

(1863–64), and *Il gerdil* (1864). In 1863 and 1864 he was a member of Parliament. He had been seeking reconciliation with the Church since 1868, and on March 8, 1887, a few days before his death, he obtained it.

Passaglia was a patristically oriented theologian with strong leanings toward Petavius and Thomassin. He published the first book of Petavius's *Dogmatics* in 1857. He showed a mastery of theology, and together with G. PERRONE and his two disciples, K. SCHRADER and J. B. FRANZELIN, he renewed the study of it at the Roman College. There he was the teacher of renowned German theologians, including H. J. DENZINGER, F. HETTINGER, B. JUNGSMANN, H. von HURTER, and M. SCHEEBEN. Passaglia took part in the preparatory work that led to the definition of the Immaculate Conception of Mary, and to the wording of the bull *Ineffabilis Deus*. Yet at Vatican I, Passaglia's view of the mediate papal power of jurisdiction was rejected. His theological works are of lasting value, for example: *Commentarium theologicorum*, 3 v. (Rome 1850–51), *De ecclesia Christi*, 2 v. (Regensburg 1853–56), and *De immaculata deiparae semper virginis conceptu*, 3 v. (Rome 1854, Naples 1855). From his unpublished material H. Schauf edited *De conciliis oecumenicis, theses* (Rome 1961).

Bibliography: C. SOMMERVOGEL et al., *Bibliothèque de la compagnie de Jésus* (Brussels-Paris 1890–1932) 6:332–336. C. BOYER, *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, ed. A. VACANT et al. (Paris 1903–50) 11.2:2207–10. H. HURTER, *Nomenclator literarius theologiae catholicae* (Innsbruck 1903–13) 5.2:1499–1500. L. BIGINELLI, *Biografia del Sac. Prof. Carlo Passaglia con documenti* (Turin 1887). P. D'ERCOLE, *Carlo Passaglia: cenno biobibliografico e ricordo* (Turin 1888). C. G. AREVALO, *Some Aspects of the Theology of the Mystical Body of Christ in the Ecclesiology of G. Perrone, C. Passaglia, and Cl. Schrader* (Rome 1959). W. KASPER, *Die Lehre von der Tradition in der römischen Schule* (Freiburg 1962).

[H. SCHAUF]

PASSERINI, PIETRO MARIA

b. Cremona, 1597; d. Rome, 1677. Passerini, a canonist, became procurator general of the Dominican Order. For 20 years he was a professor at the Sapienza in Rome and was renowned for his work on the Roman Curia. His principal writings are the *De electione canonica tractatus* (Rome 1661), *De hominum statibus et officiis* (1665), and the *Regulare Tribunale* (1677).

Bibliography: M. M. GORCE, *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, ed. A. VACANT et al. (Paris 1903–50) 11.2:2210–11. H. HURTER, *Nomenclator literarius theologiae catholicae* (Innsbruck 1903–13) 4:253–254.

[L. R. KOZLOWSKI]

PASSIO

Passio was originally the account of suffering of a martyr written by Christians and based on the testimony of eyewitnesses. In the earliest type of *passio*, the miraculous element plays a restricted part, as in the accounts of the martyrdoms of St. POLYCARP and SS. PERPETUA and Felicity, or in the *passio* of the Scillitan Martyrs (c. 180). Later authors embellished this type of narrative with fanciful and miraculous happenings to edify, or to satisfy, popular tastes. This was done in the case of the *passiones* of SS. HIPPOLYTUS, SEBASTIAN, CECILIA, AGNES, and the FOUR CROWNED MARTYRS, making the task of discovering the authentic ones difficult for modern hagiographers. Another type of *passio* that became popular from the 5th century onward was a completely legendary account of a martyr's or saint's life and death, which usually had nothing more than a name and possibly a location as foundation. The *passio* of St. CATHERINE OF ALEXANDRIA and that of St. GEORGE are without historical foundation. The *passio* even in its most authentic form is to be distinguished from an authentic Act of the martyrdom, which is the official shorthand report of the trial and death of a martyr. Only a few of these have survived. (See ACTS OF THE MARTYRS.)

The *passio* was used by the APOLOGISTS as a subsidiary proof of the divine origin of the Christian religion; but its specific purpose was to encourage Christians to honor and imitate the martyrs. In theology the *passio* as an account of the sufferings of a martyr points to the relevance of the faith as an absolute factor in the life of the early Church. The martyr was challenged to forswear his faith or die for it. Likewise, the confessions of faith frequently put into the mouth of the martyr, whether authentic or not, witness to belief in a living, triune God, the Resurrection of Christ, and Christian belief in final glory.

Bibliography: A. HAMMAN, *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, ed. J. HOFER and K. RAHNER (Freiburg 1957–67) 7:133–134; *Theologie und Glaube* 45 (1955) 35–43. G. LAZZATI, *Gli sviluppi della letteratura sui martiri nei primi quattro secoli* (Turin 1956). *Acta Sanctorum*, (Paris 1863–). *Analecta Bollandiana* (Brussels 1882–). *Bibliotheca hagiographica latina antiquae et mediae aetatis*, 2 v. (Brussels, 1898–1901; suppl. 1911). *Bibliotheca hagiographica Graeca*, ed. F. HALKIN, 3 v. (Brussels 1957). R. AIGRAIN, *L'Hagiographie* (Paris 1953). H. DELEHAYE, *Les Passions des martyrs et les genres littéraires* (Brussels 1921).

[F. X. MURPHY]

PASSION

From the Latin *passio* (Gr. πάθος), meaning something suffered or undergone, has a variety of significations. In its etymological sense it refers to physical

suffering, particularly that associated with the martyrdom of early Christians (*see* PASSIO). In a broader philosophical meaning, as opposed to action it signifies the reception of the activity of some extrinsic agent or mover, and as such is enumerated among the CATEGORIES of being (*see* ACTION AND PASSION). It is used also to designate the species of QUALITY according to which there can be alteration (*see* MOTION), and, by extension, to signify any attribute, affection, or PROPERTY of a subject. In psychology, Cartesian usage identifies passions with states of the soul resulting from the action of “animal spirits”; Aristotelian and scholastic usage, on the other hand, refers to all types of emotional activity as passions (*see* EMOTION). More commonly accepted usages refer to any violent or intense emotion, particularly an ardent affection for one of the opposite sex, as passion (*see* LOVE; SEX). Among Christians, the word is frequently used to indicate the sufferings of Christ.

[W. A. WALLACE]

PASSION OF CHRIST, I (IN THE BIBLE)

This article, concerned primarily with the story of Christ's Passion and death as told in the four Gospels, is composed of four main sections: the ancient, common basis of a Passion narrative prior to the four written Gospels; the development of the Gospel tradition about the Passion; characteristics of the four canonical Passion narratives; the use of the OT in the Passion accounts. A specific treatment of the Resurrection is not included in this article, although the realization of the unity of the one redemptive mystery, Passion-death-Exaltation, is basic to the discussion (*see* RESURRECTION OF CHRIST, I). For the theological significance of Christ's Passion, *see* EXPIATION (IN THE BIBLE); REDEMPTION (IN THE BIBLE); SALVATION.

Pre-Gospel Passion Narrative. The Passion narratives in the present Gospels (Mark ch. 14–15; Matthew ch. 26–27; Luke ch. 22–23; John ch. 18–19) differ from the rest of the Gospel material in that they seem not to have been compiled from individual, self-contained units or stories, but present a unified, sequential account of the final events in Jesus' life and ministry. Recognizing the very different character of these stories as continuous narratives, the adherents of the form-critical school have acknowledged the very ancient tradition upon which they are based. Modern Biblical scholarship agrees that there was a primitive narrative; but there are divergent opinions on the genre, content, and milieu of the formation of that narrative. Only as a whole could the story answer the question, “How could Jesus have been brought to the cross by the people who were blessed by His signs and

wonders?” To counter this scandal of the cross, individual incidents from the Passion would not do; the entire purposeful narrative, giving exact geographical and temporal data, was seen to be necessary. (*See* FORM CRITICISM, BIBLICAL.)

Several arguments from literary criticism support the hypothesis of such a primitive narrative. More than any other part of the Gospels, this section has the nature of a connected historical account. Although the first ten chapters of Mark, for example, comprise separate blocks of material loosely connected and without continuous chronological or topographical coherence, with the beginning of the Passion story, we find a definitely sequential account. Among all four Gospels there is substantial agreement regarding the course of events of the Passion. Although chronological arrangements in earlier parts of the Gospels reflect more freely the particular interests of the writers, the events of Holy Week seem to have been so fixed in the tradition and so respected as the record of the climax of Jesus' life that the order could not be freely changed; it might be abridged, expanded, or supplemented, but its general order was retained. J. Jeremias observes that John's Gospel rarely shows parallels to Mark's account in the description of Jesus' ministry, but beginning with the entrance into Jerusalem, the Johannine narrative agrees with the Marcan rather broadly until the arrest, and then quite strictly after that. These parallels are striking, for the substance of the narrative is the same, even though details and wording may differ and even though religious and doctrinal interests are more obviously present in John than in Mark. This similarity of structure in the Passion accounts of all four Gospels has a natural explanation if there was such a basic narrative, traditional before the written Gospels.

At present critics do not express complete agreement about what the pre-Gospel narrative comprised, but most include the following incidents, which can be distinguished more easily in Mark: the plot of the priests (Mk 14.1–2); JUDAS' treason (14.10–11); the LAST SUPPER (14.17–25); the arrest of Jesus (14.43–52); the trial before the CHIEF PRIESTS (14.53–72—not admitted by all as part of the primitive narrative) and before PILATE (15.1–15); the CRUCIFIXION with some of its concomitant events (15.21–41); and the burial (15.42–47). These episodes are the ones referred to in Christ's own prophecies of the Passion (Mk 8.31; 9.29–30; 10.33) and in the earliest apostolic preaching (e.g., Acts 3.13–16; 13.27–31). From an analysis of Semitic expressions in Mark, V. Taylor proposes that Mark utilized the Greek Passion narrative current in Rome and that he expanded this with certain personal reminiscences of Peter. X. Léon-Dufour, however, maintains that an examination of Semitisms in Matthew indicates that the first Gospel also witnesses to an