoenicia. Without therefore asserting that migrations may not have taken place from Crete to Philistia, we hold that the evidence adduced to prove that they did is not altogether sufficient. What is remarkable, and as if two distinct and unallied peoples bore the same appellation, on a tablet of Rameses III at Medinet HabA is sculptured a naval victory over the Sharutana, perhaps the Cherethites of Crete; while another nation of the same name, perhaps the Cherethites of the mainland, form a portion of the Egyptian army. We find also the name *Pulusata* in close connection with this Sharutana. **SEE CRETE**

Picture for Philistine (2)

On the other hand, it has been held by Ewald (1:330) and others that the Cherethites and Pelethites (^{<11123>}2 Samuel 20:23) were Cherethites and Philistines. The objections to this view are:

- (1) that it is highly improbable that David would select his officers from the hereditary foes of his country, particularly so immediately after he had enforced their submission;
- (2) that there appears no reason why an undue prominence should have been given to the Cherethites by placing that name first, and altering Philistines into Pelethites, so as to produce a paronomasia;
- (3) that the names subsequently applied to the same body (^{<12119>}2 Kings 11:19) are appellatives; and (4) that the terms admit of a probable explanation from Hebrew roots. **SEE PELETHITE.**

3. A still more important point to be decided in connection with the early history of the Philistines is *the time when they settled in the land of Canaan*. If we were to restrict ourselves to the statements of the Bible, we should conclude that this took place before the time of Abraham; for they are noticed in his day as a pastoral tribe in the neighborhood of Gerar (^{<02132>}Genesis 21:32, 34; 26:1, 8); and this position accords well with the statement in ^{<18123>}Deuteronomy 2:23 that the Avim dwelt in Hazerim, i.e., in nomad encampments; for Gerar lay in the south country, which was just adapted to such a life. At the time of the exodus they were still in the same neighborhood, but grown sufficiently powerful to inspire the Israelites with fear (^{<02137>}Exodus 13:17; 15:14). When the Israelites arrived, they were in

full possession of the Shephelah from the "river of Egypt" (el-Arish) in the south to Ekron in the north (^{<06154>}Joshua 15:4, 47), and had formed a confederacy of five powerful cities—Gaza, Ashdod, Ashkelon, Gath, and Ekron (^{<06133>}Joshua 13:3). At what period these cities were originally founded we know not, but there are good grounds for believing that they were of Canaanitish origin, and had previously been occupied by the Avim. The name Gath is certainly Canaanitish; so most probably are Gaza, Ashdod, and Ekron. Ashkelon is doubtful; and the terminations both of this and Ekron may be Philistine. Gaza is mentioned as early as in ^{<01009>}Genesis 10:19 as a city of the Canaanites; and this as well as Ashdod and Ekron was in Joshua's time the asylum of the Canaanitish Anakim (^{<06122>}Joshua 11:22). The interval that elapsed between Abraham and the exodus seems sufficient to allow for the alteration that took place in the position of the Philistines, and their transformation from a pastoral tribe to a settled and powerful nation. But such a view has not met with acceptance among modern critics, partly because it leaves the migrations of the Philistines wholly unconnected with any known historical event, and partly because it does not serve to explain the great increase of their power in the time of the Judges. To meet these two requirements a double migration on the part of the Philistines, or of the two branches of that nation, has been suggested. Knobel, for instance, regards the Philistines proper as a branch of the same stock as that to which the Hyksos belonged, and he discovers the name Philistine in the opprobrious name *Philition* or *Philitis*, bestowed on the Shepherd kings (Herod. 2:128); their first entrance into Canaan from the Casluhim would thus be subsequent to the patriarchal age, and coincident with the expulsion of the Hyksos. The Cherethites he identifies with the Caphtorim who displaced the Avim; and these he regards as Cretans, who did not enter Canaan before the period of the Judges. The former part of his theory is inconsistent with the notices of the Philistines in the book of Genesis; these, therefore, he regards as additions of a later date (*Volkert.* page 218 sq.). The view adopted by Movers is, that the Philistines were carried westward from Palestine into Lower Egypt by the stream of the Hyksos movement at a period subsequent to Abraham; from Egypt they passed to Crete, and returned to Palestine in the early period of the Judges (*Phoniz.* 3:258). This is inconsistent with the notices in Joshua. Ewald, in the second edition of his *Geschichte*, propounds the hypothesis of a double immigration from Crete, the first of which took place in the ante-patriarchal period, as a consequence either of the Canaanitish settlement or of the Hyksos movement, the second in the time of the

Judges (*Gesch.* 1:329-331). We cannot regard the above views in any other light than as speculations, built up on very slight data, and unsatisfactory, inasmuch as they fail to reconcile the statements of Scripture. For they all imply

- (1) that the notice of the Caphtorim in ^{<0104>}Genesis 10:14 applies to an entirely distinct tribe from the Philistines, as Ewald (1:331, note) himself allows;
- (2) that either the notices in ^{<0102>}Genesis 20:26: or those in ^{<0155>}Joshua 15:45-47, or perchance both, are interpolations; and
- (3) that the notice in ^{<0123>}Deuteronomy 2:23, which certainly bears marks of high antiquity, belongs to a late date, and refers solely to the Cherethites.

But, beyond these inconsistencies, there are two points which appear to militate against the theory of the second immigration in the time of the Judges:

- (1) that the national title of the nation always remained Philistine, whereas, according to these theories, it was the Cretan or Cherethite element which led to the great development of power in the time of the Judges; and
- (2) that it remains to be shown why a seafaring race like the Cretans, coming direct from Caphtor in their ships (as Knobel, page 224, understands "Caphtorim from Caphtor" to imply), would seek to occupy the quarters of a nomad race living in encampments, in the wilderness region of the south.

We hesitate, therefore, to endorse any of the proffered explanations, and, while we allow that the Biblical statements are remarkable for their fragmentary and parenthetical nature, we are not prepared to fill up the gaps. If those statements cannot be received as they stand, it is questionable whether any amount of criticism will supply the connecting links. One point can, we think, be satisfactorily shown, viz. that the hypothesis of a second immigration is not needed in order to account for the growth of the Philistine power. Their geographical position and their relations to neighboring nations will account for it. Between the times of Abraham and Joshua the Philistines had changed their quarters, and had advanced northwards into the Shephelah or plain of Philistia. This plain has

been in all ages remarkable for the extreme richness of its soil; its fields of standing corn, its vineyards and olive-yards, are incidentally mentioned in Scripture (^{<0715B>}Judges 15:5); and in time of famine the land of the Philistines was the hope of Palestine (^{<0716>}2 Kings 8:2). We should, however, fail to form a just idea of its capacities from the scanty notices in the Bible. The crops which it yielded were alone sufficient to insure national wealth. It was also adapted to the growth of military power; for while the plain itself permitted the use of war-chariots, which were the chief arm of offence, the occasional elevations which rise out of it offered secure sites for towns and strongholds. It was, moreover, a commercial country; from its position it must have been at all times the great thoroughfare between Phoenicia and Syria in the north, and Egypt and Arabia in the south. Ashdod and Gaza were the keys of Egypt, and commanded the transit trade; and the stores of frankincense and myrrh which Alexander captured in the latter place prove it to have been a depot of Arabian produce (Plutarch, *Alex.* cap. 25). We have evidence in the Bible that the Philistines traded in slaves with Edom and Southern Arabia (Amos 1:6; ^{<0718>}Joel 3:3, 5), and their commercial character is indicated by the application of the name Canaan to their land (^{<0719>}Zephaniah 2:5). They probably possessed a navy; for they had ports attached to Gaza and Ashkelon; the Sept. speaks of their ships in its version of ^{<0714>}Isaiah 11:14, and they are represented as attacking the Egyptians out of ships. The Philistines had at an early period attained proficiency in the arts of peace; they were skilful as smiths (^{<0720>}1 Samuel 13:20), as armorers (17, 5, 6), and as builders, if we may judge from the prolonged sieges which several of their towns sustained. Their images and the golden mice and emerods (6:11) imply an acquaintance with the founder's and goldsmith's arts. Their wealth was abundant (^{<0721>}Judges 16:5, 18), and they appear in all respects to have been a prosperous people.

Picture for Philistine (3)

4. Subsequent Extension. — Possessed of such elements of power, the Philistines had attained in the time of the Judges an important position among Eastern nations. Their history is, indeed, almost a blank; yet the few particulars preserved to us are suggestive. About B.C. 1209 we find them engaged in successful war with the Sidonians, the effect of which was so serious to the latter power that it involved the transference of the capital of Phoenicia to a more secure position on the island of Tyre (Justin. 18:3). About the same period, or a little after, they were engaged in a naval war with Rameses III of Egypt, in conjunction with other Mediterranean

nations; in these wars they were unsuccessful (Brugsch, *Hist. d'Egypte*, pages 185, 187), but the notice of them proves their importance, and we cannot therefore be surprised that they were able to extend their authority over the Israelites, devoid as these were of internal union, and harassed by external foes. With regard to their tactics and the objects that they had in view in their attacks on the Israelites, we may form a fair idea from the scattered notices in the books of Judges and Samuel. The warfare was of a guerilla character, and consisted of a series of *raids* into the enemy's country. Sometimes these extended only just over the border, with the view of plundering the threshing-floors of the agricultural produce (^{Q130}1 Samuel 23:1); but more generally they penetrated into the heart of the country and seized a commanding position on the edge of the Jordan valley, whence they could secure themselves against a combination of the trans- and cis-Jordanic divisions of the Israelites, or prevent a return of the fugitives who had hurried across the river on the alarm of their approach. Thus at one time we find them crossing the central district of Benjamin and posting themselves on Michmash (^{Q136}1 Samuel 13:16), at another time following the coast-road to the plain of Esdraelon and reaching the edge of the Jordan valley by Jezreel (^{Q21}1 Samuel 29:11). From such posts as their headquarters they sent out detached bands to plunder the surrounding country (^{Q137}1 Samuel 13:17), and, having obtained all they could, they established some military mark (VI., A.V. "garrison," but perhaps meaning only a *column*, as in ^{Q126}Genesis 19:26) as a token of their supremacy (^{Q105}1 Samuel 10:5; 13:3), and retreated to their own country. This system of incursions kept the Israelites in a state of perpetual disquietude: all commerce was suspended, from the insecurity of the roads (^{Q106}Judges 5:6); and at the approach of the foe the people either betook themselves to the natural hiding-places of the country, or fled across the Jordan (^{Q135}1 Samuel 13:6, 7). By degrees the ascendancy became complete, and a virtual disarmament of the population was effected by the suppression of the smiths (^{Q139}1 Samuel 13:19). The profits of the Philistines were not confined to the goods and chattels they carried off with them. They seized the persons of the Israelites and sold them for slaves; the earliest notice of this occurs in ^{Q141}1 Samuel 14:21, where, according to the probably correct reading (**byxæ** and not **μydbæ**) followed by the Sept., we find that there were numerous slaves in the camp at Michmash: at a later period the prophets inveigh against them for their traffic in human flesh (^{Q106}Joel 3:6; Amos 1:6): at a still later period we hear that "the merchants of the country" followed the army of Gorgias into Judaea for the purpose of

buying the children of Israel for slaves (1 Macc. 3:41), and that these merchants were Philistines is a fair inference from the subsequent notice that Nicanor sold the captive Jews to the "cities upon the sea-coast" (2 Macc. 8:11). There can be little doubt, too, that tribute was exacted from the Israelites, but the notices of it are confined to passages of questionable authority, such as the rendering of ^{<0132>}1 Samuel 13:21 in the Sept., which represents the Philistines as making a charge of three shekels a tool for sharpening them; and again the expression "Metheg-ammah" in ^{<1001>}2 Samuel 8:1, which is rendered in the *Vulg. frenum tributi*, and by Symmachus τὴν ἐξουσίαν τοῦ φόρου (the true text may have been **hDMai** instead of **hMāh**). In each of the passages quoted the versions presuppose a text which yields a better sense than the existing one.

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

1. Under Joshua and the Judges. — The territory of the Philistines, having been once occupied by the Canaanites, formed a portion of the Promised Land, and was assigned to the tribe of Judah (^{<0651>}Joshua 15:2, 12, 45, 47). No part, however, of it was conquered in the lifetime of Joshua (^{<0631>}Joshua 13:2), and even after his death no permanent conquest was effected (^{<0013>}Judges 3:3), though, on the authority of a somewhat doubtful passage, we are informed that the three cities of Gaza, Ashkelon, and Ekron were taken (^{<0018>}Judges 1:18). The Philistines, at all events, soon recovered these, and commenced an aggressive policy against the Israelites, by which they gained a complete ascendancy over them. We are unable to say at what intervals their incursions took place, as nothing is recorded of them in the early period of the Judges. But they must have been frequent, inasmuch as the national spirit of the Israelites was so entirely broken that they even reprobated any attempt at deliverance (^{<0752>}Judges 15:12). Individual heroes were raised up from time to time whose achievements might well kindle patriotism, such as Shamgar the son of Anath (^{<0031>}Judges 3:31), and still more Samson (Judges 13-16); but neither of these men succeeded in permanently throwing off the yoke. Of the former only a single daring feat is recorded, the effect of which appears, from ^{<0016>}Judges 5:6, 7, to have been very shortlived. The true series of deliverances commenced with the latter, of whom it was predicted that "he shall begin to deliver" (^{<0716>}Judges 13:5), and were carried on by Samuel, Saul, and David. A brief notice occurs in ^{<0707>}Judges 10:7 of invasions by the Philistines and Ammonites,

followed by particulars which apply exclusively to the latter people. It has hence been supposed that the brief reference to the Philistines is in anticipation of Samson's history.

The history of Samson furnishes us with some idea of the relations which existed between the two nations. As a "borderer" of the tribe of Dan, he was thrown into frequent contact with the Philistines, whose supremacy was so established that no bar appears to have been placed to free intercourse with their country. His early life was spent on the verge of the Shephelah between Zorah and Eshtaol, but when his actions had aroused the active hostility of the Philistines he withdrew into the central district, and found a secure post on the rock of Etam, to the south-west of Bethlehem. Thither the Philistines followed him without opposition from the inhabitants. His achievements belong to his personal history: it is clear that they were the isolated acts of an individual, and altogether unconnected with any national movement; for the revenge of the Philistines was throughout directed against Samson personally. Under Eli there was an organized but unsuccessful resistance to the encroachments of the Philistines, who had penetrated into the central district and were met at Aphek (¹⁰⁰⁰1 Samuel 4:1). The production of the ark on this occasion demonstrates the greatness of the emergency, and its loss marked the lowest depth of Israel's degradation.

The next action took place under Samuel's leadership, and the tide of success turned in Israel's favor: the Philistines had again penetrated into the mountainous country near Jerusalem; at Mizpeh they met the cowed host of the Israelites, who, encouraged by the signs of divine favor, and availing themselves of the panic produced by a thunderstorm, inflicted on them a total defeat. For the first time the Israelites erected their pillar or *stèle* at Eben-ezer as the token of victory. The results were the recovery of the border-towns and their territories "from Ekron even unto Gath," i.e., in the northern district. The success of Israel may be partly ascribed to their peaceful relations at this time with the Amorites (¹⁰⁰⁰1 Samuel 7:9-14).

2. Under the Hebrew Monarchy. — The Israelites now attributed their past weakness to their want of unity, and they desired a king, with the special object of leading them against the foe (¹⁰⁰⁰1 Samuel 8:20). It is a significant fact that Saul first felt inspiration in the presence of a pillar (A.V. "garrison") erected by the Philistines in commemoration of a victory (¹⁰⁰⁰1 Samuel 10:5, 10). As soon as he was prepared to throw off the yoke he

occupied with his army a position at Michmash, commanding the defiles leading to the Jordan valley, and his heroic general Jonathan gave the signal for a rising by overthrowing the pillar which the Philistines had placed there. The challenge was accepted; the Philistines invaded the central district with an immense force (a copyist's clerical exaggeration, *SEE NUMBERI*), and, having dislodged Saul from Michmash, occupied it themselves, and sent forth predatory bands into the surrounding country. The Israelites shortly after took up a position on the other side of the ravine at Geba, and availing themselves of the confusion consequent upon Jonathan's daring feat, inflicted a tremendous slaughter upon the enemy (chapter 13, 14). No attempt was made by the Philistines to regain their supremacy for about twenty-five years, and the scene of the next contest shows the altered strength of the two parties: it was no longer in the central country, but in a ravine leading down to the Philistine plain, the valley of Elah, the position of which is about fourteen miles south-west of Jerusalem; on this occasion the prowess of young David secured success to Israel, and the foe was pursued to the gates of Gath and Ekron (chapter 17). The power of the Philistines was, however, still intact on their own territory, as is proved by the flight of David to the court of Achish (^{<0210>}1 Samuel 21:10-15), and his subsequent abode at Ziklag (chapter 27), where he was secured from the attacks of Saul. The border warfare was continued; captures and reprisals, such as are described as occurring at Keilah (^{<0231>}1 Samuel 23:1-5), being probably frequent. The scene of the next conflict was far to the north, in the valley of Esdraelon, whither the Philistines may have made a plundering incursion similar to that of the Midianites in the days of Gideon. The battle on this occasion proved disastrous to the Israelites: Saul himself perished, and the Philistines penetrated across the Jordan, and occupied the forsaken cities (^{<0301>}1 Samuel 31:1-7). The dissensions which followed the death of Saul were naturally favorable to the Philistines; and no sooner were these brought to a close by the appointment of David to be king over the united tribes than the Philistines attempted to counterbalance the advantage by an attack on the person of the king; they therefore penetrated into the valley of Rephaim, south-west of Jerusalem, and even pushed forward an advanced post as far as Bethlehem (^{<3116>}1 Chronicles 11:16). David twice attacked them at the former spot, and on each occasion with signal success, in the first case capturing their images, in the second pursuing them "from Geba until thou come to Gazer" (^{<1057>}2 Samuel 5:17-25; ^{<3448>}1 Chronicles 14:8-16). About seven years after the defeat at Rephaim, David, who had now

consolidated his power, attacked them on their own soil, and took Gath, with its dependencies (^{<380>}1 Chronicles 18:1), and thus (according to one interpretation of the obscure expression "Metheg-ammah" in ^{<108>}2 Samuel 8:1) "he took the arm-bridle out of the hand of the Philistines" (Bertheau, *Comm.* on 1 Chronicles), or (according to another) "he took the bridle of the metropolis out of the hand of the Philistines" (Gesenius, *Thesaur.* page 113) — meaning in either case that their ascendancy was utterly broken. This indeed was the case; for the minor engagements in David's lifetime probably all took place within the borders of Philistia; Gob, which is given as the scene of the second and third combats, being probably identical with Gath, where the fourth took place (^{<1015>}2 Samuel 21:15-22; comp. the Sept., some of the copies of which read Γέθ instead of Γόβ).

The whole of Philistia was included in Solomon's empire, the extent of which is described as being "from the river unto the land of the Philistines, unto the border of Egypt" (^{<1021>}1 Kings 4:21; ^{<1492>}2 Chronicles 9:26), and again, "from Tiphseh unto Gaza" (^{<1024>}1 Kings 4:24; A.V. "Azzah"). The several towns probably remained under their former governors, as in the case of Gath (^{<1029>}1 Kings 2:39), and the sovereignty of Solomon was acknowledged by the payment of tribute (^{<1021>}1 Kings 4:21). There are indications, however, that his hold on the Philistine country was by no means established; for we find him securing the passes that led up from the plain to the central district by the fortification of Gezer and Bethhoron (^{<1097>}1 Kings 9:17), while no mention is made either of Gaza or Ashdod, which fully commanded the coastroad. Indeed the expedition of Pharaoh against Gezer, which stood at the head of the Philistine plain, and which was quite independent of Solomon until the time of his marriage with Pharaoh's daughter, would lead to the inference that Egyptian influence was paramount in Philistia at this period (verse 16).

Under the later Jewish kings these signs of aggression on the part of the Philistines increase. The division of the empire at Solomon's death was favorable to the Philistine cause: Rehoboam secured himself against them by fortifying Gath and other cities bordering on the plain (^{<1408>}2 Chronicles 11:8); the Israelitish monarchs were either not so prudent or not so powerful, for they allowed the Philistines to get hold of Gibbethon, commanding one of the defiles leading up from the plain of Sharon to Samaria, the recovery of which involved them in a protracted struggle in the reigns of Nadab and Zimri (^{<1157>}1 Kings 15:27; 16:1). Judah meanwhile had lost the tribute; for it is recorded, as an occurrence that marked

Jehoshaphat's success, that "some of the Philistines brought presents" (^{<4471>}2 Chronicles 17:11). But this subjection was of brief duration: in the reign of his son Jehoram they avenged themselves by invading Judah in conjunction with the Arabians, and sacking the royal palace (^{<4216>}2 Chronicles 21:16, 17). The increasing weakness of the Jewish monarchy under the attacks of Hazael led to the recovery of Gath, which had been captured by that monarch in his advance on Jerusalem from the western plain in the reign of Jehoash (^{<4217>}2 Kings 12:17), and was probably occupied by the Philistines after his departure as an advanced post against Judah: at all events it was in their hands in the time of Uzziah, who dismantled (^{<4406>}2 Chronicles 26:6) and probably destroyed it; for it is adduced by Amos as an example of divine vengeance (^{<3106>}Amos 6:2), and then disappears from history. Uzziah at the same time dismantled Jabneh (Jamnia), in the northern part of the plain, and Ashdod, and further erected forts in different parts of the country to intimidate the inhabitants (^{<4406>}2 Chronicles 26:6). The prophecies of Joel and Amos prove that these measures were provoked by the aggressions of the Philistines, who appear to have formed leagues both with the Edomites and Phoenicians, and had reduced many of the Jews to slavery (^{<2104>}Joel 3:4-6; Amos 1:6-10). How far the means adopted by Uzziah were effectual we are not informed; but we have reason to suppose that the Philistines were kept in subjection until the time of Ahaz, when, relying upon the difficulties produced by the Syrian invasions, they attacked the border-cities in the Shephelah, and "the south" of Judah (^{<4408>}2 Chronicles 18:18).

From this time the notices of the Philistines are largely involved in the movements of the great powers surrounding Palestine. Isaiah's declarations (^{<2349>}Isaiah 14:29-32) throw light upon these subsequent events: from them we learn that the Assyrians, whom Ahaz summoned to his aid, proved themselves to be the "cockatrice that should come out of the serpent's (Judah's) root," by ravaging the Philistine plain. A few years later the Philistines, in conjunction with the Syrians and Assyrians ("the adversaries of Rezin"), and perhaps as the subject — allies of the latter, carried on a series of attacks on the kingdom of Israel (^{<2391>}Isaiah 9:11, 12). Hezekiah's reign inaugurated a new policy, in which the Philistines were deeply interested: that monarch formed an alliance, with the Egyptians, as a counterpoise to the Assyrians, and the possession of Philistia became henceforth the turning-point of the struggle between the two great empires of the East. Hezekiah, in the early part of his reign, re-established his

authority over the whole of it, "even unto Gaza" (^{<1288>}2 Kings 18:8). This movement was evidently connected with his rebellion against the king of Assyria, and was undertaken in conjunction with the Egyptians; for we find the latter people shortly after in possession of the five Philistine cities, to which alone are we able to refer the prediction in ^{<2398>}Isaiah 19:18, when coupled with the fact that both Gaza and Ashkelon are termed Egyptian cities in the annals of Sargon (Bunsen, *Egypt*; 4:603). The Assyrians under Tartan, the general of Sargon, made an expedition against Egypt, and took Ashdod, as the key of that country (^{<2301>}Isaiah 20:1, 4, 5). Under Sennacherib Philistia was again the scene of important operations: in his first campaign against Egypt Ashkelon was taken and its dependencies were plundered; Ashdod, Ekron, and Gaza submitted, and received as a reward a portion of Hezekiah's territory (Rawlinson, *Herod.* 1:477); in his second campaign (on the view that the two were different) other towns on the verge of the plain, such as Libnah and Lachish, were also taken (^{<1284>}2 Kings 18:14; 19:8). The Assyrian supremacy, though shaken by the failure of this latter expedition, was restored by Esar-haddon, who claims to have conquered Egypt (Rawlinson, 1:481); and it seems probable that the Assyrians retained their hold on Ashdod until its capture, after a long siege, by the Egyptian monarch Psammetichus (Herod. 2:157), the effect of which was to reduce the population of that important place to a mere "remnant" (^{<3451>}Jeremiah 25:20). It was about this time, and possibly while Psammetichus was engaged in the siege of Ashdod, that Philistia was traversed by a vast Scythian horde on their way to Egypt: they were, however, diverted from their purpose by the king, and retraced their steps, plundering on their retreat the rich temple of Venus at Ashkelon (Herod. 1:105). The description of Zephaniah (^{<3114>}Zephaniah 2:4-7), who was contemporary with this event, may well apply to this terrible scourge, though more generally referred to a Chaldaean invasion. The Egyptian ascendancy was not as yet re-established, for we find the next king, Necho, compelled to besiege Gaza (if the Cadytis of Herodotus, 2:159) on his return from the battle of Mlegiddo. After the death of Necho. the contest was renewed between the Egyptians and the Chaldaeans under Nebuchadnezzar, and the result was specially disastrous to the Philistines: Gaza was again taken by the former, and the population of the whole plain was reduced to a mere "remnant" by the invading armies (Jeremiah 47). The "old hatred" that the Philistines bore to the Jews was exhibited in acts of hostility at the time of the Babylonian captivity (^{<3251>}Ezekiel 25:15-17); but on the return this was somewhat abated, for some of the Jews married

Philistine women, to the great scandal of their rulers (^{<16133>}Nehemiah 13:23, 24).

3. Post-exilian History. — From this time the history of Philistia is absorbed in the struggles of the neighboring kingdoms. In B.C. 332, Alexander the Great traversed it on his way to Egypt, and captured Gaza, then held by the Persians under Betis, after a two month's siege. In 312 the armies of Demetrius Poliorcetes and Ptolemy fought in the neighborhood of Gaza. In 198 Antiochus the Great, in his war against Ptolemy Epiphanes, invaded Philistia and took Gaza. In 166 the Philistines joined the Syrian army under Gorgias in its attack on Judaea (1 Macc. 3:41). In 148 the adherents of the rival kings Demetrius II and Alexander Balas, under Apollonius and Jonathan respectively, contended in the Philistine plain: Jonathan took Ashdod, triumphantly entered Ashkelon, and received Ekron as his reward (1 Macc. 10:69-89). A few years later Jonathan again descended into the plain in the interests of Antiochus VI, and captured Gaza (1 Macc. 11:60-62). No further notice of the country occurs until the capture of Gaza in 97 by the Jewish king Alexander Jannseus, in his contest with Lathyrus (Joseph. *Ant.* 13:13, 3; *War*, 1:4, 2). In 63 Pompey annexed Philistia to the province of Syria (*Ant.* 14:4, 4), with the exception of Gaza, which was assigned to Herod (15:7, 3), together with Jamnia, Ashdod, and Ashkelon, as appears from 17:11, 5. The last three fell to Salome after Herod's death, but Gaza was re-annexed to Syria (17:11, 4, 5). The latest notices of the Philistines as a nation, under their title of ἀλλόφυλοι, occur in 1 Macc. 3-5. The extension of the name from the district occupied by them to the whole country, under the familiar form of PALESTINE, has already been noticed under that head.

III. Usages, etc. — With regard to the institutions of the Philistines our information is very scanty. Their military tactics have been noticed above. The country in which they settled is remarkably productive (^{<1188E>}2 Kings 8:2). Thomson exclaims on entering it, "Beautiful but monotonous-wheat, wheat, a very ocean of wheat" (*Land and Book*, 2:32 sq.). The country, he adds, greatly resembles some of the prairies in Western America. "Isaac sowed in that land, and received in the same year a hundredfold" (^{<1232>}Genesis 26:12). Not only was agriculture most remunerative, but Philistia was the highway for caravans between Egypt and the north, and commerce must have added to its wealth. Harbors were attached to Gaza and Ashkelon, and a lucrative navigation may have been carried on. The

greatness of the cities was mainly owing to commerce, for the coast of Palestine was in the earliest ages exclusively in possession of the traffic which was carried on between Europe and Asia. Besides a great transit trade, they had internal sources of wealth, being given to agriculture (^{<0715>}Judges 15:5). In the time of Saul they were evidently superior in the arts of life to the Israelites; for we read (^{<0933>}1 Samuel 13:20) that the latter were indebted to the former for the utensils of ordinary life.

The five chief cities had, as early as the days of Joshua, constituted themselves into a confederacy, restricted, however, in all probability, to matters of offence and defence. Each was under the government of a prince whose official title was *seren*, $\hat{r}S_i$ (^{<0633>}Joshua 13:3; ^{<00RB>}Judges 3:3, etc.), and occasionally *sar*, *rCi* (^{<0830>}1 Samuel 18:30; 29:6). Gaza may be regarded as having exercised a hegemony over the others, for in the list of the towns it is mentioned the first (^{<0633>}Joshua 13:3; Amos 1:7, 8), except where there is an especial ground for giving prominence to another, as in the case of Ashdod (^{<0917>}1 Samuel 6:17). Ekron always stands last, while Ashdod, Ashkelon, and Gath interchange places. Each town possessed its own territory, as instanced in the case of Gath (^{<3801>}1 Chronicles 18:1), Ashdod (^{<0916>}1 Samuel 5:6), and others, and each possessed its dependent towns or "daughters" (^{<0656>}Joshua 15:45-47; ^{<3801>}1 Chronicles 18:1; ^{<0012>}2 Samuel 1:20; ^{<3667>}Ezekiel 16:27, 57), and its villages (Joshua l.c.). In later times Gaza had a senate of five hundred (Joseph. *Ant.* 13:13, 3).

The Philistines appear to have been deeply imbued with superstition: they carried their idols with them on their campaigns (^{<1052>}2 Samuel 5:21), and proclaimed their victories in their presence (^{<0809>}1 Samuel 31:9). They also carried about their persons charms of some kind that had been presented before the idols (2 Macc. 12:40). The gods whom they chiefly worshipped were Dagon, who possessed temples both at Gaza (^{<0763>}Judges 16:23) and at Ashdod (^{<0916>}1 Samuel 5:3-5; ^{<3801>}1 Chronicles 10:10; 1 Macc. 10:83); Ashtoreth, whose temple at Ashkelon was far-famed (^{<0810>}1 Samuel 31:10; Herod. 1:105); Baal-zebub, whose fane at Ekron was consulted by Ahaziah (^{<1202>}2 Kings 1:2-6); and Derceto, who was honored at Ashkelon (Diod. Sic. 2:4), though unnoticed in the Bible. Priests and diviners (^{<0916>}1 Samuel 6:2) were attached to the various seats of worship; and the Philistine magicians were in repute (^{<2006>}Isaiah 2:6).

The special authorities for the history of the Philistines are Stark, *Gaza und die philistiiische Küste* (Jena, 1852); Knobel, *Volkertafel der Genesis*

(Giess. 1850); Movers, *Phonizien* (Bonn, 1841); Hitzig, *Urgesch. und Mythologie der Philistaer* (Leips. 1845); and Kneucker, in Schenkel's *Bibel-Lex.* s.v. Philistaer. See also *Jour. Sac. Lit.* July 1852, page 323 sq.; January 1856, page 299 sq.; Frisch, *De Origine, diis et terra Palaestinatorum* (Tubing. 1696); Wolf, *Apparatus Philistceorumz bellicorum* (Viteb. 1711); Hannecker, *Die Philistaer* (Eichstadt, 1872).

Phillipps, George

a Congregational minister, was born at Rondham, in the county of Norfolk, England, near the opening of the 17th century. Having given early indications of a remarkably vigorous mind, a strong love of knowledge, and a deep sense of religion, he was sent to the University of Cambridge, where he received his education, and distinguished himself as a scholar. Theology was his favorite study; and, while yet a young man, he had made himself familiar with the most celebrated of the fathers of the Christian Church. Not long after his ordination he began to entertain scruples with regard to certain requirements of the Established Church. This dissatisfaction became so strong that at last he determined to emigrate to this country with a company of Puritans, among whom was John Winthrop. He arrived at Salem in 1630. Having founded with a number of others the settlement of Watertown, Massachusetts, Phillipps became the first pastor of the Church, and as such he continued his labors till near the time of his death, which occurred July 1, 1644. Phillipps possessed no small degree of intellectual acumen, and was an able controversial writer. He was a man of great independence of mind, and adhered with unyielding tenacity to his conscientious convictions. ie seems to have been in advance of nearly all his contemporaries in regard to the principles of strict Congregationalism; insomuch that his views were, for a time, regarded as novel and extreme. His ministry was marked by great diligence and fervor, and attended with rich blessings. His publications are, *Reply to the Confutation of some Grounds of Infant Baptism; as also Concerning the Form of a Church, put forth against me by one Thomas Lamb* (Lond. 1645, 4to). See Mather, *Magnalia*, 3:82-84, 162; Winthrop, *Journal*; Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 1:15-17. (J.H.W.)

Phillips, James, D.D.

an eminent Presbyterian divine, was born at Newendon, Essex County, England, April 22, 1792. His father was a minister of the Established

Church of England, and attached to the Evangelical party in that Church. His early education was acquired mostly while he was engaged in private study and teaching in the service of the English navy. His tastes and habits seem to have been fixed early, and to the impressions which he there received, and the scenes he witnessed at the great military and naval stations, may be traced many of his later habits and interests. He came to America in 1818, and engaged in the business of teaching at Harlem, N.Y., where he soon had a flourishing school. There were at that time in New York and the neighborhood a number of American and British mathematicians who had organized a mathematical club, of which he became a member. To the mathematical journals published at that time he was a regular contributor, or at least to two of them — the *Mathematical Repository* and *Nash's Diary*. In 1826 he was elected to the vacant mathematical chair in the University of North Carolina, and entered upon the duties of his professorship in July of the same year. In this position he continued to labor for forty-one years, devoting himself with unremitting care and attention to his duties. The amount of work he went through with is amazing. He projected a complete course of mathematical works, and published in 1828 a work on conic sections, which was afterwards adopted as a text-book in Columbia College, New York. He prepared also treatises on algebra, geometry, trigonometry, differential and integral calculus, and natural philosophy, besides making for his own use translations of many of the French mathematicians-which works, however, he never made any attempt to publish. He also joined the other members of the faculty in contributing his quota to the *Harbinger*, a newspaper published at Chapel Hill, in 1832, under the direction of Dr. Caldwell. Up to the time of his coming to North Carolina, and for many years after, he seems to have devoted himself exclusively to scientific studies. Although he had been for years a consistent member of the Church, yet now he began to experience a change, which he regarded as the true beginning of his Christian life. Henceforth he ceased to be the mere teacher of science; he added to his other duties the diligent study of theology and unwearied activity in all Christian duties, and in September, 1833, was licensed by the Presbytery of Orange, at New Hope, and in April, 1835, was ordained to the full work of the ministry. He was never installed as pastor, but he preached as a supply for some time at Pittsboro', and afterwards, for the greater part of his ministerial life, at New Hope Church. He was in the full discharge of his professional duties when he died suddenly March 14, 1867. Dr. Phillips was a man of remarkable literary, theological, and professional attainments.

He was an inexorable mathematician, but well and thoroughly read in all departments. Many books in his library had this simple comment, "Perlegi." His chief religious reading was among the old Nonconformist divines; his favorite authors were the old English classics; the book that was oftenest in his hand was the Bible. He was a great preacher; his sermons were complete structures; there was nothing oratorical about him-it was the pure "weight of metal." As a man he was uncompromisingly conscientious, remarkably modest, free from all arrogance and presumption, and yet most genial as a companion and friend. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1868, page 349. (J.L.S.)

Phillips, John, LL.D.

an American philanthropist of some note, was born in Andover, Massachusetts, December 27, 1719; was educated at Harvard College (class of 1735); and having preached for some time, at length engaged in mercantile pursuits, and was for several years a member of the Council of New Hampshire. In 1778 he and his brother, Samuel Phillips, of Andover, founded and liberally endowed the academy in that town, which was incorporated in 1780. In 1789 he further gave to this institution \$20,000. The academy called Phillips Exeter Academy, of which he was the sole founder, was incorporated in 1781, with a fund which was eventually increased to \$134,000. He endowed a professorship in Dartmouth College, and he contributed liberally to Princeton College. He died in April 1795, bequeathing to his academy two thirds of all his estate, and one third of 'the residue to the seminary at Andover, particularly for the benefit of pious youth.

Phillips, Morgan

sometimes called *Phillip Morgan*, a Roman Catholic divine, was born probably during the latter part of the 15th century. He received his education at Oxford, graduating in the class of 1537. He was made principal of St. Mary's Hall in 1546, and was one of the founders of the English College at Douay, where he died in 1570. His powers as a disputant were so great that he was called "Morgan the Sophister." and he was one of the three selected to dispute with Peter Martyr on the Eucharist, and published on that occasion *Disputatio de Sacramento Eucharistiae in Univ. Oxon. habita contra D. Peter Martyr, 13 Mai, 1549*. He also published *A Treatise showing the Regiment of Women is*

conformable to the Law of God and Nature (Liege, 1571, 8vo), written in answer to John Knox's work, *The First Blast of the Trumpet*, etc. See Wood, *Athen. Oxon.*; Dodd, *Ch. Hist.* volume 3; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* s.v.

Phillips, Richard

an English Wesleyan preacher, was born in 1777. In early life he was brought to Christ through Methodist influence, and, feeling called of God to the work of the ministry, entered the itinerant ranks in 1804, and continued in the active labors of the ministry until 1844, when debility constrained him to accept an assistant, and to preach only occasionally. "Blessed with a good understanding and a retentive memory, patient and prudent, enjoying the life of God in his soul, and warmly attached to the doctrines and discipline of Methodism, he preached those doctrines and administered that discipline to the profit of the Wesleyan body." See *Wesleyan Magazine*, 1846, page 916.

Phillips, Samuel (1)

a Congregational minister, was born February 17, 1690 (O.S.), at Salem, Massachusetts. He graduated at Harvard College in 1708, and was ordained, October 17, 1711, pastor of the South Parish, Andover, where he remained until his death, June 5, 1771. Samuel Phillips was a devoted orthodox preacher, and not only refused to be affected by the heretical tendencies of his times, but combated all Arian influences, and became a most decided opponent of the Unitarians. "As a preacher, he was highly respectable, was zealous, and endeavored not only to indoctrinate his people in sentiments which he deemed correct and important, but to lead them to the practice of all Christian duties." He published, *Elegy upon the Death of Nicholas Noyes and George Curwen* (1718): — *A Word in Season, or Duty of a People to take the Oath of Allegiance to a Glorious God* (1727): — *Advice to a Child* (1729): — *The History of the Savior* (1738): — *The Orthodox Christian, or a Child well Instructed* (1738): — *A Minister's Address to his People* (1739): — *A Sermon on Living Water to be had for Asking* (1750): — *A Sermon on the Sinner's Refusal to Come to Christ* (1753): — *A Sermon on the Necessity of God's Drawing in Order to Men's Coming unto Christ* (1753): — *Seasonable Advice to a Neighbor, in a Dialogue* (1761): — *Address to Young People, in a*

Dialogue (1763); and several occasional sermons. See Sprague, *Annals*, 1:273.

Phillips, Samuel (2), LL.D.

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

Phillips, Thomas

an English Roman Catholic priest, was born in Buckinghamshire in 1708. He received his education at St. Omer's College, and became a most zealous worker in the Church. He obtained a prebend in the collegiate church of Tongres, and resided for many years in the family of the earl of Shrewsbury. Towards the end of his life he retired to the English college at Liege, where he died in 1774. He published, *The Study of Sacred Literature fully Stated and Considered* (Lond. 1756, 8vo; 2d ed. 1758; 3d ed. 1765):— *Philemon* (1761, 8vo). This autobiographical pamphlet was privately printed, and suppressed: — *The History of the Life of Reginald Pole* (Oxford, 1764-1767, 2 parts in 1 volume, 4to; Lond. 1767, 2 volumes, 8vo). This work elicited six answers, by Richard Lillard, T. Ridley, T. Neve, E. Stone, B. Pye, and J. Jones (see Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* 26:460-461), and Phillips responded in an appendix to the *Life* (1767, 4to); see also end of his 3d ed. of *Study of Sacred Literature*:— *Reasons for the Repeal of the Law against the Papists*: — *Translation in Metre of the Hymn Lauda Sion Salvatorem*: — *Censura Commentariorum Cornelii a Lapide*, in Latin, on a single sheet. He also addressed some poetry to his sister Elizabeth, abbess of the Benedictine nuns at Ghent. See Cole's *MS. Athen.* in the British Museum; *European Magazine*, for September 1796; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* s.v.

Phillips, William (1)

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

the Massachusetts General Hospital, each \$5000; to the Medical Dispensary \$3000; to the Female Asylum, and the Asylum for Boys, each \$2000.

Phillips, William (2)

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Jessamine County, Kentucky, May 7, 1797. Even as a youth he exhibited talents of a superior order. He received a careful and pious training, but he did not as a young man make any outward profession of religion; and after entering political life, and while engaged for several years as a successful teacher, he became even less considerate of his higher and immortal interests, and sought refuge from the accusations, of conscience in the dark and cheerless regions of infidelity. His early impressions of religious truth were, however, strong and abiding, and he was finally converted, and deeply impressed with the idea that he was called of God to enter the Christian ministry. December 27, 1828, he was licensed as a local preacher. In the fall of 1831 he was received into the Kentucky Conference. He was appointed consecutively to the Winchester Circuit, Lexington Circuit, and Newport and Covington stations. He was also assistant editor of the *Western Christian Advocate*, serving for one year by appointment of the Book Committee, and then by vote of the General Conference of 1836. Among his numerous contributions to that journal was a series of articles on the peculiar tenets of Alexander Campbell, which excited very considerable attention. These were republished, by request of the Ohio Conference, after Mr. Phillips's death, which occurred June 22, 1836, only a few weeks after his election by the General Conference.

Phillips, William Wirt, D.D.

a Presbyterian divine, was born in Montgomery County, N.Y., September 23, 1796. He graduated at Union College, Schenectady, N.Y., in 1812; completed a three years' course in the Associate Reformed Theological Seminary, New York, and afterwards spent a year in the theological seminary at New Brunswick, N.J., under the instruction of Reverend Dr. Livingston; was licensed by the New Brunswick Classis of the Reformed Dutch Church, and in April 1818, was ordained and installed pastor of Pearl Street Presbyterian Church, New York City. From this church he was called to the First Presbyterian Church, New York. The congregation having disposed of their building and ground in Wall Street, in May, 1844,

the corner-stone of the building on Fifth Avenue, near Twelfth Street, was laid in the following autumn, and soon after completed. Dr. Phillips was their beloved pastor for a period of nearly forty years; he was actively engaged in the discharge of his ministerial duties until about four weeks before his death, which occurred March 20, 1865. Dr. Phillips was a man of the utmost simplicity of character; a sound and able preacher of the Gospel, whose aim in the pulpit was to hold forth the Word of Life in all its purity, and to impress it with solemnity upon the hearts of all his hearers. He was moderator of the General Assembly which met at Pittsburgh in 1835, and for many years previous to his death he was the presiding officer of the Board of Foreign Missions. He was also president of the Board of Publication; a trustee of Princeton College and Seminary; a director of the Sailors' Snug Harbor, and several other benevolent institutions. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1866, page 160; *Congreg. Quar.* 1859, page 133. (J.L. S.)

Phil(l)potts, Henry, D.D.

an English prelate of much note, was the son of a respectable hotel-keeper of Gloucester, and was born in that city in 1777. At the age of fifteen he was elected to a scholarship at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, and having taken the degree of B.A., gained the chancellor's prize for an English essay in 1795. He was elected in the following year to a fellowship at Magdalen College, which he vacated on his marriage in 1804 with Miss Surtees, a niece of the late lord chancellor Eldon. In 1806 he became chaplain to Dr. Barrington, bishop of Durham, and in that capacity distinguished himself by a controversy which he maintained against the learned Roman Catholic historian of England, Dr. Lingard (q.v.), and subsequently by the publication of some pamphlets, vindicating the established clergy in the North from the attacks of lords Grey and Durham. For these services he was rewarded with the rich living of Stanhope. In 1825 he again entered the lists of controversy as the opponent of Mr. Charles Butler's *Book of the Catholic Church*. In 1827 he published his celebrated *Letter on Catholic Emancipation* addressed to Mr. Canning, soon after which he was promoted (in 1828) to the deanery of Chester, which he exchanged in October 1830, for the bishopric of Exeter. As a member of the House of Lords, bishop Phillpotts proved the zealous champion of Tory principles, and consequently opposed the Reform Bill, the Irish Church Temporalities Bill, the Poor-law Bill, the Ecclesiastical Commission, the National

Education Bill, and every measure of a liberal tendency. Dr. Phillpott was for many years in that assembly the recognized episcopal head and representative of the extreme HighChurch party, and by his writings and speeches warmly advocated the revival of convocation, and of other innovations on the established system of ecclesiastical affairs. In 1849 he rejected Mr. Gorham, who was nominated by the crown to a living in Devoushire, on the ground that he held erroneous opinions as to the effects of infant baptism; and though he was supported by the ecclesiastical courts, their judgment was set aside on appeal by a decision of the judicial committee of the privy council in 1850. On this Dr. Phillpotts published a *Letter* in which he formally excommuniacated the archbishop of Canterbury, who had been a party to the decision (see *Edirb. Rev.* 95:59-65). **SEE OKRHATI CASE**. In the following year he held a synod of his clergy at Exeter, which was pronounced illegal by the officers of the crown, and has never since been summoned. He died in 1869. The list of Dr. Phillpotts's controversial pamphlets occupies no less than twelve pages in the new catalogue of the British Museum. His best-known publications are given in Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v. See *English Cyclop.* s.v.; *Men of the Time*, s.v.; *Blackwood's Mag.* 24:1; 29:157; *Dublin University Mag.* 20:223; *Firaser's Mag.* 2:687; *Lond. Athen.* 1861, 1:151.

Philo

(surnamed in Latin JUDAEUS, i.e., the Jew; in Hebrew, יהודאי פילון; in Greek, Φίλων [ὁ] Ἰουδαῖος), the greatest of ancient Jewish philosophers, flourished in the 1st century of the Christian sera. We give a somewhat lengthy exposition of his philosophic and religious opinions.

Life. — Philo was a native and throughout life a resident of Alexandria. The precise time of his birth is unknown, but he represents himself as of advanced age about A.D. 40, when he was sent as chief of an embassy from the Jews of Alexandria to the emperor Caligula, for the purpose of pleading their cause against Apion, who charged them with refusing to pay due honors to Caesar (Josephus, *Ant.* 18:8, 1; comp. *De Legat. ad Caium*, 28). He was probably about sixty years old; if so, he was born about B.C. 20, and was contemporary with all the important events of the New Testament. He went again to Rome in the reign of Claudius, but after this nothing is known with certainty of his whereabouts. Philo had a brother employed in the affairs of government at Alexandria, named Alexander

Lysimachus, who is supposed to be the Alexander mentioned in ~~Acts~~ Acts 4:6 as a man "of the kindred of the highpriest." That Philo was a member of the sacerdotal family is asserted by Josephus (*Ant.* 18:8, 1), and also by Eusebius, Jerome, and others, and his own writings indirectly testify that such was the fact. There is also reason to believe that he belonged to the sect of the Pharisees. Philo was eminent for his learning and eloquence. To the attainments usually secured by Jews of his social condition (Eusebius, *Prep. Evang.* 8:13) he added an extensive knowledge of the Greek philosophy, especially the Platonic, for the acquisition of which the most favorable opportunities would occur in Alexandria, at that time the very metropolis of the learned world and the home of revived Hellenism. He has been represented by Scaliger and Cudworth as ignorant of Jewish literature and customs, but Fabricius and Mangey have clearly shown that such a view is entirely groundless. The supposition of his ignorance of Hebrew must have arisen from the fact that the Jews of Alexandria at that time were so little acquainted with the original of the Old-Test. Scriptures that they had to be supplied with the Sept. and other Greek versions. But even Geiger, who says that Philo had but a schoolboy knowledge of the Hebrew language, concedes that when the translation of the Bible was undertaken for the Alexandrian Jews, "they had not yet been altogether estranged from the Hebrew language;" but that they were no longer so much at home and versed in it that they could have fully mastered the Book which was to offer them the bread and water of life; it was the Grecian language that must bring it home to them" (page 146; comp. also page 148). As absurd as is this charge of Philo's ignorance of Hebrew is the charge that Philo's Greek is unclassical, and this because he was a Jew. As well might we say of the Jewish literati of Germany that their style is Jewish-German, and not the pure tongue of Lessing and Gervinus. Philo's Greek was of course not that of Plato, nor the pure Attic of Demosthenes. No one at Alexandria wrote so purely, but Philo wrote as did his contemporaries, and as wrote the best of them. In his treatise *De Congressu*, 14. Philo refers himself to his own attainments in grammar, philosophy, geometry, music, and poetry; and his accomplished character was thus gracefully attested by his wife, who, when once asked why she alone of all her sex did not wear any golden ornaments, replied: "The virtue of a husband is a sufficient ornament for his wife" (*Fragments*, ed. Richter, 6:236).

The circumstance that Philo was contemporary with New-Test. events, coupled with his high intelligence and interest in sacred learning, as well as

with the fact that he once visited Jerusalem "to offer up prayers and sacrifices in the Temple" (although only one such visit is referred to by him [Richter's ed. of *Firagments*, 6:200], his piety and devotion probably led to occasional repetitions of this pilgrimage, which were less likely to be mentioned because of his modesty and reserve in personal matters), led ancient writers to connect Philo intimately with Christianity. Photius (*Bibl. Cod.* 15) makes him a friend of the apostle Peter; as do also Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* 2:17), Jerome (*Catal. Scriptor. Eccles.*), and Suidas. Photius goes so far as to say that Philo was admitted into the Christian Church, from which he afterwards fell. But while we have no direct means of testing the truth of such statements, they certainly do not bear the evidence on their face. A man of such decided characteristics as Philo could no more have remained quiet after conversion than did Saul of Tarsus, and, because we have no utterances from him as a Christian, we have reason to reject the story as fabulous from first to last. Besides, Philo's own extant writings do not give the slightest reference to any such important step, and this fact tells even more strongly, if possible, against the report.

His Theology and Philosophy. — In the article NEOPLATONISM *SEE* **NEOPLATONISM** (q.v.) it has been shown that this eclectic philosophy, though it developed in the 3d century after Christ, is not only to be regarded in its origin as coeval with Christianity, but must acknowledge as its father and founder Philo the Jew (see Kingsley, *Alexandria and her Schools*, page 79). Alexandria, from its very foundation by Alexander the Great in B.C. 332, had sought to establish Greek civilization within its borders, and to produce an intellect that might be the rival of Athens in her proudest day. Mind was the secret of Greek power, and for that the great conqueror would work in this African city, which he designed to be the point of union of two, or, rather, of three worlds. For in this place, named after himself, Europe, Asia, and Africa were to meet and to hold communion. Under the Ptolemies this desire was strengthened still more, and yet the outcome of all the Ptolemaean appliances was of little or no account if we except the great collection of MSS. and art treasures. The wisest men, though gathered from the most learned centres of the world, failed to produce anything that was really worth preserving. In physics they did little. In art nothing. In metaphysics less than nothing. Says Kingsley, "You must not suppose that the philosophers whom the Ptolemies collected (as they would any other marketable article) by liberal offers of pay and patronage, were such men as the old Seven Sages of Greece, or as

Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle. In these three last indeed, Greek thought reached not merely its greatest height, but the edge of a precipice, down which it rolled headlong after their decease. . . . When the Romans destroyed Greece, God was just and merciful. The eagles were gathered together only because the carrion needed to be removed from the face of God's earth. And at the time of which I now speak the signs of approaching death were fearfully apparent. Hapless and hopeless enough were the clique of men out of whom the first two Ptolemies hoped to form a school of philosophy; men certainly clever enough, and amusing withal, who might give the kings of Egypt many a shrewd lesson in kingcraft and the crafts of this world, and the art of profiting by the folly of fools and the selfishness of the selfish; or who might amuse them, in default of fighting-cocks, by puns and repartees, and battles of logic; 'how one thing cannot be predicated of another,' or 'how the wise man is not only to overcome every misfortune, but not even to feel it,' and other such weighty questions, which in those days hid that deep unbelief in any truth whatsoever which was spreading fast over the minds of men . . . during those frightful centuries which immediately preceded the Christian aera, when was fast approaching that dark chaos of unbelief and unrighteousness which Saul of Tarsus so analyzes and describes in the first chapter of his Epistle to the Romans; when the old light was lost, the old faiths extinct, the old reverence for the laws of family and national life destroyed, yea, even the natural instincts themselves perverted; that chaos whose darkness Juvenal and Petronius and Tacitus have proved in their fearful pages not to have been exaggerated by the more compassionate though more righteous Jew" (pages 55-63).

Fortunately for the Macedonians, another Eastern nation had closely intermingled with them, and from this mixture of two races came that superior product which gave to Alexandrian thought not only a new impulse, but a superior life. When Hellenism was transferred to Alexandria, the Grecian spirit, as we have seen, was in an exhausted and faded condition. But together with Hellenism had come Judaism also. True, the latter was not sought for and imported at the bidding of the mighty conqueror of three worlds, but he had suffered the Jews to find a home in Alexandria, and thus Judaism found its establishment then and there. The Ptolemies also pursued the same conciliatory policy; and Judaism gained strength and developed so much at Alexandria that it became a center of

Jewish thought and learning for several centuries, and its rabbins were called "the light of Israel."

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

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

The allegorical method of interpreting the sacred Scriptures, which had long prevailed among the more cultivated of the Alexandrian Jews, was adopted by Philo without restriction. His principle that the prophets were only involuntary instruments of the Spirit which spoke through them was favorable to the freest use of this mode of exegesis. He pronounced those

who would merely tolerate a literal interpretation of the Scriptures as low, unworthy, and superstitious; and while he was thus led astray frequently to the introduction of foreign heathen elements into the store of divine revelation, and to the refusal of all elements which, like the anthropomorphisms for instance, seemed offensive to the culture of the time, Philo, like Origen (q.v.) in later times, far from rejecting the literal sense in every case, often, especially in the case of historical events in the Old Test., assumed both this and the allegorical sense as equally true. But Philo, besides this, regarded as higher that conception of Scripture which penetrated beneath the shell of the letter to what he thought to be the kernel of philosophical truth; beneath the anthropomorphic and anthropopathic representations of God, to that idealistic view of God which, in fact, divests him in the end of all concrete attributes. In this way, in spite of his opposition to *Hellenic* mysteries, Philo set up a radical distinction of initiated and uninitiated, a mode of interpretation which leads very easily to the contempt of the letter, and thus to an unhistorical, abstractly spiritualistic tendency. *SEE INTERPRETATION*. As a devoted, believing Jew, Philo accepted Judaism as a truth requiring no proof. But in him, as probably in others of the Alexandro-Jewish school of philosophers before him, the desire was awakened to blend the Jewish inheritance with the newly acquired Grecian knowledge; to heighten the truths of Judaism by the addition of Hellenic culture; to reconcile both treasures with each other, so that each should make the lustre of the other shine the more clearly and brightly. Directly antagonistic as they were to each other, a compromise must needs be effected between them. Judaism is the fruit of self-evidence, inner experience of a vivid conviction, for which no proof is required. Hellenism, on the contrary, proceeded from investigation, from human research, starting from the physical, to reach, by combination and analysis, the higher idea. These are two processes not only diverging in their progress, but even in their whole conception, and these two directly antagonistic views clashed against each other. But there was also in Hellenism a tendency which, although grown from the Grecian spirit, nevertheless endeavored to conceive, by a certain prophetic flight of poesy, the higher, thence to descend to the lower, and thus to make the former descend into lower degrees. It desired likewise directly to conceive the divine, the ideal, by intuition, by higher perception. With such a bold flight Plato conceived the everlasting Good, the everlasting Beautiful, whence individual ideals evolve themselves, which as archetypes — we are not told whether they have a distinct existence, or must be regarded as mere fictions

of the spirit — are expressed in real objects, perfect in themselves, while the several visible objects represent them in a limited degree. This was a system which especially suited the philosophizing Jews; it afforded them a bridge between the purely spiritual and the physical objects. How does the Highest Spirit, the eternally Perfect One, enter into the finite world? He creates ideals from himself, says Plato. He introspects himself, and thus perfection is produced; but this perfection impresses itself upon more subordinate existences, and thus it descends from immediate causes to intermediate causes, until the real objects spring into existence, and creation becomes manifest to us; God, the eternal existence, the eternally perfect, is the highest cause, but the eternally Pure One does not immediately come into contact with the impure — only by means of manifold emanations and concatenations, the earthly grows into existence. Such views afforded the philosophic Jews a happy means of preserving the theory of the infallibility and inconceivableness of God, and yet of accepting the different figurative expressions concerning God in the Bible, because they could refer to the subordinate beings. Hellenism of that time, stiff and sober as it was, was unfit to conceive naive, poetical imageries, and to admit poetical expression without fearing that thereby the sublimity of thought might be violated. The latter was tenaciously adhered to, and whenever it expressed entities too directly, it had to yield to forced interpretations. To such also the Bible was frequently subjected. Narratives and commands were forcibly driven from their natural simplicity into artificial philosophemes, in the belief that their value would thus be enhanced. The figurative expressions and events in connection with God were referred to such subordinate spirits as had evolved themselves from God. In the writings of Philo that intermediate agency is comprised in the *Logos*.

As with Plato and the elder Greeks, so with Philo, *theology* was the ultimate object of all metaphysical science. But there arose a puzzle in the mind of the Jewish philosopher, as in reality it had already arisen in the minds of Socrates and Plato. How could he reconcile the idea of that absolute and eternal one Being, that Zeus, Father of gods and men, self-perfect, self-contained, without change or motion, in whom, as a Jew, he believed even more firmly than the Platonists, with the Daemon of Socrates, the divine teacher whom both Plato and Solomon confessed? Or how, again, could he reconcile the idea of him with the creative and providential energy, working in space and time, working in matter, and

apparently affected and limited, if not baffled, by the imperfection of the matter which he moulded? Philo offered a solution in that idea of a Logos, or Word of God, divinity articulate, speaking and acting in time and space, and therefore by successive acts, and so doing in time and space the will of the timeless and spaceless Father, the abysmal and eternal Being, of whom he was the perfect likeness. In calling this person the Logos, and making him the source of all human reason, and knowledge of eternal laws, he only translated from Hebrew into Greek the name which he found in his sacred books, "The Word of God." Of God himself, Philo teaches that he is incorporeal, invisible, and cognizable only through the reason; that he is the most universal of beings, the Being to whom alone being, as such, truly pertains; that he is more excellent than virtue, than science, or even than the good *per se* and the beautiful *per se*. He is one and simple, imperishable and eternal; his existence is absolute and separate from the world; the world is his work. Thus while Philo contends that God is to be worshipped as a personal being, he yet conceives him at the same time as the most general of existences: τὸ γενικώτατόν ἐστιν ὁ θεός (*Legis Alleg.* 2). God is the only truly existent *being*, τὸ ὄν (*De Somn.* 1:655, ed. Mang.). But Philo, similarly to the Neo-Platonists of a later epoch, advances upon the Platonic doctrine by representing God as exalted not only above all human knowledge and virtue-as Plato had done-but as above the idea of the Good — κρείττων τε ἢ ἀρετῆ, καὶ κρεῖττων ἢ ἐπιστήμη, καὶ κρείττων ἢ αὐτὸ τὰγαθὸν καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ καλόν (*De Mundi Officio*, 1:2, ed. Mang.) with which Plato identifies him-and by teaching that we do not arrive at the absolute by scientific demonstration (λόγων ἀποδείξει), but by an intermediate subjective certainty (ἐναργείᾳ, *De post Caini*, 48, page 258, ed. Mang.). Still a certain kind of knowledge of God, which, however, is only second in rank, results from the aesthetic and teleological view of the world, as founded on the Socratic principle that "no work of skill makes itself" (οὐδὲν τῶν τεχνικῶν ἔργων ἀπαντοματίζεται). God is one and simple: ὁ θεὸς μόνος ἐστὶ καὶ ἓν, οὐ σύγκριμα, φύσις ἀπλῆ...τέτακται οὖν ὁ θεὸς κατὰ τὸ ἓν καὶ τὴν μονάδα, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ἡ μονὰς κατὰ τὸν ἓνα θεόν (*Legis Alleg.* 2:1, 66 sq. ed. Mang.). God is the only free nature (ἡ μόνη ἐλευθέρα φύσις, *De Somn.* 2), full of himself and sufficient to himself (αὐτὸ ἐαυτοῦ πλήρης καὶ ἐαυτῷ ἰκανόν, *De Nom. Mutat.* 1:582); everything finite is involved in necessity. God is not in contact with matter; if he were he would be defiled. He who holds the world itself to be God the Lord has fallen into error and sacrilege. In his essence God is incomprehensible; we can only

know that he is, not what he is. All names which are intended to express the separate attributes of God are appropriate only in a figurative sense. since God is in truth an unqualified and pure being. Notwithstanding the pantheistically sounding neuters which Plato applies to God, Philo ascribes to him the purest blessedness: "He is without grief or fear, not subject to evils, unyielding, painless, never wearied, filled with unmixed happiness" (*De Cherubim*, 1:154). God is everywhere by his power (τὰς δυνάμεις αὐτοῦ διὰ γῆς καὶ ὕδατος, ἀέρος τε καὶ οὐρανοῦ τεΐνας), but. in no place with his essence, since space and place were first given to the material world by him (*De Linguarum Conf.* 1:425). Speaking figuratively, Philo describes God as enthroned on the outermost border of the heavens, in an extramundane place (τόπος μετακόσμιος), as in a sacred citadel (*Genes.* 28, 15; *De Vit. Mos.* 2:164, etc.). God is the place of the world, for it is he that contains and encompasses all things (*De Somniis*, 1). In creating the world, God employed as instruments incorporeal potencies or ideas, since he could not come in contact with polluting matter (ἐξ ἐκείνης τῆς οὐσίας πάντ' ἐγέννησεν ὁ θεός, οὐκ ἐφαπτόμενος αὐτός: οὐ γὰρ ἦν θέμις ἀπειρης καὶ πεφυρμένης ὕλης ψαύειν τὸν ἴδμονα καὶ μακάριον: ἀλλὰ ταῖς ἀσωμάτοις δυνάμεσιν, ὧν ἔτυμον ὄνομα αἱ ἰδέαι κατεχρήσατο πρὸς τὸ γένος ἕκαστον τὴν ἀρμόττουσαν λαβεῖν μορφήν, *De Sacrificantiibus*, 2:261). These potencies surround God as ministering spirits, just as a monarch is surrounded by the members of his court. The highest of the divine potencies, the creative (ποιητική), bears also, according to Philo, in Scripture the name of God (θεός); the second or ruling (βασιλική) potency is called the Lord (κύριος) (*De Vita Mosis*, 2:150, et al.). These are followed by the foreseeing potency, the law-giving, and many others. They are all conceived by Philo, not only in the nature of divine qualities, but also as relatively independent, personal beings, who can appear to men, and who have favored some of them with their most intimate intercourse (*De Vita Abrah.* 2:17 sq.).

From all that has been said of the Philonic doctrine of the *Logos*, it is clearly apparent that Philo recognized it as the highest of all the divine forces; and yet many of his descriptions of it were in no essential like those of the apostle John, but rather belonged to Jewish ideas which he found already existing. The distinction of a concealed God and a revelation of him was connected with the Old-Test. idea of theophany. But by tracing back all theophanies to the one principle of revelation lying at their basis,

and by making it their objective, the idea of the Logos was attained. The apocryphal book of *The Wisdom of Solomon* had already interposed *wisdom* between God and the world as the reflection of the eternal light; the fountain of all knowledge, virtue, and skill; the moulder of all things; the medium of all the Old-Test. revelations (chapters 7-10). This idea Philo also conceived, but he modified it according as the Platonic influence was more or less strongly felt. Says Neander, — "In proportion as he occupied the standpoint which divested the Divine Being of human qualities, or that which favored anthropomorphism, the ideal or the symbolical, might not the **λόγος** appear as a power of God or as a hypostatic being?" Philo describes the **λόγος**, therefore, as the first-born before all existence, the **πρωτόγονος υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ**, as the perfect reflection of God, as the **ἀρχάγγελος** among the angels, as the original power of the divine powers. Alluding to the **νοητὸν παράδειγμα** of Plato, he describes him as the world-constructing reason; he compares the world to the **ζῶον** of Plato, and the **λόγος** to the soul of the world; he calls him God's vicegerent in the world (**ὑπαρχος**); he gives him the office of mediator between God and the universe, since the connection of phenomena with God is effected through the reason revealed in the world. Hence he is the high-priest of the world, the advocate (**παράκλητος**) for the defects of men with God, and generally the revealer of the divine nature to the universe. The Logos is the archetype of the reason, which is formed not after the Absolute himself, the **Ὄν**, but after the Logos. He, as the revelation of the Absolute in the reason, is the image of God, after which man, according to Genesis, was created. In this connection he calls the Logos the ideal man; and alluding to a Jewish mystical idea, the original man. In the Logos is the unity of the collected revelations of the Divine Being which is individualized in man. In general, everything is traced back to the distinction between the Divine Being as he is in himself and his revelation in the Logos, or the **εἶναι** and the **λέγεσθαι**. The revelation of God in creation — in all positive revelation — in the communication of separate ideas by peculiar dogmas — all this forms part of the knowledge of the revealed God in the phenomenal world, and of the symbolical knowledge from the standpoint of the **υἱοὶ τοῦ λόγου**, over which the standpoint of the **υἱοὶ τοῦ Ὄντος** is raised. But this Logos by Philo is only a sort of intermediate being between *God*, who is in his nature hidden, simple. without attributes, and the eternal, shapeless, chaotic *matter* (the Platonic **ὕλη**). It is the *reflection*, the first-born Son of God; the second God; the sum of the ideas,

which are the original types of all existence; the ideal world itself (κόσμος νοητός); the medium through which the actual, sensible world (κόσμος αἰσθητός) is created and upheld; the interpreter and revealer of God; the archangel, who destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah, spoke to Jacob and to Moses in the burning bush, and led the people of Israel through the wilderness; the high-priest (ἀρχιερεύς), and advocate (παράκλητος), who pleads the cause of sinful humanity before God, and procures for it the pardon of its guilt. We see an apparent affinity of this view with the christology of St. Paul and St. John, and thus it probably came to exert no small influence with the early Church fathers in the evolution of their doctrine of the Logos. But at the same time we must not overlook the very essential difference. Philo's doctrine would not itself suggest the application of the idea of the Logos to any historical appearance whatever; for the revelation of the Logos refers not exclusively to any single fact, but to everything relating to the revelation of God in nature and history. If, according to John's Gospel, the appearance of the Logos is the highest and only medium of communication with God, then communion with the Logos in Philo's sense can only be a subordinate standpoint; for not even the highest man immediately apprehends the Absolute. Yet out of this religious idealism a preparation and a medium might be formed for Christian realism, when what was here taken in a merely ideal sense showed itself as realized in humanity. Christianity refers the Logos to the perfect revelation of God in human nature, to the one revelation in Christ; and substitutes for the immediate apprehension of the Absolute the historically founded communion with God revealed in Christ. The symbolical meaning of Philo's Paraclete was elevated by the reference to the historical Christ as the only high-priest. Thus the Alexandrian ideas formed a bridge to Christianity. But we cannot regard the doctrine of a union of the Logos with humanity, in all the forms under which it appeared, as a reflection in the first place of Christianity, but must doubtless presuppose a tendency of this kind before the Christian aera. A yearning of the spirit goes before great events — an unconscious longing for that which is to come. This must especially have been the case in that greatest revolution which the religious development of humanity experienced. It was preceded by an unconscious feeling of a revelation of the spiritual world to humanity — a longing which hastened to meet the new communications from God. It was not difficult for those who regarded the Logos as the medium of revelation, by which God made himself cognizable to pious souls, and, on the other hand, who held the Messiah to be the highest of God's messengers, to suppose a particular

connection between him and the Logos. But, after all, this Jewish idea of the Logos is quite eclipsed by the Christian idea of the Messiah: with the Jews it is simply the hope of their miraculous restoration from all parts of the world to Palestine, through the agency of a superhuman appearance (/OgLc); and even this supernatural phenomenon has no legitimate place in Philo's system; it means nothing. But again, his dualistic and idealistic view of the world absolutely excludes an incarnation, which is the central truth' of Christianity (comp. Dorner, *Person of Christ*). His Christ, if he needed any, could have been at best but a gnostic, docetistic, fantastic Christ; his redemption, but ideal and intellectual. He attained only an artificial harmony between God and the world, between Judaism and heathenism; which hovered, like a "spectral illusion," an "evanescent fata morgana," on the horizon of dawning Christianity. Says Schaff, "It is a question not yet entirely settled whether Philo's Logos was a personal hypostasis or merely a personification, a divine attribute. While Gfrorer, GrossmannDahne, Lucke, Ritter, and Semisch maintain the former view, Dorner (*Entwicklungsgeschichte der Lehre von der Person Christi*, 2d ed. 1:23 sq.) has latterly attempted to re-establish the other. To me, Philo himself seems to vibrate between the two views; and this obscurity accounts for the difference among so, distinguished scholars on this point" (*Hist. of the Apostolic Church*, page 180). The eternal atonement, which Philo imagined already *made* and *eternally being made* by his ideal Logos, could be effected only by a creative act of the condescending love of God; and it is a remarkable instance of divine wisdom in history that this redeeming act was really performed about the same time that the greatest Jewish philosopher and theologian of his age was dreaming of and announcing to the world a ghostlike shadow of it.

Of his other philosophic speculations we have space only to refer to some of his ethical views. With him knowledge and virtue are gifts of God, to be obtained only by self-abnegation on the part of man. A life of contemplation is superior to one of practical, political occupation. In other words, the business of man is to follow and imitate God (*De Caritate*, 2:404, et pass.). The soul must strive to become the dwelling-place of God, his holy temple, and so to become strong, whereas it was before weak, and wise, whereas before it was foolish (*De Somn.* 1:23). The highest blessedness is to abide in God (πέρας εὐδαιμονίας τὸ ἀκλινώς καὶ ἄρρεπὼς ἐν μόνῳ στήναι). The various minor sciences serve as a preparatory training for the knowledge of God. Of the philosophical

disciplines, logic and physics are of little worth. The highest step in philosophy is the intuition of God, to which the sage attains through divine illumination when, completely renouncing himself and leaving behind his finite self-consciousness, he resigns himself unresistingly to the divine influence.

It remains for us to notice the use that has been made of Philo's writings within the domain of New-Test. interpretation. There are some Christian exegetists who in their rationalistic tendency have gone so far as to account for the character and style of some of the New-Test. Scriptures by referring their origin to Philo's writings. (We here quote largely from Kitto's *Biblical Cyclopaedia*.) Mr. Grinfield, in his *Hellenistic Greek Testament*, and the accompanying *Scholia*, has derived many of his notes from the works of Philo; in the application, however, of such illustrations, it must be borne in mind that Philo's style was hardly a *natural* one; it is very elaborate, and avoids Alexandrian provincialisms, and on that account often fails to elucidate the simple diction of the New Test., even where there is similarity in the subject-matter (comp. Carpzovii *Exer. Sacr. in Ep. ad Hebr.* page 140). But recent critics of the rationalistic school are not content with finding in Philo such illustration of the New Test. as might be expected to occur in a contemporary, and in some respects kindred, Greek writer; they go so far as to assert that some of the prominent doctrines of the sacred writers are little else than accommodations from the opinions of Philo, mediate or immediate. Thus Grossmann (*Quaest. Philon.* sub init.) does not scruple to say that Christianity is the product of the allegories of the Jewish synagogue and of Philo. Other writers, more measured in their terms, trace isolated truths to a like source. For instance, the well-disposed Ernesti (*Institutes*), and after him Luicke, who says, "It is impossible to mistake as to the immediate historical connection of John's doctrine of the *Logos* with the Alexandrian in its more perfect form, as it occurs in Philo." Similarly, Strauss, De Wette, and others; while others again apply the like criticism to St. Paul. Among these we must especially notice Gfrorer, whose work, *Philo und die judisch-alexandrinische Theologie*, has been made accessible to English readers, in an abridged form, by Prof. Jowett, in his dissertation *St. Paul and Philo*, contained in his commentary on St. Paul's *Epp.* 1:363-417. No criticism, however, is to be tolerated by the believer in Revelation which does not start from the principle that the characteristic truths of Christianity are self-evolved, i.e., (to use Dorner's words) "have not emerged from without Christianity, but wholly from

within it" (*Person of Christ* [Clark], volume 1, Introduction, page 45). Instead of making Philo, in any sense, a fountain-head of Christian doctrine, it would be more correct to regard him as the unconscious source of antichristian opinion — *unconscious*, we say, for with all his knowledge and skill in style, Philo possessed not those energetic qualities which characterize founders of schools of opinion. To say nothing of Philo's influence upon the theosophizing fathers of the Church, Clement of Alexandria and Origen, who borrowed largely from their Jewish predecessor and fellow-citizen, some of the salient heresies of the early centuries had almost their spring in the Philonian writings (for the affinity of the opposite opinions of Arius and Sabellius to certain opinions of Philo, see Mosheim's Notes on Cudworth cited below); while that pagan philosophy, the Neo-Platonism of Alexandria, which derived much of its strength and obtained its ultimate defeat from the Christianity which it both aped and hated, is mainly traceable to our Philo. For a popular but sufficiently exact statement of (1) Philo's relation to Neo-Platonism, and (2) of the antagonism of this Neo-Platonism to Christianity, the reader is referred to Lewes's *Hist. of Philosophy*, pages 260-278. Although we cannot therefore allow that the inspired volume of the Christian religion owes in its origin anything to Philo, we do not deny to his writings a certain utility in the interpretation of the New Test. **SEE PHILOSOPHY, GREEK.** Besides the explanation of words and phrases above referred to (a service which is the more valuable because of Philo's profound acquaintance with the Septuagint version, in which the writers of the New Test. show themselves to have been well versed also), the works of Philo sometimes contribute interesting elucidation of scriptural facts and statements. We may instance his delineation of the character of Pontius Pilate (*De Legat. ad Caium*, 38, Richter, 6:134; Bohn, 4:164). This well-drawn sketch of such a man, from the masterly hand of a contemporary, throws considerable light on more than one point, such as the relations of Herod and Pilate, which are but lightly touched in the Gospels (comp. Hale's *Analysis*, 3:216-218). As a second instance, may we not regard the remarkable passage of St. Paul as receiving light from Philo's view of the twofold creation, first of the heavenly (οὐράνιος) or ideal man, and then of the earthly (γήινος) man? (Comp. ⁴⁶⁵⁶1 Corinthians 15:46, 47, with Philo, *De Allegor. Legis*, 1:12, 13 [Richter, 1:68; Bohn, 1:601, and *De Mundi Opific.* page 46 [Richter, 1:43; Bohn, 1:39]; and see Stanley on *Corinthians*, 1:331.) But then such illustration is rather an example of how Philo is corrected by St. Paul, than of how St. Paul borrowed from Philo.

Respecting the allegorical method of interpreting the Old Test., of which the apostle is alleged to have derived the idea from our author, it should be remembered that St. Paul, guided by the Divine Spirit, who had indited the ancient Scriptures, was directed to apply Old-Test. facts to New-Test. doctrines, as correlative portions of one great scheme of providential dispensation; whereas Philo's adaptations of the same facts were only the product of an arbitrary and extremely fanciful imagination; so that in the case of the former we have an authoritative and sure method of interpreting ancient events without ever impairing their historical and original truth, whereas the latter affords us nothing besides the conjectures of a mind of great vivacity indeed, but often capricious and inconsistent, which always postpones the truth of history to its allegorical sense, and oftentimes wholly reduces it to a simple myth. Readers of Philo are well aware of the extravagance and weakness of many of his allegories; of these some are inoffensive, no doubt, and some others are even neat and interesting, but none carry with them the simple dignity and expressiveness of the allegorical types of the New Test. St. Paul and Philo, it is well known, have both treated the history of Hagar and Sarah allegorically (comp. ⁸⁰²²Galatians 4:22-31 with Philo, *De Congressu*, pages 1-5 [Richter, 3:71-76; Bohn, 2:157-162]; and see Lightfoot, *Epist. to Gal.* pages 189-191; and Howson's *Hagar and Arabia*, pages 20, 36, 37); but although we have here one of the best specimens of Philo's favorite method, how infinitely does it fall short of St. Paul's! To say nothing of authority, it fails in terseness and point, and all the features of proper allegory. The reader will at once perceive this who examines both.

Literature. — For an account of Philo's philosophical and theological system in general, the reader is referred to Mosheim's notes on Cudworth, p. 640-649 [transl. by Harrison, 2:320-333], where Philo's influence on Patristic divinity and early heresy, especially the Sabellian, is clearly traced; to Ritter, *Hist. of Phil.* [transl. by Morrison], 4:407-478; and to Dollinger, *The Gentile and the Jew* [transl. by Darnell], 2:398-408; Neander, *Hist. of Christ. Dogmas*, 11:135 sq.; id. *Ch. Hist.* page 58 sq.; Ueberweg, *Hist. of Philos.* 1:222 sq.; Schaff, *Hist. of the Apost. Ch.* page 176 sq.; Tennemann, *Hist. of Phil.* page 170 sq.; Fabricius, *Dis. de Platonismo Philonis* (Leips. 1693, 4to); id. *Sylloge Dissertat.* (Hamb. 1738, 4to); Stahl, *Attempt at a Systematic Statement of the Doctrines of Philo of Alexandria*, in the *Allgem. Bibl. der Bibl. Literatur* of Eichhorn, tom. 4. fasc. 5; Schreiter, *Ideas of Philo respecting the Immortality of the Soul, the Resurrection,*

and *Future Retribution*, in the *Analecten* of Keil and Tzchirner, volume 1, section 2; see also volume 3, section 2; Scheffer, *Quaestiones*, part 1, 2, 1829-31; Grossmann, *Quaestiones Philoniane*, part 1, *De theologies Philonis fontibus et auctoritate* (1829); Gfrorer, *Philo und die Alexandrinische Theosophie* (1831, 1835, 2 volumes); Dahne, *Geschichtliche Darstellung der judisch-alexandrinischen Religionsphilosophie* (1831), part 1; id. in the *Theol. Studien und Kritiken*, 1833, page 984; Bucher, *Philonische Studien* (1848); Creuzer, *Kritik der Schriften des Juden Philon*, in *Theol. Studien und Kritiken*, January 1832. Philo's opinions about the divine *Logos* have been warmly discussed. The ancients, as we have seen, were fond of identifying them with Christian doctrine; Mangey, in the middle of the last century, accompanied his splendid edition of Philo's works (2 volumes, fol.) with a dissertation, in which he made our author attribute, in the Christian sense, a distinct personality to the *Logos*; bishop Bull had stated a similar opinion (*Def. Fid. Nic.* [transl. by the Reverend Peter Holmes for the Anglo. Cath. Lib.], 1:31-33); and, more recently, Bryant (*Sentiments of Philo Jud. concerning the λόγος*); and, very lately, Pye Smith (*Messiah*, 1:573-600). But the conclusions of these writers, however learnedly asserted, have been abundantly refuted in many works; the chief of which are Carpzovii *Disput. de λόγῳ Philonis, non Johannis*, adversus Mangey (1749); Csesar Morgan's *Investigation of the Trinity of Plato and of Philo Jud.*; Burton's *Banmpton Lectures*, note 93, pages 550-560; and Dorner's *Person of Christ* [Clarke], 1:22-41. (See also the able articles of professors H.B. Smith and Moses Stuart, in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 6:156-185, and 7:696-732.) An interesting review of Philo's writings and their relation to Judaism, from the Jewish point of view, occurs in Jost's *Geschichte des Judenthums*, 1:379-393 (the chapter is designated *Die Gnosis im Judenthume*); Gratz, *Gesch. der. Juden*, 3:298 sq.; Schultz, *Die judische Religionsphilosophie* in Gelzer's *Prot. Monatsblatt*, volume 24, No. 4 (October 1864); Clemens, *Die Therapeuten* (Konigsb. 1809); Georgius, *Ueber die neuesten Gegensatze in Auffassung der Alexandrin. Religionsphilosophie* in Illgen's *Zeitschr. f. hist. Theol.* (1839), Nos. 3 and 4; Kefersteine, *Philo's Lehre v.d. Mittelwesen* (Leips. 1846); Wolff, *Die Philonische Philosophie* (ibid. 1849; 2d ed. Gothenb. 1858); Frankel, *Zur Ethik des Philo*, in *Monatschrift f. Gesch. u. Wissensch. d. Judenthums*, July 1867; Delaney, *Philon d'Alexandrie* (Paris, 1867).

We ought not to close this article without noticing the old opinion which made Philo the author of the beautiful *Book of Wisdom* in the Apocrypha. This opinion, which was at one time very prevalent, has not stood its ground before recent critical examination. For the literature of the question we can only refer our readers to Prof. C.L.W. Grimm's *Das Buch der Weisheit*, Einleitung, section 6, where the authorities on both sides are given. Corn. a Lapide, in *Librum Sapientiae*, also discusses Philo's claims to the distinguished honor which tradition had conferred on him, but decides against him [new edition by Vives. 8:264].

Besides Mangey's edition of Philo, above referred to, we mention Turnebus's edition (Paris, 1552, fol.), emended by Hoeschelius (Colon. Allobrog. 1613; Paris, 1640; Francof. 1691); Pfeiffer's edition, incomplete (Erlangen, 1785-92, 5 volumes, 8vo), and the convenient edition by Richter (Leips. 1828-30, 8 volumes, 12mo). This last contains not only a reprint of Mangey, in the first six volumes, but two supplementary volumes of Philo's writings, discovered by Angelo Mai in a Florentine MS., and by Bapt. Aucher in an Armenian version, and translated by him into Latin. What an edition of Philo ought to be to deserve the approbation of the critical student has been pointed out by different German theologians, most recently by Creuzer, in *Theol. Studien u. Kritiken*, 1832, pages 1-43. A popular and cheap edition was published at Leipsic (1851-53); also *Philonea*, ed. Tischendorf (Leips. 1868). A fuller account of these editions, with a list of the various versions of Philo's writings, which have been made from time to time into Latin, Hebrew, German, French, Italian, Spanish, and English, is contained in Furst's *Bibl. Jud.* Furst adds a catalogue of all the leading works in which Philo and his writings have been treated. To his list of versions we must here add the useful one published by Mr. Bohn, in four vols. of his *Eccl. Library*, by Mr. Yonge.

For a complete, and withal succinct examination of the entire field of Philo's opinions, we refer to Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.* 11:578-603. Shorter and more accessible, but inevitably imperfect, notices occur in Smith's *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* 3:309 sq.; Schaff's *Apostolic Church* [Clarke], pages 211-214; Horne's *Introduction* [by Eyre], pages 277, 278; [by Davidson], pages 363-365; Davidson's *Hermeneutics* [Clarke, 1843], pages 63-65; Fairbairn's *Hermeneut. Man.* page 47. A temperate review of Jowett's *Dissertation on Philo and St. Paul* may be found, written by Dr. J.B. Lightfoot, in the *Journal of Philology*, 3:119-121; and for sound views respecting Philo's doctrine of the *λόγος*, as bearing upon the

writings of the New Test., see Neander's *Planting of the Christian Church* [Bohn], 2:13-15; Westcott's *Introduction*, pages 138-143, and Tholuck's *St. John* [Clarke], pages 62-67. The interest of Jews in the writings of their philosophic countryman is curiously exhibited in the Hebrew version of certain of them. These are enumerated by Furst, *Bibl. Judaica*, 2:90. As de' Rossi, one of the translators, has revived Philo's synonym *Jedidiah*, by which he was anciently designated in Rabbinical literature (see Bartolocci, *ut sup.*, and Steinschneider's *Bodl. Catal.* s.v. Philon).

Philo Carpathius

(from Carpathus, an island north-east of Crete), or, rather, CARPASIUS (from Carpasia, a town in the north of Cyprus), an Eastern ecclesiastic, flourished about the opening of the 5th century. His birthplace is unknown, but he derived this cognomen from his having been ordained bishop of Carpasia by Epiphanius, the well-known bishop of Constantia. According to the statements of Joannes and Polybius, bishop of Rhinoscuri, in their life of Epiphanius (*Vita Epiphan.* chapter 49), Philo, at that time a deacon, was sent, along with some others, by the sister of the emperors Arcadius and Honorius, to bring Epiphanius to Rome, that through his prayers and the laying on of hands she might be saved from a dangerous disease under which she was laboring. Pleased with Philo, Epiphanius not only ordained him bishop of Carpasia, but gave him charge of his own diocese during his absence. This was about the beginning of the 5th century (Cave, *Hist. Litt.* page 240, ed. Genev.). Philo Carpasius is principally known from his commentary on the Canticles, which he treats allegorically. A Latin translation, or, rather, paraphrase of this commentary, with ill-assorted interpolations from the commentary of Gregorius I, by Salutatus, was published (Paris, 1537, and reprinted in the *Biblioth. Pat. Lugdun.* volume 5). Fragments of Philo's commentary are inserted in that on the Canticles, which is falsely ascribed to Eusebius, edited by Meursius (Lugd. Batav. 1617). In these he is simply named Philo, without the surname. Bandurius, a Benedictine monk, promised in 1705 a genuine edition, which he never fulfilled. An edition, however, was published from a Vatican MS. in 1750, under the name of Epiphanius, and edited by Fogginius. The most important edition, however, is that of Giacomellus (Rome, 1772), from two MSS. This has the original Greek, a Latin translation, with notes, and is accompanied by the entire Greek text of the Canticles, principally from the Alexandrian recension. This is reprinted in Galland, *N. Bibl. PP.* 9:713:

Ernesti (*Neueste Theolog. Bibl.* volume 3, part 6), in a review of this edition, of which he thinks highly, is of opinion that the commentary, as we now have it, is but an abridgment of the original. Besides this commentary, Philo wrote on various parts both of the Old and New Test., fragments of which are contained in the various *Catence*. See Suidas, s.v.; Cave, l.c.; Fabricius, *Bibl. Graec.* 7:398, 611; 8:645; 10:479; Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog.* s.v.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie*, s.v.

Philo The Dialectician

SEE PHILO THE MEGARIAN.

Philo Of Larissa

an academic philosopher of Athens, flourished in the century preceding the Christian sera. He quitted the Greek capital on the success of the army of Mithridates, and went to Rome, where he had Cicero for a disciple. He gained renown by his services to philosophic science. He furnished a more complete and systematic division of the different branches of philosophy, and was more methodic in his terms. He is also often spoken of as the founder of the third academy. See Tennemann, *Manual of Hist. of Philosophy*; Ueberweg, *Hist. of Philosophy* (see Index in volume 2).

Philo The Megarian, Or Dialectician

was a disciple of Diodorus Cronus, and a friend of Zeno, though older than the latter, if the reading in Diogenes Laertius (7:16) is correct. In his *Menexenus* he mentioned the five daughters of his teacher (Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 4:528, ed. Potter), and disputed with him respecting the idea of the possible, and the criteria of the truth of hypothetical propositions. With reference to the first point, Philo approximated to Aristotle, as he recognised that not only what is, or will be, is possible (as Diodorus maintained), but also what is in itself conformable to the particular purpose of the object in question, as of chaff to burn (*κατὰ ψιλὴν λεγόμενον ἐπιτηδειότητα*; Alex. Aphrod. *Nat. Qual.* 1:14; comp. on the whole question Harris, in Upton's *Arriani Dissertat. Epict.* 2:19, ap. Schweighiuser, 2:515, etc.). Diodorus had allowed the validity of hypothetical propositions only when the antecedent clause could never lead to an untrue conclusion, whereas Philo regarded those only as false which with a correct antecedent had an incorrect conclusion (Sext. *Empir. Adv. Math.* 8:113, etc.; *Hypotyp.* 2:110; comp. Cicero, *Acad.* 2:47; *De Fato*, 6).

Both accordingly had sought for criteria for correct sequence in the members of hypothetical propositions, and each of them in a manner corresponding to what he maintained respecting the idea of the possible. Chrysippus attacked the assumption of each of them.

The Philo who is spoken of as an Athenian and a disciple of Pyrrhon, though ridiculed by Timon as a sophist, can hardly be different from Philo the dialectician (Diog. Laert. 9:67, 69). Jerome (*Jov.* 1) speaks of Philo the dialectician and the author of the *Menexenus* as the instructor of Carneades, in contradiction to chronology, perhaps in order to indicate the sceptical direction of his doctrines.

Philo The Monk

An ascetic treatise, bearing the name of Philo Monachus, whom Cave (*Hist. Litt.* page 176) deems to be much later than the other ecclesiastical writers of the same name, is preserved in the library of Vienna (*Cod. Theol.* 325, No. 15). It is entitled *Contra Pulchritudinem Feuminarum*.

Philo The Pythagorean

Clemens Alexandrinus (*Strom.* 1:305) and Sozomen (1:12) mention Philo ὁ Πεθαγόρειος. It is probable from their language that they both mean by the person so designated PHILO JUDEUS. Jonsius (*ibid.* 3, c. 4, page 17) is strongly of opinion that Philo the elder and this Philo mentioned by Clemens are the same. Fabricius, who once held this opinion, was led to change his views (*Bibl.* 1:862), and tacitly assumes (4:738) that Sozomen indicates Philo Judaeus by this epithet.

Philo The Rhetorician And Philosopher

Cave, Giacomellus, and Ernesti are of opinion that this is no other than Philo Carpathius (q.v.). His aera agrees with this, for the philosopher is quoted by Athanasius Sinaita, who flourished about A.D. 561. We need not be startled at the term *philosopher* as applied to an ecclesiastic. This was not uncommon. Michael Psellus was termed the prince of philosophers, and Nicetas was surnamed, in the same way as Philo, ῥήτωρ καὶ φιλόσοφος. Besides, Polybius, in the life of Epiphanius, expressly calls Philo of Carpathia κληρικόν ἀπὸ ῥητόρων, which Tillemont and others erroneously understand to mean a man who has changed from the profession of the law to that of the Church. Cave shows that the ῥήτωρ

held an office in the Church itself, somewhat analogous to our professorship of ecclesiastical history. Our only knowledge of Philo, under this name, whether it be Philo Carpathius or not, is from an inedited work of Anastasius Sinaita, preserved in the library of Vienna and the Bodleian. Glycas (*Annal.* page 283, etc.), it is true, quotes as if from Philo, but he has only borrowed *verbatim*, and without acknowledgment, from Anastasius. The work of Anastasius referred to is entitled by Cave *Demonstratio Historica de Magna et Angelica summi Sacerdotis Dignitate*. Philo's work therein quoted is styled a Church history, but, if we may judge from the only specimen of it we have, we need, hardly regret its loss. It consists of a tale regarding a monk, that, being excommunicated by his bishop, and having afterwards suffered martyrdom, he was brought in his coffin to the church, but could not rest till the bishop, warned in a dream, had formally absolved him. See Cave, *Hist. Litt.* page 176 (ed. Geneva, 1720); Fabricius, *Bibl. Graec.* 7:420.

Philo Senior

Josephus (*Apion*, 1:23), when enumerating the heathen writers who had treated of Jewish history, mentions together Demetrius Phalerens. *Philo*, and Eupolemon. Philo he calls *the elder* (πρεσβύτερος), probably to distinguish him from Philo Judaeus, and he cannot mean Herennius Philo, who lived after his time. Clemens Alexandrinus (*Stromat.* 1:146) also couples together the names of Philo the elder and Demetrius, stating that their lists of Jewish kings differed. Hence Vossius thinks that both authors refer to the same person (*De Hist. Graec.* page 486, ed. Westermann). In this Jonsius agrees with him, while he notices the error of Josephus, in giving Demetrius the surname of Phalereus (*De Script. Hist. Phil.* 3:4, page 17). As Huetius (*Demonstrat. Evangel.* page 62) was of opinion that the apocryphal Book of Wisdom was written by this Philo, he was necessitated to consider him as a Hellenistic Jew, who, unskilled in the original Hebrew, had it translated, and then expanded it, in language peculiar to his class (*ibid.* pages 62, 246, etc.). Fabricius thinks that the Philo mentioned by Josephus may have been a Gentile, and that a Philo different from either Philo Judaeus or senior was the author of the Book of Wisdom. Eusebius (*Prcep. Evangel.* 9:20, 24) quotes fifteen obscure hexameters from Philo, without giving hint of who he is, and merely citing them as from Alexander Polyhistor. These evidently form part of a history of the Jews in verse, and were written either by a Jew, in the character of a

heathen, as Fabricius hints is possible, or by a heathen acquainted with the Jewish Scriptures. This is, in all probability, the work referred to by Josephus and Clemens Alexandrinus. Of course the author must have lived before the time of Alexander Polyhistor, who came to Rome B.C. 83. It is doubtful whether he is the same as the geographer of the same name.

Philo Of Tarsus

a deacon. He was a companion of Ignatius of Antioch, and accompanied the martyr from the East to Rome, A.D. 107. He is twice mentioned in the epistles of Ignatius (*Ad Philadelph.* c. 11; *Ad Smynaeos*, c. 13). He is supposed to have written, along with Rheus Agathopus, the *Martyrium Ignatii*, for which **SEE IGNATIUS**. See Cave, *Hist. Litt.* page 28 (ed. Geneva, 1720).

Philolaus

a Pythagorean philosopher, was born at Crotona, or Tarentum, towards the close of the 5th century B.C. Aresas, a probable disciple of Pythagoras, was his master; so that we receive the Pythagorean doctrine from Philolaus, only as it appeared to the third generation, and an account of it is therefore more properly in place in a general examination of the philosophy of Pythagoras (q.v.). It has been repeated once and again that Philolaus divined the true theory of the universe, and was the virtual predecessor of Copernicus. Nothing can be more false. In his scheme indeed, not the earth, but *fire*, is placed in the centre of the unit verse; that fire, however, is not the *sun*, which, on the contrary, he makes revolve around the central $\pi\hat{\omicron}\rho$. The scheme, in so far as it can be understood, is altogether fantastic, based on no observation or comparison of phenomena, but on vague and now unintelligible metaphysical considerations. The only predecessor of Copernicus in antiquity was Aristarchus of Samos, whose remarkable conjectures appeared first in the editio princeps of Archimedes-published after Copernicus wrote. Of Philolaus's three works, written in the Doric dialect, only fragments now remain. See Bockh, *Leben, nebst den Bruchstücken seiner Werke* (Berl. 1819); Smith, *Diet. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* s.v.; Ueberweg, *Hist. of Philos.* (see Index in volume 2); Butler, *Hist. of Ancient Philos.* volume 2. (J.H.W.)

Philol'ogus

(φιλόλογος, *fond of talk*), one of the Christians at Rome to whom Paul sent his salutations (Romans 16:15). A.D. 55. Origen conjectures that he was the head of a Christian household which included the other persons named with him. Dorotheus makes him one of the seventy disciples, and alleges that he was placed by the apostle Andrew as bishop of Sinope, in Pontus (see Epiphanius, *Mon.* page 68, ed. Dressel). Pseudo-Hippolytus (*De LXX Apostolis*) substantially repeats the same improbable tradition. His name is found in the Columbarium "of the freedmen of Livia Augusta" at Rome; which shows that there was a Philologus connected with the imperial household at the time when it included many Julias. The name Philologus was a common one at Rome (Lewin, *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, 2:71).

Philology, Comparative

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

The ethnographical table contained in the tenth chapter of Genesis has derived no little corroboration and illustration from the researches of modern philology. It has thus been clearly established that all the languages which have furnished a polished literature are reducible to two great families, corresponding, with a few sporadic variations, to the lineage of the two older sons of Noah respectively, namely, Shem and Japheth. The former of these, which is in fact usually designated as the *Shemitic*, is emphatically Oriental, and embraces the Hebrew and Arabic, with their cognates, the Samaritan, the eastern and western Aramaean, or Chaldee and Syriac, and the Ethiopic. The latter, which is conveniently styled the *Indo-Germanic* group, includes the Sanscrit, with its sister the Zend, and their offshoots, the Greek, the Latin, the Gallic, the Saxon — in a word, the stock of the Occidental or European languages. The analogies and coincidences subsisting between the members of the Shemitic family have been pretty fully exhibited by Castell, Gesenius, and First in their lexicons, and by Ewald and Nordheimer in their grammars; while the relationship existing among the Indo-Germanic group has been extensively traced by Bopp in his *Comparative Grammar*, by Pott in his *Etymologische Forschungen*, and by Benfey in his *Wurzel-Lexicon*. Other philologists,

among whom De Sacy, Bournouf, Max Muller, and Renan may be especially mentioned, have somewhat extended the range of these comparisons, and occasional resemblances have been pointed out in particular forms between the Shemitic and Indo-Germanic branches; but no systematic collation of these latter coincidences, so far as we are aware, has been instituted, unless we accept such fanciful attempts as those of Parkhurst, who derives most of the Greek primitives from Hebrew roots! Yet notwithstanding the confusion at Babel and many a later linguistic misadventure, the common Noachian parentage ought to be capable of vindication by some distinct traces, at least of analogy if not of identity, in early forms of speech existing among both these great branches of the human family as represented by their written records. We propose in this article briefly to exhibit a few of these resemblances which have presented themselves in our own investigations as arguing a common origin, although a remote one, between the Shemitic and the Indo-Germanic tongues; the most of them are certainly too striking to have been accidental. Lest we should venture beyond our own or our readers' depth, and make our pages bristle with an unnecessary display of foreign characters, we shall confine our illustrations to the Hebrew, on the one hand, and to the Greek. Latin, French, German, and English, on the other, as sufficient representatives of the two lingual families which we are comparing.

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

the relationship in the Greek roots. Those marked with an asterisk are Chaldee. A few out of their proper column are included in brackets.

Picture for Philology

This list is sufficiently copious, after deducting those which further researches may show to be merely fortuitous, to prove a more than accidental agreement in words of frequent use. Many of the roots are evidently related to each other, and most of them are found in several kindred forms. Among these the selection has here been made not so much for the purpose of exhibiting the most palpable similarity, as to include the greatest variety of distinct etymons in each line of descent. We have not room to express the numerous cognates and derivatives of each, to trace the connection of their meanings with the common or generic import, nor to note the various orthographical changes that they have undergone. If the reader will take the trouble to investigate these points at his leisure, as he may readily do with the help of good lexicons of the respective languages, he will soon satisfy himself how widely these radices have ramified and how intimately they are connected. A comparison with their Arabic and Sanscrit parallels would still further verify the foregoing results.

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

Now it is a remarkable coincidence that the ultimate theme of the primitive Greek verb has been ascertained, in like manner, by modern philologists to be a monosyllable, consisting of two consonants vocalized, in precise conformity with the Hebrew system of vowel points, by a single mutable vowel. Thus the basis of such protracted forms even as *λανθάνω*, *μανθάνω*, *διδάσχω*, becomes *λαθ*, *μαθ*, *δαχ*. Indeed, Noah Webster has applied the same principle to all the roots of English words; and in his *Dictionary* (we speak of the quarto edition, originally published at New Haven in two volumes) he has indicated them as "class Dg, No. 28," etc., although he seems never to have published the key or list of this classification.

III. Primitive Tenses. — In nothing perhaps does the disparity between the Greek and the Hebrew verb strike the student at first more obviously than the multiplicity and variety of tense-forms in the former, compared with the meagre and vague array of tenses in the latter. A little further examination, however, shows that by means of the various so-called *conjugations* (Niphal, Hiphil, etc.) the Hebrews managed to extend their paradigm to pretty considerable dimensions. Here the Heb. Piel and other dageshed conjugations evidently correspond with the *reduplication* of the Greek perfect and pluperfect tenses, while the prefixed syllable of Hiphil, etc., affords a clew to the device of the simple *augment* in Greek. These, however, are comparatively unimportant, although interesting analogies.

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

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

IV. Verb Inflections. — In Greek, as in Hebrew, the personal endings are obviously but fragments of the personal *pronouns*, appended to the verbal root or tensestem. This is so generally recognized to be the fact with respect to both these languages that we need dwell upon it only for the purpose of explaining, by its means, some of the peculiarities of the Greek verbs in — **μι**. This termination, which reappears in the optative of other verbs, was doubtless the original and proper sign of the first person, rather than the ending in — **ω**. The former is the basis of the oblique cases of the pronoun of the first person, **μέ**, *me*; as the latter is the last, but nonradical, syllable of the nominative, **ἐγώ**, *I*. It is in keeping with this that the verbs in — **μι** are some of the oldest in the language, for example, the substantive verb, **εἰμί**. The passive terminal — **μαι** is doubtless but a modification of the same. Now the principle or fact to which we wish to call particular attention in this connection is this: *Every primitive "pure" verb in Greek is a verb in — μι*. By this rule the student may always know them, as there are no others, except the few factitious verbs in — **νμι**, and very rare exceptions like **ῥέω**, **τίω**, **πίνω**, which are attributable to disguises of the true root. Let it now be further noted, in confirmation of what we have stated above concerning the Greek primal tense, that *verbs in — μι have substantially the same inflection as the second aorist, and they have only those tenses with which these inflections are compatible*. Neither of these last-named principles, it is true, is carried out with exactness, for the aorists passive of other verbs seem to have usurped these active terminations; but we are persuaded they are in general the real clew to the defectiveness and peculiar inflection of the forms in **μι**. We therefore look upon the verbs in question as interesting links in the descent from the older Hebrew type.

V. Declensional Endings. — In the absence of any real declensions whatever in the Hebrew, or any proper cases — unless the "construct state" be entitled to be regarded as a genitive — there is little ground of comparison with the copious series of modifications of the Greek noun and adjective. Yet Webster has noted the resemblance of the plural $\mu\upsilon$ and Chaldee \hat{y} to the English oxen (archaic housen, etc.). The v "ephelcastic" has its analogue in the "paragogic" $\hat{}$, and is strikingly generalized in the "nunation" of the Arabic.

VI. Vowel Changes. — To the learner the Hebrew language seems very complicated in this respect; but the whole process of vocalization is wrought out under the following simple law: that "without the tone, a long vowel cannot stand in a closed syllable, nor a short vowel in an open syllable." From this results practically the alternative of *a long vowel or an additional consonant* (or dagesh forte) in every unaccented syllable. In the Greek the following fundamental principle prevails: that *a long vowel* (or diphthong) *indicates the omission of a consonant*, except where it represents two short vowels; and this latter is tantamount to the other, for there is one *letter* less. Thus the systems of syllabication in both languages essentially coincide in this: that *length in the vowel is equivalent to another consonant*. We might take room to exemplify these rules, but the modern scholar will readily see their truth. In none of the later cognate languages is this principle regarded with much uniformity, although from the nature of the vocal organs themselves, it follows, even in so arbitrary a tongue (or rather so *historical* a spelling) as the English, that a vowel is naturally long when it ends the syllable, and short when a consonant closes the sound. But in the Greek and Hebrew the law we have propounded is consistently carried out in a complete system of euphonic changes which lie at the very threshold of either language.

Accordingly, in exactness of *phonetic* representation these two languages have no rival, not even in the German, Italian, or Spanish. Though the original sounds are now somewhat uncertain, yet it is evident (unless we take the degenerate modern Greek, and the discrepant modern Rabbinical pronunciations as perfect guides) that each letter and vowel in both had its own peculiar power. The two alphabets, we know, were identical in origin; for if we distrust the story of the importation of the Phoenician characters by Cadmus into Greece, we have but to compare the names, order, and forms of the written signs (reversing them, as the two languages were read

in opposite directions), in order to satisfy ourselves that they are essentially the same. Even the unappreciable *a* has its equivalent in the *spiritus lenis* (as the [may be visually represented by the *spiritus asper*), and the old digamma (ΓαϞ) reappears in the consonantal *w*. Perhaps the reason why *v* initial always has the rough breathing is owing to its affinity to both these last named. *SEE ALPHABET.*

We trust we have said enough to illustrate our proposition that these two lingual families, and especially their two chiefly interesting representatives — which, widely variant as they are in age, culture, flexibility, and genius, yet by a remarkable Providence have been brought together in the only revelation written for man — have no ordinary or casual points of resemblance. We would be glad to see the subject extended by some competent hand, especially by a comparison of the venerable and rich Sanscrit and Arabic. *SEE SHEMITIC LANGUAGES.*

Philome'tor

(Φιλομήτωρ, *mother-loving*), the surname of Ptolemæus VI of Egypt (2 Macc. 4:21). *SEE PTOLEMY.*

Philon

SEE PHILO.

Philopatris

is the name of a dialogue found among the writings of Lucian (q.v.). It is quoted in Church history as a contribution to the heathen satires against Christianity. It is a frivolous derision of the character and doctrines of the Christians in the form of a dialogue between Critias, a professed heathen, and Triephton, an Epicurean, personating a Christian. It represents the Christians as disaffected to the government, dangerous to civil society, and delighting in public calamities. It calls St. Paul a half-bald, long-nosed Galilmean, who travelled through the air to the third heaven (COR 2 Corinthians 12:1-4). It combats the Church doctrine of the Trinity, and of the procession of the Spirit from the Father, though not by argument, but only by ridicule. Not its intrinsic value, but its historic references, make it a valuable production. The authenticity of the work has been called in question by Gessner, in his *De aetate et auctore dialogi Lucianei, qui Philop. inscribitur* (Jen. 1714; Leips. 1730; Getting. 1741; et in tom. 9, ed.

Bip.), who ascribes to it a post-Nicaean age. Of like opinion are Neander (*Church Hist.* 2:90) and Tzschirner (*Fall des Heidenthums*, page 312). Niebuhr (*Kleine histor. u. philolog. Schriften*, 2:73) dates it from the reign of Nicephorus Phocas (963-969), but this date is generally regarded as too recent. Compare Bernhardy, *Berl. Jahrb.* 1832, 2:131; Ehrmaln, in Stein's *Studien der evangel. Geistlichkeit Württembergs*, 1839, page 47; Schmid, *De Philopatride Luciano dialogo nova dissert.* (Leips. 1830); Wetzlar, *De cetate, vita scriptisque Luciani Samos* (Marb. 1834); Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* 2:79. (J.H.W.)

Philoponists

a sect of Tritheists in the 6th century, named after a famous Alexandrian grammarian. Nature and hypostasis, he affirmed, were identical unity not being something real, but only a generic term, according to the Aristotelian logic. *SEE PHILOPONUS.*

Philoponus, Joannes

(Ἰωάννης ὁ Φιλόπονός), or JOANNES GRAMMATICUS (ὁ Γραμματικός), an Alexandrian theologian and philosopher of great renown, but which he little deserved on account of his extreme dulness and want of good-sense, was called Φιλόπονός because he was one of the most laborious and studious men of his age. He lived in the 7th century of our aera; one of his writings, *Physica*, is dated May 10, 617. He calls himself γραμματικός, undoubtedly because he taught grammar in his native town, Alexandria, and would in earlier times have been called rhetor. He was a disciple of the philosopher Ammonius. Although his celebrity is more based upon the number of his varied productions and the estimation in which they were held by his contemporaries than upon the intrinsic value of those works, he is yet so strangely connected with one of the most important events of his time (though only through subsequent tradition) that his name is sure to be handed down to future generations. We refer to the capture of Alexandria by Amru in A.D. 639, and the pretended conflagration of the famous Alexandrian library. It is in the first instance said that Philoponus adopted the Mohammedan religion on the city being taken by Amru, whence he may justly be called the last of the pure Alexandrian grammarians. Upon this, so the story goes, he requested Amru to grant him the possession of the celebrated library of Alexandria. Having informed the absent caliph Omar of the philosopher's wishes, Amru

received for answer that if the books were in conformity with the Koran, they were useless, and if they did not agree with it, they were to be condemned, and ought in both cases to be destroyed. Thus the library was burned. But we now know that this story is most likely only an invention of Abulfaraj, the great Arabic writer of the 13th century, who was, however, a Christian, and who, at any rate, was the first that ever mentioned such a thing as the burning of the Alexandrian library. We consequently dismiss the matter, referring the reader to the 51st chapter of Gibbon's *Decline and Fall*. It is extremely doubtful that Philoponus became a Mohamomedan. His favorite authors were Plato and Aristotle, whence his tendency to heresy; and he was one of the first and principal promoters of the sect of the Tritheists, which was condemned by the Council of Constantinople of 681. Starting with Monophysite principles, taking φύσις in a concrete instead of an abstract sense, and identifying it with ὑπόστασις, Philoponus distinguished in God three individuals, and so became involved in Tritheism. This view he sought to justify by the Aristotelian categories of *genus*, *species*, and *individuum*. His followers were called Philoponiaci and Tritheistse. Philoponus, it may be remarked, was not the first promulgator of this error; but (as appears from *Assem. Bibl. Orient.* 2:327; comp. *Hefele*, 2:555) the Monophysite John Ascusnages, who ascribed to Christ only *one* nature, but to each person in the Godhead a separate nature, and on this account was banished by the emperor and excommunicated by the patriarch of Constantinople. The time of the death of Philoponus is not known. The following is a list of his works: **Τῶν εἰς τὴν Μωυσέως κοσμογονίαν ἐξηγητικῶν λόγοι ζ'**, *Commentarii in Mosaicam Cosmogoniam*, lib. 8, dedicated to Sergius, patriarch of Constantinople, who held that see from 610 to 639, and perhaps 641. Edit. Greece et Latine by Balthasar Corderius (Vienna, 1630, 4to). The editor was deficient in scholarship, and Lambecius promised a better edition, which, however, never appeared. Photius (*Biblioth. cod.* 75) compares the *Cosmogonia* with its author, and forms no good opinion of *either*: — *Disputatio de Paschale*, "ad calcem Cosmogoniae," by the same editor: — **Κατὰ Πρόκλου περὶ ἀϊδιότητος κόσμου λύσεις, λόγοι Ιή**, *Adversus Procli de Aeternitate Mundi Argumenta XVIII Solutiones*, commonly called *De Aeternitate Mundi*. The end is mutilated. Edit.: the text by Victor Trincavellus (Venice, 1535, fol.); Latin versions, by Joannes Mahotius (Lyons, 1557, fol.), and by Casparus Marcellus (Venice, 1551, fol.): — *De quinque Dialectis Graecae Lingues Liber*. Edit. Greece, together with the writings of some other grammarians, and the *Thesaurus*

of Varinus Camertes (Venice, 1476, fol.; 1504, fol.; ad calcem Lexici Graeco Latini, Venice, 1524, fol.; another, *ibid.* 1524, fol.; Basle, 1532, fol.; Paris, 1521, fol.): — **Συναγωγή τῶν πρὸς διάφορον σημασίαν διαφόρως τονουμένων λέξεων**, *Collectio Vocum quae pro diversa significatione Accentum diversum accipiunt*, in alphabetical order. It has often been published at the end of Greek dictionaries. The only separate edition is by Erasmus Schmid (Wittenb. 1615, 8vo), under the title of *Cyrelli, vel, ut alii volunt, Joanni Philoponi Opusculum utilissimum de Differentiis Vocum Graecarum, quod Tonum, Spiritum, Genus, etc.*, to which is added the editor's *Dissertatio de Pronunciatione Graeca Antiqua*. Schmid appended to the dictionary of Philoponus about five times as much of his own, but he separated his additions from the text: *Coummentarii in Aristotelem, viz.*

- (1) *In Analytica Priora*. Edit.: the text, Venice, 1536, fol.; Latin versions, by Gulielmus Dorotheus (Venice, 1541, fol.), Lucillus Philaltheus (*ibid.* 1544, 1548, 1553, 1555, fol.), Alexander Justinianus (*ibid.* 1560, fol.).
- (2) *In Analytica Posteriora*. Edit.: Venice, 1504, fol., together with *Anonymi Grseci Commentarii* on the same work (*ibid.* 1534, fol.), revised and with additions, together with Eustratii, episcopi Nicaeani (who lived about 1117) *Commentarii* on the same work. A Greek edition of 1534 is said to exist. Latin versions by Andreas Gateolus (Venice, 1542, fol.; Paris, 1543, fol.) and by Martianus Rota (Venice, 1559, 1568, fol.).
- (3) *In quatuor priores Libros Physicorum*. Edit.: the text, cum Praefatione Victoris Trincavelli ad Casparum Contarenum Cardinalem (Venice, 1535, fol.); Latin version, by Gulielmus Dorotheus (*ibid.* 1539 and 1541, fol.); a better one by Baptista Rasarius (*ibid.* 1558, 1569, 1581, fol.). Philoponus speaks of his *Scholia* to the sixth book, whence we may infer that he commented upon the last four books also.
- (4) *In Librum unicum Meteorum*. The text ad calcem Olympiodori *In Meteora* (Venice, 1551, fol.); Latine, by Joannes Baptistus Camotius (*ibid.* 1551. 1567, fol.).
- (5) *In Libros III de Anima*. Edit. Greece, cum Trincavelli Epistola ad Nicolaum Rudolphum Cardinalem (Venice, 1553, fol.); Latine, by Gentianus Hervetus (Lyons, 1544, 1548; Venice, 1554, 1568) and by Mattheus h Bove (Venice, 1544, 1581), all in folio.

(6) *In Libros V De Generatione et Interitu*. Graece, cum Praefatione Asalani (Venice, 1527, fol.), together with Alexander Aphrodisaeus's *Meteorologia*.

(7) *In Libros V De Generatione Animalium*, probably by Philoponus. Edit. Greece cum Petri Corcyraei Epistola Graeca ad Andream Mattheum Aquavivam (Venice, 1526, fol.): Latine, by the same, *ibid.* eodem anno. Black letter.

(8) *In Libros XIV Metaphysicorum*. Latine by Franciscus Patricius (Ferrara, 1583, fol.). The text was never published. Philoponus wrote many other works, some of which are lost, and others have never been published. Fabricius gives an "Index Scriptorum in Philop. De Mundi Aeternitate memoratorum," and an "Index Scriptorum in universis Philoponi ad Aristotelem Commentariis memoratorum," both of great length. See Fabricius, *Bibl. Graec.* 10:639. etc.; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* volume 1; Smith, *Dict. of Class. Biograph.* s.v.; Schaff, *Church History*, 3:674, 767; Illgenfeld, *Patristik*, page 288; Ueberweg, *History of Philosophy*, 1:255, 259, 347-9, 402; Alzog, *Kirchengeschichte*, 1:313; Stillingfleet, *Works*, volume 1; Gieseler, *Ecclesiastical History* (see Index); Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines*; Cudworth, *Intellectual System of the Universe* (see Index).

Philosarcas

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

Philosopher

(φιλόσοφος). Of the Greek sects of philosophers existing in the time of the apostles, the Stoics and Epicureans are mentioned in ~~4178~~ Acts 17:18, some of whom disputed with Paul at Athens. In ~~5018~~ Colossians 2:8 a warning is given against philosophy itself, as a departure from the knowledge of Christ; and it has been noticed that Paul, who had been a Pharisee, acted in this respect in harmony with the sect in which he had been educated (Grossmann, *De Pharisaismo Judaeor. Alex.* 1:8). At least the rabbins set the divine law above all human wisdom; yet they do not appear to have given the name of philosophy to their expositions of the law (see Josephus, *Ap.* 2; 4; 1 Macc. 1 and 5). Paul is speaking in the passage alluded to of theosophic speculations, which had found an entrance among

Christians (5:16 sq.), and on which Rheinwald (*De pseudo doctor. Colos.* Bonn, 1834), Neander (*Gesch. d. Pflanz.* 1:438 sq.), and others have made investigations (see, in brief. De Wette, *Br. a. d. Kolos.* page 1 sq.). It is plain from Paul's letters that he denied all worth to human wisdom and philosophy in comparison with that eternal salvation which is only to be obtained through the divine revelation in the Gospel; but it is not necessary to suppose that he was a despiser of sober philosophic investigation, either on the ground of his pharisaic training or of his apostolic principles. For monographs, see Volbeding, *Index Programmatuum*, page 89 sq. **SEE PHILOSOPHY.**

Philosophists

a name given to a class of French writers who entered into a combination to overturn the religion of Jesus, and eradicate from the human heart every religious sentiment. The man more particularly to whom this idea first occurred was Voltaire, who, being weary (as he said himself) of hearing people repeat that twelve men were sufficient to establish Christianity, resolved to prove that one might be sufficient to overturn it. Full of this project, he swore, before the year 1730, to dedicate his life to its accomplishment; and for some time he flattered himself that he should enjoy alone the glory of destroying the Christian religion. He found, however, that associates would be necessary; and, from the numerous tribe of his admirers and disciples, he chose D'Alembert and Diderot as the most proper persons to cooperate with him in his designs. But Voltaire was not satisfied with their aid alone. He contrived to embark in the same cause Frederick II, king of Prussia. This royal adept was one of the most zealous of Voltaire's coadjutors, till he discovered that the philosophists were waging war with the throne as well as with the altar. This, indeed, was not originally Voltaire's intention. He was vain; he loved to be caressed by the great; and, in one word, he was from natural disposition an aristocrat, and an admirer of royalty. But when he found that almost every sovereign but Frederick disapproved of his impious projects because they perceived the issue, he determined to oppose all the governments on earth rather than forfeit the glory, with which he had flattered himself, of vanquishing Christ and his apostles in the field of controversy. He now set himself, with D'Alembert and Diderot, to excite universal discontent with the established order of things. For this purpose they formed secret societies, assumed new names, and employed an enigmatical language. Thus Frederick was

called *Luc*; D'Alembert, *Protagoras*. and sometimes *Bertrand*; Voltaire, *Raton*; and Diderot, *Platon*, or its anagram, *Tonpla*; while the general term for the conspirators was *Cacoucc*. In their secret meetings they professed to celebrate the mysteries of *Mythra*; and their great object, as they professed to one another, was to confound the wretch, meaning Jesus Christ. Hence their secret watchword was *Ecrasez l'Infame*, "Crush the Wretch." If we look into some of the books expressly written for general circulation, we shall there find the following doctrines; some of them standing alone in all their naked horrors, others surrounded by sophistry and meretricious ornaments, to entice the mind into their net before it perceives their nature: "The Universal Cause, that God of the philosophers, of the Jews, and of the Christians, is but a chimera and a phantom. The phenomena of nature only prove the existence of God to a few prepossessed men: so far from bespeaking a God, they are but the necessary effects of matter prodigiously diversified. It is more reasonable to admit, with Manes, a twofold God, than the God of Christianity. We cannot know whether a God really exists, or whether there is the smallest difference between good and evil, or vice and virtue. Nothing can be more absurd than to believe the soul a spiritual being. The immortality of the soul, so far from stimulating man to the practice of virtue, is nothing but a barbarous, desperate, fatal tenet, and contrary to all legislation. All ideas of justice and injustice, of virtue and vice, of glory and infamy, are purely arbitrary, and dependent on custom. Conscience and remorse are nothing but the foresight of those physical penalties to which crimes expose us. The man who is above the law can commit without remorse the dishonest act that may serve his purpose. The fear of God, so far from being the beginning of wisdom, should be the beginning of folly. The command to love one's parents is more the work of education than of nature. Modesty is only an invention of refined voluptuousness. The law which condemns married people to live together becomes barbarous and cruel on the day they cease to love one another." These extracts from the secret correspondence and the public writings of these men will suffice to show us the nature and tendency of the dreadful system they had formed. The philosophists were diligently employed in attempting to propagate their sentiments. Their grand *Encyclopedie* was converted into an engine to serve this purpose. **SEE ENCYCLOPEDISTS**. Voltaire proposed to establish a colony of philosophists at Cleves, who, protected by the king of Prussia, might publish their opinions without dread or danger; and Frederick was disposed to take them under his protection, till he

discovered that their opinions were anarchical as well as impious, when he threw them off, and even wrote against them. They contrived, however, to engage the ministers of the court of France in their favor, by pretending to have nothing in view but the enlargement of science, in works which spoke, indeed, respectfully of revelation, while every discovery which they brought forward was meant to undermine its very foundation. When the throne was to be attacked, and even when barefaced atheism was to be promulgated, a number of impious and licentious pamphlets were dispersed (for some time none knew how) from a secret society formed at the Hotel d'Holbach, at Paris, of which Voltaire was elected honorary and perpetual president. To conceal their design, which was the diffusion of their infidel sentiments, they called themselves Encyclopedists. *SEE HOLBACH*. The books, however, that were issued from this club were calculated to impair and overturn religion, morals, and government; and these, indeed, spreading over all Europe, imperceptibly took possession of public opinion. As soon as the sale was sufficient to pay the expenses, inferior editions were printed and given away, or sold at a very low price; circulating libraries of them were formed, and reading societies instituted. While they constantly disowned these productions before the world, they contrived to give them a false celebrity through their confidential agents and correspondents, who were not themselves always trusted with the entire secret. By degrees they got possession of most of the reviews and periodical publications; established a general intercourse, by means of hawkers and pedlers, with the distant provinces, and instituted an office to supply all schools with teachers; and thus did they acquire unprecedented dominion over every species of literature, over the minds of all ranks of people, and over the education of youth, without giving any alarm to the world. The lovers of wit and polite literature were caught by Voltaire; the men of science were perverted, and children corrupted in the first rudiments of learning, by D'Alembert and Diderot; stronger appetites were fed by the secret club of baron Holbach; the imaginations of the higher orders were set dangerously afloat by Montesquieu; and the multitude of all ranks were surprised, confounded, and hurried away by Rousseau. Thus was the public mind in France completely corrupted, and this, no doubt, greatly accelerated those dreadful events which afterwards transpired in that country.

Philosophoumena

SEE HIPPOLYTUS.

Philosophy

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

Importance of the Subject. — The character of the investigations with which philosophy is concerned, and still more the superabundance during the last century of what has professed itself to be philosophy, render it excessively difficult either to define this branch of inquiry, or to determine what may be legitimately included under the wide designation. Sir William Hamilton devoted seven lectures of his course of metaphysics to the discussion of this single topic. The vagueness of the term, the instability and indistinctness of the boundaries of this department of knowledge, and the dissensions in regard to all its details, have led many quick and ingenious minds to repudiate the study altogether, and to deny to it any valid existence. Nevertheless it is necessary to recognise its reality, in spite of the uncertainty of its nature, of the confusion thus produced, and of the pretensions sheltered under its honorable name. It was a profound and keen reply, which was said to have been made by Aristotle to the assailants and abnegators of philosophy, that "whether we ought to philosophize or ought not to philosophize, we are compelled to philosophize" (εἴτε φιλοσοφητέον φιλοσοφητέον, εἴτε μὴ φιλοσοφητέον φιλοσοφητέον, πάντως δὲ φιλοσοφητέον, David. *Prolegom. Phil.*, ap. *Schol. Aristot.* page 13, ed. Acad. Berol.), for philosophy is required to demonstrate the inanity and nugatoriness of philosophy: "But the mother of demonstrations is philosophy." The same deep sense of the irrecusable obligation is manifested by Plotinus, when, in a rare access of humor, he utters the paradoxical declaration that all things, rational and irrational — animals, plants, and even minerals, air and water too — alike yearn for theoretical perfection (or the philosophical completion of their nature, *Ennead.* 3:8:1); and that nature, albeit devoid of imagination and reason, has its philosophy within itself, and achieves whatever it effects by theory, or the philosophy which it does not itself possess. "There is reason in roasting eggs," and philosophy in all things, if we can only get at it:

"the meanest flower that blows can give Thoughts that do often lie too deep for tears."

Philosophy is, like death, one of the few things that we can by no means avoid, whether we welcome or reject it; whether we regard the irresistible tendencies of our intellectual constitution to speculative inquiry, or the latent regularity, order, and law controlling all things that fall under our notice, when they develop themselves in accordance with their intrinsic nature (see Sir W. Hamilton, *Metaphysics*, lecture 4, page 46; Ueberweg, *Hist. of Philosophy*, volume 1, § 1, page 5).

There is no longer reason to dread the rarity of philosophy; there has been no occasion for such alarm for more than two thousand years; the terror has been produced by the redundance of what claims this name. There are philosophers of all sorts, who deal with all varieties of subjects. There is mental, moral, political, economical, and natural philosophy; there is the philosophy of religion, the philosophy of enthusiasm, and the philosophy of insanity; the philosophy of logic, the philosophy of rhetoric, the philosophy of language, and the philosophy of grammar; there is the philosophy of history, the philosophy of law, the philosophy of the inductive sciences; there is the philosophy of colors, the philosophy of music, the philosophy of dress, the philosophy of manners, the philosophy of cookery, the philosophy of building, etc. All imaginable topics reveal an aptitude for philosophic treatment, and pretend to furnish a basis for some special philosophy. It would occasion no surprise to encounter a philosophy of jack-straws, and other infantile amusements. There must be some legitimacy, however slight, in these numerous pretensions, some semblance of truth in such easy assumption, or such professions would not continue to be repeated and tolerated. There must be some common element, some cord of similitude, uniting together under one category these multitudinous forms of inquiry, and the unnumbered inquiries which are left unnamed.

Scope of the Term. — The word *philosophy* first appears in the Father of History. It is applied by Croesus to Solon, in his travels in search of knowledge and information, and is used as almost equivalent to *theory*, which in the context means scarcely anything more than sight-seeing or observation (Herodot. 1:30). It next appears in Thucydides. Pericles speaks of the Athenians as "philosophizing without effeminacy," where the term seems to denote the acquisition of information and culture (Thuc. 2:40). The origination of the word is ascribed to Pythagoras in a familiar anecdote, which reports that, being asked by Leon, the chief of Phlius, "What were philosophers?" he replied, with a happy allusion to the concourse at the Olympic Games, that " they were those who diligently

observed the nature of things," calling themselves "students, or lovers of wisdom," and occupied with "the contemplation and knowledge of things" (Cicero, *Tusc. Qu.* 5:3, 9). He is supposed to have thus repudiated the designation of "wise man," or "sophister," previously in vogue, and to have modestly proposed in its stead the appellation of "philosopher," a lover of wisdom. The authenticity of the anecdote has been gravely questioned; and the designation, alleged to have been rejected in this manner, continued in habitual use, with no invidious sense, and was applied to Socrates and the chiefs of the Socratic schools (Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, part 2, volume 8, chapter 67, page 350). To the numerous passages cited by Grote may be added Androtion, *Fr.* 39; Phan. Eretrius, *Fr.* 21; and Synesii *Dio*, apud Dion Chrysostom, 2:329, ed. Teubner). The censures of the Sophists by Plato and Aristotle, the character of the Socratic teaching, and the almost exclusively inquisitive and indeterminate complexion of the Platonic speculation, appear to have given currency to the designation of philosophy, as a more modest and inconclusive appellative than "sophia," or wisdom.

Originally, then, philosophy imported only the loving pursuit of knowledge, without any implication of actual attainment; but it soon acquired a more positive and distinct acceptance. In the *Republic* Plato defines philosophy as "the circuit, or beating about of the soul in its ascending progress towards real existence;" and declares those to be philosophers "who embrace the really existent," and "who are able to apprehend the eternal and unchanging." In the *Euthydemus* he goes farther, and describes philosophy as "the acquisition of true knowledge." In the definitions ascribed to Plato, which, though not his, may preserve the tradition of his teaching, it is only "the desire of the knowledge of eternal existences." Xenophon rarely employs the term, but applies "sophia" to the Socratic knowledge. In one passage where he uses it it signifies the knowledge and practice of the duties of life (*Mem.* 4:2, page 23).

A great step towards the definite restriction of the meaning of philosophy was made by the Platonic writings, though the name continued, and has always continued, to be employed with great latitude. Aristotle, who gave a sharp, scientific character to nearly everything which he touched, first confined the term to special significations, and gave to it a limited and, in some cases, a purely technical meaning. He calls philosophy "the knowledge of truth;" and he endeavored to discover a "first philosophy," or body of principles common to all departments of speculative inquiry, and

dealing solely with the primary elements and affections of being (*Met.* 1:1, page 993; *Phys.* 1:9, page 5; *Simplicii Schol.* page 345). This first philosophy, or "knowledge of the philosopher," corresponds to metaphysics in its stricter sense — a division of speculative science receiving its name from the remains of Aristotle, and, in great measure, constituted by his labors. It is the science of being as being (τὸ ὄν ἢ ὄν, *Met.* 6:1, page 1026; 11:3, page 1060; 4, page 1061). Thus, with the Peripatetics, philosophy included all science, but especially theoretical science, and was peculiarly attached to metaphysical science. With this accords the definition of Cicero, which is evidently derived from Peripatetic sources (*De Off.* 2:2, 5).

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

Philosophy is the earnest investigation of the principles of knowledge, and most appropriately of the first principles, or principles of abstract being. It is not science, but search (Kant, *Program.* 1765-66; Sir William Hamilton, *Metaph.* lectures 1, 3; *Discussions*, page 787). It is distinctively *zetetic*, or inquisitive, rather than dogmatic. Its chief value consists in the zeal, perspicacity, simplicity, and unselfishness of the persevering desire for the highest truth, not in its attainment; for the highest truth is, in its nature, unattainable by the finite intelligence of man. It has not, or ought not to have, the pretension or confident assurance of knowledge, though this claim has frequently been made (ἡ φιλοσοφία γνῶσις ἐστὶ πάντων τῶν ὄντων, David. *Interpr. x. Categ. Schol. Aristot.* page 29, ed. Acad. Berol.). It is only a systematic craving and continuous effort to reach the highest knowledge.

*"For man loves knowledge, and the beams of truth
More welcome touch his understanding's eye
Than all the blandishments of sound his ear,
Than all of taste his tongue" (Akenside).*

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

What is man? What are his faculties and powers? Whence is he? Whither is he going? How shall he guide himself? What is this vast and varied universe around him? How did it arise? How is it ordered and sustained? What is man's relation to it, and to the great Power behind the veil, manifested by its wondrous movements and changes? What is the nature of this power? What are man's duties to it, to himself, and to his fellow-men? What knowledge of these things can he acquire? What are his destinies, and his aids for their achievement? These questions, and questions like these, constitute the province of philosophy proper. They present themselves dimly or distinctly to every reflecting mind; and they will not be gainsaid. Our intellectual constitution compels us to think of them; and to think of them, however weakly and spasmodically, is the beginning of philosophy. They all admit of partial solution of an answer at least, which stimulates further investigation. None of them can receive a full and complete reply from the human reason they stretch beyond its compass. All of them, in every age, have met with some response, either in the poetic and bewildering fancies of the prevalent mythology, or in the wild guesses of popular credulity; either in the aphorisms of the prudent, or in the conclusions of those who have sedulously devoted themselves to the unravelling of these enigmas. This latter class have been the philosophers of each generation, from the commencement of rational inquiry to the current day, as they will continue to be till the closing of the great roll of time; for of philosophy there is no end.

This constant disappointment and continual renewal of effort are strange phenomena, and have often proved utterly disheartening. Hence has proceeded the objection so frequently urged that philosophy is ever in restless and fretful activity, but does not advance. The allegation of an

entire failure of progress is unjust; but the same questions constantly reappear with changed aspects, and the same solutions are offered under altered forms. But the change in the aspects and the alteration in the forms are themselves an advancement. The true source of encouragement is, however, to be derived less from the progress which can never pass the boundaries imposed by the same old questions than from the knowledge that the pursuit is more than the impracticable attainment — the race more important than the arrival at the goal could be — at least in this finite life, with our finite powers. From this habitual disappointment, and the apparent failures which bring the disappointment, have arisen, too, this variety of solutions which have been proposed for the numerous riddles that philosophy propounds to man. Varro enumerated two hundred and eighty-eight possible sects, apparently on the basis of ethics alone (*August. De Civ. Dei*, 19:1); and the number of distinguishable schemes of philosophy, to say nothing of diversities of opinion in regard to details, is countless. Yet each of these has contributed something to our knowledge: in the more precise statement of the problems to be solved, in the clearer determination of their conditions, in the refutation of former errors, in the exposure of previous misapprehensions, in presenting the inquiries under new and brighter lights, or in adding to our positive information in regard to these dark and difficult subjects. The gratitude which Aristotle expresses, in a remarkable passage (*Met.* 1), towards his predecessors, who had gone astray, or who had failed to see the truth, is due to all philosophical inquirers. They have contributed something towards the result, however incomplete that result may remain (*καὶ γὰρ οὗτοι συνεβάλοντο τι τὴν γὰρ ἕξιν προήσκησαν ἡμῶν*; and see Alexander Aphrodis. *Schol. Aristot.* ad loc. *ἢ γὰρ τῶν καταβεβλημένων δοξῶν εὐπορία εὔρετικωτεροῦς ἡμᾶς τῆς ἀληθείας παρασκευάσει*).

History of the Subject. — The hopelessness of satisfactory attainment, with the inevitable persistency of the search, and the gradual approximation, or appearance of approximation, to a goal which is never reached, but is ever receding, eventuate in changes, expansions, fluctuations, and revolutions in opinion, which are recorded and appreciated in the history of philosophy. This history chronicles the origins and original phases of philosophical inquiry, its mutations, progresses, and recessions, and the causes of them; it notes the introduction of new doctrines, new methods of procedure, new modes of exposition; the dissensions and controversies which spring up and minister to new developments; the reduction of kindred views to a

coherent body, and the constitution of sects and schools; the fortunes of such schools, the development or perversion of the several successive or contemporaneous schemes of speculation in the bosom of the schools themselves, either in consequence of their own internal activity, or of the necessities suggested or enforced by external attack. In this manner, and from these motives of change, philosophy exhibits unceasing activity and frequent novelty of form, notwithstanding the substantial identity of the questions debated, and the sameness of the ground surveyed. In these vicissitudes of opinion there is, however, an element which ought never to be overlooked, and which gives an immediate and urgent interest to all the variations. The philosophy of an age or sect is largely influenced by recent experiences, and by the present demands of the society or circle to which it is addressed; and, in turn, it exercises a most potent influence in determining the views of the rising and succeeding generations, not only within the range of theoretical inquiry, but also in government, social organization, manners, habits of thought, arts, and in everything which concerns the daily life of the people. The condition of Athenian politics and morals directly engendered the Socratic inquiries and the Socratic schools. The personal degradation and servility of the Romans under the empire provoked the revival and ardent advocacy of stoicism. The repugnance to Islamism, and the dialectical needs of Christendom, gave birth to medieval scholasticism. The antagonism which issued in the English commonwealth furnished the hotbed in which germinated the philosophy of Hobbes. Locke and the encyclopaedists were the prophets and guides of the French revolutionary spirit; and the materialism of the current years has received form as well as vitality from the predominance and achievements of the physical sciences, and the enormous fascinations of material interests and gratifications. Thus the alternations of philosophy explain and are explained by the concurrent modifications of society.

The history of philosophy admits of two distinct principles of division, both of which are simultaneously employed. It may be divided either with reference to its special subject-matter, as a part of the general domain of philosophy, or with reference to its chronological successions. Each of these distributions of course permits further subdivision.

Plato practically, though not expressly, divided philosophy into dialectics, physics, and ethics, including theology and much of metaphysics, along with natural philosophy, under the head of physics. *SEE PLATONIC PHILOSOPHY*. The division of Aristotle is indistinct and apparently

variable. But he did not complete his system. His metaphysics, which corresponds nearly with his first philosophy, or with philosophy in its strictest sense, was an incomplete collection of unfinished papers, gathered and arranged after his death. Science, or knowledge, he distributes between practice, production, and theory (*Metaph.* 6:1, *Frag.* 137, page 94, ed. Didot). Ueberweg mistakes this for a formal division of philosophy, but the third head is the only one to which Aristotle would have assigned the name of philosophy. He elsewhere distinguishes theory into physical, mathematical, and theological—the last corresponding with philosophy proper (*Metaph.* 11:7). In one of his fragments, philosophical problems are declared to be of five kinds: political, dialectical, physical, ethical, and rhetorical (Aristot. *Frag.* 137, page 108). This division excludes the greater part of philosophy. The uncertainty and confusion which these several divisions are calculated to produce may be accounted for and excused by the loose acceptance of the term physics in the Socratic schools; and by the fact that metaphysics, or philosophy, in Aristotle's estimation, lay beyond the domain of physics. Dividing philosophy into metaphysics, physics, and ethics, we now habitually exclude physics, or natural philosophy, and set it apart as the realm of exact science. The other two are assigned to philosophy. But metaphysics and ethics may be united as together constituting philosophy, or they may be kept distinct and variously subdivided. Sir William Hamilton, who, in deference to the narrowness of the Scotch school, at times almost identifies psychology with philosophy, enumerates, by a strained construction, five branches of the former: logic, ethics, politics, aesthetics, and theology (*Metaph.* lecture 3, page 44). Remusat incidentally distributes philosophy under the five heads of psychology, logic, metaphysics, theodicy (or the philosophy of religion — theology), and morals (*Vie d'Ablard*, liv. 2, chapter 3, volume 1, page 351 sq.). Ampere, in his ingenious and fantastic classification of human knowledge, by a septuple series of violent dichotomies, manufactures eightyfour distinct departments of philosophical inquiry. For the present purpose, the sufficiency or the insufficiency, the validity or the invalidity, of these various divisions and subdivisions is unimportant. The history of philosophy includes them all, either as definite members or as subordinate parts. Each may be treated separately, or all may be embraced in one treatment, or a distinct discussion may be bestowed upon several of them combined in one view. Thus there may be a history of mental philosophy, and a history of ethics, like the supplements of Dugald Stewart and Sir James Mackintosh to the *Encyclopedia Britannica*; or a history of

logic, like Mr. Blakey's very feeble treatise on that subject; or a history of heretical opinions, like those so common in the earlier ages of the Christian Church; or a general history of philosophy, like Brucken's or Tennemann's or Ueberweg's. This is the mode in which the history of philosophy may be divided.

The other process of division regards primarily the Succession of philosophical systems, or of philosophical schools, where the systems are identified with particular schools. A very loose and general distribution of this kind is into ancient, mediæval, and modern, each of which has often been handled separately. The distinction between these divisions is mainly the difference of time. They frequently run into each other. In many characteristics, both of doctrine and method, they repeat each other. The scholastic procedure is discernible in Plotinus and Joannes Damascenus, while John Scotus Erigena approached more nearly to the NeoPlatonists than to the schoolmen. Occam and Gerson exhibit many modern features; and among the moderns there are many wide differences, not only in doctrine, but in character. Hence other divisions, more precise than are attainable by these indistinct chronological periods, have latterly won more favor. The following may be offered as an example of such distribution :

- I.** The commencements of philosophy, chiefly among the Orientals, with whom philosophy, mythology, and the ology were inseparably intertwined.
- II.** The philosophy of the Greeks, which comprehends of course the philosophy of the Romans, as it was essentially Greek from Cicero to Boethius.
- III.** The philosophy of the Schoolmen, which in part overlaps modern systems. To this the philosophy of the Jews and Saracens may be joined as an appendix, since it affords the transition to it from the Greeks.
- IV.** The philosophy of the Renaissance, or Transition Age, commencing with Gemistus Pletho and the Medicean Academy, and ending with Pascal and Gassendi.
- V.** The philosophy of Modern Times — from Francis Bacon and Descartes. Each of these periods has many subdivisions, which have been variously constituted by different historians, and necessarily vary

with the variation of the aspects under which philosophy is contemplated by the several chroniclers of its fluctuations.

Literature. — The fullest repertory of works on the several schemes of philosophy, on its general and special history, and on the history of the philosophers themselves, and of particular doctrines, may be found in Ueberweg, *History of Philosophy*, translated by George S. Morris (N.Y. 1875, 2 volumes, 8vo). Up to the date of that work the fullest treatise on the subject was H. Ritter's *Geschichte der Philosophie* (Gotha, 1854, 12 volumes, 8vo). A convenient summary is Maurice's *Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy* (Lond. 1850-56, and later 4 volumes, 8vo), which gives a historical review of the whole subject. (G.F.H.)

Philosophy, Chaldean

SEE MAGI; SEE PHILOSOPHY. HEBREW.

Philosophy, Greek

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

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

The various attempts which have been made to derive Western philosophy from Eastern sources have signally failed. The external evidence in favor of this opinion is wholly insufficient to establish it (Bitter, *Gesch. d. Phil.* 1:159, etc.; Thirlwall, *Hist. of Gr.* 2:130; Zeller, *Gesch. d. Phil. d. Griechen*, 1:18-34; Max Muller, *On Language*, 84 note), and on internal grounds it is most improbable. It is true that in some degree the character

of Greek speculation may have been influenced, at least in its earliest stages, by religious ideas which were originally introduced from the East; but this indirect influence does not affect the real originality of the great Greek teachers. The spirit of pure philosophy, distinct from theology, is wholly alien from Eastern thought; and it was comparatively late when even a Greek ventured to separate philosophy from religion. But in Greece the separation, when it was once effected, remained essentially complete. The opinions of the ancient philosophers might or might not be outwardly reconcilable with the popular faith; but philosophy and faith were independent. The very value of Greek teaching lies in the fact that it was, as far as is possible, a result of simple reason, or, if faith asserts its prerogative, the distinction is sharply marked. In this we have a record of the power and weakness of the human mind written at once on the grandest scale and in the fairest characters.

Of the various classifications of the Greek schools which have been proposed, the simplest and truest seems to be that which divides the history of philosophy into three great periods, the first reaching to the aera of the Sophists, the next to the death of Aristotle, the third to the Christian aera. In the first period the world objectively is the great centre of inquiry; in the second, the "ideas" of things, truth, and being; in the third, the chief interest of philosophy falls back upon the practical conduct of life. Successive systems overlap each other, both in time and subjects of speculation, but broadly the sequence which has been indicated will hold good (Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen*, 1:111, etc.). After the Christian aera philosophy ceased to have any true vitality in Greece, but it made fresh efforts to meet the changed conditions of life at Alexandria and Rome. At Alexandria Platonism was vivified by the spirit of Oriental mysticism, and afterwards of Christianity; at Rome Stoicism was united with the vigorous virtues of active life. Each of these great divisions must be passed in rapid review.

1. *The pre-Socratic Schools.* — The first Greek philosophy was little more than an attempt to follow out in thought the mythic cosmogonies of earlier poets. Gradually the depth and variety of the problems included in the idea of a cosmogony became apparent, and, after each clew had been followed out, the period ended in the negative teaching of the Sophists. The questions of creation, of the immediate relation of mind and matter, were pronounced in fact, if not in word, insoluble, and speculation was turned into a new direction. What is the one permanent element which underlies

the changing forms of things? — this was the primary inquiry to which the *Ionic* school endeavored to find an answer. Thales (B.C. cir. 625-610), following, as it seems, the genealogy of Hesiod, pointed to moisture (water) as the one source and supporter of life. Anaximenes (B.C. cir. 520-480) substituted air for water, as the more subtle and all-pervading element; but equally with Thales he neglected all consideration of the force which might be supposed to modify the one primal substance. At a much later date (B.C. cir. 450) Diogenes of Apollonia, to meet this difficulty, represented this elementary "air" as endowed with intelligence (νόησις), but even he makes no distinction between the material and the intelligent. The atomic theory of Democritus (B.C. cir. 460-357), which stands in close connection with this form of Ionic teaching, offered another and more plausible solution. The motion of his atoms included the action of force, but he wholly omitted to account for its source. Meanwhile another mode of speculation had arisen in the same school. In place of one definite element, Anaximander (B.C. 610-547) suggested the unlimited (τὸ ἄπειρον) as the adequate origin of all special existences. Somewhat more than a century later Anaxagoras summed up the result of such a line of speculation: "All things were together; then mind (νοῦς) came and disposed them in order" (Diog. Laert. 2:6). Thus we are left face to face with an ultimate dualism.

The *Eleatic* school started from an opposite point of view. Thales saw moisture present in material things, and pronounced this to be their fundamental principle; Xenophanes (B.C. cir. 550-530) "looked up to the whole heaven, and said that the One is God" (Arist. *Met.* 1:5, τὸ νειναί φησι τὸν θεόν). "Thales saw gods in all things; Xenophanes saw all things in God" (Thirlwall, *Hist. of Gr.* 2:136). That which *is*, according to Xenophanes, must be one, eternal, infinite, immovable, unchangeable. Parmenides of Elea (B.C. 500) substituted abstract "being" for "God" in the system of Xenophanes, and distinguished with precision the functions of sense and reason. Sense teaches us of "the many," the false (phenomena); Reason of "the one," the true (the absolute). Zeno of Elea (B.C. cir. 450) developed with logical ingenuity the contradictions involved in our perceptions of things (in the idea of *motion*, for instance), and thus formally prepared the way for scepticism. If the One alone *is*, the phenomenal world is an illusion. The sublime aspiration of Xenophanes, when followed out legitimately to its consequences, ended in blank negation.

The teaching of Heraclitus (B.C. 500) offers a complete contrast to that of the Eleatics, and stands far in advance of the earlier Ionic school, with which he is historically connected. So far from contrasting the existent and the phenomenal, he boldly identified being with change. "There ever was, and is, and shall be, an ever-living fire, unceasingly kindled and extinguished in due measure" (*ἀπτόμενον μέτρα καὶ ἀποσβεννύμενον μέτρα*, Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 5:14, § 105). Rest and continuance is death. That which *is* is the instantaneous balance of contending powers (Diog. Laert. 9:7 *διὰ τῆς ἐναντιοτροπῆς ἡρμόσθαι τὰ ὄντα*). Creation is the *play* of the Creator. Everywhere, as far as his opinions can be grasped, Heraclitus makes noble "guesses at truth;" yet he leaves "fate" (*εἰμαρμένη*) as the supreme creator (Stob. *Ecl.* 1, page 59, ap. Ritter and Preller, § 42). The cycles of life and death run on by its law. It may have been by a natural reaction that from these wider speculations he turned his thoughts inwards. "I investigated myself," he says, with conscious pride (Plutarch, *adv. Col.* 1118, c); and in this respect he foreshadows the teaching of Socrates, as Zeno did that of the Sophists.

The philosophy of Pythagoras (B.C. cir. 540-510) is subordinate in interest to his social and political theories, though it supplies a link in the course of speculation: others had labored to trace a unity in the world in the presence of one underlying element or in the idea of a whole; he sought to combine the separate harmony of parts with total unity. Numerical unity includes the finite and the infinite; and in the relations of number there is a perfect symmetry, as all spring out of the fundamental unit. Thus numbers seemed to Pythagoras to be not only "patterns" of things (*τῶν ὄντων*), but causes of their being (*τῆς οὐσίας*). How he connected numbers with concrete being it is impossible to determine; but it may not be wholly fanciful to see in the doctrine of the transmigration of souls an attempt to trace in the successive forms of life an outward expression of a harmonious law in the moral as well as in the physical world. (The remains of the pre-Socratic philosophers have been collected in a very convenient form by F. Mullach in Didot's *Biblioth. Gr.* Paris, 1860.)

The first cycle of philosophy was thus completed. All the great primary problems of thought had been stated, and typical answers rendered. The relation of spirit and matter was still unsolved. Speculation issued in dualism (Anaxagoras), materialism (Democritus), or pantheism (Xenophanes). On one side reason was made the sole criterion of truth (Parmenides); on the other, experience (Heraclitus). As yet there was no

rest, and the Sophists prepared the way for a new method. Whatever may be the moral estimate which is formed of the Sophists, there can be little doubt as to the importance of their teaching as preparatory to that of Socrates. All attempts to arrive at certainty by a study of the world had failed: might it not seem, then, that truth is subjective? "Man is the measure of all things." Sensations are modified by the individual; and may not this hold good universally? The conclusion was applied to morals and politics with fearless skill. The belief in absolute truth and right was wellnigh banished; but meanwhile the Sophists were perfecting the instrument which was to be turned against them. Language, in their hands, acquired a precision unknown before, when words assumed the place of things. Plato might ridicule the pedantry of Protagoras, but Socrates reaped a rich harvest from it.

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

The famous sentence in which Aristotle (*Met.* 13:4) characterizes the teaching of Socrates (B.C. 468-389) places his scientific position in the clearest light. There are two things, he says, which we may rightly attribute to Socrates, inductive reasoning and general definition (*τούς ἑπακτικούς λόγους καὶ τὸ ὀρίζεσθαι καθόλου*). By the first he endeavored to discover the permanent element which underlies the changing forms of appearances and the varieties of opinion: by the second he fixed the truth which he had thus gained. But, besides this, Socrates rendered another service to truth. He changed not only the method, but also the subject of philosophy (Cicero, *Acad. Post.* 1:4). Ethics occupied in his investigations the primary place which had hitherto been held by physics. The great aim of his induction was to establish the sovereignty of virtue; and, before entering on other speculations, he determined to obey

the Delphian maxim and "know himself" (Plato, *Phaedr.* page 229). It was a necessary consequence of a first effort in this direction that Socrates regarded all the results which he derived as like in kind. Knowledge (*ἐπιστήμη*) was equally absolute and authoritative, whether it referred to the laws of intellectual operations or to questions of morality. A conclusion in geometry and a conclusion on conduct were set forth as true in the same sense. Thus vice was only another name for ignorance (Xenoph. *Mem.* 3:9, 4; Arist. *Eth. End.* 1:5). Every one was supposed to have within him a faculty absolutely leading to right action, just as the mind necessarily decides rightly as to relations of space and number, when each step in the proposition is clearly stated. Socrates practically neglected the determinative power of the will. His great glory was, however, clearly connected with this fundamental error in his system. He affirmed the existence of a universal law of right and wrong. He connected philosophy with action, both in detail and in general. On the one side he upheld the supremacy of conscience, on the other the working of Providence. Not the least fruitful characteristic of his teaching was what may be called its desultoriness. He formed no complete system. He wrote nothing. He attracted and impressed his followers by his many-sided nature. He helped others to give birth to thoughts, to use his favorite image, but he was barren himself (Plato, *Thecet.* page 150). As a result of this, the most conflicting opinions were maintained by some of his professed followers, who carried out isolated fragments of his teaching to extreme conclusions. Some adopted his method (Euclides, B.C. cir. 400, the *Megarians*), others his subject. Of the latter, one section, following out his proposition of the identity of self-command (*ἐγκράτεια*) with virtue, professed an utter disregard of everything material (Antisthenes, B.C. cir. 366, the *Cynics*), while the other (Aristippus, B.C. cir. 366, the *Cyrenaics*), inverting the maxim that virtue is necessarily accompanied by pleasure, took immediate pleasure as the rule of action.

These "minor Socratic schools" were, however, premature and imperfect developments. The truths which they distorted were embodied at a later time in more reasonable forms. Plato alone (B.C. 430-347), by the breadth and nobleness of his teaching, was the true successor of Socrates; with fuller detail and greater elaborateness of parts, his philosophy was as many-sided as that of his master. Thus it is impossible to construct a consistent Platonic system, though many Platonic doctrines are sufficiently marked. Plato, indeed, possessed two commanding powers, which, though

apparently incompatible, are in the highest sense complementary: a matchless destructive dialectic, and a creative imagination. By the first he refuted the great fallacies of the Sophists on the uncertainty of knowledge and right, carrying out in this the attacks of Socrates; by the other he endeavored to bridge over the interval between appearance and reality, and gain an approach to the eternal. His famous doctrines of Ideas and Recollection (*ἀνάμνησις*) are a solution by imagination of a logical difficulty. Socrates had shown the existence of general notions; Plato felt constrained to attribute to them a substantive existence (Arist. *Met.* 13:4). A glorious vision gave completeness to his view. The unembodied spirits were exhibited in immediate presence of the "ideas" of things (*Phaedr.* page 247); the law of their embodiment was sensibly portrayed; and the more or less vivid remembrance of supramundane realities in this life was traced to antecedent facts. All men were thus supposed to have been face to face with truth: the object of teaching was to bring back impressions latent but uneffaced.

The "myths" of Plato, to one of the most famous of which reference has just been made, play a most important part in his system. They answer in the philosopher to faith in the Christian. In dealing with immortality and judgment he leaves the way of reason, and ventures, as he says, on a rude raft to brave the dangers of the ocean (*Phaedr.* page 85, D; *Gorg.* page 523, A). The peril and the prize are noble and the hope is great" (*Phaedr.* page 114, C, D). Such tales, he admits, may seem puerile and ridiculous; and if there were other surer and clearer means of gaining the desired end, the judgment would be just (*Gorg.* page 527, A). But, as it is, thus only can he connect the seen and the unseen. The myths, then, mark the limit of his dialectics. They are not merely a poetical picture of truth already gained, or a popular illustration of his teaching, but real efforts to penetrate beyond the depths of argument. They show that his method was not commensurate with his instinctive desires; and point out in intelligible outlines the subjects on which man looks for revelation. Such are the relations of the human mind to truth (*Phaedr.* page 246-49); the pre-existence and immortality of the soul (*Meno*, pages 81-3; *Phaedr.* Pages 110-12; *Tim.* page 41); the state of future retribution (*Gorg.* pages 523-25; *Rep.* pages 614-16); the revolutions of the world (*Polit.* page 269. Comp. also *Sympos.* pages 189-91, 203-5; Zeller, *Philos. d. Griech.* pages 361-63, who gives the literature of the subject).

The great difference between Plato and Aristotle (B.C. 384-322) lies in the use which Plato thus made of imagination as the exponent of instinct. The dialectics of Plato is not inferior to that of Aristotle, and Aristotle exhibits traces of poetic power not unworthy of Plato; but Aristotle never allows imagination to influence his final decision. He elaborated a perfect method, and he used it with perfect fairness. His writings contain the highest utterance of pure reason. Looking back on all the earlier efforts of philosophy, he pronounced a calm and final judgment. For him many of the conclusions which others had maintained were valueless, because he showed that they rested on feeling, and not on argument. This stern severity of logic gives an indescribable pathos to those passages in which he touches on the highest hopes of men; and perhaps there is no more truly affecting chapter in ancient literature than that in which he states in a few unimpassioned sentences the issue of his inquiry into the immortality of the soul. Part of it may be immortal, but that part is impersonal (*De An.* 3:5). This was the sentence of reason, and he gives expression to it without a word of protest, and yet as one who knew the extent of the sacrifice which it involved. The conclusion is, as it were, the epitaph of free speculation. Laws of observation and argument, rules of action, principles of government remain, but there is no hope beyond the grave.

It follows necessarily that the Platonic doctrine of ideas was emphatically rejected by Aristotle, who gave, however, the final development to the original conception of Socrates. With Socrates "ideas" (general definitions) were mere abstractions; with Plato they had an absolute existence; with Aristotle they had no existence separate from things in which they were realized, though the form (*μορφή*), which answers to the Platonic idea, was held to be the essence of the thing itself (comp. Zeller, *Philos. d. Griech.* 1:119, 120).

There is one feature common in essence to the systems of Plato and Aristotle which has not yet been noticed. In both, ethics is a part of politics. The citizen is prior to the man. In Plato this doctrine finds its most extravagant development in theory, though his life, and, in some places, his teaching, were directly opposed to it (e.g. *Gorg.* page 527, D). This practical inconsequence was due, it may be supposed, to the condition of Athens at the time, for the idea was in complete harmony with the national feeling; and, in fact, the absolute subordination of the individual to the body includes one of the chief lessons of the ancient world. In Aristotle the "political" character of man is defined with greater precision, and brought

within narrower limits. The breaking up of the small Greek states had prepared the way for more comprehensive views of human fellowship, without destroying the fundamental truth of the necessity of social union for perfect life. But in the next generation this was lost. The wars of the succession obliterated the idea of society, and philosophy was content with aiming at individual happiness.

The coming change was indicated by the rise of a school of sceptics. The scepticism of the Sophists marked the close of the first period, and in like manner the scepticism of the Pyrrhonists marks the close of the second (Stilpo, B.C. cir. 290; Pyrrho, B.C. cir. 290). But the Pyrrhonists rendered no positive service to the cause of philosophy, as the Sophists did by the refinement of language. Their immediate influence was limited in its range, and it is only as a symptom that the rise of the school is important. But in this respect it foreshows the character of after-philosophy by denying the foundation of all higher speculations. Thus all interest was turned to questions of practical morality. Hitherto morality had been based as a science upon mental analysis, but by the Pyrrhonists it was made subservient to law and custom. Immediate experience was held to be the rule of life (comp. Ritter and Preller, § 350).

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

In dealing with moral questions two opposite systems are possible, and have found advocates in all ages. On the one side it may be said that the

character of actions is to be judged by their results; on the other, that it is to be sought only in the actions themselves. Pleasure is the test of right in one case; an assumed or discovered law of our nature in the other. If the world were perfect and the balance of human faculties undisturbed, it is evident that both systems would give identical results. As it is, there is a tendency to error on each side, which is clearly seen in the rival schools of the Epicureans and Stoics, who practically divided the suffrages of the mass of educated men in the centuries before and after the Christian aera.

Epicurus (B.C. 352-270) defined the object of philosophy to be the attainment of a happy life. The pursuit of truth for its own sake he regarded as superfluous. He rejected dialectics as a useless study, and accepted the senses, in the widest acceptation of the term, as the criterion of truth. Physics he subordinated entirely to ethics (Cicero, *De Fin.* 1:7). But he differed widely from the Cyrenaics in his view of happiness. The happiness at which the wise man aims is to be found, he said, not in momentary gratification, but in lifelong pleasure. It does not consist necessarily in excitement or motion, but often in absolute tranquillity (*ἀταραξία*). "The wise man is happy even on the rack" (Diog. Laert. 10:118), for "virtue alone is inseparable from pleasure" (id. page 138). To live happily and to live wisely, nobly, and justly, are convertible phrases (id. page 140). But it followed as a corollary from his view of happiness that the gods, who were assumed to be supremely happy and eternal, were absolutely free from the distractions and emotions consequent on any care for the world or man (id. page 139; comp. Lucr. 2:645-47). All things were supposed to come into being by chance, and so pass away; and the study of nature was chiefly useful as dispelling the superstitious fears of the gods and death by which the multitude are tormented. It is obvious how such teaching would degenerate in practice. The individual was left master of his own life, free from all regard to any higher law than a refined selfishness.

While Epicurus asserted in this manner the claims of one part of man's nature in the conduct of life, Zeno of Citium (B.C. cir. 280), with equal partiality, advocated a purely spiritual (intellectual) morality. The opposition between the two was complete. The infinite, chance-formed worlds of the one stand over against the one harmonious world of the other. On the one side are gods regardless of material things, on the other a Being permeating and vivifying all creation. This difference necessarily found its chief expression in ethics. For when the Stoics taught that there were only two principles of things, matter (*τὸ πᾶσιν*), and God, fate,

reason — for the names were many by which it was fashioned and quickened (τὸ ποιοῦν) — it followed that the active principle in man is of divine origin, and that his duty is to live conformably to nature (τὸ ὁμολογουμένως [τῇ φύσει] ζῆν). By "nature" some understood the nature of man, others the nature of the universe; but both agreed in regarding it as a general law of the whole, and not particular passions or impulses. Good, therefore, was but one. All external things were indifferent. Reason was the absolute sovereign of man. Thus the doctrine of the Stoics, like that of Epicurus, practically left man to himself. But it was worse in its final results than Epicurism, for it made him his own god.

In one point the Epicureans and Stoics were agreed. They both regarded the happiness and culture of the individual as the highest good. Both systems belonged to a period of corruption and decay. They were the efforts of the man to support himself in the ruin of the state. But at the same time this assertion of individual independence and breaking down of local connections performed an important work in preparation for Christianity. It was for the Gentile world an influence corresponding to the Dispersion for the Jews. Men, as men, owned their fellowship as they had not done before. Isolating superstitions were shattered by the arguments of the Epicureans. The unity of the human conscience was vigorously affirmed by the Stoics (comp. *Antoninus*, 4:4, 33, with Gataker's notes).

Meanwhile in the New Academy Platonism degenerated into scepticism. Epicurus found an authoritative rule in the senses. The Stoics took refuge in what seems to answer to the modern doctrine of "commonsense," and maintained that the senses give a direct knowledge of the object. Carneades (B.C. 213-129) combated these views, and showed that sensation cannot be proved to declare the real nature, but only some of the effects, of things. Thus the slight philosophical basis of the later schools was undermined. Scepticism remained as the last issue of speculation; and, if we may believe the declaration of Seneca (*Quaest. Nat.* 7:32), scepticism itself soon ceased to be taught as a system. The great teachers had sought rest, and in the end they found unrest. No *science* of life could be established. The reason of the few failed to create an esoteric rule of virtue and happiness. For in this they all agreed, that the blessings of philosophy were not for the mass. A "gospel preached to the poor" was as yet unknown.

But though the Greek philosophers fell short of their highest aim, it needs no words to show the work which they did as pioneers of a universal

Church. They revealed the wants and the instincts of men with a clearness and vigor elsewhere unattainable, for their sight was dazzled by no reflections from a purer faith. Step by step great questions were proposed — fate, providence — conscience, law — the state, the man; and answers were given which are the more instructive because they are generally one-sided. The discussions which were primarily restricted to a few, in time influenced the opinions of the many. The preacher who spoke of "an unknown God" had an audience who could understand him, not at Athens only or Rome, but throughout the civilized world.

The complete course of philosophy was run before the Christian sera, but there were yet two mixed systems afterwards which offered some novel features. At Alexandria Platonism was united with various elements of Eastern speculation, and for several centuries exercised an important influence on Christian doctrine. At Rome Stoicism was vivified by the spirit of the old republic, and exhibited the extreme Western type of philosophy. Of the first nothing can be said here. It arose only when Christianity was a recognised spiritual power, and was influenced both positively and negatively by the Gospel. The same remark applies to the efforts to quicken afresh the forms of paganism, which found their climax in the reign of Julian. These have no independent value as an expression of original thought; but the Roman Stoicism calls for brief notice from its supposed connection with Christian morality (Seneca, t A.D. 65; Epictetus, t A.D. cir. 115; M. Aurelius Antoninus, 121-180). The belief in this connection found a singular expression in the apocryphal correspondence of Paul and Seneca, which was widely received in the early Church (Jerome, *De Vir. III.* 12). And lately a distinguished writer (Mill, *On Liberty*, page 58, quoted by Stanley, *Eastern Ch.* lecture 6, apparently with approbation) has speculated on the "tragical fact" that Constantine, and not Marcus Aurelius, was the first Christian emperor. The superficial coincidences of Stoicism with the New Testament are certainly numerous. Coincidences of thought, and even of language, might easily be multiplied (Gataker, *Antoninus*, Praef. page 11, etc.), and in considering these it is impossible not to remember that Shemitic thought and phraseology must have exercised great influence on Stoic teaching (Grant, *Oxford Essays*, 1858, page 82). But beneath this external resemblance of Stoicism to Christianity, the later Stoics were fundamentally opposed to it. For good and for evil they were the Pharisees of the Gentile world. Their highest aspirations are mixed with the thanksgiving "that they were not as other men are" (comp.

A *nton*. i). Their worship was a sublime egotism. The conduct of life was regarded as an art, guided in individual actions by a conscious reference to reason (*Anton*. 4:2, 3; 5:32) and not a spontaneous process rising naturally out of one vital principle. The wise man, "wrapt in himself" (7:28), was supposed to look with perfect indifference on the changes of time (4:49); and yet beneath this show of independence he was a prey to a hopeless sadness. In words he appealed to the great law of fate, which rapidly sweeps all things into oblivion, as a source of consolation (4:2, 14; 6:15); but there is no confidence in any future retribution. In a certain sense the elements of which we are composed are eternal (5:13), for they are incorporated in other parts of the universe, but *we* shall cease to exist (4:14, 21; 6:24; 7:10). Not only is there no recognition of communion between an immortal man and a personal God, but the idea is excluded. Man is but an atom in a vast universe, and his actions and sufferings are measured solely by their relation to the whole (*Anton*. 10:5, 6, 20; 12:26; 6:45; v, 22; 7:9). God is but another name for "the mind of the universe" (ὁ τοῦ ὅλου νοῦς, 5:30), "the soul of the world" (4:40), "the reason that ordereth matter" (6:1). "universal nature" (ἡ τῶν ὅλων φύσις, 7:33; 9:1 comp. 10:1), and is even identified with the world itself (τοῦ γεννήσαντος κόσμου, 12:1; comp. Gataker on 4:23). Thus the stoicism of M. Aurelius gives many of the moral precepts of the Gospel (Gataker, page 18), but without their foundation, which can find no place in his system. It is impossible to read his reflections without emotion, but they have no creative energy. They are the last strain of a dying creed, and in themselves have no special affinity to the new faith. Christianity necessarily includes whatever is noblest in them, but they affect to supply the place of Christianity, and do not lead to it. The real elements of greatness in M. Aurelius are many, and truly Roman; but the study of his *Meditations* by the side of the New Testament can leave little doubt that he could not have helped to give a national standing-place to a catholic Church.

The history of ancient philosophy in its religious aspect has been strangely neglected. Nothing, so far as we are aware, has been written on the pre-Christian aera answering to the clear and elegant essay of Matter on post-Christian philosophy (*Histoire de la Philosophie dans ses rapports avec la Religion depuis l'ere Chretienne*, Paris, 1854). There are useful hints in Carove's *Vorhalle des Christenthums* (Jena, 1851), and Ackermann's *Das Christliche in Plato* (Hamb. 1835). The treatise of Denis, *Histoire des Theories et des Idles morales dans l'Antiquite* (Paris, 1856), is limited in

range and hardly satisfactory. Dollinger's *Vorhalle zur Gesch. d. Christenthums* (Regensb. 1857; transl. Lond. 1862) is comprehensive, but covers too large a field. The brief surveys in De Pressense's *Hist. des Trois Premiers Siecles de l'Eglise Chritienne* (Paris, 1858; transl. Edinb. 1862), and in Cocker, *Christianity and Greek Philosophy* (N.Y. 1870), are much more vigorous, and on the whole just. But no one seems to have apprehended the real character and growth of Greek philosophy so well as Zeller (though with no special attention to its relations to religion) in his history (*Die Philosophie der Griechen*, 2d ed. Tub. 1856), which for subtlety and completeness is unrivalled. See (in addition to works named in the adjoining articles) Brandis, *Handb. d. gr.-rom. Philosophie* (Berl. 1835 sq.); Maury, *Hist. de la Religion de la Grece* (Paris, 1857 sq., 3 volumes); Butler, *Hist. of Anc. Philos.* (Lond. 1866, 2 volumes).

II. *Connection of Greek with Hebrew Philosophy.* The literature of Greece and Judaea came in contact at Alexandria; and the first known attempt to accomplish their fusion is that ascribed to the Jewish Peripatetic Aristobulus, in the reign of Ptolemy Philometor (B.C. 180-146); but the principal extant specimens are to be found in the writings of the Jewish Platonist Philo, the date of whose birth may be placed about B.C. 20. (Aristobulus is said to have been a Peripatetic; but of his exact relations to this philosophy nothing is known. From the few fragments which remain of his writings, he seems to have anticipated Philo in the employment of an allegorical interpretation of Scripture. His name, however, is more known in connection with forgeries of the Greek poets in support of his theory that the wisdom of the Greeks was borrowed from Moses. See Valckenser, *Diatribes de Aristobulo*, Lugd. Bat. 1806, reprinted in Gaisford's edition of Eusebii *Praep. Evang.*; Dahne, 2:73; Vacherot, *Histoire de l'Ecole d'Alexandrie*, 1:140.) Philo's system may be described as the result of a contact between the Hellenic theory of the absolute and the Jewish belief in God as represented in the Old Testament. (See Dorner, *Person of Christ*, volume 1, note A [page 330, Eng. transl.]. For some of the details of this contact, see Dahne, 1:31 sq.) In his religion Philo was a Jew, with all a Jew's reverence for the oracles of God committed to the charge of his people; but his philosophical studies attached themselves to those doctrines of the Platonic philosophy which, while dealing with the same great question, approached it from an opposite point of view. (For Philo's testimony to the divine authority of the Scriptures. see *Vit. Mos.* lib. 3, c. 23 [page 163, Mangey]; *Quis rer. div. her.* c. 52, 53, pages 510, 511.

Other passages to the same effect are cited by Gfrörer, i, 54. Philo even maintains the divine inspiration of the Septuagint version, *Vit. Mos.* 2, c. 6, 7, pages 139, 140.) The result in his writings was an attempted combination of the two — the Greek philosophy supplying the fundamental idea, while the Jewish Scriptures, through the Septuagint translation, contributed, by means of an extravagant license of allegorical interpretation, much of the language and illustration of the system, besides imparting to it the apparent sanction of a divine authority. The leading idea of Philo's teaching is the expansion of that thought of Plato's which forms the connecting link between the philosophy of Greece and the pantheism of the East — that thought which represents the supreme principle of things as absolutely one and simple, beyond personality and beyond definite existence, and as such immutable and incapable of relation to temporal things. (Comp. Plato, *Rep.* 6:509; 2:381. Gfrörer, 1:134, and Franck, *Dict. des Sciences Philosophiques*, art. Philon, regard this feature of Philo's theology as of Oriental origin. But his Greek studies might suggest the same idea, and much of his language seems to point to this origin. See Dahne, 1:31, 41.)

In place of the God of the Hebrew Scriptures, who, even in his most hidden and mysterious nature, is never regarded as other than a person, Philo is led to substitute the Greek abstraction of an ideal good or absolute unity, as the first principle of a system in which philosophy and theology are to be reconciled and united: and though he is unable entirely to abandon the language of personality which the Scriptures at every page force upon their readers, he is at the same time unable, consistently with his philosophical assumptions, to admit an immediate personal relation between the Supreme Being and the creature. (See *De Mut. Nom.* c. 4, page 582; Gfrörer, 1:144; Dahne, 2:154. The various passages inconsistent with this, in which Philo seems to speak of a direct action of God in the world may perhaps be explained by supposing this action to be exerted through the medium of the Logos. Comp. *Quod Deus sit immut.* c. 12, page 281; Gfrörer, 1:199, 293.) The medium of reconciliation is sought in a development of the scriptural manifestation of the Wisdom and the Word of God, which take the place of the soul of the world as it appears in the *Timæus*, being represented as a *second* God — the connecting link between the first principle and the world; in whom are concentrated those personal attributes which are indispensable to religious belief, and which are so conspicuously present in the Scripture theology (*Fragm.* page 625,

ex Euseb. Prcep. Evang. 7:13: Διὰ τί ὡς περὶ ἑτέρου θεοῦ φησὶ τὸ ἐν εἰκόνι θεοῦ τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ τῇ ἑαυτοῦ; Παγκαλῶς καὶ σοφῶς τουτὶ κεχρησιδῆται. θνητὸν γὰρ οὐδεν ἀπεικονισθῆναι πρὸς τὸν ἀνωτάτω καὶ Πατέρα τῶν ὄλων ἐδύνατο, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸν δεύτερον θεὸν ὃς ἐστὶν ἐκείνου Λόγος). The following short summary of Philo's system will serve to exhibit those of its features which are most nearly related to our present inquiry (in this summary use has been made chiefly of that of Hegel, *Gesch. der Philos.* in his *Werke*, 15:18-23, and of that of Zeller, *Philos. der Griechen*. 3:594-665): The highest aim of philosophy, and the most perfect happiness, according to Philo, is the knowledge of God in his absolute nature (*De Vita Contempl.* c. 2, page 473. Comp. *De Conf. Ling.* c. 20, page 419; *De Vict. Offerent.* c. 16, page 264; *De Monarch.* 1:3, 4, page 216), in which he is exalted above all affinity to finite things, without qualities, and not to be expressed in speech (*Legis Alleg.* 1, c. 13, page 50: ἄποιος ὁ θεός. *Ibid.* c. 15, page 53: δεῖ γὰρ ἡγεῖσθαι καὶ ἄποιον αὐτὸν εἶναι, καὶ ἄφθαρτον καὶ ἄτρεπτον. *De Somn.* 1:39, page 655: λέγεσθαι γὰρ οὐ πέφυκεν, ἀλλὰ μόνον εἶναι τὸ ὄν. Comp. *De Vit. Cont.* c. 1, page 472; *Quod Deus immut.* c. 11, page 281). Such knowledge, though not fully attainable by any man, is nevertheless to be earnestly sought after, that it may be attained at least in that second degree in which we apprehend directly the existence of God, though falling short of a comprehension of his essence (*De Prcem. et Pan.* c. 7, page 415. Comp. Gfrorer, 1:135, 199. By this hypothesis of a primary and secondary knowledge, Gfrorer reconciles those passages in which the knowledge of God is spoken of as unattainable with others apparently of an opposite import: e.g. *De Post. Caini*, c. 48, page 258; *De Monarch.* 1:6, page 218). Even this amount, however, of direct knowledge is not to be gained by any effort of human thought, but only by God's revelation of himself; and such a revelation is only possible in the form of an ecstatic intuition, in which the seer, himself passive, is elevated by divine inspiration above the conditions of finite consciousness, and becomes one with the God whom he contemplates (*De Poster. Cain.* c. 5, page 229; *Legis Alleg.* 3:33, page 107; *De Abr.* c. 24, page 19; *De Migr. Abr.* c. 31, page 463; *Fragm.* page 654; *Quis rer. div. haer.* c. 13, 14, page 482; comp. Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 1:79, ed. Bohn. This ecstatic intuition is insisted upon also by Plotinus and the later Platonists, as in modern times by Schelling). But this ecstatic vision is possible only to a chosen few; for the many, who are incapable of it, there remains only that inferior and improper apprehension of God which can be gained through the means of derived

and created existences, especially of his Word or Wisdom, who is the medium by which God is related to the world, the God of imperfect men, as the Supreme Being is the God of the wise and perfect (*Legis Alleg.* 3:32, page 107; 3:73, page 128; *De Abr.* c. 24, page 19; *De Migr. Abr.* c. 31, page 463; *De Conf. Ling.* c. 28, page 427). This Word, or Logos, is described in various ways, some more naturally denoting an impersonal, others a personal being. (Whether the Logos of Philo is to be regarded as a distinct person or not is matter of controversy. The negative is maintained by Burton [*Bampton Lectures*, note 93] and by Dorner [*Person of Christ*, 1:27, Engl. transl. and note A], against Gfrorer, Dahne, Licke, and the majority of recent critics. An intermediate view is taken by Zeller, 3:626, and to some extent by Prof. Jowett, *Epistles of St. Paul*, 1:484, 2d ed.) He is the intelligible world, the archetypal pattern, the idea of ideas (*De Mundi Opif.* c. 6, page 5; elsewhere the **Λόγος** is distinguished from the **παράδειγμα**. See *De Conf. Ling.* c. 14, page 414), the wisdom of God (*Legis Alleg.* 1:19, page 56), the shadow of God, by which, as by an instrument, he made the world (*Legis. Alley.* 3:31, page 106; comp. *De Monarch.* 2:5, page 225; *De Cherub.* c. 35, page 162): he is the eternal image of God (*De Conf. Ling.* c. 28, page 427. The contradiction between this representation and the concrete attributes ascribed to the Logos is pointed out by Hegel, *Werke*, 15:20), the eldest and most general of created things (*Legis Alleg.* 3, 61, page 121): he is the first-born of God, the eldest angel or archangel (*De Conf. Ling.* c. 28, page 427; *Quis rer. div. haer.* c. 42, page 501), the high-priest of the world (*De Somn.* 1:37, page 653; comp. *De Gig.* c. 11, page 269; *De Migr. Abr.* c. 18, page 452), the interpreter of God (*Legis Alleg.* 3:73, page 128), the mediator between the Creator and his creatures, the suppliant in behalf of mortals, the ambassador from the ruler to his subjects (*Quis rer. div. haer.* c. 42, page 501). He is moreover the God in whose likeness man was made; for the supreme God cannot have any likeness to a mortal nature (*Fragm.* p. 625): he is the angel who appeared to Hagar (*De Somn.* 1:41, page 656; *De Prof.* c. 1, page 547), the God of Jacob's dream and the angel with whom he wrestled (*De Somn.* 1:39, page 655; *De Mut. Nom.* c. 13, page 591), the image of God who appeared to Moses at the bush (*Vit. Mos.* 1:12, page 91; comp. Gfrorer, 1, page 283, 284), the guide of the Israelites in the wilderness (*De Migr., Abr.* c. 31, page 463). This interposition of the Logos thus serves to combine the theology of contemplation with that of worship and obedience; it endeavors to provide one God for those whose philosophical meditations aspire to an intuition of the absolute, and another

for those whose religious feelings demand a personal object; while at the same time it attempts to preserve the unity of God by limiting the attribution of proper and supreme deity to the first principle only.

In addition to this, which may be regarded as the Central point of Philo's system, some have endeavored to elicit from his writings a closer approximation to Christian doctrine, in the recognition of a third divine being, distinct both from the supreme God and from the Logos. (See Allix, *Judgmyent of the Jewish Church*, page 118, ed. 1821; Kidder, *Demonstration of the Messias*, part 3, chapter 5.) A remarkable passage sometimes cited for this purpose occurs in his allegorizing commentary on the cherubim and the flaming sword placed in Eden. "With the one truly existent God," he says, "there are two first and highest powers, goodness and authority: by goodness he has produced everything, and by authority he rules over that which he has produced; and a third, which brings both together as a medium, is reason; for by reason God is both a ruler and good. Of these two powers — authority and goodness — the cherubim are the symbol; and of reason, the flaming sword" (*De Cherub. c. 9*, page 143). In like manner he comments on the threefold appearance to Abraham in the plains of Mamre: "The middle appearance represents the Father of the universe, who in the sacred writings is called by his proper name, the Existent (ὁ Ὄν), and those on each side are the most ancient powers and nearest to the Existent; one of which is called the creative and the other the kingly power. The creative power is God, for by this power he made and arranged the universe; and the kingly power is Lord, for it is meet that the Creator should rule over and govern the creature" (*De Abi. c. 24*, page 19; comp. *De Sacr. Ab. et Cain. c. 15*, page 173). The inference, however, which has been drawn from these and similar passages rests on a very precarious foundation. There is no consistency in Philo's exposition, either as regards the number or the nature of these divine powers. Even granting the disputed opinion that the powers represent distinct personal beings, we find in one of the above passages the three beings all distinguished from the supreme God; while in the other he seems to be identified with one of them; and the confusion is increased if we compare other passages in which additional powers are mentioned with further distinctions. (Comp. *De Mut. Nom. c. 4*, page 582, where a εὐεργετικὴ δύναμις is mentioned as distinct from the βασιλικὴ and ποιητικὴ, and all three are distinguished from the supreme God.) The truth seems to be that Philo indulged his allegorizing fancy in the invention of divine powers *ad libitum*, in any

number and with any signification which the text on which he was commenting for the moment might happen to suggest; and he has no more difficulty in finding six divine powers to be represented by the six cities of refuge (*De Prof.*: c. 18, 19, pages 560, 561. In this passage, again, the three higher powers, represented by the three cities beyond Jordan, are clearly distinguished from the supreme God) than he has in finding three, to suit the two cherubim and the flaming sword. In this kind of desultory playing with the language of Scripture it is idle to look for any definite doctrine, philosophical or theological.

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

In the language as well as in the doctrines of Philo we may trace the influence of Greek philosophy in conjunction with the literature of his own nation. The theory, indeed, which would trace the *term* **λόγος** to the few and unimportant passages in which it is employed by Plato is too fanciful and far-fetched to be tenable; but the appearance in Philo of the Stoical distinction between **λόγος ἐνδιάθετος** and **λόγος προφορικός**, as well as his general use of the term, seems to indicate that in the employment of this word he was influenced by the language of the Greek philosophy, though perhaps in conjunction with that of the Sept. (On the **λόγος** of the

Stoics and its relation to Philo, see Zeller, *Philos. der Griechen*, 3:630. Comp. Wyttenbach on *Plutarch*, 2:44, A. The distinction between ἐνδιάθετος and προφορικὸς λόγος, though acknowledged by Philo, is not applied by him directly to the divine reason [see Gfrorer, 1:177]. On other affinities between Philo and the Stoics, see Valckenlar, *Diatr. de Aristobulo*, sec. 32.) In the use of the cognate term Σοφία, as nearly, if not quite equivalent to Λόγος, he was probably more directly influenced by writers of his own nation, by the Sept. version of the Proverbs, and by the books of Ecclesiasticus and Wisdom. (On the identity of Λόγος and Σοφία in Philo, see Gfrorer, 1:213 sq.) Thus his language, no less than his matter, indicates the compound character of his writings; the twofold origin of his opinions being paralleled by a similar twofold source of the terms in which they are expressed.

It is necessary to dwell to some extent upon the writings of Philo, because it is through them, if at all, that the influence of the Greek philosophy on the Christian Scriptures is to be traced. Whether we admit the conjecture that St. John, during his residence at Ephesus, might have become acquainted with Philo's writings; or whether we regard these writings as the extant representatives of a widely diffused doctrine, which might have reached the apostle through other channels (see, for the one supposition, dean Milman, in a note on Gibbon, chapter 21; and for the other, Gfrorer, 1:307; 2:4), it is to the asserted coincidences between this evangelist and the Alexandrian philosopher that we must look for the chief evidence for or against the theory which asserts an influence of Greek speculations on Christian doctrine. The amount of that influence, however, has been very differently estimated by different critics; one of whom, as has been before observed, ascribes to it nearly all the distinctive doctrines of the Christian Church; while another considers that the whole resemblance between St. John and Philo may be accounted for by their common use of certain passages of the O.T., especially those concerning the angel of the Lord, and the distinction between the hidden and the revealed God (see Tholuck on the *Gopyel of St. John*, page 65, Engl. transl.). The truth may perhaps be found in an intermediate view, if we distinguish between the Christian doctrine itself and the language in which it is expressed. Notwithstanding the verbal parallels which may be adduced between the language of Philo and that of some portions of the N.T., the relation between the Alexandrian and the Christian doctrine is one rather of contrast than of resemblance. The distinguishing doctrine of the Christian revelation — that of the Word

made flesh — not only does not appear in Philo, but could not possibly appear, consistently with the leading principles of his philosophy, according to which the flesh, and matter in general, is condemned as the source of all evil. The development of Philo's doctrine, if applied to the person of Christ, will lead, as has been pointed out, not to Christianity, but to docetism (see Dorner on the *Person of Christ*, 1:17, Engl. transl.); and in the distinction, which he constantly makes, between the absolute God and the secondary deity, who alone is capable of relation to finite things, we may trace the germ of a theory which afterwards, in various forms, became conspicuous in the different developments of gnosticism.

In fact, the method of Philo, both in his philosophical theories and in his interpretations of Scripture, is so far from being, either in substance or in spirit, an anticipation of the Christian revelation, that it may rather be taken as a representative of the opposite spirit of rationalism, the tendency of which is to remove all distinction between natural and revealed religion, by striving to bring all religious doctrines alike within the compass of human reason. It is not the reception of divine truth as a fact, resting on the authority of an inspired teacher, telling us *that* these things are so; it is rather an inquiry into causes and grounds, framing theories to explain *how* they are so. The doctrine of the Logos, as it appears in Philo, is a hypothesis assumed in order to explain how it is possible that the God whom his philosophy taught him to regard as above all relation to finite existence, could nevertheless, as his religion taught him to believe, be actually manifested in relation to the world. To explain this difficulty, he has recourse to the supposition of an intermediate being between God and the world; standing, as it were, midway between the abstract and impersonal on the one side, and the definite and personal on the other; and described in language which wavers between the two conceptions, without succeeding in combining them. In this respect the theory reminds us not only of those forms of gnosticism which subsequently emanated from the Alexandrian philosophy under the influence of Christianity, as Philo's system emanated from the same philosophy under the influence of Judaism, but also, to some extent, of later speculations, which, in the endeavor to transfer the Catholic faith from a historical to a metaphysical foundation, have regarded the doctrine of the incarnation of the divine Word, not as the literal statement of a fact which took place at an appointed time, but as the figurative representation of an eternal process in the divine nature. (See Fichte, *Anweisung zum seligen Leben, Werke*, 5:482; Schelling,

Vorlesungen uber Acad. Stud. page 192; Hegel, *Philosophie der Geschichte, Werke*, 9:388; Baur, *Christliche Gnosis*, page 715.)

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

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

N.T.

<B001> **John 1:1.** Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ Λόγος, καὶ ὁ Λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν, καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ Λόγος.

<B003> **John 1:3.** Πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο αὐδὲ ἓν ὃ γέγονεν.

<B004> **John 1:4.** Καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἦν τὸ φῶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἦν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν ὃ φωτίζει πάντα ἄνθρωπον

<B018> **John 1:18.** θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακε πώποτε: ὁ μονογενὴς υἱὸς ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς, ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο. (The parallels sometimes adduced from <B040> John 4:10 and 6:32, as compared with *De Prof.* 15, page 560, and *Legis Alleg.* 2:21; 3:56, 59, are very questionable. In both cases the allusion seems to arise naturally from the conversation, and not from any reference to Philo.)

<B005> **1 John 1:5.** Ὅτι ὁ θεὸς θῶς ἐστὶ, καὶ σκοτία ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδεμία

<B011> **1 John 2:1.** Καὶ ἐάν τις ἀμάρτη, παράκλητον ἔχομεν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν δίκαιον.

<B017> **Romans 4:17.** θεοῦ τοῦ καλοῦντος τὰ μὴ ὄντα ὡς ὄντα.

<B012> **1 Corinthians 3:1, 2.** ὡς νηπίοις ἐν Χριστῷ: γάλα ὑμᾶς ἐπότισα, καὶ οὐ βρῶμα; comp. <B012> Hebrews 5:12, 13.

<B012> **1 Corinthians 4:1.** ὡς ὑπηρέτας Χριστοῦ καὶ οἰκονόμους μυστηρίων θεοῦ.

<B004> **1 Corinthians 10:4.** ἔπινον γὰρ ἐκ πνευματικῆς ἀκολουθούσης πέτρας: ἡ δὲ πέτρα ἦν ὁ Χριστός

<B012> **1 Corinthians 13:12.** βλέπομεν γὰρ ἄρτι δι' ἐσόπτρου ἐν ἀνιματι.

<B018> **2 Corinthians 3:18.** ἡμεῖς δὲ πάντες ἀνακεκαλυμμένῳ προσώπῳ τὴν δόξαν Κυρίου κατοπτριζόμενοι

<B018> **2 Corinthians 3:3.** ἐπιστολὴ Χριστοῦ διακονηθεῖσα ὑφ' ἡμῶν, ἐγγεγραμμένη οὐ μέλανι, ἀλλὰ πνεύματι θεοῦ ζῶντος, οὐκ ἐν πλαξὶ λιθινῆς, ἀλλὰ ἐν πλαξὶ καρδίας σαρκίνας.

<4004> **2 Corinthians 4:4.** τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὃς ἐστὶν εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ;
comp. <5015> Colossians 1:15.

<5015> **Colossians 1:15.** πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως; comp.
<8006> Hebrews 1:6.

<5016> **1 Timothy 2:5.** Εἰς γὰρ θεός εἰς καὶ μεσίτης θεοῦ καὶ
ἀνθρώπων, ἄνθρωπος Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς

<8002> **Hebrews 1:2.** δι' οὗ καὶ ἐποίησεν τοὺς αἰῶνας.

<8003> **Hebrews 1:3.** ὃς ἡ ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτήρ τῆς
ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ.

<8001> **Hebrews 3:1.** Κατανοήσατε τὸν ἀπόστολον καὶ ἀρχιερέα τῆς
ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν.

<8004> **Hebrews 3:4.** πὰς γὰρ οἶκος κατασκευάζεται ὑπὸ τινος; ὁ δὲ
τὰ πάντα κατασκευάσας θεός

<8002> **Hebrews 4:12.** ζῶν γὰρ ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ἐνεργής, καὶ
τομώτερος ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν μάχαιραν δίστομον, καὶ διικνούμενος
ἄχρι μερισμοῦ ψυχῆς τε καὶ πνεύματος, ἁρμῶν τε καὶ μυελῶν.

<8004> **Hebrews 4:14, 15.** Ἔχοντες οὖν ἀρχιερέα μεγάλην,
διεληλυθότα τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, Ἰησοῦν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ
θεοῦ, κρατῶμεν τῆς ὁμολογίας. Οὐ γὰρ ἔχομεν ἀρχιερέα μὴ
δυνάμενον συμπαθῆσαι ταῖς ἀσθενείαις ἡμῶν, πεπειραμένον
δὲ κατὰ πάντα καθ' ὁμοίότητα χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας.

<8003> **Hebrews 6:13.** Τῷ γὰρ Ἀβραάμ ἐπαγγελιάμενος ὁ θεός, ἐπεὶ
κατ' οὐδενὸς εἶχε μειζονος ὁμοσαι, ὥμοσε καθ' ἑαυτοῦ.

<8025> **Hebrews 7:25.** πάντοτε ζῶν εἰς τὸ ἐντυγχάνειν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν.

(It may be questioned whether the allegorical commentary on
Melchisedek [*Leg. Allg.* 3:26, page 103] is a fair parallel to Heb.vii.
The latter seems more likely to have been taken directly from Psalm ex,
without the intervention of Philo.)

<8104> **Hebrews 11:4.** καὶ διὰ τῆς ἀποθανῶν ἔτι λαλεῖται.

De Conf. Ling. 28, page 427. τῆς αἰδίου εἰκόνοσ ἀυτοῦ, λόγου τοῦ ἱερωτάτου. *De Somn.* 1:39, page 655. καλεῖ δὲ θεὸν τὸν πρεσβύτατον ἀυτοῦ νυνὶ λόγου. *Fragm.* page 625. πρὸς τὸν δεῦτερον θεὸν ὅσ ἐστιν ἐκεῖνου λόγος.

De Monarch. 2:5, page 225. Λόγος δὲ ἐστιν εἰκὼν θεοῦ, δίου σύμπασ ὁ κόσμος ἐδημιουργεῖτο

De Mundi Opif. 8, page 6. καὶ ταύτης εἰκόνα τὸ νοητὸν φῶς ἐκεῖνο, ὃ θείου λόγου γέγονεν ε.κὼν τοῦ διερμηνεύσαντος τὴν γένεσιν ἀυτοῦ.

Legis Alleg. 3:73, page 128. οὐ περὶ τῆσ φύσεωσ ἀυτοῦ διαγνῶναι δύναται, ἀλλ ἀγαπητόν ἐάν τοῦ ὀνόματοσ ἀυτοῦ δυνηθῶμεν, ὄπερ ἦν, τοῦ ἐρμηνέωσ λόγου.

De Somn. 1:13, page 632. ἐπειδὴ πρῶτον μὲν ὁ θεὸσ φῶσ ἐστι.

De Vit. Mos. 3:14, page 155. Ἀναγκαῖον γὰρ ἦν ἱερωμένον τῷ τοῦ κόσμον πατρὶ παρακλήτῳ χρῆσθαι τελειοτάτῳ τὴν ἀρετὴν νίῳ πρὸς τε ἀμνηστεῖαν ἀμαρτημάτων, κ.τ.λ.

[The Son of God here is the world, represented by the vestments of the high-priest.]

De Creat. Princ. 7, page 367. τὰ γὰρ μὴ ὄντα ἐκάλεσεν εἰς τὸ εἶναι

De Agricult. 2, page 301. Ἐπεὶ δὲ νηπίοισ μὲν ἐστι γάλα τροφή, τελείοισ δὲ τὲ ἐκ πυρῶν πέμματα, καὶ ψυχῇ γαλακτωδεῖσ μὲν νειεν τροφαί, κ.τ.λ.

De Praem. et Poen. 20, page 427. νοῦν καθαρθέντα καὶ μύστην γεγονότα τῶν θείων τελετῶν.

Legis Alleg. 2:21, p. 82. ἡ γὰρ ἀκρότομος πέτρα ἡ σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ...ἐξ ἧσ ποτίζει τὰσ φιλοφένουσ ψυχὰσ.

De Decal. 21, page 198. ὡσ γὰρ διὰ κατόπτρου φαντασιοῦται οἱ νοῦσ θεοῦ, κ.τ.λ.

Quod Omn. prob. lib. 7, page 452. Νόμος δὲ ἀψευδῆσ ὁ ὀρθὸσ λόγος οὐχ ὑπὸ τοῦ δεινοσ ἢ τοῦ δεινοσ φθαρτὸσ ἐν

χαρτιδίους ἢ στήλαις ἄψυχος ἀψύχοις, ἀλλ' ἀθανάτου φύσεως ἄφθαρτος ἐν ἀθανάτῳ διανοίᾳ τυπωθεῖς.

De Monarch. 2:5, page 225. λόγος δέ ἐστιν εἰκὼν θεοῦ. *De Conf. Ling.* 28, p. 427. θεοῦ γὰρ εἰκὼν λόγος ὁ πρεσβύτατος.

Legis Alleg. 3:61, page 121. ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ. . . . πρεσβιτατος καὶ γενικώτατος τῶν ὅσα γέγονε. *De Agricult.* 12, p. 308. τὸν ὀρθὸν αὐτοῦ λόγου, πρωτόγονον υἱόν. *De Prof.* 20, page 562, ὁ μὲν πρεσβύτατος τοῦ ὄντος λόγος. *De Somn.* 1:37, page 653. ἀρχιερεὺς ὁ πρωτόγονος αὐτοῦ υἱοῦ θεῖος λόγος. *Quis rer. div. haer.* 42, page 501. Τῷ δὲ ἀρχαγγέλῳ καὶ πρεσβυτάτῳ λόγῳ δωρεὰν ἐξαίρετον ἔδωκεν ὁ τὰ ὅλα γέννησας πατήρ, ἵνα μεθόριος στὰς το γενόμενον διακρίνη τοῦ πεποικηκότος, κ.τ.λ.

De Cherub. 35, page 162. αἴτιον μὲν αὐτοῦ τὸν θεόν. . . . νόργανον δὲ λόγον θεοῦ, δι' οὗ κατασκευάσθη.

De Mundi Opif. 51, page 35. πᾶς ἄνθρωπος κατὰ μὲν τὴν διάνοιαν ὠκείωται θεῖῳ λόγῳ, τις μακαρίας (*Comp. Sap. Sol.* 7:26). *De Plant. Noe,* 5, page 332. φύσεως ἐκμαγεῖον ἢ ἀπόσπασμα ἢ ἀπαύγασμα γεγονὼς σφραγίδι θεοῦ ἧς ὁ χαρακτήρ ἐστιν αἰδῖος λόγος.

De Somn. 1:38, page 654. ὁ μὲν δὴ μέγας ἀρχιερεὺς τῆς ὁμολογίας κ.τ.λ.

De Cherub. 35, page 162. οἰκία καὶ πόλις πᾶσα ἵνα κατασκευασθῆ, τίνα συνεισελθεῖν δεῖ; ἀρ' οὐ δημιουργόν κ.τ.λ. . . . Μετεθὼν οὖν ἀπὸ τῶν ἐν μέρει κατασκευῶν ἴδε τὴν μεγίστην οἰκίαν ἢ πόλιν, τὸν κόσμον: εὐρήσεις γὰρ αἴτιον μὲν αὐτοῦ τὸν θεόν, κ.τ.λ.τ.

Quis rer. div. hoer. 26, page 491. τῷ τομεῖ τῶν συμπάντων αὐτοῦ λόγῳ, ὃς εἰς τὴν ὄξυτάτην ἀκονηθεῖς ἀκμὴν διαιρῶν οὐδέποτε λήγει τὰ αὐθιγὰ πάντα. 27, page 492. οὕτως ὁ θεὸς ἀκονησάμενος τὸν τομέα τῶν συμπάντων αὐτοῦ λόγον, διαίρει τὴν τε ἄμορφον καὶ ἄποιον τῶν ὅλων οὐσίαν.

De Prof. 20, page 562. Λέγομεν γὰρ τὸν ἀρχιερέα οὐκ ἄνθρωπον ἀλλὰ λόγον θεῖον εἶναι, πάντων οὐχ ἔκουσίων μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀκουσίων ἀδικημάτων ἀμέτοχον.

De Vict. 10, page 246. ὅτι ὁ πρὸς ἀλήθειαν ἀρχιερεὺς καὶ μὴ ψευδώνυμος ἀμέτοχος ἀμέτοχος ἀμαρτημάτων ἐστίν.

Legis Alleg. 3:72, page 127. Ὁρᾶς γὰρ ὅτι οὐ καθ' ἑτέρου ὁμνύει θεός, οὐδεν γὰρ αὐτοῦ κρειττον, ἀλλὰ καθ' ἑαυτοῦ, ὅς ἐστι πάντων ἄριστος.

Quis rer. div. haer. 42, page 501. ὁ δ' αὐτὸς ἰκέτης μὲν ἐστὶ τοῦ θνητοῦ κηραίνοντος ἀεὶ πρὸς τὸ ἄφθαρτον.

Quod deter, potiori insid. 14, page 200. Μαρτυρήσει δὲ τὸ χρησθὲν λόγιον ἐν φωνῇ χρώμενος καὶ βοῶν < πέπονθεν ὑπὸ κακοῦ συνθέτου τηλαυγῶς εὐρίσκεται. Πῶς γὰρ ὁ μηκέτ' ν διαλέγεσθαι δυνατός ;

An examination of these passages will, we believe, confirm the view which has been above taken of the doctrinal differences between them; while, at the same time, it will enable us to discern a purpose to be served by the verbal resemblances which they undoubtedly exhibit. If we except instances of merely accidental similarity in language, without any affinity in thought; or quotations by way of illustration, such as St. Paul occasionally borrows from heathen writers; or thoughts and expressions derived from the O.T., and therefore common to Philo and the apostles, as alike acknowledging and making use of the Jewish Scriptures; they may be reduced, for the most part, to two heads: first, the use of the name ὁ Λόγος, by St. John, as a title of Christ, and the application to him, both by St. John and St. Paul, of various attributes and offices ascribed by Philo to the divine Word, and to the various philosophical representations with which the Word is identified; and, secondly, the recognition, chiefly in the acknowledged writings of St. Paul and in the Epistle to the Hebrews, of a spiritual sense, in parts of Scripture, distinct from the literal interpretation; though this is employed far more cautiously and sparingly than in Philo, and as an addition to, rather than, as Philo for the most part employs it, as a substitute for the literal sense. The apostles, it would appear from these passages, availed themselves, in some degree, of the language already established in the current speculations of their countrymen, in order to correct the errors with which that language was associated, and to lead

men's minds to a recognition of the truth of which these errors were the counterfeit. This is only what might naturally be expected from men desirous of adapting the truths which they had to teach to the circumstances of those to whom they had to teach them. There was an earlier gnosticism founded in part on the perversion of the Law, as there was a later gnosticism founded in part on the perversion of the Gospel; and it is probable that, at least at the time when St. John wrote, the influence of both had begun to be felt in the Christian Church, and had modified to some extent the language of its theology (see Burton. *Bampton Lectures*, page 218). If so, the adoption of that language, as a vehicle of Christian doctrine, would furnish the natural means both of correcting the errors which had actually crept into the Church and of counteracting the influence of the source from which they sprang. If the philosophical Jews of Alexandria, striving, as speculative minds in every age have striven, to lay the foundations of their philosophy in an apprehension of the one and the absolute, were driven by the natural current of such speculations to think of the supreme God as a being remote and solitary, having no relation to finite things, and no attributes out of which such a relation can arise, it is natural that the inspired Christian teacher should have been directed to provide, by means of their own language, the antidote to their error: to point, in the revelation of God and man united in one Christ, to the truth, and to the manner of attaining the truth; to turn the mind of the wandering seeker from theory to fact, from speculation to belief; to bid him look, with the eye of faith, to that great mystery of godliness in which the union of the infinite and the finite is realized in fact, though remaining still incomprehensible in theory. If the same philosophers, again, seeking to bridge over the chasm which their speculations had interposed between God and man, distorted the partial revelation of the Angel of the Covenant, which their Scriptures supplied, into the likeness of the ideal universe of the Platonist, or of the half-personified world-reason of the Stoic, it was surely no unworthy object of the apostolic teaching to lead them, by means of the same language, to the true import of that revelation, as made known, in its later and fuller manifestation, by the advent of the Word made flesh. If the Platonizing expositor of the Jewish Scriptures, eager to find the foreign philosophy which he adopted in the oracles of God committed to his own people, explained away their literal import by a system of allegory and metaphor, it was natural that the inspired writers of the New Covenant should point out the true meaning of those marks which the Jewish history and religion so clearly bear of a spiritual significance beyond themselves, by

showing how the institutions of the Law and the record of God's dealings with his chosen people are not an allegory contrived for the teaching of a present philosophy, but an anticipation, designed by the divine Author of the whole as a preparation, directly and indirectly, by teaching and training, by ritual and prophecy, by type and symbol, to make ready the way for him that was to come.

The attempts made by Grossmann, Gfrorer, and others, to explain the origin of Christianity as an offshoot of the Jewish philosophy of Alexandria rest mainly on these occasional coincidences of language, while overlooking fundamental differences of doctrine. The ideal Logos, the distinguishing feature of the Alexandrian philosophy, has no place in the teaching of the N.T. The belief in one Christ, very God and very man, has not only no place in, but is diametrically opposed to the philosophical speculations of Philo. For his personal relations to Christianity, *SEE PHILO*. Christianity came into the world at a time when the Graeco-Jewish modes of thought, of which Philo is the representative, were prevalent; and the earliest Christian teachers, so far as they had to deal with those to whom that philosophy was familiar, could do so most effectually by means of its language and associations. These considerations — seem naturally to explain the resemblance and the difference between the two systems — resemblance as regards the language employed; difference as regards the doctrine which that language conveys.

See Keferstein, *Philo's Lehre v.d gottl. Mittelwesen* (Leips. 1846); Niedner, *De λόγῳ apud Philonem* (in the *Zeitschr. f. hist. Theol.* 1849); Clarke's *Comm.* ad loc. Joh.; Bryant, *Philo Judcus* (Cambr. 1797, 8vo). *SEE LOGOS*.

III. *Christianity in Contact with Ancient Philosophy.* — The only direct trace of the contact of Christianity with Western philosophy in the N.T. is in the account of Paul's visit to Athens, where "certain philosophers of the Epicureans and of the Stoics" (^{<4178>}Acts 17:18) the representatives, that is, of the two great moral schools which divided the West — 'encountered him;' and there is nothing in the apostolic writings to show that it exercised any important influence upon the early Church (comp. ^{<4111>}1 Corinthians 2:22-24). But it was otherwise with Eastern speculation, which, as it was less scientific in form, penetrated more deeply through the mass of the people. The "philosophy" against which the Colossians were warned (^{<5118>}Colossians 2:8) seems undoubtedly to have been of Eastern origin,

containing elements similar to those which were afterwards embodied in various shapes of gnosticism, as a selfish asceticism and a superstitious reverence for angels (verses 16-23), and in the Epistles to Timothy, addressed to Ephesus, in which city Paul anticipated the rise of false teaching (~~401~~ Acts 20:30), two distinct forms of error may be traced, in addition to Judaism, due more or less to the same influence. One of these was a vain spiritualism, insisting on ascetic observances, and interpreting the resurrection as a moral change (~~501~~ 1 Timothy 4:1-7; ~~516~~ 2 Timothy 2:16-18); the other a materialism allied to sorcery (~~513~~ 2 Timothy 3:13, γόντες). The former is that which is peculiarly "false-styled gnosis" (~~511~~ 1 Timothy 6:20), abounding in "profane and old wives' fables" (4:7) and empty discussions (1:6; 6:20); the latter has a close connection with earlier tendencies at Ephesus (~~419~~ Acts 19:19), and with the traditional accounts of Simon Magus (comp. 8:9), whose working on the early Church, however obscure, was unquestionably most important. These antagonistic and yet complementary forms of heresy found a wide development in later times; but it is remarkable that no trace of dualism, of the distinction of the Creator and the Redeemer, the Demiurge and the true God, which formed so essential a tenet of the Gnostic schools, occurs in the N.T. (comp. Thiersch, *Versuch zur Herstellung d. hist. Standpunktes*, etc., pages 231-304).

The writings of the sub-apostolic age, with the exception of the famous anecdote of Justin Martyr (*Dial* 2-4), throw little light upon the relations of Christianity and philosophy. The heretical systems again are too obscure and complicated to illustrate more than the general admixture of foreign (especially Eastern) tenets with the apostolic teaching. One book, however, has been preserved in various shapes, which, though still unaccountably neglected in Church histories, contains a vivid delineation of the speculative struggle which Christianity had to maintain with Judaism and heathenism. The Clementine *Homilies* (ed. Dressel, 1853) and *Recognitions* (ed. Gersdorf, 1838) are a kind of philosophy of religion, and in subtlety and richness of thought yield to no early Christian writings. The picture which the supposed author draws of his early religious doubts is evidently taken from life (*Clem. Recogn.* 1:1-3; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 1:43, Engl. transl.); and in the discussions which follow there are clear traces of Western as well as Eastern philosophy (Uhlhorn, *Die Hom. u. Recogn. d. Clem. Hom.* page 404, etc.).

At the close of the 2d century, when the Church of Alexandria came into marked intellectual pre-eminence, the mutual influence of Christianity and Neo-Platonism opened a new field of speculation, or, rather, the two systems were presented in forms designed to meet the acknowledged wants of the time. According to the commonly received report, Origen was the scholar of Ammonius Saccas, who first gave consistency to the later Platonism, and for a long time he was the contemporary of Plotinus (A.D. 205-270), who was its noblest expositor. Neo-Platonism was, in fact, an attempt to seize the spirit of Christianity, apart from its historic basis and human elements. The separation between the two was absolute; and yet the splendor of the onesided spiritualism of the Neo-Platonists attracted in some cases the admiration of the Christian fathers (Basil, Theodoret), and the wide circulation of the writings of the pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite served to propagate many of their doctrines under an orthodox name among the schoolmen and mystics of the Middle Ages (Vogt, *Neu-Platonisms u. Christenthum*, 1836; Herzog, *Encyklop. s.v. Neu-Platonismus*). **SEE NEO-PLATONISM.**

The want which the Alexandrian fathers endeavored to satisfy is in a great measure the want of our own time. If Christianity be truth, it must have points of special connection with all nations and all periods. The difference of character in the constituent writings of the N.T. are evidently typical, and present the Gospel in a form (if technical language may be used) now ethical, now logical, now mystical. The varieties of aspect thus indicated combine to give the idea of a harmonious whole. Clement rightly maintained that there is a "gnosis" in Christianity distinct from the errors of gnosticism. The latter was a premature attempt to connect the Gospel with earlier systems; the former a result of conflict grounded on faith (Mohler, *Patrologie*, page 424, etc.). Christian philosophy may be in one sense a contradiction in terms, for Christianity confessedly derives its first principles from revelation, and not from simple reason; but there is no less a true philosophy of Christianity, which aims to show how completely these, by their form, their substance, and their consequences, meet the instincts and aspirations of all ages. The exposition of such a philosophy would be the work of a modern Origen.

See Haber, *Philosophie der Kirchenvater* (Miunch. 1859); Stockl, *Philos. d. patristischen Zeit* (Wurzburg, 1859); Møller, *Kosmologie in d. griech. Kirche* (Halle, 1868).

IV. Patristic Recognition of the Propaedeutic Office of Greek

Philosophy. — The divine discipline of the Jews was in nature essentially moral. *SEE PHILOSOPHY, HEBREW.* The lessons which it was designed to teach were embodied in the family and the nation. Yet this was not in itself a complete discipline of our nature.

The reason, no less than the will and the affections, had an office to discharge in preparing man for the incarnation. The process and the issue in the two cases were widely different, but they were in some sense complementary. Even in time this relation holds good. The divine kingdom of the Jews was just overthrown when free speculation arose in the Ionian colonies of Asia. The teaching of the last prophet nearly synchronized with the death of Socrates. All other differences between the discipline of reason and that of revelation are implicitly included in their fundamental difference of method. In the one, man boldly aspired at once to God; in the other, God disclosed himself gradually to man. Philosophy failed as a religious teacher practically (~~see~~ Romans 1:21, 22), but it bore noble witness to an inward law (2:14, 15). It laid open instinctive wants which it could not satisfy. It cleared away error, when it could not find truth. It swayed the foremost minds of a nation, when it left the mass without hope. In its purest and grandest forms it was "a schoolmaster to bring men to Christ" (Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 1, § 28).

This function of ancient philosophy is distinctly recognised by many of the greatest of the fathers. The principle which is involved in the doctrine of Justin Martyr on "the Seminal Word" finds a clear and systematic expression in Clement of Alexandria (comp. Redepenning, *Origenes*, 1:437439). "Every race of men participated in the Word. And they who lived with the Word were Christians, even if they were held to be godless (*ἄθεοι*), as, for example, among the Greeks, Socrates and Heraclitus, and those like them" (Just. Mart. *Ap.* 1:46; comp. 1:5, 28, and 2:10, 13). "Philosophy," says Clement, "before the coming of the Lord, was necessary to Greeks for righteousness; and now it proves useful for godliness, being in some sort a preliminary discipline (*προπαιδεια τις ουσια*) for those who reap the fruits of the faith through demonstration. . . . Perhaps we may say that it was given to the Greeks with this special object (*προηγουμενωσ*), for it brought (*επαιδαγωγει*) the Greek nation to Christ, as the law brought the Hebrews" (Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 1:5, § 28; comp. 9, § 43, and 16, § 80). In this sense he does not scruple to say that

"Philosophy was given as a peculiar testament (**διαθήκην**) to the Greeks, as forming the basis of the Christian philosophy" (*ibid.* 6:8, § 67; comp. 5, § 41). Origen, himself a pupil of Ammonius Saccas, speaks with less precision as to the educational power of philosophy, but his whole works bear witness to its influence. The truths which the philosophers taught, he says, referring to the words of Paul, were from God, for "God manifested these to them, and all things that have been nobly said" (*c. Cels.* 6:3; *Philoc.* 15). Augustine, while depreciating the claims of the great Gentile teachers, allows that "some of them made great discoveries, so far as they received help from heaven, while they erred so far as they were hindered by human frailty" (August. *De Civ.* 2:7; comp. *De Doctr. Chr.* 2:18). They had, as he elsewhere says, a distant vision of the truth, and learned from the teaching of nature what prophets learned from the Spirit (*Serm.* 68:3; 140, etc.).

But while many thus recognised in philosophy the free witness of the Word speaking among men, the same writers in other places sought to explain the partial harmony of philosophy and revelation by an original connection of the two. This attempt, which in the light of a clearer criticism is seen to be essentially fruitless and even suicidal, was at least more plausible in the first centuries. A multitude of writings were then current bearing the names of the Sibyl or Hystaspes, which were obviously based on the O.-T. Scriptures, and as long as they were received as genuine it was impossible to doubt that Jewish doctrines were spread in the West before the rise of philosophy. On the other hand, when the fathers ridicule with the bitterest scorn the contradictions and errors of philosophers, it must be remembered that they spoke often fresh from a conflict with degenerate professors of systems which had long lost all real life. Some indeed there were, chiefly among the Latins, who consistently inveighed against philosophy. But even Tertullian, who is among its fiercest adversaries, allows that at times the philosophers hit upon truth by a happy chance or blind goodfortune, and yet more by that "general feeling with which God was pleased to endow the soul" (Tertull. *De An.* 2). The use which was made of heathen speculation by heretical writers was one great cause of its disparagement by their catholic antagonists. Irenaeus endeavors to reduce the Gnostic teachers to a dilemma: either the philosophers with whom they argued knew the truth or they did not; if they did, the incarnation was superfluous; if they did not, whence comes the agreement of the true and the false? (*Adv. Haer.* 2:14, 7). Hippolytus follows out the connection of different

sects with earlier teachers in elaborate detail. Tertullian, with characteristic energy, declares that "Philosophy furnishes the arms and the subjects of heresy. What (he asks) has Athens in common with Jerusalem? the Academy with the Church? heretics with Christians? Our training is from the Porch of Solomon. . . . Let those look to it who bring forward a Stoic, a Platonic, a dialectic Christianity. We have no need of curious inquiries after the coming of Christ Jesus, nor of investigation after the Gospel" (Tertull. *De Praescr. Haer.* 7).

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

Philosophy, Hebrew

The term philosophy, as seen above, may be properly used in a wider and in a more restricted sense. In the former it is nearly synonymous with *science*, and embraces all departments of human knowledge capable of being scientifically classified — that is, where the facts are presented in their causes, where phenomena are referred to principles, and arranged under laws. In the latter it is confined to speculative knowledge, that which the mind has of its own operations and laws, or which it acquires by reasoning from its own thoughts. We have no evidence that philosophy in the stricter sense was cultivated by the ancient Hebrews; nor have we much reason to believe that scientific study, even as regards external phenomena, was much followed by them. Forming our estimate from what of their literature has been preserved to us in the Bible, we must conclude that the ancient Hebrew mind was not specially characterized by those tendencies, nor largely endowed with those faculties which give birth to speculative research. The analytical and the logical are but slightly perceptible in their mental products, while the imaginative, the synthetic, and the historical

largely predominate. We should be led to infer that they delighted rather in putting things together according to their analogies than in distributing them according to their differences. They were careful observers of phenomena, and their minds sought scope in bold flights of imagination, or reposed in calm, protracted, and profound reflection; but it was as historians and poets rather than as philosophers that they looked on the world both of being and event.

It thus appears that philosophy, if we limit the word strictly to describe the free pursuit of knowledge of which truth is the one complete end, is essentially of Western growth. In the East the search after wisdom has always been connected with practice: it has remained there, what it was in Greece at first, a part of religion. The history of the Jews offers no exception to this remark: there is no Jewish philosophy properly so called. Yet on the other hand speculation and action meet in truth; and perhaps the most obvious lesson of the O.T. lies in the gradual construction of a divine philosophy by fact, and not by speculation. The method of Greece was to proceed from life to God; the method of Israel (so to speak) was to proceed from God to life. The axioms of one system are the conclusions of the other. The one led to the successive abandonment of the noblest domains of science which man had claimed originally as his own, till it left bare systems of morality; the other, in the fulness of time, prepared many to welcome the Christ — the Truth.

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

I. *The Philosophy of Nature.* —

1. *Primitive Period.* — With the Hebrews the original theory of the world was so simple that little occasion was given to them for speculation on the mysteries of existence. Their conception of it was essentially and wholly monotheistic. They held the existence of one God, besides whom there was

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

But though this simple and childlike theory of the universe gave little scope for speculative thinking and inquiry, and though the Bible presents us with but little that indicates the existence of philosophic study among the ancient Hebrews, we are not entitled to conclude from these data that such pursuits had no existence among them. It is to be borne in mind that it was foreign to the design and pretensions of the sacred writers to discuss speculatively points on which they were commissioned to speak authoritatively in the name of God; nor must it be forgotten that we have not in the Bible the entire literature of the Hebrew people, and that, as philosophic writings would, because not addressed to the popular mind, be precisely those most likely to be allowed to perish, it is possible that much

may have been lost which, had it been preserved, would have shown how and to what extent scientific research flourished among the Hebrews. This suggestion acquires force, not only from the fact that we know that certain utterances by Solomon of a scientific kind, probably committed to writing, have perished (^{<1083>}1 Kings 4:33), but also from the statement in ^{<112>}Ecclesiastes 12:12, which, besides indicating that the literature of the Hebrews was more copious than what we now possess, leads, from its connection, to the conclusion that part of it at least was devoted to philosophic inquiry. The book of Ecclesiastes itself, as well as that of Job, may be held as proving that the Hebrew mind did not acquiesce wholly in simple faith, but had, like mind elsewhere, its seasons of doubt, question, and speculation on matters relating to man's condition and destiny. We may also point to ^{<1407>}Psalm 49:73, and to many passages in the book of Proverbs, as indicating the same thing. Nor must we overlook the fact that the Hebrew is rich in terms which are appropriate to philosophic inquiry, and indicate habits of analytic research among those by whom they were used. Of these may be mentioned **hmkj** ; *wisdom*, often used as we use *philosophy* (comp. ^{<1013>}Ecclesiastes 1:13, where **hmkj b rwt** might almost be rendered *to philosophize*); **ʿyBaf** from **ʿyB** *between, to separate, to discern, to understand*, i.e., to analyze perceptions into their component elements, so as to arrive at just notions of them, whence **hnyBaf** *insight, intelligence, judgment*; **vrD**; and **dqj** ; *to investigate, to examine*; **hgh** ; *to think, to reflect*; **ʿZaa** *to poder*; **[dj]** ; *to know*, whence **t [di]** *knowledge*. To these may be added their names for the mental part of man, **hwr** , **πνεῦμα**; **vrη**, **ψύχη**; **hmyh**] *anima*; **bl ekaρδία**, **φρήν**.

It is further to be observed that though the Bible does not present philosophic truth in a speculative form, it presents abundantly the materials out of which philosophies may be constructed. Philosophy thus exists in it as it exists in nature, not (to use the scholastic phraseology) in a manifest and evolute, but in a concrete and involute state; and it needs only a patient collection of its statements, and the arrangement of these according to their meaning and relations, to enable us to construct systematic developments of them. We may thus form not only a theology from the Bible, but an anthropology, including physiology and a system of ethics. See Roos, *Fundamenta Psychologie ex Sac. Script. Collecta* (1769); Beck, *Urriss d. biblischen Seelenlehre* (1843); Haussmann, *Die bibl. Lehre von Menschen* (1848); Von Schubert, *Gesch. der Seele* (4th ed. 1850); Delitzsch, *System*

der bibl. Psychologie (2d ed. 1861); Taylor, *Ductor Dubitantium* (1660); Buddaeus, *Instit. Theolog. Moralis* (1715); Staudlin, *Lehrbuch der Moralfliir Theologen* (2d ed. 1817); Schleiermacher, *Die Christliche Sitte* (1843); Harless, *Christliche Ethik* (4th ed. 1849); Wuttke, *Handb. der Christl. Sittenlehre* (2 volumes). **SEE BIBLICAL THEOLOGY.**

For the natural science of the Hebrews, **SEE ASTRONOMY, SEE BOTANY, SEE MEDICINE, SEE ZOOLOGY**, and the articles on subjects of natural history in this work. For the exact sciences, see the articles **SEE CHRONOLOGY** and **SEE NUMBER.**

2. Exilian Period. — This is of great interest to the student of the Bible, in consequence of the influence which the Babylonian philosophy exerted on the opinions and manner of thinking of the Israelites during their captivity in Babylon — an influence of a general and decided character, which the rabbins themselves admit, in alleging that the names of the angels and of the months were derived by the house of Israel from Babylon (*Rosh Hashanah*, page 56). The system of opinion and manner of thinking which the captives met with in Babylon cannot be characterized exclusively as Chaldaean, but was made up of elements whose birthplace was in various parts of the East, and which appear to have found in Babylon a not uncongenial soil, where they grew and produced fruit which coalesced into one general system. Of these elements the two principal were the Chaldoean and the Medo-Persian or Zoroastrian. It is to the first that the reader's attention is invited in this article.

The Chaldaeans, who lived in a climate where the rays of the sun are never darkened, and the night is always clear and bright by means of the light of the moon and stars, were led to believe that light was the soul of nature. Accordingly it was by the light of the sun and stars that the universal spirit brought forth all things; and therefore the Chaldaeans offered their homage to the Supreme Being in the heavenly bodies, where he appeared to them in a special manner to dwell. As the stars form separate bodies, imagination represented them as distinct existences, which had each their peculiar functions, and exerted a separate influence in bringing forth the productions of nature. The idea of a universal spirit disappeared, as being too abstract for the people, and not without difficulty for cultivated minds; and worship was offered to the stars as so many powers that governed the world. It is easy to see how the Chaldeeans passed from this early

corruption of the primitive religion of the Bible to a low and degrading polytheism.

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

The stars were masses of light; the space which held them were filled with light; no other power appeared to operate therein: accordingly the Chaldaeans held light to be the moving power which had produced the stars. It could not be doubted that this power possessed intelligence, and the operations of the mind appear to have so much resemblance to the subtlety and fleetness of light that men who had only imagination for their guide had no hesitation to represent intelligence as a property of light, and the universal spirit of highest intelligence as light itself. The observations of the Chaldaeans had taught them that the distances of the stars from the earth are unequal, and that light decreases in its approach to the earth, on which they concluded that light streams forth from an endless fountain far removed from the earth, in doing which it fills space with its beams, and

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

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

The space which contained the First Cause, or Fountain of radiations, was filled with pure and happy intelligences. Immediately beneath this region began the corporeal world, or the empyreum, which was a boundless space, lighted by the pure light which flowed immediately from the Great Source; this empyreum was filled with an infinitely less pure fire than the original light, but immeasurably finer than all bodies. Below this was the ether, or grosser region, filled with still grosser fire. Next came the fixed stars, spread over a wide region where the thickest parts of the ethereal fire had come together and formed the stars. The world of planets succeeded, which contained the sun, moon, and the wandering stars. Then came the last order of beings—the rude elements which are deprived of all activity, and withstand the motions and influence of light. The different parts of the world are in contact, and the spirits of the upper regions can influence the lower, as well as descend and enter into them. As the chaotic elements were without shape and motion, the spirits of the higher regions must have formed the earth, and human souls are spirits sprung from them. To these

spirits from above the system of the Chaldaeans ascribed all the productions, appearances, and movements upon the earth. The formation of the human body, the growth of the fruits, all the gifts of nature, were attributed to beneficent spirits. In the space below the moon, in the midst of night, tempests arose, lightnings threaded the dark clouds, thunder broke forth and laid waste the earth; there were found spirits of darkness, corporeal daemons spread through the air. Often, too, were flames of fire seen to rise out of the bosom of the earth, and the mountains were shaken. Earthly powers or deemons were supposed to dwell in the centre of the earth; and since matter was held to be without activity, all movements were attributed to spirits. Storms, volcanoes, tempests, appeared to have no other object than to destroy human happiness; and these daemons were held to be wicked spirits who produced these evils; to them every unfortunate event was ascribed, and a sort of hierarchy was formed of these evil beings, as had been done in the case of the good spirits. But why did not tie Supreme Mind put down, by an exertion of his power, this swarm of wicked spirits? Some thought it was beneath the dignity of the Primary Essence to contend with these deemons; others were of opinion that these bad spirits were naturally indestructible, and as the Supreme could neither destroy nor improve them, he had banished them to the centre of the earth and to the region beneath the moon, where they indulged in their baseness and exercised their dominion: in order, however, to protect the human race against fiends so numerous and fearful, he commissioned good spirits, whose office it was to defend men against these corporeal daemons. As the good and the bad spirits had various degrees of power and different offices, so they had names given to them which described their functions. As the good spirits were under an obligation to protect men and furnish succor in their need, they were compelled to learn human language; accordingly, it was believed that a guardian angel against every evil was possessed by every one who bore his mysterious name — a name which was to be pronounced only when succor was needed. All manner of names were therefore devised, by which the good spirits were conjured or informed of human necessities; and all the combinations of the alphabet were exhausted in order to bring about a commerce between men and angels. Here is the origin of the Cabala, which gave strange names to these spirits in order to bring them into connection with men, and by this means to do wonderful things (⁴¹²⁴Matthew 12:24-27). These names also sometimes served to drive bad spirits away: they were a kind of exorcism. For since it was believed that these daemons had

been banished to the centre of the earth, and that they could do evil only in consequence of having baffled the vigilance of the guardian spirits and escaped to the outer world, so, it was held, they were compelled to flee as soon as they heard the name of the good angels whose business it was to keep them shut up in subterranean caverns, and to punish them if they ventured from their prison-house. A power, too, was ascribed to the name of the spirit, or to the image which marked his office—a power which forced the spirit to come on being called; and, accordingly, it was held that this name carved on a stone kept the spirit near the person who wore the stone — a notion in which is probably found the origin of talismans, formed either by words or symbolical figures.

3. Cabalistic Period. — It is uncertain at what date the earliest Cabala (i.e., Tradition) received a definite form; but there can be no doubt that the two great divisions of which it is composed, "the Chariot" (*Mercabah*, Ezekiel 1), and "the Creation" (*Bereshith*, Genesis 1), found a wide development before the Christian aera. The first dealt with the manifestation of God in himself; the second with his manifestation in Nature; and as the doctrine was handed down orally, it received naturally, both from its extent and form, great additions from foreign sources. On the one side it was open to the Persian doctrine of emanation, on the other to the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation; and the tradition was deeply impressed by both before it was first committed to writing in the 7th or 8th century. At present the original sources for the teaching of the Cabala are the *Sepher Jezirah*, or Book of Creation, and the *Sepher Hazohar*, or Book of Splendor. The former of these dates, in its present form, from the 8th, and the latter from the 13th century (Zunz, *Gottesd. Vortr. d. Juden*, page 165; Jellinek, *Moses ben-Schenmtob de Leon*, Leips. 1851). Both are based upon a system of pantheism. In the Book of Creation the cabalistic ideas are given in their simplest form, and offer some points of comparison with the system of the Pythagoreans. The book begins with an enumeration of the thirty-two ways of wisdom seen in the constitution of the world; and the analysis of this number is supposed to contain the key to the mysteries of Nature. The primary division is into 10+22. The number 10 represents the ten *Sephiroth* (figures) which answer to the ideal world; 22, on the other hand, the number of the Hebrew alphabet, answers to the world of objects; the object being related to the idea as a word, formed of letters, to a number. Twenty-two again is equal to 3+7+12; and each of these numbers, which constantly recur in the O.-T. Scriptures, is invested with a

peculiar meaning. Generally the fundamental conceptions of the book may be thus represented: The ultimate Being is Divine Wisdom (*Chokmah*, σοφία). The universe is originally a harmonious thought of Wisdom (Number, *Sephirah*); and the thought is afterwards expressed in letters, which form, as words, the germ of things. Man, with his twofold nature, thus represents in some sense the whole universe. He is the microcosm in which the body clothes and veils the soul, as the phenomenal world veils the spirit of God. It is impossible to follow out here the details of this system, and its development in Zohar; but it is obvious how great an influence it must have exercised on the interpretation of Scripture. The calculation of the numerical worth of words (comp. Revelation 13:18; *Gematria*, Buxtorf, *Lex. Rabb.* page 446), the resolution of words into initial letters of new words (*Notaricon*, Buxtorf, page 1339), and the transposition or interchange of letters (*Temurah*), were used to obtain the inner meaning of the text; and these practices have continued to affect modern Jewish exegesis.

The fragments of Berosus, preserved by Eusebius and Josephus, and to be found in Scaliger (*De Emeindat. Temp.*), and more fully in Fabricius (*Bibl. Gr.* 14:175), afford some information on the subject of Chaldaean philosophy. Berosus was a priest of the god Baal, at Babylon, in the time of Alexander the Great. On the naturalistic philosophy of the Jews in general, the Talmud and other works of the Jewish rabbins may also be advantageously consulted, together with the following authorities: Euseb. *Praep. Evang.* 9:10; Philo, *De Mig. Mun.*; Selden, *De Diis Syris*, Proleg. 3; Stanley, *Hist. of Oriental Philosophy*; Kleuker, *Ueber die Natur und den Ursprung der Emanationslehre bei den Kabbalisten* (Riga, 1786); Molitor, *Philos. der Geschichte* (1827-28); Hartmann, *Die enge Verbindung des A.T. mit dem N.* (1831); Ketzer, *Lexicon von P. Fritz* (1838); Brucken, *Hist.-Crit. Phil.*; Ritter, *Geschichte der Phil.*; Nork, *Vergleichende Mythologie* (1836); Lutterbeck, *Neu-test. Lehrbegriff* 1:223-254; Reuss, *Kabbala*, in Herzog's *Encyklop.*; Joel, *Die Religionsphilos. d. Zohar* (1849); Westcott, *Introd. to Gospels*, pages 131-134; Franck, *La Kabbale* (1843). **SEE CABALA.**

II. The Philosophy of History. — The philosophy of the Jews is, as has been seen from the above outline of its naturalistic relations, essentially a moral philosophy, resting on a definite connection with God. The doctrines of Creation and Providence, of an Infinite Divine Person and of a

responsible human will, which elsewhere form the ultimate limits of speculation, are here assumed at the outset. The difficulties which they involve are but rarely noticed. Even when they are canvassed most deeply, a moral answer drawn from the great duties of life is that in which the questioner finds repose. The earlier chapters of Genesis contain an introduction to the direct training of the people which follows. Premature and partial developments, kingdoms based on godless might, stand in contrast with, the slow foundation of the divine polity. To distinguish rightly the moral principles which were successively called out in this latter work would be to write a history of Israel; but the philosophical significance of the great crises through which the people passed lies upon the surface. The call of Abraham set forth at once the central lesson of faith in the Unseen, on which all others were raised. The father of the nation was first isolated from all natural ties before he received the promise; his heir was the son of his extreme age; his inheritance was to him "as a strange land." The history of the patriarchs brought out into yet clearer light the sovereignty of God; the younger was preferred before the elder; suffering prepared the way for safety and triumph. God was seen to make a covenant with man, and his action was written in the records of a chosen family. A new aera followed. A nation grew up in the presence of Egyptian culture. Persecution united elements which seem otherwise to have been on the point of being absorbed by foreign powers. God revealed himself now to the people in the wider relations of Lawgiver and Judge. The solitary discipline of the desert familiarized them with his majesty and his mercy. The wisdom of Egypt was hallowed to new uses. The promised land was gained by the open working of a divine Sovereign. The outlines of national faith were written in defeat and victory; and the work of the theocracy closed. Human passion then claimed a dominant influence. The people required a king. A fixed Temple was substituted for the shifting Tabernacle. Times of disruption and disaster followed; and the voice of prophets declared the spiritual meaning of the kingdom. In the midst of sorrow and defeat and desolation the horizon of hope was extended. The kingdom which man had prematurely founded was seen to be the image of a nobler "kingdom of God." The nation learned its connection with "all the kindred of the earth." The Captivity confirmed the lesson, and after it the Dispersion. The moral effects of these, and the influence which Persian, Greek, and Roman, the inheritors of all the wisdom of the East and West, exercised upon the Jews, have been elsewhere noticed. *SEE CYRUS; SEE DISPERSED.* The divine discipline closed before the special human

discipline began. The personal relations of God to the individual, the family the nation, mankind, were established in ineffaceable history, and then other truths were brought into harmony with these in the long period of silence which separates the two Testaments. But the harmony was not always perfect. Two partial forms of religious philosophy arose. On the one side the predominance of the Chaldaean or Persian element gave rise to the Cabala; on the other the predominance of the Greek element issued in Alexandrian theosophy.

Before these one-sided developments of the truth were made the fundamental ideas of the divine government found expression in words as well as in life. The Psalms, which, among the other infinite lessons that they convey, give a deep insight into the need of a personal apprehension of truth, everywhere declare the absolute sovereignty of God over the material and moral worlds. The classical scholar cannot fail to be struck with the frequency of natural imagery, and with the close connection which is assumed to exist between man and nature as parts of one vast order. The control of all the elements by one All-wise Governor, standing out in clear contrast with the deification of isolated objects, is no less essentially characteristic of Hebrew as distinguished from Greek thought. In the world of action Providence stands over against fate, the universal kingdom against the individual state, the true and the right against the beautiful. Pure speculation may find little scope, but speculation guided by these great laws will never cease to affect most deeply the intellectual culture of men. (Comp. especially ^{<108>}Psalm 8:19:29:1, 65, 68, 77, 78, 79, 95, 97, 104, 106, 136, 147, etc. It will be seen that the same character is found in Psalms of every date.) For a late and very remarkable development of this philosophy of Nature, see Dillmann, *Das B. Henoch*, 14, 15.

One man above all is distinguished among the Jews as "the wise man." The description which is given of his writings serves as a commentary on the national view of philosophy. "And Solomon's wisdom excelled the wisdom of all the children of the east country, and all the wisdom of Egypt . . . And he spake three thousand proverbs; and his songs were a thousand and five. And he spake of trees, from the cedar that is in Lebanon even unto the hyssop that springeth out of the wall: he spake also of beasts, and of fowl, and of creeping things, and of fishes" (^{<108>}1 Kings 4:30-33). The lesson of practical duty, the full utterance of "a large heart" (verse 29), the careful study of God's creaturesthis is the sum of wisdom. Yet in fact the very practical aim of this philosophy leads to the revelation of the most sublime

truth. Wisdom was gradually felt to be a person, throned by God, and holding converse with men (Proverbs 8). She was seen to stand in open enmity with "the strange woman," who sought to draw them aside by sensuous attractions; and thus a new step was made towards the central doctrine of Christianity — the Incarnation of the Word.

Two books of the Bible — Job and Ecclesiastes — of which the latter, at any rate, belongs to the period of the close of the kingdom, approach more nearly than any others to the type of philosophical discussions. But in both the problem is moral and not metaphysical. The one deals with the evils which afflict "the perfect and upright;" the other with the vanity of all the pursuits and pleasures of earth. In the one we are led for an answer to a vision of "the enemy" to whom a partial and temporary power over man is conceded (⁻¹⁸⁰⁰⁶Job 1:6-12); in the other to that great future when "God shall bring every work to judgment" (⁻²¹²¹⁴Ecclesiastes 12:14). The method of inquiry is in both cases abrupt and irregular. One clew after another is followed out, and at length abandoned; and the final solution is obtained, not by a consecutive process of reason, but by an authoritative utterance, welcomed by faith as the truth, towards which all partial efforts had tended. (Comp. Maurice, *Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy*, 1st ed.)

The Captivity necessarily exercised a profound influence upon Jewish thought. The teaching of Persia seems to have been designed to supply important elements in the education of the chosen people. But it did yet more than this. The imagery of Ezekiel (chapter 1) gave an apparent sanction to a new form of mystical speculation. The contact of the Jews with Persia thus gave rise to a traditional mysticism. Their contact with Greece was marked by the rise of distinct sects. In the 3d century B.C. the great doctor Antigonus of Socho bears a Greek name, and popular belief pointed to him as the teacher of Sadoc and Boethus, the supposed founders of Jewish rationalism. At any rate, we may date from this time the twofold division of Jewish speculation which corresponds to the chief tendencies of practical philosophy. The Sadducees appear as the supporters of human freedom in its widest scope; the Pharisees of a religious Stoicism. At a later time the cycle of doctrine was completed, when by a natural reaction the Essenes established a mystic asceticism. The characteristics of these sects are noticed elsewhere. It is enough now to point out the position which they occupy in the history of Judaism (comp. Westcott, *Introd. to Gospels*, pages 60-66). At a later period the Fourth Book of Maccabees (q.v.) is a

very interesting example of Jewish moral (Stoic) teaching. *SEE SECTS, JEWISH.*

The conception of wisdom which appears in the book of Proverbs was - elaborated with greater detail afterwards, *SEE WISDOM OF SOLOMON*, both in Palestine, *SEE ECCLESIASTICUS*, and in Egypt; but the doctrine of *the Word* is of greater speculative interest. Both doctrines, indeed, sprang from the same cause, and indicate the desire to find some mediating power between God and the world, and to remove the direct appearance and action of God from a material sphere. The personification of Wisdom represents only a secondary power in relation to God; the Logos, in the double sense of Reason (λόγος ἐνδιάθετος) and Word (λόγος προφορικός), both in relation to God and in relation to the universe. The first use of the term Word (*Memra*), based upon the common formula of the prophets, is in the Targum of Onkelos (1st century B.C.), in which "the Word of God" is commonly substituted for God in his immediate, personal relations with man (Westcott, *Introd. to Gospels*, page 137); and it is probable that round this traditional rendering a fuller doctrine grew up. But there is a clear difference between the idea of the Word then prevalent in Palestine and that current at Alexandria. In Palestine the Word appears as the outward mediator between God and man, like the Angel of the Covenant; at Alexandria it appears as the spiritual connection which opens the way to revelation. The preface to John's Gospel includes the element of truth in both. In the Greek apocryphal books there is no mention of the Word (yet comp. *Wisd.* 18:15). For the Alexandrian teaching it is necessary to look alone to Philo (cir. B.C. 20-A.D. 50); and the ambiguity in the meaning of the Greek term, which has already been noticed, produces the greatest confusion in his treatment of the subject. In Philo language domineers over thought. He has no one clear and consistent view of the Logos. At times he assigns to it divine attributes and personal action; and then again he affirms decidedly the absolute indivisibility of the divine nature. The tendency of his teaching is to lead to the conception of a twofold personality in the Godhead, though he shrinks from the recognition of such a doctrine (*De Monarch.* § 5; *De Somnz.* § 37; *Quod. det. pot. ins.* § 24; *De Somn.* § 39, etc.). Above all, his idea of the Logos was wholly disconnected from all Messianic hopes, and was rather the philosophic substitute for them. (See Westcott, *Introd. to Gospels*, pages 138-141; Dathne, *Jud.-Alex. Religions philos.* [1834]; Gfrorer, *Philo*, etc. [1835]; Dorner, *Die Lehre v. d. Person Christi*, 1:23 sq.; Lucke, *Comm.*

1:207, who gives an account of the earlier literature.) *SEE PHILOSOPHY, GREEK.*

On the general subject, see Buch, *Weisheitslehre der Hebraer* (Strasb. 1851); Nicolas, *Les doctrines religieuses des Juifs* (Par. 1860).

Philostorgius

(Φιλοστόργιος), an Eastern ecclesiastical historian of some note, was a native of Borissus, in Cappadocia. He was the son of Carterius and Eulampia, and was born in the reign of Valentinian and Valens, in A.D. 358, according to Gothofredus (*Proleg. ad Philost.* page 5, etc.), about A.D. 367, according to Vossius (*De Hist. Gr.* page 314). He was twenty years old when Eunomius (q.v.) was expelled from Caesarea. He was educated at Constantinople, and, together with his father, warmly embraced the doctrines of Eunomius. Philostorgius wrote an ecclesiastical history from the heresy of Arius, in A.D. 300, to the period when Theodosius the Younger conferred the empire of the West on Valentinian the Younger (A.D. 425). The work, composed in twelve books, began respectively with the twelve letters of his name, so as to form a sort of acrostic. In this history he lost no opportunity of extolling the Arians and Eunomians, while he overwhelmed the orthodox party with abuse, with the single exception of Gregory of Nazianzum. Photius charges Philostorgius with introducing gross misrepresentations and unfounded statements, and says that the work is not a history, but a panegyric upon the heretics. Philostorgius, nevertheless, was a man of learning, and was possessed of considerable geographical and astronomical knowledge. Being a heretic, it is not to be wondered at that his work has not come down to us. An abstract of it, however, was made by Photius in a separate work, which has been preserved. Photius characterizes him as being elegant in his style, making use of figurative expressions, though not in excess. His figures were, however, sometimes harsh and far-fetched, and his narrative involved and indistinct (Phot. *Bibl. cod.* 40). Photius's abstract was published at Geneva in 1643 by Jac. Godefroi, or Gothofredus, entitled *Ecclesiasticae historiae, a Constantino M. Antiquae initiis ad sua usque tempora., libri 12 Photio in epitomen contracti; nunc primum editi a Jacobo Gothofredo, Gr. et Lat. cum supplementis nonnullis, indiceque accurato, ex prolixioribus dissertationibus* (Lugd. 1643, 4to), and in a somewhat corrected form, with a new Latin translation, by H. Valesius (Paris, 1673), together with the ecclesiastical history of Theodoritus, Evagrius, and Theodorus; also by

Reading, *Ex ecclesiasticis Philostorgii historiis epitome, et fragmenta* (Cantabr. 1720). There is also a French version: *Abrege de l'Histoire de l'Eglise de Philostorge* (Paris, 1676). See Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* 7:420, etc.; Vossius, *De Hist. Gr.* page 313, etc.; Scholl, *Gesch. der Griech. Lit.* 3:313. — Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog.* s.v. See Dowling, *Introd. to Church Hist.*; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* 8:72; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, 1:328; Jortin, *Remarks*, 2:121; Stanley, *Hist. of East. Ch.* page 168; Staudlin, *Gesch. d. Kirchengesch.* page 72.

Philostratus, Flavius

a famous Greek Sophist, was a native of the island of Lemnos, and was born in the second half of the 2d century of our sera. He taught rhetoric first at Athens, and Eusebius therefore calls him an Athenian, but Eunapius and Suidas always speak of him as a Lemnian, and he himself hints in his *Life of Apollonius* that he used to be at Lemnos when he was young. He frequented the schools of the Sophists, and mentions having heard Damianus of Ephesus, Proclus Naucratis, and Hippodromus of Larissa. This shows that he lived in the reign of the emperor Severus (193-212). He also taught at Rome, where he became known and was patronized by the empress Julia, the wife of Septimius Severus, who was partial to the learned, and was surnamed "the philosophic," because she gathered about herself such a brilliant circle of scholars. She commissioned him to compile the biography of Apollonius of Tyana from some memoirs written by a certain Damis of Nineveh, who had accompanied Philostratus in his peregrinations, and which had come into her possession. Philostratus professes also to have used in his compilation a collection of letters of Apollonius, which were at one time in the possession of Hadrian, and were placed by that emperor in his palace at Antium, together with certain responses of the Oracle of Trophonius, which Apollonius had also collected. The biographer availed himself also, according to his own statement, of the narrative of a certain Maximus who had known Apollonius. The book of Philostratus displays great credulity in the compiler, and a great want of critical discrimination; it also contains many anachronisms and geographical errors. Huet and others have imagined that the object of Philostratus was to write a parody of the life of Christ, but this seems doubtful: the parody, if intended as such, is too gross; besides which, it appears from the testimony of Lampridius (*Life of Alex. Severus*), that Christ was really worshipped by some of the later heathen emperors,

together with Abraham, Orpheus, and Apollonius, these being all looked upon as holy men and tutelary genii. That Apollonius of Tyana was a real character, a philosopher, and a traveller appears from various passages of ancient authors; but it is remarkable that no one mentions him until nearly a century after the time assigned for his death. The empress Julia, a Syrian by birth, was probably fond of the marvellous; and Philostratus, intending to entertain her, inserted in his book all the wonderful stories he could collect relative to his hero. It seems, however, that in the time of the great struggle between the heathen and Christian religions under Diocletian and his immediate successors, some of the heathen writers thought of availing themselves of the *Life of Apollonius* as a kind of counterpoise to the Gospel narrative. Hierocles, prefect of Alexandria, and an enemy of the Christians, wrote a book with that object, in the shape of a comparison between the life of Apollonius by Philostratus and that of Christ, of which book Eusebius wrote a refutation: *Eusebii Pamphili Animadversiones in Philostrati de Apollonio Tyanensi Commentarios ob institutam cum illo ab Hierocle Christi comparationem, adornatce*. Lactantius (*Divin. Instit.* 5:3) also combats the same notion as absurd. Augustine (*Epist.* 4) refers to Apollonius as a magician whom the heathens compared with Christ. (See Tillemont, *Hist. des Empereurs Roemains*, volume 2, and Bayle's article *Apollonius de Tyane*.) The other works of Philostratus are, *The Lives of the Sophists*, in two books (ed. by Kayser, Heidelberg, 1838): — *Heroica*, or comments on the lives of some of the heroes of Homer, in the shape of a dialogue (ed. by Boissonade, Paris, 1806, 8vo): — *Icones*, or descriptions of sixty-four paintings which were in a portico near Neapolis by the seashore (these descriptions contain valuable information concerning the state of ancient art) (ed. by F. Jacobs and F.G. Welcker, Leips. 1825, 8vo): — *Epistles*, mostly erotic, excepting a few on matters of literature; one, which is inscribed to Julia Augusta, is an apology for the Sophists. Philostratus wrote also many other works, such as a *Lexicon Rhetoricum*, orations, etc.. but they are lost. Different editions of all the existing works of Philostratus have been published. Those by Morellius (Paris; 1608) and Olearius (Leips. 1709, fol.) are good, but a better one, far more critical and correct, is that by Kayser (Zurich, 1844, 4to), with a valuable body of notes on each work. There are separate editions of the lives of the Sophists. See Neander, *Christian Dogmas*, 1:192 sq.; Baur, *Apollonius v. Tyana u. Christus* (Tub. 1832); Alzog, *Kirchengesch.* 1:149; Ritter, *Hist. of Philos.*; Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog.* s.v.; Butler, *Hist. of Ancient Philosophy*, volume 2; Lardner, *Works* (see Index).

Philotheia

(*φιλοθεία*, i.e. *the love of God*), is a term which was sometimes applied by ancient Christian writers to the monastic life, because those who embraced that life professed to renounce all for the love of God. Hence Theodoret entitles one of his books *Philotheus* (q.v.).

Philotheos Historia

(*φιλόθεος ιστορία*, *Godloving history*), the name given by Theodoret, the wellknown commentator, bishop of Cyrus, to his lives of thirty ascetics or Eastern monks. "Their virtues," he confesses, "cannot be adequately described," and he relates the most astounding prodigies of them. The tract is in the third folio of Sirmond's edition of his works. *SEE PHILOTHEIA.*

Philotheus

(*Φιλόθεος*) (1), an Eastern prelate, flourished as patriarch of Alexandria about A.D. 995. He was a man of luxurious habits and a most scandalous course of life. Philotheus wrote four works, the titles of which, as translated from the Arabic, are, *Declarator: — Rara Commentatorum, et Depravationes Haereticorum: — Detectio Arcanorum: — Autobiographia*. All of these works are lost, and it does not appear whether the author wrote in Arabic or in Greek. A sermon, *De Mandatis Domini nostri Jesu Christi* (ed. Greek and Latin by P. Possinus in his *Ascetica*), is ascribed to one S. Philotheus, perhaps the same person. See Cave. *Hist. Litt.* ad an. 995; Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog.* s.v.

Philotheus (2) Coccinus

also an Eastern ecclesiastic, flourished as patriarch of Constantinople. He was probably born in the beginning of the 14th century, and early took the monastic habit. After living for a considerable time as a monk in, and afterwards as superior of, the convent of St. Laura on Mount Sinai, he was appointed archbishop of Heracleia (before 1354). In 1355 he was employed by the emperor John Cantacuzenus in bringing about a reconciliation between Michael, the son, and John Palaeologus, the son-in-law of the emperor; and in the same year he was chosen patriarch of Constantinople, in the place of Callistus, who, however, recovered his see after John Palaeologus had taken possession of Constantinople. Callistus, however, died soon afterwards, and now Philotheus was once more placed

in the patriarchal chair, which post he occupied with great dignity till his death, which occurred in 1371, according to Cave, or in 1376 according to the *Chronologia reformatata* of J.B. Riccioli quoted by Fabricius. We append the titles of the most important of the numerous works of Philotheus, very few of which have been published: *Liturgia et Ordo instituendi Diaconum*, printed in Latin in the 26th vol. of *Bibl. Pat. Max.*: — *Libri xv Antirrhethici*, a defence of his friend the celebrated Palama, extant in different libraries: — *Sermno Encomiasticus in tres Hierarchas, Basilium, Gregorium Theologum, et Joannen Chrysostomum*, Latin, in the 26th vol. of *Bibl. Pat. Max.*, Gr. and Lat. by Jac. Pontanus, together with Philippi Solitarii Dioptra (Ingolstadt, 1604, 8vo); by Fronto Ducaeus, in the 2d volume of *Auctuar. Patr.* (Paris, 1624): — *Oratio de Cruce*, Gr. and Lat. apud Gretser. *De Cruce* (Ingolstadt, 1616, fol. volume 2); there is another *Oratio de Cruce*, in the same volume, which is attributed by some to our Philotheus: — *Oratio in tertiam Jejuniorum Dominicam*, Gr. and Lat. (ibid.): — *Refutatio Anathematismorum ab Harmenopulo scriptorum*, Gr. and Lat. apud Leunclav. *Jus. Gr. Rom.* lib. 4: — *Confutatio Capitum xiv Acindynii et Barlaami*, extant in MS.: — *Homilia*: — *Compendium de (Economia Christi, etc.* Wharton, in Cave, and Fabricius give a catalogue of the numerous works of Philotheus. See Fabricius, *Bibl. Graec.* 11:513, etc.; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* ad an. 1362. See Smith, *Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog.* s.v.; Neale, *Hist. of the East. Church* (Patriarchate of Constantinople).

Philotheus (3) Monachus or Sanctus

an unknown monk, wrote *De Mandatis Domini nostri Jesu Christi*, ed. Gr. and Lat. in P. Possinus's *A scetica* (Paris, 1684). Although this work bears the same title as the one quoted above under the head Philotheus No. 1, the works are apparently by different authors. See Fabricius, *Bibl. Grac.* 11:519; Cave, *Hist. Litf.* Dissert. 1, page 17, ed. Oxon.

Philotheus (4), archbishop of Selymbria

of unknown age, wrote *Oratio in T. Agothonicum*, which is still extant in MS.

Philoxenian Version

SEE SYRIAC VERSIONS.

Philoxenus Of Bagdad

an Eastern prelate of some distinction as an author, also known as *Lazarus Bar-Sapta*, flourished in the early part of the 9th century as bishop of Bagdad. This episcopate was founded in 762, but Philoxenus is the first incumbent of whom we have any notice. His character seems to have been a questionable one, for in the year 829 he was deposed, on which he appealed to Alalmelon, the caliph, by whom the sentence was confirmed. Philoxenus is the author of a Syro-Jacobite liturgy, which is in nowise remarkable. See Neale, *Hist. of the Eastern Church* (Introd.), 1:329.

Philoxenus Of Mabug Or Hierapolis

an Eastern prelate of some note, flourished in the second half of the 5th century. He was a devoted Jacobite, and for his zeal in the propagation of their doctrines is reckoned among the saints of that branch of the Syrian Church. He was bishop of Mabug, to which see he was consecrated by Peter the Fuller, after A.D. 485, though he is said not to have been baptized. He is the author of two Jacobite liturgies, of which only one is authenticated. The other is, according to Neale, "a sadly inflated specimen of mediaeval taste in the East." He is also noted as the translator of certain portions of the sacred Scriptures into Syrian, and as the supervisor of a general and complete version. Besides, he was the head of the Monophysites about 500, when they fought with Nestorianism at the Council of Chalcedon. See Neale, *Hist. of the East. Ch.* (Introd.), 1:333; Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.* 2:10; Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, 2:928; Renaudot, *Lit. Orient.* 2:300; Petavius, *De theol. dogmat.* lib. 1, cap. 18; Walch, *Gesch. der Ketzereien*, 6:955 sq.; 7:10 sq.; Dorner, *Entwicklungsgesch.* etc., 2:23-46, 152, 168. (J.H.W.)

Philpot, John

an English divine of the Reformation period, noted for his learning and his devotion to the Protestant cause, for which he paid his life, was born near Winchester about the close of the 15th century. He was educated at New College, Oxford, which he entered in 1534, and of which he finally became a fellow. After leaving Oxford he travelled through Italy, where, on account of his religion, he was brought into danger. On returning to England he received the preferment of the archdeaconry of Winchester. During the time of Edward his labors were abundant and successful. He

was well furnished both by nature and grace for his calling, and he devoted himself with an uncompromising zeal to the advancement of pure and undefiled religion. After the accession of Mary, Philpot distinguished himself by his bold stand for the Protestant cause. In a convocation of bishops and dignitaries, held for the purpose of changing the established religion from Protestantism to popery, the learned archdeacon, and a few others, bore a noble testimony against the design. For his exertions, notwithstanding the promised freedom of debate, he was called before the bishop of Winchester (Stephen Gardiner), and was by his order imprisoned a year and a half. He was then sent to bishop Bonner, and other commissioners, who confined him in the bishop's coal-house. He here met with every insult: was once confined from morning till night in the stocks; was examined some fifteen or sixteen times; and, though he firmly and unanswerably defended his cause, was met only with taunts and abusive epithets. Yet in all this persecution the consolations of the Holy Spirit were abundantly administered to him; insomuch that on one occasion Bonner said to him, "I marvel that you are so merry in prison, singing in your naughtiness," etc. Philpot, proving a most uncompromising devotee to the new religion, and a most ingenious exponent of the law of the land, was regarded by the Papists as a dangerous man to be abroad, and he was therefore condemned as a heretic. After his condemnation he suffered many indignities in Newgate. But he was soon brought to the stake. He kissed the wood, and said, "Shall I disdain to suffer at this stake, when my Lord and Saviour refused not to suffer a most vile death on the cross for me?" When he was bound to it, he repeated the 106th, 107th, and 108th Psalms, and prayed most fervently; till at length, in the midst of the flames, with great meekness and joy, he gave up his spirit to God. This occurred at Smithfield, December 18, 1555. For both learning and piety he was esteemed as only next to Ridley among the English Reformers. They had sound and clear views of that Gospel which they sealed with their blood. Philpot's writings have been collected and published under the title, *Examinations and Writings*, edited for the Parker Society by the Reverend R. Eden (Camb. 1842, 8vo). They contain besides a *Biographical Notice of Philpot; Notices of the Bishops and other Clergy, etc., who examined Philpot in 1555; the Process and History of Master John Philpot, examined, condemned, and martyred; Disputation in the Convocation House, October, 1553; Letters; Apology for Spitting upon an Arian; Defence of the True and Old Authority of Christ's Church*, by Coelius Secundus Curio, translated by John Philpot.

See also Richmond's *Fathers*, 4:335; *British Reformers*, volume 3; Fox, *Acts and Monuments*, anno 1555; Strype, *Memorials*, and his *Cranmer*; Fuller, *Abel Redivivus*; Wood, *Athenae Oxon.*; Bickersteth, *Christian Student*, page 328; Middleton, *Evangel. Biogr.* 1:428 sq.; Burnet, *Hist. of the English Ref.*; Soames, *Hist. of the Ref.*; Hardwick, *Hist. of the Ref.* page 216; Froude. *Hist. of England* (see Index in volume 8); Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* 8:74. (J.H.W.)

Philpotts

SEE PHILLPOTTS.

Philter, Philtre

(Gr. φίλτρον, *love-charm, lovepotion*). A superstitious belief in the efficacy of certain artificial means of inspiring and securing love seems to have been generally prevalent from very early times; and among the Greeks and Romans (among the latter in the later days of the republic, and under the emperors) love-charms, and especially love-potions, were in continual use. It is not certainly known of what these love-potions were composed—nor can we rely entirely on the details given us on this subject by classic writers, and their commentators in later time—but there is no doubt that certain poisonous or deleterious herbs and drugs were among their chief ingredients, to which other substances, animal as well as vegetable, are said to have been added, coupled with the employment of magic rites. Thessaly had the credit of producing the most potent herbs, and her people were notorious as the most skilful practicers of magic arts, whence the wellknown “Thessala philtre” of Juvenal (6:610). These potions were violent and dangerous in operation, and their use resulted often in the weakening of the mental powers, madness, and death, instead of the purpose for which they were intended. Lucretius is said to have been driven mad by a love-potion, and to have died by his own hand in consequence—though the story does not perhaps rest on sufficient authority; and the madness of the emperor Caligula was attributed by some persons to love-potions given him by his wife Coesonia by which also she is said to have preserved his attachment till the end of his life. In the corrupt and licentious days of the Roman empire the manufacture of love-charms of all kinds seem to have been carried on as a regular trade; the purchasers, if not the makers of them, being chiefly women. The use of philters seems to have been not unknown during the Middle Ages; and in the East, the nurse

of superstition of all kinds, belief in the power of love-potions lingers probably down to the present day

Philumena

one of the youngest, and in Italy one of the most revered of saints, especially as the protectress of the imprisoned, deserves to be mentioned here as one of the most extravagant examples of Romish credulity and superstition. Her remains were reported to have been exhumed in 1802 from the catacomb of St. Priscilla (q.v.) at Rome. Her history is claimed to have been revealed at the time to three different persons, and according to this she was the descendant of a Greek prince, and in her thirteenth year was brought to Rome as a Christian devotee, and came under the notice of the emperor Diocletian, who desired her for wife — an honor which she refused on the ground that she had two years previously wedded herself to her Lord in her virginity. For this refusal the emperor condemned her to death by martyrdom. In 1805 her remains were removed to her supposed birthplace — Mugnano, twenty miles from Naples. The wonders wrought at her tomb were related far and near, and soon her resting-place became the object of many pilgrimages, and she is now known as the "wonderworker of the 19th century." Pope Gregory XVI put her in the calendar of saints, and she is commemorated August 11. See Sintzel, *Verehrung der heil. Philomiena* (Munich, 1844); Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, 12:984 sq.; Abel, *Die Legende vom heil. Johann v. Nepomuck* (Berl. 1855), page 6. (J.H.W.)

Phin'ees

(Φινεές), the Grecized form of the Heb. name PHINEHAS *SEE* *PHINEHAS* (q.v.):

- a. The son of Eleazar, son of Aaron, the great hero of the Jewish priesthood (1 Esdr. 5:5; 8:2, 29; 2 Esdr. 1:2 *b*; Ecclus. 45:23; 1 Macc. 2:26);
- b. The son of Eli (2 Esdr. 1:2 *a*): but the insertion of the name in the genealogy of Ezra (in this place only) is evidently an error, since Ezra belonged to the line of Eleazar, and Eli to that of Ithamar;
- c. A priest or Levite of the time of Ezra, father of Eleazar (1 Esdr. 8:63).

(Φινοέ) In 1 Esdr. 5:31 it stands for PASEAH *SEE PASEAH* (q.v.) of the Heb. text (^{<1049>}Ezra 2:49).

Phin'ehas

(Heb. *Pinechas'*, *sj n̄Pān* *mouth of brass* [Gesén.], or *of utterance* [Furst]; Sept. Φινεές v.r. Φεινεές; Josephus, Φινεέσης), the name of two or three Hebrews.

1. Son of Eleazar and grandson of Aaron (^{<0625>}Exodus 6:25). His mother is recorded as one of the daughters of Pntiel, an unknown person, who is identified by the rabbins with Jethro the Midianite (*Targ. Pseudoj*)on. on ^{<0625>}Exodus 6:25; Wagenseil, *Sota*, 8:6). Phinehas is memorable for having while quite a youth, by his zeal and energy at the critical moment of the licentious idolatry of Shittim, appeased the divine wrath and put a stop to the plague which was destroying the nation (^{<0237>}Numbers 25:7). B.C. 1619. For this he was rewarded by the special approbation of Jehovah, and by a promise that the priesthood should remain in his family forever (verses 10-13). This seems to have raised him at once to a very high position in the nation, and he was appointed to accompany as priest the expedition by which the Midianites were destroyed (^{<0306>}Numbers 31:6). Seven years later he also headed the party who were despatched from Shiloh to remonstrate against the altar which the transjordanic tribes were reported to have built near Jordan (^{<0213>}Joshua 22:13-32). In the partition of the country he received an allotment of his own—a hill on Mount Ephraim which bore his name—Gibeath-Pinechas. Here his father was buried (^{<0242>}Joshua 24:32).

During the life of Phinehas he appears to have been the chief of the great family of the Korahites or Korhites who guarded the entrances to the sacred tent and the whole of the sacred camp (^{<1300>}1 Chronicles 9:20). After Eleazar's death he became high-priest — the third of the series. B.C. cir. 1580-1523. In this capacity he is introduced as giving the oracle to the nation during the struggle with the Benjamites in the matter of Gibeah (Judg. 20:28). Where the ark and tabernacle were stationed at that time is not clear. From verse 1 we should infer that they were at Mizpeh, while from verses 18, 26 it seems equally probable that they were at Bethel (which is also the statement of Josephus. *Ant.* 5:2, 11). Or the Hebrew words in these latter verses may mean, not Bethel the town, but. as they are rendered in the A.V., "house of God," and refer to the tabernacle at Shiloh. But wherever the ark may have been, there was the aged priest

"standing before it," and the oracle which he delivered was one which must have been fully in accordance with his own vehement temper, "Shall we go out to battle . . . or shall we cease?" The answer was, "Go up for tomorrow I will deliver them into your hand."

The memory of this champion of Jehovah was very dear to the Jews. The narrative of the Pentateuch presents him as the type of an ardent and devoted priest. The numerous references to him in the later literature all adopt the same tone. He is commemorated in one of the Psalms (^{<BAGD>}Psalm 106:30, 31) in the identical phrase which is consecrated forever by its use in reference to the great act of faith of Abraham; a phrase which perhaps more than any other in the Bible binds together the old and new dispensations — "that was *counted to him for righteousness* unto all generations for evermore" (comp. ^{<OHSB>}Genesis 15:6; ^{<SMB>}Romans 4:3). The "covenant" made with him is put into the same rank for dignity and certainty with that by which the throne was assured to king David (Ecclus. 45:25). The zeal of Mattathias the Maccabee is sufficiently praised by a comparison with that of "Phinees against Zambri, the son of Salom" (1 Macc. 2:26). The priests who returned from the captivity are enrolled in the official lists as the sons of Phinehas (^{<SMB>}Ezra 8:2; 1 Esdr. 5:5). In the *Seder Olam?*, (chapter 20) he is identified with "the prophet" of ^{<OHSB>}Judges 6:8.

Josephus (*Ant.* 4:6, 12), out of the traditions which he frequently introduces, adds to the narrative of the Pentateuch a statement that "so great was his courage and so remarkable his bodily strength that he would never relinquish any undertaking, however difficult and dangerous, without gaining a complete victory." The later Jews are fond of comparing him to Elijah, if indeed they do not regard them as one and the same individual (see the quotations in Meyer, *Chron. Hebr.* page 845; Fabricius, *Codex Pseudepiq.* page 894, note). In the Targum Pseudojonathan of Numbers 25 the slaughter of Zimri and Cozbi is accompanied by twelve miracles, and the covenant made with Phinehas is expanded into a promise that he shall be "the angel of the covenant, shall live forever, and shall proclaim redemption at the end of the world." His Midianitish origin (already noticed) is brought forward as adding greater luster to his zeal against Midian, and enhancing his glorious destiny. The verse which closes the book of Joshua is ascribed to Phinehas, as the description of the death of Moses at the end of Deuteronomy is to Joshua (*Baba Bathra*, in Fabricius,

page 893). He is also reported to be the author of a work on sacred names (*ibid.*), which, however, is so rare that Fabricius had never seen it.

The succession of the posterity of Phinehas in the high-priesthood was interrupted when Eli, of the race of Ithamar, was priest; but it was resumed in the person of Zadok, and continued in the same line to the destruction of Jerusalem. *SEE HIGH-PRIEST*. One of the members of the family — Manasseh, soil of Johanan, and brother of Jaddua — went over to the Samaritans, and they still boast that they preserve the succession (see their letter to Scaliger, in Eichhorn's *Repertorium*, 13:262).

The tomb of Phinehas, a place of great resort to both Jews and Samaritans, is shown at Awertah, four miles south-east of Nablus. It stands in the centre of the village, enclosed within a little area or compound, which is overshadowed by the thickly trellised foliage of an ancient vine. A small mosque joins the wall of the compound. Outside the village, on the next hill, is a larger enclosure, containing the tomb of Eleazar, and a cave ascribed to Elijah, overshadowed by two venerable terebinth-trees, surrounded by arcades, and forming a retired and truly charming spot. The local tradition asserts that Awertah and its neighborhood are the 'Hill of Phinehas.'

2. Second son of Eli (^{<000B>}1 Samuel 1:3; 2:34; 4:4, 11, 17, 19; 14:3). He was not of the same line as his illustrious and devoted namesake, but of the family of Ithamar. *SEE ELI*. Phinehas was killed with his brother by the Philistines when the ark was captured. B.C. 1125. He had two sons, Ahitub, the eldest — whose sons Ahijah and Ahimelech were high-priests at Shiloh and Nob in the time of Saul (14:3) — and Ichabod. He is introduced, apparently by mistake, in the genealogy of Ezra in 2 Esdr. 1:2 *a*.

3. A Levite, mentioned in ^{<158B>}Ezra 8:33 as the father of the Eleazar who aided Meremoth to weigh the vessels of the sanctuary. B.C. ante 458. The meaning, however, may be that Eleazar was of the family of the great Phinehas.

Phinney, Clement

an American Free-will Baptist preacher, noted especially as an evangelist, was born in Gorham, Maine, August 16, 1780. He possessed a good physical constitution, a large share of good-nature and cheerfulness, as well

as strong common-sense. His love of music was remarkable. When a youth his talent of song made him a favorite with both old and young. In 1806 he was converted, and after his talents had been consecrated to God his gift of song became instrumental in awakening in the human heart responses to the calls of the divine Word. He sang with the Spirit and with power, which at times produced wonderful effect. He received ordination in 1816, and feeling called of God to labor as an evangelist, declined the work of the pastorate. He seemed to be, specially qualified by nature and grace for the work of winning souls to Christ, and God gave him many as seals of his ministry — thousands were awakened by his earnest and affectionate ministrations. Though his advantages for an education were limited, yet college professors and other learned men were frequently found among his delighted auditors. He was a devoted friend of the slave, and, with the leaders of his denomination, early espoused the antislavery cause. His amiability, integrity, wisdom, and purity of character won for him universal confidence and esteem. He died at Portland, Maine, where he had performed the most of his public labors, full of years and abounding in faith.

Phipps, Joseph

a noted member of the Society of Friends, flourished in the second half of last century, He is distinguished as the writer of eight important theological treatises (Lond. 1767-96), of which we mention here, *Brief Remarks on the Common Arguments now used in Support of divers Ecclesiastical Impositions in this Nation* (1769, 8vo): — *The Original and Present State of Man briefly considered; wherein is shown the Nature of his Fall, and the Necessity, Means, and Manner of his Restoration; to which are added some Remarks on the Arguments of Samuel Newton, of Norwich* (1773, 8vo): — *A Reply to a late Publication of S. Newton, intituled An Appendix, etc.; in Answer to which it is plainly shown that the Quakers are not Calvinists, that the Gospel comprehends more than Words, and that the Spirit of Truth is to be experienced and sensibly felt in the Minds and Consciences of Men* (1774, 8vo); — *An Address to the Youth of Norwich* (1776, 12mo): — *Dissertations on the Nature and Effect of Christian Baptism, Christian Communion, and Religious Waiting upon God; to which are added a few Reflections on the Observance of Public Fasts and Festivals* (1781, 8vo).

Phi'son

(Φισών), a Graecized form (Ecclus. 24:25) of the name of the river PISON *SEE PISON* (q.v.).

Phlegethon

a river in the infernal regions, according to the system of ancient heathenism. It was one of the four rivers which the dead must cross before finding admission to the realms of Orcus. See Gardner, *Faiths of the World*, 2:655.

Phle'gon

(Φλεγων, *burning*), one of the Christians of Rome to whom Paul sent his salutations (Rom. 16:14). A.D. 55. The legend (apud Dorotheus) makes him to have been one of the seventy disciples, and bishop of Marathon. So likewise Pseudo-Hippolytus (*De LXX Apostolis*). He is said to have suffered martyrdom on April 8 (*Martyrologium Romanum*, apud Estium), on which day he is commemorated in the calendar of the Byzantine Church.

Phlegon

(Φλέγων), surnamed TRALLIANUS, from Tralles, a city of Lydia, where he was born, flourished in the reign of the emperor Hadrian. Nothing is known of the events of his life, and the date of his death is uncertain; however, as one of his chronological works, which is no longer extant, carried the history down to 01. 229.2=A.D. 141 (Suidas), he probably lived to the middle of the 2d century A.D. Phlegon's name is familiar among the moderns because, though a heathen, he bore witness to the accomplishment of Christian prophecies (Origen, *Contra Cels.* lib. 3, § 14, page 69, ed. Spencer, Cantab. 1677; but see Lardner's *Credibility*, part 2, *Heathen Testimonies*, chapter 12, who concludes that "upon the whole this citation is of no great moment"). There is also in Phlegon's writings a passage which may be reckoned still more material, as it is supposed to relate to the miraculous darkness which prevailed at the time of Christ's crucifixion. In St. Jerome's Latin version of the *Chronicle* of Eusebius (page 155, ed. Pont., Burdig. 1604), the passage occurs as follows, "And so writes Phlegon, an excellent compiler of the Olympiads, in his thirteenth book, saying, 'In the fourth year of the two hundred and second Olympiad

there was a great and extraordinary eclipse of the sun, distinguished among all that had happened before. At the sixth hour the day was turned into dark night, so that the stars in the heavens were seen, and there was an earthquake in Bithvnia which overthrew many houses in the city of Nice" (comp. Origen, *Contra Cels.* lib. 2, § 33, page 80; § 59, page 96; and other authorities quoted by Lardner). This passage was the origin of a controversy in England in the early part of the last century between Mr. Whiston, Dr. Sykes, Mr. Chapman. and others, a long and complete account of which may be found in the English translation of Bayle's *Dictionnaire Historique*, s.v., and in Chauffepid's "Supplement" to it. The immediate cause of the controversy was the omission of the passage in the eighth edition of Dr. S. Clarke's *Boyle Lectures*, published soon after his death in 1732, although it had been inserted in the first edition, which came out in 1706. This was done at the persuasion of Dr. Sykes, who had suggested to Clarke that an undue stress had been laid upon the passage. Whiston, who informs us of this affair, expresses great displeasure against Sykes, and calls "the suggestion groundless." Upon this Sykes published *A Dissertation on the Eclipse mentioned by Phlegon, or an Inquiry whether that Eclipse had any Relation to the Darkness which happened at our Saviour's Passion* (1732, 8vo). Sykes concludes it to be most probable that Phlegon had in view a natural eclipse, which happened November 24, in the first year of the two hundred and second Olympiad, and not in the fourth year of the Olympiad in which Christ was crucified. Many pieces were written against Sykes, who replied to some of them, but it may well be considered as a controversy still unsettled. The principal objections against the authority of the passage in question are thus briefly summed up by Dr. Adam Clarke (*Comment. on* ^{<4176>}*Matthew 27:45*);

- 1.** All the authors who quote Phlegon differ, and often very materially, in what they say was found in him.
- 2.** He says nothing of "Judaea;" what he says is that in such an Olympiad (some say the one hundred and second, others the two hundred and second) there was "an eclipse in Bithynia," and "an earthquake at Nice."
- 3.** He does not say that the earthquake happened at the time of the eclipse.
- 4.** He does not intimate that this "darkness" was "extraordinary," or that the eclipse happened at the "full of the moon," or that it lasted "three hours;"

all of which circumstances could not have been omitted by him if he had known them.

5. He speaks merely of an ordinary though perhaps total eclipse of the sun, and cannot mean the darkness mentioned by the evangelists. And,

6, he speaks of an eclipse that happened in some year of the one hundred and second or two hundred and second Olympiad, and therefore, upon the whole, little stress can be laid on what he says as applying to this event. Some fragments of his works are all that remain, the longest belongs to a treatise, *Περὶ θαυμασίων*, *De Mirabilibus*. It is a curious work, divided into thirty-five chapters (some of which are very short), and containing (as might be expected from the title) a great many absurd fables. The same may be said of a shorter fragment of four chapters, *Περὶ μακροβίων*, *De Longaevis*. The third fragment that remains is a chapter, *Περὶ τῶν Ὀλυμπίων*, *De Olympiis*, which is supposed by Salmasius (*Ad Spartian.* page 43) to be the preface to a lost work, *De Olympionicis*. These fragments were first published in 1568 (Basil. 8vo, Greek and Latin). by Xylander, together with Antioini Liberalis, *Transform. Conger.*, Apollonii *Hist. Mirab.*; Antigoni Carystii *Hist. Mirab.*, and M. Antoninus, *De Vita sua*. An improved edition, with notes by Meursius, appeared in 1620 (Lugd. Bat. 4to, Greek and Latin), which is reprinted by Gronovius in his *Thesaur. Antiquit. Graec.* 8:2690 sq., and 2727, and 9:1289 sq.; and also inserted among the works of Meursius, 7:77 sq. The best edition is by Westermann, in his *Scriptores Rerum Mirabilium Graeci* (Bruns. 1839). See, besides the references already given, *Engl. Cyclop.* s.v., *Genesis Biog. Dict.* s.v., Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* s.v.

Phobetor

(*Φοβήτωρ*, *frightener*), an attendant on Somnus, the god of sleep, in the ancient heathen mythology. It was his office to suggest to the mind images of animated beings, and in this capacity he is mentioned by Ovid in his *Metamorphoses*.

Phobus

(*Φόβος*), the personification of *Fear* among the ancient Greeks. He is said to have been the son of Ares and Cythereia, and a constant attendant upon his father. He was worshipped by the Romans under the equivalent name of *Metus*.

Phibus

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

1. SAMUEL, of Warcislaw, flourished in the last quarter of the 17th century, was rabbi at Furth and Schldlow, and wrote, **l aḥmv]tyBea** commentary on the codex *Eben-Ezer*, making use of other commentaries on the same, as the **bhz yrwf** of Chajim Kohen, etc. (Dyrhenfurt, 1689; corrected edition, Furth, 1694; Wilna-Grodno, 1819): — a corimentary on the codex *Orach Chajim*: — a commentary on *Jore Dea*: — *Discourses on the Pentateuch*, which have not been printed.
2. SAMUEL *ben-Joseph ha-Kohen Falk*, of Vienna, died in Palestine, where he went after the Jews had been expelled from Vienna in 1670. He wrote, **l aḥmv]fqe**, a kind of haggadistic dictionary of proper names, wherem he speaks in alphabetical order of **ṣrā; t/ba; ḥrh̄ai** etc., collected from different sources (Venice, 1694): **l aḥmv]vḥrd]** discourses on the Pentateuch (ibid. 1714). See Wolf, *Bibl. Hebr.* 3:1122 sq.
3. URI *ben-Aharon ha-Levi*, a typographer at Amsterdam, was born in 1623, and was still living in 1713. He published the Hebrew Old Testament, with many additions of Jacob Blitz, and a Preface in Judmeo-German by the editor (Amsterd. 1679). He also published *Neuer Abendsegen*, a prayer-book, in Judaeo-German (ibid. 1677). See Gratz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, 10:329 sq.
4. URI *ben-David*, flourished in the middle of the 17th century, was rabbi at Polnow, in Lithuania, and wrote **hrwT rwa**, an exegetical and allegorical commentary on the Pentateuch, with additions of Sam. El. Edeler (Lublin, 1672). See Wolf, *Bibl. Hebr.* 1:131, 3:84.
5. URI *ha-Kohen*, rabbi at Metz, wrote halachic discussions, haggadic dissertations, and discourses, under the title of **hrḥrbāk] h}**,_ (Metz, 1793).
6. URI *ben-A. Low*, of Breslau, is the author of, **vrdjñ ṣyLm**, a *Hebrew-German Dictionary* (Dyrhenfurt, 1773): **twrwa yfḥQI** , in two parts, the first gives the six hundred and thirteen precepts according to the

Pentateuch, the second, under the title **Ēl Mhi μGit P**, contains these precepts in a metrical form (ibid. 1812).

7. URI *ben-Simeon*, of Beelen, who lived in the middle of the 16th century, published **twbah; μāj y**, remarkable epitaphs of pious and distinguished Israelites in Palestine, written for pilgrims. After it had been published by an anonymous author in 1537, Uri Phobus recast the whole, and published it in 1564 at Safed, After having visited and seen himself the different places. It was then published again in Venice in 1599, and often. It was translated into Latin by Hottinger, in his *Cippi Hebraici* (Heidelberg, 1659-1662) into French by Carmoly (in *Revue Orient.* [Brussels, 1843-1844] 3:85-99): — **j wl** , a *Calendarium*, which has been translated into Latin by Jac. Christmann, under the title *Calendarium, Palestinorum et universorum Judeorum ad annos 40 supputatum, auctore Ui fil. Sim. Judaeo Palastino, nunc primum ex sermone Hebraeo in Latinum conversum, ac scholiis utilibus maximeque necessariis illustratum* (Frankf. a.M. 1594). See Wolf, *Bibl. Hebr.* 1:133 sq.; 3:84 sq. Furst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3:95 sq. (B.P.)

Phocas

a Christian martyr of the early Church, flourished as bishop of Pontus in the 3d century. He was condemned to death for his refusal to sacrifice to Neptune, and was put to death by being first cast into a hot limekiln, and afterwards thrown into a scalding bath (Fox, page 16).

Another martyr of the same name flourished near the opening of the 4th century. He was put to death in A.D. 303. He was inserted in the list of martyrs in the days of the emperor Constantine. This Phocas is to the Greek Christians the Castor and Pollux of ancient Greece, and mariners revere his memory and pray for his intercession. He is commemorated by the Romanists July 14.

Phocas, John

a noted Eastern monastic, flourished at Crete near the middle of the 12th century. He is especially distinguished by his description of a visit to Palestine, which work is entitled **Ἐχφρασις ἐν συνόψει τῶν τῶν ἀπὸ Ἀντιοχείας μέχρι Ἱεροσολύμων κάστρων καὶ χωρῶν Συρίας, Φοινίκης καὶ τῶν κατὰ Παλαιστίνην ἀγίων τόπων** (ed. Gr. et Lat.

Leo Allatius, Colon. 1653). This is a most important contribution to the department of Biblical geography, and is prized even in our day. See Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog.* 2:601.

Phoebadius

an eminent prelate of the 4th century, flourished as bishop of Agen, in Gaul. He was living in 392, when Jerome wrote his Catalogue, but was then in extreme old age. He is noted as the author of *Liber contra Arianos* (published in *Bibl. Max. Patr.* 4:300; *Bibl. Patr. Gall.* 5:250; *Athanasii Dialogi*, 5:1570, 8vo).

Phoe'be

(Φοίβη, *radiant*), a deaconess of the Church at Cenchreae, recommended to the kind attention of the Church of Rome by Paul, who had received hospitable treatment from her (^{<SIB>}Romans 16:1). A.D. 55. Her name occurs first in the long list of Christian men and women of whom express mention is there made. For the most part these were persons who had been previously known to Paul, and had some connection with him in his apostolic labors, but were at the time residing in Rome. Phoebe, however, was in the neighborhood of the apostle, probably still in Cenchreae, and was on the eve of setting out for Rome — on what business it is not said; but that she had something of importance in hand is evident from the request of the apostle, that the Christians at Rome would "receive her in the Lord, and assist her in whatever business she had need of them" (verse 2). *SEE PAUL*. It is probable that she was the bearer of the Epistle to the Romans. *SEE ROMANS, EPISTLE TO*. "What is said of her is worthy of especial notice, because of its bearing on the question of the deaconesses of the Apostolic Church. On this point we have to observe,

- (1) that the term **διάκονος**, here applied to her, though not in itself necessarily an official term, is the term which would be applied to her if it were meant to be official;
- (2) that this term is applied in the *Apostolical Constitutions* to women who ministered officially, the deaconess being called **ἡ διάκονος**, as the deacon is called **ὁ διάκονος**;
- (3) that it is now generally admitted that in ^{<SIB>}1 Timothy 3:11 Paul applies it so himself;

- (4) that in the passage before us Phoebe is called the **διάκονος** of a particular Church, which seems to imply a specific employment;
- (5) that the Church of Cenchree, to which she belonged, could only have been a small Church: whence we may draw a fair conclusion as to what was customary, in the matter of such female ministration, in the larger churches;
- (6) that, whatever her errand to Rome might be, the independent manner of her going there seems to imply (especially when we consider the secluded habits of Greek women) not only that she was a widow or a woman of mature age, but that she was acting officially;
- (7) that she had already been of great service to Paul and others (**προστάτις πολλῶν, καὶ ἐμοῦ αὐτοῦ**), either by her wealth or her energy, or both; a statement which closely corresponds with the description of the qualifications of the enrolled widows in ^{<5150>}1 Timothy 5:10;
- (8) that the duty which we here see Phoebe discharging implies a personal character worthy of confidence and respect." **SEE DEACONESS.**

Phoebus

(**Φοῖβος**, *bright*), a title, and subsequently a name, of *Apollo*. It had reference both to the youthful beauty of the god, and to the radiance of the sun, when, latterly, *Apollo* became identified with *Helios*, the sun-god.

Phoebus, William

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Somerset County, Maryland, August 1754. In 1783 he was admitted to the Conference, and preached in various places until 1798, when he located in the city of New York, entering upon the practice of medicine. In 1806 he was readmitted into the New York Conference, laboring effectively till 1821, after which time he was either supernumerary or superannuated. He died in New York November 9, 1831. He was a sound preacher and an excellent *man*. — *Minutes of Conferences*, 2:162; Sprague, *Ann. of the Amer. Pulpit*, 7:87.

Phoeni'ce

Picture for Phoenice

[some *Phe'nice*J, or, rather, PHOENIX (Φοίνιξ, a palm-tree [q.v.], which Theophrastus says was indigenous there), a town and harbor in the island of Crete, which the vessel in which the apostle Paul sailed, was attempting to reach when driven away by the euroclydon and wrecked (^{427D}Acts 27:12). The harbor or "haven" (λιμὴν) is described by Luke as βλέποντα κατὰ λίβα καὶ κατὰ χῶρον, which the A.V. renders "lieth towards the south-west and north-west." But Mr. Smith contends that *Kara* in connection with winds means "in the same direction as." Thus βλέποντα κατὰ λίβα would not mean, as is generally supposed, that the haven looked to the point *from* which the lib blows, but to the point *towards* which it blows. Consequently the haven looked *towards the north-east and the south-east* (Smith, *Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul*, page 86 sq., 2d ed.). In this rendering Mr. Smith is sustained by ancient authorities, and also by some of the best modern critics (Alford, *ad loc.*; Conybeare and Howson, *Life of St. Paul*, 2:334, note; see, however, for the contrary opinion, Hackett *On Acts*, *ad loc.*). It is certain that one meaning of *iara* with the accusative is "opposite," or "over against," as it is correctly translated in verse 7 of this very chapter. Schweighauser, in his *Lexicon Herodoteum*, has pointed out some very instructive instances of this in Herod. 9:31, where κατὰ is used indiscriminately with ἀντίον and ἀντία. In this sense, βλέποντα κατὰ Λίβα, etc., would be equivalent to βλέποντα πρὸς Λίβα, etc.; a phrase as to the meaning of which there could be no doubt (Xenophon, *Mem.* 3:8, 9). Κατὰ with an accusative also often signifies "down." But the objection to translating it so in this passage is that it would thus, with extreme awkwardness, *inferentially* mean the exact contrary of what it *directly* means in its other acknowledged sense, as marking the local relation between two objects.

Both Ptolemy and Strabo mention a town Φοίνιξ; while Ptolemy alone mentions a haven, of a similar name, which he calls in the accusative: Φοινικοῦντα. Strabo locates it on the southern coast, at the narrowest part of the island (10:4, page 475). Hierocles identifies it with *A radena*, and seems to place it opposite the island of Claudia (*Vet. Rom. Itin.* ed. Wessel. pages 650, 651); and Stephen of Byzantium identifies Aradena and Acropolis (s.v.). On the south coast of Crete, at the narrowest part of the island, and opposite the island of Claudia, is the harbor of *Lutro*. It is open

to the east; but, as a little island lies almost in front of it, it has two entrances, one looking to the north-east, and the other to the south-east. It is thus described by captain Spratt: "Having in 1853 examined generally the south coast of Crete, I was fully convinced that Lutro was the Phenice of St. Paul, for it is the only bay to the westward of Fair Havens in which a vessel of any size could find any shelter during the winter months. By hauling inside the island, and securing to the south shore of the bay, a vessel is nearly land-locked. South-east and east winds only could endanger her; but with the former, where the fetch is greatest, the wind would not blow home against such a mountain as the White Mountains, so immediately over the bay, and rising to an elevation of 9000 feet" (Smith, page 89). Mr. Brown, who since visited it, adds: "It is the only secure harbor, in all winds, on the south coast of Crete" (*Id.* page 256). This identification is confirmed by the researches of Mr. Pashley (*Travels in Crete*, 2:257), who discovered, a short distance above Lutro, a village called Acropolis ("upper city"), and another near it called Aradhena. Captain Speke also (*Researches in Crete*, 2:249) asserts that the name *Phineka* is still currently applied to Lutro, and that a Latin inscription found there, dating from the emperor Nerva, shows that ships from Alexandria resorted to this harbor. Lechler, on the other hand (*Die Apostelgesch.* 1869, page 400), maintaining the usual interpretation of *KarCi* here (*towards*), suggests that Luke is only reporting a popular opinion as to the situation of Phenix, which Paul's company did not reach; and that hence we are not to look for the usual accuracy of the writer. *SEE SHIPWRECK (OF PAUL).*

Phoenicia

(Φοινίκη), a country whose inhabitants necessarily held important and intimate relations, not only to the Hebrews, but to all antiquity. The latest and most complete authority on this subject is Rawlinson's *History of Phœnicia* (London, 1889).

I. *The Land.* —

1. Name. — "Phoenice" was not the name by which its native inhabitants called it, but was given to it by the Greeks, who called those merchants who came from that coast of the Mediterranean Sea which runs parallel with Mount Lebanon Φοινίκες. In Cicero (*De Fin.* 4:20) there occurs the doubtful reading Phœnicia (comp. the Vulgate in ^{OGSB} Numbers 33:51).

However, this latter form of the name has come into general use (comp. Gesenii *Monumenta Phœnicia* [Leips. 1837], page 338; Forbiger, *Handbuch der alien Geographie* [ibid. 1842-1844], page 659 sq.). This name has been variously derived. It is possibly from *Phoenix* the son of Agenor and the brother of Cadmus. It perhaps arose from the circumstance that the chief article of the commerce of these merchants was **φοινός**, *purple*. The word **φοινός** means *blood-red*, and is probably related to **φόνος**, *murder*. This derivation of the name is alluded to by Strabo (1:42). Others imagine as naturally that the color does not give name to the people, but is named after them: as our damask, from Damascus; or our "calico," from Calicut. The term, as an epithet of color, may also apply, as Kenrick supposes, to the sunburnt complexion of the people. But after all, in the opinion of others, a Greek derivation may not be admissible, for the name may be original or Shemitic — though it is ridiculous in Scaliger, Fuller, and Glassius to identify it with **γνῆ**, "to live luxuriously," in allusion to the results of Phœnician wealth and merchandise. Strabo, however, maintains that the Phœnicians were called **Φοίνικες**, because they resided originally on the coasts of the Red Sea. Bochart, in his *Canaan* (1:1), derives the name from the Hebrew **q̄n** [**ynb**, *sons of Anak*. Reland, in his *Palœstina ex Monumentis Veteribus Illustrata*, derives it from **φοίνιξ**, *palm-tree*; and this is the etymology now generally acquiesced in. The palmtree is seen, as an emblem, on some coins of Aradus, Tyre, and Sidon; and there are now several palm-trees within the circuit of modern Tyre, and along the coast at various points; but the tree is not at the present day one of the characteristic features of the country. The native name of Phœnicia was *Kendan* (Canaan) or *Kna*, signifying Lowland, so named in contrast to the adjoining Aram, i.e., Highland, the Hebrew name of Syria. The name *Kenaan* is preserved on a coin of Laodicea of the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, whereon Laodicea is styled "a mother city in Canaan," **^ [nkb ma akral | Kna** or *Chnd* (**Χνῶ**) is mentioned distinctly by Herodian the grammarian as the old name of Phœnicia. Hence, as Phœnicians or Canaanites were the most powerful of all tribes in Palestine at the time of its invasion by Joshua, the Israelites, in speaking of their own territory as it was before the conquest, called it "the land of Calnaa." **SEE CANAAN.**

In the O.T. the word Phœnicia does not occur, as might be expected from its being a Greek name. In the Apocrypha it is not defined, though spoken of as being, with Coele-Syria, under one military commander (2 Macc. 3:5,

8; 8:8; 10:11; 3 Macc. 3:15). In the N.T. the word occurs only in three passages, ^{<4119>}Acts 11:19; 15:3; 21:2; and not one of these affords a clew as to how far the writer deemed Phoenicia to extend. On the other hand, Josephus possibly agreed with Strabo; for he expressly says that Csesarea is situated in Phoenicia (*Ant.* 15:9, 6); and although he never makes a similar statement respecting Joppa, yet he speaks, in one passage, of the coast of Syria, Phoenicia, and Egypt, as if Syria and Phoenicia exhausted the line of coast on the Mediterranean Sea to the north of Egypt (*War.* 3:9, 2).

The Phoenicians in general are sometimes called *Sidonians* (comp. Gesenii *Monumenta Phoenicia*, 2:267 sq.; *Thesaurus Linguae Hebraicae*, under the word ^ˆ*w̄dyx*). Justinus (18:3) alludes to the etymology of this name: "A city being built which they called *Sidon*, from the abundance of fishes; for the Phoenicians call a fish *sidon*." This statement is not quite correct. But the root *dwx*, which in Hebrew means only to catch beasts and birds, can also be employed in Arabic when the catching of fishes is spoken of. This root occurs also in the Aramaic, in the signification of both hunting and fishing (*SEE ZIDON*).

2. Extent. — Phoenicia in general is the name applied to a country on the coast of Syria, bounded by the Mediterranean Sea on the west and Lebanon on the east; Syria and Judaea forming its northern and southern limits respectively, situated between about 34° to 36° N. lat., and 45° to 36° E. long. Yet the extent of its territory varied so considerably at different times that the geographical definitions of the ancient writers differ in a very remarkable manner. Thus, while in ^{<0109>}Genesis 10:19 Canaan does not reach northwards beyond Sidon—a place which in early times gave the name to the whole people (^ˆ*μȳndyx* ^ˆ*w̄dyx* *ybc̄wy*, Deuteronomy, Judges) — and Byblus and Berytus are considered as lying beyond it (^{<0105>}Genesis 10:15 sq.; ^{<0635>}Joshua 13:5), it comprised in the Persian period (Herod. 3:91) Posidium, as high as 35° 52'. Later still (Pliny, Strabo, Ptolemy) the Eleutherus (34° 60'), and subsequently (Mela, Stephanus) the island of Aradus (34° 70'), were considered its utmost northern, limits. To the south it was at times Gaza (^{<0109>}Genesis 10:19; ^{<3025>}Zephaniah 2:5; Herod., Philo, Eustath.), at others Egypt (^{<0245>}Numbers 24:5; ^{<0650>}Joshua 15:4,47; Strabo, Procop., etc.); and, from the Macedonian period chiefly, Csesarea is mentioned as its extreme point. Eastward the country sometimes

comprised parts of Syria and Palestine, beyond the mountain-ridges of the former and the hill-chains of the latter.

It will thus be seen that the length of coast to which the name Phoenicia was applied varied at different times, and may be regarded under different aspects before and after the loss of its independence.

(1.) What may be termed Phoenicia proper was a narrow undulating plain, extending from the pass of Ras el-Beyad or Abyad, the "Promontorium Album" of the ancients, about six miles south of Tyre, to the Nahr el-Auly, the ancient Bostrenus, two miles north of Sidon (Robinson, *Bib. Res.* 2:473). The plain is only twenty-eight miles in length, and, considering the great importance of Phoenicia in the world's history, this may well be added to other instances in Greece, Italy, and Palestine, which show how little the intellectual influence of a city or state has depended on the extent of its territory. Its average breadth is about a mile (Porter, *Handbook for Syria*, 2:396); but near Sidon the mountains retreat to a distance of two miles, and near Tyre to a distance of five miles (Kenrick, *Phoenicia*, page 19). The whole of Phoenicia, thus understood, is called by Josephus (*Ant.* 5:3, 1) the great plain of the city of Sidon (τὸ μέγα πεδῖον Σιδῶνος πόλεως). In it, near its northern extremity, was situated Sidon, in the north latitude of 33° 34' 05"; and scarcely more than seventeen geographical miles to the south was Tyre, in the latitude of 33° 17' (admiral Smyth's *Mediterranean*, page 469): so that in a straight line those two renowned cities were less than twenty English miles distant from each other. Zarephath, the Sarepta of the N.T., was situated between them, eight miles south of Sidon, to which it belonged (^{<117>}1 Kings 17:9; ^{<302>}Obadiah 1:20; ^{<205>}Luke 4:26).

(2.) A still longer district, which afterwards became fairly entitled to the name of Phoenicia, extended up the coast, to a point marked by the island of Aradus, and by Antaradus towards the north; the southern boundary remaining the same as in Phoenicia proper. Phoenicia, thus defined, is estimated by Mr. Grote (*Hist. of Greece*, 3:354) to have been about one hundred and twenty miles in length; while its breadth, between Lebanon and the sea, never exceeded twenty miles, and was generally much less. This estimate is most reasonable, allowing for the bends of the coast; as the direct difference in latitude between Tyre and Antaradus (Tortosa) is equivalent to one hundred and six English miles; and six miles to the south of Tyre, as already mentioned, intervene before the beginning of the pass of

Ras el-Abyad. The claim of this entire district to the name of Phoenicia rests on the probable fact that the whole of it, to the north of the great plain of Sidon, was occupied by Phoenician colonists; not to mention that there seems to have been some kind of political connection, however loose, between all the inhabitants (Diodorus, 16:41). Scarcely sixteen geographical miles farther north than Sidon was Berytus; with a roadstead so well suited for the purposes of modern navigation that, under the modern name of Beirut, it has eclipsed both Sidon and Tyre as an emporium for Syria. Whether this Berytus was identical with the Berothah and Berothai of ^{<3476>}Ezekiel 47:16, and of ^{<1088>}2 Samuel 8:8, is a disputed point. Still farther north was Byblus, the Gebal of the Bible (^{<3270>}Ezekiel 27:9), inhabited by seamen and calkers. Its inhabitants are supposed to be alluded to in the word *Giblim*, translated "stonesquarers" in the A.V. of ^{<1058>}1 Kings 5:18 (32). It still retains in Arabic the kindred name of Jebeil. Then came Tripolis (now Tarabulus), said to have been founded by colonists from Tyre, Sidon, and Aradus, with three distinct towns, each a furlong apart from one another, each with its own walls, and each named from the city which supplied its colonists. General meetings of the Phoenicians seem to have been held at Tripolis (Diod. 16:41), as if a certain local jealousy had prevented the selection for this purpose of Tyre, Sidon, or Aradus. Lastly, towards the extreme point north was Aradus itself, the Arvad of ^{<1018>}Genesis 10:18 and ^{<3278>}Ezekiel 27:8, situated, like Tyre, on a small island near the mainland, and founded by exiles from Sidon.

During the period of the conquest of Canaan by the Israelites, the Phoenicians possessed the following towns, which we will enumerate successively in the direction from south to north: Dora (*rwd*, ^{<6110>}Joshua 11:2; 17:11 sq.); Ptolemais (*wk[*, ^{<7013>}Judges 1:33); Ecdippa (*byzka*, ^{<6629>}Joshua 19:29); Tyre (*rwX*, ^{<6629>}Joshua 19:29); Sarepta (*tprX*, ^{<1170>}1 Kings 17:9 sq.; ^{<1048>}Luke 4:26); Sidon (*wdyx*, ^{<1015>}Genesis 10:15); Berytus (*htwrb*, ^{<3476>}Ezekiel 47:16; ^{<1088>}2 Samuel 8:8); Byblus (*l bg*, ^{<6616>}Joshua 13:5); Tripolis, Simyra (*yrmxh*, ^{<1018>}Genesis 10:18); Arka (*yqr[h*, ^{<1017>}Genesis 10:17); Simna (*ynysh*, ^{<1016>}Genesis 10:16); Aradus (*ydwrah*, ^{<1018>}Genesis 10:18). Comp. the respective articles on these towns. Sidon is the only Phoenician town mentioned in Homer (see *Iliad*, 6:239; 23:743; *Odys.* 15:415; 17:424).

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

The climate of Phoenicia — an item of immense moment in the history of a nation — varies very considerably. Near the coast, and in the lower plains, the heat in summer is at times tropical, while the more mountainous regions enjoy a moderate temperature, and in winter even heavy falls of snow are not uncommon. In the southern parts the early rains begin in October, and are, after an interval of dry weather, followed by the winter rains, which last till March, the time of the "latter" rains. From May till October the sky remains cloudless. The rare difference of temperature found in so small a compass is thus happily described by Volney: "If the heat of July is oppressive, a six hours' journey to the neighboring mountains transports you into the coolness of March; and if, on the contrary, the hoar-frost troubles you at Besharrai, a day's travel will bring you into the midst of blooming May;" or, as an Arabic poet has it, "Lebanon bears winter on its head, spring on its shoulders, autumn on its lap, and summer at its foot." The dense population assembled in the great mercantile towns greatly contributed to augment by artificial means the natural fertility of the soil. The population of the country is at present very much reduced, but there are still found aqueducts and artificial vineyards formed of mould carried up to the terraces of the native rock. Ammianus Marcellinus says (14:8), "Phoenicia is a charming and beautiful country, adorned with large and elegant cities." Even now this country is among the

most fertile in Western Asia. It produces wheat, rye, and barley, and, besides the more ordinary fruits, also apricots, peaches, pomegranates, almonds, citrons, oranges, figs, dates, sugar-cane, and grapes, which furnish an excellent wine. In addition to these products, it yields cotton, silk, and tobacco. The country is also adorned by the variegated flowers of oleander and cactus. The higher regions are distinguished from the bare mountains of Palestine by being covered with oaks, pines, cypress-trees, acacias, and tamarisks; and above all by majestic cedars, of which there are still a few very old trees, whose stems measure from thirty to forty feet in circumference. The inhabitants of Sur still carry on a profitable traffic with the produce of Mount Lebanon, namely, in wood and charcoal. Phoenicia produces also flocks of sheep and goats; and innumerable swarms of bees supply excellent honey. In the forests there are bears, wolves, panthers, and jackals. The sea furnishes great quantities of fish, so that Sidon, the most ancient among the Phoenician towns, derived its name from fishing.

II. *The People.* —

1. Respecting the *ethnography* of the Phoenicians, we have only to observe that the opinions are as much divided on the subject as ever. According to ^{<0005>}Genesis 10:15, Canaan had eleven "sons" ("Canaan begat Sidon his first-born, and Heth, and the Jebusite, and the Amorite, and the Girdasite, and the Hivite, and the Arkite, and the Sinite, and the Arvadite, and the Zemarite, and the Hamathite; and afterwards were the families of the Canaanites spread abroad"), six of whom had settled in the north of Palestine; and although all his descendants are sometimes included, both by classical writers and the Sept. (e.g. in ^{<0005>}Joshua 5:1, 12), in the name of **Φοίνικες**, yet in general the term chiefly applies to the inhabitants of the north. Scripture speaks of them as descendants of primeval giants (Autochthons) who had inhabited Canaan since the flood—that is, from times immemorial. Considering the careful attention paid by the Biblical writers to the early history of Palestine, and the close contact between the Phoenicians and Israelites, it would appear as if all traditions of a time anterior to their sojourn in that land had been long lost. ^{<0005>}Genesis 10:6, on the other hand, calls Canaan a descendant of Ham — a statement which, unless explained to refer to their darker skins, would seem to war against their being indigenous inhabitants of Palestine, or a Shemitic population, an assumption much favored by their language. Herodotus, however, makes them, both on their own statements and by accounts

preserved in Persian historians, immigrants from "the Erythrean Sea;" and Justin backs the notion of immigration by recording that the Tyrian nation was founded by the Phoenicians, and that these, being forced by an earthquake to leave their native land, first settled on the Assyrian lake (Dead Sea or lake of Gennesareth), and subsequently on a shore near the sea, where they founded a city called Sidon. The locality of the "Erythrean Sea," however, is a moot point still. It is taken by different investigators to stand either for the Arabian or Persian Gulf; the latter view being apparently favored by the occurrence of Phoenician names borne by some of its islands (Strabo) — though these may have been given them by late Phoenician colonists. Some have seen in them the Hyksos driven to Syria. Without entering any further into these most difficult, and, in the absence of all trustworthy information, more than vague speculations, so much appears certain, that many immigrations of Shemitic branches into Phoenicia, at different periods and from different parts, must have taken place, and that these gradually settled into the highly civilized nationality which we find constituted as early as the time of Abraham (¹¹²⁶Genesis 12:6, *wa*=then, already; comp. Aben-Ezra, ad loc., and Spinoza, *Tract. Theol.Pol.* chapter 8). It would be extremely vain to venture an opinion on the individuality of the different tribes that, wave-like, rushed into the country from various sides, at probably widely distant dates. The only apparently valuable tradition on the subject seems contained in the above-quoted passage of ¹¹⁰⁵Genesis 10:15-18. But there is one point which can be proved to be in the highest degree probable, and which has peculiar interest as bearing on the Jews, viz. that the Phoenicians were of the same race as the Canaanites. This remarkable fact, which, taken in connection with the language of the Phoenicians, leads to some interesting results, is rendered probable by the following circumstances:

1st. The native name of Phoenicia, as already pointed out, was Canaan, a name signifying "lowland." This was well given to the narrow slip of plain between the Lebanon and the Mediterranean Sea, in contrast to the elevated mountain range adjoining; but it would have been inappropriate to that part of Palestine conquered by the Israelites, which was undoubtedly a hill-country (see Movers, *Das Phoenizische Alterthum*, 1:5); so that, when it is known that the Israelites at the time of their invasion found in Palestine a powerful tribe called the Canaanites, and from them called Palestine, the land of Canaan, it is obviously suggested that the Canaanites came originally from the neighboring plain, called Canaan along the sea-coast.

2d. This is further confirmed through the name in Africa whereby the Carthaginian Phoenicians called themselves, as attested by Augustine, who states that the peasants in his part of Africa, if asked of what race they were, would answer, in Punic or Phoenician, "Canaanites" (*Opera Omnia*, 4:1235; *Exposit. Epist. ad Rom.* § 13).

3d. The conclusion thus suggested is strongly supported by the tradition that the names of persons and places in the land of Canaan — not only when the Israelites invaded it, but likewise previously, when "there were yet but a few of them," and Abraham is said to have visited it—were Phoenician or Hebrew: such, for example, as Abimelek, "father of the king" (^{<0121>}Genesis 20:2); Melchizedek, "king of righteousness" (^{<0148>}Genesis 14:18); Kirjath-sepher, "city of the book" (^{<0155>}Joshua 15:15). As above observed, in Greek writers also occurs the name *χώρα* for Phoenicia (comp. Gesenii *Thesaurus Linguae Hebraicae* [Leips. 1839], 2:696, and Gesenii *Monumenta Phoenicia*, page 570 sq.). The dialect of the Israelites perhaps resembled more the Aramaean, and that of the Phoenicians more the Arabic; but this difference was nearly effaced when both nations resided in the same country, and had frequent intercourse with each other. Concerning the original country of the Phoenicians and their immigration into Canaan, comp. especially Bertheau, *Zur Geschichte der Israeliten* (Gottingen, 1840), pages 152-186, and Lengerke, *Kanaan, Volks- und Religionsgeschichte Israels* (Kinigsberg, 1844), 1:182 sq.

2. Government. — Two principal divisions existed anciently among these Canaanites: these were those of the interior of Palestine, and the tribes inhabiting the sea-coast, Phoenicia proper. By degrees three special tribes, more powerful than the rest, formed, as it were, the nucleus around which the multitude of minor ones gathered and became one nationality, viz. the inhabitants of Sidon, of Tyre, and of Aradus. Three principal elements are to be distinguished, according to classical evidence (Cato, comp. *Serv. ad En.* 4:682), in the constitution of Phoenician states: 1. The aristocracy, consisting of certain families of noble lineage, which were divided into tribes (**fbç**), families (**hj pçm**, Phoen. **˘ybj**), and *gentes* (**twba tyb**), the last generally of the number of 300 in each state or colony. Out of the "tribes" were elected thirty *principes* (Phoen. **br**), who formed a supreme senate; besides which there existed another larger representative assembly of 300 members, chosen from the *gentes*. 2. The lower estates of the people, or "plebs" itself, who do not seem to have had their recognised

special representatives, but by constant opposition, which sometimes broke out in open violence, held the nobles in check. 3. The kingdom, at first hereditary, afterwards became elective. Nor must the priesthood be forgotten; one of the most powerful elements in the Phoenician commonwealth, and which in some provinces even assumed, in the person of the highpriest, the supreme rule. There was a kind of federal union between the different states, which, according to their importance, sent either their kings or their judges, at the head of a large number of their senators, to the general councils of the nation, held at stated periods either at Sidon or Tyre. The colonies were governed much as the home-country, except that local affairs and the executive were intrusted to two (annual, as it would seem) judges (μυφρωϚ, suffetes) elected by the senate — an institution which for some time also replaced the monarchical form in Tyre. When Tripolis was founded by Tyre, Sidon, and Aradus, as a place of joint meeting for their hegemony, every one of these cities sent 100 senators to watch her special interests at the common meeting; and the senate of Sidon seems, in the 4th century B.C., at least, to have consisted of 500 to 600 elders, some of whom were probably selected more for their wealth than for their noble lineage. The king sometimes combined in his person the office of highpriest. The turbulent seething mass of the people, consisting of the poorer families of Phoenician descent, the immigrants of neighboring tribes, the strangers, and the whole incongruous mass of workmen, tradespeople, sailors, that must have abounded in a commercial and maritime nation like the Phoenicians, and out of whose midst must have arisen at times influential men enough — was governed, as far as we can learn, as "constitutionally" as possible. The unruly spirits were got rid of in Roman fashion somehow in the colonies, or were made silent by important places being intrusted to their care, under strict supervision from home. Only once or twice do we hear of violent popular outbreaks, in consequence of one of which it was mockingly said that Phoenicia had lost all her aristocracy, and what existed of Phoenicians was of the lowest birth, the offspring of slaves. As the wealth of all the world accumulated more and more in the Phoenician ports, luxury) and too great a desire to rest and enjoy their wealth in peace, induced the dauntless old pirates to intrust the guard of their cities to the mariners and mercenary soldiers, to Libyans and Lydians — "they of Persia and of Lud and of Phut," as Ezekiel has it; although the wild resistance which this small territory offered in her single towns to the enormous armies of Assyria, Babylonia and Greece shows that the old spirit had not died out. The smaller states were sometimes so

much oppressed by Tyre that they preferred rather to submit to external enemies (comp. Heeren, *Ideen*, etc., page 15 sq.; Beck, *Anleitung zur genaueren Kenntniss der Welt- und Volkergeschichte*, page 252 sq., and 581 sq.).

3. History. — One of the most powerful and important nations of antiquity, Phoenicia has yet left but poor information regarding her history. According to Josephus, every city in Phoenicia had its collection of registers and public documents (comp. Targum to Kirjath-Jearim, ~~Chron.~~ Judges 1:11, 15). Out of these, Menander of Ephesus, and Dias, a Phoenician, compiled two histories of Tyre, a few fragments of which have survived (comp. Josephus, *Contra Ap.* 1:17, 18; *Ant.* 8:5, 3; 13:1 sq.; 9:14, 2; Theophil. *Ad Autol.* 3:22; Syncellus, *Chron.* page 182). Sanchoniatho is said to have written a history of Phoenicia and Egypt, which was recast by Philo of Byblus, under the reign of Hadrian, and from his work Porphyrius (4th century A.D.) took some cosmogonical quotations, which found their way into Eusebius (*Praep. Evang.* 1:10). Later Phoenician historians' works (Theodotus, Hesycrates, Moschos, mentioned as authors on Phoenicia by Tatianus, *Contra Grcecos*, § 37) are likewise lost. Gesenius mentions, in his *Monumenta Phoenicia* (page 363 sq.), some later Phoenician authors, who do not touch upon historical subjects. Thus nothing remains but a few casual notices in the Bible, some of the Church fathers, and classical writers (Josephus, Syncellus, Herodotus, Diodorus, Justin), which happen to throw some light upon the history of that long-lost commonwealth. A great part of this history, however, being identical with that of the cities mentioned, in which by turns the hegemony was vested, fuller information will be found under their special headings. The names of the kings from Hiram to Pygmalion are preserved by Josephus (*Apion*, 1:18) in a fragment from the history of Tyre by Menander of Ephesus. We give them, with the computations of the reigns by Movers (*ut sup.* II, 1:140, 143, 149), Duncker (*Gesch. des Alterthums* [3d ed. Berl. 1863-7], 1:526 sq.), and Hitzig (*Urgesch. und Mythol. der Philistber*, page 191). See also Herzog, *Encyklop.* 11:620 sq.

Name.	Menander.	Movers.	Duncker.	Hitzig.
Hiram I	34 years	980-947	1021-991.	1031-997
Balcazar....	7 (17) years	946-940	991-994	997-990
Abdastartus	9 years	939-931	974-965	990-981
Unknown ..	12 years	930-919	965-953	981-969

Astartus....	12 years	918-907	953-941	969-957
Astaryimus.	9 years	906-898	941-932	957-948
Pheles.....	8 months			
Ithobal	32 (12) years	897-866	931-898	948-916
Balezorus..	6 (8, 18) years	865-858	898-890	916-910
Myttonus...	9 (25, 12) years	857-833	890-861	910-901
Pygmalion.	47 (40,48) years	832-785	861-813	900-853

Broadly speaking, we may begin to date Phoenician history from the time when Sidon first assumed the rule, or about B.C. 1500. Up to that time it was chiefly the development of the immense internal resources, and the commencement of that gigantic trade that was destined soon to overspread the whole of the then known world, which seem to have occupied the attention of the early and peaceful settlers. The symbolical representative of their political history during that period is El, or Belitan, builder of cities, supreme and happy ruler of men. The conquest of Canaan by the Israelites marks a new epoch, of which lists of kings were still extant in late Greek times. We now hear first of Sidonian colonies, while the manufactures and commerce of the country seem to have reached a high renown throughout the neighboring lands. The Israelites drove out Sidonian settlers from Laish, near the sources of the Jordan. Somewhat later (beginning of 13th century), Sidonian colonization spread farther west, founding the (island) city of Tyre, and Citium and Hippo on the coast of Africa. About 1209, however, Sidon was defeated by the king of Askalon, and Tyre, assuming the ascendancy, ushered in a third period, during which Phoenicia reached the summit of her greatness. At this time, chiefly under the brilliant reign of Hiram, we hear also of a close alliance with the Israelites, which eventually led to common commercial enterprises at sea. After Hiram's death, however, political dissensions began to undermine the unparalleled peace and power of the country. His four sons ruled, with certain interruptions, for short periods, and the crown was then assumed by Ethbaal, the father of Jezebel. His grandson, Mattan, left the throne to his two children, Pygmialion and Dido (Elissa). The latter, having been excluded from power by her brother, left the country, together with some of the aristocratic families, and founded Carthage (New-Town), about B.C. 813. Of the century that followed, little further is known save

occasional allusions in Joel and Amos, which tell of the piratical commerce of Tyrians and Sidonians. Assyrian, Chaldean, Egyptian invasions followed each other in turns during the last phase of Phoenician history, dating from the 8th century, and soon reduced the flourishing country to insignificance. Deeds of prowess, such as the thirteen years' siege sustained by Tyre against overwhelming forces, could not save the doomed country. Her fleet destroyed, her colonies wrested from her or in a state of open rebellion, torn by inner factions, Phoenicia was ultimately (together with what had been once Nebuchadnezzar's empire) embodied with Persia B.C. 538. Once more, however, exasperated by the enormous taxes imposed upon them, chiefly during the Greek war, together with other galling measures issued by the successive satraps, the Phoenicians, under the leadership of Sidon, took part in the revolution of Egypt against Artaxerxes Mnemon and Ochus, about the middle of the 4th century B.C., which ended very unhappily for them. Sidon, the only city that refused to submit at once at the approach of the Persian army, was conquered, the citizens themselves setting fire to it, and more than 40,000 people perished in the flames. Although rebuilt and repopled shortly afterwards, it yet never again reached its ancient grandeur, and to Tyre belonged the hegemony, until she, too, had to submit, after a seven years' siege, to Alexander, who through the battle on the Issus (B.C. 333) had made all Phoenicia his as part and parcel of the gigantic Persian empire. Under Antiochus the Great, all except Sidon became subject to Seleucidian sway. Pompey, incorporating Phoenicia with Syria (B.C. 65), made it a Roman province. During the civil wars of Rome, when Cassius divided Syria into small provinces, and sold them separately, Tyre again became for a short period a principality, with a king of its own. Cleopatra in her turn received Phoenicia as a present from Antony. What shadow of independence was still left to the two ancient cities was taken from them by Augustus (A.D. 20). Tyre, however, retained much of her previous importance as an emporium and a manufacturing place through the various vicissitudes of Syrian history during the sixteen centuries that followed, until the Ottoman Turks conquered the country, and the opening up of the New World on the one hand, and of a new route to Asia on the other, destroyed the last remnant of the primitive grandeur of one of the most mighty empires of the ancient world, and one which has contributed one of the largest shares to the civilization of all mankind.

4. Occupations. — Commerce and colonization were the elements by which this grandeur was chiefly accomplished. Regarding the former, we have already hinted at the overflowing wealth and almost unparalleled variety of home products which this small country furnished forth, and which, far too abundant for their own consumption, easily suggested the idea of exportation and traffic of exchange. Their happy maritime position further enabled them to do that which Egypt and Assyria, with all their perfection of industry and art, were debarred from doing; partly, it is true, through their isolated habits and narrow laws, but chiefly by the natural limits of their countries. To Phoenicia alone it was given to supply the link that was to connect the East with the West, or at least with Europe and Western Africa. Communicating by means of Arabia and the Persian Gulf with India and the coast of Africa towards the equator; and on the north, along the Euxine, with the borders of Scythia, beyond the Strait of Gibraltar, with Britannia, if not with the Baltic, their commerce divides itself into different great branches according to those natural highways. From the countries on the Persian Gulf and the Red Sea, the coasts of Arabia, Africa, and India, they exported spice, precious stones, myrrh, frankincense, gold, ivory, ebony, steel, and iron, and from Egypt embroidered linen and corn. In exchange they brought not only their own raw produce and manufactures, but gums and resins for embalming, also wine and spices. From Mesopotamia and Syria came the emeralds and corals of the Red Sea; from Babylon the manifold embroideries; wine and fine wool from Aleppo and the Mesopotamian plains; from Judaea the finest wheat, grape-honey, oil, and balm. Another remote region, Armenia, furnished troops of riding and chariot horses and mules; and this same country, or, rather, the south-eastern coast of the Euxine, further furnished the Phoenician emporiums with slaves of a superior market-value-for pirating and slave-dealing went hand in hand with their maritime calling-with copper, lead, brass (or ichalcum), and tunnies, which they also fetched, together with conger-eels, from the Atlantic coast. Their extensive early commerce with Greece is frequently alluded to in Homer, and is further shown by the remarkable fact of the abundance of Shemitic or Phoenician words in Greek for such things as precious stones, fine garments, vessels, spices, and Eastern plants in general, musical instruments, weights and measures, etc. (comp. *μύρρα*, *rm*; *κίονναμον*, *ῶμνηq*; *κάννα*, *hq*; *λίβανος*, *hnl* ; *χαλβάνη*, galbanum, : *hnl j* ; *νάρδος*, *dri*; *σάμφορος* *ryrç* ; *ἴασπις*, *hrçy* ; *βύσσος*, */wb*;

κάρπασος, sprk;νάβλα, l bn; τύμπανον, āt; σαμβύκη, akbs; κύπρος, rpk; ὕσσωπος, bwza; κιβώριον, rwrk; σάκκος, qç; χάρτις; δέλτος, fdj; ἄρραβών, ^wbr [; μνᾶ, hnm; κάβος, bq; δραχμή, ^wmkrd; κόρος, rk, etc.). Beyond the Strait, along the north and west coast of Africa, they received skins of deer, lions, panthers, domestic cattle, elephants' skins and teeth, Egyptian alabaster, castrated swine, Attic pottery and cups, probably also gold. Yet the most fabulously rich mines of metals such as silver, iron, lead, tin — they found in Tartessus. So extensive and proverbial was this commerce that we enumerate its elements in detail.

Picture for Phoenicia (1)

The position of Phoenicia, as we have seen, was most favorable for the exchange of the produce of the East and West. Persians, Lydians, and Lycians frequently served as mercenaries in the Phoenician armies (³²⁷⁰Ezekiel 27:10, 11). Phoenicia exported wine to Egypt (Herod. 3:5, 6). Purple garments were best manufactured in Tyre (Amati, *De Restitutione Purpurarum*, 3d ed. Casenee, 1784). Glass was made in Sidon and Sarepta (comp. Heeren, page 86 sq.; Beck, page 593 sq.). In Phoenicia was exchanged the produce of all known countries. After David had vanquished the Edomites and conquered the coasts of the Red Sea, king Hiram of Tyre entered into a confederacy with Solomon, by which he insured for his people the right of navigation to India. The combined fleet of the Israelites and Phoenicians sailed from the seaports of Ezion-geber and Elath. These ports were situated on the eastern branch of the Red Sea, the Sinus Elaniticus, or Gulf of Akabah. Israelitish-Phoenician mercantile expeditions proceeded to Ophir, perhaps Abhira, situated at the mouth of the Indus (comp. Lassen, *Indische Alterthumskunde* [Bonn, 1844], 1:537 sq.). It seems, however, that the Indian coasts in general were also called Ophir. Three years were required in order to accomplish a mercantile expedition to Ophir and to return with cargoes of gold, algum-wood, ivory, silver, monkeys, peacocks, and other Indian produce. Some names of these products are Indian transferred into Hebrew, as **μygm̄l a**, *almuggim*, Sanscr. *valgu*, or, according to the Decanic pronunciation, *valgum*; **μyBA^ç**, *shen-habbim* (ivory), Sanscr. **āwq**; ' *koph* (ape), Sanscr. *kapi*; **μyykw̄t**, *tukkiyim* (peacock), Sanscr. *cikhi*, according to the Decanic pronunciation (comp. ¹⁰²⁷1 Kings 9:27; 10:11, 22). **SEE OPHIR**. It seems,

however, that these mercantile expeditions to India were soon given up, probably on account of the great difficulty of navigating the Red Sea. King Jehoshaphat endeavored to recommence these expeditions, but his fleet was wrecked at Ezion-geber (^{~1228}1 Kings 22:48). The names of mercantile establishments on the coasts of Arabia along the Persian Gulf have partly been preserved to the present day. In these places the Phoenicians exchanged the produce of the West for that of India, Arabia, and Ethiopia. Arabia especially furnished incense, gold, and precious stones. The Midianites (^{~0378}Genesis 37:28) and the Edomites (^{~3276}Ezekiel 27:16) effected the transit by their caravans. The fortified Idumaeen town Petra probably contained the storehouses in which the produce of southern countries was collected. From Egypt the Phoenicians exported especially byssus (verse 7) for wine. According to an ancient tradition, the tyrant of Thebes, Busiris, having soiled his hands with the blood of all foreigners, was killed by the Tyrian Hercules. This indicates that Phoenician colonists established themselves and their civilization successfully in Upper Egypt, where all strangers had usually been persecuted. At a later period Memphis was the place where, most of the Phoenicians in Egypt were established. Phoenician inscriptions found in Egypt prove that even under the Ptolemies the intimate connection between Phoenicia and Egypt still existed (comp. Gesenii *Monumenta Phoenicia*, 13:224 sq.). From Palestine the Phoenicians imported, besides wheat, especially from Judaea, ivory, oil, and balm; also wool, principally from the neighboring nomadic Arabs. Damascus furnished wine (^{~3276}Ezekiel 27:5, 6, 17, 18, 21), and the mountains of Syria wood. The tribes about the shores of the Caspian Sea furnished slaves and iron; for instance, the Tibaraeans (**l bwt**, Tubal) and Moschi (**vm**, Meshech). Horsemen, horses, and mules came from the Armenians (**hmrgt**, Togarmah) (see Heeren, pages 86-130). The treasures of the East were exported from Phoenicia by ships which sailed first to Cyprus. the mountains of which are visible from the Phoenician coast. Citium was a Phoenician colony in Cyprus, the name of which was transferred to the whole of Cyprus, and even to some neighboring islands and coasts called **pytk** (^{~0104}Genesis 10:4; ^{~2201}Isaiah 23:1, 12). Hence also **pytj**, the name of a Canaanitish or Phoenician tribe (Gesenii *Monumenta Phoenicia*, page 153). Cyprus was subject to Tyre up to the time of Alexander the Great. There are still found Phoenician inscriptions which prove the connection of Cyprus with Tyre. At Rhodes (**pyndr**) also are found vestiges of Phoenician influence. From Rhodes the mountains of

Crete are visible. This was of great importance for the direction of navigators, before the discovery of the compass. In Crete, and also in the Cycladic and Sporadic Isles, are the vestiges of Phoenician settlements. On the Isle of Thasos, on the southern coast of Thrace, the Phoenicians had gold-mines; and even on the southern shores of the Black Sea they had factories. However, when the Greeks became more powerful, the Phoenicians sailed more in other directions. They occupied also Sicily and the neighboring islands, but were, after the Greek colonization, confined to a few towns, Motya, Soloes, Panormus (Thucydides, 6:2). The Phoenician mercantile establishments in Sardinia and the Balearic Isles could scarcely be called colonies. Carthage was a Phoenician colony, which probably soon became important by commerce with the interior of Africa, and remained connected with Tyre by means of a common sanctuary. After Phoenicia had been vanquished by the Assyrians, Babylonians, and Persians, the settlements in Sicily, Sardinia, and Spain came into the power of Carthage. The Phoenicians had for a long period exported from Spain gold, silver, tin, iron, lead (^{𐤀𐤃𐤏𐤃}Ezekiel 38:13), fruit, wine, oil, wax, fish, and wool. Their chief settlement was Tarshish, **vyvrt**, *subjection*, from the root **vvr**, *he vanquished, subjected*. The Aramaeans pronounced **vytrt** ; hence the Greek *Tartessos*. This was probably the name of a town situated to the west of the Pillars of Hercules (Calpe and Abyla, now Gibraltar and Ceuta), and even more west than Gades, at the mouth of the Baetis (Herod. 4:62; Scymnus Chius, 5:161 sq.). This river was also called Tartessus (Arist. *Meteor.* 1:13; Pausan. 6:19, 3; Strabo, 3, page 148). At a later period the town of Tartessus obtained likewise the Phoenician name Carteja, from **trq**, *town* (Strabo, 3, page 151). There are other names of towns in Spain which have a Phoenician derivation: Gades, **rdg**, *septum, fence* (comp. Gesenii *Monumenta Phoenicia*, page 304 sq., 349); Malaga (**j l m**), on account of much salt fish thence exported; or, according to Gesenius (*id.* page 312 sq., and 353), from **hkl mAhkal m**, *officinae abrorum*, iron-works, or manufactory of other metals, on account of the mines to be found there; Belon, **hl [b]**, *civitas, city* (*id.* page 311 sq., and 348). The voyage to Tarshish was the most important of those undertaken by the Phoenicians. Hence it was that their largest vessels were all called *ships of Tarshish*, although they sailed in other directions (^{𐤀𐤏𐤏𐤃}1 Kings 10:22). It appears also that the Phoenicians exported tin from the British Isles, and amber from the coasts of Prussia. Their voyages on the western

coasts of Africa seem to have been merely voyages of discovery, without permanent results. The Spanish colonies were probably the principal sources of Phoenician wealth, and were founded at a very remote period. The migration of the Phoenician, Cadmus, into Bceotia likewise belongs to the earlier period of Phoenician colonization. Homer seems to know little of the Sidonian commerce; which fact may be explained by supposing that the Phoenicians avoided all collision and competition with the increasing power of the Greeks, and preferred to direct their voyages into countries where such competition seemed to be improbable. Herodotus describes the Phoenicians as beginning soon after their settlement to occupy themselves in distant voyages (1:1). From the construction of rude rafts, they must speedily have reached to a style of substantial ship-building. Their commercial vessels are represented either as long in shape, and fitted both for sailing and being rowed with fifty oars — “ships of Tarshish;” or as rounder in form, and more capacious in stowage, but slower in speed — tubs or coasting-vessels — bearers of cargo on short voyages. Xenophon (*Economics*, 8) passes a high eulogy on a Phoenician ship — “the greatest quantity of tackling was disposed separately in the smallest stowage.” Their merchantmen also carried arms for defence, and had figures on their prows, which the Greeks named *πύταικοι*. They steered by the Cynosure, or the last star in Ursa Minor; and they could cast reckonings, from the combined application of astronomy and arithmetic (Strabo, 16:2, 24). This nautical application of astronomy is ascribed by Callimachus to Thales, a Phoenician by descent (*Frag.* ed. Blomfield, page 213; Diog. Laert. Thales). Lebanon supplied them with abundance of timber, and Cyprus gave them all necessary equipments, from the keel to the topsails — “a fundamento ipso carinee ad supremos ipsos carbasos” (Amm. Marcell. 14:8-14). These daring Phoenician navigators in the reign of Pharaoh — Necho circumnavigated Africa — departing from the Red Sea and returning by the Strait of Gibraltar. They reported that in sailing round Libya they had the sun on their right hand — a story of which Herodotus says, “I, for my part, do not believe them,” and yet it is the positive proof that they had gone round the Cape (Herod. 4:42). Diodorus speaks also of Phoenician mariners — being driven westwards beyond the Pillars of Hercules into the ocean, and reaching at length a very fertile and beautiful island — “a dwelling of gods rather than of men” — one probably of the Azores or Canary Islands. The Phoenicians furnished to Xerxes 300 ships, but they were defeated at Salamis. It is said that of all the nations employed in digging the famous canal across the isthmus of Athos, they alone had

sufficient engineering skill to begin its banks on their section at a slope, and thus prevent caving in (7:23). The remote periods of Phoenician commerce and colonization are wrapped in myths. Phoenician ships may have first carried the produce of Assyria and Egypt but their own wares and manufactures were soon largely exported by them (Ezekiel 28). The commerce of Tyre reached through the world (Strabo, 3:5, 11). There was also a great trade in the tunny fisheries, and the Tyrians sold fish in Jerusalem (^{<46316>}Nehemiah 13:16). Phoenicia excelled in the manufacture of the purple dye extracted from the shell-fish murex, so abundant on parts of its coasts. This color in its richest hue was at length appropriated to imperial use, and the silk so dyed was of extraordinary value. The glass of Sidon was no less famous than the Tyrian dye — the fine white sand used for the process being very abundant near Mount Carmel. Glass has been found in Nineveh, and glass-blowing is figured at Beni-Hassan in Egypt. The art might have come from Egypt, but the discovery in Phoenicia is represented as accidental. The pillar of emerald shining brightly in the night, which Herodotus speaks of as being in the temple of Hercules, was probably a hollow cylinder of glass with a lamp within it (Kenrick, *Phenicia*, page 249). Phoenicia produced also drinking-cups of silver and gold. Homer describes Sidon as abounding in works of brass. Its building-stone was not of very good quality, but cedar-wood was largely employed. When stone was used the joints were bevelled — a practice which also characterizes Hebrew architecture, and gives it a panelled appearance. The mining operations of the Phoenicians were also celebrated. Herodotus says they turned a mountain over ἐν τῇ ζήτησει — in the search for gold. Mines were wrought in the various colonies — in the Grecian islands and in Spain — by processes much the same as those employed in more modern times. The marine knowledge and experience of Phoenicia led to the plantation of numerous colonies in Cyprus, Rhodes, Cilicia, and the islands of the AEgean—the Cyclades and Sporades (Thucyd. 1:8) — in Sicily, in Sardinia, the Balearic Islands, and in Spain. Strabo says that the Phoenicians possessed the best parts of Iberia before the days of Homer (3:22, 14). One principal colony was in Northern Africa, and Strabo asserts that they occupied the middle part of Africa soon after the Trojan war. The story of Dido and the foundation of Carthage is well known, the event being placed by some in B.C. 813. Byrsa, the name of the hill on which the city was built, denotes a fortress, being ἡρξβ; (Bozrah), the name also of the Idumaeon capital; though its Greek form, Βύρσα, gave rise to the story about the purchase of as much land as a hide would measure. Carthage

means "new town" (**hçdj trq**), and *Punici* is only another spelling of *Phuonici*. Intercourse with many strange and untutored races led the Phoenicians to indulge in fictions, and love of gain taught them mercantile deceits and stratagems. "Phoenician figment" — **ψεῦσμα φοινικικόν** — or a traveller's tale, was proverbial in former times, *likefides Punica* at a later period (Strabo, 12, page 55). The *Etymologium Magnum* bluntly **φοινικικόν** by **τὸ ψεῦδος**, the lie. In the *Odyssey* they are described as "crafty" **ναυσίκλυτοι** (*Odys.* 13:415), or as "crafty and wicked." As a trading nation they were ready sometimes to take advantage of the ignorant and savage tribes with which they bartered, and they cared nothing for law or right on the high seas, where no power could control or punish; so that Ulysses uses the phrase **Φοῖνιξ ἀνὴρ ἀρατήλια εἰδὼς τρώκτης**, "a Phoenician man knowing deceitful things — crafty" (*id.* 14:285). The term "Canaan," "Canaanite," or "man of Canaan," the native name of the Phoenician, is sometimes rendered "merchant" in the English version (**ἄρτι** Isaiah 23:8; **ἄρτι** Zephaniah 1:11; **ἄρτι** Job 41:6; **ἄρτι** Proverbs 31:24; **ἄρτι** Zechariah 14:21; **ἄρτι** Hosea 12:7; **ἄρτι** Ezekiel 17:4). "Phoenician" and "merchant" were thus interchangeable terms; so that **Φοῖνιξ γίνομαι** means, "I become a trader." But the phrase seems to have sunk in moral meaning, and trader was but another name for a hucksterer, or a pedler going from house to house, as in **ἄρτι** Proverbs 31:24. Nay, the prophet Hosea (12:7) says, "He is a Canaanite," or "Phenician," or "as for Canaan, the balances of deceit are in his hand: he loveth to oppress. And Ephraim said, Yet am I become rich, I have found me out substance." A common proverb expressive of fraud matching fraud was **Σύροι πρὸς Φοῖνικας**. No coined money of Phoenicia is extant prior to its subjugation by the Greeks. The standard seems to have been the same as the Jewish; the shekel being equal to the Attic tetradrachm; and the *zuz*, which occurs on the tablet of Marseilles, being of the value of a denarius. On the same tablet *keseph* (silver) occurs, with the probable ellipse of "shekel," as in Hebrew. Foreign silver money (**rz**) is also there referred to. Among the antiquities dug up in Nineveh are several bronze weights in the form of lions; having both cuneiform legends with the name of Sennacherib, and also Phoenician or cursive Shemitic inscriptions (Layard, *Nin. and Bab.* page 601). The *cor* was a Phoenician measure, the same as the Hebrew chomer, and holding ten Attic metretes. each metretes being equal to about ten and a half gallons. The arithmetical notation was carried out by making simple strokes for the units; 10 was a horizontal stroke or a semicircle, and 100

was a special sign, the unit strokes added to it denoting additional hundreds (*Gesenii Monumenta Phoenicia*, page 85).

It appears almost incredible how, with the comparatively small knowledge of natural science which we must attribute to them, the Phoenicians could thus on their frail rafts traverse the wide seas almost from one end of the globe to the other, with apparently no more difficulty than their inland caravans, their chapmen and dealers, found in traversing the neighboring countries. Yet it must not, on the other hand, be forgotten that theirs appears to have been an uncommon knowledge of astronomy and physical geography — witness their almost scientifically planned voyage of discovery under Hiram — and that, above all, an extraordinary amount of practical sense, of boldness, shrewdness, unscrupulousness, untiring energy, and happy genius, went far to replace some of the safe contrivances with which modern discoveries have made our mariners familiar. These qualities also made and kept them the unrivalled masters of ancient commerce and navigation. They were, moreover, known rather to destroy their own ships and endanger their lives than let others see their secret way and enterprise; and it would be very surprising if theirs had not been also the greatest discoveries, the greatest riches and splendor and power for many a long century, though they owned but a small strip of country at home. Well might Tyre once say, "I am of perfect beauty" (^{<277B>}Ezekiel 27:3), and the prophet address Sidon, "Behold, thou art wiser than Daniel, there is no secret they can hide from thee: with thy wisdom and thine understanding thou hast gotten thee riches, and hast gotten gold and silver into thy treasures: by thy great wisdom and by thy traffic hast thou increased thy riches, and thine heart is lifted up because of thy riches" (28:3-5). There can, indeed, not be fancied a fuller and more graphic account of the state of Phoenicia, especially as regards her commercial relations, than the two chapters of Ezekiel (27 and 28) containing the lamentation on Tyre: which, indeed, form our chief information on this point.

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

(1.) Up to the time of David, not one of the twelve tribes seems to have possessed a single harbor on the sea-coast: it was impossible, therefore, that they could become a commercial people. It is true that according to ^{<001B>}Judges 1:31, combined with ^{<069B>}Joshua 19:26, Accho or Acre, with its

excellent harbor, had been assigned to the tribe of Asher; but from the same passage in Judges it seems certain that the tribe of Asher did not really obtain the possession of Acre, which continued to be held by the Canaanites. However wistfully, therefore, the Israelites might regard the wealth accruing to their neighbors the Phoenicians from trade, to vie with them in this respect was out of the question. But from the time that David had conquered Edom, an opening for trade was afforded to the Israelites. The command of Ezion-geber, near Elath, in the land of Edom, enabled them to engage in the navigation of the Red Sea. As they were novices, however, at sailing, as the navigation of the Red Sea, owing to its currents, winds, and rocks, is dangerous even to modern sailors, and as the Phoenicians, during the period of the independence of Edom, were probably allowed to trade from Ezion-geber, it was politic in Solomon to permit the Phoenicians of Tyre to have docks and build ships at Ezion-geber on condition that his sailors and vessels might have the benefit of their experience. The results seem to have been strikingly successful. The Jews and Phoenicians made profitable voyages to Ophir in Arabia or India, whence gold was imported into Judaea in large quantities; and once in three years still longer voyages were made, by vessels which may possibly have touched at Ophir, though their imports were not only gold, but likewise silver, ivory, apes, and peacocks (^{1 Kings 10:22). *SEE TARSHISH.* There seems at the same time to have been a great direct trade with the Phoenicians for cedar-wood (verse 27), and generally the wealth of the kingdom reached an unprecedented point. If the union of the tribes had been maintained, the whole sea-coast of Palestine would have afforded additional sources of revenue through trade; and perhaps even ultimately the "great plain of Sidon" itself might have formed part of the united empire. But if any possibilities of this kind existed, they were destroyed by the disastrous secession of the ten tribes; a heavy blow from which the Hebrew race has never yet recovered during a period of nearly 3000 years.}

(2.) After the division into two kingdoms, the curtain falls on any commercial relation between the Israelites and Phoenicians until a relation is brought to notice, by no means brotherly, as in the fleets which navigated the Red Sea, nor friendly, as between buyers and sellers, but humiliating and exasperating, as between the buyers and the bought. The relation is meant which existed between the two nations when Israelites were sold as slaves by Phoenicians. It was a custom in antiquity, when one nation went to war against another, for merchants to be present in one or other of the

hostile camps, in order to purchase prisoners of war as slaves. Thus at the time of the Maccabees, when a large army was sent by Lysias to invade and subdue the land of Judah, it is related that "the merchants of the country, hearing the fame of them, took silver and gold very much with servants, and came into the camp to buy the children of Israel for slaves" (1 Macc. 3:41); and when it is related that at the capture of Jerusalem by Antiochus Epiphanes, the enormous number of 40,000 men were slain in battle, it is added that there were "no fewer sold than slain" (2 Macc. 5:14; Credner's *Joel*, page 240). Now this practice, which is thus illustrated by details at a much later period, undoubtedly prevailed in earlier times (*Odyssey*, 15:427; Herod. 1:1), and is alluded to in a threatening manner against the Phoenicians by the prophets (²⁰⁰Joel 3:4, and Amos 1:9, 10), about B.C. 800. The circumstances which led to this state of things may be thus explained. After the division of the two kingdoms there is no trace of any friendly relations between the kingdom of Judah and the Phoenicians: the interest of the latter rather led them to cultivate the friendship of the kingdom of Israel; and the Israelitish king, Ahab, had a Sidonian princess as his wife (¹¹⁶⁵1 Kings 16:31). Now, not improbably in consequence of these relations, when Jehoshaphat, king of Judah, endeavored to restore the trade of the Jews in the Red Sea, and for this purpose built large ships at Ezion-geber to go to Ophir for gold, he did not admit the Phoenicians to any participation in the venture, and when king Ahaziah, Ahab's son, asked to have a share in it, his request was distinctly refused (22:48,49). That attempt to renew the trade of the Jews in the Red Sea failed, and in the reign of Jehoram, Jehoshaphat's son, Edom revolted from Judah and established its independence; so that if the Phoenicians wished to despatch trading-vessels from Ezion-geber, Edom was the power which it was mainly their interest to conciliate, and not Judah. Under these circumstances the Phoenicians seem, not only to have purchased and to have sold again as slaves, and probably in some instances to have kidnapped inhabitants of Judah, but even to have sold them to their enemies the Edomites (Joel, Amos, as above). This was regarded with reason as a departure from the old brotherly covenant, when Hiram was a great lover of David, and subsequently had the most friendly commercial relations with David's son; and this may be considered as the original foundation of the hostility of the Hebrew prophets towards Phoenician Tyre (Isaiah 23; Ezekiel 28).

(3.) The only other notice in the Old Testament of trade between the Phoenicians and the Israelites is in the account given by the prophet Ezekiel of the trade of Tyre (^{<3271>}Ezekiel 27:17). While this account supplies valuable information respecting the various commercial dealings of that most illustrious of Phoenician cities, *SEE TYRE*, it likewise makes direct mention of the exports to it from Palestine. These were wheat, honey (i.e., sirup of grapes), oil, and balm. The export of wheat deserves attention [concerning the other exports, *SEE BALM*; *SEE HONEY*; *SEE OIL*,] because it shows how important it must have been to the Phoenicians to maintain friendly relations with their Hebrew neighbors, and especially with the adjoining kingdom of Israel. The wheat is called wheat of Minnith (q.v.), which was a town of the Ammonites, on the other side of the Jordan, only once mentioned elsewhere in the Bible: and it is not certain whether Minnith was a great inland emporium, where large purchases of corn were made, or whether the wheat in its neighborhood was peculiarly good, and gave its name to all wheat of a certain fineness in quality. Still, whatever may be the correct explanation respecting Minnith, the only countries specified for exports of wheat are Judah and Israel, and it was through the territory of Israel that the wheat would be imported into Phoenicia. It is suggested by Heeren (in his *Historical Researches*, 2:117) that the fact of Palestine being thus, as it were, the granary of Phoenicia, explains in the clearest manner the lasting peace that prevailed between the two countries. He observes that with many of the other adjoining nations the Jews lived in a state of almost continual warfare; but that they never once engaged in hostilities with their nearest neighbors the Phoenicians. The fact itself is certainly worthy of special notice; and is the more remarkable, as there were not wanting tempting occasions for the interference of the Phoenicians in Palestine if they desired it. When Elijah at the brook Kishon, at the distance of not more than thirty miles in a straight line from Tyre, put to death 450 prophets of Baal (^{<1184>}1 Kings 18:40), we can well conceive the agitation and anger which such a deed must have produced at Tyre. At Sidon, more especially, which was only twenty miles farther distant from the scene of slaughter, the first impulse of the inhabitants must have been to march forth at once in battle array to strengthen the hands of Jezebel, their own princess, in behalf of Baal, their Phoenician god. When again afterwards, by means of falsehood and treachery, Jehu was enabled to massacre the worshippers of Baal in the land of Israel, we cannot doubt that the intelligence was received in Tyre, Sidon, and the other cities of Phoenicia, with a similar burst of horror and

indignation to that with which the news of the massacre on St. Bartholomew's day was received in all Protestant countries; and there must have been an intense desire in the Phoenicians, if they had the power, to invade the territories of Israel without delay and inflict signal chastisement on Jehu (^{<12018>}2 Kings 10:18-28). The fact that Israel was their granary would undoubtedly have been an element in restraining the Phoenicians, even on occasions such as these; but probably still deeper motives were likewise at work. It seems to have been part of the settled policy of the Phoenician cities to avoid attempts to make conquests on the continent of Asia. For this there were excellent reasons in the position of their small territory, which, with the range of Lebanon on one side as a barrier, and the sea on the other, was easily defensible by a wealthy power having command of the sea, against second or third rate powers, but for the same reason was not well situated for offensive war on the land side. It may be added that a pacific policy was their manifest interest as a commercial nation, unless by war they were morally certain to obtain an important accession of territory, or unless a warlike policy was an absolute necessity to prevent the formidable preponderance of any one great neighbor. At last, indeed, they even carried their system of non-intervention in continental wars too far, if it would have been possible for them by any alliances in Syria and Coele-Syria to prevent the establishment on the other side of the Lebanon of one great empire. For from that moment their ultimate doom was certain, and it was merely a question of *time* as to the arrival of the fatal hour when they would lose their independence. But too little is known of the details of their history to warrant an opinion as to whether they might at any time by any course of policy have raised up a barrier against the empire of the Assyrians or Chaldees. *SEE* *COMMERCE*.

The impulse given to industry and the arts by this almost unparalleled extension of the commercial sphere of the Phoenicians was enormous. Originally exporters or traders only for the wares of Egypt and Assyria, they soon began to manufacture these wares themselves, and drew the whole world into their circle of commerce. As to the early and most extensive commercial intercourse between Phoenicia and Greece and her colonies, nothing can be more striking than the circumstance of nearly all the Greek names for the principal objects of Oriental commerce being Phoenician, or rather Shemitic; identical, almost, with the terms found in the Old Testament. The descriptions of the abundance of precious metals

verge on the fabulous. Thus, the Phoenicians are supposed to have made even their anchors of silver, when they first discovered the mines, not knowing how to stow away all the silver in their vessel. What must have been the state of these mines is clear from the fact that even in the Roman time 40,000 men were constantly employed as miners, and the state received a clear revenue of 20,500 drachms daily. The "Fortunate Islands," which, according to Diodorus, they discovered after many days' sailing along the coast of Africa, beyond the Pillars of Hercules, and which, to judge from the name *Purpurariae* given to some islands off the coast of Mauritania, would seem to have been the Canaries, yielded them the shell-fish *purpura*, so useful for their dyeing manufactories. Besides their wholesale commerce carried on by fleets and caravans, they also appear to have' gone about the interior of Syria and Palestine, retailing their home or foreign produce. What degree of perfection they had reached in metallurgy may be seen in the minute description of the mining process contained in Job (~~xxx~~ Job 28:1-11), probably derived from mines which they worked in the Lebanon, Cyprus, Thasos, Iberia, Tartessus, and wherever a trace of metal was found. That they had acquired a high standing in what we should call the fine arts may be gathered from the fact that not only architects, but skilful workers of all kinds, for the adornment and embellishment of the Temple, were sent for by Solomon when he intended to fulfil the task his father David had set himself, in all the magnificence and splendor worthy of his golden reign. Their sculptures — what there has been found of them-do not, it is true. give us a very high notion of their artistic perfection; but, for all we know, these may be only the archaic beginnings, or the remnants of a corrupt age or unskilful hands. Better things may come to light any day. There certainly exist some exceedingly skilful engravings of theirs on gems among the Assyrian remnants. We further know (comp. the gold-edged silver bowl, for instance, given to Telemachus by Menelaos, which had been previously given to Hephaestos by the king of the Sidonians; the silver vase offered by Achilles as a prize at the funeral games for Patroclus; the columns and the magnificent vessels cast for the Temple of Jerusalem by Tyrian artists, and the like) that they manufactured all kinds of beautiful vessels and ornaments in gold, silver, and ivory, and knew how to extract perfumes from the lily and cypress; but, as in every other respect, they must in this province also be declared to have been only the skilful appropriators of the knowledge of others, of which, however, they made use with a diligence and perseverance entirely unparalleled.

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

5. Religion. — The same lack of genuine and authentic information, of which we have spoken before, baffles our endeavors to arrive at anything like a proper understanding of the real character of the religion of the Phcenicians. The mutilated scraps contained in classical writers can be of as little use for its full reconstruction as the uncertain allusions of the Bible. As to Sanchoniatho. extracts of whose Phoenician writings (in Philo of Byblus's Greek version) are, as has been mentioned above, supposed to have survived in Eusebius, all that can be said regarding them is that we have more than ample reasons to suspect both the author, the translator, and the Church father, not of wilful misinterpretation, but of a certain want of candor in doing that full and fair justice to both sides which we expect from a historian of our day. A few broken votive and sacrificial stones, a few coins and unshapely images, make up the rest of our sources of

information for the present. A few years hence, however, we may, if our excavations are carried on with unflagging zeal, and are as successful as they have been of late years, have as ample a supply to work upon as we have now respecting the once-hardly fifteen years ago-much more unknown land of Nebuchadnezzar and Sennacherib, if not with respect even to Greece and Rome. It will be sufficient here to indicate that Phoenician, like Canaanitic religion, in general consisted in a worship of the powers of nature under their favorable or creative (=female), and unfavorable or destroying, yet also begetting (=male) aspects. Still more concretely were these represented in the different phases of life, as child (Adonis), youth (Esmun), man (Baal-Hercules), or old man (Belitan); again, as kings (Moloch) or queens (Astarte), and other characters most fitting to the idea symbolized in them. Their chief (visible) representatives — the sun, the moon, the planets, and the elements were revered as supreme deities, who, at the same time, were also the special Numina of particular tribes; places, and seasons, and some of their general designations, such as King (**l m**), Lord (**ˆwda**), Almighty (**l a**), etc., are also found in the Bible. To the supreme class of deities (**twrwył [w μυνwył [:**) belong Baal and Astarte, with their different attributes and ramifications, e.g. Baalsamim, **μυμς l [b Ζεύς Ὀλύμπιος**, Optimus Maximus, Baalitan, Baal Ram, Baal Mon; Baal Melkarth, **atrq l m**, king of the city (Tyre); Astarte=Tanith, **tnt**, generally with the epithet **tbr**, the great one, who appears identical with the Egypto-Persian warand moon-goddess Tanaith. Corresponding to this triad in the Syro-Sidonian worship, we meet in Northern Phoenicia with the two Sidonian tribes: El (**l a**) or Kronos, the founder of Byblus and Berytus; Baaltis (**ytł [b**, my lady) Aphrodite (Astronoe, Beruth); and Adonis (Gauas, Eljun, Esmun, etc.). Besides other well-known deities, such as Moloch and Dagon (Derketo, Atergatis) — for all of which we refer to the special articles treating of them — we find a certain mysterious number of minor gods, variously denominated the strong ones (Kabiri), or the children of the Just One (Zadik, **qydx rybk**), the principal patrons of the seafarers, worshipped alike by all the Phoenician tribes (Dioscuri, Paetaci: Chusor-Phtha [Chusartis], Astarte, Cadmus [**μdq**] or Taaut, Adod, and principally Esmun [**ˆmςa** =JEsculapius]). These, together with the infernal oi Chthonic deities, Muth (**twm** =death), further a goddess known only to us as " Persephone" (daughter of Jephtha with the Samaritan Sichemites), or

Dido (**hdydn** =the wandering one), or generally Elothi= my lady, my goddess, etc., are, as far as we know at present, the chief representatives of the Phœnician Pantheon, which, be it observed by the way, appears to have been almost as catholic in the reception of foreign deities as that of imperial Rome. Like the Greeks, and after them the Romans, the Phœnicians also deified certain natural phenomena and "elements" (sun, moon, stars, water, fire, earth, air), personal attributes, abstract ideas, allegories, the seasons of life, of the year, of the day, trades and professions, and even animals; probably as symbols only at first. The serpent (Agathodaemon, Esmun, Typhon), the bull (Ashteroth-Karnaim), the lion, the ass (symbol of Shemitic Baal-worship), the dog, fishes, doves, goats, etc., are found either representing divinities, or merely sacred to them. Anything like an investigation into the various phases of Phœnician mythology, which, stretching from the remotest prehistoric days far into the first Christian centuries, must needs contain the most contradictory, apparently irreconcilable, elements and data, lies beyond the scope of this article. We shall only mention that Sanchoniatho distinguishes — a sure sign of the consciousness on the part of native writers of the hopeless confusion in the religious notions and traditions of their time — three periods or aeras, with distinct circles of deities of special classes and families. The first period contains twelve families of gods. In the second three dynasties follow each other, and there are twenty-two supreme deities (according to the letters of the Phœnician alphabet), at the head of whom stands El or Kronos, etc., as follows:

a, El, Kronos.

b Baityl. **f**, Astarte. **[**, Apollo.

g Dagon. **y**, Rhea. **p**, Pontos.

d, Atlas. **k**, Baaltis. **x**, Typhon.

h, Persephone. **l**, Heimarmeue. **q**, Nereus.

w, Athene. **m**, Hora. **r**, Sido.

z, Zeus Demarus. **n**, Kronos. **ç**, Poseidon.

j, Sadid. **s**, Zeus Belus. **t**, Hadod.

Of the third period only fragments of Sanchoniatho have come down, but it would appear as if Zeus Belus had in this assumed the chief rank, equal to Kronos of the second period. These gods and goddesses were propitiated in various ways, but chiefly by sacrifices, which consisted on certain

occasions of first-born male children (l wml ryb[h]). Prostitution (çdqz) in honor of Astarte was considered another praiseworthy act. Among the rites of sacrifice and expiation must also be enumerated circumcision, which was not practiced with all the Phoenician tribes, but seems to have been a ceremony peculiar to the worshippers of El, the special deity of Berytus and Byblus. Whether, however, as has been held, it is to be considered analogous to this prostitution of virgins in the service of Astarte, we shall not here investigate. The country abounded with places of worship, for every grove and every height, every river and every well, were adapted for the purpose, if it could be fancied a dwelling-place for some deity. *SEE IDOLATRY*. Nor were special buildings (sanctuaries, temples), with all their accessories of arks and priests, wells and fires, wanting; as indeed the Phoenicians are supposed to have been the first who erected such permanent sanctuaries. Their construction was in accordance with their destination, which was not to be houses of prayer, but the seat of honor of the special deity. They were divided into two parts, the first of which contained the statues and symbols which were the objects of public worship. The second, the Adyton, on the other hand, contained such symbols which were not to be seen constantly, but were reserved for certain special festive occasions; besides the holy arks with their mystical contents, and the holy vehicles upon which these sacred objects were carried about. The walls were covered with the symbolical representations of the deities; and in this place also the priests kept their archives. Something of the abhorrence of all visible representations of the Deity which seems in the first stages of their existence to have filled the minds of all Shemitic nations — an abhorrence erroneously taken of late to indicate their monotheistic propensity (comp. Renan's and Munk's *Inaugural Lectures*) — is also noticeable with the Phoenicians, whose gods were legion. No paintings, statues, or other likenesses of deities are recorded as found in the ancient temples of Gades, Tyre, Samaria, Paphos, etc. There were, however, certain symbolical columns of wood, $\mu\gamma\tau\alpha$ (for the female Numen, Astarte), of stone, $t\omega b x m$ (for Baal), of gold or emerald ($\mu\gamma n m j$), together with phallic representations, found in and before the Phoenician sanctuaries. Another kind of divine mementos, as it were, were the Betylia (l a tyb), probably meteors, for which a fetich-like reverence was shown, and which were called by the names of Father, Mighty Father (ba ba yrda), and at the time of Augustine there were still a number of priests engaged in Punic Africa to wait upon these idols and to elicit

oracles from them (Eucaddirs). Among the principal festivals, with some of which, as with those of the Hebrews, were connected pilgrimages -from the farthest colonies even are the "awakening" and the "self-destruction by fire" of Hercules, a certain festival of "staves," a vintage-feast in honor of the Tyrian Bacchus, and certain others in honor of Astarte, celebrating her disappearance, flight, and wanderings, the Adonia, etc. An account of the different Phoenician gods named in the Bible will be found elsewhere (*SEE ASHERAH; SEE ASHTAROTH; SEE BAAL*, etc.), but it will be proper here to point out certain effects which the circumstance of their being worshipped in Phoenicia produced upon the Hebrews.

(1.) In the first place, their worship was a constant temptation to polytheism and idolatry. It is the general tendency of trade, by making merchants acquainted with different countries and various modes of thought, to enlarge the mind, to promote the increase of knowledge, and, in addition, by the wealth which it diffuses, to afford opportunities in various ways for intellectual culture. It can scarcely be doubted that, owing to these circumstances, the Phoenicians, as a great commercial people, were more generally intelligent, and as we should now say civilized, than the inland agricultural population of Palestine. When the simple-minded Jews, therefore, came in contact with a people more versatile and, apparently, more enlightened than themselves, but who nevertheless, either in a philosophical or in a popular form, admitted a system of polytheism, an influence would be exerted on Jewish minds, tending to make them regard their exclusive devotion to their own one God, Jehovah, however transcendent his attributes, as unsocial and morose. It is in some such way that we must account for the astonishing fact that Solomon himself, the wisest of the Hebrew race, to whom Jehovah is expressly stated to have appeared twice, not long after his marriage with an Egyptian princess, on the night after his sacrificing 1000 burntofferings on the high place of Gibeon, and the second time after the consecration of the Temple-should have been so far beguiled by his wives in his old age as to become a Polytheist, worshipping, among other deities, the Phoenician or Sidonian goddess Ashtoreth (~~1~~ 1 Kings 3:1-5; 9:2; 11:1-5). This is not for a moment to be so interpreted as if he ever ceased to worship Jehovah, to whom he had erected the magnificent Temple, which in history is so generally connected with Solomon's name. Probably, according to his own erroneous conceptions, he never ceased to regard himself as a loyal worshipper of Jehovah, but he at the same time deemed this not

incompatible with sacrificing at the altars of other gods likewise. Still the fact remains that Solomon, who by his Temple in its ultimate results did so much for establishing the doctrine of one only God, became himself a practical Polytheist. If this was the case with him, polytheism in other sovereigns of inferior excellence can excite no surprise. With such an example before him, it is no wonder that Ahab, an essentially bad man, should after his marriage with a Sidonian princess not only openly tolerate, but encourage the worship of Baal; though it is to be remembered even in him that he did not disavow the authority of Jehovah, but, when rebuked by his great antagonist Elijah, he rent his clothes and put sackcloth on his flesh, and showed other signs of contrition evidently deemed sincere (~~1161~~ 1 Kings 16:31; 21:27-29). Finally, it is to be observed generally that although, before the reformation of Josiah (2 Kings 23), polytheism prevailed in Judah as well as Israel, yet it seems to have been more intense and universal in Israel, as might have been expected from its greater proximity to Phoenicia; and Israel is sometimes spoken of as if it had set the bad example to Judah (~~1279~~ 2 Kings 17:19; ~~1418~~ Jeremiah 3:8); though, considering the example of Solomon, this cannot be accepted as a strict historical statement.

(2.) The Phoenician religion was likewise in other respects deleterious to the inhabitants of Palestine, being in some points essentially demoralizing. For example, it sanctioned the dreadful superstition of burning children as sacrifices to a Phoenician god. "They have built also," says Jeremiah, in the name of Jehovah (~~2495~~ Jeremiah 19:5), "the high places of Baal, to burn their sons with fire for burnt-offerings unto Baal, which I commanded not, nor spake it, neither came it into my mind" (comp. ~~2425~~ Jeremiah 32:35). This horrible custom was probably in its origin founded on the idea of sacrificing to a god what was most valuable in the eyes of the suppliant; but it could not exist without having a tendency to stifle natural feelings of affection, and to harden the heart. It could scarcely have been first adopted otherwise than in the infancy of the Phoenician race; but grown-up men and grown-up nations, with their moral feelings in other respects cultivated, are often the slaves in particular points of an early implanted superstition, and it is worthy of note that, more than two hundred and fifty years after the death of Jeremiah, the Carthaginians, when their city was besieged by Agathocles, offered as burnt-sacrifices to the planet Saturn, at the public expense, two hundred boys of the highest aristocracy; and, subsequently, when they had obtained a victory, sacrificed the most beautiful captives in

the like manner (Diod. 20:14, 65). If such things were possible among the Carthaginians at a period so much later, it is easily conceivable how common the practice of sacrificing children may have been at the time of Jeremiah among the Phoenicians generally; and if this were so, it would have been certain to prevail among the Israelites who worshipped the same Phoenician gods; especially as, owing to the intermarriages of their forefathers with Canaanites, there were probably few Israelites who may not have had some Phoenician blood in their veins (~~<OR85>~~Judges 3:5). Again, parts of the Phoenician religion, especially the worship of Astarte, tended to encourage dissoluteness in the relations of the sexes, and even to sanctify impurities of the most abominable description. Connected with her temples and images there were male and female prostitutes, whose polluted gains formed part of the sacred fund appropriated to the service of the goddess; and, to complete the deification of immorality, they were even known by the name of the "consecrated." Nothing can show more clearly how deeply this baneful example had eaten into the hearts and habits of the people, notwithstanding positive prohibitions and the repeated denunciations of the Hebrew prophets, than the almost incredible fact that, previous to the reformation of Josiah, this class of persons was allowed to have houses or tents close to the temple of Jehovah, whose treasury was perhaps even replenished by their gains (~~<D237>~~2 Kings 23:7; ~~<E237>~~Deuteronomy 23:17, 18; ~~<I143>~~1 Kings 14:24; 15:12; 22:46; ~~<X044>~~Hosea 4:14; ~~<R364>~~Job 36:14; comp. Lucian, *Lucius*, c. 35; *De Dea Syrd*, c. 27, 51; Gesenius, *Thesaurus*, s.v. **vdeq**; page 1196; Movers, *Phon.* 1:678, etc.; Spencer, *De Legibus Hebraeorum*, 1:561).

A few words may be added here on Phoenician theogony and cosmogony, which, as far as they are known to us, give evidence of the enormous amount of thought bestowed by the thinkers of that people on the enigma of creation. The Deity was, in accordance with the antique mind, presupposed. Speculation never questioned its eternal existence, the original quality of each of its two principal — male and female — sides, and the way in which, out of their union, sprang the universe. According to the system of Eudemus, Time, Desire, and Mist formed the first triad of existence; and from the embrace of the last two sprang air and "motion of air," out of which again was produced the mundane egg. The cosmogony, according to Sanchoniatho on the other hand, assumes, in the beginning of all things, a gloomy and agitated air, and a turbid chaos of thickest darkness, which for a long course of ages was without limits. The wind

becoming enamoured with its own essence, Mot sprang into being, as a kind of thick, putrid fluid, which contained all germs. The first beings created from this were without intellect; and from them, again, came intellectual beings, Zopha-Semin (μυμϙ γρωx), watchmen, or beholders of the heavens. "And it began to shine Mot, also the sun and the moon, the stars and the great planets. The glowing sun, heating sea and earth, raised vapors, which produced clouds and winds, lightning and thunder, and at their crash the beings began to awake in terror, and male and female moved on land and sea." The wind Kolpia further produced with Baau (WhBoof Genesis) Aion and Protogonos, the first mortals. Aion first discovered the art of nutriment from fruit-trees; and their children, Genos and Genea, who dwelt in Phcenicia, first worshipped Baalsamin, or the sun. Genos begat Light, Fire, and Flame, out of whom came giants, Cassius, Libanus, Antilibanus, and Brathys. Their sons invented the art of constructing huts of reeds and meshes and the papyrus, and the art of making coverings for the body out of the skins of wild beasts. After them came the inventors of hunting and fishing, the discoverers of iron, of the art of navigation, etc. One of their descendants was Elyon (probably the Goda whose priest was Melchisedec, ⁰¹⁴⁸Genesis 14:18, etc.; Abraham, in his reply to the king of Sodom, emphatically adds "Jehovah" to El-Elyon), who with his wife Beruth begat an Autochthon, afterwards called Uranos (heaven), and his sister Ge (earth). They had issue four sons, Ibis, Betylus, Dagon, and Atlas; and three daughters, Astarte, Rhea, and Dione. Chronos deposed his father, subsequently killed him, and travelled about in the world. He then assigned the whole of Phoenicia to Astarte, to Athene he gave Attica, and to Taut Egypt. The country being involved in war, he offered up his two sons, Jeud and Muth (tww, Pluto), in expiation. He afterwards bestowed the city of Byblus upon the goddess Baaltis (Dione), and Berytus upon Poseidon and the Kabiri. Taut made the first images of the countenances of the gods Chronos and Dagon, and formed the sacred characters of the other elements; and the Kabiri, the seven sons of Sydyc, and their eighth brother Asklepios, first set them down in memory. "Thabion," Eusebius (*Pr. Ev.* 1:10) continues, "the first hierophant, allegorized these things subsequently, and, mixing the facts with physical and mundane phenomena, he delivered them down to those that celebrated orgia, and to the prophets who presided over the mysteries, and to their successors, one of whom was Isiris, the inventor of three letters, the brother of Chna, the first Phoenician."

6. Language. — The most important intellectual invention of man, that of letters, was universally asserted by the Greeks and Romans to have been communicated by the Phoenicians to the Greeks. The earliest written statement on the subject is in Herodotus (5:57, 58), who incidentally, in giving an account of Harmodius and Aristogeiton, says that they were by race Gephyraeans; and that he had ascertained by inquiry that the Gephyraeans were Phoenicians, among those Phoenicians who came over with Cadmus into Bceotia, and instructing the Greeks in many other arts and sciences, taught them likewise letters. It was an easy step from this to believe, as many of the ancients believed, that the Phoenicians *invented* letters (Lucan, *Pharsal.* 3:220, 221). This belief, however, was not universal; and Pliny the Elder expresses his own opinion that they were of Assyrian origin, while he relates the opinion of Gellius that they were invented by the Egyptians, and of others that they were invented by the Syrians (*Nat. Hist.* 7:57). Now, as Phoenician has been shown to be nearly the same language as Hebrew, the question arises whether Hebrew throws any light on the time or the mode of the invention of letters, on the question of who invented them, or on the universal belief of antiquity that the knowledge of them was communicated to the Greeks by the Phoenicians. The answer is as follows: Hebrew literature is as silent as Greek literature respecting the precise date of the invention of letters, and the name of the inventor or inventors; but the names of the letters in the Hebrew alphabet are in accordance with the belief that the Phoenicians communicated the knowledge of letters to the Greeks: for many of the names of letters in the Greek alphabet, though without meaning in the Greek, have a meaning in the corresponding letters of Hebrew. For example: the first four letters of the Greek alphabet, Alpha, Beta, Gamma, Delta, are not to be explained through the Greek language; but the corresponding first four letters of the Hebrew alphabet, viz. Aleph, Beth, Gimel, Daleth, being essentially the same words, are to be explained in Hebrew. Thus in Hebrew Aleph or Eleph means an ox; Beth or Bayith a house; Gamal, a camel; and Deleth a door. The same is essentially, though not always so clearly, the case with almost all the sixteen earliest Greek letters said to have been brought over from Phoenicia by Cadmus, **A B Γ Δ E Γ I K Λ M N O Π P Σ T**; and called on this account Phoenician or Cadmeian letters (Herodot. l.c.; Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* 7:57; Jelf, *Greek Gram.* 1, page 2). The sixth letter, afterwards disused, and now generally known by the name of Digamma (from Dionysius, 1:20), was unquestionably the same as the Hebrew letter Vav (a hook). Moreover, as to writing, the

ancient Hebrew letters, substantially the same as Phoenician, agree closely with ancient Greek letters — a fact which, taken by itself, would not prove that the Greeks received them from the Phoenicians, as the Phoenicians might possibly have received them from the Greeks; but which, viewed in connection with Greek traditions on the subject, and with the significance of the letters in Hebrew, seems reasonably conclusive that the letters were transported from Phoenicia into Greece. It is true that modern Hebrew writing and the later Greek writing of antiquity have not much resemblance to each other; but this is owing partly to gradual changes in the writing of Greek letters, and partly to the fact that the character in which Hebrew Bibles are now printed, called the Assyrian or square character, was not the one originally in use among the Jews, but seems to have been learned in the Babylonian captivity, and afterwards gradually adopted by them on their return to Palestine (Gesenius, *Gesch. der Hebraischen Sprache und Schrift*, page 156). *SEE ALPHABET.*

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

It may not be unimportant to observe that, although so many letters of the Greek alphabet have a meaning in Hebrew or Phoenician, yet their Greek names are not in the Hebrew or Phoenician, but in the Aramaic form. There is a peculiar form of the noun in Aramaic called by grammarians the *status emphaticus*, in which the termination *a* (א) is added to a noun, modifying it according to certain laws. Originally this termination was probably

identical with the definite article "ha;" which, instead of being prefixed, was subjoined to the noun, as is the case now with the definite article in the Scandinavian languages. This form in *a* is found to exist in the oldest specimen of Aramaic in the Bible, *Yegar sahadutha*, in ⁰³⁴⁷Genesis 31:47, where *sahaduth*, testimony, is used by Laban in the *status emphaticus*. Now it is worthy of note that the names of a considerable proportion of the "Cadmeian letters" in the Greek alphabet are in this Aramaic form. such as Alpha, Beta, Gamma, Delta, Eta, Theta, Iota, Kappa, Lambda; and although this fact by itself is not sufficient to support an elaborate theory on the subject, it seems in favor, as far as it goes, of the conjecture that when the Greeks originally received the knowledge of letters, the names by which the several letters were taught to them were Aramaic. It has been suggested, indeed, by Gesenius, that the Greeks themselves made the addition in all these cases, in order to give the words a Greek termination, as "they did with other Phoenician words, as *melet*, *μάλθα*, *nebel*, *νάβλα*." If, however, a list is examined of Phoenician words naturalized in Greek, it will not be found that the ending in *a* has been the favorite mode of accommodating them to the Greek language. For example, of the words specified by Bleek (*Einleitung in das A.T.* page 69) as having been communicated through the Phoenicians to the Greeks (see above), it is remarkable that only four end in *a* in Greek which have not a similar termination in Hebrew; and of these four one is a late Alexandrian translation, and two are names of musical instruments, which, very probably. may first have been communicated to Greeks, through Syrians, in Asia Minor. Under any circumstances, the proportion of the Phoenician words which end in *a* in Greek is too small to warrant the inference that any common practice of the Greeks in this respect will account for the seeming fact that nine out of the sixteen Cadmeian letters are in the Aramaic *status emphaticus*. The inference, therefore, from their endings in *a* remains unshaken. Still this must not be regarded in any way as proving that the alphabet was invented by those who spoke the Aramaic language. This is a wholly distinct question, and far more obscure; though much deference on the point is due to the opinion of Gesenius, who, from the internal evidence of the names of the Shemitic letters, has arrived at the conclusion that they were invented by the Phoenicians (*Paliographie*, page 294). The strongest argument of Gesenius against the Aramaic invention of the letters is that, although doubtless many of the names are both Aramaic and Hebrew, some of them are not Aramaic — at least not in the Hebrew signification; while the Syrians use other words to express the same ideas.

Thus $\tilde{a}l a$ in Aramaic means only 1000, and not an ox; the word for "door" in Aramaic is not $tl d$, but $[rt]$; while the six following names of Cadmeian letters are not Aramaic: $\omega\omega d\omega\omega\mu\gamma\alpha\alpha p$ (Syr. $\mu\omega\omega P$), $\tilde{a}\omega q$, ωt .

As this obviously leads to the conclusion that the Hebrews *adopted* Phoenician as their own language, or, in other words, that what is called the Hebrew language was in fact "the language of Canaan," as a prophet called it (²³⁹¹⁸Isaiah 19:18), and this not merely poetically, but literally and in philological truth; and as this is repugnant to some preconceived notions respecting the peculiar people, the question arises whether the Israelites might not have translated Canaanitish names into Hebrew. On this hypothesis the names now existing in the Bible for persons and places in the land of Canaan would not be the original names, but merely the translations of those names. The answer to this question is,

1. That there is not the slightest direct mention, nor any indirect trace, in the Bible, of any such translation.
2. That it is contrary to the analogy of the ordinary Hebrew practice in other cases: as, for example, in reference to the names of the Assyrian monarchs (perhaps of a foreign dynasty) Pul, Tiglath-Pileser, Sennacherib, or of the Persian monarchs Darius, Ahasuerus, Artaxerxes, which remain unintelligible in Hebrew, and can only be understood through other Oriental languages.
3. That there is an absolute silence in the Bible as to there having been any difference whatever in language between the Israelites and the Canaanites, although in other cases where a difference existed that difference is somewhere alluded to, as in the case of the Egyptians (³⁸⁸¹⁶Psalms 81:5; 114:1), the Assyrians (²³¹¹⁶Isaiah 20:6, 11), and the Chaldees (²⁴⁵¹⁵Jeremiah 5:15). Yet in the case of the Canaanites there was stronger reason for alluding to it; and without some allusion to it, if it had existed, the narration of the conquest of Canaan under the leadership of Joshua would have been singularly imperfect.

The Phoenician language, however, certainly belonged to that family of languages which, by a name not altogether free from objection, but now generally adopted, is called "Shemitic." Under this name are included three distinct branches:

a. Arabic, to which belongs Aethiopic as all offshoot of the Southern Arabic or Himyaritic.

b. Aramaic, the vernacular language of Palestine at the time of Christ. in which the few original words of Christ which have been preserved in writing appear to have been spoken (^{<41746>}Matthew 27:46; ^{<41641>}Mark 5:41; and mark especially ^{<41688>}Matthew 16:18, which is not fully significant either in Greek or Hebrew). Aramaic, as used in Christian literature, is called Syriac, and as used in the writings of the Jews has been very generally called Chaldee.

c. Hebrew, in which by far the greater part of the Old Testament was composed. Now one of the most interesting points to the Biblical student connected with Phoenician, is, that it does not belong to either of the first two branches, but to the third; and that it is in fact so closely allied to Hebrew that Phoenician and Hebrew, though different dialects, may practically be regarded as the same language. This may be shown in the following way:

(1.) In passages which have been frequently quoted (see especially Gesenii *Monumenta Scripturae Linguaeque Phoenicie*, page 231), testimony is borne to the kinship of the two languages by Augustine and Jerome, in whose time Phoenician or Carthaginian was still a living language. Jerome, who was a good Hebrew scholar, after mentioning, in his Commentaries on Jeremiah (lib. 5, c. 25) that Carthage was a Phoenician colony, proceeds to state, "Unde et Poeni sermone corrupto quasi Phoeni appellantur, quorum lingua Hebraea linguae magna ex parte confinis est." Augustine, who was a native of Africa, and a bishop there of Hippo, a Tyrian colony, has left on record a similar statement several times. In one passage he says of the two languages, "Istae linguae non multum inter se differunt" (*Quaestiones in Heptateuchum*, 7:16). In another passage he says, "Cognatae sunt istae linguae et vicinae, Hebraea, et Punica, et Syra" (*In Joann. Tract.* 15). Again, on ^{<41880>}Genesis 18:9, he says of a certain mode of speaking (^{<41880>}Genesis 8:9), "Locutio est, quam propterea Hebraeam puto, quia et Punicae linguae familiarissima est, in quam multa invenimus Hebraeis verbis consonantia" (lib. 1, cap. 24). On another occasion, remarking on the word Messiah, he says, "Quod verbum Punicae linguae consonum est, sicut alia Hebraea multa et poene omnia" (*Contra literas Petilianii*, 2, c. 104).

(2.) These statements are fully confirmed by a passage of Carthaginian preserved in the *Penulus* of Plautus (act 5, scene 1), and accompanied by a Latin translation as part of the play. There is no doubt that the Carthaginians and the Phoenicians were the same race; and the Carthaginian extract is undeniably intelligible through Hebrew to Hebrew scholars (see Bochart's *Canaan*; and especially Gesenii *Monumenta Phaeniie*, pages 357-382, where the passage is translated with notes, and full justice is done to the previous translation of Bochart).

(3.) The close kinship of the two languages is, moreover, strikingly confirmed by very many Phoenician and Carthaginian names of places and persons, which, destitute of meaning in Greek and Latin, through which languages they have become widely known, and having sometimes in those languages occasioned false etymologies, become really significant in Hebrew. Thus through Hebrew it is known that Tyre, as *Ts6r*, signifies "a rock," referring doubtless to the rocky island on which the city was situated: that Sidon, as *Tsidon*, means "Fishing" or "Fishery," which was probably the occupation of its first settlers: that Carthage, or, as it was originally called, "Carthada," means "New Town," or "Newton:" and that Byrsa, which, as a Greek name, suggested the mythological mythus of the Bull's Hide (*AEneid*, 1:366, 367), was simply the citadel of Carthage — "Carthaginis arcem," as Virgil accurately termed it: the Carthaginian name of it, softened by the Greeks into **Βύρσα**, being merely the Hebrew word Botsrah, "citadel;" identical with the word called Bozrah in the English Version of ^{<330>}Isaiah 63:1. Again, through Hebrew, the names of celebrated Carthaginians, though sometimes disfigured by Greek and Roman writers, acquire a meaning. Thus Dido is found to belong to the same root as David, "beloved;" meaning "his love" or "delight:" i.e., the love or delight either of Baal or of her husband: Hasdrubal is the man "whose help Baal is:" Hamilcar the man whom the god "Milcar graciously granted" (comp. Hananeel; **θεόδωρος**): and, with the substitution of Baal for El or God. the name of the renowned Hannibal is found to be identical in form and meanifig with the name of Hannel, who is mentioned in ^{<482>}Numbers 34:23 as the prince of the tribe of Manasseh: Hannel meaning the grace of God, and Hannibal the grace of Baal.

(4.) The same conclusion arises from the examination of Phoenician inscriptions, preserved to the present day; all of which can be interpreted, with more or less certainty, through Hebrew. Some of these will be more particularly noticed below.

III. Literature. —

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

An important Phoenician literature seems to have been extant as late as the 1st century A.D., but it has disappeared from the face of the earth. After the second half of the 3d century the language had vanished entirely in the country itself, and Jerome, who lived in Palestine, mentions the Punic, but never the Phoenician. In the West it survived to a much later period. In Mauritania and Numidia it remained, in a corrupted form, the reigning tongue as late as the 4th century A.D.; and Augustine draws his explanations of Scripture from the Punic current in the 5th century. There was a translation of the whole Bible into Punic made for the use of the Punic churches; and in and near Tripolis it was the language of the common people up to a late period. From the 6th century, however, it rapidly died out, chiefly in consequence of the Vandals, Goths, Moors, and other foreign tribes overrunning the country, and ingrafting their own idioms upon it.

The literature of Phoenicia, in its original form, has, as we have said, perished entirely. What traces and fragments we have of it have survived in Greek translations. But from even these small remnants we can easily imagine the extreme antiquity, and the high importance and vast extent of these productions, which, at first, seem to have been chiefly of a theological or theogonical nature. Their authors are the gods themselves, and the writings are only accessible to the priests, and to those initiated in the mysteries. From the allegorical explanations of these exalted personages sprang a new branch of sacred literature, of which those fragments of cosmogony mentioned above are derived. To the literary age of Taaut, Cadmus, Ophion, Esmun, etc., succeeded Thabion, Isis, and

Sanchoniatho, and Mochus, who founded the schools of priests and prophets. These cultivated the sciences, chiefly the occult ones, magic, and the like. Nearest to the sacred literature stands didactic poetry, somewhat related to the Orphic, whose chief representatives are Sido, Jopas, etc. The erotic poetry is characterized as of a very sensuous nature, both in Phoenicia and the colonies. Of historians are mentioned Mochus, Hypsikrates (Sanchoniatho?) Theodotus, Philostratus, Menander, and others; but these are mere Greek versions of their Phoenician names, and absolutely nothing has been preserved of their writings. Punic literature is also frequently mentioned by Greek and Roman writers. Geography, history, agriculture, were the fields chiefly cultivated by the colonists of Carthage and the West generally.

Picture for Phoenicia (2)

The monuments that have come down to us, and which not only have enabled us to judge for ourselves of the religion, the language, and the manners of the Phoenicians, are either original, as legends on coins and lapidary inscriptions, or at second hand, as Phoenician proper nouns and texts imbedded in the works of ancient classical or sacred writers. The principal and ever-growing source for our information, however, is the monumental inscriptions, of whose existence, till the middle of the 18th century, nothing was known. The most numerous Phoenician remnants have been discovered in the colonies. Richard Pococke first found, on the site of ancient Citium (Larnaka of today), thirty-one (not thirty-three, as generally stated) Phoenician inscriptions, which he deposited at Oxford (published by Swinton, 1750). Malta, Sardinia, Carthage, Algiers, Tripolis, Athens, Marseilles, have each yielded a considerable number, so that altogether we are now in the possession of about one hundred and twenty monuments. either votive tablets or tomb inscriptions. The latest and most remarkable are those now in the British Museum, discovered at Carthage a few years ago by N. Davis, consisting of votive tablets, a (doubtful) tombstone, and a sacrificial tariff, which completes another stone found some years ago at Marseilles of the same nature; both setting forth the amount of taxes, or rather the proportionate share the priest was entitled to receive for each sacrifice. Another exceedingly valuable (trilingual) inscription, referring to the gift of an altar vowed to Eshmun-Asklepios, has lately been discovered in Sardinia (see below). One of the most important historical monuments is the sarcophagus of Eshmanasar II, king of Sidon (son of Tennes ?), found at Tyre in 1855, the age of which has

variously been conjectured between the 11th century B.C. (Ewald) — a most incongruous guess indeed — the 7th (Hitzig), the 6th (due De Luynes), and the 4th (Levy), of which we shall add the commencement, literally translated:

"In the month of Bul, in the fourteenth year that I reigned, king Eshmanaiar, king of the Sidonians, son of king Tebuith, king of the Sidoilians — spake king Eshmanasar, king of the Sidonians, saying: Carried away before my time, in the flood of days — in dumbness ceases the soin of gods. Dead do I lie in this tonlm, in the glaeve, on the place which I havie built. I myself ordaiun tiat all the nobles and all the people shall not openi this place of rest; they shall not seek for treasures and not carry taway the sarcophmagus of my resting-place, and not disturb me by mounting the couch of my slumbers. If people should speak to thee [and pypersuade thee to the contralry], do not listen to them. For all the nobles and all the people who shall open this sarcophagus of the place of rest, or carry awayt the sarcophagus of my conch, or disturb me upon this resting-place, may they find no rest with the departed; may they not be buried in a tomb, and may no son and successor live after them in their place," etc. (see Thomson, *Land and Book*, 1:198 sq.).

Picture for Phoenicia (3)

The votive tablets bear the same character throughout, differing only with respect to the name of the man or woman who placed it in a certain sanctuary in accordance with his or her vow. Their material is mostly limestone or fine sandstone, rarely marble, and they vary from 5 to 15 inches in height, from 4 to 7 in width, and from 11 to 4 in thickness. Beginning in most cases with the dedication to the god or goddess, or both, thus: "[Sacred] To the god . . . [this tablet] which vowed N. son (daughter) of N. When he (she) heard my voice and blessed," or "hear my voice and bless;" etc. The sepulchral tablets generally run somewhat in this manner: "Stone erected to . . . who lived . . . years." Much yet remains to be done. Even the palaeographical side has, notwithstanding all the ready material, not been settled satisfactorily yet. One point, however, is indisputable even now. There are at least two kinds of Phoenician writing to be distinguished most clearly. The older, purer, more orthographical, and more neatly executed, is found in the inscriptions of Phoenicia herself, of Malta, Athens, Citium, and Carthage; the younger, corrupted not only with respect to the grammar and language, but also with respect to the

form of the letters, which are less carefully executed, and even exhibit some strange, probably degenerate characters, is found chiefly on the monuments of Cyprus, Cilicia, Sardinia, Africa, Spain, Numidia, and the adjacent parts.

Picture for Phoenicia (4)

Besides these monumental sources for the language, there are a few remnants of it embedded, as we said, in ancient non-Phoenician writings. The Old Testament alone, however, has preserved its words — proper nouns chiefly — un mutilated. Later eastern writers even, not to mention the Greeks and Romans, have corrupted the spelling to such a degree that it is often most puzzling to trace the original Shemitic words. Phoenician names occur in Suidas, Dioscorides, Apuleius, in martyrologies, calendariums, Acts of Councils, in Church fathers (Augustine, Priscianus, Servus), etc. The only really important remnant, however, is found preserved—albeit fearfully mutilated and Latinized in Plautus's *Pcellsfus*, act 5, scene 1 of which contains, in sixteen lines, the Phoenician translation of the Latin text, with more than one hundred Phoenician words. Several other phrases and words are embodied in act 5, scenes 2 and 3 of the same play. Yet, although there is very little doubt among scholars about the greater portion of these texts, the corruption and mutilation which they had to undergo, first at the hands of Plautus, who probably only wrote them by the ear, then at the hands of generations of ignorant scribes, have made more than one word or passage an insoluble puzzle. The first of the two specimens of Phoenician [Punic] writing subjoined is taken from one of those Carthaginian votive tablets with which the British Museum (now the wealthiest in Phoenician monuments) has lately been enriched, as mentioned before. The emblems on it are symbolical, and refer to the deities invoked. The lower part is mutilated, but easily supplied. The date is uncertain, perhaps the 2d or 3d century B.C. The second is a trilingual inscription from a base of an altar recently found at Pauli (errei, in Sardinia, and has been fully explained by Deutsch (see *Transactions* of the Royal Society of Literature, 1864). Its contents are briefly this: A certain Cleon, Phoenician by religion, Greek by name, Roman by nationality, a salt-farmer, yows an altar-material and weight of which are only given in Phoenician: viz. copper, a hundred pounds in weight to EshmunAsklepios "the Healer" (the Phoenician *Mearrach*, clumsily transcribed *Merre* in Latin, and *Mirre* in Greek), in consideration for a cure to be performed. The date, given in Phoenician, viz. the year of two, apparently annual,

entirely unknown judges, gives no clew to the time. Palaeographical reasons, however, would place it in about the 1st century B.C.

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

In English, see Kenrick's *Phoenicia* (Lond. 1855); in Latin, the second part of Bochart's *Geographia Sacra*, under the title "Canaan" and Gesenius's work, *Scripturae Linguaeque Phoniciae Monumenta quotquot supersunt* (Leips. 1837); in German, the exhaustive work of Movers, *Die Phonizier und das Phonizische Alterthum* (Berlin, 1841-1856, 5 volumes); Gerhard, *Kunst der Phonizier* (ibid. 1848); an article on the same subject by Movers, in Ersch and Gruber's *Encyclopadie*, and an article in the same work by Gesenius on *Polaographie*. See likewise Gesenius, *Gesch. der Hebraischen Sprache und Schrift* (Leips. 1815); Bleek, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (Berl. 1860). Phoenician inscriptions discovered since the time of Gesenius have been published by Judas, *Etude demonstrative de la lanque Phenicienne et de la langue Libyque* (Paris, 1847), and forty-five other inscriptions have been published by the abbe Bourgade (ibid. 1852, fol.). In 1845 a votive tablet was discovered at Marseilles, respecting which see Movers, *Phonizische Texte* (1847), and *Judas Analyse* (Par. 1857), and *Etudes* (ibid. 1857). On the sarcophagus of Eshmanasar, see Dietrich, *Zwaei Sidonische Inschriften, nd eine alte Phonizische Konigsinschrift* (Marburg, 1855), and Ewald, *Erklärung der grossen Phonizischen Inschrift von Sidon* (GBttingen, 1856, 4to; from the seventh volume of the *Abhandlungen der Konigl. geograph. Gesellschaft zu Gottingen*). Information respecting these works, and others on Phoenician inscriptions, is given by Bleek; pages 64, 65. See also Barthelemy, *Monumens Pheoniciens* (Paris, 1795); Hamaker, *De Monumentis Punicis* (Leips. 1822); Raoul-Rochette, *Monumenta Phoenicia* (Paris, 1828); Davis, *Carthage* (Lond. 1861); Wilkins, *Phenicia and Israel* (Lond. 1871); Renan, *Mission de Phenicie* (Paris, 1864).

Phoenix

Picture for Phoenix

the name of a mythical Egyptian bird, supposed by some to be a kind of plover, like the *kibitz*, often depicted with human arms, and called in hieroglyphs *rekh*. Others consider it to be the *bennu*, or nycticorax, a bird sacred to Osiris, and represented watching in the tamarisk over his coffin. The first of these representations has sometimes a star upon the head, supposed to indicate the astronomical period of its appearance. It visited Egypt after the death of its father, and entered the shrine particularly dedicated to it at Heliopolis, and there buried its parent, putting the body into an egg or case made of myrrh, and then closing up the egg. Another account is that the Phoenix, when about to die, made a nest for itself in Arabia, from which a new Phoenix sprang of itself. This bird proceeded to Heliopolis, and there burned and buried its father. But the more popularly known version is that the Phoenix burned itself, and a new and young Phoenix sprang from the ashes. A less received version is that a worm crawled out of the body of the dead Phoenix, and became the future one. The Phoenix was, according to the most authentic accounts, supposed to visit Egypt every five hundred years; the precise period, however, was not known at Heliopolis, and was a subject of contention till its appearance. The connection of the Phoenix period with that of the Sothiac cycle, appears to be generally received by chronologists, as well as the statement of Horapollo, that it designated the soul and the inundation of the Nile. A great difference of opinion has prevailed about the Phoenix period: according to Aelian, it was a cycle of 500 years; Tacitus seems to make it one of 250 years; Lepsius, a cycle of 1500 years. The Phoenix was fabled to have four times appeared in Egypt: 1, under Sesostris; 2, under Amasis, 569-525 B.C.; 3, under Ptolemy Philadelphus, 284-246 B.C.; and lastly, 34 or 36 A.D., just prior to the death of Tiberius. The Phoenix also appears upon the coins of Constantine, 334 A.D, viz. 300 years after the death of Christ, who was considered the Phoenix by the monastic writers. It is supposed by the rabbins to be mentioned in the Bible (~~1398~~ Job 29:18; ~~1935~~ Psalm 103:5). See Herodotus, 2:73; Achilles Tatius, 3:25; Tacitus, *An.* 6:28; Tselzes, *Chil.* 5:397; Lepsius, *Einleit.* page 183; *Archaeologia*, 30:256. The East is full of fables resembling the phoenix. Thus the *Simorg* of the ancient Persians is said to have witnessed twelve catastrophes, and may yet see many- more. It has built its nest on Mount *Kaf*, and perched

upon the branches of the *Yogard*, or tree of life; it predicts good or evil to mortals. Similar legends are to be found connected with the *Rokh* of the Arabians and *Semeneda* of the Hindds. The Jews also have their sacred bird *Tsiks*. See Gardner, *Faiths of the World*, 2:655, 656.

Phonascus

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

Phorcus or Phorcys

a Homeric sea-god, to whom a harbor in Ithaca was dedicated. He is said to have been the son of Pontus and Ge, and to have been the father, by his sister Ceto, of the Gorgons, the Hesperian dragon, and the Hesperides. By Hecate he was the father of Scylla.

Pho'ros

(**Φόρος**), an incorrect Greek form (1 Esdr. 5:19; 9:26) of the Heb. name (^{ⲀⲓⲠⲏⲤ}Ezra 2:3; 8:3) PAROSH **SEE PAROSH** (q.v.).

Phos

(**φῶς**, *light*), and its allied term Photisma (*illumination*), are generally applied in the ancient Christian Church to baptism, from the great blessings supposed to arise from it. Hence baptized Christians were sometimes called **φωτιζόμενοι**, *the enlightened*, and ithe baptistry **φωτιστήριον**, *place of enlightenment*. The same terms were also applied to the Lord's Supper. Riddle, *Christian Antiquities*, pages 484, 485, 551. **SEE ALSO BAPTISM** (*Names of 5.*).

Phosphorus

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

Phota Hagia

(*φῶτα ἄγια*, *holy lights*), a term anciently used to denote the festival of Epiphany, as being commemorative of Christ's baptism. *SEE EPIPHANY.*

Photinians

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

Photinus Of Sirmium

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

died in exile, probably near the close of the 4th century. His writings are lost. His doctrines we learn from the anathemas of those synods which sat in judgment over them. See, besides the literature quoted in the article MARCELLUS *SEE MARCELLUS*, Hefele, *Conciliengesch.* volume 1. (J.H.W.)

Photisma

SEE PHOS.

Photisterion

(*φωτιστήριον*), a place of illumination, being a term frequently used in the ancient Christian Church to denote the *baptistery*, or the place of baptism, that ordinance being supposed to be attended with a divine illumination of the soul. *SEE PHOS*, This name might also be used for another reason, namely, because baptisteries were the places in which instruction was communicated previous to baptism, the catechumens being there taught the creed and instructed in the first rudiments of the Christian faith.

Photius Of Constantinople (1)

an Eastern ecclesiastic, flourished in the 4th century. In the *Acta Sanctorum*, *Jnnii*, 1:274, etc., is given an account of the martyrdom of St. Lucillianus, and several others who are said to have suffered at Byzantium, in the persecution under Aurelian. The account bears this title: *Φωτίου τοῦ μακάριωτάτου σκευοφύλακος τῶν Ἁγίων Ἀποστόλων καὶ λογοθέτου ἐγκώμιον εἰς τὸν ἅγιον ἱερομάρτυρα Λουκιλλιανόν*; *Sancti Martyris Lucilliani Encomium, auctore beatissimo Photio, Sanctorum Apostolorum Sceuophylace ac Logotheta*. Of the writer Photius, nothing further appears to be known than is contained in the title, namely, that he was keeper of the sacred vessels in the great church of the Apostles at Constantinople, which was second in importance only to that of St. Sophia; and that he must be placed after the time of Constantine, by whom the church was built. The *Encomium* is given in the *Acta Sanctorum* in the original Greek, with a *Commentarius praeivius*, a Latin version, and notes by Conradus Januingus. See Fabricius, *Bibl. Garcc.* 10:271, 678; Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog.* s.v.

Photius Of Constantinople (2)

also an Eastern ecclesiastic, flourished in the 5th century as presbyter of the Church at Constantinople, and was one of the most decided and active supporters of the unfortunate heresiarch Nestorius (q.v.). When Antonius and Jacobus were sent, some:time before the Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431, to convert, by persecution, the Quartadecimans and Novatians of Asia Minor, they presented to some of their converts at Philadelphia, not the Nicene Creed, but one that contained a passage deemed heretical on the subject of the Incarnation, which excited against them Charisius, who was ceconomus of the Church at Philadelphia. In these proceedings Antonius and Jacobus were supported by Photius, who not only gave them letters at the commencement of their mission, attesting their orthodoxy, but procured the deposition of their opponent Charisius, who thereupon presented a complaint to the Council of Ephesus (*Concilia*, volume 3, col. 673. etc., ed. Labbe). Tillemont is disposed to ascribe to Photius the answer which was drawn up to the *Epistola ad Solitarios* of Cyril of Alexandria. A certain Photius, a supporter of Nestorius, was banished to Petra, about A.D. 436 (Lupus, *Ad Ephesin Concil. varior. PP. Epistole*, cap. 188), whom, notwithstanding the objections of Lulputs (not. in loc.), we agree with Tillemont in identifying with the presbyter of Constantinople (Tillemont, *Memoires*, 14:300, 332, 494, 607, 787).

Photius Of Constantinople (3)

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

Life. — The year and place of his birth, and the name of his father, appear to be unknown. His mother's name was Irene: her brother married one of the sisters of Theodora, wife of the emperor Theophilus (Theoph. Continuat. lib. 4:22); so that Photius was connected by affinity with the imperial family. We have the testimony of Nicetas David, the Paphlagonian. that his lineage was illustrious. He had at least four brothers (Mountagu, *Not. ad Epistol. Photii*, page 138), one of whom, the eldest, enjoyed the dignity of patrician. Photius himself, in speaking of his father and mother, celebrates their crown of martyrdom, and the patient spirit by which they were adorned, during the reign of Theophilus or some other of

the iconoclastic emperors. This is the more likely, as Photius elsewhere (*Epistol.* 2, *Encycl.* § 42, and *Epistol. ad Nicol., Papam*) claims as his relative Tarasius (probably great-uncle), patriarch of Constantinople, who was one of the great champions of image worship, which shows the side taken by his family in the controversy. The ability of Photius would have adorned any lineage, and his capacious mind was cultivated, as the testimony even of his opponents and his extant works show, with great diligence. "He was accounted," says Nicetas David, the biographer and panegyrist of his competitor Ignatius, "to be of all men most eminent for his secular acquirements, and his understanding of political affairs. For so superior were his attainments in grammar and poetry, in rhetoric and philosophy, yea, even in medicine, and in almost all the branches of knowledge beyond the limits of theology, that he not only appeared to excel all the men of his own day, but even to bear comparison with the ancients. For all things combined in his favor: natural adaptation, diligence, wealth, which enabled him to form a comprehensive library; and more than all these, the love of glory, which induced him to pass whole nights without sleep, that he might have time for reading. And when the time came (which ought never to have arrived) for him to intrude himself into the Church, he became a most diligent reader of theological works? (*Vita Ignatii* apud *Conci.* volume 8, ed. Labbe). It must not, however, be supposed that Photius had wholly neglected the study of theology before his entrance on an ecclesiastical life: so far was this from being the case, that he had read and carefully analyzed, as his *Bibliotheca* attests, the chief works of the Greek ecclesiastical writers of all ages, so that his attainments in sacred literature might have shamed many a professional divine. Thus highly connected, and with a mind so richly endowed and highly cultivated, Photius obtained high advancement at the Byzantine court. He held the dignity of a *proto-a-secretis*, or chief-justice (*Codin. De Officiis CP.* page 36. ed. Bonn); and, if we trust the statement of Nicetas David (*l. c.*), of *protospatharius*, a name originally denoting the chief sword-bearer or captain of the guards, but which became, in later times, a merely nominal office (*Codin. ibid.* page 33). To these dignities may be added, on the authority of Anastasius Bibliothecarius (*Concil. Octavi Hist.* apud *Concil.* ol. 8:col. 962, ed. Labbd), that of senator; but this is, perhaps, only another title for the office of *protoa-secretis* (Gretser. et Goar. *Not. in Codin.* page 242). Besides these official duties at the capital, he was also occasionally employed on missions abroad; and it was during an embassy "to the Assyrians" (a vague and unsuitable term, denoting apparently the court of

the caliphs, or of some of the other powers of Upper Asia) that he read the works enumerated in his *Bibliotheca*, and wrote the critical notices of them which that work contains — a striking instance of the energy and diligence with which he continued to cultivate literature in the midst of his secular duties and when away from home. Of the date of this embassy, while engaged in which he must have resided several years at the Assyrian court, as well of the other incidents of his life before his elevation to the patriarchate of Constantinople, we have no knowledge. He could hardly have been a young man at the time he became patriarch.

The patriarchal throne of Constantinople was occupied in the middle of the 9th century by Ignatius (s.v.), who had the misfortune to incur the enmity of some few bishops and monks, and also of Bardas, who was allpowerful at the court of his nephew Michael, then a minor. Ignatius had excommunicated Bardas on a charge of incest, and Bardas, in retaliation, caused the patriarch's deposition, and the election of Photius in his place. Though a layman, and, according to some statements, under excommunication for supporting Gregory, less than a week sufficed, according to Nicetas David (*ibid.*), for the rapid passage of Photius through all the needful subordinate gradations: the first day witnessed his conversion from a layman to a monk; the second day he was made reader; the third day subdeacon; the fourth, deacon; the fifth, presbyter; and the sixth (Christmas-day, A.D. 858) beheld his promotion to the patriarchate, the highest ecclesiastical dignity in the empire. Nicetas (*ibid.*) states that his office was irregularly committed to him by secular hands. Photius himself, however, in his apologetic epistle to pope Nicholas I (apud Baron. *Annal.* ad ann. 859, § 61, etc.), states that the patriarchate was pressed upon his acceptance by a numerous assembly of the metropolitans, and of the other, clergy of his patriarchate; nor is it likely that the Byzantine court would fail to secure a sufficient number of subservient bishops to give to the appointment every possible appearance of regularity. A consciousness that the whole transaction was violent and indefensible, whatever care might be taken to give it the appearance of regularity, made it desirable for the victorious party to obtain from the deposed patriarch a resignation of his office; but Ignatius was a man of too lofty a spirit to consent to his own degradation. Photius, however, retained his high dignity; the secular power was on his side; the clergy of the patriarchate, in successive councils (A.D. 858, 859), confirmed his appointment, though we are told by Nicetas David that 'the metropolitans

exacted from him a written engagement that he would treat his deposed rival with filial reverence, and follow his advice; and even the legates of the Holy See were induced to side with him, a subserviency for which they were afterwards deposed by pope Nicholas I. The engagement to treat Ignatius with kindness was not kept; in such a struggle its observance could hardly be expected; but how far the severities inflicted on him are to be ascribed to Photius cannot now be determined. The critical position of the latter would be likely to aggravate any disposition which he might feel to treat his rival harshly; for Nicholas, in a council at Rome (A.D. 862), embraced the side of Ignatius, and anathematized Photius and his adherents; various enemies rose up against him among the civil officers as well as the clergy of the empire; and the minds of many, including, if we may trust Nicetas (*ibid.*), the kindred and friends of Photius himself, were shocked by the treatment of the unhappy Ignatius. To add to Photius's troubles, the Caesar Bardas appears to have had disputes with him, either influenced by the natural jealousy between the secular and ecclesiastical powers, or, perhaps, disappointed at not finding in Photius the subserviency he had anticipated. The letters of Photius addressed to Bardas (*Epistole*, 3, 6, 8) contain abundant complaints of the diminution of his authority, of the ill-treatment of those for whom he was interested, and of the inefficacy of his own intercessions and complaints. However, the opposition among his own clergy was gradually weakened, until only five bishops remained who supported the cause of Ignatius. Yet, notwithstanding these defections from the deposed patriarch, Photius labored zealously for a restoration of friendly feelings between himself and the Western patriarch. Nicholas, however, spurned all advances, and in A.D. 863 anathematized and deposed Photius anew. Of course the Roman patriarchate, failing to secure the aid of the Eastern emperor, could not give practical effect to the deposition, and Photius remained in his place. In order to retaliate on Rome, he now assembled a council of the Eastern clergy at Constantinople (A.D. 867), in which the question was removed from the region of a personal dispute between the bishops to a controversy of doctrine and discipline between the churches of the East and West themselves. In this council Photius first brought forward distinctly certain grounds of difference between the churches, which, although considerably modified, afterwards led to their final separation. In all these doctrinal differences, the council condemned the Western Church, excommunicated Nicholas and his abettors, and withdrew from the communion of the see of

Rome. The charge of heresy against the Church of Rome in general was embraced in the following articles:

1. That the Church of Rome kept the Sabbath as a fast;
2. That it permitted milk and cheese in the first week of Lent;
3. That it prohibited the marriage of priests;
4. That it confined the rite of anointing persons baptized to the bishops alone;
5. That it had corrupted the Nicene Creed by the addition of the words *filioque*.

As neither party had the secular power wherewith to carry its sentence into effect, the separation of the Eastern' and Western churches became simply a schism, and as such lasted until the actual deposition of Photius, A.D. 869.

Of the conduct which controlled Photius as patriarch, in matters not connected with the struggle to maintain his position, it is not easy to judge. That he aided Bardas, who was elevated to the dignity of Caesar, in his efforts for the revival of learning, perhaps suggested those efforts to him, is highly probable from his indisputable love of literature (Theoph. Contin. *De Mich. Theophili Iilio*, c. 26). That he possessed many kindly dispositions is indicated by his letters. The charges of the forgery of letters, and of cruelty in his struggles with the party of Ignatius, are, there is reason to believe, too true; but as almost all the original sources of information respecting his character and conduct are from parties hostile to his claims, we cannot confidently receive their charges as true in all their extent. The murder of Caesar Bardas (A.D. 866 or 867), by the emperor's order, was speedily followed by the assassination of Michael himself (A.D. 867), and the accession of his colleague and murderer, Basil I (the Macedonian). Photius had consecrated Basil as the colleague of Michael; but after the murder of the latter he refused to admit him to the communion, reproaching him as a robber and a murderer, and unworthy to partake of the sacred elements. Photius was for this offence immediately banished to a monastery, and Ignatius restored: various papers which the servants of Photius were about to conceal in a neighboring reed-bed were seized, and afterwards produced against Photius, first in the senate of Constantinople, and afterwards at the council held against him. This hasty

change in the occupants of the patriarchate had been too obviously the result of the change of the imperial dynasty to be sufficient of itself. But the imperial power had now the same interest as the Western Church in the deposition of Photius. A council (recognised by the Romish Church as the eighth oecumenical or fourth Constantinopolitan) was therefore summoned, A.D. 869, at which the deposition of Photius and the restoration of Ignatius were confirmed. The cause was in fact prejudged by the circumstance that Ignatius took his place as patriarch at the commencement of the council. Photius, who appeared before the council, and his partisans were anathematized and stigmatized with the most opprobrious epithets. He subsequently acquired the favor of Basil, but by what means is uncertain; for we can hardly give credence to the strange tale related by Nicetas (*ibid.*), who ascribes it to the forgery and interpretation by Photius of a certain genealogical document containing a prophecy of Basil's exaltation. It is certain, however, not only that he gained the favor of the emperor, but that he soon acquired a complete ascendancy over him; he was appointed tutor to the sons of Basil, had apartments in the palace assigned to him; and on the death of Ignatius, about A.D. 877, was immediately restored to the patriarchal throne. With writers of the Ignatian party and of the Romish Church this restoration is, of course, nothing less than a new irruption of the wolf into the sheepfold. According to Nicetas, he commenced his patriarchate by beating, banishing, and in various ways afflicting the servants and household of his defunct rival, and by using ten thousand arts against those who objected to his restoration as uncanonical and irregular. Some he bribed by gifts and honors, and by translation to wealthier or more eligible sees than those they occupied; others he terrified by reproaches and accusations, which, on their embracing his party, were speedily and altogether dropped. That, in the corrupt state of the Byzantine empire and Church, something of this must have happened at such a crisis, there can be little doubt; though there can be as little doubt that these statements are much exaggerated. It is probable that one great purpose of Basil in restoring Photius to the patriarchate was to do away with divisions in the Church, for it is not to be supposed that Photius was without his partisans. But to effect this purpose he had to gain over the Western Church. Nicholas had been succeeded by Hadrian II, and he by John VIII (some reckon him to be John IX), who now occupied the papal chair. John was more pliant than Nicholas, and Basil was a more energetic prince than the dissolute Michael; the pope therefore yielded to the urgent entreaties of a prince whom it would have been dangerous to

disoblige; recognised Photius as lawful patriarch, and excommunicated those who refused to hold communion with him. Pope John's yielding attitude in this case betrayed so much womanly weakness that it is, in the opinion of some, thought to have been the origin of that fable about popess Joan (q.v.), in that it obtained for him *the feminine sobriquet Joanna*. But the recognition was on condition that he should resign his claim to the ecclesiastical superiority of the Bulgarians, whose archbishops and bishops were claimed as subordinates by both Rome and Constantinople; and is said to have been accompanied by strong assertions of the superiority of the Roman see. The copy of the letter in which John's consent was given is a re-translation from the Greek, and is asserted by Romish writers to have been falsified by Photius and his party. It is obvious, however, that this charge remains to be proved; and that we have no more security that the truth lies on the side of Rome than on that of Constantinople. The ecclesiastical jurisdiction of Bulgaria was no new cause of dissension: it had been asserted as strongly by the pious Ignatius as by his successor (comp. Joan. VIII Papae *Epistol.* 78, apud *Concil.* page 63, etc.). Letters from the pope to the clergy of Constantinople and to Photius himself were also sent, but the extant copies of these are said to have been equally corrupted by Photius. Legates were sent by the pope, and even the copies of their *Commonitorium*, or letter of instruction, are also said to be falsified; but these charges need to be carefully sifted. Among the asserted additions is one in which the legates are instructed to declare the council of A.D. 869 (reputed by the Romish Church to be the eighth oecumenical or fourth Constantinopolitan), at which Photius had been deposed, to be null and void. Another council, which the Greeks assert to be the eighth ecumenical one, but which the Romanists reject, was held at Constantinople A.D. 879. The papal legates were present, but Photius presided, and had everything his own way. The restoration of Photius and the nullity of the council of A.D. 869 were affirmed: the words "filioque" (q.v.), which formed one of the standing subjects of contention between the two churches, were ordered to be omitted from the creed, and the jurisdiction of the Bulgarian Church was referred to the emperor as a question affecting the boundaries of the empire. The pope refused to recognise the acts of the council, with the exception of the restoration of Photius, though they had been assented to by his legates, whom on their return he condemned, and then anathematized Photius afresh (Baron. *Annal. Eccles.* ad ann. 880, volumes 11, 13). The schism and rivalry of the churches became greater than ever, and has never since been really healed.

SEE GREEK CHURCH. Photius, according to Nicetas (*ibid.*), had been assisted in regaining the favor of Basil by the monk Theodore or Santabaren; but other writers reverse the process, and ascribe to Photius the introduction of Santabaren to Basil. Photius certainly made him archbishop of Euchaita, in Pontus; and he enjoyed, during Photius's patriarchate, considerable influence with Basil. By an accusation, true or false, made by this man against Leo, the emperor's eldest surviving son and destined successor, of conspiring his father's death, Basil had been excited to imprison his son. So far, however, was Photius from joining in the designs of Santabaren, that it was chiefly upon his urgent entreaties the emperor spared the eyes of Leo, which he had intended to put out. Basil died A.D. 886, and Leo VI succeeded to the throne. He immediately set about the ruin of Santabaren; and, forgetful of Photius's intercession, scrupled not to involve the patriarch in his fall. Andrew and Stephen, two officers of the court, whom Santabaren had formerly accused of some offence, now charged Photius and Santabaren with conspiring to depose the emperor, and to place a kinsman of Photius on the throne. The charge appears to have been utterly unfounded, but it answered the purpose. An officer of the court was sent to the church of St. Sophia, who ascended the ambo, or pulpit, and read to the assembled people articles of accusation against the patriarch. Photius was immediately led into confinement, first in a monastery, afterwards in the palace of Pegae; and Santabaren was brought in custody from Euchaita and confronted with him; the two accusers, with three other persons, were appointed to conduct the examination, a circumstance sufficient to show the nature and spirit of the whole transaction. The firmness of the prisoners, and the impossibility of proving the charge against them, provoked the emperor's rage. Santabaren was cruelly beaten, deprived of his eyes, and banished; but was afterwards recalled, and survived till the reign of Constantine Porph'rogenitus, the successor of Leo. Photius was banished to the monastery of Bordi, in Armenia (or rather in the Thema Armeniacum), where he seems to have remained till his death. He was buried in the church of a nunnery at Merdosagares. The year in which his death occurred is not ascertained. Pagi, Fabricius, and Mosheim fix it in A.D. 891; but the evidence on which their statement rests is not conclusive. He must have been an aged man when he died, for he must have been in middle age when first chosen patriarch, and he lived after that event thirty years, and probably more. He was succeeded in the patriarchate by the emperor's brother Stephen, first his pupil, then his syncellus, and one of his clergy. (Theoph. Continuat. lib.

v, c. 100; lib. 6, c. 1-5; Symeon Magister, *De Basil. Maced.* c. 21; *De Leone Basil.* 2. c. 1; Georg. Monach. *De Basil.* c. 24; *De Leone*, c. 1-7.)

The character of Photius is by no means worthy of much respect. He was an able man of the world, but not influenced by the high principles which befitted his sacred office. Yet he was probably not below the average of the statesmen and prelates of his day; and certainly was not the monster that the historians and other writers of the Romish Church, whose representations have been too readily adopted by some moderns, would make him. A writer in the *Edinburgh Review*, 21:329, says, "He seems to have been very learned and very wicked — a great scholar and a consummate hypocrite — not only neglecting occasions of doing good, but perverting the finest talents to the worst purposes." This is unjust; he lived in a corrupt age, and was placed in a trying position; and, without hiding or extenuating his crimes, it must be remembered that his private character remains unimpeached; the very story of his being a eunuch, which, though not having the appearance of truth, shows at least that he was not open to the charge of licentiousness; his firmness is attested by his repulse of Basil from the communion of the Church, and his mercifulness by his intercession for the ungrateful Leo. It must be borne in mind also that his history has come down to us chiefly in the representations of his enemies. The principal ancient authorities have been referred to in the course of this narrative, though we have by no means cited all the places. We may add, Leo Grammaticus, *Chronographia*, pages 463-476, ed. Paris; Zonar. 16:4, 8, 11, 12; Cedren. *Compend.* pages 551, 569, 573, 593, ed. Paris; 2:172, 205, 213, 248, ed. Bonn; Glycas, *Annal.* pars 4, pages 293, 294, 297, etc., ed. Paris; pages 226, 228, 230, etc., ed. Venice; pages 544, 547, 552, ed. Bonn; Genesisius, *Reges*, lib. 4, page 48, ed. Venice; page 100, ed. Bonn; Constantin. Maneass. *Compend. Chron.* verses 5133-5163, 5233, etc., 5309, etc.; Joel, *Chronog. Compend.* page 179, ed. Paris; pages 55, 56, ed. Bonn; Ephraem. *De Patriarchis CP.* verses 10,012-10,025, ed. Bonn.

Various notices and documents relating to his history generally, but especially to his conduct in reference to the schism of the churches, may be found in the *Concilia*, volumes 8, 9, ed. Labbe; volumes 5, 6, ed. Hardouin; volumes 15, 16, 17, ed. Mansi. Of modern writers, Baronius (*Annal. Eccles.* A.D. 858-886) is probably the fullest, but at the same time one of the most unjust. Hankius (*De Byzantin. Rerum Scriptoribus*, pars 1, c. 18) has a very ample memoir of Photius, which may be advantageously compared with that of Baronius, as its bias is in the opposite direction. See

also Dupin, *Nouvelle Bibliotheque des Auteurs Ecclésiastiques*, Siecle 9, page 270, 2d ed. 1698. An essay by Francesco Fontani, *De Photio Nove Romnce Episcopo ejusque Scriptis Dissertatio*, prefixed to the first volume of his *Novae Eruditorum Delicite* (Florence, 1785, 12mo), is far more candid than most of the other works by members of the Romish Church; and is in this respect far beyond the *Memoire sur le Patriarche Photius*, by M. Weguelin, in the *Memoires de l'Academie Royale (de Prusse) des Sciences et Belles-Lettres*, annee 1777 (Berlin, 1779, 4to), page 440, etc. Shorter accounts may be found in Mosheim (*Eccles. Hist.* by Murdock, book 3, cent. 9, part 2, c. 3, § 27-32), and in the works cited at the close of this article. Fabricius has given a list of the councils held to determine questions arising out of the struggle of Ignatius and Photius for the patriarchate, or out of the contests of the Eastern and Western churches with regard to Photius. He has also given a list of writers respecting Photius, divided into — 1. Those hostile to Photius; and 2. Those more favorable to him. Of the historians of the lower empire, Le Beau (*Bas Empire*, 54, 70, 38, etc.; 71, 72:1-3) is outrageously partial, inflaming the crimes of Photius, and rejecting as untrue, or passing over without notice, the record of those incidents which are honorable to him. Gibbon (*Decline and Fall*, c. 53, 60), more favorable, has two separate, but brief and unsatisfactory, notices of the patriarch.

Writings. — The published works of Photius are the following:

1. Μυριόβιβλον ἢ Βιβλιοθήκη, *Myriobiblon seu Bibliotheca*. This is the most important and valuable of the works of Photius. It may be described as an extensive review of ancient Greek literature by a scholar of immense erudition and sound judgment. It is an extraordinary monument of literary energy, for it was written while the author was engaged in his embassy to Assyria, at the request of Photius's brother Tarasius, who was much grieved at the separation, and desired an account of the books which Photius had read in his absence. It thus conveys a pleasing impression, not only of the literary acquirements and extraordinary industry, but of the fraternal affection of the writer. It opens with a prefatory address to Tarasius, recapitulating the circumstances in which it was composed, and stating that it contained a notice of two hundred and seventy-nine volumes. The extant copies contain a notice of two hundred and eighty: the discrepancy, which is of little moment, may have originated either in the mistake of Photius himself, or in some alteration of the divisions by some transcriber. It has been doubted whether we have the work entire. An

extant analysis, by Photius, of the *Historia Ecclesiastica* of Philostorgius (q.v.), by which alone some knowledge of the contents of that important work has been preserved to us, is so much fuller than the brief analysis of that work contained in the present text of the *Bibliotheca*, as to lead to the supposition that the latter is imperfect. "It is to be lamented," says Valesius (*De Critica*, 1:29), "that many such abridgments and collections of extracts are now lost. If these were extant in the state in which they were completed by Photius, we should grieve less at the loss of so many ancient writers." But Leiche has shown (*Diatribes in Phot. Biblioth.*) that we have no just reason for suspecting that the *Bibliotheca* is imperfect; and that the fuller analysis of Philostorgius probably never formed part of it, but was made at a later period. The two hundred and eighty divisions of the *Bibliotheca* must be understood to express the number of volumes (codices) or manuscripts, and not of writers or of works: the works of some writers, e.g. of Philo Judaeus (codd. 103-105), occupy several divisions; and, on the other hand, one division (e.g. cod. 125, *Justini Martyris Scripta Varia*), sometimes comprehends a notice of several different works written in one codex. The writers examined are of all classes: the greater number, however, are theologians, writers of ecclesiastical history, and of the biography of eminent churchmen; but several are secular historians, philosophers, and orators, heathen or Christian, of remote or recent times, lexicographers, and medical writers; only one or two are poets, and those on religious subjects, and there are also one or two writers of romances or love tales. There is no formal classification of these various writers; though a series of writers or writings of the same class frequently occurs, e.g. the *Acta* of various councils (codd. 15-20); the writers on the *Resurrection* (codd. 21-23); and the secular historians of the Byzantine empire (codd. 6267). In fact, the works appear to be arranged in the order in which they were read. The notices of the writers vary much in length: those in the earlier part are very briefly noticed, the later ones more fully; their recent perusal apparently enabling the writer to give a fuller account of them; so that this circumstance confirms our observation as to the arrangement of the work. Several valuable works, now lost, are known to us chiefly by the analyses or extracts which Photius has given of them; among them are the *Persica* and *Indica* of Ctesias (q.v.), in cod. 72; the *De Rebus post Alexandrum Mognum gestis*, and the *Parthica* and the *Bithynica* of Arrian, in codd. 53, 92, and 93; the *Historiae* of Olympiodorus (q.v.), in cod. 80; the *Narrationes* of Conon, in cod. 186; the *Nova Historia* of Ptolemy

Hephaestion, in cod. 190; the *De Heracleae Ponticae Rebus* of Memnon, in cod. 224; the *Vita Isidori* by Damascius, in cod. 242; the lost *Declamationes* of Himerius, in cod. 243; the lost books of the *Bibliotheca* of Diodorus Siculus, in cod. 244; the *De Erythraeo* (s. *Rubro*) *Mari* of Agatharchides, in cod. 250; the anonymous *Vita Pauli CPolitani* and *Vita Athanasii*, in codd. 257 and 258; the lost *Orationes*, genuine or spurious, of Antiphon, Isocrates, Lysias, Iseaus, Demosthenes, Hyperides, Deinarchus, and Lycurgus, in codd. 259-268; and of the *Chrestomatheia* of Helladius of Antinoopolis, in cod. 279; besides several theological and ecclesiastical and some medical works. The above enumeration will suffice to show the inestimable value of the *Bibliotheca* of Photius, especially when we reflect how much the value of his notices is enhanced by the soundness of his judgment. The first edition of the *Bibliotheca* was published by David Hoeschelius, under the title of **Βιβλιοθήκη τοῦ Φωτίου**, *Liborum quos legit Photius Patriarcha Excerpta et Censurae* (Augsburg, 1601, fol.). Some of the *Epistolae* of Photius were subjoined. The text of the *Bibliotheca* was formed on a collation of four MSS., and was accompanied with notes by the editor; but there was no Latin version. A Latin version and scholia, by Andreas Schottus of Antwerp, were published (ibid. 1606, fol.); but the version is inaccurate, and has been severely criticised. It was, however, reprinted, with the Greek text, under the title of **Φωτίου Μυριόβιβλον ἢ Βιβλιοθήκη**, *Photii Myriobiblon sive Bibliotheca* (Geneva, 1612, fol., and Rouen, 1653, fol.). This last edition is a splendid one, but inconvenient from its size. An edition, with a revised text, formed on a collation of four MSS. (whether any of them were the same as those employed by Hoeschelius is not mentioned), was published by Immanuel Bekker (Berlin, 1824-25, 2 thin volumes 4to): it is convenient from its size and the copiousness of its index, but has neither version nor notes.

2. Ἐπιτομή ἐκ τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν ἱστοπιῶν Φιλοστοργίου ἀπὸ φωνῆς Φωτίου πατριάρχου, *Compendium Historie Ecclesiasticae Philostorgii quod dictavit Photius patriarcha*. Cave regards this as a fragment of another work similar to the *Bibliotheca*, but his conjecture rests on no solid foundation. The *Compendium* is of great importance as preserving to us, though very imperfectly, an Arian statement of the ecclesiastical transactions of the busy period of the Arian controversy in the 4th century. It was first published, with a Latin version and copious notes, by Jacobus Gothofredus (Godefroi) (Geneva, 1643, 4to); and was

reprinted with the other ancient Greek ecclesiastical historians by Henricus Valesius (Henri Valois) (Paris, 1673, fol.) and by Reading (Cambridge, 1720, fol.).

3. Νομοκανών or **Νομοκάνονον**, *Nomocanon*, s. *Nomocanonon*, a. *Nomocanonus*, s. *Canonum Ecclesiasticorum et Legum Imperialium de Ecclesiastica Disciplina Conciliatio s. Harmonia*. This work, which bears ample testimony to the extraordinary legal attainments of its author, is arranged under fourteen **τίτλοι**, *Tituli*, and was prefixed to a **Σφῆνταγμα τῶν κανόνων**, *Canonum Syntagma*, or collection of the *Canons* of the apostles and of the ecclesiastical councils recognised by the Greek Church, compiled by Photius; from which circumstance it is sometimes called **Προκάνων**, *Procanon*. It has been repeatedly published, with the commentaries of Theodore Balsamon, who strongly recommended it, in preference to similar works of an earlier date: it appeared in the Latin version of Gentianus Hervetus (Paris, 1561, fol.), and in another Latin version of Henricus Agyvaeus (Basle, 1561, fol.), and in the original Greek text with the version of Agylaeus, edited by Christophorus Justellus (Paris, 1615, 4to). It was reprinted, with the version of Agylaeus, in the *Bibliotheca Juris Canonici*, published by Guillelmus Voellus and Henricus Justellus (Paris, 1661, fol.), 2:785, etc. The *Nomocanon* of Photius was epitomized in the kind of verses called *politici* by Michael Psellus. whose work was published, with one or two other of his pieces, by Franciscus Bosquetus (Paris, 1632, 8vo).

4. Περὶ τῶν ζ οἰκουμενικῶν συνόδων, *De Septem Conciliis OEcumenicis*. This piece subjoined, with a Latin version, to the *Nomocanon* in the Paris editions of 1615 and 1661, and often published elsewhere, is really part of one of the *Epistolae* of Photius, and is noticed in our account of them.

5. Ἐπιστολαί, *Epistolae*. There are extant a considerable number of the letters of Photius. The MSS. containing them are enumerated by Fabricius (*Bibl. Graec.* 11:11). It is much to be regretted that no complete collection of them has been published. David Hoeschelius subjoined to his edition of the *Bibliotheca* (Augsburg, 1601, fol.), mentioned above, thirty-five letters selected from a MS. collection which had belonged to Maximus Margunius, bishop of Cerigo, who lived about the end of the 16th century. One consolatory letter to the nun Eusebia on her sister's death was published by Conrad Rittershausius, with a Latin version, with some other

pieces (Nürnberg, 1601, 8vo). But the largest collection is that prepared with a Latin version and notes by Richard Mountagu (Latinized Montacutius), bishop of Norwich, and published after his death (Lond. 1651, fol.). The Greek text was from a MS. in the Bodleian Library. The collection comprehends two hundred and forty-eight letters translated by the bishop, and a supplement of five letters brought from the East by Christianus Ravius, of which also a Latin version by another person is given. The first letter in Mountagu's collection is addressed to Michael, prince of the Bulgarians, on the question *Τί ἐστὶν ἔργον ἄρχοντος*, *De Officio Principis*: it is very long, and contains the account of the seven general councils already mentioned (No. 4), as subjoined to the printed editions of the *Nomocanon*. This letter to prince Michael was translated into French verse by Bernard, a Theatin monk, dedicated to Louis XV, and published (Paris, 1718, 4to). The second letter, also of considerable length, is an encyclical letter on various disputed topics, especially on that of the procession of the Holy Spirit, the leading theological question in dispute between the Eastern and Western churches. Mountagu's version has been severely criticised by Combefis (Fabricius, *Bibl. Graec.* 1:701, note f f f). Several important letters are not included in the collection, especially two to pope Nicholas I, and one to the archbishop or patriarch of Aquileia, on the procession of the Holy Spirit, of all of which Baronius had given a Latin version in his *Annales Ecclesiastici* (ad ann. 859, 61, etc.; 861, 34, etc.; and 883:5, etc.). Fragments of the Greek text of the letters to pope Nicholas were cited by Allatius in different parts of his works; the original of the letter to the archbishop of Aquileia was published in the *Auctarium Novissimum* of Combefis, part 1, page 527, etc. (Paris, 1672, fol.), with a new Latin version and notes by the editor; and the original of all the three letters, together with a previously unpublished letter, *Ad OEconomum Ecclesiae Antiochiae*, and the encyclical letter on the procession of the Holy Spirit (included in Mountagu's collection), the *Acta* of the eighth oecumenical council (that held in 879, at which the second appointment of Photius to the patriarchate was ratified), and some other pieces, with notes by Dositheus, patriarch of Jerusalem, were published by Anthimus "Episcopus Remnicus," i.e., bishop of Rimnik, in Wallachia, in his *Τὸ μὸς χαρᾶς* (Rimnik, 1705, fol.). A letter, *Ad Theophanem Monachum*, i.e., to Theophanes Cerameus, with a Latin version by Sirmond, was published by the Jesuit Franciscus Scorsus, in his *Proommiune Secundum*, § 3, to the *Homilice* of Cerameus (Paris, 1644, fol.), and another letter, *Stauracio Spatharo-candidato, Praefecto insule Cypri*, was included in the *Ecclesiae*

Graecae Monumenta of Cotelerius (2:104), together with a short piece, **Περὶ τοῦ μὴ δεῖν πρὸς τὰ ἐν τῷ βίῳ λυπηρὰ ἐπιστρέφεισθαι**, *Quod non oporteat adpresentis vitce molestias attendere*, which, though not bearing the form of a letter (perhaps it is a fragment of one), is in the MS. classed with the *Epistole*. A Latin version, from the Armenian, of some fragments of an *Epistola Photii ad Zachariam Armeniae Patriarcham*, in support of the doctrine of the Council of Chalcedon, is given in the *Conciliatio Ecclesiae Armeniae cum Romana* of Galanus (Rom. 1650, fol.). To all these we may add the *Epistola Tarasio Fratri*, usually subjoined to the *Bibliotheca*. The *Epistola ad Zachariam*, just mentioned, and another letter, *Ad Principem Armenium Asutium*, are extant in MS. in an Armenian version (comp. Mai, *Scriptor. Veterum Nov. Collectio*, Proleg. in volume 1, Rom. 1825, 4to).

6. Λέξεων συναγωγή s. **Λεξικόν**, *Lexicon*. Marquardus Gudius, of Hamburg, had an anonymous MS. lexicon, which he believed and asserted to be that of Photius; but the correctness of his opinion was first doubted by some, and is now given up by most scholars; and another lexicon, much shorter, and which is in the MSS. ascribed to Photius, is now admitted to be the genuine work of that eminent man. Of this *Lexicon* there exist several MSS., but that known as the Codex Galeanus, because given by Thomas Gale to the library of Trinity College, Cambridge, is considered to be the archetype from which the others have been transcribed; but this MS. is in itself very imperfect, containing in fact not much more than half the original work. Nearly the whole of the lexicon known as the *Lexicon Sangermanense*, a portion of which was published in the *Anecdota Græca* of Immanuel Bekker (Berlin, 1814, 8vo), 1:319, etc., appears to have been incorporated in the *Lexicon* of Photius, of which, when entire, it is estimated to have formed a third part (*Præfat.* to Porson's edition). The *Lexicon* of Photius was first published, from Continental MSS., by Gothofredus Hermannus (Leips. 1808, 4to). It formed the third volume of a set, of which the first two volumes contained the *Lexicon* ascribed to Joannes Zonaras. The publication of the *Lexicon* was followed by that of a *Libellus Aninadversionum ad Photii Lexicon* (Leips. 1810, 4to), and *Curæ Novissimæ sive Appendix Notarum et Emendationum in Photii Lexicon* (Leips. 1812, 4to), both by Jo. Fried. Schleusner. But the edition of Hermann having failed to satisfy the wants of the learned, an edition from a transcript of the Codex Galeanus, made by Porson, was published

after the death of that eminent scholar (Lond. 1822, 4to and 8vo). (Comp. *Edinb. Rev.* 21:329, etc., No. 42, July 1813, and *Class. Journ.* l.c.)

7. **Ἀμφιλόχεια**, *Amphilochia*. This work, which Allatius, not a friendly censor, declared to be "a work filled with vast and varied learning, and very needful for theologians and expositors of Scripture," is in the form of answers to certain questions, and is addressed to Amphilochius, archbishop of Cyzicus. The answers are said in one MS. (apud Fabricius, *Bibl. Grce.* 11:26) to be two hundred and ninety-seven in number; but Montfaucon (l.c.) published an index of three hundred and eight, and a Vatican MS., according to Mai (*Script. Vet. Nova Collectio*, volume 1, Proleg. page 39), contains three hundred and thirteen. Of these more than two hundred and twenty have been published, but in various fragmentary portions (Mai, l.c.). The first portion which appeared in print was in the *Lectiones Antiquae* of Canisius (Ingolstadt, 1604, etc., 4to), 5:188, etc., who gave a Latin version, by Franciscus Turrianus, of six of the *Quaestiones*; but the work to which they belonged was not mentioned. In the subsequent edition of the *Lectiones* by Basnage (Amsterd. 1725, 4to, volume 2, part 2, page 240, etc.), the Greek text of five of the six was added (the original of the sixth seems never to have been discovered), as well as the Greek text of a seventh *Quaestio*, "*De Christi Voluntatibus Gnomis*," of which a Latin version by Turrianus had been published in the *Auctarium Antiquarum Canisii Lectionum* of the Jesuit Petrus Stewartius (Ingolstadt, 1616, 4to); also without notice that it was from the *Amphilochia*. Further additions were made by Combefis, in his *SS. Patrum Amphilochii, etc., Opera* (Paris, 1644, 2 volumes, fol.) (by a strange error he ascribed the work not to Photius, but to Amphilochius of Iconium, a much older writer, from whose works he supposed Photius had made a selection), and in his *Novum Auctarium* (Paris, 1648), 2 volumes, fol.; by Montfaucon, in his *Bibliotheca Coisliniana* (Paris, 1715, fol.); and by Jo. Justus Spier, in *Wittenbergische Anmerkungen uber theologische, philosophische, historische, philologische, und kritische Materien* (Wittenberg, 1738, 8vo), part 1 (Harles, *Introd. in Historiam Linguae Graec. Supplem.* 2:47). But the principal addition was made by Jo. Chr. Wolff, of forty-six *Quaestiones*, published, with a Latin version, in his *Curae Philologicae* (Hamb. 1735, 4to), volume 5 ad fin.; these were reprinted in the *Bibliotheca Patrum* of Galland (Venice, 1779, fol.), volume 13. A further portion of eighteen *Quaestiones*, under the title **Ἐκ τῶν Φωτίου Ἀμφιλοχίων τινᾶ**, *Ex Photii Amphilochii quaedam*, was published, with

a Latin version, by Angelus Antonius Schottus (Naples, 1817, 4to); and some further portions, one of twenty *Quaestiones*, with a Latin version by Mai, in his *Scriptorum Veterum Nova Collectio*, 1:193, etc., and another of a hundred and thirty *Quaestiones*, in 9:1, etc. As many of the *Quaestiones* were mere extracts from the *Epistolce* and other published works of Photius, Mai considers that with these and with the portions published by him, the whole of the *Amphilochia* has now been published. He thinks (*Scriptor. Vet. Nova Collect.* volume 1, Proleg. p. 40) that the patriarch, towards the close of his life, compiled the work from his own letters, homilies, commentaries, etc., and addressed it to his friend Amphilochius, as a mark of respect, and not because the questions which were solved had actually been proposed to him by that prelate; and he thus accounts for the identity of many passages with those in the author's other works.

8. *Adversus Manichaeos s. Paulicianos Libri Quatuor*. No Greek title of the whole work occurs, but the four books are respectively thus described: 1. Διήγησις περί τῆς Μανιχαίων ἀναβλαστήσεως, *Narratio de Manicheis recens repullulantibus*. 2. Ἀπορίαι καὶ λύσεις τῶν Μανιχαίων, *Dubia et Solutiones Manichaeorum*. 3. Τοῦ Φωτιου λόγος, *Photii Sermo II*. 4. Κατὰ τῆς τῶν Μανιχαίων ἀρτιφυοῦς πλανῆς, Ἀρσενίῳ τῷ ἁγιωτάτῳ μοναχῷ πρεσβυτέρῳ καὶ ἡγουμένῳ τῶν ἱερῶν, *Contra repulliantem Manicheorum Eirrorem ad Arsenium Monachum Sanctissimum Presbyterum et Praefectum Sacrorum*. The title of the second book is considered by Wolff to apply to the second, third, and fourth books, which formed the argumentative part of the work. and to which the first book formed a historical introduction. The second book is intended to show that the same God who created spiritual intelligences also created the bodies with which they are united, and the material world generally; the third vindicates the divine origin of the Old Testament; and the fourth reiterates some points of the second and third books, and answers the objections of the Paulicians. The first book has several points in common with the historical work of Petrus Siculus on the same subject, so as to make it probable that one writer used the work of the other, and it is most likely Photius availed himself of that of Petrus. This important work of Photius was designed for publication by several scholars (see Wolff, *Praefat. in Anecd. Graec.* volume 1; and Fabricius, *Bibl. Graec.* 7:329; 11:18), but they were prevented by death from fulfilling their purpose. Montfaucon published the first book, with a Latin version, in his *Bibliotheca Coisliniana* (page 349, etc.); and the whole work was given by

Jo. Christoph. Wolff, with a Latin version and notes, in his *Anecdota Graeca* (Hamb. 1722, 12mo), volumes 1:ii, from which it was reprinted in volume 13 of the *Bibliotheca Patrum* of Galland (Venice, 1779, fol.). A sort of epitome of this work of Photius is found in the *Panoplia* of Euthymius Zigabenus. Oudin contended that the work of Metrophanes of Smyrna. on the Manichaeans and on the Holy Spirit, was identical with this work of Photius; but this opinion is erroneous.

9. Κατὰ τῶν τῆς παλαιᾶς Ῥώμης ὅτι ἐκ Πατρὸς μόνου ἐκπορεύεται τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἀλλ' οὐχὶ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, *A dversus Latinos de Processione Spiritus Sacfti*. This work is incorporated in the Greek text of the *Panoplia* of Euthymius Zigabenus (Tergovist. 1710, fol., pages 112, 113), of which it constitutes the thirteenth τίτλος or section. It is omitted in the Latin versions of Euthymius. The work of Photius contains several syllogistic propositions, which are quoted and answered seriatim in the *De Unione Ecclesiarum Oratio I*, of Joannes Veccus, published in the *Graecia Orthodoxa* of Allatius (Rome, 1652, 4to), 1:154, etc. It is apparently the work entitled by Cave *Disputatio Compendiaria de Processione Spiritus Sancti a solo Patre*.

10. *Homiliae*. Several of these have been published:

(1.) Ἐκφρασις τῆς ἐν τοῖς βασιλείου τοῦ ἐκκλησίας τῆς ὑπεραγίας θεοφτόκου ὑπὸ Βασιλίου τοῦ Μακεδόνης οἰκοδομηθείσης, *Descriptio Novae Sanctissimae Dei Genitricis Ecclesiae, in Palatio a Basilio Macedone exstructae*; a discourse delivered on the day of the dedication of the church described. It was first printed by Lambecius, in his notes to the work of Georgius Codinus, *De Originibus CPolitanis* (Paris, 1655, fol.), page 187, and is contained, with a Latin version, in the Bonn reprint of Codinus (1839, 8vo). It is also contained in the *Originum CPolitanarum Manipulus* of Coamefis (Paris, 1664, 4to), page 296, with a Latin version and notes; and in the *Imperium Orientale* of Bandurius (Paris, 1711, fol.), pars 3, page 117.

(2.) Εἰς τὸ γενέσιον τῆς ὑπεραγίας θεοτόκου, *Homilia in Sanctissimae Dei Genitricis Natalem Diem*, published by Combefis in his *Auctarium Novum* (Paris, 1648, fol.), volume 1, col. 1583, and in a Latin version, in his *Bibliotheca Patrum concionatoria* (Paris, 1662, fol. etc.). Both text and version are reprinted in the *Bibliotheca Patrum* of Galland.

(3.) *In Sepulturam Domini*; a fragment, probably from this, is given by Mai (*Scriptor, Vet. Nova l Collect. Proleg.* in volume 1, page 41).

(4.) *Περὶ τοῦ μὴ δεῖν πρὸς τὰ ἐν τῷ βίῳ λυπηρὰ ἐπιστρέφεισθα*, *Quod nomn oporteat ad pcesentis Vitce Molestios attendere.* — This piece, which is perhaps not a homily, but the fragment of a letter, was published in the *Ecelesie Greece Monumenta* of Cotelerius, and has already been noticed in speaking of the *Epistolae* of Photius.

11. *Ἐρωτήματα δέκα σὺν ἴσαις ταῖ ἀποκρίσεσι*, *Interrogationes decem n cune totidem Responionibus*, s. *Συναγωγὰ καὶ ἀποδείξεις ἀκριβεῖς συνειλεγμέναι ἐκ τῶν συνοδικῶν καὶ ἱστορικῶν γραφῶν περὶ ἐπισκόπων καὶ μητροπολιτῶν καὶ λοιπῶν ἑτερων ἀναγκαίων ζητημάτων*, *Collectiones accurataeque Demonstrationes de Episcopis et Metropolitibus et reliquis allis necessariis Quaestionibus ex Synodicis et Historicis Monumentis excerptae*. This piece was published, with a Latin version and notes, by Francesco Fontani, in the first volume of his *Notae Eruditorum Deliciae* (Florence; 1785, 12mo). The notes were such as to give considerable offence to "the stricter Romanists. (Mai, *Scriptor. Veteo. Nov. Collect. Proleg.* ad volume 1, page 44).

12. *Εἰς τὸν Λουκᾶν ἐρμηνεῖαι*, *In Lucam Expositiones*. Some brief *Scheoliaon* the Gospel of Luke from MSS. *Cafenae*, are given, with a Latin version, in volume 1 of the *Scriptorum Vetesume Nova Collectio* of Mai, page 189, etc., but from which of Photius's' works they are taken does not appear.

13. *Canonica Responsa*, addressed to Leo, archbishop of Calabria; also published, with a Latin version, by Mai (*ibid.* page 362), from a Palimpsest in the Vatican Library.

Many works of this great writer still remain in MS.:

1. *Commentarius in D. Paculi Epistolas*, a mutilated copy of which is (or was, according to Cave) in the public library at Cambridge. It is largely cited by OEcumenius.

2. *Catena in Psalmos*. formerly in the Coislinian library, of which, according to Montfalcon (*Bibl. Coislin.* pages 58, 59), Photius appears to have been the compiler. Bunt the Commentary on the Prophets, *Prophetarum Libe*; ascribed to him by Cave, Fabricius, and others, appears to have no real existence; the supposition of its existence was founded on

the misapprehension of a passage in Possevino's *Apparatus Sacer* (Mai, *Proleg.* ut sup. page 1).

3. *Homiice XIV*, extant in MS. at 3 Moscow, of the subjects of which a list is given in the *Auctarium Novissimum* (ad calc. volume 1) of Combefis, in the *De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis* of Oudin (col. 210, etc.), and in the *Ribl. Graeca* (11:80, etc.) of Fabricius. To these may be added two other homilies, *De Ascensione*, and *In Festo Epiphaniae*, and an *Enconmium Poto Martyis Theole* (Fabricius, *ibid.*).

4. *Odae*. Nine are or were extant in a MS. formerly belonging to the college of Clermont, at Paris, and three in an ancient Barberini MS. at Rome. The latter are described by Mai (*Proleg.* page 44) as of moderate length, and written in pleasing verse. Some *Epigrammata* of Photius are said to be extant (Montfaucon, *Bibl. Coislin.* page 520); but the **Στιχηρόν**, *In Methodiunt Col.*, said to be given in the *Acta Sanctorum, Junii*, 2:969, is not to be found there.

5. **Ἐπιτομή τῶν πρακτικῶν τῶν ἑπτὰ οἰκουμενικῶν συνοδῶν**, *Epitome Actorum Conciliorum septem Generalium*. This is described by Cave and Fabricius as a different work from the published piece (No. 4, above). Some critics have doubted whether it is different from the similar work ascribed to Photius of Tyre; but as this prelate lived in the time of the third or fourth councils, he could not have epitomized the *Acta* of the fifth, sixth, and seventh. Thus the *Epitome* cannot be by Photius of Tyre, whatever doubt there may be as to its being the work of our Photius.

6. The *Syntagma Canonum* has already been mentioned in speaking of the *Nomocanon*;

7. **Περὶ τῆς τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος μυσταγωγίας**, *De Spiritus Sancti Disciplina Arcixna*, s. **Περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου καὶ ζωοποιοῦ καὶ προσκυνητοῦ Πνεύματος**, *uber de Spiritu Sancto*, addressed to a bishop Bedas, and different from the published work (No, 9). It is described by Mai, who has given some extracts (*Proleg.* page 45), as "liber luculentus, varius, atque prolixus." It is ascribed in one MS., but by an obvious error, to Metrophanes of Smyrna.

8. **Τὰ παρὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῶν Λατίνων αἰτιώματα μερικά**, *A dversus Latinorum Ecclesiam Criminationes Particulares*.

9. *Contrea Flancos et Latinos* (*ibid.* page 48); a very short piece. Various other pieces are mentioned by Cave, Lambecius, Fabricius, and Mai, as extant in MS.; but some of these are only fragments of the published writings (*ibid.* page 1) enumerated by 'mistake as separate works.' The work *In Categories Aristotelis*, now or formerly extant in Vienna and Paris, is apparently a part of the *Amphilochia* (*ibid.* page 36). The works *De Episcopis et Metropolitibus*, and the *Annotatio del Patriarchis sede sua injuste pulsus*) mentioned by Cave and Fabricius, appear to be either the *Interrogationes decem* published by Fontani, or a part of that work. (See No. 11 of the published works.) The *Symbolem Fidei* mentioned by Lambecius, Cave, and Harles (Fabricius, *Bibl. Graec.* 11:30), part of one of the letters to pope Nicholas; and the *Liber de Pulsione Ignatii ac Restitutione* mentioned by Montfaucon (*Bibl. Bibliothecarum*, page 123), is also part of a letter of pope Nicholas; and the fragment *De decem Oratoribus*, mentioned by Vossius and others, and extant in MS. in the King's Library at Paris, is probably from the *Bibliotheca* (Mai, *Proleg.* page 1). Some works have perished, as that against the heretic Leontius of Antioch, mentioned by Suidas (s.v. [Λεόντιος](#)). Photius wrote also against the emperor Julian (Phot. *Epist.* 187, ed. Montac.), and in defence of the use of images. Some writings, or fragments of writings of his on this subject (*Adversus Iconomachos et Paulicianos*, and *De Differential inter sacras Imágenes atque Idola*) are extant in the Imperial Library at Vienna, but whether in distinct works, or under what title does not appear to be known.

In the *Synodicon* of bishop Beveridge (volume 2, ad fin. part 1) a short piece is given, of which the running title is *Balsamon in Photii Interrogationes quorundam Monachorum*; but the insertion of the name of Photius is altogether incorrect; the work belongs to the time of the emperor Alexius I Comnenus. The *Exegesis*, or Commentary of Elias Cretensis on the *Scula Paradisi* of Joannes Climacus, is, in a MS. of the Coislinian library (Montfaucon, *Bibl. Coislin.* page 141), improperly ascribed to Photius.

Two learned Romanists, Joannes Andresius and Jacobus Morellius, have in recent times contemplated the publication of a complete edition of the works of Photius; the latter proceeded so far as to draw up a *Coinspectus* of his proposed edition (Mai, *Proleg.* page 44). But unfortunately the design has never been completed. Migie has published an edition in 4 volumes, roy. 8vo, which he claims to be complete, but it is hardly as

critical as the works of the greatest genius of his age deserves. This edition is entitled *Photii, Constantinopolitani patriarcher, opera omnia in classes quinque distributa: exegetica, dogmatica, parmenetica, historiccaanonica.* etc., accurate J.P. Migne (tomes 1 et 4, in grande a deux colonnes, 1416 p., Paris, impr. et libr. J.P. Migne, 1860. Veneunt 4 volumes, 42 francis gallicis). See Cave, *Hist. Litt.* 2:47, etc. (ed. Oxford, 1740-1743); Fabricius, *Biblioth. Graec.* 1:701; 6:603; 7:803; 10:670 to 11:37; 12:185, 210, 216, 348; Oudin, *Comment. de Scriptorib. et Scriptis Eccles.* volume 2, col. 200, etc.; Hankius, *De Rerum Byzantin. Scriptorib.* pars 1, c. 18; Dupin, *Nouvelle Bibliotheque des Auteurs Eccls, IXme Siecle*, page 346 (2me ed. 1698); Ceillier, *Auteurs Sacres*, 19:426, etc.; Ittigius, *De Bibliothecis Patrum*, passim; Gallandius, *Biblioth. Patrum*, Proleg; in volume 13; Fontani, *De Photio. Nove Romae Episcopo ejusque Scriptis Dissertatio*, prefixed to volume 1 of the *Novae Eruditorum Deliciae*; Mai, *Scriptor. Vet. Nova Collectio*, Proleg. in volume 1; Assemani, *Bibliotheca Juris Orientalis*, lib. 1, c. 2, 7, 8, 9; Vossius, *De Historicis Graecis*, lib. 2, c. 25; Donaldson's *Literaturae* (see Index in volume 2); Lea, *Sacerdotal Celibacy* (see Index), Ffoullkes, *Divisions of Christendom*, volume 2, chapter 1; Flenry, *Hist. Ecclesiastique*; Maimbourg, *Schisme des Grecs*; Dollinger, *Lehrbuch der Kirchengesch.* volume 1; Jager, *Hist. de Photius, d'apres les monuments originaux* (Paris, 1845).

Photius Of Tyre

another Eastern ecclesiastic, flourished near the middle of the 5th century. On the deposition of Irenaeus, bishop of Tyre, in A.D. 448, Photius was appointed his successor. Evagrius (*Hist. Eccles.* 1:10) makes the deposition of Irenaeus one: of the acts of the notorious Council of Ephesus, held in A.D. 449, and known as the "Concilium Latrocinale;" but Tillemont more correctly considers that the council only confirmed the previous deposition (*Mmoires*, 15:268). Photius of Tyre was one of the judges appointed by the emperor Theodosius II, in conjunction with Eustathius, bishop of Berytus, and Uranius, bishop of Himerae in Osrhoene, to hear the charges against Ibas, bishop of Edessa. Photius, Eustathius, and Uranias met at Berytus, and Photius and Eustathius again met at Tyre, in the year 448 or 449, heard the charges, acquitted Ibas, and brought about a reconciliation between him and his accusers, who were presbyters of his own Church at Edessa (*Concil.* volume 4, col. 627, etc., ed. Labbe; volume 2, col. 503, etc., ed. Hardouin). There is a considerable

difficulty as to the chronology of these meetings, which is discussed by Tillemont in two of his careful notes (*Mem.* 15:897, etc.). Photius was present at the Council of Ephesus, known as the "Concilium Latrocinale," where he joined in acquitting the archimandrite Eltyches, and restoring him to his ecclesiastical rank from which he had been deposed (*Concil.* volume 4, col. 260, ed. Labbe; volume 2, col. 220, ed. Hardouin). About the same time Photius had a contest with Eustathius, bishop of Berytus, who had obtained an edict of the emperor Theodosius II, erecting Berytus into a metropolitan see, as to the extent of their respective jurisdictions. Tillemont judges that the dignity accorded to the see of Berytus was designed to be merely titular, and that the struggle was occasioned by the attempt of Eustathius to assume metropolitan jurisdiction over some bishoprics previously under the jurisdiction of Tyre. In this attempt, being supported by the patriarchs Xnatolius of Constamntinople and Maximus of Antioch, he effected his purpose; and Photius, after a struggle, was constrained, not so much by an excommunication, which was speedily recalled, as by a threat of deposition, to submit. The jurisdiction of the dioceses abstracted was, however, restored to Photius by the Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451 (*Concil.* volume 4, col. 539, ed. Labbe; volume 2, col. 435, etc., ed. Hardouin). Photius was among those who at the same council voted that Theodoret was orthodox, and should be restored to his see (*Concil.* col. 619, ed. Labbd; col. 495, ed. Hardouin). He also took part in some of the other transactions of the assembly. Nothing further is known of him. There is extant one piece of Photius, entitled *Δεήσεις*, *Preces s. Supplex Libellus*, addressed to the emperors Valentinian III and Marcian, respecting the dispute with Eustathius of Berytus. It is given in the *Actio Quarta* of the Council of Chalcedon (*Concil.* volume 4, col. 542, etc., ed. Labbd; volume 2, col. 436, etc., ed. Hardouin).

A Synopsis de Conciliis, extant in MS., is ascribed to Photius of Tyre: this cannot be, as some have supposed, the same work as the *Epitome Actorum Conciliorum*, also extant in MS., and ascribed to the more celebrated Photius, patriarch of Constantinople. See Tillemont, *Mein.* l.c.: Cave, *Hist. Litt.* ad ann. 451, 1:443; Fabricius, *Biblioth. Graec.* 10:678; 12:358; Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* s.v.

Photizomonoι

(*φωτιζόμενοι*, *enlqkhtened*), a term frequently used among the early Christians to denote the baptized as being instructed in the mysteries of the Christian religion. *SEE PHOS.*

Phrat

SEE EUPHRATES.

Phrenology

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

Phrontisterion

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

Phryg'ia

(**Φρυγία**, perhaps from **φρύγω**, hence *parched*), an inland province of Asia Minor, bounded on the north by Bithynia and Galatia. on the east by Cappadocia and Lycaonia, on the south by Lycia, Pisidia, and Isauria, and on the west by Caria, Lydia, and Mysia. Perhaps there is no geographical term in the New Testament which is less capable of an exact definition. Many maps convey the impression that it was coordinate with such terms as Bithynia, Cilicia, or Galatia. But in fact there was no Roman province of Phrygia till considerably after the first establishment of Christianity in the peninsula of Asia Minor. The word was rather ethnological than political, and denoted, in a vague manner, the western part of the central region of that peninsula. Accordingly, in two of the three places where it is used, it is mentioned in a manner not intended to be precise (**διελθότες τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ τὴν Φαλατικὴν χώραν**, ^{<4106>}Acts 16:6; **διερχόμενος καθεξῆς τὴν Γαλατικὴν χώραν καὶ Φρυγίαν**, ^{<4103>}Acts 18:23), the former having reference to the second missionary journey of St. Paul, the latter to the third. Nor is the remaining passage (^{<4101>}Acts 2:10) inconsistent with this view, the enumeration of those foreign Jews who came to Jerusalem at Pentecost (though it does follow, in some degree, a geographical order) having no referencs to political boundaries. By Phrygia we must understand an extensive district, which contributed portions to several Roman provinces, and varying portions at different times. In early times Phrygia seems to have comprehended the greater part of the peninsula of Asia Minor. It was subsequently divided into Phrygia Major on the south, and Phrygia Minor or Epictetus (*acquired*) on the northwest. The Romans divided the province into three districts: Phrygia Salutaris on the east, Phrygia Pacatiana on the west, and Phrygia Katakekaumene (*the burnt*) in the middle. The country, as defined by the specified limits, is for the most part level, and very abundant in corn, fruit, and wine. It had a peculiar and celebrated breed of cattle, and the fine raven-black wool of the sheep around Laodicca on the Lycus was in high repute. The Maeander and the Hermus were its chief rivers. The Phrygians were a very ancient people, and are supposed to have formed, along with the Pelasgi, the aborigines of Asia Minor. Jews from Phrygia were present in Jerusalem at the Feast of Pentecost (^{<4101>}Acts 2:10). All over this district the Jews were probably numerous. They were first introduced there by Antiochus the Great (Josephus, *Ant.* 12:3, 4); and we have abundant proof of their presence there from ^{<4134>}Acts 13:14; 14:1, 19, as well as from ^{<4101>}Acts 2:10.

The cities of Laodicea, Hierapolis, and Colosse, mentioned in the New Testament, belonged to Phrygia, and Antioch in Pisidia was also within its limits (see the names). See Rosenmuller, *Bibl. Geog.* 3:43-45; Leake, *Geog. of Asia Minor*; Smith, *Dict. of Claus. Geog.* s.v. **SEE ASIA MINOR.**

Phrygians or Cataphrygians

(q.v.), a sect in the 2d century, so called as being of the country of Phrygia. They were orthodox in everything, setting aside this, that they took Montanus for a prophet, and Priscilla and Maximilla for true prophetesses, to be consulted in everything relating to religion; as supposing that the Holy Spirit had abandoned the Church. **SEE MONTANISTS.**

Phtha or Ptah

the supreme god of the ancient Egyptians, in the first four dynasties or successions of kings, extending about 321 years. This god seems, however, in later times to have been degraded from his high position and become a secondary god. No image of this, nor indeed of any other god or goddess, is found upon the most ancient Egyptian monuments. The worship of Phtha passed from Egypt into Greece, and was altered into *Hephaestus*. "When, in later times," says Mr. Osburn, in his *Religions of the World*, "pictures and images of the gods made their appearance on the ruins of ancient Egypt, Ptah was represented as a tall youth, with handsome features, and a green complexion, denoting the swarthy, sallow hue which the burning sun of Africa had already impressed upon the skins of Phut and his descendants. He was swathed in white linen like a mummy to denote that he had been dead, but his hands had burst through the cerements, and grasped many symbols, to denote that he has risen again. This god is made the son of many divine parents, according to the later fables, both of the monuments and of the Greek authors, most of them prompted by political motives; but not on the monuments of all epochs. The image of Ptah of Memphis is enclosed in a shrine, to denote that he claimed affinity with no other god, and that his real parentage was unknown or forgotten."

Phthartodocetae

(from *φθαρτός*, *destructible*, and *δοκεω*, *to seem*). One of the numerous Monophysite sects. They were so called because they maintained that the body of Christ was truly corruptible before his resurrection. They were

opposed to another sect which affirmed that the body of Jesus was rendered incorruptible in consequence of the divine nature blended with it: these were called Aphthartodocetae, Phantasiasts, etc., and were likewise divided into parties, some of which debated whether the body of Christ was created or uncreated. *SEE APHTHARTODOCETAE; SEE MONOPHYSITES.*

Phthartolatrae

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

Phud

(Φούδ), an incorrect Greek form (<0023>Judges 2:23) of the Heb. name (<3270>Ezekiel 27:10) PHUT *SEE PHUT* (q.v.).

Phu'rah

(Heb. *Purah'*, hrPu, *bough*; Sept. Φαρά), the servant of Gideon, who went with him by night to spy the camp of the Midianites (<0070>Judges 7:10,11). B.C. 1362.

Phu'rim

(Esther 11:1). *SEE PURIM.*

Phut

(Heb. *Put*, fWP; Sept. Φούδ or Φούτ, but usually Λίβυες, and so Josephus *Ant*, 6:2) the name of a people mentioned in connection with Mizraim and Cush as third among the descendants of Ham (<0106>Genesis 10:6; "Put," <3008>1 Chronicles 1:8), elsewhere applied to an African country or people (<2449>Jeremiah 46:9; <3270>Ezekiel 27:40; 30:5; 38:5; "Put," <3489>Nahum 3:9. Comp. also <0023>Judges 2:23, in the Greek and Syriac). In all of these passages Phut or Put is named with Cush, Ludim, and Lubim. Putites served in the Egyptian; army (Jeremiah l.c.; comp. <3515>Ezekiel 30:5), and the Tyrian navy (<3270>Ezekiel 27:20), and are numbered in the army of Gog (<3585>Ezekiel 38:5). Josephus (*Ant*. 1:6, 2) understands here the Mauritians. He also mentions a river bearing the same name, in the

territory of the Mauri, which is called *Fut* by Pliny (page 242, ed. Hard.), and flows into the Atlantic. Ptolemy (4:1, 3) calls it *Phthouth* (long. $7\frac{1}{2}o$, lat. 30-o), in Mauritania Tingitana (comp. Michael. *Spicil.* 1:160 sq.). These traces of the name, however, are not needed. That it is a name of Libya is sufficiently obvious from the Sept. in Jeremiah and Ezekiel, and from the fact that *Faiat* is a Coptic name for Libya in Egypt — that is, for that part of Lower Egypt which lies west of the Canopic mouth of the Nile, so called (see Gesen. *Thesaur.* 2:1093). More recently Hitzig would identify with Put the tribe of *Putiya*, mentioned in the inscriptions at the tomb of Darius, and refers to Putea (Πούτεια), a city on the west bank of the river Triton in Northern Africa (Ptol. 4:3, 39). But no weight can be given to his remark that a people which served in the Egyptian army in foreign expeditions must not be sought in Western Africa. — Winer, 2:229. *SEE LIBYA.*

"In the above genealogical lists Phut follows Cush and Mizraim, and precedes Canaan. The settlements of Cush extended from Babylonia to Ethiopia above Egypt, those of Mizraim stretched from the Philistine territory through Egypt and along the northern coast of Africa to the west; and the Canaanites were established at first in the land of Canaan, but afterwards were spread abroad. The order seems to be ascending towards the north: the Cushite chain of settlements being the most southern, the Mizraite chain extending above them, though perhaps through a smaller region, at least at the first and the Canaanites holding the most northern position. We cannot place the tract of Phut out of Africa, and it would seem that it was almost parallel to that of the Mizraites, as it could not be farther to the north: this position would well agree with Libya. But it must be recollected that the order of the nations or tribes of the stocks of Cush, Mizraim, and Canaan is not the same as that we have inferred to be that of the principal names, and that it is also possible that Phut may be mentioned in a supplementary manner, perhaps as a nation or country dependent on Egypt. The few mentions of Phut in the Bible clearly indicate, as already remarked, a country or people of Africa, and, it must be added, probably not far from Egypt. It is noticeable that they occur only in the list of Noah's descendants and in the prophetic Scriptures. Isaiah probably makes mention of Phut as a remote nation or country, where the A.V. has *Pul*, as in the Masoretic text (²⁷⁶⁹ Isaiah 66:19). Nahum, warning Nineveh by the fall of No-Amon, speaks of Cush and Mizraim as the strength of the Egyptian city, and Phut and Lubim as its helpers (^{340B} Nahum 3:9). Jeremiah

tells of Phut in Necho's army With Cush and the Ludim (²⁴⁴⁰Jeremiah 46:9). Ezekiel speaks of Phut with Persia and Lud as supplying mercenaries to Tyre (²³⁷⁰Ezekiel 27:10), and as sharing with Cnsh, Lud, and other helpers of Egypt, in her fall (²³¹⁵Ezekiel 30:5); and again, with Persia, and Cush, perhaps in the sense of mercenaries, as warriors of the army of Gog (²³⁸⁵Ezekiel 38:5). From these passages we cannot infer anything as to the exact position of this; country or people; unless indeed in Nahum, Cush and Phut, Mizraim and Lubim, are respectively connected, which might indicate a position south of Egypt. The serving in the Egyptian army, and importance of Phut to Egypt, make it reasonable to suppose that its position was very near.

"In the ancient Egyptian inscriptions we find two names that may be compared to the Biblical Phut. The tribes or peoples called the Nine Bows, *IX Petuorm IX Na-Petu*, might partly or wholly represent Phut. Their situation is doubtful, and they are never found in a geographical list, but only in the general statements of the power and prowess of the kings. If one people be indicated by them, we may compare the Naphtuhim of the Bible. *SEE NAPHTUHIM*. It seems unlikely that the Nine Bows should correspond to Phut, as their name does not occur as a geographical term in use in the directly historical inscriptions, though it may be supposed that several well-known names there take its place as those of individual tribes; but this is an improbable explanation. The second name is that of Nubia, *To-pet*, "the region of the Bow," also called *Tonmeru-pet*, "the region, the island of the Bow," whence we conjecture the name of Meroe to come. In the geographical lists the latter form occurs in that of a people, *Anu-meru-pet*, found, unlike all others, in the lists of the southern peoples and countries as well as the northern. The character we read *Pet* is an unstrung bow, which until lately was read *Kens*, as a strung bow is found following, as if a determinative, the latter word, which is a name of Nubia, perhaps, however, not including so large a territory as the names before mentioned. The reading *Kens* is extremely doubtful, because the word does not signify bow in Egyptian, so far as we are aware, and still more because the bow is used as the determinative of its name *Pet*, which from the Egyptian usage as to determinatives makes it almost impossible that it should be employed as a determinative of *Kens*. The name *Kens* would therefore be followed by the bow to indicate that it was a part of Nubia. This subject may be illustrated by a passage of Herodotus, explained by Mr. Harris, of Alexandria, if he may premise that the unstrung bow is the common sign,

and, like the strung bow, is so used as to be the symbol of Nubia. The historian relates that the king of the Ethiopians unstrung a bow, and gave it to the messengers of Cambyses, telling them to say that when the king of the Persians could pull so strong a bow so easily he might come against the Ethiopians with an army stronger than their forces (3:21, 22, ed. Rawlinson: Sir G. Wilkinson's note). For the hieroglyphic names, see Brugsch, *Geogr. Inschr.*

"The Coptic *Piphaiat* must also be compared with Phut. The first syllable being the article, the word nearly resembles the Hebrew name. It is applied to the western part of Lower Egypt beyond the Delta; and Champollion conjectures it to mean the Libyan part of Egypt, so called by the Greeks, comparing the Coptic name of the similar eastern portion, *Phapabia* or *Tapabia*, the older Arabian part of Egypt and Arabian Nome (*L'Eyypte sous les Pharaons*, 2:28-31, 243). Be this as it may, the name seems nearer to Naphtuhim than to Phut. To take a broad view of the question, all the names which we have mentioned may reasonably be connected with the Hebrew Phut; and it may be supposed that the Naphtuhim were Mizraites in the territory of Phut, perhaps intermixed with peoples of the latter stock. It is, however, reasonable to suppose that the *Pet* of the ancient Egyptians, as a geographical designation, corresponds to the Phut of the Bible, which would therefore denote Nubia or the Nubians, the former, if we are strictly to follow the Egyptian usage. This identification would account for the position of Phut after Mizraim in the list in Genesis, notwithstanding the order of the other names; for Nubia has been from remote times a dependency of Egypt, excepting in the short period of Ethiopian supremacy, and the longer time of Ethiopian independence. The Egyptian name of Cush, *Kesh*, is applied to a wider region well corresponding to Ethiopia. The governor of Nubia in the time of the Pharaohs was called Prince of *Kesh*, perhaps because his authority extended beyond Nubia. The identification of Phut with Nubia is not repugnant to the mention in the prophets; on the contrary, the great importance of Nubia in their time, which comprehended that of the Ethiopian supremacy, would account for their speaking of Phut as a support of Egypt, and as furnishing it with warriors. The identification with Libya has given rise to attempts to find the name in African geography, which we shall not here examine, as such mere similarity of sound is a most unsafe guide."

The name of *Phtha*, the chief deity of Memphis, has been considered by some Egyptologists to be the hieroglyphic transcription of Phut, the son of

Ham, whose descendants settled in the oases of the Libyan desert. as is demonstrated by the circumstance that the country named after Phut, in the Hebrew, is translated Libya by the Sept. (see Gesenius, *Lexicon*, s.v. פִּוּט). "The name Phut, in its change to *Phtha*," says Osbuin, "has undergone an extraordinary process, highly characteristic of the modes of thought that prevailed in very ancient times. Written with the final *h*, which may be added to a Hebrew word without altering the sense, it represents the consonants of the verb 'to reveal,' which in the Coptic sense is 'to write hieroglyphics.' A still stranger use has been made of this pun upon the name of Phut. His animal representative has been named after the action in direct antagonism with that of the human, original. The hieroglyphic name of the bull Apis, *hp*, is the Coptic verb *pet*, 'to hide,' which is a mere transcription of the ancient verb אָפַחַּ *hpj*, with the same meaning. The comparison of the two groups renders this contrast very apparent. It will be seen that one group is as nearly as possible an inversion of the other. The meanings are in like manner in antithesis. In the bull Apis, therefore, were concealed the attributes which were revealed in Phtha" (*Mon. Hist. of Egypt*, chapter 5).

Some late Egyptologists, however, regard *Put* as a merely Egyptian pronunciation for *Punt* (Bunsen, *Egypt*, 2:304), which was the name of an Arabian tribe east of Egypt (Brugsch, *Geogr. Inschr.* 2:15). *SEE ETHNOGRAPHY.*

Phu'vah

(Ieb. *Puvvah'*, חַפְּוּא, *mouth*; Sept. Φουά), the second named of four sons of Issachar (^{<0463>}Genesis 46:13). B.C. 1900. This name is also written "Pua" in the A.V. (^{<0023>}Numbers 26:23), and "Puah," margin "Phuyalh" (^{<1001>}1 Chronicles 7:1). His descendants are called "Punites" (^{<0023>}Numbers 26:23).

Phygel'lus

(Gr. Φύγελλος, perh. *a fugitive*), a Christian of Asia, who being at Rome during Paul's imprisonment, deserted him in his necessity (^{<5015>}2 Timothy 1:15). A.D. 64. "It is open to question whether this repudiation of the apostle was joined with a declension from the faith (see Buddaeus, *Eccl. Apostol.* 2:310), and whether the open display of the feeling of Asia took place — at least so far as Phygeillus and Hermogenes were concerned — at Rome. It was at Rome that Onesiphorus, named in the next verse, showed

the kindness for which the apostle invokes a blessing on his household in Asia: so perhaps it was at Rome that Phygellus displayed that change of feeling towards Paul which the apostle's former followers in Asia avowed. It seems unlikely that Paul would write so forcibly if Phygellus had merely neglected to visit him in his captivity at Rome. He may have forsaken (see ⁵⁰⁴⁶2 Timothy 4:16) the apostle at some critical time when his support was expected; or he may have been a leader of some party of nominal Christians at Rome, such as the apostle describes at an earlier period (⁵⁰¹⁵Philippians 1:15, 16) opposing him there. Dean Ellicott, on ⁵⁰¹⁵2 Timothy 1:15, who is at variance with the ancient Greek commentators as to the exact force of the phrase 'they which are in Asia,' states various opinions concerning their aversion to Paul. The apostle himself seems to have foreseen it (⁴⁰⁰⁰Acts 20:30); and there is nothing in the fact inconsistent with the general picture of the state of Asia at a later period which we have in the first three chapters of the Revelation." ' "

Phylactery

(φυλακτήριον, a receptacle for safekeeping), a small square box, made either of parchment or black calf-skin, in which are enclosed slips of parchment or vellum with ⁰¹³²Exodus 13:2-20, 11-17; ⁰¹⁰⁴Deuteronomy 6:4-9, 13-22, written on them, and which are worn on the head and left arm by every strict Jew on week-day mornings during the time of prayer.

1. Name and its Signification. — The Greek term (φυλακτήριον = *phylactery*, is a later expression used in the N.T. for the O.T. word תפף/f, plur. תפפ/f, "frontlets," which is rendered ἕλμαρα, *prayer-fillets*, by the Chaldee paraphrases of Onkelos and Jonathan b.-Uzziel, as well as by the unanimous voice of Jewish tradition. It is now generally agreed by lexicographers that, according to the analogy of לבב; which stands for לבב and ככ; and which are formed by the reduplication of the chief two radical letters, תפף/f stands for תפפפ; from אַפ, to bind round (Ewald, *Lehrbuch der Ieberischen Sprache*, § 158, c), ant that it denotes a tie, a band, a frontlet. The Sept. in all the three instances in which ἕλμαρα occurs (⁰¹³⁶Exodus 13:16; ⁰¹⁰⁸Deuteronomy 6:8; 11:18), renders it by ἀσάλευτον πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν σου, a fixture before thine eyes. with which Symmachus and Theodotion agree. The rendering of Aquila, εἰς ἀτίνακτα, *obrain immovable* (comp. Montfaucon, *Hexapla*, nota ad vers.), is to the same

effect. Philo (2:358), however, translates it **σειόμενα πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν**, and afterwards adds that it is to be a constant- pendulum (**σάλον ἐχέτω ταῦτα κινούμενον**) to summon the sight by its motion to a very clear inspection. Herzfeld (*Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, 2:224) infers from this that Philo must either have read **σάλευτον** in the Sept., or taken the a before it as *intensitive*, and assigns to **āwf** the sense of *to move backwards and forwards*, vindicating for **twpfwf** the meaning of *pendulum, pendent ornament*. Herzfeld, moreover, maintains that this rendering is more in harmony with *the little houses, or square boxes*, constituting the phylacteries, and that it escapes the following objections to the current rendering of it by *binding round*: (1) In the phylacteries *the box* in the front is the principal part, and not the strap round the head which holds it; and (2) the **tpfwf** is to be "*between the eyes,*" which does not tally with forehead tie (*Stirnbinde*). The name **yl ypt**, *prayer-fillets*, by which the Chaldee paraphrases and the Syriac version render **twpfwf**, and which is the common appellation for the phylacteries among the Jews to the present day, owes its origin to the fact that the phylacteries are worn during prayertime. Hence the plural **yl ypt** has the masculine termination to distinguish it from the feminine **twl ypt**, which denotes *prayers*, just as the plural masculine **μυλ ht** denotes *psalms*, in contradistinction to the feminine plural **twl ht**, *praise*.

Picture for Phylactery (1)

2. The Manner in which the Phylacteries are Made and Used. — As the Mosaic law (^{<1236>}Exodus 13:16; ^{<1118>}Deuteronomy 6:8; 11:18) gives no specific directions how the phylacteries are to be made, but simply says that they are to be of a double nature, viz. for the hand and between the eyes, the Jewish canons have enacted minute regulations about the arrangement and use of them. A piece of leather is soaked, stretched on a square block cut for the purpose. sewed together with gut-strings while wet, and left on the block till it is dried and stiffened, so that when it is taken off it forms a (**tyb**) square leather box (*Jerusalem Megilla*, 4:9). As the Mosaic code enjoins one for the hand and another for the head, two such boxes (**μυtb**) are requisite for making the phylacteries. The box of which the phylactery for the hand (**dy | ç hl pt**) is made has no inscription outside, and only one cell inside, wherein is deposited a

parchment strip with the four following sections written thereon in four columns, each column having seven lines. On column "is written" ^{<P131>}Exodus 13:1-10, treating on the sanctification of the first-born, and containing the injunction about the phylacteries; on col. 2, ^{<P231>}Exodus 13:11-16, which also treats on the sanctification of the first-born, and repeats the injunction about the phylacteries; on col. 3, ^{<R104>}Deuteronomy 6:4-9, enjoining that the law and the command about the phylacteries should be inculcated into the minds of the rising generation; and on col. 4 is written ^{<S113>}Deuteronomy 11:13-21, describing the blessing attached to the keeping of the law, and to the observance of the command about the phylacteries. The order, therefore, of the passages of Scripture is as follows:

^{<S113>}Deuteronomy 11:13-21

^{<R104>}Deuteronomy 6:4-9 ^{<P231>}Exodus 13:11-16

^{<P131>}Exodus 13:1-10

The slip is rolled up, put inside, tied with white and well-washed hairs of a calf or cow, generally obtained from the tail, and put into the box; a flap connected with the brim is then drawn over the open part and sewed firmly down to the thick leather brim, in such a manner as to form a loop on one side, through which passes a very long leather strap (**h[wxr]**), wherewith the phylactery is fastened to the arm. The box of which the phylactery for the head (**çar l ç hl pt**) is made has on the outside to the right the regular three-pronged letter *Shin*, being an abbreviation for **ydç**, *wthe Almighty*, and on the-left side a *four-pronged* letter *Shin* (*Sabbath, 28 b*). In the inside are four cells, in which are deposited four slips of parchment, whereon are written the same four passages of Scripture as on the one slip in the phylactery for the hand. The box is closed in the same manner; and a thong passes through the loop with which it is fastened to the head.

Picture for Phylactery (2)

The phylacteries, like the *Mezuzah*, i.e., the scrolls on the door-posts, must be written in Hebrew characters, while the law may be written in Greek (*Mishna, Megilla, 1:8*). Every Jew, from the time that he is thirteen years of age, when he is considered a member of the congregation (**hwxm rb**), is obliged to wear the phylacteries during the time of morning prayer, every day except on Sabbath and festivals. Before commencing his devotions he first puts on one on the left arm through the sling formed by the long strap.

Having fastened it just above the elbow, on the inner part of the naked arm, in such a manner that when the arm is bent the phylactery may touch the flesh and be near the heart, to fulfil the precept, "Ye shall lay up these words in your heart," he first twists the long strap three times close to the phylactery, forming a *Shin*, which stands for **יְדֻכָּ**, *the A Almighty*, pronouncing the following benediction: "Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast sanctified us with thy commandments and enjoined us to put on the phylacteries." He then twists the long leather strap seven times around the arm (in the form of two *Shins*, one with three prongs and the other with four), and puts on the phylactery on the head, placing it exactly in the centre between the eyes, so as to touch the spot where the hair begins to grow, and before he secures it pronounces the following benediction: "Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast sanctified us with thy commandments, and enjoined upon us the command about the phylacteries;" and immediately after adjusting it says, "Blessed be the name of the glory of his kingdom forever and ever" (Maimonides, *Iad Ha-Chezaka, Hilchoth Tephillin*, 4:5). He then winds the end of the long leather strap three times around his middle finger, and the remainder around the hand, saying, "I will betroth thee unto me forever, yea, I will betroth thee unto me in righteousness and in judgment, and in loving-kindness, and in mercy, and thou shalt know the Lord" (^{<219>}Hosea 2:19).

Picture for Phylactery (3)

There is no special canon about the size of the boxes (**מַיְטָב**) which contain the slips, and thus constitute the phylacteries. They are generally made an inch and a half square, and are worn during morning prayer, except on Sabbath and festivals, because these days being themselves a sign (**תּוֹא**) require no other sign or pledge (Maimonides, *ibid.* 4:10). The pious Jews who are engaged in the study of the law, and in meditations also wear them during these hallowed engagements; they make the phylacteries a little larger than the ordinary ones to give more space, and hence more distinctness to every letter and word composing the writing inside, and walk with the phylacteries on from one place to another. The hypocrites among the Pharisees imitated this, and made their phylacteries more than ordinarily large, so as to make them conspicuous and visible to any one at a distance, thereby to indicate that they were praying or in holy meditation, which our Saviour rebuked (^{<215>}Matthew 23:5). If the

phylacteries are written by an infidel they must be burned; and if written by a Samaritan, an informer, a slave, a woman, or a minor, they are unlawful and must be shut up (Maimonides, *ibid.* 1:13). The Sadducees wore the phylacteries on the forehead or brow, and on the palm of the hand (Maimonides, *ibid.* 4:3).

3. Origin and Design of the Phylacteries. — It is the unanimous voice of Jewish tradition that the phylacteries are enjoined in ^{<Q13>}Exodus 13:9, 16; ^{<R18>}Deuteronomy 6:8; 11:18. It is true that Rashbam and Aben-Ezra (on ^{<Q13>}Exodus 13:9), who are followed by De Lyra, Calvin, bishop Patrick, H. Michaelis, Keil, etc., take the passages in question in a figurative sense. But against this the advocates of the usage urge that —

(1.) It is inconceivable that the same declaration should be used four times figuratively, there being no parallel for such a usage throughout the whole Pentateuch.

(2.) In two cases out of the four (^{<R18>}Deuteronomy 6:9; 11:20), the injunction is: immediately followed by the command about *the Mezuzah*, which is generally admitted to be literal, *SEE MEZUZAH*, and it is against all sound rules of exegesis to take one command in a figurative and the other in a literal sense.

(3.) In every one of the four instances wherein the injunction is given, the expression *twa* is used, which in all other passages of Scripture invariably denotes *a visible sign*, given either to attest an event or doctrine stated in the foregoing passage, or to serve as a remembrance. Now, on the supposition that the whole commandment is to be taken figuratively, it would be no sign whatever, and the term *wrkzl* could not have been substituted for the technical expression *tpfwfl*, as it is in ^{<Q13>}Exodus 13:9.

(4.) The *end* of the external action enjoined in the first clause of ^{<Q13>}Exodus 13:9 is immediately introduced in the second clause by *[ml]*, "that the law of the Lord may be in thy mouth;" whereas, as Philippsohn rightly remarks, the simple conjunction *w* would be required if the preceding words had the same internal figurative meaning.

(5.) It was a common custom in ancient days for those who engaged in military service, or devoted themselves to the worship of a special deity, to

be marked either on the forehead or on the hand, or on both (Veget. *de Milit.* 2:5; Herod. 2:113; Lucian, *De Syr. Dea*, 59; *Asiat. Res.* 7:281 sq.). Thus the high-priest, as being especially consecrated to the service of Jehovah, had inscribed in the plate on the front of his head "Holiness to the Lord" (^{<1286>}Exodus 28:36), the ordinary servants of Jehovah were commanded to have a mark (^{<3104>}Ezekiel 9:4, 6); and at the ingathering of Israel we are told that even the horses shall have written upon their bells "Holiness to the Lord" (Zechariah 14:20); while the worshippers of the beast are represented as bearing his inscription on their foreheads and arms (^{<1928>}Revelation 7:3; 13:16-18; 14:9-11; 16:2; 19:20; 20:4). The Moslems, Nusairieh and Bedawin Arabs, to the present day, either tie, or have tattooed, on their hands and foreheads select passages of the Koran. It was therefore natural that the Mosaic law, which forbids tattooing (^{<1928>}Leviticus 19:28), should appropriate, for the service of the Most High, the innocent and generally prevailing, custom, which the lawgiver could not eradicate, of wearing ornaments and tokens, with inscriptions declaring that they belonged to Jehovah, and that the Lord is their Redeemer. This universal custom would of itself be sufficient argument for taking the injunction in its literal sense, even if we had not the support of the ancient versions and the undeviating practice of the synagogue; and be it remembered that even the Sadducees, who rejected tradition and adhered to the simple meaning of the law, also wore phylacteries. As to the phrase **bl j wl l [μbtk** (^{<1928>}Proverbs 3:3, etc.), which is frequently quoted in support of the spiritual meaning, it must be observed that it too is to be taken literally, inasmuch as **j wl** does not denote *the external front of the breast*, but the *tablet* which the ancients wore on their hearts. It is the same as **sqnp**, which so frequently occurs in the Mishna (comp. *Kelin*, 24:7), and which the Greeks called Πίναξ, and the Romans *Pugillares*. This *tablet*, when made of wood, was called **j wl** (^{<2308>}Isaiah 30:8; ^{<3102>}Habakkuk 2:2); when of metal, it was termed **^wyl g** (^{<2308>}Isaiah 8:1), and when it was of stone it was denominated **μynba**. The argument of Spencer, that because the Sept. renders **twpww** by **ἀσάλευτα**, and not **φυλακτήρια**, therefore this version did not understand it literally, "inter eos (qui legem illam sensu tantum metaphorico exponendam censuerunt) LXX cum primis notandi veniunt, qui quod in Moysi est **twpww** ipsi non **φυλακτήρια** sed **ἀσάλευτα** transtulerunt" (*De Leg. Hebraeor. ritual.* lib. 4, c. 2), ignores the fact that **φυλακτήρια** is a term which obtained at a much later period

as an equivalent for $\gamma\lambda\ \text{pt}$. Josephus, too, who like all the ancient and modern Jews takes the injunction literally, does not render $\text{twp}^{\text{f}}\text{w}^{\text{f}}$ by φυλακτήρια (*Ant.* 4:8, 13). The fact is, that in very early days there was no fixed and technical term for those frontlets. Hence Herzfeld (*Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, 2:223) has pointed out that the phylacteries are meant in $\langle 21112 \rangle$ 2 Kings 11:12, where the high-priest is said to have put upon Joash "the crown and the tw^{d} [; and Duschak (*Josephus und die Tradition*, page 85) supposes that the *Tephillin* are meant by hdw^{f} [t^{f} rw^{x} ($\langle 21816 \rangle$ Isaiah 8:16). The injunction about the phylacteries was so generally observed among the Jews after the Babylonian captivity, that the Writers of them found it a most lucrative business. Hence we are told that "twenty-four fast days were ordained by the Great Synagogue, in order that the writers of the scrolls of the law, the phylacteries, and the mezuzahs, might not grow rich, inasmuch as they were not allowed to write them on these days" (*Pesachinim*, 50 b). In harmony with the design of the phylacteries, Maimonides propounds their utility, when he remarks: "The sacred influence of the phylacteries is very great; for as long as one wears them on his head and arm he is obliged to be meek, Godfearing, must not suffer himself to be carried away by laughter or idle talk, nor indulge in evil thoughts; but must turn his attention to the words of truth and uprightness" (Kitto). Nevertheless, the fact that these appendages, being regarded more or less in the light of amulets, engender superstition, has led interpreters generally to view the sacred injunction as a spiritual or figurative precept. This is the opinion of the Karaites, Grotius, Schottgen (*Her. Heb.* 1:194), Rosenmüller, Hengstenberg (*Pent.* 1:458 sq.), and most others. In $\langle 4135 \rangle$ Matthew 23:5 only they are called φυλακτήρια , either because they tended to promote observance of the law ($\alpha\epsilon\iota\ \mu\eta\mu\eta\eta\nu\ \epsilon\chi\epsilon\iota\nu\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$, Just. Mart. *Dial. c. Tryph.* page 205, for which reason Luther happily renders the word by *Denkzettel*), or from the use of them as amulets (Lat. *praebia*, Gr. $\text{περιαπτ\acute{\alpha}}$, Grotius ad $\langle 4135 \rangle$ Matthew 23:5). Φυλακτήριον is the ordinary Greek word for an amulet (Plutarch, 2:378, B, where φυλ. = the Roman *bullā*), and is used apparently with this meaning by a Greek translator ($\langle 21318 \rangle$ Ezekiel 13:18) for $\text{tw}\omega\text{s}^{\text{f}}\text{K}\epsilon$ cushions (Rosenmüller, *Schol.* ad loc. 1; Schleusner, *Lex. in N.T.*). Jerome (on $\langle 4135 \rangle$ Matthew 23:5) says they were thus used in his day by the Babylonians, Persians, and Indians, and condemns certain Christian "mulierculae" for similarly using the Gospels ("parvula evangelia," $\beta\acute{\iota}\beta\lambda\iota\alpha\ \mu\iota\kappa\rho\acute{\alpha}$, Chrys.) as περιάμματα , especially the Proem. to St. John (comp. Chrysost. *Horn. in Matt.* 73). The Koran

and other sacred books are applied to the same purpose to this day (Hottinger, *Hist. Orient.* 1:8, page 301; *De numinis Orient.* 17. sq.; "The most esteemed of all Chegabs is a Milshaf, or copy of the Koran," Lane, *Mod. Egypt.* 1:338). Scaliger even supposes that phylacteries were designed to supersede those amulets, the use of which had been already learned by the Israelites in Egypt. *SEE AMULET*. There was a spurious book called *Phylact. Angelorum*, where pope Gelasius evidently understood the word to mean "amulets," for he remarks that Phylacteria ought rather to be ascribed to devils. In this sense they were expressly forbiddden by pope Gregory ("Si quis ' . . . phylacteriis usus fuerit,' anathema sit," *Sixt. Senensis, Bibl. Sanct.* page 92; comp. *Can. 36, Concil. Laod.*).

The expression "they make broad their phylacteries" (παλτύνουσι τὰ φυλ. αὐτῶν, ^{<0215>}Matthew 23:5) refers not so much to the phylactery itself, which seems to have been of a prescribed breadth, as to the case (hxyxq) in which the parchment was kept, which the Pharisees (among their other pretentious customs, ^{<017>}Mark 7:3, 4; ^{<0153>}Luke 5:33, etc.) made as conspicuous as they could (Reland, *Ant.* 2:9, 15). Misled probably by the term παλτύνουσι, and by the mention of the ~~τρυπαρ~~ fringe (^{<0158>}Numbers 15:38, Sept. κλωσμα ὑακίνθινον ἐπὶ τὰ κράσπεδα τῶν περυγίων) in connection with them, Epiphanius says that they were πλάτεια σήματα πορφύρας, like the Roman *laticlave*, or the stripes on a Dalmatic cloak (πὰ δὲ σήματα τῆς πορφύρας φυλακτήρια εἰώθασιν οἱ ἠκριβωμένοι μετονομάζειν, *c. Haer.* 1:33; *Sixt. Sen.* l.c.). He says that these purple stripes were worn by the Pharisees with fringes, and four pomegranates, that no one might touch them, and hence he derives their name (Reland, *Antiq.* 2:9, 15). But that this is an error is clearly shown by Scaliger (*Elench. Trihaer.* 8:66 sq.). It is said that the Pharisees wore them always, whereas the common people only used them at prayers, because they were considered to be even holier than the /yx, or golden plate, on the priest's tiara (^{<0286>}Exodus 28:36), since that had the sacred name once engraved, but in each' of the Tephillin the tetragrammaton recurred twenty-three times (Carpzov, *App. Critic.* 196). Again the Pharisees wore the *tephillah* above the elbow, but the Sadducees on the palm of the hand (Goodwyn, l.c.). The modern Jews only wear them at morning prayers, and sometimes at noon (Leo of Modena, l.c.). In our Lord's time they were worn by all Jews, except the Karaites; women, and slaves. Boys, when (at

the age of thirteen years and a day) they become, **twxm ynb** (sons of the commandments), were bound to wear them (*Baba Berac.* fol. 22, 1, in Glossa), and therefore they may have been used even by our Lord, as he merely discountenanced their *abuse*. The suggestion was made by Scaliger (l.c.), and led to a somewhat idle controversy. Lightfoot (*Hor. Hebr. ad* **Ⲙⲓⲛⲏ** *Matthew* 24:5) and Otho (*Lex. Rab.* page 656) agree with Scaliger, but Carpzov (l.c.) and others strongly deny it, from a belief that the entire use of phylacteries arose from an error.

The rabbins even declared that God wore them, arguing from **Ⲙⲓⲛⲏ** Isaiah 62:8; **Ⲙⲓⲛⲏ** Deuteronomy 33:2; **Ⲙⲓⲛⲏ** Isaiah 49:16. Perhaps this was a pious fraud to inculcate their use; or it may have had some mystic meaning (*Zohar*, part 2, fol. 2; Carpzov, l.c.), but the rabbins disapproved the application of them to charm wounds or to lull children to sleep (*Id. Leg.* 253; Maimonides. *De Idol.* 2). He who wore them was supposed to prolong his days (Isaiah 38:f6), but he who did not was doomed to perdition, since he thereby broke eight affirmative precepts (Maimonides, *Tephil.* 4:26). We have a specimen of this style of interpretation in the curious literalism of Kimchi's' comment on **Ⲙⲓⲛⲏ** Psalm 1:2. Starting the objection that it is impossible to meditate in God's law day and night, because of sleep, domestic cares, etc., he answers that for the fulfilment of the text it is sufficient to wear *tephillin!* In spite of these considerations, Justin (*Dial. c. Tryph.* l.c.), Chrysostom, Euthymius, Theophylact, and many moderns (Baumgarten, *Comm.* 1:479; Winer, s.v. Phylact.), prefer the literal meaning. It rests, therefore, with them to account for the entire absence of all allusion to phylacteries in the O.T. The passages in Proverbs (ut sup.) contain no such reference, and in **Ⲙⲓⲛⲏ** Ezekiel 24:17, **rae]** means not a phylactery (as Jarchi says), but a turban (Gesen. *Thesaur.* page 1089).

4. Literature. — Besides the authors already quoted (Sixt. Senensis, Reland, Lightfoot, Schottgen, Carpzov, Hottinger, Goodwyn, Rosenmuller, etc.), see the following, to whom they refer: Surenhusius, *Mishna ad Tract. Berachoth*, pages 8, 9; Beck, *De Judaeorum ligamentis precativis*, and *De usu Phylact.* (1679); Basnage, *Hist. des Juifs*, V, 12:12. sq.; Braunius, *De Vest. Sacerd.* page 7 sq.; Buxtorf, *Synag. Jud.* page 170 sq.; Maimonides, *Yad Hacash.* pages 2, 3; Ugolino, *De Phylacter. Hebraeor.* in *Thesaur.* tom. 21; Townley, *Reasons for the Laws of Moses*, page 350; Bodenschatz, *Gottesdienstl. Verfassung d. Juden*, 4:15 sq.;

Gropp, *De Phylact.* (Leips. 1708); Otho, *Lex. Rabbin.* page 756; Wagenseil, *Sota.* c. 2, page 397 sq.; Spencer, *De Leg. Hebr.* IV, 1-7; Herzfeld, *Gesch. d. Jul.* 2:223 sq.; the *Dermech ha-Chayimn* (Vienna, 1859), page 24 sq.; Hochmuth, in *Ben Chananya*, page 215; and the monographs cited by Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, page 130. **SEE FRONTLET.**

Phyllobolia

(from φύλλον, a leaf, and Βάλλω, to throw), a custom which existed among the ancient heathen nations of throwing flowers and leaves on the tombs of the dead. The Greek was placed on his funeral bed as if asleep, wearing a white robe and garland. the purple pall half hidden by numerous chaplets, and so was carried out to his burial before the dawn of day. The Romans, deriving the custom from the Greeks, covered the bier and the funeral pile with leaves and flowers. It is not an unfrequent custom in different parts of England in our day to spread flowers on and around the body when committing it to the coffin. In Wales also, when the body is interred, females hasten with their aprons full of flowers to plant them on the grave. The practice of connecting flowers with the dead seems to have been of great antiquity, for an Egyptian of high rank was wont to be carried to his sepulchre in a sarcophagus adorned with lotus, had his tomb decked with wreaths, and his mummy-case painted with acacia leaves and flowers. The use of the flowers on such occasions was no doubt connected with the idea of life after death.

Physician

Picture for Physician

(ἀγοροπρόφη, a curer; ἰατρός). Among the Hebrews, as among the ancients generally, medical remedies (⁽¹²¹⁹⁾Exodus 21:19) were early (comp. Pliny, 29:5) dispensed by a special class, who probably derived their skill from the Egyptians (⁽¹⁰⁰⁰⁾Genesis 1:1; comp. Herod. 2:84; 3:1, 129; Diod. Sic. 1:82; Diog. Laert. 3:8; Pliiy, 26:3; 29:30: see Sprengel, *Geschichte*, 1:62; Wilkinson, 3:390), who were famous for their medicines (*Odys.* 4:229). Their aid was at first made use of, as among common people at all times, for surgery and in extraordinary cases, and medicines (⁽¹⁰¹⁵⁾Exodus 1:15: the "stools," μυαβῆ; there spoken of were, according to Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* page 17, benches or seats on which the parturient females were

seated; but the word, see *Studien u. Krit.* 1834, pages 81, 626, 641; 1842, page 1048, will scarcely bear this signification, see Ewald, *Gesch. Isr.* 1:481, and Lengerke; *Keizma*, page 387) were regularly employed (see Kall, *De obstetricib. matrum Hebr. in XEg.* Hamb. 1746). In later times Hebrew prescriptions obtained, which the prophets sometimes applied (^{<1012>}2 Kings 4:21; 5:10; 8:7; 20:7; Isaiah 38; which cases, although miraculous, evince the custom of seeking relief from that class of persons); mostly for *external* injuries or complaints (^{<2106>}Isaiah 1:6; ^{<3321>}Ezekiel 30:21; ^{<1189>}2 Kings 8:29; 9:15), but sometimes for internal maladies (2 Chron. 16:12), and even for mental diseases (^{<0966>}1 Samuel 16:16; comp. Josephus, *Ant.* 8:2, 5); but these never reached any extensive degree of science (see Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald.* s.v. **apr**). The resort to physicians was very general before and especially after the exile (^{<4162>}2 Chronicles 16:12; ^{<2482>}Jeremiah 8:22; Sir. 38:1; ^{<4053>}Mark 5:26; comp. ^{<1043>}Luke 4:23; 5:31; 8:43; see Josephus, *War*, 2:8, 6; Doughtaei *Analect.* 2:35), and eventually medical practitioners could be found even in the smaller cities of the land (Josephus, *Life*, 72; comp. *Ant.* 14:13, 10). Their remedies consisted mostly in salves (especially *balsam*, ^{<2482>}Jeremiah 8:22; 46:11; 51:8; comp. *Prosp. Alpin. Med. AEg.* 118 sq.; or *oil*, ^{<2104>}Luke 10:34; Mishna, *Sabb.* 14:4; including the oilbath, Josephus, *War*, 1:33, 5; Mishna, *Berachoth*, 1:2), leaves (^{<3572>}Ezekiel 47:12), plasters (e.g. *of fig*, ^{<12107>}2 Kings 20:7; comp. Pliny, 23:63; Strabo, 15:713), and bathing in mineral springs (Josephus, *Ant.* 17:6, 5; *Life*, 16; *War*, 1:33, 5; 2:21, 6; comp. ^{<4182>}John 5:2), or in flowing streams (^{<1150>}2 Kings 5:10). *Internal* nostrums are again and again recommended in the Talmud (see the Mishna, *Sabb.* 14:3; 22:6; *Joma*, 8:6); in the Old Test. honey only is mentioned (^{<3164>}Proverbs 16:24), which still holds a conspicuous place among medical compounds in the East. Specimens of the Jewish prescriptions may be seen in Lightfoot on ^{<4053>}Mark 5:26 (the formula or "*Recipe*" is **ytyyl**). Surgical operations are mentioned in the Mishna (*Sabb.* 22:6; *Chelim*, 12:4; comp. *Sabb.* 6:5). Great curative virtue was attributed to amulets (Mishna, *Sabb.* 6:2, 10), incantations, charms, the touch of certain individuals, and other superstitions of a like character (^{<1151>}2 Kings 5:11 [comp. Rosenmuller, *Morgenl.* 3:227]; Josephus, *Ant.* 8:5); especially in cases of hypochondria or supposed daemonic possession. **SEE AMULET; SEE DAEMONIAC.** The priests (^{<2174>}Luke 17:14) were appointed by the law (Leviticus 12-15) the civil health-wardens, not so much for the cure as for the inspection of the sick, or of persons suspected of certain maladies, and the instructions

given to them, especially respecting endemic diseases, exhibit a very careful observation, and afford apt and accurate symptoms. *SEE LEPROSY; SEE PLAGUE*. For the priests themselves, who, in consequence of being obliged to perform their services barefoot, were often liable to catch cold (see Kall, *De morbis sacerdotum V.T.* Hafn. 1745), a special physician (*medicus viscerum*) was (in later times) appointed at the Temple (Lightfoot, page 781). The priests must have obtained considerable anatomical knowledge (comp. the Talmudic abstract on osteology in the Mishna, *Oholoth*, 1:8) from the daily slaughter of the animal sacrifices. On the subject generally, see Borner, *Diss. de statu medicinae ap. vet. Ebr.* (Viteb. 1755) Lindlinger, *De. Hebr. vet. arte medica* (1774); Sprengel, *De medicina Ebraeor. diss.* (Hal. 1789); comp. Schmidt's *Bibl. Medicus* (Till. 1743); also Norberg, *De medicina Arabum* (in his *Opusc. acad.* 3:404 sq.); Wunderbar, *Biblisich-talmudische Medicin* (Riga, 1859). *SEE MEDICINE*.

The superstitious credulity of modern Orientals as to curative means is proverbial, and has been noticed by all travellers. The Arabs are ready to put faith in almost any Frank as a professional "medicine man" or *hakim* (literally "wise man"), as they term all physicians. Prescriptions of all sorts are at once taken by them, however absurd; but they are generally unwilling to exercise the patience, care, self-restraint, and especially the cleanliness necessary to a real cure. They expect sudden and immediate restoration, and invariably prefer extraordinary to simple remedies. All this is in keeping with the supernatural character of the nostrums ordinarily employed by them. Indeed, fatalism being the basis of Mohammedanism, a resort to direct divine power might naturally be expected. *SEE SUPERSTITION*.

"It is a very prevalent notion among the Christians of Europe that the Muslims are enemies to almost every branch of knowledge. This is an erroneous idea; but it is true that their studies, in the present age, are confined within very narrow limits. Very few of them study medicine, chemistry (for our first knowledge of which we are indebted to the Arabs), the mathematics, or astronomy. The Egyptian medical and surgical practitioners are mostly barbers, miserably ignorant of the sciences which they profess, and unskilful in their practice; partly in consequence of their being prohibited by their religion from availing themselves of the advantage of dissecting human bodies. But a number of young men, natives of Egypt, are now receiving European instruction in medicine, anatomy, surgery, and other sciences, for the service of the government. Many of the Egyptians,

in illness, neglect medical aid, placing their whole reliance on Providence or charms. Alchemy is more studied in this country than pure chemistry, and astrology more than astronomy" (Lane, *Mod. Egypt.* 1:239).

Physiognomy

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

Physiology

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

Piaggia, Teramo Or Erasmo

(also called *Teramo di Zoagli*), an Italian painter, was born at Zoagli, in the (Genoese state, near the beginning of the 16th century. He was a pupil of Lodovico Brea, and painted at Genoa in 1547. In conjunction with Antonio Semini he painted several pictures for the churches at Genoa, the most esteemed of which is an altar-piece of the *Martyrdom of Attendet*, in the church of that saint. Lanzli highly commends this work, and says, "None can witness this very beautiful altar-piece without seeing traces of

Brae's style, already enlarged and changed into one more modern." He also painted several pieces by himself, at Genoa and at Chiavari.

Piales, Jean Jacques

a French canonist, was born in 1720 at Mur-de-Barrez (Aveyron). Being received as a lawyer in the Parliament of Paris (1747), he formed a connection with Claude Mey, one of the supporters of Jansenism, and both gave a great number of consultations and took a very active part in the affairs of the appellants. While one treated of the great questions of public law and jurisdiction, the other gave himself entirely to practice relating to benefices. Although Piales lost his sight in 1763, he lost nothing of his zeal for the cause which he maintained, and M. Dupin says, "There is no counsellor in the world who dictated more consultations." He died in Paris August 4, 1789. Unforeseen changes in ecclesiastical matters have rendered his works useless; they are, *Traite de la Collation des Benefices* (Par. 1754 and 1755, 5 volumes, 12mo): — *De la Provision de la Cour de Rome a litre de Prevention* (2 volumes, 12mo): — *De la Devolution, du Decolu et des Vacances de plein Droit* (3 vols. 12mo): — *De l'Expectative des Gradues* (1758, 6 volumes, 12mo): — *Des Commnendes et des Reserves* (3 vols. 12mo): — *Des Riparations et Reconstructions des Eglises* (Par. 1762, 4 volumes, 12mo; 1788; 5 volumes, 12mo, ed. given by Camus). The first volume (the only one which appeared) of the *Histoire de la Fete de la Conception* is attributed to Piales. See *Journal Chretien* (1758 and 1759); Camus et Dupin, *Biblioth. choisie des Livres de Droit*; Picot, *Memoires Eccles.* tom. 4; Feller, *Dict. Hist.* Feller, *Nouv. Biog. Generale* 40:32.

Plane, Giovanni Maria Delle

(called *Il Molina retto*), a Genoese painter, was born at Genoa in the year 1660. According to Ratti, he studied under Gio. Battisti Gaulli, whose style he adopted, and distinguished himself by some excellent works which he executed for the churches at Genoa, but more by the excellence of his portraits. Lanzi highly extols his *Decodation of St. John the Baptist*, at Sestri di Ponente. He also says that he was particularly excellent in portraits, anmd that Genoa is full of his works in this branch. He was also invited to Parma and Piacenza, where he furnished the court with portraits, and executed some works for the churehes. He was afterwards invited to

Naples by king Charles of Bourbon, who appointed him his painter, with, a liberal pension, and he continued, in this service, till his death in 1745.

Piarists

is the name of a Roman Catholic order which was founded by St. Josep-Clasanza or Calasantius, a Spanish nobleman and priest at Rome in 1607, and was approved by pope Gregory XV in 1,622 as a congregation of regulated clergy, under the name *Patres scholarum piarum* (*Fathers of the pious schools*). Paul V was the first pontiff to give encouragement to the work of this now celebrated order. Until that time Calasanza labored at Rome only, and was so remarkably successful in getting children for instruction under himself and his associates that his work was gladly accepted as that of a religious order by 1622. Calasanza was the first general of the congregation, and under his management it spread through Poland, Germany, Italy, and other countries. In 1860 the Piarists had 33 houses in Germany, 28 in Italy, 32 in Hungary, 14 in Poland, and at least 30 in Spain. In Italy they have since been suppressed; and the only country in which the Piarists conduct at present, educational institutions of note is the Austro-Hungarian monarchy. In Cis-Lithuanian Austria, in 1870, they had 29 houses with 297 members; included in which were 4 under-gymnasia. The Piarists take besides the three usual monastic vows, a fourth that of free instruction of youth. Pope Innocent XII granted them the privileges of the Begging Monks. Their dress is a long, black coat, like the overcoat of the Jesuits, and a mantle like theirs. At the head of the congregation stands the general, who is elected for six years, and to whom are subject the generals of the different societies or countries in which the order prevails. (J.H.W.)

Piastrini, Giovanni Domienico

a painter, was born at Pistoja about 1700. He studied under Cav. Benedetto Luti at Florence, and afterwards went to Rome, where he distinguished himself by paintings in the church of St. Maria in Via Lata; in which, according to Lanzi, he rivalled the best followers of Carlo Maratti. He also painted some works for the churches in his native city, particularly in La Madonna della Umilta, where he filled two large spaces with pictures illustrating the history of that church.

Piatti, Francesco

an Italian painter, was, according to Fuessli, born at Teglio, in the Valteline, in 1650. He executed many works for the churches in the neighborhood, and painted much for the collections.

Piattoli, Gaetano

a Florentine painter, was born in 1703. He studied under Francesco Riviera at Leghorn. Lanzi says he is particularly extolled for the excellence of his portraits. He found abundant employment at Florence in that branch of the art, and was not only patronized by the inhabitants, but was employed to paint the portraits of the foreign nobility who visited that city. He died in 1770.

Piazza, Cav. Andrea

an Italian painter of the Venetian school, was born at Caitelfranco about 1600. He was the nephew and pupil of Paolo Piazza (q.v.), whom he accompanied to Rome, and whose style he adopted, though somewhat modified by an attentive study of the works of the great masters. He acquired distinction, and was patronized by the duke of Lorraine, in whose service he continued many years, and received from him the honor of knighthood. He afterwards returned to Venice, where he executed some works for the churches, the best of which is the *Marriage at Cana*, in the church of S. Maria, a grand composition of many figures, which Lanzi says is one of the best works in the place. He died there in 1670.

Piazza, Carlo Bartolomeo

an Italian monk, deserves to be mentioned here. He was abbe and counsellor of the Congregation of the Index, and published *Diarium Vaticanum* (Rome, 1687, 4to), and *La Gerarchia cardinalizia* (ibid. 1703, fol.). — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 40:35.

Piazza, Prancesco

an Italian theologian, was born in Bologna near the beginning of the 15th century. In 1424 he took the dress of the Dominicans. and distinguished himself by his skill in the science of canon law. He died at Bologna December 17, 1460. His treatise *De restitutionibus, usuris et excommunicationibus* (Cremona, 1472, fol.) has been several times

reprinted. Another, composed by him, *De actu matrimonial*, which contains singular opinions, is preserved in manuscript at Leipsic. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 40:35.

Piazza, Girolamo Bartolomeo

an Italian Dominican friar, flourished in the first half of the 18th century. He was highly esteemed by his coreligionists, and was at one time judge of the Inquisition. But the cruelty and injustice of the Roman Ultramontanists caused him to withdraw from the Church of Rome. He went over to England, and was admitted into the Church of England. He taught Italian and French for many years at Cambridge, and died there about 1745. He is the author of *A Short and True Account of the Inquisition and its Proceedings, as it is Practiced in Italy, set forth in some Particular Cases* (Engl. and Fr., Lond. 1722). See Quetif and Echard, *Scriptores ordinis Praedicationum*, s.v.

Piazza, Paolo

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

Piazzetta, Giovanni Battista

one of the most celebrated of the later Venetian painters, was born in 1682. According to Zanetti, he was instructed in the rudiments of the art by his father, a reputable sculptor in wood, and afterwards became the pupil of Antonio Molinari. His first style was distinguished for a clear and brilliant tone of coloring, but on visiting Bologna he employed himself with

Spagnoletto; and by diligently studying the works of Guercino, he imitated his strong contrasts of lights and shadows, and boldness of relief, with considerable success. Lanzi says it is supposed that he had long observed the effects of lights applied to statues of wood and images of wax, and by this means he was enabled to draw with considerable judgment and exact precision the several parts that are comprehended in the shadowing; owing to which art his designs were eagerly sought after, and his works repeatedly engraved by Pitteri, by Pelli, and by Monaco, besides many other masters in Germany and elsewhere. His method of coloring, however, diminished in a great measure the chief merit of his pictures. His shades have increased and changed, his lights sunk, and his tints become yellow; so that there remains an inharmonious and unformed mass. There are a few of his pictures still in good preservation: as the *Decoration of St. John the Baptist*, in the church of that saint at Padua, placed in competition with those of the first artists in the state, and at that period esteemed best of all. "Yet if we follow him closely he will not fail to displease us by that monotonous coloring of lakes and yellows, and by that rapidity of hand called, by some, spirit, though to the judicious it often appears neglect, as if the artist were desirous of abandoning his task before it was completed." He executed many chalkdrawings which were greatly valued. He also etched a few plates from his own designs. He died at Venice in 1754. See Spooner, *Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts*, 2:690.

Piazzzi, Calisto

an Italian painter, was born at Lodi, and flourished from 1524 to 1556 as appears from the dates on his pictures. According to Orlandi, he was one of the most successful imitators of Titian. Lanzi says that his picture of the *Assumption of the Virgin*, in the collegiate church of Codogno, is worthy of ally of the disciples of Titian. It is a grand composition, containing figures of the apostles, and two portraits of the Marchesi Trivulzi. In the church of the Incoronata, at Lodi, he painted three chapels in fresco, each ornamented with four beautiful histories. One contains the *Mysteries of the Passion*, another the *Acts of St. John the Baptist*, and the third the *Life of the Virgin*. "It is currently believed," says Lanzi, "that Titian, in passing through Lodi, painted several of the heads — a story probably originating from the exceeding beauty that may be observed in them." He sometimes imitated the style of Giorgione, as may be seen in his altar-piece in the church of St. Francesco at Brescia, representing the Virgin among several

saints, which is esteemed one of the most beautiful productions in that city. He executed many works for the churches in other cities, particularly *atr* Crema and Alessandria. In the cathedral of the latter city are several of his best works. Lanzi rebukes Ridolfi, who commends him for nothing except his coloring, whereas "he boasts a very noble design, is tolerably select in his forms, and rich, and harmonious in his coloring. His *Wedding at Cana*, in the refectory of the Padri Cisterciensi, at Milan, is truly a surprising production, no less for its boldness of hand than for the number of its figures, which seem to live and breathe, though the whole of them are not equally well studied, and a few are really careless and incorrect." Lomazzo also, speaking of his *Choir of the Muses* — in which he introduced the portraits of the president Sacco and his wife, for whom it was painted — says, "I may, without fear of temerity, observe that it is impossible to produce anything more perfectly graceful and pleasing, and more beautiful in point of coloring, among works in *fresco*."

Pi-be'seth

(Heb. *id.* תְּבַאֲסֵת Sept. Βούβαστος; Vullg. *Bubastus*), a town of Lower Egypt, mentioned but once in the Bible (²³¹⁷Ezekiel 30:17). In hieroglyphics its name is written *Bahest*, *Bast*, and *Ha-Bahest*, followed by the determinative sign for an Egyptian city, which was probably not pronounced. The Coptic forms are *Bast*, with the article *pi* prefixed, or *Poubaste*, *Poubast* *Phoubasthi*, *Bouasti*, *Pouast*; and the Greek, Βούβαστις, Βούβαστος. The first and second hieroglyphic names are the same as those of the goddess of the place, and the third signifies the abode of *Behest*, that goddess. It is probable that *Bahest* is an archaic mode of writing, and that the word was always pronounced, as it was sometimes written, *Bast*. It seems as if the civil name was *Bahest*, and the sacred *Ifa-Bahest*. It is difficult to trace the first syllable of the Hebrew and of the Coptic and Greek forms in the hieroglyphic equivalents. There is a similar case in the names *Ha-Hesar*, *Bousiri*, *Pousiri*, Βούσιρις, *Busiris*. Dr. Brugsch and M. Devdria read *Pe* or *Pa*, instead of *Ha*; but this is not proved. It may be conjectured that in pronunciation the masculine definite article *pepa* or *pi* was prefixed to *Ha*, as could be done in Coptic: in the ancient language the word appears to be common, whereas it is masculine in the later. Or it may be suggested that the first syllable or first letter was a prefix of the vulgar dialect, for it is frequent in Coptic. The name of Philae may perhaps afford a third explanation, for it is written *Eelek-t*, *Eelek*, and

P-Felek (Brugsch, *Geogr. Inschr.* 1:156, Nos. 626, 627); whence it would seem that the sign city (not abode) was common, as in the first form the feminine article, and in the last the masculine one, is used, and this would admit of the reading *Pa-Bast*, "the [city] of Bubastis [the goddess]." The goddess *Bast*, who was here the chief object of worship, was the same as *Pesht*, the goddess of fire. Both names accompany a lion-headed figure, and the cat was sacred to her. Herodotus considers the goddess Bubastis to be the same as Artemis (2:137), and that this was the current opinion in Egypt in the Greek period is evident from the name *Speos Artemidos* of a rock temple dedicated to *Pesht*, and probably of a neighboring town or village. The historian speaks of the annual festival of the goddess held at Bubastis as the chief and most largely attended of the Egyptian festivals. It was evidently the most popular, and a scene of great license, like the great Moslem festival of the Sevid el-Bedawi celebrated at Tanteh in the Delta (2:59, 60).

There are scarcely any historical notices of Bubastis in the Egyptian annals. In Manetho's list it is related that in the time of Boethos, or Bochos, first king of the 2d dynasty (B.C. cir. 2231), a chasm of the earth opened at Bubastis, and many perished (Cory's *Ancient Fragments*, 2d ed. pages 98, 99). This is remarkable, since, though shocks of earthquakes are frequent in Egypt, the actual earthquake is of very rare occurrence. The next event in the list connected with Bubastis is the accession of the 22d dynasty (B.C. cir. 990), a line of Bubastite kings *ibid.* pages 124, 125). These were either foreigners or party of foreign extraction, and it is probable that they, chose Bubastis as their capital. or as an occasional residence, on account of its nearness to the military settlements. *SEE MIGDMOI*. Thus it must have been a city of great importance when Ezekiel foretold its doom: "The young men of Aven and of Pi-beseth shall fall by the sword and these [cities] shall go into captivity" (~~23:17~~ Ezekiel 30:17). Heliopolis and Bubastis are near together, and both in the route of an invader from the East marching against Memphis. Bubastis was situated on the west bank of the Pelusiac or Bubastite branch of the Nile, about forty miles from the central part of Memphis, and was the principal town of the Bubastite nome (Pliny. *Hist. Nat* 5:9; Ptolemy, 4:5). Herodotus speaks of its site as having been raised by those who dug the canals for Sesostris, and afterwards by the labor of criminals under Sabacos the Ethiopian, or, rather, under the Ethiopian dominion. He mentions the temple of the goddess Bubastis as well worthy of description, being more beautiful than any other known to

him. It lay in the midst of the city, which, having been raised on mounds, overlooked it on every side. An artificial canal encompassed it with the waters of the Nile, and was beautified by trees on its bank. There was only a narrow approach leading to a lofty gateway. The enclosure thus formed was surrounded by a low wall, bearing sculptures; within was the temple, surrounded by a grove of fine trees (2:137, 138). Sir Gardner Wilkinson observes that the ruins of the city and temple confirm this account. The height of the mounds and the site of the temple are very remarkable, as well as the beauty of the latter, which was "of the finest red granite." It "was surrounded by a sacred enclosure, about 600 feet square, . . . beyond which was a larger circuit, measuring 940 feet by 1200, containing the minor one and the canal." The temple is entirely ruined, but the names of Rameses II of the 19th dynasty, Userken I (Osorchon I) of the 22d, and Nekht-har-heb (Nectanebo I) of the 30th, have been found here, as well as that of the eponymous goddess *Bast*. There are also remains of the ancient houses of the town, and, "amidst the houses on the N.W. side are the thick walls of a fort, which protected the temple below" (Notes by Sir G. Wilkinson in Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, 2:186, plan). Bubastis thus had a fort, besides being strong from its height. The city was taken by the Persians, who destroyed the walls (Diod. Sic. 16:51); but it was still a place of some consideration under the Romalis. It was near Bubastis that the canal leading to Arsinoe (Suez) opened to the Nile (Strabo 17:805; Mela, 1:9, 9; Herod. 2:138); and although the mouth was afterwards often changed and taken more southward, it has now returned to its first locality, as the present canal of Tel el-Wadi commences in the vicinity of Tel Basta. This Tel has recently been explored (Navile, *Bubastis*, "Eg Explor. Fund," Lond. 1891. 4to). See Wilkinson, *Modern Egypt*, 1:300, 427-429; Ritter, *Erdkunde*, 1:825; Roselini. *Monum. Storichi*, 2:76 sq.; Manliert, *Geog.* 10, 1:588 sq., Maltis, in the *Descr. de l'Egypte*, 3:8307.

Pic, Jean

a young French Christian, suffered martyrdom for his devotion to the Protestant cause. He was born in 1546, and flourished at Tournay. Together with his friend, Hugo Destailleux, accused of heresy, they were proven to have circulated the Genevese tracts, and refusing to recant, were imprisoned; and March 22, 1565, were sentenced to be burned to death. They died faithful to the Lord they had decided to serve. See Hurst, *Martyrs to the Truct Cause*, pages 154-164.

Picard, Jean (1)

a French priest, is noted especially as an astronomer. He was born at La Fleche, in the present department of the Sarthe, and after taking holy orders became prior of Rille, in the same department. He gave himself largely to astronomic studies, and many are his publications in this department of natural science. Picard died at Paris July 12, 1682. For a list of his publications, which are not of special interest to us, we refer to Condorcet, *Eloge de Picard*; Fontenelle; *Eloge de Piccard*; and the *Biographie Universelle*, s.v.

Picard, Jean (2)

a French humanist, was born in Beauvais in the 16th century. He was regular canon of St. Victor, in Paris. He died in 1617. We owe to him the edition of the chronicle of Guillaume de Neubourg (*De -ibus A Inglicis* [Paris, 1610, 8vo], lib. 5), accompanied by the life of the author and historical notes, and that of the *OEuvres de St. Bernard* (Paris, 1615. fol.). See Moreri, *Dict. Hist.* s.v.; Papillon, *Bibl. de Bourgogne*, s.v. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 40:47.

Picard, John

SEE PICARDS.

Picard, Mathurin

a French ecclesiastic who flourished in the early part of the 17th century, was curate of Mestil-Jourdain, in the diocese of Evreux. Picard is the author of a quaint book, which has become very rare, *Le Fouet des Paillards, ou juste Punition des Voluptueux et Charnels* (Rouen, 1623, 12mo). He incurred the same accusations as Urbain Grandier, and was doomed to the same penalty. His alleged crime was bewitching the nuns of Saint-Louis of Louviers, and sundry acts of profanation and debauchery. As he was tried after his death, his body was exhumed and burned at Rouen, in execution of a judgment rendered August 21, 1647. See Frere, *Bibliogr. Normande*. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 40:48.

Picardet, Charles N.

a French priest, was born at Dijon near the beginning of the 18th century. Before the Revolution he was canon of Saint-Jean-Baptiste of Dijon, and

prior of Neuilly, near that city. He died about 1794. We have of his works, *Essai sur l'Education des petits Enfants* (Dijon, 1756, 12mo): — *Les deux Abdolonymes* (ibid. 1779, 8vo): — and *Histoire metorologique, nosologique, et economique pour l'Annnee* 1785. He had undertaken a considerable work, which, under the title of *Grande Apologetique*, was to contain the refutation of all heresies since the establishment of Christianity. See *Biog. Nouv. des Contemp.* — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 40:53.

Picards

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

Such is the account which various writers, relying on the authorities of Aeneas Silvius and Varillas, have given of the Picards. Some, however, doubt whettler a sect of this denomination, chargeable with such wild principles and such wild conduct, ever existed. It appears probable that the reproachful representations of the writers just mentioned were calumnies invented and propagated in order to disgrace the Picards, merely because they deserted the communion and protested against the errors of the Church of Rome. Lasitius informs us that Picard, together with forty other persons, besides women anti children, settled in Bohemia in the year 1418. Balbinus, the Jesuit, in his *Epitome Rerum Bohemnicarum*, lib. 2, gives a

similar account, and charges on the Picards none of the extravagances or crimes ascribed to them by Svlvius. Schlecta, secretary of Ladislaus, king of Bohemia, in his letters to Erasmus, in which he gives a particular account of the Picards, says that they considered the pope, cardinals, and bishops of Rome as the true antichrists; and the adorers of the consecrated elements in the eucharist as downright idol worshippers. According to this author, the Picards are Vaudois, who fled from persecution in their own country and sought refuge in Bohemia. Beausobre held the same opinion, on the ground that the Vaudois were settled in Bohemia in the year 1178, where some of them adopted the rites of the Greek, and others those of the Latin Church. The former were pretty generally adhered to till the middle of the 14th century, when the establishment of the Latin rites caused great disturbance. At the commencement of the national troubles in Bohemia, on account of the opposition of the papal power, the Picards more publicly avowed and defended their religious opinions; and they formed a considerable body in an island by the river Launitz, or Lausnecz, in the district of Bechin, and, resorting to arms, were defeated by Zisca. See Hardwick, *Hist. of the M.A. Church*, page 436; *Ref.* page 95; Mosheim, *Church Hist.* volume 2; and the references under ADAMITES. (J.H.W.)

Picart, Bernard

a famous French engraver, was born at Paris in 1673. He was the pupil of Le Clerc. His best works are those executed in France. Having embraced the Reformed religion, he took up his residence in Holland. In Amsterdam, to which place he accompanied his father in 1710, he worked exclusively for the booksellers, and became mannered, metallic, and merely ornamental. A great many of his prints are from his own designs, in which he imitated the style of composition of Antoine Coytel. He had a facility in imitating the styles of other earlier engravers, and he published many prints of this class which are said to have deceived collectors; Picart used to call them *Impostures innocentes*, and they were published under this title, to the number of seventy-eight, with a list of his works (Amsterdam, 1738), after his death. His prints altogether amount to about 1300, and one of the best of them is a *Slaughter of the Innocents*, after a design of his own: there are various impressions of it. He died in 1733. The French text which Picart's copper-plates were intended to illustrate was Written by J.F. Bernard and Bruzen de la Martiniere. The first and best edition of the work in the original French is that of 1728-37; to which should be added

Supplement (1743, 2 volumes), and *Superstitions, Anciennes et Modernes* (1733-36, 2 volumes). Picart is the author of a work on *The Religious Ceremonies and Customs of the several Nations of the known World*, represented in more than a hundred copper-plates, which he designed, and accompanied with historical explanations and several curious dissertations (Lond. 1731-39, 7 volumes, fol.). See Duplessis, *Hist. de la Gravure en France*; Haag Freres, *La France Protestante*, s.v.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliogr.* s.v.; *English Cyclop.* s.v.

Picart, Etienne

called *Le Romain*, father of the preceding, also a celebrated French engraver, was born at Paris in 1631. His prints, chiefly portraits and history, are very numerous: they are finely executed, but want harmony. He worked with the graver and, the etching-needle, much in the style of Poilly. He is supposed to have been called *Le Romain* from his log., sojourn in Rome, or he assumed the name that he might not be confounded with another engraver of the name of Picart. He was engraver to the king, and a member of the French Academy of Painting, etc. He left his country because he was persecuted for his religious belief, and died at Amsterdam in 1721. He engraved many sacred subjects of the great masters, among them the *Birth of the Virgin*, after Guido; the *Marriage of St. Catharine*, after Correggio; the *Holy Family*, after Palma. etc.

Piccadori, Jean Baptiste

an Italian ascetic of some note, was born at Rieti in 1766. He entered the congregation of the regular Minorites, and professed philosophy and theology. In 1791 he obtained the professorship of morals, and kept it while he lived. He was at the same time curate of the parish of Saint-Vincent-et-Saint-Anastase, consultor of the Index, etc. In September, 1826, Leo XI appointed him superior-general of his order, in which he had occupied different minor charges. Piccadori published *Institutions ethique, ou de la Philosophie morale*, and was prevented by death from finishing *Institutions du Droit des Gens*. He died at Rome December 29, 1829. — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 40:55.

Picchiani, Francesco

(also called *Picchetti*), an Italian architect, was born at Ferrara in the latter part of the 17th century. He was the son, and probably the pupil, of

Bartolofimeo Picchiani, who erected the church del Monte della Misericordia at Naples. Francesco settled in that city, where he gained a high reputation for his talents. He was employed by the viceroy Don Pedro Arragona to assist in the construction of a basin for the royal galleys, and other vessels. He also constructed the beautiful avenue leading from the basin to the piazza of the palace, adorning it with elegant fountains. Among his other works were the church and monastery of S. Giovanni della Monache. without the Porta Alba; S. Agostino; La Divino Amore; the church and monastery de Miracoli; and the Monte de Poveri, in the Strada di Toledo. He died in 1690.

Picchianti, Giovanni Domenico

all Italian designer and engraver, was born at Florence about 1670. He was instructed in the rudiments of drawing by Giovanni Battista Foggini, and afterwards learned engraving. Picchianti with Lorenzini, Mogalli, and other artists, was employed in engraving a set of plates from pictures in the Florentine Gallery. Among other works of his are the following: *The Madonna della Seggiola*, after Raffaele; *The Virgin and Infant Jesus, with St. John*, after Anthony Caracci; *The Tribute-Money*, after Titian; *The Virgin and Infant*, after Titian; *Abraham Sending away Hagar*, after P. da Cortona.

Piccinardi, Serafino

an Italian theologian of some note, was born at Padua in 1634. He embraced the rule of St. Dominic; professed theology at Bologna, Verona, Genoa, and Milan and was called upon, in 1669, to occupy the chair of metaphysics at the university of his native place. According to Papadopoli, he died in 1686 at Brescia; according to Echard, in 1695. He published, *Philosophice dogmaticce peripateticce Christiane lib. 9* (Padua, 1671-1676, 2 volumes, 4to): — *De approbatione doctrinae St. Thoraе lib. 7* (ibid. 1683, 3 volumes, fol.): — and *Praedestinatus* (ibid. 1686, 4to). — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 40:55.

Piccini, Giacomo

an Italian engraver, was born at Venice in 1617. It is not known by whom he was instructed. He engraved a set of thirty portraits of the principal painters of the Venetian school, for the account of their lives by Ridolfi, published in 1648. He also engraved a few plates after the Italian masters,

among which are *The Holy Trinity*, after P. Liberi; *Judith with the Head of Holofernes at her Feet*, and *The Holy Family*, after Titian. His plates are executed in a stiff, disagreeable style. He was living in 1669.

Piccioni, Matteo

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

Piccola, Niccola (or Niccola Lapicola)

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

Piccolomini, Alessandro

one of the most distinguished of Italian prelates of the 16th century, was born at Siena in 1508. He sprang from the same family as pope Pius II (q.v.). and by his piety, modesty, and scholarship gained great renown; but no events of his life are particularly worth recording. He deserves to be remembered for the wide extent of his writings, and the esteem in which they were held by his contemporaries and immediate followers. He died in 1578. He was of an original turn of mind, and his writings are almost all in Italian, so that he is among the earliest of those who endeavored to raise the character of vernacular literature by treating all branches of knowledge in modern tongues. His commentaries on Aristotle were prized for their good sense, and for their abandonment of most of the scholasticisms by which that philosophy was disfigured by commentators. He advocated in 1578 the reformation of the calendar, which was afterwards adopted. In his book on the fixed stars and the sphere he adopts the mode of designating

the stars by letters — a small matter, but one which makes the greater part of the immortality of Bayer, and to which the diagrams of Piccolomini establish his prior claim. His works are of a most miscellaneous character — astronomy, physics, comedies, sonnets, morals, divinity, and commentaries on Aristotle. De Thou speaks in strong terms of the rare union of diversity and depth which his acquirements presented. For a list of his most important works, and an estimate of them, see Fabiani, *Vita d' Aless. Piccolomini* (Vienna, 1749, 1759, 8vo); Ughelli, *Italia Sacra*, s.v.; Tiraboschi, *Storia della letter. ital.* volume 7, part 1, page 506; Nicéron, *Memoires*, volume 23, s.v. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gen.* s.v.

Piccolomini, Francesco

an Italian philosopher, father of the preceding, was born in 1520 at Siena. At Padua, where he pursued his studies, he was condisciple of Felix Peretti, who became pope under the name of Sixtus V, and who boasted of having worsted him in public disputation. He professed philosophy, at Siena, Macerata, Perugia (1550), and finally at Padua (1560). His advanced age compelled him, in 1601, to leave the latter city and retire to Siena. He strove both by his lessons and by his writings to restore the philosophy of Plato, and to show that it is compatible after all with the principles of Aristotle. He died at Siena in 1604. He left, *Universa philosophia de moribus* (Venice, 1583, fol.); the editions of Frankfort (1601, 1611, 8vo) contain besides, under the title of *Comes politicus*, an answer to the attacks of Zabarella: — *Libri de scientiae natura V puttibus* (Frankf. 1597, 1627, 4to), which is a treatise on natural philosophy: — *De arte definiendi et eleganter discurrendi* (ibid. 1600, 4to): — *Commentaria in Aristotelem De Ortu et Interitu, De anima et De Coelo* (Mentz, 1608, 8vo); each of these commentaries was also published separately. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 40:67.

Picenardi, Carlo (1)

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

Picenardi, Carlo (2)

(called *The Younger*), son of the preceding, was born about 1610. It is not known by whom he was instructed; but, after studying at Rome, he went to Venice, and formed a style of his own, Roman in design and Venetian in coloring. On his return to Cremona he executed some works for the churches and public edifices, but painted most for the collections. Lanzi says he was very successful in burlesque histories, in imitation of the elder Picenardi. He died about the year 1680.

Pichler, Aloys, Dr.

one of the most prominent Roman Catholic theologians of Germany, was born in 1833 at Burgkirchen, in the diocese of Passau. He studied at the Passau Lyceum and at Munich, and in 1857 he received the prize for an essay on Polybius. Two years later he was made a priest; in 1861 he was honored with the theological doctorate, and in the following year he commenced his lectures on Church history. In 1869 he was appointed librarian at St. Petersburg; but two years later he was found to be guilty of kleptomaniac propensities in his official capacity, and as he had robbed the library of many valuable possessions, he was brought to trial, found guilty, and condemned to banishment to Siberia, where he remained till 1874, when he was pardoned through the intervention of the Bavarian prince Leopold. Pichler then returned to his native country. He died June 3, 1874, at Siegdorf, near Trauenstein. He wrote, *Geschichte des Protestantismus in der orientalischen Kirche im 17 Jahrhundert., oder der Patriarch Cyrillus Lucaris u. seine Zeit* (Munich, 1861): — *Die orientalische Kirchenfrage nach ihrem gegenwertigen Stande* (ibid. 1861): — *Geschichte der kirchlichen Trennung zwischen Orient und Occident* (1864-65, 2 volumes); which had the distinction of being placed on the Romish Index — *Die Theologie des Leibnitz* (1869 sq., 2 volumes): — *Die wahren Hindernisse und die Grundbedingungen einer durchgreifenden Reform der Kirche* (1870). Towards the last he became more estranged from his Church. See Ztchhold, *Bibliotheca Theologica*. 2:995; *Literarischer Hardweiser fürs katholische Deutschland*, 1874, page 335 sq.; Kurtz, *Lehrbuch der Kirchengesch.* 7th ed., 2:357. (B.P.)

Pichler, Veit

a German Roman Catholic theologian and member of the Society of Jesus, was born at Berchtesgaden, Bavaria, in the second half of the 17th century. He entered the Jesuitic order, and was a professor of canonical law at Dillingen; became in 1716 professor of jurisprudence at Ingoldstadt, and in 1731 he obtained a professorship of jurisprudence at Munich. He died in 1736. We have of him, *Iter polemnicum au Ecclesie catholicae veritatem* (Augsb. 1708, 8vo): — *Examen polemicut super Augustana confessione* (ibid. 1708, 8vo): — *Papatus numquam errans in proponendis fidei articulis* (ibid. 1709, 8vo): — *Lutheranismus constantor errans in fidei articulis* (ibid. 1709, 8vo): — *Theologia polemica* (ibid. 1719, 4to, and often): — *Summa jurisprudentiae sacrae* (ibid. 1723, 5 volumes, 8vo): — *Jus canonicum practiae explicatum* (ibid. 1728, 4to; 1735, 1746, fol.). — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 40:77.

Pichon, Jean

a French Jesuit, noted as a revivalist, was born at Lyons in 1683. He early became a preacher, but after entering the Society of Jesus in 1697, and obtaining orders, preached in missions at Rheims, Langres, and Metz. Stanislas, duke of Lorraine and Bar, gave him the direction of the missions which he founded in this country with truly royal liberality. To refute some Jansenists, who dissuaded the people from frequent communion by asserting that man must be perfect before approaching the holy table, he published *Esprit de Jesus Christ et de l'Eglise sur la Communion frequente* (1745, 12mo). His book caused a great stir. It was attacked by the authors of the *Nouvelles Ecclesiastiques*, condemned by an ordinance of M. de Caylus, bishop of Auxerre (September 27, 1747), and soon afterwards by other prelates, zealous partisans of the "Unigenitus bull." Jesuits and Jansenists being united against his book, Pichon retracted his obnoxious opinions in a letter to M. de Beaumont, archbishop of Paris, January 24, 1748. He then went to preach at Colmar; but as it soon appeared that he was endeavoring secretly to instigate a number of German prelates against the proscription of his work in France, he was banished to Maariac (1748), and soon after compelled to leave France. Having found an asylum in the house of the bishop of Lyons (Valais), he became grandvicar and general visitor of his bishopric. He died at Lyons May 3, 1751. — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 40:78.

Pichon, Thomas-Jean

a French litterateur, was born in 1731 at Le Mans. Having been ordained a priest, he attached himself to M. d'Avrincourt, bishop of Perpignan, by whose protection he became canon and chorister of the Sainte-Chapelle of Le Mans. He was historiographer of the king's brother, whose estate was in that part of France. At the time of the Revolution the constitutional bishopric of Sarthe was offered to Pichon; but he would accept only the situation of administrator of the hospital of Le Mans. He died at that place November 18, 1812. His principal writings are, *La Raison triomphante des Nouveautes* (Paris, 1756, 12mo): it is an essay, upon manners and incredulity: — *Traite historique et critique de la Nature de Dieu* (ibid. 1758, 12mo): — *Cartel aux Philosophes a quatre Pattes* (Brussels, 1763, 8vo), in which he exposes materialism: — *Memoire sur les Abus du Celibat dans l'Orde politique* (Amsterdam, 1763, 8vo); this memoir, quite singular and inaccurate, excited some complaints against the author: — *La Physique de l'Histoire* (La Haye, 1765, 12mo); general considerations upon the temperament and character of people: — *Les Droits respectifs de l'Etat et de l'Eglise rappelis a leurs Principes* (Paris, 1766, 12mo): — *Memoires sur les Abus dans les Mariages* (Amsterdam, 1766, 12mo): — *Des Etudes theologiques* (Avignon, 1767, 12mo); researches upon the abuses which opposed the progress of theology in the public schools: — *Les Arguments de la Raison en Faveur de la Religion et du Sacerdolaie* (Paris, 1776, 12mo); an examination of the treatise *De l'Homme* of Helvetius. Abbe Pichon also published the *Principes de la Religion et de la Morale* of Saurin (Amsterdam, 1768, 2 volumes, 12mo), the same work as the *Esprit de Saurin* of J.F. Duranel: — *La France agricole et marchande* of Goyen (Paris, 1768, 8vo): — and *Le Sacrae et le Couronnement de Louis XVI* of Gobet (Paris, 1775, 8vo and 4to), to which was added a *Journal historique* of this ceremony. See Desportes, *Bibliog. du Maine*; Querard, *France Litter.* s.v. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 40:79.

Pick

a name common to several Hebrew literati, of whom we mention the following:

1. AARON. — When and where he was born, and when lie became a Christian, we do not know. From his publicatiios we see, what he states himself, that he was formerly professor of Hebrew and Chaldee at the

University of Prague. He afterwards resided at London, where he published *A Literal Translation from the Hebrew of the Twelve Minor Prophets, with Notes and Critical Remarks* (Lond. 1833; 2d ed., without notes, *ibid.* 1835; 3d ed. 1838): — *A Treatise on the Hebrew Accents* (*ibid.* 1837): — *The Bible Student's Concordance, by which the English Reader may be enabled readily to ascertain the Literal Meaning of any Word in the Sacred Original* (*ibid.* 1840, 1850, 4to); a work of little account to scholars: — *The Gathering of Israel* (*ibid.* 1845). When Pick died we do not know. See Steinschneider, *Bibliographisches Handbuch* (Berl. 1859), page 111; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

2. ISRAEL, the founder of the Amenian Congregation, was born at Seufenberg, Bohemia, about the year 1825. After attaining maturity, he obtained his livelihood by writing for periodicals at Vienna till the year 1852, when he received an appointment to act as rabbi for the Jewish synagogue in Bucharest, the chief city of the present Roumania. In the latter part of 1853, having been impressed in favor of the Christian religion, he boldly confessed his faith in Christ crucified; was baptized at Breslau, Silesia, Jan. 1, 1854, on which occasion Pick delivered an address to the Jews assembled at the Hofkirche. Viewing the promises given to the Jewish people in the Old Testament from a Hebraic standpoint, Pick intended to constitute in the Holy Land a congregation of the people of God, consisting of Jewish Christians. The whole Mosaic law, including the Jewish Sabbath and circumcision, alongside of baptism and the Lord's Supper, he intended to make the basis of ecclesiastical and civil organization. Here and there he was successful in winning some believers, whom he called the *Armenian Congregation*, because in Christ (the **ḥma yhl a**, ²⁵¹⁶ Isaiah 65:16) all promises of the Old Covenant are yea and amen. The nucleus of this congregation was in Munchen-Stadbach. In the year 1857 Pick went to Palestine, in order to reconnoitre the field for a settlement of his adherents, where, however, he disappeared without leaving any traces. He wrote, *Israel hat eine Idee zu tragen: ein Wort an mein Volk* (Breslau, 1854; Engl. translation, "A Word to my People," Edinburgh, 1854): — *Der Gott der Synagoge und der Gott der Judenchristen* (*ibid.*): — *Briefe an meine Stammesgenossen* (Hamburg, 1854): — *Der Stern aus Jacob* (*ibid.* 1855-56): — *Wider Stahl und Bunsen* (Barmen, 1856). See Kurtz, *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte* (7th ed. Mitau, 1874), 2:445; Niedner, *Lehrbuch der christlichen Kirchengeschichte* (Berlin, 1866), page 950; *Jewish Intelligencer* (Lond.

1854), page 302 sq.; Pick, *In Saat auf Hoffnung* (Leips.), 1857; Zuchhold, *Bibliotheca Theologica*, 2:995. (B.P.)

Pickard, Edward

an English dissenting minister, inclined to Arianism, was born at Alcester, Warwickshire, in 1714. After studying theology, he became minister at Bermondsey in 1740, and at Carter Lane, London, in 1746. He died in 1778. He is the author of *National Praise to God for the glorious Revolution, the Protestant Succession, and the syinal Successes and Blessings with which Providence has crowned tis*, a sermon on ~~4970~~ Psalm 147:1 (Lond. 1761. 8vo):— *The Religious Government of a Family, particularly the Obligation and Importance of Family Worship*, in three discourses (ibid. 1762, 8vo).

Pickard, John H.

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Orange County, N.C., in March 1783. He received a limited education, and was not a graduate of any college. In 1816 he was licensed, and installed over Stony Creek and Bethesda churches, in N. C., where he continued to labor devotedly for upwards of thirty years. During the later years of his life he preached occasionally in the destitute portions of his neighborhood. He died September 11, 1858. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1860, page 77.

Pickering, George

one of the great pioneers of New England Methodism, was born in Talbot County, Maryland, in 1769, converted in St. George's Church, Philadelphia, when eighteen years old, and almost immediately began his public labors. In 1790 he was received on probation by the Conference, and for fifty-six years continued to receive its appointments, and lived to be the oldest active preacher in the itinerancy. He died December 8, 1846, retaining his mental faculties to the last hour; and as he laid aside his armor to give up the ghost, could use such language as "All my affairs for time and eternity are settled, glory be to God." George Pickering was a rare man in all respects. Any just delineation of him must comprehend the whole man, for it was not his distinction to be marked by a few extraordinary traits, but by general excellence. In person he was tall, slight, and perfectly erect. His countenance was expressive of energy, shrewdness, self-command, and benignity; and in advanced life his silvered locks,

combed carefully behind his ears, gave him a striking appearance. The exactitude of his mind extended to all: his physical habits. In pastoral labors, exercise, diet, sleep, and dress, he followed a fixed course, which scarcely admitted of deviation. Almost unerring prudence marked his life. If not sagacious at seizing new opportunities, he was almost infallibly perfect in that negative prudence which secures safety and confidence. No man who knew him would have apprehended surprise or defeat in any measure undertaken by him after his usual deliberation. His character was full of energy, but it was the energy of the highest order of minds, never varving, never impulsive. He continued to the last to wear the plain, Quakerlike dress of the first Methodist ministry. His voice was clear and powerful, and his step firm to the end. His intellectual traits were not of the highest, but of the most useful order. Method was perhaps his strongest mental habit, and it comprehended nearly every detail of his daily life. His sermons were thoroughly "skeletonized." He pretended to no subtlety, and was seldom if ever known to preach a metaphysical discourse. The literal import of the Scriptures, and its obvious applications to experimental and practical religion, formed the substance of his sermons. Perspicuity of style resulted from this perspicacity of thought. The most unlettered listener could have no difficulty in comprehending his meaning, and the children of his audience generally shared the interest of his adult hearers. See Stevens, *Hist. of the Meth. Episc. Church; N.Y. Methodist*, volume 7, No. 6; Sherman, *New England Sketches*, pages 399; Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 7:196-200. (J.H.W.)

Pickering, Robert

a noted Wesleyan preacher, was born at Sancton, Yorkshire, in 1786; was early converted to God, and called to the duties of the Christian ministry. Having for some time labored as a local preacher in the Hull Circuit, he offered to accompany Dr. Coke as a missionary to the East. But as Coke had obtained his complement of young men, Pickering regarded this as a providential indication that he was not intended for the mission field. Soon after he passed the required examinations, and at the Conference of 1811 was placed on the president's list of reserves. In November of the same year he was sent as temporary supply to Partington Circuit, and in the following January to Spilsby. At the Conference of 1812 he was appointed to Horncastle; and in 1813 to the Spilsby mission. His next appointment was to Louth, where he spent two years. Subsequently he travelled at

Todmorden, Barnsley, and Doncaster, and in 1822 was appointed to Colne, where he remained three years. Here his exertions, both of mind and body, in the erection of a new chapel and two preachers' houses, seriously impaired his health. In 1827 he was stationed at Kettering; next at Norwich; in 1831 at West Bromwich, and there he labored faithfully, although rapidly declining in health. While at Conference in London in 1834 he was taken very ill, and he died August 18. Pickering was a man of genuine piety. As a preacher he was a workman who needed not to be ashamed. He was well and extensively read in theology and general literature. As a man he was fearless and honorable. What he considered to be his duty he unhesitatingly discharged. See *Wesleyan Meth. Mag.* 1836, pages 889-895; 1835, page 719. (J.H.W.)

Pickett, John R.

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

Pico

SEE MIRANDULA.

Picot, Francois Edouard

a French painter, was born at Paris in 1786. He was a disciple of Vincent, and in 1811 obtained the second grand prize for paintings in France from the Academy. After studying for some time at Rome, he was intrusted with the execution of a picture representing *The Death of Sapphira* (1819) for the church of St. Sveerin. In the same year he exhibited the tableau of

Amor and Psyche, the figures of which, expressive of graceful naivete, obtained great favor, and which was bought by the duke of Orleans. M. Picot was rewarded at that exhibition by a first-class medal. After this auspicious beginning he executed freely and successfully. Among his works are *Raphael and the Fornarina*; *The Deliverance of St. Peter*; *The Annunciation*; two ceilings in the Louvre, in the Musee des Antiques. Picot had a share in the work of restoration of the paintings of the Fontainebleau palace. He executed *The Crowning of the Virgin* (Notre Dame de Loretto); the paintings of the ship and choir of St. Vincent de Paul, with M. Flandrin; and some pictures in the church of St. Clotilde. M. Picot was received a member of the Academie des Beaux Arts in 1836, in the place of Charles Vernet. He was created an officer of the Legion of Honor in 1832. He died in 1870. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 40:86.

Picot, Michel Joseph Pierre

a French writer of some note, was born March 24, 1770, at Neuvilleaux-Boix, near Orleans. He was early destined for the Church, and was received at the age of thirteen in the house of the bishop of Bayeux. He studied theology at the seminary of Orleans. While professor of humanities at Meung-sur-Loire, he refused the oath required by the civil constitution of the clergy. A warrant being issued against him for his share in the evasion of a royalist, he absconded to Paris; then, submitting to the duties of the requisition which he had shirked till then, he offered to enter the marine (1793), and, after two campaigns, was employed in the equipment office at Brest. In 1797 he was released, and devoted himself to the study of the history of the Church during the 18th century. The *Memoires* which he published in 1896 obtained the eulogies of religious societies, especially of the abbe Boulogne, who intrusted him with the redaction of the *Memorial Catholique*, a monthly paper founded by him. In the month of April, 1814, he was called upon to manage *L'Ami de la Religion et du Roi*, which soon became the official journal of the clergy. He died November 15, 1841, at Paris. He left, *Memoire pour servir a l'Histoire ecclesiastique pendant le dix-huitieme Siecle* (Paris, 1806, 1815-1816, 4 volumes, 8vo; 3d edit. 6 volumes, 8vo); this valuable publication is less polemical than the *Memoires* of father d'Avrigny, of which it is a kind of continuation; but the historical part of it is weak, and the bibliography is incomplete: — *Essai historique sur l'Influence de la Religion en France pendant le dix-septieme Siecle* (ibid. 1824, 2 volumes, 8vo). He is the chief contributor to

the collection of the *Melanges* (9 volumes, 8vo), commenced by the abbe Boulogne; and he edited in 1827 the works of that prelate, adding to the same a *Tableau religieux de la, France sous le Directoire*, and a *Precis historique sur l'Eglise constitutionnelle*. He wrote a number of articles in the *Journal des Cares*, in the *Supplement au Dict. historique* of Feller, the *Biographie Universelle* of Michaud, etc. He bequeathed part of his rich library to the seminary of Saint-Sulpice. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 40:85.

Picot, Pierre

a Swiss preacher, was born in 1746 at Geneva. He descended from Nicolas Picot, who left Noyon in company with Calvin, his friend, to settle in Geneva. His studies being finished, he visited France, Holland, and England, and connected himself with Franklin, who vainly urged him to accompany Cook in his second voyage around the world. After having served for ten years the Church of Sattigny, he was attached to that of Geneva (1783), and there received in 1787 the title of honorary professor of theology. He died in Geneva March 28, 1822. We have of his works, *De multiplici montium utilitate* (Geneva, 1790, 8vo): — the *Eloge historique de J.A. Mullet-Favre*, in the *Guide astronomique* of Lalande (1771): — and some *Sermons* (ibid. 1823, 8vo), remarkable for their harmony of style. See Rabbe, etc., *Biog. univ. et portat. des Contemp.*; Haag Freres, *La France Protestante*, s.v. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 40:83.

Picot, Victor Maria

a French engraver, was born at Abbeville in 1744. About the year 1770 he went to London, where he engaged in business. He died in 1805. Nagler gives a list of thirty-six prints by him, among which is *The Four Evangelists*, after Rubens.

Picquet, Francois (1)

a French prelate, was born at Lyons April 12, 1626. The son of a banker, he was destined to a commercial career, and travelled in France, Italy, and England. As he had thus become associated with several influential Parisians, he was in 1652 appointed to the consulship of France at Aleppo; and, although he was only twenty-six years of age, he was so successful in the discharge of his duties that the Dutch republic intrusted him with her own representation in the same city. Although a layman, he displayed

extraordinary zeal for the promotion of the missionary work. He received the tonsure in 1660 at the hands of Andre, archbishop of Syria, who was indebted to him for his elevation. Two years afterwards he resigned the consulship and went to Rome, to give to pope Alexander VII an account of the state of religion in Syria. When he returned to France he received orders, was appointed prior of Grimand (Provence), and (1663) apostolic protonotarius. He was proposed in 1674 for the apostolic vicarate of Babylon, and became in 1675 bishop in partibus of Caesaropolis, in Macedonia. In 1679 he embarked for Aleppo with the chevalier d'Arvieux. the new French consul, endeavored with unrelenting zeal to revive the faith of the Catholics, anla started in May 1681, as ambassador of the courts of France and Rome in Persia, with a view of working for the restoration and expansion of the Catholic faith. He arrived at Ispahan July 12, 1682, and soon afterrards witnessed the celebrations in that city in honor of the passage of tie khan of the Tartars, Usbeck, who was on his way to Mecca. He was granted an audience, harangued the khan in Italian, and obtained a promise of protection for the Roman Catholics of his lands. Towards the close of 1683 he took the same prince rich presents from the king of France, and transmitted to his sovereign the answer and presents of the Persian sovereign. That same year he was appointed bishop of Babylon, and he had arrived at Hamadan, when his impaired health compelled him to stop several months in that city, where he died, August 26, 1685, after writing to the Congregation of the Propaganda for a coadjutor. A special honor was conferred on him by his burial in the church of the Armelians. Picquet furnished to Nicole several important documents for his work on the perpetuity of the faith of the Church in regard to the Eucharist. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gen.* 40:87.

Picquet, Francois (2)

a French missionary, was born at Bourg (in Bresse) December 6, 1708. He took holy orders, and for a time preached in the diocese of Lyons, but finally entered the Congregation of St. Sulpice, and in 1735 was by it sent to Montreal, to share in the work of the North American missions. Towards 1740 he settled north of that city, near the lake of Two Mountains, where he constructed a fort with the money sent for that purpose by Louis XV, and by requisitions. With the aid of this fort he succeeded in keeping sedentary two roaming tribes, the Algonquins and Nipissings, who took to agriculture. He induced them, as well as the

Trokas and Hnirons, to submit to France; and during the war of 1742 to 1748, Picquet's measures for the safety of his colony were so effective that it remained untouched by English invasion. Peace being restored, he founded in 1749 a new mission near Lake Ontario, and called it La Presentation; the point, occupied by it is the same where the English afterwards founded Kingston. In 1753 he arrived at Paris, and reported to the minister of the marine as to the flourishing state of the colony, which counted already no less the five hundred families. In the war that broke out soon afterwards, he put himself at the head of the Indians which he had trained, destroyed all English forts south of Ontario, and contributed to the defeat of general Braddock. After the defeat of Quebec (1759), Picquet determined to return to France by way of Louisiana. He started with twenty-five Frenchmen and two small troops of savages, which were successively relieved by others in the tribes he met; traversed Upper Canada, reached Michilimakinac, crossed Michigan, and by the Illinois and the Mississippi rivers went to New Orleans, where he spent twenty-two months. The English had offered a reward for his head. Picquet had never received any reward, except a bounty of a thousand dollars and some books in 1751. The books he had to sell to enable him to return to France, and he was compelled to live on his scanty inheritance until the assembly of the clergy of France in 1765 presented him a bounty of twelve hundred pounds, which they gave him a second time in 1770. In 1777 he undertook a journey to Rome, where Pius VI, to honor his merits, paid all his expenses, and made him a present of five thousand pounds. Picquet came home to die at Verjou, near Bourg, the house of his sister, a poor peasant-woman, July 15, 1781. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 40:87.

Pictet, Benedict

a learned Swiss divine, was born at Geneva in 1655. He studied there under Francis Turretin, whom he succeeded as professor of theology in 1687, and obtained great celebrity. In 1690 he was made rector of the academy; in 1700 pastor of the Italian Church. He died in 1724. Pictet joined to vast erudition a vivid and natural eloquence. A list of his numerous works is given by Niceron. Among these the following are the most important: *La Theologie Chretienne, et la Science du Salut* (new ed. Genesis 1721, 3 volumes, 4to); originally *Theologia Christiana* (ibid. 1616, 2 volumes, 12mo); *Christian Theology* (translated from the Latin by the Reverend Frederick Reyroux, B.A., Lond. 1847, sm. 8vo): — *La*

Morale Chretienne, ou l'Art de bien vivre (nouv. ed. augmentee, Genesis 1709,8 volumes, 12mo); the first volume of this work appeared anonymously. It was reprinted at Lyons, in France, with a dedication to the bishop of Belley: — *Dissertation sur les Temples, leur Dedicace, et plusieurs Choses qu'on y voit. avec un Sermon* (ibid. 1716., 12mo): — *Huit Sermons sue l'Examen des Religions* (^{<S182>}1 Thessalonians 5:21) (ibid. 1716, 8vo): — *Dix Sermons sur divers Sujets* (ibid. 1718, 8vo): — *L'Histoire du douzieme Siecle* (Amst. 1732, 4to): — *Quatorze Sermons sur divers Sujets* (Genesis 1721, 8vo). See *Biblioth. Germanique*, s.v.; Nicéron, *Memoires*, volume 1; Senebler, *Hist. litter. de Geneve*, 2:249 sq.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibl.* s.v.; Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* volume 3; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* 8:92. (J.H.W.)

Picture

the rendering in the A.V. in three passages of two Hebrew words which are from the same root (**hkc**; *to look at*).

1. *Maskith*, **tykæhi**, *an image*; used alone, either literally (plur. "pictures," ^{<S151>}Proverbs 25:11) or in the sense of *imagination* ("conceit," ^{<S181>}Proverbs 18:11; plur. "wish," ^{<S171>}Psalms 73:7); with **ba**, *a stone* ("image of stone," ^{<S181>}Leviticus 26:1; plur. "pictures," ^{<S182>}Numbers 33:52); with **rdj**, *an apartment* (plur. "chambers of imagery" [q.v.], ^{<S182>}Ezekiel 8:12), "it denotes idolatrous representations, either independent images, or more usually stones 'portrayed,' i.e., sculptured in low relief, or engraved and colored (^{<S234>}Ezekiel 23:14; Layard, *Nin. and Bab.* 2:306, 308). Movable pictures, in the modern sense, were doubtless unknown to the Jews; but colored sculptures and drawings on walls or on wood, as mummy-cases, must have been familiar to them in Egypt (see Wilkinson, *Anc. Egyptians*, 2:277). In later times we read of portraits (**εἰκόνας**), perhaps busts or intagli, sent by Alexandra to Antony (Josephus, *Ant.* 15:2, 6). The 'pictures of silver' of ^{<S151>}Proverbs 25:11, were probably wall-surfaces or cornices with carvings, and the 'apples of gold' representations of fruit or foliage, like Solomon's flowers and pomegranates (^{<S107>}1 Kings 6:7). The walls of Babylon were ornamented with pictures on enamelled brick."

2. *Sekiyah*, **hykæj** the *flag* of a ship, as seen from afar (plur. "picture," ^{<S126>}Isaiah 2:16). The Phoenician and Egyptian vessels had their flags and

sails of purple and other splendid colors (see ³²⁷⁰Ezekiel 27:7; comp. Diod. Sic. 1, 51; Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* 3:211). **SEE STANDARD.**

Pictures, Worship Of In Churches

The use of paintings and images in churches was introduced as early as the commencement of the 4th century, but was speedily condemned by a council held at Illiberis, in Spain, A.D. 305. Individual writers also during this century bore their testimony against the practice in question. Eusebius of Caesarea, at the beginning of the century, and Epiphanius of Salamis, towards the close of it, denounced the practice as heathenish and unscriptural (see Milner's *Hist. of the Church.* volume 4, chapter 13, page 423). Nevertheless the practice of hanging up pictures of saints and martyrs, as well as symbolical representations of Scripture histories, prevailed in the 5th century. No images of God or representations of the Holy Trinity were tolerated in churches till after the second Nicene council. Pictures of Scripture scenes were hung on the walls of churches at first to aid those who could not read. The idolatrous devotion with which the Papists bow down before the images and paintings of the dead is a consequence of this practice. **SEE IMAGE-WORSHIP.** Besides, the pictures are used by the Romanists for working upon the superstitious belief of the masses. Thus Seymour tells us the following in: his *Pilgrimage*: "There is scarcely an incident in the life of our Lord that has not its rival incident or parallel in the legendary life of Mary. For example, a picture represents an angel announcing to Mary the miraculous conception of the Messiah; it is rivalled by another representing an angel announcing to Anna, the legendary mother of Mary, the miraculous and immaculate conception of Mary in the womb. A picture represents the birth of our Lord; it is paralleled by another representing the nativity or birth of the Virgin Mary. If there is one representing our Lord sitting on the throne and bearing the crown as King of kings, there is a rival picture representing Mary sitting on the same throne, bearing the sceptre, and wearing the crown as Queen of heaven. There are two classes of miraculous pictures. One class comprehends those which are said to have had a miraculous origin; that is, to have been painted in part or in whole by no human hands, but by an angel, or some mysterious visitant from the world of spirits. The second class of miraculous pictures is far more numerous, and comprehends all those which have performed miracles. At the church of St. Giovanni e Paolo, near Rome, is a small picture of the Virgin Mary, which

is said to have shed tears on the French invasion of Italy. At Arezzo we were shown a picture in the cathedral church, which wept many tears at the language of some drunkards. It was a Madonna, and the bishop made it the means of collecting sufficient funds to build a new chapel to commemorate it. In the church of St. Pietro Ale Montorio is a singularly ugly representation of Mary and our Lord. Indeed, it is positively hideous; but an inscription on a marble slab announces that 'this sacred likeness of the mother of God, holding her son and a book, is illustrious for miracles more and more every day.' In St. Peter's, however is a very important one, not only for the miracle, but for its authentication. It is in the subterranean chapel, usually called the Grotto. It is a picture of the Virgin with a mark under the left eye, and the following is the inscription: 'This picture of the Most Holy Virgin Mary, which stood between the pillars of the porch of the ancient Basilica, having been struck by an impious hand, poured forth blood (*sanguinem fudit*) on the stone, which is now protected by a grating.' On one side is a large stone, on the other are two small stones. All three are covered with a strong iron grating, to preserve them, as on them the blood of this miraculous picture is said to have fallen." See Riddle, *Christian Antiquities*; Coleman, *Christian Antiquities*.

Pie

is a table or rule which was used in the old Roman offices previous to the Reformation, showing in a technical way how to find out the service which is to be read upon each day, and corresponds to what the Greeks called *πίναξ*, or the index (literally a *plank*, by metonymy a painted table or picture); and because indexes or tables of books were formed into square figures resembling pictures or painters' tables hung up in a frame, these likewise were called *πίνακες*, or, being marked only with the first letters of the word, *πί*, or pies. *Pie* is the familiar English name for the Romish *pica* (*ordinal*, or service-book), which perhaps came from the ignorance of the friars, who have thrust in many barbarous words into the liturgies. Some say that the word *pye* is derived from *littera picata*, a great black letter in the beginning of some new order in the prayer, and among printers that term is still used, the *pica* type. See Procter. *Book of Common Prayer*; Eadie, *Eccles. Cyclop.* s.v

Piece Of Gold

The A.V., in rendering the elliptical expression "six thousand of gold," in a passage respecting Naaman, relating that he "took with him ten talents of silver, and six thousand of gold, and ten changes of raiment" (^{<1285>}2 Kings 5:5), supplies "pieces" as the word understood. The similar passage respecting silver in which the word understood appears to be shekels, probably justifies the insertion of that definite word. *SEE PIECE OF SILVER*. The same expression, if a weight of gold be here meant, is also found in the following passage: "And king Solomon made two hundred targets [of] beaten gold: six hundred of gold went to one target" (^{<1106>}1 Kings 10:16). Here the A.V. supplies the word "shekels," and there seems no doubt that it is right, considering the number mentioned, and that a common weight must be intended. That a weight of gold is meant in Naaman's case may be inferred, because it is extremely unlikely that coined money was already invented at the time referred to, or indeed that it was known in Palestine before the Persian period. *SEE DARIC; SEE MONEY*. Rings or ingots of gold may have been in use, but we are scarcely warranted in supposing that any of them bore the name of shekels, since the practice was to weigh money. The rendering "pieces of gold" is therefore very doubtful; and "shekels of gold" as designating the value of the whole quantity, not individual pieces, is preferable. *SEE GOLD*.

Piece Of Money

SEE KESITAH; SEE STATER.

Piece Of Silver

The passages in the O.T. and those in the N.T. in which the A.V. uses this term must be separately considered. *SEE MONEY*.

I. In the O.T. the word "pieces" is used in the A.V. for a word understood in the Hebrew, if we except one or two cases to be afterwards noticed. The phrase is always "a thousand" or the like "of silver" (^{<0216>}Genesis 20:16; ^{<0704>}37:28; ^{<1265>}45:22; ^{<0704>}Judges 9:4; ^{<1265>}16:5; ^{<1285>}2 Kings 6:25; ^{<2882>}Hosea 3:2; ^{<3812>}Zechariah 11:12, 13). In similar passages the word "shekels" occurs in the Hebrew, and it must be observed that these are either in the law, or relate to purchases, some of an important legal character, as that of the cave and field of Machpelah, that of the threshing-floor and oxen of Araunah, or to taxes, and the like (^{<0235>}Genesis 23:15, 16; ^{<0213>}Exodus 21:32;

<1878> Leviticus 27:3, 6, 16; <1872> Joshua 7:21; <1024> 2 Samuel 24:24; <1325> 1 Chronicles 21:25, where, however, shekels of gold are spoken of; <1250> 2 Kings 15:20; <1615> Nehemiah 5:15; <2430> Jeremiah 32:9). There are other passages in which the A.V. supplies the word "shekels" instead of "pieces" (<1829> Deuteronomy 22:19, 29; <1772> Judges 17:2, 3, 4, 10; <1081> 2 Samuel 18:11, 12), and of these the first two require this to be done. It becomes then a question whether there is any ground for the adoption of the word "pieces," which is vague if actual coins be meant, and inaccurate if weights. The shekel, be it remembered, was the common weight for money, and therefore most likely to be understood in an elliptical phrase. When we find good reason for concluding that in two passages (<1829> Deuteronomy 22:19, 20) this is the word understood, it seems incredible that any other should be in the other places. *SEE SHEKEL.*

One of the exceptional cases in which a word corresponding to "pieces" is found in the Hebrew is in the Psalms, where presents of submission are prophesied to be made of "pieces of silver," [*skAyXei* (68:30, Hebrews 31). The word /ri; which occurs nowhere else, if it preserve its radical meaning, from /xir; must signify a piece broken off, or a fragment: there is no reason to suppose that a coin is meant. — Smith. Another exceptional passage is <1025> 1 Samuel 2:26, where the Heb. word rendered "piece [of silver]" is *hrwǝa*) *agodah*, which seems to signify a small piece of money, as *wages*, from the idea of *collecting* (root *rga* to gather). *SEE SILVER.* For the "pieces of silver" in <1632> Joshua 24:32, *SEE KESITAH.*

II. In the N.T. two words are rendered by the phrase "piece of silver," drachma, *δραχμή*, and *ἀργύριον*.

(1.) The first (<2158> Luke 15:8, 9) should be represented by *drachm*. It was a Greek silver coin, equivalent, at the time of Luke, to the Roman denarius, which is probably intended-by the evangelist, as it had then wholly or almost superseded the former. *SEE DRACHMA.*

(2.) The second word is very properly thus rendered. It occurs in the account of the betrayal of our Lord for "thirty pieces of silver" (<1265> Matthew 26:15; 27:8, 5, 6, 9). It is difficult to ascertain what coins are here intended. If the most common silver pieces be meant, they would be denarii. The parallel passage in <3112> Zechariah 11:12, 13 must, however, be taken into consideration, where, if our view be correct, shekels must be

understood. It may, however, be suggested that the two thirties may correspond, not as of exactly the same coin, but of the chief current coin. Some light may be thrown on our difficulty by the number of pieces. It can scarcely be a coincidence that thirty shekels of silver was the price of blood in the case of a slave accidentally killed (⁴⁰²¹³Exodus 21:32). It may be objected that there is no reason to suppose that shekels were current in our Lord's time; but it must be replied that the tetradrachms of depreciated Attic weight of the Greek cities of Syria of that time were of the same weight as the shekels which we believe to be of Simon the Maccabee, *SEE MONEY*, so that Josephus speaks of the shekel as equal to four Attic drachmae (*Ant.* 3:8, 2). These tetradrachms were common at the time of our Lord, and the piece of money found by Peter in the fish must, from its name, have been of this kind. *SEE STATER*. It is therefore more probable that the thirty pieces of silver were tetradrachms than that they were denarii. There is no difficulty in the use of two terms, a name designating the denomination and "piece of silver," whether the latter mean the tetradrachm or the denarius, as it is a vague appellation that implies a more distinctive name. In the received text of Matthew the prophecy as to the thirty pieces of silver is ascribed to Jeremiah, and not to Zechariah, and much controversy has thus been occasioned. The true explanation seems to be suggested by the absence of any prophet's name in the Syriac version, and the likelihood that similarity of style would have caused a copyist inadvertently to insert the name of Jeremiah instead of that of Zechariah. *SEE SILVERLING*.

Pierce, Edward

an English painter who flourished in the reigns of Charles I and II, was eminent both in history and landscapes. He also drew architecture, perspective, etc., and was much esteemed in his time. But there is little of his work now remaining, the far greater part being destroyed in the fire of London, 1666. It chiefly consisted of altar-pieces, ceilings of churches, and the like; of these there is one yet remaining, done by him, in Covent Garden Church, where are to be found many admirable parts of a good pencil. He worked some time for Vandyck, and several good pieces by Pierce are to be seen at Belvoir Castle, in Leicestershire. He died in London about the close of the 17th century.

Pierce, George Edmond, D.D.

an American Congregational divine, noted especially as an educator, was born at Southbury, Conn., September 9, 1794. He was educated at Yale College, class of 1816; then studied theology at Andover Theological Seminary, class of 1821, teaching at the same time at the Fairfield Academy. In July 1822, he was ordained pastor of the Congregational Church at Harwinton, where he remained until called to the presidency of the Western Reserve College in 1834. He remained at the head of this high school until 1855, and gave to it an excellent reputation. He died at Hudson, Ohio, May 27, 1871.

Pierce, Gershorn

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in the closing quarter of the last century. He was converted about 1800, and called of God to the work of the sacred ministry joined the Methodist Episcopal Church, and entered in 1803 the New York Conference. His first appointment was at Plattsburgh. In 1804 he preached at Fletcher; 1805, Niagara; 1806, Oswegatchie; 1807, Dunham; 1808, Saratoga; 1809-10, Granville; 1811, Thurman; 1812, Grand Isle; 1813-14, Cambridge; 1815-16, Montgomery; 1817-18, Sharon; 1819, Albany; 1820, Coevmans; 1821-22, Chatham; 1823-24, Granville; 1825-26, Pittsfield; 1827, Burlington; 1828-29, Redding; 1830-31, Hempstead and Huntington. At the Conference of 1832 he became superannuated, and continued in that relation to the period of his death. Mr. Pierce was a man of much more than ordinary ability. His intellect, in force and habit is best described by the expression "long-headed." He was a devout man at times a most powerful preacher. His sermons, weighty with thought, fervid with feeling, and in power of the Holy Spirit, made a deep and abiding impression. He died in much peace at Milan, Ohio, March 23, 1865. See Smith, *Sacred Memories*, page 288 sq.

Pierce, James Edwin

an American divine of, note, was born at West Townsend, Vermont in 1839. He graduated at Middlebury College in 1861, and at Au.burn Theological Seminary in 1865. On his graduation he was elected to a professorship (of the Hebrew language and literature) in the last-named institution, which position he retained till his death (at Auburn, July 13,

1870). He was a close student, a thorough and able teacher, and an impressive and popular preacher. — *Appleton's Amer. Cyclop.* 10:570.

Pierce, John, D.D.

a noted American Congregational minister, was born at Dorchester, Mass., July 14, 1773. He was educated at Harvard University, class of 1793, and then became a tutor, in his alma mater. Descended of very humble parentage, he had made his way to college by his own exertions, and maintained his position by the force of his own industry feeling persuaded that his work was that of the Christian ministry, he took up the study of theology, and March 15, 1797, was ordained over the First Congregational Church, Brookline, Massachusetts, of which he was sole pastor for half a century. He died in this place August 24, 1849, respected by all who knew him, and greatly mourned by the ecclesiastic body to which he belonged. Dr. Pierce was member of the Academy of Arts and Sciences, and of the Massachusetts Historical Society. For several years he was president of the Massachusetts Bible Society. In all matters appertaining to family and literary statistics he was a prodigy. He had 18 quarto volumes of 600 pages each, of his own MS., containing memoirs and memorabilia. He published *Half-century Discourse at Brookline* (March 1847): — *Sketch of Brookline*, in "Mass. Hist. Collections," 2d sermon volume 2: — *Sermon at Ordination of S. Clark* (1817): — *Dudleian Leet.* (1821); also occasional *Sermons*, etc. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 8:331; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v. (J.H.W.)

Pierce, John J.

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Vermont in 1791. He secured his early education principally by his own exertions; graduated at Princeton College in 1820, and at the theological seminary in the same place in 1823. He was licensed by the New Brunswick Presbytery, and began preaching at Portsmouth, Virginia, where he remained until 1824, when he left for Clarksville, Tennessee. In 1825 he was elected president of an academy in Elkton, Kentucky, which position he held until 1837. Soon after he occupied temporarily the place of one of the professors in Centre College, Danville, Kentucky; then returned again to Elkton; but subsequently left, and spent two years in teaching in Illinois and Missouri. On his return he took charge of Ridgewood Church, Kentucky, where he continued to labor until his death, March 18, 1861. Mr. Pierce was a purehearted, simple-

mindful man; never attaining any very eminent success in the ministry, but ever contented and happy. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1862, page 116. (J.L.S.)

Pierce, Thomas, D.D.

an English divine of riite, flourished near the middle of the 17th Cedury. He was educated at Magdalen College, Oxford, and after graduation was presented with a fellowship. In 1648 he was ejected for nonconformity, but was restored under the Protectorate, and became prebend of Canterbury and Lincoln; in 1661 president of Magdalen College; in 1671 dean of Salisbury. He died in 1691. Dean Pierce was a man of more than ordinary talent and acquisition. In theology he was decidedly Arminialn, and published a number of occasional sermolns. theolot ical treatises, and controversial tracts. Among these we mention, *The Sinner Impleaded in his own Court, wherein are represented the Great Discouragements from Sinning which the Sinner receiveth from Sin itself* (Lond. 1656, 8vo): — *The Divine Philanthropie defended against the Declamatory Attempts of certain late printed Papers, entitled, A Correptory Correction. In Vindication of some Notes concerning God's Decrees, especially of Reprobation* [against Barlee] (Lond. 1657, 4to): — *A Collection of Sermons upon Several Occasions* (Oxf. 1671, 4to): — *A Correct Copy of some Notes concerning God's Decrees, especially of Reprobation* (Oxf. 1671, 4to): — *Pacificatorium Orthodoxae Theologiae Corpusculum. Secundae huic editioni accesserunt, De perfectissimo Dei cultu ad normam divinam exigendo* [Anon.] (Lond. 1685, sm. 8vo). Dean Pierce also greatly assisted bishop Walton in the publication of the Polyglot Bible. He was the decided antagonist of Baxter, and, according to Watson, "compelled that great controversialist to quail before him" (*Works*, 1:469). See Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*; Lowndes, *Brit. Librarian*, p. 1080; Watts, *Bibl. Brit.* s.v. (J.H.W.)

Pierce, Thomas A.

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Fauquier County, Virginia, October 25, 1819; was converted at the age of twenty; aild feeling called of God to the work of the sacred ministry, joined the Virginia Conference at Charlottesville in the fall of 1847, and was appointed to the Stafford Circuit. In 1848 he was sent to Rappahannock and Culpepper; in 1849 he, went to King William, where he travelled two

years; in 1852 and 1853 he labored on the James City and New Kent Circuit; in 1854, in King George; 1855, in New Hampshire; 1856 and 1857, in Hanover. In 1858 he was again in King William; in 1859 he was sent to Greenville; in 1860 and 1861 he had his pastoral charge in Mecklenburg; in 1862 and 1863, in Campbell; 1864 and 1865, in Appomattox. In all of these appointments he labored like a man of God, and was instrumental in doing much good. Failing health obliged him in 1866 to take a superannuated relation. He died February 26, 1867. See *Minutes of Ann. Cona. of the M.E. Church. South, 1868.*

Pieri, Stefano

a Florentine painter, born in 1513, and a pupil of Battista Naldini. He passed much of his life at Rome, where he was patronized by cardinal Alessandro Medici, by whom he was employed in the church of S. Prassede, where he painted the *Annunciation* and some pictures of the apostles. He executed other works for the churches at Rome and Florence, in which latter city he assisted Vasari in the cupola of S. Maria del Fiore. Lanzi says one of his best works is the *Sacrifice of Isaac*, in the Palazzo Pitti. Another fine picture is the *Assumption of the Virgin*, in the church of S. Maria in Via, at Rome. His works are well designed, but Baglioni censures them as being dry and hard. He died at Rome in the year 1600.

Pieritz, Joseph Abraham

a noted Anglican divine, was born of Jewish parentage in the year 1815 at Kletzko, in Prussia. At the age of twenty-three Pieritz became a Christian by being baptized at London. Four years later "the London Society for Propagating the Gospel among the Jews" appointed him a missionary among his brethren, and for about eight years he faithfully discharged his duty in that relation, residing in different places in the west of England. In the year 1851 he accepted an appointment to a pastoral charge in British Guiana. For about twenty years he labored as rector of the parish of St. Patrick, in the town of New Amsterdam, in the colony of British Guiana, where he died, October 16, 1870. See *Jewish Intelligencer* (London), 1838, page 292; 1870, page 20; *Report of the London Society*, 1851, page 34; Kalka, *Israel und die Kirche*, page 172. (B.P.)

Pierius

surnamed *the younger Origen*, a disciple of Origen, was distinguished in the Church of the 3d century as a scholar and author of high repute. We know nothing of his personal history, and his writings are no longer extant, or at least are inaccessible.

Pierpont, Hezekiah B.

an American Presbyterian minister, was a native of Connecticut, and was born about 1791. In 1821 he came to New York state and settled at Rochester, and soon after was ordained a Presbyterian minister. He became the pastor of a Church in Hopewell, Ontario County, for several years. He was then called to the pastorate at Avon, and there he lived until about 1861, when he moved to Rochester, N.Y., where he died in 1871, beloved by all his acquaintances for his many social and genial qualities. Indeed, none knew him but to honor him, both as a Christian and as a gentleman. "He lived a long life of usefulness as a pastor of the Presbyterian Church, and died full of years, in the blessed consciousness of a blameless life as an honored servant of God's ministry."

Pierpont, James

a noted New England Congregational minister of colonial days, was born at Roxbur, Connecticut, in 1661. He was educated at Harvard College, where he graduated in 1681; was ordained fourth minister in New Haven, Connecticut, in 1685, and retained that connection until his death in 1714. In the year 1698 Mr. Pierpont was one of three ministers who concerted the plan of founding a college — a plan which took effect in the establishment of Yale College in 1700. As one of the original trustees of the institution he was untiringly active; and it was through his influence, in no small degree, that the distinguished individual from whom it received its name was induced to make it the object of his liberal benefactions. Dwight, in his life of Edwards, states that Mr. Pierpont read lectures to the students in Yale College as professor of moral philosophy. This, however, Dr. Bacon considers doubtful, as the college was not removed from Saybrook till after Mr. Pierpont's death. Of the famous synod held at Saybrook in 1708, for the purpose of forming a system that should better secure the ends of Church discipline and the benefits of communion among the churches, Mr. Pierpont was a prominent member. The "Articles" which

were adopted as the result of the synod, and which constitute the well-known "Saybrook Platform," are said to have been drawn up by him. The only publication of Mr. Pierpont was a sermon preached at Boston, in Cotton Mather's pulpit in 1712, entitled *Sundry false Hopes of Heaven discovered and decryed*. Mather introduces the sermon with a short preface, in which he says of the author, "He has been a rich blessing to the Church of God." New Haven values him, all Connecticut honors him — they have cause to do so. Dr. Bacon writes thus concerning him:

"That we are not able to form so lively an idea of him as of Davenport is partly because his life was shorter, and was less involved in scenes of conflict, and partly, no doubt, because his nature and the early discipline of Divine Providence had less fitted him to make himself conspicuous by the originality and energy of his character and to leave his image stamped with ineffaceable distinctness on the records of his times. In the pulpit Mr. Pierpont was distinguished among his contemporaries. His personal appearance was altogether prepossessing. He was eminent in the gift of prayer. His doctrine was sound and discriminating, and his style was clear, lively, and impressive, without anything of the affected quaintness which characterized some of the most eminent men of that day."

See Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, 1:205, 206; Bacon, *Historical Discourses*, page 171 sq.; id. *Genesis of the New England Churches*. (J.H.W.)

Pierpont, John

an eminent American Unitarian divine, noted especially for his part in temperance and antislavery movements, was born in 1785 at Litchfield, Conn., and graduated at Yale College in 1804. The years immediately after his leaving college were occupied in teaching, a part of the time at the South and afterwards in New England, and he then studied law and settled at Newburyport. The war of 1812 interfered with his professional prospects, and he forsook the law for business, but met with indifferent success both at Boston and Baltimore, and in 1818 he entered the Cambridge Divinity School. Less than a year after this time he was installed as pastor of the Hollis Street Unitarian Church at Boston, succeeding the Reverend Dr. Holley, and for twenty-five years he held the pastorate of that church. At first he was successful, popular, and strongly beloved by his people, but the latter part of his ministry was clouded with troubles and

dissensions between himself and prominent men of his society on the temperance question, which were never amicably adjusted. While settled at Boston he visited Europe and Palestine. In 1845 he became the first pastor of the Unitarian Church at Troy, N.Y. After a four years' pastorate there he received a call to Medford, where was his last ministerial experience. After this he identified himself with the Spiritualists, having become an enthusiastic believer in animal magnetism. The breaking out of the rebellion found Mr. Pierpont at his home in Medford, but the wear and tear of over seventyfive years of life had not been sufficient to keep him quietly at his fireside while parishioners and friends were hastening to the front to uphold the government which he loved and honored. He sought a post of duty at once, and governor Andrew yielded to his request, and appointed him chaplain of the Twenty-second Regiment. The exposure of camp-life and duties on the field proved beyond his strength, and he was soon compelled to resign his place, much to his regret. Secretary Chase then appointed him to a clerkship in the treasury department, and his clerical duties were always faithfully performed, and he proved a valuable and efficient officer. He died in 1866, while yet in the employ of the government. Mr. Pierpont was a thorough scholar, a graceful and facile speaker, a poet of rare power and pathos, a most earnest advocate of the temperance and antislavery movements, and a man whose convictions, purposes, and impulses were always sincerely expressed. His strong desire for securing advancement and reform may have led him sometimes into injudicious steps, and diminished his influence for the causes he sought to advance, but his heart was always right; and temperance, freedom, and Christianity had no firmer and more consistent friend or advocate. He leaves an enviable reputation as a poet, and his pathetic "Passing Away" will live as long as our language is spoken or written. In addition to his poetical works, he published at Boston several popular school-readers, and some twenty occasional sermons and discourses. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; *Christian Examiner*, November 1866, art. 5; *Atlantic Monthly*, December 1866; Appleton's *Annual Cyclopaedia*, 1866, page 617. (J.H.W.)

Pierquin, Jean

a French ecclesiastic, noted especially as a writer, was born February 15, 1672, at Charleville. After taking holy orders, he was in 1699 appointed curate of Chatel, in the Ardennes, where he spent his whole life, dividing

his time between works of charity and literary pursuits. He died March 10, 1742. He published, *Vie de St. Tuvin, [erlmite* (Nancy, 1732, 8vo): — *Dissertations physico-theologiques sur la Conception de Jesus dans le Sein de la Vierge Manie, sanmere* (Paris, 1742, 12mo), in which work he gives some physical account of the manner in which the divine act of generation took place, etc. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 40:128.

Pierre, ST

SEE PETER.

Pierre, Jean Baptiste Maria

a French painter, was born at Paris in 1715. It is not known by whom he was instructed; but he went, when quite young, to Rome, where he remained several years. On his return to Paris he distinguished himself as a historical painter; and executed several works for the churches and public edifices, which gained him great reputation. He was appointed painter to the king, and elected member of the academy at Paris. One of his greatest works was the ceiling of the chapel of the Virgin, in the church of St. Sulpice, which has been engraved by Nicholas Dupuis. He also etched a few plates from his own designs and those of others. He died in 1789.

Pierson, Abraham

an American Congregational divine and educator was born at Lynn, Massachusetts, in 1641. Abraham, his father, first minister of Southampton, Long Island, (born in Yorkshire, England, in 1608, died August 9, 1678), was one of the first settlers of Newark in 1677, and was the first minister of that town. He preached to the Indians of Long Island in their own language, and contributed *Some Helps for the Indians in New Haven Colony to a further Account of the Progress of the Gospel in New England* (1659). His son, Abraham, Jun., was educated at Harvard University, where he graduated in, 1668. After studying theology, he was ordained colleague with his father at Newark, N.J., March 4, 1672, and was minister at Killingworth, Connecticut, from 1694 until his death, March 5, 1707. Mr. Pierson was identified with the founding of Yale College, was anxiously desired for its first principal, and did instruct for a time at Killingworth, though he never moved to Saybrook, where the commencements of Yale were held in its earliest days, because his parishioners would not suffer him to leave them. He was taken ill in the

midst of the agitation regarding his college duties, and died before he could settle the case. President Clapp, in his *History of Yale College*, says of rector Pierson that he was "a hard student, a good scholar, a great divine, and a wise, steady, and judicious gentleman in all his conduct." See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 1:116 sq.; Bacoïn, *Genesis of the New England Churches*. (J.H.W.)

Piktas

a virtue which denotes veneration for the Deity, and love and tenderness to our friends, and especially dutifulness to parents. It received divine honors among the Romans, and was made one of their gods. Acilius Glabrio first erected a temple to this new divinity, on the spot where a woman had fed with her own milk her aged father, who had been imprisoned by order of the senate, and deprived of all aliment. The goddess is seen represented on Roman coins as a matron, throwing incense upon an altar, and her attributes are a stork and children. See Cicero, *De Div.* 1; Val. Maximus, 5:4; Pliny, 7:36; Zumpt, in the *Class. Museum*, 3:452.

Pietism

is the specific appellation of a phase of religious thought which developed itself especially within the pale of the German Lutheran Church in the 18th century. Like English Methodism, it originated in a period of indifference to religion, and, like it also, aimed to supersede dead faith, knowledge without life, form without spirit, worldliness under the cloak of religion by *life* — a spiritual and living faith. Like Methodism, it laid great stress on the necessity of the new birth; it prohibited certain amusements and modes of life until then considered as at least harmless; and it encouraged private assemblies of Christian persons for purposes of edification, such as the study of the Scriptures or the interchange of spiritual experiences. Like Methodism, too, it encountered at first no little ridicule, and even persecution. It was accused of being an attempt to found a new sect, and was vehemently opposed on this ground; but, unlike Methodism, though it did here and there give rise to some insignificant bodies of separatists, it never broke off from the national Church of the country, but remained as a movement within its pale.

The development of German Lutheranism, which really means German Protestantism, repeats in a most peculiar manner the course of the general Church previous to it. As in the first four centuries the productive spirit of

the Church proposed to itself the view of Christianity as a whole, so also was the time from the beginning of the Reformation to the *Augsburg Confession* (q.v.) one pre-eminently creative, and it laid the foundation of the Lutheran Church as regards its confession of faith. With the endeavor pervading the 5th, 6th, and 7th centuries more distinctly to work out the single doctrines corresponds the work of the Lutheran Church up to the time of the *Formula Concordice* (q.v.), by which the various differences of doctrines were to be settled. As the Church of the Middle Ages had handed down to it, as a firm foundation, the doctrinal matter produced by the fathers and sanctioned by the Church, which scholasticism then undertook to work out and digest in a systematic manner, so there arose in the 17th century — the Protestant Middle Ages — a scholasticism which put into a regular form the Lutheran confession of faith embodied in the *Formula Concordiae*. As in the Middle Ages, mysticism stands side by side with the strict representatives of scholasticism, so the Protestant mystics, Jacob Bihme (q.v.), Arndt, and others, stand by the side of an effete orthodoxy. This mystical tendency acquired an importance about the end of the 17th and the beginning of the 18th centuries. A parallel again between this period and that of the 14th century is obvious. In the 14th century the romantic spirit had become extinct; scholasticism had outdone itself; from France there flowed over Europe a worldly spirit; the Roman spirit had decayed; everything was in dissolution. Then from the reaction against the externalized scholasticism and secularized life there broke forth on all sides and in the most varied forms mysticism, which had in itself a Reformatory feature. In like manner after the Thirty-years' War the blossom of Germany had withered; the religious spirit, which since the period of the Reformation had been the first power in Germany, had stepped into the background; while, on the other hand, the secular spirit had been let loose, along with a powerful retinue of immorality, especially by the preponderance of France under Louis XIV. It was a dreary period in German history.

Politically the empire had fallen asunder into a number of separate despotic little states; and the sentiment of national unity had become so nearly extinct that the loss of the fertile and beautiful Alsace to France seems to have been viewed with wonderful indifference. Socially the life of the people had greatly deteriorated. The rural population was terribly diminished in numbers and wealth; their means of communication were restricted by the destruction of their horses and the neglect of the roads;

their schools had disappeared, and were but very slowly replaced; their new houses and churches were bare and barn-like compared to the old ones; their periodical gatherings for certain purposes of local self-government or for festivities had fallen into disuse. It was a vegetating sort of existence, and the writers of the following age bear testimony to the illiteracy and coarseness of manners which prevailed towards the end of the 17th century even among the gentry of the country districts. In the towns things were but little better. The commerce of Germany had received a serious check; her merchant-princes had sunk to the level of petty traders, and adopted the manners and culture of the latter class. Her old free cities were decaying; only a few of the newer ones were growing; and what intellectual life then existed centred in them, as at Hamburg or Berlin, or at the court of any sovereign who specially protected letters, or still more at the universities. Throughout this period Germany contributed only one really great name to literature — that of Leibnitz; while in France it was the age of military glory and social brilliancy — of Racine and Moliere, of Fenelon and Bossuet, of Bayle and Voltaire. German men and women therefore found their own life mean and tiresome, and were carried away by admiration of their splendid neighbor, till it became the fashion to imitate whatever was French in manners, dress, or tone of thought, and the very language was wretchedly corrupted by the intermixture of French phrases. Of course there was a class, of which king Frederick William I of Prussia may be taken as the type, who hated foreign ways, and upheld whatever was most antiquated and unrefined as peculiarly German; but in general the tide set in favor of the foreigners. The French were now the great models, and very unfortunate ones for a people whose natural genius was so totally different. German literature reached its lowest ebb under these influences. One of the earliest signs, if not the first sign, of its revival was a rebellion against French classicism, and an admiration for the master writers of English — Shakespeare and Milton.

Religion suffered under the same depression. On the one hand was a rigid Lutheranism which had petrified what had once been living convictions into dead dogmas, and which gave its whole attention to controversies about definitions of doctrines in which the people had ceased to feel a genuine interest. On the other hand was a genteel indifference which idolized "enlightenment" (the favorite watchword of that period), and indemnified itself for its compliance with certain outward observances by laughing at the whole affair in private. Rabener, a satirist of this period, when

characterizing the earlier part of the 18th century, says: "There was a time in Germany when no satire could be witty at the expense of anything but the Bible, and there were lively heads which had, so to speak, a complete satirical concordance in readiness, that their wit might never run dry. . . . If a groom is conscious of possessing a more cultivated mind than the dairymaid, he startles her by a jest on some text or hymn; all the servants scream with laughter, all admire him down to the very cowboy, and the poor dairymaid, who is not so witty, stands there abashed." When the danger seemed imminent that the great work of the Reformation would prove in vain, and that it would soon come to ruin, providential supply and guidance came in the pietistic spirit which arose. Indeed, the learned Dörner holds, with a large number of others, that this new tendency was a necessary stage in the development of Protestantism — a supplement of the Reformation — and that Spener, the father of pietism, was the veritable successor of Melancthon.

But we must first learn what pietism proposed to do before we can properly appreciate its historical importance. Pietism commenced upon the principle that the Church was corrupt; that the ministry were generally guilty of gross neglect; and that the people were cursed with spiritual death. It therefore proposed, as a theological means of improvement:

- 1.** That the scholastic theology, which reigned in the academies, and was composed of intricate and disputable doctrines, and obscure and unusual forms of expression, should be totally abolished.
- 2.** That polemical divinity, which comprehended the controversies subsisting between Christians of different communions, should be less eagerly studied and less frequently treated, though not entirely neglected.
- 3.** That all mixture of philosophy and human science with divine wisdom was to be most carefully avoided; that is, that pagan philosophy and classical learning should be kept distinct from, and by no means supersede Biblical theology; but,
- 4,** that, on the contrary, all those students who were designed for the ministry should be accustomed from their early youth to the perusal and study of the Holy Scriptures, and be taught a plain system of theology, drawn from these unerring sources of truth.

5. That the whole course of their education was to be so directed as to render them useful in life, by the practical power of their doctrine and the commanding influence of their example. But it was not intended to confine these reforms to students and the clergy. Religious persons of every class and rank were encouraged to meet in what were called Biblical colleges, or colleges of piety (we might call them prayer-meetings), where some exercised in reading the Scriptures, singing, and prayer, and others engaged in the exposition of the Scriptures; not in a dry and critical way, but in a strain of practical and experimental piety, whereby they were mutually edified. This practice, which always more or less obtains where religion flourishes (as, for instance, at the Reformation), raised the same sort of outcry as at the rise of Methodism; and those who entered not into the spirit of the design were eager to catch at every instance of weakness or imprudence, to bring disgrace on that, which, in fact, brought disgrace upon themselves, as lukewarm and formal Christians. "In so saving, Master, thou reproachest us also."

The person who began this religious movement was John Arndt (1555-1621), who wrote *The True Christian*, a work as useful religiously as Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress* or Doddridge's *Religion in the Soul*. Spener followed (1635-1705). The private religious meetings which he established about 1675, *Collegia Pietatis*, were the origin of the application of the name pietism to the movement. One of his pupils was the saintly A.H. Francke (q.v.). Paul Gerhard, the well-known author of the German hymns, also belonged to the same party. The revival feeling spread rapidly through Germany, where the institution of the "Collegia," being in complete accord with the national instinct, soon attained great popularity. Up to 1686 pietism had spread without exciting commotion, no persecution having yet been attempted. But when in this year Spener removed to Dresden, and several of his students made bold to lecture at the University of Leipsic, in imitation of their leader's practice, giving in their lectures particular prominence to the correction of the errors contained in Luther's translation of the Bible, the great body of Lutherans, who had been accustomed to regard this translation as little short of inspired, took umbrage at such freedom of criticism, and at the practice of these Pietists who lectured in the popular tongue. All kinds of adverse rumors were circulated, they were maligned in many ways, and complaints were made to the university authorities. When these popular agitations were ignored, there followed tumults of so violent a character as to spread throughout

Leipsic the seeds and principles of mutiny and sedition, and finally the matter was forced to public trial. Of course the pious and learned men above mentioned were, indeed, declared free from the errors and heresies that had been laid to their charge, but were, at the same time, prohibited from carrying on the plan of religious instruction they had undertaken with such zeal. It was during these troubles and divisions that the invidious designation *Pietists* was first invented; it may at least be affirmed that it was not commonly known before this period. It was at first applied by some giddy and inconsiderate persons to those who frequented the Biblical colleges, and lived in a manner suitable to the instructions and exhortations that were addressed to them in these seminaries of piety. It was afterwards made use of to characterize all those who were either distinguished by the excessive austerity of their manners, or who, regardless of truth and opinion, were only intent upon practice, and turned the whole vigor of their efforts towards the attainment of religious feelings and habits. But as it is the fate of all those denominations by which peculiar sects are distinguished to be variously and often very improperly applied, so the title "Pietist" was frequently given in common conversation to persons of eminent wisdom and sanctity, who were equally remarkable for their adherence to truth and their love of piety; and not seldom to persons whose motley characters exhibited an enormous mixture of profligacy and enthusiasm, and who deserved the title of delirious fanatics better than any other denomination. This contest was by no means confined to Leipsic, but spread with incredible celerity through all the Lutheran churches in the different states and kingdoms of Europe. For from this time, in all the cities, towns, and villages where Lutheranism was professed, there started up, all of a sudden, persons of various ranks and professions, of both sexes, who declared that they were called by a divine impulse to pull up iniquity by the root; to restore to its primitive lustre and propagate through the world the declining cause of piety and virtue; to govern the Church of Christ by wiser rules than those by which it was at present directed; and who, partly in their writings and partly in their private and public discourses, pointed out the means and measures that were necessary to bring about this important revolution. Several religious societies were formed in various places, which, though they differed in some circumstances, and were not all conducted and composed with equal wisdom, piety, and prudence, were, however, designed to promote the same general purpose. In the mean time these unusual proceedings filled with uneasy and alarming apprehensions both those who were intrusted

with the government of the Church and those who sat at the helm of the state. These apprehensions were justified by this important consideration, that the pious and well-meaning persons who composed these assemblies had indiscreetly admitted into their community a number of extravagant and hot-headed fanatics, who foretold the approaching destruction of Babel (by which they meant the Lutheran Church), terrified the populace with fictitious visions, assumed the authority of prophets honored with a divine commission, obscured the divine truths of religion by a gloomy kind of jargon of their own invention, and revived doctrines that had long before been condemned by the Church. The most violent debates arose in all the Lutheran churches; and persons whose differences were occasioned rather by mere words and questions of little consequence than by any doctrines or institutions of considerable importance, attacked one another with the bitterest animosity; and in many countries severe laws were at length enacted against the Pietists. These revivers of piety proposed to carry on their plan without introducing any change into the doctrine, discipline, or form of government that were established in the Lutheran Church.

At the head of this movement stood, in Germany, the learned and pious Spener, whose sentiments were adopted by the professors of the new Academy of Halle; and particularly by Francke and Paulus Antonius, who had been invited thither from Leipsic, where they began to be suspected of pietism. Though few pretended to treat either with indignation or contempt the intentions and purposes of these good men (which, indeed, none could despise without affecting to appear the enemy of practical religion and virtue), yet many eminent Lutheran divines, and more especially the professors and pastors of Wittenberg, being of opinion that, in the execution of this laudable purpose, several unorthodox maxims were adopted and certain unwarrantable measures employed, proceeded publicly against Spener in the year 1695, and afterwards against his disciples and adherents, as the inventors and promoters of erroneous and dangerous opinions. These debates turned upon a variety of points, and therefore the matter of them cannot be comprehended under any one general head. If we consider them indeed in relation to their origin, and the circumstances that gave rise to them, we may be able to reduce them to some fixed principles. We have already said that those who had the advancement of piety most zealously at heart were possessed of a notion that no order of men contributed more to retard its progress than the clergy, whose peculiar vocation it was to inculcate and promote it. Looking upon this as the root

of the evil, it was but natural that their plans of reformation should begin here; and accordingly they laid it down as an essential principle that none should be admitted into the ministry but such as had received a proper education, were distinguished by their wisdom and sanctity of manners, and had hearts filled with divine love. Hence they proposed, in the first place, a thorough reformation of the schools of divinity; and they explained clearly enough what they meant by this reformation, as we have seen above. As these maxims were propagated with the greatest industry and zeal, and were explained inadvertently by some without those restrictions which prudence seemed to require, these professed patrons and revivers of piety were suspected of designs that could not but render them obnoxious to censure. They were supposed to despise philosophy and learning; to treat with indifference, and even to renounce, all inquiries into the nature and foundations of religious truths; to disapprove of the zeal and labors of those who defended it against such as either corrupted or opposed it; and to place the whole of their theology in certain vague and incoherent declamations concerning the duties of morality. Hence arose those famous disputes concerning the use of philosophy and the value of human learning, considered in connection with the interests of religion; the dignity and usefulness of systematic theology; the necessity of polemic divinity; the excellence of the mystic system; and also concerning the true method of instructing the people. The second great object that employed the zeal and attention of the persons now under consideration was that the candidates for the ministry should not only for the future receive such an academical education as would tend rather to solid utility than to mere speculation, but also that they should dedicate themselves to God in a peculiar manner, and exhibit the most striking examples of piety and virtue. This maxim, which, when considered in itself, must be considered to be highly laudable, not only gave occasion to several new regulations, designed to restrain the passions of the studious youth, to inspire them with pious sentiments, and to excite in them holy resolutions, but also produced another maxim, which was a lasting source of controversy and debate, viz.: "That no person who was not himself a model of piety and divine love was qualified to be a public teacher of piety, or a guide to others in the way of salvation." This opinion was considered by many as derogatory to the power and efficacy of the Word of God, which cannot be deprived of its divine influence by the vices of its ministers, and as a sort of revival of the long-exploded errors of the Donatists; and what rendered it peculiarly liable to an interpretation of this nature was the imprudence of some Pietists, who

inculcated and explained it without those restrictions that were necessary to render it unexceptionable. Hence arose endless and intricate debates concerning the following questions: "Whether the religious knowledge acquired by a wicked man can be termed theology?" "Whether a vicious person can, in effect, attain a true knowledge of religion?" "How far the office and ministry of an impious ecclesiastic can be pronounced salutary and efficacious?" "Whether a licentious and ungodly man cannot be susceptible of illumination?" and other questions of a like nature. These revivers of declining piety went still farther. In order to render the ministry of their pastors as successful as possible in rousing men from their indolence, and in stemming the torrent of corruption and immorality, they judged two things indispensably necessary. The first was to suppress entirely, in the course of public instruction, and more especially in that delivered from the pulpit, certain maxims and phrases which the corruption of men leads them frequently to interpret in a manner favorable to the indulgence of their passions. Such, in the judgment of the Pietists; were the following propositions: No man is able to attain to that perfection which the divine law requires; good works are not necessary to salvation; in the act of justification, on the part of man faith alone is concerned, without good works. The second step which they took in order to give efficacy to their plans of reformation was to form new rules of life and manners, much more rigorous and austere than those that had formerly been practiced; and to place in the class of sinful and unlawful gratifications several kinds of pleasure and amusement which had hitherto been looked upon as innocent in themselves, and which could only become good or evil in consequence of the respective characters of those who used them with prudence or abused them with intemperance. Thus dancing, pantomimes, public sports, theatrical diversions, the reading of humorous and comical books, with several other kinds of pleasure and entertainment, were prohibited by the Pietists as unlawful and unseemly, and therefore by no means of an indifferent nature. The third thing on which the Pietists insisted was that, besides the stated meetings for public worship, private assemblies should be held for prayer and other religious exercises. The University of Halle, which had been founded for the avowed purpose of promoting the pietistic movement, finally became its home and centre; and the Orphanhouse established in that town by A.H. Francke, and renowned all over Europe, one of its most effective agencies. Besides, it became a living proof that pietism was not only able to combat the religious errors of the times, but also to grapple with the grave wants of common life. Is not that a good and

safe theology which, in addition to teaching truth, can also clothe the naked and feed the hungry? It has been charged against the Pietists that they wrote but little. Writing was not their mission. It was theirs to act, to reform the practical life and faith of the people, not to waste their strength in a war of books. They wrote what they needed to carry out their lofty aim; and this was perhaps sufficient. They did lack profundity of thought; but let it be remembered that their work was restorative, not initial. Yet we would not leave the impression that pietism did not exert any influence as a literary light. The theological instruction of Francke and his coadjutors in the University of Halle was very influential. During the first thirty years of its history six thousand and thirty-four theologians were trained within its walls, not to speak of the multitudes who received a thorough academic and religious instruction in the Orphan-house. The Oriental Theological College, established in connection with the university, promoted the study of Biblical languages, and originated the first critical edition of the Hebrew Bible. Moreover, it founded missions to the Jews and Mohammedans. From Halle streams of the new life flowed out until there were traces of reawakening throughout Europe. First, the larger cities gave signs of returning faith; and the universities which were most bitter against Spener were influenced by the power of the teachings of his immediate successors. Pietism propagated its influence by means of Bengel in Wirtemberg and the University of Tubingen, and in Moravia through Zinzendorf. Arnold and Thomasius belonged to this party at the beginning of the 18th century. Oettinger at Tubingen, Crusius at Leipsic, and, to a certain extent, Buddeus also, partook of the spirit of pietism. The opposition of the old Lutheran party of other parts of Germany produced controversies which continued till about 1720 (for an account, see Weismann, *Mem. Eccl. Hist. Sacr.* [1745], page 1018 sq.). Zurich, Basle, Berne, and all the larger towns received it with gladness. It penetrated as far east as the provinces bordering on the Baltic Sea, and as far north as Denmark, Norway, and Sweden. Many of the continental courts welcomed it, and orphan-houses, after the model of Francke's, became the fashion of the day. The Reformed Church was influenced and impelled by it, and even England and the Netherlands indicated a strong sympathy for its practical and evangelical features. No higher tribute can be paid it than that of Tholuck, who avers "that the Protestant Church of Germany has never possessed so many zealous Christian ministers and laymen as in the first forty years of the 18th century."

With a new generation of professors at Halle — among them C.B. Michaelis, the younger Francke, Freilinghausen, the elder Knapp, Callenberg, and Baumgarten — taking the place of their more vigorous predecessors, pietism began to lose its first power and earnest spirit. The persistent inquiry into scriptural truth passed over into a tacit acquiescence of the understanding. Reliance was placed on the convictions, more than on the fruits of study. Spener had blended the emotions of the mind and heart, reason and faith, harmoniously; but the later Pietists cast off the former and blindly followed the latter. Hence they soon found themselves indulging in superstition, and repeating many of the errors of some of the most deluded Mystics. Science was frowned upon, because of its supposed conflict with the letter of Scripture. The language of Spener and Francke, which was full of practical earnestness, came into disuse. Definitions became loose and vague. The "Collegia," which had done so much good, now grew formal, cold, and disputatious. The missions, which had begun very auspiciously, dwindled from want of means and men. External life became pharisaical. Great weight was attached to long prayers. The duke of Coburg required the masters of schools to utter a long prayer in his presence, as a test of fitness for advancement. Pietism grew mystical, ascetic, and superstitious. Some of its advocates and votaries made great pretensions to holiness and unusual gifts. This had a tendency to bring the system into disrepute in certain quarters, though the good influences that it had exerted still existed and increased. It might disappear, but the good achieved by it would live after it. Pietism, though it ceased its aggressive power after Francke and Thomasius, was destined to exert a reproductive power long afterwards. From their day to the present, whenever there has arisen a great religious want, the heart of the people has been directed towards this same agency as a ground of hope. Whatever be said against it, it cannot be denied that it has succeeded in finding a safe lodgment in the affections of the evangelical portion of the German Church. Even in our own century the Church has had recourse to pietism as its only relief from a devastating rationalism; not the pietism of Spener and Francke, we acknowledge, but the same general current belonging to both. Its organ was the *Evangelical Church Gazette*, in 1827, and among the celebrities who attached themselves to it we find the names of Heinroth, Von Meyer, Schubert, Von Raumer, Steffens, Schnorr, and Olivier. Pietism lacked a homogeneous race of teachers. Here lay the secret of its overthrow. Had the founders been succeeded by men of much the same spirit, and equally strong intellect, its existence would have been guaranteed, so far as

anything religious can be promised in a country where there is a state Church to control the individual conscience. The great mistake of Lutheranism was in its failure to adopt it as its child. The sceptical germ which soon afterwards took root, gave evidence that it could cause its overthrow for a time, at least; but the evils of rationalism were partially anticipated by the practical teachings of the Pietists.

The inference has frequently been drawn that the two tendencies — the dogmatic and the pietistic — which marked the religious life of Germany at the opening of the 18th century, ministered indirectly to the production of scepticism; the dogmatic strictness stimulating a reaction towards latitude of opinion, and the unchurchlike and isolating character of pietism fostering individuality of belief. This inference is, however, hardly correct. Dogmatic truth in the corporate Church, and piety in the individual members, are ordinarily the safeguards of Christian faith and life. The danger arose in this case from the circumstance that the dogmas were emptied of life, and so became unreal; and that the piety, being separated from theological science, became insincere. Rationalism in Germany, without pietism as its forerunner, would have been fatal for centuries. But the relation of these tendencies, so plainly seen in the ecclesiastical history of Germany, is one of long standing. From the days of Neo-Platonism to the present they have existed, the good to balance the evil, faith to limit reason. They have been called by different names; but Christianity could little afford to do without it or its equivalent in the past, and the Church of the future will still cling as tenaciously and fondly to it or to its representative. A recent author who has shown a singular facility in grouping historical periods and discovering their great significance, says: "Pietism went back from the cold faith of the 17th century to the living faith of the Reformation. But just because this return was vital and produced by the agency of the Holy Spirit, it could not be termed a literal return. We must not forget that the orthodoxy of the 17th century was only the extreme elaboration of an error, the beginning of which we find as far back as Luther's time, and which became more and more a power in the Church through the influence of Melancthon. It was this: Mistaking the faith *by which we believe* for the faith *which is believed*. The principle of the Reformation was justification by faith, not the doctrine of faith *and* justification. In reply to the Catholics it was deemed sufficient to show that this was the true doctrine which points out the way of salvation to man. The great danger lay in mistaking faith itself for the doctrine of faith.

Therefore, in the controversies concerning justifying faith, we find that faith gradually came to be considered in relation to its doctrinal aspects more than in connection with the personal, practical, and experimental knowledge of men. In this view pietism is an *elaboration* of the faith of the 16th century. . . . So far from being heterodox, Spener even expressed himself in the most decided manner in favor of the doctrines of the Church. He would make faith consist less in the dogmatism of the head than in the motions of the heart; he would bring the doctrine away from the angry disputes of the schools and incorporate it into practical life. He was thoroughly united with the Reformers as to the real signification of justifying faith, but these contraries which were sought to be re-established he rejected. . . . From Spener's view a new phase of spiritual life began to pervade the heart. The orthodoxy of the state Church had been accustomed to consider all baptized persons as true believers if only they had been educated in wholesome doctrines. There was a general denial of that living, conscious, self faith which was vital in Luther, and had transformed the world. The land, because it was furnished with the Gospel and the sacraments, was considered an evangelical country. The contrast between mere worldly and spiritual life, between the living and dead members of the Church, was practically abolished, though there still remained a theoretical distinction between the visible and invisible Church. As to the world outside the pale of the Church, the Jews and heathen, there was no thought whatever. Men believed they had done their whole duty when they had roundly combated the other Christian churches. Thus lived the state Church in quiet confidence of its own safety and pure doctrine at the time when the nation was recovering from the devastations of the Thirty-years' War. 'In the times succeeding the Reformation,' says a Wurtemberg pastor of the past century, 'the greater portion of the common people trusted that they would certainly be saved if they believed correct doctrines; if one is neither a Roman Catholic nor a Calvinist, and confesses his opposition, he cannot possibly miss heaven; holiness is not so necessary after all'" (Auberlen, *Die gottliche Offenbarung*, 1:278-281).

The enemies of pietism have confounded it with mysticism. There are undoubted points in common, but pietism was aggressive instead of contemplative; it was practical rather than theoretical. Both systems made purity of life essential. but mysticism could not guard against mental disease, while pietism enjoyed a long season of healthful life. The latter was far too much engaged in relieving immediate and pressing wants to fall into

the gross errors which mark almost the entire career of the former. Pietism was mystical in so far as it made purity of heart essential to salvation; but it was the very antipodes of mysticism when organized and operating against a languid and torpid Church with such weapons as Spener and his coadjutors employed. Bohme and Spener were world-wide apart in many respects, but in purity of heart they were beautifully in unison.

A brief account of pietism is given in Hase's *Church Hist.* § 409; and for a fuller account, see Schrockh, *Kirchengesch. seit der Ref.* 8:255-291; Pusey, *On German Theology*, part 1 (pages 67-113); part 2, chapter 10; Amand Saintes, *Crit. Hist. of Rationalism*, chapter 7. Spener's character and life may be seen in Canstein's memoir of him; and in Weismann, pages 966-972. A philosophical view of pietism, as a necessary stage in the development of German religious life, is given by Dorner in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1840, part 2, page 137, "Ueber den Pietismus." Kahnis, who himself quotes from it (*Hist. of Germ. Prot.* page 102), regards pietism as ministering indirectly to rationalism; much in the same way as bishop Fitzgerald criticised the similar evangelical movement of England (*Aids to Faith*, page 49, etc.). The best account of pietism is to be found in Horsbach, *Spener u. seine Zeit.*; Bretschneider, *Die Grundlage des evangelischen Pietismus*; Marklin, *Darstellung u. Kritik des modernen Pietismus*. See also Hurst, *Hist. of Rationalism*, chapters 2 and 3; Hurst's Hagenbach, *Church Hist. of the 18th and 19th Centuries*; Winkworth, *Christian Sigers of Germany*, page 257 sq.; *Meth. Qu. Rev.* April 1865, page 316; *Bibliotheca Sacra*, July 1865, page 522; 1864, page 224; Gass, *Dogmengesch.*; Haag, *Hist. des Dogmes*.

Pietosi

is the name of a celebrated Jewish family, called in Hebrew $\mu\gamma\omega\mu[\text{h} \hat{m}$, which, like the families $\mu\gamma\text{j} \omega\text{p}\text{th} \hat{m}$ and $\mu\gamma\text{r}[\text{nh} \hat{m}$, traced their origin to those Jews who were led into captivity after the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus and Vespasian. To this family belong the following:

1. BENJAMIN DE, *ben-Abr.*, *b.-Jech.*, *b.-Abr. Rofe*, of Rome, who flourished in the middle of the 13th century, is the author of $\mu\gamma\text{y}\text{j} \times[\text{r}[\text{ç}$, a didactic poem (Prague, 1598): — $\mu\gamma\text{r}\gamma\text{ç}\omega \mu\gamma\text{f}\omega\text{p}\text{x}$ religious hymns. See Zunz, *Synagogale Poesie*, pages 313-315; id. *Literaturgeschichte der synagog. Poesie*, page 362 sq.; Steinschneider,

Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibl. Bodl. page 2767 sq.; Dukes, *Ozar Nachmad*, 2:199.

2. JACOB DE, of Italy, wrote **bq[ly tyrb**, a great collectaneum of diverse matters (Livorno, 1800): **bq[yl wnr**, novellas on the treatises *Chullin* and *Temura* (ibid. 1810): — **hrpk hbzm**, another collectaneum (ibid.).

3. ZIDKIA DE, a brother of Benjamin, wrote **yl bç fql h**, on Jewish rites and precepts (Venice, 1546; Sulzbach, 1699; Dubno, 1794). See Wolf, *Bibl. Hebr.* 1:1001; 3:961; 4:962; Schorr, *Kritische Untersuchung uber das Werk Schibbale ha-Leketh in Zijjon* (Frankforton-the-Main, 1841), 1:147 sq.; Furst. *Bibl. Jud.* 3:100. (B.P.)

Pietro, Michele D

an Italian prelate of note, was born January 18, 1747, at Albano. After defending in public disputation at Rome with great success some theological propositions, he was appointed professor of ecclesiastical history in the Gregorian university, and of canonical law at the Roman archi-gymnasium. He took an important share in the work of the congregation which examined the decisions of the Synod of Pistoja favorable to Jansenism, and contributed with the learned Gerdil to the redaction of the bull *Auctorem fidei* (1794). Pius VI, when he left Rome (1798), made him apostolical legate; and he had to give his advice in many a delicate question; for instance, in that of the oath of hatred against royalty which was exacted from French clergymen. Pius VII appointed him successively patriarch of Jerusalem, cardinal (February 23, 1801), and prefect of the Propaganda. When this pontiff was forced to leave Rome (1809), Pietro was chosen to occupy his place; but he was soon compelled to betake himself to Paris, and upon his refusal to attend the religious celebration of Napoleon's marriage with Maria Louisa, he was punished with banishment, loss of the ensigns of his dignities, and confiscation of his income. Relegated to Saumur with cardinals Gabrielli and Oprizzoni, confined in 1810 in the dungeon of Vincennes, he joined the pope in 1813 at Fontainebleau, and was again separated from him in January 1814. The political situation finally allowed him to return to Rome, and he became grand penitentiary, prefect of the Index, bishop of Albano (1816), and of Porto and Santa-Ruffine (1820). He died at Rome July 2, 1821. This prelate, remarkable for his circumspection and flexibility, was considered

one of the luminaries of the Sacred College, for his theological lore and administrative abilities. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 40:205.

Piety

occurs but once in the A.V.: "Let them learn first to show *piety* at home" (τὸν ἴδιον οἶκον εὐσεβεῖν, better, towards their own household," ^{<S180>} Timothy 5:4). The choice of this word here instead of the more usual equivalents of "godliness," "reverence," and the like, was probably determined by the special sense of *pietas*, as "*erga parentes*" (Cicero, *Partit.* 22; *Rep.* 6:15; *Inv.* 2:22). It does not appear in the earlier English versions, and we may recognise in its application in this passage a special felicity. A word was wanted for εὐσεβεῖν which, unlike "showing godliness," would admit of a human as well as a divine object, and this *piety* supplied. — Smith.

Piety, or godliness, only another name for personal religion, consists in a firm belief, and in right conceptions of the being, perfections, and providence of God; with suitable affections to him, resemblance of his moral perfections, and a constant obedience to his will. The different articles included in this definition, such as knowledge, veneration, love, resignation, etc., are explained in their proper places in this work. For *Perverted Piety*, *SEE ETHICS*.

Piga, Meletius

an Eastern prelate, flourished in the second half of the 16th century. He was in 1591 exarch of the Church of Constantinople, and shortly after that time was chosen to fill the chair of St. Mark's. As patriarch of Alexandria, Piga distinguished himself by great devotion to ecclesiastical studies, and as the author of one or two controversial writings for the Slavonic Church, which was exposed to the intrusion of Romanism.

Pigenat, Francois

a French preacher of the Jesuitic order, was born at Autun near the close of the 15th century. He early became a member of the Society of Jesus, and at Paris was one of the most zealous preachers of the League. In September, 1588, he was, in a somewhat quaint manner, elected curate of St. Nicolas des Champs, Legeay having been expelled by his parishioners as suspected of Huguenotism. Henry III said on that occasion that "Parisians were kings

and popes, and if you only let them have their own way, they will soon dispose of the whole spiritual and temporal power of the realm." In January 1589, Pigenat preached at Paris the funeral sermon of the duke and cardinal of Guise, assassinated at Blois by order of the king, and gave them the title of martyrs. Pigenat took a conspicuous part in all the absurd and obscene processions of the time. He organized one in his own parish, where over a thousand persons, of both sexes and every age, were marched half naked, the curate himself having only a white robe to cover him. He was one of the first to sign the deposition of Henry III, and became a member of the council of Quarante. He was by his friends claimed to be inspired, but royalist writers call him "a troublesome liar, false prophet, promoter of every kind of crime, who receives from the Spanish court numbers of doubloons for his vociferating in the chair and in the public thoroughfares." After the murder of Henry III, Pigenat transferred his animosity to Henry IV, declaring that "it was not in the power of God that the Bearnais should be converted, that the pope could not absolve him and put him on the throne, and that if he did he would be excommunicated himself." Pigenat did not live to see Henry IV make his entrance into Paris. He died in 1590. According to L'Estoile, he was not destitute of talent and imagination.

His brother, ODON PIGENAT, provincial of the Jesuits and one of the Seize, was also a chief of the League. He died at Bourges of an attack of frenzy.

A third member of the same family, JEAN PIGENAR, lived at the same time. He left *Aveuglement des Politiques, Heretiques. et Maheustres*, etc. (Paris, 1592, 8vo). — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 40:205.

Pigeon

is the rendering — but only in connection with the epithet "young" — of two very different Heb. and one Gr. word: **יֹנָת** *yonah*, **περιστερά**, a general name for any member of the dove family ("dove" everywhere, except in the Mosaic enactment, ^{<B014>}Leviticus 1:14; 5:7, 11; 12:6, 8; 14:22, 30; 15:14, 29; ^{<H60>}Numbers 6:10; ^{<D24>}Luke 2:24); but in ^{<H59>}Genesis 15:9, **יֹנָת** *gozal*, the *young* of any bird, perhaps there correctly of the dove, although in Deuteronomy 32 the "young" of the eagle is meant. The Biblical passages in which the picon is mentioned may be classified as follows:

1. Pigeons or doves were the only birds used for sacrifices (comp. already ^{<B159>}Genesis 15:9), in particular young pigeons (*hwtiynB] pulli columbini*) and turtle-doves, which were sacrificed, sometimes with other offerings (^{<B116>}Leviticus 12:6, in purifying women after childbed), sometimes alone as free-will offerings made by fire (^{<B114>}Leviticus 1:14); or were prescribed in the purifications from leprosy (^{<B142>}Leviticus 14:22), from personal uncleanness (^{<B154>}Leviticus 15:14); that of Nazarites (^{<B160>}Numbers 6:10), and of women after menstruation (^{<B159>}Leviticus 15:29). But in two cases, where poverty interfered with more costly sacrifices, these were substituted (^{<B117>}Leviticus 5:7 sq.; 12:8. Comp. ^{<B124>}Luke 2:24). Such offerings of birds were also made by the poor in Egypt. (See Pausan. 10:32, 9. Comp. Engel, *Cyprus*, 2:184 sq.) For the purpose of providing these sacrifices, dealers in pigeons used to sit in the neighborhood of the Temple (^{<B112>}Matthew 21:12; ^{<B115>}Mark 11:15; ^{<B114>}John 2:14, 16); and the raising of doves was from an early day a pursuit peculiar to the Jews (^{<B118>}Isaiah 60:8. Comp. Rosenmuller, *Morgenl.* 6:283), although there were also many wild pigeons in Palestine (^{<B116>}Ezekiel 7:16. Comp. Schubert, 3:250), which built their nests in clefts of the rocks (^{<B118>}Jeremiah 48:28; ^{<B114>}Song of Solomon 2:14; Robinson, 2:433), or at least sought a refuge there when chased (^{<B110>}Psalms 11:1. Comp. *Iliad*, 21:493 sq.; Quint. *Smyrn.* 12:12 sq.). See Schwebel, *De columbarum cultu* (Onold. 1767); Wernsdorf, *De columb. sacra Syrorum* (Helmst. 1761).

2. The flight of the pigeon was employed by the poet as a figure for swiftness (^{<B117>}Psalms 55:7; ^{<B111>}Hosea 11:11. Comp. Soph. (*Ed. Col.* 1081; Eurip. *Bacch.* 1090; Robinson, 2:484), and is so understood by many interpreters in several passages of the New Testament (Matthew 3: 16; ^{<B110>}Mark 1:10; ^{<B113>}John 1:32) in which the Holy Spirit's descent is spoken of, but this may be doubted. The figure is carried out still further by Isaiah (^{<B118>}Isaiah 60:8), and it is true that the pigeon surpasses in swiftness and directness of flight many birds of its size, without, however, being remarkable in this respect (Virg. in. 5:213 sq.; Plin. 10:52). The cause of this may be found in its long wings (Reichstein, *Naturgesch.* 4:2), by means of which it often escapes the birds which would prey upon it (Plin. 10:52; Phedr. 1:323; Aelian, *Animeal.* 3:45). In songs of love, the eyes of the beloved, as expressive of attachment and of innocence, are compared with those of the dove, or, as some say, with little doves (^{<B115>}Song of Solomon 1:15; 4:1). And in ^{<B112>}Song of Solomon 5:12 it is said, "*His eyes are like doves over brooks of water, bathed in milk, resting in fulness;*" a very

beautiful description of the swimming apple of the eye. (The explanation of these words by Umbreit and Dipke is in better taste than that of Rosenmuller.) The voice of the dove is represented by the poets as a *sigh*, an expression of sorrow (**tgh**, ^{<2334>}Isaiah 28:14; 59:11; ^{<3118>}Nahum 2:8.

Comp. ^{<3176>}Ezekiel 7:16; Theocr. 7:141; Virg. *Eclog.* 1:59; Martial, 3:59, 19; and quotations from the Oriental poets in Jones, *Poes Asiat.* page 346 sq.; Gesen. *Comment. on* ^{<2300>}Isaiah 1:992). To the white and glimmering plumage reference is made in ^{<4684>}Psalms 68:14; on which we remark that, according to Hasselquist (*Travels*, page 553), the pigeons of Palestine have usually whitish-gray feathers on the neck, head, breast, and shoulders. In the comparison used by Jesus (^{<4006>}Matthew 10:16), the dove is the image of innocence. (Comp. Schottgen and Wetstein, ad loc.)

3. ^{<4877>}Psalms 55:7 was understood by the Hebrew interpreters as affording a trace of the use of carrier-pigeons among the ancient Jews; their use being common now in the East. (See Arvieux, *Nachr.* 5:422; Troilo, *Trav.* page 610 sq.; Russell, *N.H. of Aleppo*, 2:90; and especially Bochart, *Hieroz.* 2:542; J. De Sacy, *La Colombe messagere*, from the Arabic of Michael Sabbagh [Par. 1805]; and on the use of them in ancient times, especially in sieges, see Aelian, *V.H.* 9:2; Plino 10:53; *Front. Strateg.* 3:13, 8.) But the words of this passage contain no such reference. Some would also refer to the same birds the words in ^{<4601>}Psalms 56:1 (Lengerke, *Ken.* page 166), but without reason. (See Gesen. *Thes.* 1:104.) **SEE DOVE; SEE TURTLE-DOVE.**

Piggott, John

an English Baptist divine, flourished in the second half of the 17th century, and was very popular in his day, especially in his own religious denomination. As a religious instructor, he taught with clearness and argued with strength, exhorted with vehemence and reproved with becoming authority. He published, *Account of J. Pilkington's Recantation of Romanism* (Lond. 1669, 4to): — *Eight Separate Sermons* (1700-1709, all 8vo): — *Eleven Sermons* (1714, 8vo); with the last is the sermon preached at Piggott's grave by the Reverend J. Stenneth. See Skeats, *Hist. of the Free Churches of England*, page 261; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Pighius, Albert

whose family name was *Van Campen*, was born about the year 1490 at Campen, in the Netherlands. He studied first philosophy and mathematics at Louvain, then theology, on which he lectured at the latter place and at Cologne, where he had also been honored with the doctorate of divinity. He accompanied pope Adrian VI (q.v.) to Spain and Italy, and after the death of Adrian he resided at Rome, and acted on several important missions as the representative of Rome, as at Worms and Regensburg. Under pope Paul III (q.v.) he was made provost of the church of St. John at Utrecht, where he died, December 24, 1543. Although Pighius was very fierce against Protestants, yet among his own coreligionists his orthodoxy to the Catholic faith was doubted very much. Of his works we mention, *Adversus Progynosticatorum vulgus, qui animas praedictiones edunt et se astrologos mentiuntur, astrologiae defensio: — De cequinocetiorum solstitiorumque inventione, nec non de ratione paschalis celebrationis et de restitutione ecclesiastici calendarii: Adversus novam Marci Beneventani astronomiam apologia: — Assertio hierarchiae ecclesiasticae lib. 6* (Cologne, 1538, and often): — and *De libero hominis arbitrio et divina gratia libri x adversus Lutherum, Calvinum, et alios*, to which Calvin replied in his *Defensio sanae et orthodoxae doctrinae de Servitute et Liberatione humani Arbitrii advers. Calumnias Alb. Pighii Campensis* (Geneva, 1545), published in his tractatus. See Dupin, *Nouvelle Bibliothèque des Auteurs ecclésiastiques*, etc., t. 16; Bayle, *Dict. s.v.*; Schweizer, *Centraldogmen*, 1:180; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop. s.v.*; *Theologisches Universal-Lexikon*, s.v.; Jocher, *Gelehrten-Lexikon*, s.v.; Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines*, 2:197 sq. (B.P.)

Pigneau de Behaine, Pierre-Joseph

a French missionary, was born December 1741, at Origny (Thidrache). He was brought up in the College of Laon, and studied theology at the Sdminaire des Trente-Trois at Paris. After taking holy orders, he embarked at Cadiz, in the beginning of 1756, for the Oriental missions. unknown to his parents, who were opposed to his design. In 1767 he arrived at the island of Hon-Dat, near the coast of Cochin-China. The apostolic vicar of that mission, M. Piguel, bishop of Champa in partibus, gave him the direction of his college, which he was then transferring to that place. In 1768 the governor of the province KanRao, to which the island of Hon-Dat belonged, ordered him to be arrested, and sentenced him to the

cangue, with another French missionary and a Chinese priest. They endured the torment with patience, and after three months' captivity were set at large. Pigneau resumed the direction of his college, and transferred it to Pondicherry. In 1770 he was appointed bishop of Adran in partibus, and coadjutor of the apostolic vicar of Cochin-China, whom he soon after succeeded in his office. In 1774 he entered Cochin-China by the Cambodia. He found the whole country in the power of rebels, who had put to death the king and his nephew. The brother of the latter, Nguydn-Auts, who had been imprisoned, escaped and fled to the house of the bishop of Adran, where he was concealed for a month. He succeeded afterwards in bringing together a small force, took possession of Lower Cochin-China, and called to his side his benefactor, and was, in all he did, directed by his advice. In 1783 he was beaten by the rebels, and had to flee the country. Pigneau then, taking along the pupils of his college, went to the Cambodia, and thence to Siam. Having embarked for Pondicherry, he heard, while sailing along the coast of Cambodia, that Nguyen-Auts was at a short distance on the coast; he joined him, who, with about six hundred soldiers, was reduced to the last extremity of starvation. He relieved them with his own provisions, and after spending a fortnight with them, he gained Pulo-Way, a small deserted island, situated sixty leagues from the continent. He stayed there nine months, during which time he wrote, in company with a Cochin-Chinese priest, instructions for the religious worship, and corrected several works translated from the French. In December 1784, he joined again the king of Cochin-China, and soon after went in person to solicit the assistance of Louis XVI for his friend, taking along with him the six-year-old son of the Asiatic prince. He arrived at Lorient February, 1787. His embassy was a successful one. France engaged to send four frigates and nearly two thousand soldiers to Cochin-China, and obtained in compensation the principal harbor of that country, Touron. Louis XVI appointed Pigneau his plenipotentiary, and had his prebend presented by him to Nguyen-Auts. The bishop, who had received rich presents himself, embarked for Pondicherry with the young prince, carrying to count Thomas Conway, governor-general of the French settlements, the blue cordon he had obtained for him, with the direction to prepare and command in person the projected expedition; but various obstacles, among others the Revolution, prevented it. and the hishop could only equip two little ships, which he loaded with ammunition, guns, etc. Count Conway put also at his disposition a frigate, on board of which he sailed to Cochin-China, where he joined the king in December 1789. The arrival of these

subsidies, the clever exertions of the French officers, who in a short time equipped a powerful fleet, and organized an army of six thousand soldiers after the European fashion, gave the victory to the king. The bishop was hopeful of turning to the advantage of religion the influence he had won, when he died of dysentery, October 9, 1799. In August 1861, the French government restored the tomb of Pigneau de Behaine, and proclaimed it French property. — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 40:224.

Pignone, Simone

all Italian painter, who, according to Oretti, was born at Florence in the year 1614, studied with Fabrizio Boschi, afterwards with Passignano, and lastly with Francesco Furini, whose manner he adopted, though he improved his coloring by visiting Venice, and studying the works of the great masters, particularly those of Titian and Tintoretto. After his return to Florence he distinguished himself by several works which he executed for the churches, and which were greatly admired for the delicacy and beauty of the coloring. The most esteemed of these are, *St. Michael disconfiting the Rebel Angels*, in the Nunziata: *St. Louis, King of France, Distributing his Wealth to the Poor*, in S. Felicita; and an altar-piece, Monte Oliveto. His most admired works, however, are to be found in the collections of the nobility. These are of small size, and from sacred subjects. There are also some of his pictures in the Florentine Gallery. He was fond of painting mythological subjects, the peculiar character of which afforded a fine opportunity of displaying his marvellous skill in flesh tints. Lanzi and Carlo Maratti agree as to his being among the best of the Florentine painters of his time. His death occurred in 1698. See Spooner, *Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts*, 2:695.

Pignorius, Laurentius

a noted Italian ecclesiastic, celebrated especially as an antiquary, was born at Padua in 1571, and flourished at Treviso, where he held a canonry. He died of the plague in 1631. He collected a cabinet of medals and other curiosities of rare extent and value. His principal work is an attempt to explain the famous Isiac Table, a relic of Egyptian antiquity, covered with figures of divinities, symbols, and hieroglyphs. The table is supposed by Warburton to belong to the latest period of ancient Egypt. Pignorius also wrote a treatise, *De Servis et eorum apud veteres Ministeriis*: — *Antiquities of Padua*, etc.

Pi-hahi'roth

(Heb. *Pi-hachiroth*, **tryj biyPæ** understood by some to be of Hebrew etymology, and rendered *mouth of the gorges*; Sept. ἡ ἔπαυλις, τὸ στόμα Εἰρώθ, Εἰρώθ; Vulg. *Phihihiroth*), a place before or at which the Israelites encamped, at the close of the third march from Rameses, when they went out of Egypt. Pi-hahiroth was before Migdol, and on either hand were Baal-zephon and the sea (^{<0142>}Exodus 14:2, 9; ^{<0837>}Numbers 33:7, 8). The name is probably that of a natural locality, from the unlikelihood that there should have been a town or village in both parts of the country where it is placed in addition to Migdol and Baal-zephon, which seem to have been, if not towns, at least military stations, and its name is susceptible of an Egyptian etymology giving a sense apposite to this idea. The first part of the word is apparently treated by its punctuation as a separate prefix (^{<0838>}Numbers 33:8), and it would therefore appear to be the masculine definite article *Pe*, *Pa*, or *Pi*. Jablonsky proposed the Coptic *pi-Achirot*, "the place where sedge grows," and this, or a similar name, the late M. Fulgence Fresnel recognised in the modern *Ghuweybet el-bus*, "the bed of reeds," near Ras Atakah. There is another *Ghuweybet el-bus* near Suez, and such a name would of course depend for its permanence upon the continuance of a vegetation subject to change. Migdol appears to have been a common name for a frontier watch-tower. **SEE MIGDOT**. Baal-zephon we take to have had a similar meaning to that of Migdol. **SEE BAAL-ZEPHON**. We should expect, therefore, that the encampment would have been in a depression, partly marshy, havilig on either hand an elevation marked by a watch-tower (Smith). It is evident that so vague a circumstance as the presence of reeds, which are common in any moist place near Suez, cannot serve to determine the locality. This must be fixed by the more definite notices of the narrative, which appear to us to point to the opening of the plain *el-Bfedeah*, between Jebel Atakah and Jebel Abu-Deraj. **SEE EXODE**; **SEE RED SEA, CROSSING OF**.

Pik

also called JESAJAH BERLIN, a somewhat noted Jewish rabbi, flourished at Breslau, in Silesia, where he died, May 13, 1799, after having occupied the rabbiship for about sixteen years. He wrote **twdggh**, or notes and corrections to the Talmud, which are generally printed in the modern editions of the Talmud: — **ˆykr [bç hal ph**, elucidations and

corrections to Nathan ben-Jechiel's (q.v.) dictionary, called *Aruch*, but only on the letters א k, which were edited by R.W. Gunsburg (Breslau, 1830), while the second part, comprising the letters ל t, which was prepared by Luzzatto and Hurwitz. was edited by Rosenkranz (Vienna, 1859): — amygr t ynym, i.e., glossaries on the Targum of Onkelos (q.v.), edited by D. Sklower (Breslau, 1827, and Vienna, 1836): — ךָ ar ךָ x l , glossaries on the Mishna, printed in the editions of the Mishna (Vienna, 1793; Prague, 1825-30; and with many additions edited by W. Eger, Altona, 1841-46). See Beer, *Jiidische Literaturbriefe* (Leips. 1857, page 45; reprinted from Frankel's *Monatsschrift*, 1853-1854); Furst, *Bibliotheca Judaica*, 1:110; Zunz, *Die Momnatstage des Kalenderjahres* (Berlin, 1872), page 27; Engl. transl. by Reverend B. Pick, in the *Jewish Messenger* (N.Y. 1874); Cassel, *Leiftiden zur judischen Geschichte u. Literatur* (Berlin, 1872), page 107; Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenth. u.s. Sekten*, 3:245; Steinschneider, *Bibliograph. Handb.* page 22; *Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Biblioth. Bodl.* page 1385. (B.P.)

Pike, Samuel

an English Dissenting minister, was born at Ramsey, Wiltshire, about 1717. He became minister of a congregation at Henley-on-Thames, and in 1747 succeeded John Hill at the Three Cranes, London. He died in 1773. Pike was quite a voluminous writer. Among his many productions we mention, *Thoughts on such Passages of Scripture as ascribe Affections and Passions to the Deity* (Loud. 1750, 12mo): — *Philosophia Sacra, or the Principles of Natural Philosophy extracted from Divine Revelation* (Lond. 1753, 8vo); a scarce work, written on Hutchinsonian principles: — *The Nature and Evidences of Saving Faith; being the substance of Four Sermons on ^{שׁוֹבֵי} Hebrews 11:1; Two of which were Preached at the Merchants' Lecture, Sinner's Hall. With a Preface* (Lond. 1764, 8vo): — *Religious Cases of Conscience answered in an Evangelical Manner, or the Inquiring Christian Instructed; to which are added Replies to Thirty-two Questions, or the Professing Christian Tried at the Bar of God's Word. To which is subjoined the Character of the Happy, Honest, and Faithful Man.* By Samuel Pike and Samuel Hayward (new ed. Romsey, 1819, 8vo; last Amer. ed. with an *Introd.* by Dr. H.A. Boardman, Phila. 1859, 12mo): — *Compendious Hebrew Lexicon* (1766, 8vo; new ed. 1816, 8vo). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* s.v. (J.H.W.)

Pikollos

a deity among the ancient Wends of Slavonia, who was believed to preside over the infernal regions and the realms of the dead. He was represented as an old man with a pale countenance, and having before him three death's heads. He corresponded to *Pluto* of the ancient Romans, and to *Siva* of the Hindus. Like the latter, he desires human blood, and reigns at once over the manes or souls of the dead, and over the metals in the bowels of the earth.

Pilarik, Stephen

a Hungarian ecclesiastic of some distinction, was born at Otschova in 1615. He was the son of a Protestant clergyman, and also devoted himself to the ministry, and his talent as a preacher soon got him a widespread reputation. In the year 1663, while travelling, he was captured by Tartars, who reduced him to slavery. He died February 8, 1693, at Neusalza. His principal writings are, *Currus Jehovae mirabilis* (Wittenberg, 1678, 4to); and *Turcico-Tartarica crudelitas* (Buda, 1684, 4to), a touching account of his captivity. His son, also called Stephen, who died in 1710, left some works. now forgotten. — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 40:229.

Pilate, Pontius

(Πόντιος Πίλατος, Graecized from the Latin *Pontius Pilatus*), the Roman procurator or resident as governor of Judaea during the period of our Lord's public ministry and passion, and chiefly known in history from his connection with the Crucifixion. In the following account we combine Scriptural notices with information from other ancient resources and modern examination.

I. His Name. — His *praenomen* or first name is unknown. His *nomen* or family name indicates that he was connected, by descent or adoption, with the *gens* of the Pontii, first conspicuous in Roman history in the person of C. Pontius Telesinus, the great Samnite general. The *cognomen* Pilatus has received two explanations.

(1.) As armed with the *pilum* or javelin (comp. "pilata agmina," Virg. *AEn.* 12:121);

(2.) As contracted from *pileatus*. The fact that the *pileus* or cap was the badge of manumitted slaves (comp. Suetonius, *Nero*, c. 57;

Tiber. c. 4), makes it probable that the epithet marked him out as a *libertus*, or as descended from one.

II. His Office. — Pilate was the sixth Roman procurator of Judaea (^{<427B>}Matthew 27:2; ^{<415B>}Mark 15:1; ^{<430B>}Luke 3:1; ^{<432B>}John 18:29). under whom our Lord taught, suffered, and died (^{<441B>}Acts 3:13; 4:27; 13:28; ^{<516B>}1 Timothy 6:13). The testimony of Tacitus on this point is no less clear than it is important; for it fixes beyond a doubt the time when the foundations of our religion were laid. "The author of that name (Christian) or sect was Christ, who was capitally punished in the reign of Tiberius by Pontius Pilate" (Auctor nominis ejus Christus, Tiberio imperitante, per Procuratorem Pontium Pilatum supplicio affectus est). *Aprocurator* (ἐπίτροπος, Philo, *Leg. ad Caium*, and Josephus, *War*, 2:9, 2; but less correctly ἡγεμών, ^{<427B>}Matthew 27:2; and Josephus, *Ant.* 18:3, 1) was generally a Roman knight, appointed to act under the governor of a province as collector of the revenue, and judge in causes connected with it. Strictly speaking, *procuratores Ccesaris* were only required in the imperial provinces, i.e., those which, according to the constitution of Augustus, were reserved for the special administration of the emperor, without the intervention of the senate and people, and governed by his legate. In the senatorial provinces, governed by proconsuls, the corresponding duties were discharged by quaestors. Yet it appears that sometimes *procuratores* were appointed in those provinces also, to collect certain dues of *the fiscus* (the emperor's special revenue), as distinguished from those of the *cerarium* (the revenue administered by the senate). Sometimes in a small territory, especially in one contiguous to a larger province, and dependent upon it, the procurator was head of the administration, and had full military and judicial authority, though he was responsible to the governor of the neighboring province. Thus Judaea was attached to Syria upon the deposition of Archelaus (A.D. 6), and a procurator appointed to govern it, with Caesarea for its capital. Already, during a temporary absence of Archelaus, it had been in charge of the procurator Sabinus; then, after the ethnarch's banishment, came Coponius; the third procurator was M. Ambivius; the fourth Annius Rufus; the fifth Valerius Gratus; and the sixth Pontius Pilate (Josephus, *Ant.* 18:2, 2), who was appointed A.D. 25-6, in the twelfth year of Tiberius. He held his office for a period of ten years (Josephus, *Ant.* 18:10, 2). The agreement on this point between the accounts in the New Testament and those supplied by Josephus is entire and satisfactory. It has been exhibited in detail by the learned, accurate, and

candid Lardner (t 1503-89, Lond. 1827). These procurators had their headquarters at Caesarea, which is called by Tacitus *Judeeae caput*; but they took up their temporary abode at Jerusalem on occasion of the great feasts, as a measure of precaution against any popular outbreak. *SEE PROCURATOR.*

III. *His Life.* —

1. *Of the early history* of Pilate we know nothing; but a German legend fills up the gap strangely enough. Pilate is the bastard son of Tyrus, king of Mayence. His father sends him to Rome as a hostage. There he is guilty of a murder; but being sent to Pontus, rises into notice as subduing the barbarous tribes there, receives in consequence the new name of Pontius, and is sent to Judaea. It has been suggested