

THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY
REFERENCE

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL,
THEOLOGICAL and
ECCLESIASTICAL
LITERATURE

Ploughman- Pool

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

Ploughman

(*rKaakdr*, ^{<2305>}Isaiah 61:5, which signifies not only a ploughman, but a *husbandman* in general). Among the Hebrews, the rich and the noble, it is true, in the cultivation of the soil did not always put themselves on a level with their servants; but none, however rich or noble or prophetically favored, disdained to put their hand to the plough, or otherwise to join occasionally in the labors of agriculture (^{<0910>}1 Samuel 11:7; ^{<1199>}1 Kings 19:19; comp. ^{<1490>}2 Chronicles 26:10). *SEE AGRICULTURE.*

Ploughman's Complaint, the

a remarkable anonymous work, published in England in the year 1352, which severely condemned the practices of popery, especially auricular confession, the celibacy and selfishness of the priests, the rapacity of the friars, the covetousness and negligence of the popes, etc. It was one among many means which opened the eyes of the people to the iniquity of the system, and prepared the way for the glorious Reformation.

Plough-Monday

the first Monday after twelfth day; so called from a diversion *called fiol-plough*, which was formerly in use on Ash-Wednesday, but afterwards transferred to this day. Old ploughs are preserved in the belfries of Basingbourne and Barrington. Plough alms were one penny paid for every plough harnessed between Easter and Pentecost in 878, and in 960 payable on the fifteenth night after Easter.

Ploughshare

(*taeeth*, ^{<2104>}Isaiah 2:4). The ploughshare is a piece of iron, broad but not large, which tips the end of the shaft. So much does it resemble the short sword used by the ancient warriors that it may with very little trouble be converted into that deadly weapon, and when the work of destruction is over, reduced again into its former shape, and applied to the purposes of agriculture. In allusion to the first operation the prophet Joel summons the nations to leave their peaceful employments in the cultivated field, and buckle on their armor: "Beat your ploughshares into swords, and your pruning-hooks into spears" (^{<2380>}Joel 3:10). This image the prophet Isaiah has reversed, and then applied to the establishment of that profound and lasting peace which is to bless the Church of Christ in the latter days: "And

they shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.” *SEE PLOUGH.*

Plowden, Charles

an English Roman Catholic divine who belonged to the Order of Jesuits, was born in 1743, and educated at Rome, where he entered into the society in 1759. On his return to his own country, after the suppression of his order in 1773, he was one of the most zealous advocates for the proposed reorganization of the Jesuits in England. He afterwards became president of the Catholic college of Stonyhurst, in Lancashire, and died in 1821. His publications are against Butler and Berington and for the restoration of the Jesuits (1792, 8vo; 1796, 8vo). Also, *Remarks on the Memoirs of G. Panzani* (Liege, 1794, 8vo): — *Considerations of the Modern Opinions of the Fallibility of the Pope* (1776, 8vo).

An older brother of his, Dr. FRANCIS PLOWDEN, a noted member of the English Chancery Bar, is the author of *Jura Anglorum, the Rights of Englishmen* (1792, 8vo), and *Church and State* (1795, 4to), which both plead for Roman Catholic recognition by the English government, and became the subject of much controversy. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, 2, 1609, 1610. (J.H.W.)

Plüche Noël-Antoine

a French scientist of note, was born in 1688. He flourished at one time as abbot of Valence de St. Maur. He was also a professor of rhetoric at Rheims, and is distinguished as a naturalist and man of letters, and also for his opposition to the bull “Unigenitus.” He is the author of *Spectacle de la Nature* (9 vols.): — *Hist. du Ciel* (2 vols.): — *La Mécanique des Langues*; and some lesser works. among which is a *Harmony of the Psalms and the Gospels* (12mo). He died in 1761.

Plumb-line

(**Ena**) *ansk*, a plummet) or Plummet (**tl qvina** *anishkileth*, ^{<2387>} Isaiah 28:17, or **tl qvina** *anishkoleth. ma weight*). Amos says (^{<3100>} Amos 7:7), “Behold, the Lord stood upon a wall, made by a plumb-line, with a plumb-line in his hand;” and in the threatenings denounced against Jerusalem for the idolatries of Manasseh, we read, “I will stretch over Jerusalem the line of

Samaria, and the plummet of the house of Ahab” (^{<121B>}2 Kings 21:13). In ^{<30H>}Zechariah 4:10, the original term for the plumb-bob is *lydḫāḇā*, *eben bedil*, *stone of tin*. The use of the plumb line in the measurement of superficial areas was early known to the Egyptians, and is ascribed to their king Menes. *SEE HANDICRAFT*.

Plumptre, James

an Anglican divine of note was born in 1770, and was educated at Clare Hall, Cambridge, of which he afterwards became a fellow. After taking holy orders, he became in 1793 vicar of Great Gransdon, Huntingdonshire. He died in 1832. He is best known as a miscellaneous writer. Among his publications (of which there is a list in Allibone) we notice, *Three Discourses on the Animal Creation* (1816, 8vo): *Popular Commentary on the Bible: — Sermons*, vol. 1 and 2 (1821, 1827, 8vo), which are pronounced practical and useful by Bickersteth (in his *Christian Student*).

Plunket, Oliver

an Irish Roman Catholic prelate, was born in 1629 at the castle of Rathmore, county of Meath, of a good Irish family. He completed his studies at Rome, was a professor of theology in that city, and finally elevated to the twofold dignity of archbishop of Armagh and primate of Ireland (1669). His zeal having aroused against him the suspicions of the Protestants, he fell a victim to the violent reaction of Toryism which took place in 1681. Accused of conspiracy against the court, he was arrested, carried to London, and sentenced to death by a fanatical jury. In vain four successive governors of Ireland testified to his loyalty; the court did not even await the arrival of his witnesses, and his means of defense could be produced in London only three days after his execution, which took place July 1, 1681, at Tyburn. He left a *Collection of Episcopal Circulars and Pastoral Letters* (Lond. 1686, 2 vols. 4to). See Bp. Burnet, *Hist. of his Own Times*, 2, 279. (J. H.W.)

Plunket, Thomas, D.D.

a noted Presbyterian Irish divine, flourished at Enniskillen in the second half of the 18th century. Having some scruples as to the received doctrine of the Trinity, he removed to Dublin, where he became minister of the Strand Street chapel. He died about 1780. His son was the noted Irish lord

William Conyngham Plunket, and his grandson bishop Thomas Span Plunket.

Plunket, Thomas Span

an Irish lord and prelate, was a son of William Conyngham Plunket, the great Irish chancellor, and was born in 1792. He was educated at Trinity College, Dublin, and, after having held various preferments, was appointed dean of Down in 1831, and eight years later was raised to the bishopric of Tuam. He was consecrated at Christ Church, Dublin, by the archbishop of Dublin, assisted by the bishops of Derry and Cashel; was appointed ecclesiastical commissioner in 1851, succeeded his father as second baron Plunket in 1853, and was patron of ninety-five livings in his united dioceses of Tuam, Killala, and Achonry. According to Charles's *Church Directory*, the gross value of the see is £5265, and the net value £4039. He did not confine his attention and care to the members of the Church of England in his diocese, but he threw himself into the missionary work among the Roman Catholics with remarkable zeal and energy. No opposition (and he had much to encounter) could daunt or obstacles deter him, and to his exertions are due, in no small degree, those tangible and indisputable results, in the shape of new churches, schools, and congregations of converts, which remain a memorial of his piety and zeal. He died at Tourenakeady, Galway, Oct. 19, 1866. See Appleton's *Annual Cyclop.* 6, 600, *Ch. Journal*, vol. 11; *Men of the Times*, s.v. (J. H. W.)

Pluralism

SEE PLURALITIES.

Pluralist

is one that holds more than one ecclesiastical benefice with cure of souls.
SEE PLURALITIES.

Pluralities

is a term used in canon law for the possession by one person of two or more ecclesiastical offices, whether of dignity or emolument. This practice, it is held by Non-Episcopalians, was generally forbidden in the early Church, and they quote for their authority the instructions of the apostle Paul (⁵⁰⁰⁵Titus 1:5). Others contend even that, instead of a plurality of churches to one pastor, we ought to have a plurality of pastors to one

church (~~41423~~ Acts 14:23). Episcopalians contend there is no impropriety in a presbyter holding more than one ecclesiastical benefice. A bishop could not hold two dioceses; a presbyter, however, might officiate in more than one parochial church, but not in two dioceses. In the Church of England pluralities originated in the poorness of many of the livings. Originally a clergyman might hold two or more livings if under the nominal value of £8. The distance between them was fixed by the canon law as not to be greater than thirty miles, but custom now tolerates forty-five. Two thousand parishes, it is said, want in this way a resident pastor. By those who thus evade the Canon, it is held that the prohibition is not absolute, and admits of possible exception, the natural ground of the prohibition being the impossibility, in ordinary cases, of the same individual adequately discharging the duties of more than one office, and that therefore, in cases in which this impossibility does not exist, the union of two or more offices in the hands of one person might, speaking absolutely, be permitted without infringing the divine law. Hence canonists distinguish between "compatible" and "incompatible" benefices or dignities. Two benefices may be incompatible in three ways: 1, If each requires residence (*ratione residentice*); 2, if the duties of both fall to be discharged at one and the same time (*ratione servitii*); 3, if the revenue of either fully suffices for the becoming maintenance of the incumbent (*ratione sentationis*). In other cases, benefices or dignities are considered compatible, and with the due dispensation may be held by the same person. The rules by which dispensations from the law of residence are to be regulated, as well as the penalties for its violation, whether on the part of the patron or on that of the recipient, have formed the subject of frequent legislation, as in the third and the fourth councils of the Lateran, in the decretals of Innocent III and many other popes, and especially in those of the Council of Trent. In general, it may be said that the canon law regards as incompatible, 1, two benefices, each having the cure of souls; 2, two "dignities;" 3, a "dignity" and a cure of souls; 4, a cure of souls and a simple benefice requiring residence. In other cases than these, the pope is held to have the power of dispensing. There is no department of discipline, however, in which the tendency to relaxation has been greater or more persistent; and one of the gravest of the abuses of the Church was the prevalence of pluralism of incompatible benefices, even of bishoprics; and although a constant effort was made to prevent this abuse, the evasions of the law were not only frequent, but even screened from punishment. By 13 and 14 Victoria, c. 98, it is provided that no incumbent of a benefice shall take and hold

together with it another benefice, unless the churches are within three miles of one another by the nearest road, and the annual value of one of them does not exceed £100. Nor can two benefices be held together if the population of one exceeds 3000, and that of the other exceeds 500. The word benefice, in this sense, includes any perpetual curacy, endowed public chapel, parochial chapelry, or district chapelry. But a dispensation or license can be obtained from the archbishop, so as to allow two benefices to be held together; and if the archbishop refuse his license, the party may appeal to the Privy Council. A special provision is also contained in the statute whereby the head ruler of any college or hall in the universities of Oxford or Cambridge, or warden of Durham University, is prohibited from taking any cathedral preferment, or any other benefice. If any spiritual person holding a benefice shall accept another benefice contrary to the statute, the first benefice shall *ipso facto* become void. At the same time provision is made by statutes for uniting benefices where the aggregate population does not exceed 1500, and the aggregate yearly value does not exceed £500. In Ireland, no faculty or dispensation can be granted to any spiritual person to hold two or more benefices. In Scotland, before the Reformation, pluralities were also common. Abbacies and priories were likewise often bestowed *in commendam*. **SEE COMMENDAM**. Of the twenty abbots that sat in the Parliament which decreed the Reformation, fourteen were commendators. Thus speaks the *Second Book of Discipline*: “Meikle less is it lawful that only person among these men sould have fyve, sax, ten, or twenty kirks, or mae, all having the charge of salles: and bruik the patrimonie thairof, either be admission of the prince or of the kirk, in this licht of the evangell; for it is but mockage to crave reformation where sic lyke hes place.” The question of pluralities in the Church of Scotland was raised in 1779, renewed in 1813, and the General Assembly decided against them in 1814 by an act which, however, was repealed in 1816. In 1817 it was enacted that no professor could hold a parish unless it was near the seat of the university. The question was again raised and keenly debated in 1824 to wit, the holding of a chair in a college and of a parochial charge at the same time. The university commission soon after disapproved of the practice, but not the General Assembly of that period. The tenure of many benefices by one person was finally abolished in the Church of England by I and II Victoria, c. 106. In the Roman Catholic Church this practice has been forbidden from a very early period in its history, as by the councils of Chalcedon (A.D. 451) and that of Nice (A.D. 787), and is still prohibited both by the Roman Catholic canon law and by

statute law in the Established Church of England. But the prohibition is evaded in various ways: and in all established churches pluralism, in one form or another, is not uncommon. See Hammond, *Canons of the Church*, p. 105 sq.

Plüschke, Johann G.

an eminent German Oriental scholar, was born Aug. 20, 1780, at Rohnstock, near Schweidnitz, in Silesia. He studied theology and philology, and for a number of years held the professorship of philology at Leipsic. In 1818 he was called as doctor and *professor ordinarius* of theology to Amsterdam, to take the presidency of the Lutheran seminary at Amsterdam, and died between 1837 and 1840. Pliischke wrote, *De radicum linunae Hebraicae natura, comm. grammatica* (Leips. 1817): — *De Psalterii Syriaci Alediolanensis a Caujeftno Bugato editi peculiari indole ejusdemque usu critico in emendando textu Psalterii Græci sept. interpretum* (Bonn, 1835): — *Lectiones Alexandrinæ et Hebraicæ, sive de emendando textu Veteris Testamenti Græci LXX interpretum et inde llebraico* (ibid. 1837): — *De emendando Pentateucho Græco LXX interpretum et inde lebraico addito codd. Holmesianorum recensione et textus Græci denuo castigati specimine* (ibid. 1837). See Fürst. *Bibl. Jud.* 3, 107; Steinschneider, *Bibliogr. Handb.* p. 111; Winer, *Handb. der theolog. Lit.* p. 57, 121, 711; Thiersch, *De Pentateuchi versione Alexandrina*, p. 23; Zuchold, *Bibl. Theologica*, 2, 1001 sq. (B. P.)

Plutarch

an eminent Greek philosopher, noted also as a biographical and miscellaneous writer, deserves a place here for the moral tendency of all his writings, and the vast influence he has exerted in modern as well as ancient times. Indeed, all that we know of him, which is principally gleaned from his own and others' writings, places him in a high rank as measured by the ethics of society in his time, and sets forth the morality of certain portions of that society itself during the first century of our era, and among so-called heathens, in a light of no doubtful brilliancy. Many things he wrote might have been written by the most ardent disciple of the new creed, and much of his belief was more strictly in accordance with the teachings of the apostles than are the dogmas of other writers of those days who call themselves Christians. Yet, in taking his works as our guide, we find that Plutarch had no knowledge of the great innovation amid which he lived,

and which was disturbing the West and the East alike; or if he had a knowledge of it, he regarded it merely as a passing piece of Judaic sectarianism unworthy of his notice.

Life. — Plutarch, who lived from the reign of Claudius to that of Hadrian, was born at Chaeronea, a small city of Boeotia in Greece, which had also been the birthplace of Pindar. Plutarch's family was ancient in Chaeronea: his grandfather, Lamprias, was a man eminent for his learning and as a philosopher, and is often mentioned by Plutarch in his writings, as is also his own father. The time of Plutarch's birth is not known. He was early initiated in study, to which he was naturally inclined, and was placed under Ammonius, an Egyptian, who, having taught philosophy with reputation at Alexandria, thence traveled into Greece, and settled at Athens. Under this master he made great advances in knowledge; and like a thorough philosopher, more apt to regard things than words, he pursued this knowledge to the neglect of languages. The Latin language, at that time, was not only the language of Rome, but of Greece also. Yet he became not conversant with it until the decline of life; and though he is supposed to have resided in Rome at different times, yet he never seems to have acquired a competent skill in it at all. He is reputed to have visited Egypt, which was at that time, as formerly it had been, famous for learning; and probably the mysteriousness of their doctrine might tempt him, as it had tempted Pythagoras and others, to go and converse with the priesthood of that country. On his return to Greece he visited the various academies and schools of the philosophers, and gathered from them many of those observations with which he has abundantly enriched posterity. He does not seem to have been attached to any particular sect, but culled from each of them whatever he thought excellent and worthy to be regarded. He could not bear the paradoxes of the Stoics, and yet was more averse to the impiety of the Epicureans; in many things he followed Aristotle; but his favorites were Socrates and Plato, whose memory he revered so highly that he annually celebrated their birthdays with much solemnity. Besides this, he applied himself with extreme diligence to collect, not only all books that were excellent in their kind, but also all the sayings and observations of wise men, which he had heard in conversation, or had received from others by tradition; and likewise to consult the records and public instruments preserved in cities which he had visited in his travels. He took a particular journey to Sparta, to search the archives of that famous commonwealth, to understand thoroughly the model of their ancient

government, the history of their legislators, their kings, and their ephori; and digested all their memorable deeds and sayings with so much care that he has not omitted even those of their women. He took the same methods with regard to many other commonwealths; and thus was enabled to leave us in his works such a rich cabinet of observations upon men and manners, as, in the opinion of some, Montaigne and Bayle in particular, have rendered him the most valuable author of antiquity. It appears from his writings that Plutarch visited Rome more than once, and that he delivered lectures on philosophy in his vernacular, then the language of the cultured Romans. It is probable that the substance of these lectures was afterwards embodied in his moral writings. The latter part of his life was spent in honor and comfort in his native city, where he passed through various magisterial offices, and enjoyed the honors and emoluments of the priesthood. The time and circumstances of his death are unknown.

Works. — The great work of Plutarch is his *Parallel Lives* (Βίοι Παράλληλοι), which contains the biography of forty-six distinguished Greeks and Romans, besides the lives of Artaxerxes Mnemon, Aratus, Galba, Otho, and Homer, which last is probably not by him. The forty-six lives are arranged in pairs or sets, each of which contains a Greek and a Roman, and the two lives in each pair are followed by a comparison of the characters of the two persons. These lives are: Theseus and Romulus, Lycurgus and Numa, Solon and Valerius Publicola, Themistocles and Camillus, Pericles and Fabius Maximus. Alcibiades and Coriolanus, Timoleon and AEmilius Paulus, Pelopidas and Marcellus, Aristides and Cato Major, Philopoemen and Flaminius, Pyrrhus and Marius, Lysander and Sulla, Cimon and Lucullus, Nicias and Crassus, Eumenes and Sertorius, Agesilaus and Pompey, Alexander the Great and Julius Caesar, Phocion and Cato Minor. Agis and Cleomenes and the two Gracchi, Demosthenes and Cicero, Demetrius Poliorcetes and M. Antonius, Dion and M. Brutus. The biographies of Epaminondas, Scipio, Augustus, Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius, Nero, Vitellius, Hesiod, Pindar, Crates the Cynic, Diophantus, Aristomenes, and the poet Aratus are lost. Plutarch's son, Lamprias, made a list of his father's works, which is partly preserved and printed by Fabricius (*Bibliotheca Graeca*).

In the department of biography, Plutarch is the only writer of antiquity who has established a lasting reputation. The plan of his biographies is briefly explained by himself in the introduction to the "Life of Alexander the Great," where he makes an apology for the brevity with which he is

compelled to treat of the numerous events in the lives of Alexander and Caesar. "For," he says, "I do not write histories, but lives; nor do the most conspicuous acts of necessity exhibit a man's virtue or his vice, but oftentimes some slight circumstance, a word or a jest, shows a man's character better than battles, with the slaughter of tens of thousands, and the greatest arrays of armies and sieges of cities. Now, as painters produce a likeness by a representation of the countenance and the expression of the eyes, without troubling themselves about the other parts of the body, so I must be allowed to look rather into the signs of a man's character, and thus give a portrait of his life, leaving others to describe great events and battles." The object then of Plutarch in his biographies was a moral end, and the exhibition of the principal events of a man's life was subordinate to this his main design; and though he may not always have adhered to the principle which he laid down, it cannot be denied that his view of what biography should be is much more exact than that of most persons who have attempted this style of composition. The life of a statesman or of a general, when written with the view of giving a complete history of all the public events in which he was engaged, is not biography, but history. This extract from Plutarch will also in some measure be an apology for the want of historical order observable in many of the lives. Though altogether deficient in that critical sagacity which discerns truth from falsehood, and disentangles the intricacies of confused and conflicting statements, Plutarch has preserved in his *Lives* a vast number of facts which would otherwise have been unknown to us. He was a great reader, and must have had access to large libraries. It is said that he quotes two hundred and fifty writers, a great part of whose works are now entirely lost. On the sources of Plutarch's *Lives* the reader may consult an essay by A. H. L. Heeren, *De Fontibus et Auctoritate Vitarum Parallelarum Plutarchi Commenfationes IV* (Gott. 1820, 8vo). Besides the *Lives* a considerable number of Plutarch's essays may be styled historical. They may all be read with pleasure, and some of them with instruction, not so much for their historical value as for the detached curious facts that are scattered so profusely through Plutarch's writings, and for the picture which they exhibit of the author's own mind. In one of these essays, entitled *On the Malignity of Herodotus*, he has, unfortunately for his own reputation, attacked the veracity and integrity of the father of history, and with the same success that subsequent writers, more ignorant and less honest, have made their puny attacks on a work the merit of which the closest criticism may enhance but can never depreciate. The *Lives (f the Ten Orators*, which are attributed to Plutarch,

are of little value, and may not be his; still they bear internal evidence, at least negatively, of not being of a later age than that of Plutarch. The *Lives* of Plutarch first appeared in a Latin version by several hands, at Rome, in 2 vols. fol., about 1470. This Latin version formed the basis of various Spanish and Italian translations. The first Greek edition was printed by Philip Giunta (Florence, 1517, fol.). Among more recent editions are those of Bryan (Lond. 1729, 5 vols. 4to), in Greek and Latin, which was completed by Moses du Soul, after Bryan's death; that of Coray (Par. 1809-1815, 6 vols. 8vo); and that by Schafer (Leips. 1826, 6 vols. 8vo). The translations are very numerous. The best German translation is said to be by Kaltwasser (Magdeburg, 1799-1806, 10 vols. 8vo). Another German translation appeared at Vienna in 1812. The best Italian translation is by Pompei. The French translation of Amyot, which appeared in 1559, has considerable merit, and has been often reprinted. The English translation of Sir Thomas North (Lond. 1612), which is avowedly made from that of Amyot, is often very happy in point of expression, and is deservedly much esteemed. The *Lives* were also translated into French by Dacier (Par. 1721, 8 vols. 4to). The translation sometimes called Dryden's, the first volume of which was published in 1683, was executed by a great number of persons. According to a note by Malone (Dryden's *Prose Works*, 2, 331), there were forty-one of them. Dryden himself translated nothing, but he wrote the dedication to the duke of Ormond, and the Life of Plutarch which is prefixed to the translation. The translation by John and William Langhorne, an insipid and tasteless version, has the merit of being tolerably correct in rendering the meaning of the original. The last and best English translation is that of professor Long, which however only includes the lives of those Romans who were concerned in the Civil Wars of Rome; this translation, which is enriched with a valuable body of notes, formed five volumes of Knight's "Monthly Volumes" (1844-1847).

The other writings of Plutarch, which consist of about sixty essays, are generally comprehended under the title of his *Moralia, or Ethical Works*, many of them being entirely of an ethical character. 'The minor historical pieces already referred to, of which that on the malignity of Herodotus is one, are usually comprised in the collection entitled *Moralia*. Plutarch was fond of the writings of Plato; he was strongly opposed to the Epicureans: if he belonged to any philosophical sect, it was that of the Academics. But there is nothing like a system of philosophy in his writings, and he is not characterized by depth of thought or originality. He formed for himself a

system, it we may so name that which had little of the connected character of a system, out of the writings of various philosophers. But a moral end is always a parent in his *Motralia*, as well as in his biographies. A kind, humane disposition, and a love of everything that is ennobling and excellent pervade his writings, and give the reader the same kind of pleasure that lie has in the company of an esteemed friend, whose singleness of heart appears in everything that he says or does. Plutarch rightly appreciated the importance of education, and he gives many good precepts for the bringing up of children. His philosophy was practical, and in many of its applications, as for instance his "Letter of Consolation to Apollonius," and his "Marriage Precepts," he is as felicitous in expression as he is sound in his precepts. Notwithstanding all the deductions that the most fastidious critic may make from Plutarch's moral writings, it cannot be denied that there is something in them which always pleases, and the more so the better we become acquainted with them; and this is no small merit in a writer. With regard to the purely ethical writings of Plutarch, archdean Trench says that they indicate a better state of society than is generally attributed to his age. Plutarch does not speak as one crying in the wilderness, but as to a circle of sympathetic hearers who will answer to his appeals. It may be supposed that his native kindness of heart would prevent him from taking the full measure of the sin with which he was surrounded. No doubt he was deficient in the fierce indignation which consumed the heart of Tacitus and put a lash into the hands of Juvenal. But it is certain from many passages in his writings that he took no rose-colored view of life. Several of his statements almost amount to the confession of original sin. Plutarch's style bears no resemblance to the simplicity of the Attic writers. It has not the air of being much elaborated, and apparently his sentences flowed easily from him. He is nearly always animated and pleasing, and the epithet pictorial may be justly applied to him. . Sometimes his sentences are long and ill-constructed, and the order of the words appears not the best that could be chosen to express his meaning; certainly it is not the order in which the best Greek writers of an earlier age would have arranged their thoughts. Sometimes he is obscure, both from this cause and the kind of illustration in which he abounds. He occasionally uses and perhaps affects poetic words, but they are such as give energy to his thoughts and expression to his language. Altogether he is read with pleasure in the original by those who are familiar with him, but he is somewhat harsh and crabbed to a stranger. It is his merit, in the age in which he lived, treating of such subjects as biography and morals, not to

have fallen into a merely rhetorical style, to have balanced antitheses, and to have contented himself with the inanity of commonplaces. Whatever he says is manly and invigorating in thought, and clear and forcible in expression.

The first Greek edition of the *Moralia*, which is exceedingly incorrect, was printed by the elder Aldus, with the following title, *Plutetrchi Opuscula*. 82, Gr. (Ven. 1509, fol.). It was afterwards printed at Basle by Froben (1542, fol., and 1574, fol.). The only good edition of the *Moralia* is that printed at Oxford, and edited by D. Wytttenbach, who labored on it twenty-four years. This edition consists of six volumes of text (1795-1800), and two volumes of notes (1810-1821), 4to. There is a print of it which is generally bound in 5 vols. 8vo, with two volumes of notes. The notes by Wytttenbach were printed at Leipsic in 1821, in two vols. 8vo. The first edition of all the works of Plutarch is by H. Stephens (Geneva, 1572, 13 vols. 8vo), which is said to be correctly printed. This edition was reprinted several times. A complete edition, Greek and Latin, appeared at Leipsic (1774-1785, 12 vols. 8vo), with the name of J. J. Reiske, but Reiske did very little to it, for he died in 1774. An edition by J. C. Hutten appeared at Tübingen (1791-1805, 14 vols. 8vo). A good critical edition of all the works of Plutarch is still wanted. See *Meth. Qu. Rev.* July 1851, art. 6; 1852, p. 383; *Christian Rev.* vol. 10 and 11; *Catholic World*, Sept. 1870; Neander, *Christian Dogmas*; Pressense, *Religions before Christ*, p. 183 sq.; Donaldson, *Literature* (see Index); Cudworth, *Intellectual Development of the Universe* (see Index in vol. 3); Lardner, *Works*; Schaff, *Hist. of the Apostolic Church*, p. 140, 152; *Lond. Qu. Rev.* Oct. 1861; Trench, *Plutarch, His Life, His Lives, and His Morals* (Lond. 1873, 12mo); Smith, *Dict. of Class. Biog.* s.v.

Pluto

(Πλούτων, *Rich*), originally only a surname of Hades, as the giver or possessor of riches, is, in the mythology of Greece, the third son of Kronos and Rhea, and the brother of Zeus and Poseidon. On the tripartite division of the universe, he obtained the sovereignty of the under-world—the realm of darkness and ghostly shades, where he sits enthroned as a “subterranean Zeus”—to use the expression of Homer, and rules the spirits of the dead. His dwelling-place, however, is not far from the surface of the earth. Pluto is inexorable in disposition, not to be moved either by prayers or flatteries. He is borne on a car, drawn by four black steeds, whom he guides with

golden reins. His helmet makes him invisible, whence, according to some scholars, his name of *Hades*; although others, with at least equal probability, translate the word the “all-receiver.” In Homer, Hades never means a place, but always a person. Moreover, it is to be noticed that the poet does not, divide the realm of the shades into two separate regions. All the souls of the dead— good and bad alike mingle together. Subsequently, however, when the ethical conception of future retribution became more widely developed, the kingdom of the dead was divided into Elysium (q.v.), the abode of the good, and Tartarus (q.v.), the place of the wicked. This change also exercised an important influence on the conception of Pluto. The ruler of the under-world not only acquired additional power and majesty, but the very idea of his character was essentially modified. He was now regarded as a beneficent deity, who held the keys of the earth in his hand, and possessed its metallic treasures (whence his new name *Pluto* or *Plutus*), and who blessed the year with fruits, for out of the darkness underground come all the riches and swelling fullness of the soil. Hence, in later times, mortals prayed to him before proceeding to dig for the wealth hidden in the bowels of the earth.

Pluto married Persephone (Proserpina), the daughter of Demeter (Ceres), after carrying her off from the plains of Enna. He assisted his brothers— according to the mythological story— in their war against the Titans, and received from the Cyclops, as a reward for delivering them from Tartarus, the helmet that makes him invisible, which he lent to Hermes (Mercury) in the aforesaid war, to Perseus in his combat with the Gorgons, and which ultimately came to Meriones. The Erinyes and Charon obey his behests. He sits in judgment on every open and secret act, and is assisted by three subordinate judges, Eacus, Minos, and Rhadamanthus. The worship of Pluto was widely spread both among the Greeks and Romans. Temples were erected to his honor at Athens, Elis, and Olympia. Among trees and flowers, the cypress, boxwood, narcissus, and maidenhair were sacred to him; bulls and goats were also sacrificed to him amid the shadows of night, and his priests had their brows garlanded with cypress wreaths. In works of art he resembles his brothers Zeus and Poseidon; only his hair hangs down somewhat wildly and fiercely over his brow, and his appearance, though majestic, as becomes so mighty a god, has something gloomy and terrible about it. There can be little doubt that he, as well as Pan (q.v.), helped to trick out the conception of the devil prevalent during the Middle Ages, and not yet extinct. If it was from Pan that the devil derived those physical

characteristics alluded to in the famous "Address to the Devil" by the poet Burns:

*"O thou, whatever title suit thee,
Auld Hornie, Satan, Nick, or Cloutie,"*

it is no less certain that it is to Pluto that he owes his position as "king of Hell," "his Blackness," and many of the insignia of his infernal royalty.

Plymouth Brethren or Darbyites

is the name of a religious body which originated almost simultaneously at Plymouth, England, and Dublin, Ireland, about the year 1830. They are most generally called after the name of the place where they first started in England, but sometimes they are called after their principal founder, John Darby, at the time a clergyman of the Episcopal Church of Ireland. He himself gave to his adherents the name of *Separatists*, because they left the Establishment and determined to maintain a separate existence as a Church.

Early History. — John Darby was born in England of a wealthy family, studied jurisprudence and became a lawyer, but, brought into the Church, he was strongly impressed with a call to the ministry, and, though opposed by his father, he took holy orders. Disinherited by the parent for disobedience, Darby found a friend and patron in his uncle, from whom he obtained at his decease quite an ample fortune. After ordination, Darby became gradually impressed with the idea that there was no ground for the doctrine of apostolical succession, and that any person feeling called to preach should exercise that liberty. He therefore denounced the claim of the Establishment as unwarranted, and finally broke with the Episcopalians. He, however, still held that there was a true Church, and that all who thought as he did should band themselves together and wait until Christ made his personal appearance, which they anticipated would be speedily. There were a few who united themselves together on the strength of these views, in Plymouth, England, and at Dublin, Ireland. At the former place they seemed to meet with most success. There their numbers increased to seven hundred and up to fifteen hundred; and so marked was their success that they came to be called "Plymouth Brethren." (They have never taken this name themselves, but they do not seem to object to it.) The work increased, and bands were formed in London, Exeter, and several other places. Among those who united with them were many persons of wealth, who contributed considerable sums of money to spread their views. They

established a newspaper, known as the *Christian Witness*, Mr. Darby being its chief contributor. It was not long before they were violently opposed by the English clergy. This opposition was so well directed and so ably conducted that the spread of the new faith was not only seriously checked, but their numbers were greatly reduced. In 1838, or near that time, Mr. Darby left England. He first visited Paris, where he remained for a time, and then went to Switzerland, where he found a more inviting field. The Wesleyan Methodists had commenced successful operations in Lausanne. Quite a number had withdrawn from the State Church and united with them. This excited the general attention of the people. Among the new proselytes to Methodism were many who still held the doctrine of predestination, and refused to accept the Wesleyan doctrine of Christian perfection. Those who held the doctrine of predestination were charged by those who had fully discarded it as having received but half the truth. At Vevay similar excitement prevailed. In this state of things, for the purpose of overthrowing the new faith, an influential member of the State Church at Lausanne invited Mr. Darby to come there and fight the Methodists. He went, and by his preaching, and the publication of a book entitled *The Doctrine of the Wesleyans regarding Perfection, and their Use of the Holy Scriptures*, he succeeded in so far bewildering them that not long after the greater part of them abandoned their faith, and either returned to the State Church or united with the Dissenters. Mr. Darby, besides, gave a series of lectures on the prophecies, entitled "Views regarding the actual Expectation of the Church, and the Prophecies which establish it." They were largely attended by others than Dissenters, and produced a deep impression upon the public mind. They were published in book form, first in French, and subsequently translated into German and English, and may be found in Mr. Darby's published works. In the estimation at least of the author they lifted the veil which had long, if not from the beginning, covered the prophecies. Such was Mr. Darby's influence among the people that the regular ministry was almost entirely ignored, and he became the accepted prophet. In fact, his publications had the effect directly to turn the people from the minister as a whole. It was his custom to administer the sacrament every Sabbath indiscriminately to Churchmen and Dissenters, which practice earned for him the reputation of being a large-hearted Christian, and anxious to make the Church one. But really his object was to alienate the people until he could get them under his personal control for organization, he himself being the center of the organization, as is but too clearly apparent from the fly-sheets or tracts which he published. One of

these, entitled *Apostasy of the Actual Economy*, lays the axe at the root of the tree of the Christian Church, leaving it a shapeless wreck. Another, *On the Foundation of the Church*, attacks all Dissenters, and denies their right to form any new Church. And still another, *Liberty to preach Jesus possessed by every Christian*, denies the existence of any priestly office in the Church, except the universal priesthood of believers. A tract entitled *The Promise of the Lord*, based on ~~ROM~~ Matthew 18:20, gave the *shibboleth* for the Darbyite gatherings. Another tract, entitled *Schism*, was issued, in which all who hesitated to take part in these gatherings were denominated "schismatics." Thus the work of demolition went on. A small seminary was established in which to prepare men for the evangelistic work—that is, to spread their views and make disciples to them, and the result has been a widespread sect, with little or no organic unity.

Later History. — A division took place among the "Brethren," under the leadership of B. W. Newton. It commenced in England and extended to the Continent. Mr. Newton, it is claimed, held with Irving that Christ was not sinless. This notion was repelled by most of the Darbyites, and Newton was subsequently expelled by Mr. Darby. (It might be interesting to inquire how Mr. Darby could consistently expel a man from his society when he ignores all organizations? If there be no organization, what is there to be expelled from?) "The Newton heresy extended to Vevay, where there was much trouble, the 'Brethren' splitting into two factions, which was followed soon after by many other societies. Another division took place among them, in which the famous George Muller, of Bristol, England, was the most prominent. Other divisions have occurred, but they are of very little importance. The "Brethren" are more or less numerous in Paris, Lausanne, Holland, Italy, and Belgium, on the Continent; in Plymouth, Exeter, and London, in England; a very few are in the United States, but more in Canada. They are an earnest, self-sacrificing people.

Doctrines, etc. — The "Brethren" profess to have no creed but the Bible, and condemn all who avow a creed, as putting human opinions in the place of the Word of God; and yet we seriously doubt if there is a Church in the land which has a more clearly defined creed than they have. They denounce all commentaries on the Bible as misleading, and yet Mr. Darby himself has written commentaries quite extensively on the Bible, to say nothing of M'Intosh. In faith they seem to be strongly Antinomian. If once justified, it is their belief that the soul not only can never fall from grace finally, but can never fall into condemnation. "The soul's standing remains as pure as

Christ himself. In other respects they hold substantially the great and leading doctrines of the Gospel; but as they have no written creed or confession, it is exceedingly difficult to find out exactly what they do hold. Each one is in every respect allowed to hold what he pleases, consistently with continued practical evidence that he is a real Christian, which includes a belief in the leading doctrines of evangelical Christians. No one pretends in anything to judge for another, or make his convictions obligatory any further than he can, by more perfectly instructing the other, induce him to accept them. Their views of what are called worship are also peculiar. This consists, they say, not in preaching or praying—petitioning—though these exercises may lead to worship, but simply in adoration, praise, and thanksgiving to God for what he is in himself, and what he is for those who render it. Hence worship can only be rendered by true Christians, in the breaking of bread and in the praise and thanksgiving which they render. Their services, therefore, for believers and for unconverted people are entirely distinct. They hold the obligation of the Church to come together the first day of the week to break bread; hence they observe the Lord's Supper every Sabbath morning, and believers alone are expected to come together then. They never preach in the morning, but usually simply exhort, two, or at the most three of them, speaking during the service. In the afternoon or evening of the Sabbath they preach to sinners. The Plymouth Brethren are the opposite extreme to Irvingism and Mormonism, and yet resemble these in several respects. They, too, are a protest against the present state of the Church, Protestant as well as Catholic, which they denounce as Babel, and expect the speedy coming of the Lord. But while the Irvingites and Mormons lay claim to an apostolical hierarchy, the "Brethren," like the Quakers, reject the specific ministry, and all written creeds and outward Church organization. They derive the disunion of the Church from the neglect to recognize the Holy Spirit as Christ's vicar on earth, and the all-sufficient interpreter of the Holy Scriptures. All human creeds, they say, involve a vital denial of this sufficiency of the Spirit, and practically restrict his operations. All believers are true spiritual priests, capacitated for worship (~~8009~~ Hebrews 10:19, 25), and all those who possess the qualifications from the Lord are not only authorized but obliged to evangelize the world and build up the Church, without ally ordination of men. This they consider to be the true apostolic mode of worship, according to 1 Corinthians 12 and 14. But, unlike the Quakers, they retain the ordinance of baptism, and administer the Lord's Supper every week. As a body, they hold to adult believers' baptism only; but if one comes to

them who was baptized in infancy, while they receive him, they generally manage to convince him very soon of the importance of being rebaptized. As to the remainder of their creed, they seem to agree most with the Calvinistic system, and are said to be zealous in good works. See Guinness, *Who are the Plymouth Brethren?* (Phila. 1861); Dennett, *Plymouth Brethren, their Rise, etc.*; *Brit. Qu. Oct.* 1873, art. 3; *Presbyt. Qu.* Jan. 1872, p. 48; Marsden, *Dict. of Churches*, p. 91; *Jahrb. deutscher Theologie*, 1870, vol. 4; Dr. Steele, in the *Advocate of Christian Holiness*, 1876; *Brit. and For. Ev. Rev.* July 1865, art. 2; *Lond. Qu. Rev.* No. 53, 1869, art. 3. (J. H. W.)

Pneumatology

(from *πνεῦμα*, *spirit*, and *λόγος*, *word*) is the doctrine of spiritual existence. Considered as the science of mind or spirit, pneumatology consists of three parts: treating of the divine mind, theology; the angelic mind, angelology; and the human mind. This last is now called psychology, “a term to which no competent objection can be made, and which affords us, what the various clumsy periphrases in use do not, a convenient adjective, *psychological*” (Sir W. Hamilton, *Reid’s Works*, p. 219, note). The belief in a return from the dead, apparitions, and spirits is largely incorporated in the traditions of the Jews, and prevailed almost universally in the scholastic ages. The mystic Jacob Bohme and Emanuel Swedenborg made it a popular phase of belief in Northern Europe, and Martinez Pasqualis and his disciple St. Martin caused it to prevail among the people of France and in Southern Europe. All these teachers have given accounts of the orders of spiritual beings who held communication with the living. In our own day *spiritualism* has branched out so extensively that it will be treated separately under that heading.

Pneumatomachi

i.e. *adversaries of the Holy Spirit*, is a name properly applied to all those who entertain heretical opinions as to the Scripture doctrine of the Holy Ghost, e.g. the *Sabellians* (q.v.). The name originated after the subsidence of the Arian controversy, and was applied to that party, distinguished by the denial of the catholic faith regarding the Third Person of the Holy Trinity; some denying his divinity, others his personality also. The name is, however, more specially used to designate the *Macedonians*, so called after Macedonius, who, after the death of Eusebius of Nicomedia, was called by

the Arian faction to the see of Constantinople, in opposition to the catholic bishop Paul. This led to bloody strife, inasmuch as a majority of the citizens were for Paul. The Arians got the better of their catholic adversaries with the help of the emperor Constantine, who took the part of Macedonits, and established him in the disputed see by force of arms: three thousand persons perished on that occasion. Macedonius, although called to the bishopric of Constantinople by strict Arians, seems not to have been very much of an Arian himself, but persecuted the Catholics after the fashion of other Semi-Arian bishops, and became, with Basilius of Ancyra, one of the chiefs of the Semi-Arians. As a natural consequence of the rest of their doctrine, the Arians declared the Holy Ghost, who was little spoken of explicitly at the beginning of the Arian difficulties, to be a mere creature, and most of them held him to be an inferior creature to the Son. Not only the strict Arians, but also the Semi-Arians, who called the Son “God” and ὁμοιούσιος, questioned the divinity of the Holy Ghost. Macedonius made himself the leader of this increasing and strengthening pneumatomachical party, teaching emphatically that the Holy Ghost was a creature subservient to the Father and Son, and wholly different in nature from them (comp. *Socrats, Hist. Eccles.* 2, 46; *Sozomen*, 4:27; *Theodoret. Hist. Eccles.* 2, 6; *Taret. Fab.* 5, 11; *Epiphanius, Haer.* 73 and 74). I have then invented the artifice of the “Homoion,” and connecting himself closely with the Semi-Arian party, gave them his name (*Theodoret, licer. Fab.* 4, 5). At first therefore the term Macedonian was simply equivalent to Semi-Arian, and *Socrates* calls the reply of *Liberius* to the Semi-Arian legates a letter to the bishops of the Macedonians (*Socrates, Hist. Eccles.* 4:12). The name of *Macedonius* appears in this reply. The good faith of this transaction is (to say the least) very doubtful (see the notes on the chapter of *Socrates* in *Variorum Annotationes* in *Reading’s* edition of *Valesius*). and we are in uncertainty as to the opinions which *Macedonius* really held at the close of his life. But there is no uncertainty as to the course of the heresy. The letters of *Liberius* were exhibited at the Council of *Tyana*, and the deputies who presented them were acknowledged as members of the catholic body. This was probably in A.D. 368. But just as among the Arians there never was any unity of views as to the Son, there was none among the Pneumatomachi and Macedonians as to the Holy Ghost. Some contented themselves with holding the divinity of the Holy Ghost dubious, others denied it outright; some called him a creature, but most seem to have fallen in with the ideas of *Macedonius*. Among the most active partisans of this heresy were *Marathonius* and *Eleusius*, whom *Macedonius* called

respectively to the sees of Cyzicum and Nicomedia. The influence of Marathionius is shown by the fact that the Macedonians are sometimes called *Marathonians*. Macedonius was deposed by the strict Arians at the Synod of Constantinople in 360: he spent the remainder of his life obscurely in the vicinity of Constantinople. The exact (late of Macedonius's death is not known, but it appears to have been soon after the Council of Tarsus (see Tillemont, *Hist.* vol. 9).

The appearance of the Pneumatomachi, as such, is to be dated from A.D. 360, when Athanasius wrote against them, giving them the name here adopted. Athanasius was then in the deserts of Egypt, and Serapion, bishop of Thmuis, in Lower Egypt, requested his interposition. The heresies themselves were no novelties. It was a part of the Arian creed that the Holy Spirit was a created being, superior it might be in dignity, but nowise different in nature from the angels; and in the Gnostic systems we meet with Christ and the Holy Ghost as eons, *SEE VALENTINIANS*, the latter being held, in some cases at least, to be not a distinct person, but a divine energy diffused through the universe. But there was a great difference in the mode in which these heresies were held. They then appeared, not as proceeding from a special opposition to the greatness of the Holy Spirit, but as deductions from some other leading heresy to which they were subordinate. Thus in the case of the Arians, with which our present subject is concerned, the denial of the divinity of the Holy Spirit follows upon the denial of the divinity of the Son. For as it is impossible to advance the Third Person of the Trinity above the Second Person, the controversy turned therefore on the divinity of the Second. Dealing with this, the Council of Nicea did not touch specifically upon the subordinate heresy, but left it to stand or fall with the leading one. But when the leading heresy was abandoned, and yet the subordinate heresy retained, then the latter not only became prominent, but was seen to be adopted on its own independent grounds, for its own sake. The Arian half converted to catholicity was properly a Pneumatomachist. Such were those whom Athanasius dealt with in his letter to Serapion. They were seceders from the Arians who had embraced the true faith regarding the Son, but retained their error regarding the Holy Spirit. They were consequently opposed both by Catholics and Arians, but their true controversy was with the former: their contest with the latter (Athanasius urges) could only be pretended, inasmuch as both agreed in opposing the doctrine of the Trinity (*Ad Serap.* 1, 1, 2, 9, 32). This class, then, differed from the later

Macedonian class: it held Homoousian doctrine regarding the Son, whereas the Macedonians were Homoiousians. Athanasius calls them also *Tropici*, from their figurative interpretations of Scripture; but this is rather an epithet than a proper name.

In comparison with the Macedonian party, this earlier party can have been but small. It was, however, reinforced a few years later, as we shall show, upon the return of a large portion of the Semi-Arian body to catholicity. The adoption of the truth concerning the Son leads almost necessarily to the adoption of the truth concerning the Holy Spirit. The arguments of Athanasius (*Ad Serap.* 1, 29; 4:7) show forcibly how untenable a position is that which maintains a duality instead of a trinity. The original Monarchian tenet from which the Arians started is much more easily admissible.

The Pneumatomachi of the Macedonian school were the Semi-Arians left behind in schism when, in the year 366, the majority of the sect gave in their assent to orthodoxy, and were received into the Church. Before this time Macedonius, as we have seen above, had joined the Semi-Arian party, but proving thereby unacceptable to the Arians, was deposed by the Council of Constantinople, A.D. 360 (Theodoret, *Hist. Eccles.* 2, 6). A council was appointed to meet in Tarsus to effect a reconciliation, but just before the meeting thirty-four Asiatic bishops assembled in Caria refused the Homoousion; and Valens, at the instigation of the Arian Eudoxius, by whom he had been recently baptized, forbade the council (Sozomen, *Hist. Ecclesiastes* 6:12). From this time, however, Semi-Arianism disappears from ecclesiastical history. The controversy regarding Christ's divinity ceased, and the denial of the divinity of the Holy Spirit became the distinguishing tenet of the Semi-Arian party, the tenet thus becoming associated with the name Macedonian, which the Semi-Arians had recently acquired. Of course there were some, as we have already had occasion to state, who called them Marathonians, saying that Marathonius, bishop of Nicomedia, had introduced the term Homoiousion (Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* 2, 45).

It is to be noticed here that several writers, when treating of the present heresy, use the word Semi-Arian in another sense than that now given it. Philaster (*Haer.* c. 67) defines the Semi-Arians thus: "Hi de Patre et Filio bene sentiunt, unam qualitatis substantiam, unam divinitatem esse credentes, Spiritum autem non de divina substantia, nec deum verum, sed

factum atque creatum Spiritum praedicantes.” Augustine also (*Haer.* c. 3): “Macedoniani de Patre et Filio recte sentiunt, quod unius sint ejusdemque substantiae vel essentiae, sed de Spiritu Sancto hoc nolunt credere, creaturam eum esse dicentes. Hos potius quidam SemiArianos vocant, quod in hac quaestione ex parte cum illis sint, ex parte nobiscum.” his use of the term Semi-Arian is now to be avoided, the distinctive mark of that party being the Homoiousion. But these two authorities show that the original Pneumatomachi, against whom Athanasius wrote, must have been largely reinforced from those who joined the Church under Liberius. This appears also from Epiphanius, who states that the Pneumatomachi proceeded partly from the Semi-Arians and partly from the orthodox. In the preceding article he had defined the Semi-Arians by the Homoiousion; and the “orthodox,” it cannot be doubted, were not the old Nicenes, but those who from the Arians had come over to the Homoiousion, and had been accepted by Liberius as orthodox. Thus of the Pneumatomachi some were orthodox regarding the divinity of the Son, and some retained the Homoiousion, and these latter are properly Macedonians, being SemiArians.

All these started with the tenet of the sect from which they sprung, namely, that the Holy Spirit is a created being, of the same order as the created angels (Theodoret and Epiphanius, *l. c.*). The authorities of Philaster and Augustine are sufficient to show that this was retained by the majority of the party. But another opinion arose early. It proceeded—Eustathius of Sebastia being an example (Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* 2, 45) — from a reluctance to call the Holy Spirit a creature. But as they who felt this reluctance would not consent to call him God, it followed necessarily that they were obliged to deny his personality. Still they assigned to the impersonal Spirit that which is assigned to the personal Spirit by Roman Catholics, as being the Vinculum (see Augustine, *De Fide et Symbolo*, § 19; Bull, *Def. Fid. Nic.* 2, 3, 13) of the persons of the Godhead. This is noted by Augustine (*Heres.* c. 3): “Quamvis a nonnullis perhibeantur non Deum, sed Deitatem Patris et Filii dicere Spiritum Sanctum, et nullam propriam habere substantiam.” What Catholics regard as God the Holy Ghost working in the world they regarded as a divine energy diffused through the world. Mosheim represents this, it appears upon insufficient grounds, to be the tenet of the Macedonians in general (Walch, *Gesch. der Ketzerien*, 3, 98).

The heresy of the Pneumatomachi was condemned, first, in a synod at Alexandria, A.D. 362, held by Athanasius on his return (Athanasius, *Synod. Epist. ad Antioch.* The epistle states that Arians, on their reception into the Church, are to anathematize those who say that the Holy Spirit is a created being and divided from the substance of Christ. A true renunciation of Arian doctrine is to abstain from dividing the Holy Trinity, from saying that one of the Persons is a created being). The Pneumatomachi were condemned secondly in a synod in Illyricum, A.D. 367 (*Epist. Synod. ad Orient.*; Hardouin, *Concil.* 1, 794; Sozomen, *Hist. Eccles.* 6:22); thirdly, in a synod at Rome, A.D. 367 (Damasi, *Epist. ap. Theodoret. Hist. Eccles.* 5, 11, Vales. note); and, lastly, at the great Oriental council held at Constantinople, A.D. 381, where, in opposition to the heresies of Macedonius, Apollinarius, and Eunomius, the Nicene faith was confirmed and more fully stated. The first canon anathematizes the "Semi-Arians, or Pneumatomachi;" the seventh canon uses the name Macedonians, and orders the admission of converts from this heresy to be by unction. To the simple article of the Nicene Creed, "I believe in the Holy Ghost," were added those clauses (excepting the Filioque) which stand at present as the complement of the catholic faith, viz., that to the Holy Ghost, who emanates from the Father, is due the same adoration and glorification as to the Father and to the Son. The Macedonians were invited to the Council of Constantinople in the hope that the reconciliation interrupted at Tarsus might be effected, but the hope was not realized (Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* 5, 8; Sozomen, *Hist. Eccles.* 7, 7). Facunmdus states that Macedonius himself was invited to the council. This is no doubt an error. The council completed the work which was begun at Nicea, and finally declared the catholic faith regarding the Holy Trinity. Against its determination the Semi-Arian, now the Pneumatomachist, party was not able to make any effectual resistance. — Blunt, *Dict. of Sects*, s.v. See Schaff; *Church History*, 2, 639, 644; Neander, *Hist. of Christian Dogma* (see Index); Hefele, *Conciliengesch.* vols. 1 and 2; Alzog, *Kirchengesch.* 1, 281; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* vol. 6; Klee, *Dogmengesch.* pt. 1, ch. 2, p. 215.

Poach, Andreas

a German Lutheran minister of the 16th century, studied at Wittenberg under Martin Luther, where also he was made *namgister*. In 1542 he was called to Jena as archdeacon; then he was appointed pastor at Nordhausen; and in 1550 he was called as pastor and professor of theology to Erfurt, where in 1572 in company with four others, he was deposed. He then

moved to Utenbach, near Jena, where he died, April 2, 1585. He edited Luther's *Hauspostille, with Corrections and Additions* (Jena, 1559 sq.), and wrote the biography of Ratzeberger (q.v.), *Vom christlichen Abschied aus diesern Sterblichen*, etc. (Jena, 1559). See Jocher, *Gelehrten-Lexikon*, s.v.; Winer, *Handbuch de theol. Littérateur*, 2, 130. (B. P.)

Pobian, Moses

also called *Fobian*, a Jewish writer of some note, flourished in Greece in the first part of the 16th century. He published, *ynamwr μwgrt μ[bwyā*, the book of Job, with a Runic, i.e. neo-Greek, translation in Hebrew letters (Constantinople, 1576): — *yl çm ynamwr μwgrt μ[*, the Proverbs, in the same manner (ibid. 1548):— *ydrpsw ynamwr μwgrt μ[çmwj*, i.e. the Pentateuch, with a Runic and Spanish translation, both in Hebrew letters, with the Chaldee of Onkelos and Rashi's commentary (ibid. 1547). The Spanish version of this work was reprinted at Ferrara in 1583. See Furst, *Bibl. Judaica*, 1, 285 sq.; Wolf, *Bibl. Hebraea*, I, 3, 1520. (B. P.)

Pochard, Jean

a French theologian, was born in 1715 at La Cluse, near Pontarlier. After going through the regular course of studies at Besanon, he was offered by the archbishop of that diocese the direction of the seminary, and Pochard there taught theology for thirty years. He was afterwards appointed superior of the seminary, but the weakness of his health compelled him to resign these functions, as he had already resigned his chair. He died at Besanon Aug. 25, 1786. To him is due the revision of the Missal and Breviary of the diocese of Besanon, printed by order of the cardinal of Choiseul-Beaupre. These works are considered model performances. He had the largest share in the *Mithode poumr la Direction des Ames* (Neufchhteau, 1772, 2 vols. 12mo) of Urbain Grisot, which has often been reprinted. — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, s.v.

Poche'reth

(Heb. *Poke'reth*, *trkPρensnaring*; Sept. (Φακεράθ, v. r. Φαχεράθ, etc.), the name apparently of a person ("P. of Zebaim," the Sept. in some copies supplies "son of" between the words) whose "children" were among

the Nethinim that returned from the captivity with Zerubbabel (~~1027~~ Ezra 2:57; ~~1079~~ Nehemiah 7:59). B.C. ante 540.

Pociev, Hypatius

a Russian prelate, was born at Bajanise in 1541. He occupied a conspicuous place in the religious history of Russia by the share he had, in 1595, in the return of the western provinces of the empire to the Roman Catholic Church. He was sent to Rome, with several of his colleagues, to signify the obedience of the converted provinces to the holy see: we have an account of this event by Baronius. Pociev devoted his whole life to cementing and extending this union which was finally destroyed by the emperor Nicholas in 1839. Pociev was bishop of Vladimir and Bresc, and died at Vladimir July 28, 1613. He left a number of *Homilies*, published by Leo. Kiszka (*Kazania y Homilie Hipacisca Pocieia*, 1714, 4to) *The Union*, all exposition of the principal articles relating to the union of the Greeks with the Roman Church (Wilna, 1595): — all *Account* of the embassy which the Ruthenians, in 1476, sent to Sixtus IV (Wilna, 1605, 4to); we know only one copy of this work, that in the Imperial Library of St. Petersburg: — *Privileges granted to the Uniates by the Kings of Poland* (Wilna, s. d., about 1706): — divers *Epistles* disseminated in the *Annales de la Societe Archologique de Saint-Petersbourg*, the most remarkable being addressed to the patriarch of Alexandria: — his *Testament*, inserted in the *Review of Posen*. Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, s.v.

Pockels, Carl Friedrich

a German moralist, was born Nov. 15, 1757, at Wirmlitz, near Halle. In 1780, having completed his studies at the university in Halle, he was appointed tutor of the princes of Brunswick, and afterwards guardian of one of them, the duke 'Augustus. When this house lost their estates, he lived as a private citizen at Brunswick. In 1813 he occupied again his former relation to duke Augustus. He died at Brunswick Oct. 29, 1814. Pockels's works, written in a fluent and elegant style, contain a treasury of sagacious and curious observations on man and society. He left, *Beitrag zur Beforderung der Menschenkenntniss* (Berlin, 1788-89, 2 parts, 8vo; followed by *YeueBeit aiyé*, etc., Hamb. 1798, 8vo): — *Fragmente zur Kenntniss des nenzschlichen Herzens* (Hanover, 1788-94, 3 vols. 8vo): — *Denkwzuidigkeiten zur Bereicherung der Chauc akterkunde* (Halle, 1794, 8vo): — *Versuch einer Charakteristik des weiblichen Geschlechts*

(Hanover, 1799-1802, 5 vols. 8vo); it is a writing full of witty remarks; the author published as a pendant *Der Maunn* (ibid. 1805-8, 4 vols. 8vo): — *Karl Wilh. Ferdinand von Braunzschweig* (Stuttgard, 1809, 8vo): — *Ueber den Ulgayng müit Kindesrn* (1811): — *Ueber Gesellschaft, Geselligkeit und Unzgang* (Hanover, 1813-16, 3 vols. 8vo). Pockels published a *Taschenbuch*, as keepsake, for the years 1803 and 1804; and, in common with Ch. Ph. Moritz, the *Denkwü digkeiten zur Bef Orderung des Edlen und Schloznen* (Berlin, 1786-88, 2 vols. 8vo), some articles in the *Magatzin zur Effjithrlun gsseelenlehre*, and in the *Brazuschweigisches Magazin*. — *Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, s.v.

Pocklington, John, D.D.

an English divine, noted also as an educator, flourished near the middle of the 17th century. He was at one time president of Pembroke Hall and Sidney College, Cambridge. He published *Sermons* (Lond. 1636): — *Altare Christianum* (1637, 4to), in answer to Williams's *Holy Table*. **SEE WILLIAMS, JOHN.**

Pocock, Edward (1)

an English Orientalist and theologian of great note, not only in his own times, but one whose scholarly acquirements are gladly acknowledged even in our day, was born Nov. 8, 1604. He studied in Oxford his native place, at the university, and devoted himself especially to the Oriental tongues, the Hebrew, Arabic, Chaldee, and Syriac first under the direction of Matthew Pason, and afterwards under that of William Bedwell. Pocock took his bachelor of arts degree in 1622, and his master's in 1626. Lud. de Dieu publishing a Syriac version of the Apocalypse at Leyden the following year, our author, after his example, began to prepare those four epistles which were still wanting to a complete edition of the New Testament in that language. These epistles were the second of Peter, the second and third of John, and that of Jude. All the other books, except these five, had been well printed by Albertus Widmanstadius, at Vienna, in 1555, who was sent into the West for that purpose by Ignatius, the Jacobite patriarch of Antioch, in the 16th century. Having met with a manuscript in the Bodleian Library proper to his purpose, Pocock engaged in this work and finished it; but laid it by, not having the courage to publish it, till the fame of it, in 1629, brought him into the acquaintance of Gerard Vossius, who, being then at Oxford, obtained his consent to carry it to Leyden, where it was

printed that year, in 4to, under the immediate care and inspection of Lud. de Dieu. In 1628 Pocock had been received a fellow of the principal college of Oxford; but having decided to enter the priesthood, he was ordained priest in 1629, having entered into deacon's orders some time before, and he was appointed chaplain to the English factory at Aleppo, by the interest of Selden, as appears very probable. He arrived at that place, after a long voyage, Oct. 17, 1630. His residence in the East for six years furnished an opportunity of further study in the Oriental tongues. He acquired great skill in the Arabic tongue, and he likewise endeavored to get a further insight, if possible, into the Hebrew; but soon found it fruitless, the Jews there being very illiterate. He also improved himself in the Ethiopic and Syriac, of which last he made a grammar, with a praxis, for his own use. On Oct. 30, 1631, he received a commission from Laud, then bishop of London, to buy for him such ancient Greek coins and such manuscripts, either in Greek or the Oriental languages, as he should judge most proper for a university library -which commission Pocock executed to the best of his power. He also translated a number of historical works from the Arabic, collected a great quantity of Oriental manuscripts, which he sent to England, and made a careful study of the environs of Aleppo, with respect to natural history: the result of the latter study was intended to furnish a desirable addition to the commentaries of the Old Testament. In 1634 the plague raged furiously at Aleppo; many of the merchants fled two days' journey from the city, and dwelt in tents upon the mountains: Pocock did not stir, yet neither he nor any of the English caught the infection. In 1636 he received a letter from Laud, then archbishop of Canterbury, informing him of his design to found an Arabic lecture at Oxford, and of naming him to the university as the professor; upon which agreeable news he presently settled his affairs at Aleppo, and took the first opportunity of returning home. On his arrival at Oxford this year, he took the degree of bachelor of divinity in July, and entered on the professorship in August; however, the next year, when his friend Mr. John Greaves concerted his voyage to Egypt, it was thought expedient by Laud that Pocock should attend him to Constantinople, in order to perfect himself in the Arabic language, and to purchase more manuscripts. During his abode there, he was for some time chaplain to Sir Peter Wych, then the English ambassador to the Porte, and who became Pocock's most zealous protector. He collected during his stay in that city a number of Oriental manuscripts. In 1639 he received several letters from his friends. and particularly from the archbishop, pressing him to return home; and

accordingly, embarking in August, 1640, he landed in Italy, and passed thence to Paris. Here he met with Grotius, who was then ambassador at the court of France from Sweden, and acquainted him with a design he had to translate his treatise *De veritate Christianae Religionis* into Arabic, in order to promote the conversion of some of the Mohammedans. Grotius was pleased with and encouraged the proposal, while Pocock did not scruple to observe to him some things towards the end of his book which he could not approve: as his advancing opinions which, though commonly charged by Christians upon Mohammedans, yet had no foundation in any of their authentic writings, and were such as they themselves were ready to disclaim. Grotius was so far from being displeased that he heartily thanked Pocock for the freedom he had taken; and gave him full leave, in the version he intended, to expunge and alter whatever he should think fit. This work was published in 1660 at the sole expense of Mr. Robert Royle: Grotius's introduction was left out, and a new preface added by Pocock, showing the design of the work, and giving some account of the persons to whom it would be of use. On his return to England, in 1640, Pocock found himself in very difficult circumstances. His chair of Arabic had been stipended by archbishop Laud, but after the death of that prelate the revenues had been seized upon. Pocock now devoted himself entirely to study, and escaped by his retreat, as well as by the friendship of John Selden, who enjoyed a great influence in the republican party, the vexations, if not dangers, which his royalist opinions would have been sure to bring upon him. In 1643 he was presented by his college with the living of Childrey, in Berkshire, and in 1647, in consequence of the exertions of John Selden, he was reinstated in his Oxford chair, and two years later he was appointed professor of Hebrew. The king, who was at that time a prisoner in the Isle of Wight, also bestowed on him a rich canonry. An act of Parliament confirmed the gift; but the canonry thus assigned to him being different from that originally annexed to the professorship, Pocock entered a protest against it, and refused to receive the profits. In the meantime he composed his *Specimen Historiae Arabum*, being extracts from the work of Abul-faraj in the original Arabic, together with a Latin translation and copious notes. This work, which was printed at Oxford in 1648 and 1650 (4to), was reprinted in 1806 by White, with some additions by Sylvestre de Sacy. In November 1650, about a year after publishing the preceding work, Pocock was ejected from his canonry, and it was intended to deprive him of the Hebrew and Arabic professorships; but, thanks to a petition signed by all the heads of houses, the masters, and scholars at

Oxford, Pocock was suffered to enjoy both places. In 1655 he was on the point of being deprived of his living, on the ground of “ignorance and insufficiency;” at least such were the charges preferred against him by Cromwell’s committee. Some of his Oxford friends, however, wisely prevented the disgrace to the Roundhead party which would have followed the ejection, upon such grounds, of so eminent a scholar as Pocock. The most determined against this measure was Dr. John Owen (himself one of the Parliamentary commissioners), Seth Ward, John Wilkins, and John Wallis, who withstood the stupid and bigoted creatures to their face, and made them sensible of “the infinite contempt and reproach” which would reward such treatment of a man “whom all the learned, not of England only, but of all Europe, so justly admired for his vast knowledge and extraordinary accomplishments.” Meanwhile nothing had sufficed to check either his pious care of his parish or his pursuit of sacred and Oriental learning. In Arabic and Hebrew learning he was allowed to be second to none of his age.

From the first Pocock made his Oriental attainments subservient to Biblical illustration; and his contributions, directly and indirectly, to Biblical learning were numerous and extremely valuable. Of his connection with Walton’s *Polyglot*, his biographer says: “From the beginning scarce a step was taken in that work [not excepting even the *Prolegomena*] till communicated to Mr. Pocock, without whose assistance it must have wanted much of its perfection;” he collated the Arabic Pentateuch, with two copies of Saadiah’s translation; drew up an account of the Arabic versions of that part of the Bible which is to be found in the Appendix to the Polyglot, and lent some of his own rich store of MSS. to the conductors of the work, viz. a Syriac MS. of the entire Old Testament, an Ethiopic MS. of the Psalms, two Syriac MSS. of the Psalms, and a Persian MS. of the Gospels. Soon after his escape from the commission’s purposes Pocock published his *Porta Mosis*, being six prefatory discourses of Moses Maimonides’s “Commentary upon the Mishna,” written in Arabic, but with the Hebrew letters. This work, which was the first production of the Hebrew press at Oxford, appeared in 1655, together with a Latin translation and numerous notes. Pocock made this work the more useful to Biblical students by his copious *Appendix Notarum Miscellanea*, where he discusses many points of interest to Biblical scholars. Pocock reaped golden opinions on the publication of this now neglected though still very valuable work. In the following year Pocock appears to have entertained

the idea of publishing the *Expositions of Rabbi Tanchum on the Old Testament*, as he was at that time the only person in Europe who possessed any of the MSS. of that learned rabbi; but, probably from want of encouragement, he did not prosecute his design. In 1657 the English Polyglot appeared, in which Pocock had a considerable hand. He collated the Arabic Pentateuch, and also wrote a preface concerning the different Arabic versions of that part of the Bible, and the reason of the various readings to be found in them, the whole of which was inserted in the Appendix to the Polyglot. Those parts of the Syriac version of the New Testament which had remained unpublished are due to him; he accompanied them with a Latin version and annotations. In 1658 his Latin translation of the *Annals of Eutychius* was published at Oxford (in 2 vols. 4to), at the request and at the expense of Selden, who died before it appeared. At the Restoration, Pocock was restored (June 1660) to his canonry of Christ-church, as originally annexed to the Hebrew professorship by Charles I; but the frivolous court of Charles II thought as little of rewarding further his attachment to the royal cause as they were able to appreciate his works and his worth. He took his doctor of divinity's degree, and continued afterwards to discharge the duties of both his lectures, and to give to the world, to the end of his life, new proofs of his unrivalled skill in Oriental learning. He was consulted as a master by all the most learned men in Europe: by Hornius, Alting, Hottinger, Golius, from abroad; and by Cudworth, Boyle, Hammond, Castel, at home. His next publication, in 1661, was the Arabic poem by Abli Ismail Thograi, entitled *Lámiy-yatu-l-'ajem*, with a Latin translation, copious notes, and a learned preface by Dr. Samuel Clarke. But by far the most important as well as the most useful of Pocock's works was his translation of the entire work of Abul-faraj, which, along with the text and a few excellent notes, was printed at Oxford in 1663 (2 vols. 4to), entitled *Gregorii Abul Farajii historia Dynastiarum*. (This is a compendium of the general history of the world from the creation to his own time, i.e. about the end of the 13th century, and is divided into ten dynasties.) After the publication of this work Pocock seems to have devoted himself entirely to Biblical learning. In 1674 he published, at the expense of the university, his Arabic translation of the Church Catechism and the English Liturgy. Some time after, Fell, dean of Christchurch, having concerted a scheme for a commentary upon the Old Testament, to be written by some learned hands in that university, engaged our author to take a share. This gave occasion to his commentaries. In 1677 appeared his *Commentarys on the Prophecies of*

Micah and Malachi; in 1685 that on *Hosea*, and in 1691 that on *Joel*. It was his intention to comment upon others of the lesser prophets. In these commentaries, which are all in English. Pocock's skill in his favorite subject of Biblical Hebrew is very apparent. The notes, no doubt, are too diffuse, but they exhibit much profound learning in rabbinical as well as sacred Hebrew. In his critical principles he warmly defends the general purity of the Masoretic text against the aspersions of Isaac Vossius and the theory of Capellus; but, although his Masoretic predilections are excessive, he does not depreciate the Septuagint. His scheme ever was to *reconcile* by learned explanations the sacred original and the most venerable of its versions. This great and good man labored on, harassed by enemies and neglected by friends, but respected for his purity of life, and admired for his matchless learning, in his professional and pastoral pursuits, to the very end of his life, his only distemper being extreme old age, which yet hindered him not, even the night before he died, from his invariable custom of praying from the liturgy with his family. He expired Sept. 10, 1691, after a gradual decay of his constitution, and his remains were interred in the cathedral of Christchurch, where a monument with an inscription is erected to his memory. As to his person, he was of a middle stature, and slender; his hair and eyes black, his complexion fresh, his look lively and cheerful, and his constitution sound and healthy. In his conversation he was free, open, and affable, retaining even to the last the briskness and facetiousness of youth. His temper was modest, humble, sincere; and his charity brought such numbers of necessitous objects to him that dean Fell used to tell him complainingly "that he drew all the poor of Oxford into the college property." His theological works were collected in 2 vols. fol. in 1740 by Leonard Twells, who also wrote an account of the life and works of Pocock. Pocock's services to Oriental scholarship in Europe, especially in England, are wellnigh inestimable. Bishop Marsh says of him: "Should I begin to speak of the rare endowments of this admirable man, I should not be able to end his character under a volume. His rare learning appears in his writings." "Pocock," says Hallam, "was probably equal to any Oriental scholar whom Europe had hitherto produced.... No Englishman probably has ever contributed so much to that province of [Arabic] learning." See Cattermole, *Literature of the English Church*, 1, 175; Hook, *Ecclesiastical Biography*, 8:98; Skeats, *Hist. of the English Free Church*, p. 63; Orme, *Bibliotheca Biblia*, s.v.; Perry, *Hist. Ch. of Engl.* (see Index in vol. 3); Stoughton, *Eccles. Hist. of Engl.* (since the Restoration), 2, 332;

Kitto, *Cyclopaedia of British Literature*, 3, 553; Allibone, *Dict. of British and American Authors*, vol. 2, s.v.; *Biblical Repository*, 10:2 sq. (J.H.W.)

Pocock, Edward (2)

an English Orientalist, son of the preceding, was born at Oxford in 1647, and educated at the university of that place. He published, under his father's direction, a philosophical treatise of Ibn-Tofahil, with a Latin version and notes, entitled *Philosophus autodidactus* (Oxford, 1671, 4to). The same treatise was translated into English by Ockley. He was on the point of publishing the *Description of Egypt by Abdallatif* in Arabic and in Latin when, being refused in 1691 the succession to the chair left vacant by his father's death, he renounced entirely his Oriental studies. This valuable work remained long unpublished: the Arabic text was printed at Tübingen at the close of last century, and was almost immediately translated into German. White published in 1800 the original and Pocock's Latin version (Oxf. 4to), with notes of his own.

His brother THOMAS translated into English a Hebrew treatise of Manasseh ben-Israel (*Of the Terms of Life*, Lond. 1699, 12mo). (J.H.W.)

Pococke, Richard

an English prelate, was born in 1704 at Southampton. It is believed that he belonged to the family of the preceding, notwithstanding the slight difference in the spelling of his name. He studied at Oxford, was received doctor, and embraced the ecclesiastical career. In 1734 and 1741 he traveled in the East, and published on his return a narrative of his journey, under the title, *A Description of the East and some other Countries* (Lond. 1743-45, 3 vols. in 2. folio, with 179 drawings and maps). This work most fully and with care delineates the countries and manners which make its reading interesting even now. Having accompanied lord Chesterfield to Ireland as chaplain, he remained in that country, and was appointed in 1756 bishop of Ossory. He had just been transferred to Meath when he died of apoplexy, in September 1765, There are some notices of him in the *Philosophical Transactions* and in the *Archaeologia*. (J. H.W.)

Pocularies

is an ecclesiastical term used for drinking-cups consecrated in churches.

Poderis or Talaris

is another name for the *alb* (q.v.).

Podico, John De

(also called *John de Valladolid* or *John Conversus*), a convert from Judaism and noted as a writer, was born about the year 1335. He is the author of two anti-Jewish works, viz. *Corcordia legis*, cited very often by Alfonso de Spina in his *Fortalitium fidei* (p. 117, 155, 169, 170 sq.), and *Declaratio super Aben Efram in decem pracepta*; also quoted by Alfonso de Spina. He was permitted by the king, Don Henry, to hold religious disputations with Jews, and in 1375 such a disputation took place in the cathedral of Avila, where Moses Kohen de Tordesillas was the spokesman of the Jews. The main points to be discussed were the dogmas of Christianity, the Messiahship of Jesus, his divinity and incarnation, the Trinity, and the virginity of Mary. Four discussions were held, the result of which was published by Tordesillas in his *hnWmÄh; rzL[eor* examination of one hundred and twenty-five passages of Scripture usually urged by Christians in favor of their religion. This book, which he designated "The Stronghold of the Faith," he presented to the synagogue of Avila and Toledo. See Furst, *Bibl. Judaica*, 3, 435, 467; De Rossi, *Dizionario storico degli Autori Ebrei* (Germ. transl. by Hamberger), p. 317; the same, *Bibl. Judaica antichristiana*, p. 26; Gratz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, 8, 21 sq.; Lindo, *Hist. of the Jews*, p. 159; Finn, *Sephardim*, p. 311; Kalkar, *Israel und die Kirche*, p. 25. (B. P.)

Podoniptae

(i.e. *Feet-washers*) is one of the names by which that branch of the Mennonites, otherwise known as *Flemings*, are sometimes designated. They maintain that the example of Christ, which has in this instance the force of a law, requires his disciples to wash the feet of their guests in token of their love; and for this reason they have been called *Podonipta*. But others deny that this rite was enjoined by Christ. **SEE MENNONITES.**

Poe, Adam, D.D.

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, noted for his devotion to its interests, literary, social, and religious, was born in Columbiana County, Ohio, July 21, 1804. Such limited advantages as the times and the means of

his parents afforded him for acquiring an education were eagerly embraced, and in the schools and by private tuition he secured the elements of a good English education and some knowledge of the classics, and formed a taste for reading and study which he continued through life. He received his early Christian training in the Presbyterian Church, and ever cherished for it a profound respect; but its distinctive doctrines did not find a response in his heart, and after careful examination and many severe spiritual conflicts he preferred the doctrines of religion as taught by the Methodist Episcopal Church. Having decided to give himself to the work of the ministry, to which he felt called of God, he was licensed to preach, and in 1826 became a traveling preacher in the Ohio Annual Conference. He was effective from that date to the time of the illness which resulted in his death; and as a pastor, and in the other capacities in which he served the Church and her cause, he was a most efficient laborer of the Master. Dr. Poe entered the traveling ministry when the work involved sacrifices and demanded labors of no ordinary character. The circuits were of vast extent. An absence from home of twenty-eight days, with a sermon and a class or prayer meeting for each and every day, and a horseback ride of six hundred miles through the forests and the rough roads of the border settlements to complete a single round, was common. Unchecked by heat or cold, through drenching rains or chilling sleet or snow, along miry ways, and for unmeasured reaches of distance, the Christ-loving and Christ-serving itinerant pressed forward in his tireless rounds, hunting up the lost sheep of the house of Israel, and gathering them into the fold of the great Shepherd. No man ever entered the cause with firmer faith, with greater singleness of purpose, or with more unreserved devotion than did Adam Poe. As he began, so he continued to the end. His whole being was rooted and grounded in God. His pastoral appointments were as follows: 1827, on Brunswick Circuit; 1828, on Huron Circuit; 1829, in charge of Wayne Circuit; 1830, on Columbus Circuit; 1831, on Deer Creek Circuit; 1832-3, on Miami Circuit; 1834, Marietta. In 1835 Dr. Poe succeeded the celebrated William B. Christie as presiding elder of Wooster District, and continued on that and the Tiffin District some five years, when his impaired health demanded relief from such exhausting labors. In 1839 he was stationed in Mansfield; in 1840-41, in Delaware; in 1842, presiding elder on Norwalk District; in 1843 in Delaware a second time; in 1844, agent for the Ohio Wesleyan University; 1846, again in Mansfield; 1847-9, on Norwalk or Elyria District. From 1850 to the spring of 1852, he was presiding elder of Mansfield District. At the General Conference of 1852 he was, in a manner

highly creditable to himself, elected assistant agent of the Western Book Concern. To this office he was re-elected in 1856. Upon the failure of the health of the Rev. L. Swormstedt in 1860, he was elected principal agent. To this office he was re-elected in 1864. The General Conference of 1868 would have gladly continued him in this relation had it not found him hovering between life and death. He died June 26, 1868. Dr. Poe was a sound thinker, safe rather than brilliant in his theological views, colloquial rather than oratorical in his style of speech, ever interesting and instructive in the pulpit and on the platform. His life was genial and Christian. A man of sterling integrity of character and honesty of purpose, of sound and godly judgment, he enjoyed the confidence of the Church to a degree rarely awarded to living men. Traversing the circuit, laboring in the station, charged with the arduous administration of the expansive district, or managing the vast interests of the Western Book Concern, he was the same sincere-hearted man, with one single purpose, to do well the work committed to him by the Church. This was the grand secret of his success. Dr. Poe had a commanding presence. The spirit of benevolence ruled in his heart, and its winning sunshine beamed in his countenance. He was frank almost to bluntness, yet no one could mistake the generous impulses of his heart. He was fearless, but his courage was tempered with wisdom. He was social in a high degree; his winning smile, his genial spirit, and the facility and effectiveness with which he drew upon the rich storehouse of anecdote will not soon be forgotten by his intimate friends. Dr. Poe was greatly interested in the educational advantages of the Methodist Episcopal Church, but particularly the Ohio Wesleyan University, of which he may almost be said to have been the founder. His faith in the enterprise, and his devotion to it, were truly heroic. From its inception down to the hour of his death no personal or family interest was dearer to his heart than this grand, central educational institution of the Church in the state of Ohio. I was a member of the board of trustees from the time of its foundation. See bishop Clark, in the *Western Christian Advocate*, July 8, 1868; *Minutes of the North Ohio Conference*, p. 34 sq.; *N.Y. Christian Advocate*, July 4, 1868. (J. H. W.)

Poe, Daniel

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and brother of the preceding, was born in Columbiana County, Ohio, Oct. 12, 1809. In August, 1.82, he united with the Methodist Episcopal Church. Young as he was, he was soon appointed a class-leader, and was licensed to exhort. He

prepared at an academy for college, and studied at Augusta College, Kentucky. He was licensed to preach, and admitted into the Ohio Conference, and appointed to travel the Letart Falls Circuit, where he labored acceptably and successfully. The next year he was appointed to the Eaton Circuit, and the year following to the Hamilton Circuit, and in 1835 to the Oxford Circuit. In May 1836, he was sent to the Oneida and Menomonee Mission, west of Green Bay. He commenced a school among the Oneida Indians, and extended his visits to those at Brothertown, and other fragments of tribes scattered through the Wisconsin Territory, and finally succeeded in building up a flourishing mission, which continues to our day to exert a most salutary influence among this reclaimed savage tribe. In the autumn of 1838 Mr. Poe traveled on horseback, through an almost unbroken wilderness, from Green Bay to Alton, Ill., to attend the Illinois Conference he was then transferred back to the Ohio Conference; but he could not get to Ohio in time to receive an appointment that year. In January 1839, his brother, \who was presiding elder of the Tiffin District, employed him on the Mexico Circuit, where he labored till the session of his Conference in September, 1839, when he was appointed to the M'Arthurstown Circuit. The next two years he was appointed to Tariton. In September 1842, he was transferred to the Texas Conference. On his arrival there he addressed himself with his accustomed zeal and energy to his work, but one of the great wants of the country that first impressed him was the need of schools and teachers. In view of this destitution he returned to Ohio, in order to secure a corps of teachers. After a few months he returned to Texas, and shortly after commenced laying the foundations of an institution of learning at San Augustine. The next Conference resolved to adopt it and give it their patronage. But, besides this educational work, Mr. Poe served the San Augustine Circuit, which subjected him to the necessity of traveling some three hundred miles every four weeks. He kept up his engagements with regularity, and to the satisfaction of all concerned, but the exertion necessary to this end proved too much, and in 1844 he fell a prey to disease, and died after a very short illness. His last words were a testimony of the happy servant to whom the Master bade a hearty welcome. "Happy—very, very happy!" were the last words of Daniel Poe. "As a man of intellect," says bishop Morris, "I should place Poe considerably above the medium, though his mind was sober and practical rather than striking or brilliant. His perceptions were quick and clear, and he had that strong common sense and sound, discriminating judgment that gave great weight to his counsels and great efficiency to his

movements. In his moral constitution he was distinguished chiefly for the resolute and the heroic. He had a naturally kind and amiable spirit. He was far from being impetuous in his movements or hasty in his decisions; but when his purpose was once deliberately and conscientiously formed it was impossible to divert him from the course of his sober convictions. With the highest degree of physical courage, he united that higher courage which has its foundation in principle and in faith. The sentiment of fear, except as it had respect to (God, never found a lodgment in his bosom." His preaching was such as might have been expected from his solid and well-disciplined mind, and his earnest, resolute, and eminently Christian spirit. He spoke with great simplicity and directness, but without any of the graces of oratory. His discourses were well-considered, well-digested expositions of divine truth. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 7, 786 sq.; Finley, *Sketches; Minutes of Conferences*, 1845. (J. H. W.)

Poelemberg, Kornelius

a Dutch painter, was born at Utrecht in 1586. His master was Abraham Bloemaert. He then went to Rome, where he enjoyed the lessons of Adam Elzheimer (1600). A member of the academic rank, he was there called *Il Brusco* and *Il Satiro*. He Italianized his manner. His paintings were esteemed, and brought a good price even in Italy. Pope Paul V and the grand duke of Tuscany, Ferdinand II, endeavored in vain to keep him. After a few months spent in Florence (1621), he went back to Holland, where his fame had preceded him. He was received with great honors; Rubens became his friend. Charles I called him to London, where Poelemberg painted a great deal; but he finally abandoned the service of the English monarch and returned to Utrecht, where he died, in 1660. His chief sacred works are: *The Birth of Jesus*, at Dusseldorf; *Lot and his Daughters*; the *Martyrdom of St. Stephen*; a *Flight to Egypt*; a *Holy Family*; an *Angel announcing to the Shepherds the Birth of the Savior*, in the Louvre, and one of his best; etc. At the great exhibition at Manchester (1851) the portrait of Poelemberg and his wife, painted by himself, and several landscapes, were greatly admired. He left also some good *eau-fortes*, but his engravings are rare and out of the market. Poelemberg's manner is remarkable for suavity and lightness; it betokens great facility and an uncommon science of the chiaro-oscuro; his masses are large, his backgrounds and first plans full of harmony; the details, especially those related to architecture, are carefully worked out; his figures (generally naked females) are swell grouped, but the drawing is seldom correct. See

Descamps, *Vie des Peintres*. 1, 214 sq.; Blanc, *La Vie des Peintres (Ecole Hollandaise)*, liv. 94; Spooner, *Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts*, s.v.; Mrs. Clement, *Handbook of Painters*, etc. p. 461.

Poelenburg, Arnold

a Dutch theologian, was born Sept. 12, 1628, at Horn, in the Netherlands, where he also became pastor in 1653, after having completed his studies. He removed to Rotterdam, and in 1659 became professor of theology of the Remonstrants (q.v.), and died Oct. 30, 1666. He wrote, *Confutatio disputationis F' Spanhemii de quinque articulis controversis, cuan refutatione argumenti Guil. Tuissi, cui solvendo ne diabolium? quidemo et angelos ejus esse pares gloriatur: — Dissert. epistol. qua demonstratur non posse remonstrantes integra conscientia cum Contraremonstrantibus vel congregationis vel S. Synaxeos communiionem colere: — Epistola ad Christ. Hartzaekerum in qua liber octavus summae controversiarum Joh. Hornbeckii, qui est adversus remonstrantes refellitur*, etc. See Cattenburgh, in *Biblioth. Remonstrantium*; Jocher, *Gelehrten Lexikon*, s.v. (B. P.)

Poenitentiale Romanum

a collection of rules used in the Roman Catholic Church, prescribing the time and manner of penance, the forms of prayer to be employed for the reception of those who enter upon penance, and for reconciling penitents by solemn absolution. Its history can be traced to the ninth century. *SEE PENITENTIAL*.

Poet

(ποιητής, *a doer*, as often translated) occurs but once in this sense in the Bible. Paul quotes the poet Aratus, a native, as well as himself, of Cilicia (⁴¹⁷³Acts 17:28): “*We are the children (the race) of God.*” This is part of a longer passage, whose import is, “We must begin from Jupiter, whom we must by no means forget. Everything is replete with Jupiter. He fills the streets, the public places, and assemblies of men. The whole sea and its harbors are full of this god, and all of us in all places have need of Jupiter.” It was certainly not to prove the being or to enhance the merit of Jupiter that Paul quotes this passage. But he has delivered out of bondage, as we may say, a truth which this poet had uttered, without penetrating its true meaning. The apostle used it to prove the existence of the true God, to a

people not convinced of the divine authority of the Scriptures, and who would have rejected such proofs as he might have derived from thence. *SEE ARATUS.*

The same apostle gives a pagan poet the name of prophet ('it. 1, 12, "One of themselves, even a prophet of their own, said," etc.), because, among the heathen, poets were thought to be inspired by Apollo. They spoke by enthusiasm. Oracles were originally delivered in verse. Poets were interpreters of the will of the gods. The poet quoted by Paul is Epimenides, whom the ancients esteemed to be inspired and favored by the gods. *SEE EPIMENIDES.*

The son of Sirach, intent on praising eminent men, enumerates bards or poets; who were, he says, "Leaders of the people by their counsels, and by their knowledge of learning meet for the people; wise and eloquent in their instructions: such as found out musical tunes, and recited verses in writing" (Ecclus. 42:4). It is evident that he considered them as of great importance to the community; and we know that they were of great antiquity for Moses, himself a poet, refers to those who spoke in proverbs (⁽¹⁰¹²⁷⁾Numbers 21:27), of which he inserts a specimen. Jacob was a poet, as appears from his farewell benediction on his sons. It appears extremely probable that the honorable appellation Nebi equally denoted a prophet, a poet, and a musician, as the poets principally were. *SEE POETRY.*

Poetry, Hebrew

We propose here to discuss only the poetical elements of the Bible, or ancient Hebrew poetry. For the sake of brevity and perspicuity, we shall treat this subject under the distinct heads of the character of Hebrew poetry, its existing remains, its classification, its history, and its literature. In doing this we treat the subject from a modern scientific point of view.

I. *The Essential Character of Ancient Hebrew Poetry.* — Poetry is—in its nature the language of the imagination stimulated by the passions. While prose expresses the calm statements of memory and observation, or the deliberate conclusions of the judgment, poetry gives utterance to the impulsive sentiments of the taste, the emotions and the aspirations of the heart. History can only appear in poetry in the guise of legend, and reasoning only in the form of animated colloquy. The phraseology is in keeping with the difference in spirit. Poetry tends to a more exalted and elaborate style of language in accordance with the fervid state of the mind.

Hence the invention-spontaneous in most instances of measure, whether of simple numbers or rhyme, to meet this overwrought state of the mental faculties. Biblical poetry partakes of these characteristics. It is distinguished from the prose compositions of the same book by its peculiarities of diction, as marked as those of other languages, although not so prosodical. The reader is at once made aware of entering the poetical domain by a certain elevation of style, and by the employment of more frequent and extended tropes, as well as by greater abruptness and more decided energy in the phraseology. The formal rhythm consists not-as in Greek and Latin, or even in the modern tongues-in a measured *quantity* of syllables of a particular length in utterance, but in a peculiar balance and antiphony of the clauses constituting what is known as *parallelism*. Each of these peculiar traits of Hebrew poetry we take space to develop somewhat in detail.

One characteristic of Hebrew poetry, not indeed peculiar to it, but shared by it in common with the literature of other nations, is its intensely national and local coloring. The writers were Hebrews of the Hebrews, drawing their inspiration from the mountains and rivers of Palestine, which they have immortalized in their poetic figures, and even while uttering the sublimest and most universal truths never forgetting their own nationality in its narrowest and intensest form. Their images and metaphors, says Munk (*Palestine*, p. 444 a), “are taken chiefly from nature and the phenomena of Palestine and the surrounding countries, from the pastoral life, from agriculture and the national history. The stars of heaven, the sand of the seashore, are the image of a great multitude. Would they speak of a mighty host of enemies invading the country, they are the swift torrents or the roaring waves of the sea, or the clouds that bring on a tempest; the war-chariots advance swiftly like lightning or the whirlwinds. Happiness rises as the dawn and shines like the daylight; the blessing of God descends like the dew or the bountiful rain; the anger of Heaven is a devouring fire that annihilates the wicked as the flame which devours the stubble. Unhappiness is likened to days of clouds and darkness; at times of great catastrophes the sun sets in broad day, the heavens are shaken, the earth trembles, the stars disappear, the sun is changed into darkness and the moon into blood, and so on. The cedars of Lebanon, the oaks of Bashan, are the image of the mighty man, the palm and the reed of the great and the humble, briars and thorns of the wicked; the pious man is an olive evergreen, or a tree planted by the waterside. The animal kingdom

furnished equally a large number of images: the lion, the image of power, is also, like the wolf, bear, etc., that of tyrants and violent and rapacious men; and the pious who suffers is a feeble sheep led to the slaughter. The strong and powerful man is compared to the he-goat or the bull of Bashan: the kine of Bashan figure, in the discourses of Amos, as the image of rich and voluptuous women; the people who rebel against the divine will are a refractory heifer. Other images are borrowed from the country life, and from the life domestic and social: the chastisement of God weighs upon Israel like a wagon laden with sheaves; the dead cover the earth as the dung which covers the surface of the fields. The impious man sows crime and reaps misery, or he sows the wind and reaps the tempest. The people yielding to the blows of their enemies are like the corn crushed beneath the threshing instrument. God tramples the wine in the winepress when he chastises the impious and sheds their blood. The wrath of Jehovah is often represented as all intoxicating cup, which he causes those to empty who have merited his chastisement: terrors and anguish are often compared to the pangs of childbirth. Peoples, towns, and states are represented by the Hebrew poets under the image of daughters or wives; in their impiety they are courtesans or adulteresses. The historical allusions of most frequent occurrence are taken from the catastrophe of Sodom and Gomorrah, the miracles of the departure from Egypt, and the appearance of Jehovah on Sinai." Examples might easily be multiplied in illustration of this remarkable characteristic of the Hebrew poets: they stand thick upon every page of their writings, and in striking contrast to the vague generalizations of the Indian philosophic poetry. There is accordingly no poetry which bears a deeper or broader stamp of the peculiar influences under which it was produced. It never ceases to be Hebrew in order to become universal, and yet it is universal while it is Hebrew. The country, the clime, the institutions, the very peculiar religious institutions, rites, and observances, the very singular religious history of the Israelites, are all faithfully and vividly reflected in the Hebrew muse, so that no one song can ever be mistaken for a poem of any other people. Still it remains true that the heart of man, at least the heart of all the most civilized nations of the earth, has been moved and swayed, and is still pleasingly and most beneficially moved and swayed by the strains of Biblical poesy.

There is no ancient poetic age that can be put into comparison with that of the Hebrews but that of the two classic nations, Greece and Rome, and that of India. In form and variety we grant that the poetry of these nations

surpasses that of the Hebrews. Epic poetry and the drama, the two highest styles so far as mere art is concerned, were cultivated successfully by them, while among the Israelites we find only their germs and first rudiments. So in execution we may also admit that, in the higher qualities of style, the Hebrew literature is somewhat inferior. But the thought is more than the expression; the kernel than the shell and in substance the Hebrew poetry far surpasses every other. In truth, it dwells in a region to which other ancient literatures did not and could not attain—a pure, serene, moral, and religious atmosphere; thus dealing with man in his highest relations, first anticipating, and then leading onwards, mere civilization. This, as we shall presently see more fully, is the great characteristic of Hebrew poetry; it is also the highest merit of any literature, a merit in which that of the Hebrews is unapproached. To this high quality it is owing that the poetry of the Bible has exerted on the loftiest interests and productions of the human mind, for now above two thousand years, the most decided and the most beneficial influence. Moral and religious truth is deathless and undecaying; and so the griefs and the joys of David, or the far-seeing warnings and brilliant portrayings of Isaiah, repeat themselves in the heart of each successive generation, and become coexistent with the race of man. Thus of all moral treasuries the Bible is incomparably the richest. Even for forms of poetry, ‘in which, it is defective, or altogether fails, it presents the richest materials. Moses has not, as some have dreamed, left us an epic poem, but he has supplied the materials out of which the *Paradise Lost* was created. The sternly sublime drama of *Samson Agonistes* is constructed from a few materials found in a chapter or two which relate to the least cultivated period of the Hebrew republic. Indeed, most of the great poets, even of modern days, from Tasso down to Byron, all the great musicians, and nearly all the great painters, have drawn their best and highest inspiration from the Bible. It may have struck the reader as somewhat curious that the poetical pieces of which we spoke above should, in the common version of the Bible, be scarcely, if at all, distinguishable from prose. We do not know whether there is anything extraordinary in this. Much of classical poetry, if turned into English prose, would lose most of its poetic characteristics; but, in general, the Hebrew poetry suffers less than perhaps any other by transfusion into a prosaic element: to which fact it is owing that the book of Psalms, in the English version, is, notwithstanding its form, eminently poetic. There are, however, cases in which only the experienced eye can trace the poetic in and under the prosaic attire in which it appears in the vulgar translation. Nor until the

subject of Hebrew poetry had been long and well studied did the learned succeed in detecting many a poetic gem contained in the Bible. In truth, poetry and prose, from their very nature, stand near to each other, and in the earlier stages of their existence are discriminated only by faint and vanishing lines. If we regard the thought, prose sometimes even now rises to the loftiness of poetry. If we regard the clothing, the simpler form of poetry is scarcely more than prose; and rhetorical or measured prose passes into the domain of poetry. A sonnet of Wordsworth could be converted into prose with a very few changes; a fable of Krummacher requires only to be distributed into lines in order to make blank verse. Now in translations the form is for the most part lost; there remains only the substance, and poetic sentiment ranges from the humblest to the loftiest topics. So with the Hebrew poetry in its original and native state. Whether in its case poetry sprang from prose, or prose from poetry, they are both) branches of one tree, and bear in their earlier stages a very close resemblance. The similarity is the greater in the literature of the Hebrews, because their poetic forms are less determinate than those of some other nations: they had, indeed, a rhythm; but so had their prose, and their poetic rhythm was more like that of, our blank verse than of our rhymed meter. Of poetical feet they appear to have known nothing, and in consequence their verse must be less measured and less strict. Its melody was rather that of thought than of art and skill—spontaneous, like their religious feelings, and; therefore deep and impressive, but less subject to law and escaping from the hard limits of exact definition. Rhyme, properly so called, is disowned as well as meter. Yet Hebrew verse, as it had a kind of measured tread, so had it a jingle in its feet, for several lines are sometimes found terminating with the same letter. In the main, however, its essential form was in the thought. Ideas are made to recur under such relations that the substance itself marks the form, and the two are so blended into one that their union is essential to constitute poetry. It is, indeed, incorrect to say that “the Hebrew poetry is characterized by the recurrence of similar ideas” (Latham’s *English Language*, p. 372), if by this it is intended to intimate that such a peculiarity is the sole characteristic of Hebrew poetry. One, and that the chief, characteristic of that poetry is such recurrence; but there are also characteristics in form as well as in thought. Of these it may be sufficient to mention the following:

1. There is a *verbal rhythm*, in which a harmony is found beyond what prose ordinarily presents; but as the true pronunciation of the Hebrew has long been lost, this quality can only be imperfectly appreciated.
2. There is a *correspondence of words*, i.e. the words in one verse, or member, answer to the words in another; for as the sense in the one echoes the sense in the other, so also form corresponds with form, and word with word. This correspondence in form will fully appear when we give instances (see below) of the parallelism in sentiment; meanwhile an idea of it may be formed from these specimens:

“Why art thou cast down, O my soul And why art thou disquieted in me?” (^{<19415>}Psalm 43:5).

“The memory of the just is a blessing; But the name of the wicked shall rot” (^{<21017>}Proverbs 10:7).

“He turneth rivers into a desert, And water-springs into dry ground” (^{<19473>}Psalm 107:33).

In the original this similarity in construction is more exact and more apparent. At the same time it is a free and not a strict correspondence that prevails; a correspondence to be caught and recognized by the ear in the general progress of the poem, or the general structure of a couplet or a triplet, but which is not of a nature to be exactly measured or set forth by such aids as counting with the fingers will afford.

3. *Inversion* holds a distinguished place in the structure of Hebrew poetry, as in that of every other; yet here again the remark already made holds good; it is only a modified inversion that prevails, by no means (in general) equaling that of the Greeks and Romans in boldness, decision, and prevalence. Every one will, however, recognize this inversion in the following instances, as distinguishing the passages from ordinary prose:

“Amid thought in visions of the night, When deep sleep falleth upon men, Fear and horror came upon me” (^{<18413>}Job 4:13).

“To me men gave ear and waited, To my words they made no reply” (^{<18221>}Job 29:21).

“For three transgressions of Damascus, And for four will I not turn away its punishment” (Amos 1:3).

“His grave was appointed with the wicked, And with the rich man was his sepulcher” (~~2389~~ Isaiah 53:9).

4. The chief characteristics, however, of Hebrew poetry are found in the peculiar form in which it gives utterance to its ideas. This form has received the name of “*parallelism*.” Ewald justly prefers the term “thought-rhythm,” since the rhythm, the music, the peculiar flow and harmony of the verse and of the poem, lie in the distribution of the sentiment in such a manner that the full import does not come out in less than a distich. The leading principle is that a simple verse or distich consists, both in regard to form and substance, of two corresponding members: this has been termed Hebrew rhythm, or *parallelismus membrorum*. Three kinds may be specified:

(1.) There is, first, the *synonymous parallelism*, which consists in this, that the two members express the same thought in different words, so that sometimes word answers to word; for example:

“What is man that thou art mindful of him, And the son of man that thou carest for him!” (~~1984~~ Psalm 8:4).

There is in some cases an inversion in the second line:

“The heavens relate the glory of God, And the work of his hands the firmament declares” (~~1962~~ Psalm 19:2).

“He maketh his messengers the winds, His ministers the flaming lightning” (~~1944~~ Psalm 104:4).

Very often the second member repeats only a part of the first:

“Woe to them that join house to house, That field to field unite” (~~2188~~ Isaiah 5:8).

Sometimes the verb which stands in the first member is omitted in the second:

“God, thy justice give the king, And thy righteousness to the king’s son” (~~1971~~ Psalm 72:1).

Or the verb may be in the second member:

“With the jawbone of an ass, heaps upon heaps, With the jawbone of an ass have I slain a thousand men” (~~07516~~ Judges 15:16).

The second member may contain an expansion of the first:

“Give to Jehovah, ye sons of God, Give to Jehovah glory and praise” (^{<1901>}Psalm 29:1).

Indeed the varieties are numerous, since the synonymous parallelism is very frequent.

(2.) The second kind is the *antithetic*, in which the first member is illustrated by some opposition of thought contained in the second. This less customary kind of parallelism is found mostly in the Proverbs:

“The full man treadeth the honey-comb under foot, To the hungry every bitter thing is sweet” (^{<1970>}Proverbs 27:7).

Under this head comes the following, with other similar examples:

“Day to day uttereth instruction, And night to night showeth knowledge” (^{<1902>}Psalm 19:2).

(3.) The third kind is denominated the *synthetic*: probably the term *epithetic* would be more appropriate, since the second member not being a mere echo of the first, subjoins something new to it, while the same structure of the verse is preserved; thus:

“He appointed the moon for seasons; The sun knoweth his going down” (^{<1949>}Psalm 104:19).

“The law of Jehovah is perfect, reviving the soul; The precepts of Jehovah are sure, instructing the simple” (^{<1907>}Psalm 19:7).

5. Intimately connected with the parallelistic structure is the *strophic arrangement* of Hebrew poetry. Usually the parallelism itself furnishes the basis of the versification. This correspondence in thought is not however, of universal occurrence. We find a merely rhythmical parallelism in which the thought is not repeated, but goes forward throughout the verse, which is divided midway into two halves or a distich:

“The word is not upon the tongue, Jehovah thou knowest it altogether” (^{<1934>}Psalm 138:4).

“Gird as a man thy loins, I will ask thee; inform thou me” (^{<1930>}Job 39:3).

Here poetry distinguishes itself from prose chiefly by the division into two short equal parts. This peculiarity of poetic diction is expressed by the word *rmz*; *to sing* (strictly *to play*), which properly denotes dividing the matter, and so speaking or singing in separated portions. Among the Arabians, who, however, have syllabic measure, each verse is divided into two hemistichs by a caesura in the middle. The simple two-membered rhythm- hitherto described prevails especially in the book of Job, the Proverbs, and a portion of the Psalms; but in the last, and still more in the Prophets, there are numerous verses with three, four, or yet more members. In verses consisting of three members (*tristicha*) sometimes all three are parallel:

“Happy the man who walketh not in the paths of the unrighteous,
Nor standeth in the way of sinners, Nor sitteth in the seat of
scoffers” (~~3000~~ Psalm 1:1).

Sometimes two of the members stand opposed to the third:

“To all the world goes forth their sound, To the end of the world
their words; For the sun he places a tabernacle in them” (~~1904~~ Psalm
19:4).

Verses of four members contain either two simple parallels:

“With righteousness shall he judge the poor, And decide with
equity for the afflicted of the people; He shall smite the earth with
the rod of his mouth; With the breath of his lips shall he slay the
wicked” (~~2104~~ Isaiah 11:4).

Or the first and third answer to each other; also the second and fourth:

“That smote the people in anger With a continual stroke; That
lorded it over the nations in wrath With unremitted oppression”
(~~2346~~ Isaiah 14:6).

If the members are more numerous or disproportionate (~~2311~~ Isaiah 11:11), or if the parallelism is important or irregular, the diction of poetry is lost and prose ensues; as is the case in ~~2301~~ Isaiah 5:1-6, and frequently in the later prophets, as Jeremiah and Ezekiel. The strophe, however, is frequently preserved in a quite extended form with several subdivisions, and the parallelism is often carried out in subordinate clauses; instances of

this are very common, especially in the book of Ecclesiastes. (See § 4, below.)

It is not to be supposed that each poem consists exclusively of one set of verse; for though this feature does present itself, yet frequently several kinds are found together in one composition, so as to give great ease, freedom, and capability to the style. We select the following beautiful specimen, because a chorus is introduced:

DAVID'S LAMENT OVER SAUL AND JONATHAN.

The Gazelle, O Israel, has been cut down on thy heights!

Chorus. How are the mighty fallen!

Tell it not in Gath, publish it not in the streets of Ascalon
Lest the daughters of the Philistines rejoice,
Lest the daughters of the uncircumcised exult.

Hills of Gilboa, no dew nor rain come upon you, devoted fields!
For there is stained the heroes' bow,
Saul's bow, never anointed with oil.

From the blood of the slain, from the fat of the mighty,
The how of Jonathan turned not back.
And the sword of Saul came not idly home.
Saul and Jonathan! lovely and pleasant in life!

And in death ye were not divided;
Swifter than eagles, stronger than lions!
Ye daughters of Israel! weep for Saul!

He clothed you delicately in purple,
He put ornaments of gold on your apparel.

Chorus. How are the mighty fallen in the midst of the battle!
Jonathan, slain in thy high places!

I am distressed for thee brother, brother Jonathan,
Very pleasant wast thou to me,
Wonderful was thy love, more than the love of woman.

Chorus. How are the mighty fallen,
And the weapons of war perished!

We have chosen this ode not only for its singular beauty, but also because it presents another quality of Hebrew poetry—the strophe. In this poem there are three strophes marked by the recurrence three times of the dirge sung by the chorus. The chorus appears to have consisted of three parts, corresponding with the parties more immediately addressed in the three several portions of the poem. The first choral song is sung by the entire body of singers, representing Israel; the second is sung by a chorus of maidens; the third, by first a chorus of youths in a soft and mournful strain, and then by all the choir in full and swelling chorus. But in order to the reader's fully understanding with what noble effect these "songs of Zion" came on the souls of their hearers, an accurate idea must be formed of the music of the Hebrews. See Music. Referring to the articles which bear on the subject, we merely remark that both music and dancing were connected with sacred song in its earliest manifestations, though it was only at a comparatively late period, when David and Solomon had given their master-powers to the grand performances of the Temple-service, that poetry came forth in all its excellence, and music lent its full aid to its solemn and sublime sentiments.

6. In Hebrew, as in other languages there is a peculiarity about the diction used in poetry—a kind of poetical dialect, characterized by archaic and irregular forms of words, abrupt constructions, and unusual inflections, which distinguish it from the contemporary prose or historical style. It is universally observed that archaic forms and usages of words linger in the poetry of a language after they have fallen out of ordinary use. A few of these forms and usages are here given from Gesenius's *Lehrgebäude*. The Piel and Hiphil voices are used intransitively (^{<3556>}Jeremiah 51:56; ^{<3607>}Ezekiel 10:7; ^{<3828>}Job 29:24): the apocopated future is used as a present (^{<3853>}Job 15:33; ^{<3906>}Psalms 11:6; ^{<3906>}Isaiah 42:6). The termination **tA**; is found for the ordinary feminine **hA**; (^{<0152>}Exodus 15:2; ^{<0422>}Genesis 49:22; ^{<4924>}Psalms 132:4); and for the plural **µyAæ** we have **ˆyAæ** (^{<3853>}Job 15:13; ^{<3558>}Ezekiel 26:18) and **yAi** (^{<3424>}Jeremiah 22:14; ^{<3008>}Amos 7:1). The verbal suffixes, **/m**, **/mA**; and **/mAæ** (^{<0159>}Exodus 15:9), and the pronominal suffixes to nouns, **/mA**; for **µ4A**, and **WhyAæ** for **wyA**; (^{<3580>}Habakkuk 3:10), are peculiar to the poetical books; as are **yhæ** (^{<3862>}Psalms 116:12), **/myAe** (^{<4837>}Deuteronomy 32:37; ^{<3907>}Psalms 11:7), and the more unusual forms, **hMhyAæ** (^{<3506>}Ezekiel 40:16), **hnhyAæ** (^{<3611>}Ezekiel 1:11), **hnkyAæ** (^{<3630>}Ezekiel 13:20). In poetical language also we find **/ml** ; for **/l** or **µhl** ; **/ml**] for

2ḏl , /mB]for B] /mK]for K] the plural forms of the prepositions, yl ̄ for l a, yd̄ for d [i yl ̄} and the peculiar forms of the nouns, yr̄hifor yr̄h yr̄hifor yr̄h, ḡm̄ for ḡm̄ and so on.

II. Existing Remains of Ancient Hebrew Poetry. — The poetry which is found in the Bible, rich and multifarious as it is, appears to be only a remnant of a still wider and fuller sphere of Shemitic literature. The New Testament is in fact comprised in our definition, for, besides scattered portions, which, under a prosaic form, convey a poetic thought, the entire book of the Apocalypse abounds in poetry. In no nation was the union of the requisites of which we have spoken above found in fuller measure than among the Hebrews. Theirs was eminently a poetic temperament; their earliest history was a heroic without ceasing to be a historic age, while the loftiest of all truths circulated in their souls, and glowed on and started from their lips. Hence their language, in its earliest stages, is surpassingly poetic. In one sense the Bible is full of poetry; for very much of its contents, which is merely prosaic in form, rises, by force of the noble sentiments which it enunciates, and the striking or splendid imagery with which these sentiments are adorned, into the sphere of real poetry. Independently of this poetic prose, there is in the Bible much writing which has all the ordinary characteristics of poetry. Even the unlearned reader can hardly fail to recognize at once the essence of poetry in various parts of the Bible. It is no slight attestation to the essentially poetic character of Hebrew poetry that its poetical qualities shine through the distorting coverings of a prose translation. Much of the Biblical poetry is, indeed, hidden from the ordinary reader by its prose accompaniments, standing, as it does, undistinguished in the midst of historical narrations.

It is a phenomenon which is universally observed in the literature of all nations, that the earliest form in which the thoughts and feelings of a people find utterance is the poetic. Prose is an after growth, the vehicle of less spontaneous, because more formal, expression. Snatches of poetry are discovered in the oldest prose compositions. Even in ^{Gen 4:23}Genesis 4:23 sq. are found a few lines of poetry, which Herder incorrectly terms “the song of the sword,” thinking it commemorative of the first formation of that weapon. To us it appears to be a fragment of a larger poem, uttered in lamentation for a homicide committed by Lamech, probably in self-defense. **SEE LAMECH.** Herder finds in this piece all the characteristics of Hebrew poetry. It is, he thinks, lyrical, has a proportion between its several lines,

and even assonance; in the original the first four lines terminate with the same letter, making a single or semi-rhyme.

Another poetic scrap is found in ^{<0208>}Exodus 32:18. Being told by Joshua, on occasion of descending from the mount, when the people had made the golden calf, and were tumultuously offering it their worship “The sound of war is in the camp;”

Moses said:

*“Not the sound of a shout for victory,
Nor the sound of a shout for falling;
The sound of a shout for rejoicing do I hear.”*

The correspondence in form in the original is here very exact and striking, so that it is difficult to deny that the piece is poetic. If so, are we to conclude that the temperament of the Israelites was so deeply poetic that Moses and Joshua should find the excitement of this occasion sufficient to strike improvisatore verses from their lips? Or have we here a quotation from some still older song, which occurred to the minds of the speakers by the force of resemblance? Other instances of scattered poetic pieces may be found in ^{<0214>}Numbers 21:14, 15; also ver. 18 and 27; in which passages evidence may be found that we are not in possession of the entire mass of Hebrew, or, at least, Shemitic literature. Further specimens of very early poetry are found in ^{<0237>}Numbers 23:7 sq., 18 sq.; 24:3, 15. The ordinary train of thought and feeling presented in Hebrew poetry is entirely of a moral or religious kind; but there are occasions when other topics are introduced. The entire Song of Solomon many regard as purely an erotic idol, and considered as such it possesses excellences of a very high description. In ^{<0103>}Amos 6:3 sq. may be seen a fine passage of satire in a denunciation of the luxurious and oppressive aristocracy of Israel. Subjects of a similar secular kind may *be* found treated, yet never without a moral or religious aim, in ^{<2013>}Isaiah 9:3; ^{<2510>}Jeremiah 25:10; 48:33; ^{<6822>}Revelation 18:22 sq. But, independently of the Song of Solomon, the most sensuous ode is perhaps the 45th Psalm, which Herder and Ewall consider an epithalamium. Further illustrations of this part of the subject appear under the next division.

The poetical character of the Revelation of John is evident to every attentive reader. Many parts are professedly songs, formal expressions of praise, triumph, or mourning. The language is not only highly figurative,

but it everywhere abounds with the most poetical images and modes of expression. Bishop Jebb has presented some of the songs in the form of Hebrew poetry; and Prof. Stuart has shown the metrical arrangement of a few other portions; he has also expressed his conviction that the form of poetry, as well as its spirit, prevails to a great extent throughout the work. The references to the Old Test. in this book are more numerous than in any other book of the New Test.; and they are not simple quotations, nor the transference of thought to a less poetic style of expression; but they are imitations, in general more poetic than the original. That they are presented in the form of Hebrew, and not of Grecian poetry, can occasion no surprise. No other poetry would accord, either with the habit of the apostle, or with the general character and design of the Bible. But this form of poetry would perfectly harmonize with both. The poetry of the Revelation of John appears to consist of the same description of parallelisms, with those intercalary lines and other irregularities which are found in the larger specimens of Hebrew poetry. The species of parallelism which most prevails is the synthetic or constructive; the others being obviously less suitable to the subject of the composition. There are, however, instances of every kind. Indeed, this book not only possesses the form and the spirit of Hebrew poetry, but it exhibits as much regularity in its parallelisms as any Hebrew poetry with which it can be justly compared. We give the following passages (Revelation 1, 1, 5, 6; 21:23):

*“The revelation of Jesus Christ,
Which God to him imparted,
To indicate unto his servants
What must come to pass ere long.*

*“To Him who loveth us, and washed us
From our sins in his own blood:
And constituted us a kingdom,
Priests unto God, even his Father,
To him be glory and dominion,
For ever and ever, Amen!*

*“And the city has no need of the sun
Nor of the moon to shine in it;
For the glory of God illumines it,
And the light thereof is the Lamb.”*

III. *Classification of Poetic Styles.* — According to the *Ancient Hebrew Designations*— These appear to have special, if not exclusive reference to

what is now known as *lyric* poetry. The terms are of two classes. *SEE PSALMS.*

a. General titles, referring apparently to the musical *form* or purpose of the compositions.

(1.) **ryvashir**, a song in general, adapted for the voice alone.

(2.) **r/mizmor**, *mizmor*, which Ewald considers a lyric song, properly so called, but which rather seems to correspond with the Greek **ψαλμός**, a psalm, or song to be sung with any instrumental accompaniment. *SEE PSALM.*

(3.) **hnygad**, *neginadh*, which Ewald is of opinion is equivalent to the Greek **ψαλμός**, is more probably a melody expressly adapted for stringed instruments.

(4.) **l ykani**, *maskil*, of which it may be said that if Ewald's suggestion be not correct, that it denotes a lyrical song requiring nice musical skill, it is difficult to give any more probable explanation. *SEE MASCHEL.*

(5.) **μTkan**, *niktaim*, a term of extremely doubtful meaning. *SEE MICHTAM.*

(6.) **ˆ/yvashiggayon** (~~1000~~ Psalm 7:1), a wild, irregular, dithyrambic song, as the word appears to denote; or, according to some, a song to be sung with variations. The former is the more probable meaning. The plural occurs in ~~3000~~ Habakkuk 3:1. *SEE SHIGGAION.*

b. But, besides these, there are other divisions of lyrical poetry of great importance, which have regard rather to the *subject* of the poems than to their form or adaptation for musical accompaniments. Of these we notice:

(1.) **hLhTj**, *tehillah*, a hymn of praise. The plural *tehillim* is the title of the book of Psalms in Hebrew. The 145th Psalm is entitled "David's (Psalm) of praise;" and the subject of the psalm is in accordance with its title, which is apparently suggested by the concluding verse, "The *praise* of Jehovah my mouth shall speak, and let all flesh bless his holy name for ever and ever." To this class belong the songs which relate to extraordinary deliverances, such as the songs of Moses (Exodus 15) and of Deborah (Judges 5), and the Psalms 18 and 68, which have all the air of chants to be sung in triumphal processions. Such were the hymns sung in the Temple-services,

and by a bold figure the Almighty is apostrophized as “Thou that inhabitest the *praises* of Israel,” which rose in the holy place with the fragrant clouds of incense (^{<4921>}Psalm 22:3). To the same class also Ewald refers the shorter poems of the like kind with those already quoted, such as Psalm 30, 32, 138, and Isaiah 38, which relate to less general occasions, and commemorate more special deliverances. The songs of victory sung by the congregation in the Temple, as Psalm 46, 48, 24:7-10, which is a short triumphal ode, and Psalm 29, which praises Jehovah on the occasion of a great natural phenomenon, are likewise all to be classed in this division of lyric poetry. *SEE HYMN.*

(2.) *hnyqakindh*, the lament, or dirge, of which there are many examples, whether uttered over an individual or as an outburst of grief for the calamities of the land. The most touchingly pathetic of all is perhaps the lament of David for the death of Saul and Jonathan (^{<3019>}2 Samuel 1:19-27), in which passionate emotion is blended with touches of tenderness of which only a strong nature is capable. Compare with this the lament for Abner (^{<1083>}2 Samuel 3:33, 34) and for Absalom (18:33). Of the same character also, doubtless, were the songs which the singing men and singing women spake over Josiah at his death (^{<4855>}2 Chronicles 35:25), and the songs of mourning for the disasters which befell the hapless land of Judah, of which Psalms 49, 60, 78, 137 are examples (comp. ^{<2472>}Jeremiah 7:29; 9:10 [9]) and the Lamentations of Jeremiah the most memorable instances. *SEE LAMENTATION.*

(3.) *trydþryvas* *shir yediddth*, a love-song (^{<1951>}Psalm 45:1), in its external form at least. *SEE CANTICLES.*

(4.) *hLpæ* *tephillah*, prayer, is the title of Psalm 17, 86, 90, 102, 142, and Habakkuk 3. All these are strictly lyrical compositions, and the title may have been assigned to them either as denoting the object with which they were written, or the use to which they were applied. As Ewald justly observes, all lyric poetry of an elevated kind, in so far as it reveals the soul of the poet in a pure swift outpouring of itself, is of the nature of a prayer; and hence the term “prayer” was applied to a collection of David’s songs, of which Psalm 72 formed the conclusion. *SEE PRAYER.*

Other kinds of poetry there are which occupy the middle ground between the lyric and gnomic, being lyric in form and spirit, but gnomic in subject. These may be classed as

(5.) **l vm**; *mashal*, properly a similitude, and then a parable, or sententious saying, couched in poetic language. Such are the songs of Balaam (^{<0237>}Numbers 23:7, 18; 24:3, 15, 20, 21, 23), which are eminently lyrical in character; the mocking ballad in ^{<0277>}Numbers 21:27-30, which has been conjectured to be a fragment of an old Amoritic war-song; and the apologue of Jotham (^{<0307>}Judges 9:7-20), both which last are strongly satirical in tone. But the finest of all is the magnificent prophetic song of triumph over the fall of Babylon (^{<2344>}Isaiah 14:4-27).

(6.) **hdyj**, *chidah*, an enigma (like the riddle of Samson, ^{<0744>}Judges 14:14), or “dark saying,” as the A.V. has it in ^{<3945>}Psalms 49:5; 78:2. The former passage illustrates the musical, and therefore lyrical character of these “dark sayings:” “I will incline mine ear to a parable, I will open my dark sayings upon the harp.” *Macshal* and *chidah* are used as convertible terms in ^{<3570>}Ezekiel 17:2.

(7.) Lastly, to this class belongs **hxy2a m]** *melitsah*, a mocking, ironical poem (^{<3316>}Habakkuk 2:6).

2. *The Masoretic Distribution.* — The Jewish grammarians have attached the poetic accentuation only to the three books of Psalms, Job, and Proverbs. There is no doubt that the Song of Solomon is also poetical; and with these the book of Ecclesiastes was anciently, as it is still usually, conjoined, though the form of composition is less decidedly poetical. To these five are to be added the Lamentations of Jeremiah, and the smaller pieces scattered over the historical and prophetic writings. Keeping these latter out of view, we may say that the Hebrew poetical books are six in number; and these six may be divided into two groups of three, according to the class of poetical composition to which each belongs, viz.

(1) Psalms, Song of Solomon, and Lamentations, which are predominantly *lyrical* in their character; and

(2) Proverbs, Job, and Ecclesiastes, which are predominantly *didactic*. In the former the leading aim of the poet is not to instruct, but to give free utterance to the feelings of his own heart; in the latter the instruction of others is the object that is principally aimed at; though neither is the lyrical element altogether excluded from the latter, nor the didactic from the former. Of the more sustained and elaborate epic and dramatic poetry which was alike alien to the character of the Hebrew mind, and also in a certain measure inconsistent with the purpose of the Hebrew writings as a

divine revelation we have no examples, though some have applied the term “dramatic” in a loose sense to the book of Job, and in a more strict sense to the Song of Solomon.

3. *Modern Terminology.* — For epic poetry the constituent elements do not appear to have existed during the classic period of the Hebrew muse, since epic poetry requires a heroic age an age, that is, of fabulous wonders, and falsely so-called divine interpositions. But among the Israelites the patriarchal, which might have been the heroic age, was an age of truth and reality; and it much raises the religious and historical value of the Biblical literature that neither the singular events of the age of the patriarchs, nor the wonderful events of the age of Moses, nor the confused and somewhat legendary events of the age of the Judges, ever degenerated into mythology, nor passed from the reality, which was their essence, into the noble fictions into which the imagination, if unchastened and unchecked by religion, might have wrought them; but they retained through all periods their own essential character of earnest, lofty, and impressive realities. At a later period, when the religion of Moses had, during the Babylonian captivity, been lowered by the corruptions of the religion of Zoroaster, and an entirely new world of thought introduced, based not on reality but fancy, emanating not from the pure light of heaven, but from the mingled lights and shadows of primitive tradition and human speculation -then there came into existence among the Jews the elements necessary for epic poetry; but the days were gone in which the mind of the nation had the requisite strength and culture to fashion them into a great, uniform, and noble structure; and if we can allow that the Hebrews possessed the rudimental outlines of the epic, we must seek for them not in the canonical, but in the apocryphal books; and while we deny with emphasis that the term Epos can be applied as some German critics have applied it, to the Pentateuch, we can find only in the book of Judith, and with rather more reason in that of Tobit, anything which approaches to epic poetry. Indeed fiction, which, if it is not the essence, enters for a very large share into both epic and dramatic poetry, was wholly alien from the genius of the Hebrew muse, whose high and noble function was not to invent, but to celebrate the goodness of God; not to indulge the fancy, but to express the deepest feelings of the soul; not to play with words and feign emotions, but to utter profound truth and commemorate real events, and pour forth living sentiments.

Of the three kinds of poetry which are illustrated by the Hebrew literature, the *lyric* occupies the foremost place, commencing, as we have seen, in the pre-Mosaic times, flourishing in rude vigor during the earlier periods of the Judges, the heroic age of the Hebrews, growing with the nation's growth and strengthening with its strength, till it reached its highest excellence in David, the warrior-poet, and thenceforth began slowly to decline. In this period art, though subordinate, was not neglected, as indeed is proved by the noble lyrics which have come down to us and in which the art is only relatively small and low—that is, the art is inconsiderable and secondary—merely because the topics are so august, the sentiments so grand, the religious impression so profound and sacred. At later periods, when the first fresh gushing of the muse had ceased, art in Hebrew, as is the case in all other poetry, began to claim a larger share of attention, and stands in the poems for a greater portion of their merit. Then the play of the imagination grew predominant over the spontaneous outpourings of the soul, and among other creations of the fancy alphabetical poems were produced, in which the matter is artistically distributed sometimes under two-and-twenty heads or divisions, corresponding with the number of the Hebrew letters.

Gnomic poetry is the product of a more advanced age than the lyric. It arises from the desire felt by the poet to express the results of the accumulated experiences of life in a form of beauty and permanence. Its thoughtful character requires for its development a time of peacefulness and leisure; for it gives expression, not like the lyric to the sudden and impassioned feelings of the moment, but to calm and philosophic reflection. Being less spontaneous in its origin, its form is of necessity more artificial. The gnomic poetry of the Hebrews has not its measured flow disturbed by the shock of arms or the tumult of camps; it rises silently, like the Temple of old, without the sound of a weapon, and its groundwork is the home life of the nation. The period during which it flourished corresponds to its domestic and settled character. From the time of David onwards through the reigns of the earlier kings, when the nation was quiet and at peace, or, if not at peace, at least so firmly fixed in its acquired territory that its wars were no struggle for existence, gnomic poetry blossomed and bore fruit. We meet with it at intervals up to the time of the Captivity, and, as it is chiefly characteristic of the age of the monarchy, Ewald has appropriately designated this sera the “artificial period” of Hebrew poetry. From the end of the 8th century B.C. the decline of the nation was rapid, and with its

glory departed the chief glories of its literature. The poems of this period are distinguished by a smoothness of diction and an external polish which betray tokens of labor and art; the style is less flowing and easy, and, except in rare instances, there is no dash of the ancient vigor. After the Captivity we have nothing but the poems which formed part of the liturgical services of the Temple.

Whether *dramatic* poetry, properly so called, ever existed among the Hebrews, is, to say the least, extremely doubtful. In the opinion of some writers the Song of Songs, in its external form, is a rude drama, designed for a simple stage. But the evidence for this view is extremely slight, and no good and sufficient reasons have been adduced which would lead us to conclude that the amount of dramatic action exhibited in that poem is more than would be involved in an animated poetic dialogue in which more than two persons take part. Philosophy and the drama appear alike to have been peculiar to the Indo-Germanic nations, and to have manifested themselves among the Shemitic tribes only in their crudest and most simple form.

Each of these forms of poetry, as they appear in the Bible, requires a more distinct notice separately.

(1.) *Lyrical Poetry.* — The literature of the Hebrews abounds with illustrations of all forms of lyrical poetry, in its most manifold and wide-embracing compass, from such short ejaculations as the songs of the two Lamechs, and Psalm 15, 117, and others, to the longer chants of victory and thanksgiving, like the songs of Deborah and David (Judges 5; Psalm 18). The thoroughly national character of all lyrical poetry has already been alluded to. It is the utterance of the people's life in all its varied phases, and expresses all its most earnest strivings and impulses. In proportion as this expression is vigorous and animated, the idea embodied in lyric song is in most cases narrowed or rather concentrated. One truth, and even one side of a truth, is for the time invested with the greatest prominence. All these characteristics will be found in perfection in the lyric poetry of the Hebrews. One other feature which distinguishes it is its form and its capacity for being set to musical accompaniment. The names by which the various kinds of song were known among the Hebrews will supply some illustration of this. (See above.)

(2.) *Gnomic Poetry.* — The second grand division of Hebrew poetry is occupied by a class of poems which are peculiarly Shemitic, and which represent the nearest approaches made by the people of that race to

anything like philosophic thought. Reasoning there is none: we have only results, and these rather the product of observation and reflection than of induction or argumentation. As lyric poetry is the expression of the poet's own feelings and impulses, so gnomic poetry is the form in which the desire of communicating knowledge to others finds vent. There might possibly be an intermediate stage in which the poets gave out their experiences for their own pleasure merely, and afterwards applied them to the instruction of others, but this could scarcely have been of long continuance. The impulse to teach makes the teacher, and the teacher must have an audience. It has already been remarked that gnomic poetry, as a whole, requires for its development a period of national tranquility. Its germs are the floating proverbs which pass current in the mouths of the people, and embody the experiences of many with the wit of one. From this small beginning it arises, at a time when the experience of the nation has become matured, and the mass of truths which are the result of such experience have passed into circulation. The fame of Solomon's wisdom was so great that no less than three thousand proverbs are attributed to him, this being the form in which the Hebrew mind found its most congenial utterance. The sayer of sententious sayings was to the Hebrews the wise man, the philosopher. Of the earlier isolated proverbs but few examples remain. One of the earliest occurs in the mouth of David, and in his time it was the proverb of the ancients, "From the wicked cometh wickedness" (¹⁰²¹³1 Samuel 24:13 [14]). Later on, when the fortunes of the nation were obscured, their experience was embodied in terms of sadness and despondency: "The days are prolonged, and every vision faileth," became a saying and a byword (²⁵¹²²Ezekiel 12:22); and the feeling that the people were suffering for the sins of their fathers took the form of a sentence, "The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge" (²⁵¹⁸²Ezekiel 18:2). Such were the models which the gnomic poet had before him for imitation. These detached sentences may fairly be assumed to be the earliest form, of which the fuller apophthegm is the expansion, swelling into sustained exhortations, and even dramatic dialogue. *SEE PROVERB.*

(3.) *Dramatic Poetry.* — The drama, in the sense in which the phrase is applicable to productions such as those of Euripides, Shakespeare, or Schiller, had no place in the literature of the Hebrews. This defect may be owing to a want of the requisite literary cultivation. Yet we are not willing to assign this as the cause, when we call to mind the high intellectual

culture which the Hebrews evinced in lyric and didactic poetry, out of which the drama seems naturally to spring. We rather look for the cause of this in the earnest nature of the Hebrews, and in the solemnity of the subjects with which they had to do in their literary productions. Nor is it any objection to this hypothesis that the drama of modern times had its birth in the religious mysteries of the Middle Ages, since those ages were only secondary in regard to religious truth, standing at a distance from the great realities which they believed and dramatized; whereas the objects of faith with the Israelites were held in all the fresh vividness of primitive facts and newly recognized truths. It is impossible, however, to assert that no form of the drama existed among the Hebrew people; the most that can be done is to examine such portions of their literature as have come down to us, for the purpose of ascertaining how far any traces of the drama proper are discernible, and what inferences may be made from them. It is unquestionably true, as Ewald observes, that the Arab reciters of romances will many times in their own persons act out a complete drama in recitation, changing their voice and gestures with the change of person and subject. Something of this kind may possibly have existed among the Hebrews; but there is no evidence that it did exist, nor any grounds for making even a probable conjecture with regard to it. A rude kind of farce is described by Mr. Lane (*Mod. Egypt*, 2, ch. 7), the players of which “are called *Mohabbazin*. These frequently perform at the festivals prior to weddings and circumcisions at the houses of the great; and sometimes attract rings of auditors and spectators in the public places in Cairo. Their performances are scarcely worthy of description: it is chiefly by vulgar gestures and indecent actions that they amuse and obtain applause. The actors are only men and boys, the part of a woman being always performed by a man or boy in female attire.” Then follows a description of one of these plays the plot of which was extremely simple. But the mere fact of the existence of these rude exhibitions among the Arabs and Egyptians of the present day is of no weight when the question to be decided is whether the Song of Songs was designed to be so represented, as a simple, pastoral drama. Of course, in considering such a question, reference is made only to the external form of the poem, and, in order to prove it, it must be shown that the dramatic is the only form of representation which it could assume, and not that, by the help of two actors and a chorus, it is capable of being exhibited in a dramatic form. All that has been done, in our opinion, is the latter. It is but fair, however, to give the views of those who hold the opposite. Ewald maintains that the Song of Songs is designed for

a simple stage, because it develops a complete action and admits of definite pauses in the action, which are only suited to the drama. He distinguishes it in this respect from the book of Job, which is dramatic in form only, though, as it is occupied with a sublime subject, he compares it with *tragedy*, while the Song of Songs, being taken from the common life of the nation, may be compared to *comedy*. But M. Renan, who is compelled, in accordance with his own theory of the mission of the Shemitic races, to admit that no trace of anything approaching to the regular drama is found among them, does not regard the Song of Songs as a drama in the same sense as the products of the Greek and Roman theatres, but as dramatic poetry in the widest application of the term, to designate any composition conducted in dialogue and corresponding to an action. The absence of the regular drama he attributes to the want of a complicated mythology, analogous to that possessed by the Indo-European peoples. Monotheism, the characteristic religious belief of the Shemitic races, stifled the growth of a mythology and checked the development of the drama. Be this as it may, dramatic representation appears to have been alien to the feelings of the Hebrews. At no period of their history before the age of Herod is there the least trace of a theatre at Jerusalem, whatever other foreign innovations may have been adopted; and the burst of indignation which the high-priest Jason incurred for attempting to establish a gymnasium and to introduce the Greek games is a significant symptom of the repugnance which the people felt for such spectacles. The same antipathy remains to the present day among the Arabs, and the attempts to introduce theatres at Beyrut and in Algeria have signally failed. But, says M. Renan, the Song of Songs is a dramatic poem there were no public performances in Palestine, therefore it must have been represented in private; and he is compelled to frame the following hypothesis concerning it: that it is a *libretto* intended to be completed by the play of the actors and by music, and represented in private families, probably at marriage-feasts, the representation being extended over the several days of the feast. The last supposition removes a difficulty which has been felt to be almost fatal to the idea that the poem is a continuously developed drama. Each act is complete in itself; there is no suspended interest, and the structure of the poem is obvious and natural if we regard each act as a separate drama intended for one of the days of the feast. We must look for a parallel to it in the Middle Ages, when, besides the mystery plays, there were scenic representations sufficiently developed.

SEE CANTICLES.

It is scarcely necessary after this to discuss the question whether the book of Job is a dramatic poem or not. Inasmuch as it represents all action and a progress, it is a drama as truly and really as any poem can be which develops the working of passion, and the alternations of faith, hope, distrust, triumphant confidence, and black despair, in the struggle which it depicts the human mind as engaged in, while attempting to solve one of the most intricate problems it can be called upon to regard, It is a drama as life is a drama, the most powerful of all tragedies; but that it is a dramatic poem, intended to be represented upon a stage, or capable of being so represented, may be confidently denied. *SEE JOB, BOOK OF.*

(4.) *Acrostics.* — It only remains to notice that there are twelve poems in which the letters beginning each verse or couplet or stanza are arranged in alphabetical order. These are seven Psalms (viz. Psalm 25, 34, 37, 111, 112, 119, 145), ~~2BIBD~~ Proverbs 31:10-31, and the first four chapters of the book of Lamentations. The device is a very simple one, and was probably adopted for the purpose of assisting the memory, and to make up for the want of a logical connection and progress in the thought. The more sublime poetry does not admit of being thus fettered. The Psalms in which we meet with it are all of a subdued and simple character, usually didactic. Yet even in these the alphabetical arrangement is seldom quite exact, usually one or two letters are omitted or repeated or transposed. In some of the alphabetic poems the strophical arrangement is marked more distinctly than in any other of the Hebrew poetical compositions; for example, in Psalm 119, which consists of twenty-two stanzas of eight lines each; and Lamentations 3, in which the stanza is of three lines. *SEE PSALMS, BOOK OF.*

IV. *History of the Treatments of Hebrew Poetry.* — In the 16th and 17th centuries the influence of classical studies upon the minds of the learned was so great as to imbue them with the belief that the writers of Greece and Rome were the models of all excellence; and consequently, when their learning and critical acumen were directed to the records of another literature, they were unable to divest themselves of the prejudices of early education and habits, and sought for the same excellences which they admired in their favorite models. That this has been the case with regard to most of the speculations on the poetry of the Hebrews, and that the failure of those speculations is mainly due to this cause, will be abundantly manifest to any one who is acquainted with the literature of the subject. But, however barren of results, the history of the various theories which

have been framed with regard to the external form of Hebrew poetry is a necessary part of the present article.

The form of Hebrew poetry is its distinguishing characteristic, and what this form is has been a vexed question for many ages. The ‘herapeutte, as described by Philo (*De Vita Contempl.* § 3, vol. 2, p. 475, ed. Mang.), sang hymns and psalms of thanksgiving to God, in divers measures and strains; and these were either new or ancient ones composed by the old poets, who had left behind them measures and melodies of trimeter verses, of processional songs, of hymns, of songs sung at the offering of libations or before the altar, and continuous choral songs, beautifully measured out in strophes of intricate character (§ 10, p. 484). The value of Philo’s testimony on this point may be estimated by another passage in his works, in which he claims for Moses a knowledge of numbers and geometry, the theory of rhythm, harmony, and meter, and the whole science of music, practical and theoretical (*De Vita Josis*, 1, 5, vol. 2, p. 84). The evidence of Josephus is as little to be relied upon. Both these writers labored to magnify the greatness of their own nation, and to show that in literature and philosophy the Greeks had been anticipated by the Hebrew barbarians. This idea pervades all their writings, and it must always be borne in mind as the keynote of their testimony on this as on other points. According to Josephus (*Ant.* 2, 16, 4), the Song of Moses at the Red Sea (Exodus 15) was composed in the hexameter measure (ἐν ἑξαμέτρῳ τόνῳ); and again (*Ant.* 4, 8, 44), the song in Deuteronomy 32 is described as a hexameter poem. The Psalms of David were in various meters, some trimeters and some pentaneters (*Ant.* 7, 12, 3). Eusebius (*De Praea. Evang.* 113, p. 514, ed. Col. 1688) characterizes the great Song of Moses and the 118th (119th) Psalm as metrical compositions in what the Greeks call the heroic meter. They are said to be hexameters of sixteen syllables. The other verse compositions of the Hebrews are said to be in trimeters. This saying of Eusebius is attacked by Julian (*Cyrrill. Contempl.* 7, 2), who on his part endeavored to prove the Hebrews devoid of all culture. Jerome (*Prim in Hiob*) appeals to Philo, Josephus, Origen, and Eusebius, for proof that the Psalter, the Lamentations of Jeremiah, and almost all the songs of Scripture, are composed in meter, like the odes of Horace, Pindar, Alcweus, and Sappho. Again, he says that the book of Job from 3:3 to 42:6 is in hexameters, with dactyls and spondees, and frequently, on account of the peculiarity of the Hebrew language, other feet which have not the same syllables but the same time. In *Epist. ad Patulam* (*Opp.* 2, 709, ed.

Martianay) occurs a passage which shows in some measure how far we are to understand literally the terms which Jerome has borrowed from the verse literature of Greece and Rome, and applied to the poetry of the Hebrews. The conclusion seems inevitable that these terms are employed simply to denote a general external resemblance, and by no means to indicate the existence among the poets of the Old Testament of a knowledge of the laws of meter, as we are accustomed to understand the term. There are, says Jerome, four alphabetical Psalms, the 110th (111th), 111th (112th), 118th (119th), and the 144th (145th). In the first two, one letter corresponds to each clause or versicle, which is written in trimeter iambics. The others are in tetrameter iambics, like the song in Deuteronomy. In Psalm 118 (119) eight verses follow each letter: in Psalm 144 (145) a letter corresponds to a verse. In Lamentations we have four alphabetical acrostics, the first two of which are written in a kind of Sapphic meter; for three clauses which are connected together and begin with one letter (i.e. in the first clause) close with a period in heroic measure (*Heroici comma*). The third is written in trimeter, and the verses in threes each begin with the same letter. The fourth is like the first and second. The Proverbs end with an alphabetical poem in tetrameter iambics, beginning, "A virtuous woman who can find?" In the *Praef. in Chron. Euseb.* Jerome compares the meters of the Psalms to those of Horace and Pindar, now running in iambics, now ringing with Alcaics, now swelling with Sapphics, now beginning with a half foot. What, he asks, is more beautiful than the song of Deuteronomy and Isaiah? 'What more weighty than Solomon? What more perfect than Job? All these, as Josephus and Origen testify, are composed in hexameters and pentameters. There can be little doubt that these terms are mere generalities, and express no more than a certain rough resemblance, so that the songs of Moses and Isaiah may be designated hexameters and pentameters with as much propriety as the first and second chapters of Lamentations may be compared to Sapphic odes. The resemblance of the Hebrew verse composition to the classic metres is expressly denied by Gregory of Nyssa (1 *Tract. in Psalm.* cap. 4). Augustine (*Ep.* 131 *ad Numerium*) confesses his ignorance of Hebrew, but adds that those skilled in the language believed the Psalms of David to be written in metre. Isidore of Seville (*Orig.* 1, 18) claims for the heroic meter the highest antiquity, inasmuch as the Song of Moses was composed in it, and the book of Job, who was contemporary with Moses, long before the times of Pherecydes and Homer, is written in dactyls and spondees. Joseph Scaliger (*Animadv. ad Eus. Chron.* p. 6 *b*, etc.) was one of the first to

point out the fallacy of Jerome's statement with regard to the meters of the Psalter and the Lamentations, and to assert that these books contained no verse bound by metrical laws, but that their language was merely prose, animated by a poetic spirit. He admitted the Song of Moses in Deuteronomy, the Proverbs, and Job to be the only books in which there was necessarily any trace of rhythm, and this rhythm he compares to that of two diameter iambs, sometimes of more, sometimes of fewer syllables, as the sense required. Gerhard Vossius (*Be Nat. et Const. Artis Poet.* lib. 1, c. 13, § 2) says that in Job and the Proverbs there is rhythm but no meter; that is, regard is had to the number of syllables, but not to their quantity. In the Psalms and Lamentations not even rhythm is observed.

But in spite of the opinions pronounced by these high authorities, there were still many who believed in the existence of a Hebrew meter, and in the possibility of recovering it. The theories proposed for this purpose were various. Gomarus, professor at Groningen (*Davidis Lyra*, Lugd. Bat. 1637), advocated both rhymes and meter; for the latter he laid down the following rules. The vowel alone, as it is long or short, determines the length of a syllable. *Sheva* forms no syllable. The periods or versicles of the Hebrew poems never contain less than a distich, or two verses, but in proportion as the periods are longer they contain more verses. The last syllable of a verse is indifferently long or short. This system, if system it may be called (for it is equally adapted for prose), was supported by many men of note; among others by the younger Buxtorf, Heinsius, L. de Dieu, Constantin l'Empereur, and Hottinger. On the other hand, it was vigorously attacked by L. Cappellus, Calovius, Danhauer, Pfeiffer, and Solomon van Til. Towards the close of the 17th century Marcus Meibomius announced to the world, with an amount of pompous assurance which is charming, that he had discovered the lost metrical system of the Hebrews. By the help of this mysterious secret, which he attributed to divine revelation, he proposed to restore not only the Psalms, but the whole Hebrew Scriptures, to their pristine condition, and thus confer upon the world a knowledge of Hebrew greater than any which had existed since the ages which preceded the Alexandrine translators. But Meibomius did not allow his enthusiasm to get the better of his prudence, and the condition on which this portentous secret was to be made public was that six thousand curious men should contribute £5 sterling apiece for a copy of his 'book, which was to be printed in two volumes folio. It is almost needless to add that his scheme fell to the ground. He published some

specimens of his restoration of ten Psalms and six entire chapters of the Old Test. in 1690. The glimpses which he gives of his grand secret are not such as would make us regret that the knowledge of it perished with him. The whole book of Psalms, he says, is written in distiches, except the first Psalm, which is in a different meter, and serves as all introduction to the rest. They were therefore intended to be sung, not by one priest, or by one chorus, but by two. Meibomius “was severely chastised by J. H. Mains, B. II. Gebhardus, and J.G. Zentgravius” (Jebb, *Sacr. Lit.* p. 11). In the last century the learned Francis Hare, bishop of Chichester, published an edition of the Hebrew Psalms, metrically divided, to which he prefixed a dissertation on the ancient poetry of the Hebrews (*Psalm. lib. in versiculos metriae divisuis*, etc., Lond. 1736). Bishop Hare maintained that in Hebrew poetry no regard was had to the quantity of syllables. He regarded *shivaus* as long vowels, and long vowels as short at his pleasure. The rules which he laid down are the following. In Hebrew poetry all the feet are disyllables, and no regard is had to the quantity of a syllable. Clauses consist of an equal or unequal number of syllables. If the number of syllables be equal, the verses are trochaic, if unequal, iambic. Periods for the most part consist of two verses, often three or four, sometimes more. Clauses of the same periods are of the same kind, that is, either iambic or trochaic, with very few exceptions. Trochaic clauses generally agree in the number of the feet, which are sometimes three, as in ^{394B}Psalm 94:1; 106:1, and this is the most frequent; sometimes five, as in ^{395B}Psalm 9:5. In iambic clauses the number of feet is sometimes the same, but they generally differ. Both kinds of verse are mixed in the same poem. In order to carry out these rules, they are supplemented by one which gives to the versifier the widest license. Words and verses are contracted or lengthened at will, by syncope, elision, etc. In addition to this, the bishop was under the necessity of maintaining that all grammarians had hitherto erred in laying down the rules of ordinary punctuation. His system, if it may be so called, carries its own refutation with it, but was considered by Lowth to be worthy a reply under the title of *Metrical Harmoniae Brevis Confutatio*, printed at the end of his *De Sacra Poes. Heb. Praelectiones*, etc.

Anton (*Conject. de Metro Heb. Ant.* Lips. 1770), admitting the meter to be regulated by the accents, endeavored to prove that in the Hebrew poems there was a highly artistic and regular system, like that of the Greeks and Romans, consisting of strophes, antistrophes, epodes, and the like; but his method is as arbitrary as Hare’s. The theory of Lautwein (*Versuch einer*

richtigen Theorie von der bibl. Verskunst, Tub. 1775) is an improvement upon those of his predecessors, inasmuch as he rejects the measurement of verse by long and short syllables, and marks the scansion by the tone accent. He assumes little more than a free rhythm: the verses are distinguished by a certain relation in their contents, and connected by a poetic euphony. Sir W. Jones (*Comment. Poes. Asiut.* 1774) attempted to apply the rules of Arabic meter to Hebrew. He regarded as a long syllable one which terminated in a consonant or quiescent letter (a, h, y); but he did not develop any system. The present Arabic prosody, however, is of comparatively modern invention; and it is not consistent with probability that there could be any system of versification among the Hebrews like that imagined by Sir W. Jones, when in the example he quotes of ~~צורב~~ Song of Solomon 1:5 he refers the first clause of the verse to the second, and the last to the fifteenth kind of Arabic meter. Greve (*Ultima Caopita Jobi*, etc., 1791) believed that in Hebrew, as in Arabic and Syriac, there was a metre, but that it was obscured by the false orthography of the Masorets. He therefore assumed for the Hebrew an Arabic vocalization, and with this modification he found iambic trimeters, dimeters, and tetrameters to be the most common forms of verse, and lays down the laws of versification accordingly. Bellermann (*Vetsuch über die Metrik der Hebräer*, 1813) was the last who attempted to set forth the old Hebrew meters. He adopted the Masoretic orthography and vocalization, and determined the quantity of syllables by the accentuation, and what he termed the Morensystem," denoting by *moren* the compass of a single syllable. Each syllable which has not the tone accent must have three *moren*; every syllable which has the tone accent may have either four or two, but generally three. The *moren* are reckoned as follows: a long vowel has two; a short vowel, one; every consonant, whether single or double, has one *more*. *Sheva* simple or composite is not reckoned. The quiescent letters have no *more*. *Dagesh forte* compensative has one; so has *metheg*. The majority of dissyllabic and trisyllabic words, having the accent on the last syllable, will thus form iambics and anapests. But as many have the accent on the penultimate, these will form trochees. The most common kinds of feet are iambics and anapests, interchanging with trochees and tribrachs. Of verses composed of these feet, though not uniform as regards the numbers of the feet, consist, according to Bellermann, the poems of the Hebrew Scriptures.

Among those who believed in the existence of a Hebrew meter, but in the impossibility of recovering it, were Carpzov, Lowth, Pfeiffer, Herder to a

certain extent, Jahn, Bauer, and Buxtorf. The opinions of Lowth, with regard to Hebrew meter, are summed up by Jebb (*Sacr. Lit.* p. 16) as follows: "He begins by asserting that certain of the Hebrew writings are not only animated with the true poetic spirit, but in some degree couched in poetic numbers; yet he allows that the quantity, the rhythm, or modulation of Hebrew poetry, not only is unknown, but admits of no investigation by human art or industry; he states, after Abarbanel, that the Jews themselves disclaim the very memory of metrical composition; he acknowledges that the artificial conformation of the sentences is the sole indication of meter in these poems; he barely maintains the *credibility* of attention having been paid to numbers or feet in their compositions; and at the same time he confesses the utter impossibility of determining whether Hebrew poetry was modulated by the ear alone, or according to any definite and settled rules of prosody." The opinions of Scaliger and Vossius have already been referred to. Vitranga allows to Isaiah a kind of oratorical measure, but adds that it could not on this account be rightly termed poetry. Michaelis (*Not. 4 in Prael.* 3), in his notes on Lowth, held that there never was meter in Hebrew, but only a free rhythm, as in recitative, though even less trammelled. He declared himself against the Masoretic distinction of long and short vowels, and made the rhythm to depend upon the tone syllable; adding, with regard to fixed and regular meter, that what has evaded such diligent search he thought had no existence. On the subject of the rhythmical character of Hebrew poetry, as opposed to metrical, the remarks of Jebb are remarkably appropriate. "Hebrew poetry," he says (*Sacr. Lit.* p. 20), "is universal poetry; the poetry of all languages, and of all peoples: the collocation of words (whatever may have been the sound, for of this we are quite ignorant) is primarily directed to secure the best possible announcement and discrimination of the sense: let, then, a translator only be literal, and, so far as the genius of his language will permit, let him preserve the original order of the words, and he will infallibly put the reader in possession of all, or nearly all, that the Hebrew text can give to the best Hebrew scholar of the present day. Now, had there originally been meter the case, it is presumed, could hardly have been such; somewhat must have been sacrificed to the importunities of metrical necessity; the sense could not invariably have predominated over the sound; and the poetry could not have been, as it unquestionably and emphatically is, a poetry, not of sounds or of words, but of things. Let not this last assertion, however, be misinterpreted: I would be understood merely to assert that sound, and words in subordination to sound, do not in

Hebrew, as in classical poetry, enter into the essence of the thing; but it is happily undeniable that the words of the poetical Scriptures are exquisitely fitted to convey the sense; and it is highly probable that, in the lifetime of the language, the sounds were sufficiently harmonious: when I say sufficiently harmonious, I mean so harmonious as to render the poetry grateful to the ear in recitation, and suitable to musical accompaniment; for which purpose the cadence of well-modulated prose would fully answer; a fact which will not be controverted by any person with a moderately good ear that has ever heard a chapter of Isaiah skillfully read from our authorized translation; that has ever listened to one of Kent's anthems well performed, or to a song from the *Messiah* of Handel."

Abarbanel (on Isaiah 5) makes three divisions of Hebrew poetry, including in the first the modern poems which, in imitation of the Arabic, are constructed according to modern principles of versification. Among the second class he arranges such as have no meter, but are adapted to melodies. In these occur the poetical forms of words, lengthened and abbreviated, and the like. To this class belong the songs of Moses in Exodus 15, Deuteronomy 32, the song of Deborah, and the song of David. The third class includes those compositions which are distinguished not by their form, but by the figurative character of their descriptions, as the Song of Songs, and the song of Isaiah.

Among those who maintain the absence of any regularity perceptible to the ear in the composition of Hebrew poetry may be mentioned Richard Simon (*Hist. Lit. du V. T.* 1, c. 8, p. 57), Wasmuth (*Inst. Acc. Hebr.* p. 14), Alstedius (*Enc. Bibl.* c. 27, p. 257), the author of the book *Cozri*, and R. Azariah de Rossi, in his book entitled *Meor Enayim*. The author of the book *Cozri* held that the Hebrews had no meter bound by the laws of diction, because their poetry, being intended to be sung, was independent of metrical laws. 1. Azariah expresses his approbation of the opinions of Cozri and Abarbanel, who deny the existence of songs in Scripture composed after the manner of modern Hebrew poems, but he adds, nevertheless, that beyond doubt there are other measures which depend upon the sense. Mendelssohn (on Exodus 15) also rejects the system of **tr[wntw tydty]** (literally, pegs and vowels). R. Azariah appears to have anticipated bishop Lowth in his theory of parallelism: at any rate his treatise contains the germ which Lowth developed and may be considered, as Jebb calls it, the technical basis of his system. But it also contains other elements, which will be alluded to hereafter. His conclusion, in Lowth's

words (*Isaiah*, prel. diss.), was as follows: “That the sacred songs have undoubtedly certain measures and proportions; which, however, do not consist in the number of syllables, perfect or imperfect, according to the form of the modern verse which the Jews make use of, and which is borrowed from the Arabians (though the Arabic prosody, he observes, is too complicated to be applied to the Hebrew language); but in the number of things, and of the parts of things that is, the subject and the predicate and their adjuncts, in every sentence and proposition. Thus a phrase containing two parts of a proposition consists of two measures; add another containing two more, and they become four measures; another again, containing three parts of a proposition, consists of three measures; add to it another of the like, and you have six measures.” The following example will serve for an illustration:

Thy-right-hand, O-Jehovah, is-glorious in-power, Thy-right-hand, O-Jehovah, hath-crushed the enemy. The words connected by hyphens form terms, and the two lines, forming four measures each, may be called tetrameters. “Upon the whole, the author concludes that the poetical parts of the Hebrew Scriptures are not composed according to the rules and measures of certain feet, dissyllables trisyllables, or the like, as the poems of the modern Jews are; but nevertheless have undoubtedly other measures which depend on things, as above explained. For this reason they are more excellent than those which consist of certain feet, according to the number and quantity of syllables. Of this, he says, you may judge yourself in the Songs of the Prophets. For do you not see, if you translate some of them into another language, that they still keep and retain their measure, if not wholly, at least in part? which cannot be the case in those verses the measures of which arise from a certain quantity and number of syllables.” Lowth expresses his general agreement with R. Azariah’s exposition of the rhythmus of things; but instead of regarding terms or phrases or senses in single lines, as measures, he considered “only that relation and proportion of one verse to another which arises from the correspondence of terms, and from the form of construction; from whence results a rhythmus of propositions, and a harmony of sentences.” But Lowth’s system of parallelism was more completely anticipated by Schöttgen in a treatise, of the existence of which the bishop does not appear to have been aware. It is found in his *Horae Hebraicae*, 1, 1249-1263, diss. 6 “de Exergasia Sacra.” This *exergasia* he defines to be the conjunction of entire sentences signifying the same thing; so that *exergasia* bears the same relation to

sentences that synonymy does to words. It is only found in those Hebrew writings which rise above the level of historical narrative and the ordinary kind of speech. Ten canons are then laid down each illustrated by three examples, from which it will be seen how far Schöttgen's system corresponded with Lowth's.

- (1.) Perfect *exergasia* is when the members of the two clauses correspond, each to each, as in ^{<1837>}Psalm 33:7; ^{<1847>}Numbers 24:17; ^{<1847>}Luke 1:47.
- (2.) Sometimes in the second clause the subject is omitted, as in ^{<2018>}Isaiah 1:18; ^{<1079>}Proverbs 7:19; ^{<1898>}Psalm 129:3.
- (3.) Sometimes part of the subject is omitted, as in ^{<1870>}Psalm 37:30; 102:28; ^{<2515>}Isaiah 53:5.
- (4.) The predicate is sometimes omitted in the second clause as in ^{<1845>}Numbers 24:5; ^{<1832>}Psalm 33:12; 123:6.
- (5.) Sometimes part only of the predicate is omitted, as in ^{<1879>}Psalm 57:9; 103:1; 129:7.
- (6.) Words are added in one member which are omitted in the other, as in ^{<1838>}Numbers 23:18; ^{<1942>}Psalm 102:29; ^{<2713>}Daniel 12:3.
- (7.) Sometimes two propositions will occur, treating of different things, but referring to one general proposition, as in ^{<1949>}Psalm 94:9; 128:3; Wisd. 3:16.
- (8.) Cases occur, in which the second proposition is the contrary of the first, as in ^{<1858>}Proverbs 15:8; 14:1, 11.
- (9.) Entire propositions answer each to each, although the subject and predicate are not the same, as in ^{<1807>}Psalm 51:7; 119:168; ^{<1822>}Jeremiah 8:22.
- (10.) *Exerasia* is found with three members, as in ^{<1808>}Psalm 1:1; 130:5; 3:9. These canons Schöttgen applied to the interpretation of Scripture, of which he gives examples in the remainder of that and the following Dissertation.

But whatever may have been achieved by his predecessors, there can be no question that the delivery of Lowth's lectures on Hebrew poetry, and the subsequent publication of his translation of Isaiah, formed an era in the literature of the subject more marked than any that had preceded it. Of his system we have already given (§ 1) a somewhat detailed account, which

we here slightly expand; for whatever may have been done since his time, and whatever modifications of his arrangement may have been introduced, all subsequent writers have confessed their obligations to the two works above mentioned, and have drawn their inspiration from them. Starting with the alphabetical poems as the basis of his investigation, because in them the verses or stanzas were more distinctly marked, Lowth came to the conclusion that they consist of verses properly so called, “of verses regulated by some observation of harmony or cadence; of measure, numbers, or rhythm,” and that this harmony does not arise from rhyme, but from what he denominates parallelism. Parallelism he defines to be the correspondence of one verse or line with another; and divides it into three classes synonymous, antithetic, and synthetic.

(a.) Parallel lines *synonymous* correspond to each other by expressing the same sense in different but equivalent terms, as in the following examples, which are only two of the many given by Lowth:

“O-Jehovah, in-thy-strength the-king shall-rejoice; And-in-thy-salvation how greatly shall-he-exult! The-desire of-his-heart thou-hast-granted unto-him; And-the-request of-his-lips thou-hast-not denied” (^{<320>}Psalm 21:1, 2).

“For the-moth shall-consume-them like-a-garment: And-the-worm shall-eat-them like wool: But-my-righteousness shall-endure forever; And-my-salvation to-the-age of-ages” (^{<280>}Isaiah 51:7, 8).

It will be observed from the examples which Lowth gives that the parallel lines sometimes consist of three or more synonymous terms, sometimes of two, sometimes only of one. Sometimes the lines consist each of a double member, or two propositions, as ^{<345>}Psalm 144:5, 6; ^{<270>}Isaiah 65:21, 22. Parallels are formed also by a repetition of part of the first sentence (^{<370>}Psalm 77:1, 11, 16; ^{<235>}Isaiah 26:5, 6; ^{<260>}Hosea 6:4); and sometimes a part has to be supplied from the former to complete the sentence (^{<1024>}2 Samuel 22:41; ^{<285>}Job 26:5; ^{<2428>}Isaiah 41:28). Parallel triplets occur in ^{<804>}Job 3:4, 6, 9; ^{<320>}Psalm 112:10; ^{<230>}Isaiah 9:20; ^{<2083>}Joel 3:13. Examples of parallels of four lines, in which two distiches form one stanza, are ^{<370>}Psalm 37:1, 2; ^{<2008>}Isaiah 1:3; 49:4; ^{<3002>}Amos 1:2. In periods of five lines the odd line sometimes comes in between two distiches, as in ^{<805>}Job 8:5, 6; ^{<247>}Isaiah 46:7; ^{<2840>}Hosea 14:9; ^{<2086>}Joel 3:16; or after two distiches closes the stanza, as in ^{<2426>}Isaiah 44:26. Alternate parallelism in stanzas of four lines is found in ^{<3431>}Psalm 103:11, 12; ^{<2306>}Isaiah 30:16; but the most

striking examples of the alternate quatrain are ^{<1525>}Deuteronomy 32:25, 42, the first line forming a continuous sense with the third, and the second with the fourth (comp. ^{<2316>}Isaiah 34:6; ^{<0406>}Genesis 49:6). In ^{<2300>}Isaiah 50:10 we find an alternate quatrain followed by a fifth line. To this first division of Lowth's Jebb objects that the name *synonymous* is inappropriate, for the second clause, with few exceptions, "*diversifies* the preceding clause, and generally so as to rise above it, forming a sort of climax in the sense." This peculiarity was recognized by Lowth himself in his 4th Prolection, where he says, "idem iterant, variant, augent," thus marking a cumulative force in this kind of parallelism. The same was observed by Apb. Newcome in his Preface to Ezekiel, where examples are given in which "the following clauses so diversify the preceding ones as to rise above them" (^{<2307>}Isaiah 42:7; 43:16; ^{<0932>}Psalms 95:2; 104:1). Jebb, in support of his own opinion, appeals to the passages quoted by Lowth (^{<1212>}Psalms 21:12; 107:38; ^{<2306>}Isaiah 4:6, 7), and suggests as a more appropriate name for parallelism of this kind, *cognate parallelism* (*Sacr. Lit.* p. 38).

(b.) Lowth's second division is *antithetic parallelism*; when two lines correspond with each other by an opposition of terms and sentiments; when the second is contrasted with the first, sometimes in expressions, sometimes in sense only, so that the degrees of antithesis are various. As for example:

'A wise son rejoiceth his father; But a foolish son is the grief of his mother'" (^{<1006>}Proverbs 10:1).

"The memory of the just is a blessing; But the name of the wicked shall rot" (^{<1007>}Proverbs 10:7).

The gnomic poetry of the Hebrews abounds with illustrations of antithetic parallelism. Other examples are ^{<1207>}Psalms 20:7, 8:

'These in chariots, and those in horses; But we in the name of Jehovah our God will be strong. They are bowed down, and fallen; But we are risen, and maintain ourselves firm.'

Comp. also ^{<1305>}Psalms 30:5; 37:10, 11; ^{<2540>}Isaiah 54:10; 9, 10. On these two kinds of parallelism Jebb appropriately remarks: "The *antithetic parallelism* serves to mark the broad distinctions between truth and falsehood, and good and evil: the *cognate parallelism* discharges the more difficult and more critical function of discriminating between different

degrees of truth and good on the one hand, of falsehood and evil on the other” (*Sacr. Lit.* p. 39).

(c.) *Synthetic or constructive parallelism*, where the parallel “consists only in the similar form of construction; in which word does not answer to word and sentence to sentence, as equivalent or opposite; but there is a correspondence and equality between different propositions, in respect of the shape and turn of the whole sentence, and of the constructive parts such as noun answering to noun, verb to verb, member to member, negative to negative, interrogative to interrogative.” One of the examples of constructive parallels given by Lowth is Isaiah 1, 5, 6:

“The Lord Jehovah hath opened mine ear, And I was not rebellious;
Neither did I withdraw myself backward I gave my back to the
smiters, And my cheeks to them that plucked off the hair; My face I
hid not from shame and spitting.”

Jebb gives as an illustration ~~19107~~ Psalm 19:7-10:

“The law of Jehovah is perfect, converting the soul, The testimony
of Jehovah is sure, making wise the simple,” etc.

It is instructive, as showing how difficult, if not impossible, it is to make any strict classification of Hebrew poetry, to observe that this very passage is given by Gesenius as an example of synonymous parallelism, while De Wette calls it synthetic. The illustration of synthetic parallelism quoted by Gesenius is ~~19274~~ Psalm 27:4:

“One thing I ask from Jehovah. It will I seek after My dwelling in
the house of Jehovah all the days of my life, To behold the beauty
of Jehovah, And to inquire in his temple.”

In this kind of parallelism, as Nordheimer (*Gram. Anal.* p. 87) observes, “an idea is neither repeated nor followed by its opposite, but is kept in view by the writer, while he proceeds to develop and enforce his meaning by accessory ideas and modifications.”

(d.) To the three kinds of parallelism above described Jebb adds a fourth, which seems rather to be an unnecessary refinement upon than distinct from the others. He denominates it *introverted parallelism*, in which he says, “there are stanzas so constructed that, whatever be the number of lines, the first line shall be parallel with the last; the second with the

penultimate; and so throughout in an order that looks inward, or, to borrow a military phrase, from flanks to center” (*Sacr. Lit.* p. 53). Thus:

“My son, if thine heart be wise, My heart also shall rejoice; Yea, my reins shall rejoice When thy lips speak light things” (^{<3135>}Proverbs 23:15, 16).

“*Unto* Thee do I lift up mine eyes,—O Thou that dwellest in the heavens; Behold as the eyes of servants to the hand of their masters; As the eyes of a maiden to the hands of her mistress: Even so look our eyes to Jehovah our God, until he have mercy upon us” (^{<4331>}Psalms 123:1, 2).

Upon examining these and the other examples quoted by bishop Jebb in support of his new division, to which he attaches great importance, it will be seen that the peculiarity consists in the structure of the stanza, and not in the nature of the parallelism; and any one who reads Ewald’s elaborate treatise on this part of the subject will rise from the reading with the conviction that to attempt to classify Hebrew poetry according to the character of the stanzas employed will be labor lost and in vain, resulting only in a system which is no system, and in rules to which the exceptions are more numerous than the examples.

A few words may now be added with respect to the classification proposed by De Wette, in which more regard was had to the rhythm. The four kinds of parallelism are:

1. That which consists in an equal number of words in each member, as in ^{<1023>}Genesis 4:23. This he calls the original and perfect kind of parallelism of members, which corresponds with meter and rhyme, without being identical with them (*Iie Psalmen, Einl.* § 7). Under this head are many minor divisions.

2. Unequal parallelism, in which the number of words in the members is not the same. This again is divided into

a. The simple, as ^{<4633>}Psalms 68:33.

b. The composite, consisting of the synonymous (^{<4800>}Job 10:1; ^{<4907>}Psalms 36:7), the antithetic (^{<2350>}Isaiah 15:4), and the synthetic (^{<2315>}Isaiah 15:5).

c. That in which the simple member is disproportionately small (^{<2300>}Isaiah 40:10).

d. Where the composite member grows up into three or more sentences (^{<2300>}Isaiah 1:3; 65:10).

e. Instead of the close parallelism there sometimes occurs a short additional clause, as in ^{<323>}Psalms 23:3.

3. Out of the parallelism, which is unequal in consequence of the composite character of one member, another is developed, so that both members are composite (^{<3811>}Psalms 31:11). This kind of parallelism again admits of three subdivisions.

4. Rhythmical parallelism, which lies merely in the external form of the diction. Thus in ^{<3911>}Psalms 19:11 there is nearly an equal number of words:

“Moreover by them was thy servant warned, In keeping of them there is great reward.”

In ^{<3811>}Psalms 30:3 the inequality is remarkable. In ^{<3947>}Psalms 14:7 is found a double and a single member, and in ^{<3812>}Psalms 31:23 two double members. De Wette also held that there were in Hebrew poetry the beginnings of a composite rhythmical structure like our strophes. Thus in Psalms 42, 43, a refrain marks the conclusion of a larger rhythmical period. Something similar is observable in Psalm 107. This artificial structure appears to belong to a late period of Hebrew literature, and to the same period may probably be assigned the remarkable gradational rhythm which appears in the Songs of Degrees, e.g. Psalm 121. It must be observed that this gradational rhythm is very different from the cumulative parallelism of the Song of Deborah, which is of a much earlier date, and bears traces of less effort in the composition. Strophes of a certain kind are found in the alphabetical pieces in which several Masoretic clauses belong to one letter (Psalm 9, 10, 37, 119; Lamentations 3); but the nearest approach to anything like a strophical character is found in poems which are divided into smaller portions by a refrain, and have the initial or final verse the same or similar (Psalm 39, 42, 43). In the opinion of some the occurrence of the word *Selah* is supposed to mark the divisions of the strophes.

It is impossible here to do more than refer to the essay of Kister (*Theol. Stud. und Krit.* 1831, p. 40-114) on the strophes, or the parallelism of verses in Hebrew poetry, in which he endeavors to show that the verses are

subject to the same laws of symmetry as the verse-members, and that consequently Hebrew poetry is essentially strophical in character. Ewald's treatise requires more careful consideration; but it must be read itself, and a slight sketch only can here be given. Briefly thus: Verses are divide(d into verse-members in which the number of syllables is less restricted, as there is no syllable meter. A verse-member generally contains from seven to eight syllables. Two members, the rise and fall, are the fundamental constituents. Thus (^{<ORR>}Judges 5:3):

“Hear, ye kings! give ear, ye princes! I to Jehovah, I will sing.”

To this all other modifications must be capable of being reduced. The variations which may take place may be either amplifications or continuations of the rhythm, or compositions in which a complete rhythm is made the half of a new compound, or we may have a diminution or enfeeblement of the original. To the two members correspond two thoughts which constitute the life of the verse, and each of these again may distribute itself. Gradations of symmetry are formed,

1. By the echo of the whole sentence, where the same sense which is given in the first member rises again in the second, in order to exhaust itself more thoroughly (^{<ORR>}Genesis 4:23; ^{<ORR>}Proverbs 1:8). An important word of the first member often reserves its force for the second, as in ^{<ORR>}Psalms 20:8; and sometimes in the second member a principal part of the sense of the first is further developed, as ^{<ORR>}Psalms 49:5-6.

2. When the thought trails through two members of a verse, as in ^{<ORR>}Psalms 110:5, it gives rise to a less animated rhythm (comp. also 141:10).

3. Two sentences may be brought together as protasis and apodosis, or simply to form one complex thought; the external harmony may be dispensed with, but the harmony of thought remains. This may be called the intermediate rhythm. The forms of structure assumed by the verse are many.

(1.) There is the single member, which occurs at the commencement of a series in ^{<ORR>}Psalms 18:2; 23:1; at the end of a series in ^{<ORR>}Exodus 15:18; ^{<ORR>}Psalms 92:9; and in the middle, after a short pause, in ^{<ORR>}Psalms 29:7.

(2.) The bimembral verse is most frequently found, consisting of two members of nearly equal weight.

(3.) Verses of more than two members are formed either by increasing the number of members from two to three, so that the complete fall may be reserved for the third, all three possessing the same power; or by combining four members two and two, as in ~~Psalm~~ Psalm 18:7; 28:1.

The varieties of this structure of verse are too numerous to be recounted, and the laws of rhythm in Hebrew poetry are so free that of necessity the varieties of verse-structure must be manifold. The gnomic or sententious rhythm, Ewald remarks, is the one which is perfectly symmetrical. Two members of seven or eight syllables, corresponding to each other as rise and fall, contain a thesis and antithesis, a subject and its image. This is the constant form of genuine gnomic sentences of the best period. Those of a later date have many members or trail themselves through many verses. The animation of the lyrical rhythm makes it break through all such restraints, and leads to an amplification or reduplication of the normal form; or the passionate rapidity of the thoughts may disturb the simple concord of the members, so that the unequal structure of verse intrudes with all its varieties. To show how impossible it is to attempt a classification of verse uttered under such circumstances, it will be only necessary to quote Ewald's own words: "All these varieties of rhythm, however, exert a perfectly free influence upon every lyrical song, just according as it suits the mood of the moment to vary the simple rhythm. The most beautiful songs of the flourishing period of poetry allow, in fact, the verse of many members to predominate whenever the diction rises with any sublimity; nevertheless, the standard rhythm still returns in each when the diction flags, and the different kinds of the more complex rhythm are employed with equal freedom and ease of variation, just as they severally accord with the fluctuating hues of the mood of emotion and of the sense of the diction. The late alphabetical songs are the first in which the fixed choice of a particular versification—a choice, too, made with designed art—establishes itself firmly, and maintains itself symmetrically throughout all the verses" (*Dichter d. Aiten Bundes*, 1, 83; transl. in Kitto's *Journal*, 1, 318). It may, however, be generally observed that the older rhythms are the most animated, as if accompanied by the hands and feet of the singer (Numbers 21; Exodus 15; Judges 5), and that in the time of David the rhythm had attained its most perfect development. By the end of the 8th century B.C. the decay of versification begins, and to this period belong the artificial forms of verse.

It remains now only to notice the rules of Hebrew poetry as laid down by the Jewish grammarians, to which reference was made in remarking upon the system of R. Azariah. They have the merit of being extremely simple, and are to be found at length, illustrated by many examples, in Mason and Bernard's *Heb. Gram.* (vol. 2, No. 57), and accompanied by an interesting account of modern Hebrew versification. The rules are briefly these:

1. That a sentence may be divided into members, some of which contain *two, three, or even four* words, and are accordingly termed *binary, ternary, and quaternary* members respectively.
2. The sentences are composed either of *binary, ternary, or quaternary* members entirely, or of these different members intermixed.
3. That in two consecutive members it is an elegance to express the same idea in different words.
4. That a word expressed in either of these parallel members is often not expressed in the alternate member.
5. That a word without an accent, being joined to another word by *Makkeph*, is generally (though not always) reckoned with that second word as one. It will be seen that these rules are essentially the same with those of Lowth, De Wette, and other writers on parallelism, and from their simplicity are less open to objection than any others that have been given.

In conclusion, after reviewing the various theories which have been framed with regard to the structure of Hebrew poetry, it must be confessed that beyond the discovery of very broad general laws, little has been done towards elaborating a satisfactory system. Probably this want of success is due to the fact that there is no system to discover, and that Hebrew poetry, while possessed in the highest degree of all sweetness and variety of rhythm and melody, is not fettered by laws of versification as we understand the term. Some advance towards an elucidation of the metrical structure of the poetical books, and especially in their strophic arrangement, has been made by Delitzsch in his *Commentaries*; but the whole subject admits of a more careful and minute adjustment of the clauses and phrases than has yet been achieved.

Modern Hebrew poetry, although tolerably copious, is altogether cast in the mould of the poems of the several European nations among whom the Jews are scattered, and is therefore stiffly artificial, generally with rhyme,

etc. It is of little value theologically. A very fair collection of specimens may be seen in Martinet's *Hebräische Chrestomathie* (Bamberg, 1837).

V. Literature. — England has the credit of opening a new path in this branch by the above-noticed publication of bishop Lowth's elegant and learned *Praelectiones de Sacra Poesi Hebraeorum* (Oxon. 1753, which may be found also in Ugolini *Thesaur.* vol. 31; the editions having Michaelis's *Notae et Epimetra* are to be preferred; that of Oxon. 1810, is good: the work was translated into English by Gregory). On the didactic poetry of the Hebrews the reader may consult Umbreit. *Sprüche Sal. Einleitung*; Rhode, *De Vet. Poetar. Sapientia Gnom. Hebraeor. imp. et Graecorum.* (Havn. 1800); Unger, *De Parabol. Jesu natura*, etc. (Leipz. 1828). Le Clerc, in his *Biblioth. Univers.* 9, 226 sq., has given what is worth attention; see also *Hist. abregée de la Poesie chez les Hebr.* in the "History of the Academy of Inscriptions," 23, 92 sq. But the work which has, next to that of Lowth, exerted the greatest influence, is a posthumous and unfinished piece of the celebrated Herder, who has treated the subject with extraordinary eloquence and learning, *Vom Geist der Ebrdischen Poesie* (1782, to be found in his collected writings; also Tübing. 1805, and Carlsruhe, 1826); see also Gügler, *Die Heilkunst der Hebräer* (Landshut, 1814); and Guttenstein, *Die poet. Literat. d. alten Israelit.* (Mannh. 1835). The subject of metre has been skillfully handled by Bellermann, *Versuch über d. Metrik der Hebräer* (Berl. 1813). Much useful information may be found in De Wette's *Einleitung id. A. Test.* (ibid. 1840; translated into English by Theodore Parker, Boston, 1843). In Wellbeloved's Bible translations of the poetical portions may be found, in which regard is paid to rhythm and poetical form; a very valuable guide in Hebrew poetry, both for form and substance, may be found in Noyes's *Translation of Job* (Cambridge, 1827); of the *Psalms* (Boston, 1831); and of the *Prophets* (ibid. 1833); but the best, fullest, and most satisfactory work on the subject is by Ewald, *Die poet. Bücher des Alten Bundes* (Göttingen, 1835-9, 4 vols. 8vo). See also *Critica Biblica*, 1, 111 sq.; Carpzov, *Introd. ad Libr. Can. Bibl.* pt. 2, c. 1; Schramm, *De Poesi Hebräer.* (Helmst. 1723); Jebb, *Sacred Literature*; Saalschütz, *Von der Form, der Hebr. Poesie* (Kinigsberg, 1825, which contains the most complete account of all the various theories); Nicolas, *Herme de la Poesie Hebraique* (Paris, 1833); Sarchi, *Heb. Poetry, Ancient and Modern* (Lond. 1824); Wenrich, *De Poesice Heb. et Arab. indole* (Leipz. 1843); Meier, *Gesch. der poet. National - Literatur der Hebräer* (Leipz. 1853); the commentaries of De

Wette, Delitzsch, and Hupfeld on the Psalms; and the works enumerated in Danz, *Universal-Theol. Wörterbuch*, p. 215 sq.; in Darling, *Cyclopedia Bibliographia* (Holy Scriptures), col. 28 sq.; and in Schaff's essay on the *Poetical Books of the O.T.*, prefixed to the Am. ed. of Lange's *Commentary on Job*, p. 7.

Poetry, Hebrew (Post-Biblical).

In speaking of post-Biblical poetry, we mean those poetical productions which have come down to us from the so-called *Sopherite Age*, i.e. from about B.C. 500 to A.D. 70. Productions written after this period are properly designated by the name *Neo-Hebraic Poetry*.

The divine service of the second Temple, under Ezra and his successors, was mainly a restoration, rather than a new institute; but the inspired material for liturgy was now more copious. The Psalms, several of which, like the melodious swan song of a departing inspiration, were written in the Ezra-Nehemiah time, formed of themselves a primary element. So, at the Feast of Tabernacles, the Asaphites chanted the *Confitemini* of the 118th Psalm (^{<1180>}Ezra 3:10, 11; comp. ^{<1122>}Nehemiah 12:24; ^{<1301>}1 Chronicles 26:1). The titles given to some Psalms by the men of the Great Synagogue indicate a stated use of them at certain periods of week-day and Sabbath worship (comp. Mishna, *Taamid*, ad fin.; *Sopherim*, sect. 18; and the inscriptions for the Psalms in the Septuagint, evidently rendered from Hebrew ones). Thus Psalm 24 is called ψαλμὸς...τῆς μιᾶς σαββάτου; 48, δευτέρῃ σαββάτου; 94, τετράδι σαββάτου; 29, ἑξοδίου σκηνῆς; 38:περὶ σαββάτου; 111-119, Ἀλληλούϊα. The "fifteen Songs of Degrees" (twl [mh yryç, Chald. amwhtd `ykwsml [rmatad arwç, i.e. "the hymn which was said upon the steps of the abyss") were evidently liturgical, and probably derive their name from the fifteen semicircular steps at the Nicanor gate of the great court of the Temple, on which the Levites stood while singing them. So the Mishna (*Succah*, 5, 4):" On the fifteen steps which led into the women's court, corresponding with the fifteen songs of degrees, stood the Levites with their instruments of music, and sang." Besides, the *Great Hallel* (q.v.) and certain verses of Psalms were also used, as may be seen from the treatise *Succah*, 4:5.

The poetry of this period is preserved in four forms: of *Tephillah*, *Berakah*, *Shir*, and *Mashal*.

I. *The Tephillah, or Prayer.* — Of this form we have the four collects offered by the high-priest on the Day of Atonement (q.v.), as preserved in the Jerusalem Gemara and Midrash Jelandenu, and which run thus:

1. *For Himself and his Family:* “Lord, I have committed iniquity, I have transgressed, I have sinned, I and my house. Pardon, O Lord, the iniquities and transgressions and the sins which I have committed and sinned before thee, I and my house, as it is written in the law of Moses, thy servant: for on that day will he atone for you to make you clean, from all your transgressions shall ye before Jehovah be cleansed” (Yomah, 3, 7).

2. *For Himself and the Priesthood:* “Lord, I have committed iniquity, I have transgressed, I have sinned, I and my house, and the sons of Aaron, thy consecrated people. I beseech thee, Lord, to pardon the iniquities, transgressions, and sins which I and my house, and the sons of Aaron, thy consecrated people, have perversely committed, as it is written in the law of Moses, thy servant: for on that day,” etc. (*ibid.* 4, 2).

3. *For the People at large:* “Lord, thy people, the house of Israel, have done perversely; they have transgressed, they have sinned before thee. I beseech of the Lord to pardon the iniquities, transgressions, and sins which thy people, the house of Israel, have perversely committed, and by which they have sinned and transgressed; as it is written in the law of Moses, thy servant: for on that day,” etc.

4. *When he came out from the Holy of Holies:* “May it please thee, O Lord our God, and the God of our fathers, that neither this day nor during this year any captivity come upon us; yet if captivity befall us this day or this year, let it be to a place where the law is cultivated. May it please thee, O Lord our God, and the God of our fathers, that no want come upon us either this day or this year; but if want visit us this day or this year, let it be due to the liberality of our charitable deeds. May it please thee, O Lord our God, and the God of our fathers, that this year may become a year of cheapness, of fullness, of intercourse, and of trade: a year with abundance of rain, of sunshine, and of dew: one in which thy people Israel shall not require assistance one from another. And listen not to the prayers of those who go forth on a journey. And as to thy people Israel, may no enemy exalt himself against them. May it please thee, O Lord our God, and the God of our fathers, that the houses of the men of Saron may not become their graves.”

II. *The Berakah, or Benediction.* — The benedictory adoration of the name and dominion of God is a most proper and all-pervading element in the Hebrew liturgy. Many of their prayers begin and end with it. The *berakahs* at the close of the several books of the Psalms (⁹¹¹¹³Psalm 41:13; 72:18; 89:53; 106:48) were probably added by Ezra, or the prophetic men of his time, on the final arrangement of the canonical Psalter (comp. on these doxologies Grätz, in *Monatsschrift für d. Judenth.*, 1872, 21:481 sq.). Those which accompany the prayers of the *Shemoneh Esreh*, or eighteen benedictions, comp. the art. *SEE LITURGY*, are believed to be of the same period. Thus Maimonides: “These benedictions were appointed by Ezra the *sopher*, and the *bethdin*; and no man hath power to diminish from or add to them” (*[Hilchoth Keriath Shena*, 1, 7; and *lilch. Tefila*, 1, 11). “In the innumerable instances where, in the Mishna and Aboda, this form occurs, in which the everlasting name is hallowed, and the truth of the divine dominion is reverently confessed, it appears to have been the pious desire of the institutors of the synagogue ritual that supplication, with prayer and thanksgiving, should give a spirit and tone to the entire life of the people. Indeed, almost all the affairs of Hebrew life have the prescription of their appropriate benedictions” (comp. *Berachoth*, ch. 6-9; *Rosh ha-Shanah*, 4, 5; *Tactmith*, 2, 2, etc.).

III. *The Shir, or Song, Chant* (from *shevar*, rwv] Sansc. *swar*, *swara*, “a song;” the Arab. *zabara*, i.q. *savara*., whence *zubar*, like the Hebrew *mizmor*, of the same import), is a metrical composition, designed for chanting, and consisting generally of the strophe, antistrophe, and epode. We have a fine Biblical model in the fifteenth chapter of Exodus, on which see Kennicott and Lowth. Apart from the divine poetry of the Scriptures, there are but scanty remains of Hebrew songs of a date prior to the destruction of Jerusalem. In the Mishna and Gemara we come upon a few reminiscences of them, as in the treatise *Succah*, fol. 53, col. 1, where, in connection with the solemnities of the Feast of Tabernacles, we find the following chant:

THE PIOUS AND THE MEN OF RENOWN.

*“O happy youth, devoted sage,
Who will not put to shame our age!”*

THE PENITENTS.

*“O happy, also, is our age,
Which now atones for youth, not sage!”*

CHORUS.

*“O happy be on whom no guilt doth rest,
And he who sinn’d with pardon shall be blest.”*

These songs were accompanied by the musical instruments of the Levites, who stood on the fifteen steps which led to the court of the women. Here is another, a sort of confession made by the Levites at the same feast. “When the Levites,” says the Mishna, “reached the gate that leads out to the east, they turned westward, their faces being towards the Temple, and employed these words:

*“Our fathers, here established by thy grace,
Had turn’d their backs upon thy holy place,
And to the rising sun they set their face;
But we will turn to thee, Jehovah God,
Our eyes are set on thee, Jehovah God.”*

Another fragment of a song has been preserved in the Mishna (*Taanith*, ad fin.), and was sung on the 15th day of Ab, when the collection of wood required in the sanctuary was finished. Then the maidens all went forth, arrayed in white garments specially lent them, that so rich and poor might be on an equality, into the vineyards around Jerusalem, where they danced and sung: “Around in circle gay the Hebrew maidens see, From them the happy youth their partners choose; Remember beauty soon its charms must lose, And seek to win a maid of fair degree.

“When fading grace and beauty low are laid, Yet her who fears the Lord shall praise await; God blessed her handiwork, and, in the gate, ‘Her works have followed her,’ it shall be said.”

IV. *The Mashal.* — This word, according to its Sanscrito-Shemitic root, denotes comparison or resemblance. “In the older Hebrew writings the word is applied to prophecy, to doctrine, to history in the loftier style, and to instruction given in a kind of poetic form, sometimes with the accompaniment of the harp or other music; because, in these various manners of instruction, material things are employed in the way of parallel or comparison, to illustrate those which are supersensible or spiritual.

Hence *mashal* became a general name for all poetry which relates to the ordinary or every-day economy of life, with a still more specific application to a distinct epigrammatic saying, proverb, maxim, or reflection, carrying in itself some important principle or rule of conduct. The *mashal*, then, may be said to consist commonly of two elements: the thesis, principal fact or lesson, and the type, emblem or allusion by which it is explained or enforced. The latter may be one of the phenomena of nature, or an imaginary transaction in common life (*parable*); or an emblematic group of human agents (*apologue*); or of agents nonhuman, with an understood designation (*fable*). Sometimes the *mashal* takes a mathematical cast; and the doctrine or principle is laid down after a certain arithmetical proportion or canon, *midah* (^{<0166>}Proverbs 6:16; 30:15, 18, 21; Ecclus. 23:16; 25:1, 8, 9; 26:5, 25, 27, 28). When there is no image or allusion of these kinds used, the *mashal* becomes sometimes an acute, recondite, yet generally pleasant assertion or problem *gryphos*, the ‘riddle,’ or ‘enigma;’ in Hebrew, *chidah*, **hdyj** (^{<0742>}Judges 14:12); and sometimes an axiom or oracle of practical *wisdom-massa*, **aCmj** a ‘burden,’ a weighty saying, from *masac*, ‘to bear;’ and when conveyed in a brilliant, sparkling style of speaking it becomes *melifsah*, **hxyl m**, the pleasant witticism or the pungent reproof. The remaining form of the *mashal* is the motto (apophthegm), where some moral is sententiously expressed without a simile, and generally without the parallelism, as we see in the mottoes of the Hebrew sages in the book *Aboth*.” Of such mottoes, we mention the following of Hillel:

***“The more flesh, the more worms;
The more riches, the more care:
The more wives, the more witchcraft,” etc.;***

or:

***“Because thou madest float,
They made thee float:
In turn, who made thee float***

Shall also float this having reference to a skull floating on the water;

or:

*“Each one who seeks a name,
Shall only lose his fame;
Who adds not to his lore,
Shall lose it more and more;*

*Each one deserves to perish
Who study does not cherish;
That man shall surely fade*

Who with his crown (i.e. of learning or merit) does trade.”

A valuable relic of *meshalim* is preserved in a book known among us as *The Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach*, from which we will quote a few sentences: “Honor the physician before you require his aid” (38:1). “Three things are contrary to all reason: a proud beggar; a rich man who denies it (lives and acts as if he were poor); and all old man who commits adultery” (25:3, 4). “A good wife is a good gift; such is granted to him who fears the Lord. A bad wife is a leprosy to her husband; let him divorce her, and he will be cured of his leprosy” (ch. 26). “Before you vow, consider the vow” (28:23). *SEE PARABLE.*

The non-Palestinian poetry of this time we pass over, it being written in Greek. See Delitzsch, *Zur Geschichte der jüdischen Poesie*, p. 17-29, 177 sq.; Etheridge, *Introduction to Hebrew Literature*, p. 92 sq.; Steinschneider, *Jewish Literature*, p. 35 sq.; Edersheim, *History of the Jewish Nation*, p. 349 sq., 559 sq.; id. *The Temple, its Ministry and Services as they were in the Time of Jesus Christ*, p. 246 sq., 270 sq., 286 sq. (B. P.)

Poetry, Christian.

SEE HYMNOLOGY; SEE PSALMODY.

Poggio, Braccolini Giovanni-Francesco

a celebrated Italian humanist, who contributed richly to the revival of classical studies in the period of the Italian Renaissance, and did much to encourage scholarship in the Church of Rome, was born at Terranuova, near Florence, in 1380. He was the grandson of a notary, and studied the Latin language under the direction of Giovanni di Ravenna, the Greek under Emanuel Chrysoloras, and applied himself also to the Hebrew a fact which confutes the opinion of Huetius and others, who have said that this language was not cultivated in Italy till after the 14th and 15th centuries.

After the completion of his education he went to Rome, and was for some time a copyist, and finally entered the service of the cardinal di Bari. In 1413 Poggio was appointed apostolic secretary, a poorly paid charge, which he occupied forty years. Thus he spent a large part of his life in brilliant surroundings. Eight popes bequeathed him to one another, as he had belonged to the chattels of St. Peter. The life which he led in the office he held was favorable to study, and he devoted much of it to inquiries into antiquity. His great title to the esteem of posterity is the zeal he displayed in the search for the monuments of Roman literature. He made his most important discoveries during a protracted stay in Switzerland, whither he repaired in 1414 to attend the Council of Constance. He visited the library of the monastery of St. Gall, which he found in a kind of dungeon. Here he discovered a copy, almost complete, of Quintilian's *Institutiones Orattoriae*, of which fragments only were known at the time; four books of the *Argonautica* of Valerius Flaccus, and the *Commentaries* of Asconius Pedianus. Afterwards he found, in divers places, the *History* of Ammianus Marcellinus and Frontinus's *Treatise on Aqueducts*. The searches which he caused to be made in the monasteries of France and Germany brought to light the works of Manilius, of Vitruvius, of Columella, of Priscianus, of Nonius Marcellus. a considerable portion of the poems of Lucretius and Silius Italicus, eight orations of Cicero, twelve comedies of Plautus, etc.

The freedom with which Poggio criticized several acts of the Council of Constance, especially in the affair of Jerome of Prague, was punished with a short disgrace, during which he visited England. Beaufort, bishop of Winchester, received him with distinction. But as little effect followed the brilliant promises of the prelate, and as the English libraries offered no temptations to a man of Poggio's propensities, he left a country the inhabitants of which he describes as plunged in the grossest sensuality, and returned to Rome at the close of 1420. He was reinstated into his former charge. The calm which the pontifical court enjoyed for some years gave him full leisure to correspond with his friends Niccoli, Leonardo d'Arezzo. Traversari, etc., and to write several dialogues and philosophical treatises, in which he exposes without mercy the failings of monks and priests which Poggio was most competent to describe, as he had himself at the time three sons by a mistress, though he was an ecclesiastic. His own course he excuses in the following pleasantry, in one of his letters to cardinal Julian of St. Angelo: "You say that I have sons, which is not lawful for a cleric; and without a wife, which does not become a laic. I may answer that I have

sons, which is fitting for laics; and without a wife, which from the beginning of the world has been the custom of clerics; but I will not defend my failings by any excuse.”

When, after the accession of Eugenius IV, in 1434, a sedition compelled the pope to retire to Florence, Poggio set out on his way to join his master. He was taken by soldiers of Piccinino, and given his liberty only after a heavy ransom paid by his friends. In Florence he met Filelfo, against whom he had long entertained a secret jealousy, which changed into actual hatred when his venerated and beloved Niccoli was the object of a violent attack from Filelfo. He launched against his enemy a libel, in which he heaped up all the most injurious and obscene expressions which the Latin language would afford. Filelfo answered him in the same style; whereupon Poggio replied in a still more insulting strain. After a truce of four years this edifying dispute between two of the most distinguished men of their time recommenced: Poggio wrote against Filelfo a libel full of the most atrocious accusations, almost all of his own invention. Filelfo again returned the blow. They were reconciled afterwards: neither had damaged himself in the eyes of their contemporaries, who enjoyed these invectives as literary dainties. Meanwhile Poggio had bought a villa in the vicinity of Florence, and formed there a museum of sculptures, medals, and other objects of art. Towards the close of 1435 he had married the young and beautiful Vaggia di Bondelmonti. He was poor and on the decline of life; but the young heiress of an illustrious and ancient family was in love with his literary fame, which had induced the senate of Florence to grant immunity from taxes to him and his descendants. His married life was a happy one.

He returned to Rome with the papal court, after a sojourn of ten years at Florence. During this period he had published a choice selection of letters, and composed two dialogues, full of the most curious remarks on the manners of his time (*On Nobility* and *On the Misfortunes of Princes*). He had, besides, written the panegyrics of Niccoli, Lorenzo di Medici, of the cardinal Albergato, and of Leonardo d'Arezzo. At the request of pope Nicholas V, with whom he was in great favor, he translated into Latin the first five books of Diodorus Siculus; about the same time he dedicated his version of Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* to Alfonso, king of Naples, and compelled the king, by the sarcastic remarks with which he filled his letters to his friends, to reward him with a present of six hundred ducats, whereupon he chanted, in the most pompous strains, the encomiums of the

king. To please pope Nicholas, he wrote a violent invective against the antipope, Felix V. He wrote also, under the same pope's auspices, an interesting dialogue *On the Vicissitudes of Fortune*, which, besides many curious incidents in the history of Italy in the 14th and 15th centuries, contains an account of the journey of the Venetian Niccolo Conti into India and Persia, and a precious description of the monuments of Rome as they were at his time. During the plague which broke out in Rome in 1450, he retired to his birthplace, where he published his famous *Facetiae*, a collection of tales, partly borrowed from the French *fabliaux*, and excessively licentious. This book was eagerly read throughout Europe. Soon afterwards he published his *Historia Disceptativa Convivialis*, a dialogue full of satirical attacks against physicians and lawyers. He returned to Rome in 1451, but in 1453 he was offered the position of chancellor of the republic of Florence, and a few months after his removal to that city was in addition made prior of the arts. In the latter quality he had to look to the maintenance of good order and of the public liberties. Though he was now fully seventy-two years of age, he applied himself to study more intensely than ever; and in that last period of his life, though he had an employment which took up much of his time, he composed the most considerable of his works. His love of retirement induced him to build a country house near Florence, which he called his academy, and in which he took much delight. He always spent the summer there. From this period and place dates his *History of Florence*, for which he consulted the archives of the republic, which were committed to his care. This book is one of the best historical works of the time. The Florentines, to show their gratefulness, erected to the author a statue, which now forms part of a group of the twelve apostles in the church of S. Maria del Fiore. Poggio died at Florence Oct. 30, 1459. He had some estimable parts, but these cannot make us forget his vindictive character, his irascibility, his bad manners and bad morals. Poggio appears by his works to have had a great passion for letters, and as great a regard for those that cultivated them. He excelled in Greek and Latin literature, and was one of the principal restorers of it. His pursuits were not confined to profane antiquity: we see by his quotations that he was versed in ecclesiastical history and the fathers, and especially in the writings of Chrysostom and Augustine. Poggio's treatises, especially his dialogues, are feeble imitations of the classics; though written in an easy, witty, and sometimes elegant manner, they are full of solecisms, Italicisms, and even barbarisms. His letters are altogether neglected. But the rest of his writings are still read, owing to

their variety of subjects, to some ingenious ideas, and to the freedom of speech, sometimes the grace, by which they are characterized. His *Works* were published at Strasburg (1510, fol.; 1513, 4to), at Paris (1511, 4to; 1513, fol.), and at Basle (1538, fol.). The latter edition, by Bebel, is the best; but it is still incomplete, and does not contain the following works, afterwards published apart: *De Hypocrisia* (Lyons, 1679, 4to), a violent pamphlet against the clergy: *Historia Florentina* (Ven. 1715, 4to; and in tom. 20 of the *Scriptores* of Muratori), translated into Italian by Giacomo, the third of the five sons whom Poggio had by his legitimate wife (Ven. 1476, fol.; Florence, 1492 and 1598, 4to): — *De Varietate Fortune* (Par. 1723, 4to), with fifty-seven unpublished *Letters* of Poggio. The *Facetiae* have often been printed apart (1470, 4to; Ferrara, 1471; Nuremb. 1475; Milan, 1477; Par. 1478, 4to; Utrecllt, 1797, 2 vols. 24mo). Poggio's Latin translation of Diodorus Siculus was published at Venice (1473, 1476, fol.) and at Basle (1530, 1578, fol.). See Thorschmidt, *Vita Poggocia* (Wittemb. 1713); Recanate, *Vita* (Ven. 1715); Lenfatt, *Pogianna* (1720, and enlarged 1721); Nicron, *Memoires*, vol. 9; Shepherd, *Life of Poggio* (Loud. 1802, 8vo); Nisard, *Les Gladiateurs de le Republique des Lettres*, vol. 1; Trollope, *History of Florence* (see Index in vol. 5); Hallam, *Literary Hist. of Europe* (Harper's edition), 1, 64, 92; id. *Middle Ages* (see Index); *Christian Schools and Scholmars*, 2, 30(6310; Piper, *Monumental Theologie*, § 148, 150, 153, 214; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, 8, 123; *Edinb. Rev.* 64, 32 sq.; Schlegel, *Hist. of Literatutre*, lect. 11; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, s.v.

Pogoda

is in Slavic mythology the name of a god of the spring and of fine weather. Pogoda is a pure Slavic word, and means *weather*. He is supposed to have been of a kind and amiable disposition—the god of sunny weather, of bright skies, of smiling springs; yet the qualification of *dobra* (good) would seem to be necessary in such a case. The description given of his exterior appearance is perhaps still less authentic than that of his functions: young and beautiful, crowned with blue flowers, blue wings on his shoulders, clothed in a blue garment interwoven with silver, stretched on a bed of flowers resting quietly in the bright air. It is not likely that the Slaves one thousand years ago could have drawn such pictures of their gods.

Pohlman, William John

a missionary of the Reformed (Dutch) Church, was born at Albany, N. Y., in 1812, of pious parents who belonged to the Lutheran Church. His father was of German descent. Converted at the age of sixteen, he united with the First Reformed Church of Albany, under the care of Dr. John Ludlow. Devoting himself to the Christian ministry, Pohlman studied three years at the Albany Academy, entered Rutgers College in 1832, graduated in 1834, and then entered the theological seminary at New Brunswick. While a student in this institution he consecrated himself to the foreign missionary work. In August, 1836, he offered himself to the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, in a memorable letter, which concluded with these sentences: "I wish to enlist for life. If in your view I can be of any service, I lay my all at your feet. 'Silver and gold have I none, but such as I have give I thee.' Send me abroad to publish glad tidings to the idol-serving nations. Send me to the most desert part of all the howling wildernesses of heathenism, to the most barbarous climes, or to more civilized regions. Send me to the millions of pagans, to the followers of the false prophet to the Jews or the Gentiles, to Catholics or Protestants. Send me, in fine, wherever God opens an effectual door. Send me—for necessity is laid upon me; yea, woe is unto me if I preach not the Gospel' to the perishing heathen." In this spirit he was sent to Borneo. He was ordained as an evangelist in April 1838, by the Classis of Albany, and with his wife, a sister of the late Dr. John Scudder, the famous missionary to India, sailed for his field May 25. They arrived at the island of Java Sept. 10, and after a brief sojourn at Singapore went to Batavia, where they were compelled to remain a whole year before the Dutch government would permit them to go to Borneo. Meanwhile he studied the Malay language, which prepared him to hold intercourse with the people to whom he was sent. After the year expired he settled at Pontianak, in Borneo, and immediately began his missionary labors. Mrs. Pohlman died in 1845. She was a woman of like spirit with himself and with her brother—a devoted, intelligent, and laborious missionary's wife and sister. After six years of unremitting toils on this island, Mr. Pohlman was transferred to China in 1844, with the Rev. Elihu Doty, to establish the Amoy Mission, in connection with David Abeel, D.D. He had studied the Chinese language during his residence in Borneo, and so was the better prepared to do efficient work at once in his new field. For five years more he gave himself up unreservedly to this noble service. Dr. Abeel's feeble health compelled

his return to America in 1845, and he died in 1846. *SEE ABEEL, DAVID.* But the mission was planted under the most encouraging auspices. A church building was erected in Amoy, with funds from America, when there were but three communicant members of the mission. Three other distinct missionary churches, all of which are now self-sustaining, have swarmed out of this hive. Native preachers and helpers have been raised up, and the mission has been long regarded as a model of evangelizing work in China. The strictly missionary work in Amoy is now at an end; and the churches there would doubtless live and grow and propagate Christianity, like those of ancient times, even if all American missionaries were withdrawn from them. Such is the fruit of the labors of Mr. Pohlman and his associates and successors. His valuable life and labors were suddenly ended at Breaker's Point by shipwreck of the vessel on which he was bound from Hong Kong to Amoy, Jan. 5, 1849. Pirates attacked the sinking ship, but "Mr. Pohlman sprang from the ship and was drowned." The ruling principle of Mr. Pohlman's life was his *consecration to God*. He gave himself and his all to Christ, and to the world for Christ's sake. He spared nothing. He was "totus in illis." He was amiable, buoyant, frank, earnest, enthusiastic, and tenacious to the last degree in prosecuting his good purposes. His disposition was very cheerful. He had no crotchets. But with practical common sense and intense energy and zeal, he lived and labored for the kingdom of Christ. His preaching, correspondence, and public services glowed with this one spirit, which has left its permanent impress upon the mission and Church of which he was so conspicuous a servant. (W.J.R.T.)

Poilly, François de

a French engraver, was born at Abbeville in 1622 or 1623. His father was a goldsmith. After working for three years in the studio of Pierre Daret, he went to Rome in 1649 and remained there until 1656. He engraved during his stay in Italy some drawings in a manner which resembles that of Bloemaert. On his return to France, he engraved with equal success portraits and historical subjects. His portraits are sought for even now, perhaps less on account of the merits of an art which must be confessed to be somewhat cold and monotonous, than of the persons they represent. Poilly was honored with the title of ordinary engraver to the king. He reproduced the works of Raffaele, Giulio Romano, Guido, Carraccio, Le Brun, Mignard, Le Sueur, Poussin, Ph. de Champagne, etc. The great reputation he enjoyed in his time attracted to his studio a number of pupils,

among them Gerard Edelinck. Nicolas de Poilly, his brother, Scotin, Rouillet, etc. Poilly and his brother lived together with the Mariette family, for whom Gerard worked. Poilly died at Paris, March 1693. Though Poilly's style is very laborious, there are about four hundred prints which bear his name, in which however he was of course assisted by his pupils. His masterpiece is the print from Mignard's celebrated picture, now lost, of *San Carlo Borromeo administering the Sacrament to the Milanese attacked with the Plague*. A catalogue of his prints was published by R. Hecquet in 1752. See Ioefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, s.v.; Mrs. Clement, *Handbook of Painters, Sculptors, Architects, and Engravers*, s.v.

Poimen

(ποιμήν), i.e. *pastor*, is a name given to ministers of the Gospel in the New-Testament writings and by the early Church. It is a term recommended by the circumstance that Christ had compared himself to a shepherd and his people to a flock; and the apostle Peter had called him the Chief Shepherd. *SEE PASTOR*.

Pointed

In the English Prayer-book the *Psalter*, *Venite*, *Te Deum*, etc., are punctuated throughout in a peculiar manner by the insertion of a colon in or near the middle of each verse without regard to grammatical rules. This is done with the design of facilitating the chanting by presenting to the eye the most natural division of the verse, or that which will most readily correspond with the movement of the chant-tune. In allusion to this, the title of the English Prayer-book states that the Psalms of David are pointed (or punctuated) as they are to be sung or said in churches." In the American editions the grammatical punctuation has been restored, and the above portion of the title omitted.

Pointed Style

especially applied to the Pointed arch, is an architectural term first used in the 14th century. The Pointed style occurs in Egypt, Italy, Greece, and Mexico in ancient buildings, merely as a freak of the architect, an accident, or irregularity. Some authors have traced its origin to the avenues of a forest; others have seen it in the palm, in the wooden churches of an earlier period, or the intersecting arcade. Some refer it to the Goths, like

Warburton; or to the Saracens, like Christopher Wren. *SEE GOTHIC ARCHITECTURE.*

Pointer, John

an English divine of some note, flourished in the first half of the 18th century as chaplain of Merton College, Oxford, where he was probably educated, and as rector of Slapton. He published, besides several works of an altogether secular character, *Oxonienses Academia* (Lond, 1749, 12mo). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Points, Hebrew

SEE MASORAH.

Pointz, Robert

an English theologian of some repute, flourished near the middle of the 16th century. He was educated at Oxford University, and was made perpetual fellow of New College in 1554. He was obliged to go abroad after the accession of queen Mary, he having embraced the Reformed doctrines, and preferring exile to abnegation of his religious convictions. He went to Louvain, and settled there as pastor of a Protestant congregation. He wrote several controversial works against the Romanists, examining their different characteristic doctrines. Among these are, *Testimonies for the Real Presence* (Lond. 1566, 16mo): — *Miracles performed by the Eucharist* (1570). See Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, 3, 715.

Poiret, Pierre

a French philosopher of mystical tendency, and a writer whose works are of great importance to the students of French theological thought, was born at Metz April 15, 1646. He lost his father, a mechanic, when but six years of age. As he showed some disposition for the fine arts, he entered as an apprentice the studio of a sculptor, where he learned the elements of drawing. At thirteen years he studied humanities, and from 1661 to 1663 he was tutor at Basle, and there studied at the same time philosophy and theology. He finally entered the evangelical ministry, and after residing for a while at Hanau, was called as pastor to Heidelberg in 1667; married there, and acquired the reputation of a good preacher. In 1672 he was appointed pastor at Anweiler, in the duchy of Zweibrücken. Here he

familiarized himself with the writings of the philosopher Descartes, and of the mystics Kempis, Tauler, and Antoinette Bourignon, and commenced to turn his thoughts towards the spiritual life. In 1673 a dangerous illness converted him fully to mysticism. The war having disturbed his peaceful studies, he first took refuge in Holland, then at Hamburg, in the house of Mlle. Bourignon to whom he had been long attached by feelings of esteem and admiration. In 1680 he established himself at Amsterdam. Speaking of his exemplary life there, Bayle says that "from a great Cartesian he had become so pious that, in order to apply himself the better to the things of heaven, he had broken off almost every intercourse with the earth." In order to live in more complete seclusion, he retired in 1688 to Rheinsberg, near Leyden, where he spent more than thirty years in the exercise of piety, and in the composition of spiritual and ascetic works. He died there May 21, 1719. Poiret is not the founder of a sect; he established no conventicles, because he attached no importance whatever to dogmatical questions. His theological system lacked speculative clearness and consistency, and was rather a subjective theology of the adoring heart and soaring fancy than of the seeing intellect. It lays little stress upon the forms and rules of any particular Church, and placed the ideal of the Christian life in retired, uninterrupted communion with self and with God. For him, morals were the essence of religion. Hence there was never a more tolerant theologian. If he avoided all intercourse with the world, it was to preserve the integrity of his conscience. Far from being indifferent, he was full of zeal for the Christian religion, which he defended on several occasions, especially against Spinoza. All those who were acquainted with him agree in the' praise of his meekness, his modesty, the purity of his life, the kindness of his heart. It would be unjust to deny that there are excellent things in his works. He displays a surprising sagacity in resolving the most subtle questions of metaphysics, and an uncommon talent in throwing light on the most obscure principles of theosophy. There is a methodical spirit in his writings, which is a fruit of his close study of Descartes and his system, under an appearance of disorder, is admirably connected and developed. He left about forty works, of which by far the most important is his *De AEconomia Divina*, under the French title, *L'Economie Divine, ou Systeme universel, et démontré des AEuvres et des Desseins de Dieu envers les Hommes* (Amsterd. 1687, 7 vols. 8vo), in which he means to show with certainty the general harmony of nature and grace, of philosophy and theology, of reason and faith, of natural and Christian ethics. The principle of the philosophic fabric which Poiret sought to

construct, and which really systematizes and also explains the wild and incoherent rhapsodies of Bourignon is *abstraction*, or the preference of a presumed illumination to reason; the same in essence as the *quietism* of Molinos, the *annihilation* of the Hindu philosophy, and the *divine vision* of Bohme. Theologically there are, perhaps, some things that may be considered valuable in Poiret's writings. Opposed on the one hand to Descartes, and on the other to the then growing opinions of Locke, against whom he wrote an able treatise (*Fibides et Ratio colltace ac suo utraque loco novitae adversus Piincipia J. Lockii*), Poiret sought to mend weakness of reason by *faith*, and badness of will by *grace*. But the extension of his religious notions into the proper boundaries of speculative philosophy, to say nothing of his strong tendency to fanaticism, points him out to us as one of the most decided instances of mysticism in his age. Most peculiar are Poiret's Christological views. According to ch. 11 of this same treatise, the (ideal) Son of God assumed human nature soon *after* the creation of man, and *prior* to his fall, in such a manner that he (the Son of God) took from Adam his body and a divine soul. Poiret also ascribed to Christ, previous to his incarnation in the Virgin Mary, not only various manifestations, but also human "emotions and sufferings," and an unwearying intercession for mankind, his brethren (his office as high-priest). But in the Virgin Mary he assumed *mortal* flesh. "The body of Jesus Christ, assuming the flesh and blood of the blessed Virgin, is as little composed of two different bodies as a white and shining garment, dipped in a vessel dark and full of color, and coming into contact with the matter which composes this darkness, is thereby changed into a double garment, or into two garments instead of one." A complete list of Poiret's works would be useless without a description of them, for which we have not space. The curious may consult the *Cataiogue Raisonne*, in the *Memories* of J. P. Niceron (Par. 1727-1745). We have room here for the most important writings only. Among these we would mention *Cogitationes Rationalis (de Deo, animo et malo)* (Amsterd. 1677, 4to). The edition of 1715 has besides a dissertation against the hidden atheism of Bayle and Spinoza: — *La Paix des bonnes Amles dans toutes les Parties du Christianisme* (ibid. 1687, 12mo). He advises peace in God between all righteous persons, without distinction of communion or rites. the essential is to go to God by the road of morality, the rest is of little account: — *Idea Theologiae Christianas juxta Principia J. Behmi* (ibid. 1687, 12mo). He avows that to understand Bohme is all but impossible: — *Les Principes solides Ide la Religion et de la Vie Chretienne appliques à l'Education des*

Enfants (ibid. 1690, 1705, 12mo). This book, disapproved by the ministers of Hamburg, was translated into German, English, Flemish, and Latin: — *De Eruditione triplici sotida, superficialia et falsa lib. 3* (ibid. 1692, 12mo, and 1707 4to). His purpose is to show that there can be no real erudition without inspiration from above: — *Theologie du Coeur* (Cologne, 1696, 1697, 16mo): — *La Theologie reelle, vulgairement dits la Thiologie Germanique* (Amsterd. 1700, 12mo). This translation of a German work of the 16th century, translated before by Castalion, had been published in 1676. Poiret accompanied it with a *Letter* on the mystical authors; the latter are 130 in number, and Poiret gives most curious details about their principles, character, life, and works: — *Theologie Mysticae Idea* (ibid. 1702, 12mo): — *F-ides et Ratio adversus Principia J. Lockii* (ibid. 1707, 12mo): — *Bibliotheca Mysticorum Selecta* (ibid. 1708, 8vo): — *Posthuma* (ibid. 1721, 4to). Poiret translated *The Imitation of Jesus Christ* (ibid. 1683, 12mo, sev. edit.), which he paraphrased partly according to the interior sense; the works of St. Catherine of Genoa (1691, 12mo), and those of Angele de Foligny (1696, 12mo). He edited the (*Euvres d'Antoinette Bourignon* (Amsterd. 1679 and following, 19 vols. 12mo), with a most circumstantial *Life*, which was reprinted apart (1683, 2 vols. 12mo), and followed by an apologetic *Memoire*, inserted in the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* (1685); an answer to the attacks of Scekendorf (*Monitum Necessarium*, 1686, 4to); several mystical *Opuscules*; and after having published several of the writings of Mme. Guyon, among others, *Le Nouveau et l'Ancien Testament* (Cologne, 1713-1715, 20 vols. 12mo); her *Vie, ecrite par elle-meme* (1720, 3 vols. 12mo); and her *Poesies* (1722, 12mo), brought out a complete edition with great care, in 39 vols., furnishing them with elaborate introductions, prefaces, and apologies, sufficient to make several volumes in themselves. In all this there is manifest, as in the editing of Mile. Bourignon's writings, a remarkable willingness to hide himself entirely behind the beloved objects upon which he spends his toil; so that now in many instances it is impossible to tell just how much of the worth and beauty of whole volumes is to be assigned to himself rather than to the reputed authors. Nearly all of Poiret's writings have been translated into Latin, Dutch, and German. See Walch, *Religionsstreitigkeiten ausser der evangel.* — *Luther. Kirche*, liv, 911 sq.; Niceron, *flist. des Hommes illustres*, 4, 144 sq.; 10:140 sq.; Grisse, *Literaturgesch.* vol. 3, pt. 3, p. 479 sq.; Erdmann, *Verstuch einer Gesch. d. neuern Philosophie*, vol. 1, pt. 2, p. 217 sq.; *Bibliotheca Bremens. Theol. Philol.* tom. 3, pt. 1, p. 75; Noack, *Mystik* 217; Niedner,

Zeitschr. für die hist. Theol. 1853-54; Hagenbach, *Vorlesungen über die Kirchengesch.* 4, 326 sq.; Dorner, *On the Person of Christ*, 1, 231 sq.; Morell, *Speculatioe Philos. of Europe*, p. 201; *Comment. de Vita et Scriptes Petri Poiaret, in his Posthuma* (Amsterd. 1721, 8vo); Jervis, *Hist. of the Church of France* (see Index); Hurst, *Hist. of Rationalism* (see Index); Haag, *La France Protestante*, s.v.; *Histoire des Dogmes* (see Index).

Poirey, François

a French Jesuit, was born in 1584 at Vesoul. He entered the Society of Jesus at the age of seventeen years; was a successful teacher of humanities, rhetorics, philosophy, and Holy Writ, and was appointed superior of a house of his order at Nancy; rector of the college of Lyons, and of that of Dole. He left, *Ignis Holocausti* (Pont-a-Mousson, 1629, 16mo): *La Manieae de se disposer a bien mourir* (Douai, 1638, 16mo): — *Le bon Pasteur* (Pont-a-Mousson. 1630, 12mo: — *Le Science des Saints* (Par. 1638, 4to), etc. He died at Dole Nov. 25, 1637. — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, s.v.

Poirier, Germain, Dom

a learned French Benedictine, was born Jan. 8, 1724, at Paris. He was not quite fifteen years of age when he entered the Congregation of Saint-Maur. After teaching philosophy and theology in the houses of his order, he was appointed secretary to the visitor-general of France, and resigned this place for another which was more congenial to his tastes, that of guardian of the archives of Saint-Denis. In 1762 he published in the *Nouvelle Collection des Historiens de la France*, vol. 11, which contains the reign of Henry I, an excellent Preface, which forms the fourth part of it, and is, according to Dacier, the most substantial and best work ever written on the first Capetian kings. Tired of the troubles by which his congregation was agitated, he left it in 1765, but re-entered it two years later, and was intrusted with the archives of Saint-Germain-des-Pres. In 1785 he was admitted as free associate into the Academie des Inscriptions. During the Revolution he was a member of the commission of monuments, and exerted himself actively in preserving from destruction a number of valuable manuscripts. In 1796 he was appointed librarian of the Arsenal, and in 1800 he succeeded Legrand d'Aussy in the National Institute: He united to a rare erudition a no less rare modesty; he worked for the

pleasure he found in the work; hence his easy willingness to communicate the fruit of his researches to any one who recurred to him. His death revealed the secret of his virtues and of his benevolence; the blessings of the poor, their testimonies of gratitude-written testimonies, found, with a few pieces of money, in his bureau-were his whole treasure. He wore cheap clothes, and condemned himself to privations, to be able to give food and clothing to the poor. He died at Paris Feb. 2, 1803. Besides what has been mentioned, he wrote several historical *Memoires*, which were read in the academy of which he was a member, etc. See Dacier, *Eloge de Dom Poirier* (Paris, 1804, 8vo). — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, s.v.

Poison

is the rendering in the A. V. of the Bible of two Hebrew and two Greek terms, but they are so general as to throw little light upon the knowledge and practice of poisons among the Hebrews.

1. hmj *echemaih*, from the root signifying “to be hot,” is used of the heat produced by wine (^{<3175>}Hosea 7:5), and the hot passion of anger (^{<627>}Deuteronomy 29:27, etc.), as well as of the burning venom of poisonous serpents (^{<624>}Deuteronomy 32:24, 33; ^{<604>}Psalm 58:4; 140:3). In all cases it denotes animal poison, and not vegetable or mineral. The only allusion to its application is in ^{<804>}Job 6:4, where reference seems to be made to the custom of anointing arrows with the venom of a snake, a practice the origin of which is of very remote antiquity (comp. Homer, *Od.* 1, 261, 262; Ovid, *Trist.* 3, 10, 64; *Fast.* 5, 397, etc.; Pliny, 18:1). The Soanes, a Caucasian race mentioned by Strabo (11, 499), were especially skilled in the art. Pliny (6, 34) mentions a tribe of Arab pirates who infested the Red Sea, and were armed with poisoned arrows like the Malays of the coast of Borneo. For this purpose the berries of the yew-tree (Pliny, 16:20) were employed. The Gauls (Pliny, 27:76) used a poisonous herb, *limeum*, supposed by some to be the “leopard’s bane,” and the Scythians dipped their arrow-points in vipers’ venom mixed with human blood. These were so deadly that a slight scratch inflicted by them was fatal (Pliny, 11:115). The practice was so common that the name **τοξικόν**, originally a poison in which arrows were dipped, was applied to poison generally. **SEE ARROW**. In Palestine and the countries adjacent were many venomous snakes, as well as insects, such as the scorpion and the scolopendra; but no such practice obtained among the Jews. Poisonous plants were as well known as in other countries, and we have an instance of a miracle wrought by Elisha

(^{<1048>}2 Kings 4:38), to prevent mischief by the accidental shredding of a wild gourd into a mess of pottage prepared for the sons of the prophets. This fruit or vegetable was probably the colocynth; and when those who were about to partake of it were repelled by its nauseous bitterness, the prophet commanded a handful of meal to be thrown into the pot, and thus rendered its contents fit for human food. *SEE GOURD.*

2. vao (once **v/r**, ^{<1522>}Deuteronomy 32:32), *rosh*, if a poison at all, denotes a vegetable poison primarily, and is only twice (^{<1523>}Deuteronomy 32:33; ^{<1816>}Job 20:16) used of the venom of a serpent. In other passages where it occurs it is translated “gall” in the A. V., except in ^{<2804>}Hosea 10:4 where it is rendered “hemlock.” In the margin of ^{<1528>}Deuteronomy 29:18 our translators, feeling the uncertainty of the word, gave as an alternative “*rosh*, or, a poisonous herb.” Beyond the fact that, whether poisonous or not, it was a plant of bitter taste, nothing can be inferred. That bitterness was its prevailing characteristic is evident from its being associated with wormwood (^{<1528>}Deuteronomy 29:18 [17]; ^{<2189>}Lamentations 3:19; ^{<1062>}Amos 6:12), and from the allusions to “water of *rosh*” in ^{<3484>}Jeremiah 8:14; 9:15; 23:15. It was not a juice or liquid (^{<1522>}Psalm 69:21 [22]; comp. ^{<4153>}Mark 15:23), but probably a bitter berry, in which case the expression in ^{<1522>}Deuteronomy 32:32, “grapes of *rosh*,” may be taken literally. It grew in the fields (^{<2804>}Hosea 10:4), was bitter to the taste (^{<2315>}Jeremiah 23:15; ^{<1522>}Psalm 69:22; comp. ^{<2185>}Lamentations 3:5), and bore clusters, perhaps something like the *belladonna* (^{<1522>}Deuteronomy 32:32. Yet here the words **v/r yb** might also be rendered *poison grapes*, carrying out the figure of the vine, without special allusion to the poison plant). Any special rendering which would suit all the passages is uncertain, since all the old translators have but general expressions (Sept. *χολή*, Vulg. *Jel*, or else some word meaning bitter; yet in the passage from Hos. 1. c. *ἄγρωστις*, Ven. MS. *τιθύμαλος*), and there is no kindred word found in the other dialects to compare. Oedmanu (4, 83 sq.) referred the word to the poisonous colocynth (*Cucumis colocynthis*, Linn.), which grows almost everywhere in Arabia and Palestine; a plant with a creeping stem, bright green leaves, and bears a fruit with a strangely bitter juice (Fabri *Evagat.* 2, 417 sq.). But this fruit is not a berry, but an apple, of the size of the closed hand; nor does the colocynth shoot up among the grain. Michaelis (*Fragm.* etc., p. 145) would understand the *hyoscyamus* or the *darnnel* (*Lolium temulentum*). (But see Oedmann. *ut stp.* p. 85.) This meaning suits the passage in Hosea well (Rosenmüller, *Alterth.* 4, 1, 118), but not that in

^{<672>}Deuteronomy 32:32; nor does the lolium produce so active a poison that it could be mentioned by way of eminence in these passages. Indeed, many moderns disbelieve its poisonous properties entirely. Celsius (*lierobot.* 2, 46 sq.) explains *rosh* of the *cicuta* or *hemlock*, but is opposed by Michaelis and Oedmann (*ut sup.* p. 84). Gesenius (*Thesaur.* p. 1281), on the ground that the word in Hebrew also signifies “head,” rejects the hemlock, colocynth and darnel of other writers, and proposes the “poppy” instead (comp. Livy, 1, 54, *Papaverum capita*, *Papaver somniferum*), from the “heads” in which its seeds are contained, and from which the Orientals have extracted opium from a remote antiquity. This was known to the ancients to be poisonous, when taken in excess (Pliny, 20:76). But it may be doubted whether the poppy could be so directly and pre-eminently styled the poison plant (it was even placed on the table as a sidedish, Pliny, 19:53); and if *rosh* had denoted a plant so well known, surely some one of the old interpreters would have discovered it. “Water of *rosh*” would thus be simply ‘opium;’ but it must be admitted that there appears in none of the above passages to be any allusion to the characteristic effects of opium. The effects of the *rosh* are simply nausea and loathing. It was probably a general term for any bitter or nauseous plant, whether poisonous or not, and became afterwards applied to the venom of snakes, as the corresponding word in Chaldee is frequently so used. **SEE HEMLOCK.**

3. Ἰός, strictly something *emitted*, as a missile weapon; hence the venom of a serpent (^{<508>}James 3:8; ^{<613>}Romans 3:13). **SEE SERPENT.**

4. Φάρμακον, prop. *medicine*, hence often a deadly potion. There is a clear case of suicide by poison related in 2 Macc. 10:13, where Ptolemaeus Macron is said to have destroyed himself by this means. But we do not find a trace of it among the Jews, and certainly poisoning in any form was not in favor with them. Nor is there any reference to it in the N.T., though the practice was fatally common at that time in Rome (Sueton. *Nero*, 33, 34, 35; *Tüb.* 73; *Claud.* 1). It has been suggested, indeed, that the φαρμακεία of ^{<84>}Galatians 5:20 (A. V. “witchcraft”) signifies poisoning, but this is by no means consistent with the usage of the word in the Sept. (comp. ^{<171>}Exodus 7:11; 8:7, 18. etc.), and with its occurrence in ^{<121>}Revelation 9:21, where it denotes a crime clearly distinguished from murder (see ^{<628>}Revelation 21:8; 22:15). It more probably refers to the concoction of magical potions and love philters. **SEE WITCHCRAFT.**

The reference in ^{<411638>}Mark 16:18 seems to be to the custom of condemnation to death by means of poison (κῶνειον, Plato, *Lys.* 219; Plutarch, *Phoc.* c. 36; Diog. Laert. 2, 42; Ael. V. H. 1, 16; 9:21; comp. J. Jac. Bose, *De potionibus mortiferis*, Lips. 1736). We read in 2 Macc. 10:13 of an example of suicide by poison (comp. Bose, *iss.* p. 25 sq.). The administration of poisons seems to have been no unusual crime in the days of the apostles (see Winer, *Ad Gtlat.* p. 125; comp. Philo, *Op.* 2. 315 sq.), and the Arabian women were especially famous for their skill in preparing them (Joseph. *Ant.* 17:4, 1; comp. Rein, *Romr. Criminahlecht*, p. 427 sq.). But in the New Testament the words φαρμακεία and φαρμακεύς do not refer to this, but to necromancy (q.v.). On poisoned arrows, see Bow. Swords were sometimes also dipped in poison (*Curt.* 9, 8, 20). **SEE MYRRH.**

Poissi

SEE POISSY.

Poisson, Nicolas Joseph

a French ecclesiastic, noted as a writer of philosophy, was born in 1637 at Paris. He entered the Congregation of the Oratory at the age of twenty-three (1660), and undertook to propagate the principles of Descartes by writing a general commentary on all the works of that philosopher; but after publishing the *Traite de la Memique Canote* (Par. 1668, 4to), and *Remam ques sur la Methode* (Vendome, 1671, 8vo), he gave up the project for fear of compromising his congregation, whom their zeal for the new philosophy exposed to the resentment of the followers of Aristotle. The same fear prevented him from complying with the solicitations of Clerelier and of queen Christina, who promised him ample materials for a Life of Descartes. In 1677 he went to Rome, and handed secretly to pope Innocent XI, in the name of the bishops of Arras and Saint-Pens, a *Memoire* composed by Nicolas, and thus obtained the condemnation of sixty-five propositions of lax morals which were then in vogue in the schools of theology. The real object of his journey being discovered he was recalled by order of Pere Lachaise (1679), and relegated to Nevers, where bishop Valot made him his vicar, and gave him the direction of the diocesan seminary. After the death of this prelate, Poisson retired to a house of his order at Lyons (1705), where he died, May 3, 1710. He published, besides, *Acta Ecclesiae Mediolanensis stub sancto Carolo*

(Lyons, 1681-83, 2 vols. fol.), valuable for the number of documents translated by the author from Italian into Latin: — *Delectus actorum Ecclesie Universalis* (ibid. 1706, 2 vols. fol.). This summary of the councils is the most extensive abridgment which we have on the subject he left a number of manuscripts, among them, *Vie de Charlotte de Harlay-Sancy*: — *a Description de Rome moderne*: — *a Relation of his journey to Rome*, etc. See Salmon, *Trait de l'étude des Conciles*, p. 275 sq.; Moreri, *Grand Dict. Hist.* s.v. — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, s.v.

Poissy, Conference of

an ecclesiastical colloquy held September, 1561, is of very great importance in the reformatory history of the French Church. It has been somewhat spoken of in the article HUGUENOTS *SEE HUGUENOTS* (q.v.). It was called by Catharine de' Medici, and was composed of all bishops and archbishops, and the representatives of the absent prelates of France. It was intended that the conference should prepare partly for the anticipated renewal of the *Tridentinum* (q.v.), partly as a sort of national council, to effect the reformation of the French Church; and partly to help reduce the debt of the kingdom by the treasures of the Church. But however friendly the prelates were to the state, they did not look very favorably upon the project of reform, though all classes of society were then anxiously discussing not only reform of abuses but of doctrine. Reformed preachers were invited to participate, and even Catharine wrote in favor of the project of keeping the Huguenots within the pale of the Church, and to facilitate a reconciliation by tolerating a difference of sentiment. Pius IV, then the Roman pontiff, objected to the conference, on the ground that "if every prince were to take upon himself to hold councils in his own dominions the Church would soon become a scene of universal confusion" (Fra Paolo, *Hist. du Concile de Trente*, liv. 5, § 53, 72).

The colloquy was opened Sept. 9, in presence of the young king, the queen mother, the princes of the blood, the great officers of the crown, and a brilliant audience. Cardinal de Tournon presided. The Reformers were represented by twelve of their most eminent ministers, headed by Theodore Beza the favorite disciple and confidential friend of Calvin. Peter Martyr, who was reckoned the ablest theologian of the party, was likewise present. The proceedings were opened with a speech by chancellor L'Hopital in favor of this national council, and its advantages over an ecumenical synod. Beza spoke next in elaborate exposition of the doctrinal system of the

Reformers as set forth in the “Institutions” of Calvin. Beza’s tone was calm, conciliatory, and impressive. In treating of the Eucharist, he employed language which at first seemed almost tantamount to the Catholic terminology on that vital point. But on further explanation it appeared that the presence which he recognized was subjective only; depending not on the supernatural virtue of the sacrament, but on the power of faith; to be sought not in any change of the substance of the elements, but in the heart of the devout communicant. Beza repudiated both *transubstantiation* (q.v.) and *consubstantiation* (q.v.). Cardinal de Tournon objected to Beza’s speech, and in a trembling voice prayed for its interruption on the ground that the young monarch’s mind would be poisoned. Beza, however, managed to conclude, when, after a few hasty words of angry remonstrance from the cardinal, the assembly separated in a state of agitation (De Thou, *Hist. Univ.* liv. 28; La Place, *Commentaire de l’Etat de Religion*, liv. 6).

At the second meeting, several days afterwards, the cardinal of Lorraine replied to Beza in a very able discourse. The doctrine of the real presence, as held in the Church of Rome he proceeded to establish by proofs drawn with great skill from the Holy Bible and the Church fathers. (The speech is given at full length in the *Collection des Poes-verboux des Assembles generales du Cleyrg deFrance*, vol. 1, “Pieces Justifications,” No. 2.) The sitting was then adjourned. The sessions which followed were not held in the royal presence, and were comparatively private. Though it was clear that there could be no successful settlement by the conference, it was resolved by all parties to make a final effort for approximation, and for this purpose a select committee of ten persons was named from the most moderate members of each party. After some days of negotiation, these divines drew up a formulary upon the doctrine of the Eucharist, in the terms of which it was hoped that all sincere friends of peace in the rival communions might be induced to concur. Its language, however, was so ambiguous that each party was at liberty to construe it in accordance with their own prepossessions. The following was the draft agreed upon: “We confess that Jesus Christ, in his Holy Supper, presents, gives, and exhibits to us the true substance of his body and blood by the operation of the Holy Spirit; and that we receive and eat sacramentally, spiritually, and by faith the very body which died for us, that we may be bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh; and inasmuch as faith, resting on the Word of God, makes present things which are promised, so that thereby we receive actually the

true and natural body and blood of our Lord by the power of the Holy Ghost, in that sense we acknowledge the real presence of Christ in the Holy Supper” (Beza, *Histoire des Eglises Ref* 1, 608; *Contin. de Fleury*, liv. 47, 24). Of course such evasion could not prove satisfactory. The doctors of the Sorbonne being appealed to, rejected the formulary as “captious, insufficient, and heretical;” and then the prelates put forth a counter-statement, asserting the real presence by transubstantiation of the elements, according to the authorized traditions of the Church. This they forwarded to the queen, with a request that Beza and his associates might be ordered to signify their acceptance of it without further demur, under pain of being proscribed as heretics and banished from the kingdom. This peremptory demand was equivalent to a rupture of the negotiations; and the conference of Poissy terminated without satisfactory result.

The actions of the conference were therefore of very little advantage. Several regulations relating to discipline were made. Concerning the election of bishops, it was ordered that the name of the person nominated by the king to a bishopric shall be posted at the cathedral doors, and in other public places, that all persons may have the opportunity of objecting to him if they know anything against him. The following is a summary of other important actions of this synod:

Archbishops and bishops are forbidden to absent themselves from their dioceses for more than three months; are exhorted to apply themselves to preaching and visitations, and to hold annual synods.

Archbishops are directed to summon provincial councils every three years, according to the decrees of the Council of Basle. Excommunications, save for weighty reasons, are forbidden. Curates not to be admitted to their benefices until they have been examined by the bishop: they are ordered to proceed to priest’s orders within a year from their admission: to reside constantly; to explain the Gospel to their people, and to teach them to pray. Private masses are forbidden to be said while solemn mass is celebrated.

Priests are enjoined to prepare themselves carefully before approaching the holy altar; to pronounce the words distinctly; to do all with decency and gravity; not to suffer any airs, save those of hymns and canticles, to be played upon the organ; to correct the church books; to try to abolish all superstitious practices; to instruct the people that images are exposed to view in the churches for no other reason than to remind persons of Jesus

Christ and the saints. It is further directed that all images which are in any way indecent, or which merely illustrate fabulous and ridiculous tales, shall be entirely removed.

These regulations are closed by a profession of faith in which the errors of Luther and Calvin, and other sectarians, are specially rejected.

See, besides the authorities already cited, De Felice, *History of French Protestantism*, p. 101 sq.; Bossuet, *Variations*, vol. 1; Jervis, *Church of France*, 1, 137-146; Soldan, *Gesch. des Protestantismus in Frankreich* (1855), etc., vol. 1; Ranke, *Französische Gesch.* 1, 236 sq.; Baum. *Theodor Beza* (1851), vol. 2; Smedley, *History of the Ref. Religion in France*, 1, 148 sq., 178; Smiles, *History of the Huguenots* (see Index); Hardwick, *History of the Reformation*, p. 138 sq. (J. H. W.)

Poitier, Pierre Louis

a French religious writer, was born Dec. 26, 1745, at Havre. As soon as he had taken holy orders, he was appointed superior of the seminary of Rouen, by cardinal La Rochefoucauld, archbishop of that city. After submitting to the law which exacted the constitutional oath of clergymen, he recalled it, and retired to the seminary of St. Firmin, at Paris, where he perished, Sept. 2, 1792, with almost all his companions. He left some works of edification, which had several editions. — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 40, 582.

Poitiers

(earlier POICTIERS, a corruption of the Latin *Pictavium*, so called by the Gallic tribe, the *Pictai*, who inhabited the district in Caesar's time) is one of the oldest towns in France. It is the capital of the department of Vienne, and is situated on an eminence near the rivers Clain and Boivre. Its population is now about 31,034, and it possesses many churches, chapels, and monasteries. Its cathedral, named St. Pierre, is one of the finest in France, and belongs to the 12th century. It contains the ashes of Richard Coeur de Lion, and was the seat, in its present condition, or in the older edifice that occupied its site, of twenty-three ecclesiastical councils.

Poitiers, Councils Of

(*Concilium Pictaviense*), were convened here at different times in the Middle Ages.

I. The first of these was held in 593, and was provoked by a rebellion of nuns, under the leadership of Chrodielda, a Frankish princess and nun at Poitiers, who had rebelled against Leuovera, abbess of St. Croix. She was here called to account for leaving her nunnery, and for the violence which she had committed against Gondegesile and other bishops; also for the acts of rebellion which she, in concert with Besina, another nun, had committed against their abbess. Being exhorted to ask forgiveness of the abbess, she boldly refused, and threatened to kill her. The bishops, after consulting the canons, declared her to be excommunicated, and ordered that she should remain so until she should have done penance. They then re-established the abbess, Leuovera, in the government of the monastery. See Labbe, *Concil.* 5, 1593; Gregor. Turon. *Hist. d. France*, 9, 4; 10:16, 19; Mansi, *Concil.* 9, 1011; 10:455, 459; Hardouin, *Concil.* 3, 490, 527, 531; Hefele, *Conciliengesch.* 3, 51.

II. Another council was held Jan. 13, 1004, convoked by William V, count of Poitiers and duke of Aquitaine. Five bishops were present, who published three canons:

1. Pronounces those persons to be under anathema who pillage the churches, rob the poor, or strike the clergy; and further declares that if they rebel against this sentence the bishops and barons shall assemble and march against them, ravaging all around them until they submit.

The other two canons forbid bishops to take any fees for penance and confirmation; and priests and deacons to retain women in their houses. See Labbe, *Concil.* 9, 780.

III. The third council was held in 1073, before cardinal Gerand, the Roman legate, against Berenger. The question of the Holy Eucharist was discussed, and the minds of men were so exasperated against Berenger that he narrowly escaped with his life. See Labbe, *Concil.* 10, 346.

IV. The fourth was held in 1078, by the legate Hugo, bishop of Die, who, by the account which he gave of this council to pope Gregory VII, seems to have encountered much opposition to his plans. He complains that the king of France had forbidden the count of Poitiers to allow the council to be held within his states; that the archbishop of Tours and the bishop of Rennes had rendered themselves almost complete masters of the council, and that the assembly had been disturbed by the armed followers of these

prelates. Some attribute to this council, and others to the following one, ten canons, of which these are the most worthy of note:

1. Forbids to receive investitures at the hands of kings and other laymen.
2. Forbids simony and pluralities.
4. Forbids bishops to receive any present for conferring holy orders, for consecrating churches, or for giving any benediction.
6. Forbids monks and canons to purchase churches without the bishop's consent.
8. Forbids the ordination of the children of priests, and of bastards, except they be canons or regular monks.
10. Enjoins that clerks who carry arms, or who deal in usury, shall be excommunicated. See Labbe, *Concil. 10*, 366.

V. The last council convened at Poitiers was held Nov. 18, 1100, by order of John and Benedict, the two legates of the Holy See, who presided in the place of Pascal II. About eighty bishops and abbots were present. Norigaudus, bishop of Autun, having been found guilty of simony, was condemned to give up his stole and pastoral ring. Upon his refusal to do so, he was further deposed from his bishopric and from the priesthood, and sentence of excommunication was denounced against all who continued to obey him as their bishop. He, nevertheless, persisted in his refusal to submit to the sentence, and retained his stole and ring. In this council, moreover, Philip, king of France, who had taken back to him Bertrade, his wife, was excommunicated by the legates, in spite of the opposition of many of the bishops and of William, duke of Aquitaine. Lastly, sixteen canons were published:

1. Declares that it is lawful for bishops only to give the tonsure (*coronas benedicere*) to the clergy, and for abbots to do so to monks.
2. Forbids them to require any fee for performing the operation, or even the scissors and napkin employed.
4. Reserves to the bishop the benediction of the sacerdotal vestments, and of all the vessels, etc., of the altar.

- 7.** Forbids, under excommunication, to buy or sell prebends, and to require any allowance (*pastus*) for having given one.
- 10.** Gives permission to regular canons to baptize, preach, administer the sacrament of penance, and bury the dead during the bishop's pleasure.
- 12.** Forbids to allow to preach those who carry about the relics of saints for the sake of gain.
- 16.** Confirms all that the pope had enacted in the Council of Clermont.

See Labbe, *Concil.* 10, 720; Hefele, *Conciliengesch.* vols. 4 and 5.

Poix, Louis De

a French monastic, was born Oct. 18, 1714, at Croixrault (diocese of Amiens). He devoted himself for some years to the study of the Greek, Hebrew, Chaldee, and Syriac languages, and conceived the design of a Polyglot Bible, to the redaction of which several of his confraternity (the Capuchin monks) promised to lend a hand. In 1744 the abbé Villefroy, professor at the College of France, took the direction of this enterprise; but the Bible impatiently expected by the learned world, and in regard to which Benedict XIV addressed a brief of felicitation to Louis de Poix, April 9, 1755, was not published, owing to divers contrarieties which at that time befell the Capuchins. In 1768 Poix wrote *A Memoir*, in which he advocated the foundation of an institution which, without being a burden to the State, would be of invaluable service to the Church, useful to the learned and men of letters, and honorable to the nation. He proposed the name of "Societe Royal des Etudes Orientales," and on the plan suggested by him was founded, April 1, 1822, the "Societ Asiatique." Louis de Poix died at Paris in 1782. He published, with the collaboration of several other Capuchins, the following works: *Prieres que Nerses, Patriartche des Armeniens, fit a la Gloire de Dieu, pour toute Ame fidele a Jesus Christ* (1770): — *Principes discutes pour-faciliter l'Intelligence des Livres prophetiques* (Par. 1755-64, 16 vols. 12mo), the fruit of twenty years' labor: — *Nouvelle Version des Psaumes* (ibid. 1762, 2 vols. 12mo): — a *Translation of Ecclesiastes* (1771, 12mo): — *Propheties de Jeemie* (ibid. 1780, 6 vols. 12mo): *Propheties de Baruch* (ibid. 1788, 12mo): — *Essai sur le Livre de Job* (ibid. 1768, 2 vols. 12mo): — *Taaite de let Paix inteirieuse* (1764, 1768, 12mo): — *Traite de la Joie* (1768, 12mo). He left

in manuscript a *Dictionnaire Armenien, Latin, Italien, et Francais*. — *Hoefler, Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 40, 585.

Poki, Jehuda, Ben-Elieser

(*Tshelebi ben-Isaak Puli*), a Jewish writer of some note, who belonged to the sect of the Karaites, was born and educated at Constantinople in the first half of the 16th century. He made extensive travels through Palestine, Egypt, Irak, and Persia in order to become acquainted with the Karaite literature. But having no knowledge of the Arabic, he was unable to make use of a large portion of Karaite literature, as he himself confessed in the preface of a work of his. In the year 1571 he was at Kahira, where he found many writings of the Karaites in the house of the Nasi, or head of the Karaites, where he also resided, and was told that all congregations were in possession of such collections, which, however, were very often burned or plundered. He was told that the year before (1570) three hundred very valuable and interesting works of the Karaites had been taken from the synagogue at Kahira and destroyed. At Kahira, Poki finished his work *hdwhy r [ç* about 1573, and died in 1575 in his native place. The above-named work, which was published by his son and brother at Constantinople in 1581, treats in a very elaborate way on the laws of incest, the preface of which has been reprinted by Wolf in his *Bibl. Nebr.* 3, 294 sq. See Furst, *Gesch. des Kariaerthums*, from 900 to 1575 (Leips. 1865), 2, 322 sq.; id. *Bibl. Jud.* 3, 108 sq.; De Rossi, *Dizionario storico degli Autori Ebrei*, p. 266 (Germ. transl. by Hamberger); Wolf, *Bibl. Hebr.* 3, 293 sq. (B. P.)

Pol

SEE BEAN.

Polak, Jacob

a Jewish savant, one of the greatest Talmudic authorities in his time, was born about 1460, and died about 1530 at Prague, where under his lead a great Talmudic school had flourished. Polak was a pupil of Jacob Margoles of Nuremberg, from whom he learned a new method of Talmudic casuistry, known as the "Pilpul." In the times which were disastrous and troublesome to the Jews the study of the Talmud was left to itself, and, guided by no general scientific knowledge, it unavoidably degenerated into a method repulsive to the few who were really profound scholars, or whose minds were less distorted. The transition from the short explanation of words and

things of the older commentators of the Talmud—through the discussions and disputations of the Tosaphoth (in the narrower sense) -to the exercises of wit of the Nurembergers (*Blauser*, from the German “bloss,” by which the query was introduced) and Regensbergers (so called from the principal schools), and the pettifoggings of modern times, has not yet been specially investigated. There are many analogies in Christian jurisprudence and Mohammedan theology to this kind of casuistry and discussion (“Pilpull”), which devotes more attention to the mode of treatment than to the subject itself. For it is the nature of a practical science-and the Halacha must be regarded throughout as a theory of law-that over-theorizing causes it to degenerate from a practical aim to a mere play of intellect. During this unhappy time rules derived from idle speculation were enforced as rules of life belonging to the religious law, more strictly than at any former period; and subsequently the authors of the Tosaphoth and their successors, together with the great Spanish and Provengal legal authorities (particularly the authors of compendiums, judgments, etc.), were comprised under the expression “decernents” (*Pesukinz*, מַשְׁפָּטִים). But it must be said in honor of Jacob Polak, though he introduced this “Pilpul method,” he was very careful not to write down nor publish the decisions achieved by this method of hair-splitting, for fear that his successors might follow him implicitly. The only work of his we have is a decision entitled תְּוֹדָה לְמַשְׁפָּטֵי בְּרַחֲמֵי יְבִי, published with the approbation of Simon benBezalel (Prague, 1594), and republished together with Lowe ben-Bezalel’s מִכְתָּבֵי תְּרִיפְתָּא לְיְדֵי פֶּסֶח, (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1719). See Furst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3, 109 sq.; Wolf, *Bibl. Hebr.* 3, 1095; Graitz, *Geschichte der Juden.* 9, 63 sq.; Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenth.* 2. s. *Sekten*, 3, 240 sq.; Güdemann, in Frankel’s *Monatsschrift* (Breslau, 1854), 13, 423 sq. (B. P.)

Polallion, Marie De Lumague Dame De

a French lady renowned for her piety, and the founder of a religious order, was born Nov. 29, 1599, at Paris. Belonging to a noble and rich family, and having enjoyed a brilliant education, she was wooed by several gentlemen of high standing, but, resisting all the seductions of the world, gave the preference to a life of monastic quiet. At the instigation of Lebrun, a Dominican who directed her conscience, she entered a monastery of the Capuchins. But as the weakness of her health did not suffer her to submit to the ascetic rules of the order, she was free to leave the monastery, and in 1617 she was married to Francois de Polallion. Her

husband died about a year after, and from this time she lived in retirement as tutor of one of the daughters of the duchess of Orleans. Madame de Polallion, in the midst of the most brilliant court of Europe, remained true to her early monastic habits, and when relieved of her duties sought again her former retreat. According to St. Vincent de Paul, she founded the "Institut des Filles de la Providence" in 1630: the members of this sisterhood undertook to educate the children of the poor in the country. She directed that they should be thirty-three in number, and distributed them in the villages of the environs of Paris. Her own means were soon exhausted by the enterprise, but private charity came to the rescue, and Anne of Austria, taking the institution under her protection, presented it in 1651 with a mansion in the suburb of Saint-Marceau. She also helped in the founding of the "Maison des Nouvelles Catholiques," which was liberally endowed by marshal Turenne. The life of Madame de Polallion has frequently been written. She died at Paris Sept. 4, 1657. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 40, 587.

Polanco

is the name of three brothers esteemed Spanish painters of the 16th century, natives of Seville. Francisco Zurbaran was their master, and they were so proficient in art that even in their own times their works were confounded with those of their master. This mistake, says Quillet, has been quite frequent with those who beheld the paintings of San-Esteban at Seville, where Zurbaran painted *St. Peter* and *St. Stephen*, but where the *Martyrdom* of the patron, the *Nativity*, which is below, *St. Hermenegilde*, and *St. Herman*, are works of Polanco. They always worked and lived together. Their great paintings adorn the monuments of Seville. At San-Paolo we find the *Apparition of the Angels to Abraham*; *Tobias the Younger guided by an Angel*; *Jacob Wrestling*; *Joseph's Dream*; and in the church of the Guardian Angels, *St. Theresa in Ecstasy* (1649). The last work of Carlo Polanco, who seems to have been the most celebrated of the brothers, bears the date of 1686. — Hoefer, *Nouvelles Biographies Généralé*, 40, 588.

Poland, Ecclesiastical History of

The Polish historians Naruszewicz, Friese, Lelewel, and others assert that Christianity was introduced into the Slavic countries at a very early period by some disciples of Methodius from Moravia. Lelewel, upon very unsafe

grounds, admits a bishopric of Posen anterior to the time of king Micislas I. According to Thietmar of Merseburg, the latter, under the influence of his wife Dambrouska, daughter of the Bohemian duke Boleslas, established the Christian religion in Poland in 965, prevailed upon his subjects to destroy the idols, and founded as early as 966, with the assistance of the German emperor Otho the Great, the bishopric of Posen (Poznani), over which, together with the bishoprics of Cizi, Misni, Merseburg, Brandenburg, and Havelberg, etc., jurisdiction was given to the archbishop of Magdeburg, at the Council of Ravenna, in 967. It follows that the year of foundation, 968, given by Boguphalus and the *Annales Poznan.*, has been accepted erroneously. The diocese of the bishop of Posen extended over the dominions of duke Boleslas, the boundaries of which cannot be ascertained for want of documents. Posen was the only Polish bishopric up to the year 1000, when the emperor Otho III, at the time of a pilgrimage to the tomb of St. Adalbert at Gnesen, founded the archiepiscopal see of Gnesen (nesna), and subordinated to it the bishoprics of Colobrega (Kolberg), Cracow, and Wratislavia (Breslau), all then situated in the duchy of Polonia. Stanislas Lubieniski's assertion that Cracow was the seat of the oldest Polish bishopric is thus proved to be erroneous, as it could not, as an archbishopric, have been a dependence of (Gnesen).

Early Period. — We know little about the ecclesiastical development of Poland in its first Christian century. Pope Gregory VII complained in 1075 of the small number of the bishops in proportion to the population; the dioceses were too large, and the bishops had not even fixed residences; nothing definite had been decided about the limits of the diocese of Gnesen and its dependent bishoprics, among which was then counted the bishopric of Lebus, founded by Micislas in 965; but as the city passed continually from Poland to Germany, and vice versa, its existence was a precarious one. It is believed that the papal legate AEGidius founded it a second time in 1123, and subordinated it to Gnesen; documents relating to it date only from 1133. Another episcopal see dependent upon Gnesen was the bishopric of Plock, whose foundation is referred to Boleslas the Great. It was formerly called *Ep. Masovice*. Callus (*Chronicles Pol.* ad ann. 1110) mentions a bishop Simeon: he seems to have been ordained in 1107, and to have died in 1129. A great victory of the Poles over the Prussians and Pomeranians is attributed to his intercession. And still another dependent bishopric was that of Leslau, which was founded by Micislas II, son of Boleslas the Great, and originally called *Episc. Cujaviensis*, because it was

intended for the province of Cujawia; extended afterwards over the largest part of Western Prussia, on the left bank of the Vistula; reached in a northerly direction the Baltic Sea; and was bounded west by the archbishopric of (Gnesen, which it also encircled on the south. Gallus (*Chronicle*) mentions bishop Paulas, who died in 1110. The bishopric of Ermeland, founded in 1243, came to Poland only in 1466. After the reign of Micislas II (1023-34), general anarchy ensued, and at the same time a general apostasy from the Christian faith. Bishops and priests were without authority, some were killed, and external and civil wars robbed Poland of its wealth, and of a considerable part of its population. In 1039 the Bohemians destroyed Posen and Gnesen, and took away the body of St. Adalbert. A multitude of Poles crossed the Vistula and took refuge in Masowia; wild beasts established their lairs in the churches of St. Adalbert and St. Peter. Kasimierz (Casimir) in that great distress arrived with a body of five hundred soldiers from Germany, and by his bravery and intelligence freed the country from foreign occupation. He retained the power until his death, which occurred in 1058. He promoted the interests of Christianity by all the means in his power. He was succeeded by his son, Boleslas II, whose feats were not inferior to those of his ancestors; but his ambition and pride caused his ruin. At Christmas, 1076, he put the diadem on his head, and was anointed by the bishops of the kingdom. About the same time Gregory VII sent a legate to Poland. A few years afterwards, in 1079, the king, being put under interdict by St. Stanislas, bishop of Cracow, avenged himself by the murder of the prelate. Hereupon the nobility expelled him, and he was obliged to take refuge in Hungary, where he died. He was succeeded by his younger brother, Boleslas Wladislas Hermann, who lived in peace with his neighbors and the clergy, to whom he granted rights and privileges. Having lived many years in childless matrimony with the Bohemian princess Judith, a son was granted him, in consequence of the intercession, it was believed, of St. AEGIDIUS. This son was afterwards Boleslas Krzywousty. At this time Otho, afterwards the apostle of Pomerania, lived at the Polish court. He was instrumental in bringing about Wladislas Hermann's second marriage with Judith, the widowed sister of the emperor Henry IV. In 1099 the bishops of Poland dedicated the cathedral of Gnesen. On the day previous to that ceremony St. Adalbert is said to have appeared to the Poles in a battle with the Pomeranians, and given them victory. Wladislas divided his states during his lifetime between Boleslas and another illegitimate son, Zbigniew. The latter had revolted a few years before, and was pardoned at the intercession of the bishops.

Wladislas died in 1102, at Plock. The new ruler, Boleslas III (1102-1139), married a Russian princess, and undertook expeditions, considered in the light of crusades, against the pagan Pomeranians. In 1103 Walo, chosen bishop of Beauvais, and, after his return, bishop of Paris, came to Poland as the legate of pope Paschal II, and in his zeal for justice deposed two bishops—" nullo vel prece vel pretio subveniente." In 1109 Boleslas reported such a complete victory over the Pomeranians that, of their 40,000 warriors, 10,000 only escaped; he took the stronghold of Nakel, thus preparing the way for the spiritual expedition undertaken soon afterwards by Otho, bishop of Bamberg. In 1109 the emperor Henry V was utterly defeated in his attempt to submit Poland a second time to the empire. In 1110 Boleslas fought successfully against the Bohemians: the bishops, as usual, accompanied the troops, and distributed the Eucharist to the whole army on the eve of an engagement. In 1120-1121 the Pomeranians, after a desperate struggle, were completely subdued and Stettin was taken. The conquered foe promised tribute and conversion. It was then that Boleslas besought Otho of Bamberg to instruct the Pomeranians. *SEE POMTERANIA*. The last years of the great king were less successful. In 1135 Boleslas recognized at Merseburg the emperor Lothair as his liege lord for Pomerania and Rügen; promised a tribute for twelve years, and carried the sword of the emperor as the imperial procession proceeded to church. In 1139 he divided his dominions among the four oldest of his sons, and (died Oct. 28, 1139). In 1123 the papal legate AEGidius, bishop of Tusculum, sent by Calixtus II, had to establish more distinctly the limits between the dioceses, and this division of the temporal sovereignty in nowise affected the Church. But the Church was far from enjoying in Poland the privileges she possessed in other parts of Christian Europe. Her goods and subjects stood under the secular laws; there was no immunity from taxes, and the bishops were altogether dependent on the princes. Still at the beginning of the 13th century the princes disposed of the prebends of the cathedrals, and took hold of the goods of the bishops at their demise, as the patrons did of the heritage of curates. A number of priests lived in concubinage. There were churches, the charges of which had become, in some sense, the possession of certain families. The dissensions of the successors of Boleslas, as was to be expected, dismembered the empire after a century of bloodshed. Prussians, Lithuanians, Mongols, and other tribes devastated the country. The authority of the Church grew among those ruins. Papal legates appeared more frequently, synods became more frequent too, and altogether the

Church sought for herself the rights she had long attained elsewhere. The Templars, assisted by Crusaders from the West, attacked the pagans of Prussia, and the voice of the popes constantly called the Western Christians to arms against the barbarians. In 1157 the emperor Frederick I indicted a crusade of the Germans against Poland, to re-establish the tie of vassalage that once united the land with Germany. The Poles were defeated, and Boleslas appeared at Kryszkowo before the emperor barefooted, and with a naked sword tied around his neck. Wladislas died in Germany, and was succeeded by Boleslas IV, who died in 1173, leaving an only son, Leszek: but it was his brother Licislas who succeeded him. The people, led by Getka (Gedcon), bishop of Cracow, revolted against Micislas, and his younger brother, Casimir Sprawiedliwy (the Just), was put in his place. In 1180 there was a synod of Polish bishops. They threatened with interdict whoever should rob the peasants of their stores, appropriate the heritage of an ecclesiastic, or refuse to restore within a given time whatever of Church property had been taken. After Casimir, who died May 4, 1194, at table, while talking with the bishops about salvation—"non sine veneni suspicione"—Fulko assembled the primates, and prevailed upon them to recognize the sons of Casimir. Helena, Casimir's widow, made arrangements with Alicislas, and, in the name of her minor sons, recognized him as archduke, and left him Cracow: her son Leszek was to be his successor. This Micislas died in 1202 at Kalisch, and Leszek waived in favor of his son Wladislas his own rights to Cracow. In these years the endeavors of the popes for the reformation of the Polish Church were crowned with some success. Clement III sent in 1189 cardinal Giovanni Malabranca to collect contributions for a crusade, and reform the clergy of Poland; several regulations for that purpose were agreed upon at the Synod of Cracow. Cardinal Peter came in 1197; but when he published at Prague the edict against the matrimony of clergymen, the wrath of the clergy was so great that his life was put in danger. He held another synod at Cracow, where he insisted on the same views; journeyed through the bishoprics, giving his attention to a dereliction of sound morals more deplorable than the marriage of ecclesiastics, and traditional with the Poles: for he besought the laymen to seek some consecration for their wild copulations. He made slow work of it, and it required all the energies of archbishop Henry Kentlitz to establish, little by little, a more Christian-like state of things. In 1212 bishop Peter was freely elected by the chapter of Posen. The dukes at that time promised to touch nothing of the heritage of prelates save gold, silver, etc., and waived their judiciary rights on

clergymen and their subjects. In 1231 Wladislas Odonicz became the only ruler of Great Poland. At this epoch some crusades against the Prussians took place, and the Poles, though slowly and reluctantly, had a part in them. We find the same bishoprics in the 13th and 14th centuries, but not in those firm metropolitan relations which the interest of the Church required (see Gregory VII, *Epist. (ad Boleslauum, Pol. rgeqeml, 73)*). The first bishop of Posen, Jordan, and the duke Boleslas Chrobry distinguished themselves by their successful attempts to expand the Christian faith; Bodzanta, archbishop of Gnesen, in the 14th century, by the conversion of the barbarians of Lithuania and Samogitia. This prelate extended his diocese, augmented by a half, over Pomerellia and Neringia, and added Silesia to his spiritual dominions: in one word. the country between the Netze River, the sources of the Vistula, the grand-duchies of Moscow and Sengallen, constituted the territory of his archiepiscopal see. In consequence of these aggrandizements the new bishoprics of Whilna, in the grand-duchy of Lithuania, and of Wornie or Miedniki, in the duchy of Samogitia, were established—the first in 1387, the latter in 1417.

The Reformation Period and Since. — In order to make clear the history of the Polish Church in the Reformation period, it is necessary to retrace our steps to the 11th century. It was then that the neighboring churches of Germany acquired a great influence over the Poles, while priests and monks flocked from France and Italy, but particularly from Germany, to Poland, built everywhere convents and churches, and at the same time used the Romish ritual in opposition to the simple worship of the Polish national churches, which, however, maintained their ground till the 14th century. The Hussites (q.v.) from Bohemia found a favorable field in Poland for the propagation of their peculiar tenets, and the Romish clergy in consequence took active measures for the purpose of checking the spread of the obnoxious doctrines. With this view the parish priests were ordered to seize and bring before the bishops all who were suspected of holding Hussite sentiments. Severe enactments were passed for the punishment of the heretics. But in the face of all opposition the new doctrines were embraced by some of the most influential families in the land, and the reforming party indeed was very numerous when their leader was slain on the field of battle. But although the doctrines of Huse had found many supporters in Poland, the national feeling was still in favor of the dominant Church. We append an account of the progress of Protestantism in Poland dependent largely on Gardner, *Dictionary of Religions*, p. 670 sq.

“In the commencement of the 15th century a powerful impulse was given to the cause of Polish education and literatim by the establishment of the University of Cracow, and the encouragement given in that seminary to native scholars. Already a goodly number of accomplished literary men had issued from the University of Prague, some of whom were chosen to fill the chairs at Cracow; these again were generally selected to supply the vacant episcopal sees, and thus in a short time they were found in the Polish Church not a few prelates distinguished alike for their piety and learning. The enlightened views which some of these ecclesiastical dignitaries entertained were speedily manifested in various projects started for reforming the Church. Thus Martin Tromba, the primate of Poland, ordered the liturgical books to be translated into the national language, that they might be understood by the great mass of tile people. But the boldest step in the direction of Church reform at this period was taken by Ostrotwo, palatine of Posen, who presented to the Polish diet of 1459 a proposal for introducing improvements of such a vital character that, had they been adopted, a separation of the Church of Poland from Rome would have been the immediate result. ‘In this plan,’ says count Krasinski, ‘of reforming the Church of Poland he maintained that, Christ having declared that his kingdom was not of this world, the pope had no authority whatever over the king of Poland, and should not even be addressed by the latter in humble terms, unbecoming his dignity; that Rome was drawing every year from the country large sums under the pretence of religion, but, in fact, by means of superstition; and that the bishop of Rome was inventing most unjust reasons for leaving taxes, the proceeds of which were employed, not for the real wants of the Church, but for the pope’s private interests; that all the ecclesiastical lawsuits should be decided in the country and not at Rome, which did not take “any sheep without wool;” that there were, indeed, among the Poles people who respected the Roman scribblings furnished with red seals and hempen strings, and suspended on the door of a church; but that it was wrong to submit to these Italian deceits.’ He further says: ‘Is it not a deceit that the pope imposes upon us, in spite of the king and the senate, I don’t know what, bulls called indulgences? He gets money by assuring people that he absolves their sin; but God has said by his prophet, “My son, give me thy heart, and not money.” The pope feigns that he employs his treasures for the election of churches; but he does it, ill fact, for enriching his relations. I shall pass in silence things that are still worse. There are monks who praise still such fables. There are a great number of preachers and confessors who only think how to get the

richest harvest, and who indulge themselves, after having plundered the poor people. He complains of the great number of monks unfit for the clerical office, saying, "After having shaven his head and endowed a cowl, a man thinks himself fit to correct the whole world. He cries, and almost bellows, in the pulpit, because he sees no opponent. Learned men, and even those who possess an inferior degree of knowledge, cannot listen without horror to the nonsense, and almost blasphemy, uttered by such preaches."

"These sentiments avowed by a Polish senator in the assembly of the states, plainly indicated that public opinion, even in the 15th century, was prepared for the great ecclesiastical reformation which commenced a century later in Germany and Switzerland. As if still further to pave the way for that important movement, treatises were at every little interval issuing from the press in Poland containing opinions which Rome has always been accustomed to brand as heresies. One work, in particular, was published at Cracow in 1515, which openly advocated the great Protestant principle that the Holy Scriptures must be believed, and all merely human ordinances may be dispensed with.

The date of the appearance of this these ways two years before Luther publicly avowed his opposition to Rome. No sooner, accordingly, did the German Reformer commence his warfare with the pope than he was joined by many Poles, more especially belonging to the towns of Polish Prussia; and so rapidly did the principles of the Reformation spread in Dantzic, the principality of that province, that, in 1524, no fewer than five churches were occupied by the disciples of the Wittenber reformer. A very large part of the inhabitants of Dantzic, however, still adhered to the old Church; and, anxious to restore the ancient order of things, they dispatched a deputation to Sigismund I, who at that time occupied the throne of Poland, imploring his interposition. The monarch, moved by the appeal made by the deputation, who appeared before him dressed in deep mourning, proceeded in person to Dantzic, restored the former state of things, and either executed or banished the principal leaders of the new movement. But while for purely political reasons Sigismund in this case acted in the most tyrannical and oppressive manner, he allowed the doctrines of Protestantism to spread in all the other parts of his dominions without persecuting those who embraced them. Even in Dantzic itself, when Lutheranism, in the course of a few years, began to be again preached within its walls, he refused to take a single step to check its progress, so

that in the subsequent reign it became the dominant creed of that city, without, however, infringing upon the religious liberty of the Roman Catholics.

“The works of Luther found many readers, and even admirers, in Poland, and a secret society, composed of both clergymen and laymen, met frequently to discuss religious subjects, including those points more especially which the rise of the Reformation brought prominently before the public mind. It was in connection with his society that Antitrinitarian opinions were first adopted as a creed by several individuals, and the foundation laid in Poland for that sect whose members were afterwards known by the name of Socinians (q.v.). The spread of this heresy, however, was limited to the upper classes of society, while among the great mass of the people the scriptural views of the Reformers found ready acceptance; a result in no small degree owing to the arrival of Bohemian Brethren, to the number of about a thousand, who had been driven from their own country, and found a home in the province of Posen. This event happened in 1548, and the public worship of the Brethren being conducted in the Bohemian language, which was intelligible to the inhabitants of Posen, attracted towards them the sympathies of multitudes. The Romish bishop of Posen, alarmed at the influence which the Brethren were exercising over the people of his diocese, applied for and obtained a royal edict for their expulsion from the country. This order they immediately obeyed, and proceeded to Prussia, where they found full religious liberty. Next year, however, some of them returned to Poland, where they had formerly received so much kindness, and continued their labors without being molested in any form. Their congregations rapidly increased, and in a short time they reached the large number of eighty in the province of Great Poland alone, while many others were formed in different parts of the country.

“A circumstance occurred about this time which was providentially overruled for the still wider diffusion of Protestant principles in Poland. The students of the University of Craucow, having taken offence at some real or imagined affront offered them by the rector, repaired to foreign universities, put particularly to the newly erected University of Königsberg, from which the great majority of them returned home imbued with Protestant principles. The Reformed doctrines now made extraordinary progress, particularly in the province of Cracow. In vain did the Romish clergy denounce the growing heresy; all their remonstrances were

unavailing, and at length they convened a general synod in 1551 to consider the whole subject. On this occasion Hosilis, bishop of Ermeland, composed his celebrated Confession, which has been acknowledged by the Church of Rome as a faithful exposition of its creed. The synod not only decreed that this creed should be signed by the whole body of the clergy, but petitioned the king that a royal mandate should be issued ordering its subscription by the laity. It was now resolved that violent persecution should be commenced against the heretics, and this determination was strengthened by an encyclical letter from Rome, recommending the extirpation of heresy. Several causes of bloody persecution occurred; but the nobles, aroused to jealousy by the high-handed measures of the clergy, openly declared their wish to restrict the authority of the bishops, and the people were unanimous in expressing a similar desire.

“Such was the state of matters in Poland when the diet of 1552 was convened; and scarcely had its deliberations been commenced, when a general hostility was evinced by the members to episcopal jurisdiction. The result was that at this diet religious liberty for all confessions was virtually established in Poland. At the diet of 1555 the king was earnestly urged to convoke a national synod over which he himself should preside, and which should reform the Church on the basis of the Holy Scriptures. It was proposed, also, to invite to this assembly the most distinguished Reformers, such as Calvin, Beza, Melancthon, and Vergerius. But the expectations of the Protestants in Poland were chiefly turned towards John a Lasco or Laski, who had been instrumental in promoting the cause of the Reformation in Germany, Switzerland, and England. For to long time he remained within the pale of the Romish Church, in the hope that it would be possible to effect a reformation without seceding from her communion. In 1540 he declared his adherence to the Protestant Church on the principles of Zwigli. The high reputation which Lasco had already gained, both as a scholar and a Christian, attracted the marked attention of the Protestant princes in various parts of Europe, several of whom invited him to take up his residence in their dominions. The sovereign of East Friesland, anxious to complete the reformation of the Church in that country, prevailed upon Lasco to allow himself to be nominated superintendent of all its churches. To carry out the object of his appointment was matter of no small difficulty, considering the extreme reluctance which prevailed to the entire abolition of Romish rites, but by energy, per severance, and uncompromising firmness he succeeded, in the

brief space of six years, in rooting out the last remains of Romanism, and fully establishing the Protestant religion throughout the whole of the churches of East Friesland. In 1548 Lasco received an earnest invitation from Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury, to join the distinguished Reformers who had repaired to England from all parts of the Continent, that they might complete the Reformation of the Church in that country. Having accepted Cranmer's invitation, the Polish Reformer left Friesland and went to England, where he was appointed, on his arrival in 1550, superintendent of the foreign Protestant congregation established at London. In this important sphere he continued to labor with much comfort and success, until the demise of Edward VI and the accession of Mary arrested the progress of the Reformation in England, and compelled Lasco with his congregation to leave the country. This little band of exiles, headed by the Polish Reformer, were driven by a storm upon the coast of Denmark, where, on landing, they were received at first with hospitality and kindness, but, through the influence of the Lutheran divines, they were soon obliged to seek an asylum elsewhere. The same hatred man, the part of the Lutheran clergy was shown to the congregation of Lasco at Lubeck, Hamburg, and Rostock. At length the remnants of the congregation found in Dantzic at peaceful asylum, while Lasco himself retired to Friesland, where he was received with every mark of respect and attachment. In a short time, however, finding his position by no means so comfortable as at first, he removed to Frankfort-on-the-Main, where he established a church for the Belgian Protestant refugees, and made various attempts, without success, to unite the Lutheran and Protestant churches.

“Throughout all his wanderings Lasco's thoughts were habitually turned towards Poland, and he maintained a constant intercourse with his countrymen, and also with his sovereign, Sigismund Augustus, who entertained a high regard for him. He returned to Poland in 1556, and no sooner did his arrival become known than the Romish clergy, taking the alarm, hastened to implore the king to banish from his dominions a man whom they described as an outlawed heretic, and the source of troubles and commotions wherever he went. To this representation the king paid no regard; and, to the annoyance of the bishops and the papal nuncio, Lasco was soon after entrusted with the superintendence of all the Reformed churches of Little Poland. Through his influence the tenets of the Swiss Reformers were extensively adopted by the higher classes of his countrymen. The chief objects, however, which he kept steadily in view

were the union of all Protestant sects, and the ultimate establishment of a Reformed National Church modeled on the plan of the Church of England, for which he had conceived a high admiration. But his exertions in the cause of reform were much weakened by the rise of Antitrinitarian sentiments in some of the churches which he superintended. He struggled hard, and not without success, to check the progress of these opinions. In the public affairs of the Church he took an active part, and assisted in preparing the version of the first Protestant Bible in Poland. In the midst of his unwearied labors in the cause of the Polish Reformation, Lasco was cut off in 1560, before he had an opportunity of fully maturing his great designs.

“One of the last objects on which the Polish Reformer had set his heart was the speedy convocation of a national synod. This proposal, however, met with violent opposition from Rome and its partisans. The pope, Paul IV, dispatched a legate to Poland with letters to the king, the senate, and the most influential noblemen, promising to effect all necessary reforms, and to call a general council. Lippomali, the papal legate, was an able man, and a devoted servant to the see of Rome. The Romish clergy were much encouraged by the presence of this dignitary in the country, who endeavored, but without effect, to prevail upon the king to adopt violent measures for the extirpation of heresy. The crafty emissary of the pope succeeded also by his intrigues in fomenting discord among the Protestants. He assembled a synod of the Polish clergy, which, while it lamented the dangers which threatened the Church, both from within and from without, passed many resolutions for improving its condition and coercing the heretics. The extent to which the synod, instigated by Lippomani, pushed their jurisdiction may be seen from their proceedings in a case of alleged sacrilege recorded both by Romish and Protestant writers. Dorothy Laszecka, a poor girl, was accused of having obtained from the Dominican monks of Sochaczew a host, feigning to receive communion. It was said that she wrapped that host in her clothes, and sold it to the Jews of a neighboring village, by whom she had been instigated to, commit this act of sacrilege by the bribe of three dollars and a gown embroidered with silk. This host was said to have been married by the Jews to the synagogue, where, being pierced with needles, it emitted a quantity of blood, which was collected into a flask. The Jews tried in vain to prove the absurdity of the charge, arguing that, as their religion did not permit them to believe in the mystery of transubstantiation, they never could be supposed to try a

similar experiment on the host, which they considered as a mere Wiafer. The synod, influenced by Lippomani, condemned them, as well as the unfortunate woman, to be burned alive. The iniquitous sentence could not, however, be put into execution without the *exequatur*, or the confirmation of the king, which could not be expected to be obtained from the enlightened Sigismund Augustus. The bishop Przerembski, who was also vice-chancellor of Poland, made a report to the king of the above-mentioned case, which he described in expressions of pious horror, entreating the monarch not to allow such a crime committed against the Divine Majesty to go unpunished. Myszkowski, a great dignitary of the crown, who was a Protestant, became so indignant at this report that he could not restrain his anger, and was only prevented by the presence of the king from using violence against the prelate, the impiety and absurdity of whose accusation he exposed in strong language. The monarch declared that he would not believe such absurdities, and sent an order to the *starost* (chief magistrate or governor) of Sochaczew to release the accused parties; but the vice-chancellor forged the *exequatur*, by attaching the royal seal without the knowledge of the monarch, and sent an order that the sentence of the synod should be immediately carried into execution. The king, being informed of this nefarious act of the bishop, immediately dispatched a messenger to prevent its effects. It was, however, too late, and the judicial murder was perpetrated.' This atrocious affair excited, of course, a pleat sensation throughout Poland, and awakened such feelings of hatred against Lippolani that he lost no time in quitting the country, a step which was absolutely necessary, indeed, as his life was in danger.

“The Polish Reformation went steadily forward in spite of all the opposition of Rome and its emissaries. In Lithuania particularly it received a strong impulse from the influence exerted in its favor by prince Radziwill, who had been entrusted by the monarch with almost the sole government of that province. Taking, advantage of the facilities which he thus possessed for advancing the good work, he succeeded in establishing the Reformed worship both in the rural districts and in many towns. He built also a splendid church and college in Vilna, the capital of Lithuania. To this enlightened and pious nobleman, besides, is due the merit of having caused to be translated and printed, at his own expense, the first Protestant Bible in the Polish language. It was published in 1564, and is usually known by tie name of the Radziwillian Bible. The death of Radziwill the Black as he was termed, which happened in 1565, was a severe loss to the Protestant

cause in Lithuania: but happily his counsel and successor, Radziwill the Red, was also a zealous promoter of the Reformed religion, and founded a number of Protestant churches and schools, which he endowed with landed property for their permanent support. The king of Poland was strongly urged, by a portion of the clergy, to reform the Church by means of a national synod, but he was of too irresolute a character to take a step so decided. He adopted, however, a middle course, and addressed a letter to pope Paul IV, at the Council of Trent, demanding the concession of the five following points:

- (1) The performance of the mass in the national language;
- (2) The dispensation of the communion in both kinds;
- (3) The toleration of the marriage of priests;
- (4) The abolition of the *annates* or first-fruits of benefices
- (5) The convocation of a national council for the reform of abuses, and the union of different sects.

These demands, of course, were rejected by his holiness. But the Protestants in Poland, far from being discouraged by the conduct of the pope, became bolder every day in their opposition to the Romanists. At the diet of 1559 a proposal was made to deprive the bishops of all participation in the affairs of the government, on the ground that they were the sworn servants of a foreign potentate. This motion, though strenuously urged upon the acceptance of the diet, was not carried; but a few years later, in 1563, the diet agreed to convoke a general national synod, composed of representatives of all the religious parties in Poland—a measure which would, in all probability, have been carried into effect, had it not been prevented by the dexterity and diplomatic craft of cardinal Coimmenidoni, who succeeded in dissuading the king from assembling a national council.

“The establishment of a Reformed Polish Church was much impeded by the dissensions which divided the Protestants among themselves. At that time, in fact, no less than three parties existed in Poland, each adhering to its own separate confession. Thus the Bohemian or Waldensian Confession had its own ardent admirers chiefly in Great Poland; the Genevese or Calvinistic Confession in Lithuania and Southern Poland; and the Lutheran or Augsburg Confession in towns inhabited by burghers of German origin. Of these the Bohemian and the Genevese Confessions were so completely agreed on almost all points, that their respective supporters found no difficulty in forming a union in 1555, not indeed incorporating it into one

body, but holding spiritual fellowship together, while each Church retained its own separate hierarchy. This union being the first which took place among Protestant churches after the Reformation, caused great joy among the Reformers in different parts of Europe. The two churches thus united wished to include the Lutherans also in the alliance, but the doctrine of the Augsburg Confession on the subject of the Eucharist seemed likely to prove an insuperable obstacle in the way of any union with the Lutheran churches. An attempt, however, was made to effect so desirable an object. For this purpose a synod of the Bohemian and Genevese churches of Poland was convoked in 1557, and presided over by John a Lasco. At this synod overtures were made to the Lutherans to join the union, but to no effect, and they still continued to accuse the Bohemian Church of heresy. The obstacles thus thrown in the way of a union among the Protestants of Poland only roused the Bohemians to exert themselves still more actively for its attainment. They forwarded copies of their Confession of Faith to the Protestant princes of Germany, and to the chief Reformers, both of that country and of Switzerland, and received strong testimonials of approval—so strong, indeed, as to silence for a time the objections of the Lutherans. Shortly, however, the good understanding which had begun was interrupted by the unreasonable demands of some Polish Lutheran divines that the other Protestant denominations should subscribe the Confession of Augsburg. The Bohemians, therefore, in 1568, submitted their confession to the University of Wittenberg, and received from that learned body a strong expression of their approbation, which so operated upon the minds of the Lutherans that from that time they ceased to charge the Bohemian Church with heresy.

“The long desired union was at length effected in 1570. A synod having assembled in the town of Sandomir, in April of that year, finally concluded and signed the terms of union under the name of the Consensus of Sandomir (q.v.). This important step excited the utmost alarm among the Romanists, who endeavored to bring it into discredit. But the union itself was essentially hollow and imperfect. The confessions, between which a dogmatic union had been effected, differed on a point of vital importance the presence of Christ in the Eucharist. The union, accordingly, was rather nominal than real; and many Lutherans directed their whole efforts towards bringing about a disruption of the alliance which had been established at Sandomir. This hostility of the Lutherans to the other Protestant confessions was very injurious to the interests of Protestantism in general,

and a number of noble families, followed by thousands of the common people, disgusted with the bitter contentions which raged among the Protestants of different denominations, renounced the principles of the Reformation, and returned to the Church of Rome. Another circumstance which tended to weaken the Protestant Church of Poland was the rise and rapid spread of a party who denied the divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ. Some learned divines of the Reformed churches combated these Antitrinitarian doctrines, and at length, in 1565, the professors of these doctrines seceded from their brethren, forming themselves into a separate ecclesiastical organization, called by its members the Minor Reformed Church of Poland. The arrival of Faustus Socinus in Poland in 1579 led to the tenets of the Antitrinitarians being thrown into a definite form, and to the formation of Socinian congregations, chiefly composed of nobles, among whom there were manly wealthy landowners.

“When the Consensus of Sandomir was concluded in 1570, Protestantism in Poland had reached its highest state of prosperity. Many churches and schools, belonging to Protestants of various denominations, had been established; the Scriptures had been translated and printed in the national language; and religious liberty was enjoyed in Poland to a degree unknown in any other part of Europe. These favorable circumstances attracted great numbers of foreigners, who sought an asylum from religious persecution. Among these, besides many Italian and French refugees, there were also a great number of Scotch families settled in different parts of Poland, whose descendants are found there at this day.

“At the period at which we have now arrived Romanism had, to a great extent, lost its hold of the Polish nation. The most influential portion of the nobility were on the side of Protestantism, while many powerful families, and the population generally, of the eastern provinces belonged to the Greek Church. Nay, even within the national Church itself, not only was the primate favorable to Reformed principles, but many even of the inferior clergy, and a considerable proportion of the laity, would have welcomed any proposal to correct the flagrant abuses which had in course of time crept into the Church. In the senate, also, the great proportion of the members were either Protestants or belonged to the Greek Church and even the king himself showed a decided leaning towards the adherents of the Protestant faith. The Roman Catholic Church in Poland, indeed, was on the verge of utter ruin; but in this hour of its extremist danger it was mainly saved by the exertions of cardinal Hosius, one of the most remarkable men

of his age. This zealous Romish dignitary had early made himself conspicuous by his hostility to the Protestants, and now that he had been nominated a cardinal, he used every effort to check the progress of the Reformation in Poland. Finding, however, that his own Church was fast losing ground, and that Reformed principles were almost certain ere long to obtain the ascendancy, he called to his aid the newly established Order of Jesuits, several of whom arrived from Rome in 1564, and by their intrigues and agitation the whole country was made for a long period the scene of the most unseemly commotions.

“During the life of Sigismund Augustus the Protestants indulged the hope that, although naturally of a wavering and undecided character, he might possibly decide on the establishment of a Reformed National Church; but the death of that monarch without issue, in 1572, put an end to all such expectations. The Jagellonian dynasty, which had governed Poland for two centuries, was now extinct.’ An earnest struggle commenced, therefore, between the Protestants and Romanists, each party being anxious that the vacant throne should be filled by a zealous supporter of their Church. The Romanists, headed by cardinal Commendoni, ‘were anxious to confer the crown upon the archduke Ernest, son of the emperor Maximilian II, and were even ready to secure their object by force. Coligiuy and the French Protestants had for some time, even before the death of Sigismund Augustus, entertained the project of placing Henry of Valois, duke of Anjou, on the Polish throne; and Catharine de’ Medici, the mother of the duke, eagerly lent her approbation to the proposal.

“The diet of convocation assembled at Warsaw in January, 1573, for the purpose of taking steps for the maintenance of the peace and safety of the country during the interregnum. At this diet, notwithstanding the opposition of the Romish bishops, instigated by Commendoni, a law was passed establishing a perfect equality of rights among all the Christian confessions of Poland, guaranteeing the dignities and privileges of the Roman Catholic bishops, but abolishing the obligation of Church patrons to bestow the benetices in their gift exclusively on Roman Catholic clergymen. The election of a new monarch was arranged to take place on April 7, at Kaminietz, near Warsaw. The principal competitors for the throne of Poland were the two princes already mentioned; and although meanwhile the horrid massacre of St. Bartholomew had rendered the Polish Protestants somewhat afraid to commit their interests to a French prince,

yet, being unwilling to involve their country in a civil war, they accepted Henry, duke of Anjou, who was accordingly elected king of Poland.

“A deputation of twelve noblemen were immediately dispatched to Paris to announce to Henry his election, and on Sept. 10, 1573, the ceremony of presenting the diploma of election took place in the church of Notre Dame. The circumstances attending the presentation are interesting as manifesting the intolerant spirit of the Polish Romanists. ‘The bishop Karnkowski, a member of the Polish embassy, at the beginning of the ceremony, entered a protest against the clause for securing religious liberty inserted in the oath which the new monarch was to take on that occasion. This act produced some confusion, the Protestant Zborowski having interrupted the solemnity with the following words, addressed to Montuc: “Had you not accepted, in the name of the duke, the conditions of religious liberty, our opposition would have’ prevented this duke from being elected our monarch.” Henry feigned to be astonished, as if he did not understand the subject in dispute; but Zorowski addressed him, saying, “I repeat, sire, that if your ambassadors had not accepted the condition of liberty to the contending religious persuasions, our opposition would have prevented you from being elected king; and that if you do not confirm these conditions, you shall not be our king.” After this the members of the embassy surrounded their new monarch, and Herbut, a Roman Catholic, read the formula of the oath prescribed by the electing diet, which Henry repeated without any opposition. The bishop Karnkowski, who had stood aside, approached the king after he had sworn, and protested that the religious liberty secured by the royal oath was not to injure the authority of the Church of Rome; and the king gave him a written testimony in favor of that protest.’

“Henry set out for Poland, but after what had passed the fears of the Protestants were far from being allayed, and they resolved carefully to watch the conduct of the new monarch at his coronation. Firley, the leader of the Protestant party, insisted that on that solemn occasion the oath taken at Paris should be repeated; and even in the midst of the ceremony, when the crown was about to be placed on Henry’s head, Firley boldly advanced forward and interrupted the proceedings, declaring in the name of the Protestants of Poland that, unless the Parisian oath was taken, the coronation would not be allowed to go forward. The scroll of the oath was put into the king’s hand as he knelt on the steps of the altar, and Firley, taking the crown, said to Henry with a loud voice, If you will not swear, you shall not reign.” The intrepid conduct of the Protestant leader struck

the whole assembly with awe, and the king had no alternative but to repeat the oath. Thus the religious liberties of Poland were saved from utter overthrow, and the nation delivered from all impending civil war.

“The Polish Protestants were naturally suspicious of their new king, knowing that, having taken the oath by compulsion, he was not likely to respect their rights. The Rominish bishops, on the other hand, supported by the favor of the monarch, formed projects for extending their influence, and all impression rapidly spread through the country that Henry had become a ready tool in the hands of the priests. This feeling, combined with disgust at his profligacy, rendered him so unpopular, and his subjects so discontented, that the country would undoubtedly have been speedily plunged into a civil war had not the king fortunately disappeared, having secretly left Poland for France on learning that the death of his brother, Charles IX, had opened the way for his succession to the throne of France. The crown of Poland was now conferred upon Stephen Batory, prince of Transylvania, who had earned so high a reputation that, although an avowed Protestant, his election met with no opposition from the Romish clergy. The delegation which announced to Stephen his election to the throne was composed of thirteen members, only one of whom was a Romanist: but this man, Solikowski by name, succeeded in persuading the new monarch that, if he would secure himself on the throne, he must profess the Roman Catholic religion. Next day, accordingly, to the dismay of the Protestant delegates, Stephen was seen devoutly kneeling at mass. During, his reign, which lasted tell years, he maintained inviolate the fights of the Anti-Romanist confessions, while at the same time, through the influence of his queen, who was a bigoted Romanist, he openly engaged and patronized the Jesuits, by founding and endowing various educational institutions in connection with their order.

“Stephen Batory died in 1556, and was succeeded by Sigismund III, in whose reign the Romish party acquired much strength, while many of the Protestants had become dissatisfied with the general confession, and sought to, renew the former controversies which had so much weakened their influence in the country. Poland was unhappily subjected to the rule of this infatuated monarch from 1557 to 1632, and throughout the whole of that long period his policy was uniformly directed towards the promotion of the supremacy of Rome. The Jesuits exercised an unlimited influence over the government; and all the offices of state land posts of honor were exclusively bestowed upon Romanists, and more especially upon

proselytes, who, from motives of interest, had renounced the principles of the Reformation. The whole country was covered with Jesuit colleges and schools, thus enabling the disciples of Loyola most effectually to exercise dominion over all classes of the people. 'The melancholy effects of their education,' says count Krasinski, soon became manifest. By the close of Sigismund III's reigns, when the Jesuits had become almost exclusive masters of public schools, national literature had declined as rapidly as it had advanced during the preceding century. It is remarkable, indeed, that Poland, which, from the middle of the 16th century to the end of the reign of Sigismund III (1632), had produced many splendid works on different branches of human knowledge, in the national as well as in the Latin language, call boast of but very few works of merit from that epoch to the second part of the 18th century, the period of the unlimited sway of the Jesuits over the national education. The Polish language, which had obtained a high degree of perfection during the 16th century, was soon corrupted by an absurd admixture of Latin; and a barbarous style, called Macaronic, disfigured Polish literature for more than a century. As the chief object of the Jesuits was to combat the Anti-Romanists, the principal subject of their instruction was polemical divinity; and the most talented of their students, instead of acquiring sound knowledge, by which they might become useful members of society, wasted their time in dialectic subtleties and quibbles. The disciples of Loyola knew well that, of all the weaknesses to which human nature is subject, vanity is the most accessible; and they were as prodigal of praise to partisans as they were of abuse to antagonists. Thus the benefactors of their order became the objects of the most fulsome adulation, which nothing but the corrupted taste acquired in their schools could have rendered palatable. Their bombastic panegyrics, lavished upon the most unimportant persons, became, towards the end of the 17th century, almost the only literature of the country—proof sufficient of the degraded state of the public to which such productions could be acceptable. An additional proof of the retrocession of the national intellect and the corruption of taste under the withering influence of the Jesuits is that the most classical productions of the 16th century—the Augustan era of the Polish literature—were not reprinted for more than a century, although after the revival of learning in Poland in the second half of the 18th century they went through many editions, and still continue to be reprinted. It is almost superfluous to add that this deplorable condition of the national intellect produced the most pernicious effects on the political as well as social state of the country. The enlightened statesmen who had appeared

during the reign of Sigismund III— the Zanoyskis, the Sapiehas, the Zalkiewskis, whose efforts counterbalanced for a time the baneful effects of that fatal design, as well as some excellent authors who wrote during the same period — were educated under another system; for that of the Jesuits could not produce any political or literary character with enlarged views. Some exceptions there were to this general rule; but the views of enlightened men could not be but utterly lost on a public which, instead of advancing in the paths of knowledge, were trained to forget the science and wisdom of its ancestors. It was therefore no wonder that sound notions of law and right became obscured, and gave way to absurd prejudices of privilege and caste, by which liberty degenerated into licentiousness; while the state of the peasantry was degraded into that of predial servitude.’

“Not contented with secretly imbuing the minds of the people with Romanist principles, the Jesuits connived at the ill-treatment to which many Protestants were subjected, and the courts of justice being wholly under Jesuit influence, it was vain for the injured to look for legal redress. Riotous mobs with complete impunity destroyed the Protestant churches in Cracow, Posen, Wiltna, and other places. The natural result of the adverse circumstances in which Protestants were placed under this long but disastrous reign was that their numbers were daily diminished, and what was, perhaps, more melancholy still, those who held fast to Reformed principles were divided into contending factions; and although the Consensus of Sandomir maintained an apparent union for all time, that covenant even was finally dissolved by the Lutherans. An attempt was made without effect to manage a union between the Protestants and the Greek Church at a meeting convened at Wilna in 1599, and although a confederation for mutual defense was concluded, it led to no practical results.

“At the close of the long reign of Sigismund III the cause of Protestantism was in a state of the deepest depression. But his son and successor, Wadislav IV, was a person of many different character, and so opposed to the Jesuits that he could not allow a single member of that order to be near his court. He distributed offices and rewards solely according to merit, and, being naturally of a mild disposition, he discountenanced all persecution on account of religion. He endeavored in vain to effect a general reconciliation, or at least a mutual understanding, between the contending parties, by means of a religious discussion held at Thorn in 1644. But the

early death of this benevolent monarch changed the whole aspect of affairs. His brother, John Casimir, who succeeded him, had been a Jesuit, and a cardinal; but the pope had relieved him from his vows on his election to the throne. From a monarch who had formerly been a Romish ecclesiastic the Protestants had everything to fear and little to expect. The consequence was that the utmost discontent began to prevail among all classes, and the country having been invaded by Charles Gustavus, king of Sweden, the people were disposed to place him upon the throne of Poland. Elated, however, by the success of his arms, that haughty monarch declined to accept the sovereignty in any other mode than by conquest, whereupon the Poles, rising as one man, drove him from the country. Peace was restored by the treaty of Oliva in 1660 but not until the Protestants had suffered much during the war. The king had taken refuge in Silesia during the Swedish invasion, and on his return to Poland he committed himself to the special care of the Virgin Mary, vowing that he would convert the heretics by force if necessary. A considerable number of Protestants still remained after all the persecutions to which they had been exposed, and among them were several influential families, who besides were supported by the interest of the Protestant princes throughout Europe. The king, therefore, judged it best to direct the whole force of his persecution against the Socinianus, whom he banished from the kingdom, declaring it to be henceforth a capital crime to propagate or even profess Socinianism in Poland.

“The ranks of the Protestants were now completely broken, and the Roman clergy acquired and exercised nearly uncontrolled power. John Soblieski, during his short reign, endeavored to put an end to religious persecution; but he found himself unable to maintain the laws which still acknowledged a perfect equality of religious confessions. Augustus II, also, who succeeded to the throne in 1696, confirmed, in the usual manner, the rights and libel ties of the Protestants, but with the addition of a new condition, that he should never grant them senatorial or any other important dignities and offices. This monarch had renounced Lutheranism in order to obtain the crown of Poland, and now that he had secured his object, he allowed the Romish bishops to treat the heretics as they chose. Augustus having been expelled by Charles XII of Sweden, Stanislaus Leszczynski was elected in 1704, and the accession of this enlightened monarch revived the hopes of the Protestants. The treaty of alliance concluded between Stanislaus and the Swedish sovereign usually guaranteed to the Protestants

of Poland the rights and liberties secured to them by the laws of their country, abolishing all the restrictions imposed in later times. But such favorable circumstances were of short continuance. Stanislaus was driven from his throne by Peter, the czar of Russia, and Augustus II again restored to his kingdom. Civil commotions now arose, which were only terminated by the mediation of Peter the Great, who concluded a treaty at Warsaw in 1716, into-which the Romanists had sufficient influence to get a clause inserted to the following effect: 'That all the Protestant churches which had been built since 1632 should be demolished, and that the Protestants should not be permitted, except in places where they had churches previously to the above-mentioned time, to have any public or private meetings for the purpose of preaching or singing. A breach of this regulation was to be punished, for the first time by a fine, for the second by imprisonment, for the third by banishment. Foreign ministers were allowed to have divine service in their dwellings, but the natives who should assist as it were to be subjected to the above-mentioned penalties.'

"The terms of this treaty excited feelings of discontent and alarm, not only in the minds of the Protestants, but also of the more enlightened portion of the Roman Catholics. Protests poured in from all quarters against the measure. But all remonstrance was vain; the Romanists continued to prosecute the Protestants with inveterate rancor, in some cases even to blood. The Protestant powers of Europe from time to time made representations in favor of the Polish Protestants; but instead of alleviating their persecutions, these remonstrances only increased their severity. In 1733 an act was passed excluding them from the general diet, and from all public offices, but declaring at the same time their peace, their persons, and their property inviolable, and that they might hold military rank and occupy the crown-lands.

"During the reign of Augustus III, which lasted from 1733 to 1764, the condition of the Polish Protestants was melancholy in the extreme; and, despairing of relief from every other quarter, they threw themselves under the protection of foreign powers, by whose interference they were admitted, in 1767, to equal rights with the Roman Catholics. This was followed by the abolition of the Order of Jesuits in 1773. Augustus had throughout his reign kept Poland in a state of subserviency to Russia, and that power placed his successor Poniatowski on the throne. When Catharine II, empress of Russia, obtained possession of the Polish Ralmu provinces, part of the people became members of the United Greek

Church, and part joined the Russian Church. Even the most bigoted Romanists were gained over in course of time, and, that at the Synod of Polotsk, in 1839, the higher clergy of Lithuania and White Russia declared the readiness of their people to join the Russo-Greek Church, and, accordingly, these Uniates, or United Greeks, to the number of 2,000,000, were received back into the Muscovite branch of the Eastern Church on their solemn disavowal of the pope's supremacy, and declaration of their belief in the sole Headship of Christ over his Church."

The unfortunate determination of pope Pius IX to force the infallibility dogma on the Church of Rome has had its damaging consequences to papal Christianity in Russia. After the encyclical of 1874 the czar's government saw itself forced to *urge* the union with the Russian Church of all Polish Christians not Protestant. Several popes had confirmed to the United Greeks the privileges of the use of the vernacular tongue and the marriage of the clergy. Ritualistic movements, however, had been introduced by some of the clergy, tending to assimilation to Rome, and the disputes engendered by the changes had infrequently been referred to the Vatican. When the encyclical came to the laity, only two ways seemed to lie upon either to submit to the new orders or openly defy them. In Sedletz the decision was prompt, and one sixth of the whole population of the government determined to ask the "White Czar" to admit them into his Church. Though the parish priests in no case commenced the movement, when it had once taken root they joined their flocks. The government took no notice of the first petition sent in till convinced that the movement was perfectly spontaneous, when the emperor authorized the governor-general of Warsaw to admit them into the Russian Church; and on Sunday, Jan. 24, the public ceremony was performed before an immense crowd in the town of Sedletz. Of the 50,000 people admitted, 26 were priests. The first parish entered was that of Bielsk, to which the archbishop of Warsaw proceeded, with all the convert priests and delegates from the forty-five parishes, and where a solemn service of consecration was performed in the parish church.

The Berlin correspondent of the London *Times*, under date of June, 1875, writes: "The orthodox movement is steadily progressing in Poland, and will very shortly lead to the extinction of the United Greeks. Nearly 250,000 persons in the provinces of Siedlice, Lublin, Sувальки, and Lomsa have already embraced the established faith of the empire. The Uniat remnant left is estimated at only 30,000, and as the priests who are adverse to the

movement are running away to Galicia, the last trace of the sect will soon disappear. The political advantage accruing to the Russian government from this wholesale conversion of a religious community, half Roman Catholic and half Greek, cannot 'well be overrated. Not only are all their subjects of Russian blood brought within the pale of the national Church, but a number of Poles being likewise included in the sweeping change of creed, a way is paved to a further and even more comprehensive conquest in the same field.' In 1876 the Russian government, feeling that the Papists were intriguing against the union movement, occasionally interfered by force for the transition of whole congregations from Rome. In consequence several of the bishops and priests were brought into rebellious conditions to the czar's government. More recently a concordat has been signed between the czar and the pope, which restores full diocesan authority to the bishops, together with the right to direct correspondence with Rome. The ukase of 1868 is abolished, and appeals of the bishops will henceforth be transmitted to Rome through the metropolitan of Warsaw, instead of being sent to the synod at St. Petersburg. On the other hand, the pope acknowledges the legal status of the St. Petersburg Synod, which is to form the council of a Catholic primate residing in the Russian capital.

It is computed that the Protestant Poles amount in round numbers to 442,000, the great majority of whom are found in the Prussian portion. There is a considerable number of Protestants in Poland itself but these are chiefly German settlers. In that part of Poland which was annexed to Russia by the treaty of Vienna, it was calculated in 1845 that, in a population of 4,857,250 souls, there were 252,000 Lutherans, 3790 Reformed, and 546 Moravians. In Prussian Poland, according to the census of 1846, there were in the provinces of ancient Polish Prussia, in a population of 1,019,105 souls, 502,148 Protestants; and in that of Posen, in a population of 1,364,399 souls, there were 416,648 Protestants. As the Russian government is determined to make the Poles adopt its nationality, the Russian language only is tolerated in the churches where a popular tongue is used, and all hymn and prayer books, as well as schoolbooks, must be in the Russian tongue. The Prussian government, too, anxious to use all means of Germanizing its Slavonic subjects, caused the worship in almost all the churches of Prussian Poland to be conducted in the German language, and the service in Polish is discouraged as much as possible.

On the modern ecclesiastical history of the former kingdom of Poland, *SEE PRUSSIA* and *SEE RUSSIA*. See also Ripell, *Gesch. Polens* (Hamb. 1840);

Lengich, *Diss. de Religion. Christ. in Polonia initiis* (1734); and Friese, *Gesch. Polens* (Breslau, 1786). On the Reformation: Stanislaus Lubieniecus, *Hist. Reformationis Polonicae* (Freistadii, 1685); Krasinski, *Historical Sketch of the Reformation in Poland* (Lond. 1838, 2 vols. 8vo), part 1 treating of the introduction and progress of Christianity in that country; Maclear, *ist. of Christian Missions in the Middle Ages*; Gieseler, *Eccles. Hist.* (see Index in vol. 3); *Brit. and For. Ev. Rev.* 1843, p. 502 sq.

Poland, Mission Among The Jews In.

The Polish mission was commenced by the London Society for promoting Christianity among the Jews in the year 1821. The first missionaries there were the late Dr. A. M'Caul (q.v.), at that time a simple graduate of the University of Dublin, and the Rev. W. F. Becker. The center of their operation was made in Warsaw. For a while all seemed promising, but the missionaries were compelled for a time to quit Warsaw. Early in the year 1822 the missionaries were summoned to appear before the "Commission of the Religious Confessions," and had to sign a protocol as to what was their object, of which it was said that it would be sent to St. Petersburg. Learning, however, that the answer which would be given them would be that foreign missionaries were not wanted in the country, and that if the Jews wished to be converted there were priests enough for that purpose, the missionaries—in order to avoid being sent out of the country, and hoping to get permission from the emperor Alexander—left Warsaw and went to Posen. The permission was obtained not only for Poland, but also for Russia. The first two missionaries were now joined by two others, Messrs. Wendt and Hoff, and in the winter of 1822 missionary operations were fairly commenced at Warsaw. In the year 1823 a service according to the ritual of the Church of England was established in the Reformed Church, Mr. M'Caul having received ordination in England; and this, in 1824, was followed up by the commencement of a German service in the same place in the afternoon. As the labor increased two more missionaries were sent, Messrs. Reichardt and Wermelskirch. Visits were paid to various towns, and for a time Lublin was made the scene of missionary labor. The chief work of the winter of 1825 was the preparation of a translation of the Word of God, for the use of Hebrew women more especially. It was completed by M'Caul, with the assistance of the other missionaries, as far as the end of the Pentateuch, by the spring of 1826, and has proved a work of considerable value.

The death of the emperor Alexander rendered it necessary to apply to his successor for a confirmation of the permission which had been accorded to them. The answer to their application was of a modified character: it gave them liberty to labor among the Jews of Poland, but was silent concerning Russia itself, and as was afterwards stated by the grand-duke Constantine, that, as far as Russia was concerned, the permission was withdrawn. All efforts to reobtain it were without success.

In 1829 Lublin was permanently occupied as a missionary station, and proved a success, for no less than forty-four Israelites were there admitted into the visible Church. The year 1830 was marked by some events materially affecting the state of the mission and the position of the missionaries: by an order from St. Petersburg the missionaries were placed under the General Protestant Consistory, and their correspondence with the committee was required to be laid before it, the Commission of the Interior, and the police. On Nov. 29 in the same year the Polish revolution broke out, without affecting materially the missionary labors. This year may be regarded as marking the close of the second period in the history of the Polish mission, lasting from the year 1823 to 1830.

The event of most consequence that marked the following years was the occupation of a new station, in 1834, in the south of Poland. Kielce was the place selected, a place equidistant from Warsaw and Lublin. The main features of the work that now present themselves are the missionary journeys to Suvaltri, Calvary, and other places. We have now arrived at the year 1841, and up to that period, in connection with the mission, there had been baptized at Warsaw 115, at Lublin 33, and at Kalisch-selected in 1838 as the station and other stations, occupied only for a short time, 5, making altogether a total of 153. During the year 1842 the missionaries made several journeys, and in spite of the "Cherem," or Jewish excommunication, pronounced against those who should have any intercourse with the missionaries, the work went on with great blessings, and in the year 1851 the number of those who were baptized through the mission in Poland was 326, some of the converts occupying the highest stations in life. We have now brought the history of the Polish mission down to that period when the door was closed against it. The war of England with Russia effected this change, for it could not reasonably be expected, while that war was carried on with the greatest vigor, that an English mission, however peaceful its object, would be tolerated in the very heart of the Russian empire, and indications were not wanting that soon its

work was to cease. Various tracts about to be printed, which had already received the sanction of the Consistory, were unaccountably detained at the censor's office; and in the month of May, 1854, "the missionaries in Warsaw were summoned before the Russian authorities to receive various injunctions and restrictive orders on pain of being expelled from the country. One of these was to submit all their official correspondence with the committee to the Russian government, who promised to forward it to London; and to circulate no books, not even the Bible, among Christians. The letters and journals were from that time submitted as prescribed, but never reached London. This state of things continued from the end of May till Dec. 28, when the missionaries were again summoned to appear before the Russian authorities to hear an imperial order read, which imposed upon them and their brethren in the country the discontinuance of all missionary work from that day, and to be prepared to leave the country in three weeks, viz. on Jan. 13, 1855, the New-year's day of the Russian Church."

Thus closed the Polish mission, just *three* weeks before the death of the Russian emperor, a mission which had not been in vain, for, besides the 361 members of the house of Israel who were admitted by baptism into the Christian Church, more than 10,000 Bibles, in different languages, and upwards of 10,000 New Testaments have been circulated, of which many had come into the hands of Jews.

The missionary work which had thus been suspended for over twenty years was again resumed in the year 1877, permission having been granted by the present emperor. To the Rev. J. C. Hartmann, one of the oldest missionaries of the society, was intrusted the temporary charge of the mission-field at Warsaw, where about 100,000 Jews reside, divided into Talmudists, Chasidim, and Reformers. According to the latest report of 1877, the Warsaw station is now occupied by the Revs. O. J. Ellis and H. H. F. Hartmann, son of the above, N. D. Rappoport, A.E. Ifland, and a colporteur. Comp. the *Jewish Intelligencer* and the *Annual Reports of the London Society*. (B.P.)

Pole

(*snēnes*, a flagstaff, ^{<0218>}Numbers 21:8, 9; hence the flag or standard itself, "sign," "banner," etc., as elsewhere).

Pole, Reginald

a famous English cardinal, who figures so prominently in the English Reformation period, upon whose character rests the stigma of duplicity and selfishness, and against whom both Protestants and Romanists have written in censure or praise, was descended from royal blood, being a younger son of Sir Richard Pole. lord Montague, cousin-German of king Henry VII, and Margaret, daughter of George, the duke of Clarence, and younger brother to king Edward IV. Pole was born at Stourton Castle, Staffordshire, in March, 1500. When seven years old he was sent to the Carthusian monks at Sheen for instruction. At twelve he became a student at Magdalen College, Oxford, where the famous Linacre and Will. Latimer, two great masters of Latin and Greek, were his teachers. At fifteen he took the B.A. and entered into deacon's orders, and in 1517, the year that Luther began to preach against indulgences, Pole was made prebendary of Salisbury, to which preferment the deanery of Exeter and others were soon after added by king Henry VIII, who greatly admired Pole, and desired his elevation to the highest ecclesiastical dignity. At the age of nineteen Pole went to Italy, there to continue his studies, and was by the king afforded support suitable to his rank. He visited different universities, and finally rested at Padua, where he entered a distinguished group of scholars, among whom were Leonicus, a great philosopher and philologist, Longolius, Bembo, and Lupset, a learned Englishman. These masters were his constant companions, and they have told us how he became the delight of that part of the world for his learning, politeness, and piety. From Padua he went to Venice, where he continued for some time, and then visited other parts of Italy. Having spent five years abroad, he was recalled home; but being desirous to see the jubilee, which was celebrated this year at Rome, he went to that city: whence, passing by Florence, he returned to England, where he arrived about the end of 1525. He was received by the king, queen, court, and all the nobility with great affection and honor, and was highly esteemed, not only on account of his learning, but for the sweetness of his nature and politeness of his manners. Devotion and study, however, being what he solely delighted in, he retired to his old habitation among the Carthusians at Sheen, where he spent two years in the free enjoyment of them. In 1529 when king Harry determined upon his divorce from Catharine of Aragon, Pole, foreseeing the troubles consequent upon this, and how he must needs be involved in them, resolved to withdraw, and obtained leave of his majesty to go to Paris. Here he continued in quiet till

the king, prosecuting the affair of the divorce and sending to the most noted universities in Europe for their opinion upon the illegitimacy of his marriage, commanded him to concur with his agents in procuring the approval for his contemplated step from the faculty of the University of Paris. Pole left the affair to the commissioners, excusing himself to the king as unfit for the employ, since his studies had lain another way. Henry was angry, upon which Pole returned to England in order to pacify him; but failing in this, and unwilling to make a tool of himself to the king in his questionable designs, Pole returned to Sheen, where he continued two years. It has been asserted that scruples of conscience and of religion were not his only motive: that, though a priest, he was not without hope of marrying the princess Mary Tudor, and that it was not without such views that Catharine of Aragon had committed the education of her daughter to his mother, the countess of Salisbury. Henry at length perceiving that the court of Rome resolved to oppose the affair of the divorce, conceived a resolution to shake off their authority, and to rely upon his own subjects. Pole was again pressed, but as steadfastly refused as before, even under the temptation of being made archbishop of York if he should comply with the king's demands. The king having dismissed Pole in anger, he consulted his safety by leaving the kingdom, and rejoined the company of the distinguished men he had known abroad. 'he first year he spent at Avignon; but as his health declined there he went to Padua, making now and then excursions to his friends at Venice. The literary circle in which he moved was formed by Caraffa (Paul IV), Sadoletto, Gilberto, Fregoso, archbishop of Salerno, Bembo, and Contarini. These men even embraced the doctrine of justification, and in their social meetings discussed the means of reforming the papacy-their great principle being to preserve the unity of the Church under the papal government. In Italy, during the reign of Henry VIII, Reginald Pole rose to great distinction, and on the accession of Paul III in 1534 was raised to the cardinalate, as were his friends just mentioned. Thus the days passed very agreeably in Italy, while fresh troubles were rising in England. Henry had not only divorced Catharine, but married Anne Boleyn, and resolved to throw off the papal yoke and assert his right to the supremacy, with the title of Supreme Head of the Church. To this end he procured a book to be written in defense of that title by Sampson, bishop of Chichester, which he immediately sent to Pole for his confirmation. Pole, taking courage from the security of the pope's protection, not only disapproved the king's divorce and separation from the apostolic see, but shortly after drew up a treatise, entitled *De unitate*

ecclesiasticat, in which he controverted the pretensions of Henry to the headship of the Church, and compared him to Nebuchadnezzar. He forwarded a copy of it to the king, who, displeased with Pole, under pretence of wanting some passage to be explained, sent for him to England; but Pole, aware that to deny the king's supremacy was high-treason there, and considering the fate of More and Fisher, refused to obey the call. The king therefore resolved to keep measures with him no longer, and accordingly his pension was withdrawn, he was stripped of all his dignities in England, and an act of attainder passed against him.

Pole was abundantly compensated for these losses and sufferings by the bounty of the pope and emperor. At the same time Paul III, having in view a general council for the reform of the Church, called to Rome several persons renowned for their learning, and among them Pole, to represent England. In vain his mother, brothers, and friends tried to dissuade him from going to Rome. After some wavering, the exhortations of his friend Contarini prevailed over the fears of his family, and he went to Rome in 1536. There he was, against his earnest wish, created cardinal, Dec. 22, 1536. Two months afterwards (February, 1537) Paul appointed him his legate on the other side of the Alps, and sent him on a most delicate and dangerous errand. The rebellion of the northern Catholics against Henry VIII seemed to the pope a favorable occasion to attempt the reconciliation of England with the Roman see. The legate's instructions were to promote a good understanding between the emperor and the king of France, to establish himself in the Netherlands, and if circumstances allowed of such a course to pass over to England. Scarcely had he put his foot on the French territory when Cromwell, his personal foe, claimed him in virtue of an article of a treaty concluded between Francis and Henry; but, secretly put on his guard by the king himself, he pursued his journey with the utmost speed, and stopped only at Cambrai. The regent here refused to allow him to enter the Netherlands; and, after a short stay with the prince-bishop of Liege, he was obliged to make his way back to Rome (August, 1537). At the same time Henry VIII set a price of fifty thousand crowns on his head, and promised to the emperor a subsidy of four thousand men in his war against Francis for his extradition. If the pope had up to that time shrunk from extreme measures against the schism of England, it was because he felt powerless to put them into execution. Having succeeded in restoring peace between the two great rulers of the Continent, he at last published his bull of excommunication. Pole was sent in secret mission to the courts

of Spain and France; but forestalled by the English agents, he could only get evasive answers. Charles, at Toledo, declared that he had more urgent business to attend to, but that he was ready to fulfill the promises made by him to the pope if Francis assisted him without afterthought. Francis, in his turn, protested his good will, but besought the legate not to enter his states if he did not bring some positive proof of the emperor's sincerity. After carrying on negotiations for several months, Pole came to the conclusion that he was being deluded on both sides, and advised the pope to wait patiently for a better opportunity to turn up in the course of political events. His share in these negotiations proved fatal to his relations. Henry wreaked his savage vengeance on him by sending to execution his brother, lord Montague, and his aged mother, lady Salisbury, who was dragged to the scaffold May 17, 1541. The second brother of the cardinal, Sir Geoffrey, saved his life by revealing the secrets of his relations and friends. In 1539 cardinal Pole was sent to Viterbo, where, in the exercise of his functions, until 1542, he distinguished himself by his piety, the encouragement he gave to letters, and his tolerance towards the Protestants. In 1545 he repaired to Trent, under strong escort, to superintend the works preparatory to the council. After the death of Henry (1547), he wrote to the Privy Council in favor of the Catholic communion, and to Edward VI in justification of his acts; but his letters were left unopened. Pole's book, *De unitate ecclesiastica*, was published in Rome in 1536; and though, as Burnet, says, "it was more esteemed for the high quality of the author than for any sound reasoning in it," it yet gave the most certain proof of his invincible attachment and zeal for the see of Rome, and was therefore sufficient to build the strongest confidence upon. Accordingly Pole was employed in negotiations and transactions of high concern, was consulted by the pope in all affairs relating to kings and sovereign princes, was made one of his legates at the Council of Trent, and, lastly, his penman when occasion required. Thus, for instance, when the pope's power to remove that council was contested by the emperor's ambassador, Pole drew up a vindication of that proceeding; and when the emperor set forth the interim, was employed to answer it. This was in 1548, and pope Paul III dying the next year, our cardinal was twice elected to succeed him, but refused both the election: one as being too hasty and without due deliberation, and the other because it was done in the nighttime. This unexampled delicacy disgusted several of his friends in the conclave, who thereupon concurred in choosing Julius III, March 30, 1550. The tranquility of Rome being soon after disturbed by the wars in

France and on the borders of Italy, Pole retired to a monastery in the territory of Verona, where he lived agreeably to his natural humor till the death of king Edward VI in July, 1553.

On the accession of queen Mary, Pole was appointed legate for England, as the fittest instrument to reduce that kingdom to an obedience to the pope; but he did not think it safe to venture his person thither till he knew the queen's intentions with regard to the reestablishment of the Romish religion, and also whether the act of attainder which had passed against him under Henry, and confirmed by Edward, was repealed. It was not long before he received satisfaction upon both these points; and he set out for England, by way of Germany, in October 1553. The emperor, suspecting a design in queen Mary to marry Pole, contrived means to stop his progress; nor did he arrive in England till November, 1554, when her marriage with Philip of Spain was completed. (The English ecclesiastical historian Soames thinks that Pole was delayed by bishop Gardiner, who himself desired this distinguished post.) On his arrival Pole was conducted to the archbishop's palace at Lambeth, Cranmer being then attainted and imprisoned; and on the 28th went to the Parliament and made a long and grave speech, inviting them to a reconciliation with the apostolic see, for which purpose, he said, he was sent by the common pastor of Christendom. This speech of Pole occasioned some motion in the queen, which she vainly thought was a child quickened within her womb: so that the joy of the times was redoubled, some not scrupling to say that as John the Baptist leaped in his mother's womb at the salutation of the Virgin, so here the like happiness attended the salutation of Christ's vicar. The Parliament being absolved by Pole, all went to the royal chapel, where the *Te Deum* was sung on the occasion; and thus, the pope's authority being now restored, the cardinal, two days afterwards, made his public entry into London, with all the solemnities of a legate, and presently set about reforming the Church and freeing it from heresy. In conformity with a pontifical bull, he published a decree by which, 1, churches, hospitals, and schools founded during the schisms should be preserved; 2, persons who had married at unlawful degrees without dispensation should be considered as legitimately united; 3, buyers of ecclesiastical property should not be disturbed in their possession. But such a triumph did not satisfy the fanatics. Encouraged by the chancellor, Gardiner, they filled England during four years with those horrors which left forever a bloody stain on Mary's memory. Pole had formerly been suspected of favoring the

Reformation, because he had advocated in the Council of Trent (q.v.) and at Ratisbon (q.v.) the adoption by the Church of Rome of the doctrine of justification as held by the Protestants, and being now anxious to satisfy the Papists, altered in his actions, and became the severe opponent of all Protestants. In the cruel measures which were adopted it is sometimes claimed for Pole that he had no direct part, as he was by nature humane and of good temper, and had ever previously proved most lenient to Protestants; but it would appear as if Pole, in his desire to please the pope and the queen, did adopt sterner measures than heretofore. The poet Tennyson has recently taken the favorable view of Pole's conduct, and thus makes him speak of his decision how to reconcile the heretics:

“For ourselves, we do protest
 That our commission is to heal, not harm;
 We come not to condemn, but reconcile;
 We come not to compel, but call again;
 We come not to destroy, but edify;
 Nor yet to question things already done:
 These are forgiven-matters of the past
 And range with jetsam and with offal thrown
 Into the blind sea of forgetfulness”
 (*Queen Mary*, act 3, scene 3).

In a later scene he makes bishop Gardiner (q.v.) the persecutor, and Pole the advocate and friend of the heretic:

“Indeed, I cannot follow with your grace;
 Rather would say-the shepherd doth not kill
 The sheep that wander from his flock, but sends
 His careful dog to bring them to the fold”
 (Act 3, scene 4).

There is somewhat to favor this interpretation of Pole's acts. After the death of pope Julius, and his successor Marcellus, who rapidly followed him to the grave, the queen recommended Pole to the popedom; but Peter Caraffa, who took the name of Paul IV, was elected before her dispatches arrived. This pope, who had never liked our cardinal, was pleased with Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, whose temper exactly tallied with his own; and therefore favored his views upon the see of Canterbury in opposition to Pole, whose nomination to that dignity was not confirmed by him till the death of his rival, which happened Nov. 13, 1555. After Pole's decease,

pope Paul IV himself acknowledged that if the cardinal's humane policy had been accepted, England might not have been lost again to Rome.

After his elevation to the legateship of England, Pole had the sole management and regulation of ecclesiastical affairs in that country. His concurrence in the butcheries of Protestants did not, however, secure him against the attacks of his old enemy Paul IV, who upon various pretences accused him as a suspected heretic, summoned him to Rome to answer the charge, and, depriving him of his legantine powers, conferred them upon Peyto, a Franciscan friar, whom he had made a cardinal for that purpose. The new legate was upon the road for England when queen Mary, apprised of his business, assumed some of her father's spirit, and forbade him at his peril to set foot upon English ground. Pole, however, was no sooner informed of the pontiff's pleasure, or rather displeasure, than, out of that implicit veneration which he constantly and unalterably preserved for the apostolic see, he voluntarily laid down the legate's ensigns and forbore the exercise of its power, dispatching his trusty minister Ornameto to Rome with letters clearing him in such submissive terms as melted even the obdurate heart of Paul. The cardinal was restored to his legantine powers soon after, but did not live to enjoy them a full twelvemonth, being seized with a double quartanague, which carried him off, Nov. 17, 1558. During his illness he often inquired after her majesty, and his death is said to have been hastened by that of his royal mistress, which, as if one star had governed both their nativities, happened about sixteen hours before. After lying forty days in state at Lambeth, Pole's remains were carried to Canterbury, and there interred. He was a learned, eloquent, modest, humble, and good-natured man, of exemplary piety and charity, as well as generosity becoming his birth. Though by nature he was more inclined to study and contemplation than to active life yet he was prudent and dexterous in business, so that he would have been a finished character had not his superstitious devotion to the see of Rome led him from the path his own convictions marked out to him. Burnet, who has drawn Pole in very favorable colors, acknowledges this fault in the great cardinal. Froude's delineation of Pole as a narrow-minded and fanatical bigot is precisely the reverse of the fact. Pole, like his friend Contarini, was a leading member of that moderate party of Romanists who, though they dreaded the disruption of Christendom, desired a reform not only in the discipline but also in the doctrine of the Church. From this position he was only scared by fear of losing his mitre. This betrays a weakness, it is true, but rather of ambition

than of fanaticism or narrow-mindedness. It is, besides, unjust to make Pole the *sole* responsible party for the persecutions which were inaugurated; for Fox (8, 308) has furnished clear evidence against such an insinuation. He even gives two instances where Pole personally interfered to save Protestants from execution. All that Pole did, even at the worst, was to suffer the law to take its course, and not preventing what he knew should not have been done. But, of course, this is bad enough; we only desire that it be made no worse. Hook has taken a view very much dependent on Froude. In the instructions which Pole was putting out at the time of his decease for the clergy, and in the devotional books which he was putting together for his people, it is hard to find anything but good-sense, deep piety, and hearty benevolence.

Pole wrote various controversial and theological tracts, besides the work above referred to. Among these publications are, *Liber de Concilio* (Venet. 1562, 8vo, and elsewhere): — *Refoiratio Anglica ex Decretis ipsius Sedis Apostolicae Legati* anno MDLVI (Rome, 1562, 4to); one of the most elegant pieces of composition in the Latin language, and which, for perspicuity, good-sense, and solid reasoning, is equal to the importance of the occasion on which it was written (Phillips, *Sacred Literature*): — *De Summo Pontifices Christi in Terris Vicario et de ejus Officis et Potestate; a Treatise of Justification* (Lovanii, 1569, 4to); this work is reported to have been “found among the writings of cardinal Pole.” See Hume, *Hist. of England*, ch. 37 (very favorable); Froude, *Hist. of England*, 6:369 sq.; Collier, *Eccles. Hist. of England* (see Index in vol. 7); Schröckh, *Kirchengesch. seit der Ref.* 2, 575 sq.; Soames, *Hist. of the Ref.* 1, 251 sq.; 2, 185 sq., 229 sq., 327 sq., 357 sq.; 4. 66 sq., 77, 238, 495, 545 sq., 577 sq., 595; Ffoulkes, *Divisions in Christendom*, 1, § 63; Hook, *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury* (Lond. 1869), vol. 3; Hardwick, *Hist. of the Reformation*, p. 64, et al.; Seebohm, *Hist. of the Prot. Religion*, p. 194, 206, 212; *North H’Bit. Rev.* Jan. 1870, p. 283; *Westminster Rev.* April 1871, p. 266; and especially the references in Allibone, — *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Pole-axes

were the ensigns of legates *a latere*, carried with silver pillars (⚔ Galatians 2:9) before cardinals Wolsey and Pole.

Polehampton, Henry Stedman

an English divine, was born in 1824, and educated at Pembroke College, Oxford. He took holy orders, and was ordained deacon in 1848; in the year following became assistant curate of St. Chad's, Shrewsbury; in 1855 chaplain in the Bengal Presidency. During the great Sepoy rebellion he was shot through the body in the insurrection at Lucknow and died July 20, 1857. He was a good man, and his loss was greatly deplored in all England, as well as among the English of India. See *Memoir, Letters, and Diary of the late Rev. Henry Polehampton, and the Rev. Thomas Stedman Polehampton* (Lond. 1858, 8vo, and often); *London Athenaeum*, 1858, pt. 2, 451 sq., 487.

Polehampton, Thomas Stedman

brother of the preceding, of lesser note, died at Lucknow. *SEE POLEHAMPTON, HENRY S.*

Polemics

(from *πολεμικός*, *warlike*) is the controversial branch of scientific theology. It is also sometimes called by German theologians *elenchtics* and differs from *apologetics* (q.v.) in that it is not simply intended to defend Christianity in general, but aims to attack a rival or disputed system in particular, and is the direct opposite of *irenics* (q.v.), which aims to establish peace within the Christian fold. This distinction has not always been observed in Christian theology, but is of rather recent (late. As a rule, the theologians of the Church mixed the polemical and apologetical elements in all theological controversy. In our own century, however, and especially since the days of Schleiermacher, theological encyclopaedists have insisted upon a strict severance of *polemics* from *apologetics* and *symbolics* (q.v.), and have dealt with it in an independent manner. In theory nothing can be more accurately defined and distinguished than apologetics and polemics; they bear the same relation to each other as in physical conflict the *offensive* and the *defensive* operations. In practice, however, it is impossible always to separate the apologetic and the polemical elements. See the art. *SEE APOLOGY*. In the ages of the Church fathers no great difficulty was encountered, because their object was to combat the Jewish or the heathen systems of religion, and their writings therefore bear a predominant polemical coloring. But it is one thing to combat a single religious system like paganism, and it is quite another to attack heresy

within the Church, or to make war on religious systems claiming a like foundation. Polemics, then, narrowed down to its proper sphere, is the controversy within the Christian fold regarding the *essentials* of the Church faith. In the early Church the polemical activity was confined to heresies and schismatics. Indeed, from the death of Origen to John of Damascus (A.D. 254-730)— the time which elapsed between the Sabellian and the Monothelite controversies— the polemics of the Church were developed much more prominently than either the apologetic tendency, as in the preceding period, or the systematic tendency, as in the next period. The heresies which called out polemical activity from 730 till the outbreak of the Reformation differed in tendency from those of the preceding period in their opposition to the whole ecclesiastical system rather than to any particular doctrines, But with the establishment of Protestantism the polemical activity began in real earnest, and from that time to this has continued to develop and expand in strength both among Romanists and Protestants. Among the former it has been specially cultivated by the Jesuits, who, on account of the many methods which they have proposed for attack of Protestants, have been given the appellation “Methodists” (comp. Pelt, *Theol. Encyklopädie*, § 63, p. 386 sq.). They even published large works containing the *modus operandi* for controversies of a confessional nature, under the title *Theologia Polemica* (Vitus Pichler, 1753; Gazzaniga, 1778 sq.). The Protestants were not far behind, and provided material under the more appropriate title of a *Synopsis Controversiarum* (Abraham Calow, 1685; Musaeus, 1701), to which may be added Walch, *Einleitung in die polemische Gottesgelahrtheit* (Jena, 1752, 8vo), and his other writings; Schubert, *Institutiones Theologies Polemical* (1756-58); Baumgarten, *Untersuchung theologischer Streitigkeiten* (1762-64); Mosheim, *Streittheologie* (1763 sq.); Bock, *Lehrb. für die neueste Polemik* (1782). No work of importance on the science of polemics appeared until Schleiermacher treated of it in his *Darstellung des theol. Studiums* (Berl. 1811); and his ideas found further and fuller elucidation by his disciples Sack in his *Christliche Polemik* (Bonn, 1838), and by Pelt in his *Theol. Encyklopädie* (1843); Hagenbach, *Theol. Encyklop.* (1864, and since); Hill, *System of Divinity* (N. Y. 1847, 8vo); McClintock, *Encyclop. and Method of Theol. Science* (N. Y. 1873).

The literature of polemics is divided properly into:

I. Treatises on the Controversy between Protestants and Romanists.

1. General Treatises by writers of the Church of Rome.
2. General Treatises against Popery by Protestant Divines.

II. Treatises on the Arian Controversy.

III. Treatises on the Socinian Controversy.

IV. Treatises occasioned by the Controversies between the Church of England, and between them and Dissenters.

1. The Bangoriani Controversy.
2. Subscription to the 39 Articles.
3. Baptismal Regeneration Controversy.
4. Controversial Treatises on Dissent.

V. Treatises on Heresies.

The various publications on these divisions must be sought for under their respective headings. We will refer the reader here for general treatises to the works cited by Werner, *Gesch. der apologet. u. polemischen Literatur*, and to Spanheim, *Controversiarum de Religione cum Dissidentibus Hodie Christianis Prolixe et cuan Judeis Elenchus Historico Theologicus*, and Horneck, *Summa Controversiarum*; Clarisse, *Encyclopédie Theologicae Epitome* (Lugd. 1835, 8vo). § 91. p. 499 sq. See, also, Mohler's *Symbolik*; Piper, *Monumental-Theologie*, § 135 sq.

The principles which should govern the Christian theological polemic are those of an honest offensive warfare. They may be condensed into the following points:

- (1) The question is not about persons, but about things. Only when both stand and fall together may personalities be allowed.
- (2) The attack must be directed to the point where the strength of the enemy is most formidable: as soon as the principles of the adversary have been refuted the hostility must cease.
- (3) We must not impute to the adversary more wrong than he is really guilty of; or else the attack itself assumes the appearance of a wrong, and will be considered in that light by every third party, even if successful. Polemics, then, must take the cause of the adversary just as it is; they must not attribute to him any opinions which can only be made his own by

exaggerating his expressions, or even by putting false constructions upon them.

(4) It is imprudent to think too little of an adversary. The reasons given by him must be recognized in all their force, and on the basis of full acknowledgment the proof must be given that they are not convincing.

(5) A struggle with unequal arms is not honorable. The polemic, then, will have to prove either that the weapons of his adversary are illegal, or, if this cannot be done, to inquire into his standpoint and his reasons and to prove in error the cause in its very principles.

(6) If the polemic thus succeeds in reducing his adversary *ad absurdum*, i.e. to an illogical condition, which, by reason of its untenability, forces him *hors de combat*, the vanquished is turned into a friend and convert and the truth has indeed triumphed, as God would have it.

Polemics, Jewish.

The friendly relation which existed at first between the Church and the Synagogue could not always last, and a separation became a matter of necessity. The result was that the non-identification of Christianity with Judaism gave rise to bitterness and enmity, and some of the fiercest persecutions were instigated and encouraged by the Jews. The Christians were no more called so, but "Minim," or heretics. So great became at last the enmity, that a celebrated Jewish sage (Tarphon) declared that, although the Gospels and the other writings of the "Minim" contained the sacred names of the Deity, they ought to be burned; that heathenism was less dangerous than Christianity; that heathens offended from ignorance, while Christians did so with full knowledge; and that he would prefer seeking shelter in a heathen temple rather than in a meeting-place of the "Minim" (Tarp. *Sabb.* 116 a). Another and more moderate rabbi (Ishmael) also recommended the burning of every copy of the Gospels, as in his opinion inciting to rebellion against God, and to hatred against the commonwealth of Israel (*Aboda Sara*, 43). By and by all friendly relations between the two parties entirely ceased, and the mutual estrangement was such that the ordinary civilities of life were not to be exchanged, and the bread, wine, oil, and meat used by Christians were declared polluted.

One of the earliest polemics against Christianity is that of R. Simlai, of the 3d century, who became famous for his virulent opposition to Christianity.

His polemics were especially directed against the doctrine of the Trinity (comp. *Genesis Rubba*, c. 8; *Jerus. Berach.* 9, 11 d, 12 a). It has been suggested, and with apparent probability, that he had been chiefly engaged in controversy with Origen. Another polemic was R. Abbahu, of the 4th century, who likewise attacked the Trinity and the ascension of Christ (*Jerus. Taanith*, 2, 65 b; *Genesis Rabba*, c. 29; *Exodus Rabba*, c. 29). Of this R. Abbahu, we also read (*Abodah Sarah*, fol. 4 a) that he recommended a certain R. Saphra to a noble Christian. At this recommendation the Christian permitted R. Saphra an exemption for thirteen years. When the Christian asked R. Saphra about the meaning of the passage in ~~<30RE>~~ Amos 3:2, and perceived his ignorance, he asked R. Abbahu about its meaning. Having received a satisfactory answer, the Christian asked, "Why is R. Saphra, whom you recommended to me as a great man, so ignorant in the Scriptures, which thou didst explain right away?" To this R. Abbahu answered, "We, who come in contact with you Christians, are obliged, for our self-preservation, to study the Scriptures, because you dispute so often with us from the Scriptures, and because we know that you study the Scriptures: but the other Jews, who live among Gentiles, have no need of that, since they do not dispute with them concerning the Scriptures." What a gloomy picture! The Jews read the Bible, not because they are concerned about the "one thing needful," but only for the sake of controversy! Next in order are those passages of the Talmud which speak of Jesus, and have been expurgated in the earliest editions. Eisenmenger has collected a great many of these passages in his *Neuentdecktes Judenthum*, and also Meelführer, in his *Jesus in Talmude* (Altorf, 1699, 2 vols.).

We now give an alphabetical list of such as wrote against Christianity, and who, for the most part, have been treated upon in this *Cyclopedia*, to which reference is made:

Abendana, Jacob (q.v.), carried on a controversy with Hulsius (1699), and translated the *Cusari* into Spanish.

Abrabanel, Isaac (q.v.), whose commentaries contain the strongest invectives against Christianity; and so likewise his $h[w\dot{c}w [wm\dot{c}m$ and $wj y\dot{c}m tw[w\dot{c}y$.

Albo, Joseph, who died in 1444, took part in the conference held with Jerome de Santa Fe, which took place at Tortosa in 1413-14 under the

presidency of Peter de Luna, afterwards Benedict XIII. He is the author of the *Sepher Ikkarim*, מַיְרָקֵי רִפְס, i.e. “the Book of Principles.” “This book,” says R. Wise, “was the first, and for a long time the only one which attacked the dogmas of the Roman Catholic Church. His opponents spoke, wrote, and argued so much against him that he became quite popular in Christian circles, and thus also a forerunner of the Reformation.” This effusion of the Cincinnati rabbi is of course only to be taken *cum grano salis*, for a personal acquaintance with the work would have told him that only the last division contains what can be called antichristian.

Arama, Isaac, one of the Spanish exiles, impugns Christianity in his חֶצֶק תַּוְּזִי, i.e. “the Heavy Vision.”

Bechai ben-Ashel's attacks upon Christianity can only be found in the earliest editions of his commentary on the Pentateuch.

Farrissol, Abraham (q.v.), is the author of חֲגִמַּת מִּרְבָּע, i.e. “the Shield of Abraham,” written against Christianity.

Isaac-Jacob ben-Saul, of the 18th century, wrote his *Buch der Verzeichnung. Eine Unterweisung wie man seine Religion gegen die Angriffe des Christenthums, und wie man überhaupt den Einwüfen der Polemik antworten soil* (Amsterdam, 1693).

Jechiel ben-Joseph (q.v.), author of יְכִיֵּל בְּנֵי יוֹסֵף, was a member of the conference held at Paris between Nicolaus Donin and some Jewish savans. Jechiel would not admit that the Jesus mentioned in the Talmud is Jesus of Nazareth, but another, a discovery which was copied by later writers. But Jews themselves acknowledge the failure of such an assertion; for, says Dr. Levin, in his prize essay, *Die Religions disputation des R. Jechiel von Paris*, etc. (published in Gratz's *Monatsschrift*, 1869, p. 193), “We must regard the attempt of R. Jechiel to ascertain that there were two by the name of Jesus as unfortunate, original as the idea may be.”

Jehudah ha-Levi ben-Samuel (q.v.) is the author of the famous *Cusari*.

Joseph ben-Shemtob (q.v.), the commentator on Profiat Duran's (q.v.) Epistle.

Joseph bu-Jachm (q.v.) attacks Christianity in his commentary on the Hagiographa.

Kimchi, David and Joseph (q.v.), made their commentaries the arena of attacks.

Lipmaumm, Yonmtob (q.v.), is the author of the well known *Nizzachon*.

Luppercio, Isaac, defended Judaism against a monk of Seville in his *Apolojia*. (Basle, 1658).

Machir of Toledo is the author of an eschatology of Judaism in three sections; the first Hulsius translated into Latin, with a refutation.

Monalto, Elias (q.v.), wrote an apology of Judaism in his *Livro FIato.t*

Mortera, Saul (q.v.), the teacher of Spinoza, was so virulent in his **hçm trwt** that it could not be printed.

Nachmanides, Moses (q.v.), speaks against Christianity in more than one of his works.

Ofenlhausen, Smrl. Zewi (q.v.), wrote his *Jewish Theriaca* against Brenz.

Olquenira, Isaac (q.v.), is the pretended editor of an antichristian work written by Joseph Nasi of Naxos.

Orobio, Isaac (q.v.), wrote his *Israel Venye* and *Scripta adversus Christianam Religionem*.

Profiat Duran (q.v.) is the author of the well-known satirical epistle entitled **ytwbak yht I a**, "Be not like thy Fathers," which R. Isaac Wise, of Cincinnati, published in English for the readers of his paper, under the pompous heading, "A Relic of Great Significance," respectfully inscribed "to religion peddlers." This last expression puts R. Wise on the side of these Jewish polemics, but with the difference that "quod licet Jovi, non licet bovi."

Roman, Abraham, showed his animosity by publishing antichristian works (Constantinople, 1710).

Saadia, Gaon (q.v.), devotes the second and eighth chapters of his philosophical work to attack Christianity.

Toki, Isaac ben-Abraham- (q.v.), is the author of the famous **hnwma qwzj** , which has been made use of by critical writers upon the New Testament from Voltaire to Strauss. Some years ago it was published, with a German

translation by R. David Deutsch (2d ed. 1875), under the patronage of M. Rothschild (!) of Paris. In English some chapters were published by a New York rabbi.

In the same year in which the second German edition of Toki's work appeared, a similar work in five volumes was published at Warsaw, under the title *Zerubbabel*, written by Lebensohn, under the patronage of Sir Moses Montefiore, of London; a work which, as reviewer says, by far surpasses the author of the *Chizuk l'Emrunath*. It is characterized by coarse vituperation.

The literature on this subject is very meager. For the older literature, we would refer to De Rossi, *Bibliotheca Judaica Antichristiana* (Parmse, 1800); Steinschneider, *Jewish Literature*, p. 122 sq., 211 sq. (B. P.)

Polemioi

SEE SYNSTUSISTAE.

Polemius (or Salvius or Sylvius)

a Gallican ecclesiastic of the 5th century, flourished as bishop of Martigny, in the Valais. He is the author of a sacred calendar, drawn up A.D. 448, which is entitled *Laterculus s. Index Dierum Festorum*, and which includes heathen as well as Christian festivals. A portion of this *Laterculus* was published by Bollandus, in the general preface to the *Actae Sanctorum* (1, 44, 45), and the whole will be found, but in a mutilated state, in the seventh volume of the same work (p. 178). See Mansi, *Ad Fabric. Bibl. Med. et Inufin. Lt.* vol. 6; Schonemann, *Bibl. Patrum Lat.* vol. 2, § 50. — Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* s.v.

Polemo, Antonius

a highly celebrated sophist and rhetorician, who flourished under Trajan, Hadrian, and the first Antoninus, and was in high favor with the two former emperors (Suid. s.v.; Philostr. *Vit. Sophist.* p. 532). He is placed at the sixteenth year of Hadrian, A.D. 133, by Eusebius (*Chronicles*). His life is related at considerable length by Philostratus (*Vit. Sophist.* 2, 25, p. 530-544). He was born of a consular family at Laodicea, but spent the greater part of his life at Smyrna, the people of which city conferred upon him at a very early age the highest honors, in return for which he did much to promote their prosperity, especially by his influence with the emperors.

Nor, in performing these services, did he neglect his native city Laodicea. An interesting account of his relations with the emperors Hadrian and Antoninus is given by Philostratus (p. 533, 534). Among the sophists and rhetoricians whom he heard were Timocrates, Scopelianus, Dion Chrysostom, and Apollophanes. His most celebrated disciple was Aristides. His chief contemporaries were Herodes Atticus, Marcus Byzantinus, Dionysius Milesius, and Favorinus, who was his chief rival. Among his imitators in subsequent times was St. Gregory Nazianzen. His style of oratory was imposing rather than pleasing, and his character was haughty and reserved. During the latter part of his life he was so tortured by the gout that he resolved to put an end to his existence he had himself shut up in the tomb of his ancestors at Laodicea, where he died of hunger, at the age of sixty-five. The exact time of his death is not known; but it must have been some time after A.D. 143, as he was heard in that year by Verus. The only extant work of Polemo is the funeral orations for Cynlegeimus and Callimachus, the generals who fell at Marathon, which are supposed to be pronounced by their fathers, each extolling his own son above the other. Philostratus mentions several others of his rhetorical compositions, the subjects of which are chiefly taken from Athenian history, and an oration which he pronounced, by command of Hadrian, at the dedication of the temple of Zeus Olympius at Athens, in A.D. 135. His **Λόγοι ἐπιτάφιοι** were first printed by H. Stephanus, in his collection of the declamations of Polemo, Himerius, and other rhetoricians (Paris, 1547, 4to; afterwards by themselves in Greek, Paris, 1586, 4to; and in Greek and Latin, Tolosae, 1637, 8vo). The latest and best edition is that of Caspar and Conrad Orelli (Leips. 1819, 8vo). See Fabricius, *Bibl. Graec.* 6, 2-4; Clinton, *Fasti Rogmani*, s. a. 133, 135, 143. There is a coin of Itadrian, bearing the inscription **ΠΟΛΕΜΩΝ. ΑΝΕΘΗΚΕ. CΜΥΡΝΑΙΟΙC.** (Rasche, *Lexic. Rei Vm.* s.v. Polemo; Eckhel, *Doctr. Nume. Vet.* 2, 562). This coin belongs to a class which Eckhel has explained in a dissertation (vol. 4. c. 19, p. 368-374). There is a question respecting the identity of this sophist with Polemo, the author of a short Greek work on Physiognomy, who, it is supposed, was a Christian, and must have lived in or before the 3d century. See the discussion on this question by Passow, *Ueber Ptolemio's Zeitalter*, in the *Archiv für Philologie und Pädagogik* (1, 7—9), 1825.

Polemo Of Athens,

(1) an eminent Platonic philosopher, and for some time the head of the Academy, was the son of Philostratus, a man of wealth and political

distinction. In his youth Polemo was extremely profligate; but one day, when he was about thirty, he broke into the school of Xenocrates at the head of a band of revelers. His attention was so arrested by the discourse, which the master continued calmly in spite of the interruption, and which chanced to be upon temperance, that he tore off his garland and remained an attentive listener, and from that day he adopted an abstemious course of life, and continued to frequent the school, of which, on the death of Xenocrates, he became the head, in 01, 116, B.C. 315. According to Eusebius (*Chronicles*) he died in 01, 126, 4, B.C. 273. Diogenes also says that he died at a great age, and of natural decay. He was a close follower of Xenocrates in all things, and an intimate friend of Crates and Crantor, who were his disciples, as well as Zeno and Arcesilas; Crates was his successor in the Academy. Polemo gave his attention mainly to ethics, and esteemed the object of philosophy to be to exercise men in things and deeds, not in dialectic speculations. His character was grave and severe, and he took pride in displaying the mastery which he had acquired over emotions of every sort. In literature he most admired Homer and Sophocles, and he is said to have been the author of the remark that Homer is an epic Sophocles, and Sophocles a tragic Homer. He left, according to Diogenes, several treatises, none of which were extant in the time of Suidas. There is, however, a quotation made by Clemens Alexandrinus, either from him or from another philosopher of the same name, ἐν τοῖς περὶ τοῦ κατὰ φύσιν βίου (*Strom.* 7, 117), and another passage (*Strom.* 2, 410) upon happiness, which agrees precisely with the statement of Cicero (*De Fin.* 4:6), that Polemo placed the *summum bonum* in living according to the laws of nature. Cicero gives (*Acal.* Pt. 2, 43) the following as Polemo's ethical principles: "Holeste vivere, fruentem rebus iis, quas primas homini natura conciliat." See Diog. Laert. 4:16-20; Suid. s.v.; Plut. *De Adul. et Amic.* 32, p. 71 e; Lucian, *Bis Accusat.* 16 (2, 811); Athen. 2, 44 e; Cic. *Acad.* 1, 9; 2, 35, 42; *De Olltt.* 3, 18; *De Fin.* 2, 6, 11; 4:2, 6, 16, 18; 5, 1, 5, 7, et al.; Horat. *Sernu.* 2, 3, 253 fol.; Val. Max. 6:9; Menag. *Ad Diog. Laert.* 1. c.; Fabricius, *Bibl. Græc.* 3, 183; comp. p. 323, note *hhh*; Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Roms. Biog. and Mythol.* s.v.; Ueberweg, *Hist. of Philos.* 1, 133-135; Butler, *Hist. of Anc. Philos.* (see Index).

(2.) Another Platonic philosopher was the disciple of Plotinus; but very little is known of him (Porphyry. *Plot. Vit.*; Fabricius, 1. c.; Clinton, *F. II.* sub ann. B.C. 315, vol. 2, 3d ed.).

(3.) OF ATHENS by citizenship, but by birth either of Ilium or Samos or Sicyon, a Stoic philosopher and an eminent geographer, surnamed ὁ περιηγήτης, was the son of Euegetes, and a contemporary of Aristophanes of Byzantium, in the time of Ptolemy Epiphanes, at the beginning of the 2d century B.C. (Suid. s.v.; Athen. 6:234; Clinton, *F. H.* vol. 3, sub ann. B.C. 199). In philosophy he was a disciple of Panetius. He made extensive journeys through Greece, to collect materials for his geographical works, in the course of which he paid particular attention to the inscriptions on votive offerings and on columns, whence he obtained the surname of Σηλοκόπας (Ath. 1. c.; Casaub. ad loc.). As the collector of these inscriptions, he was one of the earliest contributors to the *Greek Anthology*, and he wrote a work expressly, *Περὶ τῶν κατὰ πόλεις ἐπιγραμμάτων* (Athen. 10:436 *d*, 442 *e*); besides which, other works of his are mentioned upon the votive offerings and monuments in the Acropolis of Athens, at Lacedamon, at Delphi, and elsewhere, which no doubt contained copies of numerous epigrams. Hence Jacobs infers that in all probability his works formed a chief source of the *Garland* of Meleager (*Animadv. in Anth. Graec.* vol. 1, Procem. p. 34, 35). Athenemus and other writers make very numerous quotations from his works, the titles of which it is unnecessary to give at length. They are chiefly descriptions of different parts of Greece; some are on the paintings preserved in various places, and several are controversial, among which is one against Eratosthenes. See Fabricius, *Bibl. Graec.* 3, 184; Vossils, *De list. Graec.* p. 159 fol. ed. Westermann; Clifton, *F. II.* 3, 524, where a list of his works is given.

Polenz, John

a Polish prelate of some note, flourished in the first half of the 16th century. He was of noble parentage, and having decided to give himself to the service of the Church. studied theology in the University of Cracow, and in Germany and other Continental high schools. He also visited Rome. After filling various minor ecclesiastical offices, he was made bishop of Saalland, a province at that time paying fealty to Poland, but under the secular rule of prince Albrecht of Brandenburg. In 1522 this prince, who had refused homage to the new king Sigismund, went to Germany, in company with bishop Jacob Dobeneck and bishop Polenz, to secure the independence of Poland and to accept the Protestant doctrines at the Diet of Nuremberg, which they finally did in 1524. Bishop Polenz died shortly after this event. See Krasinlski, *Sketch of the Rise and Progress of the*

Reformation in Poland, vol. 2; Alzog, *Kirchengesch.* 2, 327, 328; Theiner, *Herzog Albrecht von Preussen*, etc. (Augsb. 1846). *SEE PRUSSIA.* (J.H.W.)

Polhemus, Abraham, D.D.

a minister of the (Dutch) Reformed Church in America, was a lineal descendant of the Rev. Johannes T. Polhemus the first minister of the Dutch Church of Brooklyn, Long Island, who had previously been a missionary of the Reformed Church of Holland at Itamarca, Brazil. He came to this country in 1654, and died in 1676. But little more is known of him than these few dates and facts of his ministry. The subject of this notice was born at Astoria, L. I., in 1812; graduated at Rutgers College in 1831, and at the theological seminary in New Brunswick in 1835. Immediately after his licensure by the Classis of New York, in 1835, he settled at Hopewell, Dutchess Co., N. Y., and remained there until 1857, when he removed to Newark, N. J., and took charge of the newly organized North Reformed Church in May of that year. In October following he died at Newburgh, N. Y., of fever, after an illness of several weeks. He was a man of majestic physical proportions, tall, broad shouldered, handsome, of amiable instincts and attractive manners. The attachment of his parishioners and friends to him was almost unbounded. He was modest, and yet energetic; frank and cordial, but always dignified and commanding respect. His pastoral qualifications were finely developed. As a preacher, he was easy, graceful, impressive in manner, solid and instructive in matter, evangelical and catholic in spirit, and full of "an unction from the Holy One" which gave him great acceptance with the people. He was a leading man in the councils of the Church and in her benevolent and educational institutions, and, had he lived, would have been eagerly sought for other high positions. His piety partook of the characteristics to which it gave its own burnished splendor. His death was a scene of glorious Christian triumph, which reminds one of Payson's experiences. A few hours before he died he exclaimed aloud, "I see Jesus! Now that I have seen him, I never can come back again. I see Jesus! Did I not tell you I should see Jesus? My soul is ravished with the sight." After a while he added, "I have perfect assurance; not a doubt, not a fear." His last sermon was on the death of Stephen, and the subject made a deep impression on his own heart. From the beginning of his sickness he felt that he would never recover, though with occasional encouragements to the contrary, and he prayed that, like Stephen, he might see Jesus. The answer

came on his dying bed. A handsome memorial volume has been published, containing his biography and a selection of his sermons. His memory has been an inspiration to the church whose foundations he laid with faith and prayer, and which, after only three short months of earthly labors, he was destined to lead in person to heaven. (W. J. B. T.)

Polhemus, Johannes T.

SEE POLIIEIUS, ABRAHAM.

Polhill, EDWARD

a learned English Calvinistic layman, flourished in the second half of the 17th century as justice of the peace at Burwast, Sussex. He wrote, *The Divine Will considered in its Eternal Decrees*, etc. (1673, 8vo): — *Answer to Dr. Sherlock's Discourse* (1675, 8vo): — *Precious Faith, considered in its Nature, Working, and Growth* (1675, 12mo): — *Speculum Theologicae in Christo, or a View of some Divine Truths* (1678, 4to) *Christus in Corde, or Mystical Union between Christ and Believers considered* (1680. sm. 8vo, and often): — *Armatura Dei, or a Preparation for Suffering in an Evil Day* (1682, 8vo): — *Discourse on Schism* (1824, 12mo). Several of his works were published in Ward's *Library of Standard Divinity*. "Everything of Polhill is evangelical and valuable," was the testimony of Cotton Mather; and Williams says: "All the works of this learned layman contain many excellent representations of Gospel truths, intermixed with a strain of sublime devotion." Of course Arminians fail to see the consistency of his Bible interpretations, but they nevertheless admire his unction and experience, and regard his writings as precious practical religious works. See *Eclectic Rev.* 4th series, 18:202. (J. II. W.)

Poliander, Johann (Originally Granmann),

a German theologian of the Reformation period, was born at Neustadt in 1487. He studied at Leipsic, where in 1516 he became magister, and in 1520 baccalaureate of theology. When the famous disputation between Dr. Eck and Luther and Carlstadt took place, he was Eck's amanuensis. The disputation convinced him of the truth of the evangelical doctrine, and in 1520 he commenced to preach in accordance with it. The consequence was that he had to leave Leipsic, and in 1522 went to Wittenberg. At the recommendation of Luther, the duke Albrecht of Prussia called Poliander to Koinigsberg, as pastor of the Altstadtkirche, where he remained until his

death in 1541. Poliander is the author of the well-known hymn *Nun lob' mein' Seel' den Herrn* (Engl. transl. by Mills, *Iiorce Germanicae*, No. 75, p. 139, "Now to the Lord sing praises"). See Koch, *Gesch. des deutschen Kirchenliedes*, 1, 355 sq.; *Theologisches Universal-Lexikon*, s.v.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 12, 18-20. (B. P.)

Polias

(Πολιάς), a surname given by the Athenians to *Minerva*, or Athene, as being the goddess- who protected the city.

Polidoro, Caldara

called *Caravaegio*, from his birthplace, was an eminent Italian painter of the Pre-Raffaelites. He was born in 1495, near Milan. He went to Rome at the time when Leo X was raising some new edifices in the Vatican, and not knowing how to get his bread otherwise, for Polidoro was very young, he hired out as a day-laborer to carry stones and mortar for the masons there at work. He drudged this way till he was eighteen, when he was led to think of devoting his life to painting. It happened thus: Several young painters were employed by Raffaele in the same place to execute his designs. Polidoro, who often carried them mortar to make their fresco, was touched with the sight of the paintings, and the pleasure he took to see the painters work stirred up the talent which he had for painting. In this disposition, he was very officious and complaisant to the young painters, pushed himself into their acquaintance, and opened to them his intention; whereupon they gave him lessons, which emboldened him to proceed. He applied himself with all his might to designing, and advanced so rapidly that Raffaele was astonished, and set him to work with the other young painters; and Polidoro distinguished himself so much from all the rest, that, as he had the greatest share in executing his master's designs in the Vatican, so he had the greatest glory. The care he had seen Raffaele take in designing the antique sculptures showed him the way to do the like. He spent whole days and nights in designing those beautiful things, and studied antiquity to the nicest exactness. The works with which he enriched the frontispieces of several buildings at Rome are proofs of the pains he took in studying the antique. He did very few easel pieces, most of his productions being in fresco, and of the same color, in imitation of the bass-reliefs. In this way he made use of the manner called scratching, consisting in the preparation of a black ground, on which is placed a white plaster,

and where, taking off this white with an iron bodkin, we discover through the holes the black, which serves for shadows. Scratched work lasts longest, but being very rough, is unpleasant to the sight. He associated himself at first with Maturino, and their friendship lasted till the death of the latter, who died of the plague in 1526. After this, Polidoro, having by Raffaele's assistance filled Rome with his pieces, thought to have enjoyed his ease and the fruits of his labors; when the Spaniards in 1527 besieging that city, all the men of art were forced to fly, or else were ruined by the miseries of the war. In this exigency Polidoro retired to Naples, where he was obliged to work for ordinary painters, and had no opportunity of making himself noted; for the Neapolitan nobility in those days were more solicitous to get good horses than good pictures. Seeing himself therefore without business, and forced to spend what he had got at Rome, he went to Sicily; and, understanding architecture as well as painting, the citizens of Messina employed him to make the triumphal arches for the reception of Charles V coming from Tunis. This being finished, and finding nothing further, he set out for Rome but, scarcely out of the place, was murdered by his servant for his money. This happened in 1543. Polidoro's principal work was done at Messina, and represented *Christ bearing his Cross*. This, with several small pictures of sacred subjects, is now in the Studj Gallery at Naples. His works have power, life, and passion, and he may be said to have originated the style which in later time formed the basis of the Neapolitan school. See Spooner, *Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts*, s.v.; Mrs. Clement, *Handbook of Painters*, etc. p 171, 172. (J. H. W.)

Polieia

(Πολίεια), a festival anciently observed at Thebes, in Greece, in honor of Apollo, when a bull was wont to be sacrificed,

Polieus

(Πολιεύς). a surname of *Zeus*, or Jupiter, under which he was worshipped at Athens, as the protector of the city. The god had an altar on the Acropolis, on which a bull was sacrificed.

Polignac, Melchior De, Cardinal,

was one of the most illustrious scholars and courtiers of France in the latter years of Louis XIV, and in the early reign of Louis XV; an ecclesiastic and high dignitary of the Roman Catholic Church; a distinguished diplomatist,

archaeologist, philosopher, and poet. It is in the last of these characters that his reputation has survived, and is likely to survive, though with continually fading luster. The elegant Latinist, whose name was for half a century in the mouths of the fashionable ladies of the court, and of the learned in their studious retreats; whose verses passed current in the gay world for years before they were committed to the press, and continued in circulation for half a century after the death of their author and the oblivion of their source; furnishing to America an inscription in honor of Franklin "Eripuit fulmenque Jovi Phoeboque sagittas;" whose poem was anxiously and frequently desired by Leibnitz, but who died without seeing it, thirty years before it saw the light—this elegant Latinist is now remembered only by a few, and the work which gave him his renown is known to still fewer, being almost as inaccessible as it is unsought. Yet Polignac can never be entirely forgotten, for he linked himself by his poetic labors with Lucretius; and' so long as the profound but dreamy philosophy, and the exquisite but melancholy graces of the greatest of Roman poets are admired, so long will Polignac shine in the radiance reflected from the great luminary with which he is in opposition.

Life. — Melchior de Polignac, the descendant of one of the oldest houses of Auvergne, was born Oct. 11, 1661, at Puly-en-Velay, now Le Puy, the capital of the present department of Haute-Loire, in France. Puy is in the heart of the mountainous region of Middle France, the region of which Puy-de-Dome is the center. It lies at the foot of Mount Anis, in a rugged valley between the great arms of the Cevennes. It is on the left bank of the Upper Loire, and is watered also by its two small tributaries, the Borne and Dolaison. The situation is wild and romantic, and is consecrated by romantic associations. The ground on which the city stands is so ragged and broken that the streets in the higher town are unfit for wheels, and are often mere stairs, like those of Valetta. The cathedral is escalated by an approach of 118 steep steps. Within is a miraculous image of the Virgin Mary, carved by resident Christians (f Lebanon from the cedars of that mountain, though skeptically suspected to have been an idol of the Egyptian Isis. In the suburb of L'Aiguille, the church of St. Michel crowns a basaltic rock 285 feet in height, and is gained by a flight of 216 steps hewn out of the rock. In the Dominican church of St. Laurent are the tomb and part of the remains of Bertrand Duguesclin, the great constable of France. Near by, and close to the village of Expailly, are the ruins of the ancient castle of Polignac, supposed to have been erected on the site of the

temple of the Celtic Apollo. From this circumstance—the *Templum Apollinim cum*—the family of Polignac claimed to have derived its appellation. The tremendous forces of volcanic action are manifest in the country round about, and the streets of Le Puv are partly paved with the volcanic breccia. The race and the birthplace of the future cardinal were thus encompassed with the evidences on which were founded legends and traditions, pagan and Christian-antiquarian, classical, ecclesiastical, chivalrous, and poetic—which might well inspire the quick fancy of the descendant of an ancient family in that marvelous land; and they were enclosed in scenes of natural beauty or sublimity which might feed his imagination in those years of youth which are susceptible to all external influences. Who shall tell to what extent and in what modes the young mind is molded by the circumstances in which infancy and boyhood are passed—in that impressible period of exulting life when it is facile to all impressions? There are no interesting recollections of Polignac’s boyhood. As the cadet of a noble house, he was destined for the Church, and was educated at Paris in the colleges of Clermont and Harcourt. He completed his courses by the study of theology at the Sorbonne, and was early provided with a living through the intervention of his family. The young abbé soon attracted attention by the extent of his acquirements, the vivacity of his disposition, the polish of his conversation, and the elegance of his manners. He is said to have added to ‘a distinguished address and personal appearance a sweet and winning eloquence, which became masculine and powerful in the close of his harangues.’ Madame de Sevigné described him in her Letters as “a man of the world, of fascinating sprightliness, knowing all things and meditating all things; yet with all the gentleness, brilliancy, and complaisance which could be desired in the intercourse of life” (March 18, 1690). Equally flattering commendations were bestowed on him about the same time by Louis XIV and pope Alexander VIII. This pope was ‘elected in a conclave attended by the cardinal de Bourbon, who had carried with him to Rome the young abbé, fresh from his theological studies. On this visit Polignac was charged with the discussion of the four articles of 1682 which asserted the liberties of the Gallican Church. He returned to France to report to Louis XIV the favorable results of the effort at conciliation between the French and Roman courts. In 1691 he accompanied the cardinal de Bourbon a second time to Rome, on the occasion of the election of Innocent XII to the pontificate. On his return to France, he shut himself up in the monastery of “Bons Enfants” to continue his studies. He was not suffered to remain long in this learned seclusion.

The previous experience of his adroitness recommended him as a suitable person to conduct the delicate negotiations in support of the candidature of the prince de Conti for the crown of Poland. He was accordingly sent to Warsaw as ambassador extraordinary. This was his first diplomatic employment. On his journey he was wrecked on the Prussian coast; and, to add to the misfortunes of the sea, he was plundered and his life imperiled by marauders of Dantzic. He managed, however, to reach the court to which he was accredited, and was cordially welcomed by the heroic king, John Sobieski. In his confidential mission at Warsaw he displayed great dexterity and capacity for intrigue, which were, however, frustrated of their expected fruit by the listlessness and delays of the French prince. But the sentiment of Poland was expressed in an epigram cited by Leibnitz (Lett. 6 a Burnet):

*“Per vivum Deum
Nolumus Condaeum.”*

The election resulted in placing the Polish crown on the head of Augustus, elector of Saxony, the first king of the Saxon line. Louis XIV manifested his disappointment by replacing Polignac at the court of Warsaw by the abbé de Chateunay, and ordered the discredited ambassador to return to his abbey of Bon Port (or Fair Haven). The rusticated diplomatist accepted his banishment with apparent gratification, and declared it altogether conformable to his wishes and fortunes. Here he remained during four years, closely occupied with those studies and labors which enabled him to merit the high but pedantic compliment of Voltaire:

*“Le cardinal, oracle de la France,
Reunissant Viroile avec Platon,
Vengeur du ciel et vainqueur de Lucrce.”*

To these years of tranquil application must be assigned the conception and commencement of the poem by which his renown was mainly acquired, and by which it has been preserved. On his return from Poland, Polignac visited the celebrated skeptic Bayle with whom he had many and earnest conferences. Bayle, in replying to the theological arguments of his clerical opponent, assumed to be a Protestant, and justified the genuineness of his Protestantism on the score of protesting against everything usually said or done against “tout ce qui se dit et tout ce qui se fait.” The French abbé could make no serious impression upon his astute and witty antagonist, but was much struck with the frequency and point of his citations from

Lucretius. He determined in consequence to re-read the great Roman poet, and to refute his infidel and materialistic arguments. To this task he addressed himself at once in his retreat at Bon Port, and occasional passages of the incipient poem were communicated to his friends, were circulated from mouth to mouth, and excited general expectation among scholars.

Notwithstanding these diligent literary avocations and his professed enjoyment of the charms of contemplative repose, Polignac was too much of a Frenchman and courtier not to sigh and scheme for a renewal of the delights of Paris and of royal favor. On the proclamation of the duke of Anjou as king of Spain, he wrote to Louis XIV: "If your majesty's prosperity does not put an end to my misfortunes, at least it makes me forget them." The compliment was graciously accepted. He was recalled from his rural banishment, and was welcomed with the utmost cordiality. The king presented him with two additional abbacies. He seems to have recited at this time long passages from his growing poem to the king, the princes, and the learned. He was sent to Rome auditor of the Rota; and was nominated to the English cardinalate by the Pretender, with whose interests he was entrusted. In 1706 he was joined with the cardinal De la Tremouille in the conduct of the French negotiations. He was recalled from Rome in 1710, and was commissioned, along with the marechal D'Uxelles, as plenipotentiary to the conferences of Gertruydenburg, being already cardinal *in petto*. The recent victories of Marlborough had rendered the plenipotentiaries of the Dutch provinces arrogant exacting, and impracticable. He rebuked their domineering tone by remarking, "It is very evident, gentlemen, that you are unused to victory." Nothing was effected at this time towards the restoration of peace, but two years later he was sent to the Congress of Utrecht, where he appeared in the habit of a layman, and under the name of the Comte de Polignac. The Dutch negotiators, suspecting the existence of secret articles between France and England, threatened to expel the French ambassadors from their territory. Hereupon Polignac retorted, "We will not depart: we will treat of you, among you, and without you." He refused, however, to sign the treaty, as it excluded from the English throne the Stuart family, to whose head he was indebted for his nomination to the cardinalate. Before the negotiations at Utrecht were closed, the promotion of Polignac was promulgated, and he received the cardinal's hat at Antwerp, Feb. 10, 1713. In the summer of the same year the *beretta* was delivered to him at Versailles by Louis XIV

himself. He did not neglect his poetic defense of Christianity even in the perplexity of diplomatic cares. He added new passages to his poem during his sojourn at Utrecht, and read his poetic labors to the eminent and aged scholar Le Clerc. Soon after his return to Paris he received the appointment of master of the Royal Chapel, an office which he resigned after three years' tenure. His influence and acceptability at court declined after the death of the great monarch. His stately manners belonged to the old regime, and were uncongenial to the license of the regency. He was involved in the conspiracy of Cellamare through his attachment to the duke and duchess of Maine, and his opposition to the regent Orleans. He was exiled to his abbey of Anchin, in Flanders; and though his arrival was distasteful to the simile and uncultivated Flemish monks, he won their regard by his gentleness and consideration, by the integrity of his government, and by the decoration of their church. He employed himself here with the continuation of his poem; but after three years returned to Paris on the death of the cardinal Dubois and of the regent. In 1724 he attended the conclave in Rome which resulted in the election of Benedict XIII, and rendered himself singularly acceptable to him and to his successor, Clement XII. He was appointed shortly after his arrival in Rome ambassador of France at the papal court, and at length brought to a happy termination the long controversy of the Gallican Church on the subject of the bull *Unigenitus*. He returned to his native land in 1730, "laden with the spoils of Rome" both the tributes paid to his dexterity, with eloquence, and fascination of manner, and the antique treasures brought from the capital of the ancient world. During his absence he had been appointed, in 1726, archbishop of Auch. and in 1728 *Commandeur des Ordres du Roi*.

During this long political and diplomatic career there had been many intervals of literary retirement, as we have seen, which had been sedulously employed in the acquisition and application of various knowledge. His poetic taste and his learned labors he never entirely laid aside, but rendered them profitable to himself and attractive to statesmen and courtiers wherever his wanderings led him. His public avocations were thus far from filling up the measure of his distinction. In 1704 he succeeded the illustrious Bossuet as a member of the Royal Academy of France. His inaugural address on this occasion was greatly admired. More than twenty years after its delivery the marquis D'Argenson deemed it superior to any discourse delivered during the century in which the Academy had existed, and declared it to be "the most perfect model for those who have a like

task to fulfill." In 1715 he was elected an honorary member of the Academy of Sciences, and in 1717 of the Academy of Belles-Lettres. These honors were fairly merited. He had through life been a diligent explorer and collector of antiquities. He gathered a large and valuable cabinet of coins and medals. He brought together at great expense a splendid assemblage of archaic remains, due in great measure to his frequent and prolonged residences at Rome. He instituted explorations in its neighborhood, between Frascati and Grotta Ferrata, and discovered the villa of Marius his conjectures being confirmed by the exhumation of a fragment of an inscription recording the fifth consulship of the conqueror of the Teutones and Cimbri. From these diggings he obtained six statues representing the detection of Achilles at the court of Lycomedes by Ulysses. The palace of the Caesars, in the Farnese vineyard on the Palatine, was opened and examined in his presence. The duke of Parma, who had ordered the excavations, presented Polignac with a bass-relief containing fourteen figures, embodying the legend of Bacchus and Ariadne. It had formed the highest step of the state platform constructed for the imperial audiences. From the Columbarium of the *Libertines* of Livia he obtained several beautiful urns. He expressed the wish that he could be master of Rome, in order that he might turn the course of the Tiber for a fortnight, and rifle its bed of the precious relics supposed to be concealed beneath its yellow stream. He had surveys executed with the view to the gratification of such a desire. Could it have been satisfied, the project of Garibaldi would have been anticipated by one hundred and fifty years; but recent discussions have indicated the hopelessness of obtaining any considerable treasures by such a laborious procedure. 'The numerous relics which Polignac acquired by these and other opportunities were arranged as a grand museum of antiquities at his hotel in Paris. They ultimately met with a sorrowful fate. The cardinal had hoped to increase them by the examination of the ruins of the *Templum Pacis*, burned in A.D. 191, in the reign of Commodus. He expected to find amid the ashes and debris the sacred vessels carried off from Jerusalem by Titus. The hope and the expectation both remained ungratified.

Polignac's liberal studies were by no means restricted to poetry and classical archaeology. A portion of his time was always devoted to philosophy, mathematics, and physics. He thus gained that diversified and extensive knowledge which is strikingly but not convincingly displayed in his *Anti-Lucretius*. The last decade of his life seems to have been chiefly

consecrated to this graceful and remarkable poem; but it was also occupied with the arrangement and study of his ample gallery of instructive curiosities, and enlivened by pleasant intercourse with his friends, and with the distinguished strangers who were attracted to his hotel by his wide and long-established reputation. For half a century he was one of the notabilities of Europe. He died at Paris Nov. 20, 1741, and his collection was scattered at his death. His habits had been elegant and courtly—his living generous—his public employments and his private pursuits expensive—his ample means consumed in costly accumulations. He was embarrassed with debt, and after his decease his books, his gems, his medals, his sculptures, and his numerous articles of *virtu* were offered for sale. His statues were purchased by Frederick the Great, and were transported to Berlin, where they were destroyed on the capture of that city in the Seven-Years' War. All that remains as a memorial of Polignac is his confutation of Lucretius.

Even that great work—for it merits the epithet of great both by its design and by its execution—the great Latin poem which preserves his reputation, was left in as incomplete and fragmentary a condition as the ancient ruins from which he had recovered the shattered monuments of ancient art. He never finished it—he never put its finished parts together (“*varias partes variis temporibus perpoliando, dissolutas, ac dissipatas in unum corpus revocare numquam curaverat*”). A few days before his death he consigned his unarranged manuscripts to his long-trying companion and friend the abbé de Rothelin, appointing him his literary executor, to revise, arrange, connect, complete the scattered leaves, or to suppress them, according to his discretion. The provision for the performance of these duties seems to have been early made. The marquis D'Argenson reports it in his *Memoires*, published fifteen years before Polignac's death: “A poem against Lucretius, of equal length with the original, and divided into nine books, requires the life of a man to carry it to perfection. The cardinal began too late, and cannot flatter himself with the hope of living to finish it. It is said that he means to charge the abbé de Rothelin with the task. who, from vanity, will not refuse it, and will think it an honor to put the work of his respectable friend in a state to appear before the public. But to this end the aid of some able professor of the university will be necessary: the abbé will never accomplish it of himself. . . . But who, at present, will read a Latin poem entirely philosophical, of five or six thousand lines? Greek is entirely forgotten; it is to be feared that Latin will soon be so, and that the cardinal

de Polignac, the abbé de Rothelin, and a certain M. Le Beau, coming up in the university, will be called *the last of the Romans*." From vanity, from affection, from love of learning, from zeal for philosophy, or from all these motives combined, the pious task intrusted to him was faithfully and creditably discharged by the abbé de Rothelin. With the counsel and assistance of the abbate Cerati, rector of the University of Pisa, he prepared the work for the press, and wrote the dedication to pope Benedict XIV. He, too, died without seeing the fruit of his labors; and the long-expected work, which for forty years it had been a mark of polite culture to know (*Anti-Lucretium nosse pars urbanitalis*), appeared at Paris under the supervision of Prof. Le Beau, to whom the charge of editing it had been consigned by Rothelin. It was reproduced at London in 1748.

D'Argenson thought that translations would be left unread; but translations soon diffused the fame of the work among those who were ignorant of the classic tongues. At the commencement of the century, while the poem was in its crude infancy, a translation was begun by the dukes of Maine and Bourbon. The French version of Bougainville was issued in 1759, and the Italian of Ricci was produced in splendid form at Verona in 1767 (3 vols. 4to).

The Anti-Lucretiusts. — The philosophical poem of cardinal Polignac, as published by Le Beau, and, apparently, as originally designed by its author, consists of nine books; but it closes without epilogue, peroration, or envoy. Notwithstanding its length, its protracted gestation, and its elaborate execution, it ends like that canto of Butler's *Ludibras* which celebrates the Bear and Fiddle, but "breaks off in the middle." It wants alike completeness and completion. It is fragmentary and desultory, deficient and redundant. Its arguments are ingenious without being convincing, and its polemics are more dazzling than satisfactory. The blind and fanatical Cartesianism of the poet confines him in a labyrinth of bewildering errors, and conceals from him at once the vagaries and weaknesses of his master, and the strength and profundity of those who had risen up to confute his philosophic hallucinations. He is dizzied by the *vortices* in which he has involved himself. He forgets his specific function as the antagonist of Epicurean ethics and physics, and devotes himself with more earnest energy to the refutation of all anti-Cartesians, whom he assimilates to and often identifies with the Epicurean herd. He is in consequence both undiscerning and unjust in the treatment of his brilliant predecessors and contemporaries. The statement and confutation of the doctrines of Spinoza

might have been very acceptable to the Cartesians and theologians of his own day, when Spinoza was so little understood and so harshly appreciated (3, 803-872; 4:1295-1307). It may be highly approved even now by those who still retain the old fanatical delusions and the old animosities in regard to Spinoza, and who cannot recognise in him Coleridge's "God-intoxicated sage." *SEE SPINOZA* But surely the language in which the cardinal assails the Newtonian system, and proceeds to confute Newton himself, does equal discredit to his good-sense and to his scientific perspicacity (2, 865-1006; 4:933-1124). He does, it is true, allow a faint echo of the universal admiration for Newton to escape him:

"Dicam
Tanti pace viri, quo non solertior alter
Naturam rerum ad leges componere motus,
Ac Mundi partes justa perpendere libra,
Et radium solis transverso primate fractum
Septem in primigenos perimansurosque colores
Solvere" (2, 874-880).

Yet how different is this deprecatory commendation from the enthusiastic eulogy bestowed on Des Cartes!

"Quo nomine dicam
Natura genium, Patrimonia decus, ac decus aevi
Cartesium nostri, quo se jactabit alumno'
Gallia foeta viris, ac duplicis arte Minervae"
(8:55-59).

This is the manifest reflection of the tribute of Lucretius to the "*Grains homo*," Epicurus. We may endure with patience Polignac's contempt for the materialistic tendencies of Locke's philosophy, and his omission of his contemporaries, Malebranche and the much greater Leibnitz (an omission which may be satisfactorily explained), but we cannot fail to observe his utter inability to discern the scientific acumen, and the wonderful faculty of logical co-ordination and development, which characterized his chosen antagonist Lucretius. One of the most admired, and probably the most brilliant passage in the *Anti-Lucretius*, is the opening, in which he announces his subject and its difficulties, and does earnest homage to the exquisite graces of the Roman poet. But this inauguration of his thesis does not prevent him from speaking of the spirit and doctrines of Lucretius in terms which reveal rather the controversialist eager to display his own powers in the best light than the sincere inquirer anxious to discover and to

promulgate only the truth. With all our regard for the courtly and clerical poet, we must confess him to be more of a *dilettante* than a philosopher or adept in science.

But, while thus taking exception to the substance and argumentation of the poem, and to the narrowness and fanaticism inseparable from the advocacy of fantastic and erroneous theories, attention may be justly called to the general execution of the difficult task, and to many episodic disquisitions, which assail by anticipation the speculations of Darwin and the evolutionists, and present many topics and many suggestions which merit careful examination in connection with the scientific controversies that distract our own day by the revival of ancient hallucinations.

Whatever deductions may be properly made from the *Anti-Lucretius* on the score of scientific superficiality and philosophic aberration, the work merits high praise on account of its design and execution; and still deserves consideration as a memorable and singularly graceful production of the modern Latin muse.

The versification and expression of Polignac have been unfavorably compared with the excellences of some of the earlier Latinists. In making the comparison with Vida, one of the chief of those elders, some advantage may be derived from a direct, though unequal, counterpart to one of his poems. The description of the game of chess in the *Anti-Lucretius* may be fairly considered in connection with the *Scacchia, Ludus*, of the Cremonese poet. The same ingenuity in rendering the stiffness of classic Latinity plastic, for the purpose of describing things and processes entirely unknown to the classical vocabulary, may be admired in both. In the one instance chess is employed only as an illustration, and the description occupies only fifteen lines (*Anti-Lucr.* 3, 892-906); in the other it constitutes the thesis of a descriptive poem. In a few lines, and in a mere illustration, there is, of course, no opportunity for detail. Nor is there room for such elaborate intricacy of narration-such subtle twisting in and twisting out of facile diction-nor for such surprising felicity of adaptation of old forms to new and undesigned uses, in the later episode as in the earlier poem. There is nothing possible within the narrower field which, for curious dexterity, admits of being adduced as a parallel for Vila's marvellous explanation of the diverse movements of the pieces at chess (*Scacch.* 85-168), or for his explanation of the maneuvers and fortunes of the game. But it may be permitted to act upon the artist's maxim, '*ex pede*

Herculem;’ and we may discern in the episode of Polignac (notwithstanding the deficiency of materials for an accurate and minute comparison) a command over the resources of the Latin tongue which is not unworthy of Vida, even in such fantastic sports of fancy and erudition. If the larger faculties of the poet are considered, Vida’s epic, the *Christiad*, fails to exhibit such compass of expression, such grace and dignity, and even melody of utterance, or such vigor of imagination, as the *Anti-Lucretius*. Both Vida and Polignac, it is true, fall into the unclassical frailty of terminating their hexameters too frequently with monosyllables and enclitics. They are careless of their caesuras, and repeat too often certain easy forms and mannerisms. There may be more liquidity and smoothness in Vida, but there is more elevation and a more masculine gravity in Polignac. If the former adheres with unconscious imitation to the transparent fluency of Virgil, the latter with equal success, but with deliberate endeavor, reproduces the peculiarities, and not rarely the splendors, of Lucretius, in the very diction of the greater Roman poet. But, whatever judgment may be passed on either the absolute or the relative merit of the *Anti-Lucretius*, it remains a very remarkable poem, which deserves to be reclaimed from the oblivion in which it has been suffered to remain so long. It was a praiseworthy and noble effort to repel the advances of skepticism in the day of Spinoza and Locke and Bayle; “to justify the ways of God to man,” by explaining the wonder of the universe in consonance with a lively and intelligent faith in a wise, beneficent, and sustaining Creator. Despite of its imperfections, its disconnections, its disorder and incompleteness, the study of the poem may be advantageously renewed after the lapse of a century, though other weapons may be required for the renovated conflict between faith and science than can thence be drawn, in consequence of the vast changes which have since been made in all the implements of intellectual warfare.

Literature. — It results from the long neglect into which the *Anti-Lucretius* had fallen that the bibliography of the subject is exceedingly scant and unsatisfactory. The histories of philosophy pass it by with little or no notice; the editors of Lucretius, and the commentators on the *De Natura Rerum*, have scarcely bestowed more attention upon it. There is very little to assist investigation which is not due to the contemporaries of Polignac. Under these circumstances, the only references which it seems expedient to make are, *Biographie Universelle*, s.v. Polignac; De Boze, *Eloge de M. le Cardinal de Polignac, prononae dans l’Academie Royale des Inscriptions*

et des Belles-Lettres; De Mairan, *Eloge de M. le Cardinal de Polignac, prononce dans l'Academie Royale des Sciences*; Fancher, *Hist. du Carcdinal de Polignac* (Paris, 1772, 2 vols.); St. Simon, *Memoires*; D'Argenson, *Memoirs*; *Anti-Lucretius, sive de Deo et Natura Libri Novem* (Lond. 1748, 2 vols. 12mo). The recent *History of French Literature* by Van Laun. though extending over three octavo volumes, has not a word on Polignac, so much has his memory fallen into neglect. For the relation of Polignac to the important ecclesiastical events of his time, see Jervis, *Hist. of the Church of France*, 2, 181, 224, and the art. **SEE NOAILLES** in this *Cyclopedia*. (G. F. H.)

Polish Brethren

SEE SOCINIANS.

Politeness

SEE COURTESY.

Politi, Adriano

an Italian writer. was born at Siena at the close of the 16th century. He chose the ecclesiastical career, and was attached as secretary to the cardinals Capisucchi, San Giorgio, and Serbelloni. He died about the middle of the 17th century. Politi edited *Opere di C. Tacito* (Rome, 1611, 4to), and another and more satisfactory edition (Venice, 1644, 4to): — *Dizionario Toscano* (ibid. 1615, 8vo): this work, an abridgment of the *Dizionario della Crusca*, caused him some tribulations: he was accused of having wittingly introduced into it some errors and falsehoods, and was thrown into jail: — *Ordo Romance historiae legendae* (ibid. 1627, 4to, and in vol. 3 of Roberti's *Miscellanea*). — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 40, 616.

Politi, Alessandro

an Italian writer, was born July 10, 1679, at Florence. After studying under the Jesuits, he entered at the age of fifteen the Congregation of the Regular Clerks of the Pious Schools, and was conspicuous among its members by his rare erudition. He was called upon to teach rhetoric and peripatetic philosophy at Florence in 1700. Barring a period of about three years, during which he was a professor of theology at Genoa (1716-18), he spent the greatest part of his life in his native city, availing himself of the

manifold resources he could find there to improve his knowledge of Greek literature, his favorite study. In 1733 he was called to the chair of eloquence vacant in the University of Pisa. Accustomed to live among his books aloof from the world, Politi was of an irritable disposition, and sensitive in the extreme to the lightest criticism. He was fond of displaying his erudition, and his useless digressions make the reading of his works a most harassing job. He died July 25, 1752. He left, *Philosophia Peripatetica, ex mente sancti Thontae* (Florence, 1708, 12mo): — *De puatria in testamentis condendis potestate, lib. 4* (ibid. 1712, 8vo): — *Etmstathii Commentarii in Homeri Iliadem*, with notes and Latin version (ibid. 1730-35, 3 vols. fol.): — *Eustuthii Commentarii in Dionysium Perietem*, Greek and Latin (Cologne, 1742, 8vo): — *Orationes XII ad Academiutam Pisanuam* (Lucca, 1746, 8vo): — *Martyrologyim Romanum castigatum* (vol. 1, Florence, 1751, 8vo); and many unpublished works. All his orations have been collected (Pisa, 1774, 8vo). See Fabroni. *Vitae Itatioarum*, vol. 8; Tipaldo, *Biogs. degli Ital. illustri*, vol. 4. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 40, 616.

Politi, Giovanni

an Italian canonist, was born June 8, 1738, at Pinzano (Frioul). He studied at Padua, obtained in 1763 the diploma as a doctor of civil and canon law, and was a professor of literature at the Seminary of Portogruaro, and also of ecclesiastical jurisprudence, in which he was remarkably proficient. In 1800 he repaired to Concordia, where the bishop provided him with a canonicate. He published one considerable work, *Jurisor udeotice ecclesiasticae universae, libri 9* (Venice, 1787, 9 vols. 4to), which was approved by a brief of Pius VI. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 40, 617.

Politian or Poliziano, Angelo

a noted scholar of the Renaissance period, flourished in France and Italy, and was the favorite of the Medici at Florence. He was born at Montepulciano, in Tuscany, in 1454, and was the son of Benedetto Ambrogini, a doctor of law. In after-life he dropped his paternal name, and assumed that of Poliziano, from his native town Mons Politianus. Lorenzo de Medici took care of his education, placed him under good preceptors, and provided for all his wants. He afterwards entered into clerical orders, took his degree of doctor of law, and was made by Lorenzo a canon of the cathedral of Florence. He was also entrusted with the education of the

ducal children, as well as with the care of the duke's library and collection of antiquities, and he was his guest and companion for the remainder of his life. Poliziano had studied Latin under Cristofiro Landino, Greek under Andronicus of Thessalonica, and philosophy under Ficino and Argyropultus of Constantinople. He was afterwards appointed professor of Latin and Greek at Florence. a chair which he filled with great reputation. He wrote *scholia* and notes on many ancient authors—Ovid, Catullus, Statius, Suetonius, Pliny the Younger, and the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*; he translated into Latin the history of Herodian, the manual of Epictetus, the aphorisms of Hippocrates, some dialogues of Plato, and other works from the Greek. The *Miscellanea* of Poliziano, published at Florence in 1489, consist chiefly of observations he had made on the ancient authors, which he arranged for the press at the request of Lorenzo. Merula made an attempt to depreciate this work, which led to an angry controversy between the two scholars, in the midst of which Merula died. Poliziano had also a violent controversy with Bartolomeo Scala. Poliziano was conceited and vain, and very irritable, and his temper led him into an unbecoming altercation with Madonna Clarice, Lorenzo's wife, because she interfered in the education of her children, a thing which Poliziano seemed to think preposterous in a woman; and at last his behavior to her was so impertinent that she turned him out of her house in the country, and wrote to her husband at Florence to inform him of what she had done. Lorenzo perceiving that a reconciliation between the offended woman and the irascible scholar was impracticable, gave Poliziano apartments in one of his houses at Fiesole, where he wrote his Latin poem *Rusticus*. During Lorenzo's last illness, Poliziano attended the deathbed of his patron, who gave him tokens of his lasting affection. Poliziano wrote an affecting monody on Lorenzo's death, and not long after died himself; in September, 1494, and was buried in the church of San Marco, agreeably to his *request*. — *English Cyclop.* s.v. See Möller, *de Polifiano* (Altorf, 1698); Wenmer, *Politimus* (Magdeb. 1718); Mencken, *Historie A. Politaai* (Leips. 1736, 4to); Bonafous, *De Politani Vita et Operibus* (Paris, 1845, 8vo); Greswell, *Memoirs of Politiano*; Roscoe, *Lives of Lorenzo de Medici and of Leo X*; Tiraboschi, *Storia della Letterat. Itrl.*; *Christian Schools and Scholars* (Lond. 1867, 2 vols. 8vo), 2, 321 sq, 329; Lawrence, *Historical Studies* (N. Y. 1877, 8vo), p. 66.

Polity, Civil, of the Jews

SEE GOVERNMENT.

Polity

(Gr. *πολιτεία*) is the term generally used to signify government or forms of government and an administration in the Christian Church. Church polity may be considered in reference to its historical development during successive centuries, and also in reference to the various systems of government heretofore and now recognized in different branches of the Church.

Historical Development. — Nothing is more obvious from the New-Testament record than the simplicity which characterized the primary organization of the Church. In this particular Christianity was in marked contrast with Judaism. Without temple, tabernacle, or altars, without priests or Levites, and almost without ceremonies, it made known at once its character and purposes as spiritual and not carnal, as, in fact, a kingdom of God “not of this world.” The first form of Church organization was that in which the Lord Jesus Christ was present as the visible Head of a body of believers. At this stage the ordinances were established by direct appointment of the Savior himself, who also gave the great command to his disciples to “Go teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.”

Following the crucifixion, the resurrection, and ascension of the Lord Jesus, the Church had for a short period a second form of organization, in which the apostles were the only officers to teach and guide the followers of the Savior. It was at this period that the promised gift of the Holy Ghost was miraculously imparted and signalized by a great awakening at Jerusalem, in which “the Lord added to the Church daily such as were saved.” This period of increase was followed by the appointment of deacons or officers of help, who were especially chosen to relieve the apostles of their minor duties of a semi-secular kind, that they might give themselves “to prayer and the ministry of the Word.” Notwithstanding their primary duties, some if not all of the deacons also devoted themselves to the preaching of the Word, as may be seen from the examples of Stephen and Philip. For a few years following there appear to have been no other officers in the Church besides the apostles and deacons. The next phase of Church administration is that in which elders were appointed. As no specific account is given of the mode of their first appointment, we are left to infer that it may have occurred as a natural designation of respect for

seniority either among the deacons or the influential members of the Church, somewhat after the analogy of eldership among the Jews. Certain it is that as churches multiplied, the apostles recognized, possibly appointed, and actually ordained elders who from the first had greater or less functions of government, and were also active agents of evangelization. Elders were known at Jerusalem about A.D. 41, or eight years after the Pentecost. A few years later they were ordained generally in all the churches (^{<4142>}Acts 14:23). In the council at Jerusalem they were associated with the apostles and brethren (^{<4150>}Acts 15:4, 6, 23). The elders of the New Testament appear to have been evangelists, teachers, and pastors, and in a collective capacity to have ordained ministers of different grades.

Near the close of the New-Testament period the term bishop is used a few times by the inspired writers Luke and Paul, indicating an additional office growing up out of the presbyterate, somewhat as the latter had done from the diaconate. On questions that have arisen respecting the office of bishop in the New-Testament Church modern controversies in reference to Church polity have largely centered. One theory is that the apostles appointed bishops to be their direct and only official successors having the prerogative of ordaining future ministers by divine right. An opposite theory is that the **ἐπίσκοποι** and **πρεσβύτεροι** of the New Testament were absolutely identical in office and order and, consequently, that every elder was a bishop. The more probable theory lies between these extremes. It is that the episcopate was a natural sequence of the presbyterate, not specially appointed, but, in fact, recognized by the apostles. Whereas for the work of evangelization not only an elder but elders were ordained in the principal churches, there would exist in every body of elders the necessity of a presidency or primacy for the purpose of general superintendence and direction. Thus one of the number would be designated, either by seniority or formal choice, as a *primus inter pares*, who should serve as overseer (**ἐπίσκοπος**) of the body and the flock under them. According to this theory, the episcopate was an office of superintendency rather than a distinct clerical order; and in this respect it was analogous if not identical in its functions with that of such apostolical legates as were Timothy and Titus. Nevertheless, it was an office of such importance in the administration of the affairs of the Church and so well adapted to the necessities of the times that it soon became general. Nothing in its original character would prevent its being held in rotation by several

elders in the same church or diocese, yet a successful administration of it would tend to its perpetuation in the same individual. Hence it soon became an office for life.

The episcopacy of the primitive Church was diocesan, and in many cases dioceses embraced only single churches. But as Christian influences radiated from those churches, and contiguous churches were established, the dioceses expanded, and the bishoprics grew in importance. At this early period an error crept into the Church which had a great influence upon its polity in after-ages. It was that of attributing priestly functions to the Christian ministry. Soon after the custom became current of calling presbyters priests, it also became customary to call bishops high-priests, and deacons Levites, and thus a full hierarchical system was initiated in the Church. After the conversion of Constantine this system became gradually expanded, until it exceeded in pomp and detail of ceremony the whole ritual of Judaism, and threw the pontifical rites of Greek and Roman paganism far in the shade. From the diocesan bishop as the primitive center, episcopal offices expanded upwards into archbishops, metropolitans, exarchs, and patriarchs; downwards into chorepiscopi, or country bishops, suffragans, titular bishops, and in the African churches intercessors or episcopal advocates. Corresponding to this expansion, the lower ranks of the clergy were similarly increased by the addition of archpresbyters, archdeacons, and subdeacons, together with acolothists, exorcists, lectors, ostiarii, psalmistae, copiatæ, parabolani, catechists, syndics, notaries, and still other officers in large churches. In the upward expansion of the episcopate, the Greek Church stopped at the patriarchate, but the Roman Church was content with nothing short of a universal patriarchate or papacy (q.v.).

To state somewhat more fully the organization of the Church in the 4th and 5th centuries, it may be said that the Church of that period consisted of several orders of men. Eusebius reckons three, viz. the Ἡγούμενοι, Πιστοί, and Κατηχούμενοι, i.e. rulers, believers, and catechumens. Origen reckons five orders; but then he divides the clergy into three orders, to make up the number. Both these accounts, when compared together, come to the same thing. Under the Ἡγούμενοι, or rulers, were comprehended the clergy, bishops, priests, and deacons; under the Πιστοί, or believers, the baptized laity; and under the Κατηχούμενοι, or catechumens, the candidates for baptism. The believers were called perfect Christians; the catechumens imperfect. The former, having received

baptism, were allowed to partake of the Eucharist, to join in all the prayers of the Church, and to hear discourses upon the most profound mysteries of religion: more particularly the use of the Lord's Prayer was the sole prerogative of the believers, whence it was called *Εὐχὴ πιστῶν*, the prayer of believers. From all these privileges the catechumens were excluded. *SEE CATECHUMENS*. The distinction between the laity and the clergy is by churchmen deduced from the very beginnings of the Christian Church; yet Rigaltius, Salmasius, and Salden insist that there was originally no distinction, but that it is an innovation, and was called forth by the ambition of the clergy of the 3d century, in which Cyprian and Tertullian lived. *SEE CLERGY*.

The various orders of the clergy were appointed to their several offices in the Church by solemn forms of consecration or ordination, and had their respective privileges, immunities, and revenues. The unity and worship of the Church were secured by laws both ecclesiastical and civil. The ecclesiastical laws were either rules and orders made by each bishop for the better regulation of his particular diocese, or laws made in provincial synods for the government of all the dioceses of a province; or, lastly, laws respecting the whole Christian Church, made in general councils or assemblies of bishops from all parts of the Christian world. *SEE SYNOD*. The civil laws of the Church were those decrees and edicts made from time to time by the emperors, either restraining the power of the Church, or granting it new privileges, or confirming the old. The breach of these laws was severally punished both by the Church and State. The ecclesiastical censures respecting offenders among the clergy were chiefly suspension from the office and deprivation of the rights and privileges of the order. Those respecting the laity consisted chiefly in excommunication, or rejection from the communion of the Church, and penance both public and private. *SEE ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY*.

The idea of the papacy or spiritual supremacy of Rome was not fully developed before the middle of the 7th century, when Theodore of Rome, not content with the title of Ecumenical patriarch, assumed that of sovereign pontiff. From that period the successive claims of the papacy — viz. temporal sovereignty, the vicariate of Peter and Paul, of Christ and of God, the janitorship of the kingdom of heaven, and the theocratic monarchy of the world — went on progressively, until in 1870 they apparently culminated in the official assumption of infallibility (q.v.). Meantime, as a system of ecclesiasticism, the papacy has retained most of

the offices of the ancient Church, and added to them that of cardinal (q.v.), nuncio, chancellor, chamberlain, prefect, referendary, auditor, inquisitor, and numerous others of a political and ceremonial character. Within the sphere of papal authority no serious controversy ever arose on the subject of Church polity. Ceremonial expansion, unchecked by any idea of scriptural example or restraint, was for centuries the order of progress. It was not till the Reformation was so far inaugurated as to feel the necessity of organizing churches after the type of the New Testament that any important discussions took place respecting the principles of Church government. The Reformed churches on the Continent generally rejected episcopacy and adopted Presbyterianism. The Lutherans practically retained the episcopal office under the title of superintendent. But scarcely any two of the principal Reformed churches agreed in detail as to their plan of organization, nor were these minor differences regarded as of any serious importance.

Systems of Church Government. — England is the country that has given birth to the chief controversies concerning Church polity which have prevailed in modern times. As the Reformation in England was largely political in its character, it not only resulted in the transfer of the cathedrals, churches, colleges, etc., built under Roman supremacy, to the Reformed Church of England, but also many Roman Catholic ceremonies and usages. Hence from the first that Church was divided into two parties in reference to Church polity. Had they been content with temperate discussion, and with the peaceful separation of those who could not harmonize their views, the result might have been very different. But unfortunately both parties had inherited the principle of intolerance, either from the Roman Church or from preceding times, and also the theory of state rule in matters of religious faith and practice. To these false principles may be charged some of the most pitiable and disgraceful facts in the history of Great Britain. The oppugnant legislation, the strifes, the persecutions, and the martyrdoms which took place in the successive reigns of Henry VIII, of Bloody Mary, of queen Elizabeth, of James I, of Charles I and II, and even under the protectorate of Cromwell, are sufficient to impress any mind with the extent of human misery, and of reproach to the Christian name caused by the errors alluded to. In all history there is not a more significant comment upon the sin of constraining men's consciences by the arbitrary standards of human authority. It was not till after more than a hundred and fifty years of party strife and bloodshed that in 1689 the

Toleration Act was passed, by which dissent from the faith and polity of the Established Church was legalized. Even after that it was a long time before many could see, and even yet it does not seem possible for all to understand, that details of Church polity were never appointed by divine authority, but designedly left by the Head of the Church to be adjusted on the basis of great principles rather than to be governed by fixed and uniform precepts. Scotland had adopted Presbyterianism from the Reformed churches of the Continent as early as 1550, but even after toleration was secured that form of Church government failed to become popular in England. Independency in various forms seemed to be preferred by the English Nonconformists and Dissenters. Between them and Presbyterians on the one hand, and the advocates of prelacy or episcopacy by divine right on the other, controversy has never ceased. But since the controversy has been limited to words it has been an innocent, though often an exciting one, owing to the many phases it has assumed from time to time.

While the Church of England has continually antagonized the Church of Rome on the ground of papal supremacy, it has itself been in ceaseless agitation as between the High and Low Church parties within its own pale, and more especially since the period of the Oxford Tracts (q.v.) and the more recent ritualistic discussions. All the English controversies respecting Church polity have found their way to this country, but with greatly altered conditions of the various parties. Independency having escaped from persecution by way of Holland, itself established a species of theocracy and became a persecutor in New England. But its period of intolerance was brief; and, on the whole, the Christian churches of the United States have been remarkably free from the spirit and practice of intolerance. The free institutions of the country and the absolute separation of the State from all the churches have tended to place all on a common level, and to make all alike dependent upon good arguments and good practice as means of securing public respect and increasing strength.

Controversies on Church polity in America have chiefly prevailed in the rivalry of denominations. For the most part, different churches, while commending their own forms of polity, have respected that of others. Discussions conducted after that manner have greatly extended the feeling of Christian fraternity, and at the same time made almost universal the opinion that particular forms of Church government are of quite inferior importance as compared with the essential elements of Christian faith and

practice. On the other hand, pretentious claims and intolerant practice have tended to defeat their own aims and to secure public disapprobation. Notwithstanding numberless varieties in unimportant particulars, the distinctive systems of Church government are few. Designated by the highest authority recognized in each, they may be enumerated as the Congregational, the Presbyterian, the Episcopal, the Patriarchal, and the Papal. The details of these systems may be seen by reference to articles on the churches adhering to them severally.

Literature. — The controversial literature of the subject of Church polity is very nearly identical with that of the subject of ordination (q.v.). The general, historical, and didactic literature of Church polity is also quite extensive. The following list of books will at least fairly represent it in its different branches and phases: Migne, *Dictionnaire des Ceremonies et des Rites sacres* (Par. 3 vols. 8vo); also *Dictionnaire de Discipline Ecclesiastique* (2 vols. 8vo); Amyrald, *Du Gouvernement de l'Eglise*; Marsden, *Churchmanship of the New Test.*; Brokesby, *Government of the Church for the first Three Centuries*; Kay, *External Government of the Church in the first Three Centuries*; Parker, *Church Government of the first Six Hundred Years*; Thorndike, *The Forms of Church Government*; Cartwright, *Directory of Church Government*; *Canons of the Church of England*; Wilberforce, *Church Courts and Discipline*; *Clergyman's Assistant*; Clay, *Essays on Church Policy*; Birk, *Church and State*; Baptist Noel, *Church and State*; Thompson, *Church and State*; *Clergyman's Instructor*; Bannerman, *The Church of Christ*; Cunningham, *Discussions on Church Principles*; *Canons of the Prot. Episc. Church*; Vinton, *Manual Commentary on the Canon Law and Constitution of the Prot. Episc. Church*; Dobney, *Three Churches*; Uhden, *New England Theocracy*; Upham, *Ratio Disciplinæ*; Punchard, *Congregationalism*; Sawyer, *Organic Christianity*; Smyth, *Ecclesiastical Republicanism*; Miller, *On Presbyterianism*; also *Ruling Elders*; Engles, *Ruling Elders*; *Form of Government*; *Cambridge Platform of Church Discipline*; Bacon. *Church Manual*; Cummings, *Congregational Dictionary*; *Lutheran Liturgy*; Kurtz, *Why are you a Lutheran?* King, *Presbyterian Church Government*; also *On the Eldership*; Hiscox, *Baptist Church Directory*; Wayland, *Principles and Practices of the Baptists*; Ripley, *Church Polity*; Schmucker, *Lutheran Manual*; Grindrod, *Compendium of the Laws and Regulations of Wesleyan Methodism*; Barrett, *Ministry and Polity of the Christian Church*; *Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church*; Baker,

On the Discipline; Emory, *Hist. of the Discipline*; Sherman, *Hist. of the Discipline*; Porter, *Compendium of Methodism*; also *Helps to Official Members*; Bond, *Economy of Methodism*; Stevens, *Ch. Polity*; Hodgson, *Polity of Methodism*; Morris, *Church Polity*; Crane, *Methodism and its Methods*. (D. P. K.)

Poliuichos

(πολιούχος), a surname of several deities among the ancient Greeks, who were believed to be the *guardians of cities*.

Poliziano

SEE POLITIAN.

Polk, Leonidas

a noted American prelate of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and a general in the late war between the Northern and Southern States, was born at Raleigh, N. C., in 1806. He was educated for the army in the United States military academy at West Point, N. Y., but had served only a few months as lieutenant when he determined to take orders in the Protestant Episcopal Church. He was ordained deacon in 1830, and in 1831 took a rectorate. In 1838 he was made the missionary bishop of Arkansas and the Indian Territory, south of 36° 30', and in 1841 bishop of Louisiana. He then took up his residence at Lafourche parish, where he had extensive plantations. Being a man of wealth and enjoying a life of ease, he never paid very much attention to ecclesiastical labors, and did but little to strengthen the work of the Church within the range of his diocese. At the outbreak of hostilities against the North he was on the side of the planters, and did all in his power to further the secession movement. Not only did he speak in public and contribute from his purse, but he offered his services to the Southern Confederacy as soon as established, and was made a general in their army. He early urged upon Jefferson Davis and the other Confederate authorities the importance of fortifying and holding the strategical points of the Mississippi Valley, and in other ways proved himself a far-seeing and skilful adviser of their cause. He took part in several battles, and though not always very prominent in action, was ever indispensable in council, and contributed greatly to whatever success the Confederate cause achieved in his days and surroundings. During a reconnaissance near Marietta, Ga., he was killed by a cannon-shot, June 14, 1864. He had never resigned his

episcopal dignity, but was buried with military honors. Though bishop Polk gave his life in what we consider an unworthy cause, we must revere his memory for his sterling qualities as a man who was not afraid to do what he believed to be his duty. He was noted for his kindness of heart and the most devout Christian life, such as he understood it to be. See *Men of the Times*, s.v.; *American Annual Cyclop.* 1868, p. 679; Drake, *Dict. of American Biography*, s.v.

Poll

(~~tl 6b6~~ *gulgoleth*, ~~000P~~ Numbers 1:2,18, 20, 22; 3:47; ~~1327B~~ 1 Chronicles 23:3, 24), the *head* (as rendered in ~~1300D~~ 1 Chronicles 10:10), or *skull* (as in ~~000S~~ Judges 9:53; ~~1205S~~ 2 Kings 9:35). The verb “to poll” in the A. V. is the rendering of ~~zz6~~; ~~j l 6~~; or ~~ssK~~; all signifying *to shear*.

Pollajuolo, Antonio

a noted Italian artist of the Florentine school of painters and sculptors, flourished in the second half of the 15th century. He was the pupil of Lorenzo Ghiberti, and assisted this master in the celebrated gates of the Baptistery of San Giovanni. Antonio is said to have been the first artist who studied the dead subject for the purposes of design. In 1484 he was invited to Rome by pope Innocent VIII, to elaborate a monument of the then but just expired Sixtus IV, which is now in the chapel of the Sacrament of St. Peter's, where is also the monument of Innocent VIII, which he afterwards elaborated. His brother PIETRO was likewise an artist of some celebrity. The two brothers wrought many great productions jointly. Their best is the *Martyrdom of St. Sebastian*, painted in 1475, and was for some time in the church De Servi at Florence. It is now in the National Gallery at London, and it is engraved in the *Etruria Pittriae* of Lastrì. It is a fine work, without being refilled or in the least idealistic. See Mrs. Clement, *Handbook of Painters*, etc., p. 462; Spooner, *Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts*, s.v.

Pollajuolo, Pietro

SEE POLLAJUOLO, ANTONIO.

Pollajuolo, Simone

a distinguished Italian architect, noted as the builder of many beautiful ecclesiastical structures, was born at Florence in 1454. He was related to Antonio del Pollajuolo, and lived with him some time at Rome. Becoming a devoted follower of Savonarola, he was discarded by the churchmen, and in his later years was obliged to spend his talents in secular labors. He was one of the most prominent architects in the building of the Strozzi Palace. He died in 1529.

Pollard, William

an English Wesleyan minister, was born at Guisborough, in Yorkshire, in 1792. He was converted when but a youth, and soon after felt called of God to preach the Gospel. He prepared himself for the ministry, a work which he not only enjoyed, but one in which his labors always met with success. He was a man of great piety and sound faith, a faithful dispenser of the Word of Life, and an exemplary teacher. He possessed a strong memory and a cultivated mind, richly stored with divine truth. He died at Newport Pagnell April 3, 1839.

Pollinctorii

an appellation given by the Romans to those who washed and anointed the dead preparatory to burial.

Pollio

a name common to a number of Lutheran theologians, of whom we mention the following:

1. JOACHIM, who was born Aug. 26, 1577, at Breslan, in Silesia. He pursued his studies at Leipsic, where he became magister of philosophy in 1597. In 1602 he was pastor at Buntzlau, in 1607 provost of the Church of the Holy Ghost and pastor of St. Bernard in Breslau; in 1615 he was made assessor of the evangelical consistory; in 1618 he was appointed pastor of St. Mary Magdalene, and died Jan. 29, 1644. He wrote *Centurias duas consiliosrum theologicorum*.

2. LUCAS, who was born at Breslau in 1536. He studied at Frankfort and Wittenberg. In the latter place he especially attended the lectures of Melancthon on the Greek language. In 1562 he was appointed professor at

the St. Elizabeth Gymnasium in Breslau; but three years afterwards, in 1565, he went to Leipsic for the study of Hebrew and theology. In the same year he was appointed deacon of St. Elizabeth in his native place, and in 1567 he was made pastor of St. Mary Magdalene. He died July 31, 1583. Lucas Pollio left a number of sermons behind him.

3. Lucas, son of Joachim, who was born Aug. 4, 1605, at Breslau. He studied at Leipsic, where he also was archdeacon of St. Nicolai. He died April 25, 1643. See Pantke, *Pastores der Kirche zu St. Elisabeth in Breslau*; the same, *Pastores zu St. Maoria Magdalene*; Adami *Vitae theol. German. eruditorum*, 1, 158; Jocher, *Gelehrten-Lexikon*, s.v. (B. P.)

Pollok, Robert, A.M.

Picture for Pollok

the noted author of the *Course of Time*, a Scotch bard of no mean order, and a minister of the Church, was born at Muirhouse, parish of Eaglesham, south-east of Glasgow, Oct. 19, 1798, of humble parentage. In his youth he worked on his father's farm, but evincing more than ordinary mental strength and love for study, he was encouraged to prepare for college, and was entered in the University of Glasgow in 1812. He graduated five years after, and determined upon the life of the holy ministry, for which he then began his studies at the seminary of the United Sessions Church. He was ready for ordination in 1827, and was in that year licensed to preach. His first public discourse, which was delivered on May 3, 1827, is spoken of as a most brilliant and interesting effort, which, while it evinced a mind of extraordinary power and promise, at the same time gave indications that the Church would too soon be deprived of its service. Such was the fatigue occasioned by this single exertion that he was immediately confined to his bed; and although in a few days he was partially restored, he preached only three times afterwards. Just before he had received his license, Pollok had finished the poem on which his great literary reputation rests, the *Course of Time*. The object of the poet, whose sentiments are strongly Calvinistic, and whose piety is rather of a gloomy cast, is to describe the spiritual life and destiny of man; and he varies his religious speculations with episodal pictures and narrations to illustrate the effects of virtue or vice. A work so ambitious from the hands of a country student, attached to a small body of Dissenters, was not likely to find a patron among publishers. It happened to be shown to Prof. Wilson, of Edinburgh, as a curiosity; but this great man hesitated not to recognize worth even in a young and unknown

student, and the work was by him so heartily commended for its great poetic power that its publication was undertaken by Mr. Blackwood, of Edinburgh. The *Course* speedily passed through several editions. It was a novelty in the class of evangelical religious literature to which it belonged, and besides pleasing those who are partial to that class of religious literature, it was a boon to many who are inclined to read religious books, but are repelled by their general dryness and insipidity, while it was warmly admired by the literary world at large. Pollok's partial admirers expected for him a place on a level with Milton. After the novelty of such a phenomenon had, however, passed off, the book became neglected by purely literary readers; and at this day it may be said that it is estimated too highly by the religious and perhaps too insignificantly by the literary world. It is certainly a work of great power, however meager in fancy. There are many flashes of original genius which light up the crude and unwieldy design, and atone for the narrow range of thought and knowledge, as well as for the stiff pomposity that pervades the diction. There are in it a few passages which are strikingly and most poetically imaginative, and some of which are beautifully touching. It has also, however, a considerable amount of sentiment deeply tinged with religious asceticism, and whole pages of plain and humble prose. These defects, it should be borne in mind, Pollok would in all probability have removed himself, guided by a more ripened judgment, in a careful revision, had Providence been pleased to prolong his life. His mind was evidently imbued with *Paradise Lost*, and he follows Milton often to the verge of direct imitation; but even as the work stands it is the undoubted production of a poetic genius, and it will always be read with profit and delight. Before the publication of his poem Pollok had undermined his constitution by excessive mental labor, and he scarcely lived to see its success. On the recommendation and through the assistance of the friends his genius had secured him, he was preparing to set out for Italy, there to stay the inroads of consumptive tendencies; but while on the eve of leaving Britain he was so greatly reduced that he tarried at Devonshire Place, Shirley Common, near Southampton. He there expired on Sept. 18, 1827. Although it was painful at his early age to relinquish all the daydreams of honorable fame which his young imagination had with so good reason been led to form, he acquiesced with uncomplaining submission in the will of God. He enjoyed during his last illness in rich abundance the comforts and hopes of the Gospel, and his death was that of the true Christian, characterized by a calm faith in that religion he had preached, and a cheerful hope in that redemption which had been the theme of his

song. The reception which the *Course of Time* has met with from the public is a sufficient testimony to the talents of its lamented author. His name is now recorded among the list of those illustrious Scotsmen who have done honor to their country; who, from obscurity, have secured for themselves an unfading reputation; and who will be remembered by distant generations with enthusiasm and admiration. His earliest productions—*Helen of the Glen*, *Ralph Gunnell*, and the *Persecuted Family*—were in prose, and were issued anonymously. They have been republished, with his name, in one volume, entitled *Tales of the Covenanters*, and have passed through several editions. A very inadequate memoir of Robert Pollok, by his brother, with extracts from his correspondence, has been published by Messrs. Blackwood (Edinb. 1842), and there is a short memoir prefixed to the *Course of Time*. One of the best American editions of this poem is by W. C. Armstrong (Cinc. 1846, 12mo). See Chambers, *Cyclop. of English Lit.* 2, 412 sq.; id. *Biog. Dict. of L'Eminent Scotsmen*, 6, 138 sq.

Pollux

a tutelary deity of mariners in ancient times (~~<4281>~~Acts 28:11), whose image was placed either at the prow or stern of the ship. *SEE CASTOR*.

Pollux, Julius

(Ἰούλιος Πολυδεύκης), a celebrated Greek sophist and grammarian, who flourished near the close of the 2d century, was a native of Anacratia, in Egypt, and, after preparatory training under his father, studied at Athens under the rhetorician Adrian. He finally opened a school himself, and was subsequently appointed by the emperor Commodus to the chair of rhetoric. Several of his contemporaries thereafter attacked him, and in many ways aimed to detract from his scholarly repute. He was the author of several works, of which Suidas has preserved the titles. None of them are of interest to us except the *Ὄνομαστικὸν ἐν Βιβλίοις*, which has come down to us, and is valuable because it treats in the first part of the gods and their worship. See Fabricius, *Bibl. Graeca*, 6:141; Grafenhahn, *Gesch. der class. Philology*, 3, 166 sq.

Polones Prates

SEE SOCINIANS.

Polotzk (Polish, Polocz), Synod of

an important ecclesiastical gathering, was held on Feb. 12, 1839, and was attended by all the Greek Uniate bishops in Russia, assisted by several of the most distinguished of their clergy. Its most important action was a synodal ordinance drawn up and signed by Joseph, bishop of Lithuania; Vasili, bishop of Orsha; Anthony, bishop of Brest, and twenty-one other dignitaries, in which they declare their ‘firm and unalterable decision to acknowledge anew the unity of their Church with the orthodox Catholic Eastern Church; and, consequently, thenceforth, together with the flocks committed to their care, to continue in the same sentiment with the holy Eastern orthodox patriarchs, and in obedience to the holy governing synod of all the Russias.’ To this act was appended the declaration of thirteen hundred and five parish priests and monastic brethren, which number was afterwards increased to sixteen hundred and seven. Besides their act, a petition was drawn up to the emperor Nicholas, praying him to sanction the union of the Uniate with the orthodox Church; which, together with the synodal act above, was submitted to the holy governing synod for examination and approval. The synod shortly after issued its decree upon the subject, by which it was ordained:

- 1.** To receive the bishops, clergy, and flocks of the hitherto called Greek Uniate Church into full and complete communion with the holy orthodox Catholic Eastern Church, and so to be integrally and inseparably incorporated with the Church of all the Russias.
- 2.** To confer the general blessing the he most holy synod on the bishops and clergy in particular, with prayer of faith and love to the supreme bishop of our confession, Jesus Christ, that he would confirm them from above in the confession they have made, and that he would rightly direct the work of their ministry to the perfecting of the saints.
- 3.** That in governing those flocks which are entrusted to them, they shall take as their fundamental guide the Word of God, the canons of the Church, and the laws of the empire, and shall confirm the flocks entrusted to them in the same sentiments with those of the orthodox faith; and that they exhibit an apostolical indulgence to any differences in local customs which do not affect the doctrines or the sacraments, and bring back their people to the ancient uniformity by free persuasion, without violence, with gentleness and long-suffering.

This decree was signed by Seraphim, metropolitan of Novgorod and St. Petersburg, by Philaret of Kief, Philaret of Moscow, and three, prelates, besides two other ecclesiastics. It was confirmed March 25, 1839, by the emperor's own hand, with these words: "I thank God, and accept it." See Blackmore's Mouravieff, *Russian Church*, Append. 4 p. 430.

Polus

a Greek sophist, lived about B.C. 400. He was born in Agrigentum (Girgenti), and studied under the celebrated sophist Gorgias, a Sicilian like himself. In his dialogue *Gorgias, or about Rhetoric*, Plato introduces Socrates in discussion with some of his disciples, among whom is Polus. The point in contest is at first the nature of rhetoric, but as the debate progresses it expands its limits, and touches the question whether the unrighteous can be happy, and whether it is not preferable to suffer injustice rather than to inflict it. The notoriety of Polus rests exclusively on the part assigned to him by Plato in this dialogue. There remains nothing of his writings. Yet he seems, as a true disciple of Gorgias, to have written a rhetorical treatise; for Plato puts the following words in the mouth of Socrates: "To tell you the truth, Polus, I do not consider truth as an art, but only as a thing which you boast of having made an art of, in a writing which I have of late perused."

Polwhele, Richard

an English divine noted as an antiquarian, historian, poet, and miscellaneous writer, whose works are exceedingly voluminous, was born at Truro in 1760, where he was also educated, and where, when a boy, with the assistance of the celebrated Dr. Wolcott, then a physician in that town, he first essayed as a poet. He took holy orders, and finally settled in his native place, where he died in 1838. He is noted rather for his secular productions, though he published also on religious topics. His principal works are, *The History of Cornwall* (7 vols. 4to): — *The History of Devonshire* (3 vols.): — *Traditions and Recollections* (2 vols.): — *The Rural Rector* (3 vols.): — *Biographical Sketches in Cornwall* (3 vols.): — *Anecdotes of Methodism*: — *Illustrations of Scriptural Characters*: — several volumes of *Sermons*; with numberless poems, and other writings of a miscellaneous character. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.5.

Polyandry

(from *πολύς*, *many*, and *άνήρ*, *a man*), that form of polygamy which permits a woman to have several husbands. *SEE MARRIAGE*. The hot-bed of polyandry is Thibet. There a wife commonly is the wife of a whole family of brothers, the elder brother being chief husband. In the Himalayan and sub-Himalayan regions adjoining and under the influence of Thibet it is of frequent occurrence, in the same form as in the valley of Cashmere, in Ladakh, among the Koech, and among the Telingese. Farther south in India we find polyandry among the Tudas of the Neilgherry Hills, the Coorgs of Mysore, and the Nayars of Malabar. We find it again off the Indian coast in Ceylon; and, going eastward, strike on it as an ancient though now almost superseded custom in New Zealand, and in one or two of the Pacific islands. Going northward, we meet it again in the Aleutian Islands; and taking the continent to the west and north of the Aleutians, it is found among the Koryaks, to the north of the Okhotsk Sea. Crossing the Russian empire to the west side, we meet it among the Saporogian Cossacks; and thus have traced it at points half round the globe. This is not all, however. It is found in several parts of Africa; and it occurs again in many parts of America among the Red, men. We have the authority of Humboldt for its prevalence among the tribes on the Orinoco, and in the same form as in Thibet. "Among the Avaroes and the Maypures," he says, "brothers have often but one wife." Humboldt also vouches for its former prevalence in Lancerota, one of the Canary Islands. Thus polyandry is a phenomenon of human life independent of race and country. See Latham, *Descriptive Ethnology* (1859), 1, 24, 28"; 2, 398, 406, 462; Humboldt, *Personal Narrative* (Williams's translation, 1819), vol. 5, pt. 2, p. 549; and vol. 1, chap. 1, p. 84; Hamilton, *New Account of the East Indies* (Edinb. 1727), 1, 274, 308; Reade, *Savage Africa*, p. 43; Erman, *Travels in Siberia*, 2, 531; Seignior Gaya, *Marriage Ceremonies* (translation) (2d ed. Lond. 1698), p. 70, 96; Emerson Tennant, *Ceylon* (3d ed. 1859), 2, 429; "Legend of Rullpe," Grey's *Polynesian Mythology* (1855), p. 81; A *Summer Ramble in the Himalayas* (1860), p. 202; Vigne, *Kashmir*, 1, 37; *Journal Asiat. Soc. of Bengal*, 9, 834; *Asiat. Research.* 5, 13.

From ancient history we learn that the area over which polyandry at one time existed was even more extended; while in certain cantons of Media, according to Strabo (2, 798; and see Goguet, vol. 3, bk. 6:c. 1), polygynia was authorized by express law, which ordained every inhabitant to maintain at least seven wives; in other cantons precisely the opposite rule prevailed-

a woman was allowed to have many husbands, and they looked with contempt on those who had less than five. Caesar informs us that in his time polyandry of the Thibetan type prevailed among the Britons (*De Bello Gallico*, lib. 5, c. 14). We find direct evidence of its existence among the Picts in the Irish Nennius (App. 51), not to mention the traces of it remaining in the Pictish laws of succession. Indeed, to pass over communities in which something like promiscuity of intercourse between the sexes is said to have prevailed such as the Massagetæ, Agathyrsi, and the ancient Spartans—we find several among which polyandry, or a modified promiscuity, must have been the rule. Assuming that the legal obligation laid on younger brothers in their turn to marry the wives of their deceased elder brother is a relic of polyandry of the Thibetan type, then we must hold that polyandry prevailed at one time throughout India (*Institutes of Menu*, ch. 3, § 173, and ch. 9. § 57, 58), among the ancient Hebrews (~~(1235)~~ Deuteronomy 25:5-11); in Siam, Burmah, in Syria among the Ostiaks, the But (Bodo), the Kasia, and the Puharies of Gurhwal. Traces of it indeed remained in the time of Tacitus among the Germans (*Tac. Germ.* 20, Latham's edition, p. 67 sq.). In short, polyandry may be regarded as one of the transitional forms in the advance from a state of promiscuity, on the assumption that pure promiscuity ever existed. Of the origin of this peculiar institution our space forbids us to write; but we believe it to be connected with the want of balance between the numbers of the sexes, due to the practice of female infanticide, which is its almost invariable accompaniment. Tribes of warriors, wholly devoted to a military life, find women an encumbrance rather than a solace; and from this cause, and probably from the difficulties of subsistence, formed the practice of killing their female children, sparing them only when they were the first-born. The disparity of the sexes would lead to polyandry, and once instituted, the custom would in many cases continue to exist after the habits and necessities which produced it disappeared. In several places, as in Ladakh, where polyandry prevails, the sexes are now either equally balanced, or the female sex predominates. In these cases polygynia and polyandry are commonly found existing side by side. The subject is one which demands, and as yet has not received, full investigation. — Chambers, s.v. See also *London Academy*, Nov. 21, 1874, p. 557; Lubbock, *Origin of Civilization* (see Index); *Blackwood's Magazine*, January, 1875, p. 69 sq., 82 sq.

Polycarp

(Πολύκαρπος), a distinguished father of the Christian Church, is one of a small number who were distinguished from the rest by the term *apostolic fathers*, as having been contemporaries of some of the apostles. The period of his death is well ascertained to have been by martyrdom in A.D. 155, in the reign of Antoninus Titus (see Waddington, *Memoires de l'Academie des Inscriptions*, tom. 26:pt. 2, p. 232 sq.). The period of his birth is not known, and we can only determine it by approximation. At the time of his martyrdom he was reputed to have been a Christian eighty-six years, and according to this statement was born probably about A.D. 69. But if with other critics we suppose him to have been converted at a riper age, he must be referred to the reign of Nero. However, there seems no reason to doubt that he was contemporary with the apostle John, and known to him, the lengthened period of whose life connects so fortunately the men of the 2d century with those who had been in personal attendance on the Savior. It is this circumstance which gives its chief importance to the lives of these persons, and thence arises the main value of the few and in other respects unimportant writings which remain of the apostolic fathers. The lives form links in the chain of Christian tradition; and their compositions recognize by frequent quotations the writings which remain of evangelists and apostles. (In the following account of Polycarp we rely largely upon Smith's *Dict. of Class. Biog. s.v.*)

Life. — An ancient life, or rather a fragment of a life of Polycarp, ascribed by Bollandus to a certain Pionius of unknown date, and given in a Latin version in the *Acta Sanctorum Januarii* (a. d. 26), 2, 695, etc., dwells much on the early history of Polycarp, but the record (if indeed it be the work of Pionius) is some centuries later than its subject, and is evidently false in several particulars. We are inclined to think, however, that it embodies some genuine traditions of Polycarp's history. According to this account, the apostle Paul visited Smyrna in his way from Galatia, through the proconsular Asia to Jerusalem (the writer apparently confounding two journeys recorded in ~~Acts~~ Acts 18:18-22, and 23, etc.), and having collected the believers, instructed them in the proper time of keeping Easter. After Paul's departure, his host, Strataeas, the brother of Timotheus, became bishop of the infant Church; or, for the passage is not clear, Stratoeas became an elder and Bucolus was bishop. It was during the episcopate of Bucolus (whether he was the contemporary or the successor of Strateas) that Callisto, a female member of the Church, eminent for riches and works

of charity, was warned of God in a dream to go to the gate of the city called the Ephesian gate, where she would find a little boy (puerulum) named Polycarp, of Eastern origin, who had been reduced to slavery, and was in the hands of two men, from whom she was to redeem him. Callisto, obedient to the vision, rose, went to the gate, found the two men with the child, as it had been revealed to her; and having redeemed the boy, brought him home, educated him with maternal affection in the Christian faith, and, when he attained to manhood, first made him ruler over her house, then adopted him as her son, and finally left him heir to all her wealth. Polycarp had been from childhood distinguished by his beneficence, piety, and self-denial; by the gravity of his deportment, and his diligence in the study of the Holy Scriptures. These qualities early attracted the notice and regard of the bishop, Bucolus, who loved him with fatherly affection, and was in return regarded by him with filial love. By Bucolus he was ordained first to the office of deacon, in which he labored diligently, confuting heathens, Jews, and heretics; delivering catechetical homilies in the church, and writing epistles, of which that to the Philippians is the only extant specimen. He was subsequently, when of mature age (his hair was already turning gray) and still maturer conduct, ordained presbyter by Bucolus, on whose death he was elected and consecrated bishop. We omit to notice the various miracles said to be wrought by Polycarp, or to have occurred on different occasions in his life.

Such are the leading facts recorded in this ancient narrative, which has, we think, been too lightly estimated by Tillemont. That it has been interpolated with many fabulous admixtures of a later date is clear; but we think there are some things in it which indicate that it embodies earlier and truer elements. The difficult is to discover and separate these from later corrections. The chief ground for rejecting the narrative altogether is the supposed difficulty of reconciling them with the more trustworthy statements of Irenaeus (*Epistola ad Florinum*, apud Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* 5, 20), who, in his boyhood, had known, perhaps lived with Polycarp, and of other writers. According to Irenaeus (*Epist. ad Victorem. Papam*, apud Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* 5, 24), Polycarp had intercourse with “John and others of the apostles;” or still more expressly (*Adv. Haeres.* 3, 3, et apud Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* 4:14), he was instructed (perhaps converted, μαθητευθείς) by the apostles, and conversed familiarly with many who had seen Christ; was by the apostles appointed (κατασταθείς) bishop of the Church at Smyrna; and always taught what he had learned from the apostles.

Tertullian (*De Praescriptionibus Haeretic*, c. 32) and Jerome (*De Viris Illustribus*, c. 17) distinctly mention John as the apostle by whom Polycarp was ordained. But we question if the expressions of Irenaeus, when critically examined and stripped of the rhetorical exaggeration with which his natural reverence for Polycarp has invested them, will prove more than that Polycarp had enjoyed opportunities of hearing some of the apostles; and was, with their sanction, appointed bishop of the Church at Smyrna. That John was one of the apostles referred to by Irenaeus there is not the slightest reason to doubt; and we are disposed, with Tillemont, to regard Philip, whom Polycrates of Ephesus (apud Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* 5, 24) states to have ended his days in the Phrygian Hierapolis, as another of those with whom Polycarp had intercourse. We believe that intercourse with these apostles, and perhaps with some other old disciples who had seen Jesus Christ, is sufficient to bear out the statements of Irenaeus, and is not inconsistent with the general truth of the ancient narrative given by Bollandus. His statement of the ordination of Polycarp by the apostles may perhaps be reduced to the fact that John, of whom alone Tertullian (*i.c.*) makes mention, was among “the bishops of the neighboring churches,” who came, according to the narrative, to the consecration of Polycarp. This circumstance enables us to fix that consecration in or before A.D. 104, the latest date assigned to the death of the venerable apostle, and which is not inconsistent with the narrative. It must be borne in mind, too, that the whole subject of the ordination of these early bishops is perplexed by ecclesiastical writers utterly neglecting the circumstance that in some of the larger churches there was in the apostolic age a plurality of bishops (comp. Phil. 1, 1), not to speak of the grave and much disputed question of the identity of bishops and presbyters. The apostolic ordination mentioned by Irenaeus and Tertullian may, therefore, have taken place during the lifetime of Bucolus, and have been antecedent to the precedency which, on his death, Polycarp obtained. We are the more disposed to admit the early origin and the truth of the leading statements embodied in the narration, as the natural tendency of a forger of a later age would have been to exaggerate the opportunities of apostolic intercourse, and the sanctions of apostolic authority, which Polycarp certainly possessed.

Polycarp was bishop of Smyrna at the time when Ignatius of Antioch passed through that city on his way to suffer death at Rome, some time between A.D. 107 and 116. Ignatius seems to have enjoyed much this intercourse with Polycarp, whom he had known, apparently, in former

days, when they were both hearers of the apostle John (*Martyr. Ignatii*, c. 3). The sentiment of esteem was reciprocated by Polycarp (*Epistol. ad Philipp.* c.13), who collected several of the epistles of Ignatius, and sent them to the Church at Philippi, accompanied by an epistle of his own. Polycarp himself visited Rome while Anicetus was bishop of that city, whose episcopate extended, according to Tillemont's calculation, from A.D. 157 to 168. Ireneus has recorded (*Epistol. ad Victor.* apud Euseb. *H. E.* 5, 14) the difference of opinion of these two holy men on the time of observing Easter, and the steadfastness of Polycarp in adhering to the custom of the Asiatic churches, derived, as they affirmed, from the apostles; as well as their mutual kindness and forbearance, notwithstanding this difference. Indeed, the character of Polycarp appears to have attracted general regard: Ireneus retained for him a feeling of deepest reverence (*Epistol. ad Florin.* apud Euseb. *II. E.* 5, 21); Jerome speaks of him (*De Viris Illustr.* c. 17) as "totius Asise princeps," the most eminent man in all proconsular Asia. An anecdote given elsewhere shows that even reputed heretics, notwithstanding his decided opposition to them, desired to possess his esteem; and it is not improbable that the reverence excited by his character conduced to his success in restoring them to the communion of the Church. It has been conjectured that he was the angel of the Church of Smyrna to whom Jesus Christ directed the letter in the Apocalypse (2, 8-11); and also that he was the bishop to whom the apostle John, according to a beautiful anecdote recorded by Clement of Alexandria (*Liber "Quis Dives salvetur?"* c. 42), committed the care of a young man, who, forsaking his patron, became a chief of a band of robbers, and was reconverted by the apostle; but these are mere conjectures, and of little probability.

The martyrdom of Polycarp occurred, according to Eusebius (*I. E.* 4, 15), in the persecution under the emperors Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus; and is recorded in a letter of the Church at Smyrna to the churches of Philomelium and other places, which is still extant, and of which Eusebius (*ibid.*) has given the chief part. The persecution began: one Germanicus, an ancient man, was thrown to the wild beasts, and several others, including some who were brought from Philadelphia, were put to death at Smyrna. Polycarp had at first intended to remain in the city and brave the danger of martyrdom; but the entreaties of his flock led him to withdraw to a retreat in the adjacent country, where he passed his time in prayer. Here, three days before his apprehension, he had a remarkable dream, which his

anticipation of his fate led him to interpret as an intimation that he should be burned alive — a foreboding but too exactly verified by the event. Messengers having been sent to apprehend him, he withdrew to another hiding-place; but his place of retreat was discovered by the confession of a child, who had been forced by torture to make known where he was. Polycarp might still have escaped by leaving the place on the approach of those sent to apprehend him; but he refused, saying, “The will of God be done.” His venerable figure and calm and courteous deportment commanded the respect of his captors; and a prayer offered by him affected some of them with remorse for their share in his apprehension. The officer into whose custody he was delivered, with the usual laxity of paganism, would have persuaded him, apparently through pity, to offer divine honors and sacrifice to the emperor; but his steady refusal changed their pity into anger, and they violently threw him down from the carriage in which they were conveying him. On entering the amphitheatre where the proconsul, Stratius Quadratus, was, a voice which excited the feelings of the old man and his companions led them to regard as from heaven, exclaimed, “Be strong, O Polycarp! and quit you like a man.” The proconsul was, like others, moved by his appearance, and exhorted him to consider his advanced age, and comply with the requirements of government: “Swear by the fortune of Caesar, recant, and cry ‘Away with the godless (τοὺς ἄθεοις).’” “Looking first round upon the heathen multitude, and then up to heaven, the old man sighed and said, “Away with the godless.” The proconsul again urged him, “Swear by Caesar’s fortune, and I will release thee. Revile Christ.” “Eighty and six years have I served him,” was the reply, “and he never did me wrong: how then can I revile my King and my Savior?” Threats of being thrown to wild beasts, and of being committed to the flames, failed to move him; and his bold avowal that he was a Christian provoked the wrath of the assembled multitude. “This man,” they shouted, “is the teacher of impiety, the father of the Christians, the man that does away with our gods (ὁ τῶν ἡμετέρων θεῶν καθαιρέτης); who teaches many not to sacrifice to nor to worship the gods.” They demanded that he should be thrown to wild beasts, and when the Asiarch, Philip of Tralles, who presided over the games which were going on, evaded the demand, on the plea that the combats with wild beasts were ended, they demanded that he should be burned alive. The demand was complied with; and the populace, in their rage, soon collected from the baths and workshops logs and fagots for the pile. The old man ungirded himself, laid aside his garments, and took his place in the midst of the fuel; and when

they would have secured him with nails to the stake, said, "Let me remain as I am; for he that has enabled me to brave the fire will so strengthen me that, without your fastening me with nails, I shall, unmoved, endure its fierceness." After he had offered a short but beautiful prayer the fire was kindled, but a high wind drove the flames on one side, so that he was roasted rather than burned; and the executioner was ordered to dispatch him with a sword. On his striking him with it, so great a quantity of blood flowed from the wound as to quench the flames, which were, however, resuscitated, in order to consume his lifeless body. His ashes were collected by the pious care of the Christians of his flock, and deposited in a suitable place of interment. The day and year of Polycarp's martyrdom are involved in considerable doubt. Samuel Petit places it in A.D. 175; Usher, Pagi, and Bollandus in A.D. 169; Eusebius (*Chronicon*) places it earlier, in the seventh year of Marcus Aurelius, who acceded to the throne March 7, A.D. 161; Scaliger, Le Moyne, and Cave place it in A.D. 167; Tillemont in 166; the *Chronicon Paschale* in the consulship of Elianus and Pastor, A.D. 163; and Pearson, who differs widely from all other critics, in A.D. 147, in the reign of Titus Antoninus Pius. Pearson brings various reasons in support of his opinion, which reasons are examined by Tillemont in one of his careful and elaborate notes. Polycarp is revered as a saint both by the Greek and Romish churches; by the former on Feb. 23, by the latter on Jan. 26, or (at Paris) on April 27. The Greeks of Smyrna, on his festival, used formerly to visit devoutly what is shown as his tomb, near the ruins of an ancient church or chapel, on a hill-side to the south-east of the city. Mr. Arundel (*Discoveries in Asia Minor*, 2, 397) is disposed to think that the tradition as to his place of interment is correct.

The principal authorities for the history of Polycarp have been cited. The account of Eusebius (*H. E.* 4:14, 15, and 5, 20) is chiefly taken from Irenaeus (*II. cc.*), and from the letter of the Church at Smyrna, giving an account of his martyrdom, which will be noticed below. Halloix (*Illustr. Eccles. Orientalis Scriptorum Vitae*), Cave (*Apostolici, or the Lives, etc., of the Primitive Fathers*), and Tillemont (*Memoires*, vol. 2) have collected the chief notices of the ancients, and embodied them in their narrative. See also Ceillier, *Hist. des Auteurs Sacraes*, 1, 672, etc. The English reader may consult (besides Cave's work just mentioned) Lardner, *Credibility*, etc., pt. 2, ch. 6, 7; Neander, *Church Hist.* transl. by Rose, 1, 106, etc.; Milman, *Hist. of Christianity*, bk. 2, ch. 7; and other ecclesiastical historians.

Works. — There is extant only one short treatise by this father, **Πρὸς Φιλιππησίους ἐπιστολή**, *Ad Philippenses Epistola*. That he wrote such an epistle, and that it was known in their time, is attested by Irenaeus (*Adv. Heres.* 3, 3, and *Epistol. ad Florinum*, apud Euseb. *II. E.* 4, 14, and 5, 20), Eusebius (*H. E.* 3, 36; 4, 14), Jerome (*De Viris Illustr.* c. 17), and later writers whom it is needless to enumerate; and, notwithstanding the objections of the Magdeburg Centuriators (*Cent.* 2, c. 10); of Daille (*De Scriptis Ignatianis*, c. 32), who, however, only denied the genuineness of a part; of Matthieu de la Roche; and, at a later period, of Semler, our present copies have been received by the great majority of critics as substantially genuine. Some have suspected the text to be interpolated; and the suspicion is perhaps somewhat strengthened by the evidence afforded by the Syriac version of the epistles of Ignatius, lately published by Mr. Cureton, of the extensive interpolation of those contemporary and kindred productions.

The *Epistola ad Philippenses* is extant in the Greek original, and in an ancient Latin version; the latter of which contains, towards the conclusion, several chapters, of which only some fragments preserved by Eusebius are found in the Greek. The letter partakes of the simplicity which characterizes the writings of the apostolic fathers, being hortatory rather than argumentative; and is valuable for the numerous passages from the New Testament, especially from the first Epistle of Peter and the epistles of Paul, which are incorporated in it, and for the testimony which it consequently affords to the early existence and wide circulation of the sacred writings. It was first published in black letter in the Latin version by Jac. Faber Stapulensis, with the works of the pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita and of Ignatius (Paris, 1498, fol.), under the title of *Theologia Vivificans*; and was reprinted at Strasburg in 1502; at Paris, 1515; at Basle, 1520; at Cologne, 1536; at Ingolstadt, with the *Clementina* (4to), 1546; at Cologne, with the Latin version of the writings of the pseudo-Dionysius, 1557; and with the *Clementina* and the Latin version of the *Epistolae* of Ignatius (fol.), 1569. It appeared also in the following collections: the *Micropresbyticon* (Basle, 1550), the *Orthodoxographa* of Heroldus (*ibid.* 1555), the *Orthodoxographa* of Grynaeus (*ibid.* 1569), the *Mella Patrum* of Francis Rous (Lond. 1650, 8vo), and in the various editions of the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, from its first publication by De la Bigne in 1575. The Greek text was first published by Halloix, subjoined to the life of Polycarp, in his *Illustrium Ecclesiae Orientalis Scriptorum Vitae et Documenta* (vol.

1, Douai, 1633, fol.); and was again published by Usher, with the *Epistolae* of Ignatius (Oxford, 1644, 4to), not in the *Appendix Ignatiana* (which came out in 1647), as incorrectly stated by Fabricius; by Maderus (Helmstadt, 1653); and in the *Patres Apostolici* of Cotelerius (Paris, 1672, 2 vols. fol.; and Amsterdam, 1724), of Ittigius (Leipsic, 1699, 8vo), of Frey (Basle, 1742), and of Russel (1746, 2 vols, 8vo). It is given likewise in the editions of Ignatius by Aldrich (Oxford, 1708, 8vo) and Smith (*ibid.* 1709, 4to). It is contained also in the *Varia Sacra* of Le Moyne (vol. 1, Leyden, 1685, 4to), and in the *Bibliotheca Patrunt* of Gallandius (vol. 1, Ven. 1765, fol.). Of more recent editions may be mentioned those of Hornemann, *Scripta Genuina Graeca Patrum Apostolicorum* (Copenhagen, 1828, 4to); Routh, *Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Opuscula Praecipua quaedam* (vol. 1, Oxford, 1832, 8vo); Jacobson, *Patrum Apostolicorum quae supersunt* (vol. 2, *ibid.* 1838, 8vo); and Hefele, *Patrum Apostolicorum Opera* (Tübingen, 1839, 8vo). There are English versions of this epistle by Wake and Clementson, and one in Cave's *Apostolici, or Lives of the Primitive Fathers*.

That Polycarp wrote other *Epistolae* is attested by Irenaeus (*Epistol. ad Florin.*): one, **Πρὸς Ἀθηναίους**, *Ad Athenienses*, is quoted by St. Maximus in his *Prologus ad Libros Dionysii Areopagitae*, and by Joannes Maxentius, but is supposed to be spurious; at any rate it is now lost: another, **Πρὸς Διονύσιον τὸν Ἀρεοπαγίτην**, *Ad Dionysium Areopagitam*, mentioned by Suidas (s.v. **Πολύκαρπος**), is supposed to be spurious also. The life of Polycarp, ascribed to Pionius, states that he wrote various *Tractatus*, *Homilie*, and *Epistolae*, and especially a book *De Obitu S. Joannis*; of which, according to Halloix (*l. c.*), some extracts from a MS. said to be extant in an abbey in Northern Italy had been given in a *Concio de S. Joanne Evangelista* by Franciscus Humblot; but even Halloix evidently doubted their genuineness. Some fragments ascribed to Polycarp, cited, in a Latin version, in a *Catena in Quatuor Evangelistas* by Victor of Capua, were published by Franciscus Feuardentius subjoined to lib. 3, c. 3 of his *Annotationes ad Irenaeum*, and were subsequently reprinted by Halloix (*l. c.*), Usher (*Appendix Ignatiana*, p. 31, etc.), Maderus (*l. c.*), Cotelerius (*l. c.*), Ittigius (*i. c.*), and Gallandius (*l. c.*), under the title of *Fragmenta Quinque e Responsionum Capitulis S. Polycarpo adscriptis*; but their genuineness is very doubtful. See Cave, *Hist. Litt.* ad ann. 108, 1, 44. etc. (Oxford, 1740, fol.); Ittigius, *De Biblioth. Patrum*, passim; Fabricius, *Bibl. Græc.* 7:47, etc.; Ceillier, *Auteurs Sacrls*, 1. c.; Lardner.

Credibility, pt. 2, bk. 1, ch. 6:etc.; Gallandius, *Biblioth. Patrum*, proleg. ad vol. 1, c. 9; Jacobson, *I. c.* proleg. p. 1, etc., 70; Schaff, *Church Hist.* vol. 1; Donaldson, *Literature* (see Index); Bohringer, *Christl. Kirche*, 1, 30 sq.; Illgen, *Zeitschrift hist. Theol.* 1866, vol. 1; Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity* (see Index); *Jahrb. . deutsche Theol.* 1870, 3, 545; Jortin, *Remarcks*, 1, 323 sq.; *Amer. Presb. Rev.* 3, 517; Riddle, *Christian Antiquities* (see Index); Hefele, *Patrum Apostolicorum Opera*, p. 18; Kitto, *Cyclop. of Bib. Lit.* 1, 812; Alzog, *Patrologie*, § 1 sq.; Killen, *Anc. Church*, p. 365 sq.; Fisher, *Beginning of Christianity* (N.Y. 1877, 8vo), p. 321 sq., 552 sq.

The *Τῆς Σμυρναίων ἐκκλησίας περὶ μαρτυρίου τοῦ ἁγίου Πολυκάρπου ἐπιστολὴ ἐγκυκλικός* is almost entirely incorporated in the *Historia Ecclesiastica* of Eusebius (4, 15); it is also extant in its original form. in which it was first published by archbishop Usher, in his *Appendix Ignatiana* (Lond. 1647, 4to); and was reprinted in the *Acta Martyrum Sincera et Selecta* of Ruiuart (Paris, 1689, 4to), and in the *Patres Apostolici* of Cotelierius (vol. 2, Paris, 1672, fol.; Antwerp [or rather Amsterdam], 1698; and Amsterdam, 1724); it was also reprinted by Maderus, in his edition of the *Epistola Polycarp*, already mentioned; by Ittigius, in his *Bibliotheca Patrum Apostolicorum* (Leips. 1699, 8vo); by Smith, in his edition of the *Epistolae* of Ignatius (reprinted at Basle by Frey, 1742, 8vo); by Russel, in his *Patres Apostolici* (vol. 2, Lond. 1746, 8vo); by Gallandius, in his *Bibliotheca Patrum* (vol. 1, Venice, 1765, fol.); and by Jacobson, in his *Patrum Apostolicorum qua supersunt* (vol. 2, Oxford, 1838, 8vo). There is an ancient Latin version, which is given with the Greek text by Usher; and there are modern Latin versions given by other editors of the Greek text, or in the *Acta Sanctorum Januarii* (ad d. 26), 2, 702, etc. There are English versions by archbishop Wake (Lond. 1693, 8vo, often reprinted), by Chevallier (Cambridge, 1833, 8vo), and by Dalrymple, in his *Remains of Christian Antiquity* (Edinburgh, 1776, 8vo). See Cave, *I. c.* p. 65; Fabricius, *I. c.* p. 51; Lardner, *I. c. c.* 7; Ceillier, *I. c.* p. 695; Ittigius, Gallandius, and Jacobson, *II. cc.*

Polycarp the Ascetic

There is extant in Greek a life of the female saint Syncretica, which has been ascribed to various persons. Some MSS. and the Greek ecclesiastical historian Nicephorus Callisti (*H. E.* 8:40) ascribe it to Athanasius; but Montfaucon, though he gives the piece with a Latin version in his edition

of the works of Athanasius (2, 681, etc.), classes it among the spurious works, and declares that the difference of style, and the absence of any external testimony for five or six centuries after Athanasius leave no room to doubt its spuriousness. A copy, which was among the papers of Combefis, contains a clause, stating that the discourses or sayings of the saint had been reported by “the blessed Arsenius of Pegadae;” but this does not seem to describe him as the compiler of the narrative, but only as the author from whom part of the materials were derived. It is then most reasonable to follow the very ancient MS. in the Vatican Library, which ascribes the biography to Polycarp the Ascetic or Monk, but where or when this Polycarp lived cannot be determined. ‘The biography was first published in the Latin version of David Colvillus in the *Acta Sancetorum Januasrii*, 1, 242, etc. The original Greek text is said to have been published with some other pieces (Ingolstadt, 1603, 4to); it is given with a new Latin version and notes in the *Ecclesiae Graecae Monumenta* of Cotelerius (Paris, 1677, 4to), 1, 201, etc. The MS. used by Cotelerius contained neither the author’s name nor the final clause about Arsenius of Pegadae. The title of the piece is Βίος καὶ πολιτεία τῆς ὀσίας καὶ αἰοιδίμου μητρὸς ἡμῶν (in Monitfaon’s edition, Β. κ. π. τῆς ἁγίας καὶ μακαρίας καὶ διδασκάλου) Συγκλητικῆς, *Vita, et Gesta sanctca celebrisque mltris nostace* (or, according to Monttfaucou, *Sanctae beataeque magistrce) Syncreticae*. See Fabicius, *Biblioth. Graeca*, 10, 329.

Polyeuct

the first martyr of Armenia, was a soldier in a Roman legion when converted to the Christian faith by one of his friends (Nearchus). For his faith he was sentenced to be beheaded. His martyrdom took place in 257. The Roman Catholic Church observes his memory on Feb. 13. The French poet, Pierre Corneille, made this case of martyrdom the subject of one of his most beautiful tragedies. — Hoefcr, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, s.v.

Polygamy

was anciently and still is a prevailing custom in the East (comp. of the Persians, Strabo, 15:733; Herod. 1, 135; 3, 88: Rhode, *Heil. Sage*, p. 443; of the Indians, Strabo, 15:714; of the Medes, 11:526; of the Getae, 7:297; see also 17:835; on the Egyptians, see Herod. 2, 92; comp. Died. Sic. 1, 80; Hengstenberg, *Mos.* p. 210 sq.), which stands in close connection with

the great fruitfulness of Eastern women; and some have tried to show that it is connected with a preponderance of female births (Mariti, *Reis.* p. 14), but this is denied by Burdach (*Physiol.* 1, 403 sq.) and the most recent authorities. Even the Mosaic law did not forbid polygamy (*Polygamy*), which, indeed, existed among the Israelites from the beginning of their nation (^{<120>}Genesis 28:9; 29, passim; 37:2; 46:10), but seems to be expressly permitted (^{<116>}Deuteronomy 21:16 sq.; ^{<120>}Exodus 21:9 sq.; ^{<118>}Leviticus 18:18); and there are several direct instances under the law (^{<130>}Judges 8:30), and more indirect ones (10:4; 12:9, 14), of polygamy, or at least bigamy, chiefly in the time of the Judges. Yet the lawgiver had certainly placed difficulties in the way of polygamy by many remarkable directions (comp. the Koran, 4:3, which allows a Mussulman but four wedded wives, without, however, limiting the number of his concubines!). The Mosaic law aimed at mitigating rather than removing evils which were inseparable from the state of society in that day. Its enactments were directed

(a.) To the discouragement of polygamy; this object was forwarded by the following enactments:

(1.) The castration of young men, which is usually associated with polygamy, was forbidden (^{<120>}Deuteronomy 23:1), and thus attendants in the harem were not easily to be obtained; while marriageable women might reasonably expect each to obtain a separate husband.

(2.) Every act of sexual intercourse rendered the man unclean for a day (^{<158>}Leviticus 15:18), which, with a considerable number of women, each of them having her peculiar claims upon him, would have been very burdensome.

(3.) The favoring of one wife among several was forbidden (^{<108>}Exodus 21:8 sq.), and the man was required to perform his marriage obligations in equal measure to every wife. This limitation also would be oppressive to many. Besides all this, the mutual jealousy of the several wives of one man, which is the inevitable consequence of polygamy (1 Samuel 1, 2 sq.; ^{<112>}2 Chronicles 11:21), renders home life unpleasant (Niebuhr, *Beschreibung*, p. 73 sq.). The same reason keeps some Turks from polygamy now (D'Ohsson, 2, 366 sq.; Volney, 2, 360 sq.). The result was that most Israelites contented themselves with a single wife (see ^{<114>}Proverbs 12:4; 19:41; 31:10 sq.), or at most took one or two concubines in addition. The same appears to have been the case with the ancient Egyptians (Wilkinson,

Anc. Egyptians, 2, 62 sq.). In the age following the Captivity monogamy appears to have prevailed (comp. Tobit 1, 11; 2, 19; 8:4, 13; Susan. 29, 63; ^{<4082>}Matthew 18:25; ^{<4006>}Luke 1:5; ^{<4401>}Acts 5:1). It became acknowledged, too, as a prescriptive obligation, although the doctors of the law still held to their old canon, that a man might marry wives at pleasure hundred if he would-provided that he had means of support for them. Hence we cannot in ^{<5402>}1 Timothy 3:2; ^{<5006>}Titus 1:6, think of a simultaneous polygamy (comp. *Vesperse Gronig*. [Amster. 1698], p. 125 sq.), although it must be confessed that Paul's expressions, taken alone, most naturally bear this interpretation. The Talmudists insist that no Jew can have more than four wives at once, and a king, at most, but eighteen (Otho, *Lex. Rabbin.* p. 528 sq.; see esp. Selden, *Jus. Nat. et Gent.* 5, 6; Buxtorf, *Sponsal.* p. 47 sq., in Ugolino, *Thesaur.* vol. 30; Michaelis, *Mos. Rit.* 2, 171 sq.; Jahn, I, 2, 235 sq.; comp. Selden, *De Polygamia.* bk. 7:in his *Otia theol.* p. 349 sq.). According to ^{<5177>}Deuteronomy 17:17, kings were forbidden to take *many* wives; but in spite of this prohibition they (as e.g. David, ^{<4053>}2 Samuel 5:13; Solomon, ^{<11103>}1 Kings 11:3; Rehoboam, ^{<4412>}2 Chronicles 11:21; Abijah, 13:21, and others; and so Herod the Great, Josephus, *Ant.* 17, 1, 3) had large harems, for whose service they procured eunuchs in foreign lands.

SEE HAREM.

(b.) The second object of the Mosaic regulations on the subject was to obviate the injustice frequently consequent upon the exercise of the rights of a father or a master. This was attained by the humane regulations relative to a captive whom a man might wish to marry (^{<4210>}Deuteronomy 21:10-14), to a purchased wife (^{<4207>}Exodus 21:7-11), and to a slave who either was married at the time of his purchase, or who, having since received a wife at the hands of his master, was unwilling to be parted from her (21, 2-6), and, lastly, by the law relating to the legal distribution of property among the children of the different wives (^{<4215>}Deuteronomy 21:15-17). These provisions embrace two quite distinct cases.

(1.) The regulations in ^{<4207>}Exodus 21:7-11 deserve a detailed notice, as exhibiting the extent to which the power of the head of a family might be carried. It must be premised that the maiden was born of Hebrew parents, was under age at the time of her sale (otherwise her father would have no power to sell), and that the object of the purchase was that when arrived at puberty she should become the wife of her master, as is implied in the difference in the law relating to her (^{<4207>}Exodus 21:7) and to a slave purchased for ordinary work (^{<4512>}Deuteronomy 15:12-17), as well as in the

term *amdh*, “maid-servant,” which is elsewhere used convertibly with “concubine” (⁽¹⁷⁹⁸⁾Judges 9:18; comp. 8:31). With regard to such it is enacted

(1) that she is not to “go out as the menservants” (i.e. be freed after six years’ service, or in the year of jubilee), on the understanding that her master either already has made, or intends to make her his wife (ver. 7);

(2) but, if he has no such intention, he is not entitled to retain her in the event of any other person of the Israelites being willing to purchase her of him for the same purpose (ver. 8);

(3) he might, however, assign her to his son, and in this case she was to be treated as a daughter, and not as a slave (ver. 9);

(4) if either he or his son, having married her, took another wife, she was still to be treated as a wife in all respects (ver. 10); and, lastly, if neither of the three contingencies took place (i.e. if he neither married her himself, nor gave her to his son, nor had her redeemed), then the maiden was to become absolutely free without waiting for the expiration of the six years or for the year of jubilee (ver. 11).

(2.) In the other case (⁽¹⁸¹⁰⁾Deuteronomy 21:10-14) we must assume that the wife assigned was a non-Israelitish slave; otherwise the wife would, as a matter of course, be freed along with her husband in the year of jubilee. In this case the wife and children would be the absolute property of the master, and the position of the wife would be analogous to that of the Roman *contubernalis*, who was not supposed capable of any *connubium*. The issue of such a marriage would remain slaves in accordance with the maxim of the Talmudists, that the child is liable to its mother’s disqualification (*Kiddush*. 3, 12). Josephus (*Ant.* 4:8, 28) states that in the year of jubilee the slave, having married during service, carried off his wife and children with him: this, however, may refer to an Israelitish maid-servant. *SEE CAPTIVE*.

(c.) The third object of the Mosaic statutes on this subject was to bring divorce under some restriction; and this was effected by rendering divorce a formal proceeding, not to be done by word of mouth as heretofore, but by a “bill of divorcement” (⁽¹⁸²⁴⁾Deuteronomy 24:1), which would generally demand time and the intervention of a third party, thus rendering divorce a less easy process, and furnishing the wife, in the event of its being carried

out, with a legal evidence of her marriageability: we may also notice that Moses wholly prohibited divorce in case the wife had been seduced prior to marriage (22, 29), or her chastity had been groundlessly impugned (22, 19).

(d.) The fourth object, which was to enforce purity of life during the maintenance of the matrimonial bond, forms the subject of one of the ten commandments (^{<0204>}Exodus 20:14), any violation of which was punishable with death (^{<0300>}Leviticus 20:10; ^{<0222>}Deuteronomy 22:22), even in the case of a betrothed person (^{<0223>}Deuteronomy 22:23, 24). *SEE ADULTERY.*

The practical results of these regulations may have been very salutary, but on this point we have but small opportunities of judging. The usages themselves to which we have referred, remained in full force to a late period. We have instances of the arbitrary exercise of the paternal authority in the cases of Achsah (^{<0012>}Judges 1:12), Ibzan (^{<0713>}Judges 12:9), Samson (^{<0740>}Judges 14:20; 15:2), and Michal (^{<0975>}1 Samuel 17:25). The case of Abishag, and the language of Adonijah in reference to her (^{<1002>}1 Kings 1:2; 2:17), prove that a servant was still completely at the disposal of his or her master. Polygamy also prevailed, as we are expressly informed in reference to Gideon (^{<0080>}Judges 8:30), Elkanah (^{<0902>}1 Samuel 1:2), Saul (^{<1028>}2 Samuel 12:8), David (^{<1053>}2 Samuel 5:13), Solomon (^{<1103>}1 Kings 11:3), the sons of Issachar (^{<1304>}1 Chronicles 7:4), Shaharaim (^{<1308>}1 Chronicles 8:8, 9), Rehoboam (^{<1412>}2 Chronicles 11:21), Abijah (^{<1432>}2 Chronicles 13:21), and Joash (^{<1448>}2 Chronicles 24:3); and as we may also infer from the number of children in the cases of Jair, Ibzan, and Abdon (^{<0704>}Judges 10:4; 12:9, 14). It does not, however, follow that it was the general practice of the country: the inconveniences attendant on polygamy in small houses or with scanty incomes are so great as to put a serious bar to its general adoption, and hence in modern countries where it is fully established the practice is restricted to comparatively few (Niebuhr, *Voyage*, p. 65; Lane, 1, 239). The same rule holds good with regard to ancient times: the discomforts of polygamy are exhibited in the jealousies between the wives of Abraham (^{<0106>}Genesis 16:6), and of Elkanah (1 Samuel 1, 6); and the cases cited above rather lead to the inference that it was confined to the wealthy. Meanwhile it may be noted that the theory of monogamy was retained, and comes prominently forward in the pictures of domestic bliss portrayed in the poetical writings of this period (^{<0303>}Psalms 128:3; ^{<1058>}Proverbs 5:18; 18:22; 19:14; 31:10-29; ^{<0109>}Ecclesiastes 9:9). The sanctity of the marriage-bond was but too frequently violated, as appears from the frequent

allusions to the “strange woman” in the book of ^{<2126>}Proverbs 2:16; 5:20, etc., and in the denunciations of the prophets against the prevalence of adultery (^{<2485>}Jeremiah 5:8; ^{<2681>}Ezekiel 18:11; 22:11).

In the post-Babylonian period monogamy appears to have become more prevalent than at any previous time; indeed, we have no instance of polygamy during this period on record in the Bible, all the marriages noticed being with single wives (Tob. 1, 9; 2, 11; Susan. 29, 63; ^{<1025>}Matthew 18:25; ^{<1005>}Luke 1:5; ^{<4401>}Acts 5:1). During the same period the theory of monogamy is set forth in Ecclus. 26, 1-27. The practice of polygamy nevertheless still existed; Herod the Great had no less than nine wives at one time (Josephus, *Ant.* 17, 1, 3); the Talmudists frequently assume it as a well-known fact (e.g. *Ketub.* 10, 1; *Yebam.* 1, 1); and the early Christian writers, in their comments on ^{<5492>}1 Timothy 3:2, explain it of polygamy in terms which leave no doubt as to the fact of its prevalence in the apostolic age. Michaelis (*Laws of Moses*, 3, 5, § 95) asserts that polygamy ceased entirely after the return from the Captivity; Selden, on the other hand, that polygamy prevailed among the Jews until the time of Honorius and Arcadius (cir. A.D. 400), when it was prohibited by an imperial edict (*Ux. Ebr.* 1, 9). *SEE MARRIAGE.*

Polygamy, Christian Doctrine Concerning.

Jesus does not directly forbid polygamy, nor even revert to the subject, since it had been almost universally given up. No case of polygamy among the Jews is presented in the Gospel narrative; and when a wife is mentioned, it is stated or implied in the account that she is the only wife. The special evil of Jewish society was the facility of divorce—men putting away their wives for any, often a trifling, cause. Our Lord, when the Pharisees asked him (^{<1005>}Matthew 19:3-9) whether it was lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause, replied that God at the beginning made them a male and a female (ἄρσεν και ἡθλυ), thus indirectly condemning polygamy as contrary to the original institution of marriage: with a male and a female only polygamy was impossible. He then declares that the bond of marriage is indissoluble; the husband and wife are no more twain, but one flesh; and what God hath thus joined together let no man put asunder; and afterwards replies to their question on divorce: “Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so.” The practice of polygamy then existed by permission, not by command. It was a positive temporary

regulation of Moses as a political governor, not of God as a moral ruler. The Jews had become hardened in their hearts; they were harsh and severe even to their own flesh. Their nearest relatives they treated with cruelty and injustice. Until the people could be brought into such a state that they could feel and understand the force of law, it was necessary for their rulers meanwhile to devise prudential regulations for the purpose of checking their lawlessness. All the evils of that early and idolatrous age of the world could not be remedied in a moment; and such was the state of society that not even until the advent of the Savior was the institution of marriage restored to its primeval integrity by revoking the permission of polygamy and divorce. The teaching of the apostle Paul, too, is worthy of most serious attention, as the subject of polygamy must have come immediately before him. The Christian converts in the apostolic age may be divided into three classes: Jews, Romans, and Greeks. Polygamy, though not unknown among the Jews, had fallen, as we have said, into general disuse. It was positively forbidden by the Roman law, though divorce was even more frequent among the Romans than the Jews; but it undoubtedly was the common usage of the Greeks. Thus Theodoret says: Πάλαι γὰρ εἰώθεισαν καὶ Ἕλληνες καὶ Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ δύο καὶ τρισὶ καὶ πλείοσι γυναίξι νόμῳ γάμου κατὰ ταυτὸν συνοικεῖν (*Com. in* ^{<48>} *1 Timothy 3:2*). The epistles of Paul were generally addressed to Grecian converts; let us see, then, how he dealt with the question, which must have come directly before him. Two ways were open to the apostle: either a partial or temporary toleration, or an immediate and direct prohibition of the custom. The multitude of Greek converts were undoubtedly polygamists; it might seem a hard measure, and would produce much domestic discontent and misery, to compel converts to abandon their wives legally married according to the Grecian law. Did, then, the apostle permit the usage temporarily, either till that generation had passed away, or until polygamists themselves were willing to conform to the higher Christian standard? We most emphatically reply that the apostle never for even the briefest period tolerated polygamy among baptized or Christian disciples, and that it never existed in the Christian Church at all. Had it been tolerated even temporarily, some notice or reference to it would be found in the apostolic epistles. The sincerity of converts must have been put to a severe test: to give up their wives no doubt often involved a painful sacrifice to Christian duty, yet so emphatic and peremptory must have been the apostle's prohibition that not a murmur of opposition was heard from Corinth, Ephesus, Philippi, Thessalonica, and other Christian communities.

The apostle often censures Grecian converts for their violation of Christian duty, some of them having fallen from their regenerate state, and abandoned themselves to their old sins; but we find no reference to polygamy in his epistles, nothing which implies that it was continued or even known among them. There is no mention, however remote or indirect, of a believer's *wives*. This silence can only intimate the utter abandonment of the usage among Christians as clearly as the most emphatic statement. It could not have been tacitly allowed as indifferent, or permitted even for a brief period; since it must be remembered that the apostle had *expressly* forbidden polygamy, and if it existed at all in the Christian communities he planted, it could only have been in defiance of his direct prohibition. No language can be plainer than that of 1 Corinthians 7: "Let every man have his own wife, and every woman her own husband; let not the wife depart from her husband, let not a husband put away his wife." Again, the non-existence of polygamy in the apostolic churches is implied in the same apostle's comparison of marriage to the union of Christ and his Church. The apostle says: "The husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the Head of the Church" (~~4123~~Ephesians 5:23). But as Christ's Church, as Paul says, is one body (~~4044~~Ephesians 4:4), there would be no meaning in the comparison, no similarity in the things compared, if the husband might have a plurality of wives: the marriage union would not then have a typical representation of the union of Christ with the one body, which is his Church. Taking, again, the testimony of the Catholic Church, the evidence against polygamy will appear most positive and decisive. The mind of the divine Legislator was so clearly and ineffaceably stamped on his followers that the usage in early and later ages of the Church was utterly unknown; there is no instance on record of a baptized polygamist for fifteen hundred years after Christ. Catholic, schismatic, and heretic, amid all their differences, agreed at least on this point. No professing Christian, however erroneous his belief or scandalous his life, ever ventured to revive the interdicted usage. The testimony of the Church, clearly brought before us by the consentient practice of Christians in all ages, is too explicit to leave room for further controversy, or any real doubt of the teaching of the New Testament on the subject. Besides, the practice of the whole world was strictly uniform, with one exception in the 16th century. In an evil hour Luther unhappily gave permission to one of his followers to marry a second wife during the lifetime of the first the landgrave of Hesse. He was the first and the only Protestant polygamist of the Christian Church.

In recent times the question of polygamy has reopened in the Christian Church, and has resumed great importance. Bishop Colenso in Africa, and missionaries of several denominations in India, have deemed it expedient to allow heathen polygamists to retain their wives after baptism; though, on becoming Christians, they are forbidden to add to the number of them. Polygamist converts are not allowed, as being it is supposed in an inferior state, to bear office in the Church.^{f1} Now this view of the subject and corresponding practice can only be founded on an opinion or theory, which, if true, would render polygamy universally allowable among Christians. Let us ask ourselves the question, Is polygamy, according to the new dispensation, allowable, or indifferent, or sinful? If allowable or indifferent, why should it only be partially conceded, and not permitted at all times? If it be wrong or sinful, how can we be justified in allowing it even during the shortest period? Its temporary permission among heathen converts rests on no authority, scriptural or patristic, or any valid plea whatever: no primitive precedent can be quoted, though it is obvious that the same reasons for it might have been alleged in the apostolic age, and also, it may be added, by missionaries in any subsequent period, as in modern times. In truth, its permission under any circumstances can only by logical sequence lead to its full sanction, as in the foul and degraded system of Mormonism. But the defenders of modern polygamy will perhaps say that their strongest argument in its defense has not yet been examined: they lay especial stress on the examples of the Old Testament saints, which is probably the real reason why they venture to allow it, maintaining that God would not have permitted it for many ages had it been necessarily immoral or sinful. But are they prepared to say—which is the real question at issue—that in the New Testament there is no precept on the subject of marriage? If there be, the argument derived from the permitted usage of the old dispensation is of no value whatever, and may thus be stated: there was no positive law on the subject in the old dispensation. and hence many of the Jews were polygamists; there is a direct law or precept in the New Testament, and as such binding on believers, by which the Christian is limited to one wife. But should it be asserted that there is no positive precept on marriage in the New Testament, we shall thus have to fall back upon the old dispensation for instruction and guidance; in which case, why should we permit polygamy only for a time, or in the case of heathen converts, instead of allowing Christians universally to follow, if they please, the example of the patriarchs and saints of the Jewish Church? If polygamy be permitted to converts from heathenism, on the ground that there is no

positive precept on the subject in the New Testament, and that we may have recourse to the permission of the Jewish law, no reason most assuredly can be given why Christians generally may not be permitted to avail themselves of the sanction given to polygamy in the old dispensation, and by the example of its patriarchs and saints. "Experience," says Dr. Spring, 'has abundantly and painfully proved that polygamy debases and brutalizes both the body and the mind, and renders society incapable of those generous and refined affections which, if duly cultivated, would be found to be the inheritance even of our fallen nature. Where is an instance in which polygamy has not been the source of many and bitter calamities in the domestic circle and to the state? Where has it reared a virtuous heaven-taught progeny? Where has it been distinguished for any of the moral virtues; or, rather, where has it not been distinguished for the most fearful degeneracy of mankind? Where has it even been found friendly to population? It has been reckoned that the number of male infants exceeds that of females in the proportion of nineteen to eighteen, the excess of the males scarcely providing for their greater consumption by war, seafaring, and other dangerous or unhealthy occupations. It seems to have been 'the order of nature that one woman should be assigned to one man.' And where has polygamy ever been friendly to the physical and intellectual character of the population? The Turks are polygamists, and so are the Asiatics; but how inferior a people to the ancient Greeks and Romans!' The practice of polygamy has sometimes been alleged to originate in the influence of climate, but the fact cannot be denied that in the coldest as well as in the warmest climates it is found to exist. And though it must be admitted to prevail more extensively in regions situated towards the south, the more probable cause of this peculiarity will be found in ancient usage or religion. The manners of different countries have varied in nothing more than in their domestic constitutions. Less polished and more luxurious nations have either not perceived the bad effects of polygamy, or, if they did perceive them, they who in such countries possessed the power of reforming the laws have been unwilling to resign their own gratifications. Polygamy is retained at this day in all Mohammedan countries, and throughout the whole Eastern world (see a recent article on this subject in the *Westminster Review*, Oct. 1867, art. 1); and even in countries like Algiers, where the French controlling influence is manifest, the Jews practice polygamy to a large extent.^{f2} But among Western, or, better, Christian nations, it is universally prohibited. In Sweden it is punished with death. In England, besides the nullity of the second marriage, it subjects the

offender to transportation or imprisonment and branding for the first offence, and to capital punishment for the second. About the middle of the 16th century, Bernardus Ochinus, general of the Order of Capuchins, and afterwards a Protestant, published Dialogues in favor of polygamy, to which Theodore Beza wrote a reply. In 1682 a work entitled *Polygamia Triumphatrix* appeared under the name of Theophilus Aletheus. The true name of the author was Lyserus, a native of Saxony. In 1780 Martin Madan published *Thelyphhora, or a Treatise on Female Ruin*, in which he defended polygamy on the part of the male. The only exception in the West to monogamous practice occurs among the Mormons (q.v.). This strange sect teaches that the use and foundation of matrimony is to raise up a peculiar, holy people for the kingdom of God the Son, that at the millennium they may be raised to reign with him; and the glory of the man will be in proportion to the size of his household of children, wives, and servants. Quoting the Scripture that “the mall is not without the woman, nor the woman without the man,” they affirm that it is the duty of every man to marry at least once, and that a woman cannot enter into the heavenly kingdom without a husband to introduce her as belonging to himself. The addition of wives after the first to a man’s family is called a “sealing to him,” a process which constitutes a relation with all the rights and sanctions of matrimony. This introduction and continuance of the baneful and immoral practice of polygamy is likely, sooner or later, to prove destructive to the whole system of Mormonism.

^{f1}In 1834 the conference of missionaries of various denominations in Calcutta, including those of the Baptist, the London, and the Church Missionary Societies, of the Church of Scotland, land the American Presbyterian Board, after having had the whole subject frequently under discussion, and after much and serious deliberation, *unanimously* agreed on the following propositions, though there had previously been much diversity of opinion among them on various points: “If a convert before becoming a Christian has married more wives than one, in accordance with the practice of the Jewish and early Christian churches, lie shall be permitted to keep them all; but such a person is not eligible to any office in the Church. In no other case is polygamy to be tolerated among Christians” (Brown, *Hist. of Missions*, 3, 365, 366). If proof had been given that polygamy was allowed in the early Church, all controversy on the subject would have been at all end; its

permission in modern times to converts from heathenism might have been allowed, or even in many cases be desirable; but the statement itself as no support whatever either from Scripture or the writings of the fathers, or ecclesiastical history.

^{f2} Since 1870, when they were made citizens, they have been obliged to conform to the order of French law.

The argument against polygamy from a strictly ethical and social standpoint is thus presented by Paley: “The equality in the number of males and females born into the world intimates the intention of God that one woman should be assigned to one man; for if to one man be allowed an exclusive right to five or more women, four or more men must be deprived of the exclusive possession of any; which could never be the order intended. It seems also a significant indication of the divine will that he at first created only one woman to one man. Had God intended polygamy for the species, it is probable he would have begun with it; especially as by giving to Adam more wives than one the multiplication of the human race would have proceeded with a quicker progress. Polygamy not only violates the constitution of nature, and the apparent design of the Deity, but produces to the parties themselves, and to the public, the following bad effects: contests and jealousies among the wives of the same husband; distracted affections, or the loss of all affection in the husband himself; a voluptuousness in the rich which dissolves the vigor of their intellectual as well as active faculties, producing that indolence and imbecility, both of mind and body, which have long characterized the nations of the East; the abasement of one half of the human species, who, in countries where polygamy obtains, are degraded into instruments of physical pleasure to the other half; neglect of children; and the manifold and sometimes unnatural mischiefs which arise from a scarcity of women. To compensate for these evils, polygamy does not offer a single advantage. In the article of population, which it has been thought to promote, the community gain nothing (nothing, I mean, compared with a state in which marriage is nearly universal); for the question is not whether one man will have more children by five or more wives than by one, but whether these five wives would not bear the same or a greater number of children to five separate husbands. And as to the care of children when produced, and the sending of them into the world in situations in which they may be likely to form and bring up families of their own, upon which the increase and succession of the human species in a great degree depend, this is less provided for and

less practicable where twenty or thirty children are to be supported by the attention and fortunes of one father than if they were divided into five or six families, to each of which were assigned the industry and inheritance of two parents.” Thus far Dr. Paley. We shall close this article with the words of an excellent writer on the same side of the subject: “When we reflect,” he says, “that the primitive institution of marriage limited it to one man and one woman; that this institution was adhered to by Noah and his sons, amid the degeneracy of the age in which they lived, and in spite of the example of polygamy which the accursed race of Cain had introduced; when we consider how very few (comparatively speaking) examples of this practice there were among the faithful; how much it brought its own punishment with it; and how dubious and equivocal those passages are in which it appears to have the sanction of the divine approbation; when to these reflections we add another respecting the limited views and temporary nature of the more ancient dispensations and institutions of religion, how often the imperfections and even vices of the patriarchs and people of God in old time are recorded, without any express notification of their criminality— how much is said to be commanded which our reverence for the holiness of God and his law will only suffer us to suppose were for wise ends permitted; how frequently the messengers of God adapted themselves to the genius of the people to whom they were sent, and the circumstances of the times in which they lived; above all, when we consider the purity, equity, and benevolence of the Christian law, the explicit declarations of our Lord and his apostle Paul respecting the institution of marriage, its design and limitation; when we reflect, too, on the testimony of the most ancient fathers, who could not possibly be ignorant of the general and common practice of the apostolic Church; and, finally, when to these considerations we add those which are founded on justice to the female sex, and all the regulations of domestic economy and national policy, we must wholly condemn the revival of polygamy.” See Paley, *Moral Philosophy*, 1, 319-325; Madan, *Thelyphthora*; Towers, Wills, Penn, R. Hill, Palmer, and Haweis, *Answers to Madan*; *Monthly Rev.* 63, 338; and also vol. 69; Beattie, *Elements of Moral Science*, 2, 127-129; Wuttke, *Christian Ethics*, 2, 306 sq.; Harless, *Ethics* (see Index); and the literature quoted in the article MARRIAGE *SEE MARRIAGE* .

Polyglot Bibles

Although the earliest specimen of a polyglot was that of a projected work of the celebrated printer Aldus Manutius, of which one page only was

published, the first of this kind was the *Complutensiam Polyglot*, entitled *Biblia Sacra Polyglotta, complectentia Vetus Testamentum, Hebraico, Chaldaico, Graeco, et Latino idiomate; Novtum Testamentum Graecum et Latinum; et vocabularium Hebraicum et Chaldaicum, grammatica Hebraica; necnon dictionario Greco. De mandato et sumptibus Cardinalis Francisci Ximenis de Cisneros* (6 vols. fol., in Complutensi Universitate, 1514-17). As the title already indicates, we are indebted for this work to the celebrated cardinal, statesman, and general, Francis Ximenes de Cisneros, *SEE XIMENES*, who published it at his own expense, at the cost of 50,000 ducats. It was commenced in 1502, completed in 1517, and published in 1522. The editors were Ailius Antonius, Ducas, Pincianus, Stunica, Zamora, Coronellus, and Johannes de Vergara. The last three were originally Jews. The first four volumes contain the O.T., with the Hebrew, Latin, and Greek, in three columns, the Targum, and a Latin version of the same. The position of the Latin between the Hebrew and the Greek was to indicate that just as Christ was crucified between two thieves, so the Roman Church, represented by St. Jerome's version, is crucified between the synagogue, represented by the Hebrew text, and the Eastern Church, denoted by the Greek version. The fifth volume contains the Greek Testament, with the Latin Vulgate. The last volume consists of vocabularies, indexes, etc. The Greek Testament was finished in 1517; but the MSS. were modern, and not of much critical value (see Dr. Bowring's letter, *Monthly Repository* for 1827, p. 572). There is little doubt that the celebrated text of the Three Witnesses in this edition was translated from the Latin. There were only 600 copies printed of this splendid work, of which three were on vellum. One of these was sold in England in 1829 for 600 guineas.

The *Antwerp Polyglot* was published in 1569-72, in 8 vols. fol., at the expense of Philip II, king of Spain, whence it is also called *Biblia Regia*. It contains, in addition to the Complutensian texts, a Chaldee paraphrase, the Syriac version, and the Latin translation of Arias Montanus, which was a correction of that of Pagnint's. It also contains lexicons and grammars of the various languages of the originals and versions. *SEE ARIAS MONTANUS*.

The *Paris Polyglot*, in addition to the contents of the former works, has a Syriac and Arabic version of both the O.T. and N.T., with the Samaritan Pentateuch, now published for the first time, and edited by J. Morinus. This polyglot also contains the Samaritan *version* of the same. It was published

in 1645, in 10 vols. large folio. The editor of this valuable but unwieldy work was Michael le Jay, who was ruined by the publication. *SEE LE JAY.*

The *London Polyglot*, edited by Brian Walton, afterwards bishop of Chester, is much more comprehensive than any of the former. It was published in 1657, in 6 vols. fol. The first volume, besides prolegomena (published separately by A. Dathe, Lips. 1777), contains the Pentateuch, exhibiting on one page the Hebrew text, with the interlinear Latin version of Arias Montanus, the Latin Vulgate of the Clementine edition, the Septuagint of the Roman edition, and the various readings of the Cod. Alex., the Latin version of Flaminius Nobilius, the Syriac with a Latin version, the Targum of Onkelos with a Latin version, the Samaritan Pentateuch with the Samaritan version of the same, and a Latin translation serving for both, and the Arabic with a Latin version. The second volume comprises the historical books, with the Targums of Jonathan. The third volume contains the books from Job to Malachi, and, besides the versions in all the former languages, the Psalms in Ethiopic, and a Latin translation. The fourth volume has all the Deutero-canonical books in Greek, Latin, Arabic, and Syriac; the two Hebrew texts of Tobit, and two Chaldee and a Persian Targum on the Pentateuch, with Latin versions. The fifth volume has the N.T., with Arias Montanus's translation; the Syriac, Persic, Latin, Vulgate, Arabic, and Ethiopic versions. These, with separate Latin versions of the Oriental translations, are all given on one page. The sixth volume contains various readings and critical remarks. The whole of this stupendous labor was completed in four years. It was published by subscription, under the patronage of Oliver Cromwell, who died before its completion. This gave occasion to the canceling of two leaves of the preface, in order to transfer to king Charles II the compliments addressed to Cromwell. There are in consequence both *republican* and *royal* copies, the former of which are the most scarce and valuable. For the variations between these, see Butler's *Force Biblicae* and Adam Clarke's *Succession of Sacred Literature*. This polyglot was accompanied by Castell's *Heptaglot Lexicon*, in 2 vols. fol. *SEE CASTELL; SEE WALTON.*

The *Leipsic* or *Reineccius's Polyglot*, published under the title *Biblia Sacra Quadrilinguica V. Test. Hebr. etc.* (1747-51, 3 vols. fol.). The N.T. was published first in 1713, and with a new title page in 1747, while the O.T. was published in 1750-51. The first volume contains the historical books, the second the remaining books of the O.T., together with the apocryphal books. Besides the Hebrew, the Alexandrian version and Seb.

Schmidt's Latin and Luther's German translation are given. The Greek text of the apocryphal books is that of Grabe. The N.T. comprising the third volume, has, besides the Greek, the Syriac, the vulgar Greek version, and S. Schmidt's Latin and Luther's German version.

Besides Reineccius's version, we may mention the *Heidelberg* or *Bertram's Polyglot* (3 vols. fol., ex officina Sanct-Andreana, 1586; 2d ed. 1599; 3d ed. 1616), the *Hamburg* or *Wolder's Polyglot* (Hamburg, 1596, fol.) and Hutter's, of which only the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, and Ruth were published (Norimbergae, 1599, fol.), and the N.T. But by far the best of all these small polyglots is Reineccius's.

Of the polyglots published in our century, we mention Mr. Bagster's *Polyglot* (Lond. 1831, fol.), containing in one volume the Hebrew text, the Samaritan Pentateuch, the Septuagint, Vulgate, and Syriac versions, the Greek text of Mill in the N.T., together with Luther's German, Diodati's Italian, Ostervald's French, Scio's Spanish, and the English A.V. of the Bible. The prolegomena of S. Lee are a very useful help to the student. The cheapest and most generally useful polyglot is one entitled *Polyglotten - Bibelzum praktischen Handgebrauch*, edited by Drs. Stier and Theile. It contains the Hebrew, Septuagint, Vulgate, and German, in the O.T., and the Greek, Vulgate, and German, in the N.T. The latest polyglot edition is the *Hexaglot Bible, comprising the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments in the original Tongues, together with the Septuagint, the Syriac (of the New Testament), the Vulgate, the Authorized English and German, and the most approved French Versions*, edited by R. De Levante (Lond. 1876, 6 vols. royal 4to).

There are also polyglots of several portions of the Bible, of which one of the most valuable is that published at Constantinople, in Hebrew, Chaldee, Persian. and Arabic, in 1546. The Rabbinical Bibles (q.v.) are in many cases also to some extent polyglot. Besides the article BIBLE *SEE BIBLE*, see Ernesti, *De Bibliis Polyglottis* (Wittenb. 1688); Darling, *Cyclopaedia Bibliographica* (Holy Scriptures), col. 39 sq.; Rosenmüller, *Handbuch der biblischen Literatur*, 3, 281 sq.; Le Long-Masch, *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1, 331 sq.; Eichhorn, *Einleituaq ina das A. Test.* (Index in vol. 5, s.v. Polyglotte); Simon, *Hist. Critique du Vieux Testament* (Rotterdam, 1685), p. 514 sq.; Carpzov, *Critica Sacra* (Lipsia, 1748), p. 387 sq.; Kortholt. *Tract. de variis Scripturae edition.* cap. 32:p. 374 sq.; Tenzel, *Diatribae Philol. de Bibliis Polyglottis* (Wittenb. 1686); Celsius, *De Bibliis*

Polyglottis dissertatio (Upsala, 1707); Wolf, *Biblioth. Hebr.* vol. 2, § 10, p. 332 sq.; Walton, *Prolegom.* § 14; Hottinger, *Bibliothecar.* *Quadripartitum*, p. 133 sq.; Alter, *Bibliograph. Nachrichten* (Wien, 1779), p. 30 sq.; Reuss, *Bibliotheca Novi Testamenti*, etc. (Brunsvigue, 1872), § 5; and his art. *Polyglotten-Bibebel* in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.*; the art. *Polyglott* in Kitto; Diestel, *Gesch. des Alten Test.* (Jena, 1869), p. 207, 254, 255; and, as far as the *Complutensian Polyglot* is concerned, the excellent monograph of Delitzsch, *Studien zur Entstehungs. gesch. der Polyglotten - Bibel des Cardinals Ximenes* (Leips. 1871). (B. P.)

Polyhistor, Alexander

a Roman writer whose works have been used by the Church fathers, a native of Cotyemim in Phrygia, according to some, and of Miletus according to others, was a geographer and historian, who lived in the 7th century of Rome, and was taken prisoner by the Romans in the war of Sulla against Mithridates. Being purchased by Cornelius Lentulus, he was entrusted by him with the education of his children, and at last received his freedom. He then assumed the name of *Cornelius*, after that of his patron. He resided chiefly at Rome, and had a country-house at Laurentum, in which, having taken fire while he was there, he perished in the flames. He is often mentioned and quoted by Pliny the Elder, Diogenes Laertius, Clemens Alexandrinus, and Eusebius, as a man of very extensive learning, in consequence of which he was styled Polyhistor. He wrote a work in forty books, each book being the description of a distinct country. Stephanus Byzantinus mentions his account of Bithynia, Caria, Paphlagonia, Syria, Libya, Crete, and other countries. Clemens Alexandrinus quotes his *Treatise on the Jews*, of which Eusebius has inserted fragments in his "Chronography." Clemens Alexandrinus mentions another work of Polyhistor, on the *Symbol of Pythagoras*; and Cyril of Alexandria, in his work against Julian, quotes his authority on the early history of the world. Unfortunately none of Polyhistor's works have come down to us.

Polyhymnia

a daughter of Zeus or Jupiter, and one of the nine Muses. She presided over lyric poetry, and was believed to have invented the lyre.

Polynesia

or the region of many islands (*πολύς*, *many*, and *νήσος*, *an island*), is the name usually given, with more or less of limitation, to the numerous groups of islands, and some few single islands, scattered throughout the great Pacific Ocean, between the eastern shores of Asia and the western shores of America. In its widest signification, the term Polynesia might be understood as embracing, besides the groups hereafter to be mentioned, the various islands, large and small, of the Indian Archipelago, in one direction, and the vast island of New Holland (q.v.) or Australia, with its dependency of Van Diemen's Land, in another. Including these, the whole region has sometimes been called Oceanica, and sometimes Australia—generally, however, in modern times, to the exclusion of the islands in the Indian Archipelago, to which certain writers have given the name of Malaysia. In proportion, also, as the area of maritime discovery has become enlarged, it has been thought convenient by some geographers to narrow still further the limits of Polynesia, to the exclusion of Australia and Van Diemen's Land; while others, again, exclude Papua (q.v.) or New Guinea, New Ireland (q.v.), Solomon's Isles (q.v.), the Louisiade group, the New Hebrides (q.v.), New Caledonia (q.v.), and certain other groups and single islands, together with New Zealand (q.v.) from the area of Polynesia, and give to these, in union with Australia, the collective designation of Australia. To all these, with the exception of New Zealand, French writers have given the name of *Melanesia*, or the *Black Islands*; while a similar name, *Keloesia*, has been given to them by Prichard and Latham—purely, however, on ethnological grounds, as we shall presently notice. Thus we have the three geographical divisions of Malaysia, Australasia, and Polynesia, the last mentioned of which embraces all the groups and single islands not included under the other two. Accepting this arrangement, still the limits between Australasia and Polynesia have not been very accurately defined; indeed, scarcely any two geographers appear to be quite agreed upon the subject; neither shall we pretend to decide in the matter. The following list, however, comprises all the principal groups and single islands not previously named as coming under the division of Australasia—viz.: 1. North of the equator—the Ladrone or Marian Islands, the Pelew Islands, the Caroline Islands, the Radack and Ralick chains, the Sandwich Islands, Gilbert's or Kingsmill's Archipelago, and the Galapagos. 2. South of the equator—the Ellice group, the Phoenix and Union groups, the Fiji Islands, the Friendly Islands, the Navigator's Islands, Cook's or

Harvey Islands, the Society Islands, the Dangerous Archipelago, the Marquesas Islands, Pitcairn Island, and Easter Island. (In the former part of this article we largely depend upon Chambers's *Cyclopaedia*, and in the latter part upon Gardner's *Faiths of all Nations*.)

Geographical Description. — These islands, which extend from about 20° north of the equator to about 30° south of it are some of them volcanic in their origin, and some of them coralline. The volcanic islands generally rise to a considerable height above the level of the ocean, and are therefore called the high islands, in contradistinction to the coralline or low islands. They consist of basalt and other igneous formations. Of these, the principal are the Friendly Islands, one of which, Otaheite or Tahiti, has a mountain rising to the height of 10,000 feet; the Marquesas Islands (q.v.), also very high; the Samoan (q.v.) or Navigator's Islands; and the Sandwich Islands (q.v.), of which Owyhee or Hawaii possesses several both active and extinct craters, 13,000, 14,000, and even 16,000 feet high. The Galapagos group, nearest of all to South America, are likewise of igneous origin, and have several still active craters. The remaining islands are for the most part of coralline formation. Of the islands generally, we need only further observe that, although situated within the tropics, the heat of the atmosphere is delightfully tempered by a succession of land and sea breezes. The soil is exceedingly fertile, and, besides the vegetable productions found growing when the islands were first discovered by Europeans, it has given a welcome home to the orange, lemon, sugar-cane, guava, cotton, potato, melon, and other fruits and plants introduced by foreign visitants. The only native quadrupeds on any of the islands when first visited were pigs, dogs, and rats; but the ox, the sheep, the goat, and even the horse, have since been successfully introduced into many of the groups. The feathered tribes are numerous, likewise the insects, and the coasts everywhere abound with a vast variety of fish and crustacea, highly important as a matter of food to the inhabitants of those islands in which quadrupeds, whether native or introduced, are found in only a small number. For a more particular description of the several groups we refer to the distinct articles of FIJI *SEE FIJI* ; FRIENDLY ISLANDS *SEE FRIENDLY ISLANDS* ; SANDWICH ISLANDS *SEE SANDWICH ISLANDS* , etc.; and shall now proceed to speak of the Polynesians generally.

Inhabitants. — This race of people, supposed at one time by certain writers to be of American origin, is now almost universally admitted to have a

close affinity with the Malays (q.v.) of the peninsula and Indian Archipelago, and hence is classified with them by Dr. Latham under his subdivision of *Oceanic Mongolide*. In physical structure and appearance, the Polynesians in general more nearly resemble the Malays than they do any other race, although differing from them in some respects, as, indeed, the natives of several of the groups also do from each other. In stature, they are generally taller than the Malays, and have a greater tendency to corpulence. In color, also, they more nearly approach that of the Europeans. The hair is often waved or curling, instead of long and straight, and the nose is frequently aquiline. These differences, however, which may all have been produced by lapse of time and different conditions of existence, offer no barrier to the strong presumption that at some long antecedent period these islands were colonized by Malay adventurers. The distance between the more western groups of Polynesia and the eastern islands of the Indian Archipelago is not so great but that it could have been easily overcome by a hardy race of sailors, even although their vessels may not have been so well constructed as in modern times; and the same reasoning holds good with respect to the other groups extending still farther east, or still more to the north or south. Each island or group, as it was attained, would only form a convenient point of departure in process of time for some other island or group more remotely situated. It is true that the affinities of language are not great between the Malays and the Polynesians; still some affinity has been recognized by philologists; while in their manners and customs a strong resemblance has been shown to exist, as in the institution of caste, the practice of circumcision, the chewing of the betel-nut, and other things. Many other facts might be mentioned in favor of the theory of a Malay settlement, not only of Polynesia, but of the islands called Melanesia or Kelaenonesia as well; the last mentioned being inhabited by a race almost identical with the Negritos, *SEE NEGRILLOS*, or Pelagian Negroes of the Eastern Archipelago.

Dr. Latham, in treating of the Polynesians, divides them into two branches—viz.: 1. The Micronesian branch, and 2. The Proper Polynesian branch. His theory as to the probable line of migration is as follows: “The reason for taking the Micronesian branch before the Proper Polynesian involves the following question: What was the line of population by which the innumerable islands of the Pacific, from the Pelews to Easter Island, and from the Sandwich Islands to New Zealand, became inhabited by tribes different from, but still allied to, the Protonesian Malays? That line,

whichever it be, where the continuity of successive islands is the greatest, and whereon the fewest considerable interspaces of ocean are to be found. This is the general answer *a priori*, subject to modifications from the counterbalancing phenomena of winds or currents unfavorable to the supposed migration. Now this answer, when applied to the geographical details regarding the distribution of land and sea in the great oceanic area, indicates the following line: New Guinea, New Ireland, the New Hebrides, the Fijis, and the Tonga group, etc. From hence the Navigator's Islands, the isles of the Dangerous Archipelago, the Kingsmill and other groups, carry the frequently diverging streams of population over the Caroline Islands, the Ladrones, the Pelews, Easter Island, etc. This view, however, so natural an inference from a mere land and sea survey, is complicated by the ethnological position of the New Guinea, New Ireland, and Hew Hebrides population. These are *not* Proto-nesian, and they are not Polynesian. Lastly, they are not intermediate to the two. They *break* rather than propagate the continuity of the human stream— a continuity which exists geographically, but fails ethnographically. The recognition of this conflict between the two probabilities has determined me to consider the Micronesian Archipelago as that part of Polynesia which is most likely to have been first peopled, and hence a reason for taking it first in order. The islands comprised in the Micronesian branch are the Pelew Islands, the Caroline Islands, the Marian Islands, and the Tarawan or Kingsmill group. In physical appearance, the inhabitants of these groups more nearly resemble the Malays than is the case with the Polynesians Proper. In person, they are not so tall as the latter. Their language has numerous dialects most of which would perhaps be unintelligible to the groups farther south and east. In religion, they are pagans; but their mythology and traditions differ from those of the Polynesians Proper. Neither is the custom of the taboo and the use of kawa so prevalent as they are found to be among the latter.

The Proper Polynesians, so called, are found in the Fiji Islands, but not to the same extent as in the following— viz., the Navigator's or Samoan Islands, the Society Islands, and Friendly Islands; also in the Sandwich Islands, the Marquesas, the Dangerous Archipelago, etc. In physical appearance, they are the handsomest and tallest of all the natives of the Pacific islands, with the exception, perhaps, of the New Zealanders or Maoris. 'The aquiline nose is commonly seen among them, and there are many varieties both of hair and complexion. Their face is generally oval,

with largish ears and wide nostrils. In the islands nearest to the equator the skin is said to be the fairest, and it is darker in the coral islands than in the volcanic. Their language is said to bear some affinity to the Tagala, and is split up into numerous dialects, all, however, to a great extent mutually intelligible among the several groups.

Religion. — Previous to the introduction of Christianity in Polynesia, in the end of the last and beginning of the present century, the Polynesians were involved in gross heathen darkness and superstition. Their objects of worship were of three kinds— their deified ancestors, their idols, and their *Etu*. Their ancestors were converted into divinities on account of the benefits which they had conferred upon mankind. Thus one of their progenitors was believed to have created the sun, moon, and stars.

“Another tradition,” says Mr. Williams, in his *Narrative of Missionary Enterprises in the South Sea Islands*, “stated that the heavens were originally so close to the earth that men could not walk, but were compelled to crawl. This was a serious evil; but at length an individual conceived the sublime idea of elevating the heavens to a more convenient height. For this purpose he put forth his utmost energy; and, by the first effort, raised them to the top of a tender plant, called *teve*, about four feet high. There he deposited them until he was refreshed: when, by a second effort, he lifted them to the height of a tree called *kauariki*, which is as large as the sycamore. By the third attempt he carried them to the summits of the mountains; and, after a long interval of repose, and by a most prodigious effort, he elevated them to their present situation. This vast undertaking, however, was greatly facilitated by myriads of dragonflies, which with their wings severed the cords that confined the heavens to the earth. Now this individual was deified; and up to the moment that Christianity was embraced, the deluded inhabitants worshipped him as ‘the elevator of the heavens.’ The Polynesians had various other gods who were deified men. The chief of these deities, to whom mothers dedicated their children, were *Hiro*, the god of thieves, and *Oro*, the god of war. The idols worshipped were different in almost every island and district. Besides the numerous objects of adoration, the islanders generally, and the Samoans in particular, had a vague idea of a Supreme Being, to whom they gave the name of Tangaroa. The mode in which these gods were adored is thus described by Mr. Williams: “The worship presented to these deities consisted in prayers, incantations, and offerings of pigs, fish, vegetable food, native cloth, canoes, and other valuable property. To these must be

added human sacrifices, which, at some of the islands, were fearfully common. An idea may be formed of their addresses to the gods from the sentence with which they invariably concluded. Having presented the gift, the priest would say, 'Now, if you are a god of mercy, come this way, and be propitious to this offering; but if you are a god of anger, go outside the world, you shall neither have temples, offerings, nor worshippers here.' The infliction of injuries upon themselves was another mode in which they worshipped their gods. It was a frequent practice with the Sandwich Islanders, in performing some of their rites, to knock out their front teeth, and the Friendly Islanders to cut off one or two of the bones of their little fingers. This, indeed, was so common that scarce an adult could be found who had not in this way mutilated his hands. On one occasion, the daughter of a chief, a fine young woman about eighteen years of age, was standing by my side, and as I saw by the state of the wound that she had recently performed the ceremony, I took her hand, and asked her why she had cut off her finger. Her affecting reply was that her mother was ill, and that, fearful lest her mother should die, she had done this to induce the gods to save her. 'Well,' said I, 'how did you do it?' 'Oh,' she replied, 'I took a sharp shell, and worked it about till the joint was separated, and then I allowed the blood to stream from it. This was my offering to persuade the gods to restore my mother.' When, at a future period, another offering is required, they sever the second joint of the same finger; and when a third or fourth is demanded, they amputate the same bones of the other little finger; and when they have no more joints which they can conveniently spare, they rub the stumps of their mutilated fingers with rough stones, until the blood again streams from the wound. Thus 'are their sorrows multiplied who hasten after other gods.'"

The most affecting of the religious observances of the Polynesians was the sacrifice of human victims. This horrid custom did not prevail at the Navigator Islands; but it was carried to a fearful extent at the Harvey group, and still more at the Tahitian and Society Islands. At one ceremony, called the Feast of Restoration, no fewer than seven human beings were offered in sacrifice. On the eve of war, also, it was customary to offer human victims. It may be interesting to notice the circumstances in which the last sacrifice of this kind was offered at Tahiti. "Pomare was about to fight a battle, which would confirm him in. or deprive him of, his dominions. 'To propitiate the gods, therefore, by the most valuable offerings he could command, was with him an object of the highest

concern. For this purpose rolls of native cloth, pigs, fish, and immense quantities of other food were presented at the maraes; but still a *tabut*, or sacrifice, was demanded. Pomare, therefore, sent two of his messengers to the house of the victim whom he had marked for the occasion. On reaching the place, they inquired of the wife where her husband was. She replied that he was in such a place, planting bananas. ‘Well,’ they continued, ‘we are thirsty; give us some cocoa-nut water.’ She told them that she had no nuts in the house, but that they were at liberty to climb the trees, and take as many as they desired. They then requested her to lend them the *o*, which is a piece of ironwood, about four feet long and an inch and a half in diameter, with which the natives open the cocoanut. She cheerfully complied with their wishes, little imagining that she was giving them the instrument which, in a few moments, was to inflict a fatal blow upon the head of her husband. Upon receiving the *o*, the men left the house, and went in search of their victim; and the woman, having become rather suspicious, followed them shortly after, and reached the place just in time to see the blow inflicted and her husband fall. She rushed forward to give vent to her agonized feelings and take a last embrace; but she was immediately seized and bound hand and foot, while the body of her murdered husband was placed in a long basket made of cocoa-nut leaves and borne from her sight. It appears that they were always exceedingly careful to prevent the wife or daughter, or any female relative, from touching the corpse, for so polluted were females considered that a victim would have been desecrated by a woman’s touch or breath to such a degree as to have rendered it unfit for an offering to the gods. While the men were carrying their victim to the marae, he recovered from the stunning effect of the blow, and, bound as he was in the coconut leaf basket, he said to his murderers, ‘Friends, I know what you intend to do with me: you are about to kill me, and offer me as a *taba* to your savage gods; and I also know that it is useless for me to beg for mercy, for you will not spare my life. You may kill my body, but you cannot hurt my soul; for I have begun to pray to Jesus, the knowledge of whom the missionaries have brought to our island: you may kill my body, but you cannot hurt my soul.’ Instead of being moved to compassion by his affecting address, they laid him down upon the ground, placed a stone under his head, and with another beat it to pieces. In this state they carried him to their ‘savage gods.’” This was the last sacrifice offered to the gods of Tahiti; for soon after Christianity was embraced, and the altars of their gods ceased to be stained with human blood.

The Polynesians, in their heathen state, had very peculiar opinions on the subject of a future world. The Tahitians believed that there were two places for departed spirits. Among the Rarotongans paradise was a very long house encircled with beautiful shrubs and flowers, which never lost their bloom or fragrance. The inmates, enjoying perpetual youth and beauty, spent their days in dancing, festivity, and merriment. The hell of the Rarotongans consisted in being compelled to crawl around this house, witnessing the enjoyment of its inmates without the possibility of sharing it. The terms on which any one could find an entrance into paradise, as Mr. Williams informs us, were these: "In order to secure the admission of a departed spirit to future joys, the corpse was dressed in the best attire the relatives could provide, the head was wreathed with flowers, and other decorations were added. A pig was then baked whole, and placed upon the body of the deceased, surrounded by a pile of vegetable food. After this, supposing the departed person to have been a son, the father would thus address the corpse: 'My son, when you were alive I treated you with kindness, and when you were taken ill I did my best to restore you to health; and now you are dead, there's your *nomae o*, or property of admission. Go, my son, and with that gain an entrance into the palace of Tiki' (the name of the god of this paradise), 'and do not come to this world again to disturb and alarm us.' The whole would then be buried; and if they received no intimation to the contrary within a few days of the interment, the relatives believed that the pig and the other food had obtained for him the desired admittance. If, however, a cricket was heard on the premises it was considered an ill omen, and they would immediately utter the most dismal howlings, and such expressions as the following: 'Oh, our brother! his spirit has not entered the paradise; he is suffering from hunger-he is shivering with cold!' Forthwith the grave would be opened and the offering repeated. This was generally successful."

The Maori of New Zealand form a branch of the Polynesian family, and as they seem to have been preserved uncontaminated by intercourse with other nations, we may discover in their superstitions some of the primitive notions of the great mass of the islanders of the Pacific Ocean. They regarded the origin of all things as Night and Nothingness, and even the older gods themselves were supposed to have sprung from Night. Another series of divinities are gods of light, and occupy the highest and most glorious of the ten heavens. The *Etu* of the other districts of Polynesia was called *Atua* in the language of New Zealand, and instead of being

worshipped like the *Etu*, was simply regarded as a powerful adversary, skilled in supernatural arts, and rendered proof against all ordinary worship. Hence arose the charms and incantations which form the chief element in Maori worship. The souls of their departed ancestors were ranked among the *Atuas*. An institution, which is common to the Maori and to all the Polynesian tribes. is the *Taboo*, which is applied both to sacred things and persons. Among the Maori, the head-chief being sacred almost to divinity, his house, his garments, and all that belonged to him was *Taboo*, his spiritual essence having been supposed to be communicated to everything that he touched. The religion of the Sandwich Islanders, before they embraced Christianity, was almost entirely a *Taboo* system—that is, a system of religious prohibitions, which had extended itself very widely, and been used by their priests and kings to enlarge their own power and influence. Temples or maraes existed in the South Sea Islands, but neither temples nor altars existed in New Zealand, nor in the Samoas nor Navigators Islands. The form of superstition most prevalent at the Samoas was the worship of the *Etu*, which consisted of some bird, fish, or reptile, in which they supposed that a spirit resided. Religious ceremonies were connected with almost every event of their lives. They presented their first-fruits to their gods, and at the close of the year observed a festival as an expression of thanksgiving to the gods for the mercies of the past year.

Paganism is becoming rapidly extirpated through the efforts of the missionaries, principally English and American, as in the Samoan, Sandwich, and Society groups, where but few absolute pagans now remain. Under date of December, 1876, a correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* writes: “Heathenism is mainly confined to the islands in the western part of the Pacific. The missionary societies, whose efforts have been so greatly blessed in other parts of Polynesia, are combining their labors upon this western section. The London Missionary Society has undertaken the work on New Guinea and the islands at its eastern end. The Melanesian Mission will extend its labors to the Banks and Solomon Islands. The Presbyterians will enlarge their work on the New Hebrides. The Wesleyans have included New Britain and New Ireland in their field. The American Board, in connection with the Hawaiian churches, is enlarging its operations in Micronesia. The history of the Polynesian missions warrants us in expecting large results from this concentration of Christian influence upon numerous island groups, some of which have as yet been only partially explored.” The superstition of the taboo, the use of

kawa as an intoxicating drink, cannibalism, infanticide, tattooing, and circumcision are now fast disappearing under the influence of Christianity. Unfortunately, however, the contact of these islanders with civilization has not been always productive of unmixed good; the introduction among them of the use of ardent spirits, and of the vices and diseases of Europeans, having thinned the population to a lamentable extent. Further particulars with respect to the natives of Polynesia will be found in some of our articles on the groups regarded as being the most important. See Littell's *Living Age*, 1854 (No. 513), art. 3; *The Lond. Rev.* 1854, pt. 2, p. 43 sq.; *Edinb. Rev.* July, 1876, art. 9; *Miss. World*, No. 630. p. 167 sq.; No. 458; *Lond. Acad.* July 15, 1876, p. 52 sq.; Gardner, *Dict. of Relig. Faiths*, s.v.; Lubbock, *Orig. of Civilization* (see Index).

Polyphemus

in the Homeric mythology, the son of Poseidon and the nymph Thoosa, the most celebrated of the fabulous Cyclopes who inhabited the island of Sicily. He was of immense size, and had only one eye. When Ulysses landed on that island he entered the cave of Polyphemus with twelve companions, of which number this tremendous cannibal ate six. The others stood expecting the same fate, but their cunning leader made Polyphemus drunk, then burned out his single eye with a blazing torch, and so escaped, leaving the blinded monster to grope about in the darkness.

Polystaurion

(*many crossed*), a name given to the cloak of the Greek patriarchs, on account of the many crosses which ornament it.

Polytheism

a general name for those systems of religion which involve a belief in more deities than one.

I. Name. — Neither this word nor the similar ones, *atheism*, *monotheism*, *theism*, are to be found in the ordinary Greek or Latin dictionaries. Philo the Jew employs such words as the neuter adjective *πολύθεον* with the article to express the idea; also the forms *πολυθεότης*, and in Philo *ἄθεότης*, occur with the sense now attached to endings in *μος*. Polytheism denotes the belief that there is a plurality of gods, and for the sake of convenience may include dualism, which, however, can be used also to

signify the doctrine of two *principles* that are not necessarily both *divine*. If it be asked what is intended by *gods*, we answer:

(1.) That in the word polytheism the notion of gods does not include absolute attributes or creative efficiency, owing to the fact that the human mind cannot readily admit the idea of more than one such being. While, then, monotheism generally means the doctrine of one absolute infinite being, polytheism is not its exact opposite, except in putting many for one, since the attributes of the many are conceived of as inferior to those of the one. This is an accommodation to the state of facts; but in philosophical writing monotheism may itself be divided into absolute and relative, as Schelling has done, with whom the latter denotes the worship of one being, thought of not as infinite, but as limited in his nature. Atheism, again, denies the real existence of any kind of gods; it is alike opposed to polytheism and to monotheism. The idea of God, the infinite one, is not transferable to gods many, and hence there is a necessary vagueness in the heathen conception of their deities, as it respects power, knowledge, duration, especially *a parte ante*, and other properties. The question, then, arises as to gradations of gods, and as to the difference between them and demigods, heroes, etc. The Greek worshipped these latter; and they had in their mythologies (*apotheoses* such as that of Hercules, the son of Zeus by a mortal mother. Hence worship is not a criterion of godship. But although the line cannot be drawn accurately between gods and superhuman beings who stood below gods but above men, and had some local agency in human affairs, it may be said that great but not infinite power and knowledge, ability to answer prayer, special functions and agencies in providence, with immortality, entered generally into the conception or definition of a god or divine being. Polytheism is used synonymously with heathenism and paganism, only that the two latter are wider terms, denoting not a mere religious system, but including also the state of things connected with such a system. Paganism comes from the Latin word *pagus*, a country district, a canton, the adjective from which, *pagtanus*, denoted *pertaining* to such a *peagus*, then *not a soldier*, then *boorish* or unlearned, and finally, among the Christian writers, one not a *Christian* or *Jew*, from the fact, apparently, that Christianity came last into the rural districts. In Augustine's time this sense, though already it may not have been uncommon, was new enough for him to say, "The worshippers of gods false and many we call *pagans*." Heathenism, from *heathen*, is generally taken, as being a derivation from *heath*, to have meant a dweller

in lonely or remote uncultivated parts of a district, and may have been a translation of *pagan* into the northern languages of the Germanic stock. From *gentes*, finally, as a Latin equivalent of the Hebrew word $\mu\gamma/\zeta$, denoting in the Old Testament the other *nations* who were polytheists, as opposed to the Jews, and from $\epsilon\theta\nu\eta$, with the same sense as used in the Septuagint, are derived *gentilism* and the *ethnic* religions. An interesting inquiry is whether the lower races of the heathen world can properly be called polytheists, or whether their spirit-worship is not so unlike the worship of gods among the higher pagan races as to require the putting of them into another class. A full answer to this question can only be given at a later stage of our way, and it is embarrassed by traces of the worship of one or more gods, strictly so called, which appear in the religions of this part of mankind. We shall adopt the plan of considering them by themselves, only remarking here that if their worship is more vague than that of the more highly endowed or more cultivated races, it is equally divided between a great number of objects. Polytheism is generally found in company with idolatry; but it can be shown that within the Aryan or Indo-European races all the branches were not primeval idolators. It is probable, therefore, that for a long period, in some parts of the world, the worship of divinities by means of visible forms was unknown; while in the dualistic religion of Iran, or the Persian religion, idol-worship was opposed with almost fanatical hostility. Another of the nations belonging to the same race, the Romans, had only symbols at first; their temples were without images for more than 170 years (Varro, in *Augustin. De Civ. Dei*, 4:31); and, according to a tradition, Etrurian artificers made the first for them out of wood or clay.

History. — A very important question, therefore, respecting polytheism relates to its origin. What did mankind first worship? And among heathen objects of worship, which were the earliest? What is the genesis of the gods of the higher races?

1. The first question that here arises is, Was polytheism earlier, in the order of time, or later than monotheism? The answers to this question rest either on historical or philosophical grounds, or on the authority of revelation.

(a) The rudest nations now and the whole world, as far as we can go back, have had some form of polytheism, if we include the worship of spirits in this term. The Jews are the only strictly monotheistic nation of antiquity: and when Abraham left his clan to go westward, they had already begun to

worship other gods (~~(621D)~~ Joshua 24:2). Some traces of the worship of one god appear in the history of Melchisedek and of Balaam. Yet all the nations with whom the Jews came into contact worshipped not only more gods than one, but worshipped them by means of images, with the exception of those addicted to the religion of Zoroaster. Approaches towards monotheism among heathen nations were the results of philosophical reflection, as in Brahminism, where a pantheistic doctrine of the universe prevailed; or in Iranism, where the reforms attributed to Zoroaster show a progress from the earlier Vedic religion, or from something like it. So much the more wonderful is it that the one small people of the Jews clung, amid innumerable temptations to idolatry and defections from their ancestral faith, to an exalted monotheistic idea of the Godhead, which has been the origin of all the monotheism now existing in the world.

(b) Philosophers are divided on the point of the priority of the two religious systems, the belief in one or many gods. Although some deists of a former age regarded monotheism as the earlier of the two, the only consistent ground for those who deny supernatural revelation is that of Mr. Hume. This is, in brief, that the natural progress of human thought is from the less perfect through abstraction to the more perfect; that polytheism was universally diffused, and that monotheism, if earlier could not have been lost. It is needless to say that a great part of the thinking of the present age runs in the same channel. Man was a savage before he became possessed of arts or settled any of the problems of the universe, just as species are evolved out of earlier less finished forms. The many gods were lost out of popular worship, according to Mr. Hume, by adulation, or the zealous attempt of some worshippers to exalt their god above the rest, which is an unfortunate way of accounting for a result that has never been reached, unless it can be shown that an elimination took place in the Jewish system. Opposite to this is Schelling's view in his lectures on mythology, written after he had left his first philosophical position: this was, in brief that monotheism was prior in the order of time, but without any dogmatic definition or distinct view of the divine attributes. At the same time man was awake to all impressions from the material world, in which the great objects seemed to him full of power and life. Here were the beginnings of a worship of nature, which at length drew a part of men away from the worship of the God above nature. This defection made those who resisted it aware, as they were not before, of the vastness, the absoluteness of the one God. Thus the human mind, in the case of those who adhered to the

primeval worship, was enlarged in its religious conceptions: it may even be regarded as a part of the scheme of Providence that the apostasy of some helped the infantile race to take grander views of the Supreme Being.

(c) The account given in the Scriptures is that God revealed himself to mankind at the creation, but, as man fell away from God, he did not like to retain him in his knowledge, and that the teachings of the world itself concerning him were rejected (⁶⁰¹⁹Romans 1:19-20). He therefore devised a religion and an idolatry of his own, which were consistent with foul wickedness. As the world became darker in its apprehensions of God, God began a new revelation of himself to Abraham, when primeval monotheism was in danger of utterly fading out of human belief. If now we may suppose that polytheism arose when men were but children in art, and had no science, those who went farthest from the central points of the primeval world would easily fall into barbarism, and their religions might show the influences of their new and less favorable situations.

(d) Have any traces remained in the world of this primeval monotheism? A number of Christian writers have given an affirmative answer, but they put their reasons for their opinions on diverse grounds. *First*, we may notice such writers as Cudworth, who in an uncritical way collect together the expressions of writers of every age, and give as much weight to later philosophers as to earlier authors. There is no doubt that philosophers like Plato reached a first principle of the world, or that, before him. Anaxagoras conceived of *mind* putting already existent matter into appropriate forms. But their voice is not that of popular religion. *Next to these* we may rank those writers who have noticed a subordination among the objects of worship. The supreme god of Greece is a monarch, father of gods and men with very great powers, the head of moral order, the chief agent in providence. Some of the poets speak of him in terms truly sublime. There are passages in the *Suppliants* of AEschylus and in the *Antigone* of Sophocles, which breathe the spirit of the Scriptures. But all that can be fairly drawn from such evidence is what Naegelsbach draws from it in his *Posthomerick Theology*-that there was in the best age of Grecian authors a certain monotheistic tendency which had no decisive control over Greek faith. "This tendency," to use his words, "was an almost unconscious, a *naive* one, an obscure impulse, a light that shineth in darkness, but the darkness comprehendeth it not." "The religious consciousness, on the one hand, so to speak, reduced the world of gods to Zeus but on the other could not shake off the plurality of divine forms which nature first

furnished to it." If there was any monotheism in the Greek religion it had its representative in Zeus. But what kind of a representative was he? He was not eternal, but born; he was not a creator, for the Greek theology never embraced a creation. He was not all-powerful, but was generally represented as controlled by fate. He had in the popular faith and mythology attributes most unlike those of a divine being. He was, in short, a monarch surrounded by gods of his own kindred, and very far from the conception of a holy or an absolute being. How could a holy and absolute being become so completely changed in the faith of a nation as to lose not only his absolute character, but also what ought naturally to be fixed in the minds of men— his purity and holiness? We can conceive of men changing their gods, passing from one to many, or from many to one, but we cannot conceive of one and the same god as undergoing such utter transmutations. Still further it has been urged, with justice, that monotheism and polytheism rest on different bases. The first separates divinity from nature; the second identifies it with nature, and incorporates it in natural objects. The two are entirely different: how can the one slide into or retain characteristics of the other? This argument, however, does not derive its force from the oneness or manifoldness of the objects of worship, but from their essential relations to the world, so that a passing over from the worship of one not absolute god to that of more than one, also not absolute, is far from being incredible. Hence, if we could accept Schelling's view of the character of original monotheism, we could admit of addition to or subtraction from the number of divinities. Nor can we maintain that traces of a primitive monotheism are certainly preserved in the religions of the other nations of antiquity. The earliest records of the Aryan race, as they appear in the Vedas, give us no indication that one god was of a higher class than the rest. Indra, as Prof. Whitney (*Orient. and Ling. Studies*, p. 36) remarks, "stands at the head of the Vedic divinities. By this is not meant, however, that he is king among them, endowed with an authority over the rest: no such reduction to system of the religion had taken place as should establish a relation of this kind among its gods. They are as independent, each in his own domain, as the natural phenomena of which they are the personifications." And the further remark is made that the nature of Varuna's attributes and of his concerns with the affairs of human life place him decidedly above Indra. Further, in the later stages of the Indian religions, a deity, comparatively subordinate, Vishnu, has reached a chief place, while the old gods have fallen more or less out of worship. The Iranian or Persian religion contains very exalted conceptions

of its supreme divinity, Ormazd, or Ahura Mazda, i.e. the wise lord — called also Spentomains, or the holy-thinking one—the holy spirit, according to Spiegel, while Haug explains this name as denoting the white spirit. He is also a creator; and in many respects this religion stands very far above all others of the same race. But if Ormazd is a creator, Ahriman (or Angramainyus), the bad spirit, is a creator also; and while there is an evident effort of philosophical reflection to elevate Ormazd, who perhaps represents Varuna, above the other mythological beings of the older faith — such, for instance, as Mithra— the religion has not succeeded in attaining to the position of a pure monotheism, but is a dualism with decided remains of polytheism. Once more the supreme divinity of the Greeks and Romans, Zeus or Jupiter, i.e. Diou-pater, is now thought by the best etymologists to answer to Dyaus-pitâ, a mythological conception of the Vedas, who is spoken of as the father of Indra, but who either dropped out of or never fully entered into the Vedic religious system. If he dropped out, we find him retained by other portions of the Indo-European race; if he had not entered into it, we find other members of the same family bringing forward this personality as their chief god. While the Greek and Italic branches did this, we find in Scandinavian mythology a god Tyr, answering, as Jacob Grimm (*Deutsche Mythol.* ch. 9) shows, to Ziu or Zio, with a genitive Ziuwas or Ziewes, in Old High-German, and thus standing for the same being as Zeus or Jupiter. How can we believe that the representative of monotheism was thus raised or depressed, that he took the place of another displaced supreme god, or himself gave way to Odin (Wuotan)? The true explanation is that the head of the gods, differing in rank but not in nature from the rest, rose and fell in his station, or even dropped out of worship altogether, owing to changes within a nation or race which we cannot now explain. This is only one of the many changes through which polytheism passed. It never had any stability or permanent condition. We only add that if Zeus can be explained, as etymology points out, to be the personification of the bright sky or daylight, this again must prevent us from regarding such a divinity as handing down the monotheistic idea, because this was only one of the most prominent of visible objects. The same remarks in general may be made in respect to the religions of all cultivated races— the Assyrian and Babylonian, the Egyptian and the Mexican religions, for instance. We do not deny that individual reflection may have risen above the level of the religions themselves, or that philosophical doctrine may have sought to mix itself with the prevailing mythologies, but that the polytheistic religions,

including their highest divinities, did not hand down a distorted monotheism, but stood on essentially another foundation.

(e) Can the actual monotheistic religions be explained on the hypothesis of elimination? This would mean that all the gods except one faded out of the religious system of a nation, or of certain nations. It is a matter of fact that there has been but one such nation. All the monotheism in the world came from Judaism into Christianity and Mohammedanism. Can the worship of one god in Judaism be accounted for on the hypothesis just spoken of, that there was a time when several gods divided the allegiance of the nation among them, and that one, by the adulation, as Mr. Hume calls it, or the superior zeal of his worshippers, crowded out the others from the minds of the people. Historically there is very small ground for such a hypothesis. The descendants of Jacob had such a hankering after polytheism and idolatry that their whole history is a succession of apostasies; new objects of worship were adopted continually, notwithstanding the efforts of prophets to inculcate what all regard as a vastly more exalted religion. The tradition carried back the worship of Jehovah-not perhaps under that name, but as the Almighty God, the maker of heaven and earth-to Abraham and to his progenitors, nay, to the very beginning; and the very idea of Judaism, that which has given to the race its historic importance, is its separation, as the people of Jehovah, from all the rest of the world. "Thou shalt have no gods before me," "Thou shalt not make any graven image," are the two "articuli stantis vel cadentis Judaismi." Without entering into this subject at length, we will only add that no hypothesis of the rise of Judaism can stand which derives it from a previous polytheism. It must have come from philosophical reflection, or from primeval tradition, or from revelation. Its unique character shows that it is no work of man, and its place in the education of the human race shows that it had an important place in the scheme of Providence (comp. O. Pfleiderer, *Das Wesen der Religion*, 1, 11).

2. Among the objects worshipped by polytheists, which were the earliest? However we may answer this question, it ought to be laid down, before we attempt an answer, that the objects of worship must have been thought of as having personal qualities and relations to man. Worship, the recognition of a divine superintending power, did not begin, could not begin, in the adoration of dead matter; of a sun invested with material qualities, for instance, then personified, and finally converted into a person with will, feeling, and agency in the world. We must start with attributing to man a

religious sense or sentiment. The world, to the first polytheists, was full of divine power and agency; they did not create to themselves the divine life in nature, quickening it into life by a personifying imagination, but it was there for them to recognize; they felt their dependence upon it; it surrounded them on every side. But it was broken up to their minds into the many great objects on which they depended; it met them everywhere, and they worshipped this divine power and will in its parts as the source of benefits. With this premised, we may say that the heavenly bodies, the phenomena of day and of light, the earth itself, the sea, the sky or heaven, were among the primeval objects of heathen worship. The sun, for instance, not only as a sun-god, but also, in what was perhaps an earlier form of religion, the visible luminary itself, was among the first divinities of heathenism. The luminary was considered as alive, and possessed of the power of seeing things upon the earth. When Hades snatched away the virgin Proserpine, and carried her to his realms below through a chasm of the earth to be his wife, no one heard her cries for help except Helios, son of Hyperion and Hecate. Zeus, to whom she cried for help, “was sitting apart from the gods in a thronged temple, and receiving choice offerings from mortal men,” so he did not hear her (*Hymn. in Cer.* 25-29). The attributes of Helios in the Greek religion, in which he was by no means a very important deity, are all to be referred to the heavenly body, endowed with perception, and noticing as well as hearing what takes place here below. The people believed that the sun was a living being, and the philosophers had the same faith. Anaximander is said to have ascribed a fiery body and a vital principle to it; and Anaxagoras so offended the Athenians by his doctrine that the sun was a red-hot stone or mass of metal that he was accused of impiety, and, although defended by Pericles, was fined five talents and banished (Plat. *Apol. Socr.* 26 D; Diog. Laert. 2, § 12 sq.). In the same manner the worship of the sun, as distinguished from the sun-gods, appears in the Vedas, although of less importance than these latter; the Greeks attributed the same worship to this luminary among the Persians; and Plato makes Socrates use the following words: “It seems to me that the earliest inhabitants of Greece held those only to be gods-whom many of the barbarians now regard as such-sun, moon, stars, and heaven” (*Cratyl.* 397 C). In the Scriptures the worship of the heavenly bodies is spoken of as an apostasy from God to which Israel would be tempted: “Take ye good heed to yourselves... lest thou lift up thine eyes unto heaven, and when thou seest the sun, and the moon, and the stars, even all the host of heaven, shouldest be driven to worship them, and serve them”

(~~FROM~~ Deuteronomy 4:15-19). And in fact they were *driven* into this kind of worship at as late an age of their history as the reign of Josiah, who put down “them that burned incense to the sun, and to the moon, and to the planets, and to all the host of heaven.” We hardly need to refer to the prevalence of such worship, especially of the planets, in Babylonia and Assyria, nor to the fact that sun-worship was the foundation probably of the honors paid to Baal and Moloch among the Ammonites, in Canaan and in Carthage, nor to the importance of this element in the Egyptian religion. We only add that the religion of Peru— that is, the religion of the Incas, which superseded an older religion—was direct sun-worship, and that the same was spread over a large part of this continent, among the tribes even of the Red men in North America. The heathen part of the Dakotas still have their sun-dances, and as late as 1872 one of their practices was to look steadily many minutes at the blazing orb, as an act, it was understood, of religious worship. This is only one of those objects of nature to which were paid divine honors. The earth, as the general nursing mother, the sea, the sky, the life in the air, in trees, even in animals, all seemed to be divine. The Earth particularly —as the Great Mother, the Syrian goddess Cybele, Demeter, Ceres—although exalted into a person separate from the dead earth, as the cause of life to vegetables, and ultimately to man, was worshipped, and in some countries, as in Asia Minor, with the most frantic rites.

3. But polytheism would have been comparatively dead, and possessed of fewer attractions to the religious sentiment of many, if it had stopped short in its development of the divine in nature. The next step was to convert these comparatively fixed objects, exhibiting superhuman agency to the eyes of men, into persons separated from the objects themselves. The sun, regarded as a god, in this process became a sun god; that is, his personality was no longer identified with the sun, and confined to its orb, but he became free to go whithersoever he would, and to exercise supernatural powers away from the sun, his proper seat. This was a very great stage through which the religions of all the higher races passed. The spirit of the sun, possessed of will and feelings like a man’s, but of more than human power, is now free to move abroad, to mingle in human affairs, and thus to transcend his first agency by a very much wider and more varied new one. It is possible for him thus to become mythological; that is, the effects which he produces become events in history. The sun god’s rays to the imagination become darts, and as the rays of the sun in summer cause

malignant fevers, so he is conceived of as shooting his arrows at men and beasts, the cause being some offence or dishonor done to his sacred rites or to his servants. The beginning of the *Iliad* will illustrate what we mean, it being assumed, what is now generally admitted, but what some eminent scholars have denied, that Apollo is indeed a sun-god. This the Greeks of the time of Sophocles and Euripides held, but they held it more as an inference than from any traditional opinion. But, furthermore, the sun god might become the especial object of worship of a city or a tribe— their tutelary god; and thus he acquired a new character, and stood in new relations to a part of a people. From them his worship might spread over the whole of a tribe or of a race, and his old original nature would be almost lost out of sight; he would have outgrown, so to speak, his youthful properties. In this way it could happen that a war-god could be developed out of the divinity of a nation of warriors, although his attributes at first might have had no relation to armed strife. Thus the Roman god Mars was the divinity of an agricultural people, it seems probable, a god of spring and of fructification, before he became a god of war. Apollo also, if a god of the sun and of light at first, had from this source naturally the attributes of a destroyer and of a healer (the latter attribute being shown in the names Apollo and Paeon, the *avertes* and *healer*), of a pure one and a purifier; to which were added his connection with music and poetry, as well as his prophetic office of giving forth oracles as a mediator between Zeus and mortals. The relations of Apollo to social life in its various departments, and his connection with Delphi, where the religion of Greece found its center, made him the most important of all the Greek divinities, Zeus only accepted. His attributes may possibly all be evolved from the original conception of him as a nature-god; but it is hard to see how this can be done.

We have reached the point where we can state in brief several laws, as they may be called, of polytheism, which might be illustrated by an infinite number of facts, but will, we trust, commend themselves to our readers, after what has been said, without much explanation.

- (1.) To a great extent, polytheism at its foundation is the worship of nature, i.e. of objects in nature which strike the attention of man, and are important aids to his well-being in the world.
- (2.) These objects are conceived of as living existences, and as having, together with superhuman power, the feelings and the will of men.

(3.) In the course of time, the living thing or god in the natural object becomes detached from it, is conceived of as an agent in human affairs, and may greatly enlarge its sphere of operations.

(4.) This process changes the attributes and functions of the divinities. In this way, or by the mythological processes, the religions of heathenism may for some time be in a constant flux, and this will last as long as faith in the gods and the mythological spirit lasts.

(5.) Among the changes may be mentioned the following:

(a) the god of a clan or district becomes the god of a race;

(b) foreign gods are introduced;

(c) the same divinity, through the help of a new name, becomes a new personality by the side perhaps of the old one;

(d) old divinities drop out of worship;

(e) the relative importance of different gods may change;

(f) what is called *theocrasia*, that is, a confusion of gods, takes place, but generally this is due to philosophical reflection: this is sometimes a pantheistic process, and in the later stages of Greek history it is carried so far that all the leading gods are considered to be forms or expressions for one and the same potency;

(g) in the most cultivated nations of heathenism there came on a time when the mythology was rejected as being immoral, or was explained on various principles so as to bring it within the limits of the natural; and the religion, under the attacks of a skepticism produced by moral feeling or philosophical doctrine, lost its hold on the national mind. This would naturally destroy the life of the nation, unless some new religion should take its place.

To illustrate the changes through which the heathen religions can pass, we refer, first, to Hinduism, which appears in the Vedas as a simple worship of the gods of light, fire, etc.; then passes into Brahminism, — where Vishnu, an inferior god of the Vedas, and Siva, perhaps the same as the storm-god Rudra of the Vedas, take the principal place, and divide in their ramified mythologies the worship of the nation between their respective religions. A second instance is presented by the religion of Rome, which in its early

stage *tias* a punctilious, superstitious veneration of certain divinities, somewhat allied to those of Greece, together with other vague, shadowy powers, and in its second stage adopted many of the gods and much of the mythology of Greece, so as to throw its own indigenou religion into the shade. Then, in its third stage, Rome almost entirely lost its old religion, and was a common harbor for all Oriental superstitions—the worship of Cybele and Isis and Mithras, and the Virgo Coelestis from Carthage, and the Moloch-Jupiters of Syria. A third instance, with less clear outlines, is presented by Mexico, the religion of which seems to be a composite made up of parts from the religion of the Mayas, from that of the Toltecs, from that of the Aztec conquerors, and of a residuum perhaps from other quarters.

(6.) From this exposition it would seem safe to affirm that few religions preserve anything more than the spirit of their original form. They continue to be religions of nature, that is, of divine power as it appears in the diversified objects of nature. Hence the philosophy which arises in heathen countries will be apt to be pantheistic, to confound God and nature.

Polytheism, in any true view of it, must be considered in its relations to mythology; but we must speak on this branch of our subject with the greatest possible brevity, as we have already considered mythology by itself. Mythology takes up the raw material, so to speak, furnished by heathen theology, and converts it into history, mingling with it much of poetic invention, but all in good faith; for there can be no doubt that the earliest successors of the mythological age believed in their religion in this shape, as presented to them by the imaginations of a prior age unconsciously coloring what they received for true. Mythology starts with attributing to its divinities human form and feelings (anthropomorphism and anthropopathism); and, of course, from these premises infers in regard to events of life certain specific feelings on the part of the gods, resentful or kindly, out of which the events grew. It attributes sex to the gods on natural principles, for in every language the gender of different objects in nature differs. Not always is the sun masculine nor the moon feminine, but all things are alive, and, according to the especial mode of thinking in each nation, are male or female. Causation, again, is conceived of under the image of procreation; and where the gods were thought of as coming into being, they themselves were begotten by parents, until the mind landed in a first cause, which was blind and impersonal. Thus theogonies arose, such as we find in Greece, Phoenicia, Scandinavia, and even among the passive

races of this continent. *SEE MYTHOLOGY*. A room was thus opened for the impure imagination, which, not content with imputing to the gods love and lust towards each other, without regard to the laws of kindred or wedlock, represented them as enamored of men or women also, and as thus the progenitors of extraordinary persons, demigods or heroes. From this conception the way was easy towards attributing to extraordinary persons some divine sire or mother, and of allying them to the celestials. And as thus the gods were only a little higher than mortals, the distance was bridged over, so that demigods were both mortal and divine. Hence it became easier to fall down into the worship of men of great power or skill, until in the old age of some of the religions we find kings receiving divine honors even in their lifetime, and deified after their death. This vagueness of the line between the divine and the human reacted on religious theory, so that a doctrine like that of Euemerus had easy currency when the divine had sunk so low—the doctrine, namely, that all the gods were originally dead men, and were deified on account of great achievements and services to mankind.

This is only one theory of mythology, which, indeed, is a wilderness where one is in danger of getting lost, and, if one would attempt explanations, must do so with caution. There are many forms of explanation. There is the physical, where phenomena of nature are turned into events, and here the difficulty, not easily solved, meets us of explaining how an event of nature which happens every day is represented in mythology as a unique occurrence in history. There is, again, historical mythology, that in which some fact is the basis, and the drapery is mythological invention. But in adding this drapery, and in other such inventions, the poets did not feel that they were chargeable with fraud, any more than Milton blamed himself for uniting his own poetical threads with the woof of Scripture truth. There was also a mythology breathing an allegorical spirit, and dictated perhaps by the desire to teach moral truth in the form which religious truth assumed. This was more consciously fictitious. Theological mythology, again, concerned itself chiefly with the births and life of the gods before they came into the religious system. We have in Greek a working up of this that goes under the name of Hesiod, and may belong to the 8th century B.C.; and the fragments of another also ascribed to a primeval poet, Orpheus, but later by one or two centuries than that of Hesiod. A comparison of these seems to show that the theological poets were free in changing the myths which they had to deal with, either inventing in part, or

drawing their materials from earlier poems where a different religious philosophy was exhibited. The mythology of Greece was fully grown in the age of Homer; it is not true that he and Hesiod created it, but rather they and others like them gathered it, and gave it a form of greater beauty. Nor is it true, as we think, that a priestly class gave the first form to mythology. More true is it to say that a nation did this, and an age—a very long age, perhaps. We are not to conceive of a body of philosophers teaching in figures, the shadows of things real, those realities that lay in sunshine before their own minds; on the contrary, the mythological spirit was spread over all; it was the way in which all conceived of things supernatural.

A word or two may not be inappropriate here in regard to objects of worship that may be called secondary, that is, such as do not attain to the rank of principal divinities, or even of divinities at all, but still played a not unimportant part in some heathen religions. Among these we name,

(1) the representatives or personifications of the life in the inferior objects of nature, like those which went by the title of nymphs in the Greek mythology, as the nymphs of the wood, of fountains, of the sea-beings having a narrow range of habitation and of attributes. Some of these spirits inhabited the object or element after which they were called, but were thought of as more or less able to disengage themselves from it. Thus the sea-nymphs wandered over the coasts, the wood or mountain nymphs over the mountain. Some of them, being personifications of the life of perishable objects as the hamadryads—were supposed to die when the tree, their substratum, died.

(2) The spirits of the departed. Such were the heroes and demigods of Greece; the spirits of ancestors or of other mortals, who might be causes of good or of harm, might be believed to be present on earth, to be under the ground, and capable of being raised by rites of evocation, or to inhabit the stars, like the Fravashis in the Persian religion. Faith in the continued existence of men after death was very widely diffused over the world, and furnished a support for such arts as necromancy, and an explanation for the phenomena of dreams. Nations in which the family feeling was strong were especially addicted to the veneration of ancestors, as the Chinese and the Romans.

(3) The attendants on other gods, who sometimes were almost deities in the popular mind. Such were the Fauns; Silvanus, among the Romans; Satyrs among the Greeks, the subordinate sea-gods of the latter, etc.

(4) Abstract notions personified, which presuppose the tendency to give full personality to real objects. Examples of these are furnished by the Greek religion, such as Thermis and Dike, personified law and justice; Metis, Mnemosyne, Thanatos, the daemons of battle; and a great number in the theology of Hesiod. The Roman religion is full of vague, misty shapes floating between reality and abstraction, such as Pavor and Pallor, to whom in a battle the third king of Rome vowed to erect shrines; Honor and Virtus, Pax and Victoria, to the two last of whom important temples were built in the later days of Roman history.

(5) The personified forces of inanimate nature. Here, as in the case of the abstractions just now mentioned, the cause or force was conceived of as an agent. Thus the winds, especially Boreas, were more or less worshipped in Greece; and the same is true of volcanic or other subterranean phenomena. In India, and even among our Red men, a similar kind of nature-worship prevailed; in some of the North American Indian tribes the north-west wind attained to a high rank among the divinities, was confounded even with the Great Spirit, and played quite an important role in the mythologies.

(6) Evil, that is malevolent, spirits, had a place in some religions of the more cultivated races, but in general not a very important place, nor were they worshipped except by way of propitiation. Such were the *rakshas* of India, the *daevas* of Iran, the god *Typhon* of Egypt, the *larvae* and *lemures* of Roman superstition—the former of whom were bad spirits of departed men, and scarcely to be distinguished from the latter, to whom the propitiatory rites of the Lemuria on the ninth of May were offered.

(7) Finally we mention certain house-spirits, who may be included under (3) as the attendants of family gods, such as the Roman Vesta. Such were the *penatos*, the spirits presiding over the *penus* or the family stores and inner part of the houses of the Romans; and the *lares*, protectors of the house, the cross-road, etc. Such, too, may have been the *traphim* of Scripture, or rather the beings represented by the teraphim, a kind of family gods answering somewhat to the protecting saints of the Roman Catholic Church.

We have come in the course of our subject to the religions of the uncultivated races, a department of the religions of mankind, where it is difficult to solve all the problems or to get upon entirely satisfactory ground. These religions have been divided, as by Wuttke (*Gesch. d. Heidenth.* vol. 1.), into *Jetichism* and *shamanisin*; but as authors differ

greatly in the meaning which they attach to the first of these words, and as what is called *shamanism* may be found everywhere, we cannot make much headway in our subject by the help of these words. We shall come upon fetichism again when we speak of worship; at present we content ourselves with saying that a fetich, as first used by Des Brosses in his *Essai sur le Culte des Dieux Fetiches* (1760), signified any object, however worthless, in which a god or spirit was supposed for the time to reside, and which might be used as a preservative against evil or malignant influences. The word-in the Portuguese form *feitico*, connected with the Italian *fattizio*, made by art, from the Latin *facticius* -denoted a charm, or object employed as a charm; and it was used to set forth a striking characteristic of the religions of Western Africa with which the Portuguese at an early day came into contact. Wuttke (*u. s.*), after Stuhr, in his *Religious Systems of the Heathen Peoples of the East* (Berlin, 1836, p. 257), regards a *fetich* as an outward object of worship, selected at will or by accident. The fetich-worshipper chooses and discards, according to a freak, the object in which his divinity is supposed to lodge. To use Wuttke's language, while in sun or star worship the heavenly body says to the man, "I am thy god," the worshipper of a fetich says to the worshipped object, "thou mayest be, I will permit thee to be, my god" (*u. .* vol. 1, § 36). Others, as Meiners (*Allg. Geschichte d. Religion* [Hanover, 1806], vol. 1, Ik. 2) and J.G. Müller (*Amer. Urrelig.* p. 74, 75), regard the fetich as in the belief of the worshipper a divine essence; not a symbol of divinity, but, like the sun or moon, a god. The fetich-worshipper carries his subdivision of nature, which is divine to the rude heathen, further down than the higher races do; he worships many worthless objects. These definitions are not satisfactory to us, nor do they point out any generic difference between the fetich-worshipper and the worshipper of an image of Athene Polius by a principal artist of Greece. For

- (1) if the fetich were a precious thing in itself, doubtless the Negro would be constant in the respect he paid it. The selection and rejection need to be accounted for, but the worthlessness of the object must greatly contribute to the inconstancy of the devotee.
- (2) There are village as well as house fetiches in Africa, and these seem to have a more fixed hold on the religious feeling.
- (3) The use of the fetich as a charm or amulet is not essentially unlike the use of saints' bones for the same purpose, and the feeling is like that of the

cultivated heathen towards his graven image. This feeling is to be accounted for in part by a confusion of the subjective and the objective. The sense of security, caused by the realization of the presence of a protector, is attributed to the object itself.

(4) Some fetiches have the rude beginnings of likeness to men. Here, certainly, there is image-worship in its infancy.

(5) The belief in spirits which-to say the least-very many rude races have, is inconsistent with Muller's view that the fetich-worship is worship of a detached part of nature. The spirit has the fetich for its house, it dwells there, as the Greek god was conceived by the mass of the people to inhabit the statue, and as the pictures of saints in some Catholic lands wink with their eyes because the saint is there in the belief of the superstitious. The fetich is discarded, perhaps, because it ceases to awaken certain religious feelings which it awakened for some reason at first, and so the Negro looks for some other reminder or the spirit's or the divinity's presence.

(6) Some fetiches are living animals, and here the inquiry arises, which we must dismiss for the present, whether these are conceived of as tenanted by higher beings, or as symbols of higher beings. The same answer, as it appears to us, must be given as it regards Egyptian or Indian animal-worship, and as it regards that which prevails in Africa or America.

We conclude, then, that fetich-worship is not essentially distinct from idol-worship, and we may find all the characteristics of it in the religions of the cultivated men. Among the Greeks, as belonging to an early period of their religion before sculpture had made much proficiency, we find such memorials of gods as three-cornered pillars in the temples of the Charites at Cyzicus, conical pillars of Apollo, the pillar of Hera at Argos, and a plank of wood sacred to her at Samos, not to mention the sacred stones called *boetyli*, and the stone of the mother of the gods, transferred from Pessinus to Rome, and there venerated and carried about in processions. These were fetiches, and so were wrought images, as long as the faith continued that the god was present in the outward object. The most characteristic mark of fetich-worship-as it seems to us-was that which struck the eyes of the first travelers in Africa-its connection with charms, and in general the prevalence of witchcraft, and of various magic arts. The religions are religions of fear, in which a small body of men governs the rest by terror, and thus stands in the way of the higher religious ideas. This cannot have been coeval with the religions themselves. It must have taken

some time, perhaps ages, to develop the system of witchcraft or magic art by which so many rude people have been kept down in their degradation, by which, according to the natural course of things, their degradation has been increased.

Shamanism may be defined as the worship of spirits, so called from the Shaman or priest-conjurer of many religions in the northern parts of the world. The spiritual world seems to embrace all things that have life, and in some parts the spirit detaches itself from the tree or other living thing at will, to return there again. This kind of religion has prevailed, or once prevailed, among the Finns, Huns, ancestors of the Magyars, Mongols, Japanese, Chinese, and in Thibet. Something like it is found among the Red men and other aborigines of this western continent.

Some of the Northern Asiatics make a threefold division of spirits: *first*, the souls or powers which have taken a concrete form in physical objects; *secondly*, the spirits of deceased ancestors; *thirdly*, spirits, some of which may have been human souls, which have a wider sphere of action, such as have relations to a whole tribe or as protectors in certain undertakings. These may be kindly or malignant.

Besides these spiritual beings, the Finns believed in a supreme god, Jumala, whose name, as Castren thinks, may have denoted at first place of thunder, heaven, then god of heaven, then god in general. The Lapps of Norway had three classes of spirits—those in the air, those in the heavens, and others above the heavens. Among the last is a higher god, who creates everything through his son—which must be a conception borrowed from the Christians in their neighborhood. Among the Tunguses there are several ranks and spheres of operation in the spirit system; but above them all is a god of heaven, Boa, who knows all things, but does not concern himself with what comes to pass, nor punish the wicked; and, besides him, a spirit of the sun, more powerful than the rest, to whom prayers are offered; a spirit of the moon, from whom dreams come; spirits of the stars, who are protectors of particular men, etc. (Comp. Castren's lectures on Finnish mythology, translated from the Swedish.) In the religions of our continent the Great Spirit has been supposed, without reason, to have corresponded with God, the sun, north-west wind, etc. The spirits are supposed to be capable of detaching themselves from their corporeal frame, and of taking various forms as they see fit.

It is a most interesting inquiry, but one in which it is difficult to reach certainty, whether there are in the uncultivated races remembrances of a primeval monotheistic faith. The difficulty is due to several causes, the first of which is their reserve, often extreme, in communicating with persons higher in the scale of civilization, and their readiness to agree for the moment to what such persons may say. Another circumstance to be considered is the propagation of religious ideas from foreign sources—in Africa on both sides of the continent from the Mohammedanism which has long been making progress, and in this continent from Christianity. The Red men near the whites have forgotten their former human sacrifices and cannibalism, and neglect of parents in extreme old age; and they seem to have imbibed some religious notions from the white men which have modified their religions. We find, also, this to be sometimes confessed by some tribes in Africa that they believe in a being above all, but neglect him because he is too far off, too high to concern himself with their affairs. This may be an excuse for neglect of worship of such a being, or it may be conformed to a real but obscure tradition. We may suppose the supreme god to have been in the primeval religion of their fathers, and to have been thrust out of worship by the spiritual weakness and imbecility of fallen man. In some tribes, again, there appear to be no such faint traces of monotheism. A missionary, who lived over thirty years in Southern Africa, once told the present writer that he never found any such embers of an early religion among those with whom he was conversant. The question is thus one not so easily settled. We close what we have to say of it by a brief citation from the important work of Waltz (*Anthropol. d. Natuvölker*, pt. 2, p. 167). He is speaking of the religion of the Negroes. After denying the justice of imputing to them a peculiar and rude form of polytheism, he adds that the deeper penetration into their religions, to which of late a number of conscientious investigators have attained, leads to the surprising result that a number of Negro tribes, among whom the influence of nations that stand higher in point of culture cannot be pointed out nor scarcely be suspected, have made much greater advances in the development of their religious conceptions than almost all other nations in a state of nature. And this to such a degree that, if we may not call them monotheists, still we may assert of them that they stand on the borders of monotheism; while yet their religion is mingled with a great amount of gross superstition, which in the case of other peoples where it is found seems entirely to cover up with its rank growth the purer religious conceptions.”

II. Observances. — We have considered polytheism thus far on the side of its nature and origin. We proceed next to a brief exposition of its practical side, or its outward worship, including priests, images, altars, and temples, liturgical services, and offerings.

(1.) Throughout paganism it has been felt that the gods must be approached in a certain way, and the knowledge of that way has been in the hands of a certain tribe or class. If there were written records, sacred songs, or formulae, the knowledge of these pertained to this class alone. Moreover, a method of ascertaining the divine will grew up of which they alone had the knowledge. Whatever rites were necessary to propitiate the anger of the gods, or to secure their favor, they alone could authoritatively tell. If any occult science relating to human destiny or the divine will existed, they possessed it exclusively. They had from their position such advantages that they first would have the literature, science, philosophy, and history of the nation in their keeping. Thus to a great extent they controlled the progress of events, stood by the side of rulers to direct their counsels, trained the people, shaped the theory of religion, turned it perhaps into a new direction.

The influence and standing of the priests varied with the freedom of the nation, with the compactness of the priestly order, and with various other causes. In some countries, as in Egypt and in India, they formed one of the leading castes, and all knowledge, secular or religious, was in their hands. In the Persian or Zoroastrian religion the priest, called *Athrava* in the records, has also in the inscription of Behistun (of the time of Darius Hystaspes), and in the Greek and Latin writers, the name of *Magus*. The *Magi*, according to Herodotus, were a Median tribe, which, becoming necessary for the offices of religion, was diffused over Persia also, and perhaps over East Iran or Bactria. They resembled the tribe of Levi in their living in villages, and had no great political power, owing perhaps to the almost religious authority of the Persian king. The *Avesta* consists, to a great degree, of long prayers, of invitations to the gods to be present at acts of worship, and the like, and religion entered into all the important concerns of life. Frequent purgations, and the maintenance also of the sacred fire, fell to their office. It is difficult to explain the connection between these *Magi* and the practice of magic, for there were Babylonian *Magi* also; but the word was probably indigenous in Iran. Duncke,— the historian, finds the connection in the formulae of conjuration which they used in order to drive away the *devas* or *devs*, the evil-minded spirit-

servants of Ahrinan, which formulae had a kind of constraining power over the spirits, just as prayer in India was conceived of as putting a force on the gods.

Greece differed from the nations already mentioned in having no order of priests: any one might assume the office, and discharge the duties which the priest performed, and “there is no trace of a priestly discipline propagated by instruction through generations, nor is there any trace of an abiding connection between the priests of different cities” (K. Ottfried Müller, *Proleg.* p. 249, 250). At Rome the religious institutions took stronger root, in conformity with the regard for precedent, the formality and the superstition which characterized the early Roman people. The public priestships were originally in patrician hands, and the priests long monopolized the knowledge of the calendar and the legal formulae. Moreover, the private rites of families seem to have been thought of more importance than was the case among the Greeks. But there was no caste, there were no hereditary public priestly offices, and politics, becoming a vastly more inviting field, drew to itself the attention and efforts of all men who aspired to influence. The magistrates themselves observed the signs in the heavens and regulated the meeting of public bodies in accordance with their own wishes, under pretence of religious scruples. North of Rome lay the Etruscans, belonging to another race, who had a gloomy religion, in which the art of divination played a more important part than in that of any other nation of which we have knowledge. Here the leading men held the office of priests, and the principal priestships were hereditary. Beyond the Alps, in Gaul, the Druids formed a great corporation, at the head of which was a kind of pope; while Julius Caesar was struck by the want of a compact priestly class in Germany, and says that the race was not given to sacrifices. Of the nations inhabiting this continent, the Mexicans had a very numerous body of priests, some five thousand of whom are said to have belonged to the great temple at the capital. Over the hierarchy of priests two chiefs selected from leading families presided, whose position gave them high authority in state affairs. Under these chiefs a third, with his subordinates, had superintendence over the lower priests and the seminaries. There were also monks in Mexico, as well as in other adjoining countries, who have been compared with the similar bodies in Buddhist countries. In Peru, owing to the sacred dignity of the Incas, the priests, unless they pertained to the race of the Children of the Sun, had less independent weight than the similar class in Mexico, and the simplicity of

the religion may have conduced to the same result. A remarkable institution of this country was that of the virgins of the sun, who, like the Roman vestals, had to keep alive the sacred symbol of fire.

(2.) The objects of worship were either invisible, or distant and yet visible, or something near at hand, in which a divine power was thought to reside. In the first case especially there was a longing in the pagan mind for some representation or image which might keep the presence of the deity in mind, and thus give a sense of protection to the worshipper. Image-worship, idolatry, arose from a desire, it seems probable, of feeling the nearness of the unseen power, or from conceiving that the divine power is lodged in or belongs to the object present before the eyes as being inherent or represented by it. Image-worship has been diffused over the heathen world, but some nations have rejected it. The religion of Ormuzd rejected images and even temples with a kind of fanatical hatred. We believe that there are no traces of it in the Vedas. The Romans at first had only symbols and not forms in the houses of their gods. The probability is therefore that through the whole of the Indo-European race idol-worship was not known at the first; but in Egypt, in Greece, in the Hamitic and in some of the Shemitic peoples, on this continent, in Africa, and over the world, no earlier period can be traced than one in which either image symbol or fetich-worship was a part of the religions. As for direct worship of nature, one would suppose that images would not be needed by the pagan religious sentiment. The heavenly bodies especially are so great a part of the time in sight that no memorial of them would be needed. Thus we find that in Babylonia and Assyria, where sun and star worship, as distinguished from the worship of sun and star gods, prevailed, idols were common. Yet we find images of Bel, Nebo, and Merodach (Mercury and Jupiter) spoken of by the prophets (^{2341E}Isaiah 46:1; ^{2400E}Jeremiah 1:2), while the Phoenician and Canaanite sun-god Baal is represented by pillars (of stone and wood? ^{2105E}2 Kings 10:26, 27), and Asherah, probably the same as Astarte, by wooden posts (groves in our version, *passim*). It seems not unlikely that in proportion to the pagan mind's separation of a divinity from the object out of which it grew, the tendency to represent it by images, and especially 'after the figure of man' ("(^{2341B}Isaiah 44:13), would become more controlling, but to this there seem to be exceptions. As for the direct worship of other objects of nature, as trees and animals, especially snakes, there is no reason why this kind of worship should need images.

And here we come to the difficult inquiry whether the animal is a symbol or a fetich, that is, a tenement of a god; and we may doubt also whether in different parts of the world, as in Egypt and on this continent the same conceptions lay under this species of cultus. In Egypt the sacred bulls Apis and Mnevis were certainly regarded as incarnations; but may not symbol have preceded and given rise to this belief? The representations with which the Egyptian religion abounds of gods in a composite form, partly human, partly bestial, hawk— or jackal-headed, etc., show a symbolizing of particular qualities united to the expression of intelligence like that of man. But, on the other hand, the worship of animals elsewhere, the great number of sacred animals in Egypt, which it was a crime to kill, and the mummies of which were preserved, seem to point to a stage of worship in that strange country where the marvelous instincts and powers of animals pointed to a god within them all.

After what has been said in another place we need not speak at length of fetich-worship. The vagueness of the word ought to be cured by definitions, or it ought to be driven out of works on the pagan religions. If a fetich is a material in which a god or spirit is conceived to dwell for the time, a spell-bound protector and coadjutor of those who offer him worship, this is a distinct idea; or if it is a tenement chosen by the worshipper for his god, that too is distinct enough; but when we find, together with stones, mountains, water, wind and fire, plants, animals, and men, heavenly bodies also in a certain stage of human culture reckoned as fetiches, it seems as if fetich-worship might be made to include everything. In Greece the Thessalian sorceresses were thought to be able to bring the moon down out of the skies, and to work magic arts by her help. That is, Hecate, the moon goddess, was believed to be wandering abroad at night, and, being identified with the moon, was thought to come down from the skies. The same general notion of power over objects of nature appears in the rude fetich-worship of Africa. A clear line cannot be drawn between the religious conceptions of paganism in the lower and in its higher culture.

We have spoken of mixed human and animal forms, where the symbol was the main idea. The highest attainment of idol-worship is to represent the divinity under the form of man. God made man in his image; the pagan lover of beauty makes his god in man's image, a reversal of the true idea, and yet expressive of a relationship. The Greek, by his anthropomorphic representations of his divinities, employed the highest conceptions of beauty in the service of religion; and thus, while he laid the foundation of

the highest art, subjected himself to the condemnation, ““thou thoughtest that I was altogether such a one as thyself.””

The image and symbol brought the god into mind, and gave him a visible connection with the worshipper. Hence, in part, the fascination of idolatry. To a great extent, even in the most refined countries of paganism, the divinity was thought-not indeed by the philosopher, but by the vulgar-to inhabit the statue, and to this both the Scriptures and the early Christian writers constantly allude. The idol was not only used at places of common worship, but in families, and gave the feeling of protection a certain vividness, as if the divine shape were there.

(3.) The images of the gods, rather than the desire of shelter for the worshipper, gave rise to the temples, which were houses of a divinity; thus *ναός* is a god's dwelling, from a root meaning to dwell, and *cedes*, in Latin, in the singular is usually a temple, but in the plural a human abode. But neither image nor temple was as important for worship as the altar, which might stand afar from any temple, or near a temple and outside of it, or, it might be, within the temple's walls, with no roof, or with an opening in the roof, for the purpose of giving free passage to incense and the smoke of sacrifices into the upper air. When the altar of the god and his statue were near one another, the statue generally stood above, that the worshipper might look upwards to the representation of the divinity. The temple as well as the statue, in the progress of refinement and of the ritualistic spirit, gained an importance that did not belong to them in the earlier times. It is ill the temple principally that architecture in most heathen lands has found the motive for its cultivation, as it was the images of the gods chiefly which promoted the progress of sculpture. We have already had occasion to say that in the Persian religion there were properly no altars nor temples. The veneration bestowed on fire and light was an obstacle in the way of confining religious rites within the walls of temples, and the pure original faith of Iran had little need of altars.

(4.) Worship, in the narrow sense of the word, may include public and private prayers and other liturgical services, with offerings unbloody or bloody, and their attendant lustrations or purgations. Some of these rites, especially such as symbolized certain mythological events, might be secret, but of these mysteries we have no time to speak.

Prayer, the natural voice of the being who realizes his dependence, might be informal in the family religion of the pagan, or attended with formalities;

it might need the presence of a priest, especially on certain important occasions of family life, or the head of the household might act as priest. In public religion a class of priests took the lead; it was felt that a certain form of words had a peculiar efficacy, and from this notion perhaps belief in incantations' derived its birth. In some religions the liturgical forms have been excessively minute and elaborate. We have already referred to the religion of Iran as an example of this. The Avesta is chiefly liturgical. The first part of the Yaçna, and a smaller collection, the Vispered, consist principally of praises, thanksgivings, and invitations addressed to various superior beings to be present at the offerings of the Haoma and at other celebrations. The Yeshts or Yasts, a part of the Khorda-Avesta (lesser Avesta), consist of prayers and praises addressed to particular objects of veneration, as to Mithras, Verethragna or Behram, and the souls of the good. In the early religion of India the three first Vedas are chiefly liturgical. The Rig-Veda contains about a thousand hymns in ten books, the first seven of which consist of hymns addressed to Agni, the fire-god, to Indra, and others. In the ninth book are classed hymns intended to be sung while the Soma offering is in preparation. The Sama-Veda takes most of its materials from the Rig, and adapts them to the purposes of chanting. The Yajur-Veda consists of formulas proper to accompany the various actions of religious worship, and belongs to a time when the worship had become complicated and the importance of the priest had increased. The Romans were in their early days a devout and reverential, but also a formal people. The same adherence to legal precedent which built up their law appeared in the minute observances of their religion; formulas of words had a certain independent power; a breach of silence at prayer and sacrifice was ominous; the evocations addressed to the divinities of conquered towns that they would leave their old abodes were conceived to have the force of a charm; and they were afraid to let it be known what god was the especial guardian of Rome, lest their enemies should practice the same evocations against them. In India, also, prayer was thought of as having a magical power. The old invocation of the sun, called the Gayatri, is of such potency, it is said, that the Brahmin can obtain happiness by it whether he performs other religious services or not. The repeating of it in the morning dawn until the sun appears removes every unperceived fault of the night, and a similar repetition in the evening twilight is equally effectual (Wuttke, *u. s.* vol. 2, § 106, from Manu, 2, 87, 101, 102).

The offerings and sacrifices of a public nature were usually attended by lustrations, which are not to be confounded with purgations of a propitiatory character practiced by those who sought cleansing from guilt. Both kinds of lustrations, however, had the same moral idea, the necessity of a pure mind, for their foundation. In or near the Greek temples, and marking the division line between profane and sacred ground, stood the vessel of holy water (*perirrhanterium*), for the uses of those who entered the pure interior. After this preparation came the offerings with prayers and praises. In some nations there was a time when these offerings were only unbloody, or at least the bloody offerings or sacrifices played a small part. The institutions of Numa sanctioned only such things as the fruits of the field, and the *mola salsa*, or broken grains of spelt mixed with salt. Not even incense was then used by the simple Romans. The usages changed greatly in this particular at a later time, owing to the influence of the Greek settlements in Southern Italy. Among the Hindus horses and horned cattle were frequent victims in the earlier times, but afterwards became less common. In the books of the Avesta little or nothing is said of animal sacrifices, but it is prescribed that for certain offences (as a fine or an atonement?) a hundred smaller cattle should be offered up. But in Persian history, whether in accordance with or in violation of the precepts of the religion, mention is made of animal victims. Xerxes on his march towards Greece honored the Trojan Athena by sacrificing a thousand cows. At the Strymon the Magi offered up white horses, and at a spot in Thrace called the Nine Roads nine boys and nine girls from among the native inhabitants were buried alive. Strabo remarks that no pieces of the victim were given, as elsewhere, to the gods, since they had need only of the animal's soul. Instead of victims, the great offering in the Indian religion of the Vedic period was that of the *Solma*, an asclepias or some other plant of the milk-weed tribe, the stalk of which was crushed between stones, and the narcotic juice, mixed with butter, was left to ferment. This mixture was supposed to nourish, strengthen, and even intoxicate the gods. The most absurd superstitions were connected with this sacred substance: it was originally in heaven, and came down with the rain to the earth; it was something that a man might offer to the higher gods only, and could feel that he had rendered a favor by it, and had a right to a return. Finally the Soma became identified with the moon-god as the cause of fruitfulness. An offering called by a corresponding name in Iran, the *Haoma*, and obtained from the same or similar plants, played a great part in the services of the old religion of that country. Similar notions that the divine powers partook

of and enjoyed sacrifices which were offered to them may be found elsewhere in many religions, but probably none so extravagant.

Sacrifices of victims, or bloody offerings, were sooner or later almost universal. What victim should be selected depended on a variety of considerations. Sometimes it was an animal that injured the gifts presented to a god, or injured that which he protected, as a goat, the destroyer of the vine, was offered to Dionysus, and a swine, which rooted in the ground, to Demeter. Sometimes it was an animal under the god's protection. Sometimes, again, there was a symbolism in the sacrifice, as when a black-colored animal was offered to the Dii Manes at Rome, or a heifer never yoked to Minerva. In Egypt, notwithstanding that the number of sacred animals was very considerable, other victims were selected for offerings. Thus a pig was presented to the god answering to Hercules and Esculapius, but not to Sarapis; a sheep to the mother of the gods, but not to Isis; a cat to Horus; a cockroach, or some kind of *blatta* at least, to the goddess identified with Thetis.

Throughout a large part of the world human beings were offered as sacrifices to the gods of the heathen, and the farther back we penetrate into antiquity the more common is this horrid practice. There are two forms of it, the sacrifice of children, especially of the first-born, and that of grown-up men. The first appears in countries where the worship of Moloch—perhaps of Baal and other kindred gods—prevailed, as in Phoenicia, the land of Canaan, Moab, perhaps, and Carthage, and traces of the same may be found in the island of Crete. Also in some parts of this continent the same practice seems to have gained some footing. To this the prophet Micah (6, 7), the law of Moses (^{<BIB>}Leviticus 20:2-5), the historical books (^{<BIB>}2 Kings 16:3; comp. ^{<BIB>}Deuteronomy 12:31), and other parts of the Scriptures refer, unless in some of these passages simple lustration by fire without burning may be intended. But far more common was the sacrifice of grown-up men. As nations grew more humane, this practice was softened down; either men condemned to death, who had to die at any rate, were selected as the victims, or a person was scourged or cut only until the blood ran, or the rite was performed upon an image substituted for a human being. Such substitution can be traced in Egypt, Greece, and Rome. In India human sacrifices were introduced, when the obscene and cruel Siva religion spread among the people, into his worship and that of his wife Durga, or Kali. The Kalika-Purana is cited by Ward and others as saying that Kali “felt a pleasure for a month in the blood of fish offered to her; for

nine months in that of wild animals; for a hundred years in that of a tiger; and in that of a lion, a stag, or a man, for a thousand years. Three men's blood appease her for a hundred thousand years. The offering of blood is like the drink of the gods (the Soma); Brahma and all the gods assemble at the offering" (Ward, 3, 174; Wuttke, 2, 355; *Asiat. Res.* 5, 371). In other countries, as in Gaul, in Mexico, in Peru, above all in Mexico, this practice assumed frightful proportions, showing how man can be debased and made savage by his religion. There is ground for believing that cannibalism may have grown but of the sacrificial feasts after battle when an enemy was slaughtered to the gods who gave the victory.

We ask at this stage of the subject, what was the meaning of pagan offerings? As they understood their religious rites, the unbloody were expressions of gratitude and acknowledgment for protection. Whatever the form of offering was, the god was conceived of as being pleased with them. How did they account for this pleasure? There are traces of the conception that the gods enjoyed offerings as we enjoy food. The faith of the Aryan race in regard to the Soma offering, and the idea that the smoke of burning sacrifices was agreeable to the divinities, show the grosser forms of anthropomorphism. Sacrifices of a public nature may be regarded as feasts to which a god or gods were invited; the altar was the public hearth; the victim was partaken of by all the worshippers after due purgations, libations, and other preparations; the god had his share of the meal, which went up to him in the skies. At the bottom of all this, however, the feeling no doubt was that the worshipper gave up something of value, and thus showed his devotion to his protector. But this explanation does not exhaust the entire meaning of animal sacrifices. Thus certain animals not used for food, as dogs, horses, wolves, bears, and even asses, were in some Greek rites the appropriate victims, the probable reason for which is given by K. Ottfried Miller (*Doier*, 1, 279) that animals hated by a particular god he would be pleased to see bleeding at his altar. The sacrifice of a dog to Hecate may be accounted for from the dog's baying at the moon, and of a stag to Artemis because she was a huntress.

But there were also propitiatory sacrifices required by a feeling of guilt and of dread. Here life is given for life. It seems impossible to put less meaning into such rites than that the worshipper acknowledged his life to be forfeited, and hoped by something which not only had value but was also a living object, to avert through confession made in this way the divine wrath. Human sacrifices were still more significant. In the case of children,

especially of the first-born, the supposition that the first fruits were consecrated and devoted, as an expression of gratitude, does not seem at all natural. It was, 'in short, a sacrifice made for the benefit of the family, caused by a painful sense of ill desert; it was giving the fruit of the body for the sin of the soul. The more general sacrifices of human beings, especially of grown-up men, which took place most frequently where some great crime had been committed by persons unknown, or when pestilence or defeat by enemies betokened the wrath of protecting divinities, must be regarded as an acknowledgment of sin, and a way of transferring and appeasing divine anger. Wrath demanded or exposed to death. The death of one or more freed the rest. In the Greek myths, the self-devotion of an innocent virgin, like Macaria in the *Heraclidae* of Euripides, and in Roman history more clearly the act of the two Decii, father and son, their self-consecration, and in the case of the younger the devotion of the hostile army, point to a faith that victory might be secured by voluntary death for others. This is the highest form that human sacrifice took in heathen antiquity.

It remains to give the briefest possible estimate of the heathen religions in their influences on man. With regard to their lower forms, as seen in wild races, they are to a great extent religions of fear; dread of superior powers weighs on the minds even of light-hearted African Negroes. A feeling of sin, and yet a very faint and half-conscious one, must be presupposed in their minds in order that this dread may exist; but the dread is greatly increased by magic practices which are kept up by priestly imposture. In the higher races it would be folly to deny that in the course of time, and partly by the help of moral sentiments which must grow up in well-ordered civil communities, the religions of paganism have been elevated in their moral tone; that under them men have more or less risen into art, freedom, philosophy; that great individual characters have appeared in such countries, and that tolerably high standards of moral excellence have counteracted depraving influences from bad religions or bad institutions. But there are some necessary evils in polytheism, owing to its very nature. They honor *power* rather than *character*, since it was divine power in objects of nature that impressed itself chiefly on the minds of men. Hence absolutism and ambition were under the protection of the religious sentiment. He was the worship of beings of *limited attributes*, more or less *under the control of fate*, who were for the most part *not from eternity*—*not* authors of the world, but parts of the world, local in their spheres of

operation and functions. There could therefore be no *universal* religion. Buddhism spread because it was an atheism which abolished caste and limited transmigration, and which allowed the cultus in the countries where it traveled to continue. There was, further, a want of *allegiance* on the part of the worshipper to his divinity; even ridicule of them in the comic mimes of the Greeks was allowed, and sometimes the people treated the idols with great indignity. These religions could not resist any increase of knowledge, but gave way to skepticism, and this brought on national ruin. But the heaviest charge almost everywhere against paganism was its sensuality, not in the lower races only, but in the higher; not so much in earlier times as at the acme of refinement. The mythologies were impure. The gods were depraved, and examples of wickedness. Licentiousness was put under the protection of religion. On this point a long chapter might be written; but it is better to pass over this in silence, and to close with saying that the Apostle to the Gentiles was no maligner when he wrote the first chapter of the Epistle to the Romans.

III. Literature. — From the immense mass of works relating to the pagan religions we can only make a selection.

1. Works on the Philosophy of Religion or of Paganism. — Constant, *De la Religion*, etc. (Paris, 1824-1831, 5 vols.); Hegel, *Religionsphilosophie* (2 vols.; in *Werke*, vols. 11:12:Berlin, 1840); Wuttke, *Gesch. d. Heidenfthums* (Breslau, 1852, 1853, 2 vols., unfinished); Schelling, *Philos. d. Mythologie* (in *Werke*, pt. 2, vols. 1, 2, Stuttgart, 1856, 1857); Pfeleiderer, *Das Wesen d. Religion* (Leips. 1869, 2 vols.); several works of Max Müller, as his *Science of Religion*, etc.

2. Explanations of Mythology. —

(a.) From the Old Testament, its events and characters, as by Vossius, *De theologia gentili* (Amsterdam, 1642); Huet, *Demonstr. evangel.* (Paris, 1672); and others of that school, now nearly forgotten.

(b.) K. Ottf. Müller, *Prolegom. zu einer wissenschaftl. Mythologie* (Götting. 1825); Max Müller in his second course of *Lectures on Language*.

3. General Pragmatical Treatises on Heathen Religions or Mythologies. — Banier (Paris, 1710-1738) and Jacob Bryant, now forgotten; Creuzer, *Symbolik* (1st ed. 1819, 1821, 4 vols.), with Mone's *Heidenith. d. nördl.*

Europas (Leips. und Darmstadt, 1822, 1823, 2 vols.); Meiners, *Allgemeine Gesch. d. Religionen* (Hanover, 1806, 1807, 2 vols.); Stuhr, *Relig. Systeme des Orients* (Berlin, 1835-1838, 2 vols.); Schwenk, *Mythologie* (Frankf.-on-the-Main, 1843-1853, 7 vols.); Eckermann, *Lehrb. der Religionsgesch. u. Mythologie* (Halle, 1848, 1849, 4 vols.).

4. The Ancient Mythiographers. —

(a.) Heathen authors, as Lucian, *De Dea Syra*; Plutarch, *De Isidi et Osiri'* (Parthey's ed., Berlin. 1850).

(b.) The attacks on heathenism by early Christian writers, as Clement of Alex. in his *Protrept.* and in part of the *Stromata*; Theodoret, *De Graecorum aft. cur.*, with the Latin writers, esp. Arnobius, Augustine in parts of the *City of God*, Julius Firmicus, Minucius Felix, Lactantius, etc.

5. Writers on the Greek Religion and Mythology. — Lobeck's *Aglcaophamus on the Mysteries*, etc. (Königsb. 1829, 2 vols.); Jacobi, *Handwörterb. d. gr. u. romse. Mythol.* (Leips. 1835, 2 vols.); Preller's *Demeter u. Persephone* (Hamb. 1837), his articles in Pauly's *Encyklop.*, and his *Griech. Mythol.* (3d ed. edited by Plew, Berlin, 1872-1876, 2 vols.); Welcker's *Griech. Gotterlehre* (Gottingen, 1857-1862, 3 vols.); Gerhard, *Griech. Mythol.* (Berlin, 1854. 1855, 2 vols.); Braun, *Griechische Gotterlehre* (Hamb. u. Gotha, 1854); the second vol. of Hermann's *Lehrb. d. Griechischen Alterthum* (1st ed. Heidelberg, 1846); Grote's *Greece*, vol. 1; and the writers on Greek art.

6. Writers on the Roman and Italic Religions. — K. O. Muller, *Die Etrusker* (Berlin, 1828, 2 vols.); Gerhard, *Die Gotter d. Etrusker*; Hartung, *Die Relig. d. Rismer* (Erlangen, 1836, 2 vols.); Constant, *Du Polytheisme Rom.* (Paris, 1833, 2 vols.); Klausen, *Aeneas u. die Penaten* (Gotha, 1839); Ambrosch, *Studien* (Breslau, 1839); Merkel's ed. of Ovid's *Fasti* (Berlin, 1841); Marquardt. in vol. 4 of the Bekker-Marquardt *Handb. d. Robn. Alt.* (Leips. 1856; Preller's *Rom. Mythologie* (Berlin, 1858).

7. Egyptian Mythology. — Jablonski's *Pantheon Egypt.* (Frankf. — on-the-Oder, 1750-1752); Lepsius, *Ueber d. ersten aqJyp. Gotterkreis* (in the "Trans. of the Berlin Acad." 1851); also his *Todtenbuch* (Leips. 1842); Bunsen, *Aegypten's Stelle*, etc. (in Germ. and Engl.; bk. 1 esp. treats of the religion); Duncker, *Gesch. des Alterth.* (1st ed. Berl. 1852; vol. 1 treats of

Egypt; four editions have appeared); Roth, *Gesch. der abendländ. Philos.* (in vol. 1. Mannheim, 1862); also works of Wilkinson and others on Egyptian antiq., Brugsch. etc.

8. Shemitic Religions. — *Movers, Die Phinizier* (Berl. u. Bonn, 1849-1856, 2 vols.); Duincker (*ut sup.* in vol. 2); the writers on Assyr. and Babyl. monuments, as Layard, the Kawlinsons, Oppert, G. Smith, Le Normant, Schrader, in his *Assyr. — Babylon. Keilinschriften* (Leips. 1872), and *Keilinschr. u. das Alte Testament* (Giessen, 1872).

9. Iranian Religion. — Spiegel, in his *Avesta*, with introductions, and in other works: Windischman's *Zoroastrische Stud.* (Basle, 1831); Roth (*ut sup.* in vol. 1); Hatig, *Essays* (Bombay, 1862); Duncker (*ut sup.* in vol. 2, of which the third ed. [1867] appeared also with the title, *Gesch. d. Aryer.*).

10. Indian Religions. — Besides the writers on the Vedic literature and transl. of the Vedas, Lassen, *Ind. Alterthumskunde* (4 vols.; in vol. 1, p. 735-792); Duncker (*ut sup.* in vol. 2); Max Müller, in several works; Whitney, *Or. and Ling. Studies* (New York, 1873); Wuttke (*ut sup.* in vol. 1); Ward's *View*, etc. (Lond. 1822, 3 vols.); with the writers on Buddhism, as Bournouf, Koppen, etc.

11. Chinese Religions. — Wuttke (*ut sup.* in vol. 2); a number of transl., as of the Shu-King, by Gaubi and De Guignes (Paris, 1770); of Meng-Tsen, by Stanislas Julien (Paris, 1824); the Y-King, by Mohl (1834); Tshuhi, by Neumann (1837); Legge's *Chinese Classics*; also Stuhr's *Reichs-Religion d. Chinesen*; Plath, *Relig. u. Cultus d. alten Chinesen* (2 pts., reprinted from "Transactions of the Royal Bavarian Academy"); together with works of Du Halde, Gutzlaff, Williams, De Mailla, etc.

12. Northern European and Asiatic Religions. —

(a.) Celtic: Davies, *Myth. of the Druids* (Lond. 1809); Mone and Eckermann (*ut sup.*).

(b.) German: J. Grimm, *Deutsche Mythol.* (1st ed. Göttingen, 1835); transl. of the *Edda*; Anderson, *Northern Mythol.* (Chicago, 1874).

(c.) Slavic: Mone, Ackerman, Schwenk (*ut sup.*).

(d.) Finnish: Castren, *Vorlesungen über d. fn. Mythol.*

13. *Religions of Lower Races.* — Waitz, *Anthrop.* (Leips. 1859-1872, 6 vols., the last by Garland); Tyler's *Primitive Culture* (Lond. 1871, 2 vols.); J.G. Miller, *Amer. Urrelig.* (Basle, 1867); Brinton, *Myths of the New World*; Wuttke (*ut sup.* in vol. 1); Meiners (*ut sup.*); Des Brosses, *Dieux Fetiches*; Schultze, *Fetischismus* (Leips. 1871); Morgan, *Anc. Society* (N. Y. 1877); accounts by Schoolcraft, Catlin, and earlier writers on the Amer. Indians; Galitzin's transl. of Wrangell, *Le Nord et la Sibirie*: histories of Mexico and Peru; travelers in Africa: Ellis's *Polynesia*, etc. In Waitz copious lists of voyagers and travelers are given. (T. D. W.)

Pomarancio

is the surname of CRISTOFORO RONCALIT, a painter of the Florentine school. He was born in 1552 at Pomarancio, and was a pupil of Nicolo Circignani, who took him to Rome quite young to assist him in his works. At the same time, under the direction of Ignazio Danti, he helped, with Tempesti, Rafatllino da Reggio, the younger Palma, and some others, in finishing the logge of Raffaella. This work being achieved, he painted, on slate, for Santa Maria degli Angeli at Rome, a *Death of Ananias and Sapphira*, a masterpiece that was deemed worthy to be copied on mosaic for the basilica of St. Peter. After painting at San Giovanni di Latrano *The Baptism of Constantine*, at San Giacomo *The Resurrection of Christ*, at San Gregorio a *St. Andrew*, one of his best works, he was selected to paint the cupola of the church of Loretto, getting the preference of Guido and Caravaggio. The latter avenged himself by having his rival's face disfigured by a spadassin. The cupola of Loretto, in the ornamentation of which Roncalli was assisted by Jaconetti, Pietro Lombardo, and Lorenzo Garbieri, offers a great variety and abundance of subjects. Although these paintings have suffered much, some heads of uncommon beauty are still discernible. Some subjects from the life of the Virgin, executed by Pomarancio, were the occasion of his being made a knight of the Order of Christ by Paul V. He worked in divers other places of the Picentino: there is a *Noli me tangere* at the Ermitani of San Severino; a *St. Francis in Prayers*, at San Agostino of Ancona; a *St. Palatia* at Osimo; and at the Palazzo Galli of the same place is a *Judgment of Solomon*, which Lanzi asserts to be his best fresco. During a rather protracted stay at Genoa, he embellished its churches and palaces with works fit to compete with the best of the century. We mention further among his paintings *The Martyrdom of St. Simon*, at the Pinacothek of Munich, and a *Virgin shedding Tears over the Body of her Son*, at the Museum of Madrid. His

manner is very variable, and reminds now of the Roman, now of the Florentine school; sometimes it comes near to the Venetian school. His colors are brighter and more brilliant in his frescos than in his oil-paintings. He likes to adorn his subjects with beautiful landscapes of great effect. Unfortunately, following the example of his masters. he was too often assisted by his pupils; hence some weak parts in his works. He is charged also with some errors of perspective. He died at Rome in 1626. See Lanzi, *Hist. of Painters* (see Index); Spooner, *Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts*, s.v. Roncalli.

Pomarancio

is also a surname by which NICCOLO CIRCIGNANI is generally known. He was a painter of the Florentine school of the 16th century, and was born at Pomarancio, near Volterra. He was probably a disciple of Titian, whose assistant he was in his works in the great room of the Belvedere, in the Vatican. He arrived at Rome quite young, and painted there a number of frescos, among which we mention the cupola of St. Pudentiana, *The Lord surrounded by Angels* (tribune of S. Giovanni Paolo), *St. John the Baptist* (church of the Consolazione), and thirty-two horrible *Scenes of Martyrdom* (San Stefano Rotondo), vigorous, but executed with little care. It is probable that Pomarancio spent the last years of his life in his native place, where he died after 1591; for the works which must be referred to his last period are all among numerous paintings of his preserved in Volterra. At S. Giusto a *Descent from the Cross* is signed "Nicolaus Circinianus di Ripomarance pingebat A.D. 1580;" and at the Battisterio, on an *Ascension*, one of his best works, we read, "Nicolaus de Circignanis Volaterranus pingebat anno 1591." In the cathedral of the same city there remains of the frescos with which he had adorned the tribune a *God-Father*; at St. Pietro, in Selci, an *Annunciation* (oil-painting), and at San Francesco a *Pieta*. Pomarancio was frequently aided by his pupils, the best known of whom are Cristoforo Roncalli, called also Pomarancio, and his own son, Antonio Circignani, who remained in obscurity during his father's lifetime, and came suddenly into repute by the paintings with which he adorned a chapel of Santa Maria Traspontina at Rome: they exhibit some features successfully borrowed from Baroccio. At Florence, under the portico of the hospital of S. Matteo, he painted some frescos in 1614: *The Disputation with the Doctors*; *The Massacre of the Innocents*; *The Adoration of the Kings*; and *The Nativity*. Called at a mature age to Citta di Castello, Antonio lived there several years, painting for churches and

private persons. It is believed that at the age of sixty years he settled again in the village of Pomarancio, the cradle of his family, where he died in 1630. See Lanzi, *Hist. of the Painters*; Spooner, *Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts*, s.v.

Pomarius, Samuel Baumgarten

a German Lutheran divine, was born April 26, 1624, near Wintzig, in Silesia. His father, a miller, was opposed to his predilection for study, and he had many obstacles to surmount before he could get through his course of studies at the college. He pursued his studies at Breslau, Frankfort, and Wittenberg. On Jan. 1, 1653, he was called to Beshin, in Silesia, but soon went to that portion of Berlin then known as Cologne-on-the-Spree as deacon of St. Peter's, and from thence to Magdeburg as pastor of St. Jacobi. In 1665 he was made rector and professor of theology at Eperies, in Upper Hungary. On account of the persecution against the evangelical party, he had to leave that position in 1673, and went to Wittenberg, where he lectured on theology, preaching at the same time. In 1674 he went as pastor and superintendent to Lubeck, where he died, March 2, 1683. Almost all the writings of Pomarius are of a polemical nature, and intended to defend the Lutheran tenets. He was engaged in many theological disputes with Jesuits, and even with Protestant theologians. We mention among his works, *De A Noctambulis* (Wittenberg, 1649, 1650, 4to): — *De moderatione theologiae* (ibid. 1674, 4to): — *Dissertatio de vetitate religionis Lutherane*: — *Comment. in epistolam Judae*: — *Analysin et exegetisn articulorum Aug. Confessionis*: — *De majestate S. Scripture*, etc. See Jocher, *Gelehrten-Lexicon*, s.v.; Chauffepie, *Dict. Histor* s.v.; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirch.* — *Lexikon*, s.v. (B. P.)

Pome

(Lat. *pomum*, i.e. an apple) is in ecclesiastic language

(1) a cup or ball filled with perfumes;

(2) a ball of metal filled with hot water, and used by the priest to warm his hands at the altar. It was sometimes made four-footed and with rings of silver.

Pomegranate

Picture for Pomegranate

the *Punica granatum* of Linneus, is by universal consent acknowledged to denote the Heb. *rimmô* (רִמּוֹ, also רִמּוֹסו called, according to Gesenius, from an Arab. root signifying *marrow*; but according to Furst, from one signifying *blood-red*; Sept. ῥοά, ῥοιά, ῥοῖσκος, κώδων; Vulg. *malum punicum, matluen granatum, malogranatum*), a word which occurs frequently in the O.T., and is used to designate either the pomegranate-tree or its fruit. It is described in the works of the Arabs by the name *roman*. The pomegranate is a native of Asia; and we may trace it from Syria, through Persia, even to the mountains of Northern India. It is common in Northern Africa. The pomegranate is not likely to have been a native of Egypt; it must, however, have been cultivated there at a very early period, as the Israelites, when in the desert lamented the loss of its fruit in the wilderness of Zin (רִמּוֹ Numbers 20:5)-this “is no place of figs, or of vines, or of pomegranates.” The tree, with its characteristic calyx-crowned fruit, is easily recognized on the Egyptian sculptures (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egyptians*, 1, 36, ed. 1854). That it was produced in Palestine during the same early ages is evident from the spies bringing some back when sent into Canaan to see what kind of a land it was; for we are told that they “came unto the brook of Eshcol, and cut down from thence a branch with one cluster of grapes, etc., and they brought of the pomegranates and of the figs” (רִמּוֹ Numbers 13:53; comp. also רִמּוֹ Deuteronomy 8:8). The villages or towns of Rimmon (רִמּוֹ Joshua 15:32), Gath-rimmon (רִמּוֹ Joshua 21:25), En-rimmon (רִמּוֹ Nehemiah 11:29), possibly derived their names from pomegranate-trees which grew in their vicinity. These trees suffered occasionally from the devastations of locusts (רִמּוֹ Joel 1:12; see also רִמּוֹ Haggai 2:19). Mention is made of “an orchard of pomegranates” in רִמּוֹ Song of Solomon 4:13; and in 4:3 the cheeks (A.V. “temples”) of the Beloved are compared to a section of “pomegranate within the locks,” in allusion to the beautiful rosy color of the fruit. Carved figures of the pomegranate adorned the tops of the pillars in Solomon’s Temple (רִמּוֹ 1 Kings 7:18, 20, 42; רִמּוֹ 2 Kings 25:17; 2 Chronicles 3, 16; 4:13); and worked representations of this fruit, in blue, purple, and scarlet, ornamented the hem of the robe of the ephod (רִמּוֹ Exodus 28:33, 34; 39:24). This is explained mystically by Philo (*Opera*, 2, 153, 226), and differently by Meyer (*Blotter Johere Wahrheit*, 10, 85; see also Bahr,

Symbolik, 2, 123 sq.). The pomegranate seems also to have been used as a holy symbol in heathen religions (see Baihr, *Symbol.* 2, 122). Among the later Jews the pomegranate was used in some cases as a measure (Mishna, *Chelim*, 17, 1, 4). Mention is made of “spiced wine of the juice of the pomegranate” in ^{2208P}Song of Solomon 8:2; with this may be compared the pomegranate-wine (ῥοῖτης οἶνος) of which Dioscorides (5, 44) speaks, and which is still used in the East. Chardin says that great quantities of it were made in Persia, both for home consumption and for exportation, in his time (*Script. Herb.* p. 399; Harmer, *Obs.* 1, 377). Being common in Syria and Persia, it must have early attracted the attention of Eastern nations. In the present day it is highly valued, and travelers describe the pomegranate as being delicious throughout Persia. The late Sir A. Burnes states that the famous pomegranates without seeds are grown in gardens under the snowy hills, near the river Cabul. It is still found in Palestine (Scholz, *Reis.* p. 140), Arabia (Niebuhr, *Beschr.* p. 148), Egypt (Pococke, *East.* 1, 319), East and West Indies, and also in the southern countries of Europe (comp. Ritter, *Erdkünde*, 11, 549 sq.). The pomegranate was well known to the Greeks, being the ῥοά of Theophrastus and of Dioscorides (1, 151). It was employed as a medicine by Hippocrates, and is mentioned by Homer under the name *side*, supposed to be of Phoenician origin; Baeot. **σίδη** (Athen. 14:650), and called by Pliny *Punica arbor* (13, 38). The Romans gave it the name of *Punica* because the tree was introduced from Carthage; its English name is derived from the *pomum granatum* (“grained apple”) of the Romans. Various parts of the plant were employed medicinally. as, for instance, the root, or rather its bark, the flowers which are called **κῦτινος** by Dioscorides, and the double flowers **βαλαύστιον**; also the rind of the pericarp, called *malicorium* by the Romans, and **σίδιον** by Dioscorides. Some of the properties which these plants possess make them useful both as drugs and as medicines. In a natural state it is but a bush, eight or ten feet high, with a straight stem and a large number of branches, a red bark, lance-formed leaves of a bright-green color, each on its own stem; and bears flowers which stand separate, star-shaped, and without odor, of a deep-red color, and producing a round fruit, green and partly red on the surface, but yellow within (comp. ^{2208S}Song of Solomon 4:3, and Celsius, 1, 275. The Romans called this fruit *malum punicum*, the *Punic apple*, but sometimes also *malum granatum*, Plin. 13:34; 16:36; Marcell. *Med.* c. 27). It is of the shape and size of an orange, three or four inches in diameter, divided into longitudinal apartments, in which the grains lie as compactly as corn on the cob, and look much like a pale-red Indian

corn. save that they are nearly transparent. They ripen about the middle of October, and remain in good condition all winter (Thomson, *Land and Book*, 2, 392; but in August, according to Russell, *Nat. Hist. of Aleppo*, 1, 107). They are uncommonly fleshy, juicy, and sweet to the taste (Pliny, 13:34), and are much enjoyed by the Orientals as a refreshment (Carne, 1. 8). The rind is used in the manufacture of morocco leather, and, together with the bark, is sometimes used medicinally to expel the tape-worm. Russell (*Nat. Hist. of Aleppo*, 1, 85, 2d ed.) states that “lemons have by no means superseded the pomegranate; the latter is more easily procured through the winter, and is often in cooking’ preferred to the lemon. The tree is much cultivated in the gardens and orchards of Palestine and Northern Syria. The fruit is seldom ripe earlier than the end of August, when most families lay in a stock for winter consumption. There are three varieties of the fruit—one sweet. another very acid, and a third, in which both qualities are agreeably blended. The juice of the sour fruit is often used instead of vinegar. The others are cut open when served up to table; or the grains, taken out and besprinkled with sugar or rose water, are brought to table in saucers. ‘he grains likewise, fresh as well as dried, make a considerable ingredient in cookery.” He adds that the trees are apt to suffer much in severe winters from extraordinary cold. See Celsius, *Hielobot.* 1, 271 sq.; Oken, *Lehrbtuch der Botmaik*, II, 2, 917 sq.; Geiger, *Pharmaceutische Botanik*, 2. 1417 sq.; Plenk, *P-’lantt. Med. Tüb.* p. 376; Layard, *Nineveh*, 2, 233.

Pomerania

a province of Prussia, situated in the north-east, and bordering on the Baltic, was once the possession of the Slaves and Swedes, and has such a peculiar ecclesiastical record that we here take space to detail it. In the 6th century some Slavic tribes settled in Northern Germany, and called the coast along the Baltic Sea *Pomoze*, i.e. on the sea-coast. The foremost deities of this Wendish people were Belbog, Czernibog, Radogost, Swantewit. Herovit. Gerovit, and Triglav.

I. *Introduction of Christianity.* — About the year 1000 the bishopric of Colberg was founded as a dependence of the archbishopric of Gnesen, and Reinbern appointed bishop; but Reinbern having gone to Kief to attend the celebration of the nuptials of the daughter of Boleslaus with the son of the czar Wladimir, and stopping at the Russian court, this commencement proved fruitless. The attempt of Bernhard, a Spanish monk, to introduce

Christianity, which was made a century afterwards, was equally unsuccessful. But Boleslaus Krzvvousti, king of Poland, having subjected to his rule part of Pomerania and wishing to make Christians of his new subjects, desired Otto, bishop of Bamberg, to bring those heathens the light of the Gospel. Otto, having obtained the agreement of pope Calixtus II, set on his way, April 19, 1124, over Prague, Breslau, Posen, and Gnesel, where he stopped seven days and celebrated Whitsuntide. Wratislav, the Pomeranian chief, who, as a boy, had been christened at Merseburg, came to meet the apostle, and gave him two of his warriors to guide him to Pvritz. In this place the pagans were engaged in the celebration of one of their feasts. Otto preached to the 4000 men assembled at that solemnity, and a week had scarcely elapsed, during which he and his associates were busy instructing the daily increasing crowd in the Christian doctrines, when the bishop prescribed a three days' fasting, after which more than 7000 heathens were admitted to baptism. After erecting an altar, and leaving one of his priests, Otto went *via* Stargard to Kammin, the residence of the prince. The wife of the latter received the apostle with great joy. He stopped fifty days, converted 3585 persons, laid the foundation of a church, and left a priest, for whose maintenance the prince had granted some lands. Julin, afterwards called Wollin, mostly inhabited by pirates, was not so favorably disposed towards the new religion; but, after more or less persecution, the Christians were permitted to leave the town unscathed and cross the Divenow. Here Otto, after resting a few days, entered upon negotiations with the inhabitants: but all he could obtain from the chiefs of the city was that they would direct themselves by the example of Stettin, the oldest and noblest city of Pomerania. Thither Otto repaired, crossing the Haff, in company with Redamir, a citizen of Julin, and his son. The Stettinians at first turned a deaf ear to Otto's exhortations. Twice a week, on the market-days, he proceeded to the market place with his eighteen priests in sacerdotal ornaments, and preached before the multitude. The people from the country listened to his words less reluctantly than the denizens of the city; yet, after two months had thus elapsed, the latter declared that they would accept baptism, if Poland would consent to diminish the tribute, to grant to the country a permanent peace, and to draw up a deed of the transaction. The bishop, whose meek ways, friendly behavior, and works of charity had won every heart, obtained those concessions from the Poles, and on Oct. 25 he christened both sons of the prominent citizen Domizlav, the father soon afterwards; then five hundred relations and other connections of that powerful family an example which

considerably influenced the people generally. The four temples of the city were destroyed, and Otto sent to the pope the three heads of the idol Triglay. After establishing two churches, one in honor of St. Adalbert-the patron saint of the Slaves-the other under the name of Peter and Paul, Otto, leaving two of his priests in the city, visited the towns of Garz and Lubezin, left a priest in each, and repaired to Julin, where the intelligence of Stettin's conversion had already been received. The inhabitants came to meet him on his way, and begged his pardon for their former conduct. Otto consecrated two altars in the city, interdicted the burying of the dead in forests, prohibited piracy, the intercourse with idolators, polygamy, and the inveterate custom of killing newborn girls when there were some girls already in the family. In the ensuing winter Otto, passing through Dodona (now Dodow), where he laid the foundations of two churches, went to Colberg and Belgard, the inhabitants of which did not prove open to his teachings. Hence he returned to Pyritz, Stettin, and Julin where he confirmed the proselytes, inaugurated the building of churches, and then journeyed over Dodona and Belgard to Colberg, where he buried the deacon Hermann, drowned in the Persante. On Ash Wednesday he set on his way homewards, having converted 22,166 persons and founded eleven churches; he traveled through Poland, Silesia, and Bohemia, and arrived at Bamberg on the Saturday before Easter, March 29. Epidemics and great mortality having afflicted Stettin, the idolators pointed at those plagues as being the punishment visited by the gods upon the apostates. This caused a general relapse, and made Otto sensible of the necessity of interfering in person, and of converting the cities of Demmin, Götzkow, Usedom, and Wolgast, still left to idolatry. He set out April 19, 1128, crossed Saxony and Mecklenburg, carrying on fifty wagons the articles required for fitting out the churches. June 10 Wratislav assembled at Usedom the nobles of the left bank of the Oder: they were baptized, and promised to protect the Christian faith in their dominions. Otto longed to gain also to Christianity the inhabitants of the island of Rügen, but insuperable obstacles lay in his way. In Stettin, where a very few had remained faithful, Otto was threatened with death; he at once repaired to the church of Paul and Peter, and while the song of hymns filled the vaults of the church, the sound of arms was heard outside. The crowd calmed down by and by, and dispersed; a sermon in the market-place, whither the clergy repaired in procession under the protection of Wirtska, retrieved the strayed flock. Julin followed again the example of Stettin. The saint now visited again all the places of Pomerania where he had worked, and, journeying through Poland, reached

Bamberg Dec. 20. Though he did not again see the country he had converted, he watched from afar over these young Christian communities to the time of his death, which occurred June 30, 1139. The conversion of Pomerania, and its accession to the German empire in 1181, induced a number of monks and colonists to immigrate to the country of the Wends, depopulated by long wars. Wratislav, the first Christian prince, was in 1134 murdered by a heathen at Stolpe, near Anelam. On the spot where the deed had been committed a little church was built, and in 1153 the first monastery was founded there, and occupied by Benedictines from Berg, near Magdeburg. We mention some other notable monasteries: Kolbatz, 1163; Belbuck, 1170; Eldena, 1207; Brukow and Neucamp, 1231; Hiddensee, 1299; Pudagla, 1308; all of which stood under “abbates baculati.” The following places of pilgrimage were distinguished:

- 1.** The Gollenberg, near Coslin, celebrated throughout Europe, with a church consecrated to the Virgin, the spire of which served as a light-house;
- 2.** The Revekohl, near Schmolsin (circle of Stolpe), a mountain on which a church had been founded in honor of St. Nicholas, the patron of mariners;
- 3.** The Holy Mountain, south of the city of Pollnow, from 1290;
- 4.** Bernstein;
- 5.** Wusseken, near Coslin, from 1395;
- 6.** Kenz, near Barth, from 1405;
- 7.** Werben, from 1474. While the largest part of the duchy of Pomerania, with part of the Ukermark, the Neumark, and of what is now called Western Prussia, was a dependency of the bishopric of Kammin, the western part of the country belonged to the diocese of Schwerin, and the island of Rügen, connected with Pomerania in 1325, resorted to the Danish bishopric of Roskilde.

The names of the bishops of Kammin are as follows:

- 1.** Adalbert, a Franconian (1128-1162), resided at Julin.
- 2.** Conrad (1162-1185). The seat of the bishops was transferred to Kammin, because Julin was destroyed by the Danes in 1175.

- 3.** Siegfried (1186-1202). Under his administration there was a considerable immigration of Germans, who founded a number of cities. Jacob Beringer, a knight from Bamberg, who settled in Stettin, built in 1187 for the Germans the church of St. Jacob, with 30 altars.
- 4.** Sigwin (1202-1217) preached himself. While he was bishop Stralsund was built, in 1209; and in 1214 the Templars arrived in Pomerania, and, owing to the great esteem they enjoyed, became counselors of the government. In November, 1216, Christian, the apostle and bishop of Prussia, visited Pomerania, his native country, and dwelt a few days with the old, sickly Sigwin at Kammin. Duke Casimir, in company with a number of Templars, undertook a pilgrimage to the Holy Sepulcher, where he died, in 1217.
- 5.** Conrad II (1218-1238). Anastasia, the pious widow of Bogislav I, founded in 1223 the nunnery of the Virgins at Treptow, endowed it, and was buried in it.
- 6.** Conrad III, count of Guitzkow (1233-1248). The abbot of Eldena, Wigard, founded in 1233 the city of Greifswalde. In 1240 Franciscans settled at Stettin, and in 1244 a nunnery was founded in the same city.
- 7.** Dr. Wilhelm, resigned in the following year. Under his administration the nunnery of Marienfliess was built by Wratislav III, whose daughter Barbara was the first abbess.
- 8.** Hermann, count of Gleichen (1249-1288), a relation of the margraves of Brandenburg, promoted German civilization, and preserved a predilection for Brandenburg. In 1263 a chapter composed of twelve canons was erected in the church of St. Mary at Stettin, and confirmed by Urban IV. In 1270 was founded the nunnery of Mary at Coslin, and in 1277 Barnim presented the diocese of Kammin with the town of Colberg.
- 9.** Jarimar, prince of Rügen (1288-1296), directed the worldly business, while the Dominican Dr. Petrus administered the ecclesiastical affairs as a vicar, until 1299.
- 10.** Henry of Wachholt (1299-1317), a Saxon, founded six archdeaconries (1303) at Kammin, Stargard, Stettin, Demmin, Usedom, and Stolpe. The possessions of the suppressed Templars were given to the Joannites; the latter had their house first at Rrike, and in 1382 at Wildenbruck. In 1313 Wratislav IV presented the Augustines with his mansion at Anelam.

- 11.** Conrad IV (1317-1322) was a learned and eloquent prelate, zealous defender of the independence of his see, and a faithful ally to the dukes in agitated times.
- 12.** He was succeeded until 1329 by Dr. Wilhelm.
- 13.** Frederick, count of Eichstüdt (1329-1343), assisted the dukes in their wars, and was entrusted with diplomatic negotiations.
- 14.** John, duke of Saxe-Lauenburg, grandson of Wratislav IV (1343-1370). In 1346 the collegiate church of St. Otto, with a deacon and twelve canons, was founded near the castle of Stettin. In 1350 the pest swept away two thirds of the inhabitants of the country; troops of Flagellants walked through the land. In 1360 the Carthusian monastery of Stettin was founded. The bishop held a synod; and in 1363, when Charles IV, emperor of Germany, married Elizabeth, the daughter of Bogislav V, he appeared at court at Cracow.
- 15.** Philip Lumbach (1370-1386), an active pastor. After his death Wenceslas (although expelled from the empire) invested his chancellor with the episcopal dignity.
- 16.** John, canon of Lebus.
- 17.** Bogislav VIII administered the diocese for a short time.
- 18.** John of Oppeln changed sees with the bishop of Kulm, Nicolas Buck (1398-1410).
- 19.** Magnus, duke of Lower Saxe Lauenburg, a son of Eric (1410-1422), was at the Council of Constance. He was called to the see of Hildesheim, and is buried in the cathedral of that city.
- 20.** Siegfried Buck, from Stolpe (1422-1446), accompanied, in 1423, king Eric of Denmark, Norway, and Sweden on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, and went in 1433 to the Council of Basle. He held a synod, in which he interdicted the game of dice and the sport to his clergy. In 1438 the Hussites, attracted by Bogislav IX, penetrated as far as Stettin, and plundered Kolbatz. In 1440 the Putzkaller sect arose near Barth, and subsisted during thirty years.
- 21.** Henning Jven, a very benevolent prelate, was greatly beloved for his Christian indulgence. He used to say, "Aut sumus, aut fuimus, aut

possumus esse quod hic est." In 1450 Barnim VIII undertook a pilgrimage to Rome with his wife, at the occasion of the jubilee. In 1454, on the Sunday Judica, the bishop held a synodi at Gilzow: the resolutions have been preserved. On Oct. 17, 1456, he inaugurated, in common with bishop Albert of Sydow, the Academy of Greifsevalde, and was appointed its chancellor and conservator.

22. Lewis, count of Eberstein, who resigned in 1480.

23. The Italian, Marino di Fregeno, till 1482. The see of Kammin remained vacant for five years, Vrolinus Westfal being administrator.

24. Benedict. Bohemian baron of Waldstein, canon at Olmiitz (1486-1499). Encouraged by him, Andrew, abbot of Michaelsberg at Bamberg, wrote in 1487 the life of St. Otto in Latin. In October, 1492, a synod met at Stargard.

25. Martin Carith, from Colberg, archdeacon at Arenswalde (1499-1521), resided at Cislin; accompanied, in 1496-1498, Bogislav X to the Holy Land; held Oct. 5, 1500, a synod in the church of St. Mary at Stettin; and ordered the synodal statutes and the Breviary to be printed, 1505. He died Nov. 26, 1521, at Stettin.

26. Erasmus of Manteufel, the last Catholic bishop of Kammin, died in his mansion at Bast, Jan. 27, 1544.

II. Introduction of Protestantism. — The duke Barnim who had studied at Wittenberg during the first effervescence of the Reformation (1518-1520), and who had even been chosen rector of the university, took in hand the reins of government, together with his elder brother George, in 1523, and favored Protestantism. George, whose sympathies remained with the old Church, died early, and his son Philip followed his uncle's example. A number of preachers traveled through Pomerania, urging on the people the necessity of returning to the purity of Christ's Church. Among these apostles of the new creed were: Paul of Rhoda, from Mansfeld, who stopped at Stettin; John Amandus, who exerted himself strenuously at Königsberg, Stolpe, Stettin, and finally went to Goslar; Nicolas Klein, at Colberg and Cislin; Paul Klotze, at Marienthron; John Kniepstraw, at Stargard, Stettin, Greifswalde, and Stralsund; Peter Swawe, at Greifswalde; John Bugenhagen, Christian Kettelhodt, and John Kiureke, at Stralsund. At the time of the wars of the peasants, Pomerania was not

exempt from civil and ecclesiastical troubles, and bloody riots took place, especially at Stettin and Stralsund. The bishop Erasmus von Manteufel invited his clergy to assemble at Stargard Aug. 20, 1525, in order to deliberate on the measures by which the progress of the Reformation could be stopped. The princes, to accomplish the ecclesiastical revolution, convoked a diet at Treptow Dec. 13, 1534, and invited the chapters thereto, with the threatening remark that, whether they attended or not, the resolutions should be law for them in any case. The bishop, the abbots, prelates, and a considerable part of the nobility, protested against the resolutions of the diet, and retired before its close. The remainder of the assembly declared for the Reformation. Bugenhagen composed a liturgy, and Erasmus was offered, if he would submit to the decision of the diet, to remain the chief of the new Church, and to preserve his dignity and the possessions connected with it; but he declined. Only a tenth of the monasteries was spared: the nunneries of Marienfliess, Stolpe, Bergen, Kammin, and Colberg-and these also had to undergo great modifications. Almost all the monks left the country. Care was taken, however, of those whom old age kept back; the younger monks were sent to Wittenberg, to study there at public expense, and those who were willing to marry were similarly assisted. After Erasmus's death, the two dukes could not at first agree on the choice of his successor. At last Bartholomew Swawe, Barnim's chancellor, united both suffrages. He was ordained, and invested in 1545 by three superintendents, in the presence of seven ministers; but part of the clergy, objecting to his being a married man, complained at the court of Charles V, and obtained in 1548 a decree of suspension. Bartholomew in this distress sent a prelate, Martin Weiher, to pope Paul III, in order to obtain the papal confirmation. The bishop's legate came back with letters from the apostolic legate and from the emperor, by which the chapter was empowered to elect Martin himself. Weiher was elected, and Julius III confirmed his election by a brief of Oct. 13, 1551. But Oct. 24, 1552, he was inaugurated again, this time according to the Protestant rite. After Martin's death, the princes, to avoid the difficulties resulting from further elections, determined to establish in the episcopal see only members of the ducal house. This noble family (it was five centuries old) was condemned to early extinction: in a period of a few years six princes died without posterity. Bogislav XIV, the last of them, by his alliance with Gustavus Adolphus, who succeeded in making himself the master of Pomerania, had so exhausted all his resources that his funeral ceremonies could be celebrated only seventeen years after his death, which occurred in

1637. His nephew, son of his sister, Ernst Bogislav, duke of Croy, had sold the bishopric of Kammin to Frederick William, elector of Brandenburg (1650). But, if we except the episcopal election, everything remained unchanged. See Milman, *Mitslav, or the Conversion of Pomerania* (1854). The history of Pomerania after this time is clearly Protestant, and will be treated in the art. PRUSSIA *SEE PRUSSIA* (q.v.).

Pomeranus

SEE BUGENHAGEN.

Pomerius, Julianus

a noted Spanish prelate, flourished in the latter part of the 7th century as archbishop of Toledo, about A.D. 680-690, while Spain was still under the dominion of the Goths, before the Saracen invasion. That he was of Jewish extraction may be seen from what Mariana (6, 18) says of him: "Brat Julianus eruditionis laude ea aetate celebris, lue ejus libri testantur. Fuit ex Judaeorum sanguine prognatus, Eugenii tertii discipulus, Quirini Toletani Praesulis successor, ingenis facili, copioso, suavi, probitatis opinione singulari." Great praise is awarded to him by the historians of that period, especially for his writings and labors as a bishop. He took part in the great monothelite disputes of his time concerning the twofold will of Christ—a question on which this bishop, or rather the Council of Toledo, at which he presided, declared quite independently of the bishop of Rome: "Nebis (Julian disputatio) aliquanto liberior visa est, quam tit Juliani modestiam erga Romanum pontificem summe Ecclesiae rectorem, deceret." Without going any further into details concerning this theological dispute, we shall only speak of Pomerius's writings concerning Jews and Judaism. At the instigation of king Ervigius, he wrote a work, which he dedicated to the king, entitled *De Sexta Etatis comprobatione adversus Judecos*, reprinted in the *Bibl. Maxim. Patrum*, vol. 12. His aim was to demonstrate that the Messiah must have already come, although the Jews claimed that the Messiah was to come 6000 years after the creation of the world; on the other hand, he wished to strengthen the Christians in their faith, for said he in his modesty, "Ut si non corrigatur Jumldeus, saltem proficiat Christianus." Besides this work, he left as the fruit of his labors, *Responsionum liber in Defensionem Canounum et Legum, quibus prohibentur Christiana mancipia infidelibus deserire: — Prognosficorum fJtturi sceculi* (Leips. 1535) lib. 3: — *Historia Wanbe Regis Toletani de*

expeditione et victoria, qua rebellanten contra se Galliae Provincinam celebri triuanpho pedomauit: — De Anima (which reminds us of a work by Nemesius): — *le Contenptu mundii ac rerum transiturarum De Vitiis et Virtutibus: — De Virginibs instituend*, etc. See *Sacsoruma Concilio Lutum noca et aniplissima collectio*, ed. Mansi (Ven. et Flor. 1759), 12:9; Andr. Duchesne, *Rerun Gallicarutin et Francicarum Scriptores* (Par. 1739), 2, 707 sq.; Antonii *Bibl. Hist. Vetus*, 2, 303; Ferrara, *Hist. of Spain* (Germ. transl.), 2, 453, etc.; Gritz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, 5, 140-146; the same, *Die westgothische Gesetzgebung in Betreff d. Juden* (Bresl. 1858), p. 14 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 12:51; Jocher, *Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lex.* s.v.; Da Costa, *Israel (and the Gentiles)*, p. 309 sq.; Basnage, *Hist. des Juifs* (Engl. transl. by Taylor), p. 582; Kalkar, *Israel und die Kirche*, p. 19 sq.; Fürst., *Bibl. Jud.* 3, 111; Pick, in the *Evangelical Review*, July, 1876, p. 359; Gennadius, *De Viris illustribus*, c. 98; Fabricius, *Bibl. mzecl. et ilfiun. Latinit.* v. *Julianus Pomerius*; Tillemont, *Mellmuoires*, 16, 29 sq. (B. P.)

Pomeroy, Benjamin, D.D.

a Congregational minister, was born at Suffield, Conn., in 1704. He graduated at Yale College in 1733, and was ordained in December, 1735, pastor in Hebron, Conn., where he labored during his life. During Whitefield's revival he preached with great zeal and power. In 1742 he was brought before the General Assembly to answer under the new law for "having committed great disorders," but was acquitted. Some time after he was punished for lecturing to the people in a grove at Colchester, the parish minister having refused his permission; and in 1744 he was convicted of denouncing the recent ecclesiastical laws as cruel, and bound for fifty pounds to continue in "good behavior" during the year. He was a chaplain in the French and Revolutionary wars, and was an excellent scholar, a man of real genius, and one of the best preachers of his day. He died Dec. 22 1784. See Sprague. *Ann. of the Amer. Pulpit*, 1, 394.

Pomeroy, Medad

an eminent Presbyterian minister, was born in Southampton, Mass., April 6, 1792. He was early left an orphan, but was blessed with prudent and kind relatives, by whom he was taught the way of life. He was educated at Williams College (Mass.), where he graduated in 1817. Soon after this he taught the academy at Aurora, N. Y., for two years, during which time and for some months after he studied theology under the direction of Dirck C.

Lansing, D.D., pastor of the First Church of Auburn, N. Y. In 1820 he began preaching at Sherwood's Corner, where he labored ten months, and was then settled at Cayuga Bridge. For six years he preached at that place and at the "Stone Church," between Cayuga and Springport; for six additional years at Cayuga only; in February, 1833, he accepted a call to Elbridge, N. Y., where he remained for nearly eight years; in November, 1840, he returned to Cayuga, and ministered to that people for another twelve years, resigning on account of impaired health; in 1854 he removed to Wellsburg, Chemung County, N. Y., and served a church there; in 1856 he was called to Otisco, Onondaga County, N. Y., where he was pastor for five years, and 1861 he removed to Auburn, to spend the remainder of his days in rest. He died June 20, 1867. Mr. Pomeroy was a man of acute mind, penetrating discernment, and tenacious thought. His style was compact and lucid, and his preaching earnest and searching. His ministrations were greatly blessed. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1868, p. 223; Appleton's *Annual Cyclopaedia* (1867), 7:566. (J. L. S.)

Pomeroy, Swan Lyman, D.D.

Congregational minister, and a man of more than ordinary scholarship, was born March 4, 1799. He was a graduate of Brown University, and of Andover Theological Seminary, where he completed his course in 1824. He was settled for some years as a pastor in Bangor, Me., and was called thence to a secretary-ship of the American Board of Commissioners of Foreign Missions. He displayed great ability and energy in this position for a number of years, but terminated his connection with it about 1860. He did not after that, we believe, have any pastoral charge. He died at Sunderland, Mass., March 17, 1869. See Appleton's *Annual Cyclopaedia*, 9, 503.

Pomfret, John

an English clergyman, more noted as a poet than as a divine, was the son of a clergyman, who held at the time of John's birth the rectory of Luton, in Bedfordshire. He was born about 1667, and was educated at a grammar school in the country, and thence sent to Cambridge, but to what college is uncertain. He devoted himself especially to the study of polite literature, wrote most of his poetical pieces, and took both the degrees in arts. After that he took holy orders, and was presented to the living of Maiden, in Bedfordshire. About 1703 he went to London for institution to a larger and

very considerable living; but was stopped some time by Compton, then bishop of London, on account of these four lines of his poem entitled *The Choice*:

*“And as I near approach’d the verge of life,
Some kind elation (for I’d have no wife)
Should take upon him all my worldly care,
While I did for a better state prepare.”*

The parenthesis in these lines was so maliciously represented that the good bishop was made to believe from it that Pomfret preferred a mistress to a wife; though no such meaning can be deduced, unless it be asserted that an unmarried clergyman cannot live without a mistress. But the bishop was soon convinced that this representation was nothing more than the effect of malice, as Pomfret at that time was actually married. The opposition, however, which his slanderers had given him was not without effect; for, being by this obliged to stay in London longer than he intended, he caught the small-pox, and died of it in 1702. “*The Choice*,” says Dr. Johnson, “exhibits a system of life adapted to common notions, and equal to common expectations; such a state as affords plenty and tranquillity, without exclusion of intellectual pleasures. Perhaps no composition in our language has been oftener perused than Pomfret’s *Choice*. In his other poems there is an easy volubility; the pleasure of smooth meter is afforded to the ear, and the mind is not oppressed with ponderous or entangled with intricate sentiment. He pleases many, and he who pleases many must have merit.” A volume of his poems; was published by himself in 1699, with a very modest and sensible preface. Two pieces of his were published after his death by his friend Philalethes; one entitled *Reason*, and written in 1700, when the disputes about the Trinity ran high; the other, *Dies Novissima, or The Last Epiphany*, a Pindaric ode. His versification is not unmusical, but there is not the force in his writings which is necessary to constitute a poet. A dissenting teacher of his name, who published some rhymes upon spiritual subjects, occasioned fanaticism to be imputed to him; but his friend Philalethes has justly cleared him from this. Pomfret had a very strong mixture of devotion, but no fanaticism. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. s.v.*; *Généralé Biog. Dict. S. V.*

Pomis, Christian de

a converted Portuguese Jew, flourished in the 17th century. In 1668 he was baptized at Nuremberg, and in 1669 he was made teacher of the Hebrew

and Talmudic language at the University of Altorf. He wrote *Comparatio agni Paschulis Vet. Test. cum agno Paschalis Novi Test. oratione Hebraea memoriter proposita*, in Hebrew, with a Latin transl. (Altorf, 1669). See *Cod. Senat. Lips. 19:4*; Delitzsch, *Wissenschaft u. Kunst d. Judenthums* (Grimma, 1838), p. 302; Jocher, *Gelehrten-Lex. s.v.* (B. P.)

Pomis, David de

a Jewish savant of note, was born in 1525 at Spoleto, of the celebrated family called in Hebrew **פּוּיַ וּפְתַח**, which, like the families **אֶמֶן מַיִר [נח]** and **מַיִר [נח]**, traced their origin to those Jews who were led into captivity after the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus and Vespasian. His father gave him his first instruction, initiating him in all the cycle of Biblical and Talmudic lore in Mecenia. After his father's death De Pomis studied medicine, and greatly distinguished himself in that department. In 1545 he went to Perugia, where he remained till 1552, prosecuting his studies in medicine, philosophy, and philology. He then entered into official service at Maghaus in Sabionetta till 1555; became physician to count Nicolo Ursino (1555-1560), and to prince Sforza (1560-1563); went to Rome, and then to Venice, where he died. Of De Pomis we have the following works: **דַּוִּד בֶּן מַיִר**, i.e. *The Offspring of David*, a Hebrew and Talmudic Lexicon in Hebrew, Latin, and Italian (Ven. 1587), dedicated to Sixtus V: — **תֵּל הַקֵּץ**, an Italian commentary on Ecclesiastes (ibid. 1571): — *Discorso a l'humana misera*, etc., being a supplement to the commentary on Ecclesiastes (ibid. 1572): — a commentary on Job and a commentary on Daniel, which are still in MS. See Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3, 111 sq.; Basnage, *Hist. des Juifs* (Engl. transl. by Taylor), p. 724; Kitto, *Cyclop.* s.v.; *Jahrbuch der Gesch. d. Juden*, 2, 359; De Rossi, *Dizionario storico degli Autori Ebrei* (Germ. transl. by Hamberger), p. 266 sq.; Acosta, *Israel and the Gentiles*, p. 487; Etheridge, *Hebrew Literature*, p. 454. (B. P.)

Pommel

[an old English term, derived from the French *pomme*, an apple, and signifying anything round, but now applied only to a part of a saddle] (**הַלְגַּ**) *gullah*, a globular or round thing, a bowl, which it signifies in Eccles. 12:6; ^{<304B>}Zechariah 4:3), the ball or round ornament on the capital of a column (^{<14012>}2 Chronicles 4:12, 13; “bowl,” ^{<10741>}1 Kings 7:41, 42). **SEE COLUMN.**

Pommeraye, Jean-François

a French Benedictine monk, was born in 1617 at Rouen. He entered in 1637 the Congregation of Saint-Maur, made his profession at Tumieges, and renounced voluntarily all charges of his order to devote himself to study. He died at Rouen Oct. 28, 1687. He left several works, more remarkable for erudition than sound criticism. We mention, *Hist. de l'Abbaye de Saint-Ouen de Rouen, de Saint-Amand, et de Sainte-Catherine de la meme Ville* (Rouen, 1662, fol.): — *Hist. des Acheveques de Rouen* (*ibid.* 1667, fol.), the best of his works: — *Hist. de la Cathedrale de Rouen* (*ibid.* 1686, 4to). Pommeraye published after the demise of Dom Jean Anger Godin, its true author, a *Recueil des Conciles et des Synodes de Rouen* (1667, 4to); but this collection was put into the shade by the excellent work *Conciles de Normandie*, published by Dom Bessin (1717, fol.). — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, s.v.

Pomona

a female deity among the ancient Romans, who presided over fruit-trees. Her worship was under the superintendence of a special priest.

Pomorani

SEE POMORYANS.

Pomoryans

are a small body of Russian Dissenters, so called from their proximity to the Lake Ladoga and the White Sea, or from Pomori, a village in the government of Olonetz, where they appear to have originated. They believe that Antichrist has already come; reigns in the world unseen, that is, spiritually; and has put an end in the Church to everything that is holy. This belief they found upon the assertion by John (~~1~~ 1 John 4:3), "This is that spirit of Antichrist whereof ye have heard that it should come, and even *now* already is it in the world." It is probable that Russian Dissenters, as well as others, consider the secular spirit of their Church establishment as the very spirit of Antichrist, blasting everything that is truly spiritual and holy. They are zealous in opposing the innovations of Nikon with regard to the Church books; prefer a life of celibacy and solitude, and rebaptize their converts from other sects. See Pinkerton, *Greek Church*, p. 330; Platon, *Greek Church* (see Index).

Pomp, Nicholas

one of the earliest and most prominent ministers of the German Reformed Church in this country, was a native of Germany, where he was born Jan. 20, 1734. He prosecuted his studies, classical and theological, in the University of Halle; came to America under the auspices of the Church of Holland in 1760, and took charge of the German Reformed Church in Faulkner Swamp, Montgomery County, Pa., where he labored with much success. In 1783 he received a call to Baltimore, Md., where he exercised his ministry for six years, when he returned again, in 1789, to the scene of his first labors; but in the following year he removed to Indianfield, in Bucks County, Pa., where he continued in the faithful discharge of his pastoral duties up to the close of the last century, when failing health compelled him to retire from the active duties of his office. From that time onwards he resided with his son, the Rev. Thomas Pomp, pastor of the German Reformed Church in Easton, Pa., where he died, Sept. 1, 1819. In the early part of his ministry he published an able little work in reply to a “mischievous book on Universalism” which was circulated among the Germans, entitled *The Everlasting Gospel*. Father Pomp occupied a prominent position in the Reformed Church of this country. See Harbaugh, *Fathers of the Ref. Church*, 2, 131-138. (D. Y. H.)

Pomp, Thomas

an amiable and eminent minister of the German Reformed Church, son of the former, was born in Montgomery County, Pa., Feb. 4, 1773. “His literary and theological studies he pursued principally, if not wholly, under the immediate care and supervision of his devoted and accomplished father.” He entered the ministry when only twenty years of age. For a short time he was pastor of some congregations in his native county. In 1796, three years after being licensed, he accepted a call from the Reformed Church in Easton, Pa. Here, in connection with some country churches, he labored earnestly and with singular fidelity for considerably more than half a century, up to near the close of his quiet and beautiful life, April 22, 1852, when he was transferred from the Church militant on earth to the blessed “inheritance of the saints in light.” Mr. Pomp was naturally gifted; but he was principally distinguished for his singular amiability, gentleness, meekness, and peaceful relations with all mankind. He retained to the last moment of his life the unabated confidence of his people and the warmest

esteem of all who knew him. See Heisler, *Fathers of the Ref. Church*, 4, 15-25. (D. Y. H.)

Pompa

a solemn procession among the ancient heathens, on the occasion of a sacred festival, a funeral, a triumph, or for any special reasons.

Pompa Circensis

the sacred procession with which the Circensian games were introduced. On this occasion the statues of the gods, placed on wooden platforms, were borne upon the shoulders of men, and when very heavy they were drawn along upon carriages.

Pompaei

(*πομπάιοι*), certain gods among the ancient Greeks, who received this name as being conductors by the way; but what gods are specially referred to is uncertain, unless Mercury be meant, whose office it was to conduct souls to Hades. On certain days, called Apopompae, sacrifices were offered to the Pompei.

Pompignan, Jean-Georges le Franc de

a French prelate, brother of the poet Pompignan, was born at Montauban Feb. 22, 1715. After finishing his studies at the College Louis le Grand and at the Seminary of St. Sulpice, he was made canon in his native diocese, but he had scarcely taken his license when he was appointed bishop of Le Puy (Dec. 25, 1742). In 1747 he obtained *in commendam* the abbey of St. Chaffre in his diocese, and was sent as a deputy to the assembly of the clergy held in 1755. He sided, in the strife which divided at that time the Church of France, with the party of the *Feuillants*, so called because they adopted the principles of the cardinal De la Rochefoucauld, the new minister of the portfolio of the prebendaries, in opposition to the party of the *Thaetins* who sided with the Theatine Boyer, previously bishop of Mirepoix. Pompignan was sent by the assembly to address the pope on the articles drawn up by both parties. He was one of the presidents of the assembly of 1760, and the author of the remonstrances to the king in favor of the members of the clergy banished by Parliament. He was untiring in writing against the vices and incredulity of his epochworks which made him many enemies, among whom was Voltaire. In 1774 Louis XV made

him archbishop of Vienne. In 1788 he sided with the tiers-etat in the etats of the Dauphine, and this conduct caused him to be deputed to the Etats Generaux. He was true there to the same line of conduct, and was conspicuous at the head of the members of the clergy who, June 22, 1789, joined the tiers-etat. The consequence was that he became one of the first presidents of the National Assembly. On Aug. 4 of the ensuing year the king entrusted him with the roll of the prebendary and the following day he was appointed minister of state, and took his seat in the council. Being aware that *he* could not reside in his diocese, he resigned the episcopal see, and received in exchange the abbey of Buzai. The suspension of the nomination to the prebendaries, Nov. 9, 1789, left him minister without portfolio, and was followed by considerable changes introduced into the Church of France by the decree of July 12, 1790, on the civil constitution of the clergy. Pius VI addressed to Pompignan a bull, in which he condemned the new decrees, and exhorted him to bring his whole influence to bear upon the king to prevent him from giving them his sanction. This bull was resultless, as the king sanctioned the decrees on Aug. 24. Pompignan had nothing to do with this decision of Louis XVI, inasmuch as he had not attended the meetings of the council since Aug. 17, suffering already of the disease of which he died at Paris, Dec. 30, 1790. Besides a number of *Mandemerts*, pastoral letters, and reports to the assembly of the clergy, he left *Questions diverses ssur l'Incredulit* (Paris, 1753, 12mo): — *Le veritable Usage de l'Autorite seculiere dans les Miatisres qui concernent la Religion* (1753, 1784, 12mo): — *L'Incredulite convaincue par les Prophetes* (1759, 3 vols. 12mo): — *La Religion venezgee de l'Incredulite par l'Incrdulite ellemenze* (1772, 12mo): — *L'Oraisor funebre de la Dauphine* (1747, 4to): — *L'Oraison Jinbre de la Reine Marie Leczinska* (1768, 4to): — *Lettres a unml Ezeque sur plusieurs Points de Morale et de Discipline* (1802, 2 vols. 8vo). See biographical sketch in his posthumous publications; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, s.v.; Jervis, *Hist. of the Church of France*, 2, 371; Van Laun, *Hist. of French Lit.* (N.Y. 1877, 3 vols. 8vo).

Pomponatius, Peter

SEE POMPONAZZI.

Pomponazzi, Pietro

a famous Italian philosopher, was born at Mantua in 1462, and after studying at the University of Padua became a professor of philosophy in his alma mater. He also taught and wrote at Bologna with the highest distinction. Although small in stature-for he was almost a dwarf-he yet astonished his contemporaries by his remarkable intellectual power, and became one of the most eminent men of his times. He had frequent disputations with the famous Achillini, whose puzzling objections would have confounded him had it not been for his skill in parrying them by his keen wit as well as by a sharp-cutting logic. He used to apply himself to the solution of difficulties so very intensely that he frequently forgot to eat, drink, sleep, and perform the ordinary functions of nature; nay, it made him almost distracted, and a laughing-stock to every one, as he himself tells us. He died in 1525. He wrote *De Immortalitate Animae* (1516), in which he maintains that the immortality of the soul cannot be proved by philosophical (or natural) reasons, but depends solely on revelation, which he accepts. This precaution, however, did not save him from attacks, and many adversaries rose up against him who did not scruple to treat him as an atheist; and the monks caused his book, although he wrote several apologies for it, to be burned at Venice. Another work of his on *Incantations* was also regarded as dangerous. He shows in this that he does not believe in magic and sorcery, and lays a prodigious stress on occult virtues in certain men by which they produced miraculous effects. He gives a great many examples of this, but his adversaries do not admit them to be true, or free from magic. See Bayle, *Dict. Hist.* s.v.; Niceron, *Mmoires*, vol. 25; Olearius, *De Pomponatio* (Jena, 1705,4to); Buhle, *Geschichte der neueren Philosophie*, vol. 2; Ueberweg, *Hist. of Philos.* (see Index); Neander, *Christian) Dogmas* (see Index); Lecky, *Hist. of Rationalism*, 1, 370; Fisher, *Hist. of the Reformation*, p. 542; Alzog, *Kirchengesch.* 2, 222; Morell, *Hist. of Philosophy* (see Index); Ranke, *Hist. of the Papacy*, 1, 63, 64, 377.

Pomponia, Graecina

the wife of Plautius, a Roman general who commanded in England in the year 45, is thought, from a sentence in the *Annals* of Tacitus (13, 32), to have been a Christian, and the first in Britain. Tacitus says: "Also Pomponia Graecina, an illustrious woman, married to Plautils (who on his return from Britain entered the city with the pomp of an ovation), but

accused of a foreign superstition, was left to the decision of her husband." She was tried, according to custom, for her abandonment of the national worship, by her own husband, Plautius, in the presence of her kindred, and was acquitted. She lived to a great age, apparently in sorrow, and wearing "no habit but that of mourning." This was attributed to grief for the fate of Julia, the daughter of Drusus, who was put to death by Messalina fourteen years before the accusation was brought against Pomponia. But this alone would not account for the charge of forsaking the Roman religion; and the supposition that she was a Christian, and that her mode of life grew out of her religious faith, is certainly quite probable. The wife of Plautius and Claudia Ruffina are supposed to be of the saints that were in Cesar's household, mentioned by Paul (Phil. 4:22). Claudia is celebrated by Martial for her admirable beauty and learning in the following epigram:

*"From painted Britons how was Claudia born!
The fair barbarian! how do arts adorn!
When Roman charms a Grecian soul commend,
Athens and Rome may for the dame contend."*

Speed, a very ancient British author, says that "Claudia sent Paul's writings, which she calls spiritual manna, unto her friends in Britain, to feed their souls with the bread of life; and also the writings of Martial, to instruct their minds with those lessons best fitting to produce moral virtues"—which Speed thinks was the occasion of this line in Martial's works: "And Britons now, they say, our verses learn to sing." Gildas, the most ancient and authentic British historian, who wrote about A.D. 564, in his book called *De Vict, Aurelii Ambrosii*, affirms that the Britons received the Gospel under Tiberius, the emperor under whom Christ suffered; and that many evangelists were sent from the apostles into this nation, who were the first planters of the Gospel; and who, he elsewhere says, continued with them until the cruel persecution of Diocletian, the emperor, about A.D. 290. See Ivimev. *Hist. of the English Baptists*; Fisher. *Beginnings of Christianity* (N. Y. 1877, 8vo), p. 521. (J. H.W.)

Pomponius Laetus, Julius

a distinguished Italian humanist, was born in 1425 at Amendolara, in Upper Calabria. He seems to have been a bastard of the illustrious house of Sanseverini, in the kingdom of Naples. So far from being proud of this relationship, he shunned every reference to it; and when, in later times, his parents invited the admired writer to acknowledge them, he answered,

“Pomponius Laetus cognatis et propinquis suis salutem. Quod petitis fieri non potest. Vale.” Hewas still very young when he arrived at Rome, where he studied literature under Pietro di Monopoli, a clever grammarian of the time. At the death of Lorenzo Valla, his last master (1457), he was deemed fit to succeed him. He founded an academy, where several literary men, devoted like himself to the study of antiquity, assembled. Most of them were voting men. Their enthusiasm for the classics made them renounce their Christian names, and adopt in their stead names borrowed from the classical languages. Perhaps these comparisons between the institutions of the past and of their own time may have resulted in depreciating criticisms of the latter. Malignity knew how to transform these, in the eyes of pope Paul II, into contempt for religion, complot against the Church, and finally conspiracy against its chief. Those of the academicians who could be got hold of were put to the rack—one of them died during the proceedings. Pomponius, who was at the time a resident of Venice, was arrested there, brought to Rome, and tortured like the others; but no avowal of his imagined crime could be pressed out of him. After interrogating him twice, Paul II declared that in future every one should be held for a heretic who, even in jest, pronounced the word “academy” (comp. on this point De Rossi, *Roma Sotteranea*, vol. 1). In 1471 Sixtus IV, Paul’s successor, allowed Pomponius to resume his professorship in the Roman college, where he met with the same favor he had formerly enjoyed, the students crowding to his lectures. Among those disciples (they were called Pomponiani) some were men of merit, as Alessandro Farnese, pope under the name of Paul III, Andrea Fulvio of Preneste, and Conrad Pentinger. No one ever was fonder of manuscripts, medals, and inscriptions than Pomponius Laetus; he was constantly seen pacing the streets of Rome in search of some monument of those pagan times in which he wished he had lived. There was no dark corner, no trace of antiquity, but he had carefully examined it, and could give an account of it. In his little house on the Janiculum, with some chosen friends, he solemnized the anniversary of the foundation of Rome and the birth of Romulus. Pomponius was of a mild and kind disposition, always ready to help or to please, and of charming modesty. Nature made him a stammerer, but he completely conquered this defect. He was often seen in the streets with a lantern in his hands, like Diogenes, whose customs and habits he had taken to imitate. He died at Rome May 21, 1497. He left several works, monuments of a profound and rare erudition. They were published at Hagenau (1520). His *Opera varia* were edited at Mentz (1521, 8vo); they comprise, *De Sacerdotiis*, *De*

*Jurisperitis. De Romanorum Magistratibus: — De Legibus and De Antiquitatibus urbis Romae: — along with Compendium Historiae Romanae ab interitu Gordiani usque (ad Justinum III, originally edited at Venice (1498, 4to). He explained and commented besides on several classical authors, and devoted his care to editions of Sallust, Columella, Varro, Festus, Nonnius Marcellus, and Pliny the younger. His commentaries on Virgil were printed at Basle (1486, fol.). See *Christian Schools and Scholars*, 2, 316, 370; Tiraboschi, *Storia de la Letter. Ital.* vol. 6 pt. 1; Ginguend, *Hist. litter. d'Italie*; Hallam, *Lit. Hist. of Europe* (Harper's ed.), 1, 266; Sabellicus, *Vita Pomponii Lceti* (Strasb. 1510, 4to). — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, s.v.*

Pomps of the Devil

a term used in the form of solemn renunciation which preceded baptism in the ancient Christian Church. The form referred to is given by the author of *The Apostolical Constitutions* in these words, "I renounce Satan, and his works, and his pomps, and his service, and his angels and his inventions, and all things that belong to him, or that are subject to him." By the pomps of the devil appear to have been meant the shows and games of heathen idolatry. And even after idolatry was in a great measure destroyed, and the public games and shows in honor of the gods were discontinued, the expression "pomps" was still used in the form of renunciation to eradicate the vanity, lewdness, and profaneness which so extensively prevailed. Some have attempted to trace this renunciation back to apostolic times, founding it on the exhortation of Paul to Timothy: "Lay hold on eternal life, whereunto thou art also called, and hast professed a good profession before many witnesses." Others, again, are content to derive it from ancient tradition. That it existed from a remote period in the history of the Christian Church is admitted on all hands; and such was the importance attached to this renunciation that, as soon as baptisteries were built, a place was assigned peculiarly to this service, the porch or anteroom being set apart for this purpose. The catechumens on entering were placed with their faces to the west, and then commanded to renounce Satan and all his pomps, with some gesture and rite expressing indignation, as by stretching out their hands, or folding them, or striking them together; and sometimes by exsufflation, or spitting at him as if he were present. In this ceremony the faces of the catechumens were turned towards the west as being the place of darkness, and therefore suitable for the renunciation of him who is the prince of darkness. The form of renunciation was repeated three times,

either because there were three things which were renounced in their baptism—the devil, his pomps, and the world or to signify the three Persons of the Trinity, by whom they were adopted as sons upon renouncing Satan; or because it was usual in cases of civil adoption and emancipation of slaves for the master to yield up his right by a triple renunciation. See Bingham, *Christian Antiquities*; Riddle, *Christian Antiquities*; Staunton, *Eccles. Dict.* s.v.

Ponce, Pedro

a Spanish Benedictine monk in the convent of Ofia, in Old Castile, was born about 1530. He is considered the inventor of the art of teaching the dumb to speak, which he carried to considerable perfection. According to Ambrosio Morales (*Antiguedades de Espana* [Alcala, 1575], fol. 38), Ponce had to instruct two brothers and one sister of the constable of Castile and a son of the gran justicia of Aragon, all of whom were born deaf and dumb. These pupils made such progress that, after some time, they not only were able to write correctly, but also to answer any questions put to them. One of them, Don Pedro de Velasco, who lived to be only twenty years of age, spoke and wrote Latin as well as his mother tongue, and was at the time of his death making considerable progress in the Greek language. Another of Ponce's pupils became a Benedictine monk, and was able to make confession and explain his creed by word of mouth. These facts were attested by the best Spanish writers of the time, as well as by Sir Kenelm Digby, who, in his *Two Treatises concerning the Body and Soul of Man* (Paris, 1644, cap. 28, note 8), says, "This priest brought the young lord to speak as distinctly as any man whatsoever; and I have often discoursed with him while I wayted upon the prince of Wales in Spaine." According to the same author (p. 254), and to Juan de Castañeda (*Vida de San Benito*), Ponce wrote a treatise in Spanish, in which he explained his method, and laid down certain rules as the result of his observations; but this interesting work has been lost, though it is generally believed that Juan Pablo Bonet, who in 1620 published his *Reduccion de lns Letras, y Arte para enseñar á hablar los Mudos* (4to), saw and consulted it. Ponce died in 1584, and was buried in the convent of his order.

Ponce de la Fuente, Constantine

a Spanish martyr to the Protestant cause, was a native of San Clemente de la Mancha, in the diocese of CuenDa. Possessing a good taste and a love of

genuine knowledge, he evinced an early disgust for the barbarous pedantry of the schools, and an attachment to such of his countrymen as sought to revive the study of polite letters. Being intended for the Church, he made himself master of Greek and Hebrew, but at the same time learned to write and speak his native language with uncommon purity and elegance. Like Erasmus, with whose writings he was early captivated, he was distinguished for his lively wit, which he took pleasure in indulging at the expense of foolish preachers and hypocritical monks. But he was endowed with greater firmness and decision of character than the philosopher of Rotterdam. During his attendance at the university Ponce's youthful spirit had betrayed him into irregularities, of which his enemies afterwards took an ungenerous advantage; but these were succeeded by the utmost decorum and correctness of manners, though he always retained his gay temper, and could never deny himself his jest. Notwithstanding the opportunities he had of enriching himself, he was so exempt from avarice that his library, which he valued above all his property, was never large. His eloquence caused his services in the pulpit to be much sought after; but he was free from vanity, the besetting sin of orators, and scorned to prostitute his talents at the shrine of popularity. He declined the situation of preacher in the cathedral of Cuenga, which was offered him by the unanimous vote of the chapter. When the more honorable and lucrative office of preacher to the metropolitan church of Toledo was afterwards tendered to him, after thanking the chapter for their good opinion of him, he declined it, alleging as a reason "that he would not disturb the bones of their ancestors," alluding to a dispute between them and the archbishop Siliceo, who had insisted that his clergy should prove the purity of their descent. Whether it was predilection for the Reformed opinions that induced him at first to fix his residence at Seville is uncertain but once there we find him co-operating with Aegidius in his plans for disseminating scriptural knowledge. The emperor, having heard him preach during a visit to that city, was so much pleased with the sermon that he immediately named Ponce one of his chaplains, to which he added the office of almoner; and he soon after appointed him to accompany his son Philip to Flanders, "to let the Flemings see that Spain was not destitute of polite scholars and orators." Constantine made it a point of duty to obey the orders of his sovereign, and reluctantly quitted his residence in Seville, for which he had hitherto rejected the most tempting offers. His journey gave him the opportunity of becoming personally acquainted with some of the Reformers. Among these was Jacob Schopper, a learned man of Biberach,

in Suabia, by whose conversation his views of evangelical doctrine were greatly enlarged and confirmed. In 1555 Ponce returned to Seville, and his presence imparted a new impulse to the Protestant cause in that city. A benevolent and enlightened individual having founded a professorship of divinity in the College of Doctrine, Ponce was appointed to the chair; and by means of the lectures which he read on the Scriptures, together with the instruction of Fernando de St. Juan, provost of the institution, the minds of many of the young were opened to the truth. On the first Lent after his return to Seville he was, besides, chosen by the chapter to preach every alternate day in the cathedral church. So great was his popularity that, though the public service did not begin till eight o'clock in the morning, yet, when he was announced to preach the church would be filled by four, and even by three o'clock. Being newly recovered from a fever when he commenced his labors, he felt so weak that it was necessary for him repeatedly to pause during the sermon, on which account he was allowed to recruit his strength by taking a draught of wine in the pulpit, a permission which had never been granted to any other preacher.

While Constantine was pursuing this career of honor and usefulness, he involved himself in difficulties by coming forward as a candidate for the place of canon magistral in the cathedral of Seville, which had become vacant by the death of AEGIDIUS. Ponce did not want the office, but his friends pressed him to lay aside his scruples; and an individual who had great influence over his mind represented so strongly the services which he would be able to render to the cause of truth in so influential a situation, and the hurtful effects which would result from its being occupied by some noisy and ignorant declaimer, that he consented at last to offer himself a candidate. In spite of all manner of accusations and opposition he carried his election, was installed in his new office, and commenced his duty as preacher in the cathedral with high acceptance. From his visit abroad Ponce, like many other preachers whom the Spanish Romanists sent to the Netherlands "to give light to others, returned home blind, having followed the example of the heretics" (Juescas, *Historia Pontifical*, 2, 337, b). In 1555 he had embraced the Protestant faith. Now that he had dared to assume the responsibilities of the Seville cathedral canonate, the envious priests, disappointed in their own seekings, boldly confronted Ponce with his heretical opinions, and loudly urged the Inquisition to take its aim at this new-made cathedral dignitary; and when, in 1559 the familiars were let loose on the Protestants of Seville, Ponce was among the first who were

apprehended. Among his books was found a treatise, in his own handwriting, on the points of controversy between the Church of Rome and the Protestants, and as Ponce had chosen to take sides with Luther and Calvin, and, when shown the work, not only acknowledged its authorship, but added, "You have there a full and candid confession of my belief; I am in your hands do with me as seemeth to you good," his doom was sealed. Though put to the torture to reveal his associates and fellow-believers, he refused steadfastly to bring suffering upon any one else. After two years of imprisonment, oppressed and worn out by a mode of living so different from what he had been used to, he died before his enemies could bring him to public execution. It was slanderously reported that he had committed suicide, but a young monk and fellow-prisoner denied the calumny. Dec. 22, 1560, his effigy and bones were brought out in the public *auto-da-fé*, but the people, who had always greatly revered Ponce, rose up in rebellion, and the services were continued in private. In the character of Ponce's writings we have one of the clearest indications of the excellence of his heart. They were of that kind which were adapted to the spiritual wants of his countrymen, and not calculated to display his own talents. or to acquire for himself a name in the learned world. They were composed in his native tongue, and in a style level to the lowest capacity. Abstruse speculations and rhetorical ornaments, in which he was qualified both by nature and education to excel, were rigidly sacrificed to the one object of being understood by all, and useful to all. Among his works were a *Catechism*, whose highest recommendation is its artless and infantine simplicity; a small treatise on *The Doctrine of Christianity*, drawn up in the familiar form of a dialogue between a master and his pupil, which, without being deficient in simplicity, is more calculated to interest persons of learning and advanced knowledge; an *Exposition of the First Psalm*, in four sermons, which show that his pulpit eloquence, exempt from the common extremes, was neither degraded by vulgarity nor rendered disgusting by affectation and effort at display; and the *Confession of a Sinner*, in which the doctrines of the Gospel, poured from a contrite and humbled spirit, assume the form of the most edifying and devotional piety. See Antonius, *Bibl. Hist. Nov.* 1, 256; M'Crie, *Hist. of the Ref. in Spain*, p. 154-156, 207 sq., 262 sq. (J. H.W.)

Poncet, Maurice

a French prelate of the 16th century, flourished as curate of St. Pierre des Arcis. He was a divine of great eloquence and considerable learning,

though not remarkable for refinement of taste or diction. He was a Gallican, and when Henry III pursued that imbecile policy which finally cost France the loss of her best citizens for conscience sake, Ponet ridiculed the Leaguers, *SEE LEAGUE*, and especially visited with the full power of his sarcasm the grotesque processions of the *Confreries des Penitents*. He made the walls of his church ring with denunciations of these hypocritical devotees, who, after parading the streets barefoot, arrayed in sackcloth, and displaying ostentatiously the outward signs of austere asceticism, were accustomed to pass the night in riotous feasting and gross debauchery. Henry, resenting this exposure, banished the offender to his abbey of St. Pere at Melun; but he was released after a brief confinement, and returned to Paris by the king's permission, his majesty remarking that "he had always believed the good doctor to have a zeal for God, but not according to knowledge; and that there was much excuse for him, since he was not quick enough of apprehension to see through the artifices of those by whom he was instigated. He had plenty of scholarship, but was grievously deficient in judgment." Poncet, unsubdued by the king's leniency, resumed his usual incisive style of pulpit oratory, and persevered in it till his death, which happened in 1586. See Jervis, *Hist. Church of France*, 1, 181 sq. (J. H. W.)

Poncher, Etienne

a French prelate, noted also as a diplomatist, was born at Tours in 1446. He was the son of a magistrate, studied law, and while yet a youth was provided with several canonicates. In 1485 he obtained the charge of counselor-clerk at the Parliament of Paris, and in 1498 he became *President aux Enquetes*. He was elected bishop of Paris Feb. 25, 1503, in compliance with the request of king Louis XII, whom he was at that time accompanying to Milan. The same prince entrusted him in 1506 with several diplomatic missions to Germany; and Poncher, in the following year, being again in Italy with the king, was alone bold enough to speak in contradiction to the angry feelings of the king against the Venetians, and to oppose the confederation of Cambrai. Louis XII, who had already appointed Poncher chancellor of the duchy of Milan, bestowed on him in 1509 the abbey of Fleuri, and in 1512 made him the guardian of the seal of France, which office he kept till the death of the king, Jan. 1, 1515. Francis I appointed him, with Arthur Gouffier, one of the plenipotentiaries who signed, on Aug. 16, 1517, the treaty of Noyon between Francis and Charles V. In the same year Poncher went to Spain as ambassador of

France, and in 1518 he was sent to Henry VIII of England, with whom he signed a new treaty of alliance. In virtue of the concordat he was transferred, March 14, 1519, to the archiepiscopal see of Sens. He died at Lyons. Feb. 24, 1524. Poncher published *Constitutions synodales*, which are still held in great esteem, especially in regard to the sacraments. — - Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, s.v.

Poncher, François

a French prelate, nephew of the preceding, was born at Tours about 1480. His father, Louis Poncher, secretary of the king and receiver general of the finances, was hung for embezzlement. Made counselor at the Parliament of Paris (1510), François Poncher obtained soon afterwards the curacy of Issy, a canonicate at Notre Dame of Paris, the abbey of St. Maurles-Fosses, and March 14, 1519, became bishop of Paris. So far from treading in the steps of his uncle, he was a simoniac and scandalous prelate. He forged documents to get possession of the abbey of Fleury-sur-Loire, but was balked in his design. While the king was a prisoner at Madrid, Poncher fell out with the queen-regent, the duchess of Angouleme, Francis's mother, plotted to deprive her of the regency, and by treacherous negotiations with the Spanish court tried to prolong the captivity of his sovereign. As soon as Francis was free again Poncher was arrested and accused of high-treason. While his process was in abeyance he died in the dungeon of Vincennes, Sept. 1, 1532. He wrote some commentaries on civil law, dedicated to his uncle, Etienne Poncher. — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, s.v.

Pond

is the rendering in the A. V. of $\mu\gamma\alpha$ } *agam* (literally a *collection* of water), in ⁽⁻¹¹⁷⁶⁾Exodus 7:19; 8:15, where it probably denotes the putrescent reservoirs or swampy pools left by the inundation of the Nile (Sept. $\delta\iota\omega\rho\upsilon\gamma\epsilon\varsigma$, Vulg. *paludes*). Again, in ⁽⁻²³⁹⁰⁾Isaiah 19:10, $\gamma\mu\gamma\alpha\iota\upsilon\upsilon\pi\eta$, which the A.V. translates “ponds for fish,” following the Vulg. “lacunas ad capiendos pisces,” Diodati and Luther, is rendered by the Sept. $\tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \psi\upsilon\chi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \pi\omicron\nu\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$. This rendering is supported by the authority of Gesenius, Vatablus, and Ewald, *alle Lohnarbeiter* ($\rho\kappa\zeta,\gamma 2\lambda\nu\phi$. = “they that earn wages”), *sind seelenbetrübt*; $\mu\gamma\alpha$; being taken as equivalent to $\mu\eta\iota$; (⁽⁻¹⁸¹²⁾Job 30:25), “to be sad.” Many interpreters, however, think that it designates fish-ponds. We have abundant evidence from the paintings in

the tombs that the Egyptians were celebrated for their fish-ponds, and it appears that almost every villa possessed one, where the master of the house occasionally amused himself in fishing. The Jews, it seems, likewise constructed similar ponds, as in describing his bride in the Canticles (⁻²¹⁰⁴Song of Solomon 7:4) Solomon says, “Thine eyes are like the fish-pools in Heshbon.” *SEE FISH*. The word occurs several times of marshy pools, in contradistinction to the dry sands of the desert (⁻¹⁹⁷⁵Psalm 107:35; 114:8); “standing water” (⁻²³⁸⁷Isaiah 35:7; 41:18), “a pool.” Such pools being commonly reedy, it is rendered “reeds” (⁻²⁵¹²Jeremiah 51:32). *SEE POOL*.

Pond, Enoch, D.D.

a noted Congregational minister and writer, was born at Wrentham, Mass., July 29, 1791, and was educated at Brown University, where he graduated in 1813. He then decided to enter the ministry, and began a course in theology with the celebrated Dr. Emmons. In June, 1814, young Pond was licensed to preach, and in the spring of the following year was ordained pastor of the Congregational Church at Auburn, Mass. He left this charge in 1828 to become the conductor of the *Spirit of the Pilgrims*, a monthly publication in Boston. He was made professor of theology in the theological seminary at Bangor in September, 1832, and continued in that responsible position until 1856, when he became president, and changed to the professorship of ecclesiastical history, and lectured on pastoral duties. He died Jan. 21, 1882. Dr. Pond published reviews of *Judson on Baptism: — Monthly Concert Lectures* (1824): — *Memoir of President Davies* (1827): *Memoir of Susanna Anthony* (1827): — *Memoir of Count Zinzendorf* (1839): — *Memoir of John Wickliffe* (1841): — *Morning of the Reformation* (1842, 12mo): — *No Fellowship with Romanism* (1843): — *The Young Pastor's Guide* (Portland, 1844, 12mo): — *The Mather Family* (1844, 12mo): — *The World's Salvation* (1845): — *Pope and Pagan, or Middleton's Celebrated Letters* (Portland, 1846, 18mo), *SEE MIDDLETON, CONYERS*: — *Swedenborgianism Reviewed* (new ed. 1846): — *Swedenborgianism Examined* (N. Y. 1861, 16mo): — *Plato, his Life, Works, Opinions, and Influence* (1846): — *Review of Bushnell's God in Christ* (1849): — *The Ancient Church* (1851): *Memoir of John Knox* (1856): — *Bangor Lectures on Pastoral Theology* (Andover, 1863, 12mo): — *Lectures on Christian Theology* (Boston, 1868, 8vo): — *Lectures on Pastoral Theology* (N. Y. 187-): — also separate *Sermons*, and articles in the *Bibl. Sacra*, *Bibl. Repos.*, *Lit. and Theolog. Rev.*, *Lord's*

Lit. and Theolog. Rev., New-Englander, and more than a dozen other periodicals.

Pone luctum, Magdalena

This is the beginning of a famous Easter hymn of uncertain date. Undoubtedly it belongs to the Middle Ages, for in this hymn, as well as in the *Dies Irae* (q.v.) and other Latin hymns, the same identification of Mary Magdalene with “the woman that was a sinner” (~~ca. 1075~~ Luke 7:37), which runs through all the theology of the Middle Ages, is expressed. This hymn may be found in almost all collections of Latin hymns, and the first verse runs thus:

*“Pone luctum, Magdalena,
Et serena lacrymas;
Non est jamn Sinioiis coena,
Noll cur fletum exprimas;
Causam mile sunt laetandi,
Cause mille exultandi:
Alleluja resonet.*

For the original, see Daniel, *Thesaurus Hymnol.* 2, 365; Trench, *Sacred Latin Poetry*, p. 159; Bässler, *Auswahl maltchristl. Lieder*, p. 237; Simrock, *Lauda Sion*, p. 188; Königsfeld, *Hymnen u. Gesänge*, 1, 230. English translations are given in Schaffs *Christ in Song*, p. 256. For German translations, see Büssler, *l. c.* p. 135; Simrock, Königsfeld, and Fortlage, *Gesänge christl. Vorzeit*, p. 142. (B. P.)

Ponet

SEE POYNET.

Pongilupus, Hermannus

an Italian monastic, flourished near the middle of the 13th century at Ferrara. He practiced great austerity as one of the *Consolati*, and died in 1269. Several years after his death (1300) charges of heresy were brought against him, and a judicial process having been declared, his bones were exhumed and ourned, and his tomb demolished by order of pope Boniface VIII. His tomb, in the principal church at Ferrara, had been the object of great veneration, and many miracles were said to have been wrought there. Some think that the process was instituted and the tomb demolished to put an end to the extravagant devotion paid to his memory. The Franciscans

attribute to Pongilupus the origin of the *Fratricelli* (q.v.), but Mosheim considers this an error, and believes him to have been one of the *Bagnotians*. Natalis Alexander (*Hist. Eccles.* 8, 87) speaks of Pongilupus as reviving several vile practices of the Gnostics. See Wadding, *Annal. Minor. Fratr.* 6, 279; Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity*, 7, 37 sq. (J.H.W.)

Pongol

a Hindu festival in honor of the sun, which is celebrated annually on Jan. 9. The high-caste Brahmins look upon this as a lucky and propitious day, but the Sudras hold it as sacred, and visit one another with presents. They boil rice on this day with milk outside the house, in some place exposed to the sun's rays, and when that luminary withdraws they cry out "Pongol!" and repeat it four times. The rice thus boiled is regarded as very holy, and kept as long as possible. The day after the Pongol the cows and buffaloes are led out early into the country, having their heads adorned with crowns and cakes.

Poniatowa, Christine

a German female visionary, was born in 1610 at Lessen, Western Prussia. Her father, Julian Poniatowa, was a Polish gentleman who, having escaped from a monastery and embraced the Protestant communion, was at first minister at Duchnick, in Bohemia, then librarian of a nobleman. He probably brought up his daughter in mystical ideas, for he is said to be himself the author of a Latin dissertation on the knowledge which the angels may have of God. Christine had been entrusted to the care of the baroness of Zelking, who had taken a liking to her, when, Nov. 12, 1627, after severe pains, she fell into a trance, attended with visions and prophetic utterances relating to the future of the Reformed Church. This strange state returned at regular intervals for a whole year, always attended with the same phenomena, and a number of people testified to its genuineness. Jan. 27, 1629, the young visionary fell into so heavy a lethargy that she passed for dead, but when she finally recovered her senses she declared that her mission was fulfilled, and that she should thenceforth have no more visions. In 1632 she was married to a Moravian minister, Daniel Vetter, and died Dec. 6, 1644, at Leszno, near Posen. Her revelations, written by herself, were translated into Latin, and published by Amos Comenius, with those of Christopher Kotter and Nicolas Drabicki,

under the title *Lux in Tenebris* (1657, 1659, 1665, 4to). They were retranslated into German by Benedict Balmsen (Amsterdam, 1664, 8vo). See Feustking, *Gynaec. fanat. kanst.* p. 238 sq.; Witsius, *Miscell. Sacra*, pt. 3, ch. 22; Arnold, *Kirchen- mu. Ketzerhistorie*; Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* 3, 391, 392. (J. H. W.)

Poniatowa, Julian

SEE PONIATOWA, CHRISTINE.

Pons, Jean

a French Protestant writer, was born at Nismes May 15, 1747. He was brother-in-law to Rabaut-Dupuis. Intimately connected with Rabaut St. Etienne, he had a narrow escape from sharing his sad fate: he owed his life to the 9th Thermidor. He was afterwards justice of the peace at Nismes, and then director of the post department in the same city. He published *Reflexions philosophiques et politiques sur la Tolerance religieuse* (Paris, 1808, 8vo); besides *Notices biographiques su- Paul Rabaut* and *Notices biographiques sur Rabaut-Dupuis*. Pons died at Nismes Jan. 15, 1816. - Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, s.v.

Ponsard de Gisi of Payens

a Crusader of the Order of the Knight Templars, flourished near the opening of the 14th century. He was a most earnest advocate of the order, and when, in 1309, it was brought to trial, and the papacy was questioning the feasibility of suffering its existence, Ponsard boldly declared himself ready to undertake its defense. All the enormous charges against the order were utterly, absolutely false; false were all the confessions, extorted by terror and pain, from himself and other brethren before the bishop of Paris. Those tortures had been applied by the sworn and deadly enemies and accusers of the order, by the prior of Montfacon and William Roberts the monk. He put in a schedule: "These are the traitors who have falsely and disloyally accused the religion of the Temple-William Roberts the monk, who had them put to the torture; Esquin de Florian of Beziers, prior of Montfalcon; Bernard Pelet, prior of Maso, Philip's envoy to England; and Gervais Boysol, knight of Gisors." Had Ponsard himself been tortured? He had been tortured before the bishop of Paris three months ere he made confession. He had stood thus in a pit for the space of an hour. He protested that in that state of agony he should confess or deny whatever

they would. He was prepared to endure beheading, the stake, or the caldron for the honor of the order; but these slow, excruciating torments he could not bear besides the horrors of his two years' imprisonment. He was asked if he had anything to allege wherefore the court should not proceed. He hoped that the cause would be decided by good men and true. The provost of Poitiers interposed: he produced a schedule of charges advanced by Ponsard himself against the order. "Truth," answered Ponsard, "requires no concealment. I own that in a fit of passion, on account of some contumelious words with the treasurer of the Temple, I did draw up the schedule." Those charges, however, dark as were some of them, were totally unlike those now brought against the brotherhood. Before he left the court, Ponsard expressed the hope that the severity of his imprisonment might not be aggravated because he had undertaken the defence of the order. The court gave instructions to the provost of Poitiers and De Jamville that he should not be more harshly treated; but he was finally condemned to death, and was burned at the stake. See Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity*, 6, 429 sq.; Porter, *Hist. of the Knights of Malta* (see Index). (J.H.W.)

Pontano, Giovanni-Giovano

(Lat. *Pontantus*), a celebrated Italian statesman, noted as a writer on morals, was born December, 1426, in the environs of Cerreto, Umbria. His father having perished in a riot, his mother fled with him to Perugia, where he received a careful education. Having in vain asserted his claim to the heritage of his parents, he entered the army of Alfonso, king of Naples, then at war with the Florentines (1447), and followed that king to Naples, where he became acquainted with the celebrated Panormita, who took him along in his embassy to Florence, and had him appointed royal secretary. Pontano's verses, highly esteemed by all competent judges, seemed to entitle him sufficiently to a seat in the academy which Panormita, under the king's auspices, established at Naples. Ferdinand I, successor of Alfonso (1457), maintained him in his office of secretary, and appointed him tutor of his son Alfonso, duke of Calabria. He followed Ferdinand in his campaign against the duke of Anjou, and distinguished himself by his bravery. Taken prisoner on different occasions, he was always brought back without ransom to the camp of Ferdinand, out of respect for his genius. On his return to Naples the king lavished his favors upon him, bestowed upon him riches and dignities, and entrusted him with the conduct of the most important matters of state. In 1482 a war, which bade

fair to become general, having broken out between the Venetians and the duke of Ferrara. Pontano brought about a reconciliation of the belligerents. He was equally successful in compounding the difficulties that had arisen between Ferdinand and pope Innocent VIII. Put on his guard against the negotiator, the pope exclaimed, "I treat with Pontano: is it meet that truth and good faith should abandon him who never abandoned them?" He became at that time first minister, and remained in that high position under Alfonso II (who erected to him a statue) and Ferdinand II. When Charles VIII of France approached Naples at the head of a French army, Pontano sent him forthwith the keys of the city, harangued the king at his coronation, and dishonored himself by the insults and aspersions which he cast in this speech at his royal benefactors. When Ferdinand returned, he contented himself with depriving Pontano of his offices. The fallen minister found in his retreat more happiness than he had enjoyed in the tumult of public business, and when Louis XII, after the conquest of the kingdom of Naples, offered to put him again at the head of the government this new Diocletian preferred his literary life to royal grandeur. It was in his retreat that he wrote most of the works he has left. He died at Naples in August, 1503. Most of his works deal with moral subjects, and abound in sound precepts and judicious reflections. His history of the Neapolitan war is a masterpiece, sufficient alone to immortalize its author. His Latinity is pure and elegant, his style noble and harmonious. His poetical works excited envy and conquered it. He announced himself, like Horace, the eternity of his fame: "The remotest posterity," he said, "will speak of Pontano, and celebrate his name." Erasmus, though a parsimonious distributor of praise to the Italians, has acknowledged Pontano's merit in the *Cicesronians*. It must be recorded also that Pontano had the merit of correcting the manuscript, then the only one, of Catullus; that we owe to him the discovery of Donat's commentaries on Virgil, and of Rhemnius Paloemon's Grammar. In his physical treatises he first signaled the law of continuity, and seems to have been the first among the moderns who, after Democritus, declared the Milky Way to be composed of an infinity of small stars. His poems, some of which unfortunately are spoiled by obscenities, were published at Venice (1505-8, 2 vols. 8vo) and at Florence (1514, 2 vols. 8vo). His prose writings were published at Venice (1518-19, 3 vols. 4to) and at Florence (1520, 4 vols. 8vo). His *Works* were edited at Naples (1505-12, 6 vols. fol.), and more completely at Basle (1556, 4 vols. 8vo). His prose writings comprise the following works: *De Obedientia*: — *De Fortitudine*: *De Principe*: — *De Liberalitate*: — *De Beneficentia*: — *De*

Managntficientia: — *De Splendore*: — *De Convenientia*: — *De Prudentia*: — *De Magnanimitate*: -*De Fortuna*: - *De Immanitate*: — *De Aspiratione*: — *Dialogi v*; full of spirit, but blamed for their obscenity by Erasmus himself: *De Sermone*: — *Belli libri 6 quod Ferdinandus Neopolitanorum rex cum Joanne Andoyavense duce gessit*; this pamphlet was printed separately (Venice, 1519, 4to), and has been translated into *Italian*: — *Centum Ptolencei sententice commentariis illustratae*: — *De rebus celestibus*: *De luna*. The poetry of Pontano comprises, *Urania, seu de stellis*: — *Metera*: — *De hortis Hesperidarum*: *Pastorales pompae*: — *Bucolica*: - *Amor um libri 2*: *De amore conjugali*: — *Tumulorum libri 2*: — *De divinis laudibus*: — *endecasyllaba*: — *Lyrici versus*: — *Edani libri 2*: — *Epigrammatua*. — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, s.v. See Hallam, *Literary History*, 1. 129 sq.; Roscoe, *Leo X*, ch. 2 and 20; Nicéron, *Memoires*, vol. 8; Tiraboschi, *Storia della Letter. Ital.* s.v.

Pontanus, Georg-Barthold von Braitenberg

a learned Bohemian prelate, was born at Brux about the middle of the 16th century. He had scarcely taken orders when he achieved a reputation by his eloquence in the pulpit, as well as for his remarkable Latin verses, for which last-named attainment he was in 1588 crowned with the poetical laurels by the emperor Rudolph. Appointed canon of the cathedral of Prague in 1582, he afterwards became provost and vicar-general in the same city. He exercised a great and happy influence on the important questions then under debate in Bohemia. He died in 1616. His works are, *Der Triumph des Podagra* (Frankf. 1605, 4to): — *Bibliothek der Pedigten aus alien und neuen Schriftstellern* (Cologne, 1608. fol.): — *Dasfromme Bohmen* (Frankf. 1608, fil.); a selection of the most remarkable acts of piety of the princes and prelates of *Bohemia*: — *Scanderbeugus, seu vita Georgii Castriotce* (Hanau, 1609. 8vo): — a number of Latin poems: — a good edition of the treatise *De geminis rerum proprietatibus* of Bartholomeus Anglicus (Frankf. 1601, 8vo). — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, s.v.

Pontard, Pierre

a French prelate, was born at Mussidan Sept. 23, 1749. He was curate of Sarlat when the Revolution broke out. He then embraced the new principles with an enthusiasm that was rewarded by his appointment as constitutional bishop of the Dordogne in 1791. A few months later he was

elected deputy of this department to the Legislative Assembly. He spoke in favor of divorce, attacked the dogmas of the Catholic Church, authorized the marriage of priests, and finally took a wife himself. It is this same Pontard who induced the visionary Suzanne Labrousse to go to Paris. Under the consulate he kept a boarding school at Paris, but his institution waned after a few years. He was intimate with Pigault-Lebrun, and aided him, if the report be true, in the composition of some of his novels. After the Restoration, the duchess-dowager of Orleans, to whom he had rendered some services during the Reign of Terror, on hearing of his precarious situation, bestowed on him a life-rent, which enabled him to enter the institution of St. Perine at Chaillot, where he died, without apparent contrition, Jan. 22, 1832. He left, *Recueil des Ouvrages de la celebre Mlle. Labrousse* (Bordeaux, 1797, 8vo): — *Grammaire Mecanique elementaire de l'Orthographe Française* (Paris, 1812, 8vo). He is also the author of the *Journal prophetique*, which was edited at Paris in 1792 and 1793. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, s.v.

Pontas, Jean

a French prelate, was born Dec. 31, 1638, at Saint-Hilaire-du-Harcouet (diocese of Avranches). Brought up by his maternal uncle, M. d'Arqueville, he studied successively under his eyes in his native city, then at the Jesuits' College of Rennes, finally in Paris at the College de Navarre. In 1663 he received, for reasons unknown, in the space of ten days, all the orders, inclusive of that of priesthood, from the bishop of Toul, with the consent of the bishop of Avranches. He was scarcely twenty-four years old. In 1668 he obtained the titles of doctor of canon and of civil law. The archbishop of Paris, Perefine, appointed him vicar of the parish of Sainte-Genevieve-des-Ardents, all easy place, which left him time enough for his learned pursuits. He next became sub-penitentiary of Notre Dame, and retired to the Petits-Augustins of the faulbourg Saint-Germain, where he died, April 27, 1728. His principal work is the *Dictionnaire des Cas de Conscience* (Paris, 1741, 3 vols. fol.). It is the completest on this subject, in the treatment of which Pontas displayed uncommon sagacity and great caution. His decisions founded on imposing authorities, are equally distant from loose morality and narrow rigorisma twofold danger which works of this description seldom avoid altogether. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, S. V.

Pont - Audemer, Council of

(*Concilium Ponsaudemlurense*), an ecclesiastical council, was held in 1279 by William de Flavecour, archbishop of Rouen, who presided; twenty-four canons were published. Among these:

- 5.** Recommends the observance of the canons of Lateran (“ornnes utritsque sexus”) upon confession and communion.
- 9.** Forbids Christians to dwell with Jews. **10.** Forbids the keeping of vigils and assemblies, and all dancing, in churches and churchyards.
- 16.** Forbids rural deans to deliver any sentence of excommunication or suspension, unless in writing.
- 23.** Forbids all those of the clergy who have taken the cross to abuse the privileges granted to them.

See Labbe, *Concil.* 11, 1144.

Pontbriant, Henri-Guillaume-Marie, Du Breil de

brother of the two following, was born at Rennes in 1709. He was a canon, grand chantre of the cathedral of Rennes, and abbé of Lanvaux, in the diocese of Vannes. He died at Rennes in 1767. He *left*, *Poeme sur Abums de lat Poesie*, crowned at the Jeux Floraux in 1722: — *Sermon sur le Sacre du Roi* (Toulouse, 1722, 4to): — *Essai de Grammaire Francaise* (1754, 8vo): — *Projet d'Ine Histoire de Brtamgsne depuis 1567 jusqu'en 1754* (Rennes, 1754, fol.). — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, s.v.

Pontbriant, Henri-Marie, Du Briel de

brother of the preceding, was born at Vannes in 1711. He was canon of Rennes. He early entered ecclesiastical life, and after several promotions was made bishop of Quebec, April 9, 1741. He set out for Quebec shortly after, and arrived there Aug. 17. He died at Montreal (Canada) June 29, 1760. A pastoral letter which he issued on the approach of the English to Quebec in 1759 is in Smith's *Hist. of Canada*.

Pontbriant, René-François, du Briel de

a French priest, was born at Rennes near the opening of the 18th century. Appointed abbé of Saint-Marien d'Auxerre, he was one of the most

zealous promoters of the institution of the Petits-Savoyards. The first idea of that institution is due to the abbé Holy canon of Dijon, who founded at Paris, towards 1665, in the interest of those poor children, an establishment which, taken up by Claude Helyet, could not support itself after his death in 1686. The abbé of Pontbriant, touched with pity at the sight of the misery of those poor little Savoyards, came to their help towards 1737, and devoted to them during the remainder of his life his time, his energies, and his fortune. The abbé de Fenelon, who died on the revolutionary scaffold in 1794 succeeded him in this task. Pontbriant died in 1760. He left, *Projet d'un Etablissement deja commence pour elever dails la Piete les petits Savoyards qui sont dans Paris*, with several appendices (Paris, 1735-43, 4 parts, 8vo): — *Pilerinaye du Calvaire sur le Mont Valerien* (ibid. 1745, 12mo; 1751, 16mo; 1816, 12mo): — *L'Incredule detrompe et le Chretien affirm'ni dans la Foi* (1752, 8vo), a work which met with uncommon favor. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, s.v.

Ponte, Luis de

a Spanish Jesuit, noted as an ascetic writer, was born at Valladolid Nov. 11, 1554. He belonged to a noble family, but renounced all the advantages the world offered him, and at the age of twenty entered the Society of Jesus. He was during many years a teacher of philosophy and theology, but his failing health compelled him at last to monastical retirement. In his retreat he divided his time between prayer, good works, and the composition of pious writings, by which he obtained throughout Europe the reputation of an excellent master of spiritual life. He died Feb. 17, 1624. Most of his numerous writings were translated into Latin by Melchior Trevinnia. We mention *Meditaciones de los Mysterios de, nuestra Santa Fe* (Valladolid, 1605, 1613, 2 vols. 4to). This work was translated into several languages: into Arabic by F. Fromaye, and into French by F. Brignon (1613, 3 vols. 4to): — *Guida Espiritual de la Oracion, Meditacion, y Contemplacion* (ibid. 1609, 4to): — *De la Perfeccion Cristiana* (ibid. 1612-16, 4 vols. 4to): — *Vida del D. Balthasar Alvarez* (Madrid, 1615, 4to): — *Epositio moralis et mystica in Canticum Canticorum* (Cologne, 1622, 2 vols. fol.; Paris, 1646, fol.): — *Directorio Espiritual* (Madrid, 1625, 8vo). He also wrote the first part of *Vida Maravillosa de Mirmina de Escobar* (ibid. 1665, fol.), which was finished and published by a member of his order, Miguel Orefia. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, s.v. See Antonio, *Bibliotheca Hispana Nova*, s.v.

Pontianus, St.

a pope of the 3rd century, was a native of Rome, and descended from the gens Calpurnia, if we may believe the ancient writers. *He* succeeded Urban I in the pontificate in 230. Platina and others assert that he introduced the singing of psalms into the Church, but this custom must be older. The first years of his pontificate under Alexander Severus were quiet, but the persecutions commenced again under Maximianus, and Pontianus, together with a presbyter by the name of Hippolytus, suffered sentence of deportation to the usual place of exile, the island of Tavolato, near Sardinia, where he died from want and exposure, Sept. 28, 235. His body was carried to Rome by order of pope St. Fabian. Two epistles are falsely attributed to him. St. Anterus was his successor. See Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s.v.; Platina, *Vitae Pontificum*, s.v.; Montor, *Hist. des Papes* (see Index); Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity*, 1, 80.

Pontier, Gédéon

a French theologian, was born near Alais (Languedoc), near the middle of the 17th century. Though brought up in the Protestant communion, he embraced Roman Catholicism, entered the ecclesiastical state, and obtained the title of apostolic prothonotary. He died at Paris in 1709, at an advanced age. He left, *Le Cabinet, ou la Bibliothèque des Grands* (1680-89, 3 vols. 12mo); the last volume contains in addition, *Les Questions de la Princesse Henriette de la Guiche, Duchesse d'Angouleme et Comtesse d'Alis, sur toutes Sortes de Sujets, avec les Réponses* (1687, 12mo): *Lettre de Saeulx, Premier Evêque d'Altis* (1696, 12mo), etc. La Bruvère gives a portrait of Pontier in his "Caractères," under the name of Dioscurus, and makes very much of him. — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s.v.

Pontifex (1)

a priest among the ancient Romans. The *pontifices* were formed into a college, and all matters of religion were placed under its exclusive superintendence. Their functions and duties were minutely detailed in the pontifical books, which were drawn up in the reign of Numa Pompilius, and contained the names of the gods and the various regulations for their worship, as well as a detailed description of the functions, rights, and privileges of the priests. The pontifices were not priests of any particular divinity, but of the worship of the gods generally. Their duties embraced the regulation of all the religious rites and ceremonies (both public and

private) of a state— e.g. how the gods should be worshipped, how burials should be conducted, how the souls of the dead (manes) should be appeased. To them was entrusted the care of the calendar, the proclamation of festival darts, etc. They also saw that every religious and every judicial act took place on the right day. “As they thus had,” says Dr. Mommsen, “an especial supervision of all religious observances. it was to them in case of need (as on occasion of marriage, testament, or *arrogatio*) that the preliminary question was addressed, whether the matter proposed did not, in any respect, offend against divine law.” In matters of religion they were the supreme authorities; from their decisions there was no appeal, and they themselves were responsible neither to the senate nor the people; further, they had power to inflict punishment on such priests as dared to disobey their injunctions and deviate into schismatical courses. The words of Festus are: “Rerum quae ad sacra et religiones pertinent, *judices et vindices.*” The head of the college was called *Pontifex Maximus*. The pontiffs, according to Roman tradition, were instituted by Numa—a mythical person, to whom the origin of nearly all the religious institutions of Rome is ascribed. But as they appear in all the Latin communities, they are regarded by Mommsen as a “thoroughly national Italian institution.” and probably found a place in the earliest religious organization of the Latin race. Their number was originally four, or, including the *pontifex maximus*, five, all of whom were taken from the patricians. In B.C. 300, the Ogulnian Law raised the number to nine, four of whom were to be plebeians. The first plebeian, however, who attained the dignity of *pontifex maximus* was Tüb. Coruncanius, B.C. 254. Sulla, in B.C. 81, again increased the number to fifteen, and Julius Caesar to sixteen. During the empire, the functions of *pontifex maximus* were generally discharged by the emperors themselves; and when at length the emperors dropped the name, it was picked up by the Christian bishops of Rome; and now this title, borrowed from a pagan cult, forms one of the sacred designations of his holiness the pope.

Pontifex (2)

is hence also the title in the Roman Catholic Church of the archbishop or bishop of a diocese. The pope himself is styled the sovereign pontifex, or *pontiff* (q.v.). (J. H. W.)

Pontifex Maximus

Before the time of Constantine the clergy were not recognized as holding any distinct rank in the state; but when Christianity was adopted as the religion of the Roman empire, its ministers were considered as occupying the place of those heathen priests whose superstitions had fallen into disrepute. According to Zosimus, Constantine himself, in the year 325, assumed the title of *Pontifex Maximus*, which the heathen emperors before him had appropriated, because it contributed to exalt at once the imperial and episcopal dignity, and served to justify the interference of the emperor in ecclesiastical councils and in the nomination of bishops. Constantine's successors followed his example until the days of Gratian, who was the last emperor to whom the title was applied. Some scholars doubt Zosimus's assertion, notwithstanding the fact that the medals of Constantine and his successors, down to Gratian, and the inscriptions relating to them, give them the title of *Pontifex Maximus*, on the ground that it may have been one of those traditional titles which the power of habit preserved, without any meaning being connected with them. As to the use of the sacerdotal garment, Zosimus may not be quite trustworthy in that respect. But even if the emperors had accepted the pontifical robes, brought to them by the pagan priests at their accession to the throne, it does not follow that they actually wore them, or even officiated as "Pontifices Maximi." It has been supposed by some authors that the first Christian emperors adopted this pagan title only as a means of proclaiming themselves the guardians and protectors of the Christian religion. At an early period of his reign Constantine issued edicts in favor of the Christian clergy, by which they were put on a footing, with respect to civil rights, with the heathen priests: these edicts were soon followed by others which gave to the clergy some special and peculiar privileges. See Bingham, *Origines Eccles.* (Index in vol. 2); Riddle, *Christian Antiquities*, p. 337; Elliott, *Romanism*, p. 620; Alzog, *Kirchengesch.* 1, 244, 251.

Pontiff, or High-Priest

a person who has the superintendence and direction of divine worship, as the offering of sacrifices, and other religious solemnities. The Romans had a college of pontiffs, called by them "pontifici." *SEE PONTIFEX.*

Pontiffs, Confraternities of

were in the 12th century guilds of associated masons for the building of churches. They appeared first at Chartres, in France, and spread thence throughout that country and England, Switzerland, and Germany. When their Christian character died out they became lodges of Freemasons.

Pontifical

(i.e. belonging to a pontiff or bishop) is a book of rites and ceremonies appertaining to the office of a high-priest, pope, or prelate; therefore the name of a book used by a bishop at consecration of churches, etc. Thus the Roman Pontifical (*Pontificale Romanum*) is the book giving directions as to those acts of worship which Roman Catholic bishops exclusively perform, or at least a priest delegated by the bishop. Several mediaeval pontificalia are extant, but they have merely a historical value. The edition published Feb. 10, 1596, by pope Clement VIII, has remained up to our day the rule of the Roman Catholic ceremonial. “Statuentes,” says the pope, “Pontificale preedictum nullo unquam in toto vel in parte mutandum, vel ei aliquid addendum, aut omnino detrahendum esse, ac quoscunque qui pontificalia munia exercere, vel alia, quae in dicto Pontificali continentur, facere aut exequi debent, ad ea peragenda et praestanda ex hujus Pontificalis prescripto et ratione teneri, neminemque ex eis... nisi formulis, quae hoc ipso Pontificali continentur, servatis satisfacere posse.” It may be seen by this quotation how stringent the prescriptions of the Pontifical are. The Pontifical contains the services for ordinations, for religious professions and receptions of monks and nuns, consecrations, benedictions, etc., as well as of the solemn administration by a bishop of those sacraments which are ordinarily administered by priests. Besides the prayers to be recited, the Pontifical also lays down the ceremonial to be observed. The rules of this ceremonial are of two *kinds*— *preceptive*, the literal observance of which is obligatory; and *directive*, which admit of a certain interpretation. The ceremonies must be performed as described in the several services without any omission, addition, or modification, whether in the administration of sacraments or the performance of public worship, in which the bishop exclusively, or a priest delegated by the bishop, officiates.

Another of the service-books of bishops is called the *Ceremoniale*, but it is chiefly confined to a description of the peculiar ceremonial with which

bishops are required to celebrate solemnly those offices, as of the mass, vespers, the funeral office, etc., which are common to them with priests. The most prized editions of both these service-books are those published by authority of the learned pope Benedict XIV.

In England the Pontifical is not by authority published separately from the Liturgy, so that it is never called by that name; though the offices of confirmation and ordination, in fact, compose the English Pontifical. For the consecration of churches and churchyards there is no office appointed by sufficient authority. See *Bible and Missal*, p. 217; Coleman, *Primitive Ch.* (Index). *SEE CONSECRATION OF CHURCHES.*

Pontificalia

properly the ensigns of a pontiff's or bishop's office, is a term loosely used for any ecclesiastical vestment or other ornament, wherein either of these functionaries performs divine service.

Pontificate

means the state or dignity of a pontiff, or high-priest; but is more particularly applied in modern times to the reign of a pope.

Pontinus, Council of

SEE PONTYON.

Pontius

a deacon of the African Church, the tried friend and constant companion of Cyprian, drew up a narrative of the life and sufferings of the martyred bishop, which is styled an excellent production (*egregium volumen*) by Jerome. If the piece extant under the name of Pontius, entitled *De Vita et Passione S. Cypriani*, be genuine, it certainly does not merit such high commendation, since it is composed in an ambitious declamatory style, full of affectation and rhetorical ornaments. Perhaps the original work may have formed the basis of what we now possess, which has probably been built up into its present form by the labor of various hands. It will be found attached to all the most important editions of Cyprian, and is contained also in the *Acta Primorum Martyrum* of Ruinart (Paris, 1690, 4to; Amsterdam, 1713, fol.). The *Acta Pontii* are preserved in the *Miscellanea* of Balutze (Paris, 1678, 8vo), 2, 124, and in the *Acta Sanctorum* under

March 8, the day marked as his festival in the Roman Martyrologies. See Jerome, *De Viris* 111. p. 68; Schinemann, *Bibl. Patrum Lot.* vol. 1, c. 3, § 6.

Pontius, Paul

a celebrated Belgian engraver, was born at Antwerp in 1596, according to some accounts, according to others in 1603. He was the pupil of Vorstermann, and is chiefly distinguished for his excellent prints after Rubens, which he executed under that great painter's inspection. He engraved also a celebrated set of portraits after Vandyck, including those of many of the most distinguished Flemish painters. He appears to have adapted himself wonderfully to whatever artist he copied. The date of his death appears not to be known. The *Slaughter of the Innocents*, after Rubens, one of his principal works, is dated 1653.

Pontius (Pilate)

SEE PILATE.

Pontoppidan, Erik Eriksen

also called *Pontoppidan the Elder*, a Norwegian prelate, was born in 1616 at Broby (town-bridge = *pons oppidanus*), in Fihlen, in Denmark, from which he took his Latin name. He was for many years minister in Kjøge, but afterwards became bishop of the Trondhjem diocese in Norway. For his many Latin poems he had the honor of being crowned poet by the old Westhof. who had himself been crowned poet in Germany. Pontoppidan's funeral sermons are very famous. But what especially entitles him to an honorable name in history is his *Danish Grammar*, which was published in 1668, while he was still minister at Kjøge. It was the first Danish grammar ever published. He died in 1678. See Barfod, *Fortcellinger*, p. 542. (R.B.A.)

Pontoppidan, Erik L.

son of the nephew of the foregoing, also called *Pontoppidan the Younger*, was born Aug. 24, 1698, in Aarhus, in Denmark, where his father was dean. He became a student in 1716 at Fredericia, and afterwards at Copenhagen; after this he was tutor in the house of general Lützwow, in Norway; traveled in foreign lands with a son of Iver Hvitfeldt, and then became tutor in the family of the last duke of Holstein-Plon. In 1723 he

was appointed chaplain of the palace chapel at Nordborg; in 1734 chaplain of the palace chapel at Fredericksborg; and in 1735 he became court-chaplain in Copenhagen. In 1738 he was elected professor of theology in the Copenhagen University; was appointed bishop of Bergen in 1747: received the degree of doctor of theology in 1749; and in 1755 became chancellor of the Copenhagen University. He died Dec. 20, 1764. As a theologian he was semi-pietistic, but not at all fanatical. He was cheerful, and disapproved the severe pietistic laws that were enforced by the Danish government in his time. During the reign of Christian VI he had the courage to write, "God never permits the laws of nature to be violated for the sake of advancing the cause of the Church. When the Church of Christ consisted exclusively of volunteers, it had living members." Some fault has been found with him, and perhaps justly, in his direction of the affairs of the university; but at the same time he did much to advance the cause of science, and he was ever on the alert to see that the several professors did not neglect any portion of their duty to the university. As a German, Danish, and Latin author he exercised a great influence, especially in theology, history, natural history, and political economy. Of his numerous works, the following are the ones most known: *An Explanation of Luther's Catechism* (1737), a book that was for a long time the text-book in Denmark and Norway in the religious education of the children, and is as such used very widely yet: — *Marmora Danica* (1739-41, 2 vols. fol.), in which he copies a number of inscriptions of various ages which elucidate the history of his country: — *Gesta et Vestigia Danorum extra Daniam* (1740-41, 3 vols.): — *Annales Ecclesiae Daniæ* (1741-52, 4 vols.), in German; a good history of the Danish Church: — *Menoza, an Asiatic Prince, who Traveled around the World in Search of Christians* (1742-43, 3 vols.). This is a philosophical work, written in Danish, and has been translated into Dutch, German, and other languages; it has recently been republished in Denmark by V. Birkeda: — *The Power of Truth in Conquering Infidelity* (1758): — *Collegitum Pastorale Praeticum* (1757): — *Origzines Hiafnienses* (1760): — *Danish Atlas* (1763-1781, 4 vols.). The fourth volume was completed by his brother-in-law, Hans de Hofman. He also published a *Hymn-book*, and wrote several short treatises. His *Natural History of Norway* (1752-54) was translated into English and German. He published *Economical Balance* in 1759, and a *Magazine of Political Ecounomy*, from 1757 to 1764. See Barfol, *Fortcellinger*, p. 542; *Nordisk Conversations Lexikon*, s.v. (R. B. A.)

Pontormo, Jacopo da

(or JACOPO CARRUCCI), a distinguished Florentine painter, was born at Pontormo in 1493. He was a short time the pupil of Leonardo da Vinci, and studied under Albertinelli, Pietro di Cosimo, and Andrea del Sarto. He painted for some time in a similar style to Andrea, and was that painter's rival; but he frequently changed his manner, and three distinct styles are ascribed to him, the last imitated from the works of Albert Durer. Towards the close of his life he spent eleven years in painting some frescos of the *Deluge* and the *Last Judgment* in the church of San Lorenzo, in the manner of the imitators of Michael Angelo, but they have long since been washed over. He died at Florence in 1558.

Pon'tus

(Πόντος, the *sea*), a large district in the north of Asia Minor, extending along the coast of the Pontus Euxinus, from which circumstance the name was derived. It is mentioned in the New Testament as furnishing a portion of that audience which listened to the apostles on the day of Pentecost (~~Acts~~ Acts 2:9), as the birthplace of Aquila (~~Acts~~ Acts 18:2), and as one of the districts through which "the strangers" addressed by Peter in his first epistle "were scattered abroad" (~~1 Peter~~ 1 Peter 1:1). All these passages agree in showing that there were many Jewish residents in the district. The term Pontus signified a country of very various extent at different times, and while the boundaries of all the provinces of Asia Minor were continually shifting, none were more affected by the changes of the times than those of Pontus. In the earlier period of its history it was merely a province of Cappadocia, which then extended from Mount Taurus to the Euxine; and tradition states that the petty kingdoms of which it was composed were subdued and consolidated by Ninus. It then fell under the alternate dominion of the Medes and Persians, the latter of whom divided it into satrapies; and in the reign of Darius Hystaspis the country of Pontus was bestowed by that prince on Artabazes, a member of his own family, who henceforth assumed the title of king of Pontus, and was the ancestor of a long line of princes rescued from oblivion by the genius, the crimes, and the vicissitudes of Mithridates VII, sometimes called "the Great." The kingdom of Artabazes was comprised between 41° and 43° N. lat., and between 35° and 42° E. long.; and was bounded on the north by the Euxine, on the south by Armenia Minor, on the east by Colchis, and on the west by the river Halys. The inhabitants were a bold, active, and warlike race, and

in the reign of Ariobarzanes they shook off the yoke of Persia, to whose sovereigns their own had from the time of Artabazes been tributary, and established the complete independence of their country. From this period the kingdom of Pontus prospered. Its monarchs gradually added to their dominions the whole of Cappadocia and Paphlagonia and a large part of Bithynia, thus dividing Asia Minor with the Attalian dynasty, which ruled at Pergamos. Mithridates VI formed an alliance with the Romans, sent a fleet to aid them in their wars against Carthage, and when, on the death of Attalus, who left his kingdom of Pergamos to the Roman people, Aristonicus contested the legacy, and attempted to make himself king of Pergamos, Mithridates espoused the cause of Rome, and aided in driving the usurper out of Asia. The policy of this able prince was reversed by his son and successor. Mithridates VII ascended the throne at the age of eleven years, and early began a career of enmity towards the Romans, the ultimate result of which was the entire subjugation of the country over which he ruled, and its reduction to the condition of a Roman province. Mithridates did, however, succeed so far as to make himself master of all Lesser Asia and of many of the adjacent islands. At Cos he plundered the Jews of a large sum of money, he annexed Athens itself to his kingdom, while his son Ariarathes overcame Macedonia and Thrace. At this period of his reign he was the master of twenty-five nations; and so great were his accomplishments as a linguist, that he is said to have been able to converse with the natives of all without the aid of an interpreter. He determined utterly to root out the Roman dominion from Asia, and in order to compromise the inhabitants of the country beyond the possibility of return, he issued orders that on a certain day throughout his dominions every Roman should be put to death, not excepting even women and children. This atrocious decree, which has covered the name of Mithridates with infamy, was carried out, and the number of persons who perished in the massacre is variously estimated at from eighty to one hundred and sixty thousand. From this time his real power began to decline; and after a romantic series of vicissitudes he was killed at his own request in the seventy-first year of his age, B.C. 64. After the death of Mithridates, his son Pharnaces submitted to the Romans. He was made king of Bosphorus, and proclaimed the ally of Rome; but after the return of Pompey he regained his hereditary kingdom, and ventured to oppose the Romans with as much obstinacy as his father, but with less success. Julius Caesar marched against him, and reduced the country to the condition of a province. Marc Anthony restored Darius, the son of Pharnaces; and a short

line of princes, none of whom require any notice in this place, governed the country till the time of Nero. The last of these, Polemo II, was the father of that Berenice who married Herod Agrippa II, before whom Paul pleaded his cause with so much eloquence. From this time Pontus ceased to be an independent state, constituting a province or dependency of the Roman Empire. On the east it was bounded by Colchis, on the south by Cappadocia and part of Armenia, and on the west by Paphlagonia and Galatia. Ptolemy (*Geog.* 5, 5) and Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* 6:4) regard Pontus and Cappadocia as one province; but Strabo (*Geog.* 12:541) rightly distinguishes them, seeing that each formed a distinct government with its own ruler or prince. Ptolemy divides what may be called the true Pontus into three districts—Pontus Galaticus, Pontus Cappadocius, and Pontus Polemoniicus. This last was imagined to be the country of the Amazons.

The climate of Pontus is hot in summer, but severe in winter, especially along the shores of the Euxine. The soil is fertile, but less so than in the more southern parts of Asia Minor; yet it abounds with olives and cherry-trees, and the valleys produce considerable quantities of grain. These advantages it owes to its being watered by many small rivers, while the great river Halys flows far into the interior. The inhabitants were a hardy and industrious race; deriving their origin, according to tradition, from Tubal Cain. They were industrious as well as warlike, and addicted to commerce, and the inhabitants of Pontus Cappadocius were celebrated for their skill in the manufacture of arms, and for working in metal in general. They had many convenient harbors on the Euxine, and abundance of fine timber for shipbuilding, and of these they seem very early to have taken full advantage. They retained more of the Eastern elements in their language and religion than the inhabitants of Lydia and Pergamos, who were brought more entirely under the influence of Greek art, literature, and philosophy. They spoke a dialect of the Persian, largely corrupted with Greek; and their religion seems to have been a compound of Greek, Scythian, and Persian. Demeter, Zeus, and Poseidon were their chief deities; but this comes to us on Greek authority; and they sacrificed to the last-named deity white horses, by harnessing them four abreast to chariots, and driving them into the sea, where they were drowned. The principal towns of Pontus were Amasia, the ancient metropolis, and the birthplace of Strabo, Themiscyra, Cerasus, and Trapezus; which last is still an important town under the name of Trebizond. See Cellarius, *Notit.* 2, 287; Mannert, 6:350; Rosenmüller, *Bibl. Geog.* 3, 5-9; *Encyclop. Methodique*, sect. *Gog.*

Ancienne, s.v. Pontos; Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Geog.* s.v. Pontus; Conybeare and Howson, *Life and Epistles* (N. Y. ed.), 1, 247. **SEE ASIA MINOR.**

Pontyon, Council of

(*Concilium Pontigonense*), was held in June and July, 876, by the Cisalpine bishops, the emperor Charles and the Roman legates being present. The pretensions of Ansegisus, metropolitan of Sens, whom pope John VIII, at the request of the emperor, had nominated primate vicar apostolic in Gaul and Germany (in violation of the canons and of the rights of the metropolitans), were brought before the council, and so resolutely opposed by the bishops that the affair for the time, came to nothing; i.e. the pontifical rescript in favor of Ansegisus remained practically null and void. The archbishop of Sens, it is true, from that time forward assumed the title of "Primate of Gaul and Germany," but it was a mere nominal distinction, unattended by jurisdiction or authority. The acts of the Synod of Pavia, in the beginning of the year, were confirmed by the Council of Pontyon. Fifty-two bishops and archbishops subscribed the acts, together with five abbots. See Labbe, *Concil.* 9:280; Hefele, *Conciliengesch.* vol. 1, 4:and 5; Sirmond, *Concil. Antiq. Gall.* vol. 3; Jervis, *Hist. of the Church of France*, 1, 38 sq.

Pool

is the rendering in the A. V. of the following Heb. and Greek words:

1. Usually **hkrB]** *berekâh* (Sept. **κρήνη** or **κολυμβήθρα**), or **hkrB]** *berekâh* (^{<1806>}Psalm 84:6, **SEE BERACHAH**), from **ĒrB**; "to fall on the knees" (see ^{<1005>}Judges 7:5, 6). This word is akin to the Arabic *Birkeli*, and its Spanish form *Al-berca*. In the Old Test. it stands for the larger reservoirs of rain or spring water; while *bor*, "cistern," is used for the smaller domestic tanks, of which every house had one or more. Some are supplied by springs, and some are merely receptacles for rain-water (Burckhardt, *Syria*, p. 314). It is thus applied to the large public reservoirs, corresponding to the tanks of India, belonging to the towns of Gibeon (^{<1023>}2 Samuel 2:13), Hebron (4:12), Samaria (^{<1228>}1 Kings 22:38), and Jerusalem; "the upper pool," ^{<1287>}2 Kings 18:17; ^{<2108>}Isaiah 7:3; 34:2 (now the "Birket el-Mamilla"); "the lower pool," ^{<2219>}Isaiah 22:9, 11 ("Birket es-Sultan"); "Hezekiah's pool," ^{<1211>}2 Kings 20:20 ("Birket el-Hammhm");

“the king’s pool,” ^{<1024>}Nehemiah 2:14 (“the fountain of the Virgin”); “the pool of Siloah,” ^{<1015>}Nehemiah 3:15 (“Birket Silwan”); and “the old pool,” ^{<2021>}Isaiah 22:11. We read also (^{<2006>}Ecclesiastes 2:6) of the “pools” or cisterns made by Solomon to irrigate his gardens. The importance of these reservoirs in a country possessing scarcely more than one perennial stream, and where wells are few and inconsiderable, can hardly be estimated by those accustomed to an unfailling abundance of the precious fluid. In ^{<2443>}Jeremiah 14:3 we have a powerful description of the disappointment caused by the failure of the water in the cisterns (μυβῆε A. V. “pits;” comp. ^{<2025>}Isaiah 42:15; ^{<2423>}Jeremiah 2:13). In modern Palestine they are often very filthy, although in constant use (Thomson, *Land and Book*, 1, 316).
SEE WATER.

2. *Agâm*, *μγα*; (^{<2342>}Isaiah 14:23; 35:7; 41:18; 42:15); elsewhere “pond” (q.v.).

3. *Mikvêh*, *hwæpæ* (^{<1079>}Exodus 7:19), a *gathering together* (i.e. of water), as rendered ^{<0010>}Genesis 1:10.

4. In the New Test. *κολυμβήθρα*, only in ^{<1010>}John 5:2; 9:7.

The following are the principal reservoirs mentioned in the Bible:

Picture for Pool

a. A *pool of Hezekiah*, ^{<1210>}2 Kings 20:20 (comp. Sirach, 48:17 [19]). It was a basin which that king had opened in the city, and fed by a watercourse (*hl* [*ṭ*] “conduit”). In ^{<1430>}2 Chronicles 32:30 it is said more definitely that Hezekiah conducted the water from the upper pool of (Cihon in the west of the city. This pool of Hezekiah, called by the Arabs *Birket el-Hanlunenz*, is pointed out by tradition in the north-western part of the modern city, not far east of the Jaffa gate (Robinson, 2, 134 sq.). And there is no doubt that this is the true location, since the waters of the upper pool of Gihon (Birket el-Mamilla) flow through small, roughly built aqueducts in the vicinity of the Jaffa gate, and thus reach the Birket el-Hanum (Robinson, 1, 396). **SEE HEZEKIAH’S POOL.**

b. The *upper pool* (*hn/yl* [*hkrB*]) and the *lower pool* (*hn/Tj* [*TihkrB*]), the former lying near the fuller’s field, and on the road to it, outside of the city (^{<2003>}Isaiah 7:3; 36:2; ^{<2007>}2 Kings 18:17), and connecting with a watercourse. The lower pool is named in ^{<2020>}Isaiah 22:9. There still remain

in the west of the city two water-basins, an upper and a lower; the one called *Biuket el-amnzilla*, at the head of the valley of Gihon, and the other *Birket es-Sultcan*, somewhat farther down the valley southward, almost in a line with the south wall of the city (Robinson, 2, 129 sq.). They are generally known as the upper and the lower pool of Gihon. It supports the identification of these with “th^e upper and lower pools” that there are no other similar or corresponding reservoirs in the neighborhood; and the western position of the upper pool suits well the circumstances mentioned in Scripture (see ^{<2381>}Isaiah 36:2; ^{<12817>}2 Kings 18:17; comp. Knobel, *Isaiah* p. 153, 257). It may be added that a trustworthy tradition places the fuller’s field westward of the city (Robinson, *ut sup.* p. 128). **SEE GIHON.**

c. The *old pool* (**hnyvjhkrB**), not far from the double wall (**μyαtαnpο** “two walls”), ^{<2321>}Isaiah 22:11. This double wall was near the royal garden (^{<12204>}2 Kings 25:4; ^{<2304>}Jeremiah 39:4), which must be sought in the southeast of the city, near the fountain of Siloam (^{<1615>}Nehemiah 3:15). Near the mouth of the Tyropoeon there are still two reservoirs or cisterns (Robinson, 1, 384; 2, 146), a smaller one hollowed out in the rock, and the other, a little larger, lying a short distance to the south of the former, and receiving its water. The water flows from an opening in the rock a few feet north of the lessen basin; i.e. from the fountain of Siloam. The larger of these basins is doubtless the pool of Siloam, and the smaller is possibly the “*old pool*,” and the same with the artificial pool named in ^{<1616>}Nehemiah 3:16 as in this vicinity (Robinson, 2, 146; comp. Thenius, in Illgen’s *Zeitschr.* 1844, 1, 22 sq.). Perhaps, however, we may rather understand the passage in Isaiah as referring to a mere damming up of the Tyropoeon itself between the two parallel parts of the old wall lining the sides of the valley, for the purpose of containing (temporarily during the siege) the waters of the then “old” (i.e. superseded) pool of Gihon outside the city, thus diverted into a new channel. **SEE JERUSALEM.**

d. The *king’s pool* (**Ēl MhitkrBæ** ^{<1614>}Nehemiah 2:14) is probably to be found in the fountain of the Virgin Mary, on the east side of Ophel (Robinson, 2, 102, 149), and is perhaps the same with the pool of Solomon (**κολυμβήθρα Σολομῶνος**) mentioned by Josephus as on this side of the city (*War*, 5, 4, 2; comp. Thenius, *op. cit.* p. 25). With less probability Schultz (*Jerus.* p. 58) takes the pool which lies south of Siloam, and which is now half choked with earth, for the king’s pool. **SEE JERUSALEM.**

In Josephus, besides the foregoing, we find the *sparrow's pool* (τὸ **Στρονθίον**, which may have a different meaning; see Beekman, *Emfind.* 4, 19), opposite the Castle of Antonia, in the north of the city (*War*, 5, 11, 4), now Birket Israil, or perhaps Birket el-Hejjah; the *pool of almonds* (**ἀμύγδαλον**), on the east side, at some distance from the city (*War*, ut sup.); the *pool of serpents* (**κολυμβήθρα τῶν ὄφεων**), near Herod's monument (Joseph. *War*, 5, 3, 2), between Scopus (a hill seven stadia, or a mile, from the city, Joseph. *War*, 2, 19, 4) and the city, and hence to the north, perhaps near the road to Shechem (Robinson, 1, 400; 2, 43, 189 sq.). This must, then, be different from the *dragon well* (*serpent well*) in ~~<K12>~~Nehemiah 2:13, which lay between the dung-gate in the south-west and the valley (comp. Thenius, *op. cit.* p. 17). There is no trace of it now to be found, for *Birket el-Mamilla* is to be identified with the upper pool, as above (Schultz, p. 67). **SEE JERUSALEM.**

For the pools of Gibeon, Hebron, Samaria, Solomon, Bethesda, and Siloam, see those words respectively. **SEE FOUNTAIN.**