

THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY
REFERENCE

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL,
THEOLOGICAL and
ECCLESIASTICAL
LITERATURE

Prowe - Pyx

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

Prowe

a divinity of the Wends and Northern Slaves, had the reputation of a wise but severe and terrible judge. He was the god of justice, and carried, as a symbol of wisdom, snakes on his breast; he held in his hand an iron shield, which in doubtful cases was made glowing for the fiery ordeal. His iron statue represents him in the shape of an old man clothed in a long, folding garment; he wears chains around his neck, and holds a sacrificial knife in his hand. He was more especially worshipped at Stargard: he had a temple in that city. and sacrifices were constantly offered to him. Around his sanctuary, and the wood consecrated to him, the people assembled every Monday: to penetrate into the holy forest itself was prohibited under penalty of death, a prohibition which among the Prussians secured likewise the solitude of the holy spots. The priests drank of the blood of the victims, and then, in the presence of the king and of the whole people; requested the advice of the idol. Sentences were then pronounced by the god, and orders given, which nobody could think of contradicting; animals and prisoners, in later times Christians, were immolated to him. On Fridays, according to the old chroniclers, women, children, and servants who brought offerings were allowed the entrance of the holy wood; a banquet was held in its surroundings, and merry dances were performed till an advanced hour of the night.

The same Prowe, it is believed, was also worshipped under a different form: he stands on a column, his nude form in a pair of boots; a bell lies at his feet. This is asserted by the chronicle of Botho, which calls the god *Promo*, and speaks of him as being the idol of Altenburg or Stargard. Botho may be mistaken in identifying this booted deity with Prowe: other idols besides the latter may have been worshipped at Stargard; perhaps the chroniclers mistook one of them for the god of justice. See 'Thorpe, *Northern Mythology* (see Index in vol. 3).

Prozymites

(from Greek *πρό*, *jonr*, *ζύμη*, *lecaven*, i.e. *Jor leavened bread*) is a term applied reproachfully by the Western Church to the adherents of the Greek Church because they contended for the use of leavened, or common, bread in the Eucharist. The Latin Church were *Azymites* (q.v.). **SEE ALSO EUCHARIST.**

Prshemishl

the first fabulous duke of Bohemia, the husband of the celebrated Libussa. His name is synonymous with that of Prometheus: it means *he who thinks in advance*, probably because Prshemishl was a seer, a great prophet.

Prshipegala

a warlike divinity in Slavic mythology, sanguinary as were his priests and all the gods of the Slavonians. The Christian prisoners were beheaded in front of his image, and their blood was presented to him to drink.

Prudden, Nehemiah

a New England minister of the Gospel, flourished near the close of the last and the opening of this century. He was born about 1750, and was educated at Yale College. He became pastor of a church at Enfield, Conn. He died in 1815. He is the author of *Marrying a Sister of a Deceased Wife* (1811): *-Sermon to a Missionary Society* (1815). See Bacon, *Hist. Discourses*, p. 55 sq.

Prudence

is the act of suiting words and actions according to the circumstances of things, or rules of right reason. Cicero thus defines it: “Est rerum expetendarum vel fulgiendarum scientia” — the knowledge of what is to be desired or avoided. Grove thus: “Prudence is an ability of judging what is best in the choice both of ends and means.” Mason thus: “Prudence is a conformity to the rules of reason, truth, and decency, at all times and in all circumstances. It differs from wisdom only in degree; wisdom being nothing but a more consummate habit of prudence, and prudence a lower degree or weaker habit of wisdom.” It is divided into,

- 1, *Christian* prudence, which directs to the pursuit of that blessedness which the Gospel discovers by the use of Gospel means;
- 2, *moral* prudence, which has for its end peace and satisfaction of mind in this world, and the greatest happiness after death;
- 3, *civil* prudence, which is the knowledge of what ought to be done in order to secure the outward happiness of life, consisting in prosperity, liberty, etc.;

4, *monastic*, relating to any circumstances in which a man is not charged with the care of others;

5, *economical* prudence, which regards the conduct of a family;

6, *political*, which refers to the good government of a state.

The idea of prudence, says one, includes due consultation — that is, concerning such things as demand consultation — in a right manner and for a competent time, that the resolution taken up may be neither too precipitate nor too slow; and a faculty of discerning proper means when they occur. To the perfection of prudence these three things are further required, viz. a natural sagacity; presence of mind, or a ready turn of thought; and experience. Plato styles prudence the leading virtue; and Cicero observes that “not one of the virtues can want prudence;” which is certainly most true, since, without prudence to guide them, piety would degenerate into superstition, zeal into bigotry, temperance into austerity, courage into rashness, and justice itself into folly. In a comparison of *prudence* and *morality*, the former has been called the vowel, the latter the consonant. The latter cannot be uttered (reduced to practice) but by means of the former. See Watts, *Sermons*, ser. 28; Grove, *Moral Philos.* vol. ii, ch. ii; Mason, *Christian Morals*, vol. i, ser. 4; Evans, *Christian Temper*, ser. 38; Coleridge, *Aids to Reflection*, i, 13, 21 sq.

Prudentius St.,

a French prelate of the 9th century, was a native of Spain. The name of his family was *Galindon*. He took the name of *Prudentius* in memory of the Christian poet, his compatriot. Taken when young to France, he passed several years at court, where it appears he occupied some important charge, until his election as bishop of Troyes in 846; then he subscribed, Feb. 14, 847, to the privilege accorded by the Council of Paris to Paschasius Radbertus, abbe of Corbie. People came from all parts to consult him, and he was called one of the most learned bishops of the Gallican Church. Hincmar, archbishop of Rheims, particularly wished, to have advice how to treat Gottschalk, or Godeschalculus (q.v.), in the dispute about predestination raised by Gottschalk. At first Prudentius sided with Hincmar, but afterwards took a mediatory position. Towards the end of 849, or the beginning of 850, he, however, abandoned Hincmar and wrote in defence of Gottschalk, then a prisoner, and directed his work to Hincmar and his confederate Pardulus, bishop of Lyons. Prudentius begins with an

encomium of St. Augustine, whose doctrines, he says, were also supported by Fulgentius and Prosper of Aquitania. He then affirms a twofold predestination, one to damnation, the other to salvation. Yet God has not predestined the reprobate to guilt, but to punishment. Christ has given his blood only for the elect, for he says it is given for *many*. It follows that it is God's will not to call and save all men. These propositions Prudentius undertakes to support by the authority of the Scriptures, and of a number of fathers, especially of the Latin Church; the most recent of the latter authorities thus invoked is Beda. Ratramnus, a learned monk of Corbie, and Servatus Lupus, the accomplished abbot of Ferrieres, sided with the bishop of Troyes. Rabanus Maurus speaks thus of this work, sent to him by Hincmar: "Prudentius's views converge sometimes with ours, when he asserts that God is not the author of evil, that the reward of the good is undeserved grace, and the punishment of the bad just expiation. But when he says that God, by his predestination, compels the sinner to go to ruin, it seems to me that the consequence of it is, according to the views of Gottschalk, a two-fold predestination (see *Op. Sirmond.* ii, 1296)." Towards the close of 851 Scotus Erigena published his work on predestination against Gottschalk which he had composed at the request of Hincmar. This work, which undertook to solve the question from the philosophical standpoint, and argued for the unbiassed freedom of the will, only complicated the dispute. Erigena was charged with Semi-Pelagianism and other heresies. Wenilo, archbishop of Sens, extracted from it nineteen articles, and sent them to Prudentius for refutation. Prudentius replied in a writing addressed to Wenilo, and divided into nineteen chapters, followed by an epilogue (*Biblioth. Max. Patr.* 15:467-597). This *Tractatus de Praedestinatione contra Joh. Scot. Erig.* was written in the year 852, and Gfrorer says of it: "Prudentius wrote against Erigena a ponderous book, in which the work of the philosopher was, with cutting sagacity and sturdy orthodoxy, so dealt with that nothing remained of it." This, it should be remembered, is the testimony of one who advocates predestination, and agrees with Erigena that evil is only a $\mu\eta\ \delta\upsilon\nu$, condemnation, not a positive punishment on the part of God; that it only consists in the tormenting consciousness of having missed one's destiny. **SEE WILL.** In the ensuing year (853) Hincmar held a national synod at Chiersy — the first had taken place in 849 — where four articles (*Capitula Carisiaca*), embodying a moderate form of Augustinianism, were adopted against Gottschalk. Although Prudentius put his name to these "quatuor capitula," he soon afterwards endeavored to refute them by writing a *Tractio a Epistola adv.*

4 *Cuip. Convent. Caris.* It is possible that he signed his name at Chiersy by demand of king Charles the Bald. In the later development of this contest, Prudentius seems to have given up his position. He died April 6, 861, and is revered as a saint in Troves. The Bollandists do not recognise his title to sanctity. Although Prudentius held himself against opposing heresies, and particularly against the doctrines of the Pelagians and Semi-Pelagians, he was suspected by some authors to have concealed the truth in the prosecution of error, and *Les Annales de St. Berlin* accuse him of having written articles against the faith. From a letter of Servatus Lupus to Prudentius, we learn (Fp. 63) that these two men were sent by king Charles to visit and reform the monasteries of France. See *Gallia Christiana*, iii; Breyer (canon at Troyes), *Life of Prudentius* (1725); Gfrorer, *Gesch. der-Carolinger* (1848), i, 210 sq.; Wenck, *Das Frankische Reich nach dem Vertraog von Verdun* (1851), p. 382; Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity*, iii, 241 sq.; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* (see Index); Manguin, *Vett. Auctorum qui in Sec. IX de Praedest. scripserunt Opera et Fragm.* (Paris, 1650, 2 vols. 4to); Kurtz, *Ch. Hist. of the Reformation*, § 91, 4; Hardwick, *Ch. Hist.* (Middle Ages), p. 163 sq.; Hefele, *Conciliengesch.* 4:124 sq.; *Jahrb. fur deutsch. Theol.* 1859, art. by Weizsacker; *Amer. Presb. Rev.* Jan. 1861 p. 200.

Prudentius, Aurelius Clemens

one of the earliest hymnists of the Latin Church, is greatly celebrated in ecclesiastical history, though generally overrated. Bentley calls him "the Horace and Virgil of the Christians," not even qualifying them as Latin Christians. There were certainly many hymnists previous to Prudentius, and they sang in the tongue of Homer, Plato, and the New Test. the very thoughts, and frequently in the very words, of evangelists and apostles. The hosannas of Ephraim the Syrian had the sound as well as the sense of those of the children of Jerusalem; and Clement of Alexandria, Gregory of Nazianzum, and the unknown earliest singers of the Oriental Church linked the passing hours with heaven by the sublimity of their language and the simplicity of their faith. As the truths of Christianity first flowed in Greek from inspired lips, so the songs of the Church came first in Greek. When, finally, the mighty new thought had been fitted to the comparatively stiff and narrow mould of Roman speech, it was not the tongue of Prudentius that gathered around it the spiritual and ecclesiastical associations of centuries. The rugged grandeur of expression, the calm and steady glow that wins for the majesty of heaven, came rather in the Latin hymns of

Ambrose, Augustine, and Hilary of Poitiers. In the words of an eminent critic, “The fire of Revelation, in its strong and simple energy, by which, as it were, it rends the rock, and bursts the icy barriers of the human heart, predominates in those oldest pieces of the sacred Latin poesy which are comprised in the Ambrosian hymnology” (Fortlage).

Life. — Prudentius was born in A.D. 348, probably at Saragossa, in Spain. Nothing is known regarding him except what he has himself told in a poetical autobiography prefixed to his works. From this we learn that he received a liberal education, was admitted to the Roman bar, practiced as a pleader, and seems to have distinguished himself in his profession, as high civil offices were twice offered to him. He was even called upon to occupy a military post at the court of the emperor Theodosius I. He was already fifty years of age, when, like other prominent men of those troublous times, he was agitated by earnest misgivings as to “what all the honors and joys of this world might do for him in eternity. In them he could not find God to whom he belonged” (*Prof. Cathenz.* 5, 28-34). Hence the resolution: “Let the soul, at the boundaries of life, renounce her folly and sin. Let her praise her God at least by her songs, as she cannot do it by her virtues. Let the day be spent in sacred hymns, and let not even night interrupt the praises of God. I will struggle against heresy, defend the catholic faith, annihilate the sacrifices of the pagans, destroy thy idols, O Rome. I will praise in my songs thy martyrs, glorify the apostles” (*l.c.* ver. 35-42). These words indicate all the different tendencies in his literary productions, which reflect them.

Works. — We have from Prudentius’s pen between 385 and 388 poems, a number of which bear Greek titles. The principal are —

1. *Cathemerinon Liber* (Book [i.e. of hymns] for Daily Use), being a series of twelve hymns, the first half of which were reckoned by the author suitable for devotional purposes at different parts of the day, and which the Latin Church has preserved in some of its collections.
2. *Apotheosis*, **Ἀποθέωσις** (a defence of the doctrine of the Trinity against heretics, with which are intermingled various discussions on the nature of the soul, on original sin, and on the resurrection).
3. *Hamartigeneia*, **ἁμαρτιγένεια** (On the Origin of Evil, a polemic, in verse, against the Marcionites and Manichaeans).

4. *Psychomachia*, **ψυχομάχια** (The Combat of the Mind against the Passions, or the Triumph of the Christian Graces in the Soul of a Believer).

5. *Contra Symmachum, Liber I* (a polemic against the heathen gods).

6. *Contra Symmachum, Liber 2* (a polemic against a petition of the Roman senator Symmachus for the restoration of the altar and statue of Victory cast down by Gratian). Prudentius supports in these two poems the arguments set forth by Ambrose against the proposition of Symmachus. The first book shows the shameful origin of the old idolatry, exposes the absurdity and abominations of the heathen mythology, the corruption resulting from the want of a moral check, and how happily Rome was inspired when it turned to Christianity. In the second book he examines the reasons alleged by his adversary, eloquently descants upon the cruel practice of gladiators' combats for the amusement of the people, and, in order to show their brutalizing influence, he instances a vestal attending in the amphitheatre, and witnessing the struggles and agonies of the fallen gladiators in the arena, exclaiming with joy that such sights were her delight, and giving without compunction the signal to despatch the fallen. Arnobius (bk. 4 towards the end) casts a similar reproach upon the vestals. As, in both books, the subject was of a nature to allow full scope to the genius of the poet, being eminently favorable to enthusiastic apology, this is the best of all his apologetical poems.

7. The *Enchiridion utriusque Testamenti s. Diptychon* (forty-eight poems of four verses each) is a historico-didactic work, of a uniform tenor, relating to some of the most remarkable events of the New and Old Test., as Adam and Eve, Abel and Cain, Joseph recognised by his brothers, the annunciation, the shepherds taught by the angels, etc. Gennadius counts this work with the other poems of Prudentius (*De Script. Ecclesiastes* 13); but its authenticity has been questioned, chiefly because it is less abundant in ideas than the others. The following are decidedly authentic, and, besides, excellent compositions: 8. Fourteen poems, **Περὶ Στεφάνων**, *Peri Stephanon Liber*, in honor of the martyrs for the faith-Laurentius, Eulalia, Vincent, Hippolytus, Peter and Paul, Agnes, etc.; full of warm feeling and splendid narratives. To the Christian lyrical poetry belong, 9, the twelve songs **Καθημερινῶν**, mostly destined for the daily prayer-hours, which were exactly observed in olden times. 'The first relates to the dawning of the (lay ("ad galli cantum")); Christ, the rising light of the world, chases the lark powers of night. Let him banish them also from our

heart and pour new light into our souls! The second is likewise a morning-song. The third and fourth are tall-prayers. The fifth is to be recited at the lighting of the candles; the sixth upon retiring for the night; the seventh and eighth while and after fasting; the ninth, an encomium on the Saviour, at all hours. To these are added *Songs for Exequies* (on the Resurrection), on the feasts of Christmas (“octavo Calendas Januariarum”) and Epiphany. All these songs breathe an earnest, Christian spirit; they show the rich symbolism of the Christian life of old, and are therefore of great archeological importance. Several passages of them and of the hymns *Περὶ Στεφάνων* have been put into the Breviary among the Church hymns. Prudentius cultivated, as we have seen, the two fundamental kinds of Christian poetry, the didactico-panegyric and the lyric, which were the necessary consequences of the historico-dogmatic and mystical character of Christianity, and borrowed their forms from the ancient Roman poetry, which is also chiefly didactico-paraenetic or panegyric. The poetical form was employed at a very early period for the popular interpretation and defence of the Christian dogmas against pagans and heretics. Prudentius achieved in a short time a great reputation in the Church. Sidonius Apollinaris (*Ep.* ii, 9) compares him with Horace, who was his chief model in a formal point of view; yet Prudentius moves in the classical forms with incomparably greater ease than his predecessors, Juvencus and Victorinus: he borrows more than the latter writers from the ecclesiastical Latinity, to keep the expression of his thoughts free from all pagan coloring. His phrases, it is true, show the decay of letters and of good Latin, yet many parts of his poems display taste as well as delicacy; for instance, his stanzas, *Salvete, flores martyrurum*, to be found in the Roman Breviary for the feast of the Holy Innocents. We are, however, at a loss to understand how any scholars of our critical age can bestow unqualified praise on Prudentius, and place him *first* in the list of Christian versifiers. Nor are we ready to shut our eyes wilfully to all the beauties of Prudentius’s verse, and declare his hymns simply “didactic essays, loaded with moral precepts and doctrinal subtleties.” His lyric style is good, and his hymns are good specimens of the best Christian song of the Latin Church in that early age. “The stanzas,” says Milman (*Hist. of Latin Christianity*, 8:309), “which the Latin Church has handed down in her services from Prudentius are but the flowers gathered from a wilderness of weeds.” Prudentius, even in Germany, was the great popular author of the Middle Ages; no work but the Bible appears with so many glosses (interpretations or notes) in High German, which show that it was a book of popular instruction (compl.

Raumer, *Einwirkung des Christenthums auf die Althochdeutsche Sprache*, p. 222). Had Ambrose lived earlier, Prudentius would not have been remembered at all; but as his contemporary he deserves a place beside that great Church father, whom he never excelled, but sometimes equalled as a hymnologist. The earliest edition of Prudentius's works is that of Deventer (1472). By far the best is that of Faustinus Arrevalus (Rome. 1788-89, 2 vols. 4to), but excellent editions are also those by Waitz (Hanover, 1613, 8vo); Chamillard (in usum Delphini. Paris. 1687, 4to); and Gallandius, *Bibl. Patr.* vol. viii. The newest and handiest is that by Obbarius (Tubing. 1844), whose Prolegomena embrace a large amount of information condensed into a small compass. See Gennadius, *De Viris Illustr.* 13; Ludwig, *Dissert. de Vita A. Prudentii* (Viteb. 1642, 4to); Le Clerque, *Vie de Prudence* (Amst. 1689); Middeldorpf, *Comment. de Prud. et Theol. Prud.* (Vratisl. 182327); Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* vol. iii; *Christian Life in Song*, p. 74 sq., 98, 110 sq.; Saunders, *Evenings with the Sacred Poets*, p. 34 sq.; Maittaire. *Poetce Latini.* p. 1587 sq.; Daniel, *Thesaurus Hymnol.* ii, 102 sq.; Smith, *Diet. of Gr. and Rom. Biog.* s.v.

Pruning-hook

(*hrmzj* *mazmerah*; Sept. *δρέπανον*; ^{<ZIMH} Isaiah 2:4; 18:5; Joel 4:10; ^{<30B} Micah 4:3), a knife for pruning the vine. The manner of tzrimming the vine (*rmzamazdr*), signifying clipping, and also the singular instrument of the vine-dresser, were well known even in the time of Moses (^{<RZB} Leviticus 25:3, 4), and no doubt both were similar to those employed by the Egyptians. *SEE KNIFE*; *SEE VINE*; *SEE VINEYARD*).

Prussia

(Ger. *Preussen*) is a kingdom of the new German Empire, virtually embracing within its own history the story of the whole empire, in which it is the guiding and ruling power. Before its recent aggrandizement, it consisted of two large tracts of land extending from Russia on the east to Holland and Belgium on the west, south of the Baltic and north of Saxony, Thuringia, Bavaria, etc., but separated from each other by the kingdom of Hanover, the duchies of Mecklenburg and Oldenburg, the electorate of Hesse-Cassel, duchy of Nassau, and some minor states. In 1866, Prussia received large accessions of territory, having annexed the kingdom of Hanover, the duchies of Hesse-Cassel, Nassau, and Sleswig and Holstein, the free city of Frankfort, and some districts of Bavaria and Hesse-

Darmstadt. The area of Prussia was thus increased from 108,212 Eng. sq. miles to 137,066, and the population from 19,304,843 to 24,106,847, of whom 23,746,790 formed the civil population, and 310,055 the military, the average density of the population being 176 per Eng. sq. mile. The variation in density is considerable, the greatest being in the manufacturing district of Dusseldorf, in the Rhine province, where it is four times the average, and smallest in the district of Kislin, Pomerania, where it amounts to three fifths of the average. Prussia is now divided into eleven provinces and three annexes, with a population, according to the official census for 1885, as follows:

Eng. sq. m. Pop. Dec. 1185.

1. Prussia	24,880	3,367,704
2. Posen	11,330	1,715,618
3. Pomerania	12,130	1,505,575
4. Silesia	15,666	4,112,219
5. Brandenburg	15,505	2,342,411
6. Saxony	9,729	2,428,367
7. Westphalia	7,771	2,204,580
8. Rhine province	10,289	4,344,527
9. Hesse-Nassau	5,943	1,592,454
10. Hanover	14,846	2,172,702
11. Sleswig-Holstein	6,959	995,873
12. Principality of Hohenzollern	453	66,720
13. City of Berlin	5	1,315,287

About 88 per cent. of the population are Germans. Of the Slavonic tribes, the most numerous are Poles, numbering two and a quarter millions. In Brandenburg and Silesia there are about 85,000 Wends, and in East Prussia upwards of 147,000 Lithuanians; while Western Prussia has rather more than 10,000 Walloons using the French language, intermixed in its generally German population, and Silesia has nearly 59,000 Bohemians or Moravians-making in all two and a half millions who do not use the German language, or who employ it only as secondary to their native tongues. Three distinct classes are recognised in Prussia — namely, nobles, burghers, and peasants. To the first belong about 177,000 persons, including the high officials of the state, although that number does not

comprise the various mediatised houses, of which sixteen are Prussian, and others belonging to different states, but connected with Prussia by still existing or former territorial possessions. The burgher class includes, in its higher branches, all public-office holders, professional men, artists, and merchants; while the peasantry — to which belong all persons engaged in agricultural pursuits are divided into classes, depending on the number of horses employed on the land, etc.

I. History and Religion. — The lands bounded by the Baltic and now constituting East Prussia, and the adjoining territory on that side of the Oder, form the original home of the Prussians within the vast territory they now occupy. These lands were early occupied by Slavonic tribes, nearly allied to the Lithuanians (q.v.) and the Letts. It is conjectured that they were visited by Phœnician navigators in the 4th century B.C.; but beyond the fact of their having come into temporary conflict with the Goths and other Teutonic hordes prior to the great exodus of the latter from their northern homes, little is known of the people till the 10th century, when they first appear in history under the name of *Borussi*, or Prussians. They were then a small but vigorous people, and had made themselves a terror to their neighbors by bold inroads, when the race of the heroes and sea-kings arrived from Norway and Sweden. Scandinavian Goths settled in the country, and the southern shores of the Baltic sounded with the praise of the exploits of Starkodder and Ragnar Lodbrog.

1. Mythological Period. — In the oldest historic times, doubtless, the primitive inhabitants — Prussians, Lithuanians, Ulmarugians, Curlanders, Livonians, etc. — worshipped the sun, the moon, the stars, and the powers of nature generally. The Scandinavians, who were further advanced in the arts of war and of peace, better armed, and skilled in agriculture, then brought in new gods, among them the three supreme rulers, *Perkunos*, *Potrimpos*, *Pikollos*, and most probably all their other deities. Much has been written and argued on the question whether the three mentioned names, or the gods to whom they are said to have belonged, really existed, or whether they were mere inventions of some imaginative chroniclers. There are even writers who have discovered in them the three persons of the Holy Trinity. We shall not dwell on these speculations, but briefly state what we positively know of the ancient mythology of a people which occupies such a high rank among the nations of Europe. Besides the three mentioned, there was another important deity, called *Curcho*, the giver of food. His image stood at the foot of many a holy oak. There was one at the

place where the city of Heiligenbeil was afterwards built. The apostle of the Prussians cut the venerable tree with a hatchet, and this circumstance gave the town its present name. There were spread over the whole country sacrificial stones, or altars, on which milk, mead, honey, beer, flour, meat, fish, etc., were offered to the god. Every year his image was made anew, out of wood, on the consecrated spots; it was clothed in goat-skins and crowned with herbs and ears. Then it was carried about amid the shouts of the populace; dances and sacrifices ensued. The inferior gods, in large number, have been divided, not, perhaps, very properly, into gods of the heavens, of earth, of the water, of men, of the cattle, of the lower world, into gods of labor, gods of trade, into good and bad gods. This was, no doubt, a kind of worship of nature, similar to that which we find among all half-civilized nations. The holiest place in the land was Romowe. Only a priest was allowed to approach it. There were but few exceptions. Thus, by special favor, a powerful ruler was permitted to come near the consecrated spot, and to speak to the Griwe, or high-priest. But not even those great personages were suffered to come near the sanctuary, the ever-verdant oak, and the gods that stood below it; for it was surrounded with a fence formed by long pieces of white linen, something like a most primitive tabernacle. To a great distance the land around the sanctuary, and the wood which encircled, it was consecrated. No one could enter this forest, which occupied many square miles; and if, unwittingly, some wretch put his foot into it, his life was forfeited to the offended deities. No tree was felled there, no wild animal chased. Besides this celebrated Romowe, there were other places of the same kind spread all over the country, and whose names, commencing with *Ronzas*, and partly preserved to our days, are expressive of calm and holiness. We find quite a number of such names in Lithuania. In Prussia the trees were held holy, as among the ancient Germans, the Anglo-Saxons, the Rugians, Holsteinians, and kindred peoples. There existed also single oaks and linden-trees which were held in particular veneration as being the seats of some divinity; they were approached with pious horror and deep reverence. The oak of Heiligenbeil, with a circumference of forty feet and a diameter of nineteen, was the most celebrated. Some mountains enjoyed the same honors. The best-known of them was near Brandenburg, at a short distance from the Frische Haff: Near the holy woods and trees there were, as a rule, holy fields, which never were touched by the plough. We also find holy springs, from which no one could take water unless he previously offered a sacrifice: their water was believed to be a sure medicine against certain diseases. There

were also holy lakes, either in a separate place or connected with the sanctuaries and forests: no one was allowed to fish in their waters.

The gods adored in those consecrated places were, besides those already named: *Okopirn*, the god of the air and of tempests; *Swaixtix*, the god of the stars most important god in the North, with its long winter nights; *Bankputtis*, the god of the sea; *Antrimpos*, the angry god, who excites the waves; *Wurskeite* and *Szwambxaite*, the protectors of cattle and poultry, worshipped extensively in the whole country; *Gardebis* and *Janztiubobis*, the protectors of oxen and sheep; *Perdoitos*, the god of trade, who made the sea propitious to the mariner, and was specially honored on the sea-coast; *Puskaitis*, the god of woods and trees, who lived under the foliage, and whose dwelling-places were held particularly holy. This god had, throughout the country, a number of sanctuaries, where he was attended by a multitude of strange, dwarf-like beings, which the imagination of the people had fitted out and ornamented in the most fantastical manner. *Perqubrius* gave fertility to the fields; *Zemlberis* strewed the earth with seeds, and covered it with flowers and herbs; *Pelwitte* filled with riches the houses and the barns; *Ausweikis* was the god of health, resorted to by the sick and invalid. To these must be added quite a number of female deities. *Jawwinna* watched over the germination and growth of corn; *Melletele* covered the meadows and gardens with herbs and grass; *Strutis* was the goddess of the flowers; *Gobjlaja* was the goddess of riches and opulence; *Guze* led the wanderers through deserts and gloomy forests; *Swaigsdunoka*, the bride of the stargod, directed the heavenly bodies on their path; *Laima* was the obstetric goddess, and fixed the destinies of the new-born. The bad goddesses were, the sanguinary *Gittine*, who brought painful death; *Magila*, the wrathful deity, who visited cruel misfortunes upon those she disliked; *Launle*, who intervened in human affairs — now sportively, now malignantly, leading the wanderer astray by will-o'-the-wisps, seizing upon helpless children, etc. Besides these gods and goddesses, there were tutelary spirits — spirits of the woods, of the waters, of the earth, most of them servants of the god Puskaitis — men of the woods, dwarfs, elves, called *barstucs*, or *perstiks*. Similar to these were the nightly spectres, who at twilight left their dark recesses to seek food. They were appeased by putting sacrificial meat in lonesome spots; thus they became guardians of house and barn, and the childish fancy shaped and ornamented them in the quaintest manner. The animal kingdom, also, held many objects for worship. The snake was the object of particular

veneration, being the favorite of Potrimpos. Snakes were believed to be a blessing for the house and household, to be immortal, and to gain renewed youth with each change of skin. They were dutifully fed in the holes of old oak-trees, and gladly admitted into buildings and chambers. Barren women fed them with milk, imploring at the same time the blessings of Laima. Carelessness towards them was attended with misfortunes of all kinds. This regard for the snake continued in Prussia and in the neighboring countries till long after the introduction of Christianity. The horse, especially the white horse, was in great honor among all Northern peoples, as well as among the Germans, as a spirit of prophecy was said to dwell in him. All white horses were consecrated to the gods, and no one would have dared to mount a steed of that color. To beat or damage it was a capital crime. Among the birds, the owl enjoyed special regard, because it was believed that she predicted to her friends the coming mishaps.

The gods being so numerous, it was but natural that the priests should form a very large body. At their head stood the Griwe, almost a god himself, so great was the veneration in which he was held among all the nations of the North. The *waidlotes*, *griwaites*, *siggones*, *wurskaiiti*, *pustones*, *saitones*, *burtones*, and *swakones* were the members of a powerful hierarchy, and exercised an unlimited influence upon those superstitious tribes. There was no lack of female priests either; and it would seem that female deities were attended exclusively by female priests, as male gods were worshipped only by male priests. Yet it is not likely that sacerdotal women were admitted into the Romowe, as the Griwe, as well as all other priests, had to remain in single blessedness. A transgression of this law was visited with capital punishment, the culprit, being dragged away from the holy ground and burned alive. 'There is some contradiction between this stern enforcement of the law of virginity and the way in which the body of female *waidlotes* was recruited. If a woman had been sterile in marriage, and became, after the death of her husband, the mother of a son or of a daughter by an unmarried man, she was considered as holy, and was admitted to the number of the female priests. As far as the institutions of the ancient Prussians are known, they exacted from their priests a pure, pious, and holy life. Those only could be admitted among the superior priests, the *grivites*, who, during many years, had shone by an exemplary life; and even the relations whom the Griwe wished to be received into the sacerdotal body had to prove that their conduct had been unblemished, or they were rejected. The priests were supported entirely by

the people, for we do not find any mention of their being addicted to agriculture or any art or trade. The sacrifices and offerings were their principal income. They received beer, milk, fruits, animals, tissues for sacerdotal garments, etc. Libations were offered to the gods, and the liquid offering was drunk by the priest. Sometimes this sacrifice was attended with quaint ceremonies. At the great springfestival, the priest filled a cup with beer, took it between his teeth without touching it with his hands, drained it, and then threw it over his head. Those behind him caught it, filled it with beer, and brought it back to him a second and a third time. The act of emptying three times the cup was intended in honor of the three great gods; the throwing of the cup was the sacrifice brought to them, which human hands durst not touch. After this ceremony the cup circulated from mouth to mouth. Each worshipper took it between his teeth, emptied it, and with his teeth the neighbor took it from him. Finally, the benedictio was given to the people; a banquet ensued, in which intoxicating beverages were so plentifully tasted that the solemnity generally ended in bloody work, as is the case, even in our days, with Poles, Lithuanians, and other nations.

2. Introduction of Christianity. — We here substantially give the account found in Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, s.v.

“Several attempts to introduce the Christian religion into Prussia had been fruitless. St. Adalbert, bishop of Prague, died April 23, 997, a martyr to his faith, while endeavoring to convert the people to Christianity. Bruno, of the family of the Barons von Querfurt, who, after renouncing his canoiny and entering the Benedictine congregainmi of Camaldoli, had repaired to Prussia in 1008, to preach there the Gospel and convert those pagan tribes, also suffered martyrdom (Feb. 11, 1008). The endeavors of the Polish princes to Christianize the Prussians by force were still most unsuccessful. As the acceptance of the Christian eligion had been made a condition of peace by Boleslas, duke of Poland, about 1018, they consideied the Christian communion as an obnoxious consequence of unhappy warfare, as a yoke imposed by the foe, and they shook it off every time when they felt strong enough to do so. Thus the disinclination to the new worship increased continually, until it reached the very pitch of hatred and disgust. Meanwhile Otto, bishop of Bamberg (1124), preached with success in Pomerania, and Christianity by degrees reached the banks of the Vistula. The first Christian ruler in Pomerania, Subislas I, founded in 1170 near

Dantzic, the monastery of Oliva, which became a seminary whence the seed of the Christian faith was in time to spread over Prussia's soil.

“Previous to the establishment of Oliva's monastery the Prussians, however, had succeeded (in 1161) in making a stand against Boleslas IV of Poland, and for a time maintained a rude and savage kind of independence, which the disturbed condition of Poland prevented its rulers from breaking down. The fear of losing their freedom if they adopted Christianity made the Prussians obstinately resist every effort for their conversion; and it was not till the middle of the 13th century, when the knights of the Teutonic Order entered upon their famous crusade against them, that the Christian faith was foreally established among them. The aggressive inroads of the pagan Prussians on the territories of their Christian neighbors, and their advance into Pomerania, were the exciting causes of this important movement. Christianity was by the reverses of the Polish plinces thrown so vastly upon the defensive that the Pomeranian duke Grimislas, of Stargald and Schurtz, called in 1198 some knights of St John into his dominions, and delivered into their hands his castle of Stargard and some adjoining territories for operations against the Prussians. The intimate commercial relations between Brunen and Livonia facilitated the woik of the missionaries, and gave easy access to the latter country. After the Christian religion had been introduced into Pomerania and Livonia, and an order of Christian knighthood had been founded for its aid and maintenance, the prospects in Prussia also seemed to brighten. Although the exertions of Gottfried, abbot of the monastery of Cistercians of Lukina (1207), in Poland, and of his fellow-monk Philip, who suffered martyrdom, were not attended with any enduring success, yet were two of the native princes converted. A few years afterwards appeared the man to whom was reserved the glorious achievement of introducing Christianity into Prussia. It was the Cistercian monk Christian, of the monastery of Oliva, a man distinguished by every virtue, and speaking fluently the German, Latin, Polish, and Prussian languages. In 1210 he obtained permission from pope Innocent III to go to Prussia with somne chosen companions, and his efforts were crowned with such brilliant success that in the fall of 1214, or at the beginning of 1215, he wnas appointed bishop of Prussia, the new converts having hitherto been committed to the pastoral care of the archbishop of Guesen. The number of the converted Prussians was considerable, and two of their princes, Warpodo, the ruler of the land of

Lansania, and Suavobuno, who reigned in the land of Lubau, had made provisions for the maintenance of the bishop.

“This partial triumph of Christianity excited the inner of the heathenish Prussians, who were, besides, maddened by the expeditions of Conrad, duke of Masovia. Help from abroad was sorely needed. Crusades, however, could not afford any lasting protection. The Order of the Knights of Christ, called also Brother-knights of Dobrin, founded in Livonia in 1225 by bishop Christian, on the pattern of the Knights of the Sword, was no match for the savage fury of the Prussians: at the very beginning of the war all the knights, save five, were killed in battle near the spot where Strasburgh was afterwards built. By bishop Christian’s advice, the Teutonic Order was applied to for assistance (1226). The grand-master, Hermann von Salza, asked consent of Fiederick II, who not only granted the request, but also promised his help, and confirmed the donations of land formally made to the order by duke Conrad of Masovia. After four years of negotiations, duke Conrad made a solemn grant to the order of the whole land of Culm, between the Vistula, Drewenz, and Ossa, with all the conquests they should add to it; while at the same time bishop Christian, and Gunther, bishop of Plock, renounced in their favor all their possessions, revenues, and patronal rights in those countries, reserving only their episcopal jurisdiction and their pontificalia. At the same time the popes, Gregory IX, in 1234, and Innocent IV, in 1244, declared the present and future conquests of the order feuds of the papal see (*‘in jus et proprietatem B. Petri suscipimus et eam sub speciali Sedis Apostolicæ protectione et defensione perpetuo tempore permanere sancimus.... Te Conrade magister ejus domus annulo, nostro de terra-investimus, ita quod ipsa... . ullius unquam subijciatur dominio potestatis; quae vero in finitimum... de terra pagailornm in eadem provincia vos contigerit adipisci, firma et illibata vobis vestrisque successoribus soub jure et proprietate Sedis Apostolicoe eo modo statuimus permanenda’*). An annual tribute was promised to the Roman court. At the same time the pope stipulated that in the newly acquired territories churches should be built, bishops and prelates appointed at his will, that a portion of the land should be granted to the latter dignitaries, etc. The grand-master selected Hermann Balk to be the leader of the knights he intended to send to Prussia, and the administrator of the land given to the order by duke Conrad; Hermann, probably of Westphalian birth, was not only a distinguished warrior, but a man full of wisdom and experience in all worldly matters; a pious knight,

too, who, during a space of ten years had administered the possessions of the order in Germany, and gained by his remarkable aptitude the full confidence of the grand-master. All other high functions were intrusted to equally distinguished persons, who, with a few knights and a considerable body of cavalry, set out on their way to Prussia. They arrived in 1228 in the dominions of Conrad of Masovia. Numerous as was their host, yet the Prussians counted a thousand warriors where they counted one. Conrad could assist them, but hardly make them formidable, by the addition of his forces, his weakness being the very cause which had made their expedition desirable. His land was torn by its unceasing troubles, and, besides, engaged in perpetual warfare with her neighbors. Pomerania, itself offered no prospect of help, as duke Swantepolk entertained but hostile relations with Conrad, and with Poland in general. It was a heroic daring in the Teutonic Order to engage in their expedition under such unfavorable circumstances. They began the war without delay, assisted by bands of crusaders (1232), Gregory IX preaching the crusade against Prussia with unabating zeal. The land of Culm was occupied, with the help of Swantepolk of Pomerania, in spite of the desperate resistance of the Prussians. The order, at the same time that it constructed forts to insure the new conquests, helped German colonists in building cities in well-protected and fertile places. Thorn was reared first, soon afterwards Culm, both in 1232, and Marienwerder in 1233. The Prussians, dismayed by the large body of troops arrayed on their frontier, and knowing perhaps that the crusades were engaged for the space of a year only, pretended to be unwilling to fight and inclined to receive baptism. Bishop Christian forthwith repaired to the district of Pomerania, in order to preach and to baptize. But a few days afterwards he was attacked by the pagans, his companions all killed, and the bishop himself led into captivity. The pope now recommended caution to the Dominicans in Prussia, and bade them beware of the wily stratagems of the heathens. A spell of cold weather having made the moorlands of Pomesania easy of access, the whole Christian army invaded that country at the beginning of 1234. The Pomeranians were defeated near the Sirgune River, in the neighborhood of a consecrated wood, after victory had been passing for several hours from host to host. The battle was a most bloody one, and the spot where it had raged was, long after the event, called 'The Field of the Dead.' As its final gain by the Christians was due to Swantepolk, an army of Pomesanians crossed the Vistula and laid waste the whole land of Pomerania. The monastery of Oliva, which had been recently put under papal protection

was stormed and reduced to ashes. To protect the land of Culnm against the vengeance of the infuriated invaders, Hermann Balk erected the fort of Rheden in 1234, which was the origin of the city of Rheden. This kind of precaution was indispensable, as the crusaders dispersed after a year's service, and the knights had to hold the country with their sole resources. There came other difficulties: the order and bishop Christian could not agree; there were grievous dissensions between the order and duke Conrad; a contest arose between Swantepolk of Pomerania and Henry of Breslau, and cut off, for the knights, all prospect of help from those quarters. The pope, informed of this state of affairs, sent his legate, bishop William of Modena, with most extensive powers, especially for the constitution to be given to the churches and for the distribution of bishoprics in the northern countries; and he announced the arrival of his legate and the object of his mission to the Christians in Livonia, Prussia, Gothland, Finland, Esthonia, Semgallen, and Courland. The legate arrived in Prussia at the beginning of summer in 1234, and exerted himself at once in compounding the dispute between bishop Christian and the order. The bishop had made a division of the land, taking two thirds as his share, and left only one third to the order; he had further expressed the opinion that the countries recently conquered for the Church were lawfully his. The legate did not approve of these views: he decided, in conformity with his instructions, that of all territories occupied and still to be occupied, two thirds should go to the order, with all revenues connected with them — the dime, for instance; that the bishop should have only one third for his share, but with this additional stipulation, that in the two thirds which went to the order, such advantages as could be enjoyed only by a bishop should also accrue to the latter. The bishop was obliged to submit to the legate's decision. The difficulties between the order and duke Conrad could not be so easily removed. The Knights of Dobrin had joined the Teutonic Order, and the latter had taken possession of the fort of Dobrin, with all its dependencies, in spite of the protest of the duke. The pope, in a bull of April 19, 1235, approved the fusion of the Brothers of Dobrin with the Teutonic Order, mainly at the request of the bishop of Plock. The latter and the principal legate, after negotiating through the summer months, succeeded in October in restoring concord. The knights delivered to Conrad the castle of Dobrin, with its dependencies, and received in exchange other territories, of which the most important was Slonzk, with its salt-mines. Gregory IX, in spite of his manifold Italian cares and troubles, endeavored with all his might to promote the enterprise of the order. The

preaching of the crusade was not interrupted in Germany, and measures were taken to increase the number of the knights. Fresh troops of crusaders having arrived from Germany, the war was resumed. Pomesania and Pogesania were conquered: with the former of these provinces the whole eastern shore of the Vistula was in the power of the order. Those of the enemy who surrendered were spared, experienced mild treatment, and were immediately christened by the priests who followed the army. Herman Balk and his knights endeavored to subdue by the influence of Christian meekness these savage spirits, whose faith in their gods was shaken by so great misfortunes. A chronicler says: 'Not like lords, but as fathers and brothers, they rode about the land, visited both the rich and the poor, invited the new Christians to their meals, took care of and nursed in their hospitals poor, sick Prussians, provided for widows and orphans whose husbands and fathers had perished in the war, and sent clever young men to Germany, especially to Magdeburg, to get well instructed in Christianity and in the German language, and to become afterwards teachers, in Prussia.' It was at this time that Henry Monte, who became so distinguished afterwards, was brought up in the celebrated monastery school of Magdeburg. The expenses of these young men were paid with these alms gathered in Germany. The landmaster's humane measures did not fail to make their impression even on the unconverted part of the nation. All measures of coercion had been prohibited. Wherever the order established its authority churches were built: Thorn, Culm, Rheden, Marienwerder, had their churches. The city of Elbing built a church and a monastery in the first year of its existence. Even the open country had not been left without churches: we find in 1236 a mention of the parish of Postelin, in Pomerania. Some pious men exerted themselves in order to instruct the people in the Christian faith. The papal legate, William of Modena, preached with great success; he was powerfully assisted by the Dominicans, several of whom were masters of the Prussian language. The most distinguished among these monks was St. Hyacinth, who belonged to the house of the counts of Odrovanz, one of the oldest and most celebrated of the families of Silesia. His father was count of Kliiski, and his uncle chancellor of Poland and bishop of Cracow. Hyacinth was born in 1185 in the castle of Gross-Stein, district of Gross-Strelitz, in Upper Silesia, and studied at Cracow, Prague, and Bologna. In the latter city he received the title of doctor of laws and theology. On his return home he was promoted to a canonry at the cathedral of Cracow, and assisted the bishop in the administration of his diocese. When his uncle Ivo

of Kolski became bishop of Cracow, he went to Rome, and took along with him Hyacinth and his brother Ceslaus. In the year 1218, when St. Dominic was in Rome, both brothers entered the Dominican Order, and Hyacinth became one of the most active northern missionaries. Another powerful missionary was bishop Christian, but his dissensions with the order could only be detrimental to the cause of Christianity. In 1237 a pest-like disease spread over the dominions of the order, and caused many of the neophytes to waver in their new faith. On May 9, 1238, a treaty was concluded with Waldemar, king of Denmark, through the exertions of the papal legate: the king received the fort of Reval and the territories of Harrien and Wirland, while the order received the district of Ierwen; only no forts were to be built in the latter without the king's consent. The king promised not to put any obstacle in the way of the order in their work of conversion, but to help them where he could: two thirds of the conquests were to go to the king, one third was the order's share. Hermann Balk, thus assisted by the Danes, undertook an expedition against the Russians, who had invaded the diocese of Dorpat; but soon important events recalled him to Prussia. The knight Hermann von Altenburg, a pious man, but rigid and austere, whom the grand-master had intrusted with the administration of the dominions of the order during his absence, had not imitated the wise moderation and patient meekness of his superior. On hearing that a Prussian village had gone over to paganism again, he set fire to it, and priests and villagers perished in the flames. This created in the country bitter dissatisfaction, and the fruit of the restless labors and struggles of ten years seemed to be lost by one reckless act. Other misfortunes had come upon the order. Their old friend Swantepolk of Pomerania had become their foe: it was fortunate that the duke was threatened by other enemies, and found it prudent to make peace. Then Hermann Balk was recalled by the grand-master in 1238, and took his departure after providing for the good administration of the country; but he never saw it again. He died March 5 1239. On March 20 the noble grand-master, Hermann von Salza, died also, and was succeeded by Conrad, landgrave of Thuringia. Henry of Wida was appointed grand-master in Prussia. After protracted hostilities with the Prussians and duke Swantepolk of Pomerania, a treaty was concluded on Feb. 7, 1249, by which the provinces of Pomesania, Pogesania, Ermland, and Nataugen submitted to the order and promised conversion. The neophytes obtained all civil rights, were allowed to enter the ecclesiastical state, and to become members of regular congregations. These civil and other rights were forfeited by their eventual apostasy. The

legate having put the question as to what worldly laws the neophytes wished to have introduced, and what tribunals they would most willingly recognise, they declared for the legislation of the Poles: this they were granted by the order. On being taught by the legate that all men were equal, they promised to give up their heathenist customs as to the burial of the dead, and those various ceremonies in which the distinctions of rank were preserved even after death, and to bury their dead in Christian cemeteries. They also promised to renounce polygamy; that no one should in future sell his daughter to another man in matrimony, nor buy a wife for himself or his son: that nobody should henceforward marry his mother-in-law, or the widow of his brother, nor any person standing to him in a degree of relationship prohibited by the canon, without a license from the pope. No child should be admitted to inherit his or her parents' estate if the matrimony of the latter had not been of such a description as to satisfy the exigencies of the Church. The killing or exposing of children was prohibited; the baptism of the new-born, within a short period, was made obligatory. As it was a consequence of the want of ecclesiastics and of churches that many children had remained unchristened, the parents promised to present them all for baptism in the course of a month. Such as should infringe upon the proscriptions, or who refused baptism for themselves, were to have their goods confiscated, to be themselves covered with a slight garment, and expelled from the territory of the Christians. The Pomesanians promised to build thirteen churches from that time to the next Whitsuntide, the Warmians promised six, the Natangians three; each church to be properly fitted out with its ornaments, chalices, books, and other implements. It was agreed upon that if the neophytes failed to construct the churches promised by them, the knights should be empowered to levy a tax on their estates and build the churches themselves, even if it should be necessary to recur to violent means. They promised to attend worship, at least on Sundays and holydays. The order, in their turn, promised to furnish the churches with priests and estate in the course of a year. Most minute and careful provisions were made for the maintenance of the ecclesiastics. The neophytes further promised to keep the fasts prescribed by the Church, not to do any hard work on Sundays and holy-days, to confess their sins at least once a year, to partake of the Lord's Supper at Easter, and, in general, to submit their conduct to the directions and teachings of the clergy. They pledged themselves to bring every year the dime into the granaries of the order; to defend the persons, honor, and rights of the order; to keep aloof from any treasonable practices

against it, and to denounce such plots if they were known to them. The order had always, even during the excitement of the war, borne in mind the highest aim of their labors, the establishment and expansion of Christianity. Honorius III had committed to bishop Christian the care of establishing bishoprics, but he did not even succeed in fully organizing the bishopric of Culm. In 1236 Gregory II had enjoined on his legate to divide the new countries into dioceses, and to establish three bishops in them. In a bull of Oct. 1, 1243, the pope informed Christian that he had divided Prussia into four bishoprics, Culm being one of them. Christian was invited to make choice of one of these bishoprics, but to content himself, according to the treaty concluded with the order, with one third of the land. Bishop Christian died in 1243 or 1244. His death greatly facilitated the legate's discharge of his duties, who now had full powers to do as he deemed fit. The first diocese was to include the land of Culm, as far as it is bounded by the rivers Vistula, Drewenz, and Ossa, with the addition of the district of Lobau; the so-called Sassenland and the territory of Gilgenburg belonged also to the first diocese. The second diocese was bounded by the rivers Ossa and Vistula and the lake of Drausen, and reached upwards to the banks of the Passaluc or Passarge River; it comprised Quidin and Zanthis, and was called the diocese of Pomesania. The third diocese was bounded west by the Frische-Haff, north by the Pregel River, or the Lipza, south by the Dransen Lake and Passaluc River, and extended east to the boundaries of Lithuania. This was the diocese of Ermland. A fourth diocese was to comprise the yet independent countries bounded west by the Baltic Sea, north by the Memel, south by the Pregel, and east by Lithuania. This was subsequently called the diocese of Samlaud. The legate, on April 10, 1244, assembled at Thorn the most distinguished clergymen of the neighboring countries — the archbishop of Gnesen, the bishops of Breslau, Leszlau, and Plock, a number (of Polish abbots, the most considerable of the Teutonic Knights, and other men of high standing — to take their advice on the constitution to be introduced into the new bishoprics. The Dominican Heidenreich (the faithful assistant of bishop Christian), who had been over ten years busy in the work of confession, was selected for the diocese of Culm. The Dominican Ernest, from Torgau, friend and companion of Heidenreich, who had, like him, worked many years for the expansion of Christianity, was selected to be the first bishop of Pomesania. A brother-priest of the Teutonic Order, Henry of Strateich, was appointed bishop of Ermland. The diocese of Samlaud received in 1255 its first bishop in the person of Henry of Strittberg, a brother-priest of the Teutonic

Order. His successor, Christian von Muhlhausen, a man distinguished by his piety as well as by his knowledge, and who was also a priest of the order, did not arrive in Prussia until 1276. The chapter was established first at Schonewik, near Fischauseu, then (in 1285) at Konigsberg. The bishops, owing to various impediments, did not occupy their sees at once. Bishop Heidenreich of Culm (whether the two others did the same cannot be ascertained) repaired to the papal court, and was consecrated by the pope himself at Lyons, probably in the course of the year 1245. By this time the legate, William of Modena, had arrived also at the court of Rome, and was soon promoted to the bishopric of Sabina. It wasn't an easy matter to find a successor to a man who had played such a prominent part in the religious organization of the north — Prussia, Livonia, Courland, and Estonia, and displayed so much zeal, intelligence, and energy in most intricate affairs. The bishops of Prussia needed, above all, a man who had insight and influence enough to draw positive limits between the dioceses, and render the decisions in a number of concerns where no rules had as yet been agreed upon. In the year 1244, pope Innocent IV thought he had found such a man in the person of the administrator of the diocese of Linbeck, Ekbert — formerly archbishop of Armagh, in Ireland. The legate was at the same time appointed archbishop of Prussia, Livonia, and Esthonia. That the new archbishop might have an income proportioned to his dignity, the pope committed to him the bishopric of Chiemsee, which had just become vacant, and enjoined the archbishop of Saltzburgh to deliver into the hands of the archbishop of Prussia the administration of said diocese. Towards the end of April, 1246, the pope sent him the archiepiscopal pallium, and allowed him, at his request, to make use of it during his sojourn in Russia and in the church of Lubeck; but this right, was not to be extended to his successors. At the same time Ekbert went to Russia, to promote the fusion of the Russian and the Roman Catholic Church; and pope Innocent IV recommended him to reward the zeal of the knights by appointing one of the priests of their order to one of the Prussian Bishoprics. Bishop Heidenreich of Culm first took in hand the administration of his diocese. The country had been devastated and neglected, was scantily populated, and churches were rare and separated by large intervals. The bishop had to induce colonists to settle in his diocese, and he succeeded so well that after five or six years he could think of the establishment of a cathedral church. The cathedral was consecrated in Culm in 1251, and received the name of the Holy Trinity; at the same time a chapter was founded, under the rule of St. Augustine, and so richly

endowed that, as soon as the revenue of the lands could be collected, forty canons might be held. Besides the churches, the number of which was continually increasing in cities and villages, the land of Culm had already several monasteries; for instance, a Dominictan monastery at Culm, and a Franciscan monastery at Thorn.

“The history of the bishopric of Pomesania is little known in the first years of its existence: we only know that bishop Ernest had taken possession of his see in 1247. In 1255 he chose for his residence Marienwerder, and there the cathedral was erected. The first bishop of Erlinland, Henry of Strateich, died in 1249 or 1250. His successor was another priest of the Teutonic Order, Anselm, who had had a considerable share in the work of conversion and in the victories of the order. The division of the land was made in 1255: the bishop chose the middle part, in which the city of Braunsberg was situated. Bishop Anselm displayed indefatigable activity in the discharge of his duties; took wise measures for the education of youth, for the erection of new churches, etc. The bishops of Prussia lived for a long time in very distressing circumstances, owing to the frequent wars and to the disinclination of the neophytes to pay the dime. Not being able to live on the produce of their own lands, they had to live abroad. The archbishop of Prussia consulted the pope in regard to these inconveniences, and the pope agreed that each of the three bishops of Prussia could accept, for his subsistence and ecclesiastical feud, if it were transferred to him in a legal way; but he was to keep it, only as long as the situation of the Prussian Church made it desirable. The popes displayed indefatigable vigor in assisting by all means in forming the Church. Their voice was continually heard exhorting priests and monks to repair to the new provinces and share in the work. In 1240 pope Innocent IV addressed a bull to the superiors of all monastic orders, in which he urged them to help the sister churches of Prussia, Livonia, and Esthonia, where books were wanted, with their superabundant wealth in this respect, or to have copies made for them. Honorius III and Innocent III had done much for the improvement of the schools. Honorius, in a special bull, had invited Christian contributions for the purpose of establishing boys’ schools, in order to promote the work of conversion. The former legate, William of Modena, had greatly distinguished himself in these efforts: he had even learned the Prussian language, and translated Donatus for the Prussian schools. The bishops also exerted themselves strenuously for the establishment of public instruction. We find traces of country schools in

Ermland as early as 1251. By an agreement between bishop Anselm and the order, the knights, in their own domains, were empowered to engage and to dismiss schoolmasters. We infer that schools for the education of the young must also have existed in the most important cities, as Thorn, Culm, Marienwerder, Elbing, Braunsberg, and Königsberg. But we have no historical data on this point, and we may well admit that the protracted and savage warfare which made everything unstable in those countries during so many years did not allow any irregular development of public instruction. The work done in other countries by monastery schools was at that time of little importance in Prussia, the order not being favorable to the establishment of monasteries. Much was done by monasteries in cities, but their influence was shut up in the town halls, and, besides, their number and their means of influence were insufficient. Yet in the second half of the 13th century the necessity of providing the people with a Christian education was deeply felt. Not only were numerous churches built in the country, and priests called, but the cathedral chapters, as may be seen by the deed of foundation of the Pomesanian chapter, were established for the express purpose that the Catholic faith should be more thoroughly taught. In consequence, only men of education and abilities were received into the chapters. Libraries were founded for the use of the ecclesiastics in the chapters; bishops endeavored to increase by donations the number of books; the pope himself came to the rescue, as we have seen above. The archbishop of Prussia was, as we know, at the same time papal legate: in this capacity he had many a contest with the Teutonic Order, and in such cases both parties are apt to exceed the limits of their rights. While the archbishop violated acknowledged rights of the order, the order made violent inroads upon the privileges of the archbishop. The sad consequences of these hostile relations appeared in 1248, when the establishment of a solid ecclesiastical constitution in the recuperated countries made an active interference of the archbishop necessary. The three bishops of Prussia — Heidenreich of Culm, Ernest of Pomesania, and Henry of England — together with the margrave Otto von Brandenburg, interposed their mediation in 1249, and promoted between the order and the legate mutual forgiveness for past wrongs and reconciliation for the future. The archbishop promised to assist the order by his preaching, and by every other means, as best he could, and to make no complaint, either at the papal court or before any other judge, as to the rights and privileges in dispute; while the knights, in their turn, promised to molest him no more, and pay him all due respect and veneration. At the same time the order

pledged itself to pay 300 marks in silver at fixed times to the archbishop, while the latter engaged never to establish his residence in Prussia unless he had the express authorization therefor from the superior of the order. This convention was concluded Jan. 10, 1249. Yet the trouble was only temporarily improved. A complete reconciliation could only be brought about by the interference of papal authority; and the popes were just then otherwise engaged. The schism in the German empire was, as it were, repeated in the Teutonic Order: there was a double election. In such a time of discord, obligations and promises are easily forgotten, or at least neglected; and it sometimes becomes impossible, or at least difficult, to live up to one's engagements. The dispute began again between the order and archbishop Allbert. But, as the inner dissensions of the order gave additional gravity to exterior troubles, the land-master, Dietrich von Gruningen, repaired to the papal court, and there represented the great disadvantages with which the missionary work would be attended if a good understanding could not be restored. Innocent summoned the land-master and the archbishop for the ensuing Easter. The archbishop appeared at the appointed time at Lyons, and the pope satisfied himself that he had exceeded his powers as a legate. In consequence, in September, 1250, the archbishop was forbidden to make any further use of his powers as legate, or to make any episcopal appointments in the future, either in Prussia, Livonia, or Estonia. But his archiepiscopal relations to the order needed also positive revaluation: the decision about these matters was given in 1251. The bishops Peter of Albano and William of Sabina (the former legate) and cardinal Giovani di San Lorenzo were commissioned by the pope to make arrangements. They negotiated on the ground of the reconciliation prepared in 1249 by the bishops and margrave Otto. Thus the dispute was allayed, Feb. 24, 1251, and bishop Bruno of Olmutz was requested by the pope to see to the faithful observance of the articles agreed upon. But at the same time the seeds of new dissension had been scattered. To give to the archiepiscopal dignity in the countries of the Baltic a firmer support, bishop William of Salbina directed, in the pope's name, that the seat of the archbishop should be Riga, which was in many respects the most important and fittest city in those parts. After the decease of the actual bishop of Riga, or if his see should become vacant in any other way, the Church of Riga should become archiepiscopal, and be transferred to archbishop Albert. Meanwhile nothing should be altered in the situation of the bishop of Riga, and the archbishop should exercise in his diocese only his archiepiscopal jurisdiction. Nicolaus, bishop of Riga,

died at the close of 1253, and Allert, in 1254, established himself in Livonia. He had already been empowered to exercise again the power of a legate in Prussia, Livonia, and Esthonia. But in Prussia, his ordinances in ecclesiastical matters, and the exercise of his power as a legate, met with some obstacles: there were the liberties and privileges granted to the order by the popes: there were the peculiar relations existing between the bishops and the order, for under Heidenzeich's successor the chapter of Culm had adopted the rule of the Teutonic Order, and the chapters of Samland and Pomesania had in their origin been filled with brothers of the order. The archbishop submitted these difficulties to the pope, and expressed a wish to be relieved of his duties as a legate so far as Prussia was concerned, discharging the same only in Livonia, Esthonia, and Russia. The pope complied with this wish, reiterating the old injunctions not to do anything in the lands of the order against the will of the same. Albert assumed in 1254 the dignity of archbishop of Riga, and found himself, as such, in quite new relations with the order in Livonia. The troubles which arose out of them were again disposed of at the papal court, whither both parties had again betaken themselves, Dec. 12, 1254. In the ensuing year pope Alexander IV, by a bull, received the Church of Riga, with all its enumerated possessions, into the protection of the apostle Peter; subordinated to it the bishoprics of Oesel, Dorpat, Wierland, Courland, Culm, Ermland, Pomesania, Samland, and Russia; defined with accuracy the rights and liberties of the archbishop, and delineated in all its bearings his situation in regard to the clergy of those countries and to the Teutonic Order. Thus the hierarchical affairs were settled. The order enjoyed in their lands the patronal rights; the bishops and chapters enjoyed them in their own territories. In the lands of the order the bishop could pretend only to what must needs be done by a bishop ("salvis tamen episcopo in duabus fratribus partibus illis omnibus quae non possunt nisi per episcopum exerceri"). Nothing now prevented the blessings of Christianity being poured over Prussia. But there were other obstacles in the way. The people had been converted under compulsion, and the spirit of Christianity had poorly prospered in such a soil. The knights, to promote the knowledge of the German language, and bring about a gradual fusion of the Prussian and the German element, used to appoint German priests exclusively; the consequence was that the pastor could speak to his flock only through the ministry of an interpreter. With the exception of Ermland, all episcopal chapters were filled by brothers of the order, and thus the grand-master's will was decisive in all episcopal elections. This was afterwards felt, when

the order had hated much of its strictly clerical spirit, to be at some disadvantage. The order was often engaged in disputes with the bishops; and the metropolitan land by their refusal to heed the papal interdict which such conduct brought upon them they set a bad example. In a moral point of view also the knights were not always shining lights; and it is a sorrowful truth that a number of members of the higher and lower clergy were not their superiors in this respect. Even the most zealous of the archbishops could not change this unfortunate state of things, the metropolitan tie of Ermland, Samland, and Pomesania with Riga, and of Culm with Guesen, being a very loose one. In the dominions of the order few monasteries were established, and not one could acquire might and influence by its wealth: the acquisition of real estate by ecclesiastical corporations, or even by individual priests, was subject to the agreement of the order, and this was usually withheld. The two Cistercian monasteries of Oliva and Pelplin were the (only exceptions: under the protection and by the liberality of the old dukes of Pomerania they had acquired such extensive possessions that they were surpassed by no other monastery, either in Pomerania or in Prussia.

“The unhappy wars between the knights and the Poles and Lithuanians, together with the moral degeneracy of the order, led, in the 14th and 15th centuries, to the gradual decline of their supremacy. In 1454 the municipal and noble classes, with the co-operation of Poland, rose in open rebellion against the knights, who were finally compelled to seek peace at any rate, and obliged in 1466 to accept the terms offered to them by the treaty of Horn, by which West Prussia and Ermland were ceded by them unconditionally to Poland, and the remainder of their territories declared to be fiefs of that kingdom. In 1511 the knights elected as their grand-master the margrave Albert of Anspach and Baireuth, a kinsman of the king of Poland, and a scion of the Frankish line of the Hohenzollern family. Although his election did not immediately result, as the knights had hoped, in securing them allies powerful enough to aid them in emancipating themselves from Polish domination, it was fraught with important consequences to Germany at large, no less than to the order itself.” The state founded by the order had, through the peculiar relations in which it stood to the papal see, through its great privileges, and through the weakness of the German emperors, secured a most independent situation, which was still strengthened by the circumstance that the bishops, being members of the order which ruled the land, had more

interest with this worldly power than with the papal see. The monasteries could put no check on the omnipotence of the order, for, as a consequence of the nature of things, they were few in number. This, and the political situation of the time, facilitated the entrance of the Reformation into Prussia. The grand-master of the Teutonic Order, margrave Albert Von Brandenburg, endeavored in 1519 to shake off the feudal supremacy of the pope. The wish of suppressing, according to Luther's advice, "the foolish, nonsensical rule of the order," of taking a wife, and making of Prussia a worldly principality, induced him, after the peace of Cracow, in 1525, to accept Prussia from the crown of Poland as a secular, hereditary feud.

Foreseeing that an example so momentous to the ecclesiastical dignitaries of Germany could not but arraign many adversaries against him, duke Albert looked about for allies, married the daughter of the king of Denmark in 1526, and, by renouncing Roman Catholicism, entered into the closest relations with the Protestants of Germany. Under the protection of king Sigismund of Poland he could stand his ground, and the protestation of the pope and of the members of the orders spoiled of their rights was just as ineffectual as the "Acht" pronounced against him by the emperor. Charles V had been powerless against him; and Maximilian, who would have been powerfully supported by the German nobility, did not care to declare war against the house of Brandenburg or to break the good understanding existing between himself and his brother-in-law, the king of Poland, especially as he lived in the hope that one of his sons would in time ascend the Polish throne. The duke's example of adopting the new faith was followed by many of the knights of Prussia, and Lutheranism, especially through many considerate as well as coercive measures, made rapid progress. Indeed, the whole country now began to improve and thrive. "Albert improved the mode of administering the laws, restored some order to the finances of the state, established schools, founded the University of Konigsberg (1544), and caused the Bible to be translated into Polish, and several books of instruction to be printed in German, Polish, and Lithuanian. Upon his death, in 1568, Protestantism had so strengthened in Prussia that there remained not the least prospect of the Catholic Church getting the supremacy again. His son and successor, Albert Frederick, having become insane, a regency was appointed. Several of his kinsmen, in turn, enjoyed the dignity of regent, and finally his son-in-law, Johann Sigismund, elector of Brandenburg, after having held the administration of affairs in his hands for some years, was, on the death of

the duke in 1618, recognised as his successor, both by the people and by the king of Poland, from whom he received the investiture of the duchy of Prussia, which, since that period, has been governed by the Hohenzollern-Brandenburg house.

“Here it will be necessary to retrace our steps in order briefly to consider the political and dynastic relations of the other parts of the Prussian state. In the 12th century the northern Mark, comprising probably the territory between the Elbe and the Oder as far as its confluence with the Spree, was held by the immediate descendants of Albert, the Bear of Luxemburg, its first hereditary margrave, who, during the next two or three centuries, extended their dominions eastward beyond the Oder into Farther Pomerania. On the extinction of this line, known as the Ascanian house, a remote kinsman, Frederick VI, count of Hohenzollern, and margrave of Nurnberg, became possessed — partly by purchase and partly by investiture from the emperor — of the Brandenburg lands, which, in his favor, were constituted into an electorate. This prince, known as the elector Frederick I, received his investiture in 1417. He united under his rule, in addition to his hereditary Franconian lands of Anspach and Bairenth, a territory of more than 11,000 square miles. His reign was disturbed by the insubordination of the nobles and the constant incursions of his Prussian and Polish neighbors, but by his firmness and resolution he restored order at home and enlarged his boundary. It is said that he gained possession of the castles of his refractory nobles by the aid of a 24-pounder, known as the ‘Faule Grete;’ but even this unwonted auxiliary was of no avail in a long war which he waged against the Hussites, who devastated the land and razed many of his cities in revenge for the part which Frederick had taken in acting as commander-in-chief of the imperial army that had been sent against them.

“Under Frederick’s successors the Brandenburg territory was augmented by the addition of many new acquisitions, although the system of granting appanages to the younger members of the reigning house, common at that time, deprived the electorate of some of its original domains — as, for instance, the Margravate of Anspach, which passed, on the death of the elector Albert Achilles, in 1486, as an independent state to his younger sons and their descendants. The most considerable addition to the electorate was the one to which reference has already been made, and which fell to the elector John Sigismund through his marriage (in 1609) with Anne, daughter and heiress of Albert Frederick, the Insane, duke of

Prussia. In consequence of this alliance, the duchy of Cleves, the countships of Ravensberg, the Mark, and Limburg, and the extensive duchy of Prussia, now known as East Prussia, became incorporated with the Brandenburg territories, which were thus more than doubled in area.

“The reign of John Sigismund’s successor, Georg Wilhelm (1619-40), was distracted by the miseries of the Thirty Years’ War, and the country was alternately the prey of Swedish and imperial armies; and on the accession of Georg Wilhelm’s son, the great elector Frederick William, in 1640, the electorate was sunk in the lowest depths of social misery and financial embarrassment. But so wise, prudent, and vigorous was the government of this prince that at his death, in 1688, he left a well-filled exchequer and a fairly equipped army of 38,000 men; while the electorate, which now possessed a population of one and a half million, and an area of 42,000 square miles, had been raised by his genius to the rank of a great European power” (Chambers). His successors, Frederick III (1688-1713) and Frederick William I (1713-40), each in his own way increased the power and credit of Prussia, which had been in 1701 raised to the rank of a kingdom — a most significant change not only in the secular, but also in the ecclesiastical history of that country. Sweden had sunk down from the eminence which it had held for a time as the leading Protestant power in the North; Prussia now rose to take the place from which Sweden was receding, and the apparently insignificant event of 1701 at Königsberg was followed by very grave consequences, both for Germany and Europe.

3. Reformation Period. — The religious history of this early period of Prussia’s aggrandizement is as full of interest as the secular. Its people, among whom, even in the 16th century, heathenish customs maintained their place side by side with Christian usages, were among the first to look favorably upon the new Gospel movement. The German order they had learned to despise, and, looking upon Christianity and knighthood as synonymous, they had steadfastly opposed conversion. But now, when a gospel was preached discarding and opposing the papacy and all its agencies, the people became ready converts; and the princes, accepting this great popular movement as insurmountable, suffered themselves to be borne along with the tide. In Prussia the priests even favored the new departure. “From the success of the Reformation the princes expected the forfeited property of the Church, the priests expected wives, and the people freedom.” So says Marx (*Ursachen der schnellen Verbreitung d. Ref.* [Mayence, 1834]). In Prussia, even the bishop of Samland, George of

Polentz (q.v.), and soon afterwards Queis, bishop of Pomerania, favored the movement; and the former finally placed himself at the head of it. and proclaimed on Christmas-day, 1523, in the cathedral of Königsberg, with great joy, that the Saviour had been born once more for his people. In 1525 the progress of the new opinions was so great that when the country was converted into a secular dukedom the entire populace signified their cordial acquiescence, and rejoiced to rank themselves among the followers of Luther. A German liturgy was soon afterwards introduced, adhering as closely as might be to the ancient forms; the convents were changed into hospitals; and by the help of *postils* (q.v.), or expository discourses on the epistles and gospels, regularly sent from Wittenberg, the doctrines of the clergy were kept in general harmony with each other, and also with the tenets advocated in the Lutheran metropolis. The two bishops, together with three evangelical preachers Luther had sent — Briesmann, Sperat, and Poliander — had prepared a Church discipline (*Agenda*), and caused its adoption, under the title “Artikel der Ceremonien u. anderer Kirchenordnung,” by Parliament (*Landtag*) in December, 1525. In 1540 the discipline was enlarged, and in 1544 still further augmented. In 1530 a confession of faith, consisting of eleven articles, was promulgated, under the title “Articuli Ceremoniarum e Germanico in Latinum Versi et nonnihil Locupletati,” by a general synod at Königsberg. This was the first *compus doctrinae*. When the *Augsburg Confession* was published (1530-31), Albert sent for a copy and caused it to be introduced into the Prussian Church by episcopal decree. But in 1544 Albert determined upon the future independence of the Prussian Church from Wittenberg, and to this end endowed the University of Königsberg — a high school which was destined not only to play a great part in the history of Prussia and of Germany, but of Poland also; for from this university much Scriptural knowledge spread to Poland, and gave rise to a strong reformatory movement there (comp. Krasinski, *Hist. of the Ref. in Poland*, 1, 158). But this university also became the source of a very serious theological controversy, in which came very near destroying the Protestant Church of Prussia and seriously damaging the evangelical cause in all Germany. We refer to the *Osiander* (q.v.) controversy. It began in 1549. Osiander was that year lecturing at Königsberg *de lege et evangelio*, and next year *de justificatione*. He died in 1552, but his son-in-law, Funk, continued to espouse Osiander’s views, and in the controversy which ensued so much bad blood was raised that in 1553 the leaders of opposition were obliged to quit the country; and when, later, the tide turned against the Osiandrians,

Funk himself and two other leaders paid for their distinction with their lives, in 1566. *SEE FUNK, JOHANN; SEE MORLIN, JOACHIM*. Duke Albert then set about restoring the peace of the Church. He was not himself able to grapple with the far-reaching theological, anthropological, and soteriological questions which the Osiandrian controversy had raised. He had as suddenly turned from one side to the other as the prosperity of the Church seemed to demand. He had unsettled all and settled none, but he had, at least, the satisfaction of seeing one good result from the agitation. It made evident the need of a generally accepted "Confession," and he intrusted its preparation to Morlin and Chemnitz, and in 1567 they brought out the *Corpus Doctrinae Prutenicum*, also called *Repetitio Corporis Doctrinae Christianae*, which became the symbolical text-book of Prussia. Although it had been intended to abide, so far as the cultus was concerned, by the regulations of 1544, a revision was called for after the publication of the *Repetitio*, and in 1568 was brought out another *Kirchenordnung u. Ceremonien wie es in Uebung Gottes Worts v. Reichung der hochwürdigen Sakramente in den Kirchen des Herzogthumes Preussen gehalten werden soll*. This finally established the evangelical cultus.

In 1548 the reforming party in Prussia was greatly strengthened by the arrival of multitudes of Bohemian brethren, who were ordered, under most severe penalties, to leave their country within forty-two days (May 4, 1548). Duke Albert offered them an asylum in his states, whither they migrated under the guidance of Mathias Sionius, the chief of the whole community.

Polish or West Prussia, together with the minor states of Courland and Livonia, gradually underwent a similar transformation, owing to many favorable influences. Luther's pamphlets, exposing the weaknesses of the papacy and of Romanism, had free entrance in these countries. The bishop of Ermland, Fabian, not only raised no opposition himself, but, as the Romanists claim, was even anxious that the reform movement should succeed. Then the government of the Polish sovereign, Sigismund Augustus, by granting plenary freedom of religion to the towns of Dantzic, Thorn, and Elbing, greatly facilitated the triumph of the Protestant opinions, which was effected about the year 1560. Germany, at last, had conquered for herself by the Reformation the valiant Prussians, and in the borders of Slavic and Roman influence had firmly planted the seed of German culture and German Protestantism, which was to germinate and spread so marvellously. The evangelical Church of Prussia, which was

always after in closest intimacy and most active co-operation with German Protestantism, to which it owed its origin, had nevertheless its own peculiar formation, and took for its development its own peculiar way. Most remarkable is the fact that the prince under whom the Prussian evangelical Church first established itself lived to see it rooted and grounded in doctrine, cultus, and discipline. Duke Albert died March 20, 1568.

4. *Modern Period.* — Frederick I was distinguished for his rigid economy of the public money and an extraordinary penchant for tall soldiers, and left to his son, the great Frederick II, a compact and prosperous state, a well-disciplined army, and a sum of nearly nine million thalers in his treasury. Frederick II (1740-86) dexterously availed himself of the extraordinary advantages of his position to raise Prussia to the rank of one of the great political powers of Europe. In the intervals between his great wars, he devoted all his energies to internal improvement, by encouraging agriculture, trade, and commerce, and reorganizing the military, financial, and judicial departments of the State. By his liberal views in regard to religion, science, and government, he inaugurated a system whose results reacted on the whole of Europe; and in Germany, more especially, he gave a new stimulus to thought, and roused the dormant patriotism of the people. Frederick was not over-scrupulous in his means of enlarging his dominions, as he proved by sharing in the first partition of Poland in 1772, when he obtained as his portion nearly all West Prussia and several other districts in East Prussia. His nephew and successor, Frederick William II (1786-97), aggrandized his kingdom by the second and third partitions of Poland in 1793 and 1795. Frederick William III (1797-1840), who had been educated under the direction of his grand-uncle Frederick the Great, succeeded his father in 1797, at a time of extreme difficulty, when Continental rulers had no choice beyond being the opponents, the tools, or the victims of French republican ambition. By endeavoring to maintain a neutral attitude, Prussia lost her political importance, and gained no real friends, but many covert enemies. But the calamities which this line of policy brought upon Prussia roused Frederick William from his apathy, and, with an energy, perseverance, and self-denial worthy of all praise, he devoted himself, with his minister, count Hardenberg, to the reorganization of the State. In the ten years which succeeded the battle of Waterloo, Prussia underwent a complete reorganization. Trade received a new impulse through the various commercial treaties made with the maritime

nations of the world, the formation of excellent roads, the establishment of steam and sailing packets on the great rivers, and, at a later period, the organization of the customs treaty, known as the Zollverein, between Prussia and the other states of Northern Germany, and through the formation of an extended net-work of railways. The most ample and liberal provision was made for the diffusion of education over every part of the kingdom and to every class.

In like manner, the established Protestant Church was enriched by the newly inaugurated system of government superintention, churches were built, the emoluments of the clergy were raised, and their dwellings improved; but, not content with that, the king wished to legislate for the Church in accordance with a set plan, and determined to force a union of the Lutherans and the Reformed, whose unhappy separation was painful to the devoted king. This union scheme was not new. A union tendency had shown itself early in the German Church, and attempts were made to bridge over the gulf which began to deepen between the Lutherans and the Reformed in consequence of the differences on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. The so-called *Concordia* of Wittenberg in 1536 and the *Augustana Variata* of 1540, with which also the Reformed Synod agreed, are prominent proofs of this. For nearly half a century, John Duraeus (died 1680), an Anglican clergyman and an apostle of union, travelled about for the accomplishment of his great object; but each of the three great Protestant churches — Lutheran, Reformed, and Anglican — contended not only for a faith in the Christ revealed in the Scriptures, which was the only basis of union insisted upon by him, but for all those peculiarities which separated it from the others. An agreement for mutual ecclesiastical recognition (*tolerantia ecclesiastica*) was formed on the principles of Calixtus at the religious conference at Cassel in 1661, and resulted in the transfer of the University of Rinteln to the Reformed Church. But notwithstanding these concessions, which gave the appearance of a unionistic and tolerating tendency, the Lutheran divines, according to Tholuck, declared that they would rather hold communion with the papists, and regarded the hope that even Calvinists might be saved as a temptation of the devil (*Geist d. luth. Theol. Wittenbergs*, p. 115, 169, 211). Yet, after the Peace of Ryswick, when it became urgently important to have fraternal connections between the Protestant nations as a security against the dangerous exaltation of the Catholic powers, the house of Prussia took upon itself the task of adjusting the dissensions which prevailed, principally

among the Lutherans, by a union of the two Protestant churches. The elector John Sigismund of Brandenburg, while accepting the Reformed creed in 1614, did nevertheless adhere to the Augsburg Confession — like the Brandenburg and Hessian theologians at the Leipsic colloquium in 1631 — and his successors, the princes of Brandenburg and Prussia, who remained in the Reformed communion, always cherished a desire to bring their evangelical people to a better understanding, and, if possible, a union in the government and worship of the churches. The appointment of a few bishops constituted a part of the ceremonial at the coronation of the first king of Prussia (1700), but this suggested the idea of a *union* by the introduction of the form of government which prevailed in the Anglican Church. Temples of peace and union churches were, however, consecrated in vain. Leibnitz succeeded in breaking off the negotiations. There was, none the less, full confidence that the object would one day be brought of itself to a successful conclusion.

When the wars with France ended so favorably, the king thought the day auspicious for the consummation of the dream of his reigning ancestry, and by royal decree of Sept. 27, 1817 (the Jubilee of the Reformation), king Frederick William III declared the union effected. But the various Protestant churches refused to be joined in the Utopian union prescribed for them. New difficulties arose. The tendency to over-legislation was long the predominating evil feature of Prussian administration. The State, without regard to the incongruous elements of which it was composed, was divided and subdivided into governmental departments, which in their turn, under some head or other, brought every individual act under governmental supervision, to the utter annihilation of political or mental independence. The people, when they gradually began to comprehend the nature of this administrative machinery, saw that it made no provision for political and civil liberty, and demanded of the king the fulfilment of the promise he had given in 1815 of establishing a representative constitution for the whole kingdom. This demand was evasively met by the king, who professed to take high religious views of his duty as a sovereign, and its immediate fruits were strenuous efforts on his part to check the spirit of liberalism. Every measure taken by other sovereigns to put down political movements was vigorously abetted by him. Siding with the pietists of Germany, he introduced a sort of Jesuitical despotism. The *Landstände*, or provincial estates, organized in accordance with the system of the Middle Ages, were the sole and inadequate mode of representation granted to

Prussia in that reign, notwithstanding the pledge made to the nation for a full and general representative government. A further attempt made forcibly to unite Lutheran and Reformed churches by royal decree of Feb. 28, 1834, excited universal indignation, while the imprisonment, at a later period, of the archbishops of Cologne and Gnesen for their conduct in regard to the vexed question of mixed marriages involved the king in a long and fruitless dispute with the pope. In his ecclesiastical regulations, the king was generally assisted by the gentle Altenstein, his minister for public worship, with whose preferences for the Hegelian philosophy in the Church and in the schools he was often displeased, but whom he never would quite abandon. When the civil power had absorbed all authorities peculiarly ecclesiastical, the king established (1817) provincial consistories, whose duties were confined to matters exclusively spiritual, and did not include the location of clergymen; district and provincial synods, composed only of clergymen, and restricted within a narrow circle of duties, but intended to be an introduction to an imperial synod; and a ministry for public worship, which was to be the organ through which the royal authority was exercised over the Church. The oath which the clergymen were to take bound them to be the servants of the State as well as of the Church. The development which had taken place in the principles of Protestantism, and the modes of speech occasioned by the new scientific and literary education of the people, next rendered some alteration of the language of the Church indispensable. New liturgies were therefore introduced into some established churches without attracting much attention. A common form of worship seemed to become necessary by the union which by the year 1821 had been *outwardly* effected. The theological commission appointed for composing such an instrument in Prussia accomplished nothing. The king then published an *Agenda* which had been adopted by his cabinet (1822) for the use of the court church, gave orders that it should be introduced into the garrison churches of his kingdom, and recommended it to all the congregations of the realm, instead of the conflicting and arbitrary forms which had previously been used in the different provinces. But it met with much opposition. The Reformed complained that it savored too much of the old ecclesiastical formula. They objected, too, to the burning of candles in broad daylight, and the kneeling and singing of the preacher before the altar, and the like, which seemed to them to betray a Roman Catholic spirit. The rigid Lutherans complained that it was not sufficiently orthodox, and was too much reformed. On the other hand, the adherents of the early theology of illuminism found it too

orthodox, too much in sympathy with the old ecclesiasticism. They did not perceive in it their own theological opinions, but just the reverse; and it was from their standpoint that they very properly hesitated to make use of expressions and ceremonies with which they could connect no other sense than one contradictory to their convictions. Some, also, were displeased with a heterogeneous political element which they discovered in it. But no general opposition to it was apparent until the government took some steps to draw over the churches by various temptations or by coercion, and some authors colluded that a strict conformity to the liturgy should be required by a law on the territorial system. In the midst of this confusion, no synodal constitution was carried into effect; for even the victorious political party took no pleasure in a measure which so forcibly reminded them of the promised representative system. It was only in Westphalia and the Rhenish provinces that a synodal form on the basis of ancient usages was introduced (1835), but even there the system left as much to be desired as it actually fulfilled. The appointment of general superintendents (1829), with means at command for a very extensive sphere of personal influence, was looked upon as a restoration of the titular bishops to their former prelatical position, and hence as the commencement of a Protestant episcopacy. The controversy now became legal, and the jurists and theologians pronounced their different opinions in answering the question as to how far the king, as the prince of the country, was authorized in prescribing his ecclesiastical usages to the people and in foisting a particular service upon them. It was only after new negotiations and revisions, in which all possible consideration was shown for personal wishes and the traditions of the country, that the liturgy entered into full force (1830) as that of the *United Evangelical State Church*. By the union it was opposed even after this; and, as we have already seen, a second decree was necessary (1834) to give the stamp of the government anew to the effort. The result was a public outbreak. In Silesia, especially, there was much trouble, and the refractory spirit assumed an alarming form. Removals, military force, and emigration were the sad results; and finally there occurred a disunion among the Lutherans themselves — some yielding to the force of circumstances, others pushing their cause to the utmost, and still others going to ruin in sectarianism. *SEE LUTHERANISM.*

The accession of Frederick William IV, in 1840, seemed to open a better prospect to the friends of constitutional freedom, but the reality was

scarcely equal to the expectations which had been warranted by the professions of the government. Still, new hopes and requirements had been excited, and a new life was infused into every department of the State. Every branch of science, art, and literature was understood to receive the attentive consideration of the sovereign, who professed to be actuated by a love of universal progress. He made similar professions in regard to religious toleration, but the pietistic tendencies of his government exerted a forced and prejudicial influence in public administration everywhere.

At an early period of his reign, the king had expressed his determination to allow the Church, over which the crown had acquired supreme power during the Reformation, freely to form for itself its own external organization. The transfer of a part of the ecclesiastic administration from the provincial governments to the consistories in 1845 might be construed as an expedient to get an easier control of the Church by the appointment of persons of a particular party. But when the provincial synods had assembled in 1844, composed of the superintendents of each of the six eastern provinces, and a clergyman chosen from each diocese, the king called a *General Synod* at Berlin — not of representatives, but of distinguished persons in the Church, thirty-seven of whom were clergymen and thirty-eight were laymen. Under the presidency of the minister for public worship, during a session continued from June 2 to Aug. 30, 1846, “this body,” says Hase, “which made no pretensions to a legal authority, but had no restraint on the expression of its opinions, and acted on conclusions drawn from the proceedings of the provincial synods, presented its views of the existing wants of the Church. Its plan for a future ecclesiastical constitution combined the consistorial administration proceeding directly from the crown with the synods proceeding directly from the congregations in regularly ascending circles. The assembly had not been convened without some reference to its nature, and only a single voice was raised in it in behalf of undisguised rationalism. But as the great majority there, as well as in the previous provincial synods, declared itself against not only unconditional freedom of instruction, but the compulsory obligation of creeds, the party led by the *Evangelical Church Journal* found itself in a decided minority. The moral impossibility of compelling men to adhere to the old creeds was conceded; and yet it was thought indispensable to the completion of the union that a confession of faith should be formed, to serve as a formula for ordination. But the confession then composed expressed only those sentiments which are essential to

Protestant Christianity in Scriptural language, and without the precision of theological science. The orthodox minority (fourteen to forty-eight), therefore, had reason to complain, notwithstanding all that was said for their satisfaction, that the adoption of the new confession was a virtual abrogation of the old." The only concession to those congregations and patrons who were especially attached to the Lutheran or the Reformed type of doctrine or worship was the assurance given them that they should have full liberty, without endangering the development and existence of the union, to use their respective confessions, if they wished, in a regular manner, to bring those clergymen whom they called under obligation to some creed. But the orthodox opposition from without, in whose eyes such a body seemed a robber-synod, in which Christ was denied, was powerful enough, at least, to postpone the execution of these enactments, although the ecclesiastical authorities had given them a unanimous concurrence, and had pronounced them of urgent importance. The superior Consistory was the only court finally formed under them (January, 1848), but as this was not sustained by any contemporary synodal regulations, it was looked upon as a mere party authority.

While the government and the Church gained so little, the people became more and more restless. There was a general displeasure against the bureaucratic spirit of over-governing which characterized the administration and became daily more irksome to the nation. In the Church it resulted in the successful formation of free churches or Protestant communities espousing the interests of a rational Christianity. A contemporaneous excitement which had arisen in the Roman Catholic Church, as the result of the schismatic movement due to the stand taken by the chaplain Ronge on the exhibition of the so-called *holy coat* (q.v.) of Treves, further complicated the ecclesiastical relations. In the State, revolution ensued. The king and his advisers, underrating the importance of the movement of 1848 in Germany, thought they had satisfied the requirements of the hour by granting, a few unimportant reforms and making equivocal promises of further concessions. When at length, however, the citizens and troops came into collision, and blood was shed, Frederick William came forward as the proposed regenerator of his country, offering to lay down his royal title and merge his kingdom in the common fatherland, for the salvation of which he recommended a cordial union of all German princes and people in one bond, and proposing himself as the leader and guide of this new Germany. His own subjects, and at first

many Germans in other states, were carried away by these Utopian schemes. The publication of a political amnesty, the nomination of a liberal ministry, the recognition of a civic guard, the retirement of the prince of Prussia, the heir presumptive — with whom every arbitrary measure of government was believed to originate — and the summoning of a representative chamber to discuss the proposed constitution — all tended to allay the general discontent. But when the National Assembly at Frankfort-on-the-Main, in 1851, in disregard of the wishes of the Prussian king, declined to accept his proffered services, and elected the archduke of Austria as lieutenant-general of Germany, his ardor in the cause of the fatherland cooled, his pledges to his own subjects were evaded as long and as completely as the occasion permitted, and his policy became more strongly tinged than before with the jealousy of Austria. His powerful co-operation in putting down the insurrection in Poland and the democratic party in Baden gave, however, ample proof of his determined opposition to every popular demonstration against absolutism. The only exception during his reign is the action of the Prussians in the war of the Sleswig-Holstein duchies, when the Prussians, acting in concert with the disaffected against their sovereign, the king of Denmark, occupied the ducal provinces in the name and on behalf of the diet. But this was the work rather of him who is now emperor of Germany, and is capable of explanation even from an ultra-royalistic standpoint. The latter years of the reign of king Frederick William IV were characterized by great advance in the material prosperity and internal improvement of the country. Extensive lines of railway and post-roads were opened, the river navigation was greatly facilitated, treaties of commerce were formed with foreign countries, great expansion was given to the Prussian and North German Zollverein, the army was put upon a footing of hitherto unprecedented efficiency of arms and artillery, and the educational system of the country was still further developed. The political freedom of Prussia cannot, however, be said to have made equal advance. The Chambers which met for the discussion and framing of a constitutional mode of government were constantly interrupted and obstructed in the prosecution of their task; and the constitution, which is now established by law, was modified every year between 1850 and 1857, until it may be said to retain few of its original features.

In the Church also the great storm of 1848 wrought destructively. An ecclesiastical administration became odious, and count Schwerin, the minister for public worship, saw himself obliged to keep watch over the

actions of the consistories, which finally so displeased him that he dissolved the superior consistory. He then appointed a committee to devise a synodal constitution, to be submitted to an imperial synod which should soon after be convened, that thus the Church might construct her future organization for herself. The outline of the electoral law for the appointment, of synods was published, and defended by counsellors of the crown versed in ecclesiastical law. It proposed that the deputies should be elected by the congregations, but that the existing synods should be made use of in the western provinces, and that district and provincial synods should be arranged so as to serve for electoral bodies in the eastern. Before the appointed synod could have its meeting, the revolution was throttled, and the government again abandoned all these liberal measures. It even denounced the clamor for a synodal constitution as *an ill-concealed enmity to Christ (!)*, and the whole scheme of an election by the people as *a denial of God (!)*. The constitution of Jan. 31, 1850, retained, with respect to religion, the whole essential spirit of the German fundamental laws. A collegiate *supreme ecclesiastical council* to decide internal affairs of the Church was formed by order of the king from the evangelical portion of the ministry of public worship, and a system of rules for the regulation of congregational affairs was bestowed upon the six eastern provinces. The supreme ecclesiastical council from that period governed the Church in the king's name; and Von Raumer, the minister for public worship, in the presence of the Chambers, declared that the new doctrine was that the Evangelical Church exercises her constitutional right independently to regulate and administer her affairs, by entire separation from and consequent independence of the State, and by government according to her ancient constitution by the sovereign as her most prominent member. By this happy thought anxiety for the independence of the Church was tranquilized, and the Chambers succeeded in repelling all complaints about violations of those articles of the fundamental law of the State which relate to the independence of the Evangelical Church. The plan for congregational government, which was looked upon as the basis of true ecclesiastical freedom, contained a suspicious limitation of the power of choosing the vestries and an extraordinary requisition that the private members should be bound by the three principal creeds, the confessions of the Reformation, and certain general laws for the Church which were yet unknown. In some of the eastern provinces this plan was protested against by parties opposed to each other, but it was at last gradually admitted into most of the congregations. The free congregations (numbering about forty

in Prussia and the contiguous countries), which had in 1848, like almost all associations, taken some part in politics, and whose leaders had to some extent been involved in the movements of the day, had nearly all their houses of worship closed by the police under the new law against political societies. These proceedings were partially confirmed by the judicial courts; but some measures of the police seemed so inconsistent with the freedom of conscience guaranteed by the fundamental laws that inquiries were instituted respecting them even in the Chambers (1852), where the government had avowed its determination to exterminate by every legal means the whole system of dissent. The supreme ecclesiastical council excommunicated all the free congregations, without reference to the various tendencies among them, and pronounced their baptisms invalid, while the civil courts punished every official act of their ministers as an invasion of the clerical office. Still there was conflict between civil and ecclesiastical authorities, and the crown saw itself perplexed daily with the disadvantages of dissent. By royal edicts of March 6, 1852, and July 12, 1853, the union movement was again given a new lease of life, the king having determined to do away with religious differences among all Protestants. The result was far from gratifying. In the very next fall (October, 1853) Dr. Rupp started a new congregation, in which the Bible was accepted as the original source of truth, and the imitation of Christ was made the supreme end of life. All ecclesiasticism was ignored. In 1856 (Nov. 4-Dec. 5) a general conference assembled to remedy these dissensions, but it failed to accomplish anything. The king remained *summus episcopus*, but the Protestants retained by the constitution of Jan. 31, 1850, tit. ii, art. 12, liberty of conscience, and the more recent immigrations from foreign lands have made Prussia the home of Protestants of all shades of religious opinion.

The obvious benefits of the presbyterial and synodal constitution in the Rhenish and Westphalian churches, the fuller co-operation there of ministers and elders, the greater activity of the laity, the room afforded for the exercise of discipline, the variety of home mission work, and the facility for checking rationalistic tendencies, which had given the Rhenish and Westphalian branch of the Prussian Church so great a power and influence, were so apparent that it would have been impossible for the leading authorities of the Prussian Church not to desire to extend this form of government, modified by the consistorial constitution, over all her old provinces. Consequently a royal order of June 29, 1850, introduced the

institution of the general Church courts, and by another of Sept. 10, 1873, it became definitively the platform for the congregations and synods there, while an extraordinary general synod for these provinces was announced. This synod was appointed by royal decree, to consist of the eleven general superintendents, of twelve deputies of the theological and the juridical faculties, of thirty members to be elected by the king, and of 150 members of the eight provincial synods, who were to be composed of not less than one third laymen and one third ministers. This general synod met for the first time from Nov. 24 to Dec. 18, 1875. The new ecclesiastical constitution of Prussia provides for a regular meeting of this general body at the call of the king every six years. The king is represented in it by the president of the *Oberkirchenrath*, the highest Church tribunal in the state. The jurisdiction and competency of the general synod, as summarized by a correspondent of *The Central Christian Advocate*, are shown by the following, which indicates also the nature of the connection between Church and State:

- 1.** The General synod co-operates with the king's functionaries for promoting the interests of the State Church on the basis of the evangelical confessions of faith.
- 2.** Laws enacted by the king, as head of the Church, must have its assent. It may also propose new measures, but these cannot be laid before the king for sanction until the cultus minister has examined them and found nothing incompatible with the interests of the State in them.
- 3.** It legislates exclusively on the amount of liberty of teaching within the Church; religious qualifications and ordination vows of the candidates of ministry; liturgies, hymnals, and catechisms; holy days to be introduced or abolished; and the form of discipline for refractory Church members and ministers.
- 4.** It controls the funds which the *Oberkirchenrath* had, and also the expenditure of the appropriations for the Church from the national treasury, which was in the hands of the cultus minister heretofore.
- 5.** Regular and periodical taxes upon the congregations for Church purposes can only be levied by its consent.
- 6.** It can incite the king's functionaries (*Oberkirchenrath* and consistories) to greater activity by taking the initiative in proposing such new measures

as are conducive to the Church's welfare. The *Oberkirchenrath* cannot reject them without giving its motives.

7. It preserves the union of the State Church interest by revoking any such resolutions of a prominent synod as may be incompatible with the Church at large."

The Advocate then continues as follows:

"The king, as *summus episcopus*, governs the Church indirectly through its consistories — one in each province — composed entirely of theologians, except the president who must be a jurist, and directly through the *Oberkirchenrath* — the highest Church tribunal in the state — to whom the consistories are responsible."

Between the sessions of the general synod a cabinet, composed of seven members, carries out the measures of the general synod, and confers with the *Oberkirchenrath* respecting new measures.

It is not difficult for the members of the Lutheran and the comparatively few Reformed churches in Prussia to meet in the same synods, because the union movement has not only given rise to a common legislative and administrative basis, but prepared the members and congregations, notwithstanding all the value they assign to their particular creeds, to lay greater stress upon that which they have in common than upon that on which they differ. The Lutheran churches have the *Confessio Augustana Invariata* from June 25, 1530 (or the *Augustana Variata* from 1540), the *Apologia Confessionis Augustanoe*, the *Articuli Smalcalderi*, the *Catechismus Minor* and *Major Lutheri*, and the *Formula Concordiæ* (1577). The Reformed Church has the Heidelberg Catechism (1563), which it highly values. The authority of these creeds — the Minor Catechism and the *Confessio Augustana* perhaps excepted — is not binding in all the details; and in the ordination vow no declaration of allegiance to the symbols is expected from the young minister, so that some of the creeds have nearly disappeared. So thoroughly has the old spirit of division died out that there is no longer any opposition to communion of the two bodies in the same church. Nor is this practice confined to the United Church of Prussia; it is equally prevalent in the other union churches of Germany, in the former duchy of Nassau, in Anhalt-Bernburg, Dessau, Birkenfeld, Baden, in the former electorate of Hesse, in Saxe-Weimar, in Hildburghausen, Waldeck, Wurtemberg, and in one part of the grand-

duchy of Hesse. In East Friesland the union has extended only to the government, and not to worship or doctrine, in Rhenish Bavaria, in the union deed, stress is laid on the common scriptural ground of the churches.

With the accession of king William I, Prussia's most brilliant page of history opens. The civil and ecclesiastical affairs of that country now became the history of a united, prosperous, and powerful people. Though Bismarck, as premier, himself controls pretty much all the measures civil and ecclesiastical; though he at first indicated by his lines of action a policy of absolutism and bureaucracy, time has unfolded a liberal and practical tendency in the government, and the only severe opposition now encountered is from the low social democracy — in this country known as Communism — and from the ultra-Romish subjects, who wage war against the repressive measures adopted by the government against Ultramontaniam and Jesuitism, because of the dangers they brood against the State. *SEE ULTRAMONTANISM*. The war of 1866 with Austria established the superiority of Prussia in Germany; the war with France in 1870 solidified the work of the intervening years, and gave to the little kingdom the imperial power on the 170th anniversary of the day when the elector of Brandenburg assumed the crown of Prussia.

II. Religious Statistics. —

1. General. — According to the census of 1885, of the 28,318,470 inhabitants of Prussia, 18,244,405 returned themselves as belonging to the Evangelical National Church; of these, 13,266,620 are of the United Church, 2,905,250 Lutherans, and 465,120 of the Reformed Church. Of those who are not of the National Church, there are 40,630 Lutherans, 35,080 Reformed, 4711 Moravians, 13,023 Irvingites and Baptists, 36,668 Mennonites, 4693 Anglicans, Methodists, etc., 9,620,326 Catholics, 1437 Greek Church, 10,360 German Catholics, 21,823 Freethinkers, etc., 366,575 Jews, and 2594 of various other beliefs. The Old Catholics are mentioned below. The Roman Catholic population of Prussia decreased so rapidly after the introduction of Protestantism that at the accession of Frederick II in 1740 there were only 50,000 Catholics in a population of 2,150,000 souls; the proportion of the Catholics to the Protestants was, in other words, one to forty-three. The kings did not recur to coercive measures, but the majority of the inhabitants of Prussia hated Romanism, and caused it to undergo heavy trials. When Prussia acquired Silesia, and after the division of Poland, it was less of a Protestant power. The number

of the Catholics was so considerably increased, especially after the treaty of Luneville (1801), that both communions were represented by nearly equal numbers. This was again changed by the treaty of Tilsit, the two treaties of Paris, and the congress of Vienna. At present the Evangelical Church constitutes a majority in the provinces of Schleswig-Holstein (99 per cent.), Pomerania (97), Brandenburg (95), Saxony (93), Hanover (87), Hesse-Nassau (70), and Prussia (70); the Roman Catholic Church in Hohenzollern (93 per cent.), the Rhine provinces (73), Posen (64), Westphalia (53), and Silesia (51). Of the Jews, fully one half live in the eastern (formerly Polish) provinces. The members of all churches recognised by the government enjoy equal civil rights. The Old Catholics (q.v.) have been recognised as a part of the Roman Catholic Church, and the bishop elected by them as a bishop of the Catholic Church. Other denominations (Baptists, Methodists, German Catholics, and Free Congregationalists) are barely tolerated, though the constitution guarantees full religious liberty. The Greek Church is also represented in Prussia. One of the Greek communities belongs to the *Philippins* (q.v.), a branch of the Greek Raskolniks, who seceded in the 17th century from the Orthodox Greek Church. Like the Mennonites, they refuse the military service. Their principal colony is at Alt-Ukta, in the kingdom of Poland. The Mennonites are tolerated, with some restrictions: they cannot increase their real estate, because the military service is in contradiction with their religious opinions. They are in consequence in a state of emigration, and their number decreases. Since 1830 they enjoy the same civil rights as all other Christian subjects. The Roman Catholic Church is directed by the two archbishops of Posen and Gnesen, and Cologne, under whom stand the four bishoprics of Culm, Munster, Paderborn, and Treves. The two episcopal sees of Breslau and Ermland are directly under the jurisdiction of the pope; while the district of Glatz, in Silesia, belongs to the archbishopric of Prague, and Katscher, in Upper Silesia, to that of Olmutz. In 1864 the Protestants had rather more than 9000 licensed places of worship, with 6500 ordained clergymen; and the Roman Catholic Church nearly 8000 churches and chapels, with upwards of 6000 priests. In 1867 there were 24,382 churches of all denominations, and 224 monastic or conventual establishments, with 5613 inmates, mostly devoted to purposes of education, or nursing the sick.

2. Education. — Education is compulsory in Prussia, and its management and direction are under the control of the State. In no country are better or

amplere means supplied for the diffusion of knowledge among all classes of the community. Prussia has nine universities, viz. Konigberg, Berlin, Greifswald, Breslau, Halle, Bonn, Kiel, Gottingen, and Marburg, with 12,823 students, and two Catholic colleges at Braunsberg and Munster. At the close of 1889 there were in Prussia 37,000 schools and educational establishments of every kind, exclusive of the universities; and of these 787 were colleges or gymnasia, about 1000 classical private schools, 58 normal, about 700 art, trade, and industrial schools, and about 30,000 public elementary schools, with 45,000 teachers and about 4,000,000 scholars. (See below.) The management of the elementary national schools is in the hands of the local communities; but the State appoints the teachers, and in part pays their salaries, the remainder being supplied by the public. In addition to the libraries of the several universities, there is the Royal Library of Berlin, with 750,000 volumes and about 16,000 MSS. Among the numerous scientific, artistic, and literary schools and societies of Prussia, the following are some of the more distinguished: the Academy of Arts, founded in 1699; the Royal Museum of Arts; the Academy of Sciences; the Natural History, Geographical, and polytechnic societies of Berlin; the Antiquarian Society of Stettin; the Breslau Natural History and Historical societies, etc.

3. Charities. — Prussia has a large number of benevolent institutions, towards the maintenance of which the State gives annually about £16,000 sterling. In 1861 there were about 1000 public civil and military infirmaries, in which upwards of 170,000 patients were under treatment, and between 7000 and 8000 poor- and alms-houses; while 800,000 poor received support through these institutions or by extraneous relief. Prussia is supplied with asylums for the deaf and dumb, the blind and the maimed, and has good schools for training midwives, nurses, etc.

4. Churches. — We append a sketch of the principal German churches, because it will in some manner enrich the article, and will, besides, greatly add to what has been said in the article GERMANY *SEE GERMANY*. The sketch and the statistics are taken from the report of the Pan-Presbyterian Council in Edinburgh in 1877.

“I. Constitution. — Each German state and each free city has a Church of its own, in which the princes or the magistrates, by whose co-operation the churches were reformed, have to some extent, since the Diet of Speyer in 1526, enjoyed the supreme administrative power.

This power they generally exercise by proxy, i.e. through the minister of worship (Prussia, Baden, Saxe-Altenburg, grand-duchy of Hesse, Mecklenburg, Wurtemberg); in other cases through the Supreme Church Council, or *Oberkirchenrath* (Prussia, 1849, 1850; Mecklenburg-Schwerin, 1819; Badin); or through the general superintendents, the consistories, and superintendents. To some extent, likewise, for the last twenty-five or thirty years, the governments have shared the administration of the Church with the district, provincial, and general synods (Prussia, Wurtemberg, Baden, Bavaria, Oldenburg. This form of Church government is called the *consistorial* (*Konsistorialverfassung*).

“The German churches have derived much benefit from the hands of the princes; but the fact that these exercise the right of control has often hindered the development of the energies, the liberality, and the practical sense of the lay element and the members of the congregations at large, as well as prevented the co-operation of the ministers and the people in Church work. Like the noble king Frederick William IV of Prussia, who longed to resign his episcopal functions into the proper hands, some of the best princes have felt the necessity of giving more self-government and liberty to the churches, and the presbyterial and synodal constitution in the newly developed form in which it has been given in Prussia is an endeavor in this direction.

“In some of the Reformed churches, as in the Palatinate, the mode of government is similar to that of the Lutheran churches; but in others the presbyterial and synodal constitution was developed.

“The presbyterial and synodal constitution was transplanted by fugitives, members of the French and Walloon congregations in London (which John a Lasco had organized according to the form he had set up in East Friesland), to the lower part of the Rhine, to the duchies of Julich, Cleves, Berg, and Mark, which form now the northern half of Rhenish Prussia, and a part of Prussian Westphalia; it was recognised and developed by the Congress of Wesel (1568) and the Synod of Emden (1571), was introduced into the duchy of Nassau (Synod of Herborn, 1586), and with some modifications, at the end of the 17th century, adopted even by the Lutherans in the territories of Cleves and Mark.

“This form of Church government was in 1835 confirmed by the *Kirchenordnung* for the churches in Rhenish Prussia and Westphalia. These churches, the Lutheran as well as the Reformed, are essentially Presbyterian, i.e., besides the ministers, each congregation has a body of elders and also of deacons. The duty of the elders is, along with the ministers, to take the oversight of the congregations, and further their well-being in all respects, especially by Christian discipline. The deacons serve the Church by works of love for the poor and afflicted. The ministers, elders, and deacons form the presbytery of the congregation (the Scottish Kirk session), the duty of which is to advance the edification of the Church, to promote whatever is good, and to discourage all that is evil. The members of this presbytery are elected for four years. Besides the presbytery there is, in larger congregations, a more numerous representative body (*die Representation*), the number of which varies according to the size of the congregation, and may amount to sixty, seventy, or more members. This body has to consult and decide in matters of greater importance, and especially when ministers or elders are to be elected. In the Reformed Calvinistic Lippe-Detmold, in 1851, such a representative body was instituted besides the presbytery.

“All the ministers and one deputy from each congregation form the *district synod* (the Scottish presbytery), which meets yearly under the superintendent, who is elected freely for six years by and from the members of the synod. His most important duties are the oversight of the ministers and presbyteries, the administration of the property of the congregations in the district, the exercise of discipline, the information and encouragement of the members as to the home mission work of the district, *and* the preparation for the next provincial synod. The superintendents, along with deputies from the district synods (each of these sending one minister and one elder), form *the provincial synod*, the president of which is elected for six years, and which has for its special function to watch over the doctrine and the spiritual affairs of the Church. The proceedings of the synod require, however, to be confirmed by the competent authorities of the State. The provincial synod meets every third year, but on extraordinary occasions it may be convened by the president. The control of the affairs of the Rhenish and Westphalian

Church is in the hands of the minister of worship, the Consistory of Rhenish Prussia, and that of Westphalia, and the government of the province. The general superintendents of Rhenish Prussia and Westphalia, who are appointed by the king, act along with the consistories, but are independent of them.

“In Baden similar provincial or diocesan and general synods have existed since the union in 1821. The diocesan synods are held every third year, the general every seventh. Two thirds of the body of the diocesan synods are ministers, and only one third laymen, who are not elected by the representatives of the congregations, but by electoral districts. To the general synod two dioceses send one minister, and the ruling elders (*Kirchengemeindenrath*) of four dioceses send one layman, who, however, must be a member of a representative body of the Church. The grand-duke nominates a president, a theological professor of the University of Heidelberg, and some lay and ministerial members, to the Supreme Church Council (*Oberkirchenrath*). The synod has a legislative, disciplinary, and consultative character, and it has the initiative in the government in the Church. Without its concurrence no law can be enacted bearing on the government, doctrine, and worship of the Church.

“In Wurtemberg yearly diocesan synods were instituted by the edict of Nov. 18, 1854, to take care of the moral and spiritual welfare of the congregations and of the poor throughout the diocese, to control the ministers and the elders, and to consult on matters of importance. These are composed of all the ministers, and of as many elders of each congregation as it has ministers. These are to be elected by the representative body of the congregation, the so-called Church councillors. A select committee has in the interval the direction of the affairs of the dioceses.

“In Bavaria on the other side of the Rhine, according to the union deed of 1818, there are diocesan and general synods. The number of the lay deputies varies with the number of the evangelical inhabitants of the diocese, so that the lay element preponderates. The yearly diocesan synods have partly a function of oversight, and partly of consultation. The general synod meets every fourth year,

and has the right of resolution, and expressing its wishes when there is a vacancy in the consistory.

“In Bavaria on this side of the Rhine yearly diocesan synods are held for consultation and for the election to the general synod. The whole of the ministers and an equal body of elders, elected by the officials of the congregation, take part. The general synod is composed of one ministerial deputy from each diocesan district, one elder from every two diocesan districts, and one deputy of the theological faculty of Erlangen. The general synod has only the right of advice, resolution, and protest.

“Similar district and general synods are in Lutheran Oldenburg, Hesse, and Mecklenburg. The Lutheran churches of the province of Hanover and of Nassau, though their territory belongs now to Prussia, have still synods for themselves.

“**II.** — *Statistical Notices.* —

(A.) *Churches.* —

(1.) *Evangelical Church.* —

(a) *Prussia.* — On Dec. 1, 1885, the German empire had 46,855,704 inhabitants, of whom 29,369,847 were Evangelicals, 16,785,734 Catholics, and 563,172 Jews.

“**(b.)** *Other German States.* — Bavaria had, Dec. 1, 1875, 5,024,832 inhabitants, 1,340,218 Evangelicals, 1055 Evangelical parishes, 1584 Evangelical churches, 1332 Evangelical ministers; on the average, belong to each Evangelical parish 1348, to each church 848, to each minister 1102. There are 81 superintendents.

“**(2.)** *Catholic Church.* —

(a.) *Roman Catholic.* — The Roman Catholic Church in Bavaria has 2826 parishes, 1022 benefices, 6157 priests and 3,448,453 members; each parish has 1220, and each priest 560 people. The State paid in 1874-75 to the Catholic Church £59,450, to the Protestant consistories £16,903.

The Catholic Church in Prussia has 3 Church provinces, 9 archdioceses and bishoprics. 2974 parishes and benefices, 6072

priests, 4 seminaries for priests. According to the Budget for 1874, the government paid for the Catholic Church £102,065; in Alsace and Lorraine for the Catholic worship there was paid, for 1876, £128,708.

“In the German empire Bavaria has 25 bishoprics, 10,353 parishes and benefices, 17,898 priests, and 13,903,026 members (in 1871).

“(b.) *Old Catholics.* — According to the report of the fourth Old-Catholic Synod, given in May, 1877, at Bonn, there are now in Prussia 35 Old-Catholic congregations with 6510 independent members; in Baden, 44 congregations with 5670 independent members; in Bavaria, 34 congregations with 3716 independent members; in Oldenburg, 2 congregations with 104 independent members; in Wurtemberg, 1 congregation with 94 independent members; 56 ministers are connected with the Old Catholics; they have in Germany at least 121 congregations, and 16,557 independent members.

“In May, 1876, the same numbers of the congregations were reported, only in Bavaria the number had fallen to 31. Sixty ministers were at that time connected with them, 4 more than now. They numbered in May, 1876, in Prussia, children included, 20,504; in Baden, 17,203; in Bavaria,

“(B.) *Schools.*

(1.) *Universities.* — In the winter session of 1875-76 there studied theology at Leipsic 337; at Tubingen, 233; at Halle, 187; Berlin, 162; Erlangen, 134; Gottingen, 78; Jena, 64, Bonn, 51; Kiel, 50; Strasburg, 50; Marburg, 45; Konigsberg 44; Breslau, 39; Greifswald, 33; Rostock, 25; Giessen, 23; Heidelberg, 9; together, 1565: in the Summer session of 1875 there were 1637 students of theology.

“(2.) *High Schools.* — The kingdom of Prussia has, according to Dr. Wiese’s historical-statistical work on the higher schools, 221 gymnasia (155 Evangelical, 50 Catholic, 16 mixed), 32 progymnasia, 92 Realschulen (in which languages, the arts, and sciences are taught — 76 Evangelical, 16 Catholic), 22 higher middle-class schools, 27 provincial trade-schools, 91 seminaries for young teachers (61 Evangelical, 25 Catholic, 4 Jewish, 1 mixed), 267 higher schools for young ladies (the Germans call them schools for daughters), 35 institutions for the deaf and dumb, 14 for the blind, and 7 higher

military schools. The number of scholars in these high schools amounted in 1874 to 128,000, that of the teachers to 6900; the cost was £1,020,750.

“(C.) *Christian Associations.* —

(1.) *Mission to the Heathen.* — Germany has eight of the sixty-three Evangelical Mission Societies for the heathen, of which only the Moravian Mission stands in an immediate connection with the Church. Of the 1559 mission stations and 2132 missionaries, Germany supports 274 stations and 470 missionaries; Germany and German Switzerland, 502 missionaries. Germany contributed for mission purposes in one year, £107,000.

“In 1890 the German missions had —

Countries	Stations	Missionar ies	Communi cants	Scholars
South Afr.	58	180	36,792	6,524
West Afr.	134	202	38,951	8,987
Eng. India	62	176	31,197	11,149
Dutch India	11	11	738	70
China	17	34	2,485	729
Austr.	10	28	305	292
West Indies	48	53	38,216	12,129
Esquimau Lands	19	72	3,073	621
Orient	24	55	3,138	1,746

“This represents about 500 stations, 825 missionaries, 145,000 communicants, 128,600 members, 42,000 scholars, and £107,000 expenses.

“The Basle Mission (established 1815) has 209 missionaries and 45 principal stations in West Africa, East Indian, and China, 9803 Christians and 20,907 natives under its care, and 8513 children in the schools; expenses £36,000.

“The Rhenish Mission Society (established 1828 in Barmen) has 131 missionaries, 56 principal stations in Africa, China, and East India, and about £19,250 expenses.

“The Hermannsburg Mission (established 1849) has 70 missionaries, 66 stations in America, Africa, East India, Australia, New Zealand, and an income of £14,466

“The Berlin Mission Society (established 1824) has 71 missionaries, 471 stations in Africa (Capeland, Orange, Free State, British Kafirland, Natal, and the Transvaal Republic), with 10,218 baptized people, and an income of about £15,500.

“(2.) *Mission among the Jews.* — in Germany there are the Society of Friends of Israel in Basle, besides four Jewish missionary societies.

“The Berlin Society (established 1822) works at Berlin, has two ordained missionaries, one layman, one or two colporteurs, and an income of £800.

“The Rhenish-Westphalian Society for Israel (established 1844) works in Rhineland, Westphalia, Hesse, and the neighborhood; has one ordained missionary, one lay missionary, one colporteur, and an income of £780.

“The Evangelical Lutheran Central Association for Israel (established 1849) has one missionary, a house for proselytes, and is supported by the Lutheran Church of Saxony, Bavaria, Hesse, etc.

“The Society of Friends of Israel in Strasburg is small.

“(3.) *Home (Inner) Missions, etc.* — Space fails to name all the smaller or larger Home Mission associations which can be found in the different parts of Germany.

“It may only be mentioned that the 2700 deaconesses of the thirty-four German Deaconesses’ institutes are not only employed in hospitals, but, at least in part, for the visitation of the sick and the poor, and for instruction in the numerous schools for little children, for which purpose the institutions at Nonneweier, Kaiserswerth, and Hanover train deaconesses; that so many Sunday-schools have sprung up in the last ten or fifteen years in Prussia that a central committee is formed at Berlin; and that the Rhenish and Westphalian Sunday-school Union at Elberfeld and Barmen, the conferences of which are excellently attended, can organize

particular district uniiions, in order to influence more vigorously the many Sunday-schools.

“We cannot speak of the associations and institutes in the different provinces of Pruussia — viz. Saxe-Weimnar, Wurtemberg, Lippe-Demold, and Alsace-Lorraine — which take care of and educate orphan children; nor can we describe the work of the many refuges for neglected children in all parts of Germany, nor that of the twenty institutions for fallen women, and partly for fallen men, nor that of the thirty-five associatios and institutions for dismissed prisoners.

“Very important for protecting from evil young men who go to the towns are the Christian Homes, upwards of 100 in number, in which the young working-man finds cheap and clean lodgings and meals, a friendly Christian word, and very often the necessary work. The second Christian Home at Berlin (established in 1869), from Oct. 1, 1874, to Jan. 1, 1876, lodged 16,060 young men, on 39,000 nights. In these homes the numerous Young Men’s Christian Associations have comfortable quarters. In Germany there are four large unions of Young Men’s Christian Associations. The union of the Rhenish-Westphailian Young Men’s Associations, which has its headquarters at Elberfeld, comprises about 120 associations; the Eastern Union, which has its centre at Berlin, has about 100 associations, with 3000 members; the union in the kingdom of Saxony has 16 associations, with 300 members; the South German Union has its 25 associations, with 500 members, chiefly in Wurtenmberg and Baden. Besides these, young clerks have formed two separate unions.

“In Germany, besides the Canstein Bible Institution, which does only the printing of the Bible, there are 25 Bible societies, the largest of which is the Prussian Principal Bible Society at Beilin, with 162 branch societies, Since its establishment in 1814 it has spread more than four million copies of the Bible. All the 25 Bible societies in 1875 distributed 186,000, and since their establishment more than 8,000,000 copies. The 35 or 40 small or larger Tract and Colportage societies have done and are doing much to promote the reading and understanding of the Bible.

“Great importance is now attached to the creation of a better popular literature and of a better daily press, and there are already five daily political papers with an earnest Christian tendency.

“It is encouraging that associations like those at Elberfeld and Barmen, for promoting a better Sunday’s rest, begin to work, and it is a very hopeful sign that there are such societies as the Central Committee of the Home Mission in Prussia, which has been so long and so ably presided over by Dr. Wichern; the Evangelical Society for Germany, which has its centre at Elberfeld and Barmen; the Baden Colportage Society; and that the Ranhe Haus, near Hamburg, the John’s Institution, near Berlin, the Barmene Mission-house, and the Crischona, near Basle, help to prepare earnest young men for the services of city missionaries, colporteurs, and evangelists: and that such societies as the Evangelical Society send out men who visit the people from house to house, go to the poor and the sick, help the ministers in large parishes, hold Bible classes, and conduct Sunday-schools and Young Men’s Associations, and other meetings. The Evangelical Society has now 22 colporteurs and city missionaries, and some travelling preachers and evangelists. It has in the last year begun popular apologetical lectures in large towns with much success, and it is quite certain that much more can and must be done by it for Germany.

“It is encouraging to think that about 45 ordained ministers are at work in the German home-mission field; yet many more are wanted; many doors are open for a larger and freer distribution and proclamation of the Word of God.

“There is, besides, to be noticed the *Reformed Church in Bentheim and East Friesland*, consisting of 9 congregations, with 6 ministers. Its standard is the Heidelberg Catechism. The body was formed about thirty years ago, after failing to induce the Church authorities to make certain reforms which it earnestly desired. It has no connection with the State. It is understood to be in correspondence with the German Reformed Church in North America, with a special view to the formation of a college for training ministers.

“Another noteworthy movement to be mentioned here is the *Free Evangelical Church of Germany*. In June, 1860, a number of

Christians in Breslau, capital of Silesia, in Prussia, formed themselves into a Church, Calvinistic in doctrine and Presbyterian in government, under the conviction that the National Protestant Church in that province was in many ways corrupt and unfaithful. They objected particularly to the Lutheran view of the sacraments, and to the altars, images, and candles which the Lutherani retain; to the prevalent neglect of the doctrines of grace, and to the recognition of the king as 'first bishop' of the Church. Not being prepared to join the Reformed Church of East Friesland, in consequence of their observing festivals, and for other points of difference, they formed themselves into the Free Evangelical Church of Germany. There are three ministers of this Church, who have just formed themselves into a presbytery. There are deacons and elders in the congregations, and an annual conference of elders. The conference has adopted the Westminster Shorter Catechism. The members of this Church aim at the conversion both of Jews and Gentiles. The Church has been fostered by one, himself a convert of the Jewish mission at Breslau, who takes a deep interest in Jewish missions."

III. Literature. — See Kux, *Organismus u. Statistik des preuss. Staates* (Leips. 1842, 2d ed.); Frantz, *Handb. des preuss. Staates* (Quedl. and Leips. 1854-55); Hase, *Church Hist.* § 288, 374, 453, 456; Hagenbach, *Church Hist. 18th and 19th Cent.* (see Index); Alzog, *Universal Kirchengesch.* (see Index in vol. ii); *Scriptures Rerum Prussicarum* (Lips. 1863 sq.); Voigt, *Gesch. Preussens*, vol. i, iv; Bender, *De Veterum Prutenorum Diis* (Braunsb. 1865); *Beitriage z. Kirchenyesch. des 19ten Jahrhunderts* (Augsb. 1835); Ellendorf, *Die kathol. Kirche Preussens* (Rudolfst. 1837); Ranke, *Memoirs of the House of Brandenburg and Hist. of Prussia* (Loui. 1849, 3 vols. 8vo); Krabbe, *Die evangel. Landeskirche Preussens* (Berl. 1849); Kurtz, *Church Hist.* ii, 56, 327, 401; Baur, *Religious Life in Germany* (Lond. 1870, 2 vols. 8vo); *Brit. and For. Ev. Rev.* Oct. 1875, art. iv; Dorner, *Hist. of Prot. Theol.* ii, 400 sq.; *Edinb. Rev.* April, 1874, art. iii; *Lend. Qu. Rev.* April, 1874, art. i; *Chambers's Cyclop.* s.v., which we have used in the treatment of secular history, though without accepting its extreme anti-Prussian expressions.

Prynne, William

famous in the history of English Puritanism, was born of a good family at Swanswick, in Somersetshire, 1600, and became a barrister-at-law and member of Lincoln's Inn at the time when Dr. Preston, a celebrated Puritan divine, was lecturer there. It was the period when the illegal operations of the Star-chamber and the courts of high commission had reduced England to a despotism equal to that of France, while the manners of the age were a scandal to religion and good morals. Marshal, Manton, Calamy, Burton, and other preachers in London kept alive the spirit of earnest piety and love of freedom which soon after produced the Commonwealth, when the mere sight of Burton, as Neale remarks, was a sermon against oppression. Prynne was a person of sour temper and austere practices, remarkable for his indefatigable devotion to his books. His name scarcely appears in the Law Reports of his time, and he never practiced at the bar to any considerable extent. He applied himself principally to the study of controversial divinity, and became a devoted follower of Dr. John Preston (q.v.). In accordance with the doctrines of the Puritans respecting Church government, he published, soon after he came to Lincoln's Inn, several tracts against Arminianism and against prelatial jurisdiction, by which, as well as by promoting and encouraging motions in the superior courts for prohibitions to the High Commission Court, he greatly exasperated archbishop Laud and the clergy against him. He was himself as ungentle as Laud. Prynne was as unspiritual in his religion, and as unsympathizing with the amenities of human nature. He tried all things by the dry logic which was to him allsufficient. Sometimes he would find a terrible sin in the wearing of long curls — love-locks, as they were called — by men, sometimes in wrong opinions on the subject of predestination. In 1632 he suddenly made his appearance with a virulent treatise entitled *Histriomastix, or a Scourge of the Stage-players*, a tedious work of more than a thousand pages, full of learning and curious quotations, and written against plays, masks, dancing, and especially against women actors. There was much room for the scourge of the satirist in the degraded state of the morals of the stage. Vile indecency tainted the highest dramatic efforts of the time, and even the noblest characters could not be introduced upon the stage unless they were smothered in a foul morass of seething corruption. But Prynne's work was too severe and too general in its sweeping denunciations to convince any one not convinced already. Bringing every charge under the sun against the players indiscriminately, he held them

responsible for every sin which the pages of history revealed to have been committed by their predecessors in Greece or Rome; but all this could not have brought the sad consequences that followed. Some passages in this work were supposed to be levelled against the queen, who had acted in a pastoral performed at Somerset House; and the language of the book was certainly, like most others of that age, anything but refined and complimentary. The real cause of offence, in the eyes of archbishop Laud, who originated the prosecution against Prynne, was, of course, far other than this libellous matter — namely, the opposition of Prynne and his entire party to the Arminian system and the jurisdiction of the bishops. The information included both the aspersions of the author against the queen and the lords of the council for their share in the diversions of the age, and his commendation of “factious persons.” The cause was tried before the Star-chamber, and the condemnation of Prynne was a matter of course. After a full hearing, he was sentenced to have his book burned by the common hangman, to be degraded from the bar and turned out of the society of Lincoln’s Inn, to be degraded at Oxford, to stand twice in the pillory at Westminster and Cheapside, and to lose one of his ears at each place, to pay a fine of £5000, and then to be imprisoned for life. This must have been a moderate sentence in the eyes of some of the lords of the council, for the earl of Dorset addressed the prisoner in these words: “Mr. Prynne, I declare you to be a schism-maker in the Church, a sedition-sower in the commonwealth, a wolf in sheep’s clothing; in a word, *omnium malorum nequissimus*. I shall fine him £10,000, which is more than he is worth, yet less than he deserves. I will not set him at liberty, no more than a plagued man, or a mad dog, who, though he can’t bite, will foam. He is so far from being a social soul that he is not a rational soul. He is fit to live in dens with such beasts of prey as wolves and tigers like himself; therefore, I condemn him to perpetual imprisonment; and for corporal punishment I should have him branded in the forehead, slit in the nose, and have his ears chopped off.” Prynne’s sentence, outrageous as it was, was not received with that general indignation which it would have called forth two or three years later. The Inns of Court, who had been roused by his wholesale condemnation of the drama to spend thousands of pounds on a gorgeous mask, which they presented to the king, and some who afterwards took the foremost part in resistance to the court, joined now in approval of its measures. The prison with which Laud rewarded Prynne’s enormous folio, however, in no wise tamed this most obstinate and narrow-minded of men. Three years afterwards, while in the Tower under

the above sentence, he issued from its walls a new tract, attacking the bishops as devouring wolves and lords of Lucifer. It was entitled *News from Ipswich*, and sorely reflected upon Laud and the hierarchy generally. For this publication he was again prosecuted in the Star-chamber, and sentenced to pay a fine of 5000, to be set in the pillory, to be branded on both cheeks with the letters S and L (Seditious Libeller), to lose the remainder of his ears, and to be closely imprisoned for life in Caernarvon Castle. The usual consequence of undue severity appeared in the popular sympathy and party spirit which these outrageous sentences excited. The Puritan friends of Prynne flocked to Caernarvon Castle in such numbers that it was thought necessary to change the scene of his confinement; and after he had been at Caernarvon about ten weeks, he was illegally removed, by a warrant from the lords of the council, to the castle of the Mont Orgueil, in the island of Jersey. Here he remained until the beginning of the Long Parliament, in 1641, when, upon his petition to the House of Commons, he was released by a warrant from the Speaker, and resolutions were passed declaring, very truly, both the sentences against him in the Star-chamber to be contrary to law. Clarendon and Anthony Wood describe the extraordinary demonstrations of popular feeling in his favor on his landing at Southampton and on his journey to London (*History of the Rebellion*, i, 199; *Athenoe Oxonienses*, iii, 848). Soon afterwards he was returned as a member of Parliament for Newport, in Cornwall, and about the same time was made a bencher at Lincoln's Inn. Besides, Parliament voted him, and the famous preacher Burton, and the physician Bastwick, two Puritans who were included with Prynne, money in compensation; but this they never got, in consequence of the disturbed state of the times. One of the principal fruits of this high-handed proceeding of the law was the rousing of the nation to indignant protests against those in authority, and preparing the way for the changes of government that ensued; yet to the credit of Prynne be it said that, notwithstanding all the injustice with which he was treated, and the cruelty that was inflicted upon him. he took no part in the violent proceedings of the later years of the Long Parliament. Quite to the contrary, immediately before the king's trial Prynne was ordered into the custody of the serjeant-at-arms for "denying the supremacy of Parliament" in a pamphlet entitled *The Memento* (Rushworth, *Collections*, ii, 1389). On Dec. 6 he was arrested by the army, and, together with many of his party, ejected from the House of Commons. From this time he became a bitter enemy of Cromwell and the army party, and, in consequence of his writings against them, was again imprisoned for several

years at Dunster Castle, in Somersetshire, and Pendennis Castle, in Cornwall. He was expressly disabled by Parliament “to officiate or be in any office concerning the administration of justice within the commonwealth.” In the early part of the year 1660, having returned to his seat in the House of Commons as an excluded member, he is said, in a letter to General Monk (Winwood, *Memorials*, vol. iii), to have “exceedingly asserted the king’s right,” but with so much of his characteristic bitterness and imprudence that Monk sent for him and admonished him to be quiet. Upon the dissolution of the Parliament, in March, 1660, he was elected to serve in the new Parliament for the city of Bath. Soon after the Restoration he was appointed keeper of the records in the Tower, an office for which his habits of study peculiarly fitted him, and which furnished him with the opportunity of compiling his laborious and useful collections respecting constitutional and parliamentary history. He died in that office in 1669. Wood calculates that he wrote a sheet of MS. for every day of his lifetime after reaching man’s estate. “His custom was, when he studied, to put on a long quilted cap, which came an inch over his eyes, serving as an umbrella, to defend them from too much light; and, seldom eating a dinner, would every three hours or more be munching a roll of bread, and would now and then refresh his exhausted spirits with ale. To this (says the editor of Neale) Butler seems to allude in his address to his muse:

*‘Thou that with ale or viler liquors
Didst inspire Withers, Prynne, or Vicars,
And teach them, though it were in spite
Of nature and their stars, to write.’”*

His works amount to forty volumes, folio and quarto. The most valuable, and a very useful performance, is his *Collection of Records*, in four large volumes. Prynne proposed to illustrate and prove in these the supremacy of the kings of England in all ecclesiastical affairs within the realm by records taken from the earliest periods of English history to the reign of Elizabeth. He only completed the design to the reign of Henry III. See *English Cyclop.* s.v.; Appleton, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.; Greene, *Short Hist. of the Engl. People*, p. 515 sq.; Gardiner, *Hist. of the Puritan Revol.* ch. v; Stoughton, *Eccles. Hist. of Engl.* i, 24, 43, 89, 121, 153, 455; Perry, *Hist. Engl. Ch.* vols. i and ii; Collier, *Ecclesiastes Hist.*; Clarendon, *Hist. of the Rebellion*, bk.3; D’Israeli, *Miscell.* p. 111 sq.; Knight, *Popular Hist. of England*, vol.

3, ch. 19; Hume, *Hist. of England*, ch. lii et al.; and the copious article in Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v. (J. H.W.)

Prytaneum

(*πρυτανεῖον*) was the common house of an ancient Greek city or state in which a sacred fire was kept constantly burning in honor of *Vesta*. It was an appropriate building, where, in the name of the city or state, the magistrates, known as the Prytanes, brought suitable offerings to the venerated goddess. The fire-service observed in honor of *Vesta* was distinguished by the name of *Prytanistis*. The temple which was called prytaneum was of a round form, in order, as some have supposed, to represent the figure of the earth, and, according to others, to represent the centre of the universe. Plutarch thus speaks on the subject: It is also said that Numa built the temple of *Vesta*, where the perpetual fire was to be kept, in an orbicular form, not intending to represent the figure of the earth, as if that was meant by *Vesta*, but the frame of the universe, in the centre of which the Pythagoreans place the element of fire, and give it the name of *Vesta* and *Unity*. The earth they suppose not to be without motion, nor situated in the centre of the world, but to make its revolution round the sphere of fire, being neither one of the most valuable nor principal parts of the great machine. Plato, too, in his old age, is reported to have been of the same opinion, assigning the earth a different situation from the centre, and leaving that, as the place of honor, to a nobler element." If the sacred fire in the prytaneum was accidentally extinguished, or even if it continued burning, the vestal virgins invariably renewed it every year on the calends of March by collecting the solar rays in a concave vessel of brass. From the fire which was kept burning in the prytaneum of the parent state, the sacred fire was supplied to each of its colonies or dependent states. Thucydides states that, before the time of Theseus, a prytaneum was to be found in every city or state of Attica. The prytaneum of Athens was originally built on the Acropolis, but afterwards it stood near the *agora*, or forum.

Psalm

SEE PSALMODY; SEE PSALMS, BOOK OF.

Psalmanazar, George

a remarkable impostor in the religions and literary world, was born, probably, in the year 1680, and was of French origin. He received his education partly in a free school taught by two Franciscan monks, and afterwards in a college of Jesuits in an archiepiscopal city, the name of which, as also that of his birthplace and of his parents, remains unknown. Upon leaving the college, he was recommended as a tutor to a young gentleman, but soon fell into a mean, rambling kind of life that produced in him plenty of disappointments and misfortunes. The first pretence he took up with was that of being a sufferer for religion; and he procured a certificate that he was of Irish extraction, had left the country for the sake of the Roman Catholic religion, and was going on a pilgrimage to Rome. Not being in a condition to purchase a pilgrim's garb, he had observed, in a chapel dedicated to a miraculous saint, that such a one had been set up as a monument of gratitude by some wandering pilgrim; and he contrived to take both staff and cloak away at noonday. "Being thus accoutred," says he, "and furnished with a pass, I began, at all proper places, to beg my way in a fluent Latin, accosting only clergymen or persons of figure, by whom I could be understood, and found them mostly so generous and credulous that I might easily have saved money and put myself into a much better dress before I had gone through a score or two of miles." His next trick was to impose on men in the garb of a soldier, menial preceptor, beggar, or vagrant nondescript, living on his wits as he could, according to the whim or necessity of the hour. In the course of his wanderings, he was thrown into the companionship of a colonel Lauder at Sluys, to whom he gave himself out under the name by which he is so celebrated, representing himself as a Japanese convert to Christianity, and native of the island of Formosa. The chaplain of the regiment took Psalmanazar to England, and he instantly became the religious lion of the day, his patron (who was a man equally acute and unprincipled) skilfully availing himself of the connection to secure for himself preferment in the Church. Different ecclesiastical dignitaries contended for the honor of being serviceable to him; and through the influence of the bishop of Oxford, apartments were assigned him at the university, in order that he might prosecute his studies there. The talent, ingenuity, and resource which he displayed in keeping up the deception go far to account for what may seem to us the strange credulity 'with which his story was received. He published, in Latin, a fabulous account of the island of Formosa, the consistency and

verisimilitude of which imposed upon the learned world. He also invented a language, compact and somewhat complex in structure, and was able, in virtue of a memory not less than astonishing, to defy the ordinary methods of detection. In the midst of his success, however, at the age of about thirty-two, he became the subject of religious impressions, and his conscience awoke to the ignominy of the deceit which he was practicing. Urged by what seems to have been a genuine feeling of penitence, he withdrew himself from public notice, and for the rest of his long life honorably earned his livelihood by literature, in which he had a moderate success. Besides much assiduous compilation for the booksellers, of history, geography, and the like, he published several works anonymously, one of which, *An Essay on Miracles, by a Layman*, was for some time exceedingly popular, and another a version of the Psalms. On his death in London in 1762, it was found that he had also busied himself in preparing for posthumous publication an account of his curious career, which, under the title *Memoirs of—commonly known as George Psalmanazar, a reputed native of Formosa, written by himself*, was some years after given to the world. See the art. in Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* s.v., and the references there given; *Chambers's Cyclop.* s.v.; *National Repository* (April, 1878), p. 376.

Psalmister (Lat. Psalmista) Or Psaltes (Singer)

one of the inferior orders in the early Church, mentioned first by the Council of Laodicea. The form used in their designation was, according to the fourth Council of Carthage, "See that thou believest in thine heart what thou singest with thy mouth, and approve in works what thou believest in thy heart." *SEE PRECENTOR*. The psaltes went up into the *ambo*, or reading-desk, and sang out of a book. That such a mode of conducting public worship was only intended to be for a time is evident from the circumstance that several of the fathers of the Church mention this practice as existing in their time of the people singing all together. The order of psaltes, on their appointment to office, required no imposition of hands or solemn consecration, but simply received their office from a presbyter, who used the form of words as laid down by the Council of Carthage and given above.

Psalmody, Ancient.

By this term we mean the singing of sacred songs as an act of worship; and in this article we shall speak only of its use in public worship, and we shall use the term in its most inclusive sense. In doing so, we substantially adopt the art. in Kitto's *Cyclopaedia*.

The simple idea of psalmody is the expression of religious feeling in lyrical poetry and in musical cadence. Rhythmical song seems to be the instinctive utterance of all strong emotion. Savage nations express themselves in language of natural poetry, uttered in the cadence of a rude chant or musical recitative. In worship, the use of poetry and music is coeval with society (Plato, *De Legib.* lib. iii, c. 15; Lowth, *Heb. Poetry*, lect. 1). Homer wrote hymns to the gods; Orpheus was a priest-musician, the tamer and sanctifier by his lyre of whatever was rude and godless. The muses were chiefly employed in the service of the gods (Phurnutus, *De Natura Deorum*, p. 157, ed. Gale), from which some of them — e.g. Melpomene, Terpsichore, Polymnia — derived their names. Clemens Alexandrinus tells us that a chief part of the worship of the Egyptians consisted in singing hymns to their gods: "First, a singer goes before, bringing forth some one thing of the symbols of music; and they say that he ought to take two books out of those of Hermes, the one containing the hymns of the gods, the other the method of a royal life... There are ten things which are suitable to the honor of their gods, and comprise the Egyptian religion, viz. sacrifices, first-fruits, hymns, prayers, shows, feasts, and such-like things" (*Stromat.* 6:633, ed. Paris). Porphyry confirms this. The Egyptians, he says, devote "the day to the worship of their gods, in which, three or four times — viz. morning and evening, noon and sunsetting — they sing hymns unto them" (*De Abstinent.* 4:8). Concerning the Indians, he says. "they spend the greatest part of the day and night in prayers and hymns to the gods" (*ibid.* 12, 18; see also *Vita Pythag.* p. 200, ed. Cantab.). A remarkable passage occurs in the writings of Arrianus, the Stoic philosopher. "If" says he, "we are intelligent creatures, what else should we do, both in public and private, than to sing a hymn to the Deity, to speak well of him, and give thanks unto him? Should we not, whether digging or ploughing or eating, sing a hymn to God?" etc. (Arrian, *Epictet.* i, 16; also iii, 26). Herodotus tells us that Homer got great credit for composing hymns to the gods (*De Vita Homeri.* c. 9). Rewards were given in the Pythian games to those who sang the best hymns to the gods (Pausanias in *Phocicis*, lib. x). The apostate Julian recommends that many of the

excellent hymns to the gods be committed to memory, most of which, he says, were composed by the gods, some few by men inspired by a divine spirit (*Opera*, p. 551, ed. Paris). Sacred song, therefore, is no peculiarity of revealed religion. It rests upon deep instincts of human nature, perhaps of all intelligent moral nature; for at the creation “the morning stars sang together for joy,” at the nativity angelic song was heard by the shepherds of Bethlehem. and in the final heaven both angels and redeemed men are represented as singing rapturous songs before the throne.

In defining sacred song as the utterance of strong emotion, we do not restrict it to praise, although praise is the most natural and prominent form of it. Deep sorrow and earnest prayer may also find their fitting expression in musical song. Augustine thus defines the more technical and Christian conception of a hymn: “Hymnus est cantus cum laude Dei; si cantus est et non laudas Deum, non dicis Iymnum; si laudas aliquid quod non pertinet ad laudem Dei, non dicis hymnum” (*Psalms* 148). Church song is restricted to lyrical poetry, for this alone can express the consentaneous emotion of a congregation. It excludes, therefore, didactic poetry, which expounds doctrines or analyzes feelings or inculcates duties; and it excludes dramatic poetry, which expresses passion by action. It is also more than mere lyrical poetry: it is lyrical poetry which assumes the pure truth of God, and gives expression to the deep religious feeling which it excites. A hymn is an outburst of religious life.

In its form, worship-song may be either rhythmical or metrical; the former was its primitive and more uncultured form; the latter is its subsequent and more artistic form. The former is exemplified in the Hebrew psalms and the Greek Christian hymns; the latter in the Latin hymns of Ambrose and Gregory, and in the subsequent hymnology of the Western Church. Each of course requires a corresponding form of music — the rhythmical hymn, a musical and *ad libitum* recitative, closing with a cadence, technically known as a “chant;” the metrical hymn, a metrical tune. The anthem differs from both, in that it consists of certain rhythmical or metrical words set to specific music, which seeks to bring out their special emphasis, and is incapable of being used to any other. The anthem is, characteristically, the performance of choirs, and not the worship of the congregation. In public worship, sacred song, may be either the singing of a choir to which the congregation are auditors, or the united act of the entire body of worshippers, the choir and organ simply leading and accompanying it. Without denying to the former the character of worship, it is obvious that it

is worship only in a very restricted and imperfect sense. It is worship of a much higher and more catholic character for the whole congregation to unite in the utterance of religious feeling. Hence, as a rule, no composition should be allowed in congregational worship too artistic or too intricate for congregational use. On the other hand, every kind of composition is legitimate that a congregation can use, and through which it can express the emotions of its spiritual life. Neither rhythmical psalm nor metrical hymn has any natural or legislative prerogative or sacredness in the Church of God.

The manner of singing, again, whether unisonal, as in the early Church, or in part harmony, as in the modern Church; whether antiphonal, between choir and congregation, or between one part of the congregation and another, as in many of the Jewish psalms, or universal and continuous by the whole congregation, is immaterial, so long as the best expression of religious feeling is secured.

In the Bible, the use and importance of sacred song are fully recognised, and large provision for it is made. The earliest fragment of song in the Bible is not sacred. Lamech expresses himself in a snatch of song which has all the characteristics of later Temple poetry.

The Jews seem almost to have restricted their use of poetry and music to divine worship, probably because their theocracy so identified their national and their religious life as that the expression of the one was the expression of the other. Music and song were joined in holy marriage, and presented themselves hand in hand to worship before the Lord.

The first record of Hebrew worship-song is the great outburst of the newly liberated life of the people on the borders of the Red Sea, where Miriam provided for the expression of their praise in her magnificent song. This is the earliest specimen of choral song that the world possesses. It was probably sung antiphonally — Miriam and the women on the one side, answered by Moses and the men on the other.

We have minute accounts of the musical service of the Tabernacle and of the Temple, as arranged by David and Solomon; and especially of the great musical celebration at the dedication of the latter, when we are told that Jehovah especially responded to the invocation of worshipping song (⁴¹⁵²2 Chronicles 5:12-14).

Beyond all question the Temple service was the most magnificent choral worship that the world has seen., On great occasions the choir consisted of four thousand singers and players (^{<1226>}1 Chronicles 23:5; 25); the statements of Josephus (*Ant.* 8:3) are evidently greatly exaggerated. Its psalmody would consist, first, of such compositions as had been written by Moses and others, with those of David, Asaph, etc. Some of David's early psalms seem to have been adapted for Temple use (comp. Psalm 18 with 2 Samuel 22). Others were doubtless composed specially for it. Hence most of David's psalms, in the collection of Hebrew poetry so designated, are inscribed "To the chief musician." From time to time fresh contributions of sacred song would be made. As we possess it, the book of Psalms was certainly not the Temple psalter. It is a collection, or rather a combination of four or five separate collections, of Hebrew poetry, of long and gradual accumulation, containing the Temple psalms, but containing also many pieces neither meant nor fitting to be sung. Hence the ritual and religious absurdity of singing indiscriminately through the whole. Hippolytus, writing in the 3d century, assigns the various authorship of the collection as a reason why no author's name is affixed to it (Hippolytus *On the Psalms*, quoted by Bunsen, *Christianity and Mankind*, i, 458; see also *ibid.* ii, 176; Josephus, *Ant.* 7:12, 3).

From the structure of some of the psalms, as well as from some expressions contained in them, it is certain that they were sung antiphonally, probably by two choirs responding to each other. Some of the psalms, the 24th, for instance, were evidently alternated between the priest and the people. Among the various suppositions concerning the meaning of the word "Selah," one is that it is the sign of a great chorus-shout of the people. See also ^{<0986>}1 Samuel 18:6; Nehemiah 9; ^{<1580>}Ezra 3:10; ^{<2301>}Isaiah 6:1-3; bishop Lowth *On Hebrew Poetry*, lect. xix; Wheatley *On the Common Prayer*, ch. iii, § 9.

From ^{<1227>}1 Chronicles 25:7 it appears that Church music was formally taught in the Jewish schools.

That Jewish song was celebrated throughout the East is implied in the ironical request of the Babylonians that their poor captives would "sing them one of the songs of Zion."

It is to be observed that the singing of the Temple was no part of the Levitical ritual; it was a fitting worship, independent of the specific

economy with which it was connected. It has, therefore, a certain permanent authority as a scriptural precedent of worship-song.

Concerning the music used in the Jewish Temple we have no certain traditions. The very meaning of the musical accents in the book of Psalms is unknown. Carl Engel (*Music of the most Ancient Nations*. ch. vi) supposes that the musical system of the Hebrews, as indeed of all the East, was derived from the Assyrians, concerning whose musical knowledge, hitherto unsuspected, much interesting information has been derived from the sculptures discovered by Mr. Layard and Mr. Botta. It is probable that David, who was musician as well as poet, composed music for the use of his psalms in public worship. From the structure of Hebrew poetry this would necessarily be a musical recitative, or "chant;" and as adapted for the use of worshipping thousands, it would probably be very simple in character. Whether the Jews had any form of written music or not, or whether the music of their Temple psalms was learned by the ear, and traditionally handed down from generation to generation, is unknown. Certainly no trace of written music has come down to us. It is to be presumed that the music originally set to David's psalms would be perpetuated from age to age; and that therefore the music to which our Lord and his disciples sang the lesser Hallel on the "night on which he was betrayed," and the music to which Paul and Silas sang their prison songs, would be the old traditional Temple music. The tradition is that the Peregrine Tone was the music to which the lesser Hallel was sung. All this, however, is pure conjecture. There is not a particle of historical proof to throw light upon it. Nor is this to be wondered at, considering the dispersions and the unparalleled sufferings of the Jews, and when it is remembered that we are equally ignorant of the music of the Greeks and the Romans.

At the dispersion, Temple-song ceased. Burney says, some Hebrew high-priest being his informant, "that all instrumental, and even vocal performances have been banished from the synagogue ever since the destruction of Jerusalem; that the little singing now in use there is an innovation and a modern license; for the Jews, from a passage in one of the prophets, think it unlawful, or at least unfit, to sing or rejoice before the coming of the Messiah, till when they are bound to mourn and repent in silence" (*Hist. of Music*, 1, 251). It is probable, however, that although at the dispersion the Temple music was forever silenced, yet that synagogue worship would be speedily restored, and that, as far as possible, its services

would be based upon the old Temple prayers and psalms, and that the traditional melodies of the latter would be sung to them.

The first recorded uninspired psalmody of the synagogue is not earlier than the 10th century, when Saadiah Gaon first introduced rhyme into Hebrew poetry. On this subject, see *Prayers of the Spanish and Portuguese Israelites, with English Translation*, by the Rev. D. A. de Sola; Steinschneider, *Jewish Lit.* (Lond. 1857); Charisi, *Jewish Lit., from the 8th to the 18th Century*, ch. 18.

No existing Jewish melodies can be proved to be of any antiquity, compared with some Christian melodies. Purely traditional, their origin is unknown. The utmost that can be said is that for some four or five centuries they have been handed down *memoriter*. As we possess them they are unmistakably modern in their forms; but then it is possible that beneath these modern forms there may be a very ancient substance. The Rev. D. A. de Sola (*Ancient Melodies of the Liturgy of the Spanish and Portuguese Jews*) says that a tradition exists that the “Birchat Cohanim” is identical with the melody used in the Temple for the blessing of the priests (^{<4162>}Numbers 6:22-26), and that it is supported by great probability, almost amounting to direct proof. The “Song of Moses” is also supposed to be the melody sung by Miriam. But this is pure conjecture. See also Maimonides, ch. 14:§ 14; Lightfoot, *Temple Service*; Bingham, *Antiquities*, vol. 14; Carl Engel, *Music of the most Ancient Nations*, ch. 6.

In the Sept. the word ὕμνος and its cognates are used as representing several Hebrew words; but in almost every case the reference is to songs of praise or thanksgiving to God. In the New Test. this is the invariable usage of the terms.

In the Christian Scriptures very little is said concerning sacred song. Matthew and Mark very touchingly record the conformity of our Lord, not to any divine command, but to a traditional custom, when he and his disciples, after the institution of the Supper, “sang a hymn” (ὕμνήσαντες) before they went out to the Mount of Olives (^{<4163>}Matthew 26:30; ^{<4165>}Mark 14:26). There is every reason to believe that what was sung on this occasion was the latter part of the Hallel, the usual Passover psalms of thanksgiving (Psalm 16-19). **SEE HALLEL**. When Paul and Silas were imprisoned at Philippi, “at midnight they prayed and sang praises unto God” (ὕμνουσιν τὸν θεόν, ^{<4165>}Acts 16:25). Whether what they sang were some of the ancient psalms or spontaneous utterances of adoration and

worship we have no means of determining. *SEE HYMN*. In his epistles to the Ephesians (^{<46B>}Ephesians 5:19) and to the Colossians (^{<50B6>}Colossians 3:16), the apostle Paul recognises and enjoins the use of sacred song. So does the apostle James (^{<50B3>}James 5:13). Michaelis and others suppose that such passages as ^{<40B>}Acts 4:24-30 are fragments of apostolic hymns. The Apocalypse contains some of the most magnificent bursts of worship-song. In the passages just cited of Ephesians and Colossians the apostle enjoins the use of hymns in the social worship of Christians, classing them with psalms and spiritual songs (**ψαλμοῖς καὶ ὕμνοις καὶ ᾠδαῖς πνευματικαῖς**). In what relation these stood to each other is a question which has occasioned considerable differences of opinion. According to some, the distinction between them was one of *subject*; according to others, it was merely one of *form*, having respect to the manner in which they were sung; while others contend that the *source* whence they were derived, and the *general character* of the composition, determined the difference between them. Under these leading opinions, endless differences of minor opinion have been advocated. Of those who adopt the first opinion is St. Jerome, who thinks that the hymn was devoted to the celebration of the divine majesty and goodness, that the psalm was occupied with themes of an ethical nature, and that the spiritual ode was occupied with things above, and the subtle discussion of the concert of the world, and the order and concord of creation (*Comment. in Eph. 5:19*). Others, again, who hold the same general view state the difference thus: The psalm belongs to ethics; the hymn, as setting forth the praises of God for redemption, to theology; and the ode, as celebrating the works of God in creation and providence, to natural science (Thomasius, *In Proefationibus*, p. 525). All this, however, is purely arbitrary. The second opinion was held by Augustine, Basil, Hilary, and others of the Christian fathers, and has been adopted by several in more recent times. By some who take this view, the distinction is supposed to lie in this, that the **ψαλμοί** were compositions which were chanted to the accompaniment of an instrument, the **ψαλτήριον**, the **ὕμνοι** songs of adoration uttered by the voice alone, and the **ᾠδαί**, short chants uttered also only by the voice (Augustine, *Enarrat. in Psalm 3*; Basil. Mag. *In Psalm 29*; Greg. Nyss. *Tr. 2 in Psalmos*, ch. iii, etc.); while others think that the distinction is to be determined by reference to the Hebrew terminology **מִזְמוֹר**, **מִזְמוֹרִים**, **מִזְמוֹרֵי**, which is in fact determining nothing, as the distinction between these is itself entirely uncertain. The third opinion is that of Beza (*Nov.*

Test. ad loc.) and Grotius (*Comment. ad* ~~1030~~ *Matthew* 26:30, et h. 1.); they think that by *psalms* are designated the sacred songs bearing that name collectively in the Old-Test. canon; by *hymns* such extemporaneous songs of praise as we have in the utterances of Deborah, Hannah, Zachariah, and Mary, and such as the apostle and his companion sang in the prison at Philippi; and by *odes* premeditated compositions of a more elaborate nature and stricter form than hymns. To this in the general, most subsequent inquirers have given their consent; only some think that the term “psalms” should not be restricted to the compositions bearing that name in the Old Test., but should be extended to all of a similar character which might be composed for the use of the Church in later times; and that by “spiritual odes” are to be understood specifically all sacred songs, of whatever kind, composed by special inspiration of the Holy Ghost (θεοπνευστοί). The former of these modifications is rendered almost imperative by ~~1031~~ 1 Corinthians 14:26; and the latter by the general sense of the adjective πνευματικός in the New Test. Not a few, despairing of satisfactorily discriminating these three kinds of sacred song, have contended that the apostle merely accumulates terms for the sake of force, and that no distinction between them is to be sought (Clem. Alex. *Poedag.* 2, 4, p. 565; Clericus, *In Not. apud Hammondii Annot.* ad loc., etc.); but this otiose method of disposing of the difficulty has been repudiated by most.

As to the *form* in which these early hymns of the Church were composed, we have no means of even approaching a certain conclusion. Among the Jewish Christians the chanting of the psalms was familiar, and it would be easy for them to compose hymns that could be sung to their accustomed tunes; but with the Gentile converts it would be somewhat different. Among the Greeks and Romans poetry had fixed metrical forms, to which the tunes of the Hebrews could not be adapted. There is no reason, however, to believe that the early Gentile Christians followed these metrical forms in their sacred poetry. The earliest specimens of Christian song extant — the hymn to Christ, preserved by Clemens of Alexandria; the evening hymn, referred to by Basil as in his time very ancient, handed down from the fathers (*De Spir. Sanc.* c. 29); and the morning hymn, which has been incorporated with the liturgy of the Church of England — have no traces of a metrical character, but are, like the Biblical hymns, adapted only for being chanted in recitative with a few and simple cadences. (“Primitiva ecclesia ita psallebat ut modico flexu vocis faceret psallentem resonare, ita ut pronuntianti vicinior esset quam canenti,”

Isidor. Hispal. *De Eccl. Offic.* i, 5.) Such singing would no doubt be new to the Gentile converts, but it would be speedily learned; and as they probably had very little sacred music of their own, they would hail with delight this accession to their sources of enjoyment, which served at the same time as a vehicle of the devotional feeling that had been kindled within them. It has been suggested that in 1 Corinthians 13 we have an apostolic hymn, and in ~~4054~~Ephesians 5:14; ~~5086~~1 Timothy 3:16; ~~5017~~James 1:17; ~~6005~~Revelation 1:5, 6; 15:3, etc., fragments of hymns sung in the apostolic churches; but this is mere conjecture, though not without some probability.

The early Christians used the Jewish psalms in their worship, which would almost certainly be sung to their traditional Temple music. G. B. Martini says (*Storia della Musica*, 1, 351): “This is the Hebrew chant of the psalmodies which ever since the time of David and Solomon has been transmitted from one generation to another, and [therefore] goes beyond the first half of the first age of the Church. These have not materially varied, but have been substantially preserved by the Hebrew nation. Is it not, then, sufficient to convince us that the apostles — who were born Hebrews, brought up in the customs of their nation, wont to frequent the Temple and engage in the prayers and divine praises therein recited — should retain the same method and use the same chants with which the people used to respond to the Levitical choir.” Forkel (*Geschichte der Musik*, 2, 188) says: “This mode of reading the Scriptures with cantilation or chant has been adopted in the Christian Church from the Temple, and is still preserved in the mode of chanting the collects, responses, etc.” See also Dr. Saalschutz, *Geschichte und Würdigung der Musik bei den Hebraern*, § 61.

Thus, while the destruction of the Temple and the dispersion of the Jews suspended Jewish worship, the singing of the psalms and the traditions of their melodies would be preserved in the Christian Church. If, therefore, we possess any vestiges of Jewish music at all, they are to be found in the Ambrosian or Gregorian tones. The Rev. J. W. Blakesley (*Four Months in Algeria*, p. 36) visited a synagogue in Algiers, and was surprised to find that “the air to which the psalms were chanted coincided almost exactly with one of the Gregorian tones.” Hardly can we suppose that the early Christians either originated a new music or adopted heathen music.

We have no record of the introduction into the Christian Church of uninspired hymnody. It would be only very gradually that Greek hymns, with corresponding music, would come into use. At first, probably, Christian hymns would be little more than centos of the Hebrew psalms, or evangelical imitations of them, or compositions after their model — the angels' song at the nativity, and the songs of Zacharias and Simeon leading the way. The earliest Christian hymns seem to have been simple glorifications of Christ.

Eusebius intimates that private individuals wrote hymns to Christ as God, which were generally sung (*H.E.* v, 38; 7:24; 2, 17). In his letter to Trajan, Pliny says, "The Christians are accustomed to sing alternately between themselves, and to praise Christ as a god" (Pliny, *Epist.* lib. 10:ep. 39), alluding probably to the *Gloria in Excelsis*, the morning hymn of the early Church.

The earliest extant fragment of Greek hymnody is found in the *Paedagoga* of Clemens Alexandrinus (*Opp.* p. 312, 313, Potter's ed.). Bunsen says, however, that this was never used in the public worship of the Church (*Christianity and Mankind*, 2, 156).

Three early Christian hymns are preserved in the venerable Alexandrian MS. as an appendix to the Old Test. psalms. The first is the morning hymn of the primitive Church, commencing with the introductory verse of the nativity song of the angels, hence called the Angelical Doxology. It is found in the liturgy of the Greek Church, whence, about the year 380, it was transferred by Hilary to the communion service of the Latin Church; thence again to the communion service of the English Church.

The other two are another short morning hymn in which the verse occurs, "Vouchsafe, O Lord, to keep us this day without sin," afterwards incorporated in the *Te Deum*; and an evening psalm, consisting of a cento of verses of the Old-Test. psalms.

Besides these, there is an evening hymn of the Greek Christians, "Ὕμνος τοῦ λυχνικοῦ," the "Hymn of the Kindling of the Lamp," corresponding to the "Ave Maria" hymns of Italy; concerning which Basil says, it is "so ancient that he knows not who is the author of it" (Bingham, bk. 13 ch. 5, § 5, 6).

The *Ter Sanctus*, or Seraphic Hymn, also belongs to the first three centuries, and is found in almost all the ancient liturgies. It is little more

than the Trisagium of the seraphim in Isaiah 6. See Palmer, *Origines Liturgicoe*, 2, 126.

These are the only fragments of Greek hymnody that have been preserved to us. Of course they are rhythmical, and would require a rhythmical tune or chant. Much of early Christian song was probably antiphonal (Socrates, *H.E.* 6:8; Theodoret, *H.E.* ii, 24; as also Hahn, *Ueber den Gesang in der Syrischen Kirche*, p. 54).

The hymnody of the Syrian churches was much more copious. They had an ampler music and poets of higher inspiration. Its invention is attributed by Ephraem Syrus to the Gnostic Bardesanes (*Hon.*, *ad Haeret.* 53, quoted by Dr. Burgess in his *Introd. to the Select Metrical Hymns and Homilies of Ephraem Syrus*, p. 30). Metres were called after his name. Next to him as an author of Syrian hymnody stands his son Harmonius, who is said to have invented new metres. Ephraem Syrus flourished in the 4th century. For an account of his contributions, see Burgess, *Metrical Hymns*, and Introduction. The Benedictine preface to the works of Ephraem Syrus, vol. 5, says: "While the Greeks reduced their sacred hymnology to about eight tunes, and to this day confine themselves to these limits, the Syrians expatiate on 275, which their ecclesiastical books exhibit here and there, inscribing the proper tunes at the beginning of individual hymns." The Syrians are said to have possessed a hymnology of twelve or fourteen thousand hymns.

Great use was made of hymnody by the early heretics; by the Gnostic Bardesanes, who endeavored to supersede the Hebrew Psalter by one of his own, containing also 150 psalms (Theodoret, *Haeret. Fab.* 209); by Paul of Samosata, who largely beguiled the faithful by his captivating hymns and music (Eusebius, *H. E.* 7. 30); by the Donatists in Africa, who adapted their hymns to common airs of a wild and passionate character, thereby inflaming the enthusiasm of the people as with a trumpet (Augustine, *Confess.*); and by Arius, who made the streets of Constantinople resound with ballads written to well-known and seductive melodies, sung in torchlight processions.

Patristic notices of early Christian hymnology are very numerous; our limits forbid more than mere reference to a few, in addition to those already given. Justin Martyr, *Apol.* 2; Tertullian, *Apol. contra Gent.* c. 39; *De Anima*, c. 3; *De Jejunio*; Cyprian, *Epist. ad Donat.*; Origen, *Contra Cels.* lib. 8:c. 67; Eusebius, *i.e.* lib. ii, c. 17; lib. v, c. 28; lib. 7 c. 24; lib. 8 c. 9;

Apost. Const. lib. 20:c. 57; Athanasius, *Ep.* 7, *ad Licet.*; Basil *In Psalmos*; Gregory of Nyssa, *Psalm 2*; Jerome, *Comm. Eph.* lib. 3, c. 5; *Epist.* 17, *ad Marcell. Epist. ad Uxorem.*, lib. ii, c. 8; Ambrose, *Hexam.* lib. iii, c. 5; Augustine, *Confess.* lib. 9 sec. 14, 15, 31; lib. 10 sec. 49, 50; Chrysostom, *On the 41st Psalm*; Hilary, quoted by Bingham, bk. 13 ch. 5, § 7. See also Neander, Kurtz, and other Church histories; Milman, *Hist. of Christianity*, vol. iii, bk. ii, ch. iii, iv. See also Deyling, *Hymni a Christianis decantandi, Obs. Sac.* iii, 430; Walch, *De Hymnis Eccl. Apostol.* (1737); Illiger, *De Psal. Hymns. atque Odar. Sac. Discrimine* (Viteb. 1720); Gerbert, *De Cantu et Musica a Primo Eccl. Statu usque ad Praesens Tenupus* (Bamb. et Frib. 1774, 2 vols. 4to); Bingham, *Antiquities*, bk. 14:ch. ii; *Works*, 4:447 sq.; Rheinwald, *Christl. Archaeologie*, p. 262. For collections and specimens of ancient hymns, see *Poetce Graeci Christiani, una cum Homericis Centonibus ex Sanctor. Patr. Opp. collecti in usum Gymnas. Soc. Jesu* (Paris, 1609); Maggi, *Sacri Himni che si leggono in tutto anno nella Santa Chiesa* (Venet. 1567); *Hymni Ecclesime e Breviario Parisiensi* (Oxon. 1838); [Faber] *Hymns translated from the Parisian Breviary* (Lond. 1839); Daniel, *Thesaurus Hymnologicus* (Hal. et Lips. 1841-55, 3 vols.); Burgess, *Select Metrical hymns and Homilies of Ephraem Syrus* (Lond. 1853); Trench, *Sacred Latin Poetry* (ibid. 1849); Mrs. Barrett Browning, *The Greek Christian Poets* (ibid. 1863). **SEE HYMNOLOGY.**

Psalmody, Christian.

Those who refuse to accept the use of hymns in public worship interpret as sacred songs only the Psalms of David, and restrict the term to the singing of metrical versions of the Psalms to short, simple airs. They do this on the ground that psalm-singing alone was practiced in Jewish worship, and that among the earliest Christians the only sacred songs were the Psalms. Psalmody, thus interpreted, means the singing of metrical versions of the Psalms to short, simple airs.

The service of the primitive Christian Church usually began with reading, or with the singing of psalms. The charge of Pliny the Younger against the Christians was that they sang psalms to Christ “quasi Deo.” No authentic record, however, exists of the kind of melodies sung to the psalms by those ancient Christians, nor are we to understand that their psalmody was performed in one course at the opening of the service, but rather that they afforded a most agreeable and delightful introduction to the service, through which they were interspersed, probably very much as hymns are in

modern Christian service. Nor were the Psalms the only sacred songs employed in the service of the early Church. *SEE HYMNOLOGY; SEE MUSIC; SEE POETRY*. Psalmody was always esteemed a considerable part of devotion in the Christian Church. The service of the early Church usually opened with psalmody; but the author of the Apostolical Constitutions prescribes first the reading of the Old Test., and then the Psalms. The service was usually performed in the standing posture; and as to the manner of pronunciation, the plain song was sometimes used, being a gentle inflection of the voice, not much different from reading, like the chant in cathedrals; at other times more artificial compositions were used, like our anthems. As to the persons concerned in singing, sometimes a single person sang alone, but the most ancient and general practice of the Church was for the whole assembly to unite with one heart and voice in celebrating the praises of God. After a time alternate psalmody was introduced, when the congregation, dividing themselves into two parts, repeated the psalms by courses, verse for verse, one in response to another, and not, as formerly, all together. The mode of singing all together was called symphony, while the alternate mode was termed antiphony, and in the West *responsonia*, the singing by responsals. This latter manner of conducting the psalmody originated in the Eastern Church, and is attributed to bishop Ignatius of Antioch, who flourished in the early part of the 2d century. It passed into the Western in the time of Ambrose, bishop of Milan. But in a short time *antiphonal* (q.v.) singing became the general practice of the whole Church, and the ecclesiastical historian Socrates informs us that the emperor Theodosius the Younger and his sisters were accustomed to sing alternate hymns together every morning in the royal palace. Augustine was deeply affected on hearing the Ambrosian Chant at Milan, and describes his feelings in these words: "The voices flowed in at my ears, truth was distilled into my heart, and the affection of piety overflowed in sweet tears of joy." Eusebius tells us that Ambrose brought his famous melodies to Milan from Antioch. These Ambrosian melodies, and the mode of their performance by canonical singers, continued in the Western Church till the time of Gregory the Great, who was devotedly zealous in the cultivation of sacred music, having been the first to introduce singing-schools at Rome. Gregory separated the chanters from the clerical order, and exchanged the Ambrosian Chant for a style of siniging named, after himself, the *Gregorian Chant* (q.v.), besides introducing musical notation by Roman letters.

It seems to be a point fully established that antiphonal singing, and, as Sir John Hawkins considers it, the commencement of Church music, originated in the churches of the East, particularly those of Antioch, Cuesarea, and Constantinople. The Greek fathers, Basil and Chrysostom, were the original instructors of the choral service in their respective churches. From the East Ambrose carried it to Milan, whence it was transferred to Rome, and afterwards passed into France, Germany, and Britain. Pope Damasus ordained the alternate singing of the Psalms, along with the *Gloia Patri and Hallelujah*; in A.D. 384, Siricius introduced the Authem; in A.D. 507, Symmachus appointed the *Gloria in Excelsis* to be sung; and in A.D. 690 the Gregorian Chant was brought into use. When Gregory, in A.D. 620, sent his chant into Britain, such was the opposition manifested to its introduction into the Church that 1200 of the clergy fell in the tumult which ensued; and it was not until fifty years after, when pope Vitalian sent Theodore the Greek to fill the vacant see of Canterbury, that the British clergy were prevailed upon to admit the cathedral service in accordance with the Romish ritual. Besides the psalms, which had been used from the earliest times, and short doxologies and hymns consisting of verses from the Holy Scriptures, spiritual songs, especially those from Ambrose of Milan and Hilary of Poitiers, came to be used in public worship in the Western Church. The *Te Deum*, often styled “the Song of St. Ambrose.” is generally supposed to have been composed jointly by him and St. Augustine early in the 4th century, though archbishop Usher ascribes it to Nicetius, and supposes it not to have been composed till about A.D. 500. Considerable opposition, it is true, was manifested to the introduction of such mere human compositions into divine worship, but the unobjectionable purity of their sentiments led to their adoption by many churches. The complaint, however, began to be raised that Church music had deviated from its ancient simplicity. It was especially objected that secular music, or an imitation of the light airs of the theatre, was introduced in the devotions of the Church. It was also objected that more regard was had to the sweetness of the composition than to the sense and meaning; thereby pleasing the ear, without raising the affections of the soul. Thus the Egyptian abbot Pambo, in the 4th century, inveighed against the introduction of heathen melodies into the psalmody of the Church. About this time Church music began to be cultivated more according to rule. In addition to the Psalter and canonical singers, Church choristers were appointed, who sang sometimes alone, sometimes illterchangeably with the choirs of the congregation. Inn the 4th century the custom began

to be introduced into some churches of having a single person lead the psalmody, who began the verse, and the people joined him in the close. *SEE ACROSTICS*; *SEE HYPOPSALMA*. This individual was called the *phonascus* or *precentor*, and he is mentioned by Athanasius as existing in his time in the Church of Alexandria. But difficulties and abuses arose from the growing neglect of musical cultivation; and, with a view of restoring public decency and order, the Council of Laodicea, in the year 363, considered it necessary to forbid the laity to sing in church at all, except in certain simple chants of a popular description. One principal reason was probably the adoption by the Arians of hymnology as a means of spreading their heresy. At first the difficulty had been overcome by providing similar compositions for the orthodox. Augustine himself made a psalm of many parts, in imitation of the 119th, to preserve his people from the errors of the Donatists. Hilary and Ambrose likewise made many hymns, which were sung in their respective churches. (A complete collection of all the ancient hymns, etc., in use in the different services of the Romish Church has been published by Hermann Adalbert Daniel, entitled *Thesaurus Hymnologicus*, etc. [Halle, 1841 sq.])

Down to the Reformation, the music of the Church was thus pretty much surrendered to the clergy and trained musicians, and there were obstacles besides the mere ordinances of the Church. The words of the songs were in Latin, a tongue foreign to the people. The music was of a nature so elaborately complex that none could take part in it unless they had studied music as a science. Yet psalmody was not entirely lost during the dark ages. The study of sacred music received peculiar attention in the 6th century, schools for instruction in this important art having been established and patronized by Gregory the Great, under whom they obtained great celebrity. From these schools originated the famous Gregorian Chant, which the choir and people sang in unison. Such schools rapidly increased in number, and at length became common in various parts of Europe, particularly in France and Germany. The prior, or principal, of these schools was held in high estimation, and possessed extensive information. In the 8th century pope Adrian, in return for the services which he had rendered to Charlemagne in making him emperor of the West, stipulated for the introduction of the Gregorian Chant into the Gallic Church; and the emperor, having paid a visit to Rome, where he kept Easter with the pope, received from the hands of his holiness the Roman *Antiphonary*, which he promised to introduce into his dominions. About the end of this century all

opposition to cathedral music ceased, and for several centuries thereafter Church music underwent little or no change in the Church of Rome. It is a remarkable fact, however, that from the 8th till the middle of the 13th century, not only was it considered a necessary part of clerical education to understand the principles of harmony and the rudiments of singing, but the clergy were generally proficient both in vocal and instrumental music.

In the Eastern Church, where sacred music, as we have seen, had its origin, there arose in the 8th century a remarkable man, John of Damascus (q.v.), who was not only a noted theologian, but a most accomplished musician. On account of his great skill in the art of vocal music, he was usually styled *Melodos*. To this noted master of music the Eastern Church is indebted for those beautiful airs to which the Psalms of David are sung in our day. The Greek word ψάλλω is applied among the Greeks of modern times exclusively to sacred music, which in the Eastern Church has never been any other than vocal, instrumental music being unknown in that Church, as it was in the primitive Church. Sir John Hawkins, following the Romish writers in his erudite work on the *History of Music*, makes pope Vitalian, in A.D. 660, the first who introduced organs into churches. But students of ecclesiastical archaeology are generally agreed that instrumental music was not used in churches till a much later date; for Thomas Aquinas, A.D. 1250, has these remarkable words: "Our Church does not use musical instruments, as harps and psalteries, to praise God withal, that she may not seem to Judaize." From this passage we are surely warranted in concluding that there was no ecclesiastical use of organs in the time of Aquinas. It is alleged that Marinus Sanutus, who lived about A.D. 1290, was the first that brought the use of wind-organs into churches, and hence he received the name of *Torcellus*. In the East, the organ was in use in the emperor's courts, probably from the time of Julian, but never has either the organ or any other instrument been employed in public worship in Eastern churches; nor is mention of instrumental music found in all their liturgies, ancient or modern. Towards the time of the Reformation, a general partiality for sacred music prevailed throughout Europe, owing, as is generally supposed, to the encouragement which pope Leo X gave to the cultivation of art. It is no doubt true that Leo was himself a skilful musician, and attached a high importance to the art as lending interest, solemnity, and effect to the devotional services of the Romish Church. But to no single individual can be traced the prevailing love for sacred music in the 16th century, for, besides Leo X, we find Charles V in Germany, Francis I in

France, and Henry VIII in England, all countenancing sacred music, and treating musicians at their court with peculiar favor.

At the Reformation a greater part of the services of the Romish Church was sung to musical notes, and on the occasion of great festivals the choral service was performed with great pomp by a numerous choir of men and boys. That abuses of the most flagrant kind had found their way into this department of Romish worship is beyond a doubt, as the Council of Trent found it necessary to issue a decree on the subject, in which they plainly state that in the celebration of the mass, hymns, some of a profane and others of a lascivious nature, had crept into the service, and given great scandal to professors of the truth. By this decree the council, while it arranged the choral service on a proper footing, freeing it from all extraneous matter, gave it also a sanction which it had hitherto wanted. From this time the Church of Rome began to display that profound veneration for choral music which she has continued to manifest down to the present day.

The Reformers, observing the excessive attention paid to musical services, endeavored to return to the plainness of apostolic times. There had previously been repeated efforts at such a transformation. "The Albigenses, during the hottest season of persecution, are stated to have solaced themselves, in the very prospect of death, with singing the psalms and hymns of their Church. Psalmody was cherished by the disciples of Wycliffe. The Bohemian Brethren published a hymnbook with musical notes, from which it appears that the melodies they used originated in the chants to which the ancient Latin hymns of the Western Church were sung" (Conder, *The Poet of the Sanctuary*, p. 6). That psalmody was cultivated by the persecuted ancient Vaudois is evident from the fact that a large manuscript collection of their psalms and hymns is preserved in the library of Geneva (Monastier, *Hist. de Eglise Vaudoise*, i, 124). But it was the Reformation in the 16th century which restored to the people their right to participate in this primitive and edifying part of public worship. Psalm-singing was taken up by the Reformers, first for private devotion, and soon as a part of the service of the Church, Luther and Calvin restoring to the people their share in the musical part of public worship, and furnishing them with the means of performing it. From the time that psalm-singing was adopted by the Reformers, it was discountenanced by the Roman Catholics, and soon came to be regarded as a badge of Protestantism. Metrical versions of the Psalms of David were executed in the principal

vernacular languages of Europe; and some of the venerable Reformers are recorded as having applied themselves to the study of music in order that they might be enabled to compose plain and solemn tunes in which all would be able to join. Luther was peculiarly qualified for providing the first psalmody of the Reformation. Not only was he a great poet and musician, but he was full of fervid spiritual life. His hymnology, and that of his coadjutors Halls Sachs, Michael Weiss, Johann Kugelman, Johann Schop, Johann Crtiger, Paul Speratus, Justus Jonas, Nicholas Decius, and other contemporary divines and Reformers — were characterized and illustrated by some dozen magnificent chorals, which excited great enthusiasm. But psalmody, in the more modern sense, began in the 16th century, when Clement Marot, the court-poet of Francis I of France, translated fifty-two of the Psalms into French verse, dedicating them both to his royal master — whom he likened to the Hebrew psalmist — and to the ladies of France. The sacred songbook, on its first appearance, not being accompanied by music, it became the practice to sing the psalms to favorite tunes—often those of popular ballads, and for a considerable time psalm-singing became a favorite fashion among the gay courtiers of Francis. Marot's collection was continued and concluded by Theodore Beza, whose psalms had the advantage of being set to music, Beza having in this the assistance of Calvin, who engaged the best composers of the day to unite his sacred songs with beautiful and simple airs of a devotional character. Luther and Calvin differed, however, in their ideal of psalmody: the former was favorable to harmony in parts, while the latter confined himself to the bare, unaccompanied melody. In 1529 Luther published his first *Hymn-book for the Congregation*, which was printed by Joseph Klug in Wittenberg, whence it was also called the *Klug'sche*. This collection contained most of Luther's hymns, which may be read in an English translation in *Luther as a hymnist* (by the Rev. B. Pick, Phila. 1875).

Prior to Luther, the Moravian Brethren had published a collection of hymns (in 1504) compiled by their archbishop, Lucas — the first example of a hymn-book constructed of original compositions in the vernacular to be found in any Western nation which had once owned the supremacy of Rome. Some of its hymns, composed in the Bohemian and German languages, are of older date than the Reformation, and were highly commended by Luther himself for their scriptural and devotional character. In the renewed Church of the Brethren psalms and hymns continue to form an integral part of every religious service. Count Zinzendorf, who

eminently contributed to its revival in 1722, was himself a Christian poet of no common order. The German hymn-book in general use among the churches of the Brethren was completed in 1778 by bishop Gregor, and has passed through numerous editions: it contains many hymns derived from the Lutheran Church, and some even from the primitive Christian Church. Some of the best hymns in this collection have been translated into English verse, and, with the addition of a number of English hymns, constitute the hymn-book now in use among the congregations of the Brethren in this country. The latest edition, comprising 1260 hymns, is entitled *Liturgy and Hymns of the Protestant Church of the Unitas Fratrum, or United Brethren* (Lond. 1849, 8vo).

In the Reformed Church, sacred songs were limited to the Psalms. As early as 1542 the *La Forme des Prieres et Chantz ecclesiastiques ques avec la Maniere*, etc., by Marot, was published. This collection contained only twenty-five psalms, to which Theodore Beza afterwards added the remaining psalms. To abridge the time devoted to singing was an object of their concern, when they could not banish it from their assemblies; and the Helvetic Confession contains a censure on the Gregorian Chant, and a commendation of its rejection by many of the Protestant churches. (See D'Israeli, *Curiosities of Literature* [Lond. 1858], ii, 474.) The first edition of the entire book of Psalms in verse appeared in France in 1561, with the royal privilege, and 10,000 copies were immediately dispersed. These were speedily set to music, and were generally sung in the Reformed churches of France, Geneva, and French Switzerland, notwithstanding their condemnation by the college of the Sorbonne. Some expressions having become obsolete, the task of retouching them was undertaken, first by Valentine Conuart, the first secretary of the French Academy, and by one of the elders of the church at Charenton; and afterwards by the pastors of Geneva, who revised their undertaking, and almost recast the work of Marot and Beza. So dear, however, was the memory of these first two poets of the French Reformation that it was found necessary to preserve the very number of their stanzas and the quantity of syllables of their verses, and the ancient music of the 16th century is to this day adapted to the singing of the revised and corrected psalms (*Musee des Protestans Celebres*, vol. 2, pt. 2, p. 11, 12). Of late years the Protestant churches in France have paid much attention to the improvement of their psalmody. To the metrical version of Marot and Beza they have added collections of hymns, with music, for various occasions. The French version of Marot

and Beza was translated into Dutch metre by Peter Dathen, pastor of the first Reformed church at Frankfort-on-the-Main, about the year 1560, and adapted to the French tunes and measure. A new Flemish metrical version of the Psalms was executed by Philip de Marnix, lord of St. Aldegonde. A Bohemian version by Stryx, said to be of high merit, was published in 1590; and a Polish version by Bernard Woiewodka, of Cracow, was printed at Breocz, in Lithuania, about the year 1565, under the auspices of prince Radzivil (Bayle, *Dictionnaire*, par Des Maizeaux, 4:124; Milner, *Life of Dr. Isaac Watts*, p. 350, note). What Marot and Beza were to the Reformed Church of France and French Switzerland, Lobwasser was to the Reformed Church of Germany, German Switzerland, and Holland. None of the strictly Calvinistic communities have a hymn-book dating back to the Reformation. David's Psalter was the first hymn-book of the Reformed or Genevan Church. The book of Psalms became the only hymn-book of the Reformed churches in France, Switzerland, Holland, Italy, Germany, and Scotland, "adapted to grave and solemn music, in metrical translations, whose one aim and glory were to render into measure which could be sung the very words of the old Hebrew psalms."

England, in some measure a place of refuge, where both forms of the Reformation lived tranquilly side by side, but also a border land where both met and contended, was given the treasures of psalmody at the moment of her embracing the new doctrines. Probably in 1538, and certainly before 1539, the venerable confessor Myles Coverdale, bishop of Exeter, during the reign of king Edward VI, published a metrical version of thirteen *Goostly Psalmes and Spirituall Songes drawn out of the Holy Scripture*. The first verse of each psalm is accompanied by musical notes, which evidently show that they were designed to be sung (Coverdale's *Remains*, p. 533). The next attempt to versify the Psalms in English was made by Thomas Sternhold, a native of Hampshire, groom of the robes to king Henry VIII and to king Edward VI, who published nineteen psalms, most probably in 1549. This translation was at first discountenanced by many of the clergy, who looked upon it as done in opposition to the practice of chanting the psalms in the cathedrals. It was increased to thirtyseven in 1551, with seven additional psalms translated by John Hopkins; to eighty-seven, most probably in 1561, by Sternhold and others; and in 1563 was published the entire book of Psalms, translated by Sternhold, Hopkins, and others. This version seems to have been authoritatively introduced into the

service of the Reformed Church of England, being sanctioned both by the crown and convocation; and it soon became exceedingly popular.

Vocal psalmody was soon after introduced into the church service, the choral mode of singing being still retained in cathedrals and collegiate churches, and the liturgic hymns being retained in the Prayer-book. Public singing of psalms by the whole congregation was begun in the month of September, 1559, at the parish church of St. Antholin, in the city of London, whence it spread first into the neighboring churches, and from them into distant towns. Bishop Jewel, in a letter to Peter Martyr, dated March 5, 1560, says: "You may sometimes see at Paul's Cross, after the service, six thousand persons, old and young, of both sexes, all singing together and praising God" (*Zurich Letters*, p. 71). Although several metrical versions of the Psalms were published with the royal license, by archbishop Parker (1560), Henry Dod (1603), George Wither (1623), King James 1 (1631), and George Sandys (1631), the "old version" of Sternhold and Hopkins continued to be used in the churches until after the Restoration, notwithstanding the efforts made, during the rebellion, to recommend the introduction and adoption of the metrical versions of Barton and Rous. The version of Sternhold and Hopkins fell into disuse after the publication of *A New Version of the Psalms of David, fitted to the Tunes in Churches*, by Nahum Tate (poet-laureate under William III and Anne) and Dr. Nicholas Brady (Lond. 1696 [2d ed. 1698], 8vo). This version, less literal in its renderings than its predecessor, and somewhat commonplace as regards poetical character, was introduced to the public under the sanction of an order in council issued by king William III, of no legal force or authority whatever since his decease, and permitting it to be used "in all such churches and chapels and congregations as think fit to receive the same." In 1703, it being found necessary to have a supplement containing "the usual hymns, Creed, Lord's Prayer, etc., with the Church tunes, Messrs. Tate and Brady obtained a similar order in council for its adoption in such churches, etc., as should think fit to receive the same." Although the "new version," as it is now commonly termed, encountered much animadversion and opposition at its first publication, it is at present used in most churches and chapels in England and Ireland, as well as in the chapels of the Episcopal communion in Scotland and in the British colonies. This extensive use of the *new* version may be ascribed to its intelligibility as a whole, tame as the largest portion of it confessedly is, and to the fact that, almost ever since its first publication, the copyright

property has been vested in the Stationers' Company, by whom, until of late years, it has almost exclusively been published. Modern hymns, selected according to the taste and at the will of the incumbent, have to a large extent taken in recent times the place of metrical psalms in the Church of England.

Of the psalm tunes which came into use, some have been attributed to Claude Goudimel, Claude Le Jeune, and Guillaume Franc, and a few owe their origin to Luther. The well-known 100th Psalm is an adaptation of Gregorian phrases by Guillaume Franc. The first important collection of psalm tunes for four voices published in England was made by Thomas Ravenscroft, Mus. Bac., and appeared in 1621; it was entitled "*The whole Booke of Psalms, etc.*, composed into four parts by sundry authors, to such several tunes as have been and are usually sung in England, Scotland, Wales, Germany, Italy, France, and the Netherlands." In this collection were included contributions by Tallis, Morley, Dowland, and all the great masters of the day, as well as by Ravenscroft himself, who contributed the tunes *St. David's*, *Bangor*, and *Canterbury*. The name of John Milton, father of the poet, appears as composer of the tunes *York* and *Norwich*. According to the then prevalent usage, the subject, or air, was given to the tenor voice. This custom was first departed from in the *Whole Book of Psalms, in Three Parts*, published in 1671, compiled and arranged by John Playford whom Sir J. Hawkins calls the "father of modern psalmody" — where we have the more proper practice, which has since obtained, of making the melody the soprano part. Croft, Courteville, Cary, the Bachs, and Handel have since that time contributed to the psalmody in use in Britain.

In 1603 was printed a Welsh translation of the Psalms, made by William Myddleton, a celebrated poet and navigator. Another version appeared about the commencement of the 17th century, from the pen of another eminent Welsh poet, Edmund Prys, archdeacon of Merioneth. A revised edition of this version, by the Rev. Peter Williams, is now in use throughout the principality of Wales. An entire version of the Psalms in the Erse, or native Irish language, made by the Rev. Dr. M'Leod, the Rev. F. H. Beamish, Mr. Thaddeus Connellan, and Mr. David Murphy, was published at London in 1836; and some portions of the Psalms have been translated into the Mohawk language by an unknown author (London, 1787, and Hamilton, Toronto, 1839), and into the language of the Munceys, a native tribe of North Americans, by the Rev. Richard Flood, a

missionary to them from the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts.

Admirably as most of the psalms are adapted to general use in public worship, it was yet felt, in the English churches, that some other metrical expressions of those astonishing hopes and consoling promises which the new dispensation has given to man in the N.T. would not be altogether inappropriate. The great German Reformer had written hymns, and many of the other Continental divines of the revived faith in Christ had done likewise. Yet no English People's Hymn-book was brought out until the closing years of the 18th century, i.e. none that was placed on cottage tables beside the Bible, and none for use when Christians met and chanted beside the grave, although they had the *Te Deum* and *Magnificat* and the Psalms. Bishop Maltby published *A Selection of Psalms and Hymns* before his elevation to the episcopate. Various selections were made and published by various individuals, principally (as it appears) since the year 1770, and these selections are derived from Dr. Watts's *Imitation of the Psalms of David in the Language of the New Testament* (1707), and from his *Hymns* (1719); the *Hymns* of the Rev. Dr. Doddridge; those of the Rev. Messrs. John and Charles Wesley; the *Olney Hymns*, composed by William Cowper and John Newton; and the sacred compositions dispersed through the works of the British poets of the 18th century. The Wesleys, however — so it seems — were the first who really gave a People's Hymn-book to England, unless that of Dr. Watts, published about the beginning of the 18th century (in 1709), may be called so. "To Dr. Watts," says a modern biographer, "must be assigned the praise of beginning, in our language, a class of productions which have taken a decided hold upon the universal religious mind. On this account Christian worshippers of every denomination, and of every English-speaking land, owe him an incalculable debt of gratitude. Mason, Baxter, and others had preceded Watts as hymn-writers; but their hymns were not used in public worship. Prejudice prevented the use of anything beyond the Psalms, and those not yet in their Christian rendering; but Watts made the Christian hymn part of modern public worship." As a supplement to Dr. Watts's hymns, Dr. Doddridge published a collection entitled *Hymns Founded on Various Texts in the Holy Scriptures* (1755). After these singers came the two Wesleys, whose hymns are sung up to this day, and John Newton and Cowper, who produced the *Olney Hymn-book*.

Of the state of psalmody among the Puritans at the close of the 16th, and in the former part of the 17th century, we have no certain information. During the commonwealth, William Barton published a metrical version in 1644, reprinted in 1645 with the license of the Protector Cromwell. This version was received with much favor, and appears to have retained its popularity for many years. In 1646, Francis Rous, the Presbyterian provost of Eton College, published his version of the psalms, sanctioned by the imprimatur of the House of Commons, in pursuance of the recommendation of the Westminster assembly of divines. This version was subsequently revised by William Barton for the optional use of churches in England, but it never became popular. But the greatest improvement in psalmody, not merely among Protestant dissenters, but among all English congregations, was effected by the learned and Rev. Dr. Isaac Watts. For a just appreciation of the value of his publication the reader is necessarily referred to Mr. Conder's *Poet of the Sanctuary*, p. 48-105, in which work will be found notices of some eminent versifiers of psalms and hymns, both Episcopalian and Nonconformist, who preceded Dr. Watts. The best compositions of Dr. Watts, and of his learned and pious friend the Rev. Dr. Doddridge, are found in every selection of psalms and hymns which has been published since the year 1770. All the great bodies of dissenters from the Church of England now have denominational hymn-books, containing the best versions or imitations of the Psalms of David, together with hymns selected from the most eminent modern devotional poets.

A curious controversy on psalmody arose among the dissenters in the end of the 17th century. Whether singing in public worship had been partially discontinued during the times of persecution to avoid informers, or whether the miserable manner in which it was performed gave persons a distaste for it, it appears that. in 1691, Mr. Benjamin Keach published a tract entitled *The Breach Repaired in God's Worship; or, Psalms, Hymns, etc., proved to be a Holy Ordinance of Jesus Christ*. To us it may seem strange that such a point should be disputed; but Mr. Keach was obliged to labor earnestly, and with a great deal of prudence and caution, to obtain the consent of his people to sing a hymn at the conclusion of the Lord's Supper. After six years more, they agreed to sing on the thanksgiving-days; but it required still fourteen years more before he could persuade them to sing every Lord's-day, and then it was only after the last prayer. that those who chose might withdraw without joining in it! Nor did even this satisfy these scrupulous consciences: for, after all, a separation took place, and the

inharmonious seceders formed a new church in May's Pond, where it was above twenty years longer before singing the praises of God could be endured. It is difficult at this period to believe it; but Mr. Ivimey quotes Mr. Crosby as saying that Mr. Keach's was the first church in which psalm-singing was introduced. This remark, however, must probably be confined to the Baptist churches. The Presbyterians, it seems, were not quite so unmusical; for the Directory of the Westminster divines distinctly stated that "it is the duty of Christians to praise God publicly by singing of psalms together in the congregation." And besides the old Scotch Psalms, Dr. John Patrick, of the Charter-house, made a version which was in very general use among dissenters, Presbyterians, and Independents before it was superseded by the far superior compositions of Dr. Watts. These Psalms, however, like those of the English and Scotch Establishment, were drawled out in notes of equal length, without accent or variety. Even the introduction of the triple-timed tunes, probably about the time of Dr. Watts's psalms, gave also great offence to some people, because it marked the accent of the measure. Old Mr. Thomas Bradbury used to call this time "a long leg and a short one." The beautiful compositions of Dr. Watts, the Wesleys, and others produced a revolution in modern psalmody. Better versions of the Psalms, and many excellent collections of hymns, are now in use, and may be considered as highly important gifts bestowed upon the modern Church of God.

In Scotland, the early Reformers, while they banished instrumental music from churches, paid great attention to singing. In John Knox's Psalter, arranged for use in churches, the metrical psalms are set to music in harmony of four parts. Several early translations of the Psalms were produced in North Britain, but that of Sternhold and Hopkins was used in worship from 1564 down to the middle of the 17th century. In 1632 an attempt made by Charles I to supersede it by king James's version was more resolutely and decidedly opposed than in England. During the Commonwealth, the commission of the General Assembly, in pursuance of a reference made to them in August, 1649, issued on the 23d of November following their decision in favor of the revised version of Francis Rous, a member of Cromwell's council, which Parliament had in vain endeavored to bring into general use in England. It was adopted in the main to be used as the only authorized metrical version of the Psalms for the Kirk of Scotland, not only in congregations, but also in families. Though somewhat rough and uncouth, it is sometimes expressive and forcible, and perhaps

nearer the original than any other metrical translation of the Psalms. A few paraphrases and hymns have since been added, by authority of the General Assembly, and form together the psalmody in use in Presbyterian worship in Scotland. In 1706 the assembly commended the Scripture songs of Mr. Patrick Sympson for use in private families; and to prepare them for public use the act was renewed in the following year, and in 1708 the commission was authorized to compare the remarks of presbyteries on these songs. Thus matters passed on for years. In 1742 the assembly anew expressed a wish for an addition to the psalmody, and in 1751 forty-five paraphrases had been selected. In 1781, after many delays, a new and fuller collection was made, twenty-two being added to the previous forty-five selections. This collection, though never formally sanctioned by the assembly, is that now in use and printed along with the Psalms in Scottish Bibles. Some of the paraphrases have an Arminian tinge. In 1787 a committee of the General Assembly, duly empowered, published a selection of *Paraphrases in Verse of several Passages of Scripture... to be sung in Churches*. It retained, in substance, the translations which had been published in 1745, under the authority of the General Assembly, and which had been in use in several churches; and a considerable number of new paraphrases were added, chiefly from the psalms or hymns of Drs. Watts, Doddridge, and Blacklock, and Mr. Logan. In 1781 a faithful and beautiful version of the psalmody of the Church of Scotland, in the Gaelic language, was made by the Rev. John Smith, by whom it was revised and published in 1783. From 1807 to 1822 the subject of a revision of the metrical psalms was before every assembly. Sir Walter Scott, when applied to, was wisely against the project; "for the Psalms," said he, "often possessed a rude sort of majesty, which would be ill exchanged for mere elegance." In 1860 an addition to a collection of paraphrases was published by the General Assembly. The Relief Synod published a hymn-book for their churches in 1794, and enlarged it in 1832. The Burgher branch of the Secession had, in 1748, requested Ralph Erskine, the author of the *Gospel Sonnets*, to undertake the duty of enlarging the psalmody, but the proposal led to no result. The United Presbyterian Church, after some years' preparation, published, in 1851, a hymn-book for the use of their churches. The most of the paraphrases are incorporated into it. In addition to what is stated in the previous portion of this article about psalmody in Scotland, it may be mentioned that there was published at the period of the Reformation a *Compendious Booke of Godly and Spiritual Songs*. Many of these are satires on the Romish clergy, and many are profane songs (*prophaine*

sangis) metamorphosed. The Romish clergy published a canon against this book—such was its popularity—and the fifth Parliament of queen Mary passed an act against such rhymes.

The first song of praise to Almighty God in the English language, on our New-England coast, was raised by the Pilgrim fathers when they landed on Plymouth Rock. Cold, ice-bound, without a roof over their heads, they remembered their first Sabbath-day to keep it holy — “10 of December, on the Sabbath day, wee rested,” is the simple and impressive record of their journal.

*“Amid the storm they sang,
And the stars heard, and the sea,
And the sounding aisles of the dim woods rang
With the anthem of the free.”*

As the first book ever printed with movable metal types was the Bible, so, as if to keep up the sacred parallel on this continent, the first book printed here was a portion of the inspired volume “done into metre.” The first press was put up at Cambridge in 1639, by Stephen Day. His first book was *The Psalms in Metre, faithfully translated for the use and edification of the saints in public and private, especially in New England* (printed at Cambridge in 1640). This version was made from the Hebrew by Thomas Welde, of Roxbury; Richard Mather, of Dorchester; and John Eliot, the Apostle of the Indians. They were a committee appointed by the Congregational or Independent churches as early as 1636. In their preface they say, “We have respected rather a plain translation than to smoothe our verses with the sweetness of any paraphrase, and so have attended to conscience rather than to elegance, and fidelity rather than poetry, in translating Hebrew words into English language and David’s poetry into English metre.” Three hundred acres of land were granted to Stephen Day, “being the first that set up printing.” Eliot’s Indian Bible, in the Nipmuck language, was printed at Cambridge in 1663, the whole of the type being set up by an Indian, and the Psalms “done in common metre” — of which the first verse from the 19th Psalm may suffice as a specimen —

*“Kesuk kukootumusheanumon
God wussosumoonk
Mamahehekesnk wumatuhkon
Wutatna kausnonk.”*

In 1718 Dr. Cotton Mather issued his *Psalterium Americanum; the Book of Psalms in a translation exactly conformed unto the original, but all in blank verse, fitted unto tunes commonly used in our churches*. From this curious book we extract a few lines, as printed:

“PSALM 22. — A PSALM OF DAVID.

“**1.** My Shepherd is the ETERNAL God I shall not be in [any] want:

“**2.** In pastures of a tender grass He [ever] makes me to lie down: To waters of tranquilities He gently carries me [along];

“**3.** *My feeble and my wandering soul* He [kindly] does fetch back again; In the plain paths of righteousness He does lead [and guide] me along; Because of the regard he has [ever] unto his glorious Name.”

In an *Admonition concerning the Tunes*, Dr. Mather states that “the director of psalmody need only say. ‘Sing with the black letter,’ or ‘Sing without the black letter,’ and the tune will be sufficiently directed” (see Belcher, *Historical Sketches of Hymns and Hymn-writers*, p. 47, 48 — a work which contains much interesting information on the whole subject of Church psalmody, hymnology, and music). These and other primitive efforts to furnish an American psalmody and hymnal were not followed with success. Between the years 1755 and 1757 the version of the Psalms of 1640 was carefully revised by the Rev. Thomas Prince, M.A., and published in 1758. In 1783 Mr. Joel Barlow, an American statesman and poet, published a corrected and enlarged edition of Dr. Watts’s version of the Psalms, and a collection of hymns, with the recommendation of the General Assembly of the Congregational Ministers of Connecticut, at whose request the work had been undertaken. Many of the psalms were altered, several were written anew, and several, which had been omitted by Dr. Watts, were supplied. This collection was in general use in that state until the bad character of the author (who died a wretched infidel) brought them into disrepute; and in the year 1800, the Rev. Timothy Dwight, D.D., president of Yale College, published a revised edition of Dr. Watts’s version of the Psalms (in which he versified upwards of twenty psalms omitted by Watts), with the approbation of the General Assembly of Ministers in the state of Connecticut, at whose request it had originally been undertaken. This edition, with the contributions of Dr. Dwight, has never been adopted by the Congregationalists of this country. Many of the

leading denominations in the United States of America now have their own separate psalm- and hymn-books.

In 1789 the new version of the Psalms by Messrs. Tate and Brady was adopted *entire* by the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, with the addition of a few hymns. Since the year 1826 a collection of 212 hymns has been in use under the authority of the General Convention of that Church, composed of the House of Bishops and of clerical and lay delegates; and since October, 1832, under the same authority, 124 selections of entire psalms, or of portions of psalms, from the new version (with certain necessary alterations or corrections, and occasionally with the substitution of a better version) has been in use in all the churches of that communion.

The constitution of the Reformed Church in America declares that “No psalms or hymns may be publicly sung in the Reformed (Dutch) churches but such as are approved and recommended by the General Synod.” The manifest reason of this prohibition is to be found in the vital relation that subsists between the psalmody and the theology of that Church. This is further illustrated by a rule of its General Synod which forbids the issue of any edition of the psalms and hymns of this Church without the Confession of Faith, the Catechisms, and the Liturgy. The history of the hymnology of this denomination, which dates back to the period of the Reformation, makes an interesting chapter of the general subject. From an elaborate report made to the General Synod of 1869 by the committee which prepared the “Hymns of the Church,” we condense a brief narrative: “The *Church Orders* ratified by the National Synod of Dordrecht (A.D. 1618-19), which are still ‘recognised’ as containing the distinctive and fundamental principles of our Church government, declare that ‘the one hundred and fifty psalms of David, the Ten Commandments, the Lord’s Prayer, the Twelve Articles of the Christian faith, the songs of Mary, Zacharias, and Simeon, versified only, shall be sung in public worship.’ The churches are left at liberty to adopt or omit that entitled *O thou, who art our Father, God!* All others are prohibited. This usage, prevailing in the Netherlands, was transferred to this country. Several copies of the psalm-books which the fathers brought with them are in the hands of the committee.” They are invariably bound up with the Bible, or the New Testament at least, the Catechism, and Liturgy. These Psalms in Dutch are the version of Peter Dathe, the eminent Biblical scholar and critic, by whom they were translated; however, not from the original, but from the

French. This was the *first* book in use in the Reformed Church in America. It contains, besides the Psalms, the Ten Commandments, the Song of Zacharias, the Song of the Virgin Mary, the Apostles' Creed, the Lord's Prayer, the Articles of the Christian faith (translated from the German by Jan Uytenhoven), the Morning Prayer, the Evening Prayer, the Prayer before Sermon, Prayer before Eating, Prayer after Eating, the Evening Prayer entitled *Christe qui Lux es et Dies*, and a translation by Abraham Van der Meer, from the Greek Bible, of the 151st Psalm of David. Every word of these psalms and creeds and prayers is set to music of a simple recitative character, in which all might join, by Cornelius De Leeuw. This book was in use in all the Dutch churches in this country, until the consistory of the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church of the city of New York found it necessary to have divine service performed in the English language; and on Nov. 9, 1767, approved and recommended for the use of their Church and schools an English psalm-book, published by their order, "which is greatly indebted to that of Dr. Brady and Mr. Tate, some of the psalms being transcribed verbatim from their version, and others altered so as to fit them to the music used in the Dutch Church" (prefatory note). This book contains, besides the Psalms of David, fifteen pages of "hymns" — viz. the Ten Commandments, the Song of Zacharias, the Song of the Virgin Mary, the Song of Simeon, the Creed, and the Lord's Prayer — all set to the simple music in which all the people joined, so that the compiler could truthfully say, "A great part of divine worship consists in harmonious singing." This first book in English was the *second* book in use in our churches. The "Articles of Union," adopted in 1771, make no mention of psalmody, but agree to "abide in all things" by the regulations of the Synod of Dort, hereinbefore quoted. In 1773 a new version of the psalms and hymns was compiled and adopted in the Netherlands, and was soon introduced into some of the Dutch churches in America, constituting the *third* book thus used. It differs from the preceding chiefly in the higher critical character of the psalms. In 1787 the General Synod appointed a committee to compile a psalm-book "out of other collections of English psalms in repute and received in the Reformed churches; no congregation, however, to be obliged thereto where that of the New York consistory is in use." Additional instructions were given the next year to print "some well-composed spiritual hymns in connection with the psalms." After approval by the Synod of 1789, this book "was speedily published." It contains, besides the Psalms of David, a century of hymns, of which "1 to 52 are suited to the Heidelberg Catechism, 53 to 73 are adapted to the holy

ordinance of the Lord's Supper, and Hymn 74, to the end, on miscellaneous subjects." Among these are such titles as "Christmas," "The Song of the Angels," "Resurrection," "Ascension," "Whitsuntide," "New Year." etc. This book, prepared by order of the General Synod, being the *fourth book* used in their churches, is without music, as have been all subsequent books until this time. This selection continued in use for full a quarter of a century, and is still an admirable one. In 1812, on petition of the Classis of New York, the General Synod requested the Rev. Dr. John H. Livingston to prepare an improved and enlarged selection of psalms and hymns. This was reported to the Synod of 1813, and by its order was "forthwith introduced into all our churches." Its use was recommended also "to all families and individuals in place of the book hitherto in use." No radical change has been made in the psalmody of the Reformed Church from that day to this — the *fifth book* sanctioned in the churches. It embraced 273 more hymns than the former collection.. Additions, however, were made, in 1831, of 172 hymns, and published as Book II. Rev. Dr. Thomas De Witt was chairman of the committee which prepared it. This was the *sixth book*. In 1843 a book of *Sabbath-school and Social Hymns*, 331 in number, was published by order of the Synod. In 1845-46 a committee, of which Rev. Dr. Isaac Ferris was chairman, prepared, by authority of the Synod, a new arrangement of psalms and hymns, embracing 342 additional selections. This was soon published, and constituted the *seventh book* thus used in the Reformed Church in America — containing, in addition to the psalms, 788 hymns. An edition with music has been published within three or four years past, under the title of *The Book of Praise*. In 1862 the *Fulton Street Hymn-book*, which is used in the celebrated daily noon prayer-meeting which bears the name of that street, and numbering 326 hymns, was published, and "recommended to the churches" by the Synod.

In this chronological sketch no reference has been made to books in the French and German languages; but so long ago as 1792 the Synod approved and recommended, in the French language, the psalms and hymns compiled by Theodore de Beza and La Marot; and in the German language, the psalms and hymns, published at Marburg and Amsterdam, used in the Reformed churches in Germany, in the Netherlands, and Pennsylvania. In October, 1852, a valuable and large collection of hymns in the German language was printed by order of the General Synod, for use in the German churches of this denomination. It was compiled by the late

Rev. John C. Guldin, of New York, Rev. Joseph F. Berg, D.D., and Rev. Abraham Berky. Since then a *German Hymn-book for Sunday-schools*, with music, has been issued. The General Synod of 1869 sanctioned a new volume, entitled *Hymns of the Church*, with tunes, which is now coming in use in many congregations. The full history of the preparation of this elegant volume is given in the *Report* of the Synod. In many respects it is the most admirable collection of hymns for ipublic worship now in use among Protestant denominations. It numbers 1007 hymns, together with many chants, sentences, etc. The music, which is designed to promote congregational singing, is of a very high order. The wide range of topics, the rich selection from the most celebrated devotional lyrics of all ages, and its fine adaptation to the great purpose of the praises of God, entitle it to a foremost place among modern collections. The committee who made the compilation were Rev. John B. Thompson, Rev. Ashbel G. Vermilye, D.D., Rev. Alexander R. Thompson, D.D., with whom was associated, as a prominent co-laborer, the Rev. Zachary Eddy, D.D. This book and the previous one are now both in use in the Reformed Church in America. It has also been introduced into a number of churches of other denominations.

The hymn-books of the various other Christian denominations embrace a large proportion of the psalms and hymns which have become the property of the Church universal, and of these it is necessary only to give the titles, which we subjoin in a list of all hymn-books. But there are hymns and hymnals characteristic of the particular doctrines, ordinances, and spirit of the Methodists so distinctive in these respects that we append a history of their hymn-books, recognising thereby the general assertion that their hymns and tunes have been among the greatest instrumentalities of their immense successes.

The origin of the first collection of hymns in use among the *Methodists* of this country cannot be satisfactorily ascertained. In 1773 one of Wesley's publications, divided into three books — 1, Hymns and Spiritual Songs; 2, Psalms and Hymns; 3, Redemption Hymns (16th ed. Bristol) — was reprinted by Isaac Collins, in Burlington, N. J. At the formation of the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1784, Wesley's abridgment of the Book of Common Prayer, with a "Collection of Psalms and Hymns" appended, was adopted by the new communion. It was not, however, long employed. There is extant a copy of the *Pocket Hymn-book* (9th ed. Phila. 1788). This contains 250 hymns. We may infer from the number of Methodists in the

country that the first edition may have been published about 1785 or 1786. There is also an edition "revised and improved," copyrighted in 1802 by Ezekiel Cooper. This contains 320 hymns. In 1808 a supplement was added by bishop Asbury, containing 337 hymns, the whole being published in two books. This was revised under the supervision of Nathan Bangs in the year 1820. To this again a supplement was added in 1836. The General Conference of 1848 appointed a committee to carefully revise the then existing book, and to "judiciously multiply the number of hymns." Their work was completed, and approved by the Book Committee, the editors of the Book Concern, and finally by the bishops, by whom it was commended to the Church in May, 1849. A revision of this hymn-book was undertaken in 1876 by order of that year's General Conference, and it is completed at our writing (1878). The Hymnal, so it is entitled, is to be the sole book containing songs of praise to be used hereafter in the Methodist Episcopal Church. The Methodist Episcopal Church, South, after the separation, in 1846 ordered the preparation of a collection specially designed for its members, which was in some respects a decided improvement on the book of 1820 with supplement. The various smaller bodies of Methodists have employed books prepared by themselves.

During the last twenty years nearly every religious organization has revised its "book of praise," and we append a list of these standard collections used in America and England:

A. ENGLAND.

1. *Baptist.* — Psalms and Hymns for Public, Social, and Private Worship (1857).

The New Hymn-book, published under the direction of the General Baptist Association (1851).

Our Own Hymn-book, compiled by C. H. Spurgeon.

2. *Church of England.* — The Year of Praise, edited by Dean Alford (1867).

Christian Psalmody by E. Bickersteth (1833).

Psalms and Hymns, by E. H. Bickersteth (1858; 6th ed. 1867).

Psalms and Hymns for Public Worship, by Burgess and Money (10th ed. 1866).

The Hymnal, by Choep (1858).

Psalms and Hymns, by W. J. Hall (1836); sometimes called the "Mitre" Hymn-book.

A Church Psalter and Hymnal, by Harland (1855, 1867).

A Selection of Psalms and Hymns, by Kemble (1853).

The Church Psalter and Hymn-book, by W. Mercer (1864).

The People's Hymnal (1867).

The Sarum Hymnal, by Nelson, Woodford, and Dayman (1868).

The Choral Book for England (1865).

3. Congregational. — The Hymn-book, by A. Reed (1841).

The Church and Home Metrical Psalter and Hymnal, by W. Windie.

Psalms, Hymns, and Passages of Scripture for Christian Worship, compiled by the Congregational Ministers of Leeds (1853).

The New Congregational Hymn-book, compiled by a Committee of the Congregational Union (1859). [This is one of the most comprehensive and excellent of modern English collections. It was compiled by a competent committee in London, who were occupied from 1855 to 1859 in its preparation. They met frequently, and had the assistance of numerous ministers and others in all parts of the country. It includes 1000 of the best psalms and hymns, of nearly 200 writers of almost every country and religious denomination, and of various ages of the world, from the time of David to our own. It was prepared upon the broadest basis of Christian catholicity, and the sale of nearly a million copies already evinces its usefulness and acceptability to the worshipping assemblies in English speaking countries.]

Methodist. — Hymns for Divine Worship, compiled for the Use of the Methodist New Connection (1865).

A Collection of Hymns for the Use of the People called Methodists, by J. Wesley, with a Supplement (1831).

The Wesleyan Methodist Hymn-book, by J. Everett (1850).

5. Presbyterian. — Psalms and Hymns for Divine Worship for the Presbyterian Church in England (1867).

6. Miscellaneous. — Hymns for Christian Worship, by the Religious Tract Society (1866).

Psalms and Hymns for Public Worship, by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

Hymnologia Christiana, or Psalms and Hymns, by B. H. Kennedy (1863).

B. AMERICA.

1. Baptist. — Baptist Praise-book, by Fuller, Levy, Phelps, Fish, etc.
Songs for the Sanctuary.

The Psalmist, by Baron Stow and S. F. Smith, with supplement by Richard Fuller and J. B. Jeter.

2. Congregational. — Songs for the Sanctuary. Plymouth Collection, by H.W. Beecher.

3. Lutheran. — A Collection of Hymns, and a Liturgy, for the Use of the Evangelical Lutheran Churches (1865). The Church-book.

4. Methodist. — Hymnal of the Methodist Episcopal Church (1878).

5. Moravian. — Liturgy and Hymns for the Use of the Protestant Church of the United Brethren, or Moravians (1872).

6. Presbyterian. — Songs for the Sanctuary. Church Hymn-book, by E. F. Hatfield. Hymns and Songs of Praise, by Hitchcock and others. Presbyterian Hymnal official] (1874).

7. Protestant Episcopal. — Hymnal, according to the Use of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America. Hymns, Ancient and Modern (1869). Hymns for Church and Home, compiled by Burgess, Muhlenberg, Howe, Coxe, and Wharton.

8. Undenominational. — Hymns of the Church, by Thompson, Vermilye, and Eddy. The use of this book is required in all congregations of the Reformed Church in America.

C. GERMAN HYMN-BOOKS.

Germany is very rich in hymn-books, to enumerate which would fill pages. Each state, each province, has its own hymn-book. The following may be mentioned among the most complete collections at present extant, viz.: 1, The *Geistlicher Liederschatz*, containing 2020 hymns (Berl. 1832, Svo); 2, Archdeacon Knapp's *Evangelischen Liederschatz, für Kirche und Haus*, containing 3572 hymns (Stuttgard, 1837, 2 vols. Svo); and, 3, The chevalier Christian Carl Josias Bunsen's *Allgemeines Evangelisches Gesang und Gebet Buch* (2d ed. Hamb. 1846, 8vo). This work is deservedly held in the highest estimation in Germany. Besides a selection of 440 of the choicest hymns of the Lutheran and Reformed churches, it contains a table of lessons from the Old and New Tests. for the whole of the ecclesiastical year, a series of formularies, and a collection of prayers aadapted to ordinary public worship, to the festivals celebrated by the universal Christian Church, and to sacramental and other occasions. The following are the hymn-books used in this country in the different denominations:

1. *Baptist*. — Glaubensstimme der Gemeinde des Herrn (Hamburg, 1860).
2. *Evangelical Association*. — Gesangbuch der evangelischen Gemeinschaft (Cleveland, 1877).
3. *Lutheran*. — Das gemeinschaftliche Gesangbuch. Lutherisches Gesaunbuch.
4. *Methodist*. — Deutsches Gesangbuch der Bisch. Methodisten-Kirche (Cincinnati).
5. *Moravian*. — Gesalligbnch zumn Gebrauch der evangel. Bruedergemeineni (Bethlehem, Pa.).
6. *Reformed and German Presbyterian*. — Deutsches Gesangbuch, von Ph. Schaff. This is one of the best German hymn-books in this country.

During the American Civil War (1861-65) many new patriotic and Christian songs resounded through the camps of the contending armies. The religious services, the meetings for prayer, the labors of chaplains and army missionaries, and of the sanitary and Christian commissions, and other voluntary organizations for the temporal and spiritual welfare of the military and naval forces, and for hospital service, were all attended with

the cheering influence of Christian song. Few of these new songs, whether patriotic or religious, survive the conflict. But the dear old hymns that resounded in the homes and churches of the soldiers in happier times rang out their inspiring strains, and stirred all the deepest sympathies and memories of peace and love. Two of these little soldiers' and sailors' hymnbooks are before us as we write — one printed for the Union and the other for the Confederate army. Both of them contain a majority of the same familiar psalms and hymns, both end with "Lord, dismiss us with thy blessing," and, with perhaps the exception of only a single hymn, either collection could have been used with equal profit on both sides of the line, just as they used the same old English Bible. Was it not prophetic of the restoration of national and Christian union which is yet advancing to a blessed consummation? Not a few waifs from the sea of newspaper and periodical literature have found fit and permanent places in modern hymnbooks, and in such exquisite collections as *The Changed Cross*, *The Shadow of the Rock*, *Drifted Snowflakes*, and similar popular volumes of the poetry of devotion and of affliction.

It may be proper here to allude to the large addition to our psalmody in consequence of the labors of evangelists, such as Bliss and Sankey. These have produced numerous books of hymns, chiefly with the music attached, which contain, along with much that is merely ephemeral, some songs and tunes which are destined to survive the occasions that have called them forth.

We close this article with a brief reference to the great increase of hymns and tunes for children, and especially for Sabbath and mission schools. It is the marvellous outgrowth of the city and home missionary and Sunday-school system of the times. Advantage has been taken of the demand to flood the market with books which are utterly unworthy of their authors and unfit for use — full of trashy verses, and of tunes that are no better. But a happy reaction has begun, which will soon result in elevating the standard, purifying the taste, and ennobling this delightful branch of Christian instruction and worship. The best poetical and musical talent of the country is now engaged in the work, and we may soon look for its ripe fruit. The songs of the children, like books and addresses for them, must not be childish nor weak, if they are to bear their part in the religious training of the rising race, and in an age like this. The hosannas which were sung to Jesus in the Temple by the youthful throng were in full unison and of equal grandeur with those of the multitudes that went before and that followed

him, and spread their garments in the way, and cried, saying, "Hosanna to the Son of David!" "Hosanna in the highest!" *SEE SUNDAY SCHOOL.*

In the preparation of this article we have freely used the labors of other reference books. We have also had valuable contributions in sections from the pens of eminent writers. Dr. W. J. R. Taylor has greatly enriched our treatment of American psalmody, especially that treating of the Reformed Church. The Rev. Dr. Pick has aided in the bibliography. Those desiring fuller information will consult the list of works quoted in the article HYMNOLOGY *SEE HYMNOLOGY.*

Psalms, Book Of,

one of the most important of the Biblical components, standing in the English Scriptures at the beginning of the practical or experimental books, and in the Hebrew Bible of the Kethubim, or Hagiographa. In the following accounts we follow the general line of the works on Biblical interpretation; but we have thrown some new light, we trust, especially upon the difficult questions connected with the titles of the several Psalms. *SEE BIBLE.*

I. *General Title of the Book.* — This collection of sacred poetry received its English name, *Psalms*, from the Greek of the Septuagint, **ψαλμοί**, in consequence of the *lyrical* character of the pieces of which it consists, as intended to be sung to stringed and other instruments of music. The word (from **ψάλλω**, to *touch* or *strike* a chord) is aptly defined by Gregory of Nyssa (*Tract.* ii, in *Psalmos*, c. 3) as melody produced by a musical instrument. Another name, *Psalter*, was given to this book from the Greek **ψαλτήριον**, the *stringed instrument* to which its contents were originally sung. *SEE PSALTERY.*

It does not appear how the Psalms were, as a whole, anciently designated. Their present Hebrew appellation is **מִזְמוֹרֹת** *Tehillim*, elsewhere rendered "Praises." But in the actual superscriptions of the psalms the word **מִזְמוֹר** is applied only to one, ^{<HEB>}Psalm 145, which is indeed emphatically a praise-hymn. The Sept. (as above noted) entitled them **Ψαλμοί**, or "Psalms," using the word **ψαλμός** at the same time as the translation of **מִזְמוֹר**, which signifies strictly a rhythmical composition (Lowth, *Prælect.* 3), and which was probably applied in practice to any poem specially intended, by reason of its rhythm, for musical performance with instrumental accompaniment. But the Hebrew word is, in the Old Test.,

never used elsewhere in the plural; and in the superscriptions of even the Davidic psalms it is applied only to some, not to all; probably to those which had been composed most expressly for the harp. The Hebrew title, **מִלִּים** (Rabbinic form, with **h** elided, **מִלִּי ת** or **מִלִּי ת**, *tillim* or *tilbin*), signifies *hymns or praises*, and was probably adopted on account of the use made of the collection in divine service, though only a part can be strictly called songs of praise, not a few being lamentations and prayers. There is evidently no proper correspondence between the titles in the two languages, though each is suitable. The word answering to **מִלִּי ת** is **ὕμνοι**, and not **ψαλμοί**, which rather (as above noted) corresponds to **מִזְמוֹרֹת** *izmorilm*, *lyrical odes* — a name which, though so plainly appropriate, does not appear to have been generally given to the book, at least so far as the Hebrew usage can now be ascertained. This is the more singular, inasmuch as no fewer than sixty-five of the songs distinctly bear the title of **מִזְמוֹר** while only one (^{<9721>}Psalm 145:1) is styled **הַלֵּל ת**. That the name **מִזְמוֹר** did, however, obtain in ancient times, rather than the present title, **מִלִּי ת**, may be presumed from the use of **ψαλμοί** in the Sept. and the New Test., and of *mizmera* in the Peshito. **SEE PRAISE.**

In ^{<9721>}Psalm 72:20 we find all the preceding compositions (1-72) styled *Prayers of David*, because many of them are strictly prayers, and all are pervaded by the spirit and tone of supplication. This notice has suggested that the Psalms may in the earliest times have been known as **תְּפִלִּים** *tephill th*, “Prayers;” and, in fact, “Prayer” is the title prefixed to the most ancient of all the psalms, that of Moses (Psalm 90). But the same designation is in the superscriptions applied to only three besides, Psalm 17, 86, 102; nor have all the psalms the character of prayers. **SEE PRAYER.**

The other special designations applied to particular psalms are the following: **רִיבָה** *Shir*, “Song,” the outpouring of the soul in thanksgiving, used in the first instance of a hymn of private gratitude (Psalm 30), afterwards of hymns of great national thanksgiving (Psalm 46, 48, 65, etc.); **לִי קָוָה** *alskil*, “Instruction” or “Homily” (Psalm 32, 42, 44 etc.; comp. the **לִי יְקַחְךָ**, “I will instruct thee,” in ^{<9721>}Psalm 32:8); **מִתְקַנָּה** *Mliktim*, “Private Memorial,” if from the root **מִתְקַן** (perhaps also with an anagrammatical allusion to the root **מִתְקַן**, “to support,” “maintain;” comp.

Psalm 16:5) (Psalm 16:56-59); *Eduth*, “Testimony” (Psalm 60, 80); and *Shiggayon*, “Irregular or Dithyrambic Ode” (Psalm 7). The strict meaning of these terms is in general to be gathered from the earlier superscriptions. Once made familiar to the psalmists, they were afterwards employed by them more loosely. (See § 4 below.)

II. Numeration of the Psalms. — The Christian Church obviously received the Psalter from the Jews not only as a constituent portion of the sacred volume of Holy Scripture, but also as the liturgical hymn-book which the Jewish Church had regularly used in the Temple. The number of separate psalms contained in it is, by the concordant testimony of all ancient authorities, one hundred and fifty; the avowedly “supernumerary” psalm which appears at the end of the Greek and Syriac Psalters, “on David’s victory over Goliath,” being manifestly apocryphal. This total number commends itself by its internal probability as having proceeded from the last sacred collector and editor of the Psalter. In the details, however, of the numbering, both the Greek and Syriac Psalters differ from the Hebrew. The Greek translators joined together Psalm 9:10 and Psalm 114, 115, and then divided Psalm 116 and Psalm 147; this was perpetuated in the versions derived from the Greek, and among others in the Latin Vulgate. The Syriac so far followed the Greek as to join together Psalm 114, 115, and to divide Psalm 147. Of the three divergent systems of numbering, the Hebrew (as followed in our A.V.) is, even on internal grounds, to be preferred. It is decisive against the Greek numbering that Psalm 116, being symmetrical in its construction, will not bear to be divided; and against the Syriac that it destroys the outward correspondence in numerical place between the three great triumphal psalms, Psalm 18, 68, 118, as also between the two psalms containing the praise of the Law, Psalm 19, 119. That Psalm 42, 43 were originally one is evident from the continuation of the refrain. There are also some discrepancies in the versal numberings. That of our A.V. frequently differs from that of the Hebrew in consequence of the Jewish practice of reckoning the superscription as the first verse. *SEE VERSE.*

III. Ancient Collection and Division. — When the Psalms, as a whole, were collected, and *by whom*, are questions that cannot be confidently answered. The Talmudists most absurdly considered David the collector of them all (*Berakoth*, i, 9). It is certain that the book, as it now stands, could not have been formed before the building of the second Temple, for Psalm

126 was evidently composed at that period. In all probability it was formed by Ezra and his contemporaries, about B.C. 450 (Ewald, *Poet. Bucher*, ii, 205).

But in the arrangement of the book there is manifest proof of its gradual formation out of several smaller collections, each ending with a peculiar formula. The Psalter is divided in the Hebrew into five books (detailed below) and also in the Sept. version, which proves the division to be older than B.C. 200. Some have fancied that this fivefold division did not originally exist, but that it arose simply from a desire to have as many parts in the Psalms as there are in the law of Moses. But strong reasons demand the rejection of such a fancy. Why should this conformity to the Pentateuch be desired and effected in the Psalms, and not also in Proverbs or in the Prophets? The five books bear decided marks, both from tradition and internal evidence, of being not arbitrary divisions, but distinct and independent collections by various hands.

The *first book* (1-41) consists wholly of David's songs (see Vriemoet, *Nomenclator Davidis ad solos Psalmos pertinet* [Rost. 1628], his name being prefixed to all except 1, 2, 10, and 33; nor do we find in it a trace of any but David's authorship. No such trace exists in the mention of the "Temple" (5:7), for that word is even in ~~(3009)~~ 1 Samuel 1:9; 3:3 applied to the Tabernacle; nor yet in the phrase "bringeth back the captivity" (14:7), which is elsewhere used, idiomatically, with great latitude of meaning (~~(3820)~~ Job 42:10; ~~(3861)~~ Hosea 6:11; Ezra 16:53); nor yet in the acrosticism of Psalm 25 etc., for that all acrostic psalms are of late date is a purely gratuitous assumption, and some even of the most sceptical critics admit the Davidic authorship of the partially acrostic ~~(3900)~~ Psalm 9:10. All the psalms of book 1 being thus Davidic, we may well believe that the compilation of the book was also David's work. In favor of this is the circumstance that it does not comprise all David's psalms, nor his latest, which yet would have been all included in it by any subsequent collector; also the circumstance that its two prefatory psalms, although not superscribed, are yet shown by internal evidence to have proceeded from David himself; and furthermore, that of the two recensions of the same hymn (~~(3945)~~ Psalm 14:53), it prefers that which seems to have been more specially adapted by its royal author to the Temple service. Others with less reason assign this division to the time of Hezekiah, who is known to have ordered a collection of Solomon's proverbs (~~(3200)~~ Proverbs 25:1), and to

have commanded the Levites to sing the words of David (^{<408>}2 Chronicles 29:30).

The *second book* (42-72) consists mainly of pieces by the sons of Korah (42-49), and by David (51-65), which may have been separate minor collections. At the end of this book is found the notice, "The prayers of David the son of Jesse are ended;" and hence some have thought that this was originally the close of a large collection comprising Psalm 1-72 (Carpzov, *Introductio*, etc., 2, 107). But that the second was *originally* distinct from the first book is proved by the repetition of one or two pieces; thus Psalm 53 is plainly the same as Psalm 14 with only a notable variation in the divine name, **יְהוָה**, *Elohim, God*, being used in the former wherever **יהוה** *Jehovah, Lord*, is found in the latter. So also Psalm 70 is but a repetition of ^{<5413>}Psalm 40:13-17, with the same singular variation in the divine name. This division appears by the date of its latest psalm (Psalm 46) to have been compiled in the reign of king Hezekiah. It would naturally comprise, first, several or most of the Levitical psalms anterior to that date, and, secondly, the remainder of the psalms of David previously uncompiled. According to others, this collection was not made till the period of the captivity, on the ground that Psalm 44 refers to the days of Jeremiah.

The *third book* (73-89) consists chiefly of Asaph's psalms, but comprises apparently two smaller collections — the one Asaphitic (73-83), the other mostly Korahitic (84-89). The collector of this book had no intention to bring together songs written by David, and therefore he put the above notice at the end of the second book (see De Wette, *Psalmen, Einleitung*, p. 21). This book, the interest of which centres in the times of Hezekiah, stretches out, by its last two psalms, to the reign of Manasseh: it was probably compiled in the reign of Josiah. In the opinion of others, the date of this collection must be as late as the return from Babylon, on the supposition that Psalm 85 implies as much.

The *fourth book* (90-106), containing the remainder of the psalms up to the date of the captivity; and the *fifth* (107-150), comprising the psalms of the return, are made up chiefly of anonymous liturgic pieces, many of which were composed for the service of the second Temple. In the last book we have the Songs of Degrees (120-134), which seem to have been originally a separate collection. There is nothing to distinguish these two books from

each other in respect of outward decoration or arrangement, and they may have been compiled together in the days of Nehemiah.

The five books may, with some propriety, be thus distinguished: the first *Davidic*, the second *Korahitic*, the third *Asaphitic*, and the two remaining *liturgic*. (Comp. § v, below.)

The ancient Jewish tradition as to this division is preserved to us by the abundant testimonies of the Christian fathers. Of the indications which the sacred text itself contains of this division the most obvious are the doxologies which we find at the end of Psalm 41, 72, 89, 106, and which, having for the most part no special connection with the psalms to which they are attached, mark the several ends of the first four of the five books. It suggests itself at once that these books must have been originally formed at different periods.

This conclusion is by various further considerations rendered all but certain, while the few difficulties which stand in the way of admitting it vanish when closely examined. Thus there is a remarkable difference between the several books in their use of the divine names Jehovah and Elohim to designate Almighty God. In book 1 the former name prevails: it is found 272 times, while Elohim occurs but fifteen times. (We here take no account of the superscriptions or doxology, nor yet of the occurrences of Elohim when inflected with a possessive suffix.) On the other hand, in book 2 Elohim is found more than five times as often as Jehovah. In book 3 the preponderance of Elohim in the earlier is balanced by that of Jehovah in the later psalms of the book. In book 4 the name Jehovah is exclusively employed; and so also, virtually, in book 5, Elohim being there found only in two passages incorporated from earlier psalms. Those who maintain, therefore, that the psalms were all collected and arranged at once, contend that the collector distributed the Psalms according to the divine names which they severally exhibited. But to this theory the existence of book 3, in which the preferential use of the Elohim gradually yields to that of the Jehovah, is fatal. The large appearance, in fact, of the name Elohim in books 2 and 3 depends in great measure on the period to which many of the psalms of those books belong — the period from the reign of Solomon to that of Hezekiah, when through certain causes the name Jehovah was exceptionally disused. The preference for the name Elohim in most of the Davidic psalms which are included in book 2 is closely allied with that character of those psalms which induced David himself to exclude them

from his own collection, book 1; while, lastly, the sparing use of the Jehovah in Psalm 68, and the three introductory psalms which precede it, is designed to cause the name, when it occurs, and above all *Jah*, which is emphatic for Jehovah, to shine out with greater force and splendor.

IV. Superscriptions. — All the Psalms, except thirty-four, bear superscriptions. According to some, there are only twenty-five exceptions, as they reckon **הַלְלוּ לַיהוָה** *hallelujah*, a title in all the Psalms which commence with it. To each of these exceptions the Talmud (Babyl. Cod. *Aboda Sarah*, fol. 24, col. 2) gives the name **אמתי ארמזם**, *Orphan Psalm*. It is confessedly very difficult, if not impossible, to explain all the terms employed in the inscriptions; and hence critics have differed exceedingly in their conjectures. The difficulty, arising no doubt from ignorance of the Temple music, was felt, it would seem, as early as the age of the Sept.; and it was felt so much by the translators of our A.V. that they generally retained the Hebrew words, even though Luther had set the example of translating them to the best of his ability. It is worth observing that the difficulty appears to have determined Coverdale (1535) to *omit* nearly all except names of authors; thus in Psalm 60, which is 59 in his version, he gives only *a Psalm of David*.

The *authority* of the titles is a matter of doubt. By most of the ancient critics they were considered genuine and of equal authority with the Psalms themselves, while most of the moderns reject them wholly or in part. They were wholly rejected at the close of the 4th century by Theodore of Mopsuestia, one of the ablest and most judicious of ancient interpreters (Rosenmüller, *Hist. Interpretationis Librorum Sacrorum* 3, 256). On the other hand, it deserves to be noticed that they are received by Tholuck and Hengstenberg in their works on the Psalms. Of the *antiquity* of the inscriptions there can be no question, for they are found in the Sept. They are supposed to be even much older than this version, since they were no longer intelligible to the translator, who often makes no sense of them. Their obscurity might, however, have been owing not so much to their antiquity as to the translator's residence in Egypt, and consequent ignorance of the psalmody of the Temple service in Jerusalem. At any rate, the appearance of the titles in the Sept. can only prove them to be about as ancient as the days of Ezra. Then it is argued by many that they must be as old as the Psalms themselves, since it is customary for Oriental poets to prefix titles to their songs. Instances are found in Arabic poems, but these

are very unlike the Hebrew inscriptions. Much more important traces of the custom appear in ^{<389>}Isaiah 38:9, in ^{<390>}Habakkuk 3:1, and in ^{<1017>}2 Samuel 1:17, 18 (Tholuck, *Psalmen*, p. 24). The other instances commonly appealed to in ^{<1250>}Exodus 15:1; ^{<1513>}Deuteronomy 31:30; ^{<1781>}Judges 5:1; ^{<1211>}2 Samuel 22:1, furnish no evidence, since they are not proper titles of the songs so much as brief statements connecting them with the narrative. But in ^{<1231>}2 Samuel 23:1 and ^{<1243>}Numbers 24:3 there is strong proof of the usage, if, with Tholuck, we take the verses as inscriptions, and not as integral parts of the songs, which most hold them justly to be from their poetical form.

The following considerations seem to militate against the authority of the titles:

- (1.) The analogy between them and the *subscriptions* to the apostolical epistles. The latter are now universally rejected: why not the former?
- (2.) The Greek and Syriac versions exhibit them with great and numerous variations, often altering the Hebrew (as in Psalm 27), and sometimes giving a heading where the Hebrew has none (as in Psalm 93-97). Would the ancient translators have taken such liberties, or could such variations have arisen, if the titles had been considered sacred like the Psalms themselves? At any rate, the existence of these glaring variations is sufficient to induce a distrust of the titles in their present form, even though they had been once sanctioned by inspired authority. If ever Ezra settled them, the variations in versions and manuscripts (Eichhorn, *Einleitung*, iii, 490, 495) have tended since to make them doubtful.
- (3.) The inscriptions are occasionally thought to be at variance with the contents of the Psalms. Sometimes the author is believed to be incorrectly given, as when David is named over psalms referring to the captivity, as in ^{<9147>}Psalm 14:7; 25:22; 51:20, 21; 69:36. It is not unlikely, however, as Tholuck thinks, that these references to the exile were added during that period to the genuine text of the royal singer. Others, as Calvin and Hengstenberg, with far less probability, take these passages in a figurative or spiritual sense. Also Psalm 139, it is supposed, cannot well be David's, for its style is not free from Chaldaisms. Then sometimes the occasion is incorrectly specified, as in Psalm 30, unless, indeed, this refers to the dedication of the *site of the Temple* (^{<1321>}1 Chronicles 22:1), as Rosenmüller, Tholuck, and Hengstenberg think after Venema. The real solution of the controversy lies in the answer to this question: Do they,

when individually sifted, approve themselves as so generally correct, and as so free from any single fatal objection to their credit, as to claim our universal confidence? This cannot be fully discussed here, although intimations are given below calculated to confirm the accuracy of the titles as found in the Hebrew and English Bible, especially as to authorship and occasion. We must simply avow our conviction, founded on thorough examination, that they are, when rightly interpreted, fully trustworthy, and that every separate objection that has been made to the correctness of any one of them can be fairly met. Moreover, some of the arguments of their assailants obviously recoil upon themselves. Thus when it is alleged that the contents of Psalm 34 have no connection with the occasion indicated in the superscription, we reply that the fact of the connection not being readily apparent renders it improbable that the superscription should have been prefixed by any but David himself.

Of the terms left *untranslated* or *obscure* in our Bible, it may be well to offer some explanation in this place, referring to them in alphabetical order for a fuller elucidation. On this subject most commentators offer instruction, but the reader may especially consult Rosenmüller, *Scholia in Comp. Redacta*, iii, 14-22; De Wette, *Commentar uber die Psalmen*, p. 27-37; Ewald, *Poet. Bucher*, i, 169-180, 195. The following summary exhibits the literary and musical systems of notation found in the individual titles to the Psalms at one view, classified under the several terms and particles used to point out their bearing and significance:

I. With the prefix **l]** *le-* (*to* or *by*):

a. The *author*: namely,

1. *David*: 3-8, 11-32, 34-41, 51, 53-65, 68-70, 86, 101, 103, 108-110, 122, 124, 131, 133, 138-144.

2. *Levites*:

(**1.**) Korahites only: 42, 44-49, 84, 85, 87.

(**2.**) Asaph[ites] specially, as a branch of the Korahites: 50, 73-83.

(**3.**) Heman the [Ezraite, i.e.] Korahite individually: 88.

(**4.**) Ethan the [Ezraite, i.e.] Korahite individually: 89.

3. *Moses*: 90.

4. *Solomon*: 72, 127.

5. General terms:

- (1) “Man of God,” 90;
- (2) “Jehovah’s servant,” 18, 36;
- (3) “an afflicted one,” 102.

b. The person to whom the poem was *dedicated*, or by whom it was set to music, or under whose direction it was to be rendered:

1. **j Kəmhj** *ham-menatstseach* (A.V. “the chief musician”), the musical *precentor* of the Temple for the time being: 4-6, 8, 11-14, 18-22, 31, 36, 39-42, 44-47, 49, 51-62, 64-70, 75-77, 80, 84, 85, 88, 109, 139, 140.

2. Jedithian in particular: 39.

c. The *object* or special purpose of the writer:

1. **ryKzpj** *hazkLr* (*to remind*, A.V. “to bring to remembrance”), as a memento of some special deliverance, etc.: 38, 70.

2. **dMēj** *lammed* (“to teach”), perhaps to be publicly pronounced *memoriter*: 60.

3. **t/N[ī** *annoth* (*to reply*, A.V. “Leannoth,” q.v.), *responsive*, perhaps a note of the style of recitation: 88.

4. **hd/T**, *todah* (*confession*, A.V. “to praise”), in *acknowledgment*, i.e. of God’s mercy: 101.

5. Commemorative of the *Sabbath-day*: 92.

II. With the prefix **B]** *be-* (*with*):

a. To designate the orchestral *accompaniment*: only **t/nygæ** *neginuth* (q.v.), or *stringed instruments* in general: 4, 6, 54, 55, 68, 76.

b. To designate the *occasion* of composition: 3, 34, 51, 52, 56, 57, 59, 60, 63, 142. The occasion is sometimes otherwise stated: vii, xviii, xxx.

III. With the preposition **l [ī** *al* (*upon*), to denote the musical style of *performance*, as indicated by:

a. The *instrument* employed by the leader:

1. **μyNævbi** *hash-shoshannim* (the lilies, i.e. lily-shaped, A.V. “Shoshannim,” q.v.), straight trumpets: 45, 69 [μyNæv], 60 [˘vllv, sing.].
 2. **tl j ni** *machalet* (the smooth-toned, A.V. “Mahalath,” q.v.), probably a lute or light stringed instrument: 53, 88.
 3. **tnyga** *neginzth*, a stringed instrument in general: 61. **SEE NEGINOTH.**
 4. **tyTæbi** *hag-gittith*, the Gittitish, probably a peculiar form of lyre: 8; or perhaps on an eight-stringed lyre. **SEE GITTITE.**
- b.** The pitch of the singing:
1. **tyyæthi** *hash-sheninith* (the eighth), the octave, i.e. in a “tenor” voice: 6, 12. **SEE SHEMINITH.**
 2. **t/ml [}** *alamoth* (q.v.), (virgins), in a female key, i.e. “soprano” 46.
- c.** After the style of some noted performer: only Juduthun: 62, 77.
- d.** The tune or melody to be imitated:
1. **˘Bèi tWm**, *muth lab-ben* (q.v.) (death to the son), i.e. a ditty so beginning or thus entitled: 9, and end of 48
 2. **rhVh tl Yai** *ayylieth hash-shahar* (q.v.), (hind of the dawn), a popular song so called: 22.
 3. **μyqæ]μl æetni'y**, *yonath elem rechokim* (q.v.) (dove of silence of distant ones), an emblematic title of some well-known air: 56.
 4. (l [iomitted on account of the alliteration with l a) **tyj æTAl ai** [or **tj A**], *al-tashchith* [or- *chth*] (q.v.) (thou mayest not desstroy), the symbolical designation of some familiar measure: 57-59, 75, 81, 84.
- IV.** With the preposition **l aæel**, towards); in imitation of (French *a la*) some peculiar “quality” of tone (as we say, the stop of the organ):
1. **t/l yj æpi** *han-nechildth* (q.v.) (the contracted), the flute or continuous sound: 5.
 2. **μyNæv**, *shoshaznnim* (q.v.) (lilies), the trumpet blast: 80.

V. The species of poetical *composition*:

1. *ryvashir* (*song*), simply an *ode* or lyrical piece: 46, 48, 65-68, 75, 76, 83, 87, 88, 108. In some of these instances it is joined with the term following. In a certain series it is coupled with the expression *t/I [Mhi ham-maalloth* (*the steps*, A.V. “degrees,” q.v.), i.e. *climactic* in construction of phrases: 120-134. In one case it is joined with the term *t/dydyeyedidoth* (i.e. “loves”), i.e. an *epithalamium*: 45.

2. *r/mzizmor* (*playing on an instrument*), simply a *hymn*, to be sung with musical accompaniment: 3-6, 8, 12, 13, 15, 19-24, 29-31, 38-41, 48, 62-68, 73, 75-77, 79, 80, 82-85, 87, 88, 98, 100, 101, 108-110, 139-141, 143.

3. *µTknAm* (*written*, “*michtam*,” q.v.), perhaps i.q. a “set piece” or “mottet:” 16, 56-60.

4. *hLpā tephallah*, a “prayer:” 17, 86, 90, 102, 142.

5. *hLhā tehillah*, a “psalm” simply: 145.

6. *lyKāni maskil* (*instructive*, “*maschil*,” q.v.), a *didactic* poem: 22, 42, 44, 45, 52-55, 74, 78, 88, 89, 142.

7. *tWd [edith* (*precept*, “*eduth*,” q.v.), an *ethical* poem: 60, 80.

8. *˘yGvāshiggayon* (*sighing*, “*shiggaion*,” q.v.), an *elegiac* or plaintive song: 7.

V. *Original Authorship of the Psalms.* — Many of the ancients, both Jews and Christians, maintained that all the Psalms were written by David, which is one of the most striking proofs of their *uncritical* judgment. So the Talmudists (*Cod. Pesachim*, 10:117); Augustine, who is never a good critic (*De Civ. Dei*, 17:14); and Chrysostom (*Prol. ad Psalmos*). But Jerome, as might be expected, held the opinion which now universally prevails (*Epist. ad Sophronium*). The titles and the contents of the Psalms most clearly show that they were composed at different and remote periods by several poets, of whom David was only the largest and most eminent contributor.

1. *David*, “the sweet psalmist of Israel” (¹⁰²⁰2 Samuel 23:1). To him are ascribed seventy-three psalms in the Hebrew text (not seventy-four, as De Wette and Tholuck state; nor seventy-one, as most others have counted), and at least eleven others in the Sept. — namely, 33, 43, 91, 94-99, 104, 137; to which may be added Psalm 10 as it forms part of Psalm 9 in that version.

To these psalms the collector, after properly appending the single psalm of Solomon, has affixed the notice that “the prayers of David the son of Jesse are ended” (¹⁹⁷²Psalm 72:20); evidently implying, at least on the *prima facie* view, that no more compositions of the royal psalmist remained. How, then, do we find in the later books — 3, 4, 5, — further psalms yet marked with David’s name? Some have sought to answer this question by a reference to the authorship assigned in the superscriptions of other psalms. If (as we shall presently see) in the times posterior to those of David the Levitical choirs prefixed to the psalms which they composed the names of Asaph, Heman, and Ethan, out of a feeling of veneration for their memories, how much more might the name of David be prefixed to the utterances of those who were not merely his descendants, but also the representatives for the time being, and so in some sort the pledges of the perpetual royalty of his lineage! The name David is used to denote, in other parts of Scripture, after the original David’s death, the then head of the Davidic family; and so, in prophecy, the Messiah of the seed of David, who was to sit on David’s throne (¹¹²⁶1 Kings 12:16; ³⁸⁵Hosea 3:5; ²⁸⁸Isaiah 55:3; ²⁴⁰Jeremiah 30:9; Ezra 34:23, 24). Thus some seek to explain the meaning of the later Davidic superscriptions in the Psalter. The psalms to which they belong are thought to have been written by Hezekiah, by Josiah, by Zerubbabel, or others of David’s posterity. This view is supposed to be confirmed by various considerations. In the later books, and even in book v taken alone, the psalms marked with David’s name are not grouped all together. In some instances there is internal evidence of occasion: thus Psalm 101 can ill be reconciled with the historical circumstances of any period of David’s life, but suits exactly with those of the opening of the reign of Josiah. Some of these psalms — Psalm 86, 108, 144 — are compacted of passages from previous psalms of David. Lastly, the Hebrew text of many (see, above all, Psalm 139) is marked by grammatical Chaldaisms, which are entirely unparalleled in Psalm 1-72, and which thus afford strong evidence of a comparatively recent date. They cannot, therefore, it is claimed, be David’s own; yet it is held that the

superscriptions are not on that account to be rejected as false, but must rather be properly interpreted, on the ground of the improbability that any would, carelessly or presumptuously, have prefixed David's name to various psalms *scattered* through a collection, while yet leaving the rest — at least in books 4, 5, — altogether unsuperscribed. Ingenious as is this explanation, we prefer to adhere to the simple and obvious meaning of the titles as ascribing the psalms in question to David himself, and we do not feel constrained to seek other authors by the nature of the contents.

When we consider David's eminence as a poet, and the delight he took in sacred song, we cannot wonder that he should be the author of so many of the Psalms — no fewer, in all likelihood, than half the collection: the wonder rather should be that we do not find more of his fine odes, for it is certain he wrote some which are not in this book; see in ^{<1019>}2 Samuel 1:19-27 his lament over Saul and Jonathan, and in 23:1-7 his last inspired effusion. His character and merit as the father of Hebrew melody and music — for it was in his hands and under his auspices that these flourished most — are thus set forth by the son of Sirach (47:8-10), “In all his work he gave thanks. To the Holy and Most High he sang songs with all his heart in words of praise (ῥήματι δόξης), and he loved his Maker. He set singers also before the altar, and from their music (ἦχον) sweet melody resounded. He gave splendor to the feasts, and adorned the solemn times unto perfection (μέχρι συντελείας), in that they praised his holy name, and the sanctuary pealed with music from early morn.”

David's compositions are generally distinguished by sweetness, softness, and grace, but sometimes, as in Psalm 18 they exhibit the sublime. His prevailing strain is plaintive, owing to his multiplied and sore trials, both before and after his occupation of the throne. How often was he beset with dangers, harassed by foes, and chastised of God! Under these circumstances, how was his spirit bowed down, and gave vent to its plaints and sorrows on the saddened chords of the lyre! But in the midst of all he generally found relief, and his sorrow gave place to calm confidence and joy in God. What wonder that a soul so susceptible and devout as his should manifest emotions so strong, so changeful, and so various, seeing that he passed through the greatest vicissitudes of life? God took him from the sheepfolds to feed Jacob his people and Israel his inheritance (^{<1980>}Psalm 78:70, 71). See Herder, *Geist der ebr. Poesie*, ii, 297-301; and especially Tholuck (*Psalmen, Einleitung*, § 3), who gives a most admirable exhibition of the psalmist's history and services. *SEE DAVID*.

The example and countenance of the king naturally led others to cultivate poetry and music. It appears from ^{<301B>}Amos 6:5 that lovers of pleasure took David's compositions as a model for their worldly songs: how much more would the lovers of piety be induced to follow him by producing sacred songs and hymns! The fine psalm in ^{<301B>}Habakkuk 3 is an exact imitation of his style as seen in Psalm 18. The celebrated singers of his day were men, like himself, moved by the divine afflatus not only to excel in music, but also to indite hallowed poetry. Of these psalmists the names of several are preserved in the titles.

2. *Asaph* is named as the author of twelve psalms — viz. 50, 73-83. He was one of David's chief musicians. All the poems bearing his name cannot be his, for in Psalm 74, 79, and 80 there are manifest allusions to very late events in the history of Israel. Either, then, the titles of these three psalms must be wholly rejected, or the name must be here taken for the "sons of Asaph;" which is not improbable, as the family continued for many generations in the choral service of the Temple. Asaph appears from Psalm 50, 73 and 78 to have been the greatest master of didactic poetry, excelling alike in sentiment and in diction. No critic whatever contends that *all* these eleven belong to the age of David, and, in real truth, internal evidence is in every single instance in favor of a later origin. They were composed, then, by the "sons of Asaph" (^{<421B>}2 Chronicles 29:13; 25:15, etc.), the members, by hereditary descent, of the choir which Asaph founded. It was to be expected that these psalmists would, in superscribing their psalms, prefer honoring and perpetuating the memory of their ancestor to obtruding their own personal names on the Church — a consideration which both explains the present superscriptions and also renders it improbable that the person intended in them could, according to a frequent but now waning hypothesis, be any second Asaph of younger generation and of inferior fame. *SEE ASAPH.*

3. The *sons of Korah* were another family of choristers, to whom eleven of the most beautiful psalms are ascribed. The authorship is assigned to the Korahites in general, not because many of them could have been engaged in composing one and the same song, but because the name of the particular writer was unknown or omitted. *SEE KORAH.* However, in Psalm 88 we find, besides the family designation, the name of the individual who wrote it — viz.:

4. Heman was another of David's chief singers (^{<13159>}1 Chronicles 15:19); he is called the Ezraite, as being descended from some Ezra, who appears to have been a descendant of Korah; at least Heman is reckoned a Kohathite (^{<13163>}1 Chronicles 6:33-38), and was therefore, probably a Korahite, for the Kohathites were continued and counted in the line of Korah; see ^{<13162>}1 Chronicles 6:22, 37, 38. Thus Heman was both an Ezraite and of the sons of Korah. That Psalm 88 was written by him is not unlikely, though many question it, regarding this term likewise as a mere patronymic. *SEE HEMAN.*

5. Ethan is reputed the author of Psalm 89. He also is called the Ezraite, but this is either a mistake, or he as well as Heman had an ancestor named Ezra, of whom nothing is known. The Ethan intended in the title is doubtless the Levite of Merari's family whom David made chief musician along with Asaph and Heman (^{<13164>}1 Chronicles 6:44; 25:1, 6). *SEE ETHAN.*

6. Solomon is given as the author of Psalm 72 and 127, and there is no decided internal evidence to the contrary, though most consider him to be the subject, and not the author, of Psalm 72. *SEE SOLOMON.*

7. Moses is reputed the writer of Psalm 90, and there is no strong reason to doubt the tradition; but the Talmudists, whom Origen, and even Jerome, follow, ascribe to him also the ten succeeding psalms (91-100), on the principle that the anonymous productions belonged to the last-named author. This principle is manifestly false, since in several of these psalms we find evidence that Moses was not the author. In Psalm 95 the forty years' wandering in the wilderness is referred to as past; in ^{<19978>}Psalm 97:8 mention is made of Zion and Judah, which proves that it cannot be dated earlier than the time of David; and in ^{<19916>}Psalm 99:6 the prophet Samuel is named, which also proves that Moses could not be the writer. *SEE MOSES.*

Jeduthun is sometimes, without just ground, held to be named as the author of Psalm 39; the ascription there being merely a dedication to the leader of the Levitical orchestra. In the view of others, this, like the superscriptions of Psalm 88, 89, "Maschil of Heman," "Maschil of Ethan," have simply a conventional purport — the one psalm having been written, as, in fact, the rest of its superscription states, by the sons of Korah, the choir of which Heman was the founder; and the other correspondingly

proceeding from the third Levitical choir, which owed its origin to Ethan or Jeduthun. *SEE JEDUTHUN.*

Many conjectures have been formed respecting other writers, especially of the anonymous psalms. The Sept. seemingly gives, as authors, Jeremiah (Psalm 137), and Haggai and Zechariah (Psalm 138). But these conjectures are too uncertain to call for further notice in this place. Hitzig (*Comment. uber die Psalmen*) ascribes to Jeremiah a large number of the elegiac or plaintive psalms.

More particularly, the Psalms may be arranged, according to the intimations of authorship contained in the titles, as follows:

A. Exclusively Davidic.. 1-41.

(Only Psalms 1, 2, 10 and 33 are somewhat doubtful.)

B. Exclusively Levitical —

a. Korahites42-49

b. Asaph 50

C. Chiefly Davidic —

a. David51-64 .

b. Uncertain 65-67.

c. David 68-70.

d. Uncertain 71.

e. David (for Solomon) 72.

D. Chiefly Levitical —

a. Asaph. 23 — 83.

b. Korahites. 84-85.

c. David 86.

d. Korahites and Heman. 87, 88.

e. Ethan 89.

f. Moses90.

g. Uncertain 91-100.

h. David101.

i. Uncertain101.

j. David103.

k. Uncertain104-107.

- l. David 108-110.
- m. Uncertain 111-119.

E. “Degrees”

- a. Uncertain 120-121.
- b. David 122.
- c. Uncertain 123.
- d. David 124.
- e. Uncertain 125, 126.
- f. Solomon 127.
- g. Uncertain 128-130.
- h. David 131.
- i. Uncertain 132.
- j. David 133.
- k. Uncertain 134.

F. Miscellaneous

- a. Uncertain 135-137.
- b. David 138-145.
- c. Uncertain. 146-159.

VI. Dates and Occasions of the Psalms. — The dates of the Psalms, as must be obvious from what has been stated respecting the authors, are very various, ranging from the time of Moses to that of the captivity — a period of nearly 1000 years. In the time of king Jehoshaphat (about B.C. 896) Psalm 83, setting forth the dangers of the nation, as we read in ~~141b~~ 2 Chronicles 20:1-25, was composed either by himself, as some suppose, or most likely, according to the title, by Jahaziel, “a Levite of the sons of Asaph,” who was then an inspired teacher (see ver. 14). In the days of Hezekiah, who was himself a poet (~~230b~~ Isaiah 38:9-20), we may date, with great probability, the Korahitic Psalms 46 and 48, which seem to celebrate the deliverance from Sennacherib (~~129b~~ 2 Kings 19:35). In the period of the captivity were evidently written such laments as Psalm 44, 79, 102, and 137; and after its close, when the captives returned, we must manifestly date Psalm 85 and 126.

Some have maintained that several psalms, especially 74, were written even in the days of the Maccabees; but this is contrary to every probability, for, according to all accounts, the Canon had been closed before that time.

SEE CANON. Moreover, the hypothesis of a Maccabaeian authorship of any portion of the Psalter can ill be reconciled with the history of the translation of the Septuagint. But the difficulties do not end here. How — for we shall not here discuss the theories of Hitzig and his followers Lengerke and Justus Olshausen, who would represent the greater part of the Psalter as Maccabean — how is it that the psalms which one would most naturally assign to the Maccabaeian period meet us not in the close, but in the middle (i.e. in the second and third books) of the Psalter? The three named by De Wette (*Einl. in das A. T.* § 270) as bearing apparently a Maccabaeian impress are Psalm 44, 60, 74; and, in fact, these, together with Psalm 79, are perhaps all that would, when taken alone, seriously suggest the hypothesis of a Maccabaeian date. Whence, then, arise the early places in the Psalter which these occupy? But even in the case of these the internal evidence, when more narrowly examined, proves to be in favor of an earlier date. In the first place, the superscription of Psalm 60 cannot possibly have been invented from the historical books, inasmuch as it disagrees with them in its details. Then the mention by name in that psalm of the Israelitish tribes, and of Moab and Philistia, is unsuited to the Maccabaeian epoch. In Psalm 44 the complaint is made that the tree of the nation of Israel was no longer spreading over the territory that God had assigned it. Is it conceivable that a Maccabean psalmist should have held this language without making the slightest allusion to the Babylonian captivity, as if the tree's growth were now first seriously impeded by the wild stocks around, notwithstanding that it had once been entirely transplanted, and that, though restored to its place, it had been weakly ever since? In Psalm 74 it is complained that "there is no more any prophet." Would that be a natural complaint at a time when Jewish prophecy had ceased for more than two centuries? Lastly, in Psalm 79, the mention of "kingdoms" in ver. 6 ill suits the Maccabaeian time; while the way in which the psalm is cited by the author of the first book of Maccabees (7:16, 17), who omits those words which are foreign to his purpose, is such as would have hardly been adopted in reference to a contemporary composition.

The superscriptions, and the places which the psalms themselves severally occupy in the Psalter. are thus the two guiding clews by which, in conjunction with the internal evidence, their various *occasions* are to be determined. In the critical results obtained on these points by those scholars who have recognised and used these helps there is, not indeed uniformity, but at least a visible tendency towards it. The same cannot be

said for the results of the judgments of those, of whatever school, who have neglected or rejected them; nor, indeed, is it easily to be imagined that internal evidence alone should suffice to assign 150 devotional hymns, even approximately, to their several epochs. The table on the following pages exhibits all that can with probability be ascertained on this head as to each psalm.

VII. *Canonicity and Use.* — The inspiration and canonical authority of the Psalms are established by the most abundant and convincing evidence. They never were, and never can be, rejected, except by impious impugnors of all divine revelation. Not to mention other ancient testimonies, *SEE CANON*, we find complete evidence in the N.T., where the book is quoted or referred to as divine by Christ and his apostles *at least seventy times*. No other writing is so frequently cited, Isaiah, the next in the scale of quotation, being cited only about fifty-five times. Twice (^{<20>}Luke 20:42 and ^{<40>}Acts 1:20) we find distinct mention of the *Book of Psalms* (Βίβλος ψαλμῶν). Once, however (^{<24>}Luke 24:44), the name *Psalms* is used, not simply for this book, but for the Hagiographa, or the whole of the third division of the Hebrew Scriptures, *SEE HAGIOGRAPHIA*, because in it the Psalms are the first and chief part, or possibly, as Havernick suggests (*Einleitung*, § 14 p. 78), because the division consists mainly of *poetry*. It deserves notice that in ^{<30>}Hebrews 4:7, where the quotation is taken from the anonymous Psalm 95, the book is indicated by *David*, most likely because he was the largest and most eminent contributor, and also the patron and model of the other psalmists. For the same reasons many ancient and modern authors often speak of the book as the *Psalms of David* (Carpzov, *Introd.* ii, 98), without intending to ascribe all the productions to him.

In every age of the Church, the Psalms have been extolled for their excellence and their use for godly edifying (Carpzov, *l.c.* p. 109116). Indeed, if Paul's estimate of ancient inspired Scripture (^{<35>}2 Timothy 3:15-17) can be justly applied to any single book, that book must be the Psalms. Even in the N.T. there is scarcely a work of equal practical utility. Basil the Great and Chrysostom, in their homilies (see Suiceri *Thes. Eccles.* s.v. ψαλμός), expatiate most eloquently, and yet judiciously, on its excellence. The close of Basil's eulogy is to this effect: "In it is found a perfect theology (ἐνταῦθα ἔνι θεολογία τελεία): prophecy of Christ's sojourn in the flesh, threatening of judgment, hope of resurrection, fear of retribution, promises of glory, revelations of mysteries — all things are

treasured in the book of Psalms, as in some great and common storehouse.” Among the early Christians it was customary to learn the book by heart, that psalmody might enliven their social hours, and soften the fatigues and soothe the sorrows of life. They employed the Psalms, not only in their religious assemblies, of which use we find probable mention in ^{<44>}1 Corinthians 14:26. but also at their meals and before retiring to rest, as Clement of Alexandria testifies: **θυσία τῷ θεῷ ψαλμοὶ καὶ ὕμνοι παρὰ τὴν ἐστίασιν, πρό τε τῆς κοίτης.** Of their use at meals we find an example also in the institution of the Lord’s Supper (^{<45>}Matthew 26:30). For their *modern* liturgical use, **SEE PSALMODY; SEE PSALTER.**

VIII. Classification. Various classifications of the Psalms have been proposed (Carpzov, *Introd.* ii, 132-134). Tholuck would divide them, according to the matter, into songs of *praise*, of *thanksgiving*, of *complaint*, and of *instruction*. De Wette suggests another method of sorting them (*Einleitung*, p. 3), somewhat as below. It is obvious, however, that no very accurate classification can be made, since many are of diversified contents and uncertain tenor. The following distribution will, perhaps, best comprise them in their general import.

Picture for Psalm

- 1. Hymns** in praise of Jehovah — *tehillim*, in the proper sense. These are directed to Jehovah, from various motives and views, e.g. as the Creator of the universe and Lord of all (Psalm 8, 19, 65, 93, 104, 145, 147); as the Protector and Helper of Israel (Psalm 20, 29, 33, 46, 47, 48, 66, 67, 75, 76, 135, 136); or as the Helper of individuals, with thanksgiving for deliverance (Psalm 18, 30, 34, 40, 138); while others refer to them or especial attributes of Jehovah (Psalm 90, 139). These psalms contain the most sublime thoughts respecting God, nature, the government of the world, etc.; they also furnish the sources of many doctrinal ideas.
- 2. Temple hymns**, sung at the consecration of the Temple, the entrance of the ark, or intended for the Temple service (Psalm 15, 24, 168, 81, 87, 132, 134, 135). So also *pilgrim songs*, sung by those who came to worship at the temple, etc. **SEE DEGREES.**
- 3. Religious and moral psalms** of a general character, containing the poetical expression of emotions and feelings, and therefore *subjective*, e.g. confidence in God (Psalm 23, 42, 43, 62, 91, 121, 125, 127, 128); longing for the worship of the sanctuary (Psalm 42, 43); and prayers for the

forgiveness of sin (Psalm 51). So, also, didactic songs relating to religion, or the expression of some truth or maxim (Psalm 1, 15, 32, 34, 50, 128, 133). This is a numerous class.

4. *Elegiac psalms*, containing *complaints* under affliction and the persecution of enemies, and prayers for succor. This class, which comprises more than a third of the whole collection, has several subdivisions:

(1.) The lamentations or complaints of particular individuals (Psalm 7, 17, 22, 51, 52, 55, 56, 109).

(2.) National lamentations, mostly in a religious point of view (Psalm 44, 74, 79, 80, 137). Some are both individual and national lamentations (Psalm 59, 77, 102). Most of these psalms are of a late date.

(3.) General psalms of complaint, reflections on the wickedness of the world (Psalm 10, 12, 14, 36). Didactic psalms, respecting the goodness of God, the condition of the pious and of the godless (Psalm 37, 49, 63, 73).

5. *Psalms relating to the king*, patriotic hymns, etc. (Psalm 20, 21, 45, 110).

6. *National psalms*, containing allusions to the ancient history of the Hebrews and of the relation of the people to Jehovah (Psalm 78, 105, 106, 114).

The *Messianic psalms* ought properly to constitute another separate class (Psalm 2, 16, 22, 40, 72, 110). Many of the prophetic psalms are distributed among the other classes, while the few which cannot be brought under any of the above classes and divisions either constitute new ones by themselves or possess an intermediate character.

IX. *Literary Features.* — The book has been styled by some moderns *the anthology of Hebrew lyric poetry*, as if it consisted of a selection of the most admired productions of the sacred muse; but the name is not altogether appropriate, since several pieces of the highest poetic merit are, to our knowledge, not included namely, the songs of Moses, in Exodus 15 and Deuteronomy 32; the song of Deborah, in Judges 5; the prayer of Hannah, in ~~1~~ 1 Samuel 2:1-10; and even David's lament over Saul and

Jonathan, in ~~<1018>~~ 2 Samuel 1:18-27. To these may be added the song of Hezekiah, in ~~<2380>~~ Isaiah 38:9-20, and the prayers of Habakkuk, in Habakkuk 3, and Jonah, in Jonah 2. The truth seems to be, as Ewald and Tholuck maintain, *that the collection was made not so much with reference to the beauty of the pieces as to their adaptation for devotional use in public worship*. This view sufficiently accounts for omitting most of the above pieces and many others as being either too individual or too secular in their application. It may account for not including the lament over Jonathan, and for the fact that only two of Solomon's compositions (Psalm 72 and 127) are professedly given, though "his songs were a thousand and five" (~~<1082>~~ 1 Kings 4:32, 33). His themes were secular, and therefore not suitable for this collection.

All the best judges, as Lowth, Herder, De Wette, Ewald, Tholuck, and others, pronounce the poetry of the Psalms to be of the *lyric* order; "They are," says De Wette (*Einleitung in die Psalmen*, p. 2), "lyric in the proper sense; for among the Hebrews. as among the ancients generally, poetry, singing, and music were united, and the inscriptions to most of the Psalms determine their connection with music, though in a way not always intelligible to us. Also, as works of taste, these compositions deserve to be called lyric. The essence of lyric poetry is the immediate expression of feeling, and feeling is the sphere in which most of the Psalms move. Pain, grief, fear, hope, joy, trust, gratitude, submission to God — everything that moves and elevates the heart is expressed in these songs. Most of them are the lively effusions of the excited, susceptible heart, the fresh offspring of inspiration and elevation of thought; while only a few are spiritless imitations and compilations, or iunpoetic forms of prayer, temple hymns, and collections of proverbs." For fuller information on this subject, *SEE POETRY*.

X. Prophetic and Messianic Significance. — The moral struggle between godliness and ungodliness, so vividly depicted in the Psalms, culminates, in Holy Scripture, in the life of the Incarnate Son of God upon earth. It only remains to show that the Psalms themselves definitely anticipated this culmination. Now, there are in the Psalter at least three psalms of which the interest evidently centres in a person distinct from the speaker, and which, since they cannot, without violence to the language, be interpreted of any but the Messiah, may be termed directly and exclusively Messianic. We refer to Psalm 2, 45, 110, to which may, perhaps, be added Psalm 72.

It would be strange if these few psalms stood, in their prophetic significance, absolutely alone among the rest; the more so inasmuch as Psalm ii forms part of the preface to the first book of the Psalter, and would, as such, be entirely out of place, did not its general theme virtually extend itself over those that follow, in which the interest generally centres in the figure of the suppliant or worshipper himself. Hence the impossibility of viewing the psalms generally, notwithstanding the historical drapery in which they are outwardly clothed, as simply the past devotions of the historical David or the historical Israel. Other arguments to the same effect are furnished by the idealized representations which many of them present: by the outward points of contact between their language and the actual earthly career of our Saviour; by the frequent references made to them both by our Saviour himself and by the Evangelists; and by the view taken of them by the Jews, as evinced in several passages of the Targum. There is yet another circumstance well worthy of note in its bearing upon this subject. Alike in the earlier and in the later portions of the Psalter, all those psalms which are of a personal rather than of a national character are marked in the superscriptions with the name of David. It results from this that, while the Davidic psalms are partly personal, partly national, the Levitical psalms are uniformly national. Exceptions to this rule exist only in appearance: thus Psalm 73, although couched in the first person singular, is really a prayer of the Jewish faithful against the Assyrian invaders; and in Psalm 42, 43, it is the feelings of an exiled company rather than of a single individual to which utterance is given. It thus follows that it was only those psalmists who were types of Christ by external office and lineage as well as by inward piety that were charged by the Holy Spirit to set forth beforehand, in Christ's own name and person, the sufferings that awaited him and the glory that should follow. The national hymns of Israel are, indeed, also prospective; but in general they anticipate rather the struggles and the triumphs of the Christian Church than those of Christ himself.

We annex a list of the chief passages in the Psalms which are in anywise quoted or embodied in the N.T., showing more or less clearly this anticipative character: ~~Psalm~~ Psalm 2:1, 2,7,8, 9; 4:4; 5:9; 6:3, 8; 8:2, 4-6; 10:7; 14:1-3; 16:8-11; 18:4, 49; 19:4; 22:1, 8, 18, 22; 23:6; 24:1; 31:5; 32:1, 2; 34:8, 12-16, 20; 35:9; 36:1; 37:11; 40:6-8; 41:9; 44:22; 45:6, 7; 48:2; 51:4; 55:22; 68:18; 68:4, 9, 22, 23, 25; 75:8; 78:2, 24; 82:6; 86:9; 89:20; 90:4; 91:11,12; 92:7; 94:11; 95:7-11; 102:25-27; 104:4; 109:8;

110:1, 4; 112:9; 116:10; 117:1; 118:6, 22, 23, 25, 26; 125:50 140:3. *SEE QUOTATIONS.*

XI. *Moral Characteristics of the Psalms.* — The great doctrines and precepts embodied in the Psalms — what views they give of God and his government, of man and his sinfulness, of piety and morals, of a future state, and of the Messiah — are most ably set forth by Tholuck in his *Einleitung*, § 4.

Foremost among these meets us, undoubtedly, the universal recourse to communion with God. “My voice is unto God, and I will cry” (~~1971~~ Psalm 72:1), might well stand as a motto to the whole of the Psalter; for, whether immersed in the depths, or blessed with greatness and comfort on every side, it is to God that the psalmist’s voice seems ever to soar spontaneously aloft. Alike in the welcome of present deliverance or in the contemplation of past mercies, he addresses himself straight to God as the object of his praise. Alike in the persecutions of his enemies and in the desertions of his friends, in wretchedness of body and in the agonies of inward repentance, in the moment of impending danger and in the hour of apparent despair, it is direct to God that he utters forth his supplications. Despair, we say; for such, as far as the description goes, is the psalmist’s state in Psalm 88. But meanwhile he is praying: the apparent impossibility of deliverance cannot restrain his Godward voice; and so the very force of communion with God carries him, almost unawares to himself, through the trial.

Connected with this is the faith by which he every where lives in God rather than in himself. God’s mercies, God’s greatness, form the sphere in which his thoughts are ever moving. Even when, through excess of affliction, reason is rendered powerless, the naked contemplation of God’s wonders of old forms his effectual support (Psalm 77).

It is of the essence of such faith that the psalmist’s view of the perfections of God should be true and vivid. The Psalter describes God as he is; it glows with testimonies to his power and providence, his love and faithfulness, his holiness and righteousness. Correspondingly it testifies against every form of idol which men would substitute in the living God’s place, whether it be the outward image, the work of men’s hands (Psalm 115), or whether it be the inward vanity of earthly comfort or prosperity, to be purchased at the cost of the honor which cometh from God alone (Psalm 4). The solemn “See that there is no idol-way (bx[rd] in me” of

Psalm 139 — the striving of the heart after the very truth, and naught besides — is the exact anticipation of the “Little children, keep yourselves from idols” of the loved apostle in the N.T.

The Psalms not only set forth the perfections of God; they proclaim also the duty of worshipping him by the acknowledgment and adoration of his perfections. They encourage all outward rites and means of worship: new songs, use of musical instruments of all kinds, appearance in God’s courts, lifting-up of hands, prostration at his footstool, holy apparel (A.V. “beauty of holiness”). Among these they recognise the ordinance of sacrifice (Psalm 4, 5, 27, 51) as an expression of the worshipper’s consecration of himself to God’s service. But not the less do they repudiate the outward rite when separated from that which it was designed to express (Psalm 40, 69): a broken and contrite heart is, from erring man, the genuine sacrifice which God requires (Psalm 51).

Similar depth is observable in the view taken by the psalmists of human sin. It is to be traced not only in its outward manifestations, but also in the inward workings of the heart (Psalm 36), and is to be primarily ascribed to man’s innate corruption (Psalm 51, 58). It shows itself alike in deeds, in words (Psalm 17, 141), and in thoughts (Psalm 139); nor is even the believer able to discern all its various ramifications (Psalm 19). Connected with this view of sin is, on the one hand, the picture of the utter corruption of the ungodly world (Psalm 14); on the other, the encouragement to genuine repentance, the assurance of divine forgiveness (Psalm 32), and the trust in God as the source of complete redemption (Psalm 130).

With regard to the law, the psalmist, while warmly acknowledging its excellence, feels yet that it cannot so effectually guide his own unassisted exertions as to preserve him from error (Psalm 19). He needs an additional grace from above, the grace of God’s Holy Spirit (Psalm 51). But God’s Spirit is also a free spirit (*ibid.*); led by this, he will discern the law, with all its precepts, to be no arbitrary rule of bondage, but rather a charter and instrument of liberty (Psalm 119).

The Psalms bear repeated testimony to the duty of instructing others in the ways of holiness (Psalm 32, 34, 51). They also indirectly enforce the duty of love, even to our enemies (~~Psalm~~ Psalm 7:4; 35:13; 109:4). On the other hand, they denounce, in the strongest terms, the judgments of God on transgressors. We here particularly notice what are called the *vindictive* psalms — namely, those which contain expressions of wrath and

imprecations against the enemies of God and his people, such as Psalm 59, 69, 79, and which, in consequence, are apt to shock the feelings of some Christian readers. In order to obviate this offence, most of our pious commentators insist that the expressions are not maledictions or imprecations, but simple declarations of what will or may take place. But this is utterly inadmissible; for in several of the most startling passages the language in the original is plainly imperative. and not indicative (see ^{<4894>}Psalm 59:14; 69:25, 28; 79:6). The truth is that only a morbid benevolence, a mistaken philanthropy, takes offence at these psalms; for in reality they are not opposed to the spirit of the Gospel, or to that love of enemies which Christ enjoined. Resentment against evil-doers is so far from being sinful that we find it exemplified in the meek and spotless Redeemer himself (see ^{<4185>}Mark 3:5). If the emotion and its utterance were essentially sinful, how could Paul (^{<4162>}1 Corinthians 16:22) wish the enemy of Christ to be accursed (ἀνάθεμα), or say of his own enemy, Alexander the coppersmith, “The Lord reward him according to his works” (^{<5044>}2 Timothy 4:14); and, especially, how could the spirits of the just in heaven call on God for vengeance? (^{<4160>}Revelation 6:10.) See a good article on this subject (“The Imprecations in the Scriptures”) in the *American Bibliotheca Sacra* for February, 1844. Such imprecations in the Psalms, however, are usually levelled at transgressors as a body, and are uniformly uttered on the hypothesis of their wilful persistence in evil, in which case the overthrow of the sinner becomes a necessary part of the uprooting of sin. They are in nowise inconsistent with any efforts to lead sinners, individually, to repentance. *SEE IMPRECATION.*

This brings us to notice the faith of the psalmists in a righteous recompense to all men according to their deeds (Psalm 37:etc.). They generally expected that men would receive such recompense, in great measure, during their own lifetime. Yet they felt withal that it was not then complete; it perpetuated itself to their children (^{<4875>}Psalm 37:25; 109:12, etc.); and thus we find set forth in the Psalms, with sufficient distinctness, though in an unmaturred, and consequently imperfect, form, the doctrine of a retribution after death.

XII. Commentaries. — The following are the special exegetical helps on the whole book; we designate a few of the most important by an asterisk, and we omit many that are merely practical, homiletical, and liturgical: Origen, *Selecta* (in *Opp.* ii, 510); also *Scholia* (in Galland’s *Bibl. Patr.* vol. xiv); Eusebius, *Commentarii* (Gr. and Lat. in Montfaucon’s *Collectio*

Nova, vol. i); Athanasius, *Expositiones*; also *Interpretatio*, etc. (all in *Opp.* vol. i and iii); Apollinarius, *Metaphrasis* (Lat. and Gr. in Galland, v, 359); Gregory Nyssen. *Inscriptiones* (in *Opp.* i, 257); Jerome, *Emendatio* and *De Virtute* (in *Opp.* [*Suppos.*], vol. xi); also *Breviarium* [spurious] (*ibid.* append.); Augustine, *Narrationes* (in *Opp.*; transl. *Expositions*, Oxf. 1847, 6 vols. 8vo); Hilarius, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* vol. i); Chrysostom, *Expositio* (in *Opp.* vol. v); Theodoret, *Commentarii* (Gr. and Lat. Padua, 1565, 4to; Halle, 1768, 8vo; also in *Opp.* vol. ii); Gregory Turonensis, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* p. 1257); Arnobius, *Commentarium* (in *Bibl. Max. Patr.* vol. viii); Cassiodorus, *Expositio* (in *Opp.* vol. ii); Isidore, *Prologus* (in Mai's *Script. Vet.* vol. iii); Albert, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* vol. vii); Bede, *Commentariat* (in *Opp.* o. ol. iii); Remigius, *Enarratio* (in *Bibl. Max. Patr.* vol. xvi); Bruno Herbip. *Expositio* (*ibid.* vol. 18); Bruno Astensis, *Psalterium* (in *Opp.* vol. i); Rupert, *In Psalmos* (in *Opp.* vol. i); Euthymius Zigabenus, *Commentarii* (Gr. and Lat. in *Bibl. Max. Patr.* vol. xix; also Gr. Ven. 1530, fol.; Lat. Verona, 1530, fol.; Par. 1545, 4to; 1560, 8vo); Hugo h St. Vict. *Annotationes* (in *Opp.* vol. i); Gerhohus, *Commentarius* (in Pez, *Thesaur.* vol. v); Oddo, *Expositio* (in *Bibl. Max. Patr.* vol. xx); Bonaventura, *Expositio* (in *Opp.* vol. i); Kimchi, ~~vWrp~~ first published separately, s. 1.1477, 4to, and often later in various forms; Lat. ed. Janvier, Par. 1666, 4to; in English by M'Caul, Lond. 1850. 12mo); Turrecremata, *Expositio* (Rom. 1470, 4to, and later in various forms); Parez [Rom. Cath.], *Commentarius* (Valenc. 1493, fol., and often later elsewhere); Pelbart [Rom. Cath.], *Commentarius* (Hag. 1504, 1513, fol.); Ludolphus, *Expositio* (Par. 1506, fol.); Felix Pratensis, *Nota* (Ven. 1515, 8vo; Hag. 1522, 4to; Basil. 1526, 16mo); Arnobius, *Commentarius* (Roterd. 1522, 4to); Bugenhagen, *Annotationes* (Argent. 1524, 4to, and often later elsewhere in various forms); Ayguanus [Rom. Cath.], *Commentariac* (Complut. 1524, 2 vols. fol., and often later in various forms); Cajetan [Rom. Cath.], *Enarratin* (Ven. 1525; Par. 1532, 1540, tol.); Bucer, *Commentarii* (Argent. 1526, fol., and often; also in French, Geneva, 1553, 8vo); Titelmann [Rom. Cath.], *Elucidationes* (Antw. 1531, fol., and often later and elsewhere in various forms); Campensis [Rom. Cath.], *Interpretatio* [with Ecclesiastes] (Par. 1534, 4to, and often later in various forms and at various places; also in French and English); Parmensis [Rom. Cath.], *Intenpretatio* (Ven. 1537, 1559, 4to); Flaminius, *Explanatio* (Ven. 1545, fol.; ed. Wald, Hal. 1785, 8vo); Athias, ~~pyL~~ ~~latæ~~ ~~vWrp~~ ~~Pe~~ from Rashi, Kimchi. etc.] (Ven. 1549, fol.); Foleng [Rom. Cath.], *Commentaria* (Basil. 1549, 1557; Rom. 1585; Colon. 1594, fol.); Musculus, *Commentarius*

(Basil. 1550, and often, fol.); AEpinus, *Enarrationes* (Francf. 1555-56, 2 vols. 8vo); *Calvin, *Commentarius* (Genev. 1557 and often, fol.; also in French, *ibid.* 1561 and often, fol.; in English, Lond. 1571, 2 vols. 4to; Oxf. 1840, 3 vols. 8vo; Edinb. 1845-49, 5 vols. 8vo); Vairlenius [Rom. Cath.], *Commentarius* (Lov. 1557, 3 vols. fol.); Marloratus, *Expositio* (Par. 1562 and often, fol.); Draconis, *Psalterium* (Vitemb. 1563, fol.); Forerius [Rom. Cath.], *Commentarius* (Ven. 1563, fol.); Strigel, *Hyponemata* (Lips. 1563, fol. and 8vo; Neost. 1574, 8vo); Selnecker, *Auslegqunq* (Norib. 1566 and often, fol.); Del Pozo [Rom. Cath.], *Elucidationes* (Complut. 1567, fol.); Shoeib, *ar/n puyLāḥ* (Salonica, 1569, 4to); Jansen [Rom. Cath.], *Paraphrasis* (Lov. 1569, 4to; Lugd. 1577, 1586, fol.); Jaabez, *vWrPe* (Salonica, 1571, 4to); Moller, *Commentarius* (Viteb. 1573, 8vo, and often in various forms); Genebrard [Rom. Cath.], *Commentarii* (Par. 1577, 8vo; and often later and elsewhere in various forms); Heshnsius, *Commentarius* (Helmst. 1586, fol.); Arama, *t/Lhæyama* (Ven. 1590, 4to; Germ. ed. by Bathysen, Hanau, 1712, 12mo); Fischer, *Auslegung* (Ulz. 1590; Leips. 1601, fol.); Mencil, *Auslegung* (Leips. 1594, 1605, fol.); Palanther [Rom. Cath.], *Commentarius* (Brix. 1600; Ven. 1617, 4to); Dosma [Rom. Cath.], *Expositio* [includ. Cant.] (Madr. 1601, 4to); Nicholson, *Analysis* [Engl.] (Lond. 1602, fol.); Alscheich, *laet/mm/r* (Ven. 1605, 4to; Amst. 1695, 4to; Jesnitz, 1721, fol.; Zolkiew. 1764, fol.); Gesner, *Commentationes* (Viternh. 1605, 1609, 1629, 1665. fol.); Agelli [Rom. Cath.], *Commentarius* (Rom. 1606; Colon. 1607; Par. 1611 f; l.) Bellarmine [Rom. Cath.], *Explanatio* (Rom. 1611, 4t., and often later elsewhere); Achselrad, *t [DÄB]* (Hanau, 1616, 4to); Witweler [Rom. Cath.], *Commentarius* (Constance, 1617, 3 vols. 4to; in Germ., Cologne, 1643, 3 vols. 4to); Lorinus [Rom. Cath.], *Commentarii* (Lugd. 1617, 3 vols. fol., and often later); Cramer, *Auslegungen* (Gies. 1618, 4to); Top, *Commentarius* (Lond. 1619, fol.); Coppen, *Notce* (Heidelb. 1619; Hanov. 1657, 4to); Schnepf, *Commentarius* (Lips. 1619, 1628, 1635, fol.); Dupin, *Notm* (Par. 1691, 8vo); Ainsworth, *Annotations* [with Pent. and Cant.] (Lond. 1627, 1639, fol.; in Dutch, Leon. 1690, fol.); Crommius [Rom. Cath.], *Expositio* (Lov. 1628, 4to; Antw. 1652, 8vo); Pulsictius [Rom. Cath.], *Expositiones* (Ven. 1628, 4to); Marotte, [Rom. Cath.], *Commentarius* [includ. other passages] (Par. 1630, fol.); Wilcox, *Exposition* (in *Works*); Boys, *Exposition* (in *Works*); Borghesius [Rom. Cath.], *Commentaria* (Duaci, 1634, 1637, 8vo); Ginnasius [Rom. Cath.], *Interpretationes* (Rom. 1636, 2 vols. fol.); Viccaro, *Commentarius*

[rabbinical] (Lond. 1639, 1655, fol.); Bohl, *Auflosung* (Rost. 1639, 12mo; 1709, 8vo); Maldonatus [Rom. Cath.], *Commentarii* [includ. other books] (Par. 1643, fol.); Gerschau, *Interpretatio* [ancient texts] (Rost. 1643, fol.); Dickson, *Explication* (Lond. 1645, 3 vols. 8vo; 1659, fol.; Glasg. 1834, 2 vols. 12mo); Ford, *Expositio* (Lond. 1646, 4to); Hulsius, *Annotationes* (Lugd. 1650, 4to); Bythiner, *Lyre* [grammatical] (Lond. 1650, 4to, and often since in various forms); Mercado, *v̄w̄rP̄* [includ. Ecclesiastes] (Amst. 1653, 4to); Hesar [Rom. Cath.], *Explanatio* (Ingolst. 1654, 8vo; enlarged, Monach. 1673, 2 vols. fol.); Leigh, *Annotationis* [includ. other books] (Lond. 1657, fol.); Hammond, *Annotations* (ibid. 1659, fol.; also in *Works*, vol. iv); Price, *Adnotationes* (in *Critici Sacri*, vol. iii, ibid. 1660, fol.); Cocceius, *Commentarius* (L. B. 1660, fol.); Wright, *Expositio* (Lond. 1662, fol.); Amyraut, *Paraphrasis* (Salmur. 1662; Traj. 1762, 4to); Bake, *Commentarius* (Francf. 1665, 1683, fol.); Le Blanc [Rom. Cath.], *Commentarius* (Lugd. 1665-77; Colon. 1680-97, 6 vols. fol.); La Palisse [Rom. Cath.], *Expositio* (Toulouse, 1666, 2 vols. fol.); Geier, *Commentarius* (Dresd. 1668, 2 vols. 4to, and later); Hesar, *Commentarius* (Monach. 1673, 2 vols. fol.); Bull, *Commentary* (Lond. 1675, 4to); Dauderstadt, *Labores* (Lips. 1679, fol.); Hamer, *Verklaaringe* (Roterd. 1681, 4to); Ferrand [Rom. Cath.], *Adnotationes* (Par. 1683, 4to); Groenwegen, *Verklaaringe* (Ench. 1687, 4to); Molderson, *Conciones* (Antw. 1691, 8vo); Baxter, *Paraphrase* (Lond. 1692, 8vo); Van Til, *Psalmen* (Dort, 1693 and later, 4to; in Germ., Cassel, 1697 and later, 4to); Clutterbuck, *Explanation* (Lond. 1702, 8vo); Frisch, *Harfe* (Stuttg. 1703, 8vo, and often later); Kortum, *Anmerkungen* (Frankf. 1706, 4to); J. Johnson, *Notes* (Lond. 1707, 8vo); De Carrieres [Rom. Cath.], *Commentaire* (Par. 1709, 12mo); Arnold, *Betrachtungen* (Cassel, 1713, 8vo); Allix, *Argument* (Lond. 1717, 8vo); P. L. D. G. [Rom. Cath.], *Reflexions* (Par. 1717, 2 vols. 12mo); Petersen, *Aufschliessung* (Francf. 1719, 4to); H. Michaelis, *Adnotationes* (Hal. 1720, 4to); Du Hamel [Rom. Cath.], *Adotationes* (Rothom. 1701, 12mo); Chasan, *dyǣhzj̄* (Amst. 1724, 4to); Zeibich, *Anmerk.* (Eilenb. 1724, 8vo); Merkerlibich, *μyLææ* [from Kimchi] (Sulzb. 1728, 4to); Irhoven, *In Titulos* (Lugd. 1728, 4to); Francke, *Erklärung* (Hal. 1730-31, 2 vols. 4to); Zeysch, *Einleitulng* (Leips. 1732, 8vo); Quesnel, *Reflexions* (Par. 1736, 3 vols. 12mo); Franke, *Notoe* (Hal. 1738, 1827, 8vo); A. Johnston, *Nota* (Lond. 1741, 8vo); Foinard, *Traduction* (Par. 1742, 12mo); Mudge, *Version* (Lond. 1744, 4to); Van Bashuysen. *Notce* (ed. Meintell, Suab. 1744, 8vo); Oetinger,

Einleitung (Essling. 1748, 8vo); Marini, *Annotationes* (Bonon. 174850, 2 vols. 4to); Edwards, *Notes* (Lond. 1755, 1850, 8vo); Fenwick, *Notes* (ibid. 1759, 8vo); Burk, *Gnomon* (Stuttg. 1760. 2 vols. 4to); Green, *Notes* (Cambr. 1762, 8vo); Venema, *Commentarius* (Leov. 1762-67, 6 vols. 4to); Vatablus, *Annotationes* (ed. Grotius and Vogel, Hal. 1767, 8vo); Vogel, *Inscriptiones* (ibid. 1767, 4to); Merrick, *Annotations* (Reading, 1768, 4to); Resch, *Hypomnema* (Prag. 1769-77, 3 vols. 8vo); Serranus, *Metaphrasis* (ed. Okely, Gr. and Lat. Lond. 1770, 8vo); Horne, *Commentary* (Oxf. 1771, 2 vols. 4to, and often since in various forms); Zacharia, *Erklrdung* (Gott. 1773, 8vo); Knapp, *Anmerk.* (Hal. 1773, 1789, 8vo); Masillon, *Paraphrase* [French] (Par. 1776, 2 vols. 12mo); Moldenhauer, *Erklldr.* (Quedlinb. 1777, 4to); Struensee, *Uebers.* [with Proverbs] (Hal. 1783, 8vo); Mendelssohn [Jewish], *Uebers.* (Berl. 1783, 1785, 8vo); Seiler, *Uebers.* (Erl. 1784, 1788, 8vo); Thenius, *Erldut.* (Dresd. 1785, 8vo); Berthier, *Reflexions* (Par. 1785, 8 vols. 8vo); Dathe, *Notce* (Hal. 1787, 1792, 8vo); Boaretti, *Volgarizzamenlto* (Ven. 1788, 2 vols. 8vo); Cole, *Key* (Cambr. 1788, 8vo); Varisco, *Annotazioni* (Milan, 1788, 8vo); Lowe, *Wab* (Berl. 1788, 8vo, and often); Briegleb, *Uebers.* (Amst. 1789-93, 5 vols. 8vo); Street, *Notes* (Lond. 1790, 2 vols. 8vo); Paulus, *Clavis* (Jen. 1791; Heidelb. 1815, 8vo); Dimock, *Notes* (Lond. 1791, 4to); Mintinghe, *Vertauldt.* (Leyd. 1791-92, 2 vols. 8vo; in Germ. by Scholl, Halle, 1792 sq., 3 vols. 8vo); Wetzell, *Animadversiones* (Francof. 1792, 4to); Meir, *Wrt* (ed. Satanow, Berl. 1794); Vien. 1816, 8vo; Travell, *Paraphrase* (Gloucester, 1794, 8vo); Redding, *Observationes* (Francof. 1796, 8vo); Jacobi, *Anmerk.* (Jena, 1796, 2 vols. 8vo); Hezel, *Uebers.* (Altenb. 1797, 8vo); Kiihnl, *Anmerk.* (Leips. 1799, 8vo); Asulai, *t/Lhāḡāśy* (Leghorn, 1801, 4to); Kelle, *Au flsung* (Meissen, 1801, 8vo); Berlin, *Notce* (Upsal. 1805, 8vo); Geddes, *Notes* (Lond. 1807, 8vo); Pinchas, *vrđīnæ μymkē* (Minsk, 1809, 4to); Anon. *Explications* [French] (Par. 1809, 3 vols. 8vo); Agier, *Notes* [French] (ibid. 1809, 2 vols. 8vo); *De Wette, *Commentar* (Heidelb. 1811, 1823, 1829, 1836, 1850, 1856, 8vo); Stuhlmann, *Erlaut.* (Hamb. 1812, 8vo); Scharer, *Amerk.* (Berne, 1812, 1852, 8vo); Hacker, *Erklärung* (Leips. 1813, 8vo); Stolz, *Auslegung* (Zur. 1814, 8vo); Reinhard, *Erlut.* (Leips. 1814, 8vo); Horsley, *Notes* [on a part only] (Lond. 1815, 1820, 1833, 1848, 8vo); Goode. *Version* (ibid. 1816, 8vo); Sheriffe, *Reflections* (ibid. 1821, 2 vols. 12mo); Ewart, *Lectures* (ibid. 1822-26, 2 vols. 8vo); Mant, *Notes* (Oxf. 1824, 8vo); Boys, *Key* (Lond. 1825, 8vo); Parkhurst, *Translation* (ibid. 1825, 8vo); Anon.

Paraphrasis (Argent. 1826, 2 vols. 8vo); Anon. *Illustration* (York, 1826, 2 vols. 12mo); Kaiser, *Erklar.* (Nurnb. 1827, 8vo); Goldwitzer, *Uebers.* (Sulzb. 1827, 8vo); Warner, *Illustrations* (Lond. 1828, 8vo); Gower, *Explanation* (ibid. 1831, 12mo); Clauss, *Beitrdge* (Berl. 1831, 8vo); Noyes, *Translation* (Bost. 1831, 1833, 1837, 12mo); Slade, *Explanation* (Lond. 1832, 12mo); Morison, *Exposition* (ibid. 1832, 3 vols. 8vo); Rogers, *Arrangementment* (Oxf. 1833, 2 vols. 12mo); French and Skinner, *Notes* (Lond. 1833, 1842, 8vo); Keil, *Auslegung* [on sixty psalms] (Leips. 1834-35, 2 vols. 8vo); Carpenter, *Reflections* (Lond. 1835, 1841, 18mo); Sachs, *Erlaut.* (Berl. 1835, 8vo); *Hitzig, *Commentar* (Heidelb. 1835-37, 2 vols. 8vo); Fry, *Exposition* (Lond. 1836, 1842, 8vo); Stier, *Auslegung* [on seventy psalms] (Halle, 1836, 8vo); Walford, *Notes* (Lond. 1837, 8vo); Kister, *Anmerk.* (Konigsb. 1837, 8vo); Krahmer, *Erklarung* (Leips. 1837-38, 2 vols. 8vo); Dargand, *Traduction* (Par. 1838, 8vo); Bush, *Commentary* (N. Y. 1838, 8vo); *Ewald, *Erklarung* (Gott. 1839, 1840, 1866, 8vo); Keble, *Metrical Version* (Oxf. 1839, 8vo); Reisenhal, *Versio* (Berl. 1840, 8vo); Wiener, *De Indole* (Erlang. 1840, 8vo); Tucker, *Notes* (Lond. 1840, 12mo); Biesenthal, *Commentar* (Berl. 1841, 8vo); Anon. *Commentar* (ibid. 1842, 8vo); Deutsch, *Commetar* (Leips. 1842, 8vo); *Hengstenberg, *Commentar* (Berl. 1842-47, 1849-54; in Engl., Edinib. 184648, 3 vols. 8vo); Tholuck, *Auslegung* (Halle, 1843, 8vo; transl. by Mambert, Lond. 1856; N. Y. 1858, 8vo); Cresswell, *Notes* (Lond. 1843, 12mo); Cumming, *Paraphrase* (ibid. 1843, 12m); *Vaihinger, *Erklarung* (Leips. 1845, 2 vols. 8vo); *Phillips, *Commentary* (Lond. 1846, 2 vols. 8vo); Jones, *Reflections* (ibid. 1846, 12mo); Jebb, *Translation* (ibid. 1846, 2 vols. 8vo); Lengerke, *Auslegung* (Leips. 1847, 2 vols. 8vo); Clowes. *Translation* (Lond. 1849. 8vo); Pridham, *Notes* (ibid. 1852, 12mo); Weiss, *Exposition* (Edinb. 1852, 8vo); Olshausen, *Erklarung* (Leips. 1853, 8vo); Ryland, *Commentary* (Lond. 1853, 12mo); *Alexander, *Notes* (N.Y. 1853-56, 3 vols. 12mo); Good, *Notes* (Lond. 1854, 8vo); *Hupfeld, *Auslegung* (Gotha, 1855-62, 1867-69, 4 vols. 8vo); Schegg, *Erklarung* (Mitn. 1856, 8vo); Hawkins, *Notes* (Lond. 1857, 12mo); Rokach, *vWrp@Leghorn*, 1858, 8vo); Rendu, *Notes* [French] (Par. 1858, 8vo); Claude, *Notes* [French] (ibid. 1858, 8vo); Bonar, *Commentary* (Lond. 1859, 8vo); *Delitzsch, *Commentar* (Leips. 1859-60, 2 vols. 8vo; rewritten in the *Commentary* of Keil and Delitzsch); *Thrupp, *Introduction* (Lond. 1860, 2 vols. 8vo); Wilson, *Exposition* (ibid. 1860, 2 vols. 8vo); De Burgh, *Commentary* (Dumbl. 1860, 8vo); Neale, *Commentary* [from primitive and mediaeval sources] (Lond. 1860-71, 3 vols. 8vo); Hammer, *Erldlut.*

(Leips. 1861, 8vo); *Perowne, *Votes* (Lond. 1864-66, 1868-70, 2 vols. 8vo); Kay, *Notes* (Oxf. 1864, 8v); Monrad, *Oversatt.* (Copenh. 1865, 8ro); Kurtz, *Zur Theologie* (Leips. 186, 8vo); Plumer, *Studies* (Lond. 1867, 8vo); Barnes, *Notes* (N. Y. 1869, 3 vols. 8vo); Splurgeoni, *exposition* (Lond. 1870-72, 3 vols. 8vo); Linton, *Explanation* (ibid. 1871, 8vo); Burton, *Paraphrase* (ibid. 1871, 8vo); Conant, *Version* (N.Y. 1871, 4to); Cowles, *Notes* (ibid. 1872, 12mo); *Murphy, *Commentary* (Lond. 1875, 8vo); M'Lean, *Expositions* (ibid. 1875, 8vo); Heiligstedt, *Auslegung* (vol. i, Halle, 1876, 8vo). *SEE OLD TESTAMENT.*

Psalter

This word is often used by ancient writers for the book of Psalms, considered as a separate book of Holy Scripture. It obtained among later Church writers a more technical meaning as the book in which the Psalms are arranged for the service of the Church. The Roman Catholic Psalter, for instance, does not follow the Scriptural order of the Psalms, but arranges them for the various services in a different manner. In the English Psalter, as it exists in the Book of Common Prayer, the Psalms are arranged in such a way as to give a reading for every day in the month, and there are also special selections to be used in the discretion of the minister. The translation is not that of the King James Version (i.e. our common Bible), but the earlier version of Cranmer's Bible, which accounts for the difference between the Psalms of the Prayer-book and those of the ordinary version of the Bible. The use of the Psalter as a system of psalmody seems to have been borrowed from the synagogue. The Psalter was always a favorite book, and one which obtained a most extensive use both in private and public. It was regarded as an epitome of the Bible, and as especially adapted to the use of youth and the people at large. The clergy were required to commit this book to memory. In later times, when the Bible as a whole was denied to the people, the Latin Psalter was left in their hands; and at the time of the Reformation the penitential psalms were in the hands and mouths of the people.

Sometimes the book, for the sake of convenience, was divided into five portions, to correspond with the Pentateuch; and again the Psalms were arranged in different classes according to their character, as hallelujah, baptismal, penitential, burial psalms, etc. In the time of St. Augustine and St. Chrysostom the burial psalms were 23, 42, 43, 59, 101; in the Roman Church they are 23, 25, 27 and the seven penitentials; in the English

Church, 33, 90; in the Greek Church, 91, 119; and for clerks, 24, 84. Beleth mentions Psalm 114 and *Confitemini*; he says charcoal was placed in the grave to show that the ground could never again be occupied. *Psalms Gradual, Pilgrims' Songs, or Psalms of Degrees*, were Psalm 120 to 134, which were sung in ascending the fifteen steps of Solomon's Temple. *Hallelujah Psalms* were 146 to 150, each beginning with the words "Praise ye the Iord." *Psalms Lucernal* were those sung in the primitive Church at the lighting of the lamps the first hour of the night. The Clementine Constitutions, Cassian, and St. Chrysostom mention the office said at this time under the same appellation. *Psalms of Praise* (Hallel) were Psalm 113 to 118, the hymn slung by Christ before his agony. *Psalms Penitential* were seven: St. Augustine, when dying and lying speechless on his bed, had the seven psalms painted on the walls of his chamber, that, looking towards them, he might resist any temptations of the devil (Psalm 6, 32, 38. 51 [*Miserere*], 102, 130 [*De Profundis*], 143). *Psalms Prostrate* were those during the saying of which seniors knelt in their stalls and the junior monks lay prostrate on the floor or forms. These were said after vespers and in Lent, before the Collects of the Hours and *Verba mea auribus percipe*. Twelve psalms, called the *Dicta*, were sung, (with three lections and responsories and six anthems) on the nocturnus of ordinary days, one for each hour of the night. Six, says Beleth, are sung at matins, lauds, and other hours, in memory of the six works of mercy; five at vespers, one for each of the senses; and four at compline, the number of perfection.

Psalter of Solomon

Under this title is extant in a Greek translation a collection of eighteen psalms or hymns, evidently modelled on the canonical psalms, breathing Messianic hopes, and forming a favorable specimen of the later popular Jewish literature. It was first edited by De la Cerda, according to an Augsborg manuscript, now no more extant, in his *Adversaria Sacra* (Lugd. 1626), and then again by Fabricius in his *Codex Pseudepitraphus Vet. Test.* (1722, 2d ed.), i, 914 sq. An English version is given by Whiston, *Authentic Records* (Lond. 1827). vol. i. Of late it has been edited by Hilgenfeld, who collated for this purpose a Vienna codex in his *Zeitschrift* (1868), p. 134-168. and in his *Messias Judaeorum*, who was followed by Geiger and Fritzsche. Later transcribers have made Solomon the author of these psalms, but the psalms themselves are against this assumption; on the contrary, they are the best proof of their later origin.

Some — as Ewald, Grimm, Oehler, Dillmann, Weiffenbach — assign these psalms to the time of Antiochus Epiphanes (q.v.); others — as Movers, Delitzsch, and Keim — to the time of Herod; but neither of these dates is correct. It is now generally held by critics like Langen, Hilgenfeld, Nedleke, Hausrath, Geiger, Fritzsche, Wittichen, that they originated soon after the taking of Jerusalem by Pompey, and this opinion is corroborated by the tenor of especially the 2d, 8th, and 17th psalms. Looking at the circumstances of the time which is presupposed in these psalms, we find the following: A generation to which the rule over Israel had not been promised took possession of it by force (οἱς οὐκ ἐπηγγείλω μετὰ βίας ἄφείλοντο, ^{<1976>}Psalm 17:6). They did not give God the honor, but put on the royal crown and took possession of David's throne (^{<1976>}Psalm 17:7, 8). In their time Israel sinned. The king was in transgression of the law (ἐν παρανομίᾳ), the judge was not in truth (οὐκ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ), and the people were in sin (καὶ ὁ λαὸς ἐν ἁμαρτίᾳ, ^{<1976>}Psalm 17:21, 22). But God put these princes down by raising against them a foreign man who did not belong to the tribe of Israel (^{<1978>}Psalm 17:8, 9). From the ends of the world God brought a strong man, who made war with Jerusalem and the country. The princes of the land, in their infatuation, met him with joy, and said, "You are welcome; come hither; enter in peace." The doors were opened to him, and he entered like a father in the house of his sons (^{<1981>}Psalm 8:15-20). Once in the city, he also took the castles and broke the walls of Jerusalem with the battering-rams (^{<1982>}Psalm 8:21; 2:1). Jerusalem was trodden down by the heathen (^{<1982>}Psalm 2:20); even the altar of God was ascended by foreign people (^{<1982>}Psalm 2:2). The most prominent men and sages of the council were killed, and the blood of the inhabitants of Jerusalem was shed like the water of impurity (^{<1982>}Psalm 8:23). The inhabitants of the country were carried away as captives into the West, and the princes for a derision (^{<1973>}Psalm 17:13, 14; 2:6; 8:24). At last, the dragon who took Jerusalem was killed at the mountain of Egypt on the sea (^{<1982>}Psalm 2:29). It hardly needs any further explanation that all these events fully agree with the history of Pompey. The princes who arrogated to themselves the throne of David are the Asmonleans (q.v.), who, since the time of Aristobulus I, called themselves kings. The last princes of this house, Alexander Jannaeus and Aristobulus II, favored the Sadducees, and in the eyes of the Pharisaic author they are sinners and unlawful. The "foreign and strong man" whom God brings from the ends of the earth is Pompey. The princes who meet him are Aristobulus II and Hyrcanus II; the adherents of the latter admit Pompey into the city, and he soon takes the

other part with force (ἐν κρίῳ, ii, 1), which was held by Aristobulus's party. All the other circumstances fully agree with what we know of Pompey's campaign in Palestine; and the fact that the 2d psalm speaks of the manner in which Pompey died, in B.C. 48, fully proves the assumption that it was written soon after this event, while the 8th and 17th psalms, as well as the greater part of the others, may have been written between 63 and 48.

The spirit which runs through these psalms is that of Pharisaic Judaism. They breathe an earnest moral tone and true piety; but the righteousness which they preach, and the absence of which they deplore, is the one which can only be attained by keeping the Pharisaic ordinances, the **δικαιοσύνη προσταγμάτων** (^{<3940>}Psalm 14:1). After death man is judged according to his works. He is at liberty to choose between righteousness or unrighteousness (comp. especially ^{<3907>}Psalm 9:7). By doing the former he will rise to eternal life (^{<3901>}Psalm 3:16); by doing the latter, eternal damnation is his destiny (13, 9 sq.; ^{<3942>}Psalm 14:2 sq.; 15). In opposition to the unlawfully arrogated reign of the Asmonaeans, which is already overthrown by Pompey, the author looks for the Messianic king of the house of David who will bring Israel to the promised glory (^{<3970>}Psalm 17:1, 5, 23-51; 18:6-10; comp. 7:9; 11).

The hypothesis of Gratz (*Gesch. d. Juden* [2d ed.], iii, 439) that these psalms were written by a Christian author deserves no refutation. Nor are we justified in assuming Christian interpolations; for the sinlessness and holiness which the author ascribes to his expected Messiah (^{<3970>}Psalm 17:41, 46) is not the sinlessness in the sense of Christian dogmatics, but merely the strict legality in the sense of Pharisaism. As to the original language of the psalms, it is now generally held against Hilgenfeld that it was Hebrew, because it is very Hebraizing, which would not be the case if Hilgenfeld were correct. Hence we are justified in the assumption that the psalms were not written at Alexandria, but in Palestine.

Literature. — Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftl. Theologie* (1868), p. 134-168; (1871), p. 383-418; *Messias Judorum Libris eorum paulo ante et paulo post Chr. nat. conscriptis illustratus* (Lips. 1869), p. 1-33; Geiger, *Der Psalter Salomo's* (Augs. 1871), and review of it in *Gottinger gel. Anzeigen* (1871), p. 841-850, and in Hauck, *Theol. Jahresbericht*, 6:421 sq.; Fritzsche, *Libri Apocryphi Veteris Testamenti Greece* (Lips. 1871), p. 569-589; Wittichen, *Die Idee des Reiches Gottes*, p. 155-160;

Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, 4:392 sq.; Grimm, *Zu 1. Makkab.* p. xxvii; Oehler, art. "Messias" in Herzog, *Real - Encyklop.* ix. 426 sq.; Dillmann, art. "Pseudepigraphen," *ibid.* 12:305 sq.; Weiffenbach, *Que Jesu in Regno Coelesti Dignitas sit Synopticorum Sententia exponitur* (Gissae, 1868), p. 49 sq.; Movers, in Wetzer u. Welte's *Kirchen-Lexicon*, i, 340; Delitzsch, *Psalmen* (1st ed.), ii, 381 sq.; Keim, *Geschichte Jesu von Nazara*, i, 243 (Engl. transl. [Lond. 1873], p. 313 sq.); Langen, *Das Judenthum in Palestina zur Zeit Christi* (1866), p. 64-70; Nildeke, *Alttestament. Literatur* (1868), p. 141 sq.; Hausrath, *Zeitgeschichte*, i, 164 sq., 176; Carriere, *De Psalterio Salomonis* (Argentorati, 1870), p. 8, and Ewald's notice of it in *Gottinger gel. Anzeigen* (1873), p. 237-240; Anger, *Vorlesungen über die Geschichte der messianischen Idee* (1873), p. 81 sq.; Schirer, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte* (Leips. 1874), p. 140 sq., 569 sq.; Stanley, *Hist. of the Jewish Church* (N.Y. 1877), 3, 335. (B. P.)

Psalterium Marianum

is the name by which the devotion of the rosary is sometimes indicated, because in it (excepting the initial prayers), instead of the 150 psalms of the Scripture, the *Ave Maria*, in honor of the Virgin Mary, is recited 150 times.

Psaltery

an Anglicism of the Greek **ψαλτήριον**, is used in the A.V. as the rendering of two Hebrew words, both of which signified stringed instruments of music to accompany the voice. In our treatment of them we observe a strictly archaeological line of investigation. See Kitto's note on Psalm 92, 3, in his *Pictorial Bible; Bible Educator*, i, 70, 215; and **SEE MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS**.

1. **לְבַנְיֹתָי** **לְבַנְיֹתָי**, *nebel*, is so rendered in the A.V. in all passages where it occurs, except in ^{<2162>}Isaiah 5:12; 14:11; 22:24 marg.; ^{<3163>}Amos 5:23; 6:5, where it is translated *viol*, following the Geneva Version, which has *virole* in all cases except ^{<1016>}2 Samuel 6:5; ^{<1102>}1 Kings 10:12 ("psaltery"); 2 Esdras 10:22; Ecclus. 40:21 ("psalterion"); ^{<2224>}Isaiah 22:24 ("musicke"); and Wisd. 19:18 ("instrument of musike"). The ancient viol was a six-stringed guitar. "Viols had six strings, and the position of the fingers was marked on the finger-board by frets, as in the guitars of the present day" (Chappell, *Pop. Mus.* i, 246). In the Prayer-book version of the Psalms, the Hebrew word is rendered "lute." This instrument resembled the guitar, but

was superior in tone, “being larger, and having a convex back, somewhat like the vertical section of a gourd, or more nearly resembling that of a pear... It had virtually six strings, because, although the number was eleven or twelve, five, at least, were doubled; the first, or treble, being sometimes a single string. The head in which the pegs to turn the strings were inserted receded almost at a right angle” (Chappell, i, 102). These three instruments — psaltery or sautry, the viol, and the lute — are frequently associated in the old English poets, and were clearly instruments resembling each other, though still different. Thus in Chaucer’s *Flower and Leaf*, p. 337

*“And before he went minstreles many one,
As harpes, pipes, lutes, and sautry;”*

and again in Drayton’s *Polyolbion*, 4:356 —

*“The trembling lute some touch,
some strain the viol best.”*

Picture for Psaltery (1)

The word *psaltery* in its present form appears to have been introduced about the end of the 16th century, for it occurs in the unmodified form *psalterion* in two passages of the Geneva Version (1560). Again, in North’s Plutarch (*Them.* [ed. 1595], p. 124) we read that Themistocles, “being mocked... by some that had studied humanitie, and other liberall sciences, was driuen for reuenge and his owne defence, to aunswer with greate and stoute words, saying, that in deed he could no skill to tune a harpe, nor a violl, nor to play of a *psalterion*; but if they did put a citie into his hands that was of small name, weake, and litle, he knew wayes enough how to make it noble, strong, and great.” The Greek *ψαλτήριον*, from which our word is derived, denotes an instrument played with the fingers instead of a plectrum or quill, the verb *ψάλλειν* being used (Eurip. *Bach.* p. 781) of twanging the bowstring (comp. *ψαλμοὶ τόξων*, Eurip. *Ion*, p. 173). But it only occurs in the Sept. as the rendering of the Heorew *nebel* in ^{<6127>}Nehemiah 12:27 and ^{<21512>}Isaiah 5:12, and in all the passages of the Psalms, except ^{<57122>}Psalms 71:22 (*ψαλμός*) and ^{<58102>}Psalms 81:2 (*κιθάρα*), while in ^{<31523>}Amos 5:23; 6:5, the general term *ὄργανον* is employed. In all other cases *νάβλα* represents *nèbel* or *nebel*. These various renderings are sufficient to show that at the time the translation of the Sept. was made there was no certain identification of the Hebrew instrument with any known to the translators. The rendering *νάβλα* commends itself on

account of the similarity of the Greek word with the Hebrew. Josephus appears to have regarded them as equivalent, and his is the only direct evidence upon the point. He tells us (*Ant.* 7:12, 3) that the difference between the **κινύρα** (Heb. **ר/נקל** *kinnor*) and the **νάβλα** was that the former had ten strings and was played with the plectrum, the latter had twelve notes and was played with the hand. Forty thousand of these instruments, he adds (*Ant.* 8:3, 8), were made of electrum by Solomon for the Temple choir. Rashi (on ^{<צפיד>} Isaiah 5:12) says that the *nebel* had more strings and pegs than the *kinnor*. That *nabla* was a foreign name is evident from Strabo (x, 471) and from Athenaeus (iv, 175), where its origin is said to be Sidonian. Beyond this, and that it was a stringed instrument (Athen. 4:175), played by the hand (Ovid, *Ars Amn.* iii, 327), we know nothing of it; but in these facts we have strong presumptive evidence that *nabla* and *nebel* are the same; and that the *nabla* and *psalterion* are identical appears from the glossary of Philoxenus, where *nablio* = **ψάτης**, and *nablizo* = **ψάλλω**. and from Suidas, who makes *psalterion* and *naula*, or *nabla*, synonymous. Of the psaltery among the Greeks there appear to have been two kinds—the **πηκτίς**, which was of Persian (Athen. 14:636) or Lydian (ibid. p. 635) origin, and the **μογάδις**. The former had only two (ibid. 4:183) or three (ibid.) strings; the latter as many as twenty (ibid. 14:634), though sometimes only five (ibid. p. 637). They are sometimes said to be the same, and were evidently of the same kind. Both Isidore (*De Orig.* iii, 21) and Cassiodorus (*Proef. in Psal.* c. 4) describe the psaltery as triangular in shape, like the Greek **Δ**, with the sounding-board above the strings, which were struck downwards. The latter adds that it was played with a plectrum, so that he contradicts Josephus if the psaltery and *nebel* are really the same. In this case Josephus is the rather to be trusted. St. Augustine (on Psalm 32 [33]) makes the position of the sounding-board the point in which the cithara and psaltery differ; in the former it is below, in the latter above the strings. His language implies that both were played with the plectrum. The distinction between the cithara and psaltery is observed by Jerome (*Prol. in Psal.*). From these conflicting accounts it is impossible to say positively with what instrument the *nebel* of the Hebrew exactly corresponded. It was probably of various kinds, as Kinmchi says in his note on Isaiah 22, 21, differing from each other both with regard to the position of the pegs and the number of the strings. In illustration of the descriptions of Isidorus and Cassiodorus reference may be made to the drawings from Egyptian musical instruments given by Sir Gard. Wilkinson (*Anc. Eg.* ii, 280, 287), some one of which may correspond to the Hebrew

nebel. Munk (*Palestine*, pl. 16, figs. 12, 13) gives an engraving of an instrument which Niebuhr saw. Its form is that of an inverted Delta placed upon a round box of wood covered with skin. Abraham de Porta-Leone, the author of *Shilte Haugibborim* (c. 5), identifies the *nebel* with the Italian *liuto* (the lute), or rather with the particular kind called *liuto chitarronato* (the German *mandolinle*), the thirteen strings of which were of gut or sinew, and were struck with a quill. **SEE HARP.**

Picture for Psalterly (2)

The *nebel asor* (^{<BRP>}Psalm 33:2; 92:3 [4]; 144:9) appears to have been an instrument of the psalterly kind of a peculiar form or number of strings (Forkel, *Gesch. der Mus.* i, 133). Aben-Ezra (on ^{<HOB>}Psalm 150:3) says the *nebel* had ten holes; so that he must have considered it to be a kind of pipe. As the latter term signifies *ten*, and never occurs but in connection with the *nebel*, the conjecture is natural that the two instruments may have differed from each other only in the number of their strings, or the openings at the bottom. Hence we meet with the Sept. translation ἐν δεκαχόρδῳ, and in the Chaldee, Syriac, and Arabic words expressing an instrument of *ten* strings, which is also followed in the A.V. (^{<BRP>}Psalm 33:2144:1). We see no reason to dissent from this conclusion. Pfeiffer was inclined to think that the *asor* may have been the quadrangular lyre which is represented in different varieties in ancient monuments (figs. 1 and 2 of the accompanying cut), and which has usually ten strings, though sometimes more. **SEE VIOL.**

From the fact that *nebel* in Hebrew also signifies a wine-bottle or skin, it has been conjectured that the term when applied to a musical instrument denotes a kind of bagpipe — the old English *cornamute*, French *cornemuse*; but it seems clear, whatever else may be obscure concerning it, that the *nebel* was a stringed instrument. In the Mishna (*Kelim*, 16:7) mention is made of a case (qyt = θήκη) in which it was kept. **SEE BOTTLE.**

The first appearance of the *nebel* in the history of the Old Test. is in connection with the “string” of prophets who met Saul as they came down from the high place (^{<OIB>}1 Samuel 10:5). Here it is clearly used in a religious service, as again (^{<IOB>}2 Samuel 6:5; ^{<IBB>}1 Chronicles 13:8) when David brought the ark from Kirjath-jearim. In the Temple band organized by David were the players on psalteries (^{<ISB>}1 Chronicles 15:16, 20), who

accompanied the ark from the house of Obed-edom (15, 28). They played when the ark was brought into the Temple (^{<4652>}2 Chronicles 5:12); at the thanksgiving for Jehoshaphat's victory (20:28); at the restoration of the Temple under Hezekiah (29:25), and the dedication of the walls of Jerusalem after they were rebuilt by Nehemiah (^{<4627>}Nehemiah 12:27). In all these cases, and in the passages in the Psalms where allusion is made to it, the psaltery is associated with religious services (comp. ^{<3023>}Amos 5:23; 2 Esdras 10:22). But it had its part also in private festivities, as is evident from ^{<2352>}Isaiah 5:12; 14:11; 22:24; ^{<3085>}Amos 6:5, where it is associated with banquets and luxurious indulgence. It appears (^{<2341>}Isaiah 14:11) to have had a soft, plaintive note. The psalteries of David were made of cypress (^{<1085>}2 Samuel 6:5), those of Solomon of algum or almug trees (^{<4491>}2 Chronicles 9:11). *SEE PSALMODY.*

2. Among the instruments of the band which played before Nebuchadnezzar's golden image on the plains of Dura, we again meet with the 'psaltery' (^{<2085>} Daniel 3:5, 10,15; ^{<2341>} *pesunterin*). The Chaldee word appears to be merely a modification of the Greek *ψαλτήριον*. Attention is called to the fact that the word is singular (see Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 1116), the termination *ιον* corresponding to the Greek - *ιον*. This, in a more narrow and exact sense, denotes an instrument like the *cithara* (Lemprid. *Al Sever*), played with both hands, and called the *magadis*, *μαγάδης* (*Athen.* 14:636); but according to Jerome (*Proem. in Psalm.*) it was the later Greek name for the *nabla* or *nebel* above. See Music.

Psathyrians Or Psatyrians

a sect of Arians, who were followers of Theoctistus, a zealous pastry-cook (*ψαθυροπώλης*) of Constantinople, who maintained the heresy of Arius in the form that the first person in the Trinity existed before the Son had a being; thus denying the eternal generation of Christ. Brought to trial in the Council of Antioch, A.D. 360, they maintained that the Son was not like the Father as to will; that he was taken from nothing, or made of nothing; and that in God generation was not to be distinguished from creation. They were also called Douleians and Cyrtiani. See Theodorus, *Hoer. Fab.* vol. 4.

Psaume, Nicholas,

a French prelate, was born in 1518 at Chaumont-sur-Aine. diocese of Verdun, of very humble parentage. He was educated by his uncle, Francois Psaume, abbe of St. Paul of Verdun, who sent him successively to the universities of Paris, Orleans, and Poitiers, and resigned the abbey in his favor in 1538. Soon after, Nicholas took the habit of the Premonstrants. In 1548 the cardinal Jean de Lorraine abdicated in his favor the bishopric of Verdun. He assisted at the Council of Trent in 1550 and in 1562, arguing against the abuse of the regular benefices, and made for himself some enemies. He died at Verdun, Aug. 10, 1575. He gave to the world *Collectio Actorum et Decretorum Concilii Tridentini* (Etival, 1725), a curious journal of all that was done at the council from Nov. 13, 1562, until its conclusion, which was published by P. Hugo, abbe d'Etival: — *Preservati' contre le Changement de Religion* (Verdun, 1563, 8vo): — an edition of the canons of the provincial council of Treves in 1548: — *Missale Viridunense* (1557): — *Portrait de l'Eglise* (1573), dedicated to the cardinal of Lorraine: — some other works relative to the Council of Trent, which he published in 1564. — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Pseudepigrapha

(**ψευδεπίγραφα**) means those writings the title (**ἐπιγραφή**) of which names a false author instead of the true one. This designation is often applied to the Apocrypha, although there are many Apocrypha which name no author at all in their title. A number of Protestant theologians restrict the term *pseudepigrapha* to such writings of the O.T. as were composed in the Greek language shortly before or after Christ, and falsely attributed to the patriarchs and prophets of the Old Covenant, as, e.g. the testament of the twelve patriarchs, the book of Enoch, etc. They designate by the name of Apocrypha the writings falsely attributed to the apostles and disciples of Jesus. **SEE APOCRYPHA.**

Pseudodoxy

(**ψευδοδοξία**, from **ψεῦδος**, *falsehood*, and **δόξα**, *opinion*) designates a false or deceptive opinion, and hence is employed for *superstition* and *error*. A synonymous expression is *pseudodidascaly* (from **διδασκαλία**, *instruction*), as he who holds erroneous opinions (**ψευδόδοξος**), if he communicates them, becomes a false teacher (**ψευδοδιδάσκαλος**). The opposite of these two expressions ought to be *orthodoxy* and

orthodidascaly, but the latter two words are used in a somewhat different sense. **SEE HETERODOX**. The word *pseudoism* is of recent formation, and means a general inclination to the false, which shows itself in thoughts, words, and doctrines, as well as in acts and in the social intercourse of life.

Pseudolatry

(**ψευδολατρεία**, from **ψεῦδος**, *falsehood*, and **λατρεία**, *service*) designates a *false worship*, of which the Christian writers, who seem to have first formed this word, accused the pagans, on account of their polytheism. Pseudolatry has also penetrated into the Christian Church; for where we find the worship of images (iconolatry, or idolatry), there is pseudolatry likewise.

Pseudology And Pseudomancy

(**ψευδολογία**, **ψευδομαντεία** from **λόγος**, *speech*, and **μαντεία**, *prediction*) are in the mutual relation of species and genus. The former refers to false and deceptive speaking in general; the latter to the foretelling of future events. in which, in this sense, there is neither truth nor wisdom. The same relation exists between the pseudologist and the pseudomantist, called also pseudo-prophet. **SEE PROPHET**. Comp. also Lucian's Pseudomantis, by which title he designates an impostor of his time called Alexander (Alexander Impostor). Pseudomania would be simulated folly (**μανία**); for mental diseases can be simulated as well as bodily. Both pretences are mean, the former still more than the latter; for he who pretends to be mentally diseased plays the part of a being deprived of reason and freedom. Criminals sometimes recur to this artifice to escape the responsibility of their actions; lawyers like, in desperate cases, to resort to the plea of insanity. The judge must, where such an excuse is attempted, take the advice of the physicians, who have to examine how far such a plea is warranted by the facts, else this mode of defence would lead to the impunity of all criminals, even the most dangerous. The words **ψευδομανία** and **ψευδομαντεία** are both unknown to antiquity, although **ψευδόμαντις** was employed. Instead of **ψευδολογία**, the ancients used also **ψευδομυθία** (from; **μῦθος** = **λόγος**); hence it would be a mistake if we employed the latter word for false fables, although *myth* is synonymous with *fable*.

Psilanthropists

are those who maintain the extreme form of Unitarian doctrine that Christ was merely (**ψιλός**) a man (**ἄνθρωπος**), and not God and man (**θεᾶνθρωπος**) in one person.

Psychici And Pneumatici

(**ψυχικοί** and **πνευματικοί**, scil. **ἄνθρωποι**) are often contrasted in such a manner that the former word is employed in a lower sense, the second with a more refined and noble signification. The Montanists thus designated the orthodox, because they rejected the prophecies and pretended inspirations of their founder, and would not receive his rigid laws respecting fasting, etc. This was the term constantly used by Tertullian after he had fallen into the errors of the Montanists. He calls his own party *the spiritual*, and the orthodox *the carnal*. Tertullian, who ranged himself with the Pneumaticists, wrote a book *Contra Psychicos s. Orthodoxos*. But this meaning is very seldom given to these words in our times. **SEE ORIGEN**. The latter found in the Scriptures a somatic, psychical, and pneumatical meaning, because man is composed of body, soul, and mind. The name appears to have originated with the Valentinians, who styled themselves *the spiritual* and *the perfect*, and said they had no need of abstinence and good works, which were unnecessary for them that were perfect.

Psychism

(a new formation, from **ψυχή**, *soul*) is the opinion that everything is soul. The followers of this doctrine are called Psychists. Although poets put a soul in every inanimate object, they do not belong to this sect of philosophers; for they do not think in the least of suppressing all distinction between the somatic and the psychical nature. Michel Petoez, a Hungarian, published in 1833 (Pesth, 8vo) a book in which he attempts to prove that the so-called bodily world is composed of nothing but souls. He divides the souls into two classes, the living and the dead; the latter, in a state of aggregation, constitute the bodies. This opinion is not so new as it would appear at first sight. It bears a striking resemblance to Leibnitz's monadology, and may be a branch of that tree. Leibnitz considers the whole universe as composed of monads, which he divides into conscious and unconscious, or slumbering; he also holds bodies to be aggregations of the second kind of monads. If they are consistent, the strict idealists will

likewise be compelled to consider all that exists as soul or spirit, as they hold the bodies to be mere representations or ideas, to which the thinking mind lends objective existence. M. Quesne (*Lettres sur le Psychisme* [Paris, 1852, 8vo]) teaches that there is a fluid diffused throughout all nature, animating equally all living and organized beings, and that the difference which appears in their actions comes of their particular organization. The fluid is general, the organization is individual. This opinion differs from that of Pythagoras (q.v.), who held that the soul of a man passed individually into the body of a brute. While M. Quesne holds that, though the body dies, the soul does not; the organization perishes, but not the psychal, or psychical, fluid. See Krug, *Philos. Worterbuch*, s.v.

Psychology

(from *ψυχή*, the *soul*, and *λόγος*, a *discourse*) is that branch of metaphysics which treats of the nature and relations of the human spirit. It has been divided into *rational*, or speculative, and *empirical*, or practical. (See Fleming and Krauth, *Vocab. of Philos.* s.v.)

Biblical Psychology is a term lately applied to the doctrines of the Holy Scriptures on the subject, especially as to the distinction between the rational and immortal *soul* in man (j Wγ, *πνεῦμα*), and the animal, sensitive, and affectional *spirit* (vρη, *ψυχή*). The subject has been treated with great acumen by Delitzsch (*Biblical Psychology*, tr. from the German, Edinb. 1867); but the results are rather curious than satisfactory. (See *Brit. Quar. Rev.* Jan. 1873, p. 162; *New-Englander*, July. 1873, art. iv.) In fact, the Bible has no scientific nomenclature, and the attempt to reduce its terms to the strict definitions of modern classification, especially on so obscure and abstract a subject, must necessarily prove abortive. **SEE MIND.**

Psychomancy

(from *ψυχή*, *soul*, and *μαντέα* *prediction*) is the pretended art of summoning the souls of the deceased, and learning the future by their communications; it is one of the branches of divination, or mantics. The ancients use only *ψυχομαντις*, a sorcerer of this kind, and *ψυχομαντειον*, the place where such performances took place (*oraculum animarum*). The same art is called necromancy, and, in a more extensive sense, pneumatomancy. **SEE DIVINATION.**

Psychometry

(a new formation, from *ψυχή*, *soul*, and *μέτρον*, *measure*) is the art of *measuring souls*. It cannot give an account with mathematical exactitude of the powers of the soul and their effects; it must content itself with an approximative valuation, the soul being a quantity inapproachable to the senses, which cannot be measured like bodies. Ch. Jul. Sim. Portius, a teacher in Leipsic, invented an instrument of psychometry, which he thus describes: “The psychometer is an instrument which shows what a man is in respect to his temperament, mind, and heart. One hundred and ten different impressions can be made on the instrument. The impression made by the person whose soul is measured shows by which of the one hundred and ten qualities enumerated on a board” — and most arbitrarily and illogically, as to that — “this person is distinguished from others.” We may ask, Only those by which he or she is distinguished from, not also those which he has in common with, other people? But, the instrument could not indicate any of those one hundred and ten qualities, as each of them must be held in common by several persons. See the description of this psychometer by its author (Leipsic, 1833, 8vo).

Psychopannychism

(*ψυχή*, *soul*; *πάν*, *all*; and , *νύξ*, *night*- the sleep of the soul) is the doctrine to which Luther, among divines, and Forney, among philosophers, were inclined, that at death the soul falls asleep, and does not awake till the resurrection of the body. Calvin wrote a treatise against this view in 1534, and there is much against it in Henry Mori’s *Works*. Pagett says, in his *Heresiography*, written about 1638, that this “heresy” revived in his time through the publication of a work entitled *Man’s Mortality*. **SEE SOUL-SLEEP.**

Psychopneumones

were those who maintained the opinion that the souls of the good, after death, became angels, and the souls of the evil became devils. See Augustinus, *Hoeres.* ch. 78; Praedest. *Hoeres.* ch. 78.

Ptolemaeus,

or PTOLEMY (Πτολεμαῖος, i.e. “the warlike,” from - *πτόλεμος* = *πόλεμος*), the dynastic name of the Greek kings of Egypt (A.V.

“Ptol’emee” or “Ptoleme’us”), and hence employed also by many private persons. The name, which occurs in early legends (*Il.* 4:228; Pausan. 10:5), appears first in the historic period in the time of Alexander the Great, and became afterwards very frequent among the states which arose out of his conquests. For the following, which are the only persons of the name mentioned in the Scriptures (and these in the Apocrypha alone, although referred to in Daniel), we adopt the statements found in the standard authorities. For the civil history of the Ptolemies the student will find ample references to the original authorities in the articles in Smith’s *Dict. of Classical Biography*, ii, 581, etc., and in Pauly’s *Real-Encyklopadie*. The literature of the subject in its religious aspects has been noticed under ALEXANDRIA *SEE ALEXANDRIA*; *SEE DISPERSION*. A curious account of the literary activity of Ptolemy Philadelphus is given (by Simon de Magistris) in the *Apologia sent. Pat. de LXX Vers.*, appended to *Daniel sec. LXX* (Romae, 1772); but this is not always trustworthy. More complete details of the history of the Alexandrine libraries are given by Ritschl, *Die Alexandrinischen Bibliotheken* (Breslau, 1838); and Parthey, *Das Alexandr. Museum* (Berlin, 1838). The foregoing table gives the descent of the royal line as far as it is connected with Biblical history. *SEE EGYPT*.

Picture for Ptolemaeus (1)

1. PTOLEMY I, *Soter* (Σωτήρ, *savior*), known as the son of Lagus, a Macedonian of low rank, was generally supposed to be an illegitimate son of Philip. He distinguished himself greatly during the campaigns of Alexander; at whose death, foreseeing the necessary subdivision of the empire, he secured for himself the government of Egypt, where he proceeded at once to lay the foundations of a kingdom (B.C. 323). His policy during the wars of the succession was mainly directed towards the consolidation of his power, and not to wide conquests. He maintained himself against the attacks of Perdiccas (B.C. 321) and Demetrius (B.C. 312), and gained a precarious footing in Syria and Phoenicia. In B.C. 307 he suffered a very severe defeat at sea off Cyyprus from Antigonus, but successfully defended Egypt against invasion. After the final defeat of Antigonus, B.C. 301, he was obliged to concede the debatable provinces of Phoenicia and Coele-Syria to Seleucus; and during the remainder of his reign his only important achievement abroad was the recovery of Cyprus, which he permanently attached to the Egyptian monarchy (B.C. 295). He

abdicated in favor of his youngest son, Ptolemy II Philadelphus, two years before his death, which took place in B.C. 283.

Ptolemy Soter is described very briefly in ²¹¹⁰⁵Daniel 11:5 as one of those who should receive part of the empire of Alexander when it was 4 divided towards the four winds of heaven.” “*The king of the south* [Egypt in respect of Judoea] *shall be strong; and one of his princes* [Seleucus Nicator, shall be strong]; *and he* [Seleucus] *shall be strong above him* [Ptolemy], *and have dominion.*” Seleucus, who is here mentioned, fled from Babylon, where Antigonos sought his life, to Egypt in B.C. 316, and attached himself to Ptolemy. At last the decisive victory of Ipsus (B.C. 301), which was mainly gained by his services, gave him the command of an empire which was greater than any other held by Alexander’s successors; and “*his dominion was a great dominion*” (*Dan. l.c.*). Jerome (*ad Dan. l.c.*) very strangely refers the latter clauses of the verse to Ptolemy Philadelphus, “whose empire surpassed that of his father.” The whole tenor of the passage requires the contrast of the two kingdoms on which the fortunes of Judaea hung.

In one of his expeditions into Syria, probably B.C. 320, Ptolemy treacherously occupied Jerusalem on the Sabbath, a fact which arrested the attention of the heathen historian Agatharcides (ap. Joseph. *C. Ap. i, 22; Ant. 12:1*). He carried away many Jews and Samaritans captive to Alexandria; but, aware probably of the great importance of the good-will of the inhabitants of Palestine in the event of a Syrian war, he gave them the full privileges of citizenship in the new city. In the campaign of Gaza (B.C. 312) he reaped the fruits of his liberal policy; and many Jews voluntarily emigrated to Egypt, though the colony was from the first disturbed by internal dissensions (Josephus, as above; *Hecat. ap. Joseph. C. Ap. l.c.*).

Picture for Ptolemaeus (2)

2. PTOLEMY II, *Philadelphus* (Φιλάδελφος, i.e. *brother-loving*), the youngest son of Ptolemy I, was made king two years before his death, to confirm the irregular succession. The conflict between Egypt and Syria was renewed during his reign in consequence of the intrigue of his half-brother Magas. “*But in the end of years they* [the kings of Syria and Egypt] *joined themselves together* [in friendship]. *For the king’s daughter of the south* [Berenice, the daughter of Ptolemy Philadelphus] *came* [as bride] *to the king of the north* [Antiochus II], *to make an agreement*” (²¹¹⁰⁶Daniel 11:6).

The unhappy issue of this marriage has been noticed already, *SEE ANTIOCHUS II*; and the political events of the reign of Ptolemy, who, however, retained possession of the disputed provinces of Phoenicia and Coele-Syria, offer no further points of interest in connection with Jewish history.

In other respects, however, this reign was a critical epoch for the development of Judaism, as it was for the intellectual history of the ancient world. The liberal encouragement which Ptolemy bestowed on literature and science (following out in this the designs of his father) gave birth to a new school of writers and thinkers. The critical faculty was called forth in place of the creative, and learning, in some sense, supplied the place of original speculation. Eclecticism was the necessary result of the concurrence and comparison of dogmas; and it was impossible that the Jew, who was now become as true a citizen of the world as the Greek, should remain passive in the conflict of opinions. The origin and influence of the translation of the Sept. will be considered in another place. *SEE SEPTUAGINT*. It is enough now to observe the greatness of the consequences involved in the union of Greek language with Jewish thought. From this time the Jew was familiarized with the great types of Western literature, and in some degree aimed at imitating them. Ezechiel (ὁ τῶν Ἰουδαϊκῶν τραγωδιῶν ποιητής, Clem. Alex. *Strom.* i, 23, § 155) wrote a drama on the subject of the Exodus, of which considerable fragments, in fair iambic verse, remain (Euseb. *Proep. Ev.* 9:28, 29; Clem. Alex. *l.c.*), though he does not appear to have adhered strictly to the laws of classical composition. An elder Philo celebrated Jerusalem in a long hexameter poem — Eusebius quotes the 14th book — of which the few corrupt lines still preserved (Euseb. *Proep. Er.* 9:20, 24, 28) convey no satisfactory notion. Another epic poem, *On the Jews*, was written by Theodotus, and as the extant passages (*ibid.* 9:22) treat of the history of Sichem, it has been conjectured that he was a Samaritan. The work of Aristobulus on the interpretation of the law was a still more important result of the combination of the old faith with Greek culture, as forming the groundwork of later allegories. While the Jews appropriated the fruits of Western science, the Greeks looked towards the East with a new curiosity. The histories of Berosus and Manetho and Hecataeus opened a world as wide and as novel as the conquests of Alexander. The legendary sibyls were taught to speak in the language of the prophets. The name of Orpheus, which was connected with the first rise of Greek polytheism,

gave sanction to verses which set forth nobler views of the Godhead (*ibid.* 13:12, etc.). Even the most famous poets were not free from interpolation (Ewall, *Gesch.* 4:297, note). Everywhere the intellectual approximation of Jew and Gentile was growing closer, or at least more possible. The later specific forms of teaching to which this syncretism of East and West gave rise have already been noticed. **SEE ALEXANDRIA.** A second time, and in a new fashion, Egypt disciplined a people of God. It first impressed upon a nation the firm unity of a family, and then in due time reconnected a matured people with the world from which it had been called out.

Picture for Ptolemaeus (3)

3. PTOLEMY III, *Euergetes* (Εὐεργέτης, i.e. *well-doer*), was the eldest son of Ptolemy Philadelphus, and brother of Berenice, the wife of Antiochus II. The repudiation and murder of his sister furnished him with an occasion for invading Syria (B.C. cir. 246). He “*stood up, a branch out o’ her stock [sprung from the same parents] in his [father’s] estate; and set himself at [the head of] his army, and came against the fortresses of the king of the north [Antiochus], and dealt against them and prevailed*” (ⲉⲛⲓⲕⲏ Daniel 11:7). He extended his conquests as far as Antioch, and then eastward to Babylon, but was recalled to Egypt by tidings of seditions which had broken out there. His success was brilliant and complete. “*he carried captive into Egypt the gods [of the conquered nations] with their molten images, and with their precious vessels of silver and gold*” (ver. 8). This capture of sacred trophies, which included the recovery of images taken from Egypt by Cambyses (Jerome, *ad loc.*), earned for the king the name *Euergetes* “Benefactor” — from the superstitious Egyptians, and was specially recorded in the inscriptions which he set up at Adule in memory of his achievements (Cosmas Ind. ap. Clinton, *F.H.* p. 382, n.). After his return to Egypt (B.C. cir. 243) he suffered a great part of the conquered provinces to fall again under the power of Seleucus. But the attempts which Seleucus made to attack Egypt terminated disastrously to himself. He first collected a fleet, which was almost totally destroyed by a storm; and then, “as if by some judicial infatuation,” “*he came against the realm of the king o’ the south and [being defeated] returned to his own land [to Antioch]*” (ⲉⲛⲓⲕⲏ Daniel 11:9; Justin. 27:2). After this Ptolemy “*desisted some years from [attacking] the king of the north*” (ⲉⲛⲓⲕⲏ Daniel 11:8), since the civil war between Seleucus and Antiochus Hierax, which he fomented, secured him from any further Syrian invasion. The remainder of the reign of Ptolemy seems to have been spent chiefly in developing the resources of

the empire, which he raised to the highest pitch of its prosperity. His policy towards the Jews was similar to that of his predecessors, and on his occupation of Syria he “offered sacrifices, after the custom of the law, in acknowledgment of his success, in the Temple at Jerusalem, and added gifts worthy of his victory” (Joseph. *C. Ap.* ii, 5). The famous story of the manner in which Joseph, the son of Tobias, obtained from him the lease of the revenues of Judaea is a striking illustration both of the condition of the country and of the influence of individual Jews (id. *Ant.* 12:4). **SEE ONIAS.**

Picture for Ptolemaeus (4)

4. PTOLEMY IV. Philopator (Φιλοπάτωρ, i.e. *father-loving*). After the death of Ptolemy Euergetes, the line of the Ptolemies rapidly degenerated (Strabo, 16:12,13, p. 798). Ptolemy Philopator, his eldest son, who succeeded him, was, to the last degree, sensual, effeminate, and debased. But, externally, his kingdom retained its power and splendor; and when circumstances forced him to action, Ptolemy himself showed ability not unworthy of his race. The description of the campaign of Raphia (B.C. 217) in the book of Daniel gives a vivid description of his character. “The sons of Seleucus [Seleucus Ceraunus and Antiochus the Great] were *stirred up, and assembled a multitude of great forces; and one of them [Antiochus] came, and overflowed, and passed through [even to Pelusium: Polyb. v, 62]; and he returned [from Seleucia, to which he had retired during a faithless truce: Polyb. v, 66]; and they [Antiochus and Ptolemy] were stirred up [in war] even to his [Antiochus’s] fortress. And the king of the south [Ptolemy Philopator] was moved with choler, and came forth and fought with him [at Raphia]; and he set forth a great multitude; and the multitude was given into his hand [to lead to battle]. And the multitude raised itself [proudly for the conflict], and his heart was lifted up, and he cast down ten thousandds (comp. Polyb. v, 86); but he was not vigorous*” [to reap the fruits of his victory] (²¹¹⁰Daniel 11:10-12; comp. 3 Maccabees 1:1-5). After this decisive success, Ptolemy Philopator visited the neighboring cities of Syria, and, among others, Jerusalem. After offering sacrifices of thanksgiving in the Temple, he attempted to enter the sanctuary. A sudden paralysis hindered his design; but when he returned to Alexandria, he determined to inflict on the Alexandrian Jews the vengeance for his disappointment. In this, however, he was again hindered: and eventually he confirmed to them the full privileges which they had enjoyed before. **SEE MACCABEES, THE THIRD BOOK OF.** The recklessness of

his reign was further marked by the first insurrection of the native Egyptians against their Greek rulers (Polyb. v, 107). This was put down, and Ptolemy, during the remainder of his life, gave himself up to unbridled excesses. He died B.C. 205, and was succeeded by his only child, Ptolemy V, Epiphanes, who was at the time only four or five years old (Jerome, *ad Dan.* 11:10-12).

Picture for Ptolemaeus (5)

5. PTOLEMY V, *Epiphanes* (Ἐπιφάνης, i.e. *illustrious*). The reign of Ptolemy Epiphanes was a critical epoch in the history of the Jews. The rivalry between the Syrian and Egyptian parties, which had for some time divided the people, came to an open rupture in the struggles which marked his minority. The Syrian faction openly declared for Antiochus the Great when he advanced on his second expedition against Egypt; and the Jews, who remained faithful to the old alliance, fled to Egypt in great numbers, where Onias, the rightful successor to the high-priesthood, not long afterwards established the temple at Leontopolis. (Jerome [*ad Dan.* 11:14] places the flight of Onias to Egypt and the foundation of the temple of Leontopolis in the reign of Ptolemy Epiphanes; but Onias was still a youth at the time of his father's death, B.C. cir. 171.) **SEE ONIAS**. In the strong language of Daniel, "*The robbers of the people exalted themselves to establish the vision*" (²¹¹⁴Daniel 11:14) — to confirm by the issue of their attempt the truth of the prophetic word, and at the same time to forward unconsciously the establishment of the heavenly kingdom which they sought to anticipate. The accession of Ptolemy, and the confusion of a disputed regency furnished a favorable opportunity for foreign invasion. "*Many stood up against the king of the south,*" under Antiochus the Great and Philip III of Macedonia, who formed a league for the dismemberment of his kingdom. "*So the king of the north [Antiochus] came, and cast up a mount, and took the most fenced city [Sidon, to which Scopas, the general of Ptolemy, had fled: Jerome, *ad loc.*], and the arms of the south did not withstand*" [at Paneas, B.C. 198, where Antiochus gained a decisive victory] (²¹¹⁴Daniel 11:14, 15). The interference of the Romans, to whom the regents had turned for help, checked Antiochus in his career; but in order to retain the provinces of Coele-Syria, Phoenicia, and Judaea, which he had reconquered, really under his power, while he seemed to comply with the demands of the Romans, who required them to be surrendered to Ptolemy, "*he gave him [Ptolemy, his daughter Cleopatra] a young maiden*" [as his betrothed wife] (²¹¹⁷Daniel 11:17). But in the end his policy only

partially succeeded. After the marriage of Ptolemy and Cleopatra was consummated (B.C. 193), Cleopatra did “*not stand on his side,*” but supported her husband in maintaining the alliance with Rome. The disputed provinces, however, remained in the possession of Antiochus; and Ptolemy was poisoned at the time when he was preparing an expedition to recover them from Seleucus, the unworthy successor of Antiochus, B.C. 181.

Picture for Ptolemaeus (6)

6. PTOLEMY VI, *Philometor* (Φιλομήτωρ, i.e. *mother-loving*). On the death of Ptolemy Epiphanes, his wife, Cleopatra, held the regency for her young son, Ptolemy Philometor, and preserved peace with Syria till she died, B.C. 173. The government then fell into unworthy hands, and an attempt was made to recover Syria (comp. 2 Maccabees 4:21). Antiochus Epiphanes seems to have made the claim a pretext for invading Egypt. The generals of Ptolemy were defeated near Pelusium, probably at the close of B.C. 171 (Clinton, F. f. iii, 319; 1 Maccabees 1:16 sq.); and in the next year Antiochus, having secured the person of the young king, reduced almost the whole of Egypt (comp. 2 Maccabees 5:1). Meanwhile Ptolemy Euergetes II, the younger brother of Ptolemy Philometor, assumed the supreme power at Alexandria; and Antiochus, under the pretext of recovering the crown for Philometor, besieged Alexandria in B.C. 169. By this time, however, his selfish designs were apparent: the brothers were reconciled, and Antiochus was obliged to acquiesce for the time in the arrangement which they made. But while doing so, he prepared for another invasion of Egypt, and was already approaching Alexandria, when he was met by the Roman embassy, led by C. Popillius Luenas, who, in the name of the Roman senate, insisted on his immediate retreat (B.C. 168), a command which the late victory at Pydna made it impossible to disobey. (Others reckon only three campaigns of Antiochus against Egypt in 171, 170, 168 [Grimm on 1 Maccabees 1:18]. Yet the campaign of 169 seems clearly distinguished from those in the years before and after, though in the description of Daniel the campaigns of 170 and 169 are not noticed separately.)

Picture for Ptolemaeus (7)

These campaigns, which are intimately connected with the visits of Antiochus to Jerusalem in B.C. 170, 168, are briefly described in ²¹²⁵Daniel 11:25-30: “*he [Antiochus] shall stir up his power and his courage against the king of the south with a great army; and the king of the south [Ptolemy*

Philometor] *shall be stirred up to battle with a very great and mighty army; but he shall not stand: for they [the ministers, as it appears, in whom he trusted] shall forecast devices against him. Yea, they that feed of the portion of his meat shall destroy him, and his army shall melt away, and many shall fall down slain. And both these kings' hearts shall be to do mischief, and they shall speak lies at one table [Antiochus shall profess falsely to maintain the cause of Philometor against his brother, and Philometor to trust in his good faith]; but it shall not prosper [the resistance of Alexandria shall preserve the independence of Egypt]; for the end shall be at the time appointed. Then shall he [Antiochus] return into his land, and his heart shall be against the holy covenant; and he shall do exploits, and return to his own land. At the time appointed he shall return and come towards the south; but it shall not be as the former, so also the latter time. [His career shall be checked at once.] For the ships of Chittim [comp. ~~0001~~ Numbers 24:24: the Roman fleet] shall come against him: therefore he shall be dismayed and return and have indignation against the holy covenant."*

After the discomfiture of Antiochus, Philometor was for some time occupied in resisting the ambitious designs of his brother, who made two attempts to add Cyprus to the kingdom of Cyrene, which was allotted to him. Having effectually put down these attempts, he turned his attention again to Syria. During the brief reign of Antiochus Eupator he seems to have supported Philip against the regent Lysias (comp. 2 Maccabees 9:29). After the murder of Eupator by Demetrius I, Philometor espoused the cause of Alexander Balas, the rival claimant to the throne, because Demetrius had made an attempt on Cyprus; and when Alexander had defeated and slain his rival, he accepted the overtures which he made, and gave him his daughter Cleopatra in marriage (B.C. 150: 1 Maccabees 10:51-58). Yet, according to 1 Maccabees 11:1, 10, etc., the alliance was not made in good faith, but only as a means towards securing possession of Syria. According to others, Alexander himself made a treacherous attempt on the life of Ptolemy (comp. 1 Maccabees 11:10), which caused him to transfer his support to Demetrius II, to whom also he gave his daughter, whom he had taken from Alexander. The whole of Syria was quickly subdued, and he was crowned at Antioch king of Egypt and Asia (1 Maccabees 11:13). Alexander made an effort to recover his crown, but was defeated by the forces of Ptolemy and Demetrius, and shortly afterwards put to death in Arabia. But Ptolemy did not long enjoy his success. He fell

from his horse in the battle, and died within a few days (1 Maccabees 11:18), B.C. 145.

Ptolemy Philometor is the last king of Egypt who is noticed in sacred history, and his reign was marked also by the erection of the temple at Leontopolis. The coincidence is worthy of notice, for the consecration of a new centre of worship placed a religious as well as a political barrier between the Alexandrian and Palestinian Jews. Henceforth the nation was again divided. The history of the temple itself is extremely obscure, but even in its origin it was a monument of civil strife. Onias, the son of Onias III (Josephus, in one place [*War*, 7:10, 2], calls him “the son of Simon,” and he appears under the same name in Jewish legends; but it seems certain that this was a mere error, occasioned by the patronymic of the most famous Onias [comp. Herzfeld, *Gesch. d. Judenth.* ii, 557]), who was murdered at Antioch B.C. 171, when he saw that he was excluded from the succession to the high-priesthood by mercenary intrigues, fled to Egypt, either shortly after his father’s death or upon the transfer of the office to Alcimus, B.C. 162 (Josephus, *Ant.* 12:9, 7). It is probable that his retirement must be placed at the later date, for he was a child, **παῖς** (Josephus, *Ant.* 12:5), at the time of his father’s death, and he is elsewhere mentioned as one of those who actively opposed the Syrian party in Jerusalem (Josephus, *War*, i, 1). In Egypt, he entered the service of the king, and rose, with another Jew, Dositheus, to the supreme command. In this office he rendered important services during the war which Ptolemy Phvscon waged against his brother; and he pleaded these to induce the king to grant him a ruined temple of Diana (**τῆς ἀγρίας Βουβάστεως**) at Leontopolis as the site of a temple which he proposed to build “after the pattern of that at Jerusalem, and of the same dimensions.” His alleged object was to unite the Jews in one body who were at the time “divided into hostile factions, even as the Egyptians were, from their differences in religious services” (Josephus, *Ant.* 13:3,1). In defence of the locality which he chose, he quoted the words of Isaiah (⁻²³¹⁹¹⁸⁻Isaiah 19:18, 19), who spoke of “an altar to the Lord in the midst of the land of Egypt,” and, according to one interpretation, mentioned “the city of the Sun” (**srj hiry[]** by name. The site was granted and the temple built, but the original plan was not exactly carried out. The *Naos* rose “like a tower to the height of sixty cubits” (Josephus, *War*, 7:10, 3, **πύργῳ παραπλήσιον...εἰς ἑξήκοντα πῆχεις ἀνεστηκότα**). The altar and the offerings were similar to those at Jerusalem, but in place of the seven-branched candlestick was “a single

lamp of gold suspended by a golden chain.” The service was performed by priests and Levites of pure descent; and the temple possessed considerable revenues, which were devoted to their support and to the adequate celebration of the divine ritual (Josephus, *War*, vii. 10, 3; *Ant.* 13:3, 3). The object of Ptolemy Philometor in flurthering the design of Onias was doubtless the same as that which led to the erection of the “golden calves” in Israel. The Jewish residents in Egypt were numerous and powerful; and when Jerusalem was in the hands of the Syrians, it became of the utmost importance to weaken their connection with their mother city. In this respect the position of the temple on the eastern border of the kingdom was peculiarly important (Jost, *Gesch. des Judenthums*, i, 117). On the other hand, it is probable that Onias saw no hope in the hellenized Judaism of a Syrian province; and the triumph of the Maccabees was still unachieved when the temple at Leontopolis was founded. The date of this event cannot, indeed, be exactly determined. Josephus says (*War*, 7:10, 4) that the temple had existed “343 years” at the time of its destruction, A.D. cir. 71; but the text is manifestly corrupt. Eusebius (ap. Hieron. 8 p. 507, ed. Migne) notices the flight of Onias and the building of the temple under the same year (B.C. 162), possibly from the natural connection of the events without regard to the exact date of the latter. Some time at least must be allowed for the military service of Onias, and the building of the temple may, perhaps, be placed after the conclusion of the last war with Ptolemy Physcon (B.C. cir. 154), when Jonathan “began to judge the people at Machmas” (1 Maccabees 9:73). In Palestine the erection of this second temple was not condemned so strongly as might have been expected. A question, indeed, was raised in later times whether the service were not idolatrous (*Jerus. Joma*, 43 d, ap. Jost, *Gesch. des Judenthums*, i, 119); but the Mishna, embodying, without doubt, the old decisions, determines the point more favorably. “Priests who had served at Leontopolis were forbidden to serve at Jerusalem, but were not excluded from attending the public services.” “A vow might be discharged rightly at Leontopolis as well as at Jerusalem, but it was not enough to discharge it at the former place only” (*Menach.* 109 a, ap. Jost, as above). The circumstances under which the new temple was erected were evidently accepted as in some degree an excuse for the irregular worship. The connection with Jerusalem, though weakened in popular estimation, was not broken; and the spiritual significance of the one Temple remained unchanged for the devout believer (Philo, *De Monarch.* ii, § 1, etc.). **SEE ALEXANDRIA.**

The Jewish colony in Egypt, of which Leontopolis was the immediate religious centre, was formed of various elements and at different times. The settlements which were made under the Greek sovereigns, though the most important, were by no means the first. In the later times of the kingdom of Judah many "trusted in Egypt," and took refuge there (²⁴³⁶Jeremiah 43:6, 7); and when Jeremiah was taken to Tahapanes, he spoke to "all the Jews which dwell in the land of Egypt, which dwell at Migdol and Tahapanes, and at Noph, and in the country of Pathros" (²⁴⁴⁰Jeremiah 44:1). This colony, formed against the command of God, was devoted to complete destruction (²⁴⁴⁷Jeremiah 44:27); but when the connection was once formed, it is probable that the Persians, acting on the same policy as the Ptolemies, encouraged the settlement of Jews in Egypt to keep in check the native population. After the Return, the spirit of commerce must have contributed to increase the number of emigrants; but the history of the Egyptian Jews is involved in the same deep obscurity as that of the Jews of Palestine till the invasion of Alexander. There cannot, however, be any reasonable doubt as to the power and influence of the colony; and the mere fact of its existence is an important consideration in estimating the possibility of Jewish ideas finding their way to the West. Judaism had secured, in old times, all the treasures of Egypt, and thus the first instalment of the debt was repaid. A preparation was already made for a great work when the founding of Alexandria opened a new era in the history of the Jews. Alexander, according to the policy of all great conquerors, incorporated the conquered in his armies. Samaritans (Josephus, *Ant.* 11:8, 6) and Jews (Josephus, *Ant.* 11:8, 5; Hecat. ap. Joseph. *C. Ap.* i, 22) are mentioned among his troops; and the tradition is probably true which reckons them among the first settlers at Alexandria (Josephus, *War*, ii, 18, 7; *C. Ap.* ii, 4). Ptolemy Soter increased the colony of the Jews in Egypt both by force and by policy; and their numbers in the next reign may be estimated by the statement (Josephus, *Ant.* 12:2, 1) that Ptolemy Philadelphus gave freedom to one hundred and twenty thousand. The position occupied by Joseph (Josephus, *Ant.* 12:4) at the court of Ptolemy Euergetes I implies that the Jews were not only numerous, but influential. As we go onward, the legendary accounts of the persecution of Ptolemy Philopator bear witness at least to the great number of Jewish residents in Egypt (3 Maccabees 4:15, 17), and to their dispersion throughout the Delta. In the next reign many of the inhabitants of Palestine who remained faithful to the Egyptian alliance fled to Egypt to escape from the Syrian rule (comp. Jerome, *ad Dan.* 11:14, who is, however, confused

in his account). The consideration which their leaders must have thus gained accounts for the rank which a Jew, Aristobulus, is said to have held under Ptolemy Philometor as “tutor of the king” (*διδάσκαλος*, 2 Maccabees 1:10). The later history of the Alexandrian Jews has already been noticed. *SEE ALEXANDRIA*. They retained their privileges under the Romans, though they were exposed to the illegal oppression of individual governors, and quietly acquiesced in the foreign dominion (Josephus, *War*, 7:10, 1). An attempt which was made by some of the fugitives from Palestine to create a rising in Alexandria after the destruction of Jerusalem entirely failed; but the attempt gave the Romans an excuse for plundering, and afterwards (B.C. 71) for closing entirely, the temple at Leontopolis (Josephus, *War*, 7:10).

7. “The son of Dorymenes” (1 Maccabees 3:38; 2 Maccabees 4:45; comp. Polyb. v, 61), a courtier who possessed great influence with Antiochus Epiphanes. He was induced by a bribe to support the cause of Menelaus (2 Maccabees 4:45-50), and afterwards took an active part in forcing the Jews to apostatize (2 Maccabees 6:8, according to the true reading). When Judas had successfully resisted the first assaults of the Syrians, Ptolemy took part in the great expedition which Lysias organized against him, which ended in the defeat at Emmaus (B.C. 166); but nothing is said of his personal fortunes in the campaign (1 Maccabees 3:38).

8. The son of Agesarchus (Ath. 6 p. 246 C), a Megalopolitan, surnamed Macron (2 Maccabees 10:12), who was governor of Cyprus during the minority of Ptolemy Philometor. This office he discharged with singular fidelity (Polyb. 27:12); but afterwards he deserted the Egyptian service to join Antiochus Epiphanes. He stood high in the favor of Antiochus, and received from him the government of Phoenicia and Coele-Syria (2 Maccabees 8:8; 10:11, 12). On the accession of Antiochus Eupator, his conciliatory policy towards the Jews brought him into suspicion at court. He was deprived of his government, and in consequence of this disgrace he poisoned himself, B.C. cir. 164 (2 Maccabees 10:13).

Ptolemy Macron is commonly identified with Ptolemy “the son of Dorymenes;” and it seems likely, from a comparison of 1 Maccabees 3:38 with 2 Maccabees 8:8, 9, that they were confused in the popular account of the war. But the testimony of Athenaeus distinctly separates the governor of Cyprus from “the son of Dorymenes” by his parentage. It is also doubtful whether Ptolemy Macron had left Cyprus as early as B.C. 170,

when “the son of Dorymenes” was at Tyre (2 Maccabees 4:45); though there is no authority for the common statement that he gave up the island into the hands of Antiochus, who did not gain it till B.C. 168.

9. The son of Abubus, who married the daughter of Simon the Maccabee. He was a man of great wealth, and, being invested with the government of the district of Jericho, formed the design of usurping the sovereignty of Judaea. With this view he treacherously murdered Simon and two of his sons (1 Maccabees 16:11-16; Josephus, *Ant.* 13:7, 4; 8, 1, with some variations); but John Hyrcanus received timely intimation of his design, and escaped. Hyrcanus afterwards besieged him in his stronghold of Dok; but in consequence of the occurrence of the Sabbatical year, Ptolemy was enabled to make his escape to Zeno Cotylas, prince of Philadelphia (Josephus, *Ant.* 13:8, 1).

10. A citizen of Jerusalem, father of Lysimachus, the Greek translator of Esther ^{<4700>}(Esther 13). Whether this is the same Ptolemy who is mentioned in the same verse as the carrier of the book to Egypt remains uncertain.

SEE LYSIMACHUS, 1.

Ptolema'is

(Πτολεμαΐς), the name of two places in Scripture.

1. The same as *Accho* (q.v.). The name is, in fact, an interpolation in the history of the place. The city which was called Accho in the earliest Jewish annals, and which is again the *Akka* or *St. Jean d'Acre* of crusading and modern times, was named Ptolemais in the Macedonian and Roman periods. In the former of these periods it was the most important town upon the coast, and it is prominently mentioned in the first book of Maccabees (5:15, 55; 10:1, 58, 60; 12:48). In the latter its eminence was far outdone by Herod's new city of Caesarea. It is worthy of notice that Herod, on his return from Italy to Syria, landed at Ptolemais (Josephus, *Ant.* 14:15, 1). Still in the New Test. Ptolemais is a marked point in Paul's travels both by land and sea. He must have passed through it on all his journeys along the great coast road which connected Caesarea and Antioch (^{<4113>}Acts 11:30; 12:25; 15:2, 30; 18:22); and the distances are given both in the Antonine and Jerusalem itineraries (Wesseling, *Itin.* p. 158, 584). But it is specifically mentioned in ^{<4207>}Acts 21:7 as containing a Christian community, visited for one day by Paul. On this occasion he came to Ptolemais by sea. He was then on his return voyage from the third

missionary journey. The last harbor at which he had touched was Tyre (ver. 3). From Ptolemais he proceeded, apparently by land, to Caesarea (ver. 8), and thence to Jerusalem (ver. 17). *SEE PAUL.*

2. A place described as *ροοοφορος*, *rose-producing* (3 Maccabees 7:17), and supposed to be the *ὄρμος Πτολεμαΐς* of Ptolemy (4:5, 57), in Central Egypt, in the Arsinoite nome, a district still abounding in roses (Mannert, *Geogr. der Griechen u. Romanen*, 10:1, p. 419; Ritter, *Erdkunde*, i, 795, 797).

Ptolemaites

a branch of the Gnostic sect of the 2d century, described by Irenaeus as “a bud from the Valentinians,” take their name from their leader Ptolemy (q.v.), who differed in opinion from Valentinian with respect to the number and nature of the aeons, as well as the authorship and design of some portions of the Old Testament. *SEE PTOLEMY.*

Ptol’emee, Ptolomae’us, Ptol’omee

forms of the name *Ptolemy* sometimes found in the Apocryphal books of Esther and Maccabees. *SEE PTOLEMAUS.*

Ptol’emy

SEE P’OLEMAEUS.

Ptolemy

was a Gnostic philosopher, in whom, according to St. Irenaeus (*Proef. ad lib. i, Adv. Hoer.*), the system of Valentinus reached its bloom. Irenaeus gives a full exposition of it in his work *Adv. Hoereses*, lib. i, c. i, 8. Ptolemy is also named by Tertullian, but without any particulars of his history (*Contr. Valent.* c. 33), and in a very few words by Philaster (*Her.* c. 39), Augustine (*Hoer.* c. 13), Praedestinatus (*Hoer.* c. xii), and the continuator of Tertullian (Pseudo-Tertullian, *Hoer.* c. xii). St. Epiphanius, in his great work on heresies (*Hoer.* lib. 30 c. iii), communicates a letter of this Ptolemy to Flora, in which the former explains to the lady the fundamental features of his doctrine. The only difference between the Ptolemaeans and the Valentinians in general appears to have been in respect to the number of aeons which they invented for their respective systems, and the name of Ptolemy is associated particularly with that of

Heracleon as regards a duplex system of four. *SEE HERACLEONITES*. In the year 1843 Mr. Stieren, who has since made himself more generally known by his recently commenced edition of the works of St. Irenaeus, published a dissertation under the title *De Ptolemoei Gnostici ad Floram Epistola, etc.* (Jenae, ap. C. Hochhausen), in which he endeavors to prove that the doctrine contained in the letter to Flora is at variance with the system of Ptolemy as known by the writings of St. Irenaeus, and that, in consequence, the letter must be considered as apocryphal. Hefele, in the *Tubinger Quartalschrift*, 1845, p. 387-396, undertook to show that there is no real contradiction between the letter and the system, and that neither the authenticity nor the integrity (except one marginal note in cap. 1, § 6) of the former can be questioned. — Wetzler u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, s.v.

Pu'a

(^{<0053>}Numbers 26:23). *SEE PHUVAH*.

Pu'ah

the form in the A.V. of the name of two men and one woman, each different in the Hebrew.

1. (Heb. *Puvvah'*, hWP, ^{<0010>}1 Chronicles 7:1.) *SEE PHUVAH*.

2. (Heb. *Pu'ah*, h[WP, thought by Gesenius and Farst to be for h[Wpy] *splendid*; Sept. Φουά, Vulg. *Phua*.) The last named of the two midwives to whom Pharaoh gave instructions to kill the Hebrew male children at their birth (^{<0015>}Exodus 1:15). B.C. cir. 1740. In the A.V. they are called "Hebrew midwives," a rendering which is not required by the original, and which is regarded by many as doubtful, both from the improbability that the king would have intrusted the execution of such a task to the women of the nation he was endeavoring to destroy, as well as from the answer of the women themselves in ver. 19, "for the Hebrew women are not like the Egyptian women;" from which we may infer that they were accustomed to attend upon the latter, and were themselves Egyptians. If we translate ^{<0018>}Exodus 1:18 in this way, "And the king of Egypt said to the women who acted as midwives to the Hebrew women," this difficulty is removed. The two, Shiphrah and Puah, are supposed to have been the chief and representatives of their profession; as Aben-Ezra says, "They were chiefs over all the midwives: for no doubt there were more than 500 midwives,

but these two were chiefs over them to give tribute to the king of the hire." According to Jewish tradition, Shiphrah was Jochebed, and Puah Miriam; "because," says Rashi. "she *cried* and talked and murmured to the child, after the manner of the women that lull a weeping infant." The origin of all this is an imaginary play upon the name Puah, which is derived from a root signifying "to cry out," as in ⁽²³²⁴⁾Isaiah 42:14, and used in Rabbinical writers of the bleating of sheep. — Smith. Josephus (*Ant.* ii, 9, 9) intimates that these were Egyptian women: but when it is considered that no Egyptian woman was likely to pollute herself by rendering such offices to a Hebrew woman; that Puah and Shiphrah are described as fearing Jehovah (⁽²⁰¹⁷⁾Exodus 1:17); that their names are Hebrew; and that though the words **Tyr b[a i t d b y m]** may be translated "midwives of the Hebrews," they more probably mean, as the A.V. gives them, "Hebrew midwives;" and that had Moses intended to convey the other meaning, he would have written **h i t a , m]** ; reason will be found for preferring the opinion that they were Hebrew women.

3. (Heb. *Pu'ah*, **haYP**, perhaps i. q. **hp**, *mouth*; Sept. **Φουά**, Vulg. *Phua*.) The father of Tola, who was of the tribe of Issachar, and judge of Israel after Abimelech (⁽²⁷⁰⁰⁾Judges 10:1). B.C. ante 1319. In the Vulg. instead of "the son of Dodo," he is called "the uncle of Abimelech;" and in the Sept. Tola is said to be "the son of Phua, the son (**υίός**) of his father's brother;" both versions endeavoring to render "Dodo" as an appellative, while the latter introduces a remarkable genealogical difficulty.

Public Worship

is the service of the different religious bodies open to all worshippers, and is so designated in distinction from minor services intended simply as auxiliaries to the devoted in their religious life. It is usually supposed to be a service under charge of clergy, though it need not be thus limited. It is at any rate supposed to embrace a public address in behalf of the truth espoused by the congregation convened. In the Christian Church the outward forms of religion tended in her very infancy to the imposing. From the ancient temples the incense and many customs of heathenism were transferred to the churches. By the use of tapers and perpetual lamps, the solemnity of nocturnal festivals was combined with the light of day. The people were called together by a piece of metal struck by a hammer, until this method led to the adoption of bells in the 7th century. Soon after the organ came into use, and added to the spectacular action of Christian

worship. But notwithstanding this unwarranted tendency towards the dramatic, the expounding of Holy Scripture and prayer formed a principal part in early worship. In the Greek Church the principal part of public worship consisted in the sermon, though it was often only a rhetorical amusement rewarded by the clapping of hands. As the Church had been formed under the Roman empire, it retained many Roman usages. The first to protest against the peculiarities of the Romish clergy were the Christians of Britain, who worshipped in the simplicity of apostolic times. But no effectual check was put upon ecclesiastical usages, *SEE IMAGE-WORSHIP*, until the great Reformatory movement which resulted in restoring the beautiful and impressive order of the Saviour and his disciples. *SEE WORSHIP*. Nearly all Protestant churches have regulations regarding the form and order of public worship. In the Anglican service-book the *rubrics* (q.v.) present it. According to article 20 the Church has power to decree rites or ceremonies that are not contrary to God's Word; and according to article 34 "it is not necessary that traditions and ceremonies be in all places one, or utterly like; for all times they have been divers, and may be changed according to the diversity of countries, times, and men's manners; so that nothing be ordained against God's Word." But in this same article provision is also made against unscriptural (popish) innovations, as well as against the abandonment of those regulations instituted by the proper authority.

"Whosoever, through his private judgment, willingly and purposely doth openly break the traditions and ceremonies of the Church, which be not repugnant to the Word of God, and be ordained and approved by common authority, ought to be rebuked openly (that others may fear to do the like), as he that offends against the common order of the Church, and hurts the authority of the magistrate, and wounds the consciences of weak brethren. Every particular or national Church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish the ceremonies or rites of the Church, ordained only by man's authority, so that all things be done to edifying."

Canon 6 provides: "whoever shall affirm that the rites and ceremonies of the Church of England by law established are wicked, anti-Christian, or superstitious: or such as, being commanded by lawful authority, men who are zealously and godly affected may not with any good conscience approve them, use them, or, as occasion requireth, subscribe unto them; let him be

excommunicated *ipso facto*, and not restored until he repent, and publicly revoke such his wicked errors.”

Canon 80. “The churchwardens or questmnen of every church and chapel shall, at the charge of the parish, provide the Book of Common Prayer, lately explained in some few points by his majesty’s authority, according to the laws and his highness’s prerogative in that behalf; and that with all convenient speed, but at thie furthest within two months after the publishing of these our constitutions. Every dean, canon, or prebendary of every cathedral or collegiate church, and all masters and other heads, fellows, chaplains, and tutors of or in anly college, hall, house of learning, or hospital, and every public professor and reader in either of the universities, or in every college elsewhere, and every parson, vicar, curate, lecturer, and every other person in holy orders, and every schoolmaster keeping any public or private school, and every person instructing or teaching any youth in any house or private family as tutor or schoolmaster, who shall be incumbent, or have possession of any deanery, canolny, prebend, mastership, hendship, fellowship, professor’s place or reader’s place, parsonage, vicarage, or any other ecclesiastical dignity or promotion, or of any curate’s place, lecture, or school, or shall instruct or teach any youth as tutor or schoolmaster, shall at or before his admission to be incumbent, or having possession aforesaid, subscribe the declaration following: ‘I, A. B., do declare that I will conform to the liturgy of the Church of England, as it is now by law established’ (13 and 14 Charles II, c. 4, s. 8, and 1 William, sess. 1, c. 8, s. 11). And no form or order of common prayers, administration of sacraments, rites, or ceremonies, shall be openly used in any church, chapel, or other place than that which is prescribed in the said book (§ 17),’

Canon 4. “Whosoever shall affirm that the form of God’s worship in the Church of England, established by law, and contained in the Book of Common Prayer and Administration of Sacraments, is a corrupt, superstitious, or unlawful worship of God, or containeth anything in it that is repugnant to the Scriptures, let him he excommunicated *ipso facto*, and not restored but by the bishop of the place, or archbishop, after his repentance and public revocation of such his wicked errors.”

Canon 38. “If any minister, after he hath subscribed to the Book of Common Prayer, shall omit to use the form of prayer, or any of the orders or ceremonies prescribed in the Communion Book, let him be suspended; and if after a month he do not reform and submit himself, let him be excommunicated; and then if he shall not submit himself within the space of another month, let him be deposed from the ministry.”

Canon 18 requires that “no man shall cover his head in the church or chapel in the time of divine service, except he have some infirmity, in which case let him wear a nightcap or coif. All manner of persons then present shall reverently kneel upon their knees, when the general confession, litany, or other prayers are read; and shall stand up at the saying of the Belief, according to the rules in that behalf prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer. And likewise, when in time of divine service the Lord Jesus shall be mentioned, due and lowly reverence shall be done by all persons present, as it hath been accustomed; testifying by these outward ceremonies and gestures their inward humility, Christian resolution, and due acknowledgment that the Lord Jesus Christ, the true eternal Son of God, is the only Saviour of the world, in whom alone all the mercies, graces, and promises of God to mankind, for this life and the life to come, are fully and wholly comprised. And none, either man, woman, or child, of what calling soever, shall be otherwise at such times busied in the church than in quiet attendance to hear, mark, and understand that which is read, preached, or ministered: saying in their due places audibly, with the minister, the Confession, the Lord’s Prayer, and the Creed, and making such other answers to the public prayers as are appointed in the Book of Common Prayer; neither shall they disturb the service or sermon by walking or talking, or any other way; nor depart out of the church during the time of divine service or sermon without some urgent or reasonable cause.”

Canon 14. “The common prayer shall be said or sung distinctly and reverently, upon such days as are appointed to be kept holy by the Book of Common Prayer, and at convenient and usual times of those days, and in such places of every church, as the bishop of the diocese or ecclesiastical ordinary of the place shall think meet for the largeness or straitness of the same, so as the

people may be most edified. All ministers likewise shall observe the orders, rites, and ceremonies prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer, as well in reading the Holy Scriptures and saying of prayers as in the administration of the sacraments, without either diminishing in regard of preaching or in any other respect, or adding anything in the matter or form thereof.”

Preface to the Book of Common Prayer:

“All priests and deacons are to say daily the morning and evening prayer, either privately or openly, not being let by sickness or some other urgent canuse. And the curate that ministereth in every parish church or chapel, being at home, and not being otherwise reasonably hindered, shall say the same in the parish church or chapel where he ministereth; and shall cause a bell to be tolled thereunto, a convenient time before he begin, that the people may come to hear God’s Word, and to pray with him.”

The American reviewers omitted from the Prayer-book the 45th canon of 1832, which enjoins that “every minister shall, before all sermons and lectures, and on all other occasions of public worship, use the Book of Common Prayer as the same is or may be established by the authority of the General Convention of this Church. And in performing said service, no other prayer shall be used than those prescribed by the said book.”

The Westminster Directory enacts: “Let all enter the assembly, not irreverently, but in a grave and seemly manner, taking their seats or places without adoration, or bowing themselves towards one place or other. The congregation being assembled, the minister, after solemn calling, on them to the worshipping of the great name of God, is to begin with prayer. The public worship being begun, the people are wholly to attend upon it, forbearing to read anything except what the minister is then reading or citing; and abstaining much more from all private whisperings, conferences, salutations, or doing reverence to any person present, or coming in; as also from all gazing, sleeping, and other indecent behavior which may disturb the minister or people, or hinder themselves or others in the service of God. If any, through necessity, be hinderd from being present at the beginning, they ought not, when they come into the congregation, to betake themselves to their private devotions, but reverently to compose themselves to join with the assembly in that ordinance of God which is then in hand.” This injunction to begin with prayer has been universally departed

from in Scotland, and the reason assigned is this: "The reader or precentor began the service with reading a chapter, and gave out a psalm as the minister came into church — so that the minister, the psalm being sung, began with prayer. But the precentor's function has ceased since the middle or towards the end of last century, and the minister now begins with praise, doing himself what used to be done by his subordinate." *SEE PRECENTOR; SEE READER.*

In most of the American churches the principal object of public worship is the expounding of the Word of God by the minister in a sermon. This is usually preceded by song and prayer and the reading of the Scriptures, and followed by prayer and song. The order of arrangement differs, being usually regarded as immaterial. *SEE CHURCH; SEE CLERGY; SEE LITANY; SEE PRAYER; SEE WORSHIP.*

Publican

(τελώνης). The word thus translated belongs only, in the New Test., to the three Synoptic Gospels. The class designated by the Greek word were employed as collectors of the Roman revenue. The Latin word from which the English of the A.V. has been taken was applied to a higher order of men. It will be necessary to glance at the financial administration of the Roman provinces in order to understand the relation of the two classes to each other, and the grounds of the hatred and scorn which appear in the New Test. to have fallen on the former.

The Roman senate had found it convenient, at a period as early as, if not earlier than, the second Punic war, to farm out at public auction the *vectigalia* (direct taxes) and the *portoria* (customs, including the *octroi* on goods carried into or out of cities) to capitalists who undertook to pay a given sum into the treasury (*in publicum*), and so received the name of *publicani* (Livy, 32:7). Contracts of this kind fell naturally into the hands of the *equites*, as the richest class of Romans. These *knights* were an order instituted as early as the time of Romulus, and composed of men of great consideration with the government — "the principal men of dignity in their several countries," who occupied a kind of middle rank between the senators and the people (Josephus, *Ant.* 12:4). Although these officers were, according to Cicero, the ornament of the city and the strength of the commonwealth, they did not attain to great offices, nor enter the senate, so long as they continued in the order of knights. They were thus more capable of devoting their attention to the collection of the public revenue.

Not unfrequently the sum bidden went beyond the means of any individual capitalist, and a joint-stock company (*societas*) was formed, with one of the partners, or an agent appointed by them, acting as managing director (*magister*; Cicero, *Ad Div.* 13:9). Under this officer, who commonly resided at Rome, transacting the business of the company, paying profits to the partners and the like, were the *submagistri*, living in the provinces. Under them, in like manner, were the *portitores*, the actual custom-house officers (*douaniers*), who examined each bale of goods exported or imported, assessed its value more or less arbitrarily, wrote out the ticket, and enforced payment. The latter were commonly natives of the province in which they were stationed, as being brought daily into contact with all classes of the population. The word **τελῶναι**, which etymologically might have been used of the *publicani* properly so called (**τέλη, ὠνέομαι**), was used popularly, and in the New Test. exclusively, of the *portitores*. The same practice prevailed in the East, from which an illustration of it has been preserved to us by Josephus. He tells us that on the marriage of Cleopatra to Ptolemy. the latter received from Antiochus as his daughters dowry Coele-Syria, Samaria, Judaea. and Phoenicia; that “upon the division of the taxes between the two kings, the principal men farmed the taxes of their several countries,” paying to the kings the stipulated sum; and that “when the day came on which the king was to let the taxes of the cities to farm, and those that were the principal men of dignity in their several countries were to bid for them, the sum of the taxes together of CceleSyria, and Phoenicia, and Judea, and Samaria, as they were bidden for, came to eight thousand talents” (*Ant.* 12:4, 1, 4). Those thus spoken of by the Jewish historian as “principal men of dignity” were the real *publicani* of antiquity. In the Roman empire especially they were persons of no small consequence; in times of trouble they advanced large sums of money to the State, and towards the close of the republic they were so generally members of the equestrian order that the words *equites* and *publicani* were sometimes used as synonymous (Smith, *Dict. Gr. and Rom. Antiq.* s.v.).

The *publicani* were thus an important section of the equestrian order. An orator wishing, for political purposes, to court that order, might describe them as “flos equitum Romanorum, ornamentum civitatis, firmamentum Reipublicae” (Cicero, *Pro Planc.* 9). The system was, however, essentially a vicious one — the most detestable, perhaps, of all modes of managing a revenue (comp. Adam Smith, *Wealth of Nations*, vol. ii), and it bore its

natural fruits. The *publicani* were banded together to support each other's interest, and at once resented and defied all interference (Livy, 25:3). They demanded severe laws, and put every such law into execution. Their agents, the *portitores*, were encouraged in the most vexatious or fraudulent exactions, and a remedy was all but impossible. The popular feeling ran strong even against the equestrian capitalists. The Macedonians complained, as soon as they were brought under Roman government, that “ubi publicanus est, ibi aut jus publicum vanum, aut libertas sociis nulla” (Livy, xlv, 18). Cicero, in writing to his brother (*Ad Quint.* i, 1, 11), speaks of the difficulty of keeping the *publicani* within bounds, and yet not offending them as the hardest task of the governor of a province. Tacitus counted it as one bright feature of the ideal life of a people unlike his own that there “nec publicanus atterit” (*Genrm.* 29). For a moment the capricious liberalism of Nero led him to entertain the thought of sweeping away the whole system of *portoria*; but the conservatism of the senate, servile as it was in all things else, rose in arms against it, and the scheme was dropped (Tacitus, *Ann.* 13:50), and the “immodestia publicanorum” (*ibid.*) remained unchecked.

If this was the case with the directors of the company, we may imagine how it stood with the underlings. They overcharged whenever they had an opportunity (☞ Luke 3:13). They brought false charges of smuggling in the hope of extorting hush-money (☞ Luke 19:8). They detained and opened letters on mere suspicion (Terence, *Phorm.* i, 2, 99; Plautus, *Trinumn.* iii, 3, 64). The *injuria portitorum*, rather than the *portoria* themselves, were in most cases the subject of complaint (Cicero, *Ad Quint.* i, 1, 11). It was the basest of all livelihoods (Cicero, *De Off* i, 42). They were the wolves and bears of human society (Stobaeus, *Serm.* ii, 34). Πάντες τελῶναι, πάντες ἄρπαγες had become a proverb, even under an earlier regime, and it was truer than ever now (Xenoph. Comic. ap. Dicaearch. Meineke, *Frag. Com.* 4:596). Of these subordinate officials there appear to have been two classes, both included by us under the general name *publican* — the ἀρχιτελῶναι, or “chief of the publicans,” of whom we have an instance in Zacchaeus; and the ordinary publicans (τελῶναι), the lowest class of servants engaged in the collection of the revenue, and of whom Levi, afterwards the apostle Matthew, is an example. The former, the ἀρχιτελῶναι, appear to have been managers under the *publicani* proper, or associations of publicans, already spoken of. They were intrusted with the supervision of a collecting district, and it was

their duty to see that, in that district, the inferior officers were faithful, and that the various taxes were regularly gathered in. Their situation was thus one of much greater consequence than that of the ordinary “publican” of the Gospels. They seem to have possessed a much higher character, and many of them became wealthy men. Zacchaeus is the only example of an ἀρχιτελώνης mentioned in the New Test., and it is the ordinary τελῶναι, neither the farmers of the revenues, nor the superintendents whom they employed, but a still lower class of servants, who most interest us. These were not the *publicani*, but the *portitores* of the Roman empire, who derived their name from their levying the taxes known as the *portoria*. The *portoria* included the duties upon imported and exported goods, and upon merchandise passing through the country — one important source of the wealth of Solomon: “Besides that, he had of the merchantmen, and of the traffic of the spice merchants” (⁴¹⁰⁰⁵1 Kings 10:15). They included also the tribute or head-money levied from individuals, and the various tolls which appear to have been exigible for the use of roads and bridges. They thus extended over a large number of particulars, and, however honorably and gently the function of the *portitor* had been discharged, it would have been impossible for him to avoid that odium which the tax-collector seldom escapes from the taxpayer. But the office, invidious enough in itself, was in the ancient world rendered still more hateful, as we have seen, by the inquisitorial proceedings and the inscrupulous exactions of those who discharged its duties. The frightful abuses practiced in conquered provinces by the governors who were sent to rule them are well known to all; but the same system of abuse marked the whole army of officials from the highest to the lowest, only that the lowest came in contact with the great mass of the people, and that their petty interferences and severities must have been felt, under one form or another, by almost all. To such an extent, indeed, did these exactions proceed, even in the very neighborhood of Rome, that at one time the Roman government, as the only means of introducing a remedy, abolished all the import and export duties in the ports of Italy (Smith, *Dict. Gr. and Rom. Antiq.* s.v. *Portitores*).

All this was enough to bring the class into ill-favor everywhere. In Judaea and Galilee there were special circumstances of aggravation. The employment brought out all the besetting vices of the Jewish character. The strong feeling of many Jews as to the absolute unlawfulness of paying tribute at all made matters worse. The Scribes who discussed the question (⁴¹²¹⁵Matthew 22:15) for the most part answered it in the negative. The

Galilaeans or Herodians, the disciples of Judas the Gaulonite, were the most turbulent and rebellious (^{<44837>}Acts 5:37). They thought it unlawful to pay tribute, and founded their refusal to do so on their being the people of the Lord, because a true Israelite was not permitted to acknowledge any other sovereign than God (Josephus, *Ant.* 18:2). The publicans were hated as the instruments by which the subjection of the Jews to the Roman emperor was perpetuated, and the paying of tribute was regarded as a virtual acknowledgment of his sovereignty. They were also noted for their imposition, rapine, and extortion, to which they were, perhaps, more especially prompted by having a share in the farm of the tribute, as they were thus tempted to oppress the people with illegal exactions that they might the more speedily enrich themselves. Theocritus considered the bear and the lion the most cruel among the beasts of the wilderness, and among the beasts of the city the publican and the parasite. In addition to their other faults, accordingly, the publicans of the New Test. were regarded as traitors and apostates, defiled by their frequent intercourse with the heathen, willing tools of the oppressor. They were classed with sinners (^{<4091>}Matthew 9:11; 11:19), with harlots (^{<4023>}Matthew 21:31, 32), with the heathen (^{<4087>}Matthew 18:17). In Galilee they consisted probably of the least reputable members of the fisherman and peasant class. Left to themselves, men of decent lives holding aloof from them, their only friends or companions were found among those who, like themselves, were outcasts from the world's law. Scribes and people alike hated them.

The Gospels present us with some instances of this feeling. To eat and drink "with publicans" seems to the Pharisaic mind incompatible with the character of a recognised rabbi (^{<4091>}Matthew 9:11). They spoke in their scorn of our Lord as the friend of publicans (^{<4019>}Matthew 11:19). Rabbinic writings furnish some curious illustrations of the same feeling. The Chaldee Targum and I. Solomon find in "the archers who sit by the waters" of ^{<4051>}Judges 5:11, a description of the **τελώναι** sitting on the banks of rivers or seas in ambush for the wayfarer. The casuistry of the Talmud enumerates three classes of men with whom promises need not be kept, and the three are murderers, thieves, and publicans (*Nedar.* iii, 4). No money known to come from them was received into the alms-box of the synagogue or the corban of the Temple (*Babac Kama*, 10:1). To write a publican's ticket, or even to carry the ink for it on the Sabbath-day, was a distinct breach of the commandment (*Shabb.* 8:2). They were not fit to sit in judgment, or even to give testimony (*Sanhedr. fol.* 25, 2). Sometimes

there is an exceptional notice in their favor. It was recorded as a special excellence in the father of a rabbi that, having been a publican for thirteen years, he had lessened instead of increasing the pressure of taxation (*ibid.*). The early Christian fathers take up the same complaint. “Publicanus ex officio peccator,” exclaims Tertullian; and from thie exhaustless vocabulary of Chrysostom they have heaped upon them every epithet of abuse. See the passages bearing upon this point in Wetstein’s note on ^{<4156>}Matthew 5:46; also Suicer’s *Thesaurus*, s.v. **Τελώνης**; Grotius, *Ad Matt.* 18; Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb. ad Matt.* 18.

The class thus practically excommunicated furnished some of the earliest disciples both of the Baptist and of our Lord. Like the outlying, so-called “dangerous classes” of other times, they were at least free from hypocrisy. Whatever morality they had was real, and not conventional. We may think of the Baptist’s preaching as having been to them what Wesley’s was to the colliers of Kingswood or the Cornish miners. The publican who cried in the bitterness of his spirit, “God be merciful to me a sinner” (^{<2183>}Luke 18:13), may be taken as the representative of those who had come under this influence (^{<4132>}Matthew 21:32). The Galilaeen fishermen had probably learned, even before their Master taught them, to overcome their repugnance to the publicans who with them had been sharers in the same baptism. The publicans (Matthew perhaps among them) had probably gone back to their work learning to exact no more than what was appointed them (^{<4113>}Luke 3:13). However startling the choice of Matthew, the publican, to be of the number of the twelve may have seemed to the Pharisees, we have no trace of any perplexity or offence on the part of the disciples.

The position of Zaccheus as an **ἀρχιτελώνης** (^{<2112>}Luke 19:2) implies a position of some importance among the persons thus employed. Possibly the balsam trade, of which Jericho was the centre, may have brought larger profits; possibly he was one of the *submagistri* in immediate communication with the bureau at Rome. That it was possible for even a Jewish publican to attain considerable wealth we find from the history of John the **τελώνης** (Josephns, *War*, ii, 14, 4), who acts with the leading Jews and offers a bribe of eight talents to the procurator, Gessius Florus. The fact that Jericho was at this time a city of the priests — 12,000 are said to have lived there — gives, it need hardly be said, a special significance to our Lord’s preference of the house of Zacchlaeus. When Jesus visited the house of Zaccheus, who appears to have been eminently

honest and upright, he was assured by him that he was ready to give one half of his goods to the poor, and if he had taken anything from any man by false accusation, to “restore him four-fold” (~~2018~~ Luke 19:8). This was in reference to the Roman law, which required that when any farmer was convicted of extortion he should return four times the value of what he had fraudulently obtained. There is no reason to suppose that either Zacchaeus or Matthew had been guilty of unjust practices, or that there was any exception to their characters beyond that of being engaged in an odious employment. Some other examples of this occur. Suetonius (*Vesp.* 1) mentions the case of Sabinus, a collector of the fortieth penny in Asia, who had several statues erected to him by the cities of the province, with this inscription, “To the honest tax-farmer.” See *Bible Educator*, iii, 193. For monographs on the publicans, see Volbeding, *Index Programmantium*, p. 52, 67. **SEE TAX-GATHERER.**

Publicani

English Waldenses (q.v.), of whom Rapin, in relating the transactions of the councils of Henry II, gives the following account, on the authority of archbishop Usher: “Henry ordered a council to meet at Oxford in 1166, to examine the tenets of certain heretics, called *Publicani*. Very probably they were disciples of the Waldenses, who began then to appear. When they were asked in the council who they were, they answered they were Christians and followers of the apostles. After that, being questioned upon the Creed, their replies were very orthodox as to the Trinity and incarnation. But (says Rapin) if the historian is to be depended on, they rejected baptism, the Eucharist, marriage, and the communion of saints. They showed much modesty and meekness in their whole behavior. When they were threatened with death, in order to oblige them to renounce their tenets, they only said, “Blessed are they that suffer for righteousness’ sake.” There is no difficulty in understanding what were their sentiments on these heretical points. When a monk says they rejected the Eucharist, it is to be understood they rejected the doctrine of transubstantiation; when he says they rejected marriage, he means that they denied it to be a sacrament, and maintained it to be a civil institution; when he says they rejected the communion of saints, nothing more is to be understood than that they refused to hold communion with the corrupt Church of Rome; and when he says that they rejected baptism, we understand by it that they rejected the baptism of infants. These were the errors for which they were branded

with a hot iron in their foreheads. See Ivimey, *History of the Baptists*, i, 56 sq.

Publius

(Graecized Πόπλιος), the chief man probably the governor of Melita, or Malta, who received and lodged Paul and his companions on the occasion of their being shipwrecked off that island (~~481E~~ Acts 28:7) A.D. 55. It soon appeared that he was entertaining an angel unawares, for Paul gave proof of his divine commission by miraculously healing the father of Publius of a fever, and afterwards working other cures on the sick who were brought to him. Publius possessed property in Melita: the distinctive title given to him is “the first (πρῶτος) of the island;” and two inscriptions — one in Greek, the other in Latin — have been found at Civita Vecchia, in which that apparently official title occurs. An inscription found in Malta designates the governor of the island by the same title. (See Lewin’s *St. Paul*, ii, 209, where the originals are given, showing this to be the only natural interpretation.) Publius may perhaps have been the delegate of the Roman praetor of Sicily, to whose jurisdiction Melita, or Malta, belonged. The Roman martyrologies assert that he was the first bishop of the island, and that he *was* afterwards appointed to succeed Dionysius as bishop of Athens. Jerome records a tradition that he was crowned with martyrdom (*De Viris Illust.* xix; Baron, *Annal.* 1, 554). See Walch, *De Publio πρώτῳ Melitensium* (Jen. 1755).

Pucci, Francesco

(Lat. *Puccius*), an Italian theologian, noted as the founder of a heretical school. flourished in the 16th century. He was a native of Florence, and belonged to a noble and ancient family which produced three cardinals. He went to Lyons to engage in commerce, but having assisted in the religious disputes so frequent at that epoch, he left his country to give himself to the study of theology. From Lyons he went to England, and in 1574 he took the degree of master of arts at Oxford. In adopting the greater part of the opinions of the Reformation, he expected to make ample use of that most precious conquest, liberty of search; he joined himself to no sect, or, rather, he took from each that which best accorded with his own mind, naturally bold and restless. This independence created for him enemies and disputes in all the countries which he visited; he led a wandering life, and instead of passing for a person of troubled mind in search of truth, he was loaded

with invectives and charged with fanaticism. At Oxford, being a candidate for a chair, he was advised to write a thesis *De Fide in Deanu qute et qualis sit*, and raised the opposition of all his future colleagues, less by the scruples which he had shown of the method of comprehending God than because he had openly combated the dogmas of Calvinism. Pucci then went to Basle, and there made the acquaintance of Faustus Socinus, but a dispute that he had with him about the first man, and his ideas of universal mercy, exposed him anew to persecution. Exiled from Basle in 1578, he returned to London, where his opinions, too frankly expressed, caused him to be imprisoned. After his release, he took refuge in the Low Countries; but always studying, writing, and disputing, he did not find his halting-place until he reached Poland. At Cracow he encountered two Englishmen — John Dee and Edward Kelly, companions of John a Laski; they won Pucci to the study of occult science, and persuaded him that by familiar intercourse with spirits he would have the privilege of discovering much that was unknown. The attraction of the marvellous, and the novelty of the phenomena that John Dee seemed to control, were strong enough to attach Pucci for four years. The papal nuncio at Prague became acquainted with Pucci, and by his personal influence drew him into the bosom of the Romnish Church in 1586. In 1592 Pucci wrote a book dedicated to pope Clement VIII, under the title *De Christi Salvatoris Efficacitate* (Gouda, 1592). in which he used new arguments in support of the doctrine of the universal atonement as follows: “Christ having made an atonement for all men by his death, no other means are now necessary for salvation than those which are provided by natural religion, and not only those who bear the name of the Saviour, but all honest men, can be saved, even in paganism.” The doctrine thus espoused was not likely to please the pontiff, though he was honored by the dedication, and Pucci was made so uncomfortable that in 1595 there came from him a public retraction of his preceding opinions. He then received sacerdotal ordination, and became secretary of cardinal Pompey, with whom he passed the last years of his life in peace. He died in 1600. He had composed the following couplet to be engraved upon his tomb:

*“Inveni portum: spes et fortuna, valete!
Nil mihi vobiscum, ludite nanc alios.”*

Some authors have asserted without proof that Pucci was sent to Rome and burned. See *Universalist Quarterly*, July, 1873, art. i; Ittig, *De*

Puccianismo; Schmid, *Dr. F. Puccio in Naturalistis et Indifferentistis Redivivo* (Lips. 1712, 4to); Bayle, *Hist. Dict.* s.v. (J. H. W.)

Puccianites

is the name of the followers of Francesco Pucci (q.v.), a class of Italian Universalists. *SEE UNIVERSALISM.*

Pucelle, Abbe,

a French ecclesiastic who flourished in the first half of the 18th century, is noted as one of the ablest defenders of the Gallican liberties. He was born at Paris in 1655, and was in Parliament in 1714 when the adoption and registration of the bull *Unigenitus*, which aimed at the destruction of the Jansenists (q.v.), was discussed, and he most vigorously opposed this act on the part of the French state. He was then one of the clerical counsellors of the "Grand Chamber." In 1730, also, after the archbishop of Paris, De Vintimille, attempted to enforce the *Unigenitus*, and the king had suffered the "lit de justice" to strengthen the papists, Pucelle stood strong, and caused the counsellors to keep their places and assert the independence and supremacy of the temporal power of France over Roman ecclesiasticism. They contended that it does not belong to ecclesiastics to define the limits between civil and spiritual authority; that the laws of the Church do not become laws of the State until they are sanctioned and promulgated by the sovereign; and that the ministers of the Church are accountable to the king and the Parliament for any offence against the statute law of the realm (see *Memoires du Marechal Duc de Richelieu*, iii, 203). It was the first step of the opposition of the clergy of France to the crown and the hierarchy. *SEE FRANCE; SEE GALLICAN CHURCH.* Of Pucelle's personal history nothing further is accessible to us than that he was obliged to go into exile after 1732, and returned only when peace was concluded between court and Parliament. He died at Paris Jan. 7, 1745. See Guette, *Hist. de l'Eglise de France*; Jervis, *Hist. Ch. of France*, ii, 220, 231, 272. (J. H. W.)

Puchta, Christian Rudolph Heinrich,

a Lutheran minister, was born Aug. 19, 1808, at Cadolzburg, in Middle Franconia. After having received his preparatory education, he entered the university in 1826, and studied at Erlangen and Berlin. In 1832 he was appointed vicar at Munich, in 1837 he went to Erlangen as private teacher, and in 1839 he was appointed professor of philosophy and religion at the

newly founded lyceum in Speyer. Being mentally and physically broken down by too much work, he retired from his professorship until 1842, when he took charge of the small congregation at Eyb, not far from Anspach. Here he wrote his *Morgen- und Abendandachten* (Erlangen, 1843). For ten years he labored at Eyb, in the meantime restoring his broken health. In 1852 he was called as second pastor of St. James's to Augsburg, advanced in 1856 to the position of the first pastor, and died Sept. 12, 1858. Puchtas was one of the most excellent of modern hymnists, his hymns being full of depth and richness of thought. Besides his *Morgen- und Abendandachten*, he also published *Der Hausaltar* (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1857); *Handbuch der praktischen Katechese* (Stuttgart, 1854), 1st pt. His hymns are found in Knapp's *Liederschatz* and in some of our modern hymn-books. See Knapp, *Biography of Puchta*, printed in the preface to Puchta's hymns (Stuttgart, 1860), p. 4-23; *Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung*, 1858, No. 268; Koch, *Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes*, 7:277 sq.; Zuchold, *Bibliotheca Theologica*, ii, 1021; Hauck, *Theol. Jahresbericht*, 1865, p. 404 sq. (B. P.)

Pudari

were, in the Indian mythology, gigantic beings with flaming hair and a number of arms, who were held in great honor as protectors of the cities. Temples were built in their honor outside of the places which stood under their guard. Sacrifices, even human victims, were offered to them.

Pudas

an Indian god whom we find frequently in the company of Ixora (one of the incarnations of Siva). Nothing is known as to his attributes. His appearance is strange and grotesque: he is small, with an enormous belly; his head is surrounded with snakes; another snake winds itself in many circles around his legs, chest, and arms; his right hand holds a staff.

Pu'dens

Picture for Pudens

(Graecized, Πούδης), a Christian friend of Timothy at Rome. St. Paul, writing about A.D. 64, says, "Eubulus greeteth thee, and Pudens, and Linus, and Claudia" (2 Timothy 4:21). Pudens is commemorated in the Byzantine Church on April 14, in the Roman Church on May 19. He is

included in the list of the seventy disciples given by Pseudo-Hippolytus. Papebroch, the Bollandist editor (*Acta Sanctorum*, Maii, 4:296), while printing the legendary histories, distinguishes between two saints of this name, both Roman senators — one the host of St. Peter and friend of St. Paul, martyred under Nero; the other the grandson of the former, living about A.D. 150, the father of Novatus, Timothy (who is said to have preached the Gospel in Britain), Praxedis, and Pudentiana, whose house, in the valley between the Viminal hill and the Esquiline, served, in his lifetime, for the assembly of Roman Christians, and afterwards gave place to a church, now the Church of Sta. Puaenziana, a short distance at the back of the Basilica of Sta. Maria Maggiore. Earlier writers (as Baronius, *Ann.* 44, § 61; 59, § 18; 162) are disposed to believe in the existence of one Pudens only. About the end of the 16th century it was observed (F. de Monceaux, *Eccl. Christianoe Veteris Britannicoe Incunabulu*, Tournay, 1614; Estius, or his editor; Abp. Parker, *De Antiquit. Britann. Eccl.* 1605; M. Alford, *Annales Eccl. Brit.* 1663; Camden, *Britanniac*, 1586) that Martial, the Spanish poet, who went to Rome A.D. 66 or earlier, in his twenty-third year, and dwelt there for nearly forty years, mentions two contemporaries, Pudens and Claudia, as husband and wife (*Epig.* 4:13); that he mentions Pudens or Aulus Pudens in 1, 32; 4:29; 5:48; 6:58; 7:11, 97; Claudia or Claudia Rufina in 8:60; 11:53; and, it might be added, Linus, in 1, 76; 2, 54; 4:66; 11:25; 12:49. That Timothy and Martial should each have three friends bearing the same names at the same time and place is at least a very singular coincidence. The poet's Pudens was his intimate acquaintance, an admiring critic of his epigrams, an immoral man if judged by the Christian rule. He was an Umbrian and a soldier. First he appears as a centurion aspiring to become a primipilus; afterwards he is on military duty in the remote north, and the poet hopes that on his return thence he may be raised to equestrian rank. His wife Claudia is described as of British birth, of remarkable beauty and wit, and the mother of a flourishing family. A Latin inscription found in 1723 at Chichester connects a [Pud]ens with Britain and with the Claudian name. It is as follows, if we fill out the usual abbreviations: “[N]eptuno et Minervae templum [pr]o salute domus divinae auctoritate Tiberii Claudii [Co]gidubni regis le:gati Augusti in Brit., [colle]gium fabrorum et qui in eo [a sacris sunt] de suo dedicaverunt, donante aream [Pud]ente, Pudentini filio.” A corner of the stone was broken off, and the letters within brackets have been inserted on conjecture. The inscription thus commemorates the erection of a temple by a guild of carpenters, with the sanction of king Tiberius Claudius

Cogidubnus, the site being the gift of [Pud]ens, the son of Pudentinus. Cogidubnus was a native king, appointed and supported by Rome (Tacit. *Agricola*, 14). He reigned with delegated power probably from A.D. 52 to A.D. 76. If he had a daughter, she would inherit the name Claudia, and might, perhaps as a hostage, be educated at Rome. Another link seems to connect the Romanizing Britons of that time with Claudia Rufina and with Christianity (see Musgrave, quoted by Fabricius, *Lux Evangelii*, p. 702). The wife of Aulus Plautius, who commanded in Britain from A.D. 43 to A.D. 52. was Pomponia Graecina, and the Rufi were a branch of her house. She was accused at Rome, A.D. 57, on a capital charge of "foreign superstition;" was acquitted, and lived, for nearly forty years, in a state of austere and mysterious melancholy (Tacit. *Ann.* 13:32). We know from the Epistle to the Romans (16:13) that the Rufi were well represented among the Roman Christians in A.D. 55. Modern researches among the Columbaria at Rome, appropriated to members of the imperial household, have brought to light an inscription in which the name of Pudens occurs as that of a servant of Tiberius or Claudius (*Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology*, 4:76).

In certain ancient documents, called the *Acts of Pastor*, it is recorded that Pudens, after the death of his wife, desired that his house should be consecrated as a church, and that this was done; that subsequently, at his daughters' request, a baptistery was constructed there; that these daughters gathered together their slaves, both from the city and from their country possessions, and gave liberty to those who were Christians, and exhorted those who were not believers in the holy law of Christ, and that the act of manumission was celebrated in the *title* (church) established by Pudens; that there, also, in a time of persecution, Praxedis and Pudentiana sheltered those who through their instrumentality had become believers; and that afterwards, when the latter, and her brother Novatus also, were dead, his property, with the consent of Timotheus, passed into the hands of Praxedis, by whose request the *thermae*, or baths, of Novatus, which are described as spacious and no longer in use, were consecrated as a church, in the name of Pudentiana, by Pius (bishop of the Church in Rome, A.D. 139-155). In this place, it is further reported, Pius also consecrated a baptistery. Here, moreover, afterwards, when a great persecution arose, numbers of Christians were concealed by Praxedis, and nourished with food and with the word of God. Pudens and his daughters, it is also narrated, were buried in the cemetery of Priscilla, on the Via Salaria.

Anastasius, librarian of the Vatican in the 9th century, also asserts that Pius dedicated the *thermae* of Novatus as a church in honor of Pudentiana. The same fact is said to be affirmed by Damasus in the latter part of the 4th century. These may be mere repetitions. The *Acts of Pastor* locate the house of Pudens in the Vicus Patricius, which corresponds with the modern Via di Sta. Pudenziana. On this street still stands a church, which is reputed to be the oldest in Rome. It is named Sta. Pudenziana, and is supposed to be located where Pudens and his family once dwelt. The text of the *Acts of Pastor* is unsettled, and is not free from anachronisms. The documents cannot have come in their present form, or forms rather, from their reputed author, or from the 2d century. Since Tillemont's learned criticism, they have fallen into disrepute. The Bollandist writer in the *Acta Sanctorum* is compelled to propose alterations of the text without authority, and to suppose the existence of two persons, each named Pudens, one either the grandfather or the paternal uncle of the other. Nor does anything preserved in the interior of the present church of Pudentiana carry us back decisively to the first generations of Roman Christians; the older portions of the edifice, however, do contain such indications.

One of the priests of the Church of St. Pudentiana attended a Roman synod in the year 499, and was enrolled as "*Presbyter Tituli Pudentis*" (Presbyter of the Church of Pudens). The building was repaired or rebuilt under Adrian I (A.D. 772-795); but portions of an older structure remain. The north aisle runs back much beyond the choir and its apse. In its side towards the choir there is a slab with the inscription SIRICIVS EPISCOPVS. Siricius was bishop A.D. 384-398. It is thought that at this time, and in that of Innocent I (402-417), an old hall, or basilica, of a family mansion which had been used as a church, and was called "Titulus Pudentis," was taken down, and a new church constructed. One wall, however, was left standing—the one at the end of the north aisle and in the rear of the choir. It is now the outer end wall of the church. This, according to competent judges, is a construction of the 1st century, and a part of some great palace. Its large hall windows can be readily distinguished. Made in the 1st century, they are now filled up with brickwork of the 2d. At this time the hall seems to have been changed for some purpose distinct from its primary design. The present church stands in the original hall of the palace. Probably long before its construction the hall itself was a place of assembly for Christians in Rome. There are, also, some subterranean chambers, said to have been first opened in 1865. Here are three long, narrow, vaulted

rooms, now opening into each other, but originally separated by brick walls. The walls are regarded as 1st-century work; but the openings which throw together the three chambers were evidently made subsequently, and apparently in the 2d century. This is indicated by the construction of the arches. In the original or 1st-century wall may still be seen hot-air flues, such as belong to *thermae*. The cutting of the arches would have spoiled the baths. It secured an admirable arrangement for the meetings of a Christian Church in troublous times. The combined chambers made a spacious room. remote from the street and below its level. Its windows were apertures in the clear-story, and opened into an inner area. Worship could be conducted without attracting attention. The testimony of the walls and the bricks and the arches thus accords with the ancient tradition that the disused baths of Novatus, the son of Pudens, were dedicated about the middle of the 2d century as a Christian church. It is thought that in still another room of this subterranean portion of the traditional mansion of Pudens there was once a baptistery. Tradition may present another point of contact with these baths. In Justin Martyr's examination by the praefect of Rome (about A.D. 166), the following dialogue is reported:

"Praefect. Where do you assemble?

"Justin Where each one chooses and can... . The God of the Christians is not circumscribed by place, but, being invisible, fills heaven and earth, and everywhere is worshipped and glorified by the faithful.

"Praefect. Say, where do you assemble, or into what place do you collect your disciples?

"Justin. I dwell above one Martii's, at the *Timotine Bath*. ... I know of no other meeting than his.

"Praefect. Are you not, then, a Christian?

"Justin. Yes, I am a Christian."

In the Roman tradition, the house of Pudens was the place where Christians coming to Rome were freely entertained; and in the baths of Novatus or Timotheus were held, in Justin's time, Christian assemblies.

On the Via Salaria is a cemetery called after Priscilla, the traditional mother of Pudens, which bears unmistakable signs of having been used by persons

of wealth and standing belonging to the earliest generations of Roman Christians. These evidences are sufficiently indicated in Northcote and Brownlow's *Roma Sotteranea*, and need not here be specified. It may be added, however, that, in the lower story of this catacomb, imprints have been found of the seal of a PUDENS FELIX upon the cement which closes a loculus or grave (De Rossi, *Imnages de la T. S. Vierge choisies dans les Catacombes de Rome* [Rome, 1863], p. 17). The cognomen suits exactly the tradition that the Pudens family belonged to the gens Cornelia (Cornelius Sulla being the first who took the surname Felix), and the further uniform tradition that this cemetery was their burial-place. The traditions are thus confirmed which represent a Pudens family of wealth and distinction to have been very early connected with the Christian Church in Rome. They increase so far the coincidences in favor of the identity of Martial's friends with the Pudena and Claudia of Paul's Epistle. The resemblance is one of family distinction, as well as of name, time, and place. See *The House of Pudens in Rome: a Lecture delivered to the Royal Archceological Institute*, June 2, 1871, by John Henry Parker, C.B., F.S.A., etc.; reprinted from the *Archceological Journal*.

On the whole, although the identity of St. Paul's Pudens with any legendary or heathen namesake is not absolutely proved, yet it is difficult to believe that these facts add nothing to our knowledge of the friend of Paul and Timothy. The identity is favored by Alford, Conybeare and Howson, and others. Objections to the details of the story do not seem to be insuperable. The difficulty is that so much is pure conjecture. In the *Acts of Pastor*, the wife of Pudens, and mother of his children, is named Savinilla. The Welsh legends are said to affirm Pudens's marriage with Gladys, the daughter or niece of Caractacus. The facts and arguments are treated at great length in a pamphlet entitled *Claudia and Pudens*, by archdeacon Williams (Llandoverly, 1848), p. 58; and more briefly by dean Alford, *Greek Testament* (ed. 1856), iii, 104; and by Conybeare and Howson, *Life of St. Paul* (ed. 1858), ii, 594; also by Lewin, *St. Paul*, ii, 392 sq. They are ingeniously woven into a pleasing romance by a writer in the *Quarterly Review*, 97, 100-105. See Prof. Smyth in the *Biblioth. Sacra*, 1875, p. 174 sq.; also Usher, *Eccl. Brit. Antiquitates*, § 3, and Stillingfleet, *Antiquities*.

Pudentiana

ST. Among the Roman families who, in the 2d century, embraced the Christian faith, one of the most distinguished seems to have been that of

the senator Pudens, his mother Priscilla, and his daughters Pudentiana and Praxedis. Pudens is frequently alleged to have been a disciple of the apostles Peter and Paul, and there is really a Pudens named in the second letter to Timothy; but this Pudens seems not to be identical with the father of Pudentiana and Praxedis. According to the Bollandists, our Pudens was converted by pope Pius I, who lived in the middle of the 2d century. After the death of his wife, the new convert had his house transformed into a church. He taught his two daughters the doctrines and all good works of Christianity, in which they soon distinguished themselves, converting to their new faith, with the assistance of the pope, who used to say mass in the now consecrated building, not only the members of their family and inmates of their house, but a large number of other pagans. We do not know when Pudens and his holy daughters died. Pudentiana, as well as Praxedis, had churches in Rome in the earliest times. See the Bollandists on May 19, where a learned commentary is given about Pudens and his two daughters, with the documents relating to them. *SEE PUDENS.*

Pudicitia

(Αἰδώς), a personification of modesty, was worshipped both in Greece and at Rome. At Athens an altar was dedicated to her (Pausan. i, 17, § 1). At Rome two sanctuaries were dedicated to her, one under the name of *Pudicitia patricia*, and the other under that of *Pudicitia plebeia*. The former was in the Forum Boarium, near the temple of Hercules. When the patrician Virginia was driven from this sanctuary by the other patrician women, because she had married the plebeian consul L. Volumnius, she built a separate sanctuary to *Pudicitia plebeia* in the Vicus Longus (Livy, 10:23; Festus, p. 242, ed. Muller). No woman who had married twice was allowed to touch her statue; and Pudicitia, moreover, was considered by some to be the same as Fortuna Muliebris. She is represented in works of art as a matron in modest attire. See Hirt, *Mythol. Bilderb.* p. 114, tab. 13.

Puernatus in Bethlehem

This joyous Christmas hymn, which belongs to the 14th century, of a beautiful simplicity, and absorbing easily so much theology in its poetry, continued long a great favorite in the Lutheran churches of Germany, well-nigh to this day. The original is given by Daniel, *Thesaurus*, i, 334; Trench, *Sacred Latin Poetry*, p. 97; Simrock, *Laudes Sion*, p. 42; Konigsfeld, *Hymnen*, ii, 304. English translations are given in *Lyra Messianica*, p. 88;

Christian Life in Song, p. 173; Schaff, *Christ in Song*, p. 50. German translations are given by Simrock and Konigsfeld, and especially by Hoffmann von Fallersleben in his *Geschichte des deutsch. Kirchenliedes*, p. 340 sq. See also Trench, Daniel, and especially Wackernagel, who, in his *Das deutsche Kirchenlied*, i, 198-200, gives ten forms of this hymn. (B. P.)

Pueri

(boys), a name often given in the Latin Church to catechumens (q.v.). They were also called *Audientes*, *Incipientes*, *Novitii*, *Rudes*, *Tirones*.

Pueris Similes

(like boys) is a sect of Anabaptists mentioned by Bullinger in his treatise on Anabaptism (q.v.). They practiced childish tricks, under the notion that this was being childlike, as required by the Gospel precept of entering into the kingdom of heaven by becoming as a little child. Hence they would ride upon sticks and hobby-horses, and take off their clothes that they might practice the innocence of childhood; ending, of course, in extremely immoral excesses.

Puffer, Isaac

a well-known pioneer preacher of American Methodism, was born in Westminister County, Mass., in June, 1784. As a boy he came with his parents to Central New York. At fifteen he was converted. Ten years later he joined the New York Conference as a travelling preacher, and was appointed to the Otsego Circuit, then a far-reaching territory, which in the following year was incorporated in the Genesee Conference. That conference was then made to cover not only much of Northern and Western New York, but also the Upper and Lower Canadas. In this large field Puffer labored for full forty years with remarkable perseverance, and had the pleasure of seeing the most wonderful results that ever crowned the labor of any Methodist preacher. Though his early advantages must have been inconsiderable, he became one of the most useful, it might almost be said one of the most popular. preachers of his time. His great strength lay in the ease and skill with which he quoted the Scriptures. The Bible was the one book he *knew*, and he used it with most marvellous power and success. He was the sturdy opponent of Calvinism and Universalism, and combated them with such vigor that he was regarded as a worthy foeman for the best advocates of those forms of Christian dogma.

After his superannuation in 1843 the venerable preacher contented himself with visiting his former charges, until, in 1848, he was attracted West, and lived chiefly in Wisconsin and Illinois. New associations, new scenes, and new calls to moral combat had a re-invigorating influence, and he again became active until 1853, when he suddenly died after a short illness. Puffer was of a large, muscular frame, and made therefore a striking appearance in public. He also attracted, aside from his religious earnestness, by a fine musical voice. He was an honest, devoted, childlike Christian, and blessed his generation by his life and his works. See *Memoir of the Rev. B. G. Paddock*, p. 341 sq.; Conable, *Hist. of the Genesee Conference*, ch. i, § 7; ch. ii, § 5.

Puffer, John M.

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Richford, Vt., Jan. 29, 1835. From a child he was noticeably correct in his habits, and thus well fitted for a life of self-reliance. His mother died when he was about six years of age, and his educational opportunities were limited to the district school and a few terms at the academy. He was converted in 1852, and united with the Methodists. He was licensed to preach in 1856. The following year he entered the Troy Conference, and filled the following appointments: Johnson and Hyde Park, under the presiding elder; Essex, Milton, and Pittsford, one year each; Essex, N. Y., two years. By a change of conference boundaries he went into Vermont Conference in 1862, and was stationed at Grand Isle two years; at St. Alban's Bay, one year; at Highgate, Waterbury Centre, Randolph, and Chelsea, two years each; and at Barre, his last appointment, which he served only the fraction of a year, when called from toil to reward. He died Jan. 7, 1874. Puffer labored with great acceptance, and almost literally "ceased at once to work and live." His last sermon was upon a funeral occasion, while ill himself, on the text, "If a man die, shall he live again?" — *Conference Minutes*, 1874, p. 96.

Puffer, Reuben

D.D., an American divine of note, was born at Sudbury, Mass., in 1756, and was educated at Harvard College, class of 1778. He then studied divinity, and became pastor of a Congregational church in Bolton (afterwards called Berlin), Mass. He held this place until his death, in 1829. He published: *Election Sermon* (1803): — *Dudleian Lecture in Harvard*

College (1808): — *Convention Sermon* (1811): — *Two Sermons* (1826); and some secular addresses. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, ii, 206 sq.

Puget, Pierre,

called the Michael Angelo of France, on account of his ability in painting and architecture, as well as in sculpture, and perhaps also on account of a kindred enthusiasm and decision of character, was born in 1622 at Marseilles, where his father practiced as an architect and sculptor. It was from him that he received his first instructions in art, after which he was placed under a shipwright, or builder of galleys, to learn to carve the ornaments used in these vessels. Disgusted with the drudgery of such workmanship, he set out for Italy, and passed a considerable time at Florence, where he pursued his studies as a sculptor with great success. He next repaired to Rome, whither he was attracted by the fame of Pietro de Cortona. He became the pupil of that artist, but made such progress that he accompanied him to Florence as assistant to paint the ceilings of the Pitti palace. He suddenly resolved upon returning to France, when only twenty-one. But, commissioned to design a vessel of extraordinary magnificence, Puget proceeded a second time to Rome, and there spent between five and six years: what afterwards became of his valuable collection of drawings is not known. On his second return from Italy he painted; but excessive application so seriously affected his health that he confined himself thenceforth to architecture and sculpture. His talents met with employment at Toulon and Marseilles, and for the latter city he projected many embellishments, which established his reputation as an architect; and he further gave proof of great skill in engineering by different ingenious machines and inventions. He was sent by Fouquet to Genoa for the purpose of selecting marble for some of the works proposed to be executed at Marseilles; but that minister being shortly afterwards disgraced, instead of returning home, Puget preferred remaining at Genoa, where he produced some of his most noted pieces of sculpture, the two statues of *St. Sebastian* and *St. Ambrosius*, and the grand bas-relief of the *Assumption*, in the chapel of the *Albergo de' Poveri*, besides various architectural ornaments. At length he was recalled by Colbert, who obtained for him a pension of 1200 crowns, in consequence, it is said, of the earnest recommendation of Bernini. That the patronage of the one and the recommendation of the other were not discredited is proved by his two celebrated performances at Versailles, the *Milo of Crotona* and the group

of *Perseus and Andromeda*, the former of which is generally reckoned the *chef d'euve* of his chisel, and a work that will bear comparison with the antique. He died at Marseilles, where he spent his last days, Dec. 2, 1694. — Engl. *Cyclop.* s.v.; Lenoir, *Musie des Monuments Francais*, s.v.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Pugillaris

is a name for the reed of gold or silver, or ivory, used for drinking from the *chalice* (q.v.).

Pugin, Augustus Northmore Welby

one of the most distinguished of modern ecclesiastical architects, was the son of a French gentleman who fled to England at the period of the Revolution. He was born in 1811, and commenced his professional career as a scene-painter and decorator at the Theatre Royal, Covent Garden, and then devoted himself to decoration in furniture, etc. Joining the Roman Catholic Church, he determined thenceforth to devote his best energies to ecclesiology, and during the few years that he lived to practice his profession he was called upon to erect a larger number of Roman Catholic churches, chapels, convents, and schools than has probably fallen to the lot of any Englishman since the Reformation. The following list includes his chief works: the cathedral church of St. Marie at Derby, one of his earlier and more pleasing works; St. Chad's, Birmingham; three churches at Liverpool; St. Wilfred's, Manchester; church and convent at Edgehill; churches at Oxford, Cambridge, Reading, Kenilworth, Stockton-on-Tees, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Preston, Keightley, Rugby, Northampton, Stoke-upon-Trent, Brewood, Woolwich, Hammersmith, Fulham, Pontefract, St. Edward's near Ware, Buckingham, and St. Wilfred near Alton; a church, and a convent and chapel, at Nottingham; convents of the Sisters of Mercy at London, Birmingham, and Liverpool; a priory at Downside, near Bath; colleges at Radcliffe and Rugby; improvements at Maynooth; and cathedrals, with schools and priests' houses attached, at St. George's (Southwark), Killarney, and Enniscorthy. To these must be added the extensive and costly works executed for his great patron, the earl of Shrewsbury, consisting, besides the alterations made in the mansion, of a church, school-house, and monastery at Alton Towers; and a church at Cheadle, which has the most splendid interior of any of his churches. The very pretty gateway to Magdalen College, Oxford, is one of the very few

works executed by him for any Protestant body; indeed, he is said to have refused to accept any commissions for Protestant places of worship. The list of works given above would in truth seem to have been more than sufficient to exhaust the time and energies of a man who ceased laboring at the age of forty; yet he was chiefly employed during his last years in designing and superintending the ornamentation of the New Palace of Westminster, which probably owes its somewhat extravagantly mediaeval and ecclesiastical character to Pugin's idiosyncrasies. But, besides the practice of his profession, he found time to add to its literature a second and revised edition of his *Contrasts*: — a treatise on the *True Principles of Pointed or Christian Architecture* (1841): — *An Apology for the Revival of Christian Architecture* (1843): — *a Glossary of Ecclesiastical Ornament* (1844): — a treatise on *Floriated Ornaments* (1849): — and a treatise on *Chancel Screens* (1851). As he advanced in life his religious feelings took more and more entire possession of him. In 1850 he wrote and published *An Address to the Inhabitants of Ramsgate:— An Earnest Appeal for the Revival of the Ancient Plain Song: — The Present State of Public Worship among the Roman Catholics*; and other pamphlets of a religious character. At length, overtaken with all this excessive labor and excitement, his intellect began to give way, and in his fortieth year he was removed to a lunatic asylum. For a brief space his mental powers were so far restored that it became practicable for him to return to his home at Ramsgate; but he expired there Sept. 14, 1852, three days after his return. He was buried in a vault of his own church of St. Augustine, which he had built on his estates. Pugin was a man of extraordinary industry and energy, and he possessed a very unusual amount of knowledge and great ability. He attempted, however, too many things, and he worked too much and too fast to produce many great works, even had he been a man of original power. In truth, his was not a creative mind, and he lacked comprehensive thought.

Pu'hite

(Heb. only as a collective, and with the art. *hap-Puthi'*, **ytWPhi** patronymic from some unknown primitive; Sept. **Ἡφιθεΐν** v. r. **Μιφιθίμ**; Vulg. *Aphuthei*), a designation of the second named of the "families of Kirjath-jearim" descended from Shobel (~~1~~ 1 Chronicles 2:53). "There is a Jewish tradition, embodied in the Targum of R. Joseph, that these families of Kirjathjearim were the sons of Moses whom Zipporah bare him, and that

from them were descended the disciples of the prophets of Zorah and Eshtaol”

Pui

the name of a fraternity, partly religious, in honor of St. Mary, and partly literary, established in Picardy and Normandy, and translated to England about the beginning of the 14th century. deriving its name from the Virgin of the Cathedral of La Puy, to which pilgrims greatly resorted. They yearly elected a prince, who was crowned with garlands or circlets, like those still used on certain occasions by the city companies; the loving cup was gayly passed at the election, and the author of the best ballad royal was also crowned. They had a chaplain-priest to sing masses, maintained a grand feast annually, and kept a common hutch for the contributions of the brotherhood. There was a chapel of St. Mary de Pui at Westminster. No woman was admitted at their meetings. Perhaps *Puits*, another form, may allude to the Song of Solomon (4:15).

Puk

SEE PAINT.

Pul

(Heb. *id.* | WP [for derivation, see below]), the name of a people and of a man.

1. (Sept. Φούδ v. r. Φούθ; Vulg. *Africa*.) A country or people located at a great distance from Judsea, and named once (²³⁶⁹Isaiah 66:19) between Tarshish and Lud: “The nations (μυθῆ), [to] Tarshish, Pul, and Lud, that draw the bow, [to] Tubal and Javan, [to] the isles afar off.” Hitzig, Knobel, and some others suppose that the true reading is fWP, *Put*, which is elsewhere joined with Lud (²⁵⁷⁰Ezekiel 27:10; ²⁴⁶⁹Jeremiah 46:9; A.V. “Libyans”); and which is sometimes rendered in the Sept. Φούδ (⁰¹⁰⁶Genesis 10:6; ¹³⁰⁸1 Chronicles 1:8), the same form which occurs here in that version; for this, however, there is no MS. authority, and we are therefore bound to receive the Masoretic reading as correct. Gesenius observes (*Thesaur.* s.v. | WP) that ΦΟΥΑ could be easily changed to ΦΟΥΔ by the error of a copyist. *SEE PHUL.* If a Mizraite Lud (q.v.) be intended in this connection, Pul may be African. It has accordingly been compared by Bochart (*Phaleg*, 4:26) and Michaelis (*Spicileg.* i, 256; ii,

114) with the island *Phile*, called in Coptic *Pelak*, *Pilnak*, *Pilakt*; the hieroglyphic name being *Eelek*, *P-eelek*, or *Eelekt* (Quatremere, *Memoire sur Egypte*, i, 387 sq.). This island was inhabited jointly by Egyptians and Ethiopians (Strabo, 17:818; Diod. Sic. i, 22; Pliny, v, 10; Ptolemy, 4:5,74; comp. Mannert, X, i, 235 sq.), and Bochart supposes the name to be, like Elephantine, derived from a word meaning elephant (**al yp**). But it must be kept in mind that the other names here mentioned are those of great countries, while Phile is a very small island. Isaiah would scarcely speak of the Jewish people being driven to it. It seems much more probable that Pul was the name of some distant province of Africa; and perhaps the suggestion of Gesenius (*Thesaur.* p. 1094) may be right, that we have a vestige of the old name in the word **Πολο** which appears on inscriptions (Champollion, *Grammaire*, p. 159). Hitzig (*Grabschrift des Darius*, p. 71) finds a Phul not far from Punicus. This only adds to the uncertainty. **SEE EGYPT.**

2. (Sept. **Φούλ** v. r., **Φουλά, Φουά, Φαλώχ, Φαλώς**; Vulg. *Phul*.) A king of Assyria, and the first of these monarchs who is mentioned in the Bible (^{<1259>}2 Kings 15:19, 20; ^{<1385>}1 Chronicles 5:26). Menahem, having succeeded in mounting the throne of Israel, proceeded to make himself master of the whole territory belonging to that kingdom. Setting forth from Tirzah, he attacked and took by storm Tiphseh. or Thapsacus, on the Euphrates, which had once more been made a border town of Israel by the conquests of Jeroboam II, whose victorious career had restored the ancient boundaries of the land in that direction as they had been in the days of Solomon (^{<1256>}2 Kings 15:16; 14:25, 28; ^{<1092>}1 Kings 4:24). He appears to have thus drawn on himself the notice of Pul, B.C. 769. Menahem is thought by some to have inherited a kingdom which was already included among the dependencies of Assyria; for as early as B.C. 880 Jehu gave tribute to Shalmaneser, according to the inscription on the black obelisk, **SEE SHALMANISER**; and if Judaea was, as it seems to have been, a regular tributary from the beginning of the reign of Amaziah (B.C. 837), Samaria, which lay between Judaea and Assyria, can scarcely have been independent. Under the Assyrian system the monarchs of tributary kingdoms, on ascending the throne, applied for “confirmation in their kingdoms” to the lord paramount, and only became established on receiving it. We may gather from ^{<1259>}2 Kings 15:19, 20 that Menahem neglected to make any such application to his liege lord, Pul — a neglect which would have been regarded as a plain act of rebellion. Possibly, in the

campaign against Tiphseh, we must regard Menahem as having attacked the Assyrians, and deprived them for a while of their dominion west of the Euphrates. However this may have been, it is evident that Pul looked upon Menahem as an enemy. He consequently marched an army into Palestine for the purpose of punishing his revolt, when Menahem hastened to make his submission, and having collected by means of a poll-tax the large sum of a thousand talents of gold, he paid it over to the Assyrian monarch, who consented thereupon to “confirm” him as king. *SEE MENAHEM.*

There is great difficulty in determining what Assyrian king is referred to under the name Pul. He must have ruled over Assyria as the immediate predecessor of Tiglath-pileser II, for this latter monarch, according to Sir H. Rawlinson (*Athenaeum*, No. 1793), is recorded to have received tribute in his eighth year from Menahem, whose reign occupied only ten years. For some time Sir H. Rawlinson identified him with a king whose cuneiform name he has variously represented as *Iva-lush*, *Vul-ulsh*, and *Yama-zalakhus* (Oppert, *Hee-likhkhush*), and who reckoned among the countries tributary to himself that of Khumri or Samaria (Rawlinson, *Herodotus*, i, 467). [Smith revives this theory (*Assyrian Eponym Canon*, p. 187) of the identity of Pul with *Vulni.rari* (as he reads the name), who, according to his dates, invaded Damascus in B.C. 773.] This identification, however, Rawlinson gave up on ascertaining that the lately deciphered Assyrian canon interposed the reigns of three kings, comprising thirty-seven years, in addition to a probable interregnum of two or three years between this king and Tiglath-pileser (*Athenaeum*, No. 1805). Subsequently he suggested that one and the same individual is denoted by the names Pul and Tiglath-pileser in the sacred narrative. His chief argument for this is that in ^{
}1 Chronicles 5:26 the same event — namely, the deportation of the tribes beyond the Jordan — is attributed to the two kings associated together as if they were one and the same individual (*Athenaeum*, No. 1869). But, as already remarked by Winer (*Realw* ii, 259), the passage in 1 Chronicles does not necessarily ascribe to the two kings the accomplishment of the same measure. Pul is mentioned in it as the first Assyrian king who came into collision with the Israelites, and thus prepared the way for the subsequent deportation of the transjordanic tribes. But that this measure is attributed solely to Tiglath-pileser, as in ^{<211>}2 Kings 20:29, is manifest from the use of the singular **𐤏𐤍 𐤗𐤏𐤍** Julius Oppert, who accepts the account of Ctesias, and takes it to refer to the subversion of the first Assyrian empire, supposes Pul to be the Babylonian *Belesys*.

The eminent Assyriologist Dr. Hincks maintains that “Pul became king of Babylon, holding Assyria in subjection, in 787 B.C. Tiglath-pileser revolted from him and established an independent kingdom of Assyria in 768 B.C.” (*Athenaeum*, No. 1810). The main difference between this view and that of Dr. Oppert is that Dr. Hincks supposes a considerable interval to have elapsed between Belesvs, the conqueror of Nineveh, and Pul. It certainly appears the most plausible opinion; and it seems safest to acquiesce in it until further discoveries of cuneiform students lead to a more exact determination. It is in accordance with the Scriptural chronology, and it falls in with what we can glean of Assyrian history from classical and monumental sources. The account of Ctesias, as found in Diodorus Siculus (*Hist.* ii), though rejected by Sir H. Rawlinson and his followers (comp. Prof. Rawlinson, *Anc. Mon.* ii, 521), has received the support of many eminent modern critics. It has been shown to be reconcilable with the narrative of Herodotus (*Hist.* i, 102, 106), which contains intimations that there had been a subversal of the Assyrian empire prior to its final overthrow alluded to by that historian (see Winer, *Realw.* i, 104). It is admitted that the Assyrian canon, in the period between Iva-lush IV and Tiglath-pileser II, gives indication “of troublous times, and of a disputed, or, at any rate, a disturbed succession” (Rawlinson, *Anc. Mon.* ii, 386). The writer last cited also asserts that the inscriptions of Tiglath-pileser II “support the notion of a revolution and change of dynasty in Assyria at this point of its history” (Rawlinson, *Herodotus*, i, 468). That Pul was a Babylonian holding rule in Assyria at this time is confirmed by the notice of Alexander Polyhistor (Euseb. *Chronicles* i, 4): “Post hos alt exstitisse Chald/eorum regem, cui nomen Phulus erat;” and also by the form of the name. The name Pul, while having, according to Prof. Rawlinson, its counterpart among known Babylonian names, is wholly alien to the rules on which Assyrian names are formed. They are “always compounds, consisting of two, three, or more characters” (*Anc. Mon.* ii, 388, note). The name is probably the same as the Sanscrit *pala*, lofty, highest; hence lord, king; perhaps the same as *bel*, i.e. lord. The same syllable is found in the names Sardanacal/us and *Nabopolassar*. Pul is also mentioned in the extracts of Alexander Polyhistor, in Eusebius (*Chronicles Arm.* i, 41), but not elsewhere. Eusebius adds, “Polyhistor says that Senecheribus was king after him,” but this is not to be understood of immediate succession. **SEE ASSYRIA.**

Pulaha

a divinity of Indian mythology. Brahma created nine Brahmins from different parts of his body. At the same time Sunyambhu, Brahma's son, created the ten celebrated rishis, or forefathers, of all existing beings. These are identical with the nine Brahmins mentioned, and one of them is Pulaha. He was so pious that he could, by his prayers, create men, animals, and gods.

Pulcheria, Aelia

Picture for Pulcheria

one of the most celebrated saints of the Greek Church, was an empress. She was the eldest daughter of the emperor Arcadius, and was born between 398 and 400. In early youth she showed rare intellectual gifts and a fervent piety. Her wisdom was an object of general admiration. She was about fifteen when she came to assist her younger brother Theodosius II in the government. Pulcheria then made a vow of eternal chastity, prevailed upon her sisters to follow her example, and gave to the Byzantine court the purity which should prevail in a monastery. Some writers charge that this chastity was feigned from political reasons, Pulcheria desiring to prevent the marriage of her sisters, and thus avoid controversy on the claims to the throne. By her wisdom and piety the prosperity of the empire was certainly promoted: she seemed to be its good genius. She defended zealously the purity of the Christian faith against the doctrines of Nestorius and Eutyches, and her influence was most beneficial at the synods of Ephesus and Chalcedon. St. Cyril of Alexandria sent her his celebrated work *De Fide ad Pulcheriam*. She was in correspondence with the popes, especially with Leo I. This great pope, in many letters, praises her wisdom and kindness. He entreats her, in 449, to take measures against the heresy of Eutyches (Jaffe, *Reg. Pontif.* n. 203, 204, p. 37); rejoices at the vigor and energy of her faith (*ibid.* n. 226, p. 339), and praises her activity in suppressing Eutychianism (451; *ibid.* n. 237, p. 40). There are in all ten letters extant from Leo I to Pulcheria. The learned Theodoret, bishop of Cyrhus, also praised her attachment to the Church, and interceded with her for his city, heavily burdened with taxes (Theod. *Ep.* 43; Baron. ad ann. 444). All her contemporaries praise her beneficent influence. She dissuaded her brother Theodosius from Nestorianism, and celebrated the victory of the orthodox creed over this heresy by building a splendid church in honor

of the Virgin Mary (Niceph. *IL E.* 14:2; Baron. ad ann. 431). She sent valuable presents to Jerusalem, and built a number of new churches (Baron. ad ann. 439, 453). She was several times exposed to the plots of the courts, which tried to destroy her good understanding with her brother and his wife Eudocia. In 446 she retired entirely from the court: but her absence was soon felt. After the death of Theodosius, Pulcheria and Marcianus, who had been honored with the title of Augustus, and whom she had wedded, took the reins of the empire. She had married for the good of the empire, and with the stipulation that she should be allowed to keep her vow of virginity. After benefiting the Church in many ways as empress, and opposing Eutychnianism with the same decision as she had previously Nestorianism, she died, Sept. 11, 453. Her saintship is recognised by the Latin as well as by the Greek Church. Baronius (ad ann. 453) and the Bollandists (vol. i, Jul.) erected literary memorials to her memory. Benedict XIV permitted, by decree of the Congregation of the Rites of Jan. 31, 1752, to the regular canons of St. Augustine in Portugal, and to some houses of Jesuits, the celebration of her feast on July 7, *sub ritu duplici*: soon afterwards, Feb. 11, the same year, this permission was extended to the whole company of Jesus. These decrees, with the office and mass of St. Pulcheria, are in the appendix of Benedict XIV's work *De Sanctorum Canonizatione*. The oration of the feast praises the chastity of the saint, and her zeal for the purity of the faith. See Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* s.v.; Wetzer u. Welte *Kirchen-Lexikon*, vol. 12 s.v.; Hefele, *Conciliengesch.* vol. ii; Alzog, *Kirchengesch.* i, 309; Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity*, ii, 243 sq.

Pulear Or Ganesha

Picture for Pulear

a divinity of Indian mythology, was the son of the wife of Siva, Parwati. She formed him, without the co-operation of her husband, by shaping into the frame of a vouth what was washed away from her body during her bath. Siva thought himself betrayed by Parwati, and in his wrath he struck off the head of the young god.

When he found out his mistake, he wished to heal his victim; but the head had been carried away by the waters of the Ganges, and had been eaten by fishes. Siva solved this difficulty by telling the son of his wife to cut off the head of the first creature he should meet and put it on his shoulders. as misfortune would have it, this creature was an elephant. Therefore Ganesha

is always represented with all elephant's trunk. Ganesha sits astride of a mouse, which is nothing else than the metamorphosed giant Gedjemuyashurim, vanquished by him while warring against the gods. Ganesha is incredibly strong, and therefore of great use to the gods in their perpetual warfare against the daemons. He is a great eater, and would eat the whole world if he had his own way: it is only in the sea of sugar, in which he has a floating abode, that he can, in some measure, satisfy the cravings of his hunger. Being the favorite son of Siva, he is worshipped like that god himself; and invoked first before every sacrifice. The Indians believed that he could at his will accumulate or remove obstacles: all Indian books commence with a prayer to him. His image is frequently found painted on the house doors, and almost every family has his statue in bronze, marble, or clay. Pular is his name as god of matrimony: it was the natural question of his father at his first appearance in the world — *Pular*, i.e. Whose son?

Pulgar, Isaac,

a Jewish convert to Christianity, flourished at Avila, in Spain, about 1300 to 1349. He was a friend of Abner of Burgos, better known (after his baptism) as Alphonso of Valladolid, against whom he afterwards wrote a polemical work entitled *twbwçt s*, "The Book of Answers." He also wrote, besides some other works which are still in MS., a work under the title *ã/s/l yPbiµ [anãThij WKwæ* "A Contest between an Orthodox and a Philosopher," wherein he endeavors to reconcile the difference between philosophy and faith, and which was reprinted after a Paris MS. in the *µ [fi µynæ]* of E. Ashkenasi (Frankf. a. M. 1854), p. 12-19. Pulgar was the first to say that "the belief in the Messianic redemption is not an essential point of Judaism, with which it stands or falls, although many passages in the prophets speak of the coming of the Messiah." See Fiirst, *Bibl. Jud.* iii, 110 sq.; De Rossi, *Dizionario Storico degli Autori Ebrei*, p. 266 (Germ. transl. by Hamberger); the same, *Bibliotheca Judaica Antichristiana*, p. 93; Gratz, *Geschichte der Juden*, 7:337 sq., 485 sq. (2d ed. Leips. 1873); Wolf, *Bibl. Hebr.* i, 1259. (B. P.)

Puliah

the lowest of all Indian castes, or, rather, the scum of the lowest, being still more despised than the Pariahs. They are not allowed to walk on the regular roads, but must, at the distance of a hundred paces, warn every

wanderer of their vicinity by uttering a well-known yell. They are not even allowed to dwell in huts, but live at a great distance from all inhabited places, in dense forests, where they build their nests on trees, like monkeys.

Puller, Timothy, D.D.,

an English divine of some distinction, flourished in the second half of the 17th century. He was rector of Sacomb, Herts, in 1671, and of St. Mary le Bow in 1679. He died in 1693. He published *Moderation of the Church of England* (Lond. 1679, 8vo; new ed. by the Rev. Robert Eden, 1843, 8vo). See Fuller, *Tracts of Anglican Fathers*, iii, 309.

Pulleyn, Robert,

an English Roman Catholic prelate of the 12th century, was born, according to Fuller, in the county of Oxford. After having studied in Paris, he returned to England in 1130, and found the University of Oxford devastated and almost ruined by the Danes, and he zealously contributed to restore it to its previously flourishing condition. In the reign of Henry I he was charged with the work of explaining the writings of, and commenting upon, Aristotle, and he acquitted himself in this double task to the great satisfaction of his scholars and the king, his constant patron. He received as recompense the archdeaconry of Rochester. After a short time he returned to Paris, and taught theology at the Sorbonne. In vain his bishop summoned him to return to England, and in order to compel him to do so, seized the revenues of his benefice. Pulleyn appealed against these proceedings to the pope, who decided in his favor. Such was his renown that Innocent II summoned him to Rome, and there received him with great honor. In 1144 Celestine II created him cardinal, and soon after Lucius II made him chancellor of the Roman Church. He died in 1150. Pulleyn wrote several works. The one which remains to us is the *Sententiarum Liber* (Paris, 1655). From it it is evident that he preferred the authority of the Bible and of reason to the testimony of the fathers or to the subtleties of the scholastics. Pulleyn belonged to the Abelard school of theology, and inclined to free dialectic discussion. He advocated the doctrine of free will, but did not admit *goratia irresistibilis*. "Through pride," he writes, "man fell; his salvation must proceed from the opposite quarter. The rational man, who was destined to rule over nature, must humble himself before the sensible elements to receive grace through them." But this was a lowering of the idea of humility to an outward act.

He favored, strangely enough for one so liberal in many things, the withholding of the cup from the laity, in order, as he taught, "that the blood might not be spilled again," and supported the doctrine of indulgences (q.v.) in a most extreme manner. But the most eccentric of all his theological notions was the absurd question he raised as to the exact moment *at* which, and the manner *in* which, the union of the divine nature of the Son with the human assumed in the womb of Mary had taken place; and that on the cross only Christ's body had died, but not the whole man Christ. Pulleyn appears to have written also on the Apocalypse. There are still twenty of his sermons preserved among the Lambeth MSS. See Merritt, *Biog. Erit.* ii, 183; Hardwick, *Church Hist. of the Middle Ages*, p. 263, 264; Neander, *Dogmas*, ii, 486, 521, 524 sq., et al.; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, ii, 14, 41, 65, et al.

Pulling, Alonzo B.

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born at Ridgefield, Conn., Nov. 28, 1818. He experienced religion in the summer of 1840. He was licensed to preach March 1, 1845, was received into the New York Conference in the following May, and appointed to Ponsett and Killingworth Circuit, which he served two years. He was admitted to full membership June 21, 1848, and ordained deacon. He was then appointed to West Granby, which charge he served two years; was ordained an elder at New Haven in May, 1850, and appointed to Pleasant Valley and New Hartford Mission, where he labored two years. He thenceforth served New Milford, Woodbury, and Berlin; was supernumerary one year, and was afterwards stationed at Southington and Forestville, Westport, Ansonia, Seymour, New Milford, Nichol's Farms, Ithaca, East Village, and Riverside. In 1876 failing health compelled him to take a superannuated relation. He died Jan. 12, 1878. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1878, p. 50.

Pulolah

is the name of the temple of the Grand Lama at Deshesho. It signifies "the temple with the golden roof." In this temple dwell, when the Dalai Lama is present, 800 priests, exclusively employed in his service. In the interior, it is said, there is a multitude of statues, every one representing a woman with a child in her arms. These are probably the mothers of as many former dalai lamas.

Pulpit

(*מגדל* *migddol*, Nehemiah 8:4, properly *tower*), an elevated stage, whence Ezra read the law unto the congregation (comp. 9:4). See *Bible Educator* ii. 263.

Picture for Pulpit (1)

PULPIT (*Lat. pulpitum*; Fr. *chaire, pupitre* meaning a lectern, *lection* being a book-desk), an elevated place from which sermons are delivered. Ezra, when reading the law, stood on a pulpit of wood high above the people (*מגדל* Nehemiah 8:4); and Solomon prayed on a brazen scaffold (*מגדל* 2 Chronicles 6:13). In mediæval times the word designates the rood-loft. Bacon uses it in its modern sense. It is said to remind the hearer of Christ going up on the mountain to preach his Sermon of Beatitudes. Originally, it would appear to have been used chiefly for the singing, chanting, or recitation which forms part of the public service, and was a kind of stage sufficiently large to accommodate two, or even more, chanters. For the convenience of the hearers, this stage began to be used by the bishop, priest, or deacon, in the delivery of the homily; and thus, by degrees, a tribune expressly suited to the latter use alone came to be introduced. The earliest pulpit was the ambo, tribune, or tribunal, as it is called by Prudentius. Epiphanius says that St. Chrysostom usually preached from the ambo; so did St. Ambrose and St. Augustine; and Nicephorus records that Macedonius, patriarch of Constantinople in 489, mounted the ambo when he desired to clear himself of a charge of heresy. In some of the older churches, the ambo, or *pulpitum*, is still used for the chanting of the Gospel and Epistles. The ambo was placed in the centre of the church by the Greeks; it is in the middle of the nave at St. Pancras's, at Rome, on the left side, but on the right at Milan and Ravenna. At St. Clement's, Rome, the Epistle desk is on the left, and that of the prophecies on the right. At Chartres, Bayeux, and Rouen the matin lections were sung on the left side of the choir-entrance, and the desk was called the legend at Chartres. At Bourges, an eagle stood in front of the matin altar. A pulpit at Orleans and Chalons-sur-Marne was used for reading the Epistle, Gradual, Tract, and Alleluia; the Gospel was sung on the west side of the jube at Chartres, Chalons, and Lyons, that for the lections facing the east. At Bayeux and Rouen there were several desks. At Lyons and Vienne, the Gospel was read in the lower part of the choir, and the Epistle from the ambo; but the latter was used at both times at Rheims, Cambrai, Tours, Rouen, Sens,

Chalons, Laon, Soissons, Noyon, Amiens, Beauvais, Senlis, Orleans, Meaux, Tournay, Bayeux, and St. Denis. The desk for reading the Gospel was called the pulpit; the lectern held the choir-books. The former was movable, so as to be transferred from the one side to the other of the choir, and used by the subdeacon for reading the Epistle; whereas the lectern stood in the centre of the choir as a fixture, and was common to all the cantors in time of singing. Both, from their common ornament, the symbol of St. John Evangelist, were called the Eagle; and it appears on the ambones of Pistoja of the 13th century, and in three ancient churches at Rome. The deacon, taking the Book of the Gospels, richly bound in ivory, metal, and jewelry, carried it processionally, preceded by thurifers and taper-bearers, to the north side, where the pulpit stood. Fulk, abbot of Lobbes in the 9th century, made a wonderful eagle, on which burned four tapers in the form of a cross; a censer was contrived in its neck, which poured fragrant smoke from the beak and flaming eyes of the bird; and the head and wings were movable, for the convenience of turning the book. Often the other three evangelists were represented as writing the words sung by the deacon; at Messina there is one with the pelican, as the symbol of the Saviour, above all. At Narbonne, in the cathedral, there is a movable pulpit of the 14th century, consisting of two iron supports set saltierwise, and supporting a bookstand of supple leather. Those of St. Augustine's, Canterbury, and Bury St. Edmund's, mentioned in the 12th century, were movable until the 14th century. In Belgium, the ambo or a faldstool, set before the altar, served as a pulpit. According to John de Garlande, who wrote at the close of the 11th century, a pulpit is the ascent of steps to the lectern, upon which the chant- or reading-book was laid. The double pulpits of Milan, Narni, and Perugia connect the tradition with the ambones; those of Toledo are of bronze, and those at Seville are still used for singing the Gospel and Epistle. In three of the ancient churches at Rome, the Epistle ambo is square, and stands on the north; while that for the Gospel is round, and stands on the south side, with flights of stairs leading up to it. The ordinary pulpit also stood on the south side, as at Toledo, because the Gospel was preached from it. The jutbe for the gospeller and epistoler in large churches took the place of the ambo, and within two centuries was used by the preacher at Rouen; but in smaller churches a pulpit was used, yet there is no existing example or record of such furniture until the 13th century. Pulpits were formerly placed not only in churches, but also in the refectories of monasteries, as at Beverley, Shrewsbury, Chester, etc.; in the cloisters, as at St. Did, in France; and

occasionally in public thoroughfares, as on the north side of the church of Notre Dame; at St. Lo, in Normandy, and in the outer court of Magdalen College, Oxford. In France there are several overlooking cemeteries. In churches the pulpits were formerly always placed in the nave, attached to a wall, pillar, or screen, and the ecclesiastics and others who occupied the choir during the mass removed into the nave to hear the sermon: this custom was continued at Ely until quite recently.

Picture for Pulpit (2)

The church pulpit is usually hexagonal or octagonal, and of wood, possibly in allusion to Christ's preaching from the boat (~~see~~ Luke 5:1). In Roman Catholic churches the pulpit is generally distinguished by some religious emblems, especially by the crucifix; and the pulpits of the Low Countries and of Germany are often masterpieces of wood-carving, the preaching-place in some of them forming part of a great artistic group, as of the *Conversion of St. Paul*, the *Vocation of Peter and Andrew*, the *Temptation of Adam and Eve*, and other similar subjects.

Early pulpits were, no doubt, movable, and kept in corners until required for use, like that still preserved at Hereford; and at Bury, the analogium, or pulpit, we know, was removed from the chapter-house into the church when it was necessary. This, no doubt, is the cause of their present rarity. There are fine examples of pulpits at King's Sutton, Kingsbury Episcopi, Wolvercot, North Kilworth, Dartmouth, and Frampton (which has images of saints). Those of Sudbury, Southwold, Hereford, and Winchester are of wood, and of the 16th century. The earliest Jacobean example is at Sopley (1606). There are stationary pulpits of stone at Wells of the 16th century, at Worcester (1504), Ripon, Combe, Nantwich, and Wolverhampton. The oldest wooden pulpit is at Fulbourne (cir. 1350). In Italy there are examples of the 13th and 14th centuries at Siena and St. Miniato, Florence; in Germany there are stone pulpits at Freiburg and Ulm of the latter part of the 15th century; at Avignon, in France; and Nieuport, in Belgium. There is a Byzantine pulpit, said to have been brought from St. Sophia's, Constantinople, at St. Mark's, Venice. Romanesque pulpits may be seen in St. Ambrose's, Milan; St. Mary's, Toscanella; and St. Sabino's, Canova. There is an octagonal pulpit, dated 1482, at Ratisbon; that of Kidrich is cir. 1491. An hexagonal pulpit is at St. Andrew's, Pistoja. The octagonal pulpit of Perugia is used for giving the benediction. There is a superb 13th-century pulpit on seven pillars in the baptistery at Pisa, with lecterns for the

Gospel and Epistle on the stairs. Abbot Wygmore's pulpit, Gloucester, was on the north, and placed against the third pillar westward of the crossing. The south, or men's, side is the most common position, as at Wells, Chartres, Haarlem, Aix, and formerly at Winchester, Peterborough, Gloucester, and Worcester. In England the pulpits were copied from those of the refectory, and such as stood in the open air. In cathedral churches the pulpit was often large enough to contain several persons, as the bishop, when preaching, was accompanied by his two archdeacons. Gilding and color were not employed on pulpits until the 15th century. Many of these pulpits were highly enriched with carving; that of Worcester has the *New Jerusalem*, and one of stone at Newton Nottage has the *Scourging* sculptured upon it. One at Burnham Norton, of wood, is painted with the *Doctors of the Church*. In the 16th century stone pulpits were introduced. There are magnificent wooden pulpits at Strasburg (1481); Mayence, Antwerp, Faye la Vineuse, Nuremberg, Brussels (1699); and Vienna, from which John Capistran preached a Turkish crusade in 1451. At Durham there was an iron pulpit, or ambo, in the galilee, from which the Sunday sermon was preached to women. There is another on the north-west at San Gil, Burgos; and two like ambones, fitted with desks, of the 15th century, flank the screen of Zamora. The two pulpits of Milan are of metal, and circular. At Aix the choir pulpit is silvergilt and jewelled. At Lugo, one of the two metal ambones has an eagle on the south. The pulpit (in Arabic, *mimber*) forms one of the scanty appliances of Mohammedan worship. — Walcott, *Sacred Architecture*,. s.v.; Parker, *Glossary of Architecture*, s.v.

Pulpit Eloquence

As pulpits in churches are constructed for the convenience of preachers and preaching, so the term *pulpit*, by a common form of metonymy, is often used to signify the collective body of the clergy or those who use the pulpit. By a slight variation of the same principle, the term is also made to signify the collective agency of preaching, as seen in the phrases "influence of the pulpit" and "power of the pulpit." In a signification which, to some extent, blends both the above meanings, the term pulpit is often used in the figure of personification, as in the expressions "Let the pulpit speak," "The voice of the pulpit must be heard." The word is thus used in the well-known passage of Cowper:

***“I say the pulpit (in the sober use
Of its legitimate, peculiar powers)
Must stand acknowledged while the world shall stand,
The most important and effectual guard,
Support, and ornament of virtue’s cause.”***

From such uses as a substantive, the same word derives its significance as an adjective; it being often used in the expressions “pulpit orator,” “pulpit eloquence,” and the like. The term *pulpit eloquence* has, in fact, come into general use as designating (1) the quality and character of the eloquence produced from the pulpit, and (2) the body of eloquent productions now in preservation as representing the utterances of preachers of the present and past generations.

No just treatment of eloquence in any of its phases can ignore the fact that its highest character and results can only be secured from the expression of the living speaker. There must be voice for the ear, action for the eye, and a certain projection of the sentiments, the sympathies, and the emotions of an animated soul upon the minds and hearts of others. Nor can it be denied that the sympathy of numbers in an audience reacts upon a speaker and augments within him the power of moving those whom he addresses. Hence, whether eloquence be considered subjectively as that subtle power which enables an orator to influence men by uttered language, or objectively in the effects produced upon those to whom he speaks, it needs to be heard and felt in order to be appreciated in its completeness. Nevertheless, this fullest realization of eloquence has its limitations, for when once heard and felt it is in that sense ended. It can thenceforward only be remembered as a thing of the past. It can neither be repeated nor transferred to other persons, times, or places. In view of this condition of eloquence in its highest realization, we can more fully appreciate the eloquence of written or printed language, which is to some extent independent both of speakers and hearers, and which may, in a partial but yet not wholly unsatisfactory degree, represent to persons distant, both in time and space, the utterances of eloquent men. To this end, writing and printing are conservative agencies of essential importance and of inestimable value. By means of them the orations and sermons of one age are handed down to ages following, and, so far as reading is substituted for hearing, the audiences of orators and preachers are multiplied without limit. It is therefore to what is preserved in books that any article upon the eloquence of the past must chiefly refer.

In order to rightly comprehend the character and relative importance of pulpit eloquence, reference must be made to preaching (q.v.) as a divinely appointed agency for the promotion of Christianity in the world. When it was so appointed by the Lord Jesus Christ (see ~~4B89~~ Matthew 28:19; ~~4B84~~ Mark 3:14; 16:15), a new and peculiar field was opened for eloquence. Indeed, a new dignity was conferred upon human speech in making it the chief agency for the spread of that truth which was designed to make men free from sin and to prepare them for the heavenly world. The very nature of this high appointment indicates that the pulpit, as representing the public utterances of Christian ministers, affords unrivalled opportunities for the production and employment of eloquence in its best forms.

- 1.** It demands capacity, convictions, and moral power on the part of preachers, which should go very far towards making them eloquent men.
- 2.** It furnishes them with everrecurring and highly favorable occasions for addressing assemblies. For that object it avails itself of the consecrated time of the holy Sabbath and of the sanctuary as a hallowed place for the delivery of its message.
- 3.** The themes which it appropriately discusses are all of an elevating and inspiring character, having an intrinsic importance superior to that of any earthly interest, being also invested with the authority of divinely revealed truth. It was in the light of such considerations that John Quincy Adams declared that “the pulpit is especially the throne of modern eloquence.” Certainly, neither the bema of the Greeks nor the forum of the Romans ever afforded such an agency of power over human minds and hearts. Nor is this agency limited in its exercise to any narrow routine of forms or circumstances. It is as much in place and as full of power in the catacombs as in a cathedral; on the shores of Galilee as in the synagogues of the Jews; in the sequestered glens where persecuted worshippers gather as in churches where kings and magistrates assemble. Indeed, its greatest triumphs have often been in circumstances outwardly the most untoward and in which any earthly record was impossible. Hence, while the function of preaching has been in exercise for nearly nineteen centuries by countless thousands of preachers, but a very small proportion of the sermons that have been delivered have been, or could have been, preserved to the reading world; yet the combined literature of the ancient and modern pulpit is of immense extent.

It is by no means assumed that all printed sermons are eloquent in any superlative sense. Many, no doubt, are far less so than thousands that have vanished with the breath that uttered them, or have only lived in the memory and lives of those who heard them. Nevertheless, study and criticism are limited to those products of the pulpit which have been preserved from the oblivion of the past and made accessible to persons living in subsequent periods. But of these there is an ever-increasing abundance, so that the task of the student is necessarily one of selection. A general or comprehensive view of pulpit eloquence can only be obtained by the study of the subject in chronological order, beginning with the apostolic age and descending to the present period, with proper attention to the characteristics of successive periods. The limits of the present article only admit of a summary outline.

I. *The Period of the Apostles and Early Fathers.* — Notwithstanding the brevity of its record, the New Testament is by no means silent as to the subject of preaching. The Gospels not only contain our Lord's Sermon on the Mount, but many fragments of the addresses or sermons which he delivered to his disciples and the multitudes. The Acts of the Apostles report in brief several of the discourses of Peter and Paul, while the Epistles may be understood to be summaries of the discussions and instructions which the different apostles were accustomed to give in their discourses as preachers. The specimens of preaching contained in the New Testament are, in fact, more full and satisfactory than any found in ecclesiastical history for several centuries after the close of the sacred canon. Indeed, our chief mode of forming any judgment of the preaching of those early centuries is from the fruits following. Even Eusebius, who wrote in the early part of the 4th century, acknowledges himself indebted to tradition for all that he knew of those successors of the apostles who had "spread the seeds of salvation and of the heavenly kingdom throughout the world far and wide."

During most, if not all, of this period, pulpits were not in existence, and even churches, as separate religious edifices, were unknown, or, at most, only beginning to exist. Worshippers, instead of assembling in large numbers, met by twos and threes wherever they could escape the surveillance of persecutors. Such circumstances would necessarily control, to no small extent, the form of address employed by Christian ministers and teachers for the propagation of the Gospel, making especially necessary personal address to individuals wherever a listener could be found.

Moreover, as the New-Testament Scriptures only existed in fragmentary manuscripts, it would be necessary to employ a part of the time allotted to pastoral instruction in reciting and explaining such portions of them as were in the possession of the several pastors and teachers.

The prevailing form of ministerial address during the period referred to must, therefore, have been that of explanation and exhortation; but of its efficiency in the best result of eloquence — namely, that of persuading men to abandon error and embrace the truth — the progress of Christianity during that period of abounding paganism is the best possible proof. The power of the early preachers of Christianity, like that of the apostles themselves, must have consisted chiefly in a straightforward utterance of the truth — the direct witness of the Gospel and its appeal to the human heart. There is no reason to think that oratory was studied, or perhaps thought of; but the influence of Christian truth and life was in plain words brought to bear upon the thoughts and lives of others, as well as upon the errors and superstitions of heathenism.

II. *The Period of the Later Fathers, or the Oratorical Period of the Ancient Church.* — During and following the age of Constantine, Christian churches became common, and the canon of Scripture having been completed, copies were multiplied by transcription. But as manuscripts were costly, they could rarely be possessed by individuals, not alinways even by churches; hence a great part of the work of preachers was to expound consecutively portions of the sacred text. Thus homilies or familiar expositions of Scripture became the form of pulpit address which primarily characterized that period. Voluminous and valuable examples have come down to us in the homilies of Athanasius, Ephraem Syrus, Basil, the Gregories, the Cyrils, Hilary, Ambrose, Chrysostom, and Augustine.

The same period was also marked by the cultivation among the more prominent preachers, of the Grecian style of oratory. Several of the most distinguished fathers having not only been students, but teachers of rhetoric, they did not neglect opportunities offered them for sacred orations and panegyrics. The latter style of address, in fact, became very common in commemoration of the martyrs and in celebrations of the great feasts of the Church.

The best specimens of the Christian oratory of this period have been much eulogized, and having been often pointed out as models for study and

imitation, have exerted no little influence on the preaching of modern times, more particularly in France and on the continent of Europe. Even the historian Gibbon, in a paragraph which severely, but not without justice, censures certain serious errors into which many of the teachers of the Church had already fallen, says, "But the compositions of Gregory and Chrysostom have been compared with the most splendid models of Attic, or at least of Asiatic, eloquence."

That the mistakes of the preachers of the ancient Church came largely from ignorance, and that the tendency of education and enlightenment was to increase the influence of truth and the power of the pulpit, is sufficiently evident from the edict of the apostate emperor Julian, which prohibited the Christians from teaching or being taught the arts of grammar and rhetoric. The motives which prompted the edict are thus set forth by Gibbon: "Julian had reason to expect that (under the influence of his edict) in the space of a few years the Church would relapse into its primeval simplicity, and that the theologians who possessed an adequate share of the learning and eloquence of the age would be succeeded by a generation of blind and ignorant fanatics incapable of defending the truth of their own principles or of exposing the various follies of polytheism." Notwithstanding the early death of Julian and the restoration of the civil rights of the Christians, yet, through a series of untoward events, to which prevailing corruption in the Church greatly contributed, the evils of general ignorance and the degradation of preaching and of the clergy came only too soon and remained too long. From the first development of ceremonialism in the Church there was manifested a tendency to limit preaching to bishops only. This tendency grew with the multiplication of ceremonial observances, until it resulted in a general transposition of preaching from its primary design as an ever-active agency of evangelization into a ceremony itself, in which it was shorn even of its oratorical power. When the number of preachers was reduced to a minimum, the chances for the development of the talent of eloquence were correspondingly diminished, and the more so since an election to the office of bishop would do little towards conferring the gift of eloquence upon men previously unaccustomed to preach. Thus it may be seen that what has been called the oratorical period of the ancient Church derived that character from a comparatively few men of extraordinary ability, rather than from the general prevalence of preaching power among the clergy. Moreover, the latter part of that period witnessed

a serious decline in the spirit and practice of preaching, which was destined to project itself forward into centuries following.

III. *The Period of the Middle Ages.* — The terms “Middle Ages” and “Dark Ages” have long been nearly synonymous; but historians have not often pointed out with sufficient clearness the extent to which the darkness of those ages was chargeable to the incompetence and unfaithfulness of those who, as Christian teachers, ought to have been the light of the world. The causes of the prevailing ignorance and degradation were numerous and complicated, but nothing would have more certainly or powerfully tended to remove them than true and zealous utterances from the clergy in the character of Christian preachers. Churches, and even cathedrals, existed in great numbers, but the idea of preaching had fallen so low that postils came to be substituted for sermons. The term postil, primarily meaning a note upon a text or texts (*postilla*), came to designate a religious discourse following the reading (in Latin) of the Gospel and Epistle of the day at public mass. The term itself was diminutive, showing that preaching was regarded as of small account in comparison with the ceremonials of worship. The postil in its best form — that of a running comment on the verses of a Scripture lesson — resembled the homily. It continued in use, both among Roman Catholics and Protestants, for several generations after the dawn of the Reformation. Persons specially skilful in delivering postils were called postillists, or postillators. Specimens of the postil abound in the ecclesiastical literature of the period under consideration, but few of them are of much present value. The best sermons of the period that have come down to us are several discourses delivered by bishops in connection with the festivals of the Church, such as the Advent, Whitsuntide, Christmas, the Crucifixion, and the Ascension. As these topics involved Scripture narrations, they rose in character far above those treated in connection with the festivals of the saints, of which tradition furnished the staple material. The most tangible, though sinister, results of preaching in medieval times were produced by the so-called preachers of the Crusades. Those results were not the peaceable fruits of righteousness, but passion, strife, and bloodshed. Peter the Hermit, a fanatical monk of the 11th century, was the preacher and prime instigator of the first Crusade. On this warlike mission he traversed Europe from country to country, enlisting high and low in his desperate scheme. He even induced pope Urban II to join him in haranguing a vast multitude assembled at Clermont, in the south of France, preparatory to the first great movement towards the Holy Land. It was

Under the hortations of Urban that the multitude cried out *Deus id vult*, and thus initiated the war-cry of all the Crusades. Bernard of Clairvaux, subsequently canonized as St. Bernard, preached the second Crusade. He was not only appointed by Louis VII, king of France, for that purpose, but commissioned by pope Eugenius III to offer plenary indulgence to those who would join the new Crusade. He also provided himself with badges in the form of a cross to be attached to the shoulders of all who would enlist. Whereas Peter stirred the lowest dregs of the populace, Bernard succeeded in enlisting kings, emperors, barons, and knights to attempt "to rescue the home and sanctuary of David from the hands of the Philistines."

Parliaments and mass-meetings were held and addressed by Bernard from a lofty pulpit, and at these the response to his appeals was the reiterated shout *Deus id vult*. In such circumstances, and backed by such influences, it was said that the eloquence of Bernard "raised armies and depopulated cities." According to his own statement, towns were deserted so that the only people left in them were widows and orphans whose husbands and fathers were yet living. The third and fourth Crusades were set in motion by the ordinary influences of papal power and kingly authority, without any special co-operation of the pulpit. The fifth, however, was brought into action by a preacher named Fulk, a Frenchman. As a result of previous disasters, the spirit of crusading had so far declined that for two years the preaching of Fulk seemed unavailing. But at length it began to be said that miracles attested his exhortations, and soon after pope Innocent III sent to his aid numerous nuncios, who traversed Europe offering absolutions and indulgences to stimulate enlistments. Robert de Courpon, an Englishman by birth, was the preacher of the sixth Crusade. He had been an assistant to Fulk, under whom he had learned the art of exciting the people. Although inferior in talents to the earlier preachers of the Crusades, he was equal to any of them in zeal and fanaticism, and if history does not misrepresent him, he at length became so unscrupulous as to embezzle the alms of his followers. The seventh and eighth Crusades followed like receding waves of the sea, growing smaller and weaker as the impulses of fanaticism abated. They were without any preachers of distinction, and may be regarded as results of the earlier agitation.

The general decadence of preaching throughout the Roman Church became a pretext, during the latter part of the mediæval period, for the organization of several preaching orders of monks. Had these orders devoted themselves to intelligent activity in proclaiming the truths of God's

Word and the practical duties of Christianity, the best of results might have been expected. But their zeal was devoted to very different objects. It was, in fact, absorbed in efforts to excite persecution against the Albigenses and other supposed heretics, together with general exertions to promote the schemes of the papacy and the inquisition. Hence it is not surprising that the preaching orders as such failed to make any valuable contributions to the eloquence of the pulpit or to stimulate activity in preaching among the clergy at large. Of the ecclesiastical celebrities of the mediæval period, few can be mentioned on account of distinguished ability as preachers. The two men who, perhaps, more than others deserve such mention were Antony of Padua, subsequently canonized as a saint, and the Jesuit Antonio Vieira, both natives of Portugal. Of the former, it has been said that "his rare talents as a preacher caused him to be employed on unceasing missions through the north and centre of Italy, especially in the neighborhood of Bologna and Padua." "We have the most ample testimony to the popularity of his sermons. The churches where he was to preach were thronged from daybreak. Multitudes were unable to force their way in at the doors. Often it happened that the preacher had to come out of the building and address his auditors in the open air. Shops were closed, thoroughfares deserted. The crowds that flocked to sermon were sometimes calculated at thirty thousand persons. Nor were the effects less striking — Italian hatreds reconciled; men that had prepared the stiletto for an enemy hurrying into his embrace, a forgiving and a forgiven friend; women leaving off their ornaments, and selling them for the benefit of the poor; old, hardened sinners brought to immediate confession" (Neale, *Mediaeval Preaching*). As in the case of many other popular preachers, Antony was greatly given to allegorizing, often introducing into his sermons animals, birds, and even fishes, and putting into their mouths quaint messages for human ears.

Vieira was born in 1608, later than the usual limit of the period under consideration; nevertheless, from his style and general character, he has been usually called "the last of the mediæval preachers." The greater part of his life was spent in Brazil, though for a time he served as court preacher at Lisbon. During that period he visited various cities of Europe, and even preached at Rome in the Italian language. His labors as superior of the missions in Brazil were self-sacrificing, requiring him to travel thousands of leagues on foot through the wildest regions, and to traverse immense rivers in canoes; yet he was ever ready to preach to a few natives through an interpreter, or to persons of rank and influence in society. His

great talent was satire, which he did not scruple to employ both in and out of the pulpit. At Maranham, one of the northern cities of Brazil, he preached a noted sermon "To the Fishes." after the method of Antony of Padua. It was based upon the text "Ye are the salt of the earth." In style and ingenuity it is not unlike his book entitled *The Art of Stealing*, which is regarded as a species of classic in the Portuguese language. Vieira lived to an advanced age and died at the city of Bahia, having, in circumstances where printing was difficult, published not less than thirteen volumes of sermons, which were followed by two others after his death.

IV. *The Modern Period.* — The beginning of the great Reformation was characterized by a revival of preaching. It was by preaching that the Reformers sought to expose the errors and corruptions into which the Church had fallen, as well as to set forth the doctrines of the Word of God. Thus Peter Waldo in the south of France, Wycliffe in England, Huss and Jerome of Prague in Bohemia, Savonarola in Italy, Luther and Melancthon in Germany, Zwingli in Switzerland, and Farel and Calvin in Switzerland and France. pursued similar courses and with similar success. Wherever such men were not overborne and crushed by opposition, they were sustained and followed by an ever-increasing number of preachers. Hence it may be said that since the Reformation preaching has been in all Protestant countries a universal accompaniment of public worship. It has not only been maintained at a single service on the Lord's-day, but usually twice or thrice in each church, and often at other times during the week. This custom has called into action a vast number of preachers, and developed the preaching talent of the Church more thoroughly than it had ever been previously cultivated subsequent to the apostolic age.

As attack prompts defence, so the zeal of Protestant preachers called out new activity and enlisted new talent among the preachers of the Roman Catholic Church. The preaching orders became greatly stimulated. Preaching ceased to be confined to bishops. Priests and curates began to preach, at least to the extent of endeavoring to antagonize Protestant influences. Thus in the two great sections of Christendom a new prominence was given to the preaching office. It is true that among Roman Catholics the mass still held the precedence and preaching did not universally become a part of Sabbath services. Nevertheless, in Protestant countries Roman Catholics came by degrees to maintain preaching in about as great frequency as the Protestants around them. Even the seating of churches and cathedrals for the convenience of auditors — a custom still

unknown in Roman Catholic countries — has come to be common among the Roman Catholics of England and America.

It may thus be seen that the influence of the Reformation tended to increase in various ways the activity and power of the pulpit. It certainly secured for preaching a degree of prominence and frequency unknown to any previous period following the days of the apostles. While the impulse thus given to pulpit eloquence has never died out, its effects have been variable in different countries and at different periods. In Germany, for example, after the Reformation became so far established as to be incorporated into the political institutions of the people, the Protestant pulpit suffered a decline in its power from which it has not even yet fully recovered. The causes of that decline were numerous, involving the influence of Jesuitic opposition, false philosophy, scepticism in various forms, and, worst of all, a prevalent indifference to the power of religious truth and the necessity of a personal religious life.

In France the most celebrated epoch of pulpit eloquence occurred during the reign of Louis XIV, a monarch who, notwithstanding personal vices and official cruelties that have made his name detestable, was a zealous patron of preaching. Through his command and example, attendance upon court preaching was made fashionable in a dissolute age, and it cannot be doubted that the influence of his patronage greatly stimulated the study and practice of pulpit oratory among the Catholic clergy of his day. It is not less true that his influence fostered among the preachers that appeared before him a spirit of servility and adulation wholly unworthy of the ministerial office. The extent to which such truly great men as Bossuet, Massillon, and even Bourdaloue carried personal compliment, not to say flattery, in their sermons before the king and the aristocracy, is equally offensive and amazing to readers of the present day. When to the names just mentioned that of Fenelon is added, we have a representation of the highest phase of pulpit oratory known to the Catholic Church of France in any age. The Protestant Church of France, including Switzerland, has furnished many distinguished preachers. Calvin and Farel, of the period of the Reformation, were worthily succeeded by such men as Du Moulin, Faucheur, Daille, Claude, Superville, Saurin, Vinet, Monod, and many others. The positions of these men were comparatively obscure, and their circumstances often greatly embarrassed by persecution; yet the specimens of printed sermons by which they are represented to succeeding generations compare favorably with any to be found in their own or other

languages. During the current century. Roman Catholic preachers of great ability have been rare in France. Beyond Lacordaire, Ravignan, and Hyacinthe, few can be named as having attained a national reputation.

Great Britain may be said to be the home of modern pulpit eloquence. Talking England, including Wales, Scotland, and Ireland, into one view, it may be doubted if any country of the world has produced more or better sermons during the last three hundred years. Since the days of Wycliffe, preaching in Great Britain has been common among "all classes and conditions of men." Successive generations have been educated to appreciate it, so that not only has the pulpit been free to speak, but the masses of the people have been disposed to hear. The British pulpit, moreover, has been favored above that of any other European country in two auxiliary conditions of great importance. namely, the free use of the Word of God and the religious observance of the Lord's-day. Without the former, there is no valid basis for pulpit instruction or appeal, and hence the sermon usually degenerates into a mere oration. Without the latter, hearers are wanting, or at least irregular in attendance, a circumstance that deprives preachers of one of the most inspiring motives for diligent preparation and high effort. More truly than in any other country, unless possibly in the English-speaking portions of North America, the pulpit of Great Britain has been an exponent of the religious life and sentiments of the people. Its utterances have consequently been greatly diversified at different periods and in different circumstances. In times of religious indifference, and in those portions or branches of the Church in which religious sentiment has run low, preaching has declined to its lowest grade of influence; whereas in periods of religious awakening, and in the more evangelical sections of the Church, pulpit eloquence has attained its maximum power, not only in the sermons of a few men of extraordinary talent, but in the average ability and success of great numbers of preachers. England, having not only had a free pulpit, but also a free press, has furnished a body of sermon literature unsurpassed in quality and extent by that of any other country in the world.

The more distinguished preachers of Great Britain may be classified by epochs and religious associations. The names of Wycliffe, Latimer, Knox, and Jewell represent the great preachers of the Reformation. A similar selection for the 17th century would embrace the names of Jeremy Taylor, Barrow, Baxter, Bunyan, Howle, Charnock, Tillotson, South, and possibly many others. In the 18th century, Wesley and Whitefield, as preachers of

extraordinary zeal and effectiveness, were instrumental in awakening a religious movement which extended not only throughout Great Britain, but, in fact, throughout the English-speaking world. One of its effects was to improve the tone and quality of preaching in all the churches. The number of great preachers who have adorned the British pulpit in the course of the 18th and 19th centuries is beyond enumeration. The following are representative names, and associated with volumes of published sermons: Cecil, Robert Hall, Chalmers, Wardlaw, Richard Watson, Robert Newton, Duff, Guthrie, F. W. Robertson, Stanley, Melville, Punshon, and Spurgeon. To this list might be added the names of a large number of other preachers of no less moral and intellectual worth, and of nearly equal though somewhat more local celebrity.

The freedom of the English pulpit, and, in fact, a greater freedom than was enjoyed in England at that time, came to America with the Pilgrim Fathers. Having been by them established on the Atlantic coast, it has been extended with the advance of civilization until the whole continent has felt its power. The pulpit in America, as in Great Britain, has been greatly aided in the accomplishment of its mission by the general observance of the Christian Sabbath and a free use of the Holy Scriptures. The importance of preaching has also been recognised from the first in the Church architecture of America. All edifices constructed as places of worship, from the log structures of the frontier to the great tabernacles of crowded cities and the Roman Catholic cathedrals, have been seated for auditors. In these and other conditions of society, not excepting that of all churches being alike thrown upon the voluntary system of self-support, the Christian pulpit has had in America one of its fairest and widest fields of effort. It would not have been creditable if in such circumstances pulpit eloquence had not been extensively and successfully cultivated. That it has been will appear from the long list of good and great preachers who have adorned the American Church, many of whom have given to the world volumes of published sermons. Probably in no country has the average grade of pulpit eloquence been higher than in the United States of America; and, owing in part to its vast extent, in no country is it more difficult to determine who may justly be said to have attained a national reputation as preachers. The truth is that each great denomination of Christians forms, in a certain sense, a world of itself, within which the principal preachers are far better known than in other similar worlds surrounding. Nevertheless, there have not been wanting a goodly number of men whose reputation for pulpit eloquence

has transcended all denominational boundaries and become indeed national. Without attempting to make an arbitrary decision as to all whose names might be thought worthy of record in this category, it may be safe to designate a few both of the dead and the living. In so doing we purposely limit our list to a careful selection, preferring for the most part to consider living men as candidates for a similar list in future years. If our selection is judiciously made, it will be sufficient to append in chronological order, without title or classification, the names of the men who may be pronounced as, thus far, the representative preachers of America: e.g. Jonathan Edwards, Samuel Davies, Timothy Dwight, John M. Mason, John Summerfield, Edward Payson, John Newland Maffit. Lyman Beecher, William Ellery Channing, Francis Wayland, Stephen Olin, Henry B. Bascom, Charles P. M'Ilvaine, George W. Bethune, Stephen H. Tyng, and Matthew Simpson. No doubt the above list might be considerably increased even at the present time; but since there is no absolute standard of determination, it is deemed preferable to incur the risk of error by diminution rather than by excess.

In such a connection, it is only just to remark that in modern times the press serves as an important factor in the creation of public reputations, both local and national. Hence those preachers who have availed themselves of its agency as a means of giving their sermons to the public, and others whose friends have been zealous to do a similar office for them, have become much more widely known than many of equal and perhaps greater ability who have not been thus represented. But as mere publicity does not secure reputation, it is also true that the reputation of some men has been more damaged than helped by the publication of their sermons. It is, in fact, no uncommon thing that published sermons wholly fail to convey to readers the impression they produced upon their hearers when delivered. Hence, to form historic judgments of the ability of preachers, attention should be given both to the influence they exerted upon their auditors and to the matter they employed in their sermons, as tested by the established principles of criticism. It was not our intention to include among the preachers named above any who have not favorably passed the double test. That many others have already done so will no doubt be the opinion of some; but time, which tries all things, will enable readers at a future day better to determine.

Even a cursory survey of the varied character and results of pulpit eloquence during the nineteen centuries of its history is suggestive of important lessons. A few may be noted:

1. There are different kinds of pulpit eloquence. In order to be intelligently studied or judged, sermons must be classified. Some are didactic, having for their chief object instruction in Christian truth. Some are hortatory, having for their object the enforcement of truth already familiar. Some are exegetical, seeking to expound the meaning of the Scriptures. Some are illustrative, seeking to create an interest in Christian truth by exhibitions of its correspondences in nature, in human consciousness, and in the facts of history; while some are composite, seeking to blend two or more of the above characteristics into a harmonious whole. Each of these different kinds of pulpit address demands a style of language and discussion adapted to its special object. Inattention to this fact might lead to gross misjudgments on the part of critics, and equal mistakes on the part of preachers. A hortatory style of address might spoil a didactic discourse, while the coolness of didactic address would render an exhortation powerless. An essential element, therefore, in determining whether a given sermon is eloquent is a just consideration of its object. Accepting the etymological, and in fact the scriptural, idea of eloquence — namely, that of speaking well (^{Exodus 4:14}) — it must be conceded that a certain degree of eloquence must be recognised in sermons well adapted to the promotion of the most common and familiar objects of Christian discourse. But inasmuch as the higher and more difficult results of human effort challenge degrees of admiration not accorded to well-doing in more common matters, so it is customary to restrict the term eloquence to those higher and more unusual qualities of speech which excite emotions and control actions. In fact, one of the best definitions of eloquence states it to be the language of emotion. This definition implies that it is easier to instruct the mind and convince the judgment than to move the sensibilities of men. Nevertheless, instruction and conviction are essential conditions to the excitement of strong emotions. Few speakers accomplish the latter without the use of those conditions as antecedent agencies.

2. The natural temperament of speakers governs in a great measure the kind of eloquence in which they may excel. Sons of thunder and sons of consolation have each their mission; but for either to attempt the office or adopt the style of the other is to hazard failure. Nevertheless, mere natural endowments are insufficient to insure success without studious self-

cultivation; whereas laborious efforts in right lines tend to the highly successful development of ordinary talents. An instance in point is that of Thomas Guthrie, the distinguished preacher of the Free Church of Scotland, than whom no man ever wielded the power of illustration more effectively. Yet, as shown in his biography, that power was acquired by diligent and continuous effort after his entrance into mature ministerial life, and as a result of personal experiences convincing him of its importance.

3. Successful pulpit address demands a wise choice of subjects, the vivid presentation of thought, and the use of language adapted to the comprehension of hearers. The character and influence of the Christian pulpit have at times been greatly lowered by the introduction of improper topics — topics either trivial in themselves or out of harmony with the spirit and truths of the Gospel. But even when the themes of discussion have been appropriate, the peculiar and more important objects of preaching have often been neutralized by languid utterances, or by styles of expression ill adapted to the comprehension of the hearers addressed. The expression of the apostle Paul, “In the Church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that by my voice I might teach others also, than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue” (~~1~~ 1 Corinthians 14:19), elucidates an important principle of all true eloquence. No matter how eloquent a man may be in his own estimation, if others fail to comprehend him his efforts will be to them either an enigma, or at best a vain show. In short, all genuine pulpit eloquence must be in harmony with those principles of human nature on which the success of secular eloquence depends. It was critically and justly shown by Lord Brougham that the triumphs in eloquence secured by Demosthenes were won by his “handling in succession a variety of topics all calculated to strike his audience.” So the successful proclamation of the Gospel depends largely upon the capacity of its preachers to present in striking forms, and in proper succession, the great truths of God’s Word and providence.

4. The higher degrees of pulpit eloquence are not attained apart from deep religious feeling on the part of preachers. Men who are secular in their lives and low in the grade of their religious opinions and experience neither choose the themes that strike the deep chords of the human soul, nor are capable of treating them in the most affecting and moving manner. Whereas men who have a profound sense of the divine presence and authority, who have a vivid conception of the realities of eternity, the value of immortal souls, and the power of Christ as the Saviour of the perishing,

they, and they only, have the proper moral basis for effective, and hence, in the most important sense, eloquent religious address to their fellow-men. “Out of the fulness of the heart the mouth speaketh.” When, therefore, the heart is full of God’s truth and love, it gives forth its sentiments in impressive utterances, and makes objective to others the eloquent feelings that glow within it. When the emotions of the speaker are not enlisted — in other words, when subjective eloquence is wanting on his part — the objective results of eloquence cannot be produced in the minds and hearts of hearers.

5. The higher effects of eloquence depend largely upon accessories favorable both to speakers and hearers. It is not sufficient that an orator realize in himself the qualities and conditions essential to eloquence. He also has need of all available agencies as helps in the task of transferring his thoughts and emotions to others. His first requisite is language, as a common medium for the expression and reception of thought. But the force of the best language may be greatly weakened by indistinct articulation, by feeble utterance, by uncouth gestures, and other faults of delivery. On the other hand, it may be greatly intensified by a corresponding physical expression, in which not only the tongue addresses the ear, but the eye, the countenance, the attitudes, and the action of an earnest speaker fix the gaze of his auditors and concentrate the magnetism of his presence and purposes upon the perception and sympathy of his hearers. That the full effect of such an address may be realized, the auditors need to be comfortably placed, and within easy range of his voice, since any form of discomfort, or any effort to understand, distracts their attention and weakens the impression they will receive. When, in circumstances like these, the thoughts and emotions of an eloquent man flow into the souls and kindle the emotions of a mass of hearers, their presence, in turn, reacts upon him, quickening his mental powers, and rousing his sensibilities to a degree unattainable in other circumstances. This mutuality of emotion rises with the increase of numbers and the unity of sentiment that pervades the mass. It may be said, therefore, that when speakers are equal to their task, large audiences are important, if not essential, to the higher effects of eloquence. Favorable expectancy on the part of hearers is also another condition greatly helpful to a speaker. It relieves him of the necessity of creating a bond of sympathy between himself and persons ignorant of him, or perhaps prejudiced against him. It is in this respect that a speaker’s reputation may become to him an

auxiliary of great value. While the conditions above specified, and others of like character, are not always within the control of ministers of the Gospel, and may sometimes be dependent on contingencies quite beyond their control, nevertheless a diligent discharge of ministerial and pastoral duty tends to create them. It was a precept of the ancient rhetoricians that the orator must be a good man, and a German writer has published a book to demonstrate that eloquence is a virtue. It is in accordance with principles thus sanctioned that extensive personal acquaintance, a high moral and religious character, and a reputation based on faithful labor and habits of doing good, all challenge sympathy, attract hearers, and awaken hopeful expectations.

6. The influence of the Holy Spirit is the crowning auxiliary of pulpit eloquence. Apart from this the preacher is like any other man. But, over and above all merely human aids, a Christian preacher of the right character and spirit is entitled to expect the influence of the Holy Ghost to give to the truths he may utter increased impressiveness, and to his hearers increased sensibility.

It is only under this last-named condition that pulpit eloquence can be hoped to attain its highest power. But this is a condition that no indolent man can reasonably hope to enjoy. It neither follows in the train of religious presumption, nor of an undue reliance upon genius or personal ability, but rather comes in answer to "the fervent, effectual prayer of a righteous man." He, therefore, who as a minister of the Gospel would, according to the apostolic injunction, study to show himself "approved, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed," should be equally diligent in the acquisition of sacred knowledge, and in the highest possible cultivation of his powers of expression, that he may with confidence ask for the unction of the Holy One as a means of rendering his utterances as a preacher of Christian truth in the highest degree efficacious. In view of this supreme object, the diligent study of pulpit eloquence, whether in its history, its principles, or its diversified illustrations, both in the published sermons and in the biographies of distinguished preachers, is of equal interest and importance.

Literature. — Bingham, *Christian Antiquities*; Smith, *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*; Paniel, *Geschichte der christlichen Beredsamkeit und der Homiletik*; Villemain, *Tableau de l'Eloquence Chretienne au IVe Siecle*; Moule, *Christian Oratory during the First Five Centuries* (Lond.

1859); Neale, *Medieval Preaching* (ibid. 1856); Baring-Gould, *Post-Medieval Preaching* (ibid. 1865); Vinet, *Histoire de la Predication parmi les Reformes le France au Dix-septieme Siecle* (Paris, 1860); Rogers, *The British Pulpit*, in the *Edinburgh Review*, 1840; Vaughan, *The Modern Pulpit* (Lond. 1842); Turnbull, *Pulpit Orators of France and Switzerland* (N.Y. 1848); Bungener, *The Preacher and the King, or Bourdaloue in the Court of Louis XIV* (Bost. 1855); Spring, *The Power of the Pulpit* (N.Y. 1854); Fish, *History and Repository of Pulpit Eloquence* (N. Y. 1856, 2 vols. 8vo); Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit* (ibid. 1850-60, 9 vols. 8vo); Potter, *Sacred Eloquence* (Dublin, 1868); Hall, *God's Word through Preaching* (N.Y. 1875); Taylor, *The Ministry of the Word* (ibid. 1876); Brooks, *Lectures on Preaching* (ibid. 1877); Dale, *Seven Lectures on Preaching* (ibid. 1878); Broadus, *Lectures on the history of Preaching* (ibid. 1876); Pettengill, *Homiletical Index* (ibid. 1878, 8vo). **SEE HOMILETICS; SEE SERMON.** (D. P. K.)

Pulse

(μυζαζερωϊμ, and μυζαζερωνιμ; Sept. ὄσπρια; Theod. σπέρματα; Vulg. *legumince*) occurs only in the A.V. in ^{<2012>}Daniel 1:12. 16, as the translation of the above plural nouns, the literal meaning of which is “seeds” of any kind. The food on which “the four children” thrived for ten days is perhaps not to be restricted to what we now understand by “pulse,” i.e. the grains of leguminous vegetables: the term probably includes edible seeds in general. Gesenius translates the words “vegetables, herbs, such as are eaten in a half-fast, as opposed to flesh and more delicate food.” Probably the term denotes uncooked grains of any kind, whether barley, wheat, millet, vetches, etc.

Our translators have also inserted in italics the word “pulse” as one of the “parched” sorts of provision which Barzillai brought to king David (^{<1078>}2 Samuel 17:28). In this they are probably right. Leguminous seeds roasted are still used in the East; and in his commentary on ^{<2112>}Matthew 21:12 Jerome mentions roasted chick-pease, along with raisins and apples, as the small-wares in which the huckster fruiterers used to deal: “Frixum cicer, uveque passae, et poma diversi generis.” Allusions in Plautus and Horace show that parched pease were a familiar article of diet among the poorer Romans.

Pulton, Andrew

a Roman Catholic divine of the Society of Jesus, flourished in the second half of the 17th century, and is noted as a zealous defender of his order and Church. He was quite a pulpit orator, but he was more successful still as a polemic. He published, *Remarks upon Dr. Tenison's Narrative*, etc. (Lond. 1687, 4to): — *Reply to a Challenge* (1688): — *Total Defeat of the Protestant Rule of Faith* (4to). See Oliver, *Biog. of English Jesuits*; Macaulay, *Hist. of England*, vol. ii, ch. vi.

Pumbaditha

([atydbmwm](#)), a name celebrated in Jewish literature as the home of one of the great schools of Judaism, was located in Babylonia, and derived its name from its situation at the (*pum*) mouth of the *Baditha*, a canal between the Tigris and Euphrates. Its academy, except only that of Sora (q.v.), was the most enduring and influential of all the Rabbinic institutions in Babylonia. Founded towards the end of the 3d century by R. Jehudah ben-Jecheskel, one of the most distinguished disciples of Abba Areka, also called Rab (q.v.), it flourished until towards the beginning of the 11th century, thus moulding, shaping, and influencing the life and literature of the Jews. Many of the rectors of this academy acquired a great renown for their Rabbinic lore, some of whom have already been mentioned in this Cyclopaedia, or will be treated in the succeeding volumes. The following list, giving the names of the famous teachers at that academy, prepared after a careful and diligent perusal of the best authorities, we hope will aid the student of Jewish literature, since it is not easy to bring the *membra disjecta* into a chronological order out of the *rudis indigestaque moles* of the different sources:

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|---------|
| 1. R. Jehudah ben-Jecheskel | 297-299 |
| 2. Chalsda of Kafri | 299-309 |
| 3. Rabba ben-Nachmlan | 309-330 |
| 4. Joseph ben-Chija, the Blind (q.v) | 330-333 |
| 5. Abji ben-Cajlil | 333-338 |
| 6. Rabba bai-Joseph bar-Chaina | 338-352 |
| 7. Nachman ben-Isaac | 352-356 |
| 8. Chanma of Nahardea | 356-377 |
| 9. Zebid ben-Ushaja | 377-385 |
| 10. Dimi ben-Chinena | 385-388 |

11. Rafem ben-Papa	388-400
12. R. Kahana	400-411
13. Mar Suntra	411-414
14. Acha ben-Rabba	414-419
15. Gebiha of Be-Katil	419-433
16. Rafem II	433-443
17. Rachumai, or Nachumai	443-456
18. Sauna 'en-Rabba	456-471
19. R. Jose	471-520

At this time the final redaction of the Babylonian Talmud (q.v.) was made, and, according to Jewish tradition, to R. Jose, who forms the end of the Amoraim (*Soph Haraah*), the honor is assigned of “completing to write and of sealing the Gemara of Babylon, in the twenty-fourth year of his rectoral and magisterial dignity, in the year from the creation 4260, and 311 years from the sealing of the Mishna.” After the death of R. Jose, the chronological chain is interrupted, and, with the exception of a few names which have come down to us, it is difficult to say who filled the space up to the year 670, for the probability is that, in the vicissitudes and persecutions of those times, the names of those famous teachers have been forgotten. With Mar Ribba, who belonged to the so-called Gaonastic period, the chronological order can again be followed down to the last of the heads of the academy of Pumbadithla. whose death sealed the closing of that famous academy forever. The following are the names:

CIRCA A.D.

1. Mar Rabba	670- 680
2. Mar Bussai, or Bostanai	680- 689
3. Hunai Mani ben-Joseph	689- 700
4. R. Chija of Mesene	700- 710
5. Mar-Rabjah	710- 719
6. Natronaei ben-Neihemia, surnamed Mar Janka	719- 730
7. Mar Jehndah	730- 739
8. Mar Joseph ben-Chutanai	
9. Samuel ben-Mari.	
10. Mar Natroi Kahinia ben-Emuna	739-761
11. Abraham Kahana	
12. R. Dadai ben-Nachman	761- 764
13. Chananja ben-Mesharshaja	764- 771

14. Malka ben-Acha	771- 773
15. Rabba ben-Dudai	773- 782
16. R. Shinui	a few months
17. Chaninai ben-Abraham Kahan	782- 786
18. Huna Mar Halevi ben-Isaac	786- 788
19. Manasseh ben-Joseph	788- 796
20. Isaiah ben-Ala	796- 798
21. Joseph d bel-Shila	798- 804
22. Mar Kahanaa ben-Chaninai	804- 810
23. Abunmari bel-Abraham	810- 814
24. Joseph ben-Abba	814- 816
25. Mar Abraham ben-Sherira	816- 828
<i>R. Joseph ben-Chija anti-Gaon.</i>	
26. R. Joseph ben-Chija <i>sole Gaon.</i>	828- 833
27. R. Joseph ben-Rabbi	833- 842
28. Paltoj ben-Abaji	842- 858
29. Menachem ben-Joseph ben-Chija <i>Mala Mattathias anti-Gaon.</i>	858- 860
30. Mar attathias <i>sole Gaon</i>	860- 869
31. Rabba ben-Ami	869- 872
32. Mar Zemach i. beni-Paltoj	872- 890
33. Hai ben-David	890- 897
34. Kimoj ben-Achai	897- 906
35. Mar Jehudai ben-Samuel	906- 917
36. Mar Kohen Zedek ii. ben-Joseph	917- 936
37. Zemach ben-Kafiai	936- 938
38. Chninlai ben-Jehudal	938- 943
39. Aaron Ibn Sarada	943- 960
40. Nehemia bei-Koheii Zedek	960- 968
41. Sherira ben-Chanania	968- 998
42. Hai ben-Sherira	998-1038

Literature. — Pinner, *Compendium des hierosolymitanischen u. babylonischen Talmud* (Berlin, 1832), p. 117 sq.; *Monatsschrift für Gesch. u. Wissenschaft d. Judenthums*, i, 203 sq., 403 sq.; 7:336 sq., 381 sq.; Griitz, *Gesch. der Juden*, vols. 4:v; Ginsburg, in Kitto's *Cyclopaedia*, arts. "Education" and "Scribes;" Jost, *Gesch. der Judenth. u. s. Secten*, vol. ii (see Index in vol. iii); Cassel, *Leitfaden zur jud. Gesch. u. Literantua* (Berlin, 1872), p. 48, 55; Etheridge, *Ints od. to Hebrew Literature*, p.

161-220 (where names and dates are, however, very often incorrect); *Liber Juchasi sive Lexicon Biographicum et Historicum* (ed. H. Filipowski, Lond. 1857), p. 199 sq.; Worman, in Kiddle and Schem's *Cyclop. of Education*, art. "Hebrews, Education of." (B. P.)

Punchao

was the greatest of the Peruvian gods, the lord of the day, the creator of light.

Pundeka

(**aqdnwp**), a village of the tribe of Dan mentioned in the Talmud (Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 144); now the village *Fundack*, about midway between Nablus and the plain of Sharon towards Jaffa, on the south side of the road (Robinson, *Later Researches*, p. 135). — Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 340.

Pungel, Nicolaus, Dr.

a Roman Catholic divine, was born at Minster in 1802. Having completed his studies, he was ordained priest in 1825, and for several years labored as chaplain in Riesenbeck and Munster. From 1835 to 1846 he superintended the parish of Riesenbeck, in the meantime pursuing his studies. The result was his work on Gerson's tract, *De Parvulis ad Christum Trahendis*, together with a *Vita Ge soenis*, which he published in 1853, and thus became a *privat-docent* at the University of Munster. He soon became professor of pastoral theology, and died April 24, 1876, as senior of the chapter. — *Literarischer Handweiser*, 1876, p. 238.

Punishment

(most properly expressed in Hebrew by some form of **dqP**; *pakad*, strictly "to visit," and in Greek by **κόλασις** or **τιμωρία**, but frequently denoted by other terms). The following account is based upon the Scripture statements, with illustrations from ancient and modern sources. **SEE CORPORAL INFLICTIONS.**

I. Historical Review of Bodily Inflictions among the Hebrews. — The earliest theory of punishment current among mankind is doubtless the one of simple retaliation, "blood for blood", **SEE BLOOD REVENGE**, a view which in a limited form appears even in the Mosaic law. Viewed

historically, the first case of punishment for crime mentioned in Scripture, next to the fall itself, is that of Cain, the first murderer. His punishment, however, was a substitute for the retaliation which might have been looked for from the hand of man, and the mark set on him, whatever it was, served at once to designate, protect, and perhaps correct the criminal. That death was regarded as the fitting punishment for murder appears plain from the remark of Lamech (^{<0024>}Genesis 4:24). In the post-diluvian code, if we may so call it, retribution by the hand of man, even in the case of an offending animal, for blood shed, is clearly laid down (^{<0025>}Genesis 9:5, 6); but its terms give no sanction to that “wild justice” executed even to the present day by individuals and families on their own behalf by so many of the uncivilized races of mankind. The prevalence of a feeling of retribution due for blood shed may be remarked as arising among the brethren of Joseph in reference to their virtual fratricide (^{<0421>}Genesis 42:21). The punishment of death appears among the legal powers of Judah, as the head of his family, and he ordered his daughter-in-law, Tamar, to be burned (^{<0324>}Genesis 38:24). It is denounced by the king of the Philistines, Abimelech, against those of his people who should injure or insult Isaac or his wife (^{<0231>}Genesis 26:11, 29). Similar power seems to have been possessed by the reigning Pharaoh in the time of Joseph (^{<0413>}Genesis 41:13).

Passing onwards to Mosaic times, we find the sentence of capital punishment, in the case of murder, plainly laid down in the law. The murderer was to be put to death, even if he should have taken refuge at God’s altar or in an asylum city, and the same principle was to be carried out even in the case of an animal (^{<0212>}Exodus 21:12, 14, 28, 36; ^{<0247>}Leviticus 24:17, 21; ^{<0451>}Numbers 35:31; ^{<0591>}Deuteronomy 19:11, 12; and see ^{<0128>}1 Kings 2:28, 34). Moses, however, did not allow parents to be put to death for their children, nor children for their parents (^{<0246>}Deuteronomy 24:16), as did the Chaldeans (^{<0724>}Daniel 6:24) and the kings of Israel (comp. ^{<0206>}1 Kings 21; ^{<0326>}2 Kings 9:26).

The extensive prescription of capital punishment by the Mosaic law, which we cannot consider as a dead letter, may be accounted for by the peculiar circumstances of the people. They were a nation of newly emancipated slaves, and were by nature perhaps more than commonly intractable; and if we may judge by the laws enjoined on them, which Mr. Hume well remarks are a safe index to the manners and disposition of any people, we must infer that they had imbibed all the degrading influences of slavery among heathens. Their wanderings and isolation did not admit of penal settlements

or remedial punishments. They were placed under immediate divine government and surveillance. Hence, wilful offences evinced an incorrigibleness which rendered death the only means of ridding the community of such transgressors, and this was ultimately resorted to in regard to all individuals above a certain age, in order that a better class might enter Canaan (^{<0443>}Numbers 14:29, 32, 35). If capital punishment in Christian nations be defended from the Mosaic law, it ought in fairness to be extended to all the cases sanctioned by that law, and, among the rest, as Paley argues, to the doing of any work on the Sabbath day (*Mor. Phil.* b. v, c. 7).

II. Capital Crimes under Mosaism. —

(A.) *Absolute.* — The following offences also are mentioned in the law as liable to the punishment of death:

1. Striking, or even reviling, a parent (^{<0215>}Exodus 21:15, 17).
2. Blasphemy (^{<0344>}Leviticus 24:14, 16, 23; see Philo, *V. M.* 3:25; ^{<1210>}1 Kings 21:10; ^{<1076>}Matthew 26:65, 66).
3. Sabbath-breaking (^{<0453>}Numbers 15:32-36; ^{<0314>}Exodus 31:14; 35:2).
4. Witchcraft, and false pretension to prophecy (^{<0228>}Exodus 22:18; ^{<0327>}Leviticus 20:27; ^{<0505>}Deuteronomy 13:5; 18:20; ^{<0289>}1 Samuel 28:9).
5. Adultery (^{<0300>}Leviticus 20:10; ^{<0522>}Deuteronomy 22:22; see ^{<0485>}John 8:5, and Josephus, *Ant.* iii, 12, 1).
6. Unchastity —
 - a. Previous to marriage, but detected afterwards (^{<0522>}Deuteronomy 22:21).
 - b. In a betrothed woman with some one not affianced to her (*ibid.* ver. 23).
 - c. In a priest's daughter (^{<0300>}Leviticus 21:9).
7. Rape (^{<0525>}Deuteronomy 22:25).
8. Incestuous and unnatural connections (^{<0311>}Leviticus 20:11, 14, 16; ^{<0229>}Exodus 22:19).
9. Man-stealing (^{<0216>}Exodus 21:16; ^{<0547>}Deuteronomy 24:7).

10. Idolatry, actual or virtual, in any shape (^{<0102>}Leviticus 20:2; ^{<0106>}Deuteronomy 13:6, 10, 15; 17:2-7: see Joshua 7 and 22:20, and ^{<0108>}Numbers 25:8).

11. False witness in certain cases (^{<0106>}Deuteronomy 19:16, 19). Some of the foregoing are mentioned as being in earlier times liable to capital or severe punishment by the hand either of God or of man, as (1) ^{<0102>}Genesis 9:25; (5) ^{<0107>}Genesis 12:17; 20:7; 39:19; (6) ^{<0103>}Genesis 38:24; (8) ^{<0108>}Genesis 19:38:10.

(B.) Relative. — But there is a large number of offences — some of them included in this list — which are named in the law as involving the penalty of “cutting off (**trK**; Sept. ἐξολοθρεύω) from the people.” On the meaning of this expression some controversy has arisen. There are all together thirty-six or thirty-seven cases in the Pentateuch in which this formula is used, which may be thus classified:

1. Breach of Morals. — Under this head we have the following:

Wilful sin in general (^{<0150>}Numbers 15:30, 31).

*Fifteen cases of incestuous or unclean connection (^{<0102>}Leviticus 18:29, and 20:9-21).

2. Breach of Covenant, as follows:

*†Uncircumcision (^{<0174>}Genesis 17:14; ^{<0104>}Exodus 4:24).

Neglect of Passover (^{<0103>}Numbers 9:13).

*Sabbath-breaking (^{<0214>}Exodus 31:14).

Neglect of Atonement-day (^{<0202>}Leviticus 23:29).

†Work done on that day (^{<0202>}Leviticus 23:30).

*†Children offered to Molech (^{<0103>}Leviticus 20:3).

*†Witchcraft (^{<0106>}Leviticus 20:6).

Anointing a stranger with holy oil (^{<0103>}Exodus 30:33).

3. Breach of Ritual, as follows:

Eating leavened bread during Passover (^{<0215>}Exodus 12:15, 19).

Eating fat of sacrifices (^{<B725>}Leviticus 7:25).

Eating blood (^{<B727>}Leviticus 7:27; 17:14).

*Eating sacrifice in an unclean condition (^{<B723>}Leviticus 7:20, 21; 22:3, 4, 9).

Offering too late (^{<B718>}Leviticus 19:8).

Making holy ointment for private use (^{<B719>}Exodus 30:32, 33).

Making perfume for private use (^{<B718>}Exodus 30:38).

Neglect of purification in general (^{<B913>}Numbers 19:13, 20).

Not bringing offering after slaying a beast for food (^{<B719>}Leviticus 17:9).

Not slaying the animal at the tabernacle door (^{<B704>}Leviticus 17:4).

Touching holy things illegally (^{<B415>}Numbers 4:15, 18, 20; and see ^{<B717>}2 Samuel 6:7; ^{<B71>}2 Chronicles 26:21).

In the foregoing list, which, it will be seen, is classified according to the view supposed to be taken by the law of the principle of condemnation, the cases marked with * are (a) those which are expressly threatened or actually visited with death, as well as with cutting off. In those (b) marked †, the hand of God is expressly named as the instrument of execution. We thus find that of (a) there are in class I seven cases, all named in ^{<B719>}Leviticus 20:9-16; in class 2, four cases; in class 3, two cases; while of (b) we find in class 2 four cases, of which three belong also to (a), and in class 3 one case. The question to be determined is, whether the phrase “cut off” be likely to mean death in all cases; and to avoid that conclusion Le Clerc, Michaelis, and others have suggested that in some of them — the ceremonial ones — it was intended to be commuted for banishment or privation of civil rights (Michaelis, *Laws of Moses*, vol. iii, § 237, p. 436, trans.). Rabbinical writers explained “cutting off” to mean excommunication, and laid down three degrees of severity as belonging to it (Selden, *De Syn.* i, 6). **SEE ANATHEMA**. But most commentators agree that, in accordance with the *prim facie* meaning of Hebrews 10:28, the sentence of “cutting off” must be understood to be death-punishment of some sort. Saalschitz explains it to be premature death by God’s hand, as if God took into his own hand such cases of ceremonial defilement as would create difficulty for human judges to decide. Knobel thinks death-

punishment absolutely is meant; so Corn. a Lapide and Ewald. Jahn explains that when *God* is said to cut off, an act of divine providence is meant, which in the end destroys the family, but that “cutting off” in general means stoning to death, as the usual capital punishment of the law. Calmet thinks it means privation of all rights belonging to the Covenant. It may be remarked (a) that two instances are recorded in which violation of a ritual command took place without the actual infliction of a death-punishment: (1) that of the people eating with the blood (^{<0462>}1 Samuel 14:32); (2) that of Uzziah (^{<0469>}2 Chronicles 26:19, 21), and that in the latter case the offender was, in fact, excommunicated for life; (b) that there are also instances of the directly contrary course, viz. in which the offenders were punished with death for similar offences: Nadab and Abihu (^{<0400>}Leviticus 10:1, 2); Korah and his company (^{<0460>}Numbers 16:10, 33), who “perished from the congregation;” Uzzah (^{<0407>}2 Samuel 6:7); and, further, that the leprosy inflicted on Uzziah might be regarded as a virtual death (^{<0422>}Numbers 12:12). To whichever side of the question this case may be thought to incline, we may perhaps conclude that the primary meaning of “cutting off” is a sentence of death to be executed, in some cases, without remission, but in others voidable (1) by immediate atonement on the offender’s part; (2) by direct interposition of the Almighty, i.e. a sentence of death always “recorded,” but not always executed. It is also probable that the severity of the sentence produced in practice an immediate recourse to the prescribed means of propitiation in almost every actual case of ceremonial defilement (^{<0457>}Numbers 15:27, 28). See Saalschitz, *Arch. Hebr.* 10:74, 75, vol. ii, 299; Knobel, Calmet, Corn. a Lapide on ^{<0173>}Genesis 17:13, 14; Keil, *Bibl. Arch.* vol. ii, p. 264, § 153; Ewald, *Gesch. App.* to vol. iii, p. 158; Jahn, *Arch. Bibl.* § 257.

III. Penalties. — Punishments, in themselves, are twofold, capital and secondary; and in the cases we are considering they were either native or foreign.

(A.) Of *capital* punishments, properly Hebrew, the following only are prescribed by the law.

1. Stoning, which was the ordinary mode of execution (^{<0270>}Exodus 17:4; Luke 20:§; ^{<0301>}John 10:31; ^{<0445>}Acts 14:5). We find it ordered in the cases which are marked in the lists above as punishable with death; and we may remark further that it is ordered also in the case of an offending animal (^{<0293>}Exodus 19:13; 21:29). The false witness, likewise, in a capital case

would, by the law of retaliation, become liable to death (^{<1519>}Deuteronomy 19:19; *Maccoth*, i, 1, 6). In the case of idolatry, and, it may be presumed, in other cases also, the witnesses, of whom there were to be at least two, were required to cast the first stone (^{<1530>}Deuteronomy 13:9; 17:7; ^{<1817>}John 8:7; ^{<4178>}Acts 7:58). The Rabbinical writers add that the first stone was cast by one of them on the chest of the convict, and if this failed to cause death, the bystanders proceeded to complete the sentence (*Sanhedr.* 6:1, 3, 4; Goodwyn, *Moses and Aaron*, p. 121). The body was then to be suspended till sunset (^{<1213>}Deuteronomy 21:23; ^{<1616>}Joshua 10:26; Josephus, *Ant.* 4:8, 24), and not buried in the family grave (*Sanhedr.* 6:5).

2. *Hanging* is mentioned as a distinct punishment (^{<1254>}Numbers 25:4; ^{<1216>}2 Samuel 21:6, 9), but is generally, in the case of Jews, spoken of as following death by some other means. *Hanging alive* may have been a Canaanitish punishment, since it was practiced by the *Gibeonites* on the sons of Saul (^{<1219>}2 Samuel 21:9).

3. *Burning*, in pre-Mosaic times, was the punishment for unchastity (^{<1334>}Genesis 38:24). Under the law it is ordered in the case of a priest's daughter (^{<1219>}Leviticus 21:9), of which an instance is mentioned (*Sanhedr.* 7:2); likewise in case of incest (^{<1314>}Leviticus 20:14); but it is also mentioned as following death by other means (^{<1325>}Joshua 7:25), and some have thought it was never used excepting after death. Among the heathens this merciful preliminary was not always observed, as, for instance, in the case of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego (^{<2101>}Daniel 3). The Rabbinical account of burning by means of molten lead poured down the throat has no authority in Scripture.

4. *Death by the sword* or *spear* is named in the law (^{<1293>}Exodus 19:13; 32:27; ^{<1237>}Numbers 25:7), although two of the cases may be regarded as exceptional; but it occurs frequently in regal and post-Babylonian times (^{<1015>}Judges 9:5; ^{<1553>}1 Samuel 15:33; 22:18; ^{<1015>}2 Samuel 1:15; 4:12; 20:22; ^{<1125>}1 Kings 2:25, 34; 19:1; ^{<1217>}2 Kings 10:7; ^{<1404>}2 Chronicles 21:4; ^{<2123>}Jeremiah 26:23; ^{<1448>}Matthew 14:8, 10) — a list in which more than one case of assassination, either with or without legal forms, is included.

5. *Strangling* is said by the rabbins to have been regarded as the most common but least severe of the capital punishments, and to have been performed by immersing the convict in clay or mud, and then strangling him by a cloth twisted round the neck (Goodwyn, *M. and A.* p. 122; Otho, *Lex. Rab.* s.v. "Supplicia;" *Sanhedr.* 7:3; Ker Porter, *Trav.* ii, 177; C. B.

Michaelis, *De Judicus*, ap. Pott, *Syll. Comm.* 4: § 10, 12). This Rabbinical opinion, founded, it is said, on oral tradition from Moses, has no Scripture authority.

(B.) Besides these ordinary capital punishments, we read of others, either of foreign introduction or of an irregular kind. Among the former,

1. *Crucifixion* (q.v.) is treated separately, to which article the following remark may be added, that the Jewish tradition of capital punishment, independent of the Roman governor, being interdicted for forty years previous to the Destruction, appears in fact, if not in time, to be justified (~~4183~~ John 18:31, with De Wette, *Comment.*; Goodwyn, p. 121; Keil, 2, 264; Josephus, *Ant.* 20:9, 1).

2. *Drowning*, though not ordered under the law, was practiced at Rome, and is said by St. Jerome to have been in use among the Jews (Cicero, *Pro Sext. Rosc. Am.* 25; Jerome, *Com. on Matthew* lib. iii, p. 138; ~~4086~~ Matthew 18:6; ~~4109~~ Mark 9:42). Josephus records that the Galilaeans, revolting from their commanders, drowned the partisans of Herod (*Ant.* 14:15, 20).

3. *Sawing asunder* or crushing beneath iron instruments. The former is said to have been practiced on Isaiah; the latter may, perhaps, not always have caused death, and thus have been a torture rather than a capital punishment (~~4023~~ 2 Samuel 12:31, and perhaps ~~4115~~ Proverbs 20:26; ~~5813~~ Hebrews 11:37; Just. Mart. *Tryph.* 120). The process of sawing asunder, as practiced in Barbary, is described by Shaw (*Trav.* p. 254).

4. *Pounding in a mortar* is alluded to in ~~4177~~ Proverbs 27:22, but not as a legal punishment. It is mentioned as a Cingalese punishment by Sir E. Tennant (*Ceylon*, ii, 88). Something similar to this, *beating to death* (*τυμπανισμός*), was a Greek punishment for slaves. It was inflicted on a wooden frame, which probably derived its name from resembling a drum or timbrel in form, on which the criminal was bound, and beaten to death (2 Maccabees 6:19,28; comp. ver. 30). In Josephus (*De Macce.*) the same instrument is called *τροχός*, or “wheel” (5, 9). Hence, to beat upon the tympanum, to drum to death, is similar to “breaking on the wheel” (~~5815~~ Hebrews 11:35). David inflicted this among other cruelties upon the inhabitants of Rabbath-ammon (~~4308~~ 1 Chronicles 20:3).

5. *Precipitation*, attempted in the case of our Lord at Nazareth, and carried out in that of captives from the Edomites, and of St. James, who is said to

have been cast from “the pinnacle” of the Temple; also said to have been executed on some Jewish women by the Syrians (^{<4512>}2 Chronicles 25:12; 2 Maccabees 6:10; ^{<1049>}Luke 4:29; Euseb. *H.E.* ii, 23). This punishment resembles that of the Tarpeian rock among the Romans.

6. The Persians had a singular punishment for great criminals. A high tower was filled a great way up with ashes, the criminal was thrown into it, and the ashes, by means of a wheel, were continually stirred up and raised about him till he was suffocated (2 Maccabees 13:4-6).

Criminals executed by law were buried outside the city gates, and heaps of stones were flung upon their graves (^{<10725>}Joshua 7:25, 26; ^{<10817>}2 Samuel 18:17; ^{<2429>}Jeremiah 22:19). Mohammedans, to this day, cast stones, in passing, at the supposed tomb of Absalom (Fabri *Evagatorium*, i, 409; Sandys, *Trav.* p. 189; Raumer, *Palast.* p. 272).

(C.) *Of secondary punishments* among the Jews, the original principles were,

1. *Retaliation*, “eye for eye,” etc. (^{<10214>}Exodus 21:24, 25; see Gell. *Noct. Att.* 20:1). Retaliation, the *lex talionis* of the Latins, and the ἀντιπεπονθός of the Greeks, is doubtless the most natural of all kinds of punishment, and would be the most just of all if it could be instantaneously and universally inflicted; but when delayed, it is apt to degenerate into revenge. Hence the desirableness that it should be regulated and modified by law. The one-eyed man mentioned by Diodorus Siculus (12) complained that if he lost his remaining eye, he would then suffer more than his victim, who would still have one left. Phavorinus argues against this law, which was one of the twelve tables, as not admitting literal execution, because the same member was more valuable to one man than another; for instance, the right hand of a scribe or painter could not be so well spared as that of a singer. Hence that law, in later times, was administered with the modification, “Ni cum eo pacet,” except the aggressor came to an agreement with the mutilated person, *de talione redimenda*, to redeem the punishment by making compensation. Moses, accordingly, adopted the principle, but lodged the application of it in the judge. “If a man blemish his neighbor, as he hath done, so shall it be done to him. Life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, wound for wound, stripe for stripe, breach for breach” (^{<10249>}Leviticus 24:19-22). He, however, makes wilful murder, even of a slave, always capital, as did the Egyptians. Roman masters had an absolute right over the lives of their slaves (Juvenal, 6:219). The Egyptians doomed

the false accuser to the same punishment which he endeavored to bring on his victim, as did Moses (^{<699>}Deuteronomy 19:19).

2. Compensation, identical (restitution) or analogous; payment for loss of time or of power (^{<9218>}Exodus 21:18-36; ^{<9348>}Leviticus 24:18-21; ^{<6921>}Deuteronomy 19:21). The man who stole a sheep or an ox was required to restore four sheep for a sheep, and five oxen for an ox thus stolen (^{<9218>}Exodus 22:1). The thief caught in the fact in a dwelling might even be killed or sold; or if a stolen animal were found alive, he might be compelled to restore double (^{<9218>}Exodus 22:2-4). Damage done by an *animal* was to be fully compensated (ver. 5). *Fire* caused to a neighbor's corn was to be compensated (ver. 6). A *pledge* stolen, and found in the thief's possession, was to be compensated by double (ver. 7). All *trespass* was to pay double (ver. 9). A *pledge* lost or damaged was to be compensated (vers. 12, 13); a *pledge* withheld, to be restored with 20 per cent. of the value (^{<9164>}Leviticus 6:4, 5). The "sevenfold" of ^{<1061>}Proverbs 6:31, by its notion of completeness, probably indicates servitude in default of full restitution (^{<9218>}Exodus 22:2-4). *Slander* against a wife's honor was to be compensated to her parents by a fine of one hundred shekels, and the traducer himself to be punished with stripes (^{<9218>}Deuteronomy 22:18, 19).

3. Stripes, whose number was not to exceed forty (^{<6253>}Deuteronomy 25:3); whence the Jews took care not to exceed thirty-nine (^{<47124>}2 Corinthians 11:24; Josephus, *Ant.* 4:8, 21). This penalty was to be inflicted on the offender lying on the ground in the presence of a judge (^{<9164>}Leviticus 19:20; ^{<9218>}Deuteronomy 22:18). In later times, the convict was stripped to the waist and tied, in a bent position, to a low pillar, and the stripes, with a whip of three thongs, were inflicted on the back between the shoulders. A single stripe in excess subjected the executioner to punishment (*Maccoth*, iii, 1, 2, 3, 13, 14). It is remarkable that the Abyssinians use the same number (Wolff, *Trav.* ii, 276). We have abundant evidence that it was an ancient Egyptian punishment. Nor was it unusual for Egyptian superintendents to stimulate laborers to their work by the persuasive powers of the stick. Women received the stripes on the back, while sitting, from the hand of a man; and boys also, sometimes with their hands tied behind them. The modern inhabitants of the valley of the Nile retain the predilection of their forefathers for this punishment. The Moslems say, "The stick came down from heaven a blessing from God." Moses allowed corporal punishment of this kind by masters to servants or slaves of both sexes (^{<9218>}Exodus 21:20). Scourging was common in after-times among the

Jews, who associated with it no disgrace or inconvenience beyond the physical pain it occasioned, and from which no station was exempt (^{<1175>}Proverbs 17:26; comp. 10:13; ^{<2475>}Jeremiah 37:15-20). Hence it became the symbol for correction in general (^{<1882>}Psalms 89:32). Solomon is a zealous advocate for its use in education (^{<2134>}Proverbs 13:24; 23:13, 14; comp. Eccles. 30:1). In his opinion, “the blueness of a wound cleanseth away evil, and stripes the inward parts of the belly” (^{<2110>}Proverbs 20:30). It was inflicted for ecclesiastical offences in the synagogue (^{<4007>}Matthew 10:17; ^{<4451>}Acts 26:11). Among torturing or tedious penalties,

4. Scourging with thorns is mentioned (^{<0786>}Judges 8:16). Reference to the scourge with scorpions, i.e. a whip or scourge armed with knots or thorns, occurs in ^{<1121>}1 Kings 12:11. So in Latin, *scorpio* means a knotted or thorny switch. The stocks are mentioned (^{<2411>}Jeremiah 20:2); *passing through fire* (^{<1023>}2 Samuel 12:31); *mutilation* (^{<0706>}Judges 1:6; 2 Maccabees 7:4; and see ^{<1042>}2 Samuel 4:12); *plucking out hair* (Isaiah 1, 6; ^{<1635>}Nehemiah 13:25); in later times, *imprisonment*, and *confiscation* or *exile* (^{<1576>}Ezra 7:26; ^{<2475>}Jeremiah 37:15; 38:6; ^{<4408>}Acts 4:3; 4:18; 12:4). Imprisonment, not as a punishment, but custody till the royal pleasure was known, appears among the Egyptians (^{<0341>}Genesis 39:20, 21). Moses adopted it for like purposes (^{<1052>}Leviticus 26:12). It appears as a punishment inflicted by the kings of Judah and Israel (^{<1227>}1 Kings 22:27; ^{<4460>}2 Chronicles 16:10; ^{<2472>}Jeremiah 37:21); and during the Christian era, as in the instance of John (^{<4042>}Matthew 4:12) and Peter (^{<4424>}Acts 12:4). Murderers and debtors were also committed to prison, and the latter “tormented” till they paid (^{<4083>}Matthew 18:30; ^{<2239>}Luke 23:19). A common prison is mentioned (^{<4158>}Acts 5:18); and also an inner prison, or dungeon, which was sometimes a pit (^{<2386>}Jeremiah 38:6), in which were “stocks” (^{<2411>}Jeremiah 20:2; 29:26; ^{<4164>}Acts 16:24). Prisoners are alluded to (^{<8088>}Job 3:18), and stocks (13:27). Banishment was inflicted by the Romans on John (^{<6109>}Revelation 1:9). As in earlier times imprisonment formed no part of the Jewish system, the sentences were executed at once (see ^{<1708>}Esther 7:8-10; Selden, *De Syn.* ii, c. 13, p. 888). Before death, a grain of frankincense in a cup of wine was given to the criminal to intoxicate him (*ibid.* 889). The command for witnesses to cast the first stone shows that the duty of execution did not belong to any special officer (^{<6707>}Deuteronomy 17:7).

(D.) Of punishments, especially non-capital, inflicted by other nations we have the following notices: In Egypt, the power of life and death and imprisonment rested with the king, and to some extent also with officers of

high rank (^{<040B>}Genesis 40:3, 22; 42:20). Death might be commuted for slavery (^{<042B>}Genesis 42:19; 44:9, 33). The law of retaliation was also in use in Egypt (Wilkinson, *Ancient Egyptians*, 2:214, 215, 217). In Egypt, and also in Babylon, the chief of the executioners, *Rab-Tabbachim*, was a great officer of state (^{<057B>}Genesis 37:36; 39; 40; ^{<249B>}Jeremiah 39:13; 41:10; 43:6; 52:15, 16; ^{<272B>}Daniel 2:14; ^{<406B>}Mark 6:27; Michaelis, *Mos. Recht*, iii, 412; Josephus, *Ant.* 10:8, 5). He was sometimes a eunuch (Josephus, *Ant.* 7:5, 4). *SEE CHERETHITE.*

Putting out the eyes of captives, and other cruelties, as flaying alive, burning, tearing out the tongue, etc., were practiced by Assyrian and Babylonian conquerors; and parallel instances of despotic cruelty are found in abundance in both ancient and modern times in Persian and other history. The execution of Hamnan and the story of Daniel are pictures of summary Oriental procedure (^{<128B>}2 Kings 25:7; ^{<170B>}Esther 7:9, 10; ^{<242B>}Jeremiah 29:22; ^{<270B>}Daniel 3:6; 6:7, 24; comp. Herod. 7:39; 9:112, 113; see Chardin, *Voy.* 6:21, 118; Layard, *Nineveh*, ii, 369, 374, 377; *Nin. and Bab.* p. 456, 457). The duty of counting the numbers of the victims, which is there represented, agrees with the story of Jehu (^{<120B>}2 Kings 10:7), and with one recorded of Shah Abbas Mirza, by Ker Porter (*Travels*, ii, 524, 525; see also Burckhardt, *Syria*, p. 57; and Malcolm, *Sketches of Persia*, p. 47).

With the Romans, stripes and the stocks, *πεντεσύριγγον ξύλον*, *nervus and columbar*, were in use, and imprisonment with a chain attached to a soldier. There were also the *liberoe custodioe* in private houses (^{<446B>}Acts 16:23; 22:24; 28:16; comp. Xenoph. *Hell.* iii, 3, 11; Herod. 9:37; Plautus, *Rud.* iii, 6, 30, 34, 38, 50; Aristot. *Eq.* [ed. Bekker] 1044; Josephus, *Ant.* 18:6, 7; 19:6, 1; Sallust, *Cat.* 47).

Exposure to wild beasts appears to be mentioned by St. Paul (^{<615B>}1 Corinthians 15:32; ^{<5047>}2 Timothy 4:17), but not with any precision. *The lion's den* was a Babylonian punishment (Daniel 6), and is still customary in Fez and Morocco (see accounts of, by Hoest. c. ii, p. 77).

Punishment, Future

The obvious fact that the sufferings of the wicked in this life are not in proportion to their sins has led even the heathen of all ages to the belief in a state of retribution after death. The Scriptures abundantly confirm this position, so that few in the present day deny its truth in some form. The

only questions that arise are those relating to its *character* and its *duration*. The former of these points has been discussed under HELL PUNISHMENTS *SEE HELL PUNISHMENTS* ; the latter we will briefly consider here.

1. No one approaching the New Testament without preconceived opinions could get any other impression from its language on this subject than that the punishments of the wicked in hell are to be everlasting. (For special passages, see ^{<1123>}Matthew 12:32; 25:26:24; ^{<1123>}Mark 3:29; 9:43; ^{<1141>}Revelation 14:11; 20:10.) Moreover, apart from special passages, the general tone of the New Testament indicates the final and irrevocable ruin of those who persist to the last in sin and in the rejection of Christ the Saviour.
2. In the ancient Church, the Alexandrian theologians were the first to teach that there could be an end to the punishments of hell. According to them discipline and reformation were the only ends of punishment, so that it could not be eternal: the final end is ἀποκατάστασις, the entire freedom from evil. Hence Clement says, “If in this life there are so many ways for purification and repentance, how much more should there be after death! The purification of souls, when separated from the body, will be easier. We can set no limits to the agency of the Redeemer; to redeem, to rescue, to discipline, is his work; and so will he continue to operate after this life” (*Stromata*, 6:638). Clement did not deem it proper to express himself more fully respecting this doctrine, because he considered that it formed a part of the Gnosis. Hence he says, “As to the rest, I am silent, and praise the Lord” (*ibid.* 7:706). Origen infers from the variety of ways and methods by which men are led to the faith in this life that there will be a diversity in the divine modes of discipline after death; notwithstanding this, however, he considers it extremely important that every one should in this life become a believer. Whoever neglects the Gospel, or after baptism commits grievous sins, will suffer so much heavier punishments after death (*In Joann.* 6:267). The doctrine of a general restoration he found explicitly in ^{<1123>}1 Corinthians 15:28. Yet he reckons this among the Gnostic (or esoteric) doctrines; for he says, “It would not be useful for all to have this knowledge; but it is well if at least fear of a material hell keep them back from sin” (*Inz Jerem. Hom.* xix). (See Neander, *Hist. of Dogmas*, i, 254.) “But, in opposition to these, the doctrine of the eternity of future punishments was affirmed by other equally distinguished teachers, e.g. Basil, John of Constantinople, among the Greeks, and, among the Latins,

by Jerome, Augustine, and others.” Gregory of Nyssa, however, defended the restorationism (ἀποκατάστασις) of Origen. Augustine, on the other hand, opposed it strenuously; the whole spirit of his system, and his full and strong conception of the justice of God, were fundamentally opposed to restorationism. “The doctrine of Origen was condemned by the Council of Alexandria, A.D. 399, and afterwards by many other councils, and the doctrine of the eternity of future punishments was established as the faith of the Church” (Knapp, *Theology*, § 158). The doctrine of purgatory soon grew up to take the place of the theory of restorationism. “The doctrine of the limited duration of future punishment fell into very ill repute in the Western Church, on account of its being professed by some of the enthusiastic and revolutionary parties in the 16th century (e.g. by the Anabaptists), and from its being intimately connected with their expectations and schemes. The mere profession of the doctrine came to be regarded as implying assent to the other extravagances of these parties, and as the signal for rebellion. Hence it is rejected in the symbolical books of the Lutheran Church as an Anabaptistical doctrine (*Augs. Confess.* art. xvii). In the form in which this doctrine was held by these sects it deserves the most unmingled disapprobation. Again, among the ill-famed Christian free-thinkers — e.g. the Socinians — there were some who professed it. In modern times it has been the same. This doctrine has been advocated in the Protestant Church both by men who have stood in suspicion of enthusiasm (e.g. Peterson, Lavater, and others) and by some of the free-thinkers in philosophy and theology, although for very different causes and on very different grounds by these two classes” (Knapp,? *sup.*). See Burnet, *De Statu Mortuorum*; Cotta, *Historia Succincta Dogmatis de Poenarum Infernalium Duratione* (Tiibingen, 1774, 8vo); Dietelmair, *Antiq. Comment. Fanatici de ἀποκατάσεως πάντων* (Altorf, 1769, 8vo); Tillotson, *Sermons*, vol. ii; Lewis, *The Nature of Hell* (Lond. 1720, 8vo); Strong, *Doctrine of Eternal Misery* (Hartford, 1796, 8vo); Stuart, *Exegetical Essays on Future Punishment* (Andover, 1830, 12mo); Baumgarten, *Vindicioe Poenarum Eternarum* (Halle, 1742); *Meth. Quar. Rev.* April, 1861; *New-Englander*, 1861, p. 63; *Contemporary Rev.* April, 1872; *Presbyterian Rev.* Oct. 1872. **SEE PURGATORY, SEE RETRIBUTION, SEE UNIVERSALISM**, under which latter title the subject will be more fully treated.

Pu'nites

(Heb. *Puni'*, *יְנִיטִי*, a Gentile term, from *Puvvuah*, *חֻבְּוּא*; Sept. *ὁ Φουᾶ δῆμος* v. r. *ὁ Φουαῖ*), a collective term for the descendants of Phuvah or Pua (^{<0423>}Numbers 26:23). *SEE PHUVAH*.

Punjabi Or Sikh Version

A version of the New Test. for the people inhabiting an extensive country of North-west Hindostan called Punjab was commenced in 1807 at Serampore, but the fonts of type were destroyed by fire. The loss, however, was soon replaced, and in 1813 the Gospels and Acts were announced as finished. In 1815 the entire New Test., in an edition of 1000 copies, was completed, and in 1832 a second edition was undertaken. The translation of the Old Test. was also undertaken, and in 1820 the Pentateuch and historical books were issued, and now the whole Bible, published by the Serampore Mission, is read in Punjabi, as the seventy-third report of the British and Foreign Bible Society (1877) shows. (B. P.)

Pu'non

(Heb. *Punon'*, *פִּנּוֹן*, *darkness* [Gesenius], *ore-pit* [Fiirst]; Sept. *Φινῶν* v. r. *Φινῶ*), a camp station of the Israelites on their journey to Canaan (^{<0392>}Numbers 33:42), on the east side of the mountains of Edom, and perhaps belonging to that district, since a duke Pinon is mentioned (^{<0394>}Genesis 36:41; ^{<1015>}1 Chronicles 1:52) among the chieftains of the Edomites. It lay next beyond Zalmonah, between it and Oboth, and three days' journey from the mountains of Abarim, which formed the boundary of Moab. By Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomasticon*, *Φινῶν*, "Fenon") it is identified with *Pinon*, the seat of the Edomitish tribe of that name, and, further, with *Phoen*, which contained the copper-mines so noted at that period, and was situated between Petra and Zoar; It is often mentioned by other Christian authors (see Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 1095). It is not to be identified with the modern Tufileh (Burckhardt, 2, 677; see Raumer, *Zug der Israel*, p. 46); but on the *Kalaat Phenan* of Seetzen (Zach's *Monatl. Corresp.* 17:137) we must await more particular intelligence. *SEE EXODE*.

Punti Version

The Punti, or Canton Colloquial, as it is sometimes called, is a dialect spoken by a large population which is to be found in and around Canton, in China. Into this dialect only portions of the Bible were translated, viz. Mark's Gospel, by the Rev. G. Piercy, and published in 1872, with the title *Ma ko fuh yin chuen*. Luke's Gospel was translated in the Roman character by members of the Rhenish Mission, and published in 1867, with the title *Das Evangelium des Lucas in Volkedialekte der Punti Chinesen*. John's Gospel was translated by the Rev. C. F. Preston, and published at Canton on wooden blocks, under the title *Yo han chuen fuh yin shoo*. In 1872 St. Paul's Epistles — Galatians to Philemon — were published, under the title *Paou le ta hwuy seaou shoo*, as translated by Mr. Piercy; while the Acts of the Apostles were also published in the same year, with the title *She t'oo hing chuen*, in the translation of Mr. Preston. These are all the parts of the New Test. published in that dialect, of which St. Mark and St. Luke have been reprinted by the American Bible Society, changing the term for "God." Of the Old Test., the book of Genesis was translated by the Rev. G. Piercy, and published in 1873, under the title *Kiew yo chwhang she k'e*, to which the book of Psalms must be added, which has been translated by the Rev. A. B. Hutchinson, of the Church Missionary Society, and was published in 1876. Comp. the annual reports of the British and Foreign Bible Society for 1872, 1873, 1874, and 1877. (B. P.)

Pupilla Octili

(*pupil of the eye*) is a clerical manual written by John de Burgh. It was very popular during the 15th and 16th centuries.

Puppet-plays

(Lat. *pupa*, a girl; Fr. *poupee*, a doll) are exhibitions in which the parts of the different characters are taken by miniature figures worked by wires, while the dialogue is given by persons behind the scenes. These plays are of very ancient date, and, originally intended to gratify children, they ended in being a diversion for adults. In China and India puppets are still made to act dramas, either as movable figures or as shadows behind a curtain. In Italy and France puppet-plays were at one time carried to a considerable degree of artistic perfection; and even Lessing and Goethe, in Germany, thought the subject worth their serious attention. In England, they are mentioned under the name of *motions* by many of our early authors; and

frequent allusions to them occur in the plays of Shakspeare, Ben Jonson, and the older dramatists. The earliest exhibitions of this kind consisted of representations of stories taken from the Old and New Testaments, or from the lives and legends of saints. They thus seem to have been the last remnant of the *moralities* of the 15th century. *SEE MYSTERIES*. We learn from Ben Jonson and his contemporaries that the most popular of these exhibitions at that time were the *Prodigal Son* and *Nineveh with Jonas and the Whale*. Even the Puritans, with all their hatred of the regular stage, did not object to be present at such representations. The most noted exhibitions of the kind were those of Robert Powel, in the beginning of the 18th century (see Chambers, *Book of Days*, ii, 167). So recently as the time of Goldsmith, scriptural "motions" were common; and in *She Stoops to Conquer* reference is made to the display of Solomon's Temple in one of these shows. The regular performances of the stage were also sometimes imitated; and Dr. Samuel Johnson has observed that puppets were so capable of representing even the plays of Shakspeare that *Macbeth* might be represented by them as well as by living actors. These exhibitions, however, much degenerated, and latterly consisted of a wretched display of wooden figures, barbarously formed, and decorated without the least degree of taste or propriety, while the dialogues were jumbles of absurdities and nonsense.

Purana

(literally, "old," from the Sanscrit *pura*, before, past) is the name of that class of religious works which, besides the *Tantras* (q.v.), is the main foundation of the actual popular creed of the Brahminical Hindlis (q.v.). According to the popular belief, these works were compiled by Vyasa (q.v.), the supposed arranger of the *Vedas* (q.v.), and the author of the *Mahabharata* (q.v.), and possess an antiquity far beyond the reach of historical computation. A critical investigation, however, of the contents of the *existing* works leads to the conclusion that, in their present form, they do not only not belong to a remote age, but can barely claim an antiquity of a thousand years. The word *Purana* occurs in some passages of the *Mahabharata*, the law-books of Yajnavalkya and Manu (q.v.); it is even met with in some *Upanishads* and the great Brahmana portion of the *White-Yajur-Veda*; but it is easy to show that in all these ancient works it cannot refer to the existing Purana, and therefore that no inference relative to the age of the ancient can be drawn from the modern. There are, however, several circumstances tending to show that there were a number

of works called Purana which preceded the existing, and were the source whence these probably derived a portion of their contents. The oldest known author of a Sanscrit vocabulary, Amara-Sinha, gives as a synonym of Purana the word *Pancha-lakshana*, which means “that which has five (*panchan*) characteristic marks” (*bakshanas.*); and the scholiasts of that vocabulary agree in stating that these *lakshanas* are:

1. Primary creation, or cosmogony;
2. Secondary creation, or the destruction and renovation of worlds;
3. Genealogy of gods and patriarchs;
4. *Manwantaras*, or reigns of Manus; and,
5. The history of the princes of the solar and lunar races.

Such, then, were the characteristic topics of a Purana at the time, if not of Amara-Sinha himself — which is probable — at least, of his oldest commentators. Yet the distinguished scholar most conversant with the existing Puranas, who, in his preface to the translation of the *Vishnu-Purana*, gives a more or less detailed account of their chief contents (Prof. H. H. Wilson), observes, in regard to the quoted definition of the commentators on Amara-Sinha, that in no one instance do the actual Puranas conform to it exactly; that “to some of them it is utterly inapplicable; to others, it only partially applies.” To the *Vishnu-Purana*, he adds, it belongs more than to any other Purana; but even in the case of this Purana he shows that it cannot be supposed to be included in the term explained by the commentators. The age of Amara-Sinha is, according to Wilson, the last half of the century preceding the Christian era; others conjecture that it dates some centuries later. On the supposition, then, that Amara-Sinha himself implied by *Pancha-lakshana* the sense given to this term by his commentators, there would have been Puranas about 1900 years ago; but none of these has descended to our time in the shape it then possessed. Various passages in the actual Puranas furnish proof of the existence of such elder Puranas. The strongest evidence in this respect is that afforded by a general description given by the *Matsya-Purana* of the extent of each of the Puranas (which are uniformly stated to be eighteen in number), including itself; for, leaving aside the exceptional case in which it may be doubtful whether we possess the complete work now going by the name of a special Purana, Prof. Wilson, in quoting the description from the *Matsya-Purana*, and in comparing with it the real extent of the great majority of Puranas, the completeness of which, in their actual state, does not admit of a reasonable doubt, has conclusively shown that the *Matsya-*

Purana speaks of works which are not those we now possess. We are, then, bound to infer that there have been Puranas older than those preserved, and that their number has been eighteen; whereas, on the contrary, it will be hereafter seen that it is very doubtful whether we are entitled to assign this number to the actual Purana literature.

The modern age of this latter literature, in the form in which it is known to us, is borne out by the change which the religious and philosophical ideas taught in the epic poems and the philosophical Sutras have undergone in it; by the legendary detail into which older legends and myths have expanded; by the numerous religious rites — not countenanced by the Vedic or epic works — which are taught; and, in some Puranas at least, by the historical or quasi-scientific instruction which is imparted in it. To divest that which, in these Puranas, is ancient, in idea or fact, from that which is of parasitical growth, is a task which Sanscrit philology has yet to fulfil; but even a superficial comparison of the contents of the present Puranas with the ancient lore of Hindu religion, philosophy, and science must convince every one that the picture of religion and life unfolded by them is a caricature of that afforded by the Vedic works, and that it was drawn by priestcraft, interested in submitting to its sway the popular mind, and unscrupulous in the use of the means which had to serve its ends. The plea on which the composition of the Puranas was justified, even by great Hindu authorities — probably because they did not feel equal to the task of destroying a system already deeply rooted in the national mind, or because they apprehended that the nation at large would remain without any religion at all, if, without possessing the Vedic creed, it likewise became deprived of that based on the Puranas — this plea is best illustrated by a quotation from Sayana, the celebrated commentator on the three principal *Vedas*. He says (*Rigv.* ed. Muller, vol. i, p. 33): “Women and Sudras, though they, too, are in want of knowledge, have no right to the Veda, for they are deprived of [the advantage of] reading it, in consequence of their not being invested with the sacred cord; but the knowledge of law [or duty] and that of the supreme spirit arises to them by means of the Puranas and other books [of this kind].” Yet, to enlighten the Hindu nation as to whether or not these books — which sometimes are even called a fifth Veda — teach that religion which is contained in the Vedas and Upanishads, there would be no better method than to initiate such a system of popular education as would reopen to the native mind those ancient works, now virtually closed to it.

Though the reason given by Sayana, as clearly results from a comparison of the Puranas with the oldest works of Sanscrit literature, is but a poor justification of the origin of the former; and though it is likewise indubitable that, even at his time (the middle of the 15th century A.D.), they were, as they still are, not merely an authoritative source of religion for “women and Sudras,” but for the great majority of the males of other castes also, it nevertheless explains the great variety of matter of which the present Puranas are composed — so great and so multifarious, indeed, that, in the case of some of them, it imparts to them a kind of cyclopedical character. They became, as it seems, the source of all popular knowledge; a substitute to the masses of the nation not only for theological literature, but for scientific works, the study of which was gradually restricted to the leisure of the learned few. Thus, while the principal subjects taught by nearly all the Puranas are cosmogony, religion (including law), and the legendary matter which, to a Hindi, assumes the value of history, in some of them we meet with a description of places which gives to them something of the character of geography; and one, the *Agni-Purana*, also pretends to teach archery, medicine, rhetoric, prosody, and grammar; though it is needless to add that its teaching has no real worth.

One purpose, however, and that a paramount one, is not included in the argument by which Sayana endeavored to account for the composition of the Puranas; it is the purpose of establishing a sectarian creed. At the third phase of the Hindu religion, two gods of the Hindu pantheon especially engrossed the religious faith of the masses — Vishnu (q.v.) and Siva (q.v.), each being looked upon by his worshippers as the supreme deity, to whom the other, as well as the remaining gods, was subordinate. Moreover, when the power or energy of these gods had been raised to the rank of a separate deity, it was the female Sakti, or energy, of Siva who, as Durga, or the consort of this god, was held in peculiar awe by a numerous host of believers. Now, apart from the general reasons mentioned before, a principal object, and probably *the* principal one, of the Puranas was to establish, as the case might be, the supremacy of Vishnu or Siva, and, it may be likewise assumed, of the female energy of Siva, though the worship of the latter belongs more exclusively to the class of works known as Tantras. There are, accordingly, Vaishnava-Puranas, or those composed for the glory of Vishnu; Saiva-Puranas, or those which extol the worship of Siva; and one or two Puranas, perhaps, but merely as far as a portion of

them is concerned, will be more consistently assigned to the Sakta worship, or that of Durga, than to that of Vishnu or Siva.

“The invariable form of the Puranas,” says Prof. Wilson, in his preface to the *Vishnu-Purana*, “is that of a dialogue, in which some person relates its contents in reply to the inquiries of another. This dialogue is interwoven with others, which are repeated as having been held on other occasions, between different individuals, in consequence of similar questions having been asked. The immediate narrator is commonly, though not constantly. Lomaharshana, or Romaharshana, the disciple of Vyasa, who is supposed to communicate what was imparted to him by his preceptor as he had heard it from some other sage... Lomaharshana is called Suta, as if it were a proper name; but it is, more correctly, a title, and Lomaharshana was ‘a Sata,’ that is, a hard or panegyrist, who was created, according to the *Vishnu-Purana*, to celebrate the exploits of princes, and who, according to the *Vayu* and *Padma Puranas*, has a right, by birth and profession, to narrate the Puranas, in preference even to the Brahmins.” The number of the actual Puranas is stated to be eighteen, and their names, in the order given, are the following:

1. *Brahma*-;
2. *Padma*-;
3. *Vishnu*-;
4. *Siva*-;
5. *Bhagavata*-;
6. *Naoradiya*-;
7. *Markandeya*-;
8. *Agni*-;
9. *Bhavishya*-;
10. *Brahma-vaivaroita* -;
11. *Linga*-;
12. *Varaha*-;
13. *Skanda*-;
14. *Varaha*-;
15. *Kurma*-;
16. *Matsya*-;
17. *Garuda*-; and
18. *Brahmanda-Purana*.

In other lists, the *Agni-Puradna* is omitted, and the *Vayu-Purana* inserted instead of it; or the *Garuda* and *Brahmanda* are omitted, and replaced by the *Vayu* and *Nrisinha Puranas*. Of these Puranas, 2, 3, 5, 6, 10, 12, 17 and probably 1, are Puranas of the Vaishnava sect; 4, 8, 11, 13, 15, 16. of the Saiva sect; 7 is, in one portion of it, called *Devimahatmya*, the text-book of the worshippers of Durga; otherwise,, it has little of a sectarian spirit, and would, therefore, neither belong to the Vaishnava nor to the Saiva class; 14, as Prof. Wilson observes, “divides its homage between Siva and Vishnu with tolerable impartiality; it is not connected, therefore, with any sectarian principles, and may have preceded their introduction.” The *Bhavishya-Purana* (9), as described by the *Matsya-Purana*, would be a book of prophecies; but the *Bhavishya-Purana* known to Prof. Wilson consists of five books, four of which are dedicated to the gods Brahma, Vishnu, Siva, and Twashtri; and the same scholar doubts whether this work could have any claim to the name of a Purana, as its first portion is merely a transcript of the words of the first chapter of Manu, and the rest is entirely a manual of religious rites and ceremonies. There are similar grounds for doubt regarding other works of the list.

If the entire number of works, nominally, at least, corresponding with those of the native list, were taken as a whole, their contents might be so defined as to embrace the five topics specified by the commentators on the glossary of Amara-Sinha; philosophical speculations on the nature of matter and soul, individual as well as supreme; small codes of law; descriptions of places of pilgrimage; a vast ritual relating to the modern worship of the gods; numerous legends; and, exceptionally, as in the *Agni-Purana*, scientific tracts. If taken individually, however, the difference between most of them, both in style and contents, is so considerable that a general definition would become inaccurate. A short description of each Purana has been given by the late Prof. H. H. Wilson in his preface to his translation of the *Vishnu-Purana*; and to it, as well as to his detailed account of some Puranas in separate essays (collected in his works) we must therefore refer the reader who would wish to obtain a fuller knowledge of these works.

The age of the Puranas, though doubtless modern, is uncertain. The *Bhagavata.*, on account of its being ascribed to the authorship of the grammarian Vopadeva, would appear to yield a safer computation of its age than the rest; for Vopadeva lived in the 12th century, or, as some hold, 13th century after Christ; but this authorship, though probable, is not

proved to a certainty. As to the other Puranas, their age is supposed by Prof. Wilson to fall within the 12th and 17th centuries of the Christian sera, with the exception, though, of the *Markandeya-Purana*, which, in consideration of its unsectarian character, he would place in the 9th or 10th century. But it must be borne in mind that all these dates are purely conjectural, and given as such by the scholar whose impressions they convey.

Besides these eighteen Puranas or great Puranas, there are minor or *Upapuranas*, “differing little in extent or subject from some of those to which the title of Purana is ascribed.” Their number is given by one Purana as four; another, however, names the following eighteen:

1. *Sanatkumara*-;
2. *Narasinha*-;
3. *Naradiya*-;
4. *Siva*-;
5. *Durvasasa*-;
6. *Kapila*-;
7. *Manava*-;
8. *Ausanasa*-;
9. *Varuna*-;
10. *Kalika*-;
11. *Samba*-;
12. *Nandi*-;
13. *Saura*-;
14. *Parasara*-;
15. *Aditya*-;
16. *Maheswara*-;
17. *Bhagavata*- (probably, however, a misreading for *Bhargava*); and
18. *Vasishtha-Upapurana*.

Another list, differing from the latter, not in the number, but in the names of the *Upapuranas*, is likewise given in Prof. Wilson’s preface to the *Vishnu-Purana*. Many of these *Upapuranas* are, apparently, no longer procurable, while other works so called, but not included in either list, are sometimes met with; for instance, a *Mudgala*- and *Ganesa-Upapurana*. The character of the *Upapuranas* is, like that of the *Puranas*, sectarian; the *Siva-Upapurana*, for instance, inculcates the worship of Siva, the *Kalika-Upapurana* that of Durga or Devi.

Both Puranas and Upapuranas are for a considerable portion of their contents largely indebted to the two great epic works, the *Mahabharata* (q.v.) and *Ramayana* (q.v.), more especially to the former of them. Of the Puranas, the original text of three has already appeared in print: that of the *Bhagavata* in several native editions, published at Bombay, with the commentary of Sridharaswamin, and partly in a Paris edition by Eugene Burnouf, which remained incomplete through the premature death of that distinguished scholar; that of the *Markandeya-Purana*, edited at Calcutta in the *Bibliotheca Indica*, by the Rev. K. M. Banerjea; and that of the *Linga-Purana*, edited at Bombay; for, regarding a fourth, the *Garuda-Purana*, edited at Benares and Bombay, it seems doubtful whether that little work is the same as the Purana spoken of in the native list. Besides these, small portions from the *Padma*, *Skanda*, *Bhavishyottara*, *Markandeya*, and other Puranas have been published in India and Europe. Of translations, we have only to name the excellent French translation by Burnouf of the first nine books of the *Bhagavata*, and the elegant translation of the whole *Vishnu-Purana*, together with valuable notes, by the late Prof. H. H. Wilson, which is now in course of republication in his *Works*, in a new edition, amplified with numerous notes, by Prof. F. E. Hall. For general information on the character and contents of the Puranas, see especially Wilson's preface to his translation of the *Vishnu-Purana* (*Works*, vol. 6:Lond. 1864); Burnouf's preface to his edition of the *Bhagavata* (Paris, 1840); Wilson, *Analysis of the Puranas* (*Works*, vol. iii, Lond. 1864, edited by Prof. R. Rost); Banerjea, *Introduction to the Markandeya* (Calcutta, 1862); and Muir, *Original Sanscrit Texts on the Origin and History of the People of India* (Lond. 1858/1863), vols. i-iv; Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters* (see Index in vol. ii); Muller, *Chips*, ii, 3, 75, 316; Clarke, *Ten Great Religions* (see Index).

Purasa

was, according to the Indian mythology, the first man—the father of the human race; his wife, the first woman, Prakriti, gave birth to the ancestors of the Indian castes;

Purcell, Henry

an English composer of great note, celebrated especially as the author of church music, was born at Westminster in 1658. He was the son of a musician attached to the chapel of Charles II. At the age of six, having lost

his father, he was admitted into the choir of boys at the royal chapel. His masters were Cooke, Pellham, Humphrey, and Dr. Blow. He was remarkable for precocity of talent, but, what was better, he seconded the liberality of nature by his zeal and diligence. His progress was so rapid that, while still a member of the choir, he produced several anthems of his own composition, which were eagerly sought for almost as soon as written; and at eighteen he received the fullest recognition of his ability, by being chosen organist of Westminster Abbey (1676) to succeed Dr. Christopher Gibbons. In 1682, Purcell was given the place of organist of the royal chapel, and this position he held until his death, in 1695. Purcell is the first English composer who introduced the use of various instruments in the church to support the voice, which, until then, the organ had alone accompanied. The original character of his music, the variety of its forms, the majesty of style which governs all his works — principally his *Te Deum* and his *Jubilate* — extended the renown of Purcell throughout Great Britain. Although English writers are extravagant in their eulogies in comparing Purcell to Scarlatti and to Keiser, yet he is doubtless the greatest composer England has produced. He has treated of all kinds of music, and upon all has impressed the seal of his greatness. One is astonished at the great fruitfulness of his genius, when it is considered how young he died. It is said of Purcell that “his anthems far exceed in number those of any other composer, and would alone have furnished sufficient employment for a moderately active mind and a life of average duration.” It is to be regretted, however, that his ambition was boundless. He attempted dramatic music, for which the vividness of his imagination and the fertility of his invention remarkably fitted him; but he had been reared in the midst of religious influences, and if confined to ecclesiastical music would have stood out as its curator and propagator in the modern Church. His efforts in several directions weakened any one line he undertook to cover, and he failed to attain that perfection which alone entitles to enduring greatness. His own countrymen so greatly revered his memory that they buried him in the mausoleum of their greatest. He rests in the north transept of Westminster Abbey. His epitaph was composed by Dryden. A part of the music written for the theatre has been published in the collection of *Airs composed for the Theatre and on other Occasions*, by Henry Purcell (Lond. 1697). All his sacred works, which have retained their place to the present day, and include fifty anthems, besides the *Te Deum* and *Jubilate*, with orchestral accompaniments, a complete service, and a number of hymns and psalms, have been collected by M. Vincent Novello, who has

published them in seventy-two numbers, under the title of *Purcell's Sacred Music* (Lond. 1826-36). This publication is preceded by a notice of the life and works of the composer and his portrait. See Ambros, *Gesch. der Musik* (Leips. 1878, 8vo), vol. 4.

Purchas, John

an Anglican divine, noted especially in the department of *belles-lettres*, was born at Cambridge in 1823, received his preparatory training at Rugby, and then studied at Christ's College, Cambridge, in 1840, graduating in 1844. Entering the Church of England, Mr. Purchas became curate of Ellsworth, Cambridge, in 1851, remaining there two years. In 1856 he was appointed curate of Orwell, in the same county, and remained until 1859. In 1861 he went to St. Paul's, in West Street, Brighton, and soon became notorious for his ritualistic proclivities. He was appointed perpetual curate in St. James's Chapel, Brighton, becoming incumbent in 1866. His mode of conducting public worship culminated in his trial in the Court of Arches, the case being subsequently carried by appeal before the judicial committee of the Privy Council. The final result of these trials was that Mr. Purchas was admonished to discontinue the use of certain vestments, lighted candles, incense, wafer bread, and the ceremonies he had practiced in the regular services. He failed to obey, however, and was in consequence suspended *ab officio* on Feb. 7, 1872, a sequestration being levied upon his lay property to defray the costs of the proceedings. He contemplated thereafter entering the Roman Catholic Church, but was probably prevented by his sudden illness and decease in October, 1872. Among the works published by him were the *Directorium Anglicanum*, which forms the text-book of Anglican ritualism. His other works are: *The Miser's Daughter*, a comedy and poems (1839): — *Poems and Ballads* (1846): — *Book of Feasts*, a series of sermons (1853): — *The Death of Ezekiel's Wife*: — *and Three Sermons*, preached at St. Paul's, West Street, Brighton (1866).

Purchas, Samuel

a learned English divine, and compiler of a valuable collection of travels, was born at Thaxstead, in Essex, in 1577, and educated at Cambridge. In 1604 he was instituted vicar of Eastwood, in Essex, but, leaving the cure of it to his brother, removed to London, the better to carry on the great work he had undertaken. He published the first volume in 1613, and the four last

in 1625, under this title: *Purchas: his Pilgrimage, or Relations of the World, and the Religions observed in All Ages and Places discovered from the Creation unto this present*. In 1615 he was incorporated at Oxford, as he stood at Cambridge, bachelor of divinity, and a little before had been collated to the rectory of St. Martin's, Ludgate, in London. He was also chaplain to Abbott, archbishop of Canterbury. By the publishing of his books he brought himself into debt: however, he did not die in prison, as some have asserted, but in his own house, and about 1628. His *Pilgrimages*, and the learned Hackluyt's *Voyages*, led the way to all other collections of that kind, and have been justly valued and esteemed. Boissard says of Purchas that he was "a man exquisitely skilled in languages and all arts divine and human; a very great philosopher, historian, and divine; a faithful presbyter of the Church of England; very famous for many excellent writings, and especially for his vast volumes of the *East and West Indies*, written in his native tongue" (*in Biblioth. Joannis Boissardi*). See Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*; Hallam, *Lit. Hist. of Europe*, iii, 227; Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Auth.* S. V.

Purdman

in Indian mythology, is an embodiment of Kamadewa, in which he was born as son of Krishna and Rukmani. The gigantic demon Samber caused him to be cast into the sea; he was swallowed by a fish, but the fish being caught, the child was saved and brought back to his parents.

Purgation

a clearing of an accused person from impeachment by oath of himself and others: this, in 696, was done at the altar. The number of witnesses, or consacramentals, varied; the common man had four. In Wales three hundred were required; and in 1194 the bishop of Ely purged himself with one hundred priests' hands. The practice was general among the Teutonic nations; in England it was called the *atha*. If the offence was alleged to have been committed in Lent or on a festival, a triple purgation was enjoined in 1018. *SEE ORDEAL*.

Purgatory

(*Lat. purgatorium*, from *purgo*, I cleanse) is the name given in ecclesiastical language to the place of *durance* which the Church of Rome and the Eastern Church teach holds the departed souls until fitted for the divine

presence. According to the teachings of these churches, the Protestant is wrong in declaring that Christ brings a full and perfect pardon for all the sins of man. Before man can be received into heaven, his soul must be purged by fire from all carnal impurities. Christ only affords a way whereby eternal punishment may be escaped, and though contrition (q.v.) secures forgiveness of sins, the ordinary experiences of penitence, attrition, must be supplemented by penance. In other words, it is necessary, according to Romish theology, to complete salvation and purification, that the soul should suffer a part of the penalty of its sins; and if these are not voluntarily borne in penances in this life, they will be inflicted in purgatory in the life to come, except when special suffering, inflicted by Divine Providence, serves the same purifying purpose. The doctrine of purgatory does not, therefore, involve the idea of the future redemption of the impenitent. "The souls who go to purgatory are only such as die in the state of grace, united to Jesus Christ. It is their imperfect works for which they are condemned to that place of suffering, and which must all be there consumed, and their stains purged away from them before they can go to heaven." The Council of Trent decides thus: "If any one say that after the grace of justification received the fault is so pardoned to every penitent sinner, and the guilt of temporal punishment is so blotted out that there remains no guilt of temporal punishment to be done away in this world, or that which is to come in purgatory, before the passage can be opened into heaven, let him be accursed." Elsewhere it is said, "There is a purgatory, and the souls detained there are helped by the suffrages of the faithful, but principally by the sacrifices of the acceptable altar" — a statement obviously vague and indefinite. It leaves the most important inquiry undetermined — viz. whether the souls in purgatory are in a state of happiness or misery: they are "detained," but nothing more as *defide* is stated. By referring, however, to the Catechism of the Council of Trent, drawn up by order of the fathers there assembled, we get a clearer and more explicit definition: "There is a purgatorial fire, where the souls of the righteous are purified by a temporary punishment [*ad definitum tempus cruciatce expiantur*], that entrance may be given them into their eternal home, where nothing that is defiled can have a place. And of the truth of this doctrine, which holy councils declare to be confirmed by the testimony of Scripture and of apostolic tradition, the pastor will have to declare more diligently and frequently, because we are fallen on times in which men will not endure sound doctrine" (*Conc. Trident. sess. 6 can. 30; sess. 25:§ 1; Catech. Trident. c. 6 qu. 3*). Thus a definite meaning is given to the vague teaching

of the council: there is a purgatorial *fire*, and the souls of the faithful are *punished* for a defined period till their sins are expiated. The almost universal belief prevailing among Roman Catholics though they do not consider torment *by fire* as being *de fide*, but only the most probable opinion — is that purgatory is a place of suffering or punishment for imperfect Christians. Thus Dr. Vilmer, though he says that “in the Council of Trent all is contained that is necessary to be believed on this subject,” yet afterwards defines purgatory “as a place of temporary *punishment*,” which is not asserted by, and goes beyond, the decree of the council (*End of Controversy*, p. 173, 174). Bellarmine says, “Purgatory is a certain place in which, as in a prison, the souls are purged after this life which were not fully purged in this life — to wit, so that they may be able to enter into heaven, where no unclean thing can enter;” and elsewhere, “that the fathers *unanimously* [*sic*] teach that the pains of purgatory are most severe or terrible” (*De Purgatorio*, ii, 14).

The arguments advanced for purgatory are these:

1. Every sin, how slight soever, though no more than an idle word, as it is an offence to God, deserves punishment from him, and will be punished by him hereafter, if not cancelled by repentance here.
2. Such small sins do not deserve eternal punishment.
3. Few depart this life so pure as to be totally exempt from spots of this nature, and from every kind of debt due to God’s justice.
4. Therefore, few will escape without suffering something from his justice for such debts as they have carried with them out of this world, according to the rule of divine justice, by which he treats every soul hereafter according to his works, and according to the state in which he finds it in death. From these positions, which the advocates of the doctrine of purgatory consider as so many self-evident truths, they infer that there must be some third place of punishment; for since the infinite holiness of God can admit nothing into heaven that is not clean and pure from all sin, both great and small, and his infinite justice can permit none to receive the reward of bliss who as yet are not out of debt, but have something in justice to suffer, there must, of necessity, be some place or state where souls departing this life, pardoned as to the eternal guilt of sin, yet obnoxious to some temporal penalty, or with the guilt of some mortal sins (*peccata amortalia*), or some venial faults (*peccata venalia*), are purged

and purified before their admittance into heaven. Those in purgatory are relieved by the prayers of their fellow-members here on earth, also by alms and masses offered up to God for their souls. Such as have no relations or friends to pray for them, or give alms to procure masses for their relief, are remembered by the Church, which makes a general commemoration of all the faithful departed in every mass and in every one of the canonical hours of the divine office. Besides the above arguments, the following Bible passages are alleged by them in support of these views: 2 Maccabees 12:43-46 (on which they rely on the supposition of its being inspired); ~~<1125>~~ Matthew 5:25 (the "prison" therein referred to being interpreted by them to mean purgatory); 12:32; ~~<4111>~~ 1 Corinthians 3:11-15; 15:29; ~~<6127>~~ Revelation 21:27; as well as on certain less decisive indications contained in the language of some of the Psalms, as ~~<1370>~~ 37 (in the A.V. 38), 1; 45:12 12; ~~<2004>~~ Isaiah 4:4; 22:14; ~~<4113>~~ Malachi 3:3. Respecting all these passages as containing the doctrine of a purgatory, arguments are drawn not alone from the words themselves, but from the interpretation of them by the fathers.

The direct testimonies cited by Roman Catholic writers from the fathers to the belief of their respective ages as to the existence of a purgatory are very numerous. We may instance among the Greeks, Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata*, 7:12; Origen, *Honr.* 16:c. 5, 6, in *Jeremiam*; 6: *Hom. in Exod.*; 14: *Hom. in Levit.*; 28: *Hom. in Numbers*; Eusebius, *De Vita Constantini*, 4:71; Athanasius, *Quaest.* 34: *ad Antioch.*; Cyril of Jerusalem, *Cat. Mystcag.* v, 9; Basil, *Hom. in Psalm.* 5:7; Gregory of Nazianzum, 41, *Orclt. de Lacude Athanasii*; Gregory of Nyssa, *Orat. de Bapt.*; as also Epiphanius, Ephraem, Theodoret, and others. Among the Latins, Tertullian, Cyprian, Arnobius, Lactantius, Hilary, Ambrose, and, above all, Augustine (from whom many passages are cited), Paulinus of Nola, and Gregory the Great, in whom the doctrine is found in all the fullness of its modern detail. The epitaphs of the catacombs, too, occasionally supply Romish controversialists with some testimonies to the belief of a purgatory, and of the value of the intercessory prayers of the living in obtaining not merely repose, but relief from suffering for the deceased; and the liturgies of the various rites are still more decisive and circumstantial. Beyond these two points, Romish faith, as defiled by the Council of Trent, does not go. The council expressly prohibits the popular discussion of the "more difficult and subtle questions, and everything that tends to curiosity or superstition, or savors of filthy lucre."

Of the further questions as to the nature of purgatory, there is one of great historical importance, inasmuch as it constitutes one of the grounds of difference between the Greek and Latin churches. As to the existence of purgatory, both these churches are agreed, and they are further agreed that it is a place of suffering; but, while the Latins commonly hold that this suffering is “by fire,” the Greeks do not determine the manner of the suffering, but are content to regard it as “through tribulation.” The decree of union in the Council of Florence (1439) left this point free for discussion. Equally free are the questions as to the situation of purgatory; as to the duration of the purgatorial suffering; as to the probable number of its inmates; as to whether they have, while there detained, *a certainty* of their ultimate salvation; and whether a “particular judgment” takes place on each individual case immediately after death. Throughout the Eastern liturgies there is no express mention of the purgatorial suffering of souls in the intermediate state. In the apostolical constitutions and in the liturgy of St. Chrysostom, the Church prays for those who rest in faith (ὕπὲρ τῶν ἐν πίστει ἀναπαυσσάμενων δεηθῶμεν, lib. 8 c. 13). In other liturgies, as of St. James, St. Mark, and St. Basil, there is prayer for the rest and forgiveness of the departed (τὰς ψυχὰς ἀνάπαυσον: St. Mark). Even in the Roman canon there is only a prayer for those resting in Christ, and a common inscription in the catacombs over the departed is *In pace*. Such statements are not, indeed, necessarily inconsistent with the departed Christian being in a state of suffering; for even then he would rest from the sorrows and trials of life, and have the assured hope of eternal life. Still, where there is no direct allusion (as in the Mozarabic and Gallican missals) to the suffering of the departed, we cannot fairly and reasonably suppose that a state of suffering is implied when the faithful departed are said to be at rest. Such an expression must be taken in its ordinary meaning as denoting a more or less perfect happiness. (The theory of the early Church, which may be called the “Judgmentday Purgatory,” we treat of below.) See Bellarmine, *De Purgatorio*; Suaresius, *De Purgatorio*; and on the Greek portion of the subject. Leo Allatius, *De Utrusque Ecclesies in Dogmat de Purgatorio Perpetua Consensione*.

The mediaeval doctrine and practice regarding purgatory were among the leading grounds of the protest of the Waldenses and other sects of that age. The Reformers as a body rejected the doctrine.

In the modern Romish Church the doctrine of purgatory has led to others more directly injurious and corrupting. By the terror which it inspires it

gives the priesthood power to impose penances; it leads to indulgences (q.v.) and prayers for the dead, for it is held that the sufferings in purgatory may be greatly mitigated and shortened by the prayers, the services, the masses, the charities, and other works of supererogation of their friends upon the earth. The extent to which this doctrine has been employed in increasing the income of the Church receives a significant illustration in one singular fact. There exists a purgatorial insurance company which, for a certain premium paid annually, insures the payor a given number of masses for his soul in the event of his death, and the certificates of this insurance company may be seen hung up on the walls in hundreds of rooms in the tenement-houses of our great cities, especially of New York.

Protestantism, in rejecting the doctrine of purgatory, takes the ground that it is inadmissible to depend upon any authority outside of the Bible and not in harmony therewith. It not only, however, refuses to admit the authority of tradition or the testimonies of the fathers, but, at the same time, alleges that most, if not all, of the passages quoted from the fathers as in favor of purgatory are in themselves insufficient to prove that they held any such doctrine as that now taught by the Roman Catholic Church, some of them properly relating only to the subject of prayer for the dead (q.v.), and others to the doctrine of Limbo (q.v.). That the doctrine of purgatory is the fair development of that which maintains that prayer ought to be made for the dead, Protestants generally acknowledge, but refuse to admit that the fathers carried out their views to any such consequence. For Origen says, "We, after the labors and strivings of this present life, hope to be in the highest heavens," not in purgatory. So Chrysostom, "Those that truly follow virtue, after they are changed from this life, are truly freed from their fightings, and loosed from their bonds. For death, to such as live honestly, is a change from worse things to better, from this transitory to an eternal and immortal life that hath no end." Macarius, speaking of the faithful, says, "When they go out of their bodies, the choirs of angels receive their souls into their proper places, to the pure world, and so lead them to the Lord." Hence Athanasius says, "To the righteous it is not death, but only a change, for they are changed from this world to an eternal rest. And as a man comes out of prison, so do the saints go from this troublesome life to the good things prepared for them." Certainly, these fathers were no purgatorians, since they unanimously affirmed that the souls of the saints go directly from earth to heaven, never touching upon purgatory. To these we may add Gennadius, who assures us that, "after the

ascension of the Lord to heaven, the souls of all the saints are with Christ, and, going out of the body, go to Christ, expecting the resurrection of their body." Prosper tells us: "According to the language of the Scriptures, the whole life of man upon earth is a temptation or trial. Temptation is to be avoided until the fight is ended; and the fight is to be ended when, after this life, secure victory succeeds the fight; so that when all the soldiers of Christ, being helped by God, have to the end of this present life unwearily resisted their enemies, their wearisome travail being ended, they may reign happily in their country." Evidently they do not, according to Prosper, go from one fight here to another in purgatory, but immediately from the Church militant on earth to the Church triumphant in heaven. But whatever the views of some Church fathers on the subject, as a doctrine it was unknown in the Christian Church for the first 600 years, and it does not appear to have been made an article of faith until the 10th century, when "the clergy," says Mosheim, "finding these superstitious terrors admirably adapted to increase their authority and promote their interest, used every method to augment them; and by the most pathetic discourses, accompanied with monstrous fables and fictitious miracles, they labored to establish the doctrine of purgatory, and also to make it appear that they had a mighty influence in that formidable region" (*Eccl. Hist.* cent. 10 pt. ii, ch. iii, § 1). "Purgatory as a burning-away of sins," said Dollinger at the Bonn Conference of Old Catholics in 1875, "was an idea unknown in the East as well as the West till Gregory the Great introduced it. What was thought was that after death those who were not ready for heaven were kept for some time in a state of preparation, and that the prayers of the living were an advantage for them. *SEE INVOCATION OF SAINTS.* Gregory the Great added the idea of a tormenting fire. This the schoolmen gradually converted into doctrine which they associated with papal indulgence, till it came to apply to the dead generally, which, of course, made all seek indulgence. It went on to have degrees: some could receive indulgence for a few of their sins, others for all, and so on; so that eventually the pope, having already the keeping of heaven and the dominion on earth, obtained also sovereignty under the earth." Certain it is, and beyond reasonable dispute, that the doctrine of purgatory, in all its representations and forms, is a variation from scriptural authority: divine revelation affords it no countenance. The doctrine of an *intermediate state* (q.v.), from which the merits of Jesus Christ cannot deliver man, is not only "grounded on no warranty of Scripture," but is so far positively "repugnant to the Word of God" as it is contrary to the absolute and unreserved offers

of mercy, peace, and happiness contained in the Gospel, and as it derogates from the fullness and perfection of the one expiatory sacrifice made by the death of Christ for the sins of mankind. For the Scriptures say, “The dead know not anything, neither have they any more a reward, for the memory of them is forgotten. Also their love and their hatred and their envy are now perished; neither have they any more a portion, forever, in anything that is done under the sun” (^{<2015>}Ecclesiastes 9:5, 6); whereas this Romish doctrine of an intermediate state for purgation teaches, quite to the contrary, that when they are dead they have a part or portion in the prayers of the faithful and the sacrifices of the altar. Again, the Scripture makes mention but of a twofold receptacle of souls after death — the one of happiness, the other of misery (^{<0259>}1 Samuel 25:29; ^{<0173>}Matthew 7:13, 14; 8:11; ^{<0162>}Luke 16:22, 23); whereas this doctrine brings in a third, called purgatory, between heaven and hell, half happiness and half misery. Again, Scripture says, “The blood of Jesus Christ, his Son, cleanseth [or purgeth] us from all sin” (^{<0107>}1 John 1:7); but this doctrine would persuade us there are some sins which are to be purged away by the prayers and good works of others. To name no more, the Gospel represents Lazarus as at once conveyed to a state of comfort and joy (^{<0162>}Luke 16:22, 23); Christ promised to the penitent thief upon the cross, “*This day* shalt thou be with me in paradise” (^{<0238>}Luke 23:43); Paul exults in the prospect of a “crown of righteousness after death” (^{<0148>}2 Timothy 4:8); and he represents “to depart and to be with Christ” (^{<0123>}Philippians 1:23), and “to be absent from the body and present with the Lord” (^{<0158>}2 Corinthians 5:8), as states which were immediately to follow each other. On the contrary, this Romish doctrine about purgatory bids him not to be so hasty, for he might depart and yet not be with Christ; he might pass from death, and yet not to life; he might and must be absent from the body a good while before he can be present with the Lord; he might go from earth, yet not to heaven, but to purgatory, a place St. Paul never dreamed of.

The Bible passages quoted by Romanists as in direct support of the doctrine of purgatory, Protestants simply set aside as a ridiculous attempt at malpractice in exegesis. First it is answered that the books of Maccabees have no evidence of inspiration, and that the second of these books, whence the support is purported to come, is far from being one of the best books of the Apocrypha (q.v.); besides, that the passage referred to would rather prove that there is no such place as purgatory, since Judas did not expect the souls departed to reap any benefit from the sin-offering till the

resurrection. The texts quoted from the Scriptures have no reference to the doctrine, as may be seen by consulting the context, and any just commentator upon it; they relate to nothing more than prayer for the dead. The text ^{<1123>}Matthew 12:32 is explained as relating to the final judgment; and ^{<4181>}1 Corinthians 3:11, 15, as relating to a trial of *works*, and not of persons; while ^{<4152>}1 Corinthians 15:29 is regarded as having nothing more to do with the subject than any verse taken at random from any part of the Bible. (An excellent examination of all these passages was made in the *Episcopalian*, Feb. 16, 1867.) What is called the “historical” or critical view of the genesis of this doctrine is well given by Neander (*Dogmengeschichte*, vol. 1). This learned Church historian conceives that its source is to be sought for in the ancient Persian doctrine of a purifying conflagration which was to precede the victory of Ormuzd, and consume everything that was impure. From the Persians it passed with modifications to the Jews, and from them found its way into the ethical speculations of the more cultivated Christians. It harmonized admirably with the widespread philosophical notion borrowed by the Gnostic Christians from Neo-Platonism, that matter is inherently evil. If, then, the *body* was to rise, it must be purged of evil, and the instrument of purification fire — was at hand for the purpose. Moreover, the high and pure conception of the character of God revealed in the New Testament, necessitating a corresponding moral excellence on the part of his worshippers — “without holiness shall no man see the Lord” — must have greatly assisted in the establishment of the doctrine; for how could men, only lately gross heathens, possessing yet but the rudiments of the new faith, and with most of their heathen habits still clinging about them, be pronounced “holy” or “fit for the presence of God?” Their “faith” in Christ was sufficient to save them, but the work of sanctification was incomplete when they died, and must go on. Probably it was a strong Christian feeling of this sort that determined the reception of the doctrine of purgatory into the creed of the Roman Church, rather than any Gnostic philosophizings, though the Neo-Platonic divines of Alexandria are the first to mention it.

It remains for us to speak of the theory in the Christian Church regarding the preparation for final admission into the divine presence. Blunt is pleased to call it the “Judgment-day Purgatory.” In its support are pleaded the words of the apostle Paul literally understood, that the “fire shall try every man’s work,” and that even he who has built wood, hay, straw, stubble, on the true foundation “shall be saved, yet so as by fire” (^{<4181>}1

Corinthians 3:11-15). In proof of this doctrine is also quoted the frequent use of the word *fire* in connection with Christ's coming or the Day of Judgment (see ~~100B~~ Psalm 1:3; ~~200B~~ Isaiah 4:4; ~~300B~~ Daniel 7:9; Zechariah 12:9; ~~400B~~ Malachi 3:2, 3; 4:1). Many of the Church fathers are cited in support of the belief that Christians must pass through the fire on the Day of Judgment, though all will not be injured by it — the highest saints passing through unhurt, and others suffering a punishment proportioned to their sins, till “the wood, hay, straw, and stubble” built on the true foundation be consumed. Among the fathers of the Western Church, St. Hilary thus speaks of the severity of the Judgment-day purgation by fire, through which all, even the Virgin Mary, must pass (*Luc.* 2, 35; *Tract. in Psalm. 118*, lib. iii, § 12); and St. Ambrose says: “We must all pass through the fire, whether it be John the Evangelist, whom the Lord so loved that he said to Peter, ‘If I will that he remain, what is that to thee; follow thou me.’ Of his death some have doubted, of his passing through the fire we cannot doubt; for he is in paradise, and not separated from Christ” (Jerome, *in Psalm. 118i*, serm. 20:§ 12, *et rid.* § 15). St. Jerome likewise compares the ten revolted tribes of Israel to heretics, and the other two “to the Church, and to sinners [members] of the Church, who confess the true faith, but on account of the defilement of vice [*vitiorum sordes*] have need of the purging fires” (Jerome, *Comment. in Amos*, lib. iii, c. 7). Again he says, “As we believe that the torments of the devil, and of all infidel [*neqatorum*] and wicked men who have said in their hearts ‘There is no God,’ are eternal, so of sinners, although Christians [the common reading is “sic peccatorum atque impiorum et tamen Christianorum.” “In vetulstiori Ambrosiano MS. ‘sic peccatorum et tamen Christianorum,’ verius opinor ad Hieronymi mentem” (Note, Migne ed.)], whose works are to be tried and purged by fire [*in igne*], we believe that the sentence of the Judge will be lenient [*moderatam*] and tempered with mercy.” “Let me not be among those,” says St. Augustine, “to whom thou wilt hereafter say, Go into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels. Neither chasten me in thy hot displeasure, so that thou mayest cleanse me in this life, and make me such that I may after that stand in no need of the cleansing fire for those who are to be saved so as by fire. Why? Why, but because they build upon the foundation wood, stubble, and hay. Now, they should build on it gold, silver, and precious stones, and should have nothing to fear from either fire; not only that which is to consume the ungodly forever, but also that which is to purge those who are to escape through [*per*] the fire. For it is said, he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire. And because it is said he

shall be saved. that fire is thought lightly of. For all that, though we shall be saved by fire, yet will that fire be more grievous than anything that man can suffer in this life whatsoever” (Augustine *on the Psalms* [Oxf. transl.], 2, 71). Again, “But if he shall have built on the foundation wood, hay, stubble, that is, have built worldly attachments on the foundation of his faith; yet if Christ be in the foundation, so that he have the first place in the heart, and nothing absolutely is preferred to him, even such are borne, even such are tolerated. The furnace shall come; it shall burn the wood, the hay, the stubble: but himself, he saith, shall be saved, yet so as by fire.’ This shall the furnace do; some it shall sever to the left, others it shall in a manner melt out to the right” (*ibid.* v, 105). To illustrate the doctrine of the Eastern Church, a passage may first be quoted from Clement of Alexandria: “We say that fire sanctifies not flesh, but sinful souls, speaking of that fire which is not all-devouring, such as is used by artisans (παμφάγον καὶ βάναδσον), but of that which is discriminative (φρόνιμον), pervading the soul which passes through the fire” (Clem. Alex. *Stromata*, lib. v, c. 6). Origen often speaks of the Judgment-day fire: thus he says that though Peter and Paul must pass through the fire, they shall hear the words, “When thou passest through the fire, the flame shall not harm thee” (Orig. *Homii. 3, in Psalm 36; vid. Homil. 6 in Exodus*). St. Basil, in his *Commentary on Isaiah* (4:4), says that baptism may be understood in three senses — in the one, of regeneration by the Holy Spirit; in another, of the punishment of sin in the present life; and in a third, “of the trial of judgment by fire.” They who have committed deadly sins after they have received the knowledge of the truth, need the judgment which is by fire (τῆς ἐν τῷ καύματι κρίσεως) (Basil. *Opera*, t. i, *ad loc.* Gaume). In his work on the Holy Spirit, illustrating the passage “He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire,” he calls the trial of judgment a “baptism of fire;” as the apostle says, “the fire shall try every man’s work of what sort it is” (*ibid.* iii, p. 40). Gregory of Nazianzum, speaking of the Novatians, says: “Perchance in the future world they shall be baptized with fire, the last baptism more severe and long continued, which devours as grass the stubble, and consumes every vestige of wickedness” (δαπανῶ πάσης κακίας κουφότητα) (Greg. Naz. *Opera*, t. ii, c. 358, Migne). Also in one of his poems he speaks of standing in fear of the fiery river of judgment (μέσος φόβων ἕστηκε πυρωποτάμου) (*ibid.* t. iii, c. 1423). Gregory of Nyssa says, speaking of infants who die unbaptized: “How shall we judge of those who thus died? Shall that soul behold its Judge, and shall it be placed with others before his tribunal?”

Shall its past life be judged, and will it receive a deserved recompense, purified by fire according to the teaching (φωνὰς) of the Gospel, or refreshed by the dew of benediction?" (Greg. Nyss. t. 3, c. 161). So he teaches, in another oration, that "we must either be purified in this present life by prayer and the love of wisdom (φιλοσοφίας), or after our departure hence in the furnace of the purging fire" (*ibid.* t. iii, c. 498). See Willet, *Synopsis Papismi*; Bull, *On the Trinity*; Haag, *list. des Dogmes*; Elliott, *Delineation of Romanism*, ch. xii; Cramp, *Text-book of Popery*; Knapp, *Theology*, p. 52; Neander, *Hist. of Dogmas*, p. 618 sq.; Doddridge, *Lectures*, lect. 270; Barnett, *On the XXXIX Articles*, art. 22; Edgar, *Variations of Popery*, ch. xiv; Faber. *Difficulties of Romanism*, p. 157-192, 448-471, 2d ed.; and especially Hale, *Doctrine of Purgatory and the Practice of Prayer for the Dead Examined* (Lond. 1843); Alger, *Hist. of the Doctrine of a Future Life*; Hagenbach, *Hist. o' Doctrines*, ii, 126 sq., 130 sq., 326 sq.; *Tracts for the Times*, No. 79 and No. 90; Wetstein, *De Vanitate Purgatorii*; Allen, *Defence of Purgatory*; Marshall, *Doctrine of Purgatory, Patriarchal, Papistical, and Rational*; Valverde, *Iqnis Purgatorius Assertus*; Bellarmine, *De Controversiis Fidei*; Usher, *Answer to a Jesuit's Challenge*; Hall, *Doctrine of Purgatory*; Kitto, *Journ. of Sacred Literature*, i, 289 sq.; vol. xx *Wesleyan Mag.* 1843, p. 832 sq. **SEE HADES; SEE INTERMEDIATE STATE.**

Purgatory, Rabbinic.

The doctrine of purgatory (q.v.) is not only a peculiarity of the Romish Church, but also of orthodox Judaism. The latter maintains "that the souls of the righteous enjoy the beatific vision of God in paradise, and that the souls of the wicked are tormented in hell with fire and other punishments. It teaches that the sufferings of the most atrocious criminals are of eternal duration, while others remain only for a limited time in purgatory, which does not differ from hell with respect to the place, but to the duration. They pray for the souls of the dead, and imagine that many are delivered from purgatory on the great day of expiation. They suppose that no Jew, unless guilty of heresy, or certain crimes specified by the rabbins, shall continue in purgatory above a year, and that there are but few who suffer eternal punishment." Maimonides (q.v.), Abrabanel (q.v.), and other celebrated Jewish writers maintain the annihilation of the wicked. Others suppose that the sufferings of hell have the power of purifying souls and expiating sin. This statement will be made the more clear when we examine some of the writings bearing on this subject. Among the prayers of the

Feast of Tabernacles we find the following declaration and prayer: "It is customary among the dispersions of Israel to make mention of the souls of their departed parents, etc., on the day of atonement, and the ultimate days of the three festivals, and to offer prayers for the repose of their souls. 'May God remember the soul of my honored father, A. B., who is gone to his repose; for that I now solemnly vow charity for his sake; in reward of this, may his soul be bound up in the bundle of life, with the souls of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; Sarah, Rebekah, Rachel, and Leah; with the rest of the righteous males and females that are in paradise, and let us say Amen.' 'May God remember the soul of my honored mother,'" etc. In the Jewish ritualistic work called *Joreh Deah*, by Joseph Karo (q.v.), p. 376, we read: "Therefore the custom is for twelve months to repeat the prayer called Kaddish, and also to read the lesson in the prophets, and to pray the evening prayer at the going-out of the Sabbath, for that is the hour when the souls return to hell; but when the son prays and sanctifies the public, he redeems his father and his mother from hell." The doctrine of the Talmud is that those who die in communion with the synagogue, or who have never been Jews, are punished for twelve months, but that Jewish heretics and apostates are doomed to eternal punishment. "Israelites who sin with their body, and also Gentiles, descend into hell, and are judged there for twelve months. After the twelve months their body is consumed and their soul is burned, and the wind scatters them under the soles of the feet of the righteous, as it is said: 'Ye shall tread down the wicked. for they shall be ashes under the soles of your feet' (^{300B}Malachi 4:3). But heretics, and informers, and Epicureans, who have denied the law or the resurrection of the dead, or who have separated from the customs of the congregation, or who have caused their fear in the land of the living, who have sinned, or caused many to sin, as Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, all such go down to hell, and are judged forever" (*Rosh Hashanah*, p. 17, a). According to this, the dying Israelite ought to expect twelve months of torment, and his surviving son ought to repeat the prescribed prayer for twelve months; but the rabbins have commanded that the prayer should be repeated only for eleven months, to intimate that the deceased was not so wicked as to be obliged to remain all the time of torment: "The custom is not to say Kaddish more than eleven months, so as not to cast a reproach on the character of the deceased father and mother as if they were wicked, for twelve months are the term appointed for the wicked" (*Joreh Deah*, i, 1). As to the prayer used, it is found in all Hebrew prayerbooks, and runs thus: "May his great name be exalted and sanctified throughout the world, which

he has created according to his will. May he establish his kingdom in our lifetime, and in the lifetime of the whole house of Israel, soon, and in a short time, and say ye, Amen, Amen. May his great name be blessed and glorified for ever and ever. May his hallowed name be praised, glorified, exalted, magnified, honored, and most excellently adored; blessed is he, far exceeding all blessings, hymns, praises, and beatitudes that are repeated throughout the world, and say ye Amen. May our prayer be accepted with mercy and kindness. May the prayers and supplications of the whole house of Israel be accepted in the presence of their Father, who is in heaven, and say ye Amen. Blessed be the name of the Lord from henceforth and for evermore. May the fulness of peace from heaven, with life, be granted unto us, and all Israel: and say ye Amen. My help is from the Lord, who made heaven and earth. May he who maketh peace in his high heavens bestow peace on us, and on all Israel; and say ye Amen.” See Adams, *Hist. of the Jews*. ii, 249 sq.; M’Caul, *Old Paths*, p. 295 sq.; Basnage, *Hist. des Juifs* (Taylor’s transl.), p. 390; Bodenschatz, *Kirchliche Verfassung der heiligen Juden*, iii, 78 sq. (B. P.)

Purification

(prop. ἁρῆς; *tohorah*, καθαρισμός), a ceremony enjoined in the Mosaic law for the purpose of cleansing from pollution or defilement (^{<440>}Numbers 19:9). Purifications were, for the most part, performed with water, sometimes with blood and with oil (^{<312>}Hebrews 9:21, 22; ^{<215>}Exodus 30:26-29; ^{<180>}Leviticus 8:10, 11). Sometimes fire was used for the purpose of purging or purifying (^{<215>}Isaiah 1:25; 10:26; ^{<313>}Zechariah 13:9; ^{<318>}Malachi 3:3).

In its legal and technical sense, the term is specially applied to the ritual observances whereby an Israelite was formally absolved from the taint of uncleanness, whether evidenced by any overt act or state, or connected with man’s natural depravity. The cases that demanded it in the former instance are defined in the Levitical law, **SEE UNCLEANNESS**: with regard to the latter, it is only possible to lay down the general rule that it was a fitting prelude to any nearer approach to the Deity; as, for instance, in the admission of a proselyte to the congregation, **SEE PROSELYTE**, in the baptism (καθαρισμός ^{<485>}John 3:25) of the Jews as a sign of repentance **SEE BAPTISM**, in the consecration of priests and Levites, **SEE LEVITE**; **SEE PRIEST**, or in the performance of special religious acts (^{<164>}Leviticus 16:4; ^{<419>}2 Chronicles 30:19). In the present article we are

concerned solely with the former class, inasmuch as in this alone were the ritual observances of a special character. The essence of purification, indeed, in all cases, consisted in the use of water, whether by way of ablution or aspersion; but in the *majora delicta* of legal uncleanness, sacrifices of various kinds were added, and the ceremonies throughout bore an expiatory character. Simple ablution of the person was required after sexual intercourse (^(-R1518)Leviticus 15:18; ⁽⁻¹⁰¹⁰⁴⁾2 Samuel 11:4); ablution of the clothes after touching the carcass of an unclean beast, or eating or carrying the carcass of a clean beast that had died a natural death (^(-R1125)Leviticus 11:25, 40); ablution both of the person and of the defiled garments in cases of *gonorrhoea dormientium* (15:16, 17) — the ceremony in each of the above instances to take place on the day on which the uncleanness was contracted. A higher degree of uncleanness resulted from prolonged *gonorrhoea* in males and menstruation in women: in these cases a probationary interval of seven days was to be allowed after the cessation of the symptoms; on the evening of the seventh day the candidate for purification performed an ablution both of the person and of the garments, and on the eighth offered two turtledoves or two young pigeons, one for a sin-offering, the other for a burnt-offering (vers. 1-15, 19-30). Contact with persons in the above states, or even with clothing or furniture that had been used by them while in those states, involved uncleanness in a minor degree, to be absolved by ablution on the day of infection generally (vers. 5-11, 21-23), but in one particular case after an interval of seven days (ver. 24). In cases of childbirth the sacrifice was increased to a lamb of the first year, with a pigeon or turtle-dove (12:6), an exception being made in favor of the poor, who might present the same offering as in the preceding case (ver. 8; ⁽⁻¹¹⁷²²⁾Luke 2:22-24). The purification took place forty days after the birth of a son, and eighty after that of a daughter, the difference in the interval being based on physical considerations. The uncleannesses already specified were comparatively of a mild character: the more severe were connected with death, which, viewed as the penalty of sin, was in the highest degree contaminating. To this head we refer the two cases of (1) touching a corpse, or a grave (⁽⁻⁰⁴⁹¹⁶⁾Numbers 19:16), or even killing a man in war (31:19); and (2) leprosy, which was regarded by the Hebrews as nothing less than a living death. The ceremonies of purification in the first of these two cases are detailed in Numbers 19.

A peculiar kind of water, termed the *water of uncleanness* (^(hDNbaAyme)A.V. “water of separation”), was prepared in the following manner: an

unblemished red heifer, on which the yoke had not passed, was slain by the eldest son of the high-priest outside the camp. A portion of its blood was sprinkled seven times towards (ynEJj kñA a) the sanctuary; the rest of it, and the whole of the carcass, including even its dung, were then burned in the sight of the officiating priest, together with cedar-wood, hyssop, and scarlet. The ashes were collected by a clean man and deposited in a clean place outside the camp. Whenever occasion required, a portion of the ashes was mixed with spring-water in a jar, and the unclean person was sprinkled with it on the third and again on the seventh day after the contraction of the uncleanness. That the water had an expiatory efficacy is implied in the term *sin-offering* (taFj i; A.V. “purification for sin”) applied to it (Numbers 19:9), and all the particulars connected with its preparation had a symbolical significance appropriate to the object sought. The sex of the victim (female, and hence life-giving) its red color (the color of blood, the seat of life), its unimpaired vigor (never having borne the yoke), its youth, and the absence in it of spot or blemish, the cedar and the hyssop (possessing the qualities, the former of incorruption, the latter of purity), and the scarlet (again the color of blood)-all these symbolized life in its fulness and freshness as the antidote of death. At the same time, the extreme virulence of the uncleanness is taught by the regulations that the victim should be wholly consumed outside the camp, whereas generally certain parts were consumed on the altar, and the offal only outside the camp (comp. Leviticus 4:11, 12); that the blood was sprinkled *towards*, and not *before*, the sanctuary; that the officiating minister should be neither the high-priest, nor yet simply a priest, but the *presumptive* high-priest, the office being too impure for the first and too important for the second; that even the priest and the person that burned the heifer were rendered unclean by reason of their contact with the victim; and, lastly, that the purification should be effected, not simply by the use of water, but of water mixed with ashes which served as a lye, and would, therefore, have peculiarly cleansing qualities. *SEE PURIFICATION-WATERS.*

The purification of the leper was a yet more formal proceeding, and indicated the highest pitch of uncleanness. The rites are thus described in Leviticus 14:4-32: The priest having examined the leper and pronounced him clear of his disease, took for him two birds “alive and clean,” with cedar, scarlet, and hyssop. One of the birds was killed under the priest’s directions over a vessel filled with spring-water, into which its blood fell; the other, with the adjuncts, cedar, etc., was dipped by the priest

into the mixed blood and water, and, after the unclean person had been seven times sprinkled with the same liquid, was permitted to fly away “into the open field.” The leper then washed himself and his clothes, and shaved his head. The above proceedings took place outside the camp, and formed the first stage of purification. A probationary interval of seven days as then allowed, which period the leper was to pass “abroad out of his tent:” on the last of these days the washing was repeated, and the shaving was more rigidly performed, even to the eyebrows and all his hair. The second stage of the purification took place on the eighth day, and was performed “before the Lord at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation.” The leper brought thither an offering consisting of two he-lambs, a yearling ewe-lamb, fine flour mingled with oil, and a log of oil. In cases of poverty the offering was reduced to one lamb, and two turtle-doves, or two young pigeons, with a less quantity of fine flour, and a log of oil. The priest slew one of the he-lambs as a trespass-offering, and applied a portion of its blood to the right ear, right thumb, and great toe of the right foot of the leper; he next sprinkled a portion of the oil seven times before the Lord, applied another portion of it to the parts of the body already specified, and poured the remainder over the leper’s head. The other he-lamb and the ewe-lamb, or the two birds, as the case might be, were then offered as a sin-offering and a burnt-offering, together with the meat-offering. The significance of the cedar, the scarlet, and the hyssop, of the running water, and of the “alive (full of life) and clean” condition of the birds, is the same as in the case previously described. The two stages of the proceedings indicated, the first, which took place outside the camp, the readmission of the leper to the community of men; the second, before the sanctuary, his readmission to communion with God. In the first stage, the slaughter of the one bird and the dismissal of the other symbolized the punishment of death deserved and fully remitted. In the second, the use of oil and its application to the same parts of the body as in the consecration of priests (^{<BIB3>}Leviticus 8:23, 24) symbolized the rededication of the leper to the service of Jehovah. *SEE PURIFICATION-OFFERING.*

The ceremonies to be observed in the purification of a house or a garment infected with leprosy were identical with the first stage of the proceedings used for the leper (^{<BIB3>}Leviticus 14:33-53). *SEE LEPROSY.*

The necessity of purification was extended in the post-Babylonian period to a variety of unauthorized cases. Cups and pots, brazen vessels and couches, were washed as a matter of ritual observance (^{<BIB4>}Mark 7:4). The

washing of the hands before meals was conducted in a formal manner (^{<4073>}Mark 7:3), and minute regulations are laid down on this subject in a treatise of the Mishna entitled *Yadaim*. These ablutions required a large supply of water, and hence we find at a marriage feast no less than six jars containing two or three firkins apiece, prepared for the purpose (^{<4116>}John 2:6). We meet with references to purification after childbirth (^{<4122>}Luke 2:22), and after the cure of leprosy (^{<4184>}Matthew 8:4; ^{<4174>}Luke 17:14), the sprinkling of the water mixed with ashes being still retained in the latter case (^{<4093>}Hebrews 9:13). What may have been the specific causes of uncleanness in those who came up to purify themselves before the Passover (^{<4155>}John 11:55), or in those who had taken upon themselves the Nazarite's vow (^{<4123>}Acts 21:24, 26), we are not informed; in either case it may have been contact with a corpse, though in the latter it would rather appear to have been a general purification preparatory to the accomplishment of the vow. *SEE WASHING.*

In conclusion, it may be observed that the distinctive feature in the Mosaic rites of purification is their expiatory character. The idea of uncleanness was not peculiar to the Jew: it was attached by the Greeks to the events of childbirth and death (Thucyd. 3, 104; Eurip. *Iph. in Taur.* 383), and by various nations to the case of sexual intercourse (Herod. 1, 198; 2, 64; Pers. 2, 16). But with all these nations simple ablution sufficed: no sacrifices were demanded. The Jew alone was taught by the use of expiatory offerings to discern to its full extent the connection between the outward sign and the inward fount of impurity. *SEE ABLUTION.*

Purification In The Christian Church.

The Protestant Church recognises no ceremonial purifications, because it does not seek for anything emblematic to point to the necessity of holiness in the people of the Lord. Christ taught purification of the heart only, and so the evangelical Christians teach purity of heart as the fit condition in which to approach the Deity in worship; the blood of the Son of God having cleansed from all sin those who accept of his atonement in righteousness. *SEE IMPURITY; SEE SIN.*

In the Roman Catholic Church and the Greek Church as well as some of the ultra-ritualistic churches which still cling to Protestantism, acts of purification prevail to some extent. There is, firstly, the act of purification after the communion in the mass. It relates

(a) to the purification of the chalice; some wine is poured into it by the servant of the altar, and slightly shaken with a circular motion, to take in all particles of the holy blood; then the chalice is emptied in two draughts, the mouth touching the same place from which the holy blood has been drunk. During this performance the prayer *Quod ore sumsimus* is recited: this prayer stands in an old Gothic missal of Charlemagne's time as *Postcommunio*. In the oldest times of Christianity the purification of the chalice was done with water, which was afterwards poured into a special vessel placed at the side of the altar, and called *piscina* (q.v.). It was Innocent III who directed that the purification of the chalice should be done with wine.

(b) To the periodical purification of the *ciborium* (q.v.), which is performed after the partaking of the holy blood and before the purification of the chalice, by gathering with wine the rest of the holy blood left in the *ciborium*, and emptying it as before, and then wiping out its inside with *the purificatorium* (q.v.). There is, secondly, the act of purification for women, which has been derived *through* rather than *from* the Jewish rite (^{<BIB>}Leviticus 12). It is based upon the practice of the Blessed Virgin Mary, whose compliance with the demand of the Jewish ceremonial law is related in ^{<BIB>}Luke 2:22-24. The Romish Church has in commemoration of this purification act instituted a festival called *Feast of Purification of the Blessed Virgin Mary*; and as by the Levitical law the ceremony was appointed for the fortieth day after childbirth, the feast is put on Feb. 2 (reckoning from Dec. 25, the Nativity of Christ). As on the same occasion the Holy Virgin complied also with the law of ^{<BIB>}Numbers 18:15, by the offering prescribed in redemption of the first-born, the festival is also called by the name of the *Presentation of the Child Jesus*, or the *Feast of Simeon*, and sometimes, also, of the *Meeting (occursus)*, in allusion to Simeon's meeting the Virgin Mother, and taking the child into his arms (Luke ii, 25). The date of the introduction of this festival is uncertain. The first clear trace of it is about the middle of the 5th century, during the reign of Marcia, and in the Church of Jerusalem. Its introduction in the Roman Church, in 494, was made by pope Gelasius the occasion of transferring to a Christian use the festivities which at that season were annexed to the pagan festival of the Lupercalia.

In the Church of England, the restoration of woman to the privileges of the Church is accompanied by a solemn thanksgiving for deliverance in her great danger. The title of the service, *The Thanksgiving of Women offer*

Childbirth, was adopted in 1552 to bring this point into prominence. The old Sarum title, *Ordo ad Purificandam Mulieresreme post Partum*, and that in the Prayerbook of 1549, *The Order of the Purification of Women*, seemed to mark an unholiness in the woman which the service removed. The Puritans objected to the use of the service for this very reason — “For what else doth this churching imply but a restoring her unto the Church, which cannot be without some bar or shutting forth pre-supposed?” They complained, too, against such individualizing of prayer and praise (see the controversy between Cartwright and Whitgift and Hooker, in Keble, 3d ed. of Hooker’s *Works*, ii, 434-438). In the Sarum use the service was read at the church door, *ante ostium ecclesie*; in the book of 1549, “nigh unto the quire door,” afterwards at the altar rails; now at “some convenient place.” The solemn readmission of the woman to divine service of the Sarum use has been wholly discontinued. The Book of Common Prayer requires of the woman to be “decently apparelled,” which means that she shall appear at church veiled. Hooker gives an instance where a woman appeared unveiled and was therefore excommunicated, and when the case was appealed to the bishops they confirmed the decision. Palmer says that all the Western rituals and that of Constantinople had offices for this rite. A service of the 10th century is given by Migne, *Cursus* (Paris, 1841), 138: “Benedictio Puerperae secundum usum Aethiopum.” The anointing the forehead of the woman and child, *sacra unctio*, the imposition of hands, the reception of holy communion, the giving of incense, are parts of this rite. See Siegel, *Christliche Alterthümer* (Index in vol. 4); Riddle, *Christian Antiquities* (see Index); *Brit. Quar. Rev.* July, 1871, p. 110. **SEE ABLUTION.**

Purification-offerings

were such as the law enjoined upon those who had been raised from leprosy, unclean issues, hemorrhages, and childbed. **SEE POLLUTION.** Those for lepers were the most burdensome, since a trespass-offering was among them.

1. The purifying offerings of menstrual women and of men after unclean issues were just the same (Leviticus 15). And the eighth day after the cure was certain, each brought two turtle-doves, or young pigeons, to be slain by the priests — the one as a sin-offering, the other as a burnt-offering (15, 14 sq., 29 sq.). Drink-offerings are not expressly mentioned in connection with these. **SEE WOMAN.**

2. The offerings of purification of women after childbirth (^{Q126}Leviticus 12:6-8), offered thirty-three or sixty-six days after confinement, consisted in a yearling lamb as a burnt-offering, and a young pigeon or a turtle-dove as a sin-offering. In case of poverty, two turtle-doves or young pigeons sufficed — the one as a burnt-offering, the other as a sin-offering (comp. ^{Q124}Luke 2:24). *SEE CHILD.*

3. More extended was the purifying ceremony of healed lepers (Leviticus 14; comp. *Negaim*, in the 6th part of the Mishna, ch. 14). The ritual is composed of two parts:

(a) vers. 2-8. The healed leper brought to the priest for cleansing must present two small birds, alive and clean (according to the *Negaiml*, 14:5, they must be in form, size, and value precisely alike and bought at the same time; but this was not necessary; comp. Lutz, *De Duab. Avib. Puayat. Leprosi Destino. earum. Myster.* [Hal. 1737]). The one was to be slain over an earthen vessel filled with fresh spring-water (and then buried; *Negaim*, 14:1), and the living bird, together with a bundle consisting of cedar-wood, scarlet wool, and hyssop, was dipped into the vessel, now containing water and blood mixed together, and the leper was sprinkled with it seven times. The priest then let the living bird loose into the open air (perhaps bearing away the guilt). *SEE EXPIATION.* Then the man healed was required to wash, shave off all his hair, and bathe. He was now so far cleansed as no longer to render unclean the place he occupied (*Negaim*, 14:2), and might again abide in the city, but was required to “tarry abroad out of his own tent” or house. This is referred by the rabbins, as a euphemism, to sexual intercourse, but without reason (yet Bahr follows them; *Symbol.* ii, 520 sq.). The ceremony with the two birds is not a sacrifice, but a mere symbol of the purifying of the blood from the humors of the disease, and the return of freedom on the part of the leper again to associate with men (otherwise explained in Bahr, *op. cit.* p. 515 sq.).

(b) Vers. 9-31. On the seventh day, the leper was required again to shave his whole body with the utmost care — not even sparing the eyebrows — to wash, and to bathe. A special chamber was provided in a corner of the women’s court-yard of the second Temple for this purpose (*Middotih*, ii, 5; comp. *Negaim*, 14:8. Bahr is mistaken, and contradicts ^{Q140}Leviticus 14:9, in referring this washing to the eighth day). On the eighth day he presented two lambs and a yearling sheep. The lamb was first slain as a trespass-offering, and the healed man was

touched with its blood in three places — on the right ear, the right thumb, and the great toe of the right foot. Then the priest took the oil offered by the leper, and, after sprinkling of it seven times “before the Lord,” touched the leper with it in the same three places of the body, and poured the remainder over his head. Finally, the sin-offering and the burnt-offering were slain. Poor persons were allowed to bring for these two turtle-doves or young pigeons. *SEE LEPROSY*. The putting of the blood on the body, as well as touching it with oil, in this second service, is considered as a ceremony expressing reconciliation; but the rabbins consider the final anointing with the oil as the essential part (*Negaim*, 14:10), because in this connection alone is mention made of “an atonement before the Lord” (^{<CH48>}Leviticus 14:18). In other respects, the whole ceremony strongly resembles the consecration of priests (Bahr, *op. cit.* 521 sq.). The cutting-off of the hair belonged to the medical police of the law, for the leprosy conceals itself most easily under the hair, and hence the last traces of the disease could thus be detected. On the ceremonies of purification in consecrating priests and Levites, see those articles. *SEE NAZARITE*.

Purification-waters

(^{<HDNA>}*emney* - *nid' dca'*, properly *waters of uncleanness*. i.e. of *purification*; Sept. ὕδωρ ῥαντισμοῦ, *water of sprinkling*, after the Chaldee usage; comp. *nedach'*. ^{<HDN>}*hdn*] *to sprinkle* [see Rosenmuller, *on onNb*. 19:9]). This was a holy water of cleansing, which was mixed with the ashes of a red or reddish-brown heifer — one which had never been under the yoke (comp. ^{<CH28>}Deuteronomy 21:3; Bochart, *Hieroz.* i, 328: on the age of this heifer the interpreters of the law were not agreed; see *Para*, i, 1; Jonathan, *on Numbers l.c.*, speaks of a two-year-old). With this water those who had contracted impurity by contact with a corpse or otherwise were sprinkled by means of a sprig or branch of hyssop, and were thus cleansed (^{<CH22>}Numbers 19:2 sq.; 31:19 sq.; ^{<CH23>}Hebrews 9:13; Josephus, *Ant.* 4:4, 6; comp. the Talmudical tract *Para*, in the 6th part of the Mishna), The ceremony of burning the heifer, which was accounted a sin-offering (^{<CH22>}Numbers 19:9, 17), was as follows according to the law (comp. Mishna, *Para*, 6:4): A priest, who had set himself apart and purified himself for this work for seven days previous (*ibid.* iii, 1; Josephus ascribes the duty to the high-priest, which may have been the custom in his time, although the Mishna usually speaks only of a priest, iii, 1, 9, 10;

comp. Philo, *opp.* ii, 252; *Para* (, iii, 8), led it out of the Temple (through the east door, Mishna, *Middoth*, i, 3) before the city (on the Mount of Olives, *Para*, iii, 6), slew it, and burned it entire, with its flesh, skin, blood, and dung (^{<0495>}Numbers 19:5), on a fire fed with cedar-wood, scarlet wool, and hyssop (comp. ^{<0846>}Leviticus 14:6). The ashes were then gathered, and kept in a clean place outside the city (according to the *Para*, iii, 2, they were divided into three parts, one of which was kept in a court outside the Temple, the second on the Mount of Olives, and the third was given to the priests). A heifer was burned thus anew whenever the supply of ashes was exhausted. The *Para* (iii, 5) tells us that only nine in all were ever burned, and only one of them before the captivity (Jerome, *Ep.* 108 *cad Eustachl.*, says that one was burned yearly). A part of these ashes was mixed with fresh water (comp. *Para*, 8:8), and a clean person sprinkled with it the unclean on the third and on the seventh day after the contraction of uncleanness. With it, too, the house of the dead and the vessels rendered unclean by a corpse were sprinkled. He who burned the heifer, the priest who slew her, and the man who collected the ashes were unclean until evening (^{<0497>}Numbers 19:7, 8, 10). The same took place in the use of the water; he who sprinkled it on the unclean, and all that touched it, were unclean until evening (19, 21 sq.). This is analogous to ^{<0864>}Leviticus 16:24, 26, 28; although in that case the uncleanness contracted by contact with the goats was considered as removed immediately after the required washings. Clericus properly remarks on this passage in Numbers, “The victim was considered as unclean through the sins which the prayer of the priest placed on his head. The ashes of this victim cleansed the unclean by taking his pollution; but they also defiled the clean, because no pollution could seem to pass from them to the water.” The last clause, however, is not clear.

The whole ceremony is peculiar, and suggests many questions which have never been fully solved. In particular, the symbolic meaning of the details is still unsettled, as the disagreement of recent expositors shows (Bahr, *Symbol.* ii, 493 sq.; Hengstenberg, *Moses und Egypten*, p. 181 sq.; Anonymous, *Evangel. K.-Z.* 1843, No. 19; Baumgarten, *Comment. zum Pentat.* ii, 333 sq.; Philippson, *Pentat.* p. 768 sq.; Kurtz, in the *Stud. u. Krit.* [1846], 3:629 sq.). We cannot here dwell upon this unfruitful investigation, but will refer singly to the principal points.

1. The purification of those made unclean by a corpse was effected, not by the usual means of cleansing — pure water — but by this sharp fluid,

because this kind of uncleanness was considered very deep and sad. The reason of this is obvious. Hence the means of cleansing is a kind of lye, which is strong in its action. We find ashes and lye among the means of purification used not merely by the Romans (Virgil, *Eclog.* 8:101; Ovid, *Faust.* 4:639, 725, 733; Arnob. *Gent.* v, 32), but by the old Persians, who made their most powerful cleansing stuff out of water and ashes by means of fire (*Zend avesta*, iii, 216; another kind of sacred water used by Egyptian priests is mentioned in Aelian. *Anim.* 7:45). Besides, this lye among the Israelites was made, not out of ashes in general, but from the ashes of a sin offering, and from that which alone remained of this sin-offering.

2. A heifer, not a bull (^{<RBH4>}Leviticus 4:14), is used, perhaps (Bahr, p. 498) because the female sex is that which brings forth life (comp. ^{<OR3>}Genesis 3:20; otherwise Hengstenberg and Baumgarten — the former interpreting too outwardly, *op. cit.* p. 182; the latter too artificially). But the object may have been simply to distinguish this particular sin-offering, when the animal was made a means to a hallowing purpose, from that in which it was presented to Jehovah in his sanctuary as a sacrifice of reconciliation. Yet physical uncleanness is always less burdensome than sin against the moral law (comp. Philippson, p. 769). Why a *red* heifer? The explanation of Spencer (*Leg. Rit.* ii, 15, 2, 6), that a red heifer was chosen in token of opposition to the Egyptian custom of sacrificing red cattle to Typhon, who was fancied to be of a red color (Plut. *Isidor.* 22), is worthless. The recent expositors of the symbols waver between red as the color of *life* (Bahr, Kurtz) and of sin and death (Hengstenberg). According to the rabbins, Solomon did not know the reason, and no ancient tradition respecting it has reached us. The secret will never be discovered. If it be said that red heifers were chosen for their scarcity, which rendered them prized in the East (Reland, *Antiq. Sacr.* ii, 5, 23; *Amralkeis* [ed. Lette], p. 74), the answer is only rendered more difficult. Rarity is not made an object in the directions given. Perhaps the dark color is simply selected as according with the serious nature of the work in hand, and aiding to keep the removal of sin steadily before the eye. White heifers were unfitted for this purpose; black ones are very rare in the East. As the accompaniments — cedar-wood, hyssop, and scarlet wool, which Maimonides in his time already felt the difficulty of explaining — have never yet been fully accounted for, Bahr's explanation is the most intelligent (p. 502 sq.), while Baumgarten's is absurd. *SEE HYSSOP.*

3. The twofold sprinkling on the third and seventh days has an analogy in two other places (^{CRIB}Leviticus 12:2 sq.; 14:8 sq.). That terrible impurity was not to be removed in a moment; its serious nature demanded two periods of effort. Three and seven, too, are significant numbers in themselves. The seven, or week, is also a liturgically complete period, and with it the ceremony of purification ends.

4. The reason why the heifer was burned without the holy city, and the persons occupied in this work were accounted unclean, is not the impurity of the sacrifice in itself (as Bahr has well remarked), but in the fact of its relation with the most unclean things — death and the corpse.

See, in general, Moses Maimon. *Tr. de Vacca Rufa*, Hebr. et Lat. (ed. Zeller, Amsterd. 1711); Marck, *Dissert. ad Vet. Test. Fascic.* p. 114 sq.; Deyling, *Observat.* iii, 89 sq.; Th. Dassov. *De Vacca Rufa, Observat. Instrux.* (J. G. W. Dunkel. Lips. 1758); Bashuysen, *De Aspersione Sacra ex Mente Gemaristar.* (Serv. 1717); Reland, *Anti. Sacr.* ii, 5, 23.

Purificatorium

is a piece of linen folded several times, which is used in drying the chalice and wiping the paten during the mass. It was originally a towel fastened to the piscina, or vessel placed at the side of the altar. Only in later times it took the present simpler form — probably at the time when the priest himself drank the wine which had been used for the purification of the chalice and the ablution of the fingers. The cleaning of the *purificatorium*, as it comes in immediate contact with the consecrated forms, must, by prescription of the canon, be done by the priest himself. Its length and width must be about half an ell, and as it is exclusively employed for the ritual use, it must be consecrated and marked in the middle with a cross. The Greeks use a sponge for the cleaning of the chalice and paten—a custom mentioned by Chrysostom (*Homil. in Epist. ad Ephes.*). — Wetzler u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* s.v.

Purifier

SEE PURIFICATORIUM.

Pu'rim

Picture for Purim

(𐤒𐤓𐤓, *Purim* ; Sept. Φρουράι v. r. Φρουρίμ, etc.; also 𐤒𐤓𐤓𐤁𐤇𐤓𐤁𐤇 *days of the Purim*, ^{<1026>}Esther 9:26, 31), the annual festival instituted by Mordecai, at the suggestion of Esther, to commemorate the wonderful deliverance of the Jews in Persia from the destruction with which they were threatened through the designs of Haman (Esther 9; Josephus, *Ant.* 11:6, 13). (The following article is substantially compiled from Biblical and Rabbinical authorities. *SEE FESTIVAL*.)

I. *Name of the Festival and its Signification.* — The name 𐤒𐤓𐤓 (singular 𐤓𐤓), which is derived from the Persian *pari*, cognate with *pars*, *part*, and which is explained in Esther (^{<1027>}Esther 3:7; 9:24) by the Hebrew ל 𐤒𐤓𐤁 *lot*, has been given to this festival because it records the casting of lots by Haman to ascertain when he should carry into effect the decree which the king issued for the extermination of the Jews (^{<1024>}Esther 9:24). The name Φρουρά, which, as Schleusner (*Lex. in LXX*, s.v.) and others rightly maintain, is a corruption of Φουράι, is the Greek pronunciation of the Hebrew term. In like manner, the modern editors of Josephus have changed (Φρουραῖοι into Φουραῖοι (*Ant.* 11:6, 13). In the following article we follow the Scriptural and Talmudical authorities, with illustrations from modern sources. *SEE FESTIVAL*.

It was probably called Purim by the Jews in irony. Their great enemy Haman appears to have been very superstitious and much given to casting lots (^{<1027>}Esther 3:7). They gave the name Purim, or Lots, to the commemorative festival because he had thrown lots to ascertain what day would be auspicious for him to carry into effect the bloody decree which the king had issued at his instance (^{<1024>}Esther 9:24).

Ewald, in support of his theory that there was in patriarchal times a religious festival at every new and full moon, conjectures that Purim was originally the fullmoon feast of Adar, as the Passover was that of Nisan, and Tabernacles that of Tisri.

II. *The Manner in which the Feast was and still is observed.* — All that the Bible tells us about it is that Mordecai ordered the 14th and 15th of Adar to be kept annually by the Jews, both nigh and afar; that these two

days are to be made days of feasting and of joy, as well as of interchange of presents and of sending gifts to the poor, and that the Jews agreed to continue to observe this festival every year in the same manner as they had begun it (^{<17097>}Esther 9:17-24). No further directions are given about its observance, and the Bible here, as elsewhere, left the rites and ceremonies to develop themselves with the circumstances of the nation. It is not easy to conjecture what may have been the ancient mode of observance, so as to have given the occasion something of the dignity of a national religious festival. The traditions of the Jews, and their modern usage respecting it, are curious. It is stated that eightyfive of the Jewish elders objected at first to the institution of the feast, when it was proposed by Mordecai (Jerus. Gem. *Megilloth*; Lightfoot, *one* ^{<8102>}*John* 10:21). A preliminary fast was appointed, called “the fast of Esther,” to be observed on the 13th of Adar, in memory of the fast which Esther and her maids observed, and which she enjoined, through Mordecai, on the Jews of Shushan (^{<17046>}Esther 4:16).

SEE MORDECAI.

The following is the mode in which the festival of Purim is kept at the present day. The day preceding — i.e. the 13th of Adar — is kept as a fast-day, and is called “the fast of Esther” (**רַתְּסָא תַנְגַּל**), in accordance with the command of this Jewish queen (^{<17046>}Esther 4:5, 6); and sundry prayers expressive of repentance, humiliation, etc. (**תַּוְּי יל ס**), are introduced into the regular ritual for the day. As on all the fast-days, ^{<18211>}Exodus 32:11-14; 34:1-11, are read as the lesson from the law, and ^{<23816>}Isaiah 55:6-56:9, as the Haphtarah. If the 13th of Adar falls on a Sabbath, the fast takes place on the Thursday previous, as no fasting is allowed on this sacred day, nor on the preparation-day for the Sabbath. Some people fast three days, as Esther enjoined at first. On the evening of this fast-day — i.e. the one closing the 13th of Adar and introducing the 14th, as soon as the stars appear the festival commences, when the candles are lighted, and all the Israelites resort to the synagogue, where, after the evening service, the book of Esther, called, **κατ' ἐξοχήν**, *the iegillah* (**הַלְגֵּאָה** *the Roll*), is read by the praelector. Before commencing to read it he pronounces the following benediction: “Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast sanctified us with thy commandments, and hast enjoined us to read the Megillah ! Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast wrought miracles for our forefathers in those days and at this time. Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast preserved us alive, sustained us, and brought us to this season!” The

Megillah is then read. The praelector reads in a histrionic manner, suiting his tones and gestures to the changes in the subject-matter. As often as he pronounces the name of Haman the congregation stamp on the floor, saying, "Let his name be blotted out. The name of the wicked shall rot!" while the children spring rattles. The passage in which the names of Haman and his sons occur (^{<1707>}Esther 9:7, 9) is read very rapidly, and if possible in one breath, to signify that they were all hanged at the same time, the congregation stamping and rattling all the time. It is for this reason that this passage is written in the MSS. in larger letters than the rest, and that the names are arranged under one another. After the Megillah is read through, the whole congregation exclaim, "Cursed be Haman; blessed be Mordecai. Cursed be Zorsh (the wife of Haman); blessed be Esther. Cursed be all idolaters; blessed be all Israelites, and blessed be Harbonah who hanged Haman." The volume is then solemnly rolled up. Lastly, the following benediction is pronounced by the reader: "Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe. who hast contended our contest, judged our cause, hast avenged our wrongs, requited all the enemies of our souls, and hast delivered us from our oppressors. Blessed art thou who hast delivered thy people from all their oppressors, thou Lord of salvation!" All go home and partake of a repast said to consist mainly of milk and eggs.

On the morning of the 14th of Adar the Jews again re sort to the synagogue, insert several appointed prayers into the ordinary daily ritual; ^{<1718>}Exodus 17:8-16 is read as the lesson from the law, which relates the destruction of the Amalekites, the people of Agag (^{<1718>}1 Samuel 15:8), the supposed ancestor of Haman (^{<1718>}Esther 3:1), and the Megillah or the Book of Esther as the Haphtarah, under the same circumstances as those of the previous evening. The rest of the festival is spent in great rejoicings; presents are sent backwards and forwards! among friends and relations, and gifts are liberally forwarded to the poor. Games of all sorts, with dancing and music, commence. In the evening a quite dramatic entertainment, the subject of which is connected with the occasion, sometimes takes place, and men frequently put on female attire, declaring that the festivities of Purim, according to ^{<1712>}Esther 9:22, suspend the law of ^{<1715>}Deuteronomy 22:5, which forbids one sex to wear the dress of the other. A dainty meal then follows, sometimes with a free indulgence of wine, both unmixed and mulled. According to the Gemara (*Meille*, 7:2), "tenetur homo in festo Purim eo usque inebriari, ut nullum discrimen norit inter maledictionem Hamanis et benedictionem Mardochoei."

From the canons which obtained in the time of Christ, we learn that the Megillah had to be written in Hebrew characters, on good parchment, and with ink (Mishna, *Megilla*, ii, 2); that if the 14th of Adar fell on a Tuesday or Wednesday, the inhabitants of villages read the Megillah on the Monday in advance, or on Thursday, because the country people came to town to attend the markets and the synagogues in which the law was read and tribunals held (*Megilla*, i, 1-3); that any one was qualified to read it except deaf people, fools, and minors (*ibid.* ii, 4), and that it was lawful to read it in a foreign language to those who understood foreign languages (*ibid.* ii, 1). But though the Mishna allows it to be read in other languages, yet the Megillah is generally read in Hebrew.

The rejoicings continue on the 15th, and the festival terminates on the evening of this day. During the whole of the festival the Jews may engage in trade, or any labor, if they are so inclined, as there is no prohibition against it. When the month Adar used to be doubled, in the Jewish leap-year, the festival was repeated on the 14th and 15th of the second Adar.

It would seem that the Jews were tempted to associate the Christians with the Persians and Amalekites in the curses of the synagogue (see *Cod. Theodos.* 16:8, 18). Hence probably arose the popularity of the feast of Purim in those ages in which the feeling of enmity was so strongly manifested between Jews and Christians. Several Jewish proverbs are preserved which strikingly show the way in which Purim was regarded, such as, "The Temple may fail, but Purim never;" "The Prophets may fail, but not the Megillah." It was said that no books would survive in the Messiah's kingdom except the law and the Megillah. This affection for the book and the festival connected with it is the more remarkable because the events on which they are founded affected only an exiled portion of the Hebrew race, and because there was so much in them to shock the principles and prejudices of the Jewish mind. So popular was this festival in the days of Christ that Josephus tells us that, "even *now*, all the Jews that are in the habitable earth keep these days festivals, and send portions to one another" (*Ant.* 11:6, 13), and certainly its popularity has not diminished in the present day.

III. *Did Christ celebrate this Feast?* — It was first suggested by Kepler that the ἑορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων of ^{
}John 5:1 was the feast of Purim. The notion has been confidently espoused by Petavius, Outram, Lamy, Hug, Tholuck, Lucke, Olshausen, Stier, Wieseler, Winer, and Anger (who,

according to Winer, has proved the point beyond contradiction), and is favored by Alford and Ellicott. The question is a difficult one. It seems to be generally allowed that the opinion of Chrysostom, Cyril, and most of the fathers, which was taken up by Erasmus, Calvin, Beza, and Bengel. that the feast was Pentecost, and that of Cocceius, that it was Tabernacles (which is countenanced by the reading of one inferior MS.), are precluded by the general course of the narrative, and especially by ~~ⲉⲓⲃⲏⲥ~~ John 4:35 (assuming that the words of our Lord which are there given were spoken in seed-time) compared with 5:1. The interval indicated by a comparison of these texts could scarcely have extended beyond Nisan. The choice is thus left between Purim and the Passover.

The principal objections to Purim are, (*a*) that it was not necessary to go up to Jerusalem to keep the festival; (*b*) that it is not very likely that our Lord would have made a point of paying especial honor to a festival which appears to have had but a very small religious element in it, and which seems rather to have been the means of keeping alive a feeling of national revenge and hatred. It is alleged, on the other hand, that our Lord's attending the feast would be in harmony with his deep sympathy with the feelings of the Jewish people, which went further than his merely "fulfilling all righteousness" in carrying out the precepts of the Mosaic law. It is further urged that the narrative of John is best made out by supposing that the incident at the pool of Bethesda occurred at the festival which was characterized by showing kindness to the poor, and that our Lord was induced, by the enmity of the Jews then evinced, not to remain at Jerusalem till the Passover, mentioned ~~ⲉⲓⲃⲏⲥ~~ John 6:4 (Stier).

The identity of the Passover with the feast in question has been maintained by Ireneus, Ensebius, and Theodoret, and, in modern times, by Luther, Scaliger, Grotius, Hengstenberg, Gresswell, Neander, Tholuck Robinson, and the majority of commentators. The principal difficulties in the way are, (*a*) the omission of the article, involving the improbability that the great festival of the year should be spoken of as "a feast of the Jews;" (*b*) that as our Lord did not go up to the Passover mentioned ~~ⲉⲓⲃⲏⲥ~~ John 6:4, he must have absented himself from Jerusalem for a year and a half, that is, till the feast of Tabernacles (~~ⲉⲓⲃⲏⲥ~~ John 7:2). Against these points it is contended that the application of *ἑορτή* without the article to the Passover is countenanced by ~~ⲉⲓⲃⲏⲥ~~ Matthew 27:15; ~~ⲉⲓⲃⲏⲥ~~ Luke 23:17 (comp. ~~ⲉⲓⲃⲏⲥ~~ John 18:39); indeed, it makes but little difference in Hellenistic Greek whether the article is present or absent with a noun thus in regimen with a following

cognitive; that it is assigned as a reason for his staying away from Jerusalem for a longer period than usual, that “the Jews sought to kill him” ([John 7:1](#); cf. [5:18](#)); that this long period satisfactorily accounts for the surprise expressed by his brethren ([John 7:3](#)); and that, as it was evidently his custom to visit Jerusalem once a year, he went up to the feast of Tabernacles ([John 7:2](#)) instead of going to the Passover. A still more conclusive argument in favor of the Passover is the use of the peculiar epithet **δευτερόπρωτος** in [Luke 6:1](#), for the Sabbath following, which can mean no other than that occurring after the Paschal week. Moreover, the fact of the ripe but unharvested barley at that time leads to the same conclusion. *SEE PASSOVER.*

The arguments on one side are best set forth by Stier and Olshausen on [John 5:1](#), by Kepler (*Eclogie Chronicoe*, Frankfort, 1615), and by Anger (*De Temup. in Act. Apost.* i, 24); also, in Hug’s *Introd.* (pt. ii, § 64), and in Lucke’s *Comment. on St. John’s Gospel* (see the English translation of Lucke’s *Dissertation* in the appendix to Tittmann’s *Meletemata Sacra, or a Commentary on St. John’s Gospel, in Bib. Cabinet*, vol. xlv); those on the other side, by Hengstenberg (*Christology* vol. ii, “On the Seventy Weeks of Daniel,” p. 408-414, Engl. transl., Washington, 1839); Robinson, *Harmony*, note on the “Second Passover;” and Neander, *Life of Christ*, § 143. See also Lightfoot, Kuinoll, and Tholuck, on [John 5:1](#), and Gresswell, *Diss.* 8, vol. ii; Ellicott *Lect.* 135.

IV. Literature. — See Carpzov, *App. Crit.* iii, 11; Reland, *Ant.* 4:9; Schickart, *Purim sire Bacchanalia Judaeorum* (Crit. Sac. iii, col. 1184); Buxtorf, *Syn. Jud.* 29. The Mishnic treatise *Megilla* contains directions respecting the mode in which the scroll should be written out and in which it should be read, with other matters, not much to the point in hand, connected with the service of the synagogue. See also Stauben, *La Vie Juive en Alsace*; Mills, *British Jews*, p. 188; Axenfeld, *Betrachten* **μy1rVP li** (Erlang. 1807); *Bible Educator*, iii, 26. *SEE ESTHER.*

Puritans

a name given to a large party in the reign of queen Elizabeth, who complained that the Reformation in England was left in an imperfect state, many abuses both in worship and discipline being still retained. The name Puritans was derived from the frequent assertion of those who composed the party that the Church of England was corrupted with the remains of

popery, and that what they desired was a “pure” system of doctrine and discipline; but the English word “Puritans” happens accidentally to represent the Greek name “Cathari” which had been assumed by the Novatians, and which had been adopted in Germany during the Middle Ages in the vernacular form “Ketzer” for the Albigenses and other opponents of the Church. It first came into use as the designation of an English Church party about the year 1564 (Fuller, *Ch. Hist.* 9:66), but after a few years it got to be used also as inclusive of many who had separated from the Church of England. It was gradually superseded as regards the latter by the names of their various sects, as Independents, Presbyterians, Baptists, etc., and as regards the former by the term “Nonconformists.” At a still later time, towards the end of the 17th century, the Church Puritans were represented by “Low-Churchmen,” and the Non-Church Puritans by “Dissenters.”

The presence of a Puritan party in the Church of England is, however, traceable for two centuries before the name of “Puritan” was assumed. In the 14th century the common people had become alienated from their parish priests by the influence of the friars, who had authority from the pope to preach and to receive confessions wherever they pleased, and quite independently of the ordinary clergy. This extra-parochial system of mission clergy weakened the hold of the Church upon the populace at large; and, when the friars themselves began to lose their influence, alienation from the clergy developed into alienation from the Church. Thus arose the Lollards of the 15th century, a party which made no attempt to set up separate places of worship or a separate ministry, but which introduced its antisacerdotal principles into many parish churches, and made many of the clergy as strong opponents of the existing ecclesiastical system as was Wycliffe himself. During the trying times of the Reformation the party thus formed was largely augmented by those whose opposition to popish abuses had, by a similar excess, developed into opposition to the whole of the established ecclesiastical system — men who thought that “pure” doctrine and “pure” worship could only be attained by an utter departure from all that had been believed and practiced during the times when the Church of England had contracted impurities of doctrine and worship through popish influences.

While Luther’s movement was at its height, the party which thus became the progenitors of the Puritans was formed into a society under the name of “The Christian Brethren,” which seems, from the faint view we get of it,

to have been very similar to that organized by John Wesley two centuries later. The headquarters of the Brethren were in London, but they had gained a footing at both the universities, apparently among the undergraduates and younger graduates. As early as the year 1523, a body of Cambridge residents “met often at a house called ‘The White Horse’ to confer together with others, in mockery called Germans, because they conversed much in the books of the divines of Germany brought thence. This house was chosen because those of King’s College, Queen’s College, and St. John’s might come in at the back side and so be the more private and undiscovered” (Strype, *Ecclesiastes Mem.* i, 568, ed. 1822). Among those mentioned as so meeting are the names of Barnes, Arthur, Bilney, Latimer, and Coverdale, familiarly known as precursors of the Puritan movement in Edward VI’s and queen Elizabeth’s reign. A few years later, in 1527, similar gatherings were detected at Oxford, where the names of Frith, Taverner, Udal, Farrar, and Cox, Edward VI’s tutor, are found among those who met together for the same purpose (*ibid.* i, 569). Among the Oxford party the men of Wolsey’s college held a conspicuous position, and his leniency towards all who were brought before him on charges of heresy was very striking.

The principles which were developed among the more extreme section of these early Puritans may be seen by an extract from a work written by William Tyndale (himself a friar and a priest), who was their representative man. Writing of the ministerial office, he says: “Subdeacon, deacon, priest, bishop, cardinal, patriarch, and pope be names of offices and service, or should be, and not sacraments. There is no promise coupled therewith. If they minister their offices truly, it is a sign that Christ’s Spirit is in them; if not, that the devil is in them. . . O dreamers and natural beasts, without the seal of the Spirit of God, but sealed with the mark of the beast, and with cankered consciences,...By a priest understand nothing but an elder to teach the younger, and to bring them unto the full knowledge and understanding of Christ, and to minister the sacraments which Christ ordained, which is also nothing but to preach Christ’s promises.... According, therefore, as every man believeth God’s promises, longeth for them, and is diligent to pray unto God to fulfil them, so is his prayer heard; and as good is the prayer of a cobbler as of a cardinal, and of a butcher as of a bishop; and the blessing of a baker that knoweth the truth is as good as the blessing of our most holy father the pope.... Neither is there any other manner of ceremony at all required in making our spiritual officers than to choose an able

person, and then to rehearse him his duty, and give him his charge, and so put him in his room” (*Obed. of Christ. Man* [Park. Soc. ed.], p. 254-259).

These floating elements of Puritanism had, however, very little compactness and unity except in the one particular of opposition to the principles and practices which then prevailed in the Church of England. But in the latter years of Henry VIII’s reign, Calvin was consolidating a system of doctrine, worship, and ecclesiastical discipline which was exactly calculated to unite in a wieldy form the individual particles which had previously been comparatively powerless for want of cohesion. Calvin gained some personal influence in England by means of pertinacious letters addressed to the king, the protector Somerset, and archbishop Cranmer; but the principles of his system were chiefly propagated through the introduction of some of his foreign disciples into positions of influence in the Church of England. Thus an Italian named Pietro Vermigli, who had been an Augustinian friar, was made regius professor of divinity at Oxford, and is known to history as Peter Martyr (q.v.). A similar appointment was made at Cambridge, where the regius professor of divinity was a German named Martin Bucer (q.v.), who had been a Dominican friar. Paul Biicher, or Fagius, a companion of Bucer, was destined for the professorship of Hebrew at Cambridge, but died in 1549. Bernard Ochinus (q.v.), ex-vicar-general of the Capuchin friars and confessor to pope Paul III, came from Geneva with Peter Martyr, and was made canon of Canterbury, being afterwards banished from place to place on the Continent for his Socinianism and his advocacy of polygamy. John a Lasco, the Pole, was an inmate of Lambeth Palace, where he and other foreigners formed a kind of Calvinistic privy council to Cranmer; and John Knox (A.D. 1505-72), the Scotch preacher, was at one time carrying out his duties as chaplain to the young king, and at another going on a roving commission to preach down the Church in Northumberland, Durham, and the other northern counties (Jackson, *Works*, iii, 273).

It was not to be expected from his character that Henry VIII, though he rescued the kingdom from the papal yoke, would proceed very far in reforming the religion of the country. His successor, however, Edward VI, a young prince of earnest piety, was likely, had his valuable life been spared, to have carried out a real reform, which would have rendered the Church of England more simple in her ritual and more strict in her discipline than she has ever had it in her power to be. But Mary succeeded to the throne, and the ancient superstitions were restored. Several

congregations of German Protestants, fleeing from Continental persecution, had found an asylum in England. One of the principal of these was settled in London under the pastoral care of John a Lasco, a man of great repute. the friend and patron of Erasmus; while another was placed by the duke of Somerset, the protector during the king's minority, at Glastonbury, upon the lands of the famous monastery then recently dissolved. The influence of the foreigners in matters of religion, however imperceptible, must have already been such as to excite suspicion, for they were commnanded to leave the kingdom without delay. Nor did they retire alone. A furious burst of persecution drove with them a thousand Englishmen, who felt that to remain at home was to incur a needless hazard. The Low Countries, the free cities of the Rhine, and Switzerland were now filled with these wanderers. Frankfort. Basle, Zurich, and Geneva particularly attracted them; for there the doctrines of the Reformation had taken the strongest hold, and there its most eminent professors dwelt. Mingled with these were the leaders of the Continental Reformation. The English refugees had constant intercourse with Calvin, with Gualter, with Peter Martyr, and John a Lasco, and, above all, with Henry Bullinger.

On the death of Mary, the English exiles returned home, "bringing nothing back with them," says Fuller, "but much learning and some experience." It is likely that they were influenced by the manners of the German churches. On their return to England, the contrast between the splendor of the English ceremonial and the simplicity of that abroad was the more striking. Their opponents never ceased to attribute much of the discontent that followed to the Genevan exile. "They were for the most part Zwinglian-gospellers at their going hence," says Heylin, "and became the great promoters of the Puritan faction at their coming home." The Pulritans themselves were never unwilling to own their obiigations to the German Reformers, still, however, founding their scruples rather upon what they themselves conceived to be the absence of scriptural simplicity than upon the practice of other Christians. The question of the habits, or, as it has since been termed, the *vestiarian controversy* (q.v.), most unsettled them, and it then began to wear an anxious, if not a threatening aspect.

It was urged by the dissatisfied party that the imposition of the vestments was an infringement of their Christian liberty. They were called under the Gospel to worship God in spirit and in truth; and no outward forms or splendors could contribute in any measure to assist the devout mind in a

service so spiritual and exalted. On the contrary, the tendency of these official garments was to distract the worshipper, and to debase his devotions by an admixture of those sentiments which are allowed no place in spiritual things. The Church of Christ was only safe in its simplicity, and such was its inward glory that any attempts to decorate could but in fact degrade it. They objected, too, that the vestments against which they were contending had a Jewish origin, and belonged not to the Christian ministry, but to the priesthood of the house of Aaron. To introduce them into the Church of Christ was to pervert their meaning. They were a part of the divinely appointed constitution of the Jewish Church, and had passed away, together with the rest of its figurative and mystic ceremonial.

It was a further objection, and one that appealed not only to divines and controversialists, but to the feelings of the common people, that the vestments were identical with all the superstitions of popery. They were looked upon as the badge of antichrist; and those who wore them were regarded with suspicion, as men either indifferent to the cause of the Reformation, or not yet sufficiently enlightened as to the danger, and indeed the sinfulness, of approaching the most distant confines of a system which ought to be avoided with alarm and horror. "If we are bound to wear popish apparel when commanded, we may be obliged to have shaven crowns, and to use oil, and cream, and spittle, and all the rest of the papistical additions to the ordinances of Christ."

The accession of Elizabeth, after the brief but bloody reign of Mary, revived the hopes of those who had been longing for a day of more complete reformation. But it soon became quite apparent that the queen, though opposed in principle to popery, was resolved, notwithstanding, to retain as much show and pomp in religious matters as might be possible. A meeting of convocation was held in the beginning of the year 1562, at which the proposal for a further reformation was seriously discussed. Six alterations in particular were suggested — the abrogation of all holidays except Sabbaths and those relating to Christ; that in prayer the minister should turn his face to the people; that the signing of the cross in baptism should be omitted; that the sick and aged should not be compelled to kneel at the communion; that the partial use of the surplice should be sufficient; and that the use of organs should be laid aside. By a majority of one, and that the proxy of an absent person, these proposed alterations were rejected.

From this time the court party and the Reformers, as they may be termed, became more decidedly opposed to each other. The difference in their views is well described by Dr. Hetherington in his *History of the Westminster Assembly*. "The main question," says he, "on which they were divided may be thus stated: whether it were lawful and expedient to retain in the external aspect of religion a close resemblance to what had prevailed in the times of popery, or not? The court divines argued that this process would lead the people more easily to the reception of the real doctrinal changes, when they saw outward appearances so little altered, so that this method seemed to be recommended by expediency. The Reformers replied that this tended to perpetuate in the people their inclination to their former superstitions, led them to think there was, after all, little difference between the Reformed and the Papal churches; and, consequently, that if it made them quit popery the more readily at present, it would leave them at least equally ready to return to it should an opportunity offer; and for this reason they thought it best to leave as few traces of popery remaining as possible. It was urged by the court party that every sovereign had authority to correct all abuses of doctrine and worship within his own dominions: this, they asserted, was the true meaning of the Act of Supremacy, and consequently the source of the Reformation in England. The true Reformers admitted the Act of Supremacy in the sense of the queen's explanation given in the Injunctions, but could not admit that the conscience and the religion of the whole nation were subject to the arbitrary disposal of the sovereign. The court party recognised the Church of Rome as a true Church, though corrupt in some points of doctrine and government; and this view it was thought necessary to maintain, for without this the English bishops could not trace their succession from the apostles. But the decided Reformers affirmed the pope to be antichrist, and the Church of Rome to be no true Church; nor would they risk the validity of their ordinations on the idea of a succession through such a channel. Neither party denied that the Bible was a perfect rule of faith; but the court party did not admit it to be a standard of Church government and discipline, asserting that it had been left to the judgment of the civil magistrate in Christian countries to accommodate the government of the Church to the policy of the State. The Reformers maintained the Scriptures to be the standard of Church government and discipline as well as of doctrine; to the extent, at the very least, that nothing should be imposed as necessary which was not expressly contained in, or derived from, them by necessary consequence, adding that if any discretionary power in minor

matters were necessary, it must be vested, not in the civil magistrate, but in the spiritual office-bearers of the Church itself. The court Reformers held that the practice of the primitive Church for the four or five earliest centuries was a proper standard of Church government and discipline, even better suited to the dignity of a national establishment than the times of the apostles; and that, therefore, nothing more was needed than merely to remove the more modern innovations of popery. The true Reformers wished to keep close to the Scripture model, and to admit neither office-bearers, ceremonies, nor ordinances, but such as were therein appointed or sanctioned. The court party affirmed that things in their own nature indifferent, such as rites, ceremonies, and vestments, might be appointed and made necessary by the command of the civil magistrates; and that then it was the bounden duty of all subjects to obey. But the Reformers maintained that what Christ had left indifferent no human laws ought to make necessary; and, besides, that such rites and ceremonies as had been abused to idolatry, and tended to lead men back to popery and superstition, were no longer indifferent, but were to be rejected as unlawful. Finally, the court party held that there must be a standard of uniformity, which standard was the queen's supremacy and the laws of the land. The Reformers regarded the Bible as the only standard, but thought compliance was due to the decrees of provincial and national synods, which might be approved and enforced by civil authority."

From this contrast between the opinions of the two parties, it is plain that, though the use of the sacerdotal vestments formed the rallying-point of the whole controversy, its foundation lay deeper than any mere outward forms. The queen gave strict orders to the archbishop of Canterbury that exact order and uniformity should be maintained in all external rites and ceremonies. Nay, so determined was she that her royal will should be obeyed that she issued a proclamation requiring immediate uniformity in the vestments on pain of prohibition from preaching and deprivation from office. Matters were now brought to a crisis by this decided step on the part of the queen. Multitudes of godly ministers were ejected from their churches and forbidden to preach anywhere else. Hitherto they had sought reformation within the Church, but now, their hopes from that quarter being wholly blasted, they came to the resolution in 1566 to form themselves into a body distinct from the Church of England, which they regarded as only half reformed.

Elizabeth was enraged to see her royal mandate so signally set at naught. The suspended ministers took strong ground, and, having separated from the Church as by law established, they published a treatise in their own vindication, boldly declaring that the imposition of mere human appointments, such as the wearing of particular vestments by the clergy, was a decided infringement on Christian liberty, which it was not only lawful but a duty to resist. In the face of persecution, and under threats of the royal displeasure, the Puritans, who, since the Act of Uniformity had been passed, in 1562, were sometimes called *Nonconformists*, continued to hold their private meetings. Their first attempt to engage in public worship was rudely interrupted by the officers of justice, and under color of law several were sent to prison and were afterwards tried. The party, however, continued to increase, and so infected were the younger students at Cambridge with the Puritan doctrines that the famous Thomas Cartwright, with three hundred more, threw off their surplices in one day within the walls of one college.

The religious condition of England at this time was truly deplorable. “The Churchmen,” says Strype, in his *Life of Parker*, “heaped up many benefices upon themselves, and resided upon none, neglecting their cures; many of them alienated their lands, made unreasonable leases and wastes of their woods, granted reversions and advowsons to their wives and children, or to others for their use. Churches ran greatly into dilapidations and decays, and were kept nasty and filthy, and indecent for God’s worship. Among the laity there was little devotion. The Lord’s day was greatly profaned and little observed. The common prayers were not frequented. Some lived without any service of God at all. Many were mere heathens and atheists. The queen’s own court was a harbor for epicures and atheists, and a kind of lawless place, because it stood in no parish. Which things made good men fear some sad judgments impending over the nation.”

To provide a remedy for the ignorance and inefficiency of the clergy, associations were established in different dioceses for the purpose of conducting “prophesyings,” as they were called, or private expositions of difficult passages of Scripture. These meetings, however, excited the jealousy of the queen, who issued an order for their suppression. The Parliament seemed to be somewhat disposed to mitigate the sufferings of the Puritans, and in 1572 two bills were passed having that object in view. Encouraged by this movement in their favor, they prepared a full statement of their grievances under the title of an “Admonition to the Parliament;”

and in this document, which is understood to have been the production of Cartwright, the Parliament was urged to reform the churches. Instead of obtaining redress, several of the leading Puritans were imprisoned and treated with great severity. The decided opposition which the queen had manifested to all reform in the Church finally led the Puritans to surrender all hope of any legislative act in favor of their views; and being most of them Presbyterians in principle, those of them resident in London and its neighborhood formed themselves into a presbytery, although the step thus taken called forth from the queen another proclamation enforcing uniformity.

In 1572, a Presbyterian Church was formed and a meeting-house erected at Wandsworth, in Surrey. Field, the lecturer of Wandsworth, was its first minister; and several names of consideration with the Puritans, including those of Travers and Wilcox, were among its founders. Presbyteries were formed in other parts of the kingdom, and numerous secret meetings were held in private houses, which gave more alarm to the government, or at least a stronger pretext for severity. Even moderate men began to express anxiety. To meet the danger, the High Court of Commission was now first put in motion. It empowered the queen and her successors, by their letters patent under the great seal, to authorize, whenever they thought fit, and for as long a period as they pleased, a commission of persons, lay or clerical, to exercise all manner of jurisdiction, under the queen and her successors, in spiritual things; and “to order, visit, reform, and redress all heresies, errors, schisms, abuses, contempts, offences, and enormities whatsoever.” One of its first acts was the violent suppression of the Presbyterian meeting at Wandsworth; its subsequent labors were of the same character. Notwithstanding these severities, Puritanism continued to increase; for the persecution which does not exterminate a religious party never fails to strengthen it. And while the cause was gaining strength in London, it was taking firm root in the great seats of learning.

The Puritans were now effectually separated from the Church of England, and were organized under a different form of Church polity. But the independent attitude which they had thus assumed rendered them only the more obnoxious to the queen and the High Church party. Stronger measures were accordingly adopted to discourage them and destroy their influence; many of them were silenced, imprisoned, banished, and otherwise oppressed. In 1580, an act of Parliament was passed prohibiting the publication of such books or pamphlets as assailed the opinions of the

prelates and defended those of the Puritans. This was followed in the same session by another act authorizing the infliction of heavy fines and imprisonment upon those who absented themselves from “church, chapel, or other place where common prayer is said according to the Act of Uniformity.”

The effect of these harsh and rigorous enactments was to render the Puritans bolder and more determined. No longer limiting their complaints against the Established Church to merely outward rites and ceremonies, some of them even went so far as to renounce her communion, and to declare her as scarcely entitled to the name of a Christian Church. Political discussion broke in upon religious inquiry. The hierarchy was assailed, the Prayer-book vilified, and ministers who had been silenced for their irregularities were listened to, perhaps with the greater satisfaction because of their nonconformity, in the prophesyings. The general religious condition of the country meanwhile suffered greatly. In many counties scarcely one preacher could be found. In some dioceses there were two or three; there was a general thirst for religious instruction, but the people, as the archbishop told the queen, were allowed to perish for lack of knowledge. Grindal resolved to take the “prophesyings” under his own care, and at the same time to remove the causes of objection. He therefore forbade the introduction of politics, the speaking of laymen, or ministers suppressed, and the allusions, hitherto not unfrequent, to matters of government; and instead of a chairman elected by the societies, he placed the meetings for the future under the care of the archdeacon, or of some grave divine to be appointed by the bishop. Ten bishops heartily approved of the primate’s decision, and encouraged the prophesyings in their dioceses. But the queen regarded them with great dislike, and the court resolved on their suppression. It was in vain the faithful primate remonstrated with the queen. “Alas! madam, is the Scripture more plain in any one thing than that the Gospel of Christ should be plentifully preached? I am forced, with all humility, and yet plainly, to profess that I cannot with safe conscience. and without offence to the majesty of God, give my assent to the suppressing of the said exercises.” In vain did the earl of Leicester and the lord-treasurer Burleigh, who presented the remonstrance, add the weight of their intercessions. The queen was enraged. and the primate, who was old and sick, was ordered to consider himself a prisoner in his own house, and would probably have been deprived if death had not stepped in to his release. He died July 6, 1583. Preaching fell into contempt, and the

Church of England has never since entirely recovered from the blow. There has always since this event been a party in the Church which has regarded this divine ordinance with real or well-feigned contempt.

One of the leaders of the extreme section of the Puritan party was Robert Brown, who is thought to have been the founder of the Independent or Congregational Church in England. *SEE BROWNISTS*. The greater number of the Puritans, however, were either Presbyterians, or still retained their connection with the Church of England. But in all circumstances they were the objects of the most bitter and unrelenting hostility on the part of Elizabeth. The tide of persecution ran high and strong. In vain did the House of Commons attempt to throw the shield of their protection over the poor oppressed Puritans; the queen was inexorable, and parliament was compelled to yield.

In this state of matters all hope of a legislative remedy was abandoned, and the Puritan ministers set themselves to devise plans for their own usefulness and efficiency as Christian teachers. Although many of the Puritans thus formed separate sects, a very large proportion of them still continued in the Church; and very subtle measures were taken by some of their leaders a few years later, under Cartwright's advice and direction, for the inoculation of the country with Presbyterian principles in such a manner as to avoid the forfeiture of their benefices. On May 8, 1582, sixty clergymen from the eastern counties met at Cockfield, in Suffolk, of which parish one of them — Knewstub — was vicar (oddly enough, Cockfield is within a short distance of Hadleigh, where the earliest plans of the Tractarians were laid), to consult about the ordinary Puritan platform — “apparel, matter, form, days, fastings, injunctions.” etc. They adjourned to Cambridge, and from thence to London, “where they hoped to be concealed by the general resort of the people to Parliament.” At length, under the guidance of Cartwright, the late Margaret professor, and of Travers, afterwards Hooker's opponent, and who was at the time domestic chaplain and tutor in the family of lord Burleigh, this convocation of Puritan clergy framed the following systematic plan for grafting their new system on that of the Church. The document is of sufficient importance to be given at full length:

“*Concerning Ministers.* — Let no man, though he be a university man, offer himself to the ministry; nor let any man take upon him an uncertain and vague ministry, though it be offered unto him.

“But such as be called to the ministry by some certain Church, let them impart it unto that *Classis* or *Conference* whereof themselves are, or else unto some greater Church assembly; and if such shall be found fit by them, then let them be commended by their letters unto the bishop, that they may be ordained ministers by him.

“Those ceremonies in the Book of Common Prayer which, being taken from popery, are in controversy ought to be omitted and given over, if it may be done without danger of being put from the ministry. But if there be any imminent danger to be deprived, then this matter must be communicated to the *Classis* in which that Church is, that by the judgment thereof it may be determined what ought to be done.

“If subscription to the Articles of Religion and to the Book of Common Prayer shall be again urged, it is thought that the Book of Articles may be subscribed unto, according to the statutes 13 Eliz., that is, unto such of them only as contain the sum of Christian faith and doctrine of the sacraments. But, for many weighty causes, neither the rest of the Articles in that book nor the Book of Common Prayer may be allowed; no, though a man should be deprived of his ministry for it.

“*Concerning Churchwardens.* — It seemeth that churchwardens and collectors for the poor might be thus turned into elders and deacons.

“When they are to be chosen, let the Church have warning fifteen days before of the time of elections, and of the ordinances of the realm; but especially of Christ’s ordinance touching appointing of watchmen and overseers in his Church, who are to foresee that none offence or scandal do arise in the Church; and if any such happen, that by them it be duly abolished.

“*Of Collectors for the Poor, or Deacons.* — And touching deacons of both sorts — viz., men and women — the Church shall be admonished what is required by the apostle; and that they are not to choose men of custom and of course, or of riches, but for their faith, zeal, and integrity; and that the Church is to pray, in the

meantime, to be so directed that they make choice of them that be meet.

“Let the names of such as are chosen be published the next Lord’s day, and after that their duties to the Church, and the Church’s towards them, shall be declared; then let them be received unto the ministry to which they are chosen with the oeneral prayeis of the whole Church.

“*Of Classes.* — The bletren are to be requested to ordain a distribution of all churches, according to these rules in that behalf that are set down in the Synodical Discipline, touching classical, provincial, comital, or of commencements and assemblies for the whole kingdom.

“The Classes are to be required to keep acts of memorable matters, which they shall see delivered to the comital assembly, that from thence they may be brought by the provincial assembly.

“They are to deal earnestly with patrons to present fit men whensoever any Church is fallen void in that Classis.

“The comital assemblies are to be admonished to make collections for the relief of the poor aind of scholars, but especially for the relief of such ministers here as are put out for not subscribing to the articles tendered by the bishops; also for relief of Scottish ministers and others, and for other profitable and necessary uses.

“All the provincial synods must continually aforehand foresee in due time to appoint the keeping of their next provincial synods, and for the sending of chosen persons with certain instructions unto the national synod, to be holden whensoever the Parliament for the kingdom shall be called, and at some certain time every year”

(*Dangerous Positions and Proceedings* [1593], p. 46; Neal, *Hist. of the Puritans*, i, 345).

A Book of Discipline was prepared for their direction in their pastoral work; and this document was subscribed by upwards of five hundred of the most devoted ministers in England.

The High-Church party now took a bold step in advance. Dr. Bancroft, in a sermon which he preached at Paul’s Cross, Jan. 12, 1588, maintained the

divine right of bishops, thus exposing the Puritans to the charge of heresy. The promulgation of a doctrine so novel and startling excited the utmost commotion throughout all England. Many of the moderate supporters of episcopacy were not prepared to coincide in the extreme view which Dr. Bancroft had taken, and the friends of royal supremacy were alarmed lest the propagation of such opinions might lead to an infringement of the queen's prerogative as head of the Church of England. The Puritans, on the other hand, were for a considerable time disposed to treat the whole matter with ridicule, and, accordingly, the famous Martin Mar-Prelate tracts were issued at this time, characterized by the most pungent wit and caustic satire, levelled against the bishops and their supporters. These anonymous pamphlets were circulated in great numbers throughout the country, and read with the utmost avidity by all classes of the people. The authors of these clever though coarse productions were never discovered, and their damaging effect upon the High-Church party was only arrested by the seizure of the printing-press from which they had been thrown off.

But the evil which Bancroft wrought was not limited to the extravagant assertion of the divine right of episcopacy; he persecuted the Puritans with such relentless fury that in one year three hundred ministers were silenced, excommunicated, imprisoned, or compelled to leave the country. An act was passed for the suppression of conventicles on pain of perpetual banishment. In short, throughout the whole reign of Elizabeth, the Puritans were assailed with the most cruel persecution in almost every conceivable form. At length, as the life of the despotic queen approached its close, the hopes of the oppressed and down-trodden party began to revive. The throne, when vacant, was likely to be filled by James VI of Scotland, whose education in a Presbyterian country, as well as his avowed preference for a Presbyterian Church, was likely to predispose him to favor their views.

March 24, 1603, queen Elizabeth died, and the Scottish king was proclaimed sovereign of England. The Puritans lost no time in taking steps to call the attention of the new king to the heavy grievances under which they had long labored. As James was travelling southwards to take possession of the English throne, a document, commonly known by the name of the Millenary Petition, was put into his hands, in the preamble of which the petitioners declared — and hence the name — “That they, to the number of more than a *thousand* ministers, groaned under the burden of human rites and ceremonies, and cast themselves at his majesty's feet for

relief.” This petition was signed by seven hundred and fifty ministers, which was probably about one half of the Puritan ministers in England. As was to have been expected, the prelatic party also assailed the royal ear with plausible statements of their HighChurch views. James professed to have a peculiar skill in theological debate, and by way of appearing to be impartial, he arranged a public discussion of the contested points to take place in his presence on an appointed day. This is well known as the *Hampton Court Conference*, which ended in convincing the Puritans that they were utterly mistaken in looking for protection, not to speak of favor, from the new monarch, who had evidently become a sudden convert to Episcopacy, and that, too, of the strongest and most High-Church character.

James had no sooner ascended the throne of England than he began to manifest a disposition to be still more tyrannical and despotic than even Elizabeth herself had been. The High Commission, which had long been an engine of the most cruel oppression against the Puritans, was continued; subscription to canons and articles was enforced with the utmost rigor, and those ministers who refused to subscribe were silenced or deposed. Thus insulted and oppressed, both by the government and the dominant party in the Church, the Puritans felt it to be important that their true principles should be thoroughly understood by the people. With this view a treatise was published, entitled *English Puritanism*, which afforded a full and impartial statement of their peculiar opinions.

The extent to which James was disposed to push the royal prerogative was well fitted to awaken alarm both in the Parliament and the people. Both civil and religious liberty were evidently in danger, and Parliament prepared to interfere and to demand redress of grievances which had now become intolerable. “But the king,” says Dr. Hetherington, “met all their remonstrances and petitions for redress with the most lofty assertions of his royal prerogative, in the exercise of which he held himself to be accountable to God alone, affirming it to be sedition in a subject to dispute what a king might do in the height of his power. The Parliament repeated the assertion of their own rights, accused the High Commission of illegal and tyrannical conduct, and advocated a more mild and merciful course of procedure towards the Puritans. Offended with the awakening spirit of freedom thus displayed, the king, by the advice of Bancroft, dissolved the Parliament, resolved to govern, if possible, without parliaments in future. This arbitrary conduct on the part of James aroused, in the mind of

England, a deep and vigilant jealousy with regard to their sovereign's intentions, which rested not till, in the reign of his son, it broke forth in its strength and overthrew the monarchy."

Deprived of all hope of redress, numbers of the Puritans fled to the Continent, and some of them, having there become imbued with the principles of Independency, returned to introduce that system of Church polity into England. Thus arose a body of Christians which ere long assumed a prominent place both in the religious and political history of the kingdom. The king, though a professed religionist, was still more a politician; and so completely was the former character merged in the latter that he had come to rank all as Puritans who dared to limit the royal prerogative or to uphold the rights and liberties of the people as established by law and the constitution of the country. To the maintenance of despotism in the State he added also the fostering of a novel theology in the Church, avowing his hostility to the Calvinistic views in which he had been reared in Scotland, and bestowing his favors upon those of the English clergy who were beginning to teach Arminian sentiments. The condition of the country, both in a political and religious aspect, was every day becoming more agitated, and matters were fast ripening for a great national convulsion, when the death of James, in 1625, and the accession of his son Charles I, arrested the revolutionary tendencies for a time. Additional cruelties, however, were inflicted upon the Puritans under the new reign; fresh ceremonies of a thoroughly Romish character were introduced by Laud with the royal sanction; and, in consequence, numbers who refused to conform were obliged to seek refuge in other countries.

A few years before the new reign had commenced, a body of Puritans, unable longer to endure the persecution to which they were exposed, had embarked as exiles, seeking a new home on the western shores of the Atlantic, and had formed a settlement in New England, destined to be the foundation of a new empire. This colony of the Pilgrim fathers (q.v.) received vast accessions in consequence of the arbitrary measures of Latd. An association for promoting emigration to New England was formed on a large scale. Men of rank and influence and ejected Puritan ministers of high standing encouraged the scheme, and a grant of land from the government was applied for. The king was not opposed to the design, and a patent was obtained for the government and company of Massachusetts Bay. Emigrants to the number of 200 set sail, and, landing at Salem in 1629, established a new colony there. Next year 1500 left the shores of England,

including many both of wealth and education. The desire for emigration on the part of the oppressed Puritans continued to gather strength, and year after year large numbers of them proceeded to New England. Neal alleges that had not the civil power interfered to check the rage for emigration, in a few years one-fourth part of the property of the kingdom would have been taken to America. But the government became alarmed, and a proclamation was issued “to restrain the disorderly transporting of his majesty’s subjects, because of the many idle and refractory humors, whose only or principal end is to live beyond the reach of authority.” Next day an order appeared to “stay eight ships now in the river of Thames prepared to go for New England,” and the passengers, among whom was Oliver Cromwell, were obliged to disembark. Notwithstanding the check thus given to emigration, it is calculated that during twelve years the emigrants amounted to no less than 21,000 persons.

The tyrannical conduct of Charles and his minions, both in the government and the Church, soon precipitated the country into all the horrors of a civil war, which ended in the death of the king by the axe of the executioner, and in the establishment of the Commonwealth under the protectorate of Cromwell. By the act of Sept. 10, 1642, it was declared that prelacy should be abolished in England from and after Nov. 5, 1643, and it was resolved to summon together an assembly of divines in order to complete the necessary reformation. In the meantime, various enactments were passed for the suppression of some of the most crying evils, and for affording some support to those Puritan ministers who had been ejected in former times for nonconformity, or had recently suffered from the ravages of the king’s army. It was a religious age; and though the people had trampled the crown beneath their feet, they showed no disposition to depreciate the office of the clergy. During the heat of the war the Puritans, who almost to a man sided with the Parliament, preached to large congregations; and, in all the great towns at least, they had the implicit ear of the people. Episcopacy being at an end, they acted, for a while, according to the dictates of conscience or mere taste; the surplice was generally laid aside; and extempore prayer was used in the parish churches even before the ordinance of Parliament appeared, in 1645, forbidding the Book of Common Prayer. The old Puritanism, however, was now passing away. A generation had arisen in whose eyes the principles of Cartwright were crude and imperfect. They no longer contended against the forms and vestments, but against the constitution of the Church of England. Prelacy,

by which we understand the episcopacy titled and associated with civil authority, was detested; all forms of prayer were decried; and episcopacy, even in its mildest forms, was thought unscriptural. Thus Puritanism, properly so called, became extinct because the grounds of the old contention no longer existed. The later Puritans appeared and immediately fell into two great parties, Presbyterians (q.v.) and Independents (q.v.). For nine months after the passing of the act for the abolition of prelacy there was no fixed and legalized form of Church government in England at all. Even Charles had consented to the removal of the bishops from the House of Lords; and though he had not sanctioned the abolition of the hierarchy, yet a large party regarded the measure as called for in the circumstances of the country. In this state of matters the Westminster Assembly of Divines was convened, consisting largely of Puritan preachers who had gradually become attached to Presbyterianism. The Independent or Congregational party in the Assembly, however, though few in point of number, yet had sufficient influence to prevent presbytery from being established in England. Throughout the days of the Commonwealth Puritanism existed in the form chiefly of Independency. On Dec. 25, 1655, Cromwell issued a proclamation that thenceforth no minister of the Church of England should dare to preach, administer the sacraments, or teach schools, on pain of imprisonment or exile. After the Restoration of Charles II, in 1662, the name of Puritan was changed into that of *Non-conformist*, which comprehended all who refused to observe the rites and subscribe to the doctrines of the Church of England in obedience to the Act of Uniformity. By this act nearly 2000 ministers of the Church of England were ejected from their charges and thrown into the ranks of the Nonconformists (q.v.).

It may be proper to mention, in conclusion, the doctrinal Puritans. These formed, in fact, the moderate Church party during the reign of Charles I. Their leaders were bishops Davenant, Hall, Williams, and Carleton. The title of doctrinal Puritans was fastened upon them by the Laudian party. They held and taught the doctrines of the Reformation, in opposition to the sacramental system which Laud had recently introduced. They entertained no scruples as to the forms and ceremonies of the Church of England, to which they willingly conformed. But they rejected with indignation the innovations of the Laudian party, who, in return, branded them with the name of Puritans. It was an entirely new application of the word, and one against which they did not fail to protest. It seems to have been first used about 1625 by bishop Montague in a controversy with Carleton, and the

latter exclaims, "This is the first time that I ever heard of a Puritan doctrine in points dogmatical, and I have lived longer in the Church than he hath done. I thought that Puritans were only such as were factious against the bishops, in the point of pretended discipline; and so I am sure it hath been understood in our Church." The controversies which have ever since existed within the bosom of the Church of England now for the first time appeared. The construction of the baptismal offices became a subject of contention, and the whole question of baptismal and sacramental grace. The doctrinal Puritans adhered to the ancient forms of worship, and for doing so were severely harassed. The Laudian party maintained "that whatever rites were practiced in the Church of Rome, and not expressly abolished at the Reformation, nor disclaimed by any doctrine, law, or canon, were consistent with the Church of England." Under this general maxim they introduced a multitude of ceremonies — such, for instance, as bowing to the east and placing candles on the altar, now gorgeously decorated once more — which had long been dismissed as badges of popery. Thus in a short time a difference was apparent between the two parties both in doctrinal teaching and in visible forms. To complete the quarrel, the Laudians were of the Arminian school, while the doctrinal Puritans were moderate Calvinists. For twenty years the doctrinal Puritans were subjected to all manner of annoyance; but they remained steadfast in their attachment to the Church, and when the storm burst upon it they were exposed to all its fury. They took no share in Laud's convocation of 1640, and greatly disapproved of its arbitrary measures. But the popular rage made no distinctions, and the Church Puritans suffered just as much as their old opponents of the high prelatial party. The Church itself was overthrown; and in the darkness and confusion that ensued they disappear from sight during the civil war.

The literature of the Puritans, as a religious party, consists chiefly of controversial and practical theology, and in both its ability is confessed by friend and foe. As Whitgift and his disciple Hooker exhausted the argument in favor of episcopacy and a liturgical Church, so did Cartwright and Travers that in behalf of Presbyterian discipline. The student, after a wide search among the combatants of later times, finds, to his surprise, how insignificant are all their additions to a controversy opened, and, as far as learning and argument can go, finally closed, by the earliest champions on either side. Of the practical divinity of Elizabeth's reign, a large proportion was contributed by the Puritans. The party embraced men of high rank and

general education as well as men of theological learning; and the literature of the age bears many tokens of their influence. If we descend to the next age, the names of the greatest men of the reigns of James, Charles I, and the Commonwealth present themselves as in a greater or less degree connected with the Puritans. Selden, Whitelock, Milton, with their pens; Ruyard, Hampden, Vane, in Parliament; Owen, Marshall, Calamy, Baxter, and a host of others, in the pulpit; Cromwell, Essex, and Fairfax, in the field — all ranged themselves under the Puritan cause. Never was a party more distinguished in its advocates; never was a cause lost amid more hopeful prospects, or when to human eyes its triumph was more secure. In 1650 it was at the summit of its pride and power, with the Church of England at its feet. Ten years afterwards its influence had passed away; and, in the persons of the Presbyterians who crossed over to propitiate the yomung king at Breda, it was submissively pleading for its life. See *Zurich Letters*; Strype, *Life of Cranmer*; Paul, *Life of Whitgift*; Brook, *A Memoir of Thomas Cartwright*; Hall, *Hard Measure and Shaking of the Olive Tree*; Whitelock, *Memorials*; *Speeches in this Great and Happy Parliament, 1645*; *History of the Westminster Assembly*; Clarendon, *History of the Great Rebellion*; Neal, *History of the Puritans*; Heylin, *History of the Reformation*, and *Life of Laud*; Gardiner, *History of the English Revolution* (republished in the excellent series of history manuals by Scribner & Co., New York); Marsden, *Dictionary of Sects and Heresies*; and the exhaustive articles in Gardner. *Dictionary of Faiths*, and Blunt, *Dictionary of Historical Theology*, both of which we have freely used.

Purity

the freedom of anything from foreign admixture; but more particularly it signifies the temper directly opposite to criminal sensualities, or the ascendancy of irregular passions. *SEE CHASTITY.*

Purity implies —

1. A fixed, habitual abhorrence of all forbidden indulgences of the flesh.
2. All past impurities, either of heart or life, will be reflected on with shame and sorrow.
3. The heart will be freed, in a great measure, from impure and irregular desires.

4. It will discover itself by a cautious fear of the least degree of impurity.

5. It implies a careful and habitual guard against everything which tends to pollute the mind. In the relations of the sexes purity was strictly guarded in the early Church. It needed to be so, for heathenism around it was one mass of defilement, as the first chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, the satires of Juvenal, the poems of Catullus, Petronius Arbiter, Johannes Secundus, etc., abundantly show. Women were, therefore, forbidden to wash in the same bath with men. If a clergyman bathed with women, he was to be deposed, and a layman so guilty was to be excommunicated. A man, by one of the laws of Justinian, might divorce his wife if she had been found bathing with men. Certain kinds of dancing and songs were also strictly forbidden, especially at marriage feasts, for they were the remains of old pagan obscenities. Women, also, were not allowed to keep vigils in churches under pretence of devotion, because the practice led to secret wickedness, as the council of Elvira intimates. Lascivious books were condemned, and these at the period must have been common. Stage-plays were no less put under ban. Cyprian says, "Adultery was learned by seeing it acted." To know what this means, the reader has only to be referred to the English comedies of the reign of Charles II. The heathen deities in those primitive times were brought upon the stage — the wanton Venus and the rake Jupiter — and men, as Cyprian says again, "imitate the gods whom they worship." The impurities of the stage were virtually the "pomps of Satan," which Christians renounced at baptism. For similar reasons intemperance was reprobated. "Drunkenness and lust," said Tertullian, "are two devils combining." Changing of their respective dresses on the part of the sexes was also condemned. "If any woman," said the council of Gangra, "on pretence of living a religious life, take the apparel of men, let her be anathema." Similar enactments may be found in more recent times. "The General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, by their act, July 19, 1649, finding that scandal and abuse arose from promiscuous dancing, do therefore discharge the same; the censure is referred to the several presbyteries." By the Church discipline of France, c. 14 art. 27, "those who make account to dance, or are present at dancing, after having been several times admonished, shall be excommunicated upon their growing obstinate and rebellious, and all Church judicatures are to see this act put to execution." By art. 26, "all persons who wear habits to have open marks of dissoluteness, shame, and too much newness, as painting, naked breasts, and the like, the consistory shall use all possible means to suppress such

badges of immodesty by censures. All obscene pictures, which are apt to dispose and incite to unclean thoughts and desires, are declared to be most improper furniture for the houses of Christians, and therefore the users of them may fall under Church censure, if they be not removed." See Taylor, *Holy Living*; Evans, *Sermons on the Christian Temper*, ser. 23; and Watts, *Sermons*, ser. 27; *Meth Qu. Rev.* April, 1873, art. ii. — Buck, *Theol. Dict.* s.v.; Eadie, *Ecclesio Dict.* s.v.

Purkhiser, Micah Gilbert,

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Washington township, Clermont County, O., Oct. 15, 1813. in his nineteenth year he was converted at a camp-meeting, and united with the Church. In 1834 he was licensed to preach, and in the following year joined the travelling connection in the Ohio Conference, and was appointed to Monroe Circuit, in Michigan Territory. During the year he rode about 2000 miles, preached nearly 200 times, obtained many seals to his ministry, and for his living received the modest sum of \$47,371. His next appointment was to Spring Arbor Circuit. His next charge was as assistant on Georgetown Circuit, O. Next he preached on the West Charge, Cincinnati, and then removed to Batavia Circuit, where he labored two years. His subsequent appointments were: 1841, Fulton, Guyandotte, W. Va.; Frankfort, West Union, Highland, New Lexington, West White Oak, New Richmond, Goshen, Clarksville, Highland, Lynchburgh, New Market, Union, Miamisburgh and Germantown, New Paris, Highland, and Sinking Springs. At the conference of 1869 he took a supernumerary relation, and he died April 29, 1875. See *Minutes of Conferences*, 1875, p. 114.

Purmann, Johann G.

a German theologian and educator, was born Jan. 1, 1733, at Konigsberg. After having completed his studies, in 1760 he was appointed co-rector at Frankfort-on-the-Main, and in 1770 rector of the gymnasium, and there he died, Dec. 11, 1813. He wrote, *Archceologioe Georgioe Spec. de Re Rustica Veterum Hebrorum* (Frankf.-on-the-Main, 1786-87): — *Geschichte des Glaubens an einen Gott* (ibid. 1795-96, 2 pts.): — *Fata Doctrine de Immortalitate Animorum* (ibid. 1798-1802, 6 pts.): — *De Paschate Christ. ex Antiquitate* (ibid. 1799): — *Narratio de Synodo Ecclesiast. anno 794, a Carolo M. Francfurti ad Moenum habita* (ibid.

1794, 2 pts.). See Winer, *Handbuch der theoloq. Literatur*, p. 717 and Index; First, *Bibl. Judaica*, 3, 124. (B. P.)

Purner, John Milton

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Cecil County, Md., March 31, 1833. He was converted at Elkton, Md., in 1854, and was for some time engaged in business at Oxford, Pa. In 1858 he felt called to preach, and was made assistant pastor on Lewistown Circuit. In the following year he joined the Philadelphia Conference, and was made junior preacher on Laurel Circuit, Del., in 1859, and on Church Creek Circuit, Md., in 1860. In 1861 and 1862 he was in charge on Aries Circuit, Md. In 1863 and 1864 he was in charge on Sharptown Circuit, Md., and in 1865 was appointed junior preacher on Princess Anne Circuit, Md., and at the same time attended the Biblical Institute, Concord, N. H. In 1866 he was in charge of Atlantic Circuit, Va., and in 1867 he preached in Accomac Circuit for a short time, whence he was removed by the presiding elder and appointed in charge of Princess Anne Circuit, Md. There he closed his labor and his life in September, 1867. See *Minutes of Conferences*, 1867.

Purple

Picture for Purple (1)

(¹⁰⁶𐤀𐤎𐤁𐤂𐤁) *aryaman*, from the Sanscrit *raga*, *red*; see (esen. *Thes.* s.v.; Chald. ¹⁰⁶𐤀𐤎𐤁𐤂𐤁) *ayrevdn*, from the same root, in ⁴⁰⁷2 Chronicles 2:7; ²⁸⁷Daniel 5:7, 16, 29; Sept. and Greek Test. **πορφύρα**; Vulg. *purpura*) occurs in ¹²⁵Exodus 25:4; 26:1, 31, 36; 27:16; 28:5, 6, 8, 15, 33; 35:6, 23, 25, 35; 36:8, 35, 37; 38:18, 23; 39:1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 24, 29; ⁴⁰³Numbers 4:13; ¹⁰⁸Judges 8:26; ⁴⁰⁴2 Chronicles 2:14; 3:14; ¹⁰⁰⁶Esther 1:6; 8:15; ¹⁸²Proverbs 31:22; ²⁸⁰Song of Solomon 3:10; 7:5; ⁴¹⁰Jeremiah 10:9; ²⁵⁷Ezekiel 27:7, 16; Ecclesiasticus 45:10; Bar. 6:12, 72; 1 Macc. 4:23; 8:14, 10:20, 62; 2 Macc. 4:38; ⁴¹⁵⁷Mark 15:17, 20; ²⁶⁹Luke 16:19; ³⁹¹John 19:2, 5; ⁴¹⁶⁴Acts 16:14; ⁶⁷⁰Revelation 17:4; 18:12, 16. In many of these passages the word translated “purple” means “purple cloth,” or some other material dyed purple, as wool, thread, etc.; but no reference occurs to the means by which the dye was obtained, except in 1 Macc. 4:23, where we have **πορφύρα θαλασσία**, ‘purple of the sea’ (comp. Diod. Sic. iii, 68; Josephus, *War*, v, 5, 4). There is, however, no reason to doubt that it was obtained, like the far-famed Tyrian purple, from the juice of

certain species of shell-fish. Different accounts are given by the ancients respecting the date and origin of this invention. Some place it in the reign of Phoenix, second king of Tyre, B.C. 500; others at the time that Minos I reigned in Crete, B.C. 1439, and consequently before the Exodus (Suidas, s.v. Ἡρακλῆς, ii, 73). But the person to whom the majority ascribe it is the Tyrian Hercules, whose dog, it is said, instigated by hunger, broke a certain kind of shell-fish on the coast of Tyre, and his mouth becoming stained of a beautiful color, his master was induced to try its properties on wool, and gave his first specimens to the king of Tyre, who admired the color so much that he restricted the use of it by law to the royal garments (Pollux, *Onom.* i, 4; Achilles Tatius, *De Clitoph.*; Palaephat. in *Chronicles Paschal.* p. 43). It is remarkable that though the Israelites, as early as the first construction of the tabernacle in the wilderness, appear to have had purple stuff in profusion (^{<1251>}Exodus 25:1-4), which they had most likely brought with them out of Egypt, yet no instance occurs in the pictorial language of the Egyptians, nor in Wilkinson's *Ancient Manners and Customs*, of the actual process of dyeing either linen or woollen, although dyes similar to the Tyrian were found among them. These facts agree, at least, with the accounts which ascribe the invention to the earliest of these two periods, and the pre-eminent trade in it to the Tyrians. The Greeks attributed its first introduction among themselves to the Phoenicians (Eurip. *Phoen.* 1497). Their word φοῖνιξ, *Phoenix*, means both *Phenician* and *purple*. The word πορφύρα is, according to Martinius, of Tyrian origin. Though purple dyes were by no means confined to the Phoenicians (comp. ^{<3270>}Ezekiel 27:7, "purple from the isles of Elisha," supposed to mean Elis, "and from Syria," ver. 16), yet violet purples and scarlet were nowhere dyed so well as at Tyre, whose shores abounded with the best kind of purples (Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* 9:60, p. 524, ed. Harduin), and which was supplied with the best wool by the neighboring nomads. The dye called purple by the ancients, and its various shades, were obtained from many kinds of shell-fish, all of which are, however, ranged by Pliny under two classes: one called "buccinum," because shaped like a horn, found, he says, in cliffs and rocks, and yielding a sullen blue dye, which he compares to the color of the angry raging sea in a tempest; the other called "purpura," or "pelagia," the proper purple shell, taken by fishing in the sea, and yielding the deep-red color which he compares to the rich, fresh, and bright color of deep-red purple roses and to coagulated blood, and which was chiefly valued (*ibid.* c. 61,62). The latter is the *Murex trunculus* of Linnaeus and Lamarck (see *Syst. Nat.* p. 1215, and

Animaux sans Vertebres [Paris, 1822], 7:170). Both sorts were supposed to be as many years old as they had spirals round. Michaelis thinks that Solomon alludes to their shape when he says (Cant. 7:5), “The hair of thine head is like purple,” meaning that the tresses (Sept. *πλόκιον κεφαλῆς*, Vulg. *comae capitis*) were tied up in a spiral or pyramidal form on the top. Others say that the word “purple” is here used like the Latin *papuureus*, for beautiful, etc., and instance the “*purpurei olores*,” “beautiful swans” of Horace (*Carm.* 4:1, 10), and the “*u purpureus capillus*” of Virgil (*Georg.* 1, 405); but these phrases are not parallel. The juice of the whole shell-fish was not used, but only a little thin liquor called the flower, contained in a white vein or vessel in the neck. The larger purples were broken at the top to get at this vein without injuring it, but the smaller were pressed in mills (Aristot. *Hist. An.* v, 13, 75; Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* 9:60). The *Murex trunculus* has been demonstrated to be the species used by the ancient Tyrians by Wilde, who found a concrete mass of the shells in some of the ancient dye-pots sunk in the rocks of Tyre (*Narrative* [Dublin, 1840], ii, 482). It is of common occurrence now on the same coasts (Kitto, *Physical History of Palestine*, p. 418), and throughout the whole of the Mediterranean, and even of the Atlantic. In the Mediterranean, the countries most celebrated for purples were the shores of Peloponnesus and Sicily, and in the Atlantic the coasts of Britain, Ireland, and France. Horace alludes to the African (*Carm.* ii, 16, 35). There is, indeed, an essential difference in the color obtained from the purples of different coasts. Thus the shells from the Atlantic are said to give the darkest juice; those of the Italian and Sicilian coasts, a violet or purple; and those of the Phoenician, a crimson. It appears from the experiments of Reaumur and Duhamel that the tinging juice is perfectly white while in the vein; but upon being laid on linen, it soon appears first of a lightgreen color, and, if exposed to the air and sun, soon after changes into a deep green, in a few minutes into a sea-green, and in a few more into a blue; thence it speedily becomes of a purple red, and in an hour more of a deep purple red, which, upon being washed in scalding water and soap, ripens into a most bright and beautiful crimson, which is permanent. The ancients applied the word translated “purple” not to one color only, but to the whole class of dyes manufactured from the juices of shell-fish, as distinguished from the vegetable dyes (*colores herbacei*), and comprehending not only what is commonly called purple, but also light and dark purple, and almost every shade between. Various methods were adopted to produce these different colors. Thus, a sullen blue was obtained from the juice of the buccinum alone; a plain red, yet

also deep and brown, from the pelagia; a dark red by dipping the wool, etc., first in the juice of the purpura, and then in that of the buccinum; a violet (which was the amethyst color so much valued by the Romans) by reversing the process; and another, the most valued and admired of all—the tyriamethystus—by again dipping the amethyst in the juice of the pelagia. This Pliny calls *diblaptha Tyria*; so named, he says, because “bis tinctoria” (*Hist. Nat.* 9:39). No reference to this process occurs in the Scriptures, but it is often alluded to in Roman authors. Thus, Horace (*Epod.* 12:21): “Muricibus Tyrii iteratae vellera lanæ” (the wools with Tyrian purple double dyed). Other varieties of color may have been produced by the use of various species of mollusks, and of those from different coasts. The Phœnicians also understood the art of throwing a peculiar lustre into this color by making other tints play over it, and producing what we call a shot color, which seems to have been wonderfully attractive (Pliny, 9:41).

Picture for Purple (2)

Purple was employed in religious worship both among Jews and Gentiles. It was one of the colors of the curtains of the tabernacle (^{<1230>}Exodus 26:1); of the veil (ver. 31); of the curtain over the grand entrance (ver. 36); of the ephod of the high-priest (^{<1235>}Exodus 28:5, 6), and of its girdle (ver. 8); of the breastplate (ver. 15); of the hem of the robe of the ephod (ver. 33); (comp. Ecclesiasticus 45:10); of cloths for divine service (^{<1230>}Exodus 39:1; comp. ^{<1015>}Numbers 4:13), resumed when the Temple was built (^{<1410>}2 Chronicles 2:7, 14; 3:14). The material upon which the Jews used purple and other brilliant colors, at least in their sacred paraphernalia, seems to have been exclusively *wool*, which, it is well known, takes colors better than linen. *SEE TABERNACLE*. Pliny records a similar use of it among the Romans: “Diis advocatur placandis” (*Hist. Nat.* 9:60; Cicero, *Epist. ad Atticum* ii, 9). The Babylonians arrayed their idols in it (^{<2410>}Jeremiah 10:9; Bar. 12:72). It was at an early period worn by kings (^{<1035>}Judges 8:26). Homer speaks as if it were almost peculiar to them (*II.* 4:144; 1 Macc. 8:14). Pliny says it was worn by Romulus and the succeeding kings of Rome, and by the consuls and first magistrates under the republic. Suetonius relates that Julius Caesar prohibited its use by Roman subjects, except on certain days; and that Nero forbade it altogether, upon pain of death. The use of it was bestowed by kings upon favorites, etc.; Josephus says by Pharaoh on Joseph (*Ant.* ii, 5, 7). It was given by Ahasuerus to Mordecai (^{<1785>}Esther 8:15); to Daniel by Belshazzar (^{<2100>}Daniel 5:7, 16, 29). It was the dress of an ethnarch or prince, and as such given by

Alexander to Jonathan (1 Macc. 10:20, 62, 64, 65; comp. 2 Macc. 4:38). In the last chapter of the Proverbs it is represented as the dress of a matron (ver. 22). It was at one time worn by Roman ladies and rich men (Livy, 34:7, and Valerius Max. ii, 1). See also the parable of the rich man and Lazarus (^{<2169>}Luke 16:19). In ^{<7006>}Esther 1:6, it appears as part of the royal furniture of Ahasuerus; and in ^{<2180>}Song of Solomon 3:10, as the covering of the royal chariot; and Pliny refers to its general use, not only for clothes, but carpets, cushions, etc. (ix, 39). The robe in which the Prnetorian guard arrayed the Saviour, called **χλαμὺς κοκκινῆ** by ^{<1278>}Matthew 27:28, and **πορφύρα** by ^{<4157>}Mark 15:17, 20, and **ἱμάτιον πορφυροῦν** by ^{<899>}John 19:2, and which appears to have been the cast-off sagum of one of their officers, was no doubt scarlet—that is, proper *crimson*, as will hereafter appear of a deeper hue and finer texture than the sagum or chlamys of the common soldier, but inferior in both respects to that of the emperor, which was also of this color in the time of war, though purple during peace. The adjectives used by the evangelists are, however, often interchanged. Thus a vest, which Horace (*Sat.* ii, 6, 102) calls “*rubro cocco tincta*,” in 1, 106 he styles “*purpurea*.” Braunius shows that the Romans gave this name to any color that had a mixture of red (*De Vestitu Sacerdotum* [Lugd. Bat. 1680], i, 14). Ovid applies the term “*purpureus*” to the cheeks and lips (*Amor.* i, 3). In ^{<4004>}Acts 10:14, reference is found to Lydia, of the city of Thyatira, a seller of purple cloth. The manufacture seems to have decayed with its native city. A colony of Jews which was established at Thebes in Greece in the 12th century carried on an extensive manufactory for dyeing purple. It ultimately became superseded by the use of indigo, cochineal, etc., whence a cheaper and finer purple was obtained, and free from the disagreeable odor which attended that derived from shell-fish (Martial, 1, 50, 32). The method of the ancients in preparing and applying it, and other particulars respecting its history, uses, and estimation, are most fully given by Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* 9:36-42). The best modern books are Amati, *De Restitutione Puiypuracrum* (3d ed. Cesena, 1784); the treatise by Capelli, *De Antiqua et Nupera Purpura*, with notes; and Don Michaele Rosa, *Dissertazione delle Porpore*. etc. (1768). See also *Dictionnaire des Sciences Naturelles*, 43, 219, etc.; Bochart, edit. Rosenmuller, iii, 675, etc.; Heeren, *Historical Researches*, translated (Oxford, 1833), ii, 8, etc. Steger, *De Pupura, Sacroe Dignitatis Insigni* (Lips. 1741).

Crimson (leb. *karmiil'*, | **ymæĵi** a Persian word akin to Sanscrit *krimi*, *Eng. crimson*. It occurs in ^{<4417>}2 Chronicles 2:7-14; 3:14; Sept. **κόκκινος**,

Vulg. coccinum). This word is by some supposed to signify another kind of shell-fish, yielding a crimson dye, so called because found on the shore near Mount Carmel. If so, these words (^{צורב}Song of Solomon 7:5), “thine head upon thee is like Carmel,” may contain another reference to the shape of some sort of *purpura* (Bochart, iii, 661, etc.). Gesenius says it is a word belonging to later Hebrew, and most probably of Persian or Armenian origin.

The purple dye itself was a liquor, contained in a vein situated in the neck of the animal, which when first opened resembled cream in color and consistence. Small shells were collected and bruised in mortars, but the larger ones were opened singly, the fluid carefully removed, and mingled with salt to prevent decomposition. It was diluted with five or six times as much water, and kept moderately hot in leaden or tin vessels for eight or ten days, during which the liquor was often skimmed, to separate all the impurities. After this, the wool to be dyed, being first well washed, was immersed, and kept therein for five hours, then taken out, cooled, and again immersed, and continued in the liquor till all the color was exhausted (Thomson, *Hist. of Chemistry*, i, 91). Prior to the researches of Mr. Wilde, noticed above, it had been concluded that the *purpura* of Pliny was the *Murex trunculus* of Linnaeus from indirect evidence. The buccinum of the same ancient writer is thought to be the *Purpurat patula* of Lamarck; and probably the *P. lapillus*, one of the most abundant of species on the rocky shores of Europe, including Great Britain, may have been the chief of the smaller sorts. It has been supposed by some that the conchylium of Pliny, which gave a paler and bluer purple, was our *Janthina fragilis*; but this is out of the question, because though this snail-like mollusk discharges a violet fluid, it is exceedingly volatile, and therefore wholly unfit for dyeing, whereas unalterable permanency characterized the Phoenician purples. *Scalaria clathrus*, another European shell-fish which discharges a coloring fluid, is liable to the same objection, unless the ancients had some mode of fixing what we find evanescent. Colonel Montagu instituted some experiments on this. “The purple juice,” he says, “may be collected either from the recent or dried animal, by opening the part behind the head; and as much can be procured from five individuals as is sufficient, when mixed with a few drops of spring-water, to cover half a sheet of paper.” Neither volatile nor fixed alkali materially affects it; mineral acids turn it a bluish green or sea-green; sulphuric acid renders it a shade more inclining to blue; vegetable acids probably do not affect it. since cream of tartar did not in

the least alter it. These colors, laid on paper, were very bright, and appeared for some months unchanged by the action of the air or the sun; but being exposed for a whole summer to the solar rays in a south window, they almost vanished. The application of alkali to the acidulated color always restores it to its primitive state, and it is as readily changed again by mineral acid (Montagu, *Testacea Brit. Supp.* p. 122). The circumstance that the fluid effused by *Janthina* and *Scalariat* is purple from the first is conclusive against its being the purple dye of the ancients, who tell us distinctly that this was white or cream-like while within the vein. This agrees accurately with the genera *Murex* and *Purpura*, as may be readily tested in the case of *P. lapillus*, the common dog-whelk of the British coast. Montagu thus records the result of his experiments on this species: "The part containing the coloring-matter is a slender longitudinal vein, just under the skin on the back, behind the head, appearing whiter than the rest of the animal. The fluid itself is of the color and consistence of cream. As soon as it is exposed to the air it becomes of a bright yellow, speedily turns to a pale green, and continues to change imperceptibly, until it assumes a bluish cast, and then a purplish red. Without the influence of the solar rays, it will go through all these changes in the course of two or three hours; but the process is much accelerated by exposure to the sun. A portion of the fluid, mixed with diluted vitriolic acid, did not at first appear to have been sensibly affected; but, by more intimately mixing it in the sun, it became of a pale purple, or purplish red, without any of the intermediate changes. Several marks were now made on fine calico, in order to try if it were possible to discharge the color by such chemical means as were at hand; and it was found that after the color was fixed at its last natural change, nitrous no more than vitriolic acid had any other effect than that of rather brightening it; aqua regia, with or without solution of tin, and marine acid, produced no change; nor had fixed or volatile alkali any sensible effect. It does not in the least give out its color to alcohol, like cochineal, and the succus of the animal of *Turbo (Sclariat) clathrus*; but it communicates its very disagreeable odor to it most copiously, so that opening the bottle has been more powerful in its effects on the olfactory nerves than the effluvia of assafetida, to which it may be compared. All the markings which had been alkalized and acidulated, together with those to which nothing had been applied, became, after washing in soap and water, of a uniform color rather brighter than before, and were fixed at a fine unchangeable crimson" (*Test. Brit. Sulpp.* p. 106). The changes of color are absolutely dependent on the stimulus of light. Dr. Bancroft found that linen stained with the fluid

of the *Purpura* might be kept for years shut between the leaves of a book without any visible change, which at the expiration of its incarceration presently passed through all the changes, under the influence of light, to a glowing purple (*On Perman. Col. i, 145*). Reaumur asserts that the immature egg-capsules of the same mollusk will yield the dye more abundantly, and with more facility, than the animal itself (*Hist. Acad. Sci. 1711*). It would appear as if the knowledge of this art had never been lost, but had been perpetuated even in Great Britain from the classical ages. Bede, in the 8th century, alludes to it familiarly, and with admiration of the brilliancy and permanency of the hue (*Hist. Ecclesiastes Ang. i, 1*); and Richard of Cirencester speaks of it in the 14th (*Descr. of Brit. p. 28*). About the same time the following description was given in a translation of Higden's *Polychronicon*: "Ther is also of shel that we dyeth with fine reede. The reednesse ther of is wondre fayre and stable and steyneth nevyr with colde withwith hete ne with drie but ever the eldere the hew is fayrere" (*Of Bretacyne, i, 38*). Three hundred years later the art was practiced for profit by persons on the coast of Ireland, who guarded it as an heirloom secret. Cole, however, found that the *Purpura lapillus* was the shell employed. See *Bible Educator, 3, 327 sq.; 4:217*; and **SEE COLOR**.

Purple Manuscript

Picture for Purple Manuscript

(CODEX PURPUREUS, sometimes called "*the Cotton MS.*," variously designated as N, J, and P of the Gospels), a beautiful uncial MS. of the Greek Gospels, of which only twelve leaves remain: four of these (containing ⁴⁰⁸⁷Matthew 26:57-65; 27:26-34; ⁴⁸⁴²John 14:2-10; 15:15-22) are in the Cotton Library (*Codex Cottonianus*, the "J" of Wetstein) of the British Museum; two (containing ⁴²⁴³Luke 24:13-21, and 34-39) are in the Imperial Library at Vienna ("N" of Wetstein and others); and six (containing ⁴⁰¹⁶Matthew 19:6-13; 20:6-22) are in the Vatican Library at Rome (called "F" by Scholz). These are written in silver letters (now turned black), occasionally in gold letters, on purple vellum, in a large round hand, and in two columns, with the Ammonian sections and Eusebian canons in the margin. The date is of the end of the 6th or the beginning of the 7th century. Some of the fragments were collated in part by Wetstein and Scholz, and the whole were accurately published by Tischendorf in his *Monumenta Sacra Inedita* (Lips. 1846). See Tregelles,

in Horme's *Introd.* 4:177; Scrivener, *Introd.* p. 110 sq. *SEE MANUSCRIPTS, BIBLICAL.*

Purpose of God

The word *purpose* is commonly used and preferred to the word *decree* when God's (etermination regarding man's relation to eternity is referred to. The word *purpose* owes its use to the fact that it is more comprehensive and expresses the idea of intelligent design, and therefore more clearly and with less of prejudice sets forth the true scope of the divine government. *SEE PREDESTINATION.*

Purpureus Codex.

SEE PURPLE MANUSCRIPT.

Purse

(*sykakis*, ^{<2014>}Proverbs 1:14; a "bag" for money, ^{<246>}Isaiah 46:6, or for weights, ^{<653>}Deuteronomy 25:13; ^{<161>}Proverbs 16:11; ^{<361>}Micah 6:11; *βαλάντιον*, ^{<200>}Luke 10:4; 12:23 ["bag"; 1 22:35, 36; but *ζώνη*, ^{<100>}Matthew 10:9; ^{<168>}Mark 6:8, is the *gin-dle*, as elsewhere rendered). The Hebrews, when on a journey, were provided with a bag, in which they carried their money (^{<168>}Genesis 43:35; ^{<2014>}Proverbs 1:14; 7:20; ^{<246>}Isaiah 46:6), and if they were merchants, also their weights (^{<653>}Deuteronomy 25:13; ^{<361>}Micah 6:11). This bag is variously termed in Heb. *μυκάκις* (as above); *ρωσχ*, *tseror*; and *fyryæ*, *charit*. The last occurs only in 2 Kings v, 23 ("bags"); ^{<282>}Isaiah 3:22 (A. V. "crisping-pins"). The latter is supposed to refer to the long, round form of the purse. The money-bag is described in the New Test. by the terms *βαλάντιον* (as above, peculiar to ^{<200>}Luke 10:4; 12:33; 22:35, 36), and *γλωσσόκομον* (peculiar to ^{<426>}John 12:6; 13:29). The former is a classical term (Plato, *Coulit.* p. 190, *σύσπαστα βάλαντια*); the latter is connected with the classical *γλωσσοκομείον*, which originally meant the bag in which musicians carried the mouthpieces of their instruments. In the Sept. the term is applied to the chest for the offerings at the Temple (^{<408>}2 Chronicles 24:8, 10, 11), and was hence adopted by John to describe the common purse carried by the disciples. The girdle also served as a purse, and hence the term *ζώνη* occurs in ^{<100>}Matthew 10:9; ^{<168>}Mark 6:8. *SEE GIRDLE.* Ladies wore ornamental purses (^{<283>}Isaiah 3:23). The Rabbinitists forbade

any one passing through the Temple with stick, shoes, and purse, these three being the indications of travelling (Mishna, *Berachoth*, 9, § 5). *SEE BAG*; *SEE MONEY*.

Purslain

*SEE MALLOW*S; *SEE WHITE OF AN EGG*.

Purtenance

(*brq*., *keeb*, *e'eb*, *midst*, or inner part) stands improperly in one passage of the A.V. (⁽¹²¹⁾Exodus 12:9) f(or the *viscera*, or “inwards” (as elsewhere rendered), of a sacrificial victim.

Puru

in Hindul mythology, was the son of Jajadu and of Devajani, the daughter of a Brahmin. He was the boldest warrior in the army of the Devas during their struggles against the dremons and giants: he distinguished himself by the terrible use he knew how to make of his war-hatchet. There was another Puru — the first king of India from the family of the Children of the Moon: his father, Buddha, was the son of the Moon. He is the forefather of the whole dynasty of the Children of the Moon, who were all celebrated rulers, and seemed to have founded on the upper Ganges an eternal empire. The kings Dushmanta, Kuru, Dritarashtra, Pandu, etc., belonged to this family, in which Krishna was born several times.

Purus

in Hindu mythology, was the name of the first man created, the Adam of the Indians. The name of his wife was Pargute. *SEE PURU*.

Purver, Anthony

a Quaker preacher of great note for his remarkable literary attainments, especially his exegetical knowledge, was born at Up Hurstbourne, in Hampshire, about 1702. He was originally apprenticed to a shoemaker, but later he was employed in keeping sheep. Though his early education was very limited, his capacity and inclination for the acquisition of learning were very great. He found leisure for study, and his curiosity being excited by the perusal of a tract in which some inaccuracies of the A. V. were pointed out, he determined to study the original languages of the

Scriptures. He secured the assistance of a Jew in the acquisition of Hebrew, Chaldee, etc., and other aid for learning Greek and Latin. He joined the Society of Friends, and preached among them. While laboring as a schoolmaster at Andover, he occupied himself in preparing a new version of the Scriptures; and this, after spending more than thirty years over it, he published by the aid of Dr. Fothergill, who gave him £1000, and carried it through the press at his own expense. It appeared in 1764, entitled *A New Translation of the Old and New Testaments, with notes, Critical and Explanatory* in two volumes folio, beautifully got up. Notwithstanding the enormous labor bestowed upon it by its author, and though there is now and then a better rendering to be found in it than in the A. V., Purver's translation, as a whole, is not of much critical value. The style is crude and bombastic, the very reverse of what might have been expected from a member of the society whose language is so simple; while the notes, though containing much valuable matter, abound in contemptuous expressions about the labors of others in the same department. Purver's Bible is therefore deservedly scarce. He died in 1777. See Orme, *Biblioth. Bibl.* s.v.; Kitto, *Bible Dict.* s.v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amr. Authors*, s.v. (J. H. W.)

Purvey, John

the friend and fellow-laborer of Wycliffe, with whom he lived in his latter years. His denunciations of the errors of the Romish Church, as well as his endeavors to make the Bible accessible to the people at large by translating it into English, drew upon him the severest penalties which it was in the power of the hierarchy to inflict. He was forbidden, by a mandate of the bishop of Bristol, dated August, 1387, to preach in this diocese where he officiated after the death of Wycliffe; his books were declared to be erroneous and heretical, and were among those which the bish. ops of Worcester, Salisbury, and Hereford were authorized to seize (May 29, 1388; Jan. 18, Dec. 16, 1389). Some years after, however, he made a recantation at St. Paul's Cross (Sunday, March 6, 1401), and was admitted (Aug. 11, 1401), on the presentation of the archdeacon of Canterbury, to the vicarage of West Hythe, in Kent. which he resigned Oct. 8, 1403. He then returned to the simple teaching of the Bible, denouncing the erroneous doctrines of the Church, for which he was again imprisoned, and in 1421 recanted a second time, at Saltwood, before archbishop Arundel. He is supposed to have died about 1427. Purvey immortalized his name through his translation of the Scriptures into English. As the Bible of *late translated*

by Wycliffe required correction, he tells Is, in the general introduction that he undertook to make the version more faithful, intelligible, and popular. The plan which he adopted to effect this, according to his own description, was as follows: With the assistance of several fellow-laborers he

- (1) corrected the Latin text by comparison of Bibles, doctors, and glosses;
- (2) studied the text thus corrected with the gloss and other authorities, particularly De Lyra on the Old Test.;
- (3) made special reference to the works of grammarians and theologians for the meaning of difficult words and passages; and
- (4) did not translate literally, but according to the sense and meaning as clearly as he could, taking care to have many persons of ability present at the correction of the translation. He inserted numerous textual glosses in the Old 'est., and only occasionally omitted those of Wycliffe's version, but made no such insertions in the New Test., and carefully excluded all the glosses which were introduced into the former version. That he improved upon Wycliffe's translation is beyond doubt, as may be seen from a comparison of the following passages in the respective versions: ^{<1093>}Genesis 9:13; ^{<1230>}Exodus 29:2; Deuteronomy 32:2; 33:7; ^{<1655>}Joshua 5:15; 6:25; ^{<1800>}Job 10:1; 11:12; 14:12; ^{<1125>}Matthew 12:5; 13:52; ^{<1613>}1 Corinthians 3:13-15; which are pointed out by the erudite editors, the Rev. Josiah Forshall and Sir Frederic Madden, who for the first time published this early English version, together with Wycliffe's translation, in an entire form, in parallel columns, 4 vols. 4to, Oxford University Press, 1850. Purvey's translation of the New Test. was first published by Lewis (Lond. 1731, fol.) as Wycliffe's translation; it was then erroneously reprinted as Wycliffe's by Baber (Lond. 1810, 4to), and by Bagster in the English *Hexapla*. Comp. Foxe, *The Acts and Monuments*, Townsend's ed. (Lond. 1844), 3, 285, 292, 822, 826; and the elaborate preface by Forshall and Madden to their edition of Wycliffe's and Purvey's translation of the Bible.

Purveyor

This word is not found in the A. V., although it would perhaps represent the meaning of the Heb. בְּחִינַת *natsdb'*, in ^{<1045>}1 Kings 4:5, 7, rather than the word καθεσταμένοι, or the similar "officers" of our version. The Hebrew word, however, is the Niphal (passive) participle of the word בָּחַן; *natsctb'*, to put or station, and is literally translated by the Greek, which

has the same meaning, *the appointed*. Solomon divided his kingdom into twelve parts, and these men were placed, one over each province, to procure provisions for the king's household. Thus he was enabled to entertain foreigners, and to support a vast number of wives, servants, and attendants (Patrick, *Comment.* ad loc.). The number twelve refers, not to the tribes, but the months of the year, each being required to furnish the provisions of a month. These collections probably corresponded to tax-gathering among the moderns. Patrick thinks the officers were merely purchasers; but Kitto regards this as an error (Kitto. *Pict. Bible*, ad loc.). Rosenmuller calls these officers head collectors of taxes (*Alt. u. n. Morgenland*, 3, 166), and Ewald thinks they were stewards of the royal domains; but Thenius (*Exeq. Handb.* ad loc.) holds that they were officers of higher rank, of whose duties the supply of the royal table formed only a part. Josephus calls them ἡγεμόνες (*Alt.* 8:2, 4). **SEE PALESTINE; SEE SOLOMON.**

Puseyism

is one of the names by which the ritualistic movement of the Church of England and her offspring is sometimes designated, but it is properly descriptive only of the followers of the much-celebrated Oxford professor in theology, the Rev. Dr. E. B. Pusey. Though he was by no means alone in originating the movement to which his name has been given, the Puseyites now form a very different class from that which organized and kept alive what is known as the Tractarian movement, and of which we have treated in the art. **SEE OXFORD TRACTS** (q.v.).

The *Tractarians* advocated the acceptance by the Church of England of the doctrines of Apostolical Succession, Priestly Absolution, Baptismal Regeneration, the Real Presence, the Authority of the Church, and of Tradition. "Scripture and tradition," says one of the Tractarians, "taken together, are the joint rule of faith" (No. 78, p. 2, English ed.).

"Consentient patristical tradition," says Keble in his *Sermons*, "is the record of that oral teaching of the apostles which the Holy Spirit inspired." By this patristic tradition, which these tractarians extolled as an infallible interpretation of Scripture and test of doctrinal truth, they understood the *voice of Catholic antiquity*, or the voice of the theologians of the Nicene age, of the 4th century; and yet a majority of them were at one time devoted to the Arian heresy. For example, Froude says, "Your trumpety principles about Scripture being the sole rule in fundamentals, I nauseate

the word” (i, 413). Thus, having broken away from the corner-stone of Protestantism, it was easy for them to accept the Romish view of the sacraments (q.v.), restoring also the old Romish number of *seven* (Tract 90), and affirming with the Church of Rome that “the sacraments, and not preaching, are the sources of divine grace.” Says Mr. Dennison, “I understand the Tractarian doctrine of the sacraments to be this:

“**I.** That man is ‘made a member of Christ, the child of God, and and inheritor of the kingdom of heaven,’ in and by holy baptism.

“**II.** That man ‘made a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven,’ in and by holy baptism, is renewed from time to time in holy communion.

“**III.** That ‘a death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness’ are given to every adult and every infant, in and by the outward visible sign or form in baptism, ‘water in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.’

“**IV.** That the gift may be received, in the case of adults, worthily or unworthily, but that it is always received.

“**V.** That the body and blood of Christ are given to every one who receives the sacramental bread and wine.

“**VI.** That the gift may be received worthily or unworthily, but that it is always received.”

“Antiquity,” wrote the author of Tract 90, “continually affirms *a change in the sacred elements*” (p. 73). Palmer, in his *Letter to a Protestant Catholic*, declared that “the bread and wine are *changed* by the consecration of the priest and the operation of the Holy Ghost, and become the very body and blood of our Lord” (p. 30). “The table is properly an altar,” said their organ, the *British Critic*. “and altars presume a propitiatory sacrifice” (July, 1841, p. 24).^{*} With such views of the sacraments evangelical views on regeneration were impossible for the Tractarians, and there need be no surprise that they stigmatized the grand Protestant doctrine of justification by faith alone as a “Lutheran heresy.” “Whether any one heresy,” says the *Critic*, “has ever infested the Church so hateful and unchristian as this doctrine [of justification], it is perhaps not necessary to determine: none certainly has ever prevailed so subtle and extensively poisonous. We must

plainly express our conviction that a religious heathen, were he really to accept the doctrine which Lutheran language expresses, so far from making any advance, would sustain a heavy loss in exchanging fundamental truth for fundamental error” (No. 46, p. 391). Again, speaking of the Tractarian party, this open confession is made: “We cannot stand where we are; we must go backward or forward, and it will surely be the latter. As we go on, we must recede more and more from the principles, if any such there be, of the English Reformation” (No. 59, p. 45). “The Reformation,” says Froude (i, 433), “was a limb badly set; it must be broken again, in order to be righted.” “Utterly reject and anathematize the principle of the Reformation as a heresy, with all its forms, sects, and denominations.” says Palmer (*Letter to Golightly*, p. 9).

The Tractarian movement terminated with Newman’s secession to Rome, but its effect remains in several visible results: the revival and strengthening of the High-Church party, which still maintains, to a great extent, the principles advocated in the Tracts; the introduction of various alterations in the mode of performing divine service, such as the use of the surplice instead of the gown, intoning the prayers and singing the responses, the elevation of the communion-table into an altar, the substitution of low, open benches for high pews; a remarkable impulse given to the building and restoration of churches, and the revival of Gothic architecture in all parts of England; the secession of many English clergy and laity, some of them men of considerable ability and distinction, to the Church of Rome; and the establishment of colleges and sisterhoods, and other religious and charitable institutions, under Episcopal auspices.

Dr. Pusey himself, in his earlier years, inclined to that Protestant view of Christianity according to which all things and ceremonies acting on the senses must be removed from the Church (see his *Rise and Decline of Rationalism in Germany*). But he gradually turned away from that system in which the heart and soul are sustained by the intellectual appreciation of theological truths, and came to accept another which is dependent upon the outward actions of the body — one which abounds in observances, reaching the heart through the medium of the senses, and encouraging a habit of devotion by the use of bodily action. This change in Pusey’s ideas is attributed to the influence of his friend, John Henry Newman, and in the year 1833 Pusey accepted the confession of faith and practice drawn up by Newman. The publication of writings called *Tracts for the Times* was in 1841 interdicted by the bishop of Oxford, but the ninety that had reached

the public gave a clear insight into the new religious tendencies. Newman, Pusey, and their friends wished no fusion with the Roman Church, some of the tenets of which filled them with actual horror; but they tried to introduce into the English Church, the origin of which they did not approve and the decay of which they acknowledged, such doctrines as the Romish Church has distinctively preserved. Newman tried, in consequence, to conciliate the Thirty-nine Anglican Articles with the resolutions of the Council of Trent, in which, of course, he did not succeed, as he could satisfy neither of the parties, Catholics nor Anglicans. Newman was made aware that his position between the two churches was a false and untenable one, and he passed over to Romanism. His example was followed by several ecclesiastics and professors of the High Church, and by men belonging to the first families of the kingdom. Pusey, however, has persevered in his former course. He and his followers have remained to this day in the Anglican Church, the situation of which they do not despair of mending. But they discard the name by which they are generally designated as a class. In 1870, Dr. Pusey himself wrote respecting this party-name as follows: "I never was a party leader, I never acted on any system. My name was used first to designate those of us who gave themselves to revive the teaching of forgotten truth and piety, because I first had occasion to write on baptismal regeneration; but it was by opponents, and not by confederates. We should have thought it a note against us to have deserved any party name, or to have been anything but the followers of Jesus, the disciples of the Church, the sons and pupils of the great fathers whom he raised up in her. I never had any temptation to try to form a party, for it was against our principles... Then, personally, I was the more exempt from this temptation, because God has given me neither the peculiar organizing abilities which tempt men to it, nor any office — as that of an archdeacon—which would entitle me directly to counsel thus ... My life, contrary to the character of party leaders, has been spent in a succession of insulated efforts; bearing, indeed, upon one great end — the growth of Catholic truth and piety among us, or, contrariwise, resistance to what might hinder, retard, or obscure it; but still insulated" (*Eirenicon*, iii, 338).

The Puseyites have adopted from the Romish Church, without assenting in a general way to her dogmas, a number of ritual institutions, and even some points of faith. They affix to their churches portable crosses; have burning tapers on their altars; adorn chasubles and Prayer-books with

crosses; have a Latin choir; and, what is more than these exterior conformities, they have declared for the Romish doctrine about the situation and power of the Church, and about the sacraments, the number of which they have increased; they also introduced auricular confession. In the doctrine of justification, where it was first intended to deviate from the Roman Catholic tenets, the resolutions of the Tridentinum were finally admitted as a base. The Puseyites went even the length of acknowledging in the pope a pre-eminence of spiritual honor and authority; they say that, as patriarch of Rome, not only his spiritual, but also his temporal authority extends over Italy; that the Church of England is bound to recognise it; and that all decrees of the Council of Trent may be authoritatively construed in such a sense as to make them acceptable to the Anglican Church. The Puseyites call themselves *Catholics*, a branch of the universal Catholic Church: they object most decidedly to being called Protestants. They regard the Church as one organic body, and primitive apostolic Christianity as a mere germ or seminal principle, to be developed and properly matured in the progress of ages. They adopt as such legitimate additions to Biblical Christianity obvious gross corruptions, which gained currency in the Church in different centuries, and were taught by leading fathers or councils — a practice which “throws an uncertainty about the lineaments of Christianity, and opens the door for every species of error that designing men may be inclined to adopt, while it enables the so-called Church Catholic to justify every one of her errors, both doctrinal and ritual” (Schmucker). Another gross appendage sometimes associated with this theory of development is that Christ has placed himself in some kind of physical connection or concorporation with the mass of his disciples, the Church, by which his body nourishes them in some mystical manner through the Eucharist, and furnishes the germ of their resurrection body. Though Newman, still before his perversion, recommended, in the *Ninetieth Tract for the Times*, the acceptance of the doctrines of purgatory, of the invocation of saints, and of papal authority, Pusey has persisted in rejecting them. He also rejects the worship of Mary, the use of Latin in the mass, and the communion in one form (comp. Pusey, *A Letter to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury* [Oxf. 1842], and *The Holy Eucharist* [ibid. 1843]). As Puseyism is in progress among the cultivated classes of England, especially among the clergy, and as it is thought to be only a forerunner of Catholicism, it is combated by the English bishops with admonitions, speeches, and disciplinary measures. They do not tolerate the rites introduced by the Puseyite ecclesiastics, and pronounce them a

“mixture of Romanism or popery.” They ordain no student of divinity if suspected of Puseyistic tendencies. At the University of Oxford, the seminary of the High-Church clergy, the antagonism of Puseyites and anti-Puseyites has broken out so openly that there is a storm of both parties on every vacant professorship. Puseyism has its mepresentatives in the most influential literary papers: the *Quarterly Review* has published a series of articles in favor of the Puseyite innovations. The chief adversaries of the Puseyites, or Anglo-Catholics, are the Evangelicals, a party which originated in Methodism — the latter being opposed both to the Puseyites and to the Episcopalians. If we compare the judgment of the English papers of different colors on the religious situation of Great Britain, and especially on Puseyism, we find a great diversity of appreciations. The radical press of the Dissenters, averse to Anglicanism, rejoices at its visible decay, and attributes the embarrassment of the Church to the circumstance that, owing to the opposition of the bishops, reformation could not completely achieve its work. It could only produce an imperfect, undecided form, and was smothered in the arms of an exterior political priesthood. The Tory papers originally advocated Puseyism, in which they saw a support for the High-Church; but they soon changed their mind: they agree with the Whig papers on this point that the manner in which philosophy is taught at the University of Oxford is the cause of these religious phenomena. It is thought that the facility with which so many leave the High-Church for Puseyism, and from Puseyism step over to Romanism, is due to the miserable situation of philosophical studies in general, and especially in the latitudinarianism of the Aristotelian logic which is taught at Oxford, and of the Platonic mysticism after the scholastic fashion. Others expect from Puseyism a regeneration of the High-Church and of the whole Anglican religious situation. See Petri, *Wurdigung des Wesens und Ide? Beceutung des Puseyismus* (Gott. 1843); Schleyer, *Der Puseyismus nach seinem Ursprung und als Lehrsystem* (Freib. 1845); IHurst’s Hagenbach, *Church Hist. 18th and 19th Centuries*, ii, 392 sq.; Schumaker, *Elemental Contrast* (Gettysb. 1852); Garbett, *Pusey and the University of Oxford* (1847); Taylor, *Ancient Christianity and the Doctrines of the Oxford Triacts for the Times* (Lond. 1844, 3 vols.); Fletcher, *Lectures on the Principles of the Roman Catholic Church and of Puseyism* (Lond. 1846); Boyd, *England, Rome, and Oxford* (Lond. 1846); Saville, *A Letter to Rev. Dr. Pusey on Auricular Confession* (Lond. 1878); Dorner, *Hist. Prot. Theol.* ii, 488 sq., 504 sq.; *London Academy*, 1873, p. 87; Nov. 14, 1874, p. 529; *Ch. of Engl. Quar. Rev.* July, 1855, art. vii; *Amer. Presb.*

Rev. Oct. 1861; Rez, *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1838-47; *Brit. and For. Rev.* 1844, p. 5; 1846, p. 189; *Christian Remembrancer*, Jan. 1866, p. 164; Oct. 1868, p. 381.

*This inference is undoubtedly correct, and as Christ is not sacrificed in Protestant churches, the table on which the sacramental elements are placed ought not to be termed an *altar*, but a table. Altars are not congenial to the spirit of Protestantism; and as the thing was wisely discarded by the Reformers, the name also should be dropped.

Pushtu Version

Pushtu is the language spoken in Afghanistan (q.v.), in Asia; hence it is also called *Afghan*. We have not as yet a complete version of the Holy Scriptures. The New Testament was first translated by the Rev. J. Lowenthal (d. 1864), a convert from Judaism. Besides the New Testament, the historical books of the Old Testament have been published by the Serampore Mission. At present the Rev. T. P. Hughes, of the Church Missionary Society at Peshamwer is preparing a translation of the *Old Testament in Pushtu*. The committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society had some sheets of his MS. printed by the zinco-photographic process, to be submitted to Afghan scholars with a view of having the whole work printed in the same manner. For the study of the language, comp. Bellev, *A Dictionary of the Pukshto or Pukshto Language, on a New and Improved System* (Lond. 1867); the same, *A Grammacer of the Pukkhto or Pukshto Language* (ibid. 1867); Raverty, *A Dictionary of the Pukhto, Pushto, or Language of the Aghains; with Remarks on the Originality of the Language, and its Affinity to the Semitic and other Oriental Languages* (ibid. 1860); the same, *A Grammar of the Pukshto, Pushto, or Language of the Afghans* (ibid. 1860); *Selections from the Poetry of the Afghans* (ibid. 1862); *The Gulshan-i-Roh: being Selections, Prose and Poetical, in the Pushto or Afgan Language* (ibid. 1860); *The Poetry of the Afghans, from the 16th to the 19th Century* (ibid. 1863); Dorn, *A Chrestomathy of the Pushtu or Afghan Language* (St. Petersburg, 1847), and his contributions to *The Pushtu Grammar in the Memoires de l'Accadiemie Imperiale des Sciences de Sf. Pukshto* (ibid. 1840, 1845); F. Miiller, *Die Conjugation des Avghinischen Verbunls* (Wien, 1867); *Ueber die Sprache der Av qhanen* (ibid. 1862-63); E. Trumpp, *Grammar of the Pashto, or Language of the Afghans, compared with the Iranian and North-Indian Idioms* (Tubingen, 1873). (B. P.)

Pusillanimity

is a feebleness of mind, by which one is terrified at mere trifles or imaginary dangers, unauthorized by the most distant probability.

Puspadanta

in Hindu mythology, was one of the celebrated *twelve* Buddhas who were particularly worshipped by the Jainas. He was the son of Sugyriya and of Roma, from the family of Ikswaku. He is represented as a man ending in the body of a fish.

Pustkuchen-Glanzow

FR. CPH., a German theologian of some note, flourished as pastor at Wiebelskirchen, near Treves. He was born Feb. 4, 1793, at Detmold, and died Jan. 2, 1834. He wrote, *Die Urgeschichte der l Menschheit in ihrem vollen Usnfcange* (Lemgo, 1821): — *Historisch-kritische Untersuchung der bibl. Urgeschichte* (Halle, 1823): — *hiederherstellung des dchten Protestantismus*, etc. (Hamb. 1827): — *Der Beruf des evangel. Pfcrrer s nach seinem Zweck u. Wesen*, etc. (Barmen, 1832): — *Grundziige des Christenthums* (Hamb. 1827, 3d ed.): — *Glaubens- u. Sittenlehre* (Barmen. 1831-33, 2 vols.): — *Maria, oder die Frmmigkeit der Weiber* (Hamb. 1827, 2d ed.): — *Kiche. Schule u. flaus* (Elberfeld, 1832). See Winer, *landbuch der theolog. Literatur*, p. 717 (see Index); Furst, *Bibl. Judaica*, iii, 124; Zuchold, *Bibl. Theologica*, iii, 1022; Diestel, *Gesch. des Alten Testaments*, p. 726, 733. (B. P.)

Pustrich

an ill-shaped Slavonic idol: it is of bronze, and hollow. It represents a small, chubby boy holding one of his hands over his head. The head has two holes, one at the top, the other at the place of the mouth. It is believed that the priests used this figure to terrify the people by the spectacle of an infuriated deity. It was filled with water, and, the holes being stopped, put on a fire: in due time the stoppers were driven out of the holes with considerable noise and tremendous eruption of steam and boiling water. Other more modern investigations would lead to the conclusion that the chubby god was nothing but an instrument of distillery.

Put

(~~1300B~~ 1 Chronicles 1:8; ~~3400B~~ Nahum 3:9). *SEE PHUT.*

Pute'oli

Picture for Puteoli (1)

(Gruecized Ποτίολοι [~~400B~~ Acts 28:13], but in classical Greek often Ποντεύολοι; a Latin word, from *puteus*, a well, on account of the wells or sources of a volcanic origin with which it abounded), a maritime town of Campania, in Italy, on the northern shore of the bay of Naples, and about eight miles north-west from that city. Here Paul landed on his way to Rome (~~400B~~ Acts 28:13). As above noted, it derived its name from its tepid baths, and the district in which they exist is now called Terra di Lavoro. The earlier name of Puteoli, when the lower part of Italy was Greek, was *Diccpriarchia*; and this name continued to be used to a late period. Josephus uses it in two passages (*Ant.* 17:12, 7; 18:7, 2); in a third (*Life*, 3), he speaks of himself (after the shipwreck which, like St. Paul, he had recently gone through) as διασωθείς εἰς τὴν Δικαιαρχίαν, ἣν Ποτιόλους Ἰταλοὶ καλοῦσιν. So Philo, in describing the curious interview which he and his fellow Jewish ambassadors had here with Caligula, uses the old name (*Leglat. cad Caium*, ii, 521). Its Roman history may be said to have begun with the Second Punic War. It was a favorite watering-place of the Romans, as its numerous hot-springs were judged efficacious for the cure of various diseases. It was also the port where ships usually discharged their passengers and cargoes, partly to avoid doubling the promontory of Circeium, and partly because there was no commodious harbor nearer to Rome. Hence the ship in which Paul was conveyed from Melita landed the prisoners at this place, where the apostle stayed for a week (~~400B~~ Acts 28:13). In connection with St. Paul's movements, we must notice its communications, in Nero's reign, along the mainland with Rome. The coast road leading northward to Sinuessa was not made till the reign of Domitian; but there was a cross-road leading to Capua, and there joining the Appian Way. *SEE THREE TAVERNS.* The remains of this road may be traced at intervals; and thus the apostle's route can be followed almost step by step. We should also notice the fact that there were Jewish residents at Puteoli. We might be sure of this from its mercantile importance; but we are positively informed of it by Josephus (*Ant.* 17:12, 1) in his account of the visit of the pretended Herod-Alexander to Augustus; and the

circumstance. shows how natural it was that the apostle should find Christian “brethren” there immediately on landing. From this port it was that the Roman armies were despatched to Spain, and here the ambassadors from Carthage landed. It had the privileges of a colony from a very early period, and these were successively renewed by Nero and Vespasian, the latter bestowing on the place the title of *Colonia Flavia*. Puteoli was at that period a place of very great importance. We cannot elucidate this better than by saying that the celebrated bay a part of which is now “the bay of Naples,” and in early times was “the bay of Cumo,” was then called “*Sinus Puteolanus*.” The city was at the north-eastern angle of the bay. Close to it was *Baiae*, one of the most fashionable of the Roman watering-places. The emperor Caligula once built a ridiculous bridge between the two towns; and the remains of it must have been conspicuous when St. Paul landed at Puteoli in the Alexandrian ship which brought him from Malta. *SEE CASTOR ANND POLLUX; SEE MELITA; SEE RHEGIUM; SEE SYRACUSE*. In illustration of the arrival here of the cornships we may refer to Seneca (1 p. 77) and Suetonius (*Octan.* 98). No part of the Campanian shore was more frequented. The associations of Puteoli with historical personages are very numerous. Scipio sailed from hence to Spain. Cicero had a villa (his “*Puteolanum*”) in the neighborhood. Here Nero planned the murder of his mother. Vespasian gave to this city peculiar privileges, and here Hadrian was buried. In the 5th century Puteoli was ravaged both by Alaric and Genseric, and it never afterwards recovered its former eminence. It is now a fourth-rate Italian town, still retaining the name of *Pozzuoli*.

Picture for Puteoli (2)

The remains of Puteoli are considerable. The aqueduct, the reservoirs, portions (probably) of baths, the great amphitheatre, the building called the temple of Serapis, which affords very curious indications of changes of level in the soil, are all well worthy of notice. But our chief interest here is concentrated on the ruins of the ancient mole, which is formed of the concrete called *Pozzolana*, and sixteen of the piers of which still remain. No Roman harbor has left so solid a memorial of itself as this one at which St. Paul landed in Italy. Here, too, was the statue erected to Tiberius to commemorate his restoration of the Asiatic cities destroyed by an earthquake, and of which statue the pedestal with its inscription remains almost entire to this day. See Mazzella, *Situs et Antiquitas Puteol.* in Graevius and Burnam, *Thesaur.* 9 pt. 4; Romanelli, *Viaggio a Pozzuoli*

(Naples, 1817); Jorio, *Guida di Pozzuoli* (ibid. 1830); Lowenigh, *Die Landschaft Pozzuoli* (Aachen, 1841); Lewin, *St. Paul*, 2, 218 sq. *SEE ITALY; SEE PAUL.*

Pu'tiel

Heb. *Putiel'*, **אֶפְתָּיִם**, *afflicted of God*; Sept. **Φουτιήλ**), the father of the wife of Eleazar the priest and the mother of Phinehas (⁽¹⁶²⁵⁾Exodus 6:25). B.C. cir. 1619. In modern Jewish traditions Putiel is confounded with Jethro the Midianite, “who fattened the calves for idolatrous worship” (Targum Pseudojon. On *Ezod.* 6:25; *Gemara of Sota* by Wagenseil, c. viii. § 6).

Putnam, Franklin

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Marietta, O., July 22, 1801. After receiving a good academical training, he entered Athens College, O., and graduated with honor in 1823. During the last year of his college course he was converted, and though up to this time the law had been the object of his studies, the Gospel now became his all-absorbing hope. He entered the Theological Seminary at Auburn, N.Y., and in 1826 was licensed by Oneida Presbytery, N. Y. In 1827 he returned to Ohio, and was appointed to labor as a missionary and evangelist to the feeble churches in Springfield, Urbana, and Buck Creek, O. Subsequently he accepted a call to Springfield Church, and was ordained and installed pastor by Dayton Presbytery; here he labored for eighteen months, when he accepted a call to the Church in Dayton, O. In 1837, at the division in the Church, he resigned, and accepted a call to Circleville, O., where he continued to labor for over six years, when, by reason of paralysis of one half of his body, he resigned his charge, and removed to Delaware, O. Here, after devoted care on the part of his family, his health was restored, and he resumed preaching and ministered to the Church at Delaware, and subsequently at Tiffin, Greenville, and Republic, O., and Thorntown, Ind. He died at the latter place Oct. 11, 1859. Mr. Putnam was a logical thinker, and full of zeal for the cause of Christ; an excellent pastor, ever ready in sorrow to administer comfort and consolation. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1861, p. 162. (J. L. S.)

Putnam, George

D.D., a Unitarian minister of the Old School, was born in Massachusetts in 1808, and was educated at Harvard University, class of 1826. He early entered the ministry, and finally became pastor at Roxbury, Mass., where he sustained a pastorate of nearly half a century, enjoying not only the warm affection of his own people, but the highest respect and confidence of the whole community. Away from home also Dr. Putnam wielded a very wide influence in all directions, and he was beloved by men of every religious school in an eminent degree. Dr. Putnam was more than an ordinary man. He was not only possessed of the most noble personal characteristics, but was endowed with excellent scholarship, remarkable intellectual powers, and great wisdom in judgment. He was always vigorous, fresh, and often very eloquent in his pulpit discourses. For years his Fast-day and Thanksgiving services were largely attended by visitors from what was then the adjoining city (Boston), to listen to his thoughtful and powerful discussions upon public and national questions. A shock of paralysis in 1872 warned him that the period of his vigor was terminating, and he was obliged to consent to have a younger associate with him in the pastorate. For the last two years before his death, which occurred in 1878, he was able to render service only at the marriage or funeral of some one of his beloved parishioners, who, in these joyful and painful domestic aeras, especially welcomed even the trembling voice of their old pastor. From 1849 to 1856 Dr. Putnam was editorially connected with the *Christian Examiners*. He published a number of separate sermons, orations, etc.

Putnam, Jonathan W.

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Leyden, N. Y., July 31, 1815. He was converted at the age of twelve, and was received into the Methodist Episcopal Church. He was licensed to exhort in 1835; in 1836 he received license to preach. He travelled four years in the Ne/wJersey Conference, and then went to the Wiscionsin Conference. In 1856 he was transferred to the East Genesee Conference, and stationed at East Palmyra. Afterwards he was successively appointed to Tyrone, Catharine, Southport, Jackson, Canton, Prattsburgh, Dresden, and Middlesex. He had just begun the work of the second year on this last charge, with good promise of success, when death overtook him on Sept. 9, 1871. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1872, p. 130, 131; *Northern Christian Advocate*, 1871.

Putsha

in Hindu mythology, is the name of the small, bloodless sacrifices, consisting of fruits and flowers, which were offered to the genii, as well as to the three great gods.

Putshiari

in Hindu mythology, is the name of the Brahmins who, after twelve years' study, determine to devote their lives entirely to the gods, and in consequence attach themselves to some pagoda.

Puxis

is the box in which the consecrated hosts for the sick are preserved. *SEE PUX.*

Puzza

is a Chinese goddess who has some resemblance to the Cybele of the Greeks and the Isis of the Egyptians. The bonzes relate that three genii of the female sex descended once from their heavenly abode to enjoy a bath in an earthly stream. The water hadt scarcely touched their bodies when the most beautiful of them perceived on her garment a lotos-plant, with blossoms and fruit, and could not imagine whence the plant had come. She coulll not resist the desire of tasting the fruit; but this was attended with evil consequences, for behold a little son was born from her at the same moment. She brought him up, and when he had reached the years of maturity she returned to heaven. This nymph was Puzza; and, as her offspring became a mighty ruler of the heavenly empire of China, she was worshipped as the queen of the world, the mother of all that is good, and the supporter of all that is living. Puzza is represented with eighteen arms, sitting on a flower, and her head surrounded with an aureola.

Pyer, John

an English minister who labored successively with the Wesleyans and the Independents, was born in 1790. He began his labors as a tent missionary, devoting himself entirely to the conlcted evangelistic work. After the tent ceased to be the property of the Methodist body, he built a chapel at Manchester, where he remained nine years. As he changed his doctrinal views, he abandoned the Wesleyan Church, and joined the

Congregationalists. For the succeeding four years he was agent of the London Christian Instruction Society. Ill health finally required him to seek a less laborious position, and he became the Congregational pastor of South Molten. Later he removed to Cork, and in 1839 accepted a pastorate at Devon, where he remained the last twenty years of his life, and died in 1859, laborious and active to the very last: he was found by the servants lifeless, having literally fallen asleep in Jesus. Pyer was the writer of a few useful hymns; among them, "Met again in Jesus' name," which is found in the *New Congregational Hymn-book*, No. 803.

Pygarg

Picture for Pygarg

(^ωωyDadishon, from *dush*, √WD, *to tread*, or perhaps *duts*, XWD, *to leap*; Sept. πύγαργος, Vulg. *pygargus*) occurs only (¹⁶⁴⁵Deuteronomy 14:5) in the list of clean animals, being the name apparently of some species of *antelope*, though it is by no means easy to identify it. The Greek πύγαργος denotes an animal with a "white rump," and is used by Herodotus (iv. 192) as the name of some Libyan deer or antelope. Aelian (vii, 19) also mentions the πύγαργος, but gives no more than the name; comp. also Juvenal (*Sct.* 11:138). It is usual to identify the *pygarg* of the Greek and Latin writers with the *addax* of North Africa, Nubia, etc. (*Addax nasomaculatus*), known to the ancient Greeks under the same title (*Oryx addax*, Lieht.), which has been recognised as a beast of chase in the old Egyptian sculptures. It is widely spread over Central Africa, extending to the borders of the Nile in Nubia, and is well known to the Arabs, who still distinguish it by its ancient name, with the familiar prefix of Abu, or father — *Father Addas*. The *addax* is a coarse and heavy antelope, three feet high at the withers, with a large clumsy head and stout legs. The horns exist in both sexes, are long, twisted outwards, covered with rings nearly to the points, which are sharp; the tail is long and tufted. The head and neck are of a deep reddish brown color, with a band of white across the face; the forehead and throat are clothed with coarse black hair, and all the rest of the body and limbs is of a whitish gray hue. It is one of that group of antelopes in which we may clearly discern an approach to the bovine race. **SEE OX.**

Against this identification of the *dishon* with the *addax*, however, there are some considerable objections. In the first place, this antelope does not

present at all the required characteristic implied by its name; and, in the second, there is much reason for believing, with Ruppell (*Atlas zu der Reise im no'rd. Afrika*, p. 21) and Hamilton Smith (Griffith's Cuvier's *Anim. Kingdom*, 4:193), that the *addax* is identical with the *strepsiceros* of Pliny (*N. It.* 11:37), which animal, it must be observed, the Roman naturalist distinguishes from the *Pygargus* (viii, 53). Indeed, we may regard the identity of the *addax* and Pliny's *strepsiceros* as established; for when this species was, after many years, at length rediscovered by Hemprich and Ruppell, it was found to be called by the Arabic name of *akas* or *adas*, the very name which Pliny gives as the local one of his *strepsiceros*. The *pygargus*, therefore, must be sought for in some animal different from the *addax*. The required characters seem to be found in a group of antelopes described by Mr. Bennett (*Trans. Zool. Soc.* vol. i). They have many peculiarities in common with the group which includes the spring-bok (*Antidorcas euchores*) and the houte-bok (*Damalis pygarga*), those fine white-rumped species of South Africa, but are distinguished by the characters of the horns, which are larger, thicker, more bovine, and of bolder curvature, turning first almost horizontally backwards, and then hooked abruptly forwards. The legs are long, the neck long and slender, and there is a white patch on the throat in all the species. The group is confined to the northern half of the African continent. The best-known species is the mhorr (*Antilope mhorr*, Bennett), which stands two feet eight inches high at the croup. The horns are ringed from the base about half-way up, whence to the tip they are round, smooth, and obtusely pointed. The expression of the face is gentle; the eye large, dark, and liquid. The tail is long, close-haired at the base, but tipped with a tuft of long black hair — a very ox-like character. The general hue of the coat, which is short and sleek, is a deep brownish red; the line of the belly and the inner surface of the limbs are white. But *the whole region around the base of the tail is pure white*, abruptly separated from the dark red of the flanks; the patch running forwards in a point on each hip, and downwards on the posterior surface of the thighs. The strong contrast of the two colors has a very singular effect, and would probably be seized on to form a descriptive appellation. Two males of this beautiful species were sent to the Zoological Society from Morocco; they were not, however, indigenous to that country, but had been brought from the eastern side of the desert. The species is hunted by the Arabs for the sake of the stomachal concretion called *bezoar*, to which it is peculiarly subject, and which is so highly valued in Oriental pharmacy. These stones are called in Morocco *baid el-*

mhorr, or *mhorr's* eggs. There is, however, another species, considerably larger than the *mhorr*, but having the same general form and the same distributions of the colors. It is the *addra* (*A. ruficolis*), a fine beast found in the wastes of Nubia by Ruppell, and by Hemprich and Ehrenberg in Dongola. This animal stands about three feet three inches high at the croup and is five feet four inches in length. It is seen in considerable flocks on the eastern borders of the Great Desert, and may well have been the pygarg of the ancients. See Tristram, *Natural History of the Bible*, p. 126; Wood, *Bible Animals*, p. 141 sq.; *Bible Educator*, ii, 24, 135, 167. **SEE ANTELOPE.**

Pygmies Of Western Africa.

The existence of pygmy races of human beings in Africa has often been asserted, and many circumstances less easily credible than their diminutive size have been reported. Du Chaillu has recently discovered the actual existence of a pygmy race, but of whom the diminutive size is the only remarkable characteristic. He found them in the mountainous country on the east of the southern great branch of the Ogobai. They are called *Obongos*, and live in the midst of negro tribes of ordinary stature. They showed extreme timidity on being visited by a white man. In stature they are only about four feet and a half. They subsist chiefly on animal food, but partly also on the roots, berries, and nuts which they find in the forests. In their mental calibre, these pygmies vary as greatly as ordinary races. Hence there is no settled theory as to their religious tendency, some of them comprehending their religious need, while others seem to be almost void of any religious consciousness. **SEE PRE-ADAMITES; SEE RELIGION.**

Pyle, Thomas

an eminent Anglican divine, was born at Stodey, near Holt, Norfolk, in 1674. He was educated at Caius College, Cambridge, and, after taking holy orders, distinguished himself as minister of St. Margaret's parish, in King's Lynn. He was afterwards made prebendary of Salisbury by Dr. Hoadly for his services in the Bangorian Controversy. His *Paraphrase on the Acts and all the Epistles* is an excellent work, often reprinted. He published, besides, *Paraphrase of the Books of the Old Testament* (Lond. 1717-25, 4 vols. 8vo): — *The Scripture Preservative against Popery* (ibid. 1735): — and three volumes of *Sermons*. He died at Lynn in 1757, greatly respected and highly admired in all England for his excellency in purpose and superiority

in scholarship. See Hook, *Ecclesiastes Biog.* 8:172; *Gentleman's Magazine* (Lond. 1783), p. 659, 692; Nichols, *Literary Anecdotes*.

Pynchon, Wiliam

an English divine, was born in the second half of the 16th century, and, after migrating to this country, settled at Roxbury, Mass., in 1630, aged 71 or 73. In 1637 he removed to Springfield, Mass. He finally returned to England, and died at Wraysbury, Buckinghamshire, in 1662. He published, *The Meritorious Price of Christ's Redemption* (Lond. 1650 and 1655, 4to); which was so heretical in tendency that it offended the Puritanic fathers, and was burned on the Common by order of the authorities of Massachusetts: — *The Jewes' Synagogue* (1652, 4to): — *Time and Manner how the First Sabbath was Ordained*, etc. (1654, 4to).

Pyne, Smith, D.D.,

a clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was a native of Ireland, and was educated at Eton and Oxford. England. After arriving in this country he studied theology, and was admitted to holy orders by bishop Hobart in 1826. He was in turn rector of a parish at Elizabeth, N. J.; Christ Church, Middletown, Conn.; St. John's Church, Yonkers, N. Y.; Calvary parish and St. John's Church, Washington. In the latter position he remained upwards of twenty years. During the war, Dr. Pyne worked in the camps and hospitals and among the soldiers. He was at one time a trustee of the General Theological Seminary, and of Trinity College, Hartford. He died in New York Dec. 7, 1875.

Pyramid

Picture for Pyramid (1)

(*πυραμίζ*, perhaps from the Egyptian *br*), a structure of the shape of the geometric figure so called, erected in different parts of the Old and the New World, the most important being the pyramids of Egypt and Mexico. Those of Egypt were considered one of the seven wonders of the world. They are in all seventy in number, of different sizes, lying between 29° and 30° N. lat., and are masses of stone or brick, with square bases and triangular sides. Although various opinions have prevailed as to their use, as that they were erected for astronomical purposes, for resisting the encroachment of the sand of the desert, for granaries, reservoirs, or

sepulchres, the last-mentioned hypothesis has been proved to be correct in recent times by the excavations of the late general Howard Vyse. They were all the tombs of monarchs of Egypt who flourished from the fourth to the twelfth dynasty, none having been constructed later than that time, the subsequent kings being buried at Abydos, Thebes, and other places, in tombs of a very different construction. The picture of a pyramid forms a part of the hieroglyphic name of Memphis, and the immutability of most things in Egypt leads us to infer, from this circumstance, that the foundation of the pyramids was coeval with that of the city. It is probable that the title of being the builders of them, and the honor of being buried in them, were given to the monarchs by whom they were finished. The pyramids are solid mounds raised over the sepulchral chambers of the kings, the first act of an Egyptian monarch being to prepare his future "eternal abode." For this purpose, a passage of the size of the intended sarcophagus was first hollowed in the rock at a suitable incline to lower it, and at a convenient depth a rectangular chamber was excavated in the solid rock. Over this chamber a cubical mass of masonry, of square blocks, was then placed, leaving the orifice of the shaft open. Additions continued to be made to this cubical mass both in height and breadth as long as the monarch lived, so that at his death all that remained to be done was to face or smooth the exterior of the stepformed mound. But in some cases the masonry passed beyond the orifice of the shaft, which involved the construction of a new shaft, having its orifice beyond it. The pyramid was faced by adding courses of long blocks on each layer of the steps, and then cutting the whole to a flat or even surface, commencing from the summit. The outer masonry, however, or casing, as it is called, has in most instances been partially stripped off. Provision was made for protecting the vertical joints by placing each stone half way over another. The masonry is admirably finished, and the mechanical means by which such immense masses of stone were raised to their places has long been a mystery; the discovery, however, of large circular holes in some of the stones has led to the conclusion that they were wound up by machines. The stones were quarried on or near the spot; sometimes, however, granite taken from the quarries of Syene was partially employed. The entrances were carefully filled up, and the passage protected by stone portcullises and other contrivances, to prevent ingress to the sepulchral chamber. There appears to have been also a door, or pylon, at the entrance of the shaft, ornamented with Egyptian sculptures and hieroglyphs. The sides of the pyramids face

the cardinal points, and the entrances face the north. The work of the larger pyramids was executed by corvees of laborers.

Picture for Pyramid (2)

The most remarkable and finest pyramids are those of Gizeh, situated on a level space of the Libyan chain at Memphis, on the west bank of the Nile. The largest three are the most famous. The first or Great Pyramid, as appears from the excavations of Vyse, was the sepulchre of the Cheeps of Herodotus, the Chembes, or Chlemmis, of Diodoorns, and the Suphis of Manetho and Eratosthenes (Shufu I, B.C. 2218-2186). The name of the founder of the Great Pyramid has been detected in a small tomb in its immediate vicinity. It is written in Greek by Manetho, Σοῦφις, which is said by Eratosthenes to mean in Egyptian κοματος, “one who has much hair.” The hieroglyphic name, *Shufu*, has also the same meaning as in the Coptic, “much hair.” Its height was 480 feet 9 inches, and its base 764 feet square, having an area of about 13 acres. Its slope or angle is $51^{\circ} 50'$. It has, however, been much spoiled and stripped of its exterior blocks for the building of Cairo. The original sepulchral chamber, called the Subterranean Apartment, 46 feet by 27 feet, and 11 feet 6 inches high, has been hewn in the solid rock, and was reached by the original passage, 320 feet long, which descended to it by an entrance at the foot of the pyramid. The excavations in this direction were subsequently abandoned on account of the vast size attained by the pyramid, rendering it impracticable to carry on the entrance on a level with the natural rock, which had been cut down and faced for that purpose. Accordingly a second chamber, with a triangular roof, was constructed in the masonry of the pyramid, 17 feet by 18 feet 9 inches, and 20 feet 3 inches high. This was reached by a passage rising at an inclination of $26^{\circ} 18'$, terminating in a horizontal passage. It is called the Queen's Chamber, and occupies a position nearly in the centre of the pyramid. The monument — probably owing to the long life attained by the monarch — still progressing, a third chamber, called the King's, was finally constructed, by prolonging the ascending passage of the Queen's Chamber for 150 feet farther into the very centre of the pyramid, and, after a short horizontal passage, making a room 17 feet 1 inch by 34 feet 3 inches, and 19 feet 1 inch high. To diminish, however, the pressure of the superincumbent masonry on the flat roof five small chambers were made vertically in succession above the roof. the last one pointed, varying in height from 1 foot 4 inches to 8 feet 7 inches, the apex of the top one being rather more than 69 feet above the roof of the King's Chamber. The end of

the horizontal passage was finished in a superior style, and cased with red svenitic granite; and in the King's Chamber was the granite sarcophagus of the king, Cheops, 7 feet 6.5 inches long, 3 feet 3 inches broad, and 3 feet 5 inches high, for whom the pyramid was built. As the heat of this chamber was stifling, owing to want of ventilation, two small air-channels, or chimneys, about nine inches square, were made, ascending to the north and south sides of the pyramid. They perfectly ventilate this chamber. After the mummy was deposited in the King's Chamber, the entrance was closed with granite portcullises, and a well made at the junction of the upward-inclined and horizontal passages, by which the workmen descended into the downward-inclined passage, after carefully closing the access to the sepulchral chambers. The changes which took place in this pyramid gave rise to various traditions, even in the days of Herodotus, Cheops being reported to lie buried in a chamber surrounded by the waters of the Nile. It took a long time for its construction — 100,000 men being employed on it for thirty years. The operations in this pyramid by general Vyse gave rise to the discovery of marks scrawled in red ochre in a kind of cursive hieroglyphs on the blocks brought from the quarries of Turah. These contained the name and titles of Shufiu (the hieroglyphic form of Cheops); numerals and directions for the position of materials: with them were mason's marks.

Picture for Pyramid (3)

The second pyramid is situated on a higher elevation than the first, and was built by Shufu II, or Chephren (B.C. 2186-2163), the son of Shufi I. His name reads *Shefre*: he is called Suphis II by Manetho, and Cephrenes by Herodotus. It is inscribed on a beautiful tablet in the British Museum, which was brought from one of the tombs near Memphis, and was engraved in memory of a personage who acted as superintendent of the building of the pyramid. This pyramid has two sepulchral chambers, and appears to have been broken into by the caliph Alaziz Othman ben Yussuf; A.D. 1196. Subsequently, it was opened by Belzoni. The masonry is inferior to the first, but it was anciently cased below with red granite. The casing still remains at the summit.

Picture for Pyramid (4)

The third pyramid, built by Mencheres, or Mycerinus (brother of Chephren, B.C. 2163-2130), is much smaller than the other two, being only 218 feet high by 354 feet 6 inches square. It also has two sepulchral chambers, both

in the solid rock. The lower sepulchral chamber, which held a sarcophagus of rectangular shape, of whinstone, had a pointed roof, cut like an arch inside; but the cedar coffin, in shape of a mummy, had been removed to the upper or large apartment, and its contents there rifled. Among the debris of the coffin and in the chambers were found the legs and part of the trunk of a body with linen wrapper, supposed by some to be that of the monarch, but by others to be that of an Arab, on account of the ancvlosed right knee. This body and fragments of the coffin were removed to the British Museum; but the stone sarcophagus was unfortunately lost off Carthagera, by the sinking of the vessel in which it was being transported to England. There is a hieroglyphic inscription very beautifully engraved on the fragment of the coffin. containing a royal name, which reads *Menka-re*. The masonry of this pyramid is most excellent, and it was anciently cased half-way up with black granite.

Picture for Pyramid (5)

The second pyramid has a line of chambers cut in the rock, and on its eastern side are the ruins of a temple. The third has a similar temple and avenue; and, indeed, the eastern face of the Great Pyramid has traces, though more indistinct, of a similar structure; but the second temple, that of Chephren, is distinguished by having the Sphinx ranged in front of the centre of its eastern face, bearing all the marks of having been connected with it by communications cut through the rock under-ground. Between the paws of the Sphinx a perfect temple was discovered, a few years ago, by Belzoni, on clearing away the sand by which it had been choked up for ages. There are six other pyramids of inferior size and interest at Gizeh: one at Abu Rdsh, five miles to the north-west of the same spot, is ruined, but of large dimensions; another at Zowyet el-Arrian, also made of limestone, is still more ruined; another at Rigah, a spot in the vicinity of Abusir, also much ruined, and built for the monarch User-en-Ra, by some supposed to be Busiris. There are five of these monuments at Abusir, one with a name supposed to be that of a monarch of the third dynasty; and another with that of the king Sahura. A group of eleven pyramids remains at Sakkara, one with a doorway inlaid with porcelain tiles, and having a royal name. Five other pyramids are at Dashur, the northernmost of which, built of brick, is supposed to be that of the king Asychis of Herodotus, and has a name of a king apparently about the twelfth dynasty. Others are at Meyduin and IllahMin; and two at Biahmo, at Mecinet el-Fay um, apparently the sepulchres of the last kings of the twelfth dynasty. Some

small brick pyramids of the kings of the eleventh dynasty are at the Draḥ Abu. Negr at Thebes. In Nubia, the ancient Ethiopia, are several pyramids, the tombs of the monarchs of Meromi, and of some of the Ethiopian conquerors of Egypt. They are taller in proportion to their base than the Egyptian pyramids, and generally have a sepulchral hall, or propylon, with sculptures, which faces the east. The principal groups of these pyramids are at Bege Rauie, or Begromni, 17° N. lat., in one of which gold rings and other objects of late art, resembling that of the Ptolemaic period, were found. *SEE EGYPT.*

Picture for Pyramid (6)

In Assyria, the Birs Nimrud, or Tower of Belus, was a kind of step-shaped pyramid of seven different-colored bricks, dedicated to the planets by Nebuchadnezzar. *SEE BABEL.* The Mujellibe, another mound, was of pyramidal shape. The pyramid also entered into the architecture of the tomb of Sardanapalus at Tanus, and of the mausoleum of Artemisia at Halicarnassus. A small pyramid, the sepulchre of C. Cestius, imitated from the Egyptian in the days of Augustus, still exists within the wall of Aurelian at Rome. Temples and other monuments of pyramidal shape are found in India, China, Java, the Polynesian Islands, and elsewhere. The Toltecs and Aztecs erected temples in Mexico, called *Teodalli*, or abodes of gods, of pyramidal shape, with steps or terraces by which to ascend and reach an altar, generally placed on the summit, where they performed human sacrifices and other rites. These, however, are not true pyramids, the pure and simple form of which is restricted to Egypt. The pyramid entered extensively into the architecture of the Egyptians, and appears on the tops of obelisks and tombs as a kind of roof. Small models of pyramids, with inscribed adorations to the sun, or having royal names, were also placed in the tombs. See Lepsius, *Ueber den Bau der pyramiden* (1843), p. 143, 217; Wilkinson, *Topogr. of Thebes* (Lond. 1835); Vyse, *Operations carried on at Gizeh in 1837* (ibid. 1840-42); Perring, *Views, etc.* (ibid. 1839-42); Gliddon, *Olica Egyptiaca* (ibid. 1849); Taylor, *The Great Pyramid* (ibid. 1859, 1864); Smyth, *Life and Work at the Great Pyramid* (1867); also, *Our Inheritance on the Great Pyramids* (Lond. 1864, 1866, 1877, a work full of fanciful theories); St. Day, *Plates and Notes* (Edinb. 1869).

Picture for Pyramid (7)

Picture for Pyramid (8)

PYRAMID, a sepulchral monument in imitation of a spire of flame. Beleth mentions one built at Tours, and another, called St. Peter's Needle, at Rome. — Walcott. *SEE EFFIGIES.*

Pyrker, Johann Ladislav Of Felso-Eor,

a Roman Catholic prelate, and a poet of some talent, was born Nov. 2, 1772, at Lanigk. in Hungary. His father was the manager of an estate. John studied first at the gymnasium of Stuhlweissenburg and the academy of Funfkirchen, and then decided to enter the service of the State. His application for admission in the chief chancery at Oten having met with a refusal, he accepted a situation as private secretary in the house of a count at Palermo, but never performed these functions; for, while on his journey, in the spring of 1792, and on the point of passing over to Sicily, he suddenly changed his mind and returned. On his journey home he escaped an ambush of pirates, which circumstance gave origin to the tale that he was taken by pirates, sold at Algiers, and escaped to Genoa. The aspect of the South exercised an animating influence upon Pyrker's poetical talent. On his return through Venice and Vienna, he made the acquaintance of a former Cistercian monk, and applied for admission to that order. His request was granted at Lilienfeld (Lower Austria), Oct. 18, 1792. He studied theology at St. Palten, received holy orders in 1796, and subsequently exercised several monastical functions. In 1807 he became curate of Tirniz. In 1811 he was recalled to his monastery as prior, and in 1812 he was elected abbot of Lilienfeld. In 1818 he was appointed bishop of Zips, where he founded a seminary for country teachers. In 1820 he became patriarch of Venice, and in the ensuing year primate of Dalmatia, chaplain of the Lombardo-Venetian kingdom, etc. In 1827 he was called to the archiepiscopal see of a Erlau, which post he held until his death, at Vienna, Dec. 2, 1847. Pyrker was a man of amiable manners, a conscientious and courageous priest, a Meecenas to the arts, a father to the poor, an ornament to science, and enjoyed general esteem and affection. His heart rests in the cathedral at Erlau; his body, in conformity with his will, in a spot of the cemetery of Lilienfeld chosen by himself. His epitaph, chiselled on a simple slab of marble, is also of his own composition: *Ossa I. L. Patr. Archiep. Agriensis requiescent in pace.* Of his works, we consider it appropriate to mention here only *Perlen deor*

heiligcn Vorzeit (Vienna, 1821; 2d ed. 1826): — *Bildeir aus demn Leben Jesu und deri Apostel* (Leips. 1842-43): — *Legende der on eiligen* (ibid. 1842). His complete works were published at Stuttgart (1832-34, 3 vols.; new ed. 1843). Severe critics miss in Pyrker's poems creative freshness and the charm of an original fancy; but they cannot deny the power and beauty of his poetical pictures, the pronounced relief of his characters, and his masterly management of the language and rhythm. See Ignaz Hub, *Deutschlands Balladen- und Romanzen-Dichter* (Carlsruhe, 1849, 2d ed.), p. 188; Winer, *Handb. desr theol. Literatur*, ii, 351, 718; but especially Bruhl, *Gesch. der kathol. Literature, Deutschlands* (Vienna, 1861), p. 340 sq.

Pyrlaeus, John Christopher

a Moravian itinerant and missionary among the Indians, was born April 25, 1713, at Pausa, in Swabia, graduated at the University of Leipsic, and immigrated to America in 1740. After having spent a part of the year 1743 in the Mohawk country, in order to learn its language and customs, he opened a so-called "Indian school" at Bethlehem, Pa., in which he prepared young men for missionary service among the aborigines. and, in particular, taught them the Mohawk tongue. The illustrious David Zeisberger (q.v.) was one of his pupils. He continued such instructions at Gnadenhutten, a missionary settlement in Pennsylvania. whither he removed in 1747, taking part at the same time in the work of the mission. Besides translating a number of hymns into the Mohawk, he wrote three valuable treatises on this language, which, however, were never printed. The MSS. are deposited in the library of the American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia. In 1751 he went to England, where he labored in the ministry for nearly twenty years. He died at Herrnhut, Saxony, May 28, 1785. (E. de S.)

Pyrrho

(Πύρρων), a Greek philosopher of much eminence, is especially noted as the fomunder of the Pvrrian or first Sceptic school of Greece. He was the son of Pleistarchus. or Pleistocrates, and a native of Elis, a town of Peloponnesus. He lived about the time of Philip and Alexander of Macedonia, and was originally a poor painter; but, after having learned the elements of science from Dryson, he followed Alexander the Great in his Eastern expedition, and thus became acquainted with the doctrines of the

Indian gymnosophists and the Persian magi (Diog. Laert. 9:11, 2). He was also an ardent admirer of Democritus. During the greater part of his life he dwelt in quiet retirement, abstaining from pronouncing any decided opinion upon anything, and endeavoring to preserve the greatest calmness and composure in whatever circumstances he was placed. Notwithstanding this apparently inactive and indolent mode of life, he was highly honored by his countrymen, who not only made him their high-priest, but, for his sake, decreed that all philosophers should be exempt from payment of taxes (Diog. Laert. 9, 11, 5). Pausanias (6, 24, 4) saw his statue in a portico at Elis, and a monument erected in honor of him at a little distance from the town. The Athenians honored him with the franchise of their city. He died at the advanced age of ninety. Cicero (not so far wrongly either) ranks him among the Socratics; and, indeed, he was as much opposed to the pretensions of the Sophists as Socrates himself, though from a different point of view. An undisturbed peace of mind (*ἀπαθία*) appeared to Pyrrho the highest object of philosophy; and, thinking that this peace of mind was disturbed by the dogmatic systems and the disputes of all other philosophic schools, he was led to scepticism; but he was by no means of that class of thorough-going scepticism which is usually associated with his name, and which is synonymous with absolute and unlimited infidelity. He simply considered a real scientific knowledge of things to be altogether impossible. His fundamental principle was, that there is nothing true or false, right or wrong, honest or dishonest, just or unjust; that there is no standard in anything, but that all things depend upon law and custom, and that uncertainty and doubt belong to everything. Yet, like the eminent modern German thinker, he appears to have tenaciously maintained the obligations of morality, and he declared virtue to be the only thing worth striving after (Cicero, *De Fin.* 4:16). On all occasions, therefore, he answered his opponents, "What you say may be true, but I cannot decide." This and other similar expressions drew upon him the ridicule of his adversaries; and most of the absurd anecdotes respecting his conduct in the common occurrences of life, which Diogenes repeats with all the credulity of a gossip, are probably the fabrications of his opponents, made for the purpose of ridiculing Pyrrho. He had many distinguished followers and disciples, who are called *Pyrrhoeni*, or simply Sceptics: some of them are mentioned and characterized by Diogenes Laertius (ix, c. 7, etc., and c. 12; comp. Gellius, 11:5; and Cicero, *De Orat.* iii, 17). Their doctrines and mode of reasoning are seen clearest in the works of Sextus Empiricus: their object was rather to overthrow all other systems than to establish a new

one; hence we can scarcely speak of a school of Pyrrhonists, inasmuch as they opposed every school. The whole philosophy of Pyrrho and his followers is called Pyrrhonism — a name which in subsequent times has been applied to any kind of scepticism, though the Pyrrhonian philosophy in reality is, as we have seen above, only one particular, and an elementary, form of scepticism. Cicero, in several passages, speaks of the philosophy of Pyrrho as long exploded and extinct. Pyrrho himself is said by some ancient authors to have left no works behind him; the tropes or epochs, or fundamental principles of his philosophy, being justly ascribed to one or more of his followers. But Sextus Empiricus (*Adv. Math.* i, 282) says that he wrote a poem addressed to Alexander the Great, for which he was richly rewarded; and Athenæus (x, p. 419) quotes a passage from a work of Pyrrho, the character of which is entirely unknown. The first writer on the scepticism of Pyrrho is said to have been Timon, his friend and disciple, whose life is written by Diogenes Laertius. See *English Cyclop.* s.v.; Smith, *Dict. of Class. Biog.* s.v.; Kingsley, *Alexandria and her Schools*, p. 59 sq.; Ueberweg, *Hist. of Philos.* (see Index in vol. ii); Mackintosh, *Works*, i, 306, 307; Bordas-Demoulin, *Melanges Philosophiques* (Par. 1846), p. 47 sq.

Pyrrhonii

SEE PYRRHO.

Pyrrhonism

SEE PYRRHO.

Pyr'rhus

(Πύρρος - haired, a common Greek name) is given in the best MSS. as the name of the father of Sopater, Paul's companion (⁴⁰⁸Acts 20:4). SEE SOPATER.

Pythagoras

one of the earliest and most celebrated sages of Greece, the alleged originator of the name and of the profession of *philosopher*, and the founder of a sect which enjoyed great and enduring reputation. Notwithstanding the numerous fables which are interwoven with the traditionary accounts of his career, it is certain that none of the elder philosophers of Greece attained higher eminence in speculation, impressed

himself more forcibly on the contemporary world, or influenced more widely and more permanently the character of subsequent investigation, Engaged equally and simultaneously in abstract inquiry and in scientific research, at once theorist and practical politician, and predominant wherever his efforts were directed, he instituted a school, a religious fraternity, a secret society, and a political association, all combined in one body; and he controlled for many years the public movement of the community in which he had fixed his abode. His political ascendancy was a potent influence during a considerable part of his life, and was prolonged, in a mitigated and disguised form, through successive generations. His sect survived alike the peculiar circumstances which had favored its original establishment and the violent catastrophe which crushed the primitive association, and, after his characteristic doctrines had been accepted, with modifications and additions, by other schools, devoted itself with marked earnestness to the public and private ethics which had chiefly attracted the regards of the master. His discoveries, or happy conjectures, in mathematics, in astronomy, in music, etc., fascinated Plato, and were largely incorporated into the all-embracing system of Aristotle. Even in cases in which they were questioned, rejected, or almost forgotten by later antiquity, they have been revived by modern philosophy, and may frequently be recognised as furnishing the corner-stones for modern sciences. To Pythagoras have been ascribed the anticipation of the Copernican system, the demonstration of the relation between the squares of the sides of a right-angled triangle, and the determination of the mathematical basis of the theory of music. To him must also be assigned the honor of introducing, however fantastically, numerical relations for the explanation of the laws and operations of the material universe. A man connected so prominently and so effectively with so many important branches of human research and of human action, at the very outset of systematic speculation and systematized activity, may well excite wonder and attract curiosity — a wonder which is converted into amazement by reputed miracles, and a curiosity which is baffled and bewildered by the accumulation of myths around his name and around all the salient incidents of his career.

I. *Life and Labors.* — The details of the life and opinions of Pythagoras, as transmitted to us by the ancients, are so confused and contradictory, and are so blended with fantastic fables, that it is impracticable to extract from them a plain, trustworthy, and consistent account (Brucker, *Hist. Crit.*

Phil. i, 991). The founder, in a remote age, of a secret society at once religious and political, philosophical and scientific, afforded an apt frame on which to hang the exaggerations of admiring disciples and the credulous fancies of his own and of other generations. We have no authentic remains and no contemporary memorials of the Samian philosopher. The relics attributed to his earlier followers are not acknowledged to be genuine. The special works of Aristotle and of his pupils, Dicearchus, Aristoxenus, and Heraclides Ponticus, on the subject of the Pythagoreans, were early lost. A few scant notices survive in Herodotus, Heraclitus, Xenophanes, Isocrates, Plato, and Aristotle; but our chief sources of information are the late writers Diogenes Laertius, Porphyry, and Iamblichus. Whatever materials may have been accessible to them, they cannot be supposed to have had credible authorities for their compilations. 'The loose and uncritical habits of Diogenes do not invite confidence, while the mythical and thaumaturgic proclivities of the Neo-Platonists to provoke constant suspicion. These miracle-mongers would greedily welcome any marvellous legends, and would not be scrupulous about adding embellishments or fictions of their own to the tales of wonder which they might find already in circulation. We are singularly unfortunate in regard to this pioneer in philosophy. Antiquity has bequeathed to us much in regard to him which is absurd as well as incredible; it has left little that can be received without hesitation, to form a portrait of the man, or to furnish an adequate scheme of his doctrines.

The birth of Pythagoras is placed by Mullach in the first year of the 43d Olympiad (B.C. 608), on the strength of a legend reported by Eratosthenes and cited by Diogenes Laertius. The same date is deduced, with some uncertainty, from a statement made by Antiochus and preserved by Clemens Alexandrinus. The nativity of Pythagoras is brought down nearly forty years later by accepting the declaration of Aristoxenus that he left Samos at the age of forty, in the reign of Polycrates. The difference between these estimates is sufficient to destroy any confidence in either, and distrust is increased by the very dubious character of early Greek chronology; yet each of these deductions has been espoused by eminent scholars. Bentley and Larclher are on the side of Mullach; Dodswell attaches himself to the declaration of Aristoxenus; Grote, apparently convinced of the inconclusiveness of all reasoning on the subject, aims at the golden mean, and places the birth of Pythagoras about B.C. 580. The

only safe conclusion is that the philosopher began to flourish in the second half of the 6th century before Christ.

The birthplace of Pythagoras, if less doubtful than the date of his birth, has been monre variously deterrnined. He is usually designated the Samnian. This rests, primarily, upon a passage in Herodotus, in which the curious story of Zamolxis is related. Grote considers the passage decisive. On referring to the text, it will be found that Herodotus says nothing positively of the philosopher's place of birth. The general belief of antiquity, however, accredited Pythagoras to Samos, and it is only this belief that is attested in Isocrates (*Bttsil.c.* xi). Aristoxenus represented him as a Tyrrhenian from Lemnos or Imbros. Bv some writers he was represented as the son of a Phliasian refugee who settled in Samos. Neanthes regarded him as a Syrian or Tyrian; Theopompus and Aristarchus entertained the opinion of Aristoxenus; Hippobotus and Hermipipus endorsed the common belief.

Contradictions continue to mutliply. There is no agreement in regard to the paternity of Pythagoras. The accepted tradition presents him as the son of Mnesarchus; Justin, however, names his father Demaratus. Those who assigned a Phliasian origin to his father gave him the name of Marmacus, which Voss and Faber think that Justin blunderingly converted into Demaratus. Tzetzes, a very late author indeed, calls his mother Pythais. His father is variously reputed to have been an engraver of gems and a rich merchant; he may have been both or neither. Two brothers, older than himself, are given to Pythagoras — Eunomus, or, according to other accounts, Eunostes, and Tyrrhenus. These names are very suspicious.

These confusions and perplexities are noticed, not with any desire of exhibiting the numerous opinions which prevailed in relation to the birth of Pythagoras, but to show how uncertain and unauthenticated, even in antiquity, were those points in his history which were least apt to provoke diversity of statement. If there were such differences in such matters, there is little reason to expect trustworthy accounts in regard to more important concerns, where enforced secrecy promoted fanciful conjecture, where the love of the marvellous might indulge itself without check or fiar of detection, and where the character of the school cherished the wildest inventions and encouraged their acceptance. The story is, throughout, involved in fable and in superfetations of fable.

Tradition has been wholly unrestrained in relating the education of Pythagoras. Several teachers have been assigned to him. He is said to have been placed by his uncle Zoilus under the charge of Pherecydes in the island of Lemnos. He is reported to have afterwards attached himself to Hermiodamas, or Leodamas (both names are given), the grandson of Creophylus, the cyclic poet. He is alleged to have been the disciple of Thales, of the Milesian Anaximander, and of the Cretan Epimenides, who is even a more shadowy personage than himself. The true significance of this combination of names may probably be found in the disposition of later times to regard Pythagoras as instructed in all the learning of the Greeks. Yet the accumulation of Hellenic knowledge was not considered a sufficient equipment for his career. He is supposed to have set out, while still young, on extensive travels through the Oriental world, just as the mediaeval sages were believed to have gathered their stores of learning from the Saracenic schools in Spain and in the East.

Egypt seems to have been the first foreign country visited by Pythagoras. He is said to have been commended to Amasis by a letter from his friend Polycrates, and to have remained in the country long enough to acquire all the wisdom of the Egyptians — their language, arithmetic, geometry, religious rites, etc. During his stay, he is alleged to have been captured by the Persian armies of Cambyses, and to have received the instructions of the Magi; he is also said to have studied astrology with the Chaldeans, and to have received from the Brahmins in India their peculiar doctrines. This last imagination is apparently a late deduction from the correspondence of the Pythagorean metempsychosis with Hindu tenets. Hermippus and Porphyry ascribe to him also studies among the Jews. He may have visited Crete, and there is no improbability in the supposition that anxiety to note the institutions of Lycurgus may have carried him to Sparta.

After a long and uncertain absence, Pythagoras returned to Samos, and opened a school, at the request of his countrymen, for the dissemination of the marvels of learning which he had collected in his extensive travels. His pupils were few and listless, and his method of teaching — by signs and symbols — irritated rather than enlightened his acolytes. To add mystery to his instructions and a divine sanction to his wisdom, he visited Delos and other oracular shrines. To these journeys may be assigned his appearance at the Olympic Games, and his celebrated invention of the name of “Philosopher,” though this is also referred to a conversation with the Tyrant of Phlius, and probably did not originate with him.

Having, by these journeys, by frequent intercourse with the divinities, by the pretension of a divine origin and of miraculous gifts, and also by the admiration excited in the congresses of men, extended and heightened his reputation, Pythagoras came back to Samos, and reopened his school under brighter auspices than before. He gave public instruction in ethical and political philosophy, and freely responded to those who consulted him in regard to the government of the island. But, besides conducting this public academy, he provided a retreat for those who sought and were deemed worthy of more recondite education. Outside of the city he procured a cave, to which he retired with his more select disciples. Here he spent much of the night, as well as of the day, in esoteric instruction, and especially in teaching the wonders of mathematical science. He added the arts of the charlatan to the learning of the scholar and the wisdom of the sage.

Samos, however, proved an uncongenial abode. Whether his philosophical vocation was too much interrupted by the embassies and public duties imposed on him by his countrymen, or the Samians displayed too little aptitude for philosophy; whether he was offended by the tyranny of his friend Polycrates, or imperiled by that of Syloson, the brother and successor of Polycrates, it is vain to inquire. It is sufficient to know, from the universal testimony of antiquity, that Pythagoras abandoned Samos, and migrated to Southern Italy, which proved singularly hospitable to philosophy. But there is as much discrepancy in regard to the time when this migration took place as in regard to other circumstances in the life of the Samian teacher; it is placed about B.C. 531 by Fynes Clinton, in 529 by Ueberweg, and other dates are given.

Crotona received the emigrant. He was soon surrounded by numerous admirers, belonging to the wealthier and more influential part of the population. He is said to have united these, to the number of three hundred or more, in a secret organization. Among the earliest consequences of his residence in Crotona is mentioned the complete reformation of the manners and morals of the people, produced by his persuasive address, by the authority of his divine pretensions, by his imposing demeanor, and by his judicious counsels. His disciples were of the rich and noble class, and, by converting them to a more sober and abstemious life, he would necessarily suppress luxury and sensuality; for these are not the vices of poor laborers and "rude mechanicals." Moreover, as the political control was still in the hands of the aristocracy, though already contested, political interest might

conspire with religious enthusiasm and philosophical convictions in facilitating a reform requisite to maintain a doubtful ascendancy. That aristocratic rule was confirmed by the action of Pythagoras was the belief of later times; and that Crotona was strengthened by the reformation is shown by its subsequent victory over Sybaris, under Pythagorean leadership. How far the Pythagorean rule was intentionally political, how far Pythagoras directed his secret society to political aims, cannot be ascertained, and has been diversely determined. It has been well observed that a select body of influential men, interested in the maintenance of a specific policy; bound together by the closest ties of opinion, sentiment, and affectionate regard; united, moreover, by secret obligations, would necessarily employ concerted action in public affairs. It should also be observed that the Greek schools, until the close, or nearly the close, of Plato's career, had always a decided political inclination.

It may well be supposed that Pythagoras, who had already tested, at Samos, the efficacy of supernatural claims, would avail himself of like arts to establish his predominance in a new land. He had previously presented himself as a son of Phoebus, and he is said to have been worshipped in Italy, after his death, as the offspring of the Hyperborean Apollo; his golden thigh had been shown to Abaris at the Olympic Games as evidence of his divine descent. The claim was consonant with the whole tenor of Greek genealogy, and is illustrated by many striking parallels in Greece and in other lands. He offered, in confirmation of his doctrine of the transmigration of souls, his recognition, in the temple of Juno at Argos, of the shield of Euphorbus, slain in the Trojan War, whose body he had then inhabited.

*“Ipse ego (jam memini) Trojani tempore belli,
Painthoides Euphorbus eram” (Ovid, Met. 15:160, 161).*

To the earlier years of his residence at Crotona may be assigned his death, burial, and resurrection, and his report of the wonders of the nether world; to the same time may be referred (though there is really no chronology in these matters) his familiar intercourse with animals, his handling snakes with impunity, his prediction of earthquakes, his control over tempests, his removal of pestilences, etc. To the closing years of his life must be referred his remarkable apparition to his friends at Metapontum and Tarentum simultaneously, and his public conversation with them. It is scarcely surprising that the Neo-Platonists, by whom his biography was composed

(or consarcinated), should have presented him as the counterpart and rival of Christ. It is natural that these miraculous endowments should be regarded as the bold inventions of late pagans; but this solution is not satisfactory, as some of them are evidently of much earlier origin, and all of them appear, in modified forms, in other myths in widely separated regions. There are many points in the story of Pythagoras which appear to be only late survivals of primitive superstitions and delusions.

The high and various endowments of Pythagoras, real and fictitious, rendered him singularly successful in the institution of his school at Crotona. The most important, the most credulous, or the most zealous of his pupils were constituted as a secret society, were subjected to the most stringent discipline, and to the most absolute obedience to their inspired teacher. According to some traditions, the property of all was surrendered for the common use. This is scarcely probable, as the age of communism had not yet arrived. The statement may simply indicate that the means of the members were freely employed for common objects, and that the wealthier brethren generously ministered to the requirements of the poorer.

The society seems to have been divided into two classes: the more advanced, or esoteric, and the neophytes, or exoteric. Other divisions are also mentioned, as into *Pythagorici*, *Pythagorei*, and *Pythagoristic*, according to their progress in the studies of the sect, and the intimacy of their communion with their common superior.

The candidates for admission were carefully scrutinized, and great attention was paid to physiognomy and the external indications of moral and mental qualities. If accepted, they had to pass through a long period of probation. It was credited in after-times that they had to maintain silence for five years; that, during this period, they were not allowed to behold the face of the master; and that they were required to undergo other tests of fitness for membership. Silence, or the government of the tongue (*ἔχεμυθία*), was prescribed as earnestly as by St. James; but the length and degree of the silence required were not uniform in all cases. The fellows of the guild received instruction in all the knowledge then existent, either directly from the scholar himself, or through the intervention of his more instructed pupils. The esoteric studies have been differently supposed to have been the political theories and the political projects of Pythagoras, and the mystic religious rites, or *orgies*, which rendered the society a theosophic sect: they were probably the latter.

The publication of the characteristic Pythagorean doctrines was absolutely prohibited: and when these were published by Philolaus, in a later age, the procedure was regarded as a grave infraction of Pythagorean proprieties. Daily self-examination, which presupposes habitual meditation, was a constant requirement.

*“They summ’d the actyonns of the daie
Eche nyghte before they slept.”*

Such reverence was paid to the declarations of the master that all contradicticon, cavil, and doubt were unknown. Every difference of opinion was promptly settled by the autocratic dictum, *Αὐτὸς ἔφα*.

In the midst of the luxury, sensuality, idleness, and extravagance for which Crotona, like other cities of Magna Graecia, was noted, the greatest restraint was imposed on the elect in regard to all those vices which undermine or fritter away morality. Modesty and simplicity in dress, decorum in behavior, abstemiousness in food, abstinence from meats, beans, and other articles of food, and moderation in all things, iwere earnestly inculcated. The institutions of Pythagoras appear to have been, in many respects, an anticipation of the monastic life of the early mediaeval Benedictines. Healthful recreations for mind and body, music and gymnastics, each of which embraced a large and varied sphere, were zealously prosecuted.

The members of the association were segregated from “the vulgar herd,” not merely by their secret organization and higher culture, but also by the pride of learning, of creed, of power, and by the haughty contempt for inferiors which usually attends such pride. The mystic secrecy and the careful separation from the multitude were maintained by signs and enigmatic symbols, which enabled Pythagoreans to recognise each other with certainty and without display.

The best and the latest investigators of the perplexed subject of Pythagoreanism agree in rejecting the opinion that Pythagoras intended to founmd a distinct political organization for the purpose of maintaining aristmocratic authority. Nevertheless, if any weight is to be given to concurrent testimony, or to the natural tendencies of an aristocratic organization held together by secret bonds, or to the existing condition of Greek communities, the Pythagorean fraternity did secure the control of Crotona, and instituted affiliated societies in Metapontum and other

neighboring cities. The influence exercised by the Pythagoreans may well have been favorable to private morals, to public virtues, and to general prosperity. But the power of an exclusive, arbitrary, and haughty section of the community, and the constraint imposed by it on the free action as well as on the accustomed passions, the sensual gratifications, and the avidity of license, which is the first manifestation of the spirit of progressive freedom, would be certain to provoke reaction. It would thus be in perfect consonance with the natural order of events that the story should be true which related that, after Pythagoras had taught at Crotona for twenty years, the people made a combined attack upon the coenobitic association assembled in the house of Milo the athlete. Cylon, a noble who had been refused admission into the society, and Ninon were the reputed leaders. The assailants are sometimes said to have been only Crotoniates; at other times they are reputed to have consisted also of deputations from the other cities in which Pythagorean clubs had been established. The *coenaculum* was burned to the ground, and most of the congregation lost their lives. According to some accounts, Pythagoras himself perished in the flames; according to others, he escaped, retired to Metapontum, and soon after died, or was slain. This calamity is calculated to have happened about B.C. 510, when Pythagoras was ninety-eight years of age, if the earliest date of his nativity be accepted. The same story, however, with the requisite modifications, is told in regard to the Pythagoreans of a later generation. But there are so many and such inconsistent narratives of the end of the philosopher, and of the suppression or dispersion of the Pythagorean organization, that no greater certainty can be expected in these matters than is attainable in regard to other points in his career. The whole story is as mythical as the fable of King Arthur and the Knights of the Round Table, though unquestionably encrusting a large substratum of fact. "The stories told of him," says Cox, "must be classed along with the tales which related the exploits of the Messenian Aristomenes."

Pythagoras was married, and had a family consisting of two sons. Telauges and Mnesarchus, and three daughters or more, Damo, Muia, and Arignote, all of whom became his disciples. Telauges is said to have succeeded him in the conduct of the school. But the disciples appear to have been scattered, the school broken up, and the sect utterly dissipated as a community, though its chiefs continued to be named, as late, at least, as Archytas of Tarentum. His wife, and the mother of his children, is usually reported to have been Theano, the daughter of Brontinus of Crotona; but

she is called a Cretan, and the daughter of Pythonax, by Suidas. Confusion and discord attend every step of the inquiry.

II. Writings and Doctrines. — All the works ascribed to Pythagoras are spurious beyond all doubt. The *Golden Song* is not excepted from this censure. David, the scholiast of Aristotle (p. 13, l. 15-26, r. ed. Brandis), gives the reasons assigned by Pythagoras for his refusal to commit anything to writing, and explicitly assigns the *Golden Song* to a nameless Pythagorean. This shows how utterly destitute the ancients themselves were of genuine Pythagorean texts, and how uncertain are all sources of information. The earliest documents are the *Fragments* of Philolaus, whose authenticity is still debated, and the *Golden Song*, often ascribed to Lysis, but, in all probability, the production of a later age. As Philolaus was the pupil of Archytas and the instructor of Simmias and Cebes, he belonged to the Socratic aera; and, as Lysis was the teacher of Epaminondas, he may be regarded as the contemporary of Plato. The interval must have been considerable between Pythagoras and Philolaus, as Archytas, the instructor of the latter, was regarded as the eighth in the succession of the Pythagorean scholars. Yet the distinctive doctrines of Pythagoras must have been bruited abroad long before the publication of Philolaus; for we find among the fragments of Xenophanes an epigram on the Pythagorean doctrine of metempsychosis, and Xenophanes was born before the death of Pythagoras. But the doctrines of Pythagoras, deducible from earlier and later writers, cannot be regarded as even a fragmentary exposition of a definite system constructed by him. They are only the mutilated expression of his leading principles, as interpreted and expanded by those who claimed to be representatives of his teachings. The remnants of the early Greek inquirers, whether didactic or speculative, exhibit their disposition to employ terse aphorisms for the utterance of their views. This is the tendency of all primitive speculation. While recognising the un-systematic character of the exposition thence resulting, it is well also to remember the commendation and employment of the same mode of communication by Francis Bacon in a period of much ampler knowledge and more diffused intelligence.

Gathering from the unsatisfactory materials that remain the distinctive doctrines of Pythagoras, they appear to be these: The soul is, in its nature, immortal, and akin to divinity. It consists of two parts: the rational, which is alone immortal; and the sensuous, or irrational, which is ultimately mortal. Plants possess the latter. In this distinction may be found the germ

of the Aristotelian dogma of three souls: the intelligent, the animal, and the vegetative. The rational soul is pure; the irrational impure, because immersed in matter: both are united in man. The former attests his divine nature and origin; the latter guides and governs his material frame; with which it is united in life, and through which it is diffused. Death is the withdrawal of this complex soul from the corporeal involucre in which it has been enclosed, and which it has animated. The spirit, thus released, dwells in the circumambient air, retaining, in shadowy guise, its former shape, visible as a ghost, or intervening in the affairs of men through dreams and other influences. Souls that have divested themselves in life of the taint of their irrational companion, and of their corporeal environment, enter into enduring bliss, and become wholly divine, apparently without loss of individual nature.

ἦν δ' ἀπολείψας σῶμα ἐς αἰθέρ' ἐλεύθερον ἔλθης,
ἔσσει αἰθάνατος, θεὸς ἄμβροτος, οὐκ ἔτι θνητός
(*Carm. Aur* 70, 71).

Souls not liberated from the vices and passions of the lower soul, or from the impurities and temptations of their material vesture, float for a time in the air, tormented by the Furies and the ministers of vengeance, till they are allowed a new trial, and are subjected to a new ordeal, by passing into new bodies, human or bestial.

*“animam sic semper eandem
Esse, sed in varias doceo migrare figuras”*
(*Ovid, Met. 15:171, 172*).

The air is always full of souls, undergoing the penal consequences of their sins, and awaiting their descent into new bodies.

*“penitusque necesse est
Multa din concreta mtdis inolescere miris”*
(*Virgil, AEn 6, 737, 738*).

This is the noted metempsychosis of Pythagoras, which is usually conceived to have been of Hindu origin, but is often referred to an Egyptian source, though having little correspondence with the metempsychosis or the anacatastasis of Egyptian mythology. It is much more reasonable to consider it a philosophical adaptation of the primitive beliefs in regard to spiritual existence after death (see Tylor, *Primitive Culture*).

It is an obvious deduction from the doctrine of metempsychosis that animal life should be scrupulously regarded, and that animals should not be slaughtered for food. The butcher is a homicide, if not a murderer. It is a natural consequence from the doctrine of disembodied spirits that Pythagoras should have attached great importance to dreams and other spiritual communications. The sanctity of all life, and the consideration of human life as a probation and as a progress to a higher existence, explain his strong condemnation of suicide.

*“The Everlasting had fixed
His canon ‘gainst self-slaughter.”*
(See Thom. Aquin. Summan Theolog. II, ii, qu. 24, art.v.)

Not only the spirits of men are divine, according to Pythagoras, but those of the sun, moon, and stars, which move at such musical intervals from each other, and in such regulated concord, as to produce the music of the spheres—a doctrine welcome to the poetic imagination of Plato.

*“Such harmony is in immortal souls.
But while this muddy vesture of decay
Doth grossly close it in, we cannot hear it.”*

The ontology of Pythagoras was intimately associated with his transcendental theory of numbers. It can scarcely be determined which suggested the other, or by what series of reciprocal reactions both were produced. The cosmogony attributed to him is much more manifestly an evolution from the numerical fantasy which has always been held to be the most distinctive part of Pythagoreanism.

Mullach justly observes that the exposition of the significance and potency of numbers in the Pythagorean theory would require an ample volume; hence he notices them very briefly. The like course must be adopted here, and a summary, abridged from an abridgment by Baring-Gould, must suffice.

“1. The unit, or Monad, is the beginning and end of all. It is the symbol of existence, identity, equality, conservation, and harmony (comp. Philolai *Fragm.* 15).

“2. Two, or the Dyad, is the origin of contrasts, the symbol of diversity, division, change, disorder.

“**3.** Three, or the Triad, is the first of unequals. It represents God and the soul of man.

“**4.** Four, or the Tetrad, is the most perfect of numbers; the root, or origin, of all things, whence the soul derives its eternal nature: hence it furnishes the Pythagorean oath.

Ναὶ μὰ τὸν ἀμετέρῃ ψυχῇ παραδόντα τετρακτὺν,
Παγὰν ἀενάου φύσεως (*Carm. Aur.* 47, 48)].

“**5.** Five, or the Pentad, is everything, supplying the principle of everything, and repelling evil spirits.

“**6.** Six, or the Hexad, is the number of good fortune.

“**7.** Seven, or the Heptad, is a sacred number, generating good and evil.

“**8.** Eight, or the Octad, the first cube, is a perfect number.

“**9.** Nine, or the Ennead, being the square of three, is sacred.

“**10.** Ten, or the Decad, the sum of the first four numbers, contains all numeric relations. All science proceeds from it and returns to it (comp. Philolai *Fragm.* 13).”

Whether numbers constituted the essences of things, or were only similitudes, or symbols, is still in dispute, and was, perhaps, never clearly determined. The language of Aristotle (*Met.* I, v) is vague and indistinct. That they were generally employed in a symbolic sense is apparent. The monad was the first principle of all things, the origin whence all things emanated; it was at once the odd and the even, the limited and the unlimited, God and the universe. The dyad, or first evolution of number, was the even, and represented the interval between limiting extremes. The triad generated the progressive scale of numbers. The tetrad was the union of the triad with the unit, or of the dyad with itself, and indicated geometrical body. The pentad was physical body, with its properties and accidents of sense. Numbers, again, represented points; by the procession of points, lines are formed; by the movement of lines, surfaces; by the progress of surfaces, solids. From these last arise all bodies, and the four elements of earth, air, water, fire, which undergo constant change and reciprocal conversion.

*“Nec species sua cuique manet: rerumque novatrix
Ex aliis alias separat Natura figuras.
Nec perit in tanto quicquam, mihi credite, mundo,
Sed variat, faciemque novat” (Ovid, Met. 15:252-255).*

A fifth element was added by the pentad; this was the upper air, the surrounding ether, the Quintessence. These five cosmic elements were also symbolized by the five mathematical bodies. The cube was the earth; the pyramid, fire; the octahedron, air; the dodecahedron, space, or ether; and the icosahedron, water. All were contained within the enveloping sphere. Such are the bare outlines of the Pythagorean cosmogony.

Much more influential than this in the intellectual development of Greece was the moral instruction, which long continued to form a large part of Pythagorean speculation. Morals were divided into two departments: disciplinary, or ethical, for the perfection of the individual; and political, for the furtherance of the common welfare. In both parts, great stress was laid upon the obligation and the benefit of friendship, which extended, also, to the metaphysical and to the material constitution of the universe, producing the harmony of the former, and the attractions, combinations, and absorptions of the latter. The efficacy, in actual life, of the Pythagorean friendship is exemplified by the well-known story of Damon and Pythias. The Pythagorean Symbols belong mainly to practical morals, and exhibit a decided advance on the contemporaneous sentiments of the Greek world. They are unauthentic. Many belong to a later date, many are simply ceremonial, and others are general and traditional precepts.

Condensed and inadequate as is this summary of the alleged career and teachings of Pythagoras, it reveals the powerful influence exercised by him on the communities with which he was associated, and on the latter generations which professed the adoption of his alleged philosophy. Admitting the utmost confusion and uncertainty in the chronology of both his biography and his doctrines, and the fabulous nature of much that was ascribed to him, he must yet be deemed worthy of the reputation he left behind him, and is still “claruin et venerabile nomen.”

III. Literature. — All the historians of ancient philosophy, and all the extended histories of Greece, necessarily treat of Pythagoras with more or less fulness and with more or less discernment. Brucker, as usual, provides an ample accumulation of materials; Ueberleg is brief but perspicacious; while Ritter is very copious and discreet. Grote’s observations are

valuable. Of more special sources of information may be enumerated: Mullach, *Fragmenta Philosophorum Graecorum* (Paris, 187577); Hieroclis *Commentarius in Carmenz Aureulm* (ap. Mullach, *Frany. Plil. Grcec.*); Aristotelis *Metapysica*, lib. i, 9, 12, 13; Diogenes Laertius (ed. Hiibner, Lips. 1828-31, 2 vols.); Porphyrii *Pythagorte Vita.*; Iamblichi *Pythagorce Vitca* (ed. Kiessling, Lips. 1813); Fabricii *Bibliotheca Grceco*, i, 750-804; Mason, ap. Smith. *Dict. Greek and Rooman Biog. and Mytl.* ss.v.; Schilter, *Diss. de Discipl. Pyithatgorae*; Terpstra, *De Sodclitii Pythagor. Origine* (Utrecht, 1824); Wendt, *De Rebus Princ. sec. Pythagoram* (Lips. 1827); Ritter, *Cesch. der pythag. Philosophie* (Hamburg, 1826); Kriche, *De Societatis a Pythag. conduc Scopu Politico* (Gottingen, 1830); Beckmann, *De Pythagoreor. Reliquiis* (Berlin, 1844); also *Qucestiones Pythagoricae* (Braunsberg, 18521858); Langel, *Pythagore, sca Doctrine et son Histoire*, in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* (Paris, 1864); Zeller. *Pythagoras und die Pythalgorassage* (Leips. 1865); Balzer, *Pythagoras der Weise von Samsos* (Nordhausen, 1865); Rathgeber, *Grossgriechenla und und Pythagoras* (Gotha, 1866); Chaignet, *Pythagore* (Paris, 1873); Montle, *Quelques Maots sur le Philosophe Pythagore* (Douai, 1876). (G. F. H.)

Python

occurs in the margin of ~~4166~~ Acts 16:16, a *spirit of Python*, where the text of the A. V. reads a *spirit of divination*. The word Python (Πύθων in Greek mythology) is the name of a serpent, or dragon slain by Apollo, then transferred to Apollo himself; in later times used for *diviners, soothsayers*, held to be inspired of the Pythian Apollo (Plutarch, *De Delect.; Orac. c. q.*). The *Pythones*, like the *obolth*, “familiar spirits,” among the idolatrous Hebrews (~~1838~~ Leviticus 19:31; ~~1838~~ 1 Samuel 28:3, 7, 8, 9), were called *ventriloquists* because the god or spirit was supposed to be in them, and to speak from their bellies without any motion of the lips. **SEE NECROMANCY.**

Pythonism

(from *Pythonissa*, a prophetess inspired by the Pythian god in Delphi, Apollo, who killed the serpent Python in the country called Pytho, near Mount Parnassus) is the ecstatic striving after supernatural enlightenment, in order to be able to foresee the future: it is oracular mania. This degeneracy of the natural instinct of curiosity is well described by an anonymous author in the writing *Une Pythonisse Contemporaine* (Paris,

1835, 8vo). This book relates the adventures of a young lady of noble extraction, who is inveigled by the arts of a modern Pythoness, and, by her superstitious regard for the insane oracles of her teacher, gets from aberration to aberration, and falls at last into all kinds of turpitudes — into crime, vice, and misery. Pythonism is also called *Sibyllinism*.

Pyx

Picture for Pyx

(*πύξος*, the *box-tree*; hence a *box*, properly *boxwood*), the sacred vessel used in the Roman Catholic Church to contain the consecrated eucharistic elements, which are preserved after consecration, whether for the communion of the sick or for the adoration of the faithful in the churches. Already in the 4th century the host was kept in a special vessel, but this vessel was not called by its present name until the Councils of Tours and York in 1179. Its use was enjoined by pope Innocent III, in 1215, and by Odo of Rouen, in 1266, to be over or near an altar. The form of the Pyx has varied very much at different times. Anciently it was sometimes of the form of a dove, which was hung suspended over the altar. More commonly, however, it was, as its name implies, a simple box. Up to the 13th century the material was ivory, but subsequently, when it became rare, it was generally made of the precious metals, or at least of metal plated with gold or silver. At present, the pyx is commonly cup-shaped, with a close-fitting cover of the same material. The interior is ordered to be of gold, or at least plated with gold. Like all other sacred utensils connected with the administration of the Eucharist, it must be blessed by a bishop, or priest delegated by a bishop. See Walcott, *Sacred Archæol.* s.v.; Siegel, *Christliche Alterthümer* (see Index in vol. iv); Barnum, *Romanism*, p. 476; Elliott, *Romanism*; *Chambers's Encyclop.* sv. **SEE CIBORIUM.**