## Poll[[@Headword:Poll]]

             (גֻּלְגֹּלֶת, gulgoleth, Num 1:2; Num 1:18; Num 1:20; Num 1:22; Num 3:47; 1Ch 23:3; 1Ch 23:24), the head (as rendered in 1Ch 10:10), or skull (as in Jdg 9:53; 2Ki 9:35). The verb ‘“to poll” in the A. V. is the rendering of גָּזִז, גָּלִח, or כָּסִס, all signifying to shear.

## Pollajuolo, Antonio[[@Headword:Pollajuolo, Antonio]]

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

## Pollajuolo, Pietro[[@Headword:Pollajuolo, Pietro]]

             SEE POLLAJUOLO, ANTONIO.

## Pollajuolo, Simone[[@Headword:Pollajuolo, Simone]]

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

## Pollard, William[[@Headword:Pollard, William]]

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

## Pollinctorii[[@Headword:Pollinctorii]]

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

## Pollio[[@Headword:Pollio]]

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

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

2. LUCAS, who was born at Breslau in 1536. He studied at Frankfort and Wittenberg. In the latter place he especially attended the lectures of Melancthon on the Greek language. In 1562 he was appointed professor at  the St. Elizabeth Gymnasium in Breslau; but three years afterwards, in 1565, he went to Leipsic for the study of Hebrew and theology. In the same year he was appointed deacon of St. Elizabeth in his native place, and in 1567 he was made pastor of St. Mary Magdalene. He died July 31, 1583. Lucas Pollio left a number of sermons behind him.

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

## Pollok, Robert, A.M[[@Headword:Pollok, Robert, A.M]]

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

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

Although it was painful at his early age to relinquish all the daydreams of honorable fame which his young imagination had with so good reason been led to form, he acquiesced with unmurmuring submission in the will of God. He enjoyed during his last illness in rich abundance the comforts and hopes of the Gospel, and his death was that of the true Christian, characterized by a calm faith in that religion he had preached, and a cheerful hope in that redemption which had been the theme of his  song. The reception which the Course of Time has met with from the public is a sufficient testimony to the talents of its lamented author. His name is now recorded among the list of those illustrious Scotsmen who have done honor to their country; who, from obscurity, have secured for themselves an unfading reputation; and who will be remembered by distant generations with enthusiasm and admiration. His earliest productions- Helen of the Glen, Ralph Gunnell, and the Persecuted Family—were in prose, and were issued anonymously. They have been republished, with his name, in one volume, entitled Tales of the Covenanters, and have passed through several editions. A very inadequate memoir of Robert Pollok, by his brother, with extracts from his correspondence, has been published by Messrs. Blackwood (Edinb. 1842), and there is a short memoir prefixed to the Course of Time. One of the best American editions of this poem is by W. C. Armstrong (Cinc. 1846, 12mo). See Chambers, Cyclop. of English Lit. 2, 412 sq.; id. Biog. Dict. of L'Eminent Scotsmen, 6, 138 sq.

## Pollux[[@Headword:Pollux]]

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

## Pollux, Julius[[@Headword:Pollux, Julius]]

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

## Polones Pratres[[@Headword:Polones Pratres]]

             SEE SOCINIANS.

## Polotzk (Polish, Polocz), Synod of[[@Headword:Polotzk (Polish, Polocz), Synod of]]

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

1. To receive the bishops, clergy, and flocks of the hitherto called Greek Uniate Church into full and complete communion with the holy orthodox Catholic Eastern Church, and so to be integrally and inseparably incorporated with the Church of all the Russias.

2. To confer the general blessing the he most holy synod on the bishops and clergy in particular, with prayer of faith and love to the supreme bishop of our confession, Jesus Christ, that he would confirm them from above in the confession they have made, and that he would rightly direct the work of their ministry to the perfecting of the saints.

3. That in governing those flocks which are entrusted to them, they shall take as their fundamental guide the Word of God, the canons of the Church, and the laws of the empire, and shall confirm the flocks entrusted to them in the same sentiments with those of the orthodox faith; and that they exhibit an apostolical indulgence to any differences in local customs which do not affect the doctrines or the sacraments, and bring back their people to the ancient uniformity by free persuasion, without violence, with gentleness and long-sulfuring.  This decree was signed by Seraphim, metropolitan of Novgorod and St. Petersburg, by Philaret of Kief, Philaret of Moscow, and three, prelates, besides two other ecclesiastics. It was confirmed March 25, 1839, by the emperor's own hand, with these words: “I thank God, and accept it.” See Blackmore's Mouravieff, Russian Church, Append. 4 p. 430.

## Polus[[@Headword:Polus]]

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

## Polwhele, Richard[[@Headword:Polwhele, Richard]]

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

## Polyander, Johann[[@Headword:Polyander, Johann]]

             a Reformed theologian, was born at Metz, March 28, 1568. He studied at different universities, was in 1588 pastor at Dort, in 1611 professor of theology at Leyden, and died February 4, 1646. He wrote, Concertatio anti-Sociniana: — Syntagmae Exercitationum: — Theologicarum: — A Miscellanea Tractationes Theologicae: — De Existentia Jesu Christi Essentiali et Gloria Divina contra Crellium: — Harmonia Lacorum Sacrae Scripturae invicem Discrepantium: — Disputatio adversus Invocationem Sanctorum: — Annotationes in Jonam. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; Meursius, Athenae Batavae. (B.P.)

## Polyandry[[@Headword:Polyandry]]

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

From ancient history we learn that the area over which polyandry at one time existed was even more extended; while in certain cantons of Media, according to Strabo (2, 798; and see Goguet, vol. 3, bk. 6:c. 1), polygynia was authorized by express law, which ordained every inhabitant to maintain at least seven wives; in other cantons precisely the opposite rule prevailed-  a woman was allowed to have many husbands, and they looked with contempt on those who had less than five. Caesar informs us that in his time polyandry of the Thibetan type prevailed among the Britons (De Bello Gallico, lib. 5, c. 14). We find direct evidence of its existence among the Picts in the Irish Nennius (App. 51), not to mention the traces of it remaining in the Pictish laws of succession. Indeed, to pass over communities in which something like promiscuity of intercourse between the sexes is said to have prevailed such as the Massagetfe, Agathyrsi, and the ancient Spartans-we find several among which polyandry, or a modified promiscuity, must have been the rule. Assuming that the legal obligation laid on younger brothers in their turn to marry the wives of their deceased elder brother is a relic of polyandry of the Thibetan type, then we must hold that polyandry prevailed at one time throughout India (Institutes of Menu, ch. 3, § 173, and ch. 9. § 57, 58), among the ancient Hebrews (Deu 25:5-11); in Siam, Burmah, in Syria among the Ostiaks, the But (Bodo), the Kasia, and the Puharies of Gurhwal. Traces of it indeed remained in the time of Tacitus among the Germans (Tac. Germ. 20, Latham's edition, p. 67 sq.). In short, polyandry may be regarded as one of the transitional forms in the advance from a state of promiscuity, on the assumption that pure promiscuity ever existed. Of the origin of this peculiar institution our space forbids us to write; but we believe it to be connected with the want of balance between the numbers of the sexes, due to the practice of female infanticide, which is its almost invariable accompaniment. Tribes of warriors, wholly devoted to a military life, find women an encumbrance rather than a solace; and from this cause, and probably from the difficulties of subsistence, formed the practice of killing their female children, sparing them only when they were the first-born. The disparity of the sexes would lead to polyandry, and once instituted, the custom would in many cases continue to exist after the habits and necessities which produced it disappeared. In several places, as in Ladakh, where polyandry prevails, the sexes are now either equally balanced, or the female sex predominates. In these cases polygynia and polyandry are commonly found existing side by side. The subject is one which demands, and as yet has not received, full investigation. — Chambers, s.v. See also London Academy, Nov. 21, 1874, p. 557; Lubbock, Origin of Civilization (see Index); Blackwood's Magazine, January, 1875, p. 69 sq., 82 sq.

## Polycarp[[@Headword:Polycarp]]

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

Life. — An ancient life, or rather a fragment of a life of Polycarp, ascribed by Bollandus to a certain Pionius of unknown date, and given in a Latin version in the Acta Sanctorum Januarii (a. d. 26), 2, 695, etc., dwells much on the early history of Polycarp, but the record (if indeed it be the work of Pionius) is some centuries later than its subject, and is evidently false in several particulars. We are inclined to think, however, that it embodies some genuine traditions of Polycarp's history. According to this account, the apostle Paul visited Smyrna in his way from Galatia, through the proconsular Asia to Jerusalem (the writer apparently confounding two journeys recorded in Act 18:18-23, etc.), and having collected the believers, instructed them in the proper time of keeping Easter. After Paul's departure, his host, Strataeas, the brother of Timotheus, became bishop of the infant Church; or, for the passage is not clear, Stratoeas became an elder and Bucolus was bishop. It was during the episcopate of Bucolus (whether he was the contemporary or the successor of Strateeas) that Callisto, a female member of the Church, eminent for riches and works  of charity, was warned of God in a dream to go to the gate of the city called the Ephesian gate, where she would find a little boy (puerulum) named Polycarp, of Eastern origin, who had been reduced to slavery, and was in the hands of two men, from whom she was to redeem him. Callisto, obedient to the vision, rose, went to the gate, found the two men with the child, as it had been revealed to her; and having redeemed the boy, brought him home, educated him with maternal affection in the Christian faith, and, when he attained to manhood, first made him ruler over her house, then adopted him as her son, and finally left him heir to all her wealth. Polycarp had been from childhood distinguished by his beneficence, piety, and self- denial; by the gravity of his deportment, and his diligence in the study of the Holy Scriptures. These qualities early attracted the notice and regard of the bishop, Bucolus, who loved him with fatherly affection, and was in return regarded by him with filial love. By Bucolus he was ordained first to the office of deacon, in which he labored diligently, confuting heathens, Jews, and heretics; delivering catechetical homilies in the church, and writing epistles, of which that to the Philippians is the only extant specimen. He was subsequently, when of mature age (his hair was already turning gray) and still maturer conduct, ordained presbyter by Bucolus, on whose death he was elected and consecrated bishop. We omit to notice the various miracles said to be wrought by Polycarp, or to have occurred on different occasions in his life.

Such are the leading facts recorded in this ancient narrative, which has, we think, been too lightly estimated by Tillemont. That it has been interpolated with many fabulous admixtures of a later date is clear; but we think there are some things in it which indicate that it embodies earlier and truer elements. The difficult is to discover and separate these from later corrections. The chief ground for rejecting the narrative altogether is the supposed difficulty of reconciling them with the more trustworthy statements of Irenaeus (Epistola ad Florinum, apud Euseb. Hist. Eccles. 5, 20), who, in his boyhood, had known, perhaps lived with Polycarp, and of other writers. According to Irenaeus (Epist. ad Victorem. Papam, apud Euseb. Hist. Eccles. 5, 24), Polycarp had intercourse with “John and others of the apostles;” or still more expressly (Adv. Haeres. 3, 3, et apud Euseb. Hist. Ecc 4:14), he was instructed (perhaps converted, μαθητευθείς) by the apostles, and conversed familiarly with many who had seen Christ; was by the apostles appointed (κατασταθείς) bishop of the Church at Smyrna; and always taught what he had learned from the apostles.  Tertullian (De Praescriptionibus Haeretic, c. 32) and Jerome (De Viris Illustribus, c. 17) distinctly mention John as the apostle by whom Polycarp was ordained. But we question if the expressions of Irenaeus, when critically examined and stripped of the rhetorical exaggeration with which his natural reverence for Polycarp has invested them, will prove more than that Polycarp had enjoyed opportunities of hearing some of the apostles; and was, with their sanction, appointed bishop of the Church at Smyrna.

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

Polycarp was bishop of Smyrna at the time when Ignatius of Antioch passed through that city on his way to suffer death at Rome, some time between A.D. 107 and 116. Ignatius seems to have enjoyed much this intercourse with Polycarp, whom he had known, apparently, in former  days, when they were both hearers of the apostle John (Martyr. Ignatii, c. 3). The sentiment of esteem was reciprocated by Polycarp (Epistol. ad Philipp. c.13), who collected several of the epistles of Ignatius, and sent them to the Church at Philippi, accompanied by an epistle of his own. Polycarp himself visited Rome while Anicetus was bishop of that city, whose episcopate extended, according to Tillemont's calculation, from A.D. 157 to 168. Ireneus has recorded (Epistol. ad Victor. apud Euseb. H. E. 5, 14) the difference of opinion of these two holy men on the time of observing Easter, and the steadfastness of Polycarp in adhering to the custom of the Asiatic churches, derived, as they affirmed, from the apostles; as well as their mutual kindness and forbearance, notwithstanding this difference. Indeed, the character of Polycarp appears to have attracted general regard: Irenaeus retained for him a feeling of deepest reverence (Epistol. ad Florin. apud Euseb. II. E. 5, 21); Jerome speaks of him (De Viris Illustr. c. 17) as “totius Asise princeps,” the most eminent man in all proconsular Asia. An anecdote given elsewhere shows that even reputed heretics, notwithstanding his decided opposition to them, desired to possess his esteem; and it is not improbable that the reverence excited by his character conduced to his success in restoring them to the communion of the Church. It has been conjectured that he was the angel of the Church of Smyrna to whom Jesus Christ directed the letter in the Apocalypse (2, 8-11); and also that he was the bishop to whom the apostle John, according to a beautiful anecdote recorded by Clement of Alexandria (Liber “Quis Dives salvetur?” c. 42), committed the care of a young man, who, forsaking his patron, became a chief of a band of robbers, and was reconverted by the apostle; but these are mere conjectures, and of little probability.

The martyrdom of Polycarp occurred, according to Eusebius (I. E. 4, 15), in the persecution under the emperors Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus; and is recorded in a letter of the Church at Smyrna to the churches of Philomelium and other places, which is still extant, and of which Eusebius (ibid.) has given the chief part. The persecution began: one Germanicus, an ancient man, was thrown to the wild beasts, and several others, including some who were brought from Philadelphia, were put to death at Smyrna. Polycarp had at first intended to remain in the city and brave the danger of martyrdom; but the entreaties of his flock led him to withdraw to a retreat in the adjacent country, where he passed his time in prayer. Here, three days before his apprehension, he had a remarkable dream, which his  anticipation of his fate led him to interpret as an intimation that he should be burned alive — a foreboding but too exactly verified by the event. Messengers having been sent to apprehend him, he withdrew to another hiding-place; but his place of retreat was discovered by the confession of a child, who had been forced by torture to make known where he was. Polycarp might still have escaped by leaving the place on the approach of those sent to apprehend him; but he refused, saying, “The will of God be done.” His venerable figure and calm and courteous deportment commanded the respect of his captors; and a prayer offered by him affected some of them with remorse for their share in his apprehension. The officer into whose custody he was delivered, with the usual laxity of paganism, would have persuaded him, apparently through pity, to offer divine honors and sacrifice to the emperor; but his steady refusal changed their pity into anger, and they violently threw him down from the carriage in which they were conveying him.

On entering the amphitheatre where the proconsul, Stratius Quadratus, was, a voice which the excited feelings of the old man and his companions led them to regard as from heaven, exclaimed, “Be strong, O Polycarp! and quit you like a man.” The proconsul was, like others, moved by his appearance, and exhorted him to consider his advanced age, and comply with the requirements of government: “Swear by the fortune of Caesar, recant, and cry ‘Away with the godless (τοὺς ἀθέους).' “Looking first round upon the heathen multitude, and then up to heaven, the old man sighed and said, “Away with the godless.” The proconsul again urged him, “Swear by Caesar's fortune, and I will release thee. Revile Christ.” “Eighty and six years have I served him,” was the reply, “and he never did me wrong: how then can I revile my King and my Savior?” Threats of being thrown to wild beasts, and of being committed to the flames, failed to move him; and his bold avowal that he was a Christian provoked the wrath of the assembled multitude. ‘This man,” they shouted, “is the teacher of impiety, the father of the Christians, the man that does away with our gods (ὁ τῶν ἡμετέρων θέων καθαιρέτης); who teaches many not to sacrifice to nor to worship the gods.” They demanded that he should be thrown to wild beasts, and when the Asiarch, Philip of Tralles, who presided over the games which were going on, evaded the demand, on the plea that the combats with wild beasts were ended, they demanded that he should be burned alive. The demand was complied with; and the populace, in their rage, soon collected from the baths and workshops logs and fagots for the pile. The old man ungirded himself, laid aside his garments, and took his place in the midst of the fuel; and when  they would have secured him with nails to the stake, said, “Let me remain as I am; for he that has enabled me to brave the fire will so strengthen me that, without your fastening me with nails, I shall, unmoved, endure its fierceness.” After he had offered a short but beautiful prayer the fire was kindled, but a high wind drove the flames on one side, so that he was roasted rather than burned; and the executioner was ordered to dispatch him with a sword. On his striking him with it, so great a quantity of blood flowed from the wound as to quench the flames, which were, however, resuscitated, in order to consume his lifeless body. His ashes were collected by the pious care of the Christians of his flock, and deposited in a suitable place of interment. The day and year of Polycarp's martyrdom are involved in considerable doubt. Samuel Petit places it in A.D. 175; Usher, Pagi, and Bollandus in A.D. 169; Eusebius (Chronicon) places it earlier, in the seventh year of Marcus Aurelius, who acceded to the throne March 7, A.D. 161; Scaliger, Le Moyne, and Cave place it in A.D. 167; Tillemont in 166; the Chronicon Paschale in the consulship of Elianus and Pastor, A.D. 163; and Pearson, who differs widely from all other critics, in A.D. 147, in the reign of Titus Antoninus Pius. Pearson brings various reasons in support of his opinion, which reasons are examined by Tillemont in one of his careful and elaborate notes. Polycarp is reverenced as a saint both by the Greek and Romish churches; by the former on Feb. 23, by the latter on Jan. 26, or (at Paris) on April 27. The Greeks of Smyrna, on his festival, used formerly to visit devoutly what is shown as his tomb, near the ruins of an ancient church or chapel, on a hill-side to the south-east of the city. Mr. Arundel (Discoveries in Asia Minor, 2, 397) is disposed to think that the tradition as to his place of interment is correct.

The principal authorities for the history of Polycarp have been cited. The account of Eusebius (H. E. 4:14, 15, and 5, 20) is chiefly taken from Irenaeus (11. cc.), and from the letter of the Church at Smyrna, giving an account of his martyrdom, which will be noticed below. Halloix (Illustr. Eccles. Orientalis Scriptorum Vitae), Cave (Apostolici, or the Lives, etc., of the Primitive Fathers), and Tillemont (Memoires, vol. 2) have collected the chief notices of the ancients, and embodied them in their narrative. See also Ceillier, Hist. des Auteurs Sacraes, 1, 672, etc. The English reader may consult (besides Cave's work just mentioned) Lardner, Credibility, etc., pt. 2, ch. 6, 7; Neander, Church Hist. transl. by Rose, 1, 106, etc.; Milman, Hist. of Christianity, bk. 2, ch. 7; and other ecclesiastical historians.  Works. — There is extant only one short treatise by this father, Πρὸς Φιλιππησίους ἐπιστολή, Ad Philippenses Epistola. That he wrote such an epistle, and that it was known in their time, is attested by Irenaeus (Adv. Heres. 3, 3, and Epistol. ad Florinum, apud Euseb. II. E. 4, 14, and 5, 20), Eusebius (H. E. 3, 36; 4, 14), Jerome (De Viris Illustr. c. 17), and later writers whom it is needless to enumerate; and, notwithstanding the objections of the Magdeburg Centuriators (Cent. 2, c. 10); of Daille (De Scriptis Ignatianis, c. 32), who, however, only denied the genuineness of a part; of Matthieu de la Roche; and, at a later period, of Semler, our present copies have been received by the great majority of critics as substantially genuine. Some have suspected the text to be interpolated; and the suspicion is perhaps somewhat strengthened by the evidence afforded by the Syriac version of the epistles of Ignatius, lately published by Mr. Cureton, of the extensive interpolation of those contemporary and kindred productions.

The Epistola ad Philippenses is extant in the Greek original, and in an ancient Latin version; the latter of which contains, towards the conclusion, several chapters, of which only some fragments preserved by Eusebius are found in the Greek. The letter partakes of the simplicity which characterizes the writings of the apostolic fathers, being hortatory rather than argumentative; and is valuable for the numerous passages from the New Testament, especially from the first Epistle of Peter and the epistles of Paul, which are incorporated in it, and for the testimony which it consequently affords to the early existence and wide circulation of the sacred writings. It was first published in black letter in the Latin version by Jac. Faber Stapulensis, with the works of the pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita and of Ignatius (Paris, 1498, fol.), under the title of Theologia Vivificans; and was reprinted at Strasburg in 1502; at Paris, 1515; at Basle, 1520; at Cologne, 1536; at Ingolstadt, with the Clementina (4to), 1546; at Cologne, with the Latin version of the writings of the pseudo, Dionysius, 1557; and with the Clementina and the Latin version of the Epistolae of Ignatius (fol.), 1569. It appeared also in the following collections: the Micropresbyticon (Basle, 1550), the Orthodoxographa of Heroldus (ibid. 1555), the Orthodoxographa of Grynaeus (ibid. 1569), the Mella Patrum of Francis Rous (Lond. 1650, 8vo), and in the various editions of the Bibliotheca Patrum, from its first publication by De la Bigne in 1575. The Greek text was first published by Halloix, subjoined to the life of Polycarp, in his Illustrium Ecclesiae Orientalis Scriptorum Vitae et Documenta (vol.  1, Douai, 1633, fol.); and was again published by Usher, with the Epistolae of Ignatius (Oxford, 1644, 4to), not in the Appendix Ignatiana (which came out in 1647), as incorrectly stated by Fabricius; by Maderus (Helmstadt, 1653); and in the Patres Apostolici of Cotelerius (Paris, 1672, 2 vols. fol.; and Amsterdam, 1724), of Ittigius (Leipsic, 1699, 8vo), of Frey (Basle, 1742), and of Russel (1746, 2 vols, 8vo). It is given likewise in the editions of Ignatius by Aldrich (Oxford, 1708, 8vo) and Smith (ibid. 1709, 4to). It is contained also in the Varia Sacra of Le Moyne (vol. 1, Leyden, 1685, 4to), and in the Bibliotheca Patrunt of Gallandius (vol. 1, Ven. 1765, fol.). Of more recent editions may be mentioned those of Hornemann, Scripta Genuina Graeca Patrum Apostolicorum (Copenhagen, 1828,4to); Routh, Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Opuscula Praecipua qucedamn (vol. 1, Oxford, 1832, 8vo); Jacobson, Patrum Apostolicorum que supersunt (vol. 2, ibid. 1838, 8vo); and Hefele, Patrum Apostolicorum Opera (Tübingen, 1839, 8vo). There are English versions of this epistle by Wake and Clementson, and one in Cave's Apostolici, or Lives of the Primitive Fathers.

That Polycarp wrote other Epistolae is attested by Irenaeus (Epistol. ad Florin.): one, Πρὸς Α᾿θηναίους, Ad Athenienses, is quoted by St. Maximus in his Prologus ad Libros Dionysii Areopagitae, and by Joannes Maxentius, but is supposed to be spurious; at any rate it is now lost: another, Πρὸς Διονύσιον τὸν Α᾿ρεοπαγίτην, Ad Dionysium Areopagitam, mentioned by Suidas (s.v. Πολύκαρπος), is supposed to be spurious also. The life of Polycarp, ascribed to Pionius, states that he wrote various Tractatus, Homilie, and Epistolae, and especially a book De Obitu S. Joannis; of which, according to Halloix (1. c.), some extracts from a MS. said to be extant in an abbey in Northern Italy had been given in a Concio de S. Joanne Evangelista by Franciscus Humblot; but even Halloix evidently doubted their genuineness. Some fragments ascribed to Polycarp, cited, in a Latin version, in a Catena in Quatuor Evangelistas by Victor of Capua, were published by Franciscus Feuardentius subjoined to lib. 3, c. 3 of his Annotationes ad Irenaeum, and were subsequently reprinted by Halloix (1. c.), Usher (Appendix Ignatitana, p. 31, etc.), Maderus (1. c.), Cotelerius (1. c.), Ittigius (i. c.), and Gallandius (1. c.), under the title of Fragmenta Quinque e Responsionum Capitulis S. Polycarpo adscriptis; but their genuineness is very doubtful. See Cave, Hist. Litt. ad ann. 108, 1, 44. etc. (Oxford, 1740, fol.); Ittigius, De Biblioth. Patrum, passim; Fabricius, Bibl. Grcec. 7:47, etc.; Ceillier, Auteurs Sacrls, 1. c.; Lardner.  Credibility, pt. 2, bk. 1, ch. 6:etc.; Gallandius, Biblioth. Patrum, proleg. ad vol. 1, c. 9; Jacobson, 1. c. proleg. p. 1, etc., 70; Schaff, Church Hist. vol. 1; Donaldson, Literature (see Index); Bohringer, Christl. Kirche, 1, 30 sq.; Illgen, Zeitschrift hist. Theol. 1866, vol. 1; Milman, Hist.of Latin Christianity (see Index); Jahm b. . deutsche Theol. 1870, 3, 545; Jortin, Remarcks, 1, 323 sq.; Amer. Presb. Rev. 3, 517; Riddle, Christian Antiquities (see Index); Hefele, Patrum Apostolicorum Opera, p. 18; Kitto, Cyclop. of Bib. Lit. 1, 812; Alzog, Patrologie, § 1 sq.; Killen, Anc. Church, p. 365 sq.; Fisher, Beginning of Christianity (N.Y. 1877, 8vo), p. 321 sq., 552 sq.

The Τῆς Σμυρναίων ἐκκλησίας περὶ μαρτυρίου τοῦ ἁγίου Πολυκάρπου ἐπιστολὴ ἐγκυκλικός is almost entirely incorporated in the Historia Ecclesiastica of Eusebius (4, 15); it is also extant in its original form. in which it was first published by archbishop Usher, in his Appendix Ignatiana (Lond. 1647, 4to); and was reprinted in the Acta Martyrum Sincera et Selecta of Ruiuart (Paris, 1689, 4to), and in the Patres Apostolici of Cotelerius (vol. 2, Paris, 1672, fol.; Antwerp [or rather Amsterdam], 1698; and Amsterdam, 1724); it was also reprinted by Maderus, in his edition of the Epistola Polycarp, already mentioned; by Ittigius, in his Bibliotheca Patrum Apostolicorum (Leips. 1699, 8vo); by Smith, in his edition of the Epistolae of Ignatius (reprinted at Basle by Frey, 1742, 8vo); by Russel, in his Patres Apostolici (vol. 2, Lond. 1746, 8vo); by Gallandius, in his Bibliotheca Patrum (vol. 1, Venice, 1765, fol.); and by Jacobson, in his Patrum Apostolicorum qua supersunt (vol. 2, Oxford, 1838, 8vo). There is an ancient Latin version, which is given with the Greek text by Usher; and there are modern Latin versions given by other editors of the Greek text, or in the Acta Sanctorum Januarii (ad d. 26), 2, 702, etc. There are English versions by archbishop Wake (Lond. 1693, 8vo, often reprinted), by Chevallier (Cambridge, 1833, 8vo), and by Dalrymple, in his Remains of Christian Antiquity (Edinburgh, 1776, 8vo). See Cave, 1. c. p. 65; Fabricius, 1. c. p. 51; Lardner, 1. c. c. 7; Ceillier, 1. c. p. 695; Ittigius, Gallandius, and Jacobson, 11. cc.

## Polycarp the Ascetic[[@Headword:Polycarp the Ascetic]]

             There is extant in Greek a life of the female saint Syncletica, which has been ascribed to various persons. Some MSS. and the Greek ecclesiastical historian Nicephorus Callisti (H. E. 8:40) ascribe it to Athanasius; but Montfaucon, though he gives the piece with a Latin version in his edition  of the works of Athanasius (2, 681, etc.), classes it among the spurious works, and declares that the difference of style, and the absence of any external testimony for five or six centuries after Athanasius leave no room to doubt its spuriousness. A copy, which was among the papers of Combefis, contains a clause, stating that the discourses or sayings of the saint had been reported by “the blessed Arsenius of Pegadae;” but this does not seem to describe him as the compiler of the narrative, but only as the author from whom part of the materials were derived. It is then most reasonable to follow the very ancient MS. in the Vatican Library, which ascribes the biography to Polycarp the Ascetic or Monk, but where or when this Polycarp lived cannot be determined. ‘The biography was first published in the Latin version of David Colvillus in the Acta Sancetorum Januasrii, 1, 242, etc. The original Greek text is said to have been published with some other pieces (Ingolstadt, 1603, 4to); it is given with a new Latin version and notes in the Ecclesiae Graecae Monumenta of Cotelerius (Paris, 1677, 4to), 1, 201, etc. The MS. used by Cotelerius contained neither the author's name nor the final clause about Arsenius of Pegadae. The title of the piece is Βίος καὶ πολιτεία τῆς ὁσίας καὶ ἀοιδίμου μητρὸς ἡμῶν (in Monitfaon's edition, Β. κ. π. τῆς ἁγίας καὶ μακαρίας καὶ διδασκάλου) Συγκλητικῆς, Vita, et Gesta sanctca celebrisque mltris nostace (or, according to Monttfaucon, Sanctae beataeque magistrce) Syncleticae. See Fabicius, Biblioth. Graeca, 10, 329.

## Polychronius[[@Headword:Polychronius]]

             bishop of Apamea, and brother of Theodore of Mopsuestia, was one of the most prominent exegetes of the school of Antioch in the 4th century. Of his life nothing further is known. He wrote commentaries on Job, Daniel, and Ezekiel. Of his commentary on Daniel we have a great many fragments. He explains the book as referring to Antiochus Epiphanes, and not to the anti- Christ; in the fourth monarchy he sees the Macedonian empire, and in the ten heads the diadochai. He everywhere contends for the historical sense and opposes the allegorical interpretation, as well as the theory of a twofold sense. Though he was never formally condemned, yet he was nevertheless considered a heretic. See Plitt-Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v., but more especially Bardenhewer, Polychronius (Freiburg, 1879), and Moller's review, in Schurer, Theol. Literaturzeitung, 1879, col. 255 sq. (B.P.)

## Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus[[@Headword:Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus]]

             A.D. 196, is known in Church history by his opposition to the Roman bishop, Victor, in the famous Paschal controversy (q.v.). Eusebius has preserved Polycrates' letter of protest, which is given in English by Schaff, History of the Christian Church (N.Y. 1883), 2:216 sq. See also Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. 5:24 (ed. Heinichen, 1:250 sq.); Ceillier, Hist. des Aut. Sacr. et Eccles. 2:203 sq.; Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Polyeuct[[@Headword:Polyeuct]]

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

## Polygamy[[@Headword:Polygamy]]

             was anciently and still is a prevailing custom in the East (comp. of the Persians, Strabo, 15:733; Herod. 1, 135; 3, 88: Rhode, Heil. Sage, p. 443; of the Indians, Strabo, 15:714; of the Medes, 11:526; of the Getae, 7:297; see also 17:835; on the Egyptians, see Herod. 2, 92; comp. Died. Sic. 1, 80; Hengstenberg, Mos. p. 210 sq.), which stands in close connection with  the great fruitfulness of Eastern women; and some have tried to show that it is connected with a preponderance of female births (Mariti, Reis. p. 14), but this is denied by Burdach (Physiol. 1, 403 sq.) and the most recent authorities. Even the Mosaic law did not forbid polygamy (Polygymy), which, indeed, existed among the Israelites from the beginning of their nation (Gen 28:9; Genesis 29, passim; 37:2; 46:10), but seems to be expressly permitted (Deu 21:16 sq.; Exo 21:9 sq.; Lev 18:18); and there are several direct instances under the law (Jdg 8:30), and more indirect ones (10:4; 12:9, 14), of polygamy, or at least bigamy, chiefly in the time of the Judges. Yet the lawgiver had certainly placed difficulties in the way of polygamy by many remarkable directions (comp. the Koran, 4:3, which allows a Mussulman but four wedded wives, without, however, limiting the number of his concubines!). The Mosaic law aimed at mitigating rather than removing evils which were inseparable from the state of society in that day. Its enactments were directed

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

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

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

(3.) The favoring of one wife among several was forbidden (Exo 21:8 sq.), and the man was required to perform his marriage obligations in equal measure to every wife. This limitation also would be oppressive to many. Besides all this, the mutual jealousy of the several wives of one man, which is the inevitable consequence of polygamy (1Sa 1:2 sq.; 2Ch 11:21), renders home life unpleasant (Niebuhr, Beschreibung, p. 73 sq.). The same reason keeps some Turks from polygamy now (D'Ohsson, 2, 366 sq.; Volney, 2, 360 sq.). The result was that most Israelites contented themselves with a single wife (see Pro 12:4; Pro 31:10 sq.), or at most took one or two concubines in addition. The same appears to have been the case with the ancient Egyptians (Wilkinson,  Anc. Egyptians, 2, 62 sq.). In the age following the Captivity monogamy appears to have prevailed (comp. Tob 1:11; 2:19; 8:4, 13; Susan. 29:63; Mat 18:25; Luk 1:5; Act 5:1). It became acknowledged, too, as a prescriptive obligation, although the doctors of the law still held to their old canon, that a man might marry wives at pleasure hundred if he would-provided that he had means of support for them. Hence we cannot in 1Ti 3:2; Tit 1:6, think of a simultaneous polygamy (comp. Vesperce Gronig. [Amster. 1698], p. 125 sq.), although it must be confessed that Paul's expressions, taken alone, most naturally bear this interpretation. The Talmudists insist that no Jew can have more than four wives at once, and a king, at most, but eighteen (Otho, Lex. Rabbin. p. 528 sq.; see esp. Selden, Jus. Nat. et Gent. 5, 6; Buxtorf, Sponsal. p. 47 sq., in Ugolino, Thesaur. vol. 30; Michaelis, Mos. Rit. 2, 171 sq.; Jahn, I, 2, 235 sq.; comp. Selden, De Polygamia. bk. 7:in his Otia theol. p. 349 sq.). According to Deu 17:17, kings were forbidden to take many wives; but in spite of this prohibition they (as e.g.David, 2Sa 5:13; Solomon, 1Ki 11:3; Rehoboam, 2Ch 11:21; Abijah, 13:21, and others; and so Herod the Great, Josephus, Ant. 17, 1, 3) had large harems, for whose service they procured eunuchs in foreign lands. SEE HAREM.

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

(1.) The regulations in Exo 21:7-11 deserve a detailed notice, as exhibiting the extent to which the power of the head of a family might be carried. It must be premised that the maiden was born of Hebrew parents, was under age at the time of her sale (otherwise her father would have no power to sell), and that the object of the purchase was that when arrived at puberty she should become the wife of her master, as is implied in the difference in the law relating to her (Exo 21:7) and to a slave purchased for ordinary work (Deu 15:12-17), as well as in the  term amdh, “maid-servant,” which is elsewhere used convertibly with “concubine” (Jdg 9:18; comp. Jdg 8:31). With regard to such it is enacted

(1) that she is not to “go out as the menservants” (i.e. be freed after six years' service, or in the year of jubilee), on the understanding that her master either already has made, or intends to make her his wife (Jdg 8:7);

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

(3) he might, however, assign her to his son, and in this case she was to be treated as a daughter, and not as a slave (Jdg 8:9);

(4) if either he or his son, having married her, took another wife, she was still to be treated as a wife in all respects (Jdg 8:10); and, lastly, if neither of the three contingencies took place (i.e. if he neither married her himself, nor gave her to his son, nor had her redeemed), then the maiden was to become absolutely free without waiting for the expiration of the six years or for the year of jubilee (Jdg 8:11).

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

(c.) The third object of the Mosaic statutes on this subject was to bring divorce under some restriction; and this was effected by rendering divorce a formal proceeding, not to be done by word of mouth as heretofore, but by a “bill of divorcement” (Deu 24:1), which would generally demand time and the intervention of a third party, thus rendering divorce a less easy process, and furnishing the wife, in the event of its being carried  out, with a legal evidence of her marriageability: we may also notice that Moses wholly prohibited divorce in case the wife had been seduced prior to marriage (22, 29), or her chastity had been groundlessly impugned (22, 19).

(d.) The fourth object, which was to enforce purity of life during the maintenance of the matrimonial bond, forms the subject of one of the ten commandments (Exo 20:14), any violation of which was punishable with death (Lev 20:10; Deu 22:22), even in the case of a betrothed person (Deu 22:23-24). SEE ADULTERY.

The practical results of these regulations may have been very salutary, but on this point we have but small opportunities of judging. The usages themselves to which we have referred, remained in full force to a late period. We have instances of the arbitrary exercise of the paternal authority in the cases of Achsah (Jdg 1:12), Ibzan (Jdg 12:9), Samson (Jdg 14:20; Jdg 15:2), and Michal (1Sa 17:25). The case of Abishag, and the language of Adonijah in reference to her (1Ki 1:2; 1Ki 2:17), prove that a servant was still completely at the disposal of his or her master. Polygamy also prevailed, as we are expressly informed in reference to Gideon (Jdg 8:30), Elkanah (1Sa 1:2), Saul (2Sa 12:8), David (2Sa 5:13), Solomon (1Ki 11:3), the sons of Issachar (1Ch 7:4), Shaharaim (1Ch 8:8-9), Rehoboam (2Ch 11:21), Abijah (2Ch 13:21), and Joash (2Ch 24:3); and as we may also infer from the number of children in the cases of Jair, Ibzan, and Abdon (Jdg 10:4; Jdg 12:9; Jdg 12:14). It does not, however, follow that it was the general practice of the country: the inconveniences attendant on polygamy in small houses or with scanty incomes are so great as to put a serious bar to its general adoption, and hence in modern countries where it is fully established the practice is restricted to comparatively few (Niebuhr, Voyage, p. 65; Lane, 1, 239). The same rule holds good with regard to ancient times: the discomforts of polygamy are exhibited in the jealousies between the wives of Abraham (Gen 16:6), and of Elkanah (1 Samuel 1, 6); and the cases cited above rather lead to the inference that it was confined to the wealthy. Meanwhile it may be noted that the theory of monogamy was retained, and comes prominently forward in the pictures of domestic bliss portrayed in the poetical writings of this period (Psa 128:3; Pro 5:18; Pro 18:22; Pro 19:14; Pro 31:10-29; Ecc 9:9). The sanctity of the marriage- bond was but too frequently violated, as appears from the frequent  allusions to the “strange woman” in the book of Pro 2:16; Pro 5:20, etc., and in the denunciations of the prophets against the prevalence of adultery (Jer 5:8; Eze 18:11; Eze 22:11).

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

## Polygamy, Christian Doctrine Concerning[[@Headword:Polygamy, Christian Doctrine Concerning]]

             Jesus does not directly forbid polygamy, nor even revert to the subject, since it had been almost universally given up. No case of polygamy among the Jews is presented in the Gospel narrative; and when a wife is mentioned, it is stated or implied in the account that she is the only wife. The special evil of Jewish society was the facility of divorce-men putting away their wives for any, often a trifling, cause. Our Lord, when the Pharisees asked him (Mat 19:3-9) whether it was lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause, replied that God at the beginning made them a male and a female (ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ), thus indirectly condemning polygamy as contrary to the original institution of marriage: with a male and a female only polygamy was impossible. He then declares that the bond of marriage is indissoluble; the husband and wife are no more twain, but one flesh; and what God hath thus joined together let no man put asunder; and afterwards replies to their question on divorce: “Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so.” The practice of polygamy then existed by permission, not by command. It was a positive temporary  regulation of Moses as a political governor, not of God as a moral ruler. The Jews had become hardened in their hearts; they were harsh and severe even to their own flesh. Their nearest relatives they treated with cruelty and injustice. Until the people could be brought into such a state that they could feel and understand the force of law, it was necessary for their rulers meanwhile to devise prudential regulations for the purpose of checking their lawlessness. All the evils of that early and idolatrous age of the world could not be remedied in a moment; and such was the state of society that not even until the advent of the Savior was the institution of marriage restored to its primeval integrity by revoking the permission of polygamy and divorce. The teaching of the apostle Paul, too, is worthy of most serious attention, as the subject of polygamy must have come immediately before him. The Christian converts in the apostolic age may be divided into three classes: Jews, Romans, and Greeks.

Polygamy, though not unknown among the Jews, had fallen, as we have said, into general disuse. It was positively forbidden by the Roman law, though divorce was even more frequent among the Romans than the Jews; but it undoubtedly was the common usage of the Greeks. Thus Theodoret says: Πάλαι γαὶ εἰώθεισαν καὶ ῎Ελληνες καὶ ῾Ιουδαῖοι καὶ δύω καὶ τρισὶ καὶ πλείοσι γυναιξὶ νόμῳ γάμου κατὰ ταυτὸν συνοικεῖν (Com. in 1Ti 3:2). The epistles of Paul were generally addressed to Grecian converts; let us see, then, how he dealt with the question, which must have come directly before him. Two ways were open to the apostle: either a partial or temporary toleration, or an immediate and direct prohibition of the custom. The multitude of Greek converts were undoubtedly polygamists; it might seem a hard measure, and would produce much domestic discontent and misery, to compel converts to abandon their wives legally married according to the Grecian law. Did, then, the apostle permit the usage temporarily, either till that generation had passed away, or until polygamists themselves were willing to conform to the higher Christian standard? We most emphatically reply that the apostle never for even the briefest period tolerated polygamy among baptized or Christian disciples, and that it never existed in the Christian Church at all. Had it been tolerated even temporarily, some notice or reference to it would be found in the apostolic epistles. Tie sincerity of converts must have been put to a severe test: to give up their wives no doubt often involved a painful sacrifice to Christian duty, yet so emphatic and peremptory must have been the apostle's prohibition that not a murmur of opposition was heard from Corinth, Ephesus, Philippi, Thessalonica, and other Christian communities.

The apostle often censures Grecian converts for their violation of Christian duty, some of them having fallen from their regenerate state, and abandoned themselves to their old sins; but we find no reference to polygamy in his epistles, nothing which implies that it was continued or even known among them. There is no mention, however remote or indirect, of a believer's wives. This silence can only intimate the utter abandonment of the usage among Christians as clearly as the most emphatic statement. It could not have been tacitly allowed as indifferent, or permitted even for a brief period; since it must be remembered that the apostle had expressly forbidden polygamy, and if it existed at all in the Christian communities he planted, it could only have been in defiance of his direct prohibition. No language can be plainer than that of 1 Corinthians 7 : “Let every man have his own wife, and every woman her own husband; let not the wife depart from her husband, let not a husband put away his wife.” Again, the non-existence of polygamy in the apostolic churches is implied in the same apostle's comparison of marriage to the union of Christ and his Church. The apostle says: “The husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the Head of the Church” (Eph 5:23). But as Christ's Church, as Paul says, is one body (Eph 4:4), there would be no meaning in the comparison, no similarity in the things compared, if the husband might have a plurality of wives: the marriage union would not then have a typical representation of the union of Christ with the one body, which is his Church. Taking, again, the testimony of the Catholic Church, the evidence against polygamy will appear most positive and decisive. The mind of the divine Legislator was so clearly and ineffaceably stamped on his followers that the usage in early and later ages of the Church was utterly unknown; there is no instance on record of a baptized polygamist for fifteen hundred years after Christ. Catholic, schismatic, and heretic, amid all their differences, agreed at least on this point. No professing Christian, however erroneous his belief or scandalous his life, ever ventured to revive the interdicted usage.

The testimony of the Church, clearly brought before us by the consentient practice of Christians in all ages, is too explicit to leave room for further controversy, or any real doubt of the teaching of the New Testament on the subject. Besides, the practice of the whole world was strictly uniform, with one exception in the 16th century. In an evil hour Luther unhappily gave permission to one of his followers to marry a second wife during the lifetime of the first the landgrave of Hesse. He was the first and the only Protestant polygamist of the Christian Church.  In recent times the question of polygamy has reopened in the Christian Church, and has resumed great importance. Bishop Colenso in Africa, and missionaries of several denominations in India, have deemed it expedient to allow heathen polygamists to retain their wives after baptism; though, on becoming Christians, they are forbidden to add to the number of them. Polygamist converts are not allowed, as being it is supposed in an inferior state, to bear office in the Church.f1 Now this view of the subject and corresponding practice can only be founded on an opinion or theory, which, if true, would render polygamy universally allowable among Christians.

Let us ask ourselves the question, Is polygamy, according to the new dispensation, allowable, or indifferent, or sinful? If allowable or indifferent, why should it only be partially conceded, and not permitted at all times? If it be wrong or sinful, how can we be justified in allowing it even during the shortest period? Its temporary permission among heathen converts rests on no authority, scriptural or patristic, or any valid plea whatever: no primitive precedent can be quoted, though it is obvious that the same reasons for it might have been alleged in the apostolic age, and also, it may be added, by missionaries in any subsequent period, as in modern times. In truth, its permission under any circumstances can only by logical sequence lead to its full sanction, as in the foul and degraded system of Mormonism. But the defenders of modern polygamy will perhaps say that their strongest argument in its defense has not yet been examined: they lay especial stress on the examples of the Old Testament saints, which is probably the real reason why they venture to allow it, maintaining that God would not have permitted it for many ages had it been necessarily immoral or sinful. But are they prepared to say-which is the real question at issue- that in the New Testament there is no precept on the subject of marriage? If there be, the argument derived from the permitted usage of the old dispensation is of no value whatever, and may thus be stated: there was no positive law on the subject in the old dispensation. and hence many of the Jews were polygamists; there is a direct law or precept in the New Testament, and as such binding on believers, by which the Christian is limited to one wife. But should it be asserted that there is no positive precept on marriage in the New Testament, we shall thus have to fall back upon the old dispensation for instruction and guidance; in which case, why should we permit polygamy only for a time, or in the case of heathen converts, instead of allowing Christians universally to follow, if they please, the example of the patriarchs and saints of the Jewish Church? If polygamy be permitted to converts from heathenism, on the ground that there is no  positive precept on the subject in the New Testament, and that we may have recourse to the permission of the Jewish law, no reason most assuredly can be given why Christians generally may not be permitted to avail themselves of the sanction given to polygamy in the old dispensation, and by the example of its patriarchs and saints. “Experience,” says Dr. Spring, ‘has abundantly and painfully proved that polygamy debases and brutalizes both the body and the mind, and renders society incapable of those generous and refined affections which, if duly cultivated, would be found to be the inheritance even of our fallen nature. Where is an instance in which polygamy has not been the source of many and bitter calamities in the domestic circle and to the state?

Where has it reared a virtuous heaven- taught progeny? Where has it been distinguished for any of the moral virtues; or, rather, where has it not been distinguished for the most fearful degeneracy of mankind? Where has it even been found friendly to population? It has been reckoned that the number of male infants exceeds that of females in the proportion of nineteen to eighteen, the excess of the males scarcely providing for their greater consumption by war, seafaring, and other dangerous or unhealthy occupations. It seems to have been ‘the order of nature that one woman should be assigned to one man.' And where has polygamy ever been friendly to the physical and intellectual character of the population? The Turks are polygamists, and so are the Asiatics; but how inferior a people to the ancient Greeks and Romans!” The practice of polygamy has sometimes been alleged to originate in the influence of climate, but the fact cannot be denied that in the coldest as well as in the warmest climates it is found to exist. And though it must be admitted to prevail more extensively in regions situated towards the south, the more probable cause of this peculiarity will be found in ancient usage or religion. The manners of different countries have varied in nothing more than in their domestic constitutions. Less polished and more luxurious nations have either not perceived the bad effects of polygamy, or, if they did perceive them, they who in such countries possessed the power of reforming the laws have been unwilling to resign their own gratifications. Polygamy is retained at this day in all Mohammedan countries, and throughout the whole Eastern world (see a recent article on this subject in the Westminster Review, Oct. 1867, art. 1); and even in countries like Algiers, where the French controlling influence is manifest, the Jews practice polygamy to a large extent.f2  But among Western, or, better, Christian nations, it is universally prohibited. In Sweden it is punished with death.

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

f1In 1834 the conference of missionaries of various denominations in Calcutta, including those of the Baptist, the London, and the Church Missionary Societies, of the Church of Scotland, land the American Presbyterian Board, after having had the whole subject frequently under discussion, and after much and serious deliberation, unanimously agreed on the following propositions, though there had previously been much diversity of opinion among them on various points: “If a convert before becoming a Christian has married more wives than one, in accordance with the practice of the Jewish and early Christian churches, lie shall be permitted to keep them all; but such a person is not eligible to any office in the Church. In no other case is polygamy to be tolerated among Christians” (Brown, Hist. of Missions, 3, 365, 366). If proof had been given that polygamy was allowed in the early Church, all controversy on the subject would have been at all end; its  permission in modern times to converts from heathenism might have been allowed, or even in many cases be desirable; but the statement itself as no support whatever either from Scripture or the writings of the fathers, or ecclesiastical history.

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

The argument against polygamy from a strictly ethical and social standpoint is thus presented by Paley: “The equality in the number of males and females born into the world intimates the intention of God that one woman should be assigned to one man; for if to one man be allowed an exclusive right to five or more women, four or more men must be deprived of the exclusive possession of any; which could never be the order intended. It seems also a significant indication of the divine will that he at first created only one woman to one man. Had God intended polygamy for the species, it is probable he would have begun with it; especially as by giving to Adam more wives than one the multiplication of the human race would have proceeded with a quicker progress. Polygamy not only violates the constitution of nature, and the apparent design of the Deity, but produces to the parties themselves, and to the public, the following bad effects: contests and jealousies among the wives of the same husband; distracted affections, or the loss of all affection in the husband himself; a voluptuousness in the rich which dissolves the vigor of their intellectual as well as active faculties, producing that indolence and imbecility, both of mind and body, which have long characterized the nations of the East; the abasement of one half of the human species, who, in countries where polygamy obtains, are degraded into instruments of physical pleasure to the other half; neglect of children; and the manifold and sometimes unnatural mischiefs which arise from a scarcity of women.

To compensate for these evils, polygamy does not offer a single advantage. In the article of population, which it has been thought to promote, the community gain nothing (nothing, I mean, compared with a state in which marriage is nearly universal); for the question is not whether one man will have more children by five or more wives than by one, but whether these five wives would not bear the same or a greater number of children to five separate husbands. And as to the care of children when produced, and the sending of them into the world in situations in which they may be likely to form and bring up families of their own, upon which the increase and succession of the human species in a great degree depend, this is less provided for and  less practicable where twenty or thirty children are to be supported by the attention and fortunes of one father than if they were divided into five or six families, to each of which were assigned the industry and inheritance of two parents.” Thus far Dr. Paley. We shall close this article with the words of an excellent writer on the same side of the subject: “When we reflect,” he says, “that the primitive institution of marriage limited it to one man and one woman; that this institution was adhered to by Noah and his sons, amid the degeneracy of the age in which they lived, and in spite of the example of polygamy which the accursed race of Cain had introduced; when we consider how very few (comparatively speaking) examples of this practice there were among the faithful; how much it brought its own punishment with it; and how dubious and equivocal those passages are in which it appears to have the sanction of the divine approbation; when to these reflections we add another respecting the limited views and temporary nature of the more ancient dispensations and institutions of religion, how often the imperfections and even vices of the patriarchs and people of God in old time are recorded, without any express notification of their criminality— how much is said to be commanded which our reverence for the holiness of God and his law will only suffer us to suppose were for wise ends permitted; how frequently the messengers of God adapted themselves to the genius of the people to whom they were sent, and the circumstances of the times in which they lived; above all, when we consider the purity, equity, and benevolence of the Christian law, the explicit declarations of our Lord and his apostle Paul respecting the institution of marriage, its design and limitation; when we reflect, too, on the testimony of the most ancient fathers, who could not possibly be ignorant of the general and common practice of the apostolic Church; and, finally, when to these considerations we add those which are founded on justice to the female sex, and all the regulations of domestic economy and national policy, we must wholly condemn the revival of polygamy.” See Paley, Moral Philosophy, 1, 319-325; Madan, Thelypthora; Towers, Wills, Penn, R. Hill, Palmer, and Haweis, Answers to Madan; Monthly Rev. 63, 338; and also vol. 69; Beattie, Elements of Moral Science, 2, 127-129: Wuttke, Christian Ethics, 2, 306 sq.; Harless, Ethics (see Index); and the literature quoted in the article MARRIAGE SEE MARRIAGE .

## Polyglot Bibles[[@Headword:Polyglot Bibles]]

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

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

The Paris Polyglot, in addition to the contents of the former works, has a Syriac and Arabic version of both the O.T. and N.T., with the Samaritan Pentateuch, now published for the first time, and edited by J. Morinus. This polyglot also contains the Samaritan version of the same. It was published  in 1645, in 10 vols. large folio. The editor of this valuable but unwieldy work was Michael le Jay, who was ruined by the publication. SEE LE JAY.

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

The Leipsic or Reineccius's Polyglot, published under the title Biblia Sacra Quadrilinguica V. Test. Hebr. etc. (1747-51, 3 vols. fol.). The N.T. was published first in 1713, and with a new title page in 1747, while the O.T. was published in 1750-51. The first volume contains the historical books, the second the remaining books of the O.T., together with the apocryphal books. Besides the Hebrew, the Alexandrian version and Seb.  Schmidt's Latin and Luther's German translation are given. The Greek text of the apocryphal books is that of Grabe. The N.T. comprising the third volume, has, besides the Greek, the Syriac, the vulgar Greek version, and S. Schmidt's Latin and Luther's German version.

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

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

There are also polyglots of several portions of the Bible, of which one of the most valuable is that published at Constantinople, in Hebrew, Chaldee, Persian. and Arabic, in 1546. The Rabbinical Bibles (q.v.) are in many cases also to some extent polyglot. Besides the article BIBLE SEE BIBLE , see Ernesti, De Bibliis Polyglottis (Wittenb. 1688); Darling, Cyclopaedia Bibliographica (Holy Scriptures), col. 39 sq.; Rosenmüller, Handbuch der biblischen Literatur, 3, 281 sq.; Le Long-Masch, Bibliotheca Sacra, 1, 331 sq.; Eichhorn, Einleituag ina das A. Test. (Index in vol. 5, s.v. Polyglotte); Simon, Hist. Critique du Vieux Testament (Rotterdam, 1685), p. 514 sq.; Carpzov, Critica Sacra (Lipsia, 1748), p. 387 sq.; Kortholt. Tract. de variis Scripturae edition. cap. 32:p. 374 sq.; Tenzel, Diatribe Philol. de Bibiis Polyglottis (Wittenb. 1686); Celsius, De Bibliis  Polyglottis dissertatio (Upsala, 1707); Wolf, Biblioth. Hebr. vol. 2, § 10, p. 332 sq.; Walton, Prolegom. § 14; Hottinger, Bibliothecar. Quadripartitum, p. 133 sq.; Alter, Bibliograph. Nachrichten (Wien, 1779), p. 30 sq.; Reuss, Bibliotheca Novi Testamenti, etc. (Brunsvigue, 1872), § 5; and his art. Polyglotten-Bibebl in Herzog, Real-Encyklop.; the art. Polyglott in Kitto; Diestel, Gesch. des Alten Test. (Jena, 1869), p. 207, 254, 255; and, as far as the Complutensian Polyglot is concerned, the excellent monograph of Delitzsch, Studien zur Entstehungs. gesch. der Polyglotten - Bibel des Cardinals Ximenes (Leips. 1871). (B. P.)

## Polyhistor, Alexander[[@Headword:Polyhistor, Alexander]]

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

## Polyhymnia[[@Headword:Polyhymnia]]

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

## Polynesia[[@Headword:Polynesia]]

             or the region of many islands (πολύς, many, and νῆσος, an island), is the name usually given, with more or less of limitation, to the numerous groups of islands, and some few single islands, scattered throughout the great Pacific Ocean, between the eastern shores of Asia and the western shores of America. In its widest signification, the term Polynesia might be understood as embracing, besides the groups hereafter to be mentioned, the various islands, large and small, of the Indian Archipelago, in one direction, and the vast island of New Holland (q.v.) or Australia, with its dependency of Van Diemen's Land, in another. Including these, the whole region has sometimes been called Oceanica, and sometimes Australia- generally, however, in modern times, to the exclusion of the islands in the Indian Archipelago, to which certain writers have given the name of Malaysia. In proportion, also, as the area of maritime discovery has become enlarged, it has been thought convenient by some geographers to narrow still further the limits of Polynesia, to the exclusion of Australia and Van Diemen's Land; while others, again, exclude Papua (q.v.) or New Guinea, New Ireland (q.v.), Solomon's Isles (q.v.), the Louisiade group, the New Hebrides (q.v.), New Caledonia (q.v.), and certain other groups and single islands, together with New Zealand (q.v.). from the area of Polynesia, and give to these, in union with Australia, the collective designation of Australia.

To all these, with the exception of New Zealand, French writers have given the name of Melanesia, or the Black Islands; while a similar name, Keloenesia, has been given to them by Prichard and Latham-purely, however, on ethnological grounds, as we shall presently notice. Thus we have the three geographical divisions of Malaysia, Australasia, and Polynesia, the last mentioned of which embraces all the groups and single islands not included under the other two. Accepting this arrangement, still the limits between Australasia and Polynesia have not been very accurately defined; indeed, scarcely any two geographers appear to be quite agreed upon the subject; neither shall we pretend to decide in the matter. The following list, however, comprises all the principal groups and single islands not previously named as coming under the division of Australasia—viz.: 1. North of the equator-the Ladrone or Marian Islands, the Pelew Islands, the Caroline Islands, the Radack and Ralick chains, the Sandwich Islands, Gilbert's or Kingsmill's Archipelago, and the Galapagos. 2. South of the equator-the Ellice group, the Phoenix and Union groups, the Fiji Islands, the Friendly Islands, the Navigator's Islands, Cook's or  Harvey Islands, the Society Islands, the Dangerous Archipelago, the Marquesas Islands, Pitcairn Island, and Easter Island. (In the former part of this article we largely depend upon Chambers's Cyclopedia, and in the latter part upon Gardner's Faiths of all Nations.)

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

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

Dr. Latham, in treating of the Polynesians, divides them into two branches- viz.: 1. The Micronesian branch, and 2. The Proper Polynesian branch. His theory as to the probable line of migration is as follows: “The reason for taking the Micronesian branch before the Proper Polynesian involves the following question: What was the line of population by which the innumerable islands of the Pacific, from the Pelews to Easter Island, and from the Sandwich Islands to New Zealand, became inhabited by tribes different from, but still allied to, the Protonesian Malays? That line,  whichever it be, where the continuity of successive islands is the greatest, and whereon the fewest considerable interspaces of ocean are to be found. This is the general answer a priori, subject to modifications from the counterbalancing phenomena of winds or currents unfavorable to the supposed migration. Now this answer, when applied to the geographical details regarding the distribution of land and sea in the great oceanic area, indicates the following line: New Guinea, New Ireland, the New Hebrides, the Fijis, and the Tonga group, etc. From hence the Navigator's Islands, the isles of the Dangerous Archipelago, the Kingsmill and other groups, carry the frequently diverging streams of population over the Caroline Islands, the Ladrones, the Pelews, Easter Island, etc. This view, however, so natural an inference from a mere land and sea survey, is complicated by the ethnological position of the New Guinea, New Ireland, and Hew Hebrides population. These are not Protonesian, and they are not Polynesian. Lastly, they are not intermediate to the two. They break rather than propagate the continuity of the human stream— a continuity which exists geographically, but fails ethnographically. The recognition of this conflict between the two probabilities has determined me to consider the Micronesian Archipelago as that part of Polynesia which is most likely to have been first peopled, and hence a reason for taking it first in order. The islands comprised in the Micronesian branch are the Pelew Islands, the Caroline Islands, the Marian Islands, and the Tarawan or Kingsmill group. In physical appearance, the inhabitants of these groups more nearly resemble the Malays than is the case with the Polynesians Proper. In person, they are not so tall as the latter. Their language has numerous dialects most of which would perhaps be unintelligible to the groups farther south and east. In religion, they are pagans; but their mythology and traditions differ from those of the Polynesians Proper. Neither is the custom of the taboo and the use of kawa so prevalent as they are found to be among the latter.

The Proper Polynesians, so called, are found in the Fiji Islands, but not to the same extent as in the following— viz., the Navigator's or Samoan Islands, the Society Islands, and Friendly Islands; also in the Sandwich Islands, the Marquesas, the Dangerous Archipelago, etc. In physical appearance, they are the handsomest and tallest of all the natives of the Pacific islands, with the exception, perhaps, of the New Zealanders or Maoris. ‘The aquiline nose is commonly seen among them, and there are many varieties both of hair and conmplexion. Their face is generally oval,  with largish ears and wide nostrils. In the islands nearest to the equator the skin is said to be the fairest, and it is darker in the coral islands than in the volcanic. Their language is said to bear some affinity to the Tagala, and is split up into numerous dialects, all, however, to a great extent mutually intelligible among the several groups.

Religion. — Previous to the introduction of Christianity in Polynesia, in the end of the last and beginning of the present century, the Polynesians were involved in gross heathen darkness and superstition. Their objects of worship were of three kinds— their deified ancestors, their idols, and their Etu. Their ancestors were converted into divinities on account of the benefits which they had conferred upon mankind. Thus one of their progenitors was believed to have created the sun, moon, and stars. “Another tradition,” says Mr. Williams, in his Narrative of Missionary Enterprises in the South Seta Islands, “stated that the heavens were originally so close to the earth that men could not walk, but were compelled to crawl. This was a serious evil; but at length an individual conceived the sublime idea of elevating the heavens to a more convenient height. For this purpose he put forth his utmost energy; and, by the first effort, raised them to the top of a tender plant, called teve, about four feet high. There he deposited them until he was refreshed: when, by a second effort, he lifted them to the height of a tree called kauariki, which is as large as the sycamore. By the third attempt he carried them to the summits of the mountains; and, after a long interval of repose, and by a most prodigious effort, he elevated them to their present situation. This vast undertaking, however, was greatly facilitated by myriads of dragonflies, which with their wings severed the cords that confined the heavens to the earth. Now this individual was deified; and up to the moment that Christianity was embraced, the deluded inhabitants worshipped him as ‘the elevator of the heavens.' The Polynesians had various other gods who were deified men. The chief of these deities, to whom mothers dedicated their children, were Hiro, the god of thieves, and Oro, the god of war. ‘The idols worshipped were different in almost every island and district. Besides the numerous objects of adoration, the islanders generally, and the Samoans in particular, had a vague idea of a Supreme Being, to whom they gave the name of Tangaroa. The mode in which these gods were adored is thus described by Mr. Williams: “The worship presented to these deities consisted in prayers, incantations, and offerings of pigs, fish, vegetable food, native cloth, canoes, and other valuable property. To these must be  added human sacrifices, which, at some of the islands, were fearfully common. An idea may be formed of their addresses to the gods from the sentence with which they invariably concluded.

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

The most affecting of the religious observances of the Polynesians was the sacrifice of human victims. This horrid custom did not prevail at the Navigator Islands; but it was carried to a fearful extent at the Harvey group, and still more at the Tahitian and Society Islands. At one ceremony, called the Feast of Restoration, no fewer than seven human beings were offered in sacrifice. On the eve of war, also, it was customary to offer human victims. It may be interesting to notice the circumstances in which the last sacrifice of this kind was offered at Tahiti. “Pomare was about to fight a battle, which would confirm him in. or deprive him of, his dominions. ‘To propitiate the gods, therefore, by the most valuable offerings he could command, was with him an object of the highest  concern. For this purpose rolls of native cloth, pigs, fish, and immense quantities of other food were presented at the maraes; but still a tabut, or sacrifice, was demanded. Pomare, therefore, sent two of his messengers to the house of the victim whom he had marked for the occasion. On reaching the place, they inquired of the wife where her husband was. She replied that he was in such a place, planting bananas. ‘Well,' they continued, ‘we are thirsty; give us some cocoa-nut water.' She told them that she had no nuts in the house, but that they were at liberty to climb the trees, and take as many as they desired.

They then requested her to lend them the o, which is a piece of ironwood, about four feet long and an inch and a half in diameter, with which the natives open the cocoanut. She cheerfully complied with their wishes, little imagining that she was giving them the instrument which, in a few moments, was to inflict a fatal blow upon the head of her husband. Upon receiving the o, the men left the house, and went in search of their victim; and the woman, having become rather suspicious, followed them shortly after, and reached the place just in time to see the blow inflicted and her husband fall. She rushed forward to give vent to her agonized feelings and take a last embrace; but she was immediately seized and bound hand and foot, while the body of her murdered husband was placed in a long basket made of cocoa-nut leaves and borne from her sight. It appears that they were always exceedingly careful to prevent the wife or daughter, or any female relative, from touching the corpse, for so polluted were females considered that a victim would have been desecrated by a woman's touch or breath to such a degree as to have rendered it unfit for an offering to the gods. While the men were carrying their victim to the marae, he recovered from the stunning effect of the blow, and, bound as he was in the coconut leaf basket, he said to his murderers, ‘Friends, I know what you intend to do with me: you are about to kill me, and offer me as a taba to your savage gods; and I also know that it is useless for me to beg for mercy, for you will not spare my life.

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

The Maori of New Zealand form a branch of the Polynesian family, and as they seem to have been preserved uncontaminated by intercourse with other nations, we may discover in their superstitions some of the primitive notions of the great mass of the islanders of the Pacific Ocean. They regarded the origin of all things as Night and Nothingness, and even the older gods themselves were supposed to have sprung from Night. Another series of divinities are gods of light, and occupy the highest and most glorious of the ten heavens. The Etu of the other districts of Polynesia was called Atua in the language of New Zealand, and instead of being  worshipped like the Etu, was simply regarded as a powerful adversary, skilled in supernatural arts, and rendered proof against all ordinary worship. Hence arose the charms and incantations which form the chief element in Maori worship. The souls of their departed ancestors were ranked among the Atuas. An institution, which is common to the Maori and to all the Polynesian tribes. is the Taboo, which is applied both to sacred things and persons. Among the Maori, the head-chief being sacred almost to divinity, his house, his garments, and all that belonged to him was Taboo, his spiritual essence having been supposed to be communicated to everything that he touched. The religion of the Sandwich Islanders, before they embraced Christianity, was almost entirely a Taboo system-that is, a system of religious prohibitions, which had extended itself very widely, and been used by their priests and kings to enlarge their own power and influence. Temples or maraes existed in the South Sea Islands, but neither temples nor altars existed in New Zealand, nor in the Samoas nor Navigators Islands. The form of superstition most prevalent at the Samoas was the worship of the Etu, which consisted of some bird, fish, or reptile, in which they supposed that a spirit resided. Religious ceremonies were connected with almost every event of their lives. They presented their first- fruits to their gods, and at the close of the year observed a festival as an expression of thanksgiving to the gods for the mercies of the past year.

Paganism is becoming rapidly extirpated through the efforts of the missionaries, principally English and American, as in the Samoan, Sandwich, and Society groups, where but few absolute pagans now remain. Under date of December, 1876, a correspondent of the Manchester Guardian writes: “Heathenism is mainly confined to the islands in the western part of the Pacific. The missionary societies, whose efforts have been so greatly blessed in other parts of Polynesia, are combining their labors upon this western section. The London Missionary Society has undertaken the work on New Guinea and the islands at its eastern end. The Melanesian Mission will extend its labors to the Banks and Solomon Islands. The Presbyterians will enlarge their work on the New Hebrides. The Wesleyans have included New Britain and New Ireland in their field. The American Board, in connection with the Hawaiian churches, is enlarging its operations in Micronesia. The history of the Polynesian missions warrants us in expecting large results from this concentration of Christian influence upon numerous island groups, some of which have as yet been only partially explored.” The superstition of the taboo, the use of  kawa as an intoxicating drink, cannibalism, infanticide, tattooing, and circumcision are now fast disappearing under the influence of Christianity. Unfortunately, however, the contact of these islanders with civilization has not been always productive of unmixed good; the introduction among them of the use of ardent spirits, and of the vices and diseases of Europeans, having thinned the population to a lamentable extent. Further particulars with respect to the natives of Polynesia will be found in some of our articles on the groups regarded as being the most important. See Littell's Living Age, 1854 (No. 513), art. 3; The Lond. Rev. 1854, pt. 2, p. 43 sq.; Edinb. Rev. July, 1876, art. 9; Miss. World, No. 630. p. 167 sq.; No. 458; Lond. Acad. July 15, 1876, p. 52 sq.; Gardner, Dict. of Relig. Faiths, s.v.; Lubbock, Orig. of Civilization (see Index).

## Polyphemus[[@Headword:Polyphemus]]

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

## Polystaurion[[@Headword:Polystaurion]]

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

## Polytheism[[@Headword:Polytheism]]

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

I. Name. — Neither this word nor the similar ones, atheism, monotheism, theism, are to be found in the ordinary Greek or Latin dictionaries. Philo the Jew employs such words as the neuter adjective πολύθεον with the article to express the idea; also the forms πολυθεότης, and in Philo ἀθεότης, occur with the sense now attached to endings in μος. Polytheism denotes the belief that there is a plurality of gods, and for the sake of convenience may include dualism, which, however, can be used also to  signify the doctrine of two principles that are not necessarily both divine. If it be asked what is intended by gods, we answer:

(1.) That in the word polytheism the notion of gods does not include absolute attributes or creative efficiency, owing to the fact that the human mind cannot readily admit the idea of more than one such being. While, then, monotheism generally means the doctrine of one absolute infinite being, polytheism is not its exact opposite, except in putting many for one, since the attributes of the many are conceived of as inferior to those of the one. This is an accommodation to the state of facts; but in philosophical writing monotheism may itself be divided into absolute and relative, as Schelling has done, with whom the latter denotes the worship of one being, thought of not as infinite, but as limited in his nature. Atheism, again, denies the real existence of any kind of gods; it is alike opposed to polytheism and to monotheism. The idea of God, the infinite one, is not transferable to gods many, and hence there is a necessary vagueness in the heathen conception of their deities, as it respects power, knowledge, duration, especially a parte ante, and other properties. The question, then, arises as to gradations of gods, and as to the difference between them and demigods, heroes, etc. The Greek worshipped these latter; and they had in their mythologies (apotheoses such as that of Hercules, the son of Zeus by a mortal mother. Hence worship is not a criterion of godship. But although the line cannot be drawn accurately between gods and superhuman beings who stood below gods but above men, and had some local agency in human affairs, it may be said that great but not infinite power and knowledge, ability to answer prayer, special functions and agencies in providence, with immortality, entered generally into the conception or definition of a god or divine being. Polytheism is used synonymously with heathenism and paganism, only that the two latter are wider terms, denoting not a mere religious system, but including also the state of things connected with such a system.

Paganism comes from the Latin word pagus, a country district, a canton, the adjective from which, pagtanus, denoted pertaining to such a peagus, then not a soldier, then boorish or unlearned, and finally, among the Christian writers, one not a Christian or Jew, from the fact, apparently, that Christianity came last into the rural districts. In Augustine's time this sense, though already it may not have been uncommon, was new enough for him to say, “The worshippers of gods false and many we call pagans.” Heathenism, from heathen, is generally taken, as being a derivation from heath, to have meant a dweller  in lonely or remote uncultivated parts of a district, and may have been a translation of pagan into the northern languages of the Germanic stock. From gentes, finally, as a Latin equivalent of the Hebrew word גּוֹים, denoting in the Old Testament the other nations who were polytheists, as opposed to the Jews, and from ἔθνη, with the same sense as used in the Septuagint, are derived gentilism and the ethnic religions. An interesting inquiry is whether the lower races of the heathen world can properly be called polytheists, or whether their spirit-worship is not so unlike the worship of gods among the higher pagan races Is. to require the putting of them into another class. A full answer to this question can only be given at a later stage of our way, and it is embarrassed by traces of the worship of one or more gods, strictly so called, which appear in the religions of this part of mankind. We shall adopt the plan of considering them by themselves, only remarking here that if their worship is more vague than that of the more highly endowed or more cultivated races, it is equally divided between a great number of objects. Polytheism is generally found in company with idolatry; but it can be shown that within the Aryan or Indo-European races all the branches were not primeval idolators. It is probable, therefore, that for a long period, in some parts of the world, the worship of divinities by means of visible forms was unknown; while in the dualistic religion of Iran, or the Persian religion, idol-worship was opposed with almost fanatical hostility. Another of the nations belonging to the same race, the Romans, had only symbols at first; their temples were without images for more than 170 years (Varro, in Augustin. De Civ. Dei, 4:31); and, according to a tradition, Etrurian artificers made the first for them out of wood or clay.

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

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

(a) The rudest nations now and the whole world, as far as we can go back, have had some form of polytheism, if we include the worship of spirits in this term. The Jews are the only strictly monotheistic nation of antiquity: and when Abraham left his clan to go westward, they had already begun to  worship other gods (Jos 24:2). Some traces of the worship of one god appear in the history of Melchisedek and of Balaam. Yet all the nations with whom the Jews came into contact worshipped not only more gods than one, but worshipped them by means of images, with the exception of those addicted to the religion of Zoroaster. Approaches towards monotheism among heathen nations were the results of philosophical reflection, as in Brahminism, where a pantheistic doctrine of the universe prevailed; or in Iranism, where the reforms attributed to Zoroaster show a progress from the earlier Vedic religion, or from something like it. So much the more wonderful is it that the one small people of the Jews clung, amid innumerable temptations to idolatry and defections from their ancestral faith, to an exalted monotheistic idea of the Godhead, which has been the origin of all the monotheism now existing in the world.

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

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

(d) Have any traces remained in the world of this primeval monotheism? A number of Christian writers have given an affirmative answer, but they put their reasons for their opinions on diverse grounds. First, we may notice such writers as Cudworth, who in an uncritical way collect together the expressions of writers of every age, and give as much weight to later philosophers as to earlier authors. There is no doubt that philosophers like Plato reached a first principle of the world, or that, before him. Anaxagoras conceived of mind putting already existent matter into appropriate forms. But their voice is not that of popular religion. Next to these we may rank those writers who have noticed a subordination among the objects of worship. The supreme god of Greece is a monarch, father of gods and men with very great powers, the head of moral order, the chief agent in providence. Some of the poets speak of him in terms truly sublime. There are passages in the Suppliants of AEschylus and in the Antigone of Sophocles, which breathe the spirit of the Scriptures. But all that can be fairly drawn from such evidence is what Naegelsbach draws from it in his Posthomeric Theology-that there was in the best age of Grecian authors a certain monotheistic tendency which had no decisive control over Greek faith. “This tendency,” to use his words, “was an almost unconscious, a naive one, an obscure impulse, a light that shineth in darkness, but the darkness comprehendeth it not.” “The religious consciousness, on the one hand, so to speak, reduced the world of gods to Zeus but on the other could not shake off the plurality of divine forms which nature first  furnished to it.” If there was any monotheism in the Greek religion it had its representative in Zeus. But what kind of a representative was he? He was not eternal, but born; he was not a creator, for the Greek theology never embraced a creation. He was not all-powerful, but was generally represented as controlled by fate. He had in the popular faith and mythology attributes most unlike those of a divine being. He was, in short, a monarch surrounded by gods of his own kindred, and very far from the conception of a holy or an absolute being. How could a holy and absolute being become so completely changed in the faith of a nation as to lose not only his absolute character, but also what ought naturally to be fixed in the minds of men— his purity and holiness? We can conceive of men changing their gods, passing from one to many, or from many to one, but we cannot conceive of one and the same god as undergoing such utter transmutations. Still further it has been urged, with justice, that monotheism and polytheism rest on different bases.

The first separates divinity from nature; the second identifies it with nature, and incorporates it in natural objects. The two are entirely different: how can the one slide into or retain characteristics of the other? This argument, however, does not derive its force from the oneness or manifoldness of the objects of worship, but from their essential relations to the world, so that a passing over from the worship of one not absolute god to that of more than one, also not absolute, is far from being incredible. Hence, if we could accept Schelling's view of the character of original monotheism, we could admit of addition to or subtraction from the number of divinities. Nor can we maintain that traces of a primitive monotheism are certainly preserved in the religions of the other nations of antiquity. The earliest records of the Aryan race, as they appear in the Vedas, give us no indication that one god was of a higher class than the rest. Indra, as Prof. Whitney (Orient. and Ling. Studies, p. 36) remarks, “stands at the head of the Vedic divinities. By this is not meant, however, that he is king among them, endowed with an authority over the rest: no such reduction to system of the religion had taken place as should establish a relation of this kind among its gods. They are as independent, each in his own domain, as the natural phenomena of which they are the personifications.” And the further remark is made that the nature of Varuna's attributes and of his concerns with the affairs of human life place him decidedly above Indra. Further, in the later stages of the Indian religions, a deity, comparatively subordinate, Vishnu, has reached a chief place, while the old gods have fallen more or less out of worship. The Iranian or Persian religion contains very exalted conceptions  of its supreme divinity, Ormazd, or Ahura Mazda, i.e. the wise lord — called also Spentomainyus, or the holy-thinking one-the holy spirit, according to Spiegel, while Haug explains this name as denoting the white spirit. He is also a creator; and in many respects this religion stands very far above all others of the same race. But if Ormazd is a creator, Ahriman (or Angramainyus), the bad spirit, is a creator also; and while there is an evident effort of philosophical reflection to elevate Ormazd, who perhaps represents Varuna, above the other mythological beings of the older faith — such, for instance, as Mithra— the religion has not succeeded in attaining to the position of a pure monotheism, but is a dualism with decided remains of polytheism. Once more the supreme divinity of the Greeks and Romans, Zeus or Jupiter, i.e. Diov-pater, is now thought by the best etymologists to answer to Dyaus-pitâ, a mythological conception of the Vedas, who is spoken of as the father of Indra, but who either dropped out of or never fully entered into the Vedic religious system. If he dropped out, we find him retained by other portions of the Indo-European race; if he had not entered into it, we find other members of the same family bringing forward this personality as their chief god. While the Greek and Italic branches did this, we find in Scandinavian mythology a god Tyr, answering, as Jacob Grimm (Deutsche Mythol. ch. 9) shows, to Ziu or Zio, with a genitive Ziuwas or Ziewes, in Old High-German, and thus standing for the same being as Zeus or Jupiter.

How can we believe that the representative of monotheism was thus raised or depressed, that he took the place of another displaced supreme god, or himself gave way to Odin (Wuotan)? The true explanation is that the head of the gods, differing in rank but not in nature from the rest, rose and fell in his station, or even dropped out of worship altogether, owing to changes within a nation or race which we cannot now explain. This is only one of the many changes through which polytheism passed. It never had any stability or permanent condition. We only add that if Zeus can be explained, as etymology points out, to be the personification of the bright sky or daylight, this again must prevent us from regarding such a divinity as handing down the monotheistic idea, because this was only one of the most prominent of visible objects. The same remarks in general may be made in respect to the religions of all cultivated races— the Assyrian and Babylonian, the Egyptian and the Mexican religions, for instance. We do not deny that individual reflection may have risen above the level of the religions themselves, or that philosophical doctrine may have sought to mix itself with the prevailing mythologies, but that the polytheistic religions,  including their highest divinities, did not hand down a distorted monotheism, but stood on essentially another foundation.

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

2. Among the objects worshipped by polytheists, which were the earliest? However we may answer this question, it ought to be laid down, before we attempt an answer, that the objects of worship must have been thought of as having personal qualities and relations to man. Worship, the recognition of a divine superintending power, did not begin, could not begin, in the adoration of dead matter; of a sun invested with material qualities, for instance, then personified, and finally converted into a person with will, feeling, and agency in the world. We must start with attributing to man a  religious sense or sentiment. The world, to the first polytheists, was full of divine power and agency; they did not create to themselves the divine life in nature, quickening it into life by a personifying imagination, but it was there for them to recognize; they felt their dependence upon it; it surrounded them on every side. But it was broken up to their minds into the many great objects on which they depended; it met them everywhere, and they worshipped this divine power and will in its parts as the source of benefits. With this premised, we may say that the heavenly bodies, the phenomena of day and of light, the earth itself, the sea, the sky or heaven, were among the primeval objects of heathen worship. The sun, for instance, not only as a sun-god, but also, in what was perhaps an earlier form of religion, the visible luminary itself, was among the first divinities of heathenism. The luminary was considered as alive, and possessed of the power of seeing things upon the earth. When Hades snatched away the virgin Proserpine, and carried her to his realms below through a chasm of the earth to be his wife, no one heard her cries for help except Helios, son of Hyperion and Hecate. Zeus, to whom she cried for help, “was sitting apart from the gods in a thronged temple, and receiving choice offerings from mortal men,” so he did not hear her (Hymn. in Cer. 25-29). The attributes of Helios in the Greek religion, in which he was by no means a very important deity, are all to be referred to the heavenly body, endowed with perception, and noticing as well as hearing what takes place here below. The people believed that the sun was a living being, and the philosophers had the same faith. Anaximander is said to have ascribed a fiery body and a vital principle to it; and Anaxagoras so offended the Athenians by his doctrine that the sun was a red-hot stone or mass of metal that he was accused of impiety, and, although defended by Pericles, was fined five talents and banished (Plat. Apol. Socr. 26 D; Diog. Laert. 2, § 12 sq.).

In the same manner the worship of the sun, as distinguished from the sun-gods, appears in the Vedas, although of less importance than these latter; the Greeks attributed the same worship to this luminary among the Persians; and Plato makes Socrates use the following words: “It seems to me that the earliest inhabitants of Greece held those only to be gods-whom many of the barbarians now regard as such-sun, moon, stars, and heaven” (Cratyl. 397 C). In the Scriptures the worship of the heavenly bodies is spoken of as an apostasy from God to which Israel would be tempted: “Take ye good heed to yourselves… lest thou lift up thine eyes unto heaven, and when thou seest the sun, and the moon, and the stars, even all the host of heaven, shouldest be driven to worship them, and serve them”  (Deu 4:15-19). And in fact they were driven into this kind of worship at as late an age of their history as the reign of Josiah, who put down “them that burned incense to the sun, and to the moon, and to the planets, and to all the host of heaven.” We hardly need to refer to the prevalence of such worship, especially of the planets, in Babylonia and Assyria, nor to the fact that sun-worship was the foundation probably of the honors paid to Baal and Moloch among the Ammonites, in Canaan and in Carthage, nor to the importance of this element in the Egyptian religion. We only add that the religion of Peru— that is, the religion of the Incas, which superseded an older religion-was direct sun-worship, and that the same was spread over a large part of this continent, among the tribes even of the Red men in North America. The heathen part of the Dakotas still have their sun-dances, and as late as 1872 one of their practices was to look steadily many minutes at the blazing orb, as an act, it was understood, of religious worship. This is only one of those objects of nature to which were paid divine honors. The earth, as the general nursing mother, the sea, tie sky, the life in the air, in trees, even in animals, all seemed to be divine. The Earth particularly -as the Great Mother, the Syrian goddess Cybele, Demeter, Ceres-although exalted into a person separate from the dead earth, as the cause of life to vegetables, and ultimately to man, was worshipped, and in some countries, as in Asia Minor, with the most frantic rites.

3. But polytheism would have been comparatively dead, and possessed of fewer attractions to the religious sentiment of many, if it had stopped short in its development of the divine in nature. The next step was to convert these comparatively fixed objects, exhibiting superhuman agency to the eyes of men, into persons separated from the objects themselves. The sun, regarded as a god, in this process became a sun god; that is, his personality was no longer identified with the sun, and confined to its orb, but he became free to go whithersoever he would, and to exercise supernatural powers away from the sun, his proper seat. This was a very great stage through which the religions of all the higher races passed. The spirit of the sun, possessed of will and feelings like a man's, but of more than human power, is now free to move abroad, to mingle in human affairs, and thus to transcend his first agency by a very much wider and more varied new one. It is possible for him thus to become mythological; that is, the effects which he produces become events in history. The sun god's rays to the imagination become darts, and as the rays of the sun in summer cause  malignant fevers, so he is conceived of as shooting his arrows at men and beasts, the cause being some offence or dishonor done to his sacred rites or to his servants. The beginning of the Iliad will illustrate what we mean, it being assumed, what is now generally admitted, but what some eminent scholars have denied, that Apollo is indeed a sun-god. This the Greeks of the time of Sophocles and Euripides held, but they held it more as an inference than from any traditional opinion. But, furthermore, the sun god might become the especial object of worship of a city or a tribe— their tutelary god; and thus he acquired a new character, and stood in new relations to a part of a people. From them his worship might spread over the whole of a tribe or of a race, and his old original nature would be almost lost out of sight; he would have outgrown, so to speak, his youthful properties. In this way it could happen that a war-god could be developed out of the divinity of a nation of warriors, although his attributes at first might have had no relation to armed strife. Thus the Roman god Mars was the divinity of an agricultural people, it seems probable, a god of spring and of fructification, before he became a god of war. Apollo also, if a god of the sun and of light at first, had from this source naturally the attributes of a destroyer and of a healer (the latter attribute being shown in the names Apollo and Paean, the avertes and healer), of a pure one and a purifier; to which were added his connection with music and poetry, as well as his prophetic office of giving forth oracles as a mediator between Zeus and mortals. The relations of Apollo to social life in its various departments, and his connection with Delphi, where the religion of Greece found its center, made him the most important of all the Greek divinities, Zeus only accepted. His attributes may possibly all be evolved from the original conception of him as a nature-god; but it is hard to see how this can be done.

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

(1.) To a great extent, polytheism at its foundation is the worship of nature, i.e. of objects in nature which strike the attention of man, and are important aids to his well-being in the world.

(2.) These objects are conceived of as living existences, and as having, together with superhuman power, the feelings and the will of men.

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

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

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

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

(b) foreign gods are introduced;

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

(d) old divinities drop out of worship;

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

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

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

To illustrate the changes through which the heathen religions can pass, we refer, first, to Hinduism, which appears in the Vedas as a simple worship of the gods of light, fire, etc.; then passes into Brahminism, — where Vishnu, an inferior god of the Vedas, and Siva, perhaps the same as the storm-god Rudra of the Vedas, take the principal place, and divide in their ramified mythologies the worship of the nation between their respective religions. A second instance is presented by the religion of Rome, which in its early  stage tias a punctilious, superstitious veneration of certain divinities, somewhat allied to those of Greece, together with other vague, shadowy powers, and in its second stage adopted many of the gods and much of the mythology of Greece, so as to throw its own indigenous religion into the shade. Then, in its third stage, Rome almost entirely lost its old religion, and was a common harbor for all Oriental superstitions-the worship of Cybele and Isis and Mithras, and the Virgo Coelestis from Carthage, and the Moloch-Jupiters of Syria. A third instance, with less clear outlines, is presented by Mexico, the religion of which seems to be a composite made up of parts from the religion of the Mayas, from that of the Toltecs, from that of the Aztec conquerors, and of a residuum perhaps from other quarters.

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

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

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

This is only one theory of mythology, which, indeed, is a wilderness where one is in danger of getting lost, and, if one would attempt explanations, must do so with caution. There are many forms of explanation. There is the physical, where phenomena of nature are turned into events, and here the difficulty, not easily solved, meets us of explaining how an event of nature which happens every day is represented in mythology as a unique occurrence in history. There is, again, historical mythology, that in which some fact is the basis, and the drapery is mythological invention. But in adding this drapery, and in other such inventions, the poets did not feel that they were chargeable with fraud, any more than Milton blamed himself for uniting his own poetical threads with the woof of Scripture truth. There was also a mythology breathing an allegorical spirit, and dictated perhaps by the desire to teach moral truth in the form which religious truth assumed. This was more consciously fictitious. Theological mythology, again, concerned itself chiefly with the births and life of the gods before they came into the religious system. We have in Greek a working up of this that goes under the name of Hesiod, and may belong to the 8th century B.C.; and the fragments of another also ascribed to a primeval poet, Orpheus, but later by one or two centuries than that of Hesiod. A comparison of these seems to show that the theological poets were free in changing the myths which they had to deal with, either inventing in part, or  drawing their materials from earlier poems where a different religious philosophy was exhibited. The mythology of Greece was fully grown in the age of Homer; it is not true that he and Hesiod created it, but rather they and others like them gathered it, and gave it a form of greater beauty. Nor is it true, as we think, that a priestly class gave the first form to mythology. More true is it to say that a nation did this, and an age-a very long age, perhaps. We are not to conceive of a body of philosophers teaching in figures, the shadows of things real, those realities that lay in sunshine before their own minds; on the contrary, the mythological spirit was spread over all; it was the way in which all conceived of things supernatural.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(1) if the fetich were a precious thing in itself, doubtless the Negro would be constant in the respect he paid it. The selection and rejection need to be accounted for, but the worthlessness of the object must greatly contribute to the inconstancy of the devotee.

(2) There are village as well as house fetiches in Africa, and these seem to have a more fixed hold on the religious feeling.

(3) The use of the fetich as a charm or amulet is not essentially unlike the use of saints' bones for the same purpose, and the feeling is like that of the  cultivated heathen towards his graven image. This feeling is to be accounted for in part by a confusion of the subjective and the objective. The sense of security, caused by the realization of the presence of a protector, is attributed to the object itself.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Besides these spiritual beings, the Finns believed in a supreme god, Jumala, whose name, as Castren thinks, may have denoted at first place of thunder, heaven, then god of heaven, then god in general. The Lapps of Norway had three classes of spirits-those in the air, those in the heavens, and others above the heavens. Among the last is a higher god, who creates everything through his son-which must Le a conception borrowed from the Christians in their neighborhood. Among the Tunguses there are several ranks and spheres of operation in the spirit system; but above them all is a god of heaven, Boa, who knows all things, but does not concern himself with what comes to pass, nor punish the wicked; and, besides him, a spirit of the sun, more powerful than the rest, to whom prayers are offered; a spirit of the moon, from whom dreams come; spirits of the stars, who are protectors of particular men, etc. (Comp. Castren's lectures on Finnish mythology, translated from the Swedish.) In the religions of our continent the Great Spirit has been supposed, without reason, to have corresponded with God, the sun, north-west wind, etc. The spirits are supposed to be capable of detaching themselves from their corporeal frame, and of taking various forms as they see fit.  It is a most interesting inquiry, but one in which it is difficult to reach certainty, whether there are in the uncultivated races remembrances of a primeval monotheistic faith. The difficulty is due to several causes, the first of which is their reserve, often extreme, in communicating with persons higher in the scale of civilization, and their readiness to agree for the moment to what such persons may say. Another circumstance to be considered is the propagation of religious ideas from foreign sources-in Africa on both sides of the continent from the Mohammedanism which has long been making progress, and in this continent from Christianity. The Red men near the whites have forgotten their former human sacrifices and cannibalism, and neglect of parents in extreme old age; and they seem to have imbibed some religious notions from the white men which have modified their religions.

We find, also, this to be sometimes confessed by some tribes in Africa that they believe in a being above all, but neglect him because he is too far off, too high to concern himself with their affairs. This may be an excuse for neglect of worship of such a being, or it may be conformed to a real but obscure tradition. We may suppose the supreme god to have been in the primeval religion of their fathers, and to have been thrust out of worship by the spiritual weakness and imbecility of fallen man. In some tribes, again, there appear to be no such faint traces of monotheism. A missionary, who lived over thirty years in Southern Africa, once told the present writer that he never found any such embers of an early religion among those with whom he was conversant. The question is thus one not so easily settled. We close what we have to say of it by a brief citation from the important work of Waltz (Anthropol. d. Natuvolker, pt. 2, p. 167). He is speaking of the religion of the Negroes. After denying the justice of imputing to them a peculiar and rude form of polytheism, he adds that the deeper penetration into their religions, to which of late a number of conscientious investigators have attained, leads to the surprising result that a number of Negro tribes, among whom the influence of nations that stand higher in point of culture cannot be pointed out nor scarcely be suspected, have made much greater advances in the development of their religious conceptions than almost all other nations in a state of nature. And this to such a degree that, if we may not call them monotheists, still we may assert of them that they stand on the borders of monotheism; while yet their religion is mingled with a great amount of gross superstition, which in the case of other peoples where it is found seems entirely to cover up with its rank growth the purer religious conceptions.”

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

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

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

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

(2.) The objects of worship were either invisible, or distant and yet visible, or something near at hand, in which a divine power was thought to reside. In the first case especially there was a longing in the pagan mind for some representation or image which might keep the presence of the deity in mind, and thus give a sense of protection to the worshipper. Image- worship, idolatry, arose from a desire, it seems probable, of feeling the nearness of the unseen power, or from conceiving that the divine power is lodged in or belongs to the object present before the eves as being inherent or represented by it. Image-worship has been diffused over the heathen world, but some nations have rejected it. The religion of Ormud rejected images and even temples with a kind of fanatical hatred. We believe that there are no traces of it in the Vedas. The Romans at first had only symbols and not forms in the houses of their gods. The probability is therefore that through the whole of the Indo-European race idol-worship was not known at the first; but in Egypt, in Greece, in the Hamitic and in some of the Shemitic peoples, on this continent, in Africa, and over the world, no earlier period can be traced than one in which either image symbol or fetich-worship was a part of the religions. As for direct worship of nature, one would suppose that images would not be needed by the pagan religious sentiment. The heavenly bodies especially are so great a part of the time in sight that no memorial of them would be needed. Thus we find that in Babylonia and Assyria, where sun and star worship, as distinguished from the worship of sun and star gods, prevailed, idols were common. Yet we find images of Bel, Nebo, and Merodach (Mercury and Jupiter) spoken of by the prophets (Isa 46:1; Jer 1:2), while the Phoenician and Canaanite sun-god Baal is represented by pillars (of stone and wood? 2Ki 10:26-27), and Asherah, probably the same as Astarte, by wooden posts (groves in our version, passim). It seems not unlikely that in proportion to the pagan mind's separation of a divinity from the object out of which it grew, the tendency to represent it by images, and especially ‘after the figure of man “(Isa 44:13), would become more controlling, but to this there seem to be exceptions. As for the direct worship of other objects of nature, as trees and animals, especially snakes, there is no reason why this kind of worship should need images.  And here we come to the difficult inquiry whether the animal is a symbol or a fetich, that is, a tenement of a god; and we may doubt also whether in different parts of the world, as in Egypt and on this continent the same conceptions lay under this species of cultus. In Egypt the sacred bulls Apis and Mnevis were certainly regarded as incarnations; but may not symbol have preceded and given rise to this belief? The representations with which the Egyptian religion abounds of gods in a composite form, partly human, partly bestial, hawk— or jackal-headed, etc., show a symbolizing of particular qualities united to the expression of intelligence like that of man. But, on the other hand, the worship of animals elsewhere, the great number of sacred animals in Egypt, which it was a crime to kill, and the mummies of which were preserved, seem to point to a stage of worship in that strange country where the marvelous instincts and powers of animals pointed to a god within them all.

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

We have spoken of mixed human and animal forms, where the symbol was the main idea. The highest attainment of idol-worship is to represent the divinity under the form of man. God made man in his image; the pagan lover of beauty makes his god in man's image, a reversal of the true idea, and yet expressive of a relationship. The Greek, by his anthropomorphic representations of his divinities, employed the highest conceptions of beauty in the service of religion; and thus, while he laid the foundation of  the highest art, subjected himself to the condemnation, ‘“thou thoughtest that I was altogether such a one as thyself.”

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

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

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

Prayer, the natural voice of the being who realizes his dependence, might be informal in the family religion of the pagan, or attended with formalities;  it might need the presence of a priest, especially on certain important occasions of family life, or the head of the household might act as priest. In public religion a class of priests took the lead; it was felt that a certain form of words had a peculiar efficacy, and from this notion perhaps belief in incantations' derived its birth. In some religions the liturgical forms have been excessively minute and elaborate. We have already referred to the religion of Iran as an example of this. The Avesta is chiefly liturgical. The first part of the Yaçna, and a smaller collection, the Vispered, consist principally of praises, thanksgivings, and invitations addressed to various superior beings to be present at the offerings of the Haoma and at other celebrations. The Yeshts or Yasts, a part of the Khorda-Avesta (lesser Avesta), consist of prayers and praises addressed to particular objects of veneration, as to Mithras, Verethragna or Behram, and the souls of the good. In the early religion of India the three first Vedas are chiefly liturgical. The Rig-Veda contains about a thousand hymns in ten books, the first seven of which consist of hymns addressed to Agni, the fire-god, to Indra, and others. In the ninth book are classed hymns intended to be sung while the Soma offering is in preparation. The Sama-Veda takes most of its materials from the Rig, and adapts them to the purposes of chanting. The Yajur-Veda consists of formulas proper to accompany the various actions of religious worship, and belongs to a time when the worship had become complicated and the importance of the priest had increased. The Romans were in their early days a devout and reverential, but also a formal people.

The same adherence to legal precedent which built up their law appeared in the minute observances of their religion; formulas of words had a certain independent power; a breach of silence at prayer and sacrifice was ominous; the evocations addressed to the divinities of conquered towns that they would leave their old abodes were conceived to have the force of a charm; and they were afraid to let it be known what god was the especial guardian of Rome, lest their enemies should practice the same evocations against them. In India, also, prayer was thought of as having a magical power. The old invocation of the sun, called the Gayatri, is of such potency, it is said, that the Brahmin can obtain happiness by it whether he performs other religious services or not. The repeating of it in the morning dawn until the sun appears removes every unperceived fault of the night, and a similar repetition in the evening twilight is equally effectual (Wuttke, u. s. vol. 2, § 106, from Manu, 2, 87, 101, 102).  The offerings and sacrifices of a public nature were usually attended by lustrations, which are not to be confounded with purgations of a propitiatory character practiced by those who sought cleansing from guilt. Both kinds of lustrations, however, had the same moral idea, the necessity of a pure mind, for their foundation. In or near the Greek temples, and marking the division line between profane and sacred ground, stood the vessel of holy water (perirrhanterium), for the uses of those who entered the pure interior. After this preparation came the offerings with prayers and praises. In some nations there was a time when these offerings were only unbloody, or at least the bloody offerings or sacrifices played a small part. The institutions of Numa sanctioned only such things as the fruits of the field, and the mola salsa, or broken grains of spelt mixed with salt. Not even incense was then used by the simple Romans. The usages changed greatly in this particular at a later time, owing to the influence of the Greek settlements in Southern Italy. Among the Hindus horses and horned cattle were frequent victims in the earlier times, but afterwards became less common. In the books of the Avesta little or nothing is said of animal sacrifices, but it is prescribed that for certain offences (as a fine or an atonement?) a hundred smaller cattle should be offered up. But in Persian history, whether in accordance with or in violation of the precepts of the religion, mention is made of animal victims. Xerxes on his march towards Greece honored the Trojan Athena by sacrificing a thousand cows. At the Strymon the Magi offered up white horses, and at a spot in Thrace called the Nine Roads nine boys and nine girls from among the native inhabitants were buried alive. Strabo remarks that no pieces of the victim were given, as elsewhere, to the gods, since they had need only of the animal's soul. Instead of victims, the great offering in the Indian religion of the Vedic period was that of the Solma, an asclepias or some other plant of the milk- weed tribe, the stalk of which was crushed between stones, and the narcotic juice, mixed with butter, was left to ferment. This mixture was supposed to nourish, strengthen, and even intoxicate the gods. The most absurd superstitions were connected with this sacred substance: it was originally in heaven, and came down with the rain to the earth; it was something that a man might offer to the higher gods only, and could feel that he had rendered a favor by it, and had a right to a return. Finally the Soma became identified with the moon-god as the cause of fruitfulness. An offering called by a corresponding name in Iran, the Haoma, and obtained from the same or similar plants, played a great part in the services of the old religion of that country. Similar notions that the divine powers partook  of and enjoyed sacrifices which were offered to them may be found elsewhere in many religions, but probably none so extravagant.

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

Throughout a large part of the world human beings were offered as sacrifices to the gods of the heathen, and the farther back we penetrate into antiquity the more common is this horrid practice. There are two forms of it, the sacrifice of children, especially of the first-born, and that of grown- up men. The first appears in countries where the worship of Moloch- perhaps of Baal and other kindred gods-prevailed, as in Phoenicia, the land of Canaan, Moab, perhaps, and Carthage, and traces of the same may be found in the island of Crete. Also in some parts of this continent the same practice seems to have gained some footing. To this the prophet Micah (6, 7), the law of Moses (Lev 20:2-5), the historical books (2Ki 16:3; comp. Deu 12:31), and other parts of the Scriptures refer, unless in some of these passages simple lustration by fire without burning may be intended. But far more common was the sacrifice of grown-up men. As nations grew more humane, this practice was softened down; either men condemned to death, who had to die at any rate, were selected as the victims, or a person was scourged or cut only until the blood ran, or the rite was performed upon an image substituted for a human being. Such substitution call be traced in Egypt, Greece, and Rome. In India human sacrifices were introduced, when the obscene and cruel Siva religion spread among the people, into his worship and that of his wife Durga, or Kali. The Kalika-Purana is cited by Ward and others as saying that Kali “felt a pleasure for a month in the blood of fish offered to her; for  nine months in that of wild animals; for a hundred years in that of a tiger; and in that of a lion, a stag, or a man, for a thousand years. Three men's blood appease her for a hundred thousand years. The offering of blood is like the drink of the gods (the Soma); Brahma and all the gods assemble at the offering” (Ward, 3, 174; Wuttke, 2, 355; Asiat. Res. 5, 371). In other countries, as in Gaul, in Mexico, in Peru, above all in Mexico, this practice assumed frightful proportions, showing how man can be debased and made savage by his religion. There is ground for believing that cannibalism may have grown but of the sacrificial feasts after battle when an enemy was slaughtered to the gods who gave the victory.

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

But there were also propitiatory sacrifices required by a feeling of guilt and of dread. Here life is given for life. It seems impossible to put less meaning into such rites than that the worshipper acknowledged his life to be forfeited, and hoped by something which not only had value but was also a living object, to avert through confession made in this way the divine wrath. Human sacrifices were still more significant. In the case of children,  especially of the first-born, the supposition that the first fruits were consecrated and devoted, as an expression of gratitude, does not seem at all natural. It was, ‘in short, a sacrifice made for the benefit of the family, caused by a painful sense of ill desert; it was giving the fruit of the body for the sin of the soul. The more general sacrifices of human beings, especially of grown-up men, which took place most frequently where some great crime had been committed by persons unknown, or when pestilence or defeat by enemies betokened the wrath of protecting divinities, must be regarded as an acknowledgment of sin, and a way of transferring and appeasing divine anger. Wrath demanded or exposed to death. The death of one or more freed the rest. In the Greek myths, the self-devotion of an innocent virgin, like Macaria in the Heraclidae of Euripides, and in Roman history more clearly the act of the two Decii, father and son, their self- consecration, and in the case of the younger the devotion of the hostile army, point to a faith that victory might be secured by voluntary death for others. This is the highest form that human sacrifice took in heathen antiquity.

It remains to give the briefest possible estimate of the heathen religions in their influences on man. With regard to their lower forms, as seen in wild races, they are to a great extent religions of fear; dread of superior powers weighs on the minds even of light-hearted African Negroes. A feeling of sin, and yet a very faint and half-conscious one, must be presupposed in their minds in order that this dread may exist; but the dread is greatly increased by magic practices which are kept up by priestly imposture. In the higher races it would be folly to deny that in the course of time, and partly by the help of moral sentiments which must grow up in well-ordered civil communities, the religions of paganism have been elevated in their moral tone; that under them men have more or less risen into art, freedom, philosophy; that great individual characters have appeared in such countries, and that tolerably high standards of moral excellence have counteracted depraving influences from bad religions or bad institutions. But there are some necessary evils in polytheism, owing to its very nature. They honor power rather than character, since it was divine power in objects of nature that impressed itself chiefly on the minds of men. Hence absolutism and ambition were under the protection of the religious sentiment. He was the worship of beings of limited attributes, more or less under the control of fate, who were for the most part not from eternity— not authors of the world, but parts of the world, local in their spheres of  operation and functions. There could therefore be no universal religion. Buddhism spread because it was an atheism which abolished caste and limited transmigration, and which allowed the cultus in the countries where it traveled to continue. There was, further, a want of allegiance on the part of the worshipper to his divinity; even ridicule of them in the comic mimes of the Greeks was allowed, and sometimes the people treated the idols with great indignity. These religions could not resist any increase of knowledge, but gave way to skepticism, and this brought on national ruin. But the heaviest charge almost everywhere against paganism was its sensuality, not in the lower races only, but in the higher; not so much in earlier times as at the acme of refinement. The mythologies were impure. The gods were depraved, and examples of wickedness. Licentiousness was put under the protection of religion. On this point a long chapter might be written; but it is better to pass over this in silence, and to close with saying that the Apostle to the Gentiles was no maligner when he wrote the first chapter of the Epistle to the Romans.

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

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

2. Explanations of Mythology. —

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

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

3. General Pragmatical Treatises on Heathen Religions or Mythologies. — Banier (Paris, 1710-1738) and Jacob Bryant, now forgotten; Creuzer, Symbolik ( st ed. 18191821, 4 vols.), with Mone's Heidenith. d. nördl.  Europas (Leips. und Darmstadt, 1822, 1823, 2 vols.); Meiners, Allgemeine Gesch. d. Religionen (Hanover, 1806, 1807, 2 vols.); Stuhr, Relig. Systeme des Orients (Berlin, 18351838, 2 vols.); Schwenk, Mythologie (Frankf.-on-the Main, 1843-1853, 7 vols.); Eckermann, Lehrb. der Religionsgesch. u. Mythologie (Halle, 1848, 1849, 4 vols.).

4. The Ancient Mythiographers. —

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

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

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

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

7. Egyptian Mythology. — Jabloliski's Pantheon Egypt. (Frankf. — on- the- Oder, 1750-1752); Lepsius, Ueber d. ersten aqJyp. Gotterkreis (in the “Trans. of the Berlin Acad.” 1851); also his Todtenbuch (Leips. 1842); Bunsen, Aegypten's Stelle, etc. (in Germ. and Engl.; bk. 1 esp. treats of the religion); Duncker, Gesch. des Alterth. (1st ed. Berl. 1852; vol. 1 treats of  Egypt; four editions have appeared); Roth, Gesch. der abendländ. Philos. (in vol. 1. Mannheim, 1862); also works of Wilkinson and others on Egyptian antiq., Brugsch. etc.

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

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

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

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

12. Northern European and Asiatic Religions. —

(a.) Celtic: Davies, Myth. of the Druids (Lond. 1809); Mone and Eckermann (ut sup.).

(b.) German: J. Grimm, Deutsche Mythol. (lst ed. Göttingen, 1835); transl. of the Edda; Anderson, Northern Mythol. (Chicago, 1874).

(c.) Slavic: Mone, Ackerman, Schwenk (ut sup.).

(d.) Finnish: Castren, Vorlesungen über d. fn. Mythol.

13. Religions of Lower Races. — Waitz, Anthrop. (Leips. 1859-1872, 6 vols., the last by Garland); Tyler's Primitive Culture (Lond. 1871, 2 vols.); J.G. Miller, Amer. Urrelig. (Basle, 1867); Brinton, Myths of the New World; Wuttke (ut sup. in vol. 1); Meiners (ut sup.); Des Brosses, Dieux Fetiches; Schultze, Fetischisnmus (Leips. 1871); Morgan, Anc. Society (N. Y. 1877); accounts by Schoolcraft, Catlin, and earlier writers on the Amer. Indians; Galitzin's transl. of Wrangell, Le Nord et la Siberie: histories of Mexico and Peru; travelers in Africa: Ellis's Polynesia, etc. In Waitz copious lists of voyagers and travelers are given. (T. D. W.)

## Pomarancio[[@Headword:Pomarancio]]

             is the surname of CRISTOFORO RONCALIT, a painter of the Florentine school. He was born in 1552 at Pomarancio, and was a pupil of Niecolo Circignani, who took him to Rome quite young to assist him in his works. At the same time, under the direction of Ignazio Danti, he helped, with Tempesti, Rafatllino da Reggio, the younger Palma, and some others, in finishing the logge of Raffaelle. This work being achieved, he painted, on slate, for Santa Maria degli Angeli at Rome, a Death of Ananias and Sapphira, a masterpiece that was deemed worthy to be copied on mosaic for the basilica of St. Peter. After painting at San Giovanni di Latrano The Baptism of Constantine, at San Giacomo The Resurrection of Christ, at San Gregorio a St. Andrew, one of his best works, he was selected to paint the cupola of the church of Loretto, getting the preference of Guido and Caravaggio. The latter avenged himself by having his rival's face disfigured by a spadassin. The cupola of Loretto, in the ornamentation of which Roncalli was assisted by Jaconetti, Pietro Lombardo, and Lorenzo Garbieri, offers a great variety and abundance of subjects. Although these paintings have suffered much, some heads of uncommon beauty are still discernible.

Some subjects from the life of the Virgin, executed by Pomarancio, were the occasion of his being made a knight of the Order of Christ by Paul V. He worked in divers other places of the Picentino: there is a Noli me tangere at the Ermitani of San Severino; a St. Francis in Prayers, at San Agostino of Ancona; a St. Palatia at Osimo; and at the Palazzo Galli of the same place is a Judgment of Solomon, which Lanzi asserts to be his best fresco. During a rather protracted stay at Genoa, he embellished its churches and palaces with works fit to compete with the best of the century. We mention further among his paintings The Martyrdom of St. Simon, at the Pinacothek of Munich, and a Virgin shedding Tears over the Body of her Son, at the Museum of Madrid. His  manner is very variable, and reminds now of the Roman, now of the Florentine school; sometimes it comes near to the Venetian school. His colors are brighter and more brilliant in his frescos than in his oil-paintings. He likes to adorn his subjects with beautiful landscapes of great effect. Unfortunately, following the example of his masters. he was too often assisted by his pupils; hence some weak parts in his works. He is charged also with some errors of perspective. He died at Rome in 1626. See Lanzi, Hist. of Painters (see Index); Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v. Roncalli.

## Pomarancio (2)[[@Headword:Pomarancio (2)]]

             is also a surname by which NICCOLO CIRCIGNANI is generally known. He was a painter of the Florentine school of the 16th century, and was born at Pomarancio, near Volterra. He was probably a disciple of Titian, whose assistant he was in his works in the great room of the Belvedere, in the Vatican. He arrived at Rome quite young, and painted there a number of frescos, among which we mention the cupola of St. Pudentiana, The Lord surrounded by Angels (tribune of S. Giovanni Paolo), St. John the Baptist (church of the Consolazione), and thirty-two horrible Scenes of Martyrdom (San Stefano Rotondo), vigorous, but executed with little care. It is probable that Pomarancio spent the last years of his life in his native place, where he died after 1591; for the works which must be referred to his last period are all among numerous paintings of his preserved in Volterra. At S. Giusto a Descent from the Cross is signed “Nicolaus Circinianus di Ripomarance pingebat A.D. 1580;” and at the Battisterio, on an Ascension, one of his best works, we read, “Nicolaus de Circignanis Volaterranus pingebat anno 1591.” In the cathedral of the same city there remains of the frescos with which he had adorned the tribune a God- Father; at St. Pietro, in Selci, an Annunciation (oil-painting), and at San Francesco a Pieta. Pomarancio was frequently aided by his pupils, the best known of whom are Cristoforo Roncalli, called also Pomarancio, and his own son, Antonio Circignani, who remained in obscurity during his father's lifetime, and came suddenly into repute by the paintings with which he adorned a chapel of Santa Maria Traspontina at Rome: they exhibit some features successfully borrowed from Baroccio. At Florence, under the portico of the hospital of S. Matteo, he painted some frescos in 1614: The Disputation with the Doctors; The Massacre of the Innocents; The Adoration of the Kings; and The Nativity. Called at a mature age to Citta di Castello, Antonio lived there several years, painting for churches and  private persons. It is believed that at the age of sixty years he settled again in the village of Pomarancio, the cradle of his family, where he died in 1630. See Lanzi, Hist. of the Painters; Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v.

## Pomarius, Samuel Baumgarten[[@Headword:Pomarius, Samuel Baumgarten]]

             a German Lutheran divine, was born April 26, 1624, near Wintzig, in Silesia. His father, a miller, was opposed to his predilection for study, and he had many obstacles to surmount before he could get through his course of studies at the college. He pursued his studies at Breslau, Frankfort, and Wittenberg. On Jan. 1, 1653, he was called to Beshin, in Silesia, but soon went to that portion of Berlin then known as Cologne-on-the-Spree as deacon of St. Peter's, and from thence to Magdeburg as pastor of St. Jacobi. In 1665 he was made rector and professor of theology at Eperies, in Upper Hutngaria. On account of the persecution against the evangelical party, he had to leave that position in 1673, and went to Wittenberg, where he lectured on theology, preaching at the same time. In 1674 he went as pastor and superintendent to Lubeck, where he died, March 2, 1683. Almost all the writings of Pomarius are of a polemical nature, and intended to defend the Lutheran tenets. He was engaged in many theological disputes with Jesuits, and even with Protestant theologians. We mention among his works, De A Noctambulis (Wittenberg, 1649, 1650, 4to): — De moderatione theologiae (ibid. 1674, 4to): — Dissertatio de vetitate religionis Lutherane: — Comment. in epistolam Judae: — Analysin et exegesisn articulorum Aug. Confessionis: -De majestate S. Scripture, etc. See Jocher, Gelehrten-Lexicon, s.v.; Chaufepie, Dict. Histor s.v.; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirch. — Lexikon, s.v. (B. P.)

## Pome[[@Headword:Pome]]

             (Lat. pomum, i.e. an apple) is in ecclesiastic language

(1) a cup or ball filled with perfumes;

(2) a ball of metal filled with hot water, and used by the priest to warm his hands at the altar. It was sometimes made four-footed and with rings of silver.

## Pomegranate[[@Headword:Pomegranate]]

             the Punica granatum of Linneus, is by universal consent acknowledged to denote the Heb. rimmô (רמּוֹן, also רַמֹּן, so called, according to Gesenius, from an Arab. root signifying marrow; but according to Furst, from one signifying blood-red; Sept. ῥοά, ῥοιά, ῥοϊvσκος, κώδων; Vulg. malum punicum, matluen granatum, malogranatum), a word which occurs frequently in the O.T., and is used to designate either the pomegranate-tree or its fruit. It is described in the works of the Arabs by the name roman. The pomegranate is a native of Asia; and we may trace it from Syria, through Persia, even to the mountains of Northern India. It is common in Northern Africa. The pomegranate is not likely to have been a native of Egypt; it must, however, have been cultivated there at a very early period, as the Israelites, when in the desert lamented the loss of its fruit in the wilderness of Zin (Num 20:5)-this “is no place of figs, or of vines, or of pomegranates.” The tree, with its characteristic calyx-crowned fruit, is easily recognized on the Egyptian sculptures (Wilkinson, Anc. Egyptians, 1, 36, ed. 1854). That it was produced in Palestine during the same early ages is evident from the spies bringing some back when sent into Canaan to see what kind of a land it was; for we are told that they “came unto the brook of Eshcol, and cut down from thence a branch with one cluster of grapes, etc., and they brought of the pomegranates and of the figs” (Numbers 13:53; comp. also Deu 8:8). The villages or towns of Rimmon (Jos 15:32), Gath-rimmon (Jos 21:25), En-rimmon (Neh 11:29), possibly derived their names from pomegranate-trees which grew in their vicinity. These trees suffered occasionally from the devastations of locusts (Joe 1:12; see also Hag 2:19). Mention is made of “an orchard of pomegranates” in Son 4:13; and in Son 4:3 the cheeks (A.V. “temples”) of the Beloved are compared to a section of “pomegranate within the locks,” in allusion to the beautiful rosy color of the fruit. Carved figures of the pomegranate adorned the tops of the pillars in Solomon's Temple (1Ki 7:18; 1Ki 7:20; 1Ki 7:42; 2Ki 25:17; 2 Chronicles 3, 16; 2Ch 4:13); and worked representations of this fruit, in blue, purple, and scarlet, ornamented the hem of the robe of the ephod (Exo 28:33-34; Exo 39:24). This is explained mystically by Philo (Opera, 2, 153, 226), and differently by Meyer (Blotter Johere Wahrheit, 10, 85; see also Bahr,  Symbolik, 2, 123 sq.). The pomegranate seems also to have been used as a holy symbol in heathen religions (see Baihr, Symbol. 2, 122).

Among the later Jews the pomegranate was used in some cases as a measure (Mishna, Chelim, 17, 1, 4). Mention is made of “spiced wine of the juice of the pomegranate” in Son 8:2; with this may be compared the pomegranate-wine (ῥοϊvτης οινος) of which Dioscorides (5, 44) speaks, and which is still used in the East. Chardin says that great quantities of it were made in Persia, both for home consumption and for exportation, in his time (Script. Herb. p. 399; Harmer, Obs. 1, 377). Being common in Syria and Persia, it must have early attracted the attention of Eastern nations. In the present day it is highly valued, and travelers describe the pomegranate as being delicious throughout Persia. The late Sir A. Burnes states that the famous pomegranates without seeds are grown in gardens under the snowy hills, near the river Cabul. It is still found in Palestine (Scholz, Reis. p. 140), Arabia (Niebuhr, Beschr. p. 148), Egypt (Pococke, East. 1, 319), East and West Indies, and also in the southern countries of Europe (comp. Ritter, Erdkünde, 11, 549 sq.). The pomegranate was well known to the Greeks, being the ῥοά of Theophrastus and of Dioscorides (1, 151). It was employed as a medicine by Hippocrates, and is mentioned by Homer under the name side, supposed to be of Phoenician origin; Baeot. σίδη (Athen. 14:650), and called by Pliny Punica arbor (13, 38). The Romans gave it the name of Punica because the tree was introduced from Carthage; its English name is derived from the pomum granatum (“grained apple”) of the Romans. Various parts of the plant were employed medicinally. as, for instance, the root, or rather its bark, the flowers which are called κύτινος by Dioscorides, and the double flowers βαλαύστιον; also the rind of the pericarp, called malicorium by the Romans, and σίδιον by Dioscorides.

Some of the properties which these plants possess make them useful both as drugs and as medicines. In a natural state it is but a bush, eight or ten feet high, with a straight stem and a large number of branches, a red bark, lance-formed leaves of a bright-green color, each on its own stem; and bears flowers which stand separate, star-shaped, and without odor, of a deep-red color, and producing a round fruit, green and partly red on the surface, but yellow within (comp. Son 4:3, and Celsius, 1, 275. The Romans called this fruit malum punicum, the Punic apple, but sometimes also malum granatum, Plin. 13:34; 16:36; Marcell. Med. c. 27). It is of the shape and size of an orange, three or four inches in diameter, divided into longitudinal apartments, in which the grains lie as compactly as corn on the cob, and look much like a pale-red Indian  corn. save that they are nearly transparent. They ripen about the middle of October, and remain in good condition all winter (Thomson, Land and Book, 2, 392; but in August, according to Russell, Nat. Hist. of Aleppo, 1, 107). They are uncommonly fleshy, juicy, and sweet to the taste (Pliny, 13:34), and are much enjoyed by the Orientals as a refreshment (Carne, 1. 8). The rind isused in the manufacture of morocco leather, and, together with the bark, is sometimes used medicinally to expel the tape-worm. Russell (Nat. Hist. of Aleppo, 1, 85, 2d ed.) states that “lemons have by no means superseded the pomegranate; the latter is more easily procured through the winter, and is often in cooking' preferred to the lemon. The tree is much cultivated in the gardens and orchards of Palestine and Northern Syria. The fruit is seldom ripe earlier than the end of August, w- hen most families lay in a stock for winter consumption. There are three varieties of the fruit-one sweet. another very acid, and a third, in which both qualities are agreeably blended. The juice of the sour fruit is often used instead of vinegar. The others are cut open when served up to table; or the grains, taken out and besprinkled with sugar or rose water, are brought to table in saucers. ‘he grains likewise, fresh as well as dried, make a considerable ingredient in cookery.” He adds that the trees are apt to suffer much in severe winters from extraordinary cold. See Celsius, Hielobot. 1, 271 sq.; Oken, Lehrbtuch der Botmaik, II, 2, 917 sq.; Geiger, Pharmaceutische Botanik, 2. 1417 sq.; Plenk, P-'lantt. Med. Tüb. p. 376; Layard, Nineveh, 2, 233.

## Pomerania[[@Headword:Pomerania]]

             a province of Prussia, situated in the north-east, and bordering on the Baltic, was once the possession of the Slaves and Swedes, and has such a peculiar ecclesiastical record that we here take space to detail it. In the 6th century some Slavic tribes settled in Northern Germany, and called the coast along the Baltic Sea Pomoze, i.e. on the sea-coast. The foremost deities of this Wendish people were Belbog, Czernibog, Radogost, Swantewit. Herovit. Gerovit, and Triglav.

I. Introduction of Christianity. — About the year 1000 the bishopric of Colberg was founded as a dependence of the archbishopric of Gnesen, and Reinbern appointed bishop; but Reinbern having gone to Kief to attend the celebration of the nuptials of the daughter of Boleslaus with the son of the czar Wladimir, and stopping at the Russian court, this commencement proved fruitless. The attempt of Bernhard, a Spanish monk, to introduce  Christianity, which was made a century afterwards, was equally unsuccessful. But Boleslaus Krzvvousti, king of Poland, having subjected to his rule part of Pomerania and wishing to make Christians of his new subjects, desired Otto, bishop of Bamberg, to bring those heathens the light of the Gospel. Otto, having obtained the agreement of pope Calixtus II, set on his way, April 19, 1124, over Prague, Breslau, Posen, and Gnesel, where he stopped seven days and celebrated Whitsuntide. Wratislav, the Pomeranian chief, who, as a boy, had been christened at Merseburg, came to meet the apostle, and gave him two of his warriors to guide him to Pvritz. In this place the pagans were engaged in the celebration of one of their feasts. Otto preached to the 4000 men assembled at that solemnity, and a week had scarcely elapsed, during which lie and his associates were busy instructing the daily increasing crowd in the Christian doctrines, when the bishop prescribed a three days' fasting, after which more than 7000 heathens were admitted to baptism. After erecting an altar, and leaving one of his priests, Otto went via Stargard to Kammin, the residence of the prince.

The wife of the latter received the apostle with great joy. He stopped fifty days, converted 3585 persons, laid the foundation of a church, and left a priest, for whose maintenance the prince had granted some lands. Julin, afterwards called Wollin, mostly inhabited by pirates, was not so favorably disposed towards the new religion; but, after more or less persecution, the Christians were permitted to leave the town unscathed and cross the Divenow. Here Otto, after resting a few days, entered upon negotiations with the inhabitants: but all he could obtain from the chiefs of the city was that they would direct themselves by the example of Stettin, the oldest and noblest city of Pomerania. Thither Otto repaired, crossing the Haff, in company with Redamir, a citizen of Julin, and his son. The Stettinians at first turned a deaf ear to Otto's exhortations. Twice a week, on the market-days, he proceeded to the market place with his eighteen priests in sacerdotal ornaments, and preached before the multitude. The people from the country listened to his words less reluctantly than the denizens of the city; yet, after two months had thus elapsed, the latter declared that they would accept baptism, if Poland would consent to diminish the tribute, to grant to the country a permanent peace, and to draw up a deed of the transaction. The bishop, whose meek ways, friendly behavior, and works of charity had won every heart, obtained those concessions from the Poles, and on Oct. 25 he christened both sons of the prominent citizen Domizlav, the father soon afterwards; then five hundred relations and other connections of that powerful family an example which  considerably influenced the people generally.

The four temples of the city were destroyed, and Otto sent to the pope the three heads of the idol Triglay. After establishing two churches, one in honor of St. Adalbert-the patron saint of the Slaves-the other under the name of Peter and Paul, Otto, leaving two of his priests in the city, visited the towns of Garz and Lubezin, left a priest in each, and repaired to Julin, where the intelligence of Stettin's conversion had already been received. The inhabitants came to meet him on his way, and begged his pardon for their former conduct. Otto consecrated two altars in the city, interdicted the burying of the dead in forests, prohibited piracy, the intercourse with idolators, polygamy, and the inveterate custom of killing newborn girls when there were some girls already in the family. In the ensuing winter Otto, passing through Dodona (now Dodow), where he laid the foundations of two churches, went to Colberg and Belgard, the inhabitants of which did not prove open to his teachings. Hence he returned to Pyritz, Stettin, and Julin where he confirmed the proselytes, inaugurated the building of churches, and then journeyed over Dodona and Belgard to Colberg, where he buried the deacon Hermann, drowned in the Persante. On Ash Wednesday he set on his way homewards, having converted 22,166 persons and founded eleven churches; he traveled through Poland, Silesia, and Bohemia, and arrived at Bamberg on the Saturday before Easter, March 29. Epidemics and great mortality having afflicted Stettin, the idolators pointed at those plagues as being the punition visited by the gods upon the apostates. This caused a general relapse, and made Otto sensible of the necessity of interfering in person, and of converting the cities of Demmin, Götzkow, Usedom, and Wolgast, still left to idolatry. He set out April 19, 1128, crossed Saxony and Mecklenburg, carrying on fifty wagons the articles required for fitting out the churches. June 10 Wratislav assembled at Usedom the nobles of the left bank of the Oder: they were baptized, and promised to protect the Christian faith in their dominions. Otto longed to gain also to Christianity the inhabitants of the island of Rügen, but insuperable obstacles lay in his way.

In Stettin, where a very few had remained faithful, Otto was threatened with death; he at once repaired to the church of Paul and Peter, and while the song of hymns filled the vaults of the church, the sound of arms was heard outside. The crowd calmed down by and by, and dispersed; a sermon in the market-place, whither the clergy repaired in procession under the protection of Wirtska, retrieved the strayed flock. Julin followed again the example of Stettin. The saint now visited again all the places of Pomerania where he had worked, and, journeying through Poland, reached  Bamberg Dec. 20. Though he did not again see the country he had converted, he watched from afar over these young Christian communities to the time of his death, which occurred June 30, 1139. The conversion of Pomerania, and its accession to the German empire in 1181, induced a number of monks and colonists to immigrate to the country of the Wends, depopulated by long wars. Wratislav, the first Christian prince, was in 1134 murdered by a heathen at Stolpe, near Anelam. On the spot where the deed had been committed a little church was built, and in 1153 the first monastery was founded there, and occupied by Benedictines from Berg, near Magdeburg. We mention some other notable monasteries: Kolbatz, 1163; Belbuck, 1170; Eldena, 1207; Brukow and Neucamp, 1231; Hiddensee, 1299; Pudagla, 1308; all of which stood under “abbates baculati.” The following places of pilgrimage were distinguished:

1. The Gollenberg, near Coslin, celebrated throughout Europe, with a church consecrated to the Virgin, the spire of which served as a light- house;

2. The Revekohl, near Schmolsin (circle of Stolpe), a mountain on which a church had been founded in honor of St. Nicholas, the patron of mariners;

3. The Holy Mountain, south of the city of Pollnow, from 1290;

4. Bernstein;

5. Wusseken, near Coslin, from 1395;

6. Kenz, near Barth, from 1405;

7. Werben, from 1474. While the largest part of the duchy of Pomerania, with part of the Ukermark, the Neumark, and of what is now called Western Prussia, was a dependency of the bishopric of Kammin, the western part of the country belonged to the diocese of Schwerin, and the island of Rügen, connected with Pomerania in 1325, resorted to the Danish bishopric of Roskilde.

The names of the bishops of Kammin are as follows:

1. Adalbert, a Franconian (1128-1162), resided at Julin.

2. Conrad (1162-1185). The seat of the bishops was transferred to Kammin, because Julin was destroyed by the Danes in 1175.

3. Siegfried (1186-1202). Under his administration there was a considerable immigration of Germans, who founded a number of cities. Jacob Beringer, a knight from Bamberg, who settled in Stettin, built in 1187 for the Germans the church of St. Jacob, with 30 altars.

4. Sigwin (1202-1217) preached himself. While he was bishop Stralsund was built, in 1209; and in 1214 the Templars arrived in Pomerania, and, owing to the great esteem they enjoyed, became counselors of the government. In November, 1216, Christian, the apostle and bishop of Prussia, visited Pomerania, his native country, and dwelt a few days with the old, sickly Sigwin at Kammin. Duke Casimir, in company with a number of Templars, undertook a pilgrimage to the Holy Sepulcher, where he died, in 1217.

5. Conrad II (1218-1238). Anastasia, the pious widow of Bogislav I, founded in 1223 the nunnery of the Virgins at Treptow, endowed it, and was buried in it.

6. Conrad III, count of Guitzkow (1233-1248). The abbot of Eldena, Wigard, founded in 1233 the city of Greifswalde. In 1240 Franciscans settled at Stettin, and in 1244 a nunnery was founded in the same city.

7. Dr. Wilhelm, resigned in the following year. Under his administration the nunnery of Marienfliess was built by Wratislav III, whose daughter Barbara was the first abbess.

8. Hermann, count of Gleichen (1249-1288), a relation of the margraves of Brandenburg, promoted German civilization, and preserved a predilection for Brandenburg. In 1263 a chapter composed of twelve canons was erected in the church of St. Mary at Stettin, and confirmed by Urban IV. In 1270 was founded the nunnery of Mary at Coslin, and in 1277 Barnim presented the diocese of Kammin with the town of Colberg.

9. Jarimar, prince of Rügen (1288-1296), directed the worldly business, while the Dominican Dr. Petrus administered the ecclesiastical affairs as a vicar, until 1299.

10. Henry of Wachholt (1299-1317), a Saxon, founded six archdeaconries (1303) at Kammin, Stargard, Stettin, Demmin, Usedom, and Stolpe. The possessions of the suppressed Templars were given to the Joannites; the latter had their house first at Rrike, and in 1382 at Wildenbruck. In 1313 Wratislav IV presented the Augustines with his mansion at Anelam.

11. Conrad IV (1317-1322) was a learned and eloquent prelate, zealous defender of the independence of his see, and a faithful ally to the dukes in agitated times.

12. He was succeeded until 1329 by Dr. Wilhelm.

13. Frederick, count of Eichstüdt (1329-1343), assisted the dukes in their wars, and was entrusted with diplomatic negotiations.

14. John, duke of Saxe-Lauenburg, grandson of Wratislav IV (1343-1370). In 1346 the collegiate church of St. Otto, with a deacon and twelve canons, was founded near the castle of Stettin. In 1350 the pest swept away two thirds of the inhabitants of the country; troops of Flagellants walked through the land. In 1360 the Carthusian monastery of Stettin was founded. The bishop held a synod; and in 1363, when Charles IV, emperor of Germany, married Elizabeth, the daughter of Bogislav V, he appeared at court at Cracow.

15. Philip Lumbach (1370-1386), an active pastor. After his death Wenceslas (although expelled from the empire) invested his chancellor with the episcopal dignity.

16. John, canon of Lebus.

17. Bogislav VIII administered the diocese for a short time.

18. John of Oppeln changed sees with the bishop of Kulm, Nicolas Buck (1398-1410).

19. Magnus, duke of Lower Saxe Lauenburg, a son of Eric (1410-1422), was at the Council of Constance. He was called to the see of Hildesheim, and is buried in the cathedral of that city.

20. Siegfried Buck, from Stolpe (1422-1446), accompanied, in 1423, king Eric of Denmark, Norway, and Sweden on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, and went in 1433 to the Council of Basle. He held a synod, in which he interdicted the game of dice and the sport to his clergy. In 1438 the Hussites, attracted by Bogislav IX, penetrated as far as Stettin, and plundered Kolbatz. In 1440 the Putzkaller sect arose near Barth, and subsisted during thirty years.

21. Henning Jven, a very benevolent prelate, was greatly beloved for his Christian indulgence. He used to say, “Aut sumus, aut fuimus, aut  possumus esse quod hic est.” In 1450 Barnim VIII undertook a pilgrimage to Rome with his wife, at the occasion of the jubilee. In 1454, on the Sunday Judica, the bishop held a synodi at Gilzow: the resolutions have been preserved. On Oct. 17, 1456, he inaugurated, in common with bishop Albert of Sydow, the Academy of Greifsevalde, and was appointed its chancellor and conservator.

22. Lewis, count of Eberstein, who resigned in 1480.

23. The Italian, Marino di Fregeno, till 1482. The see of Kammin remained vacant for five years, Vrolinus Westfal being administrator.

24. Benedict. Bohemian baron of Waldstein, canon at Olmiitz (14861499). Encouraged by him, Andrew, abbot of Michaelsberg at Bamberg, wrote in 1487 the life of St. Otto in Latin. In October, 1492, a synod met at Stargard.

25. Martin Carith, from Colberg, archdeacon at Arenswalde (1499-1521), resided at Cislin; accompanied, in 14961498, Bogislav X to the Holy Land; held Oct. 5, 1500, a synod in the church of St. Mary at Stettin; and ordered the synodal statutes and the Breviary to be printed, 1505. He died Nov. 26, 1521, at Stettin.

26. Erasmus of Manteufel, the last Catholic bishop of Kammin, lied in his mansion at Bast, Jan. 27, 1544.

II. Introduction of Protestantism. — The duke Barnim who had studied at Wittenberg during the first effervescence of the Reformation (1518-1520), and who had even been chosen rector of the university, took in hand the reins of government, together with his elder brother George, in 1523, and favored Protestantism. George, whose sympathies remained with the old Church, died early, and his son Philip followed his uncle's example. A number of preachers traveled through Pomerania, urging on the people the necessity of returning to the purity of Christ's Church. Among these apostles of the new creed were: Paul of Rhoda, from Mansfeld, who stopped at Stettin; John Amandus, who exerted himself strenuously at Königsberg, Stolpe, Stettin, and finally went to Goslar; Nicolas Klein, at Colberg and Cislin; Paul Klotze, at Marienthron; John Kniepstrow, at Stargard, Stettin, Greifswalde, and Stralsund; Peter Swawe, at Greifswalde; John Bugenhagen, Christian Kettelhodt, and John Kiureke, at Stralsund. At the time of the wars of the peasants, Pomerania was not  exempt from civil and ecclesiastical troubles, and bloody riots took place, especially at Stettin and Stralsumnd. The bishop Erasmus von Manteufel invited his clergy to assemble at Stargard Aug. 20, 1525, in order to deliberate on the measures by which the progress of the Reformation could be stopped. The princes, to accomplish the ecclesiastical revolution, convoked a diet at Treptow Dec. 13, 1534, and invited the chapters thereto, with the threatening remark that, whether they attended or not, the resolutions should be law for them in any case. The bishop, the abbots, prelates, and a considerable part of the nobility, protested against the resolutions of the diet, and retired before its close. The remainder of the assembly declared for the Reformation. Bugenhagen composed a liturgy, and Erasmus was offered, if he would submit to the decision of the diet, to remain the chief of the new Church, and to preserve his dignity and the possessions connected with it; but he declined. Only a tenth of the monasteries was spared: the nunneries of Marienfliess, Stolpe, Bergen, Kammin, and Colberg-and these also had to undergo great modifications.

Almost all the monks left the country. Care was taken, however, of those whom old age kept back; the younger monks were sent to Wittenberg, to study there at public expense, and those who were willing to marry were similarly assisted. After Erasmus's death, the two dukes could not at first agree on the choice of his successor. At last Bartholomew Swawe, Barnim's chancellor, united both suffrages. He was ordained, and invested in 1545 by three superintendents, in the presence of seven ministers; but part of the clergy, objecting to his being a married man, complained at the court of Charles V, and obtained in 1548 a decree of suspension. Bartholomew in this distress sent a prelate, Martin Weiher, to pope Paul III, in order to obtain the papal confirmation. The bishop's legate came back with letters from the apostolic legate and from the emperor, by which the chapter was empowered to elect Martin himself. Weiher was elected, and Julius III confirmed his election by a brief of Oct. 13,1551. But Oct. 24,1552, he was inaugurated again, this time according to the Protestant rite. After Martin's death, the princes, to avoid the difficulties resulting from further elections, determined to establish in the episcopal see only members of the ducal house. This noble family (it was five centuries old) was condemned to early extinction: in a period of a few years six princes died without posterity. Bogislav XIV, the last of them, by his alliance with Gustavus Adolphus, who succeeded in making himself the master of Pomerania, had so exhausted all his resources that his funeral ceremonies could be celebrated only seventeen years after his death, which occurred in  1637. His nephew, son of his sister, Ernst Bogislav, duke of Croy, had sold the bishopric of Kammin to Frederick William, elector of Brandenburg (1650). But, if we except the episcopal election, everything remained unchanged. See Milman, Mitslav, or the Conversion of Pomerania (1854). The history of Pomerania after this time is clearly Protestant, and will be treated in the art. PRUSSIA SEE PRUSSIA (q.v.).

## Pomeranus[[@Headword:Pomeranus]]

             SEE BUGENHAGEN.

## Pomerius, Julianus[[@Headword:Pomerius, Julianus]]

             a noted Spanish prelate, flourished in the latter part of the 7th century as archbishop of Toledo, about A.D. 680-690, while Spain was still under the dominion of the Goths, before the Saracen invasion. That he was of Jewish extraction may be seen from what Mariana (6, 18) says of him: “Brat Julianus eruditionis laude ea aetate celebris, lut ejus libri testantur. Fuit ex Judaeorum sanguine prognatus, Eugenii tertii discipulus, Quirini Toletani Praesulis successor, ingenis facili, copioso, suavi, probitatis opinione singulari.” Great praise is awarded to him by the historians of that period, especially for his writings and labors as a bishop. He took part in the great monothelite disputes of his time concerning the twofold will of Christ-a question on which this bishop, or rather the Council of Toledo, at which he presided, declared quite independently of the bishop of Rome: “Nebis (Julian disputatio) aliquanto liberior visa est, quam tit Juliani modestiam erga Romanum pontificem summe Ecclesiae rectorem, deceret.” Without going any further into details concerning this theological dispute, we shall only speak of' Pomerius's writings concerning Jews and Judaism. At the instigation of king Ervigius, he wrote a work, which he dedicated to the king, entitled De Sexta Etatis comprobatione adversus Judecos, reprinted in the Bibl. Maxim. Patrum, vol. 12. His aim was to demonstrate that the Messiah must have already come, although the Jews claimed that the Messiah was to come 6000 years after the creation of the world; on the other hand, he wished to strengthen the Christians in their faith, for said he in his modesty, “Ut si non corrigatur Jumldeus, saltem proficiat Christianus.” Besides this work, he left as the fruit of his labors, Responsionum liber in Defensionem Canounum et Legum, quibus prohibentur Christiana mancipia infidelibus deserire: — Prognosficorum fJtturi sceculi (Leips. 1535) lib. 3: — Historia Wanbe Regis Toletani de  expeditione et victoria, qua rebellanten contra se Galliae Provincinam celebri triuanpho pedomauit: — De Anima (which reminds us of a work by Nemesius): — le Contenptu mundii ac rerum transiturarum De Vitiis et Virtutibus: — De Virginibs instituend, etc. See Sacsoruma Concilio Lutum noca et aniplissima collecio, ed. Mansi (Ven. et Flor. 1759), 12:9; Andr. Duchesne, Rerun Gallicarutin et Francicarum Scriptores (Par. 1739), 2, 707 sq.; Antonii Bibl. Hist. Vetus, 2, 303; Ferrara, Hist. of Spain (Germ. transl.), 2, 453, etc.; Gritz, Gesch. d. Juden. 5, 140-146; the same, Die westgothische Gesetzgebung in Betreff d. Juden (Bresl. 1858), p. 14 sq,; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 12:51; Jocher, Allqemeines Gelehrten-Lex. s.v.; Da Costa, Israel (and the Gentiles, p. 309 sq.; Basnage, Hist. des Juifs (Engl. transl. by Taylor), p. 582; Kalkar, Israel und die Kirche, p. 19 sq.; Fürst,. Bibl. Jud. 3, 111; Pick, in the Evangelical Review, July, 1876, p. 359; Gennadius, De Viris illustribus, c. 98; Fabricius, Bibl. mzecl. et ilfiun. Latinit. v. Julianus Pomerius; Tillemont, Me1lmuoirees, 16, 29 sq. (B. P.)

## Pomeroy, Benjamin, D.D[[@Headword:Pomeroy, Benjamin, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Suffield, Conn., in 1704. He graduated at Yale College in 1733, and was ordained in December, 1735, pastor in Hebron, Conn., where he labored during his life. During Whitefield's revival he preached with great zeal and power. In 1742 he was brought before the General Assembly to answer under the new law for “having committed great disorders,” but was acquitted. Some time after he was punished fir lecturing to the people in a grove at Colchester, the parish minister having refused his permission; and in 1744 he was convicted of d(enouncing the recent ecclesiastical laws as cruel, and bound for fifty pounds to continue in “good behavior” during the year. He was a chaplain in the French and Revolutionary wars, and was an excellent scholar, a man of real genius, and one of the best preachers of his day. He died Dec. 22 1784. See Sprague. Ann. of the Amer. Pulpit, 1, 394.

## Pomeroy, Medad[[@Headword:Pomeroy, Medad]]

             an eminent Presbyterian minister, was born in Southampton, Mass., April 6, 1792. He was early left an orphan, but was blessed with prudent and kind relatives, by whom he was taught the way of life. He was educated at Williams College (Mass.), where he graduated in 1817. Soon after this he taught the academy at Aurora, N. Y., for two years, during which time and for some months after he studied theology under the direction of Dirck C.  Lansing, D.D., pastor of the First Church of Auburn, N. Y. In 1820 he began preaching at Sherwood's Corner, where he labored ten months, and was then settled at Cayuga Bridge. For six years lie preached at that place and at the “Stone Church,” between Cayuga and Springport; for six additional years at Cayuga only; in February, 1833, lie accepted a call to Elbridge, N. Y., where he remained for nearly eight years; in November, 1840, he returned to Cayuga, and ministered to that people for another twelve years, resigning on account of impaired health; in 1854 he removed to Wellsburg, Chemung County, N. Y., and served a church there; in 1856 he was called to Otisco, Onondaga County, N. Y., where he was pastor for five years, and 1861 he removed to Auburn, to spend the remainder of his days in rest. He died June 20, 1867. Mr. Pomeroy was a man of acute mind, penetrating discernment, and tenacious thought. His style was compact and lucid, and his preaching earnest and searching. His ministrations were greatly blessed. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1868, p. 223; Appleton's Annual Cyclopaedia (1867), 7:566. (J. L. S.)

## Pomeroy, Swan Lyman, D.D[[@Headword:Pomeroy, Swan Lyman, D.D]]

             Congregational minister, and a man of more than ordinary scholarship, was born March 4,1799. He was a graduate of Brown University, and of Andover Theological Seminary, where he completed his course in 1824. He was settled for some years as a pastor in Bangor, Me., and was called thence to a secretary-ship of the American Board of Commissioners of Foreign Missions. He displayed great ability and energy in this position for a number of years, but terminated his connection with it about 1860. He did not after that, we believe, have any pastoral charge. He died at Sunderland, Mass., March 17, 1869. See Appleton's Annual Cyclopaedia, 9, 503.

## Pomfret, John[[@Headword:Pomfret, John]]

             an English clergyman, more noted as a poet than as a divine, was the son of a clergyman, who held at the time of John's birth the rectory of Luton, in Bedfordshire. He was born about 1667, and was educated at a grammar school in the country, and thence sent to Cambridge, but to what college is uncertain. He devoted himself especially to the study of polite literature, wrote most of his poetical pieces, and took both the degrees in arts. After that he took holy orders, and was presented to the living of Maiden, in Bedfordshire. About 1703 he went to London for institution to a larger and  very considerable living; but was stopped some time by Compton, then bishop of London, on account of these four lines of his poem entitled The Choice:

“And as I near approach’d the verge of life,

Some kind elation (for I’d have no wife)

Should take upon him all my worldly care,

While I did for a better state prepare.”

The parenthesis in these lines was so maliciously represented that the good bishop was made to believe from it that Pomfret preferred a mistress to a wife; though no such meaning can be deduced, unless it be asserted that an unmarried clergyman cannot live without a mistress. But the bishop was soon convinced that this representation was nothing more than the effect of malice, as Pomfret at that time was actually married. The opposition, however, which his slanderers had given him was not without effect; for, being by this obliged to stay in London longer than he intended, he caught the small-pox, and died of it in 1702. “The Choice,” says Dr.Johnson, “exhibits a system of life adapted to common notions, and equal to common expectations; such a state as affords plenty and tranquillity, without exclusion of intellectual pleasures. Perhaps no composition in our language has been oftener perused than Pomfret's Choice. In his other poems there is an easy volubility; the pleasure of smooth meter is afforded to the ear, and the mind is not oppressed with ponderous or entangled with intricate sentiment. He pleases many, and he who pleases many must have merit.” A volume of his poems; was published by himself in 1699, with a very modest and sensible preface. Two pieces of his were published after his death by his friend Philalethes; one entitled Reason, and written in 1700, when the disputes about the Trinity ran high; the other, Dies Novissima, or The Last Epiphany, a Pindaric ode. His versification is not unmusical, but there is not the force in his writings which is necessary to constitute a poet. A dissenting teacher of his name, who published some rhymes upon spiritual subjects, occasioned fanaticism to be imputed to him; but his friend Philalethes has justly cleared him from this. Pomfret had a very strong mixture of devotion, but no fanaticism. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. s.v.; Géneralé Biog. Dict. S. V.

## Pomis, Christian de[[@Headword:Pomis, Christian de]]

             a converted Portuguese Jew, flourished in the 17th century. In 1668 he was baptized at Nuremberg, and in 1669 he was made teacher of the Hebrew  and Talmudic language at the University of Altorf. He wrote Comparatio agni Paschulis Vet. Test. cum agno Paschalis Novi Test. oratione Hebraea memoriter proposita, in Hebrew, with a Latin transl. (Altorf, 1669). See Cod. Senat. Lips. 19:4; Delitzsch, Wissenschaft u. Kunst d. Judenthums (Grimma, 1838), p. 302; Jocher, Gelehrten-Lex. s.v. (B. P.)

## Pomis, David de[[@Headword:Pomis, David de]]

             a Jewish savant of note, was born in 1525 at Spoleto, of the celebrated family called in Hebrew התפוחים, which, like the families הנערים מןand הנעוים, traced their origin to those Jews who were led into captivity after the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus and Vespasian. His father gave him his first instruction, initiating him in all the cycle of Biblical and Talmudic lore in Mecenia. After his father's death De Pomis studied medicine, and greatly distinguished himself in that department. In 1545 he went to Perugia, where he remained till 1552, prosecuting his studies in medicine, philosophy, and philology. He then entered into official service at Maghaus in Sabionetta till 1555; became physician to count Nicolo Ursino (1555-1560), and to prince Sforza (1560-1563); went to Rome, and then to Venice, where he died. Of De Pomis we have the following works: דוד צמח, i.e. The Offspring of David, a Hebrew and Talmudic Lexicon in Hebrew, Latin, and Italian (Ven. 1587), dedicated to Sixtus V: — קהלת, an Italian commentary on Ecclesiastes (ibid. 1571): — Discorso a l'humana misera, etc., being a supplement to the commentary on Ecclesiastes (ibid. 1572): — a commentary on Job an a commentary on Daniel, which are still in MS. See Fürst, Bibl. Jud. 3, 111 sq.; Basnage, Hist. des JuiJs (Engl. transl. by Taylor), p. 724; Kitto, Cyclop. s.v.; Jahrbuch der Gesch. d. Juden, 2, 359; De Rossi, Dizionario storico degli Autori Ebrei (Germ. transl. by Hamberger), p. 266 sq.; Acosta, Israel and the Gentiles, p. 487; Etheridge, Hebrew Literature, p. 454. (B. P.)

## Pommel[[@Headword:Pommel]]

             [an old English term, derived from the French pomme, an apple, and signifying anything round, but now applied only to a part of a saddle] (גְּלּה, gullah, a globular or round thing, a bowl, which it signifies in Ecc 12:6; Zec 4:3), the ball or round ornament on the capital of a column (2Ch 4:12-13; “bowl,” 1Ki 7:41-42). SEE COLUMN.

## Pommeraye, Jean-Francois[[@Headword:Pommeraye, Jean-Francois]]

             a French Benedictine monk, was born in 1617 at Rouen. He entered in 1637 the Congregation of Saint-Maur, made his profession at Tumieges, and renounced voluntarily all charges of his order to devote himself to study. He died at Rouen Oct. 28, 1687. He left several works, more remarkable for erudition than sound criticism. We mention, Hist. de I'Abbaye de Saint-Ouen de Rouen, de Saint-Amand, et de Sainte- Catherine de la meme Ville (Rouen, 1662, fol.): — Hist. des Acheveques de Rouen(ibid. 1667, fol.), the best of his works: — Hist. de la Cathedrale de Rouen (ibid. 1686, 4to). Pommeraye published after the demise of Dom Jean Anger Godin, its true author, a Recueil des Conciles et des Synodes de Rouen (1667, 4to); but this collection was put into the shade by the excellent work Conciles de Normandie, published by Dom Bessin (1717, fol.). — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.

## Pomona[[@Headword:Pomona]]

             a female deity among the ancient Romans, who presided over fruit-trees. Her worship was under the superintendence of a special priest.

## Pomorani[[@Headword:Pomorani]]

             SEE POMORYANS.

## Pomoryans[[@Headword:Pomoryans]]

             are a small body of Russian Dissenters, so called from their proximity to the Lake Ladoga and the White Sea, or from Pomori, a village in the government of Olonetz, where they appear to have originated. They believe that Antichrist has already come; reigns in the world unseen, that is, spiritually; and has put an end in the Church to everything that is holy. This belief they found upon the assertion by John (1Jn 4:3), “This is that spirit of Antichrist whereof ye have heard that it should come, and even now already is it in the world.” It is probable that Russian Dissenters, as well as others, consider the secular spirit of their Church establishment as the very spirit of Antichrist, blasting everything that is truly spiritual and holy. They are zealous in opposing the innovations of Nikon with regard to the Church books; prefer a life of celibacy and solitude, and rebaptize their converts from other sects. See Pinkerton, Greek Church, p. 330; Platon, Greek Church (see Index).

## Pomp, Nicholas[[@Headword:Pomp, Nicholas]]

             one of the earliest and most prominent ministers of the German Reformed Church in this country, was a native of Germany, where he was born Jan. 20, 1734. He prosecuted his studies, classical and theological, in the University of Halle; came to America under the auspices of the Church of Holland in 1760, and took charge of the German Reformed Church in Faulkner Swamp, Montgomery County, Pa., where he labored with much success. In 1783 he received a call to Baltimore, Md., where he exercised his ministry for six years, when he returned again, in 1789, to the scene of his first labors; but in the following year he removed to Indianfield, in Bucks County, Pa., where he continued in the faithful discharge of his pastoral duties up to the close of the last century, when failing health compelled him to retire from the active duties of his office. From that time onwards he resided with his son, the Rev. Thomas Pomp, pastor of the German Reformed Church in Easton, Pa., where he died, Sept. 1, 1819. In the early part of his ministry he published an able little work in reply to a “mischievous book on Universalism” which was circulated among the Germans, entitled The Everlasting Gospel. Father Pomp occupied a prominent position in the Reformed Church of this country. See Harbaugh, Fathers of the Ref. Church, 2, 131-138. (D. Y. H.)

## Pomp, Thomas[[@Headword:Pomp, Thomas]]

             an amiable and eminent minister of the German Reformed Church, son of the former, was born in Montgomery County, Pa., Feb. 4, 1773. “H is literary and theological studies he pursued principally, if not wholly, under the immediate care and supervision of his devoted and accomplished father.” He entered the ministry when only twenty years of age. For a short time he was pastor of some congregations in his native county. In 1796, three years after being licensed, he accepted a call from the Reformed Church in Easton, Pa. Here, in connection with some country churches, he labored earnestly and with singular fidelity for considerably more than half a century, up to near the close of his quiet and beautiful life, April 22,1852, when he was transferred from the Church militant on earth to the blessed “inheritance of the saints in light.” Mr. Pomp was naturally gifted; but he was principally distinguished for his singular amiability, gentleness, meekness, and peaceful relations with all mankind. He retained to the last moment of his life the unabated confidence of his people and the warmest  esteem of all who knew him. See Heisler, Fathers of the Ref. Church, 4, 15-25. (D. Y. H.)

## Pompa[[@Headword:Pompa]]

             a solemn procession among the ancient heathens, on the occasion of a sacred festival, a funeral, a triumph, or for any special reasons.

## Pompa Circensis[[@Headword:Pompa Circensis]]

             the sacred procession with which the Circensian games were introduced. On this occasion the statues of the gods, placed on wooden platforms, were borne upon the shoulders of men, and when very heavy they were drawn along upon carriages.

## Pompaei[[@Headword:Pompaei]]

             (πομπαίοι), certain gods among the ancient Greeks, who received this name as being conductors by the way; but what gods are specially referred to is uncertain, unless Mercury be meant, whose office it was to conduct souls to Hades. On certain days, called Apopompae, sacrifices were offered to the Pompei.

## Pomponatius, Peter[[@Headword:Pomponatius, Peter]]

             SEE POMPONAZZI.

## Pomponazzi, Pietro[[@Headword:Pomponazzi, Pietro]]

             a famous Italian philosopher, was born at Mantua in 1462, and after studying at the University of Padua became a professor of philosophy in his alma mater. He also taught and wrote at Bologna with the highest distinction. Although small in stature-for he was almost a dwarf-he yet astonished his contemporaries by his remarkable intellectual power, and became one of the most eminent men of his times. He had frequent disputations with the famous Achillini, whose puzzling objections would have confounded him had it not been for his skill in parrying them by his keen wit as well as by a sharp-cutting logic. He used to apply himself to the solution of difficulties so very intensely that he frequently forgot to eat, drink, sleep, and perform the ordinary functions of nature; nay, it made him almost distracted, and a laughing-stock to every one, as he himself tells us. He died in 1525. He wrote De Immortalitate Animae (1516), in which he maintains that the immortality of the soul cannot be proved by philosophical (or natural) reasons, but depends solely on revelation, which he accepts. This precaution, however, did not save him from attacks, and many adversaries rose up against him who did not scruple to treat him as an atheist; and the monks caused his book, although he wrote several apologies for it, to be burned at Venice. Another work of his on Incantations was also regarded as dangerous. He shows in this that he does not believe in magic and sorcery, and lays a prodigious stress on occult virtues in certain men by which they produced miraculous effects. He gives a great many examples of this, but his adversaries do not admit them to be true, or free from magic. See Bayle, Dict. Hist. s.v.; Niceron, Mnmoires, vol. 25; Olearius, De Pomponatio (Jena, 1705,4to); Buhle, Geschichte der neueren Philosophie, vol. 2; Ueberweg, Hist. of Philos. (see Index); Neander, Christian ) Dogmas (see Index); Lecky, Hist. of Rationalism, 1, 370; Fisher, Hist. of the Reformation, p. 542; Alzog, Kirchengesch. 2, 222; Morell, Hist. of Philosophy (see Index); Ranke, Hist. of the Papacy, 1, 63, 64, 377.

## Pomponia, Graecina[[@Headword:Pomponia, Graecina]]

             the wife of Plautius, a Roman general who commanded in England in the year 45, is thought, from a sentence in the Annals of Tacitus (13, 32), to have been a Christian, and the first in Britain. Tacitus says: “Also Pomponia Graecina, an illustrious woman, married to Plautils (who on his return from Britain entered the city with the pomp of an ovation), but  accused of a foreign superstition, was left to the decision of her husband.” She was tried, according to custom, for her abandonment of the national worship, by her own husband, Plautius, in the presence of her kindred, and was acquitted. She lived to a great age, apparently in sorrow, and wearing “no habit but that of mourning.” This was attributed to grief for the fate of Julia, the daughter of Drusus, who was put to death by Messalina fourteen years before the accusation was brought against Pomponia. But this alone would not account for the charge of forsaking the Roman religion; and the supposition that she was a Christian, and that her mode of life grew out of her religious faith, is certainly quite probable. The wife of Plautius and Claudia Ruffina are supposed to be of the saints that were in Cesar's household, mentioned by Paul (Php 4:22). Claudia is celebrated by Martial for her admirable beauty and learning in the following epigram:

“From painted Britons how was Claudia born!

The fair barbarian! how do arts adorn!

When Roman charms a Grecian soul commend,

Athens and Rome may for the dame contend.”

Speed, a very ancient British author, says that “Claudia sent Paul's writings, which she calls spiritual manna, unto her friends in Britain, to feed their souls with the bread of life; and also the writings of Martial, to instruct their minds with those lessons best fitting to produce moral virtues”—which Speed thinks was the occasion of this line in Martial's works: “And Britons now, they say, our verses learn to sing.” Gildas, the most ancient and authentic British historian, who wrote about A.D. 564, in his book called De Vict, Aurelii Ambrosii, affirms that the Britons received the Gospel under Tiberius, the emperor under whom Christ suffered; and that many evangelists were sent from the apostles into this nation, who were the first planters of the Gospel; and who, he elsewhere says, continued with them until the cruel persecution of Diocletian, the emperor, about A.D. 290. See Ivimev. Hist. of the English Baptists; Fisher. Beginnings of Christianity (N. Y. 1877, 8vo), p. 521. (J. H.W.)

## Pomponius Laetus, Julius[[@Headword:Pomponius Laetus, Julius]]

             a distinguished Italian humanist, was born in 1425 at Amendolara, in Upper Calabria. He seems to have been a bastard of the illustrious house of Sanseverini, in the kingdom of Naples. So far from being proud of this relationship, he shunned every reference to it; and when, in later times, his parents invited the admired writer to acknowledge them, he answered,  “Pomponius Laetus cognatis et propinquis suis salutem. Quodpetitis fieri non potest. Vale.” Hewas still very young when he arrived at Rome, where he studied literature under Pietro di Monopoli, a clever grammarian of the time. At the death of Lorenzo Valla, his last master (1457), he was deemed fit to succeed him. He founded an academy, where several literary men, devoted like himself to the study of antiquity, assembled. Most of them were voting men. Their enthusiasm for the classics made them renounce their Christian names, and adopt in their stead names borrowed from the classical languages. Perhaps these comparisons between the institutions of the past and of their own time may have resulted in depreciating criticisms of the latter. Malignity knew how to transform these, in the eyes of pope Paul II, into contempt for religion, complot against the Church, and finally conspiracy against its chief. Those of the academicians who could be got hold of were put to the rack-one of them died during the proceedings. Pomponius, who was at the time a resident of Venice, was arrested there, brought to Rome, and tortured like the others; but no avowal of his imagined crime could be pressed out of him. After interrogating him twice, Paul II declared that in future every one should be held for a heretic who, even in jest, pronounced the word “academy” (comp. on this point De Rossi, Roma Sotteranea, vol. 1).

In 1471 Sixtus IV, Paul's successor, allowed Pomponius to resume his professorship in the Roman college, where he met with the same favor he had formerly enjoyed, the students crowding to his lectures. Among those disciples (they were called Pomponiani) some were men of merit, as Alessandro Farnese, pope under the name of Paul III, Andrea Fulvio of Preneste, and Conrad Pentinger. No one ever was fonder of manuscripts, medals, and inscriptions than Pomponius Laetus; he was constantly seen pacing the streets of Rome in search of some monument of those pagan times in which he wished he had lived. There was no dark corner, no trace of antiquity, but he had carefully examined it, and could give an account of it. In his little house on the Janiculan, with some chosen friends, he solemnized the anniversary of the foundation of Rome and the birth of Romulus. Pomponins was of a mild and kind disposition, always ready to help or to please, and of charming modesty. Nature made him a stammerer, but he completely conquered this defect. He was often seen in the streets with a lantern in his hands, like Diogenes, whose customs and habits he had taken to imitate. He died at Rome May 21, 1497. He left several works, monuments of a profound and rare erudition. They were published at Hagenau (1520). His Opera varia were edited at Mentz (1521, 8vo); they comprise, De Sacer-dotiis, De  Jurisperitis. De Romanorumu Magistratibus: — De Legibus and De Antiquitatibus urbis Romae: — along with Compendium Historiae Romanae ab interitu Gordiani usque (ad Justinum III, originally edited at Venice (1498, 4to). He explained and commented besides on several classical authors, and devoted his care to editions of Sallust, Columella, Varro, Festus, Nonnius Marcellus, and Pliny the younger. His commentaries on Virgil were printed at Basle (1486, fol.). See Christian Schools and Scholars, 2, 316, 370; Tiraboschi, Storia de la Letter. Ital. vol. 6 pt. 1; Ginguend, Hist. litter. d'ltalie; Hallam, Lit. Hist. of Europe (Harper's ed.), 1, 266; Sabellicus, Vita Pomponii Lceti (Strasb. 1510, 4to). — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.

## Pomps of the Devil[[@Headword:Pomps of the Devil]]

             a term used in the form of solemn renunciation which preceded baptism in the ancient Christian Church. The form referred to is given by the author of The Apostolical Constitutions in these words, “I renounce Satan, and his works, and his pomps, and his service, and his angels and his inventions, and all things that belong to him, or that are subject to him.” By the pomps of the devil appear to have been meant the shows and games of heathen idolatry. And even after idolatry was in a great measure destroyed, and the public games and shows in honor of the gods were discontinued, the expression “pomps” was still used in the form of renunciation to eradicate the vanity, lewdness, and profaneness which so extensively prevailed. Some have attempted to trace this renunciation back to apostolic times, founding it on the exhortation of Paul to Timothy: “Lay hold on eternal life, whereunto thou art also called, and hast professed a good profession before many witnesses.” Others, again, are content to derive it from ancient tradition. That it existed from a remote period in the history of the Christian Church is admitted on all hands; and such was the importance attached to this renunciation that, as soon as baptisteries were built, a place was assigned peculiarly to this service, the porch or anteroom being set apart for this purpose. Tile catechumens on entering were placed with their faces to the west, and then commanded to renounce Satan and all his pomps, with some gesture and rite expressing indignation, as by stretching out their hands, or folding them, or striking them together; and sometimes by exsufflation, or spitting at him as if he were present. In this ceremony the faces of the catechumens were turned towards the west as being the place of darkness, and therefore suitable for the renunciation of him who is the prince of darkness. The form of renunciation was repeated three times,  either because there were three things which were renounced in their baptism-the devil, his pomps, and the world or to signify the three Persons of the Trinity, by whom they were adopted as sons upon renouncing Satan; or because it was usual in cases of civil adoption and emancipation of slaves for the master to yield up his right by a triple renunciation. See Bingham, Christian Antiquities; Riddle, Christian Antiquities; Staunton, Eccles. Dict. s.v.

## Ponce de la Fuente, Constantine[[@Headword:Ponce de la Fuente, Constantine]]

             a Spanish martyr to the Protestant cause, was a native of San Clemente de la Mancha, in the diocese of CuenDa. Possessing a good taste and a love of  genuine knowledge, he evinced an early disgust for the barbarous pedantry of the schools, and an attachment to such of his countrymen as sought to revive the study of polite letters. Being intended for the Church, he made himself master of Greek and Hebrew, but at the same time learned to write and speak his native language with uncommon purity and elegance. Like Erasmus, with whose writings he was early captivated, he was distinguished for his lively wit, which he took pleasure in indulging at the expense of foolish preachers and hypocritical monks. But he was endowed with greater firmness and decision of character than the philosopher of Rotterdam. During his attendance at the university Ponce's youthful spirit had betrayed him into irregularities, of which his enemies afterwards took an ungenerous advantage; but these were succeeded by the utmost decorum and correctness of manners, though he always retained his gay temper, and could never deny himself his jest. Notwithstanding the opportunities he had of enriching himself, he was so exempt from avarice that his library, which he valued above all his property, was never large. His eloquence caused his services in the pulpit to be much sought after; but he was free from vanity, the besetting sin of orators, and scorned to prostitute his talents at the shrine of popularity. He declined the situation of preacher in the cathedral of Cuenga, which was offered him by the unanimous vote of the chapter.

When the more honorable and lucrative office of preacher to the metropolitan church of Toledo was afterwards tendered to him, after thanking the chapter for their good opinion of him, he declined it, alleging as a reason “that he would not disturb the bones of their ancestors,” alluding to a dispute between them and the archbishop Siliceo, who had insisted that his clergy should prove the purity of their descent. Whether it was predilection for the Reformed opinions that induced him at first to fix his residence at Seville is uncertain but once there we find him co-operating with AEgidius in his plans for disseminating scriptural knowledge. The emperor, having heard him preach during a visit to that city, was so much pleased with the sermon that he immediately named Ponce one of his chaplains, to which he added the office of almoner; and he soon after appointed him to accompany his son Philip to Flanders, “to let the Flemings see that Spain was not destitute of polite scholars and orators.” Constantine made it a point of duty to obey the orders of his sovereign, and reluctantly quitted his residence in Seville, for which he had hitherto rejected the most tempting offers. His journey gave him the opportunity of becoming personally acquainted with some of the Reformers. Among these was Jacob Schopper, a learned man of Biberach,  in Suabia, by whose conversation his views of evangelical doctrine were greatly enlarged and confirmed. In 1555 Ponce returned to Seville, and his presence imparted a new impulse to the Protestant cause in that city. A benevolent and enlightened individual having founded a professorship of divinity in the College of Doctrine, Ponce was appointed to the chair; and by means of the lectures which he read on the Scriptures, together with the instruction of Fernando de St. Juan, provost of the institution, the minds of many of the young were opened to the truth. On the first Lent after his return to Seville he was, besides, chosen by the chapter to preach every alternate day in the cathedral church. So great was his popularity that, though the public service did not begin till eight o'clock in the morning, yet, when he was announced to preach the church would be filled by four, and even by three o'clock. Being newly recovered from a fever when he commenced his labors, he felt so weak that it was necessary for him repeatedly to pause during the sermon, on which account he was allowed to recruit his strength by taking a draught of wine in the pulpit, a permission which had never been granted to any other preacher.

While Constantine was pursuing this career of honor and usefulness, he involved himself in difficulties by coming forward as a candidate for the place of canon magistral in the cathedral of Seville, which had become vacant by the death of AEgidius. Ponce did not want the office, but his friends pressed him to lay aside his scruples; and an individual who had great influence over his mind represented so strongly the services which he would be able to render to the cause of truth in so influential a situation, and the hurtful effects which would result from its being occupied by some noisy and ignorant declaimer, that he consented at last to offer himself a candidate. In spite of all manner of accusations and opposition he carried his election, was installed in his new office, and commenced his duty as preacher in the cathedral with high acceptance. From his visit abroad Ponce, like many other preachers whom the Spanish Romanists sent to the Netherlands “to give light to others, returned home blind, having followed the example of the heretics” (Juescas, Historia Pontifical, 2, 337, b).

In 1555 he had embraced the Protestant faith. Now that he had dared to assume the responsibilities of the Seville cathedral canonate, the envious priests, disappointed in their own seekings, boldly confronted Ponce with his heretical opinions, and loudly urged the Inquisition to take its aim at this new-made cathedral dignitary; and when, in 1559 the familiars were let loose on the Protestants of Seville, Ponce was among the first who were  apprehended. Among his books was found a treatise, in his own handwriting, on the points of controversy between the Church of Rome and the Protestants, and as Ponce had chosen to take sides with Luther and Calvin, and, when shown the work, not only acknowledged its authorship, but added, “You have there a full and candid confession of my belief; I am in your hands do with me as seemeth to you good,” his doom was sealed. Though put to the torture to reveal his associates and fellow-believers, he refused steadfastly to bring suffering upon any one else. After two years of imprisonment, oppressed and worn out by a mode of living so different from what he had been used to, he died before his enemies could bring him to public execution. It was slanderously reported that he had committed suicide, but a young monk and fellow-prisoner denied the calumny. Dec. 22, 1560, his effigy and bones were brought out in the public auto-da-fé, but the people, who had always greatly revered Ponce, rose up in rebellion, and the services were continued in private. In the character of Ponce's writings we have one of the clearest indications of the excellence of his heart.

They were of that kind which were adapted to the spiritual wants of his countrymen, and not calculated to display his own talents. or to acquire for himself a name in the learned world. They were composed in his native tongue, and in a style level to the lowest capacity. Abstruse speculations and rhetorical ornaments, in which he was qualified both by nature and education to excel, were rigidly sacrificed to the one object of being understood by all, and useful to all. Among his works were a Catechism, whose highest recommendation is its artless and infantine simplicity; a small treatise on The Doctrine of Christianity, drawn up in the familiar form of a dialogue between a master and his pupil, which, without being deficient in simplicity, is more calculated to interest persons of learning and advanced knowledge; an Exposition of the First Psalm, in four sermons, which show that his pulpit eloquence, exempt from the common extremes, was neither degraded by vulgarity nor rendered disgusting by affectation and effort at display; and the Confession of a Sinner, in which the doctrines of the Gospel, poured from a contrite and humbled spirit, assume the form of the most edifying and devotional piety. See Antonius, Bibl. Hist. Nov. 1, 256; M'Crie, Hist. of the Ref. in Spain, p. 154-156, 207 sq., 262 sq. (J. H.W.)

## Ponce, Pedro[[@Headword:Ponce, Pedro]]

             a Spanish Benedictine monk in the convent of Ofia, in Old Castile, was born about 1530. He is considered the inventor of the art of teaching the dumb to speak, which he carried to considerable perfection. According to Ambrosio Morales (Antiguedades de Espana [Alcala, 1575], fiol. 38), Ponce had to instruct two brothers and one sister of the constable of Castile and a son of the gran justicia of Aragon, all of whom were born deaf and dumb. These pupils made such progress that, after some time, they not only were able to write correctly, but also to answer any questions put to them. One of them, Don Pedro de Velasco, who lived to be only twenty years of age, spoke and wrote Latin as well as his mother tongue, and was at the time of his death making considerable progress in the Greek language. Another of Ponce's pupils became a Benedictine monk, and was able to make confession and explain his creed by word of mouth. These facts were attested by the best Spanish writers of the time, as well as by Sir Kenelm Digby, who, in his Two Treatises concerning the Body and Soul of Man (Paris, 1644, cap. 28, note 8), says, “This priest brought the young lord to speak as distinctly as any man whatsoever; and I have often discoursed with him whiles I wayted upon the prince of Wales in Spaine.” According to the same author (p. 254), and to Juan de Castafiiza (Vida de San Benito), Ponce wrote a treatise in Spanish, in which he explained his method, and laid down certain rules as the result of his observations; but this interesting work has been lost, though it is generally believed that Juan Pablo Bonet, who in 1620 published his Reduccion de lns Letras, y Arte para enseñar á hablar los Mudos (4to), saw and consulted it. Ponce died in 1584, and was buried in the convent of his order.

## Poncet, Maurice[[@Headword:Poncet, Maurice]]

             a French prelate of the 16th century, flourished as curate of St. Pierre des Arcis. He was a divine of great eloquence and considerable learning,  though not remarkable for refinement of taste or diction. He was a Gallican, and when Henry III pursued that imbecile policy which finally cost France the loss of her best citizens for conscience sake, Ponet ridiculed the Leaguers, SEE LEAGUE, and especially visited with the full power of his sarcasm the grotesque processions of the Confreries des Penitents. He made the walls of his church ring with denunciations of these hypocritical devotees, who, after parading the streets barefoot, arrayed in sackcloth, and displaying ostentatiously the outward signs of austere asceticism, were accustomed to pass the night in riotous feasting and gross debauchery. Henry, resenting this exposure, banished the offender to his abbey of St. Pere at Melun; but he was released after a brief confinement, and returned to Paris by the king's permission, his majesty remarking that “he had always believed the good doctor to have a zeal for God, but not according to knowledge; and that there was much excuse for him, since he was not quick enough of apprehension to see through the artifices of those by whom he was instigated. He had plenty of scholarship, but was grievously deficient in judgment.” Poncet, unsubdued by the king's leniency, resumed his usual incisive style of pulpit oratory, and persevered in it till his death, which happened in 1586. See Jervis, Hist. Church of France, 1, 181 sq. (J. H. W.)

## Poncher, Etienne[[@Headword:Poncher, Etienne]]

             a French prelate, noted also as a diplomatist, was born at Tours in 1446. He was the son of a magistrate, studied law, and while yet a youth was provided with several canonicates. In 1485 he obtained the charge of counselor-clerk at the Parliament of Paris, and in 1498 he became President aux Enquetes. He was elected bishop of Paris Feb. 25,1503, in compliance with the request of king Louis XII, whom he was at that time accompanying to Milan. The same prince entrusted him in 1506 with several diplomatic missions to Germany; and Poncher, in the following year, being again in Italy with the king, was alone bold enough to speak in contradiction to the angry feelings of the king against the Venetians, and to oppose the confederation of Cambrai. Louis XII, who had already appointed Poncher chancellor of the duchy of Milan, bestowed on him in 1509 the abbey of Fleuri, and in 1512 made him the guardian of the seal of France, which office he kept till the death of the king, Jan. 1, 1515. Francis I appointed him, with Arthur Gouffier, one of the plenipotentiaries who signed, on Aug. 16, 1517, the treaty of Noyon between Francis and Charles V. In the same year Poncher went to Spain as ambassador of  France, and in 1518 he was sent to Henry VIII of England, with whom he signed a new treaty of alliance. In virtue of the concordat he was transferred, March 14, 1519, to the archiepiscopal see of Sens. He died at Lyons. Feb. 24, 1524. Poncher published Constitutions synodales, which are still held in great esteem, especially in regard to the sacraments. — - Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.

## Poncher, Francois[[@Headword:Poncher, Francois]]

             a French prelate, nephew of the preceding, was born at Tours about 1480. His father, Louis Poncher, secretary of the king and receiver general of the finances, was hung for embezzlement. Made counselor at the Parliament of Paris (1510), Francois Poncher obtained soon afterwards the curacy of Issy, a canonicate at Notre Dame of Paris, the abbey of St. Maurles- Fosses, and March 14,1519, became bishop of Paris. So far from treading in the steps of his uncle, he was a simoniac and scandalous prelate. He forged documents to get possession of the abbey of Fleury-sur-Loire, but was balked in his design. While the king was a prisoner at Madrid, Poncher fell out with the queen-regent, the duchess of Angouleme, Francis's mother, plotted to deprive her of the regency, and by treacherous negotiations with the Spanish court tried to prolong the captivity of his sovereign. As soon as Francis was free again Poncher was arrested and accused of high-treason. While his process was in abeyance he died in the dungeon of Vincennes, Sept. 1, 1532. He wrote some commentaries on civil law, dedicated to his uncle, Etienne Poncher. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.

## Pond[[@Headword:Pond]]

             is the rendering in the A. V. of אֲגָם, agam (literally a collection of water), in Exo 7:19; Exo 8:15, where it probably denotes the putrescent reservoirs or swampy pools left by the inundation of the Nile (Sept. διώρυγες, Vulg. paludes). Again, in Isa 19:10, נֶפֶשׁ אִגְמֵי, which the A.V. translates “ponds for fish,” following the Vulg. “lacunas ad capiendos pisces,” Diodati and Luther, is rendered by the Sept. τὰς ψυχὰς πονέσουσι. This rendering is supported by the authority of Gesenius, Vatablus, and Ewald, alle Lohnarbeiter (עשִֹׁי שֶׂכֶר.= “they that earn wages”), sind seelenbetrübt; אָגִםbeing taken as equivalent to עָנִם (Job 30:25), “to be sad.” Many interpreters, however, think that it designates fish-ponds. We have abundant evidence from the paintings in  the tombs that the Egyptians were celebrated for their fish-ponds, and it appears that almost every villa possessed one, where the master of the house occasionally amused himself in fishing. The Jews, it seems, likewise constructed similar ponds, as in describing his bride in the Canticles (Son 7:4) Solomon says, “Thine eyes are like the fish- pools in Heshbon.” SEE FISH. The word occurs several times of marshy pools, in contradistinction to the dry sands of the desert (Psa 107:35; Psa 114:8); “standing water” (Isa 35:7; Isa 41:18), “a pool.” Such pools being commonly reedy, it is rendered “reeds” (Jer 51:32). SEE POOL.

## Pond, Enoch, D.D[[@Headword:Pond, Enoch, D.D]]

             a noted Congregational minister and writer, was born at Wrentham, Mass., July 29, 1791, and was educated at Brown University, where he graduated in 1813. He then decided to enter the ministry, and began a course in theology with the celebrated Dr. Emmons. In June, 1814, young Pond was licensed to preach, and in the spring of the following year was ordained pastor of the Congregational Church at Auburn, Mass. He left this charge in 1828 to become the conductor of the Spirit of the Pilgrims, a monthly publication in Boston. He was made professor of theology in the theological seminary at Bangor in September, 1832, and continued in that responsible position until 1856, when he became president, and changed to the professorship of ecclesiastical history, and lectured on pastoral duties. He died Jan. 21,1882. Dr. Pond published reviews of Judson on Baptism: — Monthly Concert Lectures (1824): — Memoir of President Davies (1827): Memoir of Susaunna Anthony (1827): — Memoir of Count Zinzendorf (1839): — Memoir of John Wicklise (1841): -Morning of the Reformation (1842, 12mo): — No Fellowship with Romanism (1843): — The Young Pastor's Guide (Portland, 1844, 12mo): — The Mather Family (1844, 12mo): — The World's Salvation (1845): — Pope and Pagan, or Middleton's Celebrated Letters (Portland, 1846, 18mo), SEE MIDDLETON, CONYERS: — Swedenborgianism Reviewed (new ed. 1846): — Swedenborgianism Examined (N. Y. 1861, 16mo): — Plato, his Life, Works, Opinions, and Influence (1846): — Review of Bushnell's God in Christ (1849): — The Ancient Church (1851):Memoir of John Knox (1856): — Bangor Lectures on Pastoral Theology (Andover, 1863, 12mo): — Lectures on Christian Theology (Boston, 1868, 8vo): — Lectures on Pastoral Theology (N. Y. 187-): — also separate Sermons, and articles in the Bibl. Sacra, Bibl. Repos., Lit. and Theolog. Rev., Lord's  Lit. and Theolog. Rev., New-Englander, and more than a dozen other periodicals.

## Pone luctum, Magdalena[[@Headword:Pone luctum, Magdalena]]

             This is the beginning of a famous Easter hymn of uncertain date. Undoubtedly it belongs to the Middle Ages, for in this hymn, as well as in the Dies Irae (q.v.) and other Latin hymns, the same identification of Mary Magdalene with “the woman that was a sinner” (Luk 7:37), which runs through all the theology of the Middle Ages, is expressed. This hymn may be found in almost all collections of Latin hymns, and the first verse runs thus:

“Pone luctum, Magdalena,

Et serena lacrymas;

Non est jamn Sinioiis coena,

Noll cur fletum exprimas;

Causam mile sunt laetandi,

Cause mille exultandi:

Alleluja resonet.

For the original, see Daniel, Thesaurus Hymnol. 2, 365; Trench, Sacred Latin Poetry, p. 159; Bässler, Auswahl maltchristl. Lieder, p. 237; Simrock, Lauda Sion, p. 188; Königsfeld, Hymnen u. Gesänge, 1, 230. English translations are given in Schaffs Christ in Song, p. 256. For German translations, see Büssler, 1. c. p. 135; Simrock, Königsfeld, and Fortlage, Gesänge christl. Vorzeit, p. 142. (B. P.)

## Ponet[[@Headword:Ponet]]

             SEE POYNET.

## Pongilupus, Hermannus[[@Headword:Pongilupus, Hermannus]]

             an Italian monastic, flourished near the middle of the 13th century at Ferrara. He practiced great austerity as one of the Consolati, and died in 1269. Several years after his death (1300) charges of heresy were brought against him, and a judicial process having been declared, his bones were exhumed and ourned, and his tomb demolished by order of pope Boniface VIII. His tomb, in the principal church at Ferrara, had been the object of great veneration, and many miracles were said to have been wrought there. Some think that the process was instituted and the tomb demolished to put an end to the extravagant devotion paid to his memory. The Franciscans  attribute to Pongilupus the origin of the Fratricelli (q.v.), but Mosheim considers this an error, and believes him to have been one of the Bagnotiants. Natalis Alexander (Hist. Eccles. 8, 87) speaks of Pongilupus as reviving several vile practices of the Gnostics. See Wadding, Annal. Minor. Fratr. 6, 279; Milman, Hist. of Latin Christianity, 7, 37 sq. (J.H.W.)

## Pongol[[@Headword:Pongol]]

             a Hindu festival in honor of the sun, which is celebrated annually on Jan. 9. The high-caste Brahmins look upon this as a lucky and propitious day, but the Sudras hold it as sacred, and visit one another with presents. They boil rice on this day with milk outside the house, in some place exposed to the sun's rays, and when that luminary withdraws they cry out “Pongol!” and repeat it four times. The rice thus boiled is regarded as very holy, and kept as long as possible. The day after the Pongol the cows and buffaloes are led out early into the country, having their heads adorned with crowns and cakes.

## Poniatowa, Christine[[@Headword:Poniatowa, Christine]]

             a German female visionary, was born in 1610 at Lessen, Western Prussia. Her father, Julian Poniatowa, was a Polish gentleman who, having escaped from a monastery and embraced the Protestant communion, was at first minister at Duchnick, in Bohemia, then librarian of a nobleman. He probably brought up his daughter in mystical ideas, for he is said to be himself the author of a Latin dissertation on the knowledge which the angels may have of God. Christine had been entrusted to the care of the baroness of Zelking, who had taken a liking to her, when, Nov. 12, 1627, after severe pains, she fell into a trance, attended with visions and prophetic utterances relating to the future of the Reformed Church. This strange state returned at regular intervals for a whole year, always attended with the same phenomena, and a number of people testified to its genuineness. Jan. 27, 1629, the young visionary fell into so heavy a lethargy that she passed for dead, but when she finally recovered her senses she declared that her mission was fulfilled, and that she should thenceforth have no more visions. In 1632 she was married to a Moravian minister, Daniel Vetter, and died Dec. 6, 1644, at Leszno, near Posen, Her revelations, written by herself, were translated into Latin, and published by Amos Comenius, with those of Christopher Kotter and Nicolas Drabicki,  under the title Lux in Tenebris (1657, 1659, 1665, 4to). They were retranslated into German by Benedict Balmsen (Amsterdam, 1664, 8vo). See Feustking, Gynaec. fanat. kanst. p. 238 sq.; Witsius, Miscell. Sacra, pt. 3, ch. 22; Arnold, Kirchen- mu. Ketzerhistorie; Mosheim, Eccles. Hist. 3, 391, 392. (J. H. W.)

## Poniatowa, Julian[[@Headword:Poniatowa, Julian]]

             SEE PONIATOWA, CHRISTINE.

## Ponpignan, Jean-Georges le Franc de[[@Headword:Ponpignan, Jean-Georges le Franc de]]

             a French prelate, brother of the poet Pompignan, was born at Montauban Feb. 22, 1715. After finishing his studies at the College Louis le Grand and at the Seminary of St. Sulpice, he was made canon in his native diocese, hut he had scarcely taken his license when he was appointed bishop of Le Puy (Dec. 25, 1742). In 1747 he obtained in commendam the abbey of St. Chaffre in his diocese, and was sent as a deputy to the assembly of the clergy held in 1755. He sided, in the strife which divided at that time the Church of France, with the party of the Feuillants, so called because they adopted the principles of the cardinal De la Rochefoucauld, the new minister of the portfolio of the prebendaries, in opposition to the party of the Thaetins who sided with the Theatine Boyer, previously bishop of Mirepoix. Pompignan was sent by the assembly to address the pope on the articles drawn up by both parties. He was one of the presidents of the assembly of 1760, and the author of the remonstrances to the king in favor of the members of the clergy banished by Parliament.

He was untiring in writing against the vices and incredulity of his epochworks which made him many enemies, among whom was Voltaire. In 1774 Louis XV made  him archbishop of Vienne. In 1788 he sided with the tiers-etat in the etats of the Dauphine, and this conduct caused him to be deputed to the Etats Generaux. He was true there to the same line of conduct, and was conspicuous at the head of the members of the clergy who, June 22, 1789, joined the tiers-etat. The consequence was that he became one of the first presidents of the National Assembly. On Aug. 4 of the ensuing year the king entrusted him with the roll of the prebendary and the following day he was appointed minister of state, and took his seat in the council. Being aware that he could not reside in his diocese, he resigned the episcopal see, and received in exchange the abbey of Buzai. The suspension of the nomination to the prebendaries, Nov. 9,1789, left him minister without portfolio, and was followed by considerable changes introduced into the Church of France by the decree of July 12, 1790, on the civil constitution of the clergy. Pius VI addressed to Pompignan a bull, in which he condemned the new decrees, and exhorted him to bring his whole influence to bear upon the king to prevent him from giving them his sanction. This bull was resultless, as the king sanctioned the decrees on Aug. 24. Pompignan had nothing to do with this decision of Louis XVI, inasmuch as he had not attended the meetings of the council since Aug. 17, suffering already of the disease of which he died at Paris, Dec. 30, 1790. Besides a number of Mandemerts, pastoral letters, and reports to the assembly of the clergy, he left Questions diverses ssur l'Incredulit (Paris, 1753, 12mo): — Le veritable Usage de l'Autorite seculiere dans les Miatisres qui concernent la Religion (1753, 1784, 12mo): — L'Incredulite convaincue par les Prophetes (1759, 3 vols. 12mo): — La Religion venzgee de l'Incredulite par l'Incrdulite ellemenze (1772, 12mo): — L'Oraisor funebre de la Dauphine (1747, 4to): — L'Oraison Jinbre de la Reine Marie Leczinska (1768, 4to): — Lettres a unm1 Ezeque sur plusieurs Points de Morale et de Discipline (1802, 2 vols. 8vo). See biographical sketch in his posthumous publications; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.; Jervis, Hist. of the Church of France, 2, 371; Van Laun, Hist. of French Lit. (N.Y. 1877, 3 vols. 8vo).

## Pons, Jean[[@Headword:Pons, Jean]]

             a French Protestant writer, was born at Nismes May 15, 1747. He was brother-in-law to Rabaut-Dupuis. Intimately connected with Rabaut St. Ettienne, he had a narrow escape from sharing his sad fate: he owed his life to the 9th Thermidor. He was afterwards justice of the peace at Nismes, and then director of the post department in the same city. He published Reflexions philosophiques et politiques sur la Tolerance religieuse (Paris, 1808, 8vo); besides Notices biographiques su- Paul Rabaut and Notices biographiques sur Rabaut-Dupuis. Pons died at Nismes Jan. 15, 1816. - Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.

## Ponsard de Gisi of Payens[[@Headword:Ponsard de Gisi of Payens]]

             a Crusader of the Order of the Knight Templars, flourished near the opening of the 14th century. He was a most earnest advocate of the order, and when, in 1309, it was brought to trial, and the papacy was questioning the feasibility of suffering its existence, Ponsard boldly declared himself ready to undertake its defense. All the enormous charges against the order were utterly, absolutely false; false were all the confessions, extorted by terror and pain, from himself and other brethren before the bishop of Paris. Those tortures had been applied by the sworn and deadly enemies and accusers of the order, by the prior of Montfacon and William Roberts the monk. He put in a schedule: “These are the traitors who have falsely and disloyally accused the religion of the Temple-William Roberts the monk, who had them put to the torture; Esquin de Florian of Beziers, prior of Montfalcon; Bernard Pelet, prior of Maso, Philip's envoy to England; and Gervais Boysol, knight of Gisors.” Had Ponsard himself been tortured? He had been tortured before the bishop of Paris three months ere he made confession. He had stood thus in a pit for the space of an hour. He protested that in that state of agony he should confess or deny whatever  they would. He was prepared to endure beheading, the stake, or the caldron for the honor of the order; but these slow, excruciating torments he could not bear besides the horrors of his two years' imprisonment. He was asked if he had anything to allege wherefore the court should not proceed. He hoped that the cause would be decided by good men and true. The provost of Poitiers interposed: he produced a schedule of charges advanced by Ponsard himself against the order. “Truth,” answered Ponsard, “requires no concealment. I own that in a fit of passion, on account of some contumelious words with the treasurer of the Temple, I did draw up the schedule.” Those charges, however, dark as were some of them, were totally unlike those now brought against the brotherhood. Before he left the court, Ponsard expressed the hope that the severity of his imprisonment might not be aggravated because he had undertaken the defence of the order. The court gave instructions to the provost of Poitiers and De Jamville that he should not be more harshly treated; but he was finally condemned to death, and was burned at the stake. See Milman, Hist. of Latin Christianity, 6, 429 sq.; Porter, Hist. of the Knights of Malta (see Index). (J.H.W.)

## Pont - Audemer, Council of[[@Headword:Pont - Audemer, Council of]]

             (Concilium Ponsaudemlurense), an ecclesiastical council, was held in 1279 by William de Flavecour, archbishop of Rouen, who presided; twenty-four canons were published. Among these:

5. Recommends the observance of the canons of Lateran (“ornnes utritsque sexus”) upon confession and communion.

9. Forbids Christians to dwell with Jews. 10. Forbids the keeping of vigils and assemblies, and all dancing, in churches and churchyards.

16. Forbids rural deans to deliver any sentence of excommunication or suspension, unless in writing.

23. Forbids all those of the clergy who have taken the cross to abuse the privileges granted to them.

See Labbe, Concil. 11, 1144.

## Pontano, Giovanni-Giovano[[@Headword:Pontano, Giovanni-Giovano]]

             (Lat. Pontantus), a celebrated Italian statesman, noted as a writer on morals, was born December, 1426, in the environs of Cerreto, Umbria. His father having perished in a riot, his mother fled with him to Perugia, where he received a careful education. Having in vain asserted his claim to the heritage of his parents, he entered the army of Alfonso, king of Naples, then at war with the Florentines (1447), and followed that king to Naples, where he became acquainted with the celebrated Panormita, who took him along in his embassy to Florence, and had him appointed royal secretary. Pontano's verses, highly esteemed by all competent judges, seemed to entitle him sufficiently to a seat in the academy which Panormita, under the king's auspices, established at Naples. Ferdinand I, successor of Alfonso (1457), maintained him in his office of secretary, and appointed him tutor of his son Alfonso, duke of Calabria. He followed Ferdinand in his campaign against the duke of Anjou, and distinguished himself by his bravery. Taken prisoner on different occasions, he was always brought back without ransom to the camp of Ferdinand, out of respect for his genius. On his return to Naples the king lavished his favors upon him, bestowed upon him riches and dignities, and entrusted him with the conduct of the most important matters of state. In 1482 a war, which bade  fair to become general, having broken out between the Venetians and the duke of Ferrara. Pontano brought about a reconciliation of the belligerents. He was equally successful in compounding the difficulties that had arisen between Ferdinand and pope Innocent VIII.

Put on his guard against the negotiator, the pope exclaimed, “I treat with Pontano: is it meet that truth and good faith should abandon him who never abandoned them?” He became at that time first minister, and remained in that high position under Alfonso II (who erected to him a statue) and Ferdinand II. When Charles VIII of France approached Naples at the head of a French army, Pontano sent him forthwith the keys of the city, harangued the king at his coronation, and dishonored himself by the insults and aspersions which he cast in this speech at his royal benefactors. When Ferdinand returned, he contented himself with depriving Pontano of his offices. The fallen minister found in his retreat more happiness than he had enjoyed in the tumult of public business, and when Louis XII, after the conquest of the kingdom of Naples, offered to put him again at the head of the government this new Diocletian preferred his literary life to royal grandeur. It was in his retreat that he wrote most of the works he has left. He died at Naples in August, 1503.

Most of his works deal with moral subjects, and abound in sound precepts and judicious reflections. His history of the Neapolitan war is a masterpiece, sufficient alone to immortalize its author. His Latinity is pure and elegant, his style noble and harmonious. His poetical works excited envy and conquered it. He announced himself, like Horace, the eternity of his fame: “The remotest posterity,” he said, “will speak of Pontano, and celebrate his name.” Erasmus, though a parsimonious distributor of praise to the Italians, has acknowledged Pontano's merit in the Cicesronians. It must be recorded also that Pontano had the merit of correcting the manuscript, then the only one, of Catullus; that we owe to him the discovery of Donat's commentaries on Virgil, and of Rhemnius Paloemon's Grammar. In his physical treatises he first signaled the law of continuity, and seems to have been the first among the moderns who, after Democritus, declared the Milky Way to be composed of an infinity of small stars. His poems, some of which unfortunately are spoiled by obscenities, were published at Venice (1505-8, 2 vols. 8vo) and at Florence (1514, 2 vols. 8vo). His prose writings were published at Venice (1518-19, 3 vols. 4to) and at Florence (1520, 4 vols. 8vo). His Works were edited at Naples (1505-12, 6 vols. fol.), and more completely at Basle (1556, 4 vols. 8vo). His prose writings comprise the following works: De Obedientia: — De Fortitudine: De Priincipe: — De Liberalitate: — De Benficentia: — De  Managntficentia: — De Splendore: — De Convenientia: — De Prudentia: — De Magnanimitate: -De Fortuna: - De Immanitate: — De Aspiratione: — Dialogi v; full of spirit, but blamed for their obscenity by Erasmus himself: De Sermone: — Belli libri 6 quod Ferdinandus Neopolitanorum rex cum Joanne Andoyavense duce gessit; this pamphlet was printed separately (Venice, 1519, 4to), and has been translated into Italian: — Centum Ptolencei sententice commentariis illustratae: — De rebus celestibus: De luna. The poetry of Pontano comprises, Urania, seu de stellis: — Metera: — De hortis Hesperidarum: Pastorales pompae: — Bucolica: - Amor um libri 2: De amore conjugali: — Tumulorum libri 2: — De divinis laudibus: — endecasyllaba: — Lyrici versus: — Edani libri 2: — Epigrammatua. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v. See Hallam, Literary History, 1. 129 sq.; Roscoe, Leo X, ch. 2 and 20; Niceron, Memoires, vol. 8; Tiraboschi, Storia della Letter. Ital. s.v.

## Pontanus, Georg-Barthold von Braitenberg[[@Headword:Pontanus, Georg-Barthold von Braitenberg]]

             a learned Bohemian prelate, was born at Brux about the middle of the 16th century. He had scarcely taken orders when he achieved a reputation by his eloquence in the pulpit, as well as for his remarkable Latin verses, for which last-named attainment he was in 1588 crowned with the poetical laurels by the emperor Rudolph. Appointed canon of the cathedral of Prague in 1582, he afterwards became provost and vicar-general in the same city. He exercised a great and happy influence on the important questions then under debate in Bohemia. He died in 1616. His works are, Der Triumph des Podagra (Frankf. 1605, 4to): — Bibliothek der Pedigten aus alien und neuen Schriftstellern (Cologne, 1608. fol.): — Dasfromme Bohmen (Frankf. 1608, fil.); a selection of the most remarkable acts of piety of the princes and prelates of Bohemia: — Scanderbeugus, seu vita Georgii Castriotce (Hanau, 1609. 8vo): — a number of Latin poems: — a good edition of the treatise De geminis rerum proprietatibus of Bartholomeus Anglicus (Frankf. 1601, 8vo). — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.

## Pontanus, Heinrich[[@Headword:Pontanus, Heinrich]]

             a Protestant theologian, who died at Utrecht, September 5, 1714, doctor and professor of theology, is the author of, De Sale Sacrificiorum: — De Ritu Mersionis in Baptismate. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:630. (B.P.)

## Pontanus, Jacob[[@Headword:Pontanus, Jacob]]

             a Jesuit, was born at Brilck, Bohemia, in 1542, and died at Augsburg, November 25, 1626, professor. He edited Cyrilli Alec. Comment. in Duodecim Prophetas Minores, Graece et Latine cum Notis (Ingolstadt, 1607). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:889; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Pontard, Pierre[[@Headword:Pontard, Pierre]]

             a French prelate, was born at Mussidan Sept. 23,1749. He was curate of Sarlat when the Revolution broke out. He then embraced the new principles with an enthusiasm that was rewarded by his appointment as constitutional bishop of the Dordogne in 1791. A few months later he was  elected deputy of this department to the Legislative Assembly. He spoke in favor of divorce, attacked the dogmas of the Catholic Church, authorized the marriage of priests, and finally took a wife himself. It is this same Pontard who induced the visionary Suzanne Labrousse to go to Paris. Under the consulate he kept a boarding school at Paris, but his institution waned after a few years. He was intimate with Pigault-Lebrun, and aided him, if the report be true, in the composition of some of his novels. After the Restoration, the duchess-dowager of Orleans, to whom he had rendered some services during the Reign of Terror, on hearing of his precarious situation, bestowed on him a life-rent, which enabled him to enter the institution of St. Perine at Chaillot, where he died, without apparent contrition, Jan. 22, 1832. He left, Recueil des Ouvrages de la celebre Mlle. Labrousse (Bordeaux, 1797, 8vo): — Grammaire Mecanique elementaire de l'Orthographe Française (Paris, 1812, 8vo). He is also the author of the Journal prophetique, which was edited at Paris in 1792 and 1793. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.

## Pontas, Jean[[@Headword:Pontas, Jean]]

             a French prelate, was born Dec. 31, 1638, at Saint-Hilaire-du-Harcouet (diocese of Avranches). Brought up by his maternal uncle, M. d'Arqueville, he studied successively under his eves in his native city, then at the Jesuits' College of Rennes, finally in Paris at the College de Navarre. In 1663 he received, for reasons unknown, in the space of ten days, all the orders, inclusive of that of priesthood, from the bishop of Toul, with the consent of the bishop of Avranches. He was scarcely twenty-four years old. In 1668 he obtained the titles of doctor of canon and of civil law. The archbishop of Paris, Perefine, appointed him vicar of the parish of Sainte- Genevieve-des-Ardents, all easy place, which left him time enough for his learned pursuits. He next became sub-penitentiary of Notre Dame, and retired to the Petits-Augustins of the fauIbourg Saint-Germain, where he died, April 27, 1728. His principal work is the Dictionaire des Cas de Conscience (Paris, 1741, 3 vols. fol.). It is the completest on this subject, in the treatment of which Pontas displayed uncommon sagacity and great caution. His decisions founded on imposing authorities, are equally distant from loose morality and narrow rigorisma twofold danger which works of this description seldom avoid altogether. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, S. V.

## Pontbriant, Henri-Guillaume-Marie, Du Breil de[[@Headword:Pontbriant, Henri-Guillaume-Marie, Du Breil de]]

             brother of the two following, was born at Rennes in 1709. He was a canon, grand chantre of the cathedral of Rennes, and abbé of Lanvaux, in the diocese of Vannes. He died at Rennes in 1767. He left, Poeme sur Abums de lat Poesie, crowned at the Jeux Floraux in 1722: — Sermon sur le Sacre du Roi (Toulouse, 1722, 4to): — Essai de Grammaire Francaise (1754, 8vo): — Projet d'lne Histoire de Brtamgsne depuis 1567 jusqu'en 1754 (Rennes, 1754, fol.). — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.

## Pontbriant, Henri-Marie, Du Briel de[[@Headword:Pontbriant, Henri-Marie, Du Briel de]]

             brother of the preceding, was born at Vannes in 1711. He was canon of Rennes. He early entered ecclesiastical life, and after several promotions was made bishop of Quebec, April 9, 1741. He set out for Quebec shortly after, and arrived there Aug. 17. He died at Montreal (Canada) June 29, 1760. A pastoral letter which lie issued on the approach of the English to Quebec in 1759 is in Smith's Hist. of Canada.

## Pontbriant, Rene-Francois, du Briel de[[@Headword:Pontbriant, Rene-Francois, du Briel de]]

             a French priest, was born at Rennes near the opening of the 18th century. Appointed abbé of Saint-Marien d'Auxerre, he was one of the most  zealous promoters of the institution of the Petits-Savoyards. The first idea of that institution is due to the abbé Holy canon of Dijon, who founded at Paris, towards 1665, in the interest of those poor children, an establishment which, taken up by Claude Helyet, could not support itself after his death in 1686. The abbé of Pontbriant, touched with pity at the sight of the misery of those poor little Savoyards, came to their help towards 1737, and devoted to them during the remainder of his life his time, his energies, and his fortune. The abbé de Fenelon, who died on the revolutionary scaffold in 1794 succeeded him in this task. Pontbriant died in 1760. He left, Projiet d'un Establissement deja commence pour elever dails la Piete les petits Savoyards qui sont dans Paris, with several appendices (Paris, 1735-43, 4 parts, 8vo): — Pilerinaye du Calvaire sur le Mont Valerien (ibid. 1745, 12mo; 1751, 16mo; 1816, 12mo): — L'Incredule detrompe et le Chretien afferm'ni dans la Foi (1752, 8vo), a work which met with uncommon favor. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.

## Ponte, Luis de[[@Headword:Ponte, Luis de]]

             a Spanish Jesuit, noted as an ascetic writer, was born at Valladolid Nov. 11, 1554. He belonged to a noble family, but renounced all the advantages the world offered him, and at the age of twenty entered the Society of Jesus. He was during many years a teacher of philosophy and theology, but his failing health compelled him at last to monastical retirement. In his retreat he divided his time between prayer, good works, and the composition of pious writings, by which he obtained throughout Europe the reputation of an excellent master of spiritual life. He died Feb. 17, 1624. Most of his numerous writings were translated into Latin by Melchior Trevinnia. We mention Meditaciones de los Mysterios de, nuestra Santa Fe (Valladolid, 1605, 1613, 2 vols. 4to). This work was translated into several languages: into Arabic by F. Fromaye, and into French by F. Brignon (1613, 3 vols. 4to): — Guida Espiritual de la Oracion, Meditacion, y Contemplacion (ibid. 1609, 4to): — De la Perfeccion Cristiana (ibid. 1612-16, 4 vols. 4to): — Vida del D. Balthasar Alvarez (Madrid, 1615, 4to): — Epositio moralis et mystica in Canticum Canticorum (Cologne, 1622, 2 vols. fol.; Paris, 1646, fol.): — Directorio Espiritual (Madrid, 1625, 8vo). He also wrote the first part of Vida Maravillosa de Mirmina de Escobar (ibid. 1665, fol.), which was finished and published by a member of his order, Miguel Orefia. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v. See Antonio, Bibliotheca Hispansa Nova, s.v.

## Pontianus, St[[@Headword:Pontianus, St]]

             a pope of the 3rd century, was a native of Rome, and descended from the gens Calpurnia, if we may believe the ancient writers. He succeeded Urban I in the pontificate in 230. Platina and others assert that he introduced the singing of psalms into the Church, but this custom must be older. The first years of his pontificate under Alexander Severus were quiet, but the persecutions commenced again under Maximiulls, and Pontianus, together with a presbyter by the name of Hippolytus, suffered sentence of deportation to the usual place of exile, the island of Tavolato, near Sardinia, where he died from want and exposure, Sept. 28, 235. His body was carried to Rome by order of pope St. Fabian. Two epistles are falsely attributed to him. St. Anterus was his successor. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.; Platina, Vitae Pontificum, s.v.; Montor, Hist. des Popes (see Index); Milman, Hist. of Latin Christianity, 1, 80.

## Pontier, Gedeon[[@Headword:Pontier, Gedeon]]

             a French theologian, was born near Alais (Languedoc), near the middle of the 17th century. Though brought up in the Protestant communion, he embraced Roman Catholicism, entered the ecclesiastical state, and obtained the title of apostolic prothonotary. He died at Paris in 1709, at an advanced age. He left, Le Cabinet, ou la Bibliotheque des Graneds (1680-89, 3 vols. 12mo); the last volume contains in addition, Les Questions de la Princesse Henriette de la Guiche, Duchesse d'Angouleme et Comtesse d'Alis, sur toutes Sortes de Slijets, avec les Reponses (1687, 12mo): Lettre de Saeulx, Premier Evsaque d'Altis (1696, 12mo), etc. La Bruvisre gives a portrait of Pontier in his “Caractires,” under the name of Dioscurus, and makes very much of him. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.

## Pontifex (1)[[@Headword:Pontifex (1)]]

             a priest among the ancient Romans. The pontifices were formed into a college, and all matters of religion were placed under its exclusive superintendence. Their functions and duties were minutely detailed in the pontifical books, which were drawn up in the reign of Numa Pompilius, and contained the names of the gods and the various regulations for their worship, as well as a detailed description of the functions, rights, and privileges of the priests. The pontifices were not priests of any particular divinity, but of the worship of the gods generally. Their duties embraced the regulation of all the religious rites and ceremonies (both public and  private) of a state— e.g. how the gods should be worshipped, how burials should be conducted, how the souls of the dead (manes) should be appeased. To them was entrusted the care of the calendar, the proclamation of festival darts, etc. They also saw that every religious and every judicial act took place on the right day. “As they thus had,” says Dr. Mommsen, “an especial supervision of all religious observances. it was to them in case of need (as on occasion of marriage, testament, or arrogatio) that the preliminary question was addressed, whether the matter proposed did not, in any respect, offend against divine law.” In matters of religion they were the supreme authorities; from their decisions there was no appeal, and they themselves were responsible neither to the senate nor the people; further, they had power to inflict punishment on such priests as dared to disobey their injunctions and deviate into schismatical courses. The words of Festus are: “Rerum quae ad sacra et religiones pertinent, judices et vindices.” The head of the college was called Pontifex Maximus. The pontiffs, according to Roman tradition, were instituted by Numa-a mythical person, to whom the origin of nearly all the religious institutions of Rome is ascribed. But as they appear in all the Latin communities, they are regarded by Mommsen as a “thoroughly national Italian institution.” and probably found a place in the earliest religious organization of the Latin race. Their number was originally four, or, including the pontifex maximus, five, all of whom were taken from the patricians. In B.C. 300, the Ogulnian Law raised the number to nine, four of whom were to be plebeians. The first plebeian, however, who attained the dignity of pontifex maximus was Tüb. Coruncanius, B.C. 254. Sulla, in B.C. 81, again increased the number to fifteen, and Julius Caesar to sixteen. During the empire, the functions of pontifex maximus were generally discharged by the emperors themselves; and when at length the emperors dropped the name, it was picked up by the Christian bishops of Rome; and now this title, borrowed from a pagan cult, forms one of the sacred designations of his holiness the pope.

## Pontifex Maximus[[@Headword:Pontifex Maximus]]

             Before the time of Constantine the clergy were not recognized as holding any distinct rank in the state; but when Christianity was adopted as the religion of the Roman empire, its ministers were considered as occupying the place of those heathen priests whose superstitions had fallen into disrepute. According to Zosimus, Constantine himself, in the year 325, assumed the title of Pontifex Maximus, which the heathen emperors before him had appropriated, because it contributed to exalt at once the imperial and episcopal dignity, and served to justify the interference of the emperor in ecclesiastical councils and in the nomination of bishops. Constantine's successors followed his example until the days of Gratian, who was the last emperor to whom the title was applied. Some scholars doubt Zosimus's assertion, notwithstanding the fact that the medals of Constantine and his successors, down to Gratian, and the inscriptions relating to them, give them the title of Pontifex Maximus, on the ground that it may have been one of those traditional titles which the power of habit preserved, without any meaning being connected with them. As to the use of the sacerdotal garment, Zosimus may not be quite trustworthy in that respect. But even if the emperors had accepted the pontifical robes, brought to them by the pagan priests at their accession to the throne, it does not follow that they actually wore them, or even officiated as “Pontifices Maximi.” It has been supposed by some authors that the first Christian emperors adopted this pagan title only as a means of proclaiming themselves the guardians and protectors of the Christian religion. At an early period of his reign Constantine issued edicts in favor of the Christian clergy, by which they were put on a footing, with respect to civil rights, with the heathen priests: these edicts were soon followed by others which gave to the clergy some special and peculiar privileges. See Bingham, Origines Eccles. (Index in vol. 2); Riddle, Christian Antiquities, p. 337; Elliott, Romanism, p. 620; Alzog, Kirchengesch. 1, 244, 251.

## Pontiff, or High-Priest[[@Headword:Pontiff, or High-Priest]]

             a person who has the superintendence and direction of divine worship, as the offering of sacrifices, and other religious solemnities. The Romans had a college of pontiffs, called by them “pontifici.” SEE PONTIFEX.

## Pontiffs, Confraternities of[[@Headword:Pontiffs, Confraternities of]]

             were in the 12th century guilds of associated masons for the building of churches. They appeared first at Chartres, in France, and spread thence throughout that country and England, Switzerland, and Germany. When their Christian character died out they became lodges of Freemasons.

## Pontifical[[@Headword:Pontifical]]

             (i.e. belonging to a pontiff or bishop) is a book of rites and ceremonies appertaining to the office of a high-priest, pope, or prelate; therefore the name of a book used by a bishop at consecration of churches, etc. Thus the Roman Pontifical (Pontificale Romanum) is the book giving directions as to those acts of worship which Roman Catholic bishops exclusively perform, or at least a priest delegated by the bishop. Several mediaeval pontificalia are extant, but they have merely a historical value. The edition published Feb. 10, 1596, by pope Clement VIII, has remained up to our day the rule of the Roman Catholic ceremonial. “Statuentes,” says the pope, “Pontificale preedictum nullo unquam in toto vel in parte mutandum, vel ei aliquid addendum, aut omnino detrahendum esse, ac quoscunque qui pontificalia munia exercere, vel alia, quae in dicto Pontificali continentur, facere aut exequi debent, ad ea peragenda et praestanda ex hujus Pontificalis prescripto et ratione teneri, neminemque ex eis… nisi formulis, quae hoc ipso Pontificali continentur, servatis satisfacere posse.” It may be seen by this quotation how stringent the prescriptions of the Pontifical are. The Pontifical contains the services for ordinations, for religious professions and receptions of monks and nuns, consecrations, benedictions, etc., as well as of the solemn administration by a bishop of those sacraments which are ordinarily administered by priests. Besides the prayers to be recited, the Pontifical also lays down the ceremonial to be observed. The rules of this ceremonial are of two kinds— preceptive, the literal observance of which is obligatory; and directive, which admit of a certain interpretation. The ceremonies must be performed as described in the several services without any omission, addition, or modification, whether in the administration of sacraments or the performance of public worship, in which the bishop exclusively, or a priest delegated by the bishop, officiates.

Another of the service-books of bishops is called the Ceremoniale, but it is chiefly confined to a description of the peculiar ceremonial with which  bishops are required to celebrate solemnly those offices, as of the mass, vespers, the funeral office, etc., which are common to them with priests. The most prized editions of both these service-books are those published by authority of the learned pope Benedict XIV.

In England the Pontifical is not by authority published separately from the Liturgy, so that it is never called by that name; though the offices of confirmation and ordination, in fact, compose the English Pontifical. For the consecration of churches and churchyards there is no office appointed by sufficient authority. See Bible and Missal, p. 217; Coleman, Primitive Ch. (Index). SEE CONSECRATION OF CHURCHES.

## Pontificalia[[@Headword:Pontificalia]]

             properly the ensigns of a pontiff's or bishop's office, is a term loosely used for any ecclesiastical vestment or other ornament, wherein either of these functionaries performs divine service.

## Pontificate[[@Headword:Pontificate]]

             means the state or dignity of a pontiff, or high-priest; but is more particularly applied in modern times to the reign of a pope.

## Pontifix (2)[[@Headword:Pontifix (2)]]

             is hence also the title in the Roman Catholic Church of the archbishop or bishop of a diocese. The pope himself is styled the sovereign pontifex, or pontiff (q.v.). (J. H. W.)

## Pontinus, Council of[[@Headword:Pontinus, Council of]]

             SEE PONTYON.

## Pontius[[@Headword:Pontius]]

             a deacon of the African Church, the tried friend and constant companion of Cyprian, drew up a narrative of the life and sufferings of the martyred bishop, which is styled an excellent production (egregium volumen) by Jerome. If the piece extant under the name of Pontius, entitled De Vita et Passione S. Cypriani, be genuine, it certainly does not merit such high commendation, since it is composed in an ambitious declamatory style, full of affectation and rhetorical ornaments. Perhaps the original work may have formed the basis of what we now possess, which has probably been built up into its present form by the labor of various hands. It will be found attached to all the most important editions of Cyprian, and is contained also in the Acta Primorum Martyrum of Ruinart (Paris, 1690, 4to; Amsterdam, 1713, fol.). The Acta Pontii are preserved in the Miscellanea of Balutze (Paris, 1678, 8vo), 2, 124, and in the Acta Sanctorum under  March 8, the day marked as his festival in the Roman Martyrologies. See Jerome, De Viris 111. p. 68; Schinemann, Bibl. Patrum Lot. vol. 1, c. 3, § 6.

## Pontius (Pilate)[[@Headword:Pontius (Pilate)]]

             SEE PILATE.

## Pontius, Paul[[@Headword:Pontius, Paul]]

             a celebrated Belgian engraver, was born at Antwerp in 1596, according to some accounts, according to others in 1603. He was the pupil of Vorstermann, and is chiefly distinguished for his excellent prints after Rubens, which he executed under that great painter's inspection. He engraved also a celebrated set of portraits after Vandyck, including those of many of the most distinguished Flemish painters. He appears to have adapted himself wonderfully to whatever artist he copied. The date of his death appears not to be known. The Slaughter of the Innocents, after Rubens, one of his principal works, is dated 1653.

## Pontoppidan, Erik Eriksen[[@Headword:Pontoppidan, Erik Eriksen]]

             also called Ponfoppidan the Elder, a Norwegian prelate, was born in 1616 at Broby (town-bridge =pons oppidanus), in Fihlen, in Denmark, from which he took his Latin name. He was for many years minister in Kjoge, but afterwards became bishop of the Trondhjem diocese in Norway. For his many Latin poems he had the honor of being crowned poet by the old Westhof. who had himself been crowned poet in Germany. Pontoppidan's funeral sermons are very famous. But what especially entitles him to an honorable name in history is his Danish Grammar, which was published in 1668, while he was still minister at Kjoge. It was the first Danish grammar ever published. He died in 1678. See Barfod, Fortcellinger, p. 542. (R.B.A.)

## Pontoppidan, Erik L[[@Headword:Pontoppidan, Erik L]]

             son of the nephew of the foregoing, also called Pontoppidan the Younger, was born Aug. 24, 1698, in Aarhus, in Denmark, where his father was dean. He became a student in 1716 at Fredericia, and afterwards at Copenhagen; after this he was tutor in the house of general Lützow, in Norway; traveled in foreign lands with a son of Iver Hvitfeldt, and then became tutor in the family of the last duke of Holstein-Plon. In 1723 he  was appointed chaplain of the palace chapel at Nordborg; in 1734 chaplain of the palace chapel at Fredericksborg; and in 1735 he became court- chaplain in Copenhagen. In 1738 he was elected professor of theology in the Copenhagen University; was appointed bishop of Bergen in 1747: received the degree of doctor of theology in 1749; and in 1755 became chancellor of the Copenhagen University. He died Dec. 20, 1764. As a theologian he was semi-pietistic, but not at all fanatical. He was cheerful, and disapproved the severe pietistic laws that were enforced by the Danish government in his time. During the reign of Christian VI he had the courage to write, “God never permits the laws of nature to be violated for the sake of advancing the cause of the Church.

When the Church of Christ consisted exclusively of volunteers, it had living members.” Some fault has been found with him, and perhaps justly, in his direction of the affairs of the university; but at the same time he did much to advance the cause of science, and he was ever on the alert to see that the several professors did not neglect any portion of their duty to the university. As a German, Danish, and Latin author he exercised a great influence, especially in theology, history, natural history, and political economy. Of his numerous works, the following are the ones most known: An Explanation of Luther's Catechism (1737), a book that was for a long time the text-book in Denmark and Norway in the religious education of the children, and is as such used very widely yet: — Marmora Danica (1739-41, 2 vols. fol.), in which he copies a number of inscriptions of various ages which elucidate the history of his country: — Gesta et Vestigia Danorum extra Daniam (1740-41, 3 vols.): — Annales Ecclesiae Daniw (1741-52, 4 vols.), in German; a good history of the Danish Church: — Menoza, an Asiatic Prince, who Traveled around the World in Search of Christians (1742-43, 3 vols.). This is a philosophical work, written in Danish, and has been translated into Dutch, German, and other languages; it has recently been republished in Denmark by V. Birkeda: — The Power of Truth in Conquering Infidelity (1758): — Collegitum Pastorale Praeticum (1757): — Origzines Hiafnienses (1760): — Danish Atlas (1763-1781, 4 vols.). The fourth volume was completed by his brother-in-law, Hans de Hofman. He also published a Hymn-book, and wrote several short treatises. His Natural History of Norway (1752-54) was translated into English and German. He published Economical Balance in 1759, and a Magazine of Political Ecounomy, from 1757 to 1764. See Barfol, Fortcellinger, p. 542; Nordisk Conversations Lexikon, s.v. (R. B. A.)

## Pontormo, Jacopo da[[@Headword:Pontormo, Jacopo da]]

             (or JACOPO CARRUCCI), a distinguished Florentine painter, was born at Pontormo in 1493. He was a short time the pupil of Leonardo da Vinci, and studied under Albertinelli, Pietro di Cosimo, and Andrea del Sarto. He painted for some time in a similar style to Andrea, and was that painter's rival; but he frequently changed his manner, and three distinct styles are ascribed to him, the last imitated from the works of Albert Durer. Towards the close of his life he spent eleven years in painting some frescos of the Deluge and the Last Judgment in the church of San Lorenzo, in the manner of the imitators of' Michael Angelo, but they have long since been washed over. He died at Florence in 1558.

## Pontus[[@Headword:Pontus]]

             (Πόντος, the sea), a large district in the north of Asia Minor, extending along the coast of the Pontus Euxinus, from which circumstance the name was derived. It is mentioned in the New Testament as furnishing a portion of that audience which listened to the apostles on the day of Pentecost (Act 2:9), as the birthplace of Aquila (Act 18:2), and as one of the districts through which “the strangers” addressed by Peter in his first epistle “were scattered abroad” (1Pe 1:1). All these passages agree in showing that there were many Jewish residents in the district. The term Pontus signified a country of very various extent at different times, and while the boundaries of all the provinces of Asia Minor were continually shifting, none were more affected by the changes of the times than those of Pontus. In the earlier period of its history it was merely a province of Cappadocia, which then extended from Mount Taurus to the Euxine; and tradition states that the petty kingdoms of which it was composed were subdued and consolidated by Ninus.

It then fell under the alternate dominion of the Medes and Persians, the latter of whom divided it into satrapies; and in the reign of Darius Hystaspis the country of Pontus was bestowed by that prince on Artabazes, a member of his own family, who henceforth assumed the title of king of Pontus, and was the ancestor of a long line of princes rescued from oblivion by the genius, the crimes, and the vicissitudes of Mithridates VII, sometimes called “the Great.” The kingdom of Artabazes was comprised between 41° and 43° N. lat., and between 35° and 42° E. long.; and was bounded on the north by the Euxine, on the south by Armenia Minor, on the east by Colchis, and on the west by the river Halys. The inhabitants were a bold, active, and warlike race, and  in the reign of Ariobarzanes they shook off the yoke of Persia, to whose sovereigns their own had from the time of Artabazes been tributary, and established the complete independence of their country. From this period the kingdom of Pontus prospered. Its monarchs gradually added to their dominions the whole of Cappadocia and Paphlagonia and a large part of Bithynia, thus dividing Asia Minor with the Attalian dynasty, which ruled at Pergamos. Mithridates VI formed an alliance with the Romans, sent a fleet to aid them in their wars against Carthage, and when, on the death of Attalus, who left his kingdom of Pergamos to the Roman people, Aristonicus contested the legacy, and attempted to make himself king of Pergamos, Mithridates espoused the cause of Rome, and aided in driving the usurper out of Asia.

The policy of this able prince was reversed by his son and successor. Mithridates VII ascended the throne at the age of eleven years, and early began a career of enmity towards the Romans, the ultimate result of which was the entire subjugation of the country over which he ruled, and its reduction to the condition of a Roman province. Mithridates did, however, succeed so far as to make himself master of all Lesser Asia and of many of the adjacent islands. At Cos he plundered the Jews of a large sum of money, he annexed Athens itself to his kingdom, while his son Ariarathes overcame Macedonia and Thrace. At this period of his reign he was the master of twenty-five nations; and so great were his accomplishments as a linguist, that he is said to have been able to converse with the natives of all without the aid of an interpreter. He determined utterly to root out the Roman dominion from Asia, and in order to compromise the inhabitants of the country beyond the possibility of return, he issued orders that on a certain day throughout his dominions every Roman should be put to death, not excepting even women and children. This atrocious decree, which has covered the name of Mithridates with infamy, was carried out, and the number of persons who perished in the massacre is variously estimated at from eighty to one hundred and sixty thousand. From this time his real power began to decline; and after a romantic series of vicissitudes he was killed at his own request in the seventy-first year of his age, B.C. 64. After the death of Mithridates, his son Pharnaces submitted to the Romans. He was made king of Bosphorus, and proclaimed the ally of Rome; but after the return of Pompey he regained his hereditary kingdom, and ventured to oppose the Romans with as much obstinacy as his father, but with less success. Julius Caesar marched against him, and reduced the country to the condition of a province. Marc Anthony restored Darius, the son of Pharnaces; and a short  line of princes, none of whom require any notice in this place, governed the country till the time of Nero. The last of these, Polemo II, was the father of that Berenice who married Herod Agrippa II, before whom Paul pleaded his cause with so much eloquence. From this time Pontus ceased to be an independent state, constituting a province or dependency of the Roman Empire. On the east it was bounded by Colchis, on the south by Cappadocia and part of Armenia, and on the west by Paphlagonia and Galatia. Ptolemy (Geog. 5, 5) and Pliny (Hist. Nat. 6:4) regard Pontus and Cappadocia as one province; but Strabo (Geog. 12:541) rightly distinguishes them, seeing that each formed a distinct government with its own ruler or prince. Ptolemy divides what may be called the true Pontus into three districts-Pontus Galaticus, Pontus Cappadocius, and Pontus Polemoniacus. This last was imagined to be the country of the Amazons.

The climate of Pontus is hot in summer, but severe in winter, especially along the shores of the Euxine. The soil is fertile, but less so than in the more southern parts of Asia Minor; yet it abounds with olives and cherry- trees, and the valleys produce considerable quantities of grain. These advantages it owes to its being watered by many small rivers, while the great river Halys flows far into the interior. The inhabitants were a hardy and industrious race; deriving their origin, according to tradition, from Tubal Cain. They were industrious as well as warlike, and addicted to commerce, and the inhabitants of Pontus Cappadocius were celebrated for their skill in the manufacture of arms, and for working in metal in general. They had many convenient harbors on the Euxine, and abundance of fine timber for shipbuilding, and of these they seem very early to have taken full advantage. They retained more of the Eastern elements in their language and religion than the inhabitants of Lydia and Pergamos, who were brought more entirely under the influence of Greek art, literature, and philosophy. They spoke a dialect of the Persian, largely corrupted with Greek; and their religion seems to have been a compound of Greek, Scythian, and Persian. Demeter, Zeus, and Poseidon were their chief deities; but this comes to us on Greek authority; and they sacrificed to the last-named deity white horses, by harnessing them four abreast to chariots, and driving them into the sea, where they were drowned. The principal towns of Pontus were Amasia, the ancient metropolis, and the birthplace of Strabo, Themiscyra, Cerasus, and Trapezus; which last is still an important town under the name of Trebizond. See Cellarius, Notit. 2, 287; Mannert, 6:350; Rosenmüller, Bibl. Geog. 3, 5-9; Encyclop. Methodique, sect. Gog.  Ancienne, s.v. Pontos; Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Geog. s.v. Pontus; Conybeare and Howson, Life and Epistles (N. Y. ed.), 1, 247. SEE ASIA MINOR.

## Pontyon, Council of[[@Headword:Pontyon, Council of]]

             (Concilium Pontigonense), was held in June and July, 876, by the Cisalpine bishops, the emperor Charles and the Roman legates being present. The pretensions of Ansegisus, metropolitan of Sens, whom pope John VIII, at the request of the emperor, had nominated primate vicar apostolic in Gaul and Germany (in violation of the canons and of the rights of the metropolitans), were brought before the council, and so resolutely opposed by the bishops that the affair for the time, came to nothing; i.e. the pontifical rescript in favor of Ansegisus remained practically null and void. The archbishop of Sens, it is true, from that time forward assumed the title of “Primate of Gaul and Germany,” but it was a mere nominal distinction, unattended by jurisdiction or authority. The acts of the Synod of Pavia, in the beginning of the year, were confirmed by the Council of Pontyon. Fifty- two bishops and archbishops subscribed the acts, together with five abbots. See Labbe, Concil. 9:280; Hefele, Conciliengesch. vol. 1, 4:and 5; Sirmond, Concil. Antiq. Gall. vol. 3; Jervis, Hist. of the Church of France, 1, 38 sq.

## Pool[[@Headword:Pool]]

             is the rendering in the A. V. of the following Heb. and Greek words:

1. Usually בְּרֵכָה, berekâh (Sept. κρήνη or κολυμβήθρα), or בְּרָכָה, berekâh (Psa 84:6, SEE BERACHAH ), from בָּרִךְ, “to fall on the knees” (see Jdg 7:5-6). This word is akin to the Arabic Birkeli, and its Spanish form Al-berca. In the Old Test. it stands for the larger reservoirs of rain or spring water; while bor, “cistern,” is used for the smaller domestic tanks, of which every house had one or more. Some are supplied by springs, and some are merely receptacles for rain-water (Burckhardt, Syria, p. 314). It is thus applied to the large public reservoirs, corresponding to the tanks of India, belonging to the towns of Gibeon (2Sa 2:13), Hebron (2Sa 4:12), Samaria (1Ki 22:38), and Jerusalem; “the upper pool,” 2Ki 18:17; Isa 7:3; Isa 34:2 (now the “Birket el-Mamilla”); “the lower pool,” Isa 22:9; Isa 22:11 (“Birket es- Sultan”); “Hezekiah's pool,” 2Ki 20:20 (“Birket el-Hammhm”);  “the king's pool,” Neh 2:14 (“the fountain of the Virgin”); “the pool of Siloah,” Neh 3:15 (“Birket Silwan”); and “the old pool,” Isa 22:11. We read also (Ecc 2:6) of the “pools” or cisterns made by Solomon to irrigate his gardens. The importance of these reservoirs in a country possessing scarcely more than one perennial stream, and where wells are few and inconsiderable, can hardly be estimated by those accustomed to an unfailing abundance of the precious fluid. In Jer 14:3 we have a powerful description of the disappointment caused by the failure of the water in the cisterns (גֵּבַים; A. V. “pits;” comp. Isa 42:15; Jer 2:13). In modern Palestine they are often very filthy, although in constant use (Thomson, Land and Book, 1, 316). SEE WATER.

2. Agâm, אָגָם(Isa 14:23; Isa 35:7; Isa 41:18; Isa 42:15); elsewhere “pond” (q.v.).

3. Mikvêh, מַקַוַה(Exo 7:19), a gathering together (i.e. of water), as rendered Gen 1:10.

4. In the New Test. κολυμβήθρα, only in Joh 5:2; Joh 9:7.

The following are the principal reservoirs mentioned in the Bible:

a. A pool of Hezekiah, 2Ki 20:20 (comp. Sir 48:17 [19]). It was a basin which that king had opened in the city, and fed by a watercourse (תְּעָלָה, “conduit”). In 2Ch 32:30 it is said more definitely that Hezekiah conducted the water from the upper pool of (Cihon in the west of the city. This pool of Hezekiah, called by the Arabs Birket el-Hanlunenz, is pointed out by tradition in the north-western part of the modern city, not far east of the Jaffa gate (Robinson, 2, 134 sq.). And there is no doubt that this is the true location, since the waters of the upper pool of Gihon (Birket el-Mamilla) flow through small, roughly built aqueducts in the vicinity of the Jaffa gate, and thus reach the Birket el- Hanum (Robinson, 1, 396). SEE HEZEKIAH'S POOL.

b. The upper pool (בְּרֵכָה עֶלְיוֹנָה) and the lower pool (בְּרֵכָה תִּחְתּוֹנָה), the former lying near the fuller's field, and on the road to it, outside of the city (Isa 7:3; Isa 36:2; 2Ki 18:17), and connecting with a watercourse. The lower pool is named in Isa 22:9. There still remain  in the west of the city two water-basins, an upper and a lower; the one called Biuket el-amnzilla, at the head of the valley of Gihon, and the other Birket es-Sultcan, somewhat farther down the valley southward, almost in a line with the south wall of the city (Robinson, 2, 129 sq.). They are generally known as the upper and the lower pool of Gihon. It supports the identification of these with “the upper and lower pools” that there are no other similar or corresponding reservoirs in the neighborhood; and the western position of the upper pool suits well the circumstances mentioned in Scripture (see Isa 36:2; 2Ki 18:17; comp. Knobel, Isaiah p. 153, 257). It may be added that a trustworthy tradition places the fuller's field westward of the city (Robinson, ut sup. p. 128). SEE GIHON.

c. The old pool (בְּרֵכָה יְשָׁנָה), not far from the double wall (חֹמֹתִיַם, “two walls”), Isa 22:11. This double wall was near the royal garden (2Ki 25:4; Jer 39:4), which must be sought in the southeast of the city, near the fountain of Siloam (Neh 3:15). Near the mouth of the Tyropoeon there are still two reservoirs or cisterns (Robinson, 1, 384; 2, 146), a smaller one hollowed out in the rock, and the other, a little larger, lying a short distance to the south of the former, and receiving its water. The water flows from an opening in the rock a few feet north of the lessen basin; i.e. from the fountain of Siloam. The larger of these basins is doubtless the pool of Siloam, and the smaller is possibly the “old pool,” and the same with the artificial pool named in Neh 3:16 as in this vicinity (Robinson, 2, 146; comp. Thenius, in Illgen's Zeitschr. 1844, 1, 22 sq.). Perhaps, however, we may rather understand the passage in Isaiah as referring to a mere damming up of the Tyropoeon itself between the two parallel parts of the old wall lining the sides of the valley, for the purpose of containing (temporarily during the siege) the waters of the then “old” (i.e. superseded) pool of Gihon outside the city, thus diverted into a new channel. SEE JERUSALEM.

d. The king's pool (בַּרֵכִת הִמֶּלֶךְ, Neh 2:14) is probably to be found in the fountain of the Virgin Mary, on the east side of Ophel (Robinson, 2, 102, 149), and is perhaps the same with the pool of Solomon (κολυμβήθρα Σολομῶνος) mentioned by Josephus as on this side of the city (War, 5, 4, 2; comp. Thenius, op. cit. p. 25). With less probability Schultz (Jerus. p. 58) takes the pool which lies south of Siloam, and which is now half choked with earth, for the king's pool. SEE JERUSALEM.  In Josephus, besides the foregoing, we find the sparrow's pool (τὸ Στρονθίον, which may have a different meaning; see Beekman, Emfind. 4, 19), opposite the Castle of Antonia, in the north of the city (War, 5, 11, 4), now Birket Israil, or perhaps Birket el-Hejjah; the pool of almonds (ἀμύγδαλον), on the east side, at some distance from the city (War, ut sup.); the pool of serpents (κολυμβήθρα τῶν ὄφεων), near Herod's monument (Joseph. War, 5, 3, 2), between Scopus (a hill seven stadia, or a mile, from the city, Joseph. War, 2, 19, 4) and the city, and hence to the north, perhaps near the road to Shechem (Robinson, 1, 400; 2, 43, 189 sq.). This must, then, be different from the dragon well (serpent well) in Neh 2:13, which lay between the dung-gate in the south-west and the valley (comp. Thenius, op. cit. p. 17). There is no trace of it now to be found, for Birket el-Mamilla is to be identified with the upper pool, as above (Schultz, p. 67). SEE JERUSALEM.

For the pools of Gibeon, Hebron, Samaria, Solomon, Bethesda, and Siloam, see those words respectively. SEE FOUNTAIN.

## Poole, Georige Ayliffe[[@Headword:Poole, Georige Ayliffe]]

             an English theologian, was born in 1809. He was a scholar of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, and tool his degree in 1831. After holding several curacies and a benefice at Leeds, he settled permanently in Northamptonshire, first as vicar of Welford, from 1843 to 1876, and then as rector of Winwick, from 1876 to 1883. Poole, who died September 25 of the latter year, ranked as one of the leading English authorities on ecclesiastical architecture. He published a variety of sermons and theological works, including an account of the Life and Times of St. Cyprian (1840). His chief works, however, related to ecclesiology. In 1842 appeared Appropriate Character of Church Architecture: — Churches, their Structure (1845): — History of Ecclesiastical Architecture in England (1848); in conjunction with Mr. J.W. Hugall, he issued an account of the Churches of Scarborough, Filey, and Neighborhood, and Guide to York Cathedral. Poole's last work was History of the Diocese of Peterborough, for the series of Diocesan Histories, in the course of publication by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. (B.P.)

## Poole, Matthew[[@Headword:Poole, Matthew]]

             an eminent English Nonconformist minister, was born in York in 1624. He received his education and took his degree at Emmanuel College, Cambridge. Having attached himself to the Presbyterians, he entered the ministry, and about the year 1648 became rector of St. Michael le Querne, in London. In 1657, when Richard Cromwell succeeded his father in the chancellorship at Oxford, Mr. Poole was incorporated master of arts in that university. He soon became famous and of influence among his brethren, especially after 1658, when he published A Model for the Maintaining of Students of Choice Abilities at the University, and principally in order to the Ministry, which was accompanied with a recommendation from the university, signed by several Cambridge professors and savans, among whom were Cudworth, Witchcot, Worthington, Dillingham, etc. In 1660, after the restoration of Charles II, he published a sermon upon Joh 4:23-24, preached before the mayor of London, against reestablishing the Liturgy of the Church of England; and refusing to comply with the Act of Uniformity, in 1662, he was ejected from his rectory. He published on this occasion Vox clamantis in Deserto, but submitted to the law with a commendable resignation, and retired to his studies at his paternal estate, resolving to employ his pen in the service of religion in general, regardless of the particular disputes among Protestants. He now devoted himself to a laborious and useful work entitled Synopsis Criticorum Biblicum, which was published in 1669 and the following years.

The design was nothing less than to bring into one view whatever had been written by critics of all ages and nations on the books of Holy Scripture. The work when finally brought out was probably as good as any of the kind can be, and few will deny that it is a very valuable and useful abridgment; but synopses and abridgments are rather for the multitude than for scholars, who are rarely satisfied with the opinions of any author which are thus presented to them at second- hand, without the fullness of illustration which the author himself had given; yet being written in Latin, it is manifest that the compiler contemplated a work adapted to the necessities and tastes of Biblical scholars. Its chief use is as a convenient body of exegetical criticism for Biblical students who are placed in situations which cut them off from convenient access to large libraries, and for them it has been rendered to a great extent obsolete by the important results of recent research. But in its day it was a great work. In the midst of this employment he testified his zeal against popery in a number of works, the principal one of which is  entitled The Nullity of the Romish Faith concerning the Church's Infallibility (1666, 8vo). When Oates's depositions concerning the Popish plot were printed in 1679, Poole found his name in the list of those that were to be cut off; and an incident befell him soon after which gave him the greatest apprehensions of his danger.

Having passed an evening at the house of his friend, alderman Ashurst, he took one Mr. Chorley to bear him company home. When they came to the narrow passage which leads from Clerkenwell to St. John's Court, there were two men standing at the entrance; one of whom, as Poole came along, cried out to the other, “Here he is!” upon which the other replied, “Let him alone, for there is somebody with him.” As soon as they had passed, Poole asked his friend if he heard what those men said; and upon his answering that he had, “Well,” replied Poole, “I had been murdered tonight, if you had not been with me.” It is said that, before this incident, he gave not the least credit to what was said in Oates's deposition; but he soon thought proper to retire to Holland, where he died, in October 1679, not without a suspicion of being poisoned, as Calamy relates. He published several small pieces, besides what has been mentioned; and he also wrote a volume of English Annotations upon the Holy Scriptures; but was prevented by death from going farther than the 58th chapter of Isaiah. That work was completed by others, and published (1688) in two vols. fol, Poole is spoken of as profound in learning strict in piety, and universal in his charity. He was more especially distinguished as a commentator. Mr. Cecil observes, “Commentators are excellent where there are but few difficulties; but they leave the harder knots still untied; but after all, if we must have commentators, as we certainly must, Poole is incomparable, and I had almost said, abundant of himself.” Wood observes that “he left behind him the character of a very celebrated critic and casuist;” and Calamy tells us that “he was very facetious in conversation, very true to his friend, very strict in his piety, and universal in his charity.” See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. s.v.; Middleton, Evangel. Biogr. vol. 3; Géneralé Biogr. Dict. s.v.

## Poor[[@Headword:Poor]]

             This word, in the Scriptures, often denotes not so much a man destitute of the good things of this world, as a man sensible of his spiritual wants. In this sense the greatest and richest men of the world are on a level with the poorest in the eyes of God. In the following treatment of the subject we combine the Scriptural and the Talmudic information.

I. Hebrew and Greek terms so rendered in the A. V. These are:

1. אֶבְיוֹן, ebyôn (Sept. πτωχός; Vulg. pauper);

2. דִּל, dal (πένης; pauper);

3. חֵלְכָה, chelekâh (πτωχός; pauper);

4. מַסְכֵּן, misken (πένης; pauper), a word of later usage;

5. עֲנִָה, anrah, Chald. (Dan 4:27) (πένης; pauper); from same root as,

6. עָנַי, 2ani, the word most usually “poor” in A. V. (πενιχρός, πτωχός πένης; indigens, pauper. Also Zec 9:9, and Isa 26:6, πρύς; pauper);

7. רשׁ, rosh, part. of רוּשׁ(ταπεινός; pauper). In 2Sa 12:1,

רָאשׁ; πένης, πτωχός.

8. Poverty; מִחַסוֹרmachsor, lack (ἐνδεία; egestas). In the N.T., πτωχός, pauper, and πένης; egenus, once only (2Co 9:9). “Poor” is also used in the sense of “afflicted,” “humble,” etc., e.g. Mat 5:3.

II. Jewish Enactments. — The general kindly spirit of the law towards the poor is sufficiently shown by such passages as Deu 15:7, for the reason that (Deu 15:11) “the poor shall never cease out of the land;” and a remarkable agreement with some of its directions is expressed in Job 20:19; Job 24:3 sq., where among acts of oppression are particularly mentioned “taking (away) a pledge,” and withholding the sheaf from the poor (Job 24:9-10; Job 29:12; Job 29:16; Job 31:17), “eating with” the poor (comp. Deu 26:12, etc.). See also such passages as Eze 18:12; Eze 18:16-17; Eze 22:29; Jer 5:28; Jer 22:13; Jer 22:16; Isa 10:2; Amo 2:7; Zec 7:10, and Sir 4:1; Sir 4:4; Sir 7:32; Tob 12:8-9. SEE ALMS. Among the special enactments in their favor the following must be mentioned:

1. The right of gleaning. The “corners” of the field were not to be reaped, nor all the grapes of the vineyard to be gathered, the olive-trees not to be beaten a second time, but the stranger, fatherless, and widow to be allowed to gather what was left. So, too, if a sheaf forgotten was left in the field,  the owner was not to return for it, but leave it for them (Lev 19:9-10; Deu 24:19; Deu 24:21). Of the practice in such cases in the times of the Judges the story of Ruth is a striking illustration (Rth 2:2, etc.). SEE CORNER; SEE GLEANING.

2. From the produce of the land in sabbatical years the poor and the stranger were to have their portion (Exo 23:11; Lev 25:6).

3. Re-entry upon land in the jubilee year, with the limitation as to town homes (Lev 25:25-30). SEE JUBILEE.

4. Prohibition of usury, and of retention of pledges, i.e. loans without interest enjoined (Lev 25:35; Lev 25:37; Exo 22:25-27; Deu 15:7-8; Deu 24:10-13). SEE LOAN.

5. Permanent bondage forbidden, and manumission of Hebrew bondsmen or bondswomen enjoined in the sabbatical and jubilee years, even when bound to a foreigner, and redemption of such previous to those years (Deu 15:12-15; Lev 25:39-42; Lev 25:47-54). SEE SLAVERY.

6. Portions from the tithes to be shared by the poor after the Levites (Deu 14:28; Deu 26:12-13). SEE TITHES.

7. The poor to partake in entertainments at the feasts of Weeks and Tabernacles (Deu 16:11; Deu 16:14; see Neh 8:10).

8. Daily payment of wages (Lev 19:13). On the other hand, while equal justice was commanded to be done to the poor man, he was not allowed to take advantage of his position to obstruct the administration of justice (Exo 23:3; Lev 19:15).

On the law of gleaning the Rabbinical writers founded a variety of definitions and refinements, which, notwithstanding their minute and frivolous character, were on the whole strongly in favor of the poor. They are collected in the treatise of Maimonides's Mithnoth Anim, translated by Prideaux (Ugolino, 8:721), and specimens of their character will appear in the following titles: There are, he says, thirteen precepts, seven affirmative and six negative, gathered from Leviticus 19, 23; Deuteronomy 14, 15, 24. On these the following questions are raised and answered: What is a “corner,” a “handful?” What is to “forget” a sheaf? What is a “stranger?” What is to be done when a field or a single tree belongs to two persons;  and further, when one of them is a Gentile, or when it is divided by a road or by water; when insects or enemies destroy the crop? How much grain must a man give by way of alms? Among prohibitions is one forbidding any proprietor to frighten away the poor by a savage beast. An Israelite is forbidden to take alms openly from a Gentile. Unwilling almsgiving is condemned, on the principle expressed in Job 30:25. Those who gave less than their due proportion were to be punished. Mendicants are divided into two classes, settled Door and vagrants. The former were to be relieved by the authorized collectors but all are enjoined to maintain themselves if possible. Lastly, the claim of the poor to the portions prescribed is laid down as a positive right.

Principles similar to those laid down by Moses are inculcated in the N.T., as Luke 3, 11; Luk 14:13; Act 6:1; Gal 2:10; Jam 2:15. In later times mendicancy, which does not appear to have been contemplated by Moses, became frequent. Instances actual or hypothetical may be seen in the following passages: Mar 10:46; Luk 16:20-21; Luk 18:35; Joh 9:8; Act 3:2. SEE BEGGAR.

But notwithstanding this, the prophets often complain of the prevalent hardheartedness towards the poor, and especially of judicial oppression practiced upon them (Isa 10:2; Amo 2:7; Jer 5:28; Eze 22:29; Zec 7:10). Among the later Jews kindness to the poor was regarded as a prominent virtue (Job 29:16; Job 30:25; Job 31:19 sq.; Tobit 2:15; Tob 4:11; Tob 12:9; Luk 19:8), and pharisaic self-righteousness often took this form (comp. Mat 6:2; Otho, Lex. Rabb. p. 512). SEE ALMS. Beggars, in the proper sense, are unknown in the Mosaic economy (Deu 15:4; comp. Michaelis. Hos. Recht, 2, 456 sq.), yet such extremity of want is threatened in Psa 109:10 as a punishment from God. In the New Testament, however, they are mentioned, as Mar 10:46; Luk 18:35; Joh 9:8; Act 3:2, but only in the case of infirm persons.

On the whole subject, besides the treatise above named, see Mishna, Ieah, 1, 2-5; 2, 7; Pesach. 4, 8; Selden, De Jure Natur. 6, 6, p. 735, etc.; Saalschütz. Archaöl. d. Heb. 2, 256; Michaelis, vol. 2, § 142, p. 248; Otho, Lex. Rabb. p. 308. SEE POVERTY.  Poor, Christian Care Of The.

In the early Church great regard was had for those in want. As duly as the Lord's day returned, and as soon as they had brought their sacred duties to a close, the lists of orphans, widows, aged, and poor were produced for consideration, and forthwith a donation was ordered out of the funds of the Church. No heart-stirring appeal was necessary to touch the sympathies of the people of God and no cold calculations of prudence regulated the distribution of alms: wherever there was an object of misery, or a proved necessity, there the treasures of the Church were expended. When the poor in any place were numerous, and the brethren in that place were unable to afford them adequate support, application was made to some richer Church in the neighborhood; and never was it known that the application was fruitlessly received. After the more complete organization of the Church, the poor had one fourth part in the distribution of the revenues, the other three parts going respectively to the bishop, the clergy, and the maintenance of the edifice. In Antioch, in the time of Chrysostom, three thousand poor people were thus provided for, and half that number were similarly supported at Rome in the days of Cornelius. In times of famine the plate of the church was sometimes melted down to support the poor. How pointedly Ambrose replies to the charge of sacrilege brought against him on this account by the Arians: “Is it not better that the bishop should melt the plate to sustain the poor, when other sustenance cannot be had, than that some sacrilegious enemy should carry it off by spoil and plunder? Will not our Lord expostulate with us on this account? ‘Why did you suffer so many helpless persons to die with famine when you had gold to provide them sustenance? Why were so many captives carried away and sold without redemption? Why were so many suffered to be slain by the enemy? It had been better to have preserved the vessels of living men than lifeless metals.' What answer can be returned to this? For what shall a man say ? I was afraid lest the temple of God should want its ornaments. But Christ will answer, ‘My sacraments, which are not bought with gold, do not require gold, nor please me the more for being ministered in gold; the ornament of my sacraments is the redemption of captives; and those are truly precious vessels which redeem souls from death.'” The very poor were often placed in the portico of the church to ask alms. Severe censure was also directed against those who permitted the poor to starve, or defrauded the Church of those dues which were set apart to maintain them. Many instances are recorded where churches in the early ages of  Christianity, after providing for their own poor, gave to neighboring and foreign churches in distant parts. On intelligence of any pressing necessity, ministers and people would hasten with their treasures to the relief of those whom they had never seen, but with whom they were united by the strong ties of the same faith and hope. Thus when a multitude of Christian men and women in Numidia had been taken captive by a horde of neighboring barbarians, and when the churches to which they belonged were unable to raise the sum demanded for their ransom, they sent deputies to the Church in the metropolis of North Africa, and no sooner had Cyprian, who was at the head of it, heard the statement of distress than he commenced a collection in behalf of the unfortunate slaves, and never relaxed his exertions till he had obtained a sum equivalent to about £1000, which he forwarded to the Numidian churches, together with a letter full of Christian sympathy and tenderness.

“In the Roman Catholic states of Europe at the present day, the Church still remains, to a great extent, the public almoner. In Rome, a Commission of Aids has the general direction and administration of the principal public charities. It is composed of a cardinal-president and fifteen members, among whom is the pope's chaplain. The city is divided into twelve districts, over each of which a member of the central council presides. Each parish is represented by its curd and two deputies-a layman and a dame de charlit, named for three years— and has a secretary and a steward or treasurer, who are paid. The alms are given in money, tools, and clothes. Requests for assistance are addressed to the parochial body, from which they are sent to the district, and thence to the central council. The more urgent cases are referred to the cardinal-president, or the curd of the parish. Three brotherhoods search out cases of hidden poverty; and not only do all the religious associations, convents, and monasteries distribute relief, but there is hardly a noble or wealthy house which does not take a regular part in the assistance of the poor.

“In Spain, the state supports several asylums for lunatics, the blind, and the deaf and dumb. It also distributes a large sum annually among the provinces for the relief of the poor— each province being bound to raise double the amount received from the state. The state also steps in for the relief of great calamities, and devotes a certain sum annually for the assistance of unfortunate Spaniards abroad. A general directory of the charitable and sanitary services superintends the parochial bodies charged with the distribution of assistance to the poor.  “In Austria, each commune is charged with the relief of its poor. All who have legal domicile, or, being unable to prove their domicile, are resident in the commune, are entitled to relief out of the general assessment. There is no special rate, and the administration is strictly municipal. In many provinces private charity is associated with public assistance, administered by the cure, a few chosen inhabitants, who are called ‘Fathers of the Poor.' and an officer accountable to the commune. This system is called the ‘Poor's Institutes;' and their funds are principally derived from private sources; but they receive a third part of the property of ecclesiastics who die intestate, and certain fines, etc. Applicants are subjected to minute inquiry as to the cause of poverty, and a weekly allowance is made on a scale according to age and necessity. The infirm poor, who have no relatives to reside with, are taken into hospitals established in almost every commune, where they receive, besides lodging, fire and light, clothing, medical care, and a small allowance in money to provide for their food and other wants. Children are either provided for in the homes of their parents, put into asylums, or boarded with people of probity, who receive a monthly payment, as in Scotland. The welfare of these children is superintended by the cures, the mayors, and the sanitary officers of the commune. Foundlings, lunatics, the blind, the deaf-and-dumb, are provided for by the state. Vagrancy is punished, and parents permitting children under fourteen to beg are liable to three months' imprisonment. Able-bodied vagrants are sent to houses of correction, and kept to work. Pawnbroking is a charitable institution in Austria, under government control; and many pawnbroking establishments rest on endowments, and lend without interest. The trade is forbidden to private persons.

“In France, the relief of the poor is not compulsory. in so far as its distributors may, after making inquiry, refuse relief, except in the case of foundlings and lunatics. The minister of the interior has a general superintendence of the machinery of relief, as well as the immediate administration of many large hospitals and refuges. He also assists a great number of private charities. The other ministers of state give assistance on the occurrence of great calamities. The departmental funds are called upon for the compulsory relief, but the commune is the main source of public assistance. Its duty is to see that no real suffering remains unrelieved, and that the nature of the relief is such as can most easily be discontinued when the necessity ceases. The commune encourages and stimulates voluntary charities, and receives gifts for the benefit of the poor's funds. Except in  Paris, the administration of the hospitals, and of the relief given at the homes of the poor, are under different management, the communes only interfering to supplement the funds of the hospitals, when these are insufficient. The mayor is president both of the administration of the hospitals and of the body for giving out-door relief (the bureau de bienfaisance). During industrial calamities the poor are sometimes employed in workshops supported by the public, and in public works. In Paris, since 1849, there has been a responsible director set over all the charities of the city. He manages the out-door relief through the medium of the committees of assistance, formerly called bureatux de bienfaisance, in each arrondissement. He is under the inspection of a council, composed as follows: the prefect of the Seine (president), the prefect of police, two members of the Municipal Council, two maires or deputy-maires, two members of the committees of assistance, one councilor of state or a master of requests, one physician and one surgeon practicing at the hospitals, one professor of medicine, one member of the Chamber of Commerce, one member of the Council of Prud'hommes and five members taken from other classes than those above mentioned. Begging is forbidden, and punished, wherever there are establishments for the relief of the poor.”

The poor-law of England, and recently of Scotland, too, is a civil enactment. Formerly, in Scotland, many shifts were tried. Beggary was often resorted to, and as often condemned by statute. In Scotland, at the end of the 17th century, Fletcher says, there were 200,000 beggars-more on account of national distress at that time than at other times-but never less, he affirms, than 100,000. Various severe acts had been passed from time to time, and cruel punishments threatened-such as scourging and branding with a hot iron. The famous act of 1579, in enumerating the various classes of beggars condemned, has the following: “All minstrelles, sangsters, and tale-tellers, not avowed in special service, by some of the lords of Parliament or great burrowes, or by the head burrowes and cities, for their common minstrelles; all commoun labourers, being persones abill in bodie, living idle, and fleeing labour; all counterfaicters of licences to beg, or using the same, knowing them to be counterfaicted; all vagabound schollers of the universities of Saint Andrewes, Glasgow, and Abirdene, not licensed by the rector and deane of facultie of the universitie to ask almes; all schipmen and mariners, alledging themselves to be schiipbroken, without they have sufficient testimonials.” The fines levied for ecclesiastical  offences were often given to the poor, as may be seen in the notes to principal Lee's second volume of Church History. Ins 1643, 1644, and 1645, the general session of Edinburgh gives the following to the poor: “1643. Feb. 10 — Penalties and gifts for the use of the poor: Given by Dr. Polurt as a volluntary gift… 100 merks. Penalty for Neill Turner and his partie…16 merks.

Feb. 15. — Given in by Geo. Stuart, advocat, for not coming to the ile… 20 merks. Given by Col. Hume's lady for private marriage with young Craigie…20 merks. Given by Sir John Smytt as a yearlie voluntary gift…100 merks. Given by Mr. Robt. Sinyth for private marriage…20 merks.

“1644. The six sessions ordain the ordinar poor enrolled to be threatened if they learn not the grounds of religion, and to be deprived of their weeklie penssione if they cannot answer to the Cathechise.

May 9. — By Mr. Luis Stuart and Isbell Gerldes, for fornication…21 lib. 6s. 8d. By Robert Martin, for his private marriage… 20 merks, 1645.

March 13. — Given for Wm. Salinond, relapse in fornication… 531. 6s. Sd.”

SEE PAUPERISM.

In the United States, the poor who are members of any ecclesiastical organization are usually provided for by that body. Besides, the churches voluntarily assume very frequently the care of non-believers. In the Protestant Episcopal and in the Methodist Episcopal churches collections for the poor are taken on communion Sundays. Many churches make it the practice to take the poor collection every first Sabbath in the month.

## Poor Catholics[[@Headword:Poor Catholics]]

             SEE WALDENSES.

## Poor Mens Box[[@Headword:Poor Mens Box]]

             is a chest put up usually at the church entrance for the deposit of alms (q.v.). It is found on the continent of Europe not only in the churches, but also in the synagogues. In England the Poor Men's Box (unictulus, pyxis  ad oblations faciendas) is a box affixed near the high-altar, and was introduced there by archbishop Cranmer, to serve in lieu of pilgrimage. In 1559 it was enjoined in every church in England. As architectural specimens, many of these “boxes” are a curiosity. Thus there is a curious alms-box in St. Helen's, Bishopsgate, supported by the figure of a mendicant, and another at Outwell, with a grinning mouth. The idea for the style of these boxes was probably derived from such objects as the bracket of the 15th century adjoining the tomb of Edward II at Gloucester, and the oaken box with a slit for alms used at St. Richard's shrine at Chichester, which is of the 16th century, although the iron-work dates back three hundred years earlier. There is a wooden alms-box of the 14th century at Fribourg. There is a stone box at Bridlington. A flasket or box of wood for collecting alms is mentioned in England in the 17th century. At Selby there is a chest made out of the bole of a single tree. In 1292 such hutches were forbidden at Chichester, as tile oblations hitherto made at; the altar were placed in them. At St. David's, two centuries ago, old people could remember having seen basinfuls of oblations made by seamen and passengers.

## Poor Pilgrims[[@Headword:Poor Pilgrims]]

             an order that started up in the year 1500. They came out of Italy into Germany barefooted and bareheaded, feeding all the week, except on Sundays, upon herbs and roots sprinkled with salt. They remained not above twenty-four hours in a place. They went by couples, begging from door to door. This penance they undertook voluntarily— some for three, others for five or seven years, as they pleased, and then returned home to their callings. SEE WALDENSES.

## Poor Priests[[@Headword:Poor Priests]]

             were those of the Lollards who in the 14th and 15th centuries wandered about the country holding what are called in modern times “missions' wherever they pleased, without any cure of souls being given to them, or license by the bishop of the diocese. The name poor seems to show an association of idea with the Pauperes Cathlolici (q.v.), or the Poor of Lyons.

## Poor of Lyons[[@Headword:Poor of Lyons]]

             SEE WALDENSES.

## Poor, Daniel D.D[[@Headword:Poor, Daniel D.D]]

             a Congregational minister and missionary to India, was born June 27, 1789, in Danvers, Mass. He graduated at Dartmouth College in 1812; was ordained June 21, 1815 with the intention of becoming a missionary, and  sailed Oct. 23 for Ceylon, which lie reached March 22, 1816. He commenced to labor at Tillipally, Jaffna, and remained until July, 1823, when he went to Batticotta, to superintend the missionary seminary. In 1836 he went to Madras, on the mainland, and returned to Ceylon in 1841. He came home in 1848, and spent about two years in the service of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, visiting various parts of the country, delivering addresses, and otherwise stimulating missionary enterprise. He sailed again to Ceylon in 1850, and took his station at Mampy, where he died of cholera, Feb. 2, 1855. le is the author of various publications in the Tamil and English languages. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 2, 617.

## Pooree[[@Headword:Pooree]]

             is the name of the little town situated near the temples where the Juggernaut worship is performed by the Hindûs. It is situated in the province of Orissa (q.v.), in the southeastern part of India, and is a dirty little town, with a district of about ten miles of like name, within which the temples are located. It constitutes a part of the endowment of the temple, nobody being allowed to enter the territory without paying a prescribed fee. The population of the town is about seventy-five thousand, there being among the number about four thousand priests, who attend daily upon the temple. Here is found probably one of the greatest strongholds of superstition in India, and it might be called the greatest seat of Brahminical power. The stone wall enclosing the great temples is about thirty feet high, and the area forms a rectangle of six hundred and fifty feet by six hundred and sixty. Within this wall are a number of smaller temples. A visit to these temples is enjoined upon a Hindûs one of the most important acts in the ritual of his religion, and year after year this Mecca is resorted to by representatives from every section of the country. See the literature quoted under the article JUGGERNAUT SEE JUGGERNAUT .

## Pope[[@Headword:Pope]]

             Having treated in the article PAPACY SEE PAPACY of the rise and development of the papal dignity and power, we shall speak in the present article of the personal attributes of the incumbent of the Roman see.

I. The Title. — The word pope is derived from the Latin papa, Greek πάππας, and means father. While the Greek word was used in the Greek Church to designate both bishops and priests, and has gradually come to be reserved for the priests exclusively the Latin term was for several centuries a title applied to all bishops, and was finally reserved for the bishops of Rome. As far as is known, bishop Siricius, in the 4th century, was the first to use the word as a title. After the 5th century it came into more general use, and after the 7th it gradually disappeared from ecclesiastical language for every ecclesiastical dignity except that of the bishop of Rome. It was expressly made the exclusive prerogative of the Roman bishops by Gregory VII. In a like manner several other titles, which at first were applied to the bishops of the principal seats, such as apostolicus, dominus apostolicus, sedes apostolica, were gradually monopolized by the bishops of Rome. The designation servtus sermorum Dei was first used by Gregory I, and though occasionally also bishops, priests, and emperors adopted it, it likewise remained in the course of time the prerogative of the popes. During the 8th and the following centuries it was common to call the bishop of Rome vicarius Petri. The expression occurs in the Pseudo- Isidorian Decretals, in the oath which was taken in 722 by Boniface to Gregory II, in the oath taken by Gregory VII to the king of Germany, in the conclusion of peace between Alexander III and the emperor Frederick Barbarossa; but from the time of Innocent III, when the power of the popes had become more absolute, the vicarius Petri gave way to the vicarius Christi. The title Sanctitas tua or Beatitudo tuc, which came into use in the 3d or 4th century, the pope shares even now with the bishops of the Eastern Church. It is accorded to him even by Protestant governments. (See Brit. and For. Ev. Rev. Jan. 1866, p. 48 sq.)

II. Rights and Functions. —

1. Personal Prerogatives. The rights claimed by the popes within the Roman Catholic Church, and accorded to them by the bishops, priests, and laity of the Church, have of course greatly varied according to the degrees  of power which the incumbents of the Roman see attained in various periods of Church history. For a long time they claimed and received as bishops of Rome and patriarchs of the West only those rights and honors which also belonged to other bishops and patriarchs. SEE BISHOP; SEE PATRIARCH.

When their superiority over other bishops and patriarchs came finally to be recognized and established, the popes were by no means regarded as absolute rulers of the Church, but their rights were limited and circumscribed by general councils and secular princes. While the popes were with an unyielding consistency endeavoring to develop the extreme papal system which now prevails, many of the greatest scholars of the Church defended an episcopal system which assigned to the pope a position similar to that of a constitutional monarch, and, in particular, maintained the superiority of a general council over the pope. At the general councils of Constance and Basle the friends of this view had an undisputed majority; and in the following centuries the history of Gallicanism, of Febronius, of Joseph II, are some of many proofs that in several countries the episcopal system had numerous adherents, even among bishops. After having been long on the decline, the episcopal system within the Roman Catholic Church was totally extinguished by the Vatican Council, and the extensive rights which the popes, in the course of many centuries, had claimed as their exclusive monopoly, were recognized by the entire Church. A common division of the papal rights is that into primatus jurisdictionis and primatus honoris. The former comprises the sovereign law of legislation, the supreme administration and the final decision on all subjects relating to ecclesiastical offices, especially the right of confirming, consecrating, transferring, and deposing bishops; the regulation of all religious institutions, especially of the religious orders; the supreme ecclesiastical jurisdiction, the supreme right of supervision, and the supreme management of ecclesiastical finances and property; the highest authority in all doctrinal questions. In the decision of doctrinal questions the popes have long claimed infallibility (q.v.), and the Vatican Council has recognized this claim as a doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church. The pope has also the supreme right of regulating the divine worship, of granting indulgences (q.v.), and the sole right of beatifying and canonizing deceased members of the Church. SEE BEATIFICATION; SEE CANONIZATION. The primatus honoris comprises the following distinctions:

(1.) The tiara, also called mitra turbinata cum corona, triregnum, regnum, diadema, phrygium, consisting of the bishop's cap (mitra) encompassed with a triple golden crown. It is for the first time mentioned in the forged donation of Constantine (8th century), and was for the first time used at the coronation of Nicholas II (858). The third crown was added to the mitra by Urban V (1362-1370). The pope receives it on the day of coronation in the loggia of St. Peter's Church from two cardinal deacons, who place it upon his head with the words, “Accipo tiaram tribus coronis ornatam et scias, patrem te esse principum et regum, rectorem orbis in terra, vicaritum salvatoris nostri Jesu Christi, cui est honor in smecula saeculorum.” The pope only wears the timara at great ecclesiastical festivities and processions, but not during the performance of ecclesiastical functions.

(2.) The so-called pedum rectum, the straight bishop's staff ornamented with a cross, but not the crooked episcopal pastoral staff.

(3.) The pallium, a vestment having the form of a scarf, composed of white wool, and embroidered with six black silken crosses. The pope sends it as a mark of honor to patriarchs, primates, metropolitans, and sometimes to bishops all of whom are only allowed to wear it within their own dioceses and on certain occasions, while the pope wears it always and everywhere on saying mass.

(4.) The so-called adoratio, a homage which in the old Oriental Church was shown to bishops and priests generally. It consists in kneeling down and kissing the pope's foot. Gregory VII still demanded it from princes, the Dictatus Gregorii saying on this subject, “Quod solius papae pedes omnes principes deosculentur.” The kiss upon the cross on the pope's shoes is still demanded from clergymen and laymen, but an exception is made with princes and persons of higher rank. Sovereign princes only kiss the hand, cardinals the foot and the hand, after which they are admitted to an embrace; archbishops and bishops the foot and the knee.

(5.) During the Middle Ages the popes received from the princes the officium strepae, the princes holding the stirrups when the pope mounted the horse, and leading the horse for a while. Among the princes who are recorded to have rendered this homage were Louis II, Henry VI, Henry VII, Frederick III, Charles V, and Philip IV of France. Of Frederick Barbarossa, pope Adrian IV complained that he held the left, instead of the right stirrup.

2. Dress, etc. — At home the pope's habit is a white silk cassock, rochet, and scarlet mantle. In winter he wears a fur cap; in summer a satin one. When he celebrates mass, the color of his habit varies according to the solemnity of the festival. At Whitsuntide, and all festivals of the martyrs, he officiates in red; at Easter, and all festivals of virgins, in white; in Lent, Advent, and eves of fasting-days, in violet; and on Easter-eve, and at all masses for the dead, in black. All these colors are said to be typical: the red expresses the cloven tongues and the blood of the martyrs; the white, the joy caused by our Savior's resurrection and the chastity of virgins; the violet, the pale aspect of those who fast; and the black, grief and mourning. The tiara is a council-cap, with three coronets rising one above another, and adorned with jewels. Paul II was the first who added the ornaments of precious stones to his crown. The jewels of Clement VIII's crown were valued, they say, at 500,000 pieces of gold. That of Martin V had five pounds and a half weight of pearls in it. “Nor is there anything unreasonable in this (says Father Bonani), since the pope governs the kingdom of Christ in quality of his viceroy: now this kingdom is infinitely superior to all the kingdoms of the universe. The high priest of the Jews wore on his head and breast the riches which were to represent the majesty of the Supreme God. The pope represents that of the Savior of the world, and nothing better expresses it than riches.” We must not omit that the two strings of the tiara are said to represent the two different manners of interpreting the Scriptures, the mystical and the literal. The pope has two seals. One is called “the fisherman's ring,” and is the impression of Peter holding a line with a bait to it in the water. It is used for briefs sealed with wax. The other seal bears the figures of Peter and Paul, with a cross on one side; and on the other an effigy, with the name of the reigning pope. This is used for the bulls, which are sealed with lead. On the decease of a pope these seals are defaced and broken by the cardinal-chamberlain in the presence of three others. When the pope goes in procession to St. Peter's, the cross is carried before him on the end of a pike about ten palms long. “Many reasons,” says Father Bonani, “authorize this custom. It is a monument of the sufferings of Jesus Christ, and of the pope's adherence to the Savior of the world. It is the true mark of the pontifical dignity, and represents the authority of the Church, as the Roman fasces did that of the consuls.” At the same time two grooms bear two fans on each side of his  holiness's chair, to drive away the flies. This (according to the above-cited author) represents the seraphim covering the face of God with their wings.

3. Officers. — The pope has a Vicar who is always a cardinal. He who manages that charge has jurisdiction over the priests and regulars, over the lay-communities, hospitals, places of piety, and Jews. His place may be worth to him two hundred ducats per month. He has two lieutenants, one for civil and the other for criminal affairs, and a vicegerent, who is a bishop, for the exercise of episcopal functions.

The Penitentiary has jurisdiction in cases referred to the pope; and gives to approved confessors power to absolve. At solemn feasts he goes into one of the churches of Rome, where, sitting in a high chair, he has a switch in his hand, and hears the confession of particular cases. This place is worth eight thousand crowns a year.

The Chancellor was properly secretary to the pope, ab intimis. This charge is now bestowed upon none but a cardinal, and it may be worth to him fifteen or sixteen thousand crowns a year. His business is to dispatch the apostolic letters, except those signed by the pope, which are dispatched by a brief sub annulo piscatoris. He has under him a regent, and twelve abbreviators di parco maggiore, who are all prelates. The regent has power to commit all causes of appeal to the rota and referendaries. The abbreviators di parco maggiore draw the bulls, and send them when they are written. Besides these, there are abbreviators di parco minore, who are scriveners, and other officers of the chancery, appointed to receive and sign bulls. The vice-chancellor keeps a register of the collation of titles given to cardinals, and of promotions to bishoprics and consistorial abbeys.

The Chamberlain is always a cardinal, and has for substitutes the clerks of the apostolic chamber, a treasurer, and a president. This office is worth to him fourteen thousand crowns a year. He takes cognizance of all causes within the verge of the apostolic chamber, and, besides, judges of appeals from the masters of the streets, bridges, and edifices. When the see is vacant, the chamberlain remains in the palace, in the pope's apartment, goes through the streets with the Swiss guards attending him, coins money with his own arms thereon, and holds a consistory. He is one of the three chief treasurers of the Castle of St. Angelo, whereof the dean is another, and the pope the third.  The Prefect of the signature of justice is also one of the cardinals, and has two hundred ducats in gold per month. His business is to make rescripts of all the petitions and the commissions of causes which are delegated by the court. Every Thursday the signature of justice is held in the palace of the cardinal-prefect, where assist twelve prelates-referendaries, that have votes, and all the other referendaries, with power to propose each two causes; as also an auditor of the rota, and the civil auditor of the cardinal- vicar, having no vote, but only to maintain their jurisdiction in what relates to them. The prefect of the signature of grace signs all the petitions and grants which the pope bestows in the congregations held in his own presence once a week. The prefect of the briefs is always a cardinal; he revises and signs the copies of the briefs.

The General of the Holy Church is created by a brief of the pope, who gives him the staff himself in his chamber, and takes his oath. In time of peace he has allowed him a thousand crowns per month, and three thousand in time of war. He commands all the troops and all the governors in the places and fortresses of the ecclesiastical estate. His lieutenant has three thousand crowns a year, and is made also by a brief from the pope, as is the general of the artillery, who has twelve hundred crowns per annum.

The governor of the Castle of St. Angelo has six thousand crowns per annum.

The pope has four Masters of Ceremonies, who are always clad in purple, and have great authority in public affairs. Besides these, there are other masters of the ceremonies, which are in the congregations of privileges, whereof one discharges the office of secretary, and the other dispatches orders.

The Master of the Sacred Palace is always a Dominican. He reviews and approves all the books that are printed, being assisted by two priests of the same order. The palace, besides a table, allows him a coach.

The Major-domo, or steward to the household of the pope, is always a prelate. The chamberlains of honor are persons of quality, who come to the palace when they please.

The Master of the Stables is a gentleman who has the office of master of the horse, without the title of it; for the pope bestows no such upon any person. He is sword-bearer, and sometimes one of the greatest lords in Rome. as was Pompey Frangipani under Leo II.  The Vestry-keeper is an Augustine monk, who has the same allowance as the master of the palace. He takes care of all the riches in the pope's vestry. He goes like a prelate; and if he be a titular bishop, takes place among the assistant bishops.

The pope's Secretary is always a cardinal, and very often his nephew. This place is united to that of superintendent of the ecclesiastical estate. He writes and subscribes all tile letters sent to the princes and nuncios. All ambassadors and all ministers at Rome, after having negotiated with the pope, are obliged to give him an account of their negotiations. The secretaries of state are subject to the secretary superintendent, or cardinal patron, whose orders they receive, and to whom they send their letters to be subscribed. They live in the palace, and are prelates clad in purple.

There are twenty-four Secretaries of Briefs, the chief of whom lives in the palace. Their business is to subscribe and dispatch all the briefs that are received by the cardinal-prefect of the briefs. The secretary of the secret briefs takes care to prepare them when the cardinal-patron or some one of the secretaries of state commands him. These briefs are shown to nobody, nor signed by the prefect of the briefs, except when they are sealed sub annulo piscatoris, and accompanied with a letter from the cardinal-patron. The copies of these briefs are carefully kept; and, when the pope is dead, they are carried to the Castle of St. Angelo.

The Mareschal of Rome has under him two civil judges, one of whom is called the first collateral judge, and the other the second collateral, with a judge for criminal affairs. He, together with these judges, takes cognizance of matters between the citizens and inhabitants of Rome. He is always a foreigner, and lives in the Capitol: while in the discharge of his office he appears clad like an old senator, having a robe of cloth of gold that hangs down to the earth, with large sleeves to it lined with red taffeta.

4. Official Powers. — As we have seen above, the pope of Rome is now the supreme head of what is known as the Roman Catholic world. Held to be the successor of the apostle Peter, the pope is claimed to be Christ's vicar on earth. The Council of Florence, 1439, says: “Definimus, Sanctam apostolicam Sedem et Romanum Pontificem in universum orbem tenere primatum, et ipsum Pontificem Romanum sluccessorem esse B. Petri principis apostolorum et verum Christi vicarium, totiusque Ecclesia caput et omnium Christianorum patrem ac doctorem existere, et ipsi in B. Petro pascendi, regendi ac gubernandi universalem Ecclesiarn a Domino Nostro  Jesu Christo plenum potestatem traditam esse, quemadmodum etiam in gestis oecumenicorum conciliorum et in sacris canonibus continetur” (Bullarium Romanum [ed. Luxemb.], 1, 336). A similar doctrine is proclaimed by the fifth Lateran Council of 1512 (c. 1, De Conciliis in V, 3, 7), in the Roman Catechism, pt. 1, c. 10, qu. 11, and in the Profession of Faith of the Council of Trent: “Sanctam Catholicam et apostolicam Romanam Ecclesiam omnium Ecclesiarum matrem et magistram agnosco; Romanoque Pontifici, beati Petri apostolorum principis successori ac Jesu Christi vicario, veram obedientiam spondeo ac juro.” As such he is to be invested with all power necessary for the government of the Universal Church. This embraces authority to examine and decide authoritatively all controversies to convoke councils, to revise and confirm their decrees, to issue general decrees, whether upon discipline and morals or upon doctrine, to appoint bishops in all parts of the Church, to confirm the election when made by the clergy or by the civil authorities, no matter how it may have been made; he call also depose bishops and set others in their place, and even, in cases of great emergency, suppress bishoprics, and change their ecclesiastical limits according to his judgment of the existing requirements of the Church; he is also to judge of the doctrines taught in particular books or by particular individuals, and to pronounce infallibly as to their conformity with the Catholic faith, or the contrary. In addition to these powers, it is still further claimed for him by the Ultramontanes, as we have seen above and in the article INFALLIBILITY SEE INFALLIBILITY , that he is endowed by God with infallibility; so that what he says ex cathedua, i.e. officially and as pope, is of divine authority, and cannot be questioned or denied; and that also, as the vicar of Christ, he has a supreme authority over all civil rulers and civil jurisdiction, the allegiance of all the faithful to him being superior to that which is due to their respective governments. SEE PRIVACY.

The principal scriptural authority for the papacy relied upon by the Roman Catholic Church is Mat 16:18-19. Without entering into a discussion of the meaning of this famous passage, we may here quote from Abbott's Commentary on the New Testament a statement of the Roman Catholic interpretation, and the grounds on which that view is rejected by all Protestants:

“The ordinary Roman Catholic view of this passage is that Christ declared his purpose to found a great ecclesiastical organization; that this organization was to be built upon Peter and his successors as its true  foundation; that they were to represent to all time the authority of God upon the earth, being clothed, by virtue of their office, with a continuous inspiration, and authorized by the Word, and fitted by the indwelling Spirit of God, to guide, direct, illumine, and command the disciples of Christ, with the same force and effect as Christ himself (see Phillips, Kirchenrecht, 1, 146). SEE PETER. This view is untenable for the following reasons:

1. Christ does not, as we have seen, refer to a definite ecclesiastical organization by the word church, and would not be so understood by his disciples.

2. Peter was not by nature rock-like; he was, on the contrary, characteristically impulsive and unstable. There must be, therefore, some other significance in the words ‘Thou art a rock' which the Roman Catholic interpretation loses.

3. Neither he nor the other disciples understood that Christ invested him with any such authority and position. He did not occupy any such place in the Church while he lived. In the first council a; Jerusalem (Act 15:7-11) he was simply an adviser, the office of chief or president being apparently held by James; Paul withstood Peter to his face, as no disciple ever withstood Christ, or would have withstood his acknowledged representative (Gal 2:11-14); and throughout the N.T. the apostles are all treated as co-equals (Mat 18:1; Mat 19:28; Mat 23:8; Joh 15:1-5 Rev 21:14).

4. There is neither here nor anywhere else in the N.T. any hint of a successor to Peter, or of any authority in him to appoint a successor, or of any such authority vested in any of the apostles, or exercised, or assumed to be exercised, by any of them.

5. The N.T. throughout, and the O.T. in all its prophecies, recognizes Christ as the chief corner-stone, the foundation on which the kingdom of God can alone be built.

6. Mark and Luke omit from their account this utterance of Christ; if it really designated Peter as the foundation of the visible Church, and was thus essential and not incidental to the right understanding of the whole incident, it would not be omitted from their accounts.” SEE ROCK.

Few Christian governments have ever been willing to recognize to their full extent the rights claimed by and for the Roman popes. The placet (q.v.)  was introduced in the Middle Ages by most of the states, and without it no papal bull could be promulgated; and the popes found it necessary to consent to the conclusion of special concordats (q.v.) or conventions, which, in the way of compromise, regulated the papal rights which a state government bound itself to recognize.

Many popes in the Middle Ages also claimed the power of deposing kings, of absolving the subjects of excommunicated princes from their oath of allegiance, and, in general, an unlimited power over temporal as well as spiritual affairs. That a number of popes assumed this right is a fact admitted on all sides; but it is quite common among Roman Catholics to deny that this is a right inherent in the papal dignity, and also that it was ever claimed by the popes as a right belonging to them in virtue of their office. A few samples of pontifical arrogance may suffice for illustration here:

Pope Paschal II, in 1099, deprived Henry IV, and excited enemies to persecute him; telling them they could not “offer a more acceptable sacrifice to God than by impugning him who endeavored to take the kingdom from God's Church.” Pope Gregory VII says: “For the dignity and defense of God's holy Church, in the name of Almighty God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, I depose from- imperial and royal administration king Henry, son of Henry sometime emperor, who too boldly and rashly hath laid hands on thy Church; and I absolve all Christian subjects to the empire from that oath whereby they were wont to plight their faith unto true kings; for it is right that he should be deprived of dignity who doth endeavor to diminish the majesty of the Church. Go to, therefore, most holy princes of the apostles, and what I said, by interposing your authority, confirm; that all men may know at length, understand, if ye can bind and loose in heaven, that ye also can upon earth take away and give empires, kingdoms, and whatsoever mortals can have; s for if ye can judge things belonging unto God, what is to be deemed concerning these inferior and profane things? And if it is your part to judge angels, who govern proud princes, what becometh it you to do towards their servants? Let kings now, and all secular princes, learn by this man's example what ye can do in heaven, and in what esteem ye are with God; and let them henceforth fear to slight commands of holy Church, but put forth suddenly his judgment, that all men may understand that not casually, but by your means, this son of iniquity doth fall from his kingdom.”

Pope Boniface VIII, in 1294, has a decree extant in the canon law running thus: “We  declare, say, define, pronounce it to be of necessity to salvation for every human creature to be subject to the Roman pontiff. One sword must be under another, and the temporal authority must be subject to the spiritual power, whence, if the earthly power doth go astray, it must be judged by the spiritual power.” Before him, pope Innocent III affirmed “the pontifical authority so much to exceed the royal power, as the sun doth the moon;” and applies to the former the words of the prophet Jeremiah Ecce, constitui te super gentes et regna—” See, I have set thee over the nations and over the kingdoms, to root out and to pull down, and to destroy and to throw down,” etc. Of this power that pope made experiment by deposing the emperor Otho IV, “whom,” says Nauclerus, “as rebellious to the apostolical see, he first did strike with an anathema; then him persevering in his obstinacy, did, in a council of prelates held at Rome, pronounce deposed from empire.” This monstrous authority was avowed by that great council under this pope which, according to the Council of Trent, did represent or constitute the Church, ‘when it was ordained that if a “temporal lord, being required and admonished by the Church, should neglect to purge his territory from heretical filth, he should, by the metropolitan and the other co-provincial bishops, be noosed in the band of excommunication; and that if he should slight to make satisfaction within a year, it should be signified to the pope, that he might from that time denounce the subjects absolved from their fealty to him, and expose the territory to be seized on by Catholics,” etc. Pope Pius V, in 1570, begins his bull against queen Elizabeth in these words: “He that reigneth on high, to whom is given all power in heaven and in earth, hath committed the one holy catholic and apostolic Church, out of which there is no salvation, to one alone on earth, namely, to Peter, prince of the apostles, and to the Roman pontiff, successor of Peter, to be governed with a plenitude, of power. This one he hath constituted prince over all nations and all kingdoms, that he might pluck up, destroy, dissipate, ruinate, plant, and build.”

And in the same bull he declares that “he thereby deprives the queen of tier pretended right to the kingdom, and of all dominion, dignity, and privilege whatsoever: and absolves all the nobles, subjects, and people of the kingdom, and whoever else have sworn to her, from their oath, and all duty whatsoever, in regard of dominion, fidelity, and obedience.” The bull of pope Sixtus V, in 1585, against Henry, king of Navarre, and the prince of Condu, begins thus: “The authority given to St. Peter and his successors, by the immense power of the Eternal King, excels all the powers of earthly kings and princes. It passes uncontrollable sentence upon  them all; and if it find any of them resisting God's ordinance, it takes more severe vengeance of them, casting them down from their thrones, though never so puissant, and tumbling them down to the lowest parts of the earth, as the ministers of aspiring Lucifer.” He then proceeds to thunder against them, “We deprive them and their posterity forever of their dominions and kingdoms; “and accordingly he deprives those princes of their kingdoms and dominions, absolves their subjects from their oaths of allegiance, and forbids them to pay any obedience to them. “By the authority of these presents, we do absolve and set flee all persons, as well jointly as severally, from any such oath, and from all duty whatsoever in regard of dominion, fealty, and obedience: and do charge and forbid all and every of them that they do not dare to obey them, or any of their admonitions, laws, and commands.”

For a full review of this question, SEE GALLICAN CHURCH; SEE INVESTITURE; SEE TEMPORAL POWER.

III. The Election of the Pope. — In the 2nd and 3rd centuries the bishops of Rome were, like all the bishops of the ancient Church, elected by the clergy and the people. When Christianity was declared to be the religion of the state, the emperors claimed a share in the election of the pope. The clergy of Rome greatly disliked the interference of the emperors in the election of their bishops. and. after the destruction of the Western Roman empire in 499, a Roman synod under bishop Symmachus vindicated to the Roman clergy the exclusive right of electing the bishop. Three years later, 502, the Roman synod declared a decree issued by Odoacer, who as successor of the Roman emperor demanded that no bishop of Rome should be elected “sine nostra consultatione,” to be an unwarranted encroachment upon the rights of the Church. That Odoacer paid no attention to these resolutions is proved by the fact that in 514 he had a share in the election of Felix III. The Gothic kings Theodoric and his successors, as well as Justinian I and the Byzantine emperors, likewise disregarded the occasional protests of the Roman bishops. They are known to have appointed or confirmed several popes as Vigilius, Pelagius I, and Pelagius II. The so- called Liber diurnus, a collection of formulas of the Roman Curia, which relates to the time from the 6th to the 8th century, and received its present shape in the 8th century, expressly mentions that the Roman bishops elected by the clergy and the people were confirmed by the Greek emperor, or his representative, the exarch of Ravenna. The weak rule of the last Longobardian kings, and the impotence of the emperors in Constantinople,  greatly favored the endeavors of the popes to exclude altogether the influence of princes from the papal elections. During the reign of Pepin the Short and Charlemagne the elections were entirely free, and the report that a Roman synod under Adrian I conferred upon Charlemagne the right of confirming the elected pope is a forgery.

The popes of this time only notified Pepin and Charles of the result of the elections. The baneful influence which was soon after obtained by the Roman nobility upon the elections of the popes induced again an interference of the imperial power, and in 824 Lothaire, the son of Louis le Dibonnaire, entered into an agreement with Eugenius II, according to which the consecration of a newly elected pope was not to take place without the concurrence of an imperial delegate. This agreement remained in force throughout the following century. In the 10th century Otho the Great rescued the Church from the most disgraceful condition in which it had yet found itself, and rid it of some of the most wicked popes which have ever disgraced the see of Rome. It was quite common in the Church then to look upon the emperor as the chief pillar of reform, and it is therefore not to be wondered at that a greater influence was accorded to him than had been possessed by any of his predecessors. When he entered the city of Rome, the people, according to Luitprand, had to take an oath “numquam se papam electuros aut ordinaturos praeter consensum atque electionem domini imperatoris Ottonis Caesaris Augusti filiique regis Ottonis.” After the Synod of Sutri had, in 1046, deposed all the three popes, the Roman people conferred upon Henry III, for himself and his successors, the right “in electione semper ordinandi pontificis principatum.” Henry availed himself of this in the appointment of the German popes Clement II, Leo IX, and Victor II, for which he consulted only his German advisers, as if it had been an affair of the German empire. After the death of Henry III, the influence of Hildebrand upon the popes of that time soon brought on the beginning of a new era in the history of the papacy. One of the events which mark the beginning of this new era is the radical change which was made in the papal elections by the famous decree of Nicholas II and the Lateran Synod in 1059. The essential points of the decree are the transfer of the papal election to the cardinal-bishops, the total abolition of the former concurrence of the Roman people and nobility, and virtual abolition of the former imperial right; for the words “salvo debito honore et reverentia” do not appear to imply more than the right of the emperor to demand a notification of the result of the election. The emperors were to possess the insignificant rights which were left to them only as a personal privilege, for  the conferring of which every new emperor had to make an application. The decree of Nicholas I was further developed and defined by that of Alexander III and the Lateran Synod of 1179, which made the validity of the papal election contingent upon a two-thirds vote of the cardinals. The defeat of the emperor Frederick Barbarossa in his struggle with the papacy put an end forever to even the nominal rights of the emperors in regard to the papal elections. The first provisions concerning the conclave were made by Gregory X and the Council of Lyons in 1274. The town for holding the conclave (q.v.) was not to be exclusively Rome, but the city in which the pope died; and in case this city was under an interdict, the next adjacent city. The place for the conclave was the episcopal palace. The provisions of the decree of Gregory X were somewhat, though not essentially, modified by Clement V (1305-1314) and Clement VI (1342- 1356). The councils of Pisa, Constance, and Basle elected new popes, without binding themselves to the papal provisions concerning the conclaves; but in this as in many other respects their proceedings were of an exceptional character, and were without abiding consequences in the law of the Church. In 1621 Gregory XV issued the constitution Eterni Patris filius, which contained all the principal provisions in regard to the conclave that are now in use. In a few points only it was supplemented by bulls of Urban VIII (1625) and Clement XII (1732).

The present mode of electing a pope has been fully described in the article CONCLAVE SEE CONCLAVE . The right of voting is limited to the cardinals who have been ordained deacons. The lack of this ordination may, however, be supplied by a special privilege of the pope. The cardinals do not lose their right of voting even by excommunication, but they can cast their votes only if they are personally present in the conclave. Those who live outside of the city of Rome are not specially invited. Since Boniface IX (1389) all the popes have been taken from the College of Cardinals, but in a legal point of view the eligibility of the pope is not conditioned by his being a cardinal. The decree of Nicholas II abolished a former provision by a Roman synod which demanded it, and since then a number of popes have been elected who were not cardinals. Urban III, elected in 1185, was only archbishop of Milan; Urban IV (1261) was patriarch of Jerusalem; Clement V (1305), archbishop of Bordeaux; Urban VI, with whose election in 1378 the papal schism began, was archbishop of Bari. Celestine V (1294) was an eremite, who after a long conclave was agreed upon by two contending parties as a mere figurehead, and Urban V  (1360) was abbot of St. Victor in Marseilles. No pope is allowed to appoint his own successor, and the election by a conclave is an indispensable condition. In troublesome times some popes, as Pius VI (died 1799) and Pius VII (died 1823), provided that at the election of their successors some of the regulations for the holding of the conclave might be dispensed with. Pius IX is reported to have made similar arrangements for the election of his successor. The emperor of Austria, as the successor of the Roman emperor, and the governments of France and Spain, have exercised, and the governments of Naples and Portugal have claimed, the right of excluding some particular cardinal, as persona minus grata, from the papal throne. The right is exercised before an election through a member of the College of Cardinals, who is commissioned for that purpose by the government, and it is limited to one veto at each conclave. It is generally believed at the time of this writing (1877) that, on the death of pope Pius IX, the empire of Germany will claim this right, in order to prevent the election of the candidate of the Jesuits. Long usage causes the selection of the candidate from the Italian cardinals. Several popes, like Celestine V, have resigned the office; quite a number, in the course of the Middle Ages, have been deposed by the emperors; and in the 15th century the councils of Pisa, Constance, and Basle claimed and exercised the right of deposing the pope. The principle, first enounced by the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals, and ever since maintained by the advocates of the extreme papal system, that the apostolical see is not judged by any one (“apostolica sedes a nemine judicatur”), has more and more been accepted by the Church; and after the Vatican Council it would appear to be impossible that the Catholic world would ever recognize any vacancy of the papal see except those caused by the voluntary resignation or the death of the incumbent.

The coronation and consecration ceremonies attending the inauguration of the pope are of a very solemn and impressive character. We give a description in the words of an eyewitness:

“About eleven o'clock the procession began to arrive from the Quirinal Palace. It was immensely long. Tile cardinals were in their state carriages, and each was accompanied by several carriages full of attendants. The senator and governor of Rome formed part of the train. The pope was in a state coach drawn by six black horses, and preceded by a priest riding on a white mule, and bearing a large crucifix. The procession went round by the back of St. Peter's, and the pope went up to the Sistine Chapel, where various ceremonies were performed which I did not see. In about half an  hour the procession entered the center door of St. Peter's. In all these processions the lowest orders of the clergy came first, then bishops, archbishops, cardinals, and, lastly, the pope. He was borne aloft on his throne, carried by twelve bearers, the choir singing, Ecce sacerdos magnus— ‘Behold the great priest!' At the chapel of the Sauntissimo lie stopped and adored the host. He was then borne forward to the highaltar, and, passing by the north side of it, alighted in a space enclosed for the use of the pope and the cardinals on the east side. He walked up to the altar, prayed at the foot of it, ascended the steps, and seated himself on the middle of the altar, on the very spot where the ciborium or pyx, containing the host, usually stands. The cardinals in succession went through the ceremony of adoration. This ceremony is performed three times: first, before quitting the conclave; secondly, in the Sistine Chapel before the procession came into St. Peter's: and now, for the third time, each cardinal prostrated himself before the pope, then kissed his toe, or rather his slipper, next kissed his hand, which was not bare, but covered by the cape of his robes: and, lastly, the pope embraced each twice, and when all had gone through this ceremony, the pope rose and bestowed his blessing on the people present, and retired in a sedan chair, on the back of which there is embroidered in gold a dove, to represent the Holy Spirit.” On the Sabbath after his solemn installation his holiness performs mass at an altar of the richest decoration, the pontifical mantle being placed on him by the oldest cardinal-deacon, who addresses him thus: “Receive the holy mantle, the plenitude of the pontifical offices, to the honor of Almighty God, and of the most glorious Virgin Mary, his mother, and of the blessed apostles Peter and Paul, and of the holy Roman Church.” After this comes the public coronation on the balcony above the great door of St. Peter's. His mantle as a priest is taken off, and his triple crown as a king is put on, with these words: “Receive the tiara adorned with three crowns, and know that thou art the father of princes and kings, the governor of the world, on earth vicar of our Savior Jesus Christ, to whom is honor and glory for ever and ever. Amen.” His holiness then pronounces this prayer: “May the holy apostles Peter and Paul, ill whose power and authority we confide, intercede for us with the Lord. By the prayers and merits of the blessed Mary, always a virgin, of the blessed Michael, the archangel, of the blessed John the Baptist, and the holy apostles Peter and Paul, and all the saints; may Almighty God have mercy upon you, and may Jesus Christ, having remitted all your sins, lead you to life everlasting. Amen.” “May the Almighty and merciful Lord grant you indulgence, absolution, and  remission of all your sins, space for true and fruitful repentance, a heart always penitent, and amendment of life, the grace and consolation of the Holy Spirit, and final perseverance in good works.” Two keys are also given him in the church of St. John Lateran. (See also Wesleyan Mag. 1851.)

IV. List of the Roman Popes. — In the article PAPACY SEE PAPACY we have referred to the uncertainty prevailing in regard to the first bishops of Rome. Roman Catholic writers themselves quite generally admit that the statements of ancient Church-writers on the subject are entirely irreconcilable, and that it is impossible to establish with any degree of certainty the order in which they followed each other, the years of their accession to the see of Rome, and the year of their death. The following table is given from the Roman almanac entitled Gerarchia Cattolica (with the original names of the popes, and notices of antipopes, from other sources), and although it is so uncritical in its first part that even the Roman historians do not adopt it, it is of some value, as presenting the claims of the Church of Rome:

[St. stands for Saint, B. for Blessed, M. for Martyr.]

No. Name.  Place of Birth. Term.

1. St. Peter, M... Bethsaida in Galilee 42-67

2. St. Linus, M... Volterra...     67-78

3. St. Cletus, M... Rome... 78-90

4. St. Clement I, M… Rome… 90-100

5. St. Anacletus, M…Athens… 100-112

6. St. Evaristus, M… Syria…112-121

7. St. Alexander I, M… Rome… 121-132

8. St. Sixtus I. M… Rome… 132-142

9. St. Telesphorus, M… Greece… 142-154

10. St. lyginlus, M… Greece… 154-158

11. St. Pius I, M… Aquileja … 158-167

12. St. Anicetus, M… Syria… 167-175

13. St. Soterus, M…Campania… 175-182

14. St. Eleutherius, M… Epirus… 182-193

15. St. Victor I, M… Africa… 193-203

16. St. Zephyrinns, M… Rome… 203-220

17. St. Calixtus I, M… Rome… 221-227

18. St. Urban I, M… Rome… 227-233

19. St. Pontianus, M… Rome… 233-238

20. St. Anterus, M… Greece…238-239

21. St. Fabian, M… Rome… 240-253

22. St. Cornelius, M… Rome… 254-255 [Novatian, first antipope.]

23. St. Lucius I, M… Rome… 255-257

24. St. Stephen I, M… Rome… 257-260

25. St. Sixtus II, M… Athens… 260-261

26. St. Dionysius… Italy… 261-272

27. St. Felix I. M… Rome… 272-275

28. St. Eltychianus… Tuscany… 225-283

29. St. Caius, M… Dalmatia… 283-296

30. St. Marcellinus, M… Rome… 296-304

31. St. Miarcellus I, M… Rome…304-309

32. St. Esebius… Calabria… 309-311

33. St. Melchiades…. Africa… 311-314

34. St. Sylvester… Rome… 314-337

35. St. Malrcus… Rome… 337-340

36. St. Jillius I… Rome… 341-352

37. St. Liberius… Rome… 352-363

38. St. Felix II… Rome… 363-365

39. St. Darnass... Spain... 366-384 [Ursicinus, antipope.]

40. St. Siricius... Rome... 384-398

41. St. Anastasius... Rome… 399-402

42. St. Innocet I... Albano... 402-417

43. St. Zosim... Greece... 417-418

44. St. Boniface I... Rome... 418-423

45. St. Celestine I... Campania... 423-432

46. St. Sixts III... Rome... 432-440

47. St. Leo I, the Great... Tuscany... 440-461

48. St. Hilary... Cagilari... 461-468

49. St. Simplicius... Tivoli... 468483

50. St. Felix II... Rome... 483492

51. St. Gelasius I... Africa... 492-496

52. St Anastasius II... Rome... 496-498

53. St. Symnachus... Rome... 498-514

54. St. Hormisdas... Frosinone... 514-523

55. St. John I, M... Tuscany... 523-526

56. St. Felix IV... Benevet... 526-530

57. Boniface II... Rome...   530-532

58. John II... Rome... 532-535

59. St. Agapetus I... Rome... 535-536

60. St. Sylverius, M... Frosinone... 536-538

61. Vigilius... Rome... 538-555

62. Pelagius I... Rome... 555-560

63. John III... Rome... 560-573

64. Benedict I... Rome... 574-578

65. Pelagius II... Rome... 578-590

66. St. Gregory I, the Great. Rome... 50-604

67. Sabiniaus... Volterra... 604-606

68. Boniface III... Rome... 607-607

69. St. Boniface IV... The Marches... 608-615

70. St. Adeodatus I... Rome... 615-619

71. Boniface V... Naples... 619-625

72. Honorins I... Campania... 625-638

73. Severinus... Rome... 640-640

74. John IV... Dalmatia... 640-642

75. Theodorus I... Greece... 642-649

76. St. Martin, M... Todi... 649-655

77. St. Engenius I... Rome... 655-656

78. St. Vitalianus... Segi... 657-672

79. Adeodatus II... Rome... 672-676

80. Donus I... Rome... 676-678

81. St. Agathon... Greece... 678-682

82. St. Leo II... Sicily... 682-683

83. St. Benedict II... Rome... 684-685

84. John V... Antiochia... 685-686

85. Conon... Thrace... 686-687

86. St. Sergis I... ?... 687-701

87. John VI... Greece... 701-705

88. John VII... Greece... 705-707

89. Sisinnius... Syria... 708-708

90. Constantine... Syria... 708-715

91. St. Gregory II... Rome... 715-731

92. St. Gregory III... Syria... 731-741

93. St. Zachary... Greece... 741-752

94. St. Stephen II... Rome... 752-752

95. Stephen III... Rome... 752-757

96. St. Paul I... Rome... 757-767

97. Stephen IV... Syracuse... 768-771

98. Adrian I... Rome... 771-795

99. St. Leo III... Rome ... 795-816

100. Stephen V... Rome... 816-817

101. St. Paschal I... Rome... 817-824

102. Eugenius II... Rome... 824-827

103. Valentiuns... Rome... 827-827

104. Gregory IV... Rome... 827-844

105. Sergius II... Rome... 844-847

106. St. Leo IV... Rome... 847-855 [Fabulous antipope Joan.]

107. Benedict III... Rome... 855-858

108. St. Nicholas I, the Great… Rome... 858-867

109. Adrian II... Rome... 867-872

110. John VIII... Rome... 872-882

111. Marinus I... Gallese... 882-884

112. Adrian III... Rome... 884-885

113. Stephen VI... Rome... 885-891

114. Formosus... Ostia... 891-896  [Sergius, antipope.]

115. Boniface VI... Rome... 896-96

116. Stephen VII... Rome... 897-898

117. Romanus... Gallese... 898-898

118. Theodorus II... Gallese...    898-898

119. John IX... Tivoli... 898-900

120. Benedict IV... Rome... 900-903

121. Leo V... Ardea... 903-903

122. Christopher... Rome... 903-904

123. Sergius III... Rome... 904-911

124. Anastasius III... Rome... 911-913

125. Lando... Sabine... 913-914

126. John X... Ravenna... 915-928

127. Leo VI... Rome... 928-929

128. Stephen VIII... Rome... 929-931

129. John XI... Rome... 931-936

130. Leo VII... Rome... 936-939

131. Stephen IX... Rome... 939-942

132. Marinus II... Rome... 943-946

133. Agapetus II... Rome... 946-956

134. John XI\*... Rome... 956-964 (Octavian Conti.) [Leo 8:antipope.]

135. Benedict V... Rome... 964-965

136. John XIII... Rome... 96S-972 (Bishop John of Ravenna.)

137. Benedict VI... Rome... 972-973

138. Donus II... Rome... 973-975

139. Benedict VII... Rome ... 975-984 (Conti, bishop of Sutri.)

140. John XIV... Pavia... 984-985 (Peter, bishop of Pavia.)

141. Boniface VII... ?...    985-985 (Cardinal Boniface Franco.)

142. John XV... Rome... 985-996

143. John XVI... ... 996-996

144. Gregory V... Germany... 996-999 (Bruno, court chaplain of the emperor.)

145. John XVI... ?... 999-999

146. Sylvester II... France... 999-1003 (Gerbert.) \* The first pope who changed his name on ascending the papal throne.

147. John XVIII... Rome... 1003-1003

148. John XIX... Rome... 1003-1009

149. Sergius IV... Rome... 1009-1012

150. Benedict VIII... Rome... 1012-1024 (Conti.)

151. John XX... Rome... 1024-1033 (Conti, a brother of the preceding.)

152. Benedict IX ... Rome... 1033-1044 (Theophylact, nephew of the two preceding.) [Sylvester, antipope.]

153. Gregory VI... Rome... 1044-1046 (Archpriest John Gratianus.)

154. Clement II... Germany... 1046-1048 (Bishop Suidger of Bamlberg.)

155. Damasus II... Germany... 1048-1048 (Bishop Pappo of Brixen.)

156. St. Leo IX... Germany... 1049-1055 (Bishop Bruno of Toul.)

157. Victor II... Germany... 1055-1057 (Bishop Gebhard of Eichstidt.)

158. Stephen X... Germany... 1057-1058 (Abbot Frederick of Montecassino.)

159. Benedict X... .?... 1058-1059 (John Mincius Conti, bishop of Velletri.)

160. Nicholas II... France... 1059-1061 (Bishop Gerard of Florence.)

161. Alexander II... Milan... 1061-1073  (Anselm Badagio, bishop of Lucca.)

162. St. Gregory VII... Soana... 1073-1085 (Cardinal Hildebrand.) [Clement III, antipope.]

163. Victor III... Benevent... 1087-1087 (Desiderius, duke of Capua, abbot of Montecassino.)

164. Urban II... France... 1088-1099 (Otto de Lagers, cardinal-bishop of Ostia.)

165. Paschal II... Bieda... 1099-1118 (Cardinal Rainer.) [Albert and Theodoric, antipopes.]

166. Gelasius II... Gaeta... 1... 1118-1119 (Cardinal Johannes Cajetani.)

167. Calixtus II... France...1119-1124 (Guido, count of Burgundy, archbishop of Vienne.)

168. Honorius II... Bologna... 1124-1130 (Lambert, cardinal-bishop of Ostia.)

169. Innocent I... Rome... 1130-1143 (Cardinal Glegory Papy.) [Anacletus, antipope.]

170. Celestine II... Citta di Castello... 1143-1144

171. Lucius II... Bologna... 1144-1145 (Cacciauemici)

172. B. Eugenius III... Montemagno... 1145-1153 (Bernardus, abbot at Rome.)

173. Anastasius IV... Rome... 1153-1154

174. Adrian IV... England... 1154-1159

175. Alexander III... Siena... 1159-1181 (Roland Bandinelli.) [Victor, Paschal, and Callixtus, antipopes.]

176. Lncius III... Lucca... 1181-1185

177. Urban III... Milan... 1185-1187 (Bishop Humbert of Milan.)

178. Gregory VII... Beneventum... 1187-1187

179. Clemelnt III... Rome... 1187-1191

180. Celestinie III... Rome... 1191-1198

181. Innocent III... Anagni. ... .1198-1216 (Cardinal Conti.)

182. Honorius III... Rome... 1216-1227 (Savelli.)

183. Gregoury IX... An agni... 1227-1241 (Conti.)

184. Celestine IV... Milan... 1241-1241 (Castislione.)

185. Innocent IV... Genoa... 1243-1254 (Fieschi.)

186. Alexander IV... Anagni... .1254-1261 (Conti.)

187. Urban IV... France... 1261-1264 (Jacob Pantalean, patriarch of Jerusalem.)

188. Clement IV... France... 1265-1269 (Guido Fulcodi.)

189. B. Gregory X... Piacenza... 1271-1276 (Theobald Visconti, archdeacon at Liuge.)

190. Innocent V... ... Savoy... 1276-1276 (Peter de Tarantaise.)

191. Adrian V... Genoa... 1276-1276 (Fieschi.)

192. John XXI... Portugal... 1276-1277 (Peter Julian, bishop of Tusculum.)

193. Nicholas III... Rome... 1277-1280 (Cardinal John Cajetan Orfini.)

194. Martin IV... France... 1281-1285 (Simon de Brie.)

195. Honorius IV... Rome... 1285-1287 (Savelli.)

196. Nicholas IV... A... Ascoli... .1288-1292 (Cardinal Jerome, bishop of Tusculum.)

197. St. Celestine V... Isenia... .1294-1294  (Peter, an eremite.)

198. Boniface VIII... Anagni... 1294-1303 (Benedict Cajetan.)

199. B. Benedict XI... Treviso... 1303-1304 (Boccasini.)

200. Clement V... France... 1305-1314 (De Gout, archbishop of Bordeaux.)

201. John XXII... France... 1316-1334 (Cardinal Jacob de Esne.) [Nicholas, antipope.]

202. Benedict XII... France... 1334-1342 (Cardinal Jacob Fournier.)

203. Clement VI... France... 1342-1352 (Cardinal Peter Roger.)

204. Innocent VI... France... .1352-1362 (Cardinal Stephen Aubert.)

205. B. Urban V... France... 1362-1370 (Abbot at Marseilles.)

206. Gregory XI... France... 1370-1378 (Cardinal Peter Roger.)

207. Urban VI... Naples... 1378-1389 (Prignano, archbishop of Bari.) [From 1378 to 1410 occurs the great Western Schism, during which, in conflict with the line of popes inserted in the catalogue, is found a rival line residing at Avignon-Clement VII 1378-1394; Benedict XIII 1394-1410. The Council of Pisa, 1410, deposed both rival popes; but Benedict XIII remained in schism till his death in 1424.]

208. Boniface IX... Naples... 1389-1404 (Cardinal Peter Tomacelli.)

209. Innocent VII... Sulmona... .1404-1406 (Migliorati.)

210. Gregory XII... Venice... 1406-1409 (Coriario.)

211. Alexander V... Bologna... 1409-1410 (Cardinal Peter Philargi.)

212. John XXIII... Naples... 1410-1415 (Cardinal Cossa.)

213. Martin V... Rome... 1417-1431 (Cardinal Otto Colonna.)

214. Eugenius IV... Venice... 1431-1447 (Condulmero.) [Felix, antipope.]

215. Nicholas V... Sarzana... .1447-1455 (Thomas de Sarzano.)

216. Calixtus III... Spain... 1455-1458 (Cardinal Alphons Borgia.)

217. Pius II... Sieia... 1458-1464 (AEneas Sylvius Piccolomini.)

218. Paul II... Venice... 1464-1471 (Barbo.)

219. Sixtus IV... Savona... 1471-1484 (Cardinal Francesco della Rovere.)

220. Innocent VIII... Genoa... 1484-1492 (Cardinal John Baptist Cibo.)

221. Alexander VI... Spain... .1492-1503 (Cardinal Rodrigo Borgia.)

222. Pius III... Siena... 1503-1503 (Cardinal Francis Piccolomini.)

223. Julius II... Savona...1503-1513 (Cardinal Rovere.)

224. Leo X... Florence... 1513-1521 (Cardinal de' Medici.)

225. Adrian VI... Netherlands... 1522-1523 (Adrian Florent.)

226. Clement VII... Florence... 1523-1534 (Cardinal de' Medici.)

227. Paul III... Rome... 1534-1549  (Cardinal Alexander Farnese.)

228. Julius III... Tuscany... 1550-1555 (Cardinal del Monte.)

229. Marcellus II... Montepulciano... 1555-1555 (Cardinal Cervino.)

230. Paul IV... Naples... 1555-1559 (Cardinal Caraffa.)

231. Pius IV... Milan... 1559-1565 (Cardinal de' Medici.)

232. St. Pins V... Bosco... 1566-1572 (Michael Ghisleri, cardinal of Alessandria.)

233. Gregory XIII... Bologna... 1572-1585 (Cardinal Hugo Buoncompagno.)

234. Sixtus V... Marchigiano... 1585-1590 (Felix Peretti, cardinal Montalto.)

235. Urban VII... Rome... 1590-1590 (Cardinal Castagna.)

236. Gregory XIV... Cremona... 1590-1591 (Cardinal Sondrati.)

237. Innocent IX... Bologna... 1591-1592 (Cardinal Fachinetti.)

238. Clement VIII... Florence... 1592-1605 (Cardinal Aldobrandini.)

239. Leo XI... Florence... 1605-1605 (Cardinal Octavian de' Medici.)

240. Paul V... Rome... 1605-1621 (Cardinal Camillo Borghese.)

241. Gregory XV... Bologna... 1621-1623 (Cardinal Alexander Ludovisio.)

242. Urban VIII... Florence... 1623-1644 (Cardinal Maffeo Barberini.)

243. Innocent X... Rome... 1644-1655 (Cardinal John Pamfili.)

244. Alexander VII... Siena... 1655-1667  (Cardinal Fabio Chigi.)

245. Clement IX... Pistoia... 1667-1669 (Cardinal Rospigliosi.)

246. Clement X... Rome ... .1670-1676 (Cardinal Altieri.)

247. Innocent XI... Cono... 1676-1689 (Cardinal Benedict Odescalchi.)

248. Alexander VIII... Venice... 1689-1691 (Cardinal Peter Ottoboni.)

249. Innocent XII... Naples... .1691-1700 (Cardinal Anthony Pignatelli.)

250. Clement XI... Urbino... 1700-1721 (Cardinal Albani.)

251. Innocent XIII... Rome... 1721-1724 (Cardinal Conti.)

252. Benedict XIII... Rome... 1724-1730 (Cardinal Orsini.)

253. Clement XII... Floence... 1730-1740 (Cardinal Colsini.)

254. Benedict XIV... Bologna... .1740-1758 (Cardinal Prosper Lambertini.)

255. Clement XIII... Venice... 1758-1769 (Cardinal Rezzonico.)

256. Clement XIV... St. Angelo in Vado…1769-1774 (Cardinal Gianganelli.)

257. Pius VI... Cesena... 1775-1799 (Cardinal Braschi.)

258. Pius VII... Cesena... 1800-1823 (Cardinal Chiaramonte.)

259. Leo XII... Spoleto... 1823-1829 (Cardinal della Genga.)

260. Pius VIII... Cingoli... .1829-1830 (Cardinal Castiglione.)

261. Gregory XVI... Belluno... 1831-1846  (Cardinal Mauro Capellari.)

262. Pius IX... Siniagli... 1846-1878 (Cardinal Mastai Ferretti.)

263. Leo XIII... Carpinetto... 1878 (Cardinal Gioacchino Pesci.)

How uncertain the table of the early Roman bishops is, may be seen by comparing it with the catalogue given in Alzog's Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte (9th ed. 1872), a work probably more extensively used as a text-book of Church history than any other Roman Catholic's work. It gives (2, 649) the catalogue of the first Roman bishops, as follows:

St. Peter, 42-67 or 68.St. Anterus, 235-236.“Linus.  “Fabianus, 235-236.  “Anacletus (or Cletus). “Cornelius, 251-252. “Clement I, 92, 101 “Licius, 253.“Evaristus.  “Stephen I, 253-257. “Alexander, until 119. “Xystus or Sixtus II, 257-258. Xystus or Sixtus, until 127. “Dionysius, 259-269. “Telephorus, 127-139 “Felix I, 269-274. “Hyginus, 139-142. “Eutychianus, 274-283. Pius I, 142-157. “Caius, 283-296. “Anicetus, 157-168. “Marcellinus, until 304. Soter, 168-177. “Marcellus, 308-310. “Eleutherius, 177-192. “Melchiades, 311-335.  “Victor, 192-202. “Sylvester I, 314-335. “Zephyrinus, 202-219.“Marcus, 336. “Callistus, 219-223.  “Julius I, 337-352. “Urbanus, 223-230.Liberius, 352-366.“Pontianus, 230-235Felix, 355 (antipope)

It will be seen that, according to this list, one of the Roman bishops, whom the Roman list calls St. Felix II, was neither a saint nor even a legitimate  pope. In the Roman list of popes, 80 are enumerated as saints, 4 as blessed, and 32 as martyrs. In regard to their nationality, 14 were Frenchmen, 11 Greeks, 6 Germans. 6 Syrians and natives of Asia Minor, 3 Africans, 3 Spaniards, 2 Dalmatians, 1 Thracian, 1 Englishman, 1 Portuguese, 1 Dutchman; all the remainder were Italians. The last non-Italian pope was Adrian VI (1522-23); the last saint, St. Pius V (1566-72). As the Roman legend claimed that the apostle Peter had been 25 years bishop of Rome, although it is very doubtful whether he ever even visited Rome, SEE PETER, a belief gained ground within the Church that no pope would reign 25 years until the last under whom the world would come to and end; but the pontificate of Pius IX, which in 1877 had already lasted 31 years, put an end to this tradition. Besides Pius IX, only the following nine popes reigned 20 years or more: Sylvester I, 23 years; Leo I, 21; Adrian I, 23; Leo III, 20; Alexander II, 21; Urban 8:20; Clement 11:2(); Pius 6:24; Pius 7:23. Sixty-four popes reigned from 10 to 20 years each; and forty-five reigned each less than one year.

The see of Rome was frequently disputed. The first antipope was Novatians, who was chosen by some of the clergy and laity in opposition to Cornelius; the last, Felix V, who was elected in opposition to Eugenius IV. Sometimes the whole Church was for a number of years divided by the rival claims of two popes, and in one instance this division continued for thirty-nine years (1378-1417). SEE ANTIPOPES.

The story that at one time, in the 9th century, the papal chair was filled by a woman, the popess Joan, was quite generally credited from the latter part of the 11th until the opening of the 16th century, but it is now admitted by nearly all writers to be a fable. SEE JOAN.

On the several Latin titles given to the popes, see Ducange, Glossariums. On the rights and functions of the popes, see the manuals of ecclesiastical laws, especially those by Richter, Lehrbuch des Kirchenrechts (7th ed., by Dove, Leipsic, 1874); Meier, Lehrbuch des Kirchenrechts (3rd ed. Götting. 1869); Schulte, Lehrbuch des kath. Kirchenrechts (3rd ed. Giessen, 1873); Phillips, Kirchenrecht (Ratisbon, 1845-69, 7 vols.). The principal work on the papal elections is by Zopffel, Die Papstvahlen (1872). See also Camarda, Synopsis constitutionum rapost. cum ceremoniali Gregoriano de pertinentibus ad electionem Papae (1732); Menschen, Ceremonialia electionis et coronationis Pontif. Rom. (Frankfort, 1732); Adler, Cer-emonien und Feierlichkeiten bei der Wahl  und Kronung eines Papstes (Vienna, 1834); Pipping, De triplici corona Pontif: Rom. (Leipsic, 1642); Hermansen, De com. trip. Pontiff Rom. (Upsala, 1736); Krebs, De mutatione nominum Pontiff Rom. (Leipsic, 1719); Mayer, De osculo pedum Pontiff Rom. (Wittenberg, 1687); Foulkes, Divis. of Christendom, 2. 556; Thompson, Papacy and the Civil Power (N. Y. 1877, 12mo); Brownson's Rev. July and Oct. 1855; North Brit. Rev. vol. 11; Cath. World, Aug. 1870, art. 11; Lond. Quar. Rev. April, 1871; Oct. 1876, art. 3; Princeton Rev. Jan. 1871, art. 9; Bibl. Sac. Jan. 1871, art. 4; Edinb. Rev. July, 1871, art. 5; July, 1872, art. 4. (A. J. S.)

POPE is the title given in the Russian Church to the secular clergy, and corresponds in import to the (Latin) word curate used in the English Church. We find full information about Russian curates or popes in the earliest times. A passage of Nikon (1, 198) shows plainly that about the year 1094, when Wewolod died, there were priests in Russia. They formed, with the deacons, subdeacons, and the persons belonging to an inferior degree of the ecclesiastic order, what was called the secular clergy, the highest office of it being that of archpriest or protopope. The verger, the bellringer, the lamb-baker, were counted also with the ecclesiastic order, and formed together a special class distinguished from the regular and secular clergies as well by their cloth as by their peculiar privileges. The conditions required for admission into the ecclesiastic state had been set down, among others, by the metropolitan Cyrillus (1274) at the Synod of Wladimir on the Klaisma, celebrated in Russian history. It was decreed there: “If the bishops wish to ordain a pope, let them first examine his life from his childhood; only he who has lived temperately and chastely, who has married a virgin, who is proficient in the art of reading and writing, who is neither a gambler nor a cheat, who is not addicted to drinking, swearing, or cursing, who is not quarrelsome, shall receive the consecration.” The right to appoint a pope belonged to the bishop in his diocese, and the community seem to have had originally no share whatever in the choice of their pastor. But it was one of the directions of the Stoglawnik (of the year 1551) that the parishioners should elect their pastors and deacons themselves. As the revenue of the popes accrued either from special properties or from the voluntary gifts of the parishioners, it would seem that in the first case the right of nomination was exercised by the bishop, and in the other case by the people. The pope was chosen from the deacons, the deacons from the subdeacons, and the  latter were taken from among the sons of the secular clergy. Ordination was bestowed by the bishop who received as a compensation the so-called ordination money. This practice was opposed in Novgorod and Pskow, and occasioned the formation of the sect called Strigolniks (q.v.). At the present time the priests are appointed by the bishop, archbishop, or metropolitan to whose eparchy they belong. Yet the right of the bishop is not of a quite unlimited description: he has to make sure of the consent of the church patron, i.e. the proprietor of the ground on which the church stands, or of the colonel, if the pope to be appointed is to officiate in a regiment. The lower servants of the Church are appointed by the priest or the patron, seldom by the higher dignitaries.

The official duties of the Greek popes are the following: Every Sunday and holyday, and at least three times in tile week, they officiate mechanically and distribute the Eucharist; they give their blessing to confined wives, christen new-born children, administer confession, marry betrothed couples, recite their prayers in uninterrupted series before the bodies of the deceased until they are under ground, and visit from time to time their parishioners in their houses for the purpose of bestowing their benediction, etc. Extemporaneous preaching is severely prohibited. Once in a while they read for the assembled people after worship a homily of the fathers, or some composition sent to them by the bishop. Many liturgical acts cannot be done by the pope alone without the assistance of the deacon. Every pope must have married already as subdeacon, and the reputation of his bride must have been unblemished. If his wife dies, his usefulness as a pastor comes to an end, and, as a rule, he retires to some monastery, where, as a priest monk, he enjoys special honors. But, according to more modern rules, popes of good repute are allowed to remain in office after the death of their wives; but a second marriage is entirely out of the question. If the widowed priest marries again, he renounces ipso facto the ecclesiastical state, for one marriage only is allowed and prescribed to him.

The honors paid to the secular priests do not follow them into private life. Their religious duties performed, the borrowed nimbus falls, and the boyar who devoutly kissed their hand at the altar ignores them in the street. The cause thereof is mostly to be found in their licentious conduct, their coarseness, their ignorance of worldly and spiritual things-in short, in their vices, against which the metropolitans, bishops, and even the councils have accumulated in vain all kinds of prohibitory measures. Witnesses relate that the ignorance of the Greek clergy is indescribable; that out of a thousand  priests, scarcely ten are able to sign their names, and that he who can do it can pass himself off for a scholar: it does not seem that the Russian popes can lay claim to a much higher degree of consideration. Most of those who are destined to the Church belong to the lowest class of the population- they are generally the sons of the lower clergy. The sad predicament of the district schools and colleges allows of an inference as to the studies preparatory to them. The first son of a pope belongs by law to the clerical career; and if the necessities of the Church require it, two of his children receive orders. The embryo pastor gets his first education in the church, where he performs the lower church duties, and in the ecclesiastical schools of the district. Then he spends two years in a clerical seminary, where he learns reading, writing, elementary arithmetic, and the ritual: at this stage of his development the black cloak is thrown on his shoulders, and the priest is made. Now he has to marry, if he does not cherish the idea of retiring to a monastery. He has not the least smattering of Latin or Greek, nor indeed any kind of knowledge. The sum of his acquirements is the ability to read and write the liturgy of the Church. Even the little he has learned in school is slowly obliterated by the frequent mechanical performance of ceremonies and the toils of agriculture, to which he must devote his spare time to avoid starvation.

The income of the popes and inferior ecclesiastics is very scanty. As a rule they dwell in a house belonging to the parish, till with their own hands the land conceded to them for their maintenance, and have mostly to depend on their casual fees. It follows that everything-baptism, blessings, exorcisms, visits to the sick, celebration of the Eucharist, even confessions- must be paid for according to the rank and wealth of the parishioner, else the pope could not maintain himself and his family with a salary of $100 at the utmost. The dress of the popes differs little from that of laymen. Their long beard (which they consider sinful to shave off), their uncombed hair, hanging wildly about their neck and shoulders, give them all untidy appearance. In the church alone the popes appear bareheaded; outside they wear a kind of cap or a round hat, with a broad, flat border. A long stick is their constant companion.

The ordination of popes (hierey, presbyters, priests) is observed in the following way: The bishop makes the sign of the cross over the head of the candidate, while the latter kisses the bishop's knees. He then, with the other ecclesiastics, walks three times processionally around the altar, kneels down before the same, and lays his forehead between his hands,  which he rests crosswise on the altar. The bishop lays his right hand on the head of the young priest, and says, “The divine grace promotes the most pious deacon to the order of priesthood.” Then the ordinated youth receives the benediction, and kisses the hand of the bishop. As to priestly garments, he receives, instead of the crarion, a similar stripe, four inches wide and four ells long, around the neck: this ornament is called epibrachelion; further, a belt and a round cloak, the great phelonion (the casula of the Latins), which reaches to his feet.

The secular clergy stand under the control of the diocesan bishop, but are in many respects also amenable to the worldly authorities. See for literature the art. SEE RUSSIA.

## Pope, Alexander[[@Headword:Pope, Alexander]]

             the celebrated English poet of the 18th century, deserves a place here as the writer of poems of a decidedly religious cast, for the speculative character of some of his productions, and their peculiar philosophical tendency. Pope was born May 21, 1688, in London, of rather humble parentage, of the Romish communion. A sickly child, Alexander's early educational advantages were scanty, but notwithstanding all deficiencies his poetic talent was manifest at a most tender age, though it is true that his celebrity is chiefly due to his satirical power, which was displayed in the writings of his maturer years. We would not, however, be understood as underestimating Pope's poetical qualifications; for, although he confined himself to the didactic style-leaving untouched the two higher orders of poetry, the epic and dramatic-he was yet in this department the master unsurpassed. No other English poet, not even Cowper, has combined such powers of reasoning with such splendid decorations of fancy; and Pope's works have been more frequently edited than those of any other British poet except Shakespeare. When but fifteen years old, Pope prepared poetical translations of several Latin poets, and thereby proved his attainments in the classical languages.

From the age of twelve he had himself formed a plan of study, to which he rigidly adhered, and completed with little other incitement than the desire of excellence. His general reading, too, was uncommonly extensive and various, and at twenty-five he was one of the best-informed men of his generation. When only eighteen years old he produced his Messiah, a sacred eclogue in imitation of Virgil's Pollio. Pollio was a Roman senator in the time of Augustus, and celebrated not only as a general, but as a patron of letters and the fine arts. Virgil  addressed to him his fourth eclogue at a time (B.C. 40) when Augustus and Antony had ratified a league of peace, and thus, as it was thought, established the tranquility of the empire, as in the times of the “golden age.” In this eclogue Virgil is most eloquent in the praise of peace and in some of his figures and expressions is thought to have imitated the prophecies of Isaiah, which he had possibly read in the Greek Septuagint. But, however this may be as regards Virgil, Roscoe well remarks of this production of Pope, that “the idea of uniting the sacred prophecies and grand imagery of Isaiah with the mysterious visions and pomp of numbers displayed in the Pollio, thereby combining both sacred and heathen mythology in predicting the coming of the Messiah, is one of the happiest subjects for producing emotions of sublimity that ever occurred to the mind of a poet.”

Pope's next remarkable work was his Essay on Criticism- (written in 1709), which displays such extent of comprehension, such nicety of distinction, such acquaintance with mankind, and such knowledge both of ancient and modern learning, as are not often attained by the maturest age and longest experience. About 1713 he set about a translation of Homer's Iliad and Odyssey, which he published from 1715 to 1720, and secured by it a worldwide renown. It was received with admiration, and well deserved the praises of his contemporaries. But the work which gives him special interest in our line of study is his Essay on Man (1733), a philosophical didactic poem in vindication of the ways of Providence, in which the poet proposes to prove that, of all possible systems, Infinite Wisdom has formed the best; that in such a system coherence, union, subordination, are necessary; that it is not strange that we should not be able to discover perfection and order in every instance; because, in an infinity of things mutually relative, a mind which sees not infinitely can see nothing fully. Thus we see Pope setting forth, after Bolingbroke, a theory of optimism (q.v.), the consequences of which he probably did not fully understand. The Essay aspires to be, like Leibnitz's celebrated work, a theodicy, and is really a poetical version of the religious creed of Pope's age of that deism which took various shapes with Clarke, Tindal, and Shaftesbury, and which Bolingbroke seems to have more or less put into shape to be celebrated in poetry by his friends. The poem is didactic, and not only didactive, but ratiocinative. The emotion is always checked by the sense that the Deity whose ways are indicated is after all but a barren abstraction, in no particular relation to our race or its history. He never touches the circle of human interests. Considered as a whole, this production, though Pope's most ambitious, remains radically  unsatisfactory; yet there are, it must be granted, many brief passages marked by Pope's special felicity of touch; many in which the moral sentiment is true and tender; many in which he forgets for a moment the danger of open heterodoxy, and utters with genuine force some of the deeper sentiments that haunt us in this mysterious universe. Of his other works, none interest us here. One of the most admirable of Pope's religious poems is “The Universal Prayer,” beginning with

“Father of all! in every age,

In every clime adored.”

Pope's celebrated lyric, “Vital spark of heavenly flame,” like some other productions of his pen, is an imitation. The original source of this hymn is supposed to be a poem composed by the emperor Adrian, who, dying A.D. 138, thus gave expression to his mingled doubts and fears. His poem begins: Animulum vagula blandula, Hospes comesque corporis (“Sweet spirit, ready to depart, guest and companion of the body”). It is afterwards found freely rendered in a piece by a poet of some note in his day— Thomas Flatman, of London, a barrister, poet, and painter. Flatman's poem is called “A Thought of Death;” and as he died in the year Pope was born, 1688, and the poems are very similar, there can be little doubt that Pope has imitated his predecessor. From Pope's correspondence we learn that on Nov. 7, 1712, he sent a letter to Mr. Steele for insertion in the Spectator on the subject of Adrian's last words; to which Steele responded by asking him to make of them an ode, in two or three stanzas of music. Pope replied immediately, saying that he had done as required, and sent the piece. To show how close is this parallel between the poets, we print a stanza of each:

FLATMAN.

Full of sorrow, full of anguish,

Fainting, grasping, trembling, crying,

Panting, groaning, shrinking, dying

Methinks I hear some gentle spirit say,

‘Be not fearful, come away'

POPE.

“Vital spark of heavenly flame!

Quit, oh, quit this mortal frame!

Trembling, hoping, ling'ring, flying,

Oh, the pain, the bliss of dying!

Cease, fond nature, cease thy strife,

 And let me languish into life!”

It has been urged by critics that it is inconsistent and inconceivable that a dying man should hold such a soliloquy with his soul-it is altogether too studied and rhetorical, too artificial. Although undoubtedly a grand poem, yet it cannot be regarded strictly as a hymn, any more than Toplady's famous production, “Deathless principle! arise,” judged by the rule of St. Augustine, who tells us, “A hymn must be praise-the praise of God, and this in the form of a song.”

Pope died May 30, 1744. He does not seem to have been a very lovable character, if we may judge him by his caustic satires. His person was small and deformed; and his temper of mind often also crooked, as we learn from one of his best friends, bishop Atterbury, who once, referring to Pope's irascibility, described him as “mens curva in corpore curve.” The best edition of his Works is by Roscoe (Lond. 10 vols. 8vo). It is one of the choicest contributions to English literature of the present century. See Life by Dr. Johnson prefixed to Pope's Works; Stephen, Hist. of English Thought, 2, 348-360 et al.; Chambers, Cyclop. of Engl. Lit. vol. 2; Warton, Essay on the Genius and Writings of Pope; Macdonald, England's Antiphon, p. 285. See also the excellent notes on the literature of Pope by Superintendent Winsor, of Boston, in his Catalogue of the Boston Public Library (2d ed. July, 1873), p. 221, Colossians 1; Westminst. Rev. 92, 149; Lond. Qu. Rev. Oct. 1875, art. 3. (J. H. W.)

## Pope, Fielding[[@Headword:Pope, Fielding]]

             a Presbyterian divine, noted especially as an educator, was born in Virginia in 1800. He was educated in Marysville College, Tenn., studied divinity at the Southern and Western Theological Seminary, was licensed and ordained in 1826 and began his labors as stated supply for Mars' Hill, Columbiana, and Shilo churches, near Athens, Tenn. This relation existed until 1833, when he accepted a professorship in Marysville College, Tenn.; in 1844 he resigned this position and devoted all his time to the ministry; in  1852 he was connected as president with the Masonic Female Institute of Marysville; and in 1857 he took charge of New Providence Church in Marysville, in all of which labors he was earnest and faithful. He died March 23, 1867. Mr. Pope was a man of great power and popularity in the pulpit. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1868, p. 365. (J.L.S.)

## Poper, Henry[[@Headword:Poper, Henry]]

             a clergyman of the Church of England and missionary among the Jews, was born of Jewish parentage, in the year 1813, at Breitenbach, in Electoral Hesse, Germany. At Hildesheim, the native place of his mother, he received his early education at the famous school which flourished under the superintendence of the Jewish rabbi Wolfsohn. Besides, he was also privately instructed that he might prepare himself for the office of a teacher. When about the age of eighteen (May, 1831), Poper received an appointment as Jewish teacher and reader in the synagogue, having also occasionally to lecture in the synagogue. During the period of eight years he filled this office in two places in the kingdom of Hanover, when, at last, by reading the N.T. Scriptures and Christian intercourse, that change was brought about which was decisive for his whole future life. July 15,1839, he received Christian baptism. When in the following year the London Society for Propagating Christianity among the Jews opened the Hebrew college for the purpose of training up missionaries to work among God's ancient people, Poper was enrolled as one of the first students. In June, 1842, Poper was appointed by the committee to labor at Frankfort-on-the- Main, was subsequently ordained to the ministry of the Church of England, and continued to be engaged in the Master's service in that city until his death, April 22, 1870. Poper was a very active missionary, and was highly esteemed for his zeal and efforts both among Jews and Christians. When, on April 25, 1870, his earthly remains were carried to their resting place, all the Protestant pastors of the city, accompanied by many Hebrew- Christians and Jews, followed to the grave. A rabbi of a reformed synagogue, when informed by a missionary of Poper's death, said, “Mr. Poper was a very good man. I have known him well. He was greatly respected among my friends, who were also his friends. I liked him very much, although he was a convert to Christianity”—a remarkable testimony for a Jew to make of an apostate. See Jewish Intelligencer— 1870; Missionsblutt für Israel, 1870; Dibreh Emeth (Breslau, 1870). (B. P.)

## Popery[[@Headword:Popery]]

             literally means attachment to the religion or to the party of the pope; and in this sense the word is synonymous with the profession of the Roman Catholic religion. In its use, however, it has come to involve either the idea of' contempt or disparagement, or is intended to designate what are regarded by Protestants as the most exaggerated and superstitious among the doctrines and practices which they ascribe to Roman Catholics, and of which the principal are the infallibility of the Church; the supremacy of the pope; the doctrine of the seven sacraments-namely, baptism, confirmation, the Eucharist, penance, extreme unction, orders, and matrimony; the celibacy of the clergy; the worship of saints and the Virgin Mary, of pictures and images; prayers for the dead, intercession of saints, purgatory. unwritten traditions, etc. A proper distinction is made by some writers between popery and the papacy. Popery is the erroneous principle- salvation by man-in opposition to the truth of the Gospel, which is salvation by grace. The papacy is the secular organization in which this error is embodied. The one is the body, the other the animating and controlling spirit. SEE POPISH VIEW.

The Church of Rome is charged with having departed from apostolic Christianity by requiring all who communicate with her to believe, as necessary to salvation:

1. That that man is accursed who does not kiss and honor and worship the holy images.

2. That the Virgin Mary and other saints are to be prayed to.

3. That, after consecration in the Lord's Supper, the bread is no longer bread, and the wine no longer wine.

4. That the clergyman should he excommunicated who, in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, gives the cup to the people.

5. That they are accursed who say that the clergy may marry.

6. That there is a purgatory— that is, a place where souls which had died in repentance are purified by suffering.

7. That the Church of Rome is the mother and mistress of all churches.

8. That obedience is due from all churches to the bishop of Rome.

9. That they are accursed who deny that there are seven sacraments.

From these doctrines, contrary to Scripture and the primitive Church, have resulted these evil practices:

From the veneration of images has sprung the actual worship of them.

The invocation of the Blessed Virgin, and of other saints, has given rise to the greatest blasphemy and profaneness. The bread in the Eucharist has been worshipped as it were the eternal God. From the doctrine of purgatory has sprung that of indulgences, and the practice of persons paying sums of money to the Romish bishops and clergy to release the souls of their friends from the fabulous fire of purgatory.

We append a list of these principal heresies of the Church of Rome, and the time at which they were introduced:

Invocation of saints first taught with authority by a Council of Constantinople, A.D. 754.

Use of images and relics in religious worship first publicly affirmed and sanctioned in the Council of Nicaea, A.D. 787.

Compulsory celibacy of the clergy first enjoined publicly at the first Council of Late an, A.D. 1123.

Papal supremacy first publicly asserted by the fourth Council of Lateran, A.D. 1215.

Auricular confession first enjoined by Innocent III, at the fourth Council of Lateran, A.D. 1215.

Prayers in a foreign tongue first deliberately sanctioned by the Council of Trent, A.D. 1562.

Transubstantiation was first publicly insisted on by the fourth Council of Laterman, A.D. 1215.

Purgatory aid indulgences first set forth by the Council of Florence, A.). 1438.

Judicial absolution authorized by the Council of Trent, A.D. 1551.  Apocrypha received as canonical at the Council of Trent, A.D. 1547.

Communion in one kind only, first authoritatively sanctioned by the Council of Constance, A.D. 1414.

The Roman number of the sacraments first settled by the Council of Trent, A.D. 1545.

This system of doctrine will be best understood by a reading of the creed of popery as adopted by pope Pius IV (q.v.), and published in 1564. SEE PROFESSIO FIDEI. It embodies the decisions of the Council of Trent. Every Roman Catholic is bound by it, and Romish officials swear to it. After repeating the Apostles' Creed, the form of the oath goes on:

“I most firmly admit and embrace apostolical and ecclesiastical traditions, land all other constitutions and observances of the same Church. I also admit the sacred Scriptures according to tile sense which the holy mother Church has held and does hold, to whom it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the holy Scriptures; nor will I ever take and interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the fathers. I profess, also, that there are truly and properly seven sacraments of the new law, instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord, and for the salvation of mankind, though all ale not necessary for every one — viz., baptism, confirmation, Eucharist, prenance, extreme unction, order, and matrimony; and that they confer grace; and of these, baptism, confirmation, and order cannot be reiterated without sacrilege. I also receive and admit the ceremonies of the Catholic Church, received and approved in the solemn administration of all the above-said sacraments. I receive and embrace all and every one of the things which have been defined and declined in the holy Council of Trent concerning original sin ad justification. I profess likewise that in the mass is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead; and that in the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist there is truly, really, aid substantially the body and blood, together with the son and divinity, of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that there is made a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood, which conversion the Catholic Church calls transubstantiation. I confess, also, that under either kind alone, whole and entire, Christ and a true sacrament is received. I constantly hold that there is a purgatory, and that the souls detained therein are helped by the suffrages of the faithful. Likewise that the saints leaning together with Christ are to be honored and invocated, that they  offer prayers to God for us, and that their relics are to he venerated. I most firmly assert that the images of Christ and of the mother of God, ever virgin, and also of the other saints, are to be had and retained, and that due honor and veneration are to be given to them. I also affirm that the power of indulgences was left by Christ in the Church; and that the use of them is most wholesome to Christian people. I acknowledge the holy Catholic and Apostolic Roman Church, the mother and mistress of all churches; and I promise and swear true obedience to the Roman bishop, the successor of St. Peter, prince of the apostles, and vicar of Jesus Christ. I also profess and undoubtedly receive all other things delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred canons and general councils, and particularly by the holy Council of Trent: and likewise I also condemn, reject, and anathematize all things contrary thereto, and all heresies whatsoever, condemned and anathematized by the Church. This true catholic faith, out of which none can be saved, which I now freely profess and truly hold, I, N., promise, vow, and swear most constantly to hold and profess the same whole and entire, with God's assistance, to the end of my life. Amen.”

For literature, SEE ROMANISM.

## Popish Plot[[@Headword:Popish Plot]]

             the name given to an imaginary plot on the part of the Roman Catholics in England during the reign of Charles II. the object of which was believed to be a general massacre of the Protestants. SEE OATES, TITUS.

## Popish View of Christianity[[@Headword:Popish View of Christianity]]

             The supporters of this view regard the Church as the mediator between God and the individual: the Church (by which some of them seem to mean “the clergy”) is a sort of chartered corporation, by belonging to or by being attached to which any given individual acquires certain privileges. The opponents of such a view regard it as a priest craft, because it lays the stress not on the relations of a man's heart towards God and Christ, as the Gospel does, but on something wholly artificial and formal-his belonging to a certain so-called Society; and thus, whether the Society be alive or dead, whether it really help the man in goodness or not, still it claims to step in and interpose itself, as the channel of grace and salvation, when it certainly is not the channel of salvation, because it is visibly and notoriously no sure channel of grace. The opponents of the popish views acknowledge that, where the Church is what it should be, it is so great a means of grace that  its benefits are of the highest value; yet they regard relation to any Church as a thing quite subordinate and secondary, the salvation of a man's soul being effected by the change in his heart and life wrought by Christ's Spirit; and because all who go straight to Christ (their baptism into the communion of the Church being assumed) do “manifestly and visibly receive grace, and have the seal of his Spirit, and therefore are certainly heirs of salvation.” They adopt this view of Christianity because it seems “simple and scriptural,” while any other is complex in its character and human in its source. According to this view, all seems plain: “we are not to derive our salvation through or from the Church, but to be kept or strengthened in the way of salvation by the aid or example of our fellow- Christians, who are formed into societies for this very reason that they might help one another, and not leave each man to fight his own fight alone; the Scripture notion of the Church being that religious society should help a man to become better and holier, just as civil society helps us in civilization.” SEE POPERY.

## Popkin, John Snelling, D.D[[@Headword:Popkin, John Snelling, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born June 19, 1771, in Boston, Mass. He graduated at Harvard College in 1792, and held the office of tutor of Greek from 1795 to 1798. Having entered the ministry, he was ordained pastor of the Federal Street Church, Boston, July 16, 1799, which charge he resigned in 1802, and became pastor of the First Parish in Newburgh Sept. 19, 1804. In 1815 he was elected professor of Greek in Harvard College, and served until 1826, when he accepted the professorship of Greek literature. He resigned it in 1833, and lived in retirement until his death, March 2, 1852. Dr. Popkin published Three Lectures on Liberal Education (1836), and a number of occasional sermons. Some of his lectures and sermons, with a Life by Prof. Felton, were published in 1852. See Sprague, Annals, 2, 434; North Amer. Rev. 1875, p. 473; Christian Examiner, vol. 53.

## Poplar[[@Headword:Poplar]]

             (לַבְנֶה, libneh; Sept. στυράκινος, in Gen 30:37; λεύκη, in Hos 4:13; Vulg. populus), the rendering of the above-named Hebrew word, which occurs only in the two places cited. Peeled rods of the libneh were put by Jacob before Laban's ring-streaked sheep. This tree is  mentioned with the oak and the terebinth, by Hosea, as one under which idolatrous Israel used to sacrifice.

Several authorities, Celsius among the number (Hierob. 1, 292), are in favor of the rendering of the A. V., and think the “white poplar” (Populus alba) is the tree denoted. The Hebrew name libneh, being supposed to be derived from לָבִן(to be white), has been considered identical with the Greek λεύκη, which both signifies “white” and also the “white poplar.” This poplar is said to be called white, not on account of the whiteness of its bark, but of that of the under surface of its leaves. It may perhaps be so designated from the whiteness of its hairy seeds, which have a remarkable appearance when the seed-covering first bursts. The poplar is certainly common in the countries where the scenes are laid of the transactions related in the above passages of Scripture (comp. Belon, Obs. 2, 106). Rauwolf also mentions the white poplar as abundant about Aleppo and Tripoli, and still called by the ancient Arabic name hatur or her, which is the word used in the Arabic translation of Hosea.

Others, however, have been of opinion that libneh denotes the storax-tree rather than the white poplar. Thus, in Gen 30:37, the Sept. has ῥάβδον στυρακίνην, “a rod of styrax;” and the Greek translation of the Pentateuch, according to Rosenmüller, is more ancient and of far greater authority than that of Hosea. So R. Jonah, as translated by Celsius, says of libneh, “Dicitur lingua Arabum Lubna;” and in the Arabic translation of Genesis lubne is employed as the representative of the Hebrew lib Nehemiah Lubne, both in Arabic and in Persian, is the name of a tree, and of the fragrant resin employed for fumigating which exudes from it, and which is commonly known by the name of storax. This resin was well known to the ancients, and is mentioned by Hippocrates and Theophrastus. Dioscorides (1, 79) and Pliny (Nat. Hist. 12, 17 and 25) both speak of the storax. Pliny says, “That part of Syria which adjoins Judaea above Phoenicia produces storax, which is found in the neighborhood of Gabala (Jebeil) and Marathus, as also of Casius, a mountain of Seleucia. I… That which comes from the mountain of Amanus, in Syria, is highly esteemed for medicinal purposes, and even more so by the perfumers.” Dioscorides describes several kinds, all of which were obtained from Asia Minor; and all that is now imported is believed to be the produce of that country. But the tree is cultivated in the south of Europe, though it does not there yield any storax. It is found in Greece, and is supposed to be a native of Asia Minor, whence it extends into Syria, and probably farther south. It is  therefore a native of the country which was the scene of the transaction related in the above passage of Genesis. From the description of Dioscorides, and his comparing the leaves of the styrax to those of the quince, there is no doubt of the same tree being intended: especially as in early times, as at the present day, it yielded a highly fragrant balsamic substance which was esteemed as a medicine, and employed in fumigation. From the similarity of the Hebrew name libneh to the Arabic lubne. and from the Sept. having in Genesis translated the former by sty-tax, it seems most probable that this was the tree intended. It is capable of yielding white wands as well as the poplar; and it is also well qualified to afford complete shade under its ample foliage, as in the passage of Hos 4:13. We may also suppose it to have been more particularly alluded to from its being a tree yielding incense. “They sacrifice upon the tops of the mountains, and burn incense upon the hills, under the terebinth and the storax trees, because the shadow thereof is good.”

Storax (στόραξ) is mentioned in Sir 24:15, together with other aromatic substances. The modern Greek name of the tree, as we learn from Sibthorpe (Flor. Graec. 1, 275), is στουράκι, and is a common wild shrub in Greece and in most parts of the Levant. The resin exudes either spontaneously or after incision. This property, however, it would seem, is only for the most part possessed by trees which grow in a warm country; for English specimens, though they flower profusely, do not produce the drug. Mr. Daniel Hanbury, who has discussed the whole subject of the storax plants with much care (see the Pharmaceutical Journal and Transactions for Feb. 1857), tells us that a friend of his quite failed to obtain any exudation from Styrax officinale, by incisions made in the hottest part of the summer of 1856, on specimens growing in the botanic garden at Montpellier. “The experiment was quite unsuccessful; neither aqueous sap nor resinous juice flowed from the incisions.” Still Mr. Hanbury quotes two authorities to show that under certain favorable circumstances the tree may exude a fragrant resin even in France and Italy. The Styrax officinale is a shrub from nine to twelve feet high, with ovate leaves, which are white underneath; the flowers are in racemes, and are white or cream-colored. The white appearance agrees with the etymology of the Hebrew lib Nehemiah The liquid storax of commerce is the product of the Liquidambar Orientale, Mill. (see a fig. in Mr. Hanbury's  communication), an entirely different plant, whose resin was probably unknown to the ancients. SEE STACTE.

## Poplicani[[@Headword:Poplicani]]

             a name applied to the Albigenses (q.v.).

## Popo Version Of The Scriptures[[@Headword:Popo Version Of The Scriptures]]

             The Popo or Dahomey is spoken at Dahomey, between the Volta and Lagos. A translation of Matthew and Mark was made by the Reverend T.J. Marshall, a native minister, and printed by the British and Foreign Bible Society at London in 1884. Other parts of the New Test. are now being translated. (B.P.)

## Popoftchins, or Popovshchins[[@Headword:Popoftchins, or Popovshchins]]

             a name given to the different sects of Russian dissenters who recognize the validity of ordination as given in the Established Church, and receive most of their popes (q.v.), i.e. priests, from that communion. The Popoftchins are divided into five principal sects: the Starobertzi, or Old Ceremonialists, the Diaconoftschins, the Peremayanoftschins, the Epefanoftschins, and the Tschernaboltsi. Those who have no priests at all, or who do not acknowledge the validity of Church ordination, are termed Bez- Popoftchins, or No-Priesters. See Mosheim, Eccles. History, vol. 3; Platon, Greek Church (see Index).

## Popogano[[@Headword:Popogano]]

             is the name by which the primitive inhabitants of Virginia designated hell, which they imagined floating in the air between heaven and earth.

## Poppaea[[@Headword:Poppaea]]

             SEE SABINA.

## Poppie, Poppy, Poppy-head[[@Headword:Poppie, Poppy, Poppy-head]]

             (from Fr. paupe=a doll, or Lat. puppis =the “poop” of a ship), an architectural term designating an elevated ornament often used on the tops of the upright ends, or elbows, which terminate seats, etc., in churches; they are sometimes merely cut into plain fleurs-de-lis or other simple forms, with the edges chamfered or slightly hollowed, but are frequently carved with leaves, like finials, and in rich work are sculptured into animals and figures, and are often extremely elaborate. No examples are known to exist of earlier date than the Decorated style, and but few so early; of Perpendicular date specimens are to be found in very many churches, especially in the cathedrals and old abbey churches. SEE STALL; SEE STANDARD.

## Poppy-head[[@Headword:Poppy-head]]

             SEE POPPIE.

## Populonia[[@Headword:Populonia]]

             a surname of Juno (q.v.) among the ancient Romans, as being the protectress of the whole Roman people.

## Poratha[[@Headword:Poratha]]

             (Heb. Poratha', פּוֹרָתָא, prob. Persian, perhaps a lot bestowed; Sept. Βαρδαθά v. r. Φαραδαθά), the fourth named of the ten sons of Haman, slain by the Jews in the palace of Ahasuerus (Est 9:8). B.C. 473.

## Porch[[@Headword:Porch]]

             is the rendering in the A. V. of the following words:

1. אוּלָםor אֻלָם, ulam (from אוּל, before), a vestibule or hall (Sept. αὐλάμ; Vulg. porticus [1Ch 28:11]; ναός; porticus). It is used of the entrance-hall of a building (Eze 40:7; Eze 40:48); of the place where the throne was placed, and where judgment was administered (1Ki 7:7, SEE PALACE ); and of the veranda surrounding a court (Eze 41:15). It is especially applied to the vestibule of the Temple (1Ki 6:7; Joe 2:17). SEE TEMPLE. “The porch of the Lord” (2Ch 15:8; 2Ch 29:17) seems to stand for the Temple itself.

2. מַסְדְּרוֹן, misderon, a sort of colonnade or balcony with pillars (Jdg 3:23); probably a corridor connecting the principal rooms of the house (Wilkinson, Ancient Egyptians, 1, 11). It may have been a sort of veranda chamber in the works of Solomon, open in front and at the sides, but capable of being enclosed with awnings or curtains, like that of the royal palace at Ispahan described by Chardin (7, 386, and pl. 39). The word is used in the Talmud (Middoth, 3, 7).

3. Πυλών (Mat 26:71), probably the passage from the street into the first court of the house, in which, in Eastern houses, is the mastdbah, or stone bench for the porter or persons waiting, and where also the master of the house often receives visitors and transacts business (Lane, Mod. Eq. 1, 32; Shaw, Trac. p. 207). The word rendered “porch” in the parallel passage (Mar 14:68) is προαύλιον, the outer court. The scene  therefore of the denial of our Lord took place either in that court or in the passage from it to the house-door. SEE HOUSE.

4. The term στοά is used for the colonnade or portico of Bethesda, and also for that of the Temple called Solomon's porch (Joh 5:2; Joh 10:23; Act 3:11; Act 5:12). Josephus describes the porticos or cloisters which surrounded the Temple of Solomon, and also the royal portico (Ant. 8, 3, 9; 15:11, 3, 5; War, 5:5, 2). These porticos are described by Tacitus as forming an important line of defense during the siege (Hist. 12). SEE SOLOMON'S PORCH.

PORCH (Lat. polticus) is the term applied in ecclesiastic architecture to the adjunctive erection placed over the doorway of a church. In the early ecclesiastical structures, raised after infant baptism became prevalent in the West, and the discipline of the catechumens (q.v.) had fallen into desuetude, the narthex (q.v.) was given the form of a vestibule, frequently closed, and sufficiently capacious to contain a large number of persons and permit the celebration of different ceremonials. This was really what we now understand by porch. Few churches, cathedrals, conventual or parochial, were, until the middle of the 12th century, unprovided with a central porch in front of the principal entrance; but after the 13th century they were not so common.

The earliest porches in the West, dating from the 8th to the 11th century, are shallow, and extended across the church front, as at Clermont. One of the earliest is at St. Font, Perigueux. In some cases they were recessed under the tower, as at St. Germain-des-Pres (Pais), Limoges, Poissy, of the 9th or 10th century, St. Benet-sur-Loire, Moissac, and St. Savin. During the 11th century this became the rule; in the 13th it was rare, but at a later date it reappeared at Caen, Fribourg, and Gralinrook. At St. Savin the porch is defensible and protected by a ditch, just as the castellated palace stands in front of the western entrance of Cashel Cathedral. The giant porch of Vienna, imposing as it is, is far exceeded by the three magnificent Early English porches of Peterborough, in which accord with the entire work, while those of many of the great French cathedrals are mere afterthoughts, noble but accidental additions. At Fribourg, Rheims, and Chartres (1250-80) the porches are covered with statuary.

Towards the close of the 12th century the ceremonies performed within them fell into desuetude, and they in consequence dwindled into a mere appendage of the nave. Then, from the exclusive use of western doors,  large lateral porches, usually in cathedrals, as at Chartres, Mans, Bayeux, Puyen-Velay Chalons-sur-Marne, Wells, Salisbury, Lincoln, and Hereford, were built for the convenience of worshippers when entering or leaving the church, for benedictions, and the preliminaries of marriages and baptism, and the passage of funerals. The monastic churches in towns imitated the arrangement. These porches were usually closed at the sides, as in the Norman examples of Kelso, Selby, Southwell, Sherborne, and Malmesbury, although that of Alencon is open. At Hereford the outer porch (cir. 1513) is open, but the inner Decorated porch is closed. Until the close of the 14th century porches, generally of open form, were commonly built. The lateral porch fronted the side which faced the more populous portion of the city — at Gloucester, Canterbury, Malmesbury, Chester, and St. David's, on the south; at Durham, Hereford, Exeter, Christchurch (Hants), and Selby, on the north. At Chichester it is on the south side, opening on the cloister to admit processions to the shrine; at Westminster (called from its beauty Solomon's Porch) it stood in advance of the north front of the transept; at Lincoln the bishop's porch is in the presbytery. There are Early English porches at St. Alban's and Barnack, the latter, like All Saints', Stamford, Albury, and St. Mary's, Nottingham, having external and internal stone roofs. At Tewkesbury the vast western arch may have formed a gigantic porch. At Lincoln three recessed porches exist, as once at St. Alban's.

Wooden porches occur at all dates, and of these also fine examples remain. At Covington, Suffolk, is a wooden porch of Early English date, but much impaired by modern work. In the Decorated style wooden porches are not infrequently found; they are of one story only in height, sometimes entirely enclosed at the sides, and sometimes with about the upper half of their height formed of open screen-work; the gables have barge-boards, which are almost always feathered, and more or less ornamented: good specimens remain at Warblington, Hampshire; Horsemondeil and Brookland, Kent; Aldham, Essex; Hascombe, Surrey; Northfiell, Worcestershire, etc. Stone porches of this date have, not unusually, a room over them, as they have also in the Perpendicular style. Of this last-mentioned style there are many wooden porches, which differ but little from those of the preceding, except that the upper half of the sides is almost always formed of open screenwork: examples remain at Halden, Kent; Albury, Surrey, etc.

It is common to find porches of all ages considerably ornamented; those of the Norman style, and perhaps also the Early English, have the decorations principally on the inside and about the doorway; those of later date are often as much enriched externally as internally and sometimes more so: the room over the porch frequently contains a piscina, which shows that it once contained an altar, and was used as a chapel, and is sometimes provided with a fireplace, as if it had served for a dwelling-room.

IMAGE ERRORThere are large porches at Tours, Pol, St. Leon, and Ulrichsk, and smaller specimens in several churches at Cologne. English cathedrals and minsters are remarkable for the homeliness of their doorways, resembling those of parish churches on an enlarged scale. The cathedral, in distinction to a minster, in the 12th century, was built with many porches and western doors opening directly on the close, as if inviting the entrance of crowds. Noyon, at the end of the 13th or beginning of the 14th century, is a solitary exception to this rule in possessing large porches in advance of its principal front.

Up to the 6th century children were exposed in the porch, and the Council of Aries required those who adopted them to place in the priest's hand a letter of contestation with regard to the sex and age of the child; and the Council of Vaison, complaining that the children were exposed to dogs, for fear of scandal required the priest at the altar to announce on Sundays the name of the adopter. Kings and princes were permitted to be buried in porches by the Council of Nantes (658), and interments were forbidden within church walls till the 12th century. At Ely, as in many ascertained examples in France, probably the recesses above the arcading were used as charnels, fenced in with an iron screen; and at Chichester there are still lateral tombs. (Gradually incense was used and litanies were chanted in porches. Fonts and basins for the ablutions of the faithful before entering the church were erected, and exhibitions of relics and sacred images were made. Markets were permitted, just as objects of piety are still sold in foreign porches on festival days. Feudal and other courts were held. At Sandwich a school was taught and books sold, and even in 1519 peddlers hawked their wares at Riccald. Chapters and religious bodies appealed to the civil power to put an end to such irregularities, and the great abbeys of Clugny, Matlbronn, and Citeaux, about the beginning of the 12th century, began to erect large enclosed porches in front of their churches. The Clugniacs built large ante-churches of two stories, as at Lewes; at Tournus,  near the close of the 11th century. At the latter place they consisted of a nave and aisles of thirteen bays, with an upper chapel of St. Michael, in which the altar was used for a mass attended by penitents. At Clugny in the 13th century an altar and pulpit adjoined the church door. Their influence is perceptible in the large upper chapel over the porch at Pluv-en-Velay and Autun, and the tribune for an altar at Chatel Montagne, Monreale, and Dijon, which are said to have been used by women and minstrels. In many instances the view into the nave was unimpeded.

The Cistercians built western porches deep and longitudinal, in imitation of the narthex, according to the desire of St. Bernard, at Toury, Moutier, Charite-sur-Loire, Fountains, and Beaulieu. At Vezelay, in the 13th century, the porch, of two bays in length, forms a nave with aisles, lateral galleries, and a tribune for an altar over the minster door. In many French parish churches this plan was followed in order to accommodate mourners at funerals. In England an upper chamber sometimes occurs over porches, as at Southwell, Christchurch (Hants), and in parish churches used as a schoolroom or a chaplains' or watchers' dormitory. Placentia, Parma, and Modena have porches of two stories.

In the foreign examples pilgrims or penitents were marshaled on the ground-floor in order to hear an address from the pulpit, or mass said at the upper altar, while those who came from a distance found shelter in these vaulted porches just as the country people on the eves of great festivals pass the night under the porticos of St. Peter's at Rome. At Paulinzelle, cir. 1150, there is, and at Sherborne there was, a large parochial antechurch. At Glastonbury and Durham the Lady-chapel was placed in a similar position.

It is possible that these outer buildings served the same purpose of a place of previous assembly, just as the great western transept of Ely or Lincoln may have been also occupied on occasions when large multitudes flocked to the church. In some monastic churches it served as the forensic parlor for conversation with persons inadmissible within the inner portions. The children of the abbey serfs were baptized and the office at which their domestic servants and laborers attended was said. In all large churches the processions where arranged in the porch on Palm-Sunday, on Holy-cross Day, and in Rogatioins. Sometimes it formed a sanctuary, containing a ring in the door to which the fugitive cling, as at Durham, and at Cologne there  was an inscription to this effect, “Here stood the great criminal.”— Walcott, Sacred Archaeology, s.v.; Parker, Glossary of Architecture, s.v.

## Porchet, Joseph[[@Headword:Porchet, Joseph]]

             a converted Jew, flourished in the 14th century in Spain, and by his learning rendered great service to the Church of Christ in that day. He was acquainted with Martini (a.v.), the author of Pugio Fidei, and transcribed a great part of it into a work which he himself composed under the title of Victoria adversus Hebraeos (1520), and which is one of the ablest polemics of the Christian Church against Judaism. See M'Crie, Hist. of the Reformation in Spain, p. 66.

## Porcius Festus[[@Headword:Porcius Festus]]

             SEE FESTUS.

## Porcupine[[@Headword:Porcupine]]

             SEE BITTERN.

## Pordage, John[[@Headword:Pordage, John]]

             an English mystic, who, with Jane Leade and Thomas Bromley, founded the so- called “Philadelphian” society, was born in London in 1608. He studied theology and medicine at Oxford, and became a curate at Reading; but, after a short pastorate, was settled at Bradfield in Berkshire. From the works of Bohme, which Charles I had caused to be published in English,  Pordage derived the germs of his strange and incoherent mysticism. A time of such sudden veering from the extreme of churchliness to the mildest independentism as was the case under Charles I and Cromwell is very favorable to sporadic outbursts of fanaticism. Hence, as Pordage was very susceptible in this direction, it was not long until he found himself the center of a group of disciples. The effect of association was to intensify his delusion and to brighten his imagination. This culminated in a series of the wildest pretendedly supernatural visions. In the night of Jan. 3, 1651, he assumed to have had three of these. The first was that of a being with clothes, beard, and hat, who drew back his bed-curtains, and then mysteriously vanished. Hardly had Pordage fallen asleep again when he saw a giant with an uprooted tree on his shoulder and a sword in his hand. He threw the tree to the earth, and then began to wrestle with Pordage, but was successfully resisted by the latter with spiritual weapons. The third vision was that of an immense dragon, which vomited fire upon him, and left him exhausted upon the floor. On occasion of such visions a session of the “Philadelphians” was held. Those in attendance also now fell into a state of ecstasy, and had visions of the heavenly and of the infernal world.

 As these visions continued for a period of three weeks, clay and night, Pordage affirmed that they could not be mere fanatical imaginations, but were a heavenly admonition to them to break off from the world. and to enter upon a life of complete devotion to God. But their meetings called for the intervention of the police. The matter was investigated, but led to no other serious result than the deposition of Pordage from his priestly office. A very venomous book was now written against Pordage— Daemonium Meridianum (Lond. 1655)— by one Fowler, a preacher in Reading. Pordage defended himself in Innocency Appearing. Thereupon Fowler retorted, with fresh accusations in a new volume (1656). Meantime the enthusiasts had gone to London, but, driven away by the plague, they returned to Bradfield. On the death of Mrs. Pordage, in 1670, they went again to London. It was now that, in accordance with a vision granted to Jane Leade, the “Philadelphians” became an organized society. The members of the society were to live according to the laws of Paradise. Pordage opened to the society his own house in London. The membership reached near a hundred. Upon these the frequent visions of Pordage and Leade exerted a magnetic effect. In the close of 1671 Pordage fell into a trance, in which he affirmed that his spirit, breaking loose from his soul and body, was translated to the mountain of eternity. There he saw heavenly and eternal things with direct, naked vision.  Pormdage lays claim to three degrees of revelation:

(1) Visions placed before the human spirit by the Holy Ghost;

(2) Illuminations shed directly by the Holy Spirit into the immortal part of man, man, aig mim to see the thoughts of the Spirit;

(3) Translations of the mortal spirit into the very heart of the Deity, whereby it is enabled to behold and read the secret mysteries of the Trinity itself.

The voluminous writings of Pordage contain a very elaborate and fantastic system of mystical theology. Throughout he claims to be in harmony with the Scriptures; he simply penetrates below the letter, and unveils their deeper meaning. Among the curiosities of his teaching are the following: The immortal spirits of men have a cylindrical form, and resemble a transparent whiff of mist; their movements are as rapid as thought; they can traverse mountains, rocks, ocean, earth, and have about the size and contour of a human body. Angels are sexless, or rather they are man and woman entirely merged into one person-the spirit being the male, and the soul the female element. Adam was also primarily a man-woman, and bore within himself the faculty of procreation. Christian perfection is a state of absolute celibacy, in which the soul is married to the heavenly sophiut.

The whole system of Pordage claimed to rest upon a series of supernatural visions. With the other “Philadelphians,” he regarded the actual state of the Church as one of utter degeneration, and as incapable of reformation. Even the Quakers he regarded as among the antichristian sects. He believed himself called to organize and restore the primitive Church. Up to his death, Pordage was the most influential of the “Philadelphiaus.” When he died, in 1698 the society seemed ready to perish. But it lingered awhile, as will be seen by reference to the art. SEE LEADIE, JANE. See the literature there quoted. See also Morell, Modern Philosophy, p. 213; Mosheim, Eccles. Dict. 3, 481; Neal, Hist. of the Puritans; Haag, Les Dogmas Chretiennes; Blackey, Hist. of Philosophy, 2, 414. (J. P. L.)

## Pordenone, Giovanni Antonio Licin (I)o Regillo DA[[@Headword:Pordenone, Giovanni Antonio Licin (I)o Regillo DA]]

             generally called simply “Il Pordenone,” an Italian painter of great celebrity, was born at Pordenone, in Friunli, in 1484. From the vigor of conception, the elevation of mind, and the style of execution which distinguish his works, it has been presumed, though it is not certain, that he  frequented the school of Giorgione. Though on the whole inferior to Titian, he presumed to be his rival. Pordenone chiefly excelled in fresco. His composition was very simple, his heads rarely speak of deep passion, and his chief excellence was color. He painted flesh with a marvelous softness. His portraits were fine, and he frequently represented several persons on one canvas. It is difficult to see on what qualities his competition with Titian is founded; for though Pordenone painted lifelike and rich toned portraits, and grouped his compositions in a spirited manner, he is not by any means to be compared with Titian, of whom he professed himself in such dread that he painted with his shield and poniard lying at his side. Certainly the saints and virgins of Pordenone, which hang in the gallery of Venice beside tile works of Titian, do not look as if it had cost the latter much trouble to distance his competitor. As Pordenone principally painted frescos in North or Upper Italy. he was known in Lower Italy only by his tine oil-paintings. His most splendid work in oil is the altar-piece of Santa Maria dell' Orto at Venice, representing a San Lorenzo Giustiniani surrounded by other Saints, among whom are St. John the Baptist and St. Augustine. The frescos of Pordenone are spread over the towns and castles of Friuli; some are at Genoa, Mantua, and Venice, but the best-preserved are on N.T. subjects at Piacenza, and especially in the cathedral at Cremona. He was highly esteemed by the emperor Charles V, who ennobled him. Hercules II, duke of Mantua, called him to Mantua to paint cartoons for tapestry to be made in Flanders, but he soon afterwards died (in 1539), as it was suspected, of poison. We have very few easel pictures by Pordenone, and those which are attributed to him in galleries are oftentimes proved not to be his, or are under so much doubt that it is unsafe to risk a list of them. The Glory of S. Lorenzo Giustiniani, in the Academy of Venice, is one of his finest works. Much has been said of The Woman taken in Adultery, in the Berlin Museum, but it is so repainted (the heads of the Savior and the woman being almost new) that it can do little honor to any artist of the 16th century. Several of Pordenone's pictures are in England. In the National Gallery is a colossal figure of An Apostle. See Mrs. Clement, Handbook of Painters, Sculptors, etc., s.v.; Radcliffe, Schools and Masters of Painting, p. 209 sq., et al.; Vasari, Lives of the Painters; Lanzi, History of Painting in Italy; Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v. (J. H. W.)

## Porodakhsta[[@Headword:Porodakhsta]]

             is a personage of the Persian mythology, the father of the famous hero Eshevand. He is to be one of the assistants of Sosiash, son of Zoroaster, in his great work, the resurrection of the dead.

## Poroq, Jean le[[@Headword:Poroq, Jean le]]

             a French Oratorian, was born near Bologne-sur-Mer in 1636. Professor of theology for fifty years at the school founded at Sarumur by the Oratorians, he was one of the most active adversaries of the Jansenists, and published against them Les Sentiments de Stiuint Agustine sur la Grace (Lyons, 1682. 1700, 4to). Although he abstains from all personalities, his adversaries spoke of it with the utmost contempt. Abbé Goujet acknowledges Porcq's piety, and says that he always carefully avoided anything that was akin to sectarianism, but that he wrote against Jansenism because he considered it wrong. He wrote as a true polemic against doctrines, and not persons. See Dupin, Bibl. des Aut. Eccles. du 18ieme Siecle, 2, 385.

## Porphyrians[[@Headword:Porphyrians]]

             was the name given to the Arians in an edict of the emperor Constantine issued in the year 325, the reason stated being that, as they had emulated the impiety of Porphyry in their errors so they ought to be named after him (Socrat. Hist. Ecclesiastes 1, 6). This decree was afterwards quoted as a precedent by Theodosius the Younger, who ordered that the Nestorians should, in a similar manner, be called Simonians. It may be doubted whether either name extended much beyond the four corners of the edicts in which they were given. See Baronius, Annales, ad ann. 325, vol. 84, 85.

## Porphyry[[@Headword:Porphyry]]

             (Πορφύριος), a celebrated heathen philosopher, the ablest expounder and defender of NeoPlatonism as taught by Plotinus (q.v.), and one of the most sagacious and learned antagonists of Christianity under the Roman empire, flourished in the second half of the 3d century.

Life. — Porphyry was born A.D. 233. Eunapius and Slitlas (following, no doubt, Porphyry himself, Vit. Plot. 8, 107) in their biographies call him a Tyrian; but both St. Jerome (Praef. Epist. ad Gul.) and St. Chrysostom (Homil. VI in I and Corinth. p. 58) term him Βατανεώτης, a word on the fancied correction of which a good deal of ingenuity has been unnecessarily expended; some imagining that it is a corruption of some term of reproach (such as βοτανιώτης, herb-erter, βιοθάνατος, or βαλανεώτης). The more reasonable view is that the word is correct enough, and describes  more accurately the birthplace of Porphyry-Batanea, the Bashan of Scripture. To account for his being called a Tyrian some have supposed that he was originally of Jewish origin, and having first embraced, and afterwards renounced Christianity, called himself a Tyrian to conceal his real origin. Heumann, making a slight alteration in the text of Chrysostom, supposed that Porphyry falsely assumed the epithet Βατανεώτης, to induce the belief that he was of Jewish origin, so that his statements with regard to the Jewish Scriptures might have the more weight. None of these conjectures seems in any degree probable. The least improbable view is that of Jonsius, who is followed by Fabricius Brucker, and others, that there was a Tyrian settlement in the district of Batanea, and that Porphyry was born there, but, from the neighborhood of the more important place, called himself. and was called by others, a Tyrian (Brucker, list. Crit. Phil. 2, 240; Harless, Ad Fabricius Bibl. Gr. 5, 725).

The original name of Porphyry was Mafchus Μάλχος, the Greek form of the Syro-Phoenician Melek), a word, as he himself tells us, which signified king. His father bore the same name, and was a man of distinguished family (Porph. Vit. Plot. c. 16). Aurelius, in dedicating a work to him, styled him Βασιλεύς. The more euphonious name Πορφύριος (in allusion to the usual color of royal robes) was subsequently devised for him by his preceptor, Longinus (Eunapius, Porph. p. 13; Suidas, s.v.). Suidas states that he lived in the reign of Aurelian, and died in that of Diocletian. Eunapius says, more explicitly, that he lived in the reigns of Gallienus, Claudius, Tacitus, Aurelian, and Probus. Porphyry himself tells us that he was thirty years of age when he first became the pupil of Plotinus, which was in the tenth year of the reign of Gallienus (Vit. Plot. 4, 99); the date of his birth was, therefore, A.D. 233. Exhibiting in his earliest youth a thirst for knowledge, a quickness of mental perception, combined with indications of intellectual vigor, his father provided the very best instruction for him, especially in philosophy and literature. From Porphyry himself, as quoted by Eusebius (II. E. 3, 19; comp. Proclus, in Tim. 1, p. 20), it appears that when very young he was placed under the instruction of Ori Genesis This could not have been, as some have imagined, at Alexandria, for about the time of the birth of Porphyry Origen quitted Alexandria, and did not return to it. It was most likely at Caesarea that Porphyry attended the instructions of Ori Genesis Eunapius has been charged with a gross blunder in making Origen the fellow-student of Porphyry; but it does not seen necessary to suppose that he meant the  celebrated Chi ch father of that name. Porphyry next removed to Athens, and became the pupil of Apolloniuse (Porph. Quaest. Comm. 25), and of the much-celebrated Longinus, whose reputation for wisdom and skill in instruction brought him scholars from all parts of the then civilized world. Under his tuition he received that early molding which subsequently secured such vigor of thought and elegance of style, and the tutor was so much pleased with his scholar that he not only warmly commended him, but applied the name to him by which alone posterity has known him. At the age of twenty he went to Rome to study under Plotinus (q.v.), but as that philosopher was not then teaching, Porphyry returned to the care of his former preceptor. At the age of thirty he went again to Rome, this time in the company of Antonius of Rhodes, and he now studied philosophy with the great exponent of Neo-Platonism, and with Plotinus's oldest disciple, Amelius ( Vi. Plot. c. 4). Porphyry remained six years, and became thoroughly attached to his master-a man endowed with an extraordinary understanding and vigorous imagination, who as a teacher of the eclectic philosophy capalle of felicitously unfolding the sublime ideas of Plato had obtained a great reputation. Under such guidance the pupil, by nature well endowed for study, and led on by his zeal for distinction and acquirements, very soon came to be regarded as one of the chief ornaments of the school.

He wrote and disputed with great freedom and masterly ability. Thus, e.g., when, having some doubts respecting a dogma which Plotinus had inculcated, Porphyry hesitated not to call the philosopher's dicta in question, and wrote a treatise endeavoring to establish in reply ὅτι ἔξω τοῦ νοῦ ὑφέστηκε τὰ νοητά, hoping to get a rejoinder, which Amelius wrote by request of Plotinus. Porphyry, still unsatisfied, again wrote, and was once more replied to by Amelius, who this time succeeded in pacifying the inquisitive pupil. Porphyr; now evinced his manliness by a public recantation of his erroneous criticisms. This generous action gained so thoroughly the approbation and confidence of Plotinus that he was admitted by him to terms of close intimacy, and frequently had assigned to him the task of refuting opponents, and was besides entrusted with the still more difficult and delicate duty of correcting and arranging the writings of Plotinus (Vii. Plot. 7, 107; 13, 115; 15, 117; 24, 139). So closely did Porphyry apply himself to these studies that his health became impaired, and, naturally of hypochondriacal disposition, a cloud, settling into confirmed melancholy was cast over his mind. While in this state he formed a resolution of putting an end to his life, hoping by this method, according to the Platonic teaching, to release the soul from the prison of the body.  From this mad design, however, he was dissuaded by his master, who advised a voyage to Sicily. Complying with this advice, Porphyry recovered his bodily vigor and serenity of mind, and devoted himself to authorship. He then wrote, according to Eusebius (Hist. Eccles. 6, 19) and Jerome (Catal. Script. Illust.), his treatise against the Christian religion (see below, under Works), on which account St. Amugustine (Retract. 2, 31) styles him Siculure illum cujus celeberima fisma est. The notion that this work was written in Bithynia is quite without foundation, being merely derived from a passage of Lactantius (5, 2), referring to somebody whose name is not mentioned, and who wrote against the Christians and which was supposed by Baronius to refer to Porphyry. But the account does not suit him in any respect. It was very likely about this period that Porphyry took occasion to visit Carthage. That he also went to Athens after the death of Plotinus has been inferred (by Holstenius) from a passage quoted by Eusebius, where, as the text stands, Porphyry is made to speak of celebrating the birthday of Plotinus at Athens with Longinus. There can be little doubt, however, that the reading should be, as Brucker (1. c. p. 148) suggests, Πλατώνεια, and that the incident refers to the earlier part of the life of Porphyry, otherwise the allusion will not accord with the history either of Porphyry or Longilnus.

Of the remainder of the life of Porphyry we know very little. According to Eunapius he returned to Rome, where he taught, and gave frequent public exhibitions of his acquirements and talents as a speaker, and was held in high honor by the senate and people till he died. But his mind again lost its balance, f(r lie pretended to be not only a philosopher “endued with superior wisdom, but a divine person, favored with supernatural communications from heaven.” He avers that in the sixty-eighth year of his age (lit. Plot. c. 23) he had a vision of the Supreme Intelligence, the (God superior to all gods, without an image-the result, as Augustine thought, of the agency of evil spirits, but more probably an entire fiction, employed to offset the supernatural elements of Christianity, or a mere phantasm of an overwrought brain. When probably at a somewhat advanced period of his life, he married Marcella, the widow of one of his friends, and the mother of seven children (Ad Mairc. 1), with the view, as he avowed, of superintending their education. About ten months after his marriage he had occasion to leave her and go on a journey; and to console her during his absence he wrote to her an epistle, which is still extant. The date of his  death cannot be fixed with any exactness; it was probably about A.D. 305 or 306.

His Philosophy. — It appears from the testimony even of antagonists, and from what we have left of Porphyry's writings, that he was a man of great abilities and very extensive learning. Eusebius speaks of him as one τῶν μάλιστα διαφανῶν καὶ πᾶσι γνωρίμων, κλέος τε οὐ μικρὸν φιλοσοφίας παῤ ῞Ελλησιν ἀπενηνεγμένον (Praep. Ev. 3, 9); and Augustine styles him “hominem non mediocri ingenio praeditulm” (De Civ. Dei, 10, 32; comp. 19, 22). The philosophical doctrines of Porphyry were in all essential respects the same as those of his master, Plotinus. To that system he was ardently attached, and proved himself one of its most energetic defenders. His writings were all designed directly or indirectly to illustrate, commend, or establish it. His rhetorical training, extensive learning, and comparative clearness of style, no doubt did good service in the cause of his school. Thus Eunapius (Vita Porph. p. 8, Boiss) ascribes to Porphyry as his principal merit that by his perspicuous and pleasing diction he brought within the range of the understanding of all men the doctrine of Plotinus, which in the language of its author had seemed difficult and obscure. Indeed, Porphyry lays himself less claim to originality than to the merit of an expositor and defender of the doctrine of Plotinus, which he regarded as identical with that of Plato, and substantially also with that of Aristotle. Porphyry is, nevertheless, charged with inconsistencies and contradictions; his later views being frequently at variance with his earlier ones (Eunapius, Vit. Porlph. fin.; Eusebius, Precept. Ev. 4, 10; Iambl. ap. Stobeuum, Eel. 1, 866).

The reason of this may probably be found in the vacillation of his views with respect to theurgy and philosophy—a vacillation which would doubtless attract the greater attention, as it was in opposition to the general tendencies of his age and school that he ranked philosophy higher than the theurgic superstitions which were connected with the popular polytheism. With the latter, some features of his doctrines had considerable affinity. He insisted strongly on the contrast between the corporeal and the incorporeal, and the power of the latter over the former. ‘The influence of the incorporeal was, in his view, unrestricted by the limits of space, and independent of the accident of contiguity. When free from intermixture with matter, it is omnipresent, and its power unlimited. His doctrine with regard to daemons pointed in the same direction. Over both them and the souls of the dead power could be obtained by enchantments (l)e Abst. 2, 38, 39, 41, 43, 47). Yet these notions seem to have been taken  up by him rather in deference to the prevalent opinion of his times than as forming an essential part of his philosophy. Though at first somewhat disposed to favor theurgy, he still ranked philosophy above it, considering, with Plotinus, that the true method of safety consisted in the purgation of the soul and the contemplation of the eternal Deity. The increasing value set upon theurmgy, and the endeavors to raise it above philosophy itself, probably produced something like a reaction in his mind, and strengthened the doubts which he entertained with regard to the popular superstition. These doubts he set forth in a letter to the Egyptian prophet Anebos, in a series of questions. The distrust there expressed respecting the popular notions of the gods, divinations, incantations, and other theturgic arts, may have been, as Ritter believes (Gesch. der Philosophie, 4:678), the modified opinion of his later years, provoked, perhaps, by the progress of that superstition to which at an earlier period he had been less opposed. The observation of Augustine is, doubtless, in the main correct: “Ut videas eum inter vitium sacrilege curiositatis et philosophise professionem fluctuasse, et nunc hanc artem tamquam fallacem, et in ipsa actione pericuilosam, et legibus prohibitam, cavendam monere, nunc autem velut ejus laudatoribus cedentem, utilem dicere esse mundanae parti animne, non quidem intellectuali qua rerum iutelligibilium percipiatur veritas, nullas habentium similitudines corporum, sed spirituali, qua rerum corporalium capiantur imagines.” The letter to Anlebos called forth a reply, which is still extant, and known under the title Περὶ Μυστηρίων, and is the production probably of Iamblichus (q.v.).

So many are the variations of Porphyry in his philosophic views from those of Plotinus, that Porphyry must really be assigned to a class of his own rather than called an exponent of Plotinus. Not only did Porphyry popularize the Neo-Platonism of Plotinus, but he distinguished it by the more practical and religious character which he gave to the system. Understanding the power of the Christian religion, which was fast superseding the national creeds, he felt the necessity for antagonizing it. He therefore undertook to spiritualize the old creeds, and to harmonize them with philosophy by treating them as symbolic. He perceived the national craving for a theology (Farrar, p. 57) which rested oil some divine authority, or revelation from the world invisible (comp. Augustine's criticism on him in Civ. Dei, 10, c. 9, 11, 26, 28); and hence he drew such a system from the real or pretended answers of oracles in his περὶ τῆς ἐκ λογίων φιλοσοφίας, of which fragments exist in Eusebius and Augustine  (Fabricius, Mibl. Gr. 5, 744). Heathens, it would seem, had consulted oracles on this very subject of Christianity; and it is these, the genuineness of which may be doubted, that he uses.

The end of philosophizing, according to Porphyry, is the salvation of the soul (ἡ τῆς ψυχῆς σωτηρία). The cause of evil is to be found in the soul, in its desires after the low and base, and not in the body as such (Ad Alma. 29). The means of deliverance from evil are self-purification (κάθαρσις) through asceticism and the philosophical cognition of God. To divination and theurgical initiations Porphyry conceded only a subordinate significance; in his later years, especially, he was instant in warning his followers against their misuse (see, in particular. his epistle to Anebos, the Egyptian priest). He acknowledged one absolute, supreme Deity, who is to be worshipped with pure words and thoughts (Ad Miarc. 18). He also, however, distinguished two classes of visible and invisible gods, the former being composed of body and soul, and consequently neither eternal nor immutable (De Abst. 2, 34, 36, 37-39). He also distinguished between good and evil daemons, and held that the latter ought to be appeased, but that it should be the object of the philosopher to free himself as much as possible from everything placed under the power of evil daemons. For that reason, among others, he rejected all animal sacrifices (De Abst. 2, 38, 39, 43).

The ascetic tendency of his philosophy, as connected with his exalted ideas of the power of reason, which is superior to nature and the influence of daemons, conduced to raise him above the superstitious tendencies of his age; the spirit of the philosopher being, in his view, superior to all impressions from without. The object of the philosopher should be to free himself as much as possible from all desires of or dependence on that which is external, such appetites being the most hateful tyrants, from which we should be glad to be set free, even with the loss of the whole body (Ad Marc. 34). We should, therefore, restrain our sensual desires as much as possible. It was mainly in this point of view that he rejected all enjoyment of animal food (see Bernays, Theosoph. Schr. über Friummigkeit, emit krit. u. erkl. Benerk. zu Porph. Schr. über Enthaltsainkeit. p. 4-38). Though bad genii have some power over us, yet through abstinence and the steady resistance of all disturbing influences we can pursue the good in spite of them. If we could abstain from vegetable as well as animal food, he thought we should become still more like the gods (De Abst. 3, 27). It is by means of reason only that we are exalted to the supreme God, to whom nothing material should be offered, for everything material is unclean (De  Abst. 1, 39, 57; 2, 34; Ad Marc. 15). He distinguishes four degrees of virtues, the lowest being political virtue, the virtue of a good man who moderates his passions. Superior to this is putrefying virtue, which completely sets the soul free from affections. Its object is to make us resemble God, and by it we become demoniacal men or good daemons. In the higher grade, when entirely given up to knowledge and the soul, man becomes a god, till at last he lives only to reason, and so becomes the father of gods, one with the one Supreme Being (Sent. 34). Porphyry appears to have taught (in his six books περὶ ὕλης ‘) more distinctly than Plotinus the doctrine of the emanation of matter from the supersensuous, and proximately from the soul (Procl. in Tim. p. 109, 133,189). The doctrine that the world is without beginning in time was defended by Porphyry against the objections of Atticus and Plutarch (Procl. in Tim. p. 119).

His Attacks against Christianity. — Porphyry has especial interest for us, however, not so much as a philosopher of the New-Platonic school, great as he was as such, but as the constructor of a new philosophy, the aim of which was not merely speculation and the enchantment of reason, but its acceptance as a national creed, and its dethronement of Christianity. When made aware that his system could not of itself accomplish all that he desired, he left the apologetic domain, and became the most determined of heathen polemics the world ever beheld or Christianity ever encountered. Lucian and Celsus, a hundred years earlier, had vainly striven to stay the rising fortunes of the Gospel. He now came forward to attempt the death- grapple, and it must be confessed that he made a most vigorous effort to retrieve a sinking cause, to turn back the tide of new ideas, and to reinstate in the minds of the people of the Roman empire the principles of an effete religious system, of a waning and insufficient philosophy.

As already indicated above, Porphyry was a man of remarkable powers of mind and of high culture, of a caliber altogether above that of Lucian and Celsus. Lucian, though endowed with keen wit, was a careless jester, and Celsus, in his attacks on the Gospel, often reminds us of the vulgar gibes and ribald remarks of Thomas Paine; but nothing of this is found in Porphyry. Speaking in the name of philosophy, he assumes a dignity, an elevation of' tone, an apparent candor in the treatment of his subject, akin to that of the judge, who is supposed impartially to survey the whole field of evidence, and to give weight to no doubtful statements, to no specious arguments. Undoubtedly honest in his convictions and in his attachment to the  philosophy of his master, he brought the resources of a great, a cultured mind to bear against the more vulnerable points of the Christian system, testing it by weapons of the highest temper. Porphyry certainly enjoyed a vantage-ground in the school of philosophy to which he belonged. Platonism, as already suggested, approximated more nearly than any of the other philosophic systems of antiquity to the elevated teachings of the Gospel. But during the past century or two, while Christianity had been spreading through the Roman world this philosophy, under the teachings of Plotinus, had been drawing nearer to the doctrines of the New Testament, insomuch that to a casual observer the two streams of thought and speculation seemed likely to unite and flow on in a single channel. Like Christianity, Platonism opened a spiritual world superior to that of sense, and revealed a Supreme Being, if not absolutely free, yet capable of giving shape to the visible as the architect of the universe. It awakened also in man the consciousness of the supernatural, the divine, so that man was attracted towards the supreme spiritual existence, was permitted to have cognition of fellowship with it; not absorbed on the one hand in the depths of the infinite spirit, nor sunk on the other into the material. The one radical point of separation between the philosophy of the schools and that of the Church seemed to be the views of matter entertained by the former- that it was eternal, and the seat of evil in opposition to God. But even this view was softened as the system came in contact with the Gospel. Plotinus held that the evil principle is only apparent, and that only the good has a substantial and permanent existence. The opposers concluded that as the teachings of Christianity could not be entirely ignored or disproved, the philosophical system must be brought upon the same platform as a rival of the Gospel.

All former attacks against Christianity had proved futile because the Gospel could claim supernatural origin, and demonstrate its claims by the response which its teachings found in the depths of the human soul. Instead, therefore, of denying the grand ethical and religious principles of the evangelical scheme, Porphyry sought supernatural surroundings for his own system, and then moved in bold attack against the supernatural in Christianity, seeking to disprove, not the substance of the Gospel teachings, but the records in which that substance is delivered-an attack so general in our day among the disbelievers of the supernatural claims of Christianity. SEE RATIONALISM.

Porphyry's course was in all respects a novel one. Indeed, it was the reverse of that pursued by all other opponents  of the new religion who had preceded him. By them the facts, the records of the Gospel were acknowledged, but the facts were held to be wrong, and to have been produced by an unauthorized agency, to have been the work of magic or charms; now the lapse of a hundred years has convinced the enemy that the method of attack affording any hope of success is the direct one against the authority, the inspiration of the documents of the Gospel. If by the trenchant knife of criticism these supports could be cut away, the system would be left to sink down upon a level with philosophy, with all merely human systems of speculation.

Of the nature and merits of the work by Porphyry against Christianity it is not easy to judge, as it has not come down to us. He is reputed to have written it about the year 270, while in retirement in Sicily. It was entitled Κατὰ Χριστιανῶν. In A.D. 435 all the copies extant were burned by order of the emperor, and its contents are only preserved to us in part by the lengthy extracts made of it in the numerous refutations which were published by the Christian apologists of the early Church.

The entire work consisted of fifteen books, but only concerning five of these is information thus afforded. From these we learn that the first book of his work dragged to light some of the discrepancies, real or supposed, in Scripture. The examination of the dispute between Peter and Paul was quoted as an instance of the admixture of human ingredients in the body of apostolic teaching. His third book was directed to the subject of Scripture interpretation, especially, with some inconsistency, against the allegorical or mystical tendency which at that time marked the whole Church, and especially the Alexandrian fathers. The allegorical method coincided with, if it did not arise from, the Oriental instinct of symbolism, the natural poetry of the human mind. But in the minds of Jews and Christians it had been sanctified by its use in the Hebrew religion, and had become associated with the apocryphal literature of the Jewish Church. It is traceable to a more limited extent in the inspired writers of the New Testament, and in most of the fathers; but in the school of Alexandria it was adopted as a formal system of interpretation. It is this allegorical system which Porphyry attacked he assaulted the writings of those who had fancifully allegorized the Old Testament in the pious desire of finding Christianity in every part of it, in spite of historic conditions; and he hastily drew the inference, with something like the feeling of doubt which rash interpretations of prophecy are in danger of producing at this day, that no consistent sense can be put upon the Old Testament.

His fourth book was a  criticism on the Mosaic history, and on Jewish antiquities. But the most important books in his work were the twelfth and thirteenth, which were devoted to an examination of the prophecies of Daniel; and in these he detected some of those peculiarities on which modern criticism has employed itself, and arrived at the conclusions in reference to their date revived by the English deist Collins in the last century, and by many German critics in the present. It is well known that half of the book of Daniel is historic, half prophetic. Each of these parts is distinguished from similar portions of the Old Testament by some peculiarities. Porphyry is not recorded as noticing any of those which belong to the historic part, unless we may conjecture, from his theory of the book being originally written in Greek, that he detected the presence of those Greek words in Nebuchadnezzar's edicts which many modern critics have contended could not be introduced into Chaldiea antecedently to the Macedontian conquest. The peculiarity alleged to belong to the prophetical part is its apocalyptic tone. It looks, it has been said, historical rather than prophetical. Definite events, and these in a distinct chain, are predicted with the precision of historical narrative; whereas most prophecy is a moral sermon, in which general moral predictions are given, with specific historic ones interspersed. Nor is this, which is shared in a less degree by occasional prophecies elsewhere, the only peculiarity alleged, but it is affirmed also that the definite character ceases at a particular period of the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, down to which the very campaigns of the Seleucid and Ptolemaic dynasties are noted, but subsequently to which the prophetic tone becomes more vague and indefinite.

Hence the conjecture has been hazarded that it was written in the reign of Antiochus by a Palestinian Jew, who gathered in the traditions of Daniel's life and wrote the recent history of his country in eloquent language in an apocalyptic form, which, after the literary fashion of his age, he imputed to an ancient seer, Daniel; definite up to the period at which he composed it indefinite as he gazed on the future. It was this peculiarity, the supposed ceasing of the prophecies in the book of Daniel at a definite date, which was noticed by Porphyry, and led him to suggest the theory of its authorship just named. He seems also to have entered into some examination of the specific prophecies, for he objects to the application of the words “the abomination of desolation” to other objects than that which he considers its original meaning (see Jerome on Mat 24:15). These remarks will give an idea of the critical acuteness of Porphyry. A few other traces of Porphyry's views remain, which are of less importance, and are leveled against parts of the New  Testament: e.g. the change of purpose in our blessed Lord (John 7), [Jerome, vol. 4, pt. 2, p. 521 (Dial. adv. Pelage.); Ep. (101) ad Pammach. Several are given in Holsten. (Vit. Porphyr. p. 861, the reasons why the Old Economy was abrogated if divine [Agulsst. Epist. (102, olim 49, Beledict. ed. 1689), 2, 274, where six questions are named, some of which come from Porphyry]; the question what became of the generations which lived before Christianity was proclaimed, if Christianity was the only way of salvation; objections to the severity of Peter in the death of Ananias; and the inscrutable mystery of an infinite punishment in requital for finite sin (August. Retract. bk. 2, c. 31, vol. 1, p. 53, concerning Mat 7:2). His objections are not it will be observed, founded on quibbles like those of Celsus, but on instructive literary characteristics, many of which are greatly exaggerated or grossly misinterpreted, but still are real, and suggest difficulties or inquiries which the best modern theological critics have honorably felt to demand candid examination and explanation.

It was by no means an easy matter to reply to such a critique as Porphyry adopted, and it may be said that lie never was answered as he should have been. The reply which Origen made to Celsus set aside all the objections of the heathen disputant, but the thirty separate replies to Porphyry, among which the best are those by Methodius, Eusebius, and Apollinarius, very insufficiently solve the intricate and deep problems proposed by the most successful exponent of Neo-Platonism. That he made a profound impression on the Church is seen in the fact that to all Christians his name became hateful, odious, the synonym for all that is vile and dangerous in unbelief, like that of Turk or Moslem or Papist in later ages. When Constantine wished to blacken the reputation of the Arians. he only had to attach to them the epithet of Porphyrian. That name carried in it a Satanic import, a heavy curse, able to sink to irretrievable infamy any individual or sect who bore it. A great deal of discussion has taken place respecting the assertion of Socrates (If. E. 3, 23), that in his earlier years Porphyry was a Christian, and that, having been treated with indignity by the Christians, he apostatized, and revenged himself by writing against them. The authority is so slight, and the improbability of the story so great (for it does not appear that any of his antagonists charged him with apostasy, unless it was Eusebius), while it may so easily have arisen from the fact that in his early youth Porphyry was instructed by Origen, that it may confidently be rejected. An able summary of the arguments on both sides is given by Brucker (2, 251, etc.). A doubt has been raised as to the identity of the  assailant of Christianity with the Neo-Platonic philosopher, but it is totally without foundation.

Other Works. Of the very numerous writings of Porphyry the following are extant:

1. Πυθαγόρου βίος; supposed by many to be a fragment of his larger history of philosophers.

2. Περὶ Πλωτίνου βίου καὶ τῆς τάξεως τῶν βιβλίων αὐτοῦ. SEE PLOTINTS.

3. Περὶ ἀποχῆς τῶν ἐμψύχων, in four books, dedicated to his friend and fellow-disciple Firmus Castricius.

4. Fragments of his epistle Πρὸς Α᾿νεβῶ τὸν Αἰγύπτιον. Large quotations from this work are made by Eusebius in his Praepartatio Evangelica.

5. Πρὸς τὰ νοητὰ ἀφορμαὶ 1.

6. ῾Ομηρικὰ ζητήματα, addressed to Anatolius.

7. Περὶ τοῦ ἐν Ο᾿δυσσείᾷ τῶν Νυμφῶν ἄντρου, a fanciful allegorical interpretation of the description of the cave of the nymphs in the Odyssey, showing both the ingenuity and the recklessness with which Porphyry and other writers of his stamp pressed writers and authorities of all kinds into their service, as holders of the doctrines of their school.

8. A fragment from a treatise Περὶ Στυγός, preserved by Stobmeus.

9. Εἰσαγωγή, or Περὶ τῶν πέντε φωνῶν, addressed to Chrysaorius, and written by Porphyry while in Sicily. It is commonly prefixed to the Organon of Aristotle.

10. A commentary on the Categories of Aristotle, in questions and answers.

11. Some fragments of a commentary on Aristotle's books Περὶ φυσικῆς ἀκροάσεως.

12. A commentary on the Harmonica of Ptolemmcus, leaving off at the seventh chapter of the second book.

13. Περὶ προσῳδιας (see Villoison, Alnead. Graeca, 2, 103-118).

14. Scholia on the Iliad, preserved at Leyden among the books and papers of Is. Vossius. A portion of them was published by Valckenaer, in an appendix to Ursinlls's irin, with a copious account of the scholia generally. Other scholia on the Iliad, preserved in the Vatican library, were published by Villoison (Anaed. Graeca, 2, 266, etc.), and in his edition of the Iliad.

15. Portions of a commentary, apparently on the Ethics of Aristotle, and of one on the Organon.

16. Two books on the philosophy of Plato were affirmed to be extant by Gesner.

17. All epistle to his wife Marcella. This piece was discovered by Anigelo Mai in the Ambrosian library, and published at Milan in 1816. The letter is not quite complete, as the end of the MS. is mutilated. The contents of it are of a general philosophical character, designed to incite to the practice of virtue and self-restraint and the study of philosophy. The sentiments are a little obscure here and there, but many of the maxims and remarks exhibit great wisdom, and a considerable depth of very pure religious feeling. Porphyry considers sorrow to be a more wholesome discipline for the mind than pleasures (c. 7). With great energy and some eloquence he urges the cultivation of the soul and the practice of virtue, ill preference to attention to the body. His views of the Deity, of his operations, and the right mode of contemplating and worshipping him, are of a very exalted kind, some reminding the reader strongly of passages in the Scriptures. The laws under which man is placed he distinguishes into natural, civil, and divine, and marks out their respective provinces with considerable beauty and clearness.

18. A poetical fragment, from the tenth book of a work entitled Περὶ τῆς ἐκ λογίων φιλοσοφίας, is published at the end of the preceding work.

19. An introduction to the Tetirabiblos of Ptoleminus is also attributed by some to Porphyry, by others to Antiochus. The ἐπίτομος διήγησις εἰς τὰς καθ᾿ ῾Ομήρου πλάνας τοῦ Ο᾿δυσσέως, the production of Nicephorus Gregoras, has also been attributed by some to Porphyry. Besides these we have mention of the following lost works of Porphyry:

20. Περὶ ἀγαλμάτων (Euseb. Precept. Ev. 3, 7; Stob. Ecl. Phys. 1, 25).

21. Περὶ ἀνόδου ψυχῆς (August. De Civ. Dei, 10:910, etc.).

22. Περὶ τοῦ μίαν ειναι τὴν Πλάτωνος καὶ Α᾿ριστοτέλους αίρεσιν (Suidas, s.v. Πορφ).

23. A commentary on Aristotle's treatise Περὶ ἑρμηνείας (Boethius, ad loc. 2).

24. Πρὸς Α᾿ριστοτέλην, περὶ τοῦ ειναι τὴν ψυχὴν ἐντελέχειαν (Suidas).

25. Ε᾿ξήγησις τῶν κατηγοριῶν, dedicated to Gedalius (Eustath. Ad 11. 3, 293).

26. Περὶ ἀρχῶν (Suidas).

27. Περὶ ἀσωμάτων (ibid.).

28. Περὶ τοῦ γνῶθι σεαυτόν (ibid.).

29. Γραμματικαὶ ἀπορίαι (ibid.).

30. A reply to the Apology for Alcibiades in the Symposium of Plato, by Diophanes (Porph. Vit. Plot. 15).

31. Ε᾿πιγράμματα (Eustath.).

32. Περὶ τοῦ ἐφ᾿ ἡμῖν, dedicated to Chrysaorius (Stob. Ecl.).

33. A treatise against a spurious work attributed to Zoroaster (Porph. Vif. Plot. 16).

34. Περὶ θείων ὀνομάτων (Suidas).

35. Εἰς τὸ θεοφράστου περὶ καταφάσεως καὶ ἀποφάσεως (Boethius in Arist. De Interpr.).

36. Εἰς τὸ θουκυδιδου πεοοίμιον, πρὸς Α᾿ριστείδην (Suidas).

37. Περὶ ἰδεῶν, πρὸς Λογγῖνον (Porph. Vit. Plot. 20).

38. ῾Ο ἱερὸς γάμος, a poem composed for the birthday of Plato (ibid. 15).

39. Εἰς τὴν τοῦ Ι᾿ουλιανοῦ Χαλδαίου φιλοσόφου ἱστορίαν (Suidas).

40. Εἰς τὴν Μινουκιανοῦ τέχνην (ibid.).

41. ῾Ο πρὸς Νημέρτιον λόγος (Cyrill. c. Julian. 3, 79, etc.). It appears to have been a treatise on the providence of God.

42. ῞Οτι ἔξω τοῦ ὑφέστηκε τὸ νόημα (Porph. Vif. Plot. 18).

43. Περὶ τῆς ῾Ομήρου φιλοσοφίας (Suidas).

44. Περὶ τῆς ἐξ ῾Ομήρου ὠφελείας τῶν βασιλέων, in ten books (ibid.).

45. Περὶ παραλελειμμένων τῷ ποιητῇ ὀνομάτων. This and the two preceding were probably only parts of a larger work.

46. Περὶ τῶν κατὰ Πίνδαρον τοῦ Νείλου πηγῶν (ibid.).

47. Commentaries on several of the works of Plotinus (Eiunap. Vit. Porph.).

48. Εἰς τὸν Σοφίστην τοῦ Πλάτωνος (Boethius, De Divis. Proef.).

49. Σύμμικτα ζητήματα, in seven books (Suidas).

50. Τὰ εἰς τὸν Τίμαιον ὑπομνήματα, a commentary on the Timceus of Plato (Macrob. In Somn. Scip. 2, 3; Proclus, In Timaeum).

51. Περὶ ὕλης, in six books (Suidas).

52. Φιλόλογος ἱστορία, in five books (ibid.; Euseb. Precept. Ev. 10:3, who quotes a passage of some length from the first book).

53. Φιλόσοφος ἱστορία, in four books, a work on thle lives and doctrines of philosophers (Socrates, 11. E. 3, 23; Eunap. Pr. p. 10).

54. Περὶ ψυχῆς, in five books (Suidas; Euseb. Prcap. Ev. 14:10). 55. Περὶ τῶν ψυχῆς δυνάμεων (Stob. Eclog.).

See Eusebius, Dem. Evang. 3, 6; Fabricius, Bibl. Grec. 5, 725, etc.; Holstenius, De Vita et Scriptis Porphyrii; Ritter, Gesch. d. Philos. 4, 666 sq.; Larldner, Credibility of the Gosp. Hist. pt. 2. ch. 37; Jortin, Remarks, 2, 389; Schaff, Ch. Hist. 1, 190 sq.; Neander, Ch. Hist. 1, 170 sq.; Ullman, in Stud. u. Krit. 1854; Neander, Domanzas, 1, 85, 202; 2, 467; Donaldson, Greek Lit. ch. 53; Lecks, Hist. of European Morals, 1, 344 sq.; Degerando, Hist. de la Philos. 3, 383 sq.; Valerien Parisot. Dissertatio historica de Porphyrio (1845); Ueberweg, History of Philosophy, 1, 251 sq.; Mosheim, History of the First Three Centuries, 2, 103 sq.; Theological Quarterly, 1865, 1, 59; Revue des Deux Mondles, May 15, 1866, 1. 435; Farrar, Critical History of Free Thought, p. 56 sq.; Journal  of Speculatiae Philosophy, vol. 3, No. 1, art. 3; Fisher, The Beginnings (f Christianity (N. Y. 1877, 8vo), p. 178 sq.; Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology.

## Porree, Gilbert de la[[@Headword:Porree, Gilbert de la]]

             SEE PORRETANI.

## Porreta Margareta[[@Headword:Porreta Margareta]]

             one of the numerous victims of religious intolerance in the Middle Ages, was born in Hainault, and published at Paris a book which, according to the decision of the theologians who examined it, contained a number of errors and heresies, “et inter caeteras (hoereses) quod anima annihilata in amore conditoris sine reprehensione conscientite vel remorsu potest et debet naturae, quidquid appetit et desiderat concedere.” These errors the foolish woman refused to retract, and as she also scorned the excommunication visited upon her by the Inquisition, the Church delivered her up to the secular arm for execution. At the stake she is said to have changed her mind, and to have died with great signs of repentance; but for this we have only the testimony of the priests who attended her in her last hours as her persecutors.

## Porretani[[@Headword:Porretani]]

             a name for the followers of GILBERT DE LA PORREE, bishop of Poitiers, a metaphysical divine of the 12th century, who held opinions respecting the personality and the essence of the Holy Trinity analogous to those of the Letratheitae or Damianists of the 6th century. Porretanus attempted to distinguish the divine essence from the Deity, and the properties of the three divine Persons from the Persons themselves, not in reality, but by abstraction. In consequence of these distinctions, he denied the incarnation of the divine nature, respecting which he ventured to set forth the proposition, “Quod Divina natura non esset incarnata.” Porretanus was accused by two of his clergy of teaching blasphemy, and at their instigation St. Bernard brought the matter before Eugenius III, the pontiff, who was then in France. The case was discussed first in the Council of Paris in A.D. 1147, and then in the Council of Rheims, which was held in the following year. To put an end to the contest, Porretanus yielded his own judgment to that of the council and the pope. It does not appear that any large party was formed by Porretanus, but some are  spoken of under his name as his followers. See Gallia Christiana, 2, 1175; Harduin, Concil. 6, 2, 1297; Mansi, Concil. 21. 712.

## Porst, Johann[[@Headword:Porst, Johann]]

             a Lutheran minister, was born Dec. 11, 1668, at Oberkotzau, not far from Hof. In 1689 he went to Leipsic for the study of theology. In 1695 he was appointed pastor at Malchow, near Berlin; in 1704 he was called to Berlin as preacher at Friedrichswerder and Dorotheenstadt; in 1709 he was made court preacher, and in 1712 provost of St. Nicolai, pastor primarius, and inspector. He died Jan. 9, 1728, having occupied since 1717 the position as counselor of consistory. Of his many writings, none is so well known as is hymn-book, published in 1713, and which is still in use in some churches at Berlin. See Jocher, Gelehrten Lexikon, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theolog. Literatur, p. 113 and index; Koch, Gesch. des deutschen Kirchenliedes, 4, 297 sq.; Kurtz, Lehrbuch der Kirchengesch. (7th ed.) § 166, 2; Staudt, In gottliche Führung (Stuttg. 1850); Bachmann, Zür Geschichte der Berliner Gesangbicher (Berl. 1856); id. Die Gesangbicher Berlin's (ibid. 1857). (B. P.)

## Port[[@Headword:Port]]

             is the rendering in Neh 2:13 of the Heb. sha'uar, שִׁעִר, elsewhere rendered “gate” (q.v.), as twice in the same verse. These gates of the cities, and the unoccupied spaces on which they opened, served in all Hebrew antiquity for places of public assembling of the citizens (comp. the forum, ἀγορά, of the Greeks and Romans). In the East this is still the custom, the gates taking the place of the coffeehouses and other places of resort among the Western nations (Gen 19:1; 1Sa 4:18; 1Sa 9:18; Job 29:7; Jer 37:7). There the people came together in great numbers when any public calamity occurred (2Ma 3:19), there the judges heard causes and complaints (Deu 21:19 sq.; Deu 22:15 sq.; Isa 29:21; Job 21:21; Psa 137:5; Amo 5:12; Amo 5:15; Zec 8:16; Pro 22:22), and there deeds which required legal sanction, especially important contracts, were performed (Gen 23:10; Gen 23:18; Deu 25:7; Rth 4:1; Rth 4:11; comp. the early Germans, Grimm, Deutsche Rechtsallterthümer, p. 104 sq.; and see Hist, Milarokko, p. 239). There princes stood to receive homage (2Sa 19:8; but see below), or for public discussion of important affairs (1Ki 22:10), and markets were held in the vicinity (2Ki 7:1; Arvieux, Nachr. 5, 186;  Rosenmüller, Horgen II. 6, 272; Jacobi, De foro in portis [Leips. 1714], in Ugolino, Thes. vol. 25). At the gate public announcements were made (Jer 17:19; Pro 1:21; Pro 8:3).

Idolatries, too, were sometimes practiced here (2Ki 23:8), just as in Catholic cities altars are placed at the gates. On the whole, we must consider the gate, not as a mere port or entrance, but as a strong defense, and as connected with an open place within; perhaps even with benches (Hist, Marokklo, ut sup.). They were barred with strong bolts and posts, SEE CITY, and often built over (2Sa 18:33) with watch-towers (2Sa 18:24 sq.). Gate-keepers are mentioned, at least in Jerusalem, with some political duties and powers (Jer 37:13; Neh 13:19). On the other hand, in 2Sa 15:2 (and perhaps in 19:8), the allusion is not to a city gate, but to that of a palace in the royal city; and in Est 3:2; Dan 2:49, the word is used, according to a tisage still customary in the East, for the king's court (tulai e.g., in Latin, is a similar synecdoche; conip. also the Arabic Gate of Rashid for court, in Elmacin, Hist. Sacra. p. 120; see Lüdeke. Türk. Reich, 1, 281). To sit at the palace door or gate (Est 2:19; Est 2:21; Est 4:2; Est 5:9; Est 5:13 sq.; Est 6:10), among the Persians, was to wait in the hall or vestibule of the king. Not only courtiers and attendants, but even high officers of the government were found there (Herod. 3, 20). SEE DOOR.

## Port-Royal, Recluses of[[@Headword:Port-Royal, Recluses of]]

             Occupy a most important position in the ecclesiastical and literary history of France, especially in the 17th century, and are largely identified with the Jansenistic controversy.

Port-Royal (Porrigium, Portus Regis, Porreal) lay in the vicinity of the hamlet of Chevreuse, three leagues from Versailles, and six from Paris. Here occurred a memorable reproduction of the austerities of the Thebaid and the ascetic labors of Lerins. The monastery of Port Royal des Champs, an abbey of the Order of Citeaux, was founded in 1204 by Matilda, wife of Matthew I of Montmorency-Marly, during her husband's absence in the fourth crusade. It lay on the left of the high-road from Rambouillet to Chartres, in a damp, low spot, which had once been called, from its natural features, Porrois (from Porra or Borra, dog-Latin for a woody valley with stagnant water: cavus dumetis plenus ubi stagnut xaqua). Abandoned for a long time to the für niente existence of ordinary convents, it fell at length, in the beginning of the 17th century (1608), under the direction of the family of Arnauld. Angelique Arnauld was, through family interest, appointed abbess when only seventeen and a half years old (some declared that she was only eleven, and that her relatives falsely stated her age). Touched by grace as she grew to womanhood, she undertook tile reform of the convent. Her mother, five of her sisters, and six nieces became her spiritual children. Mere Angelique's change to such pious devotion is said to have been occasioned by a sermon on the death of Christ which was preached” by a wandering Capuchin friar, father Basil, who had learned the truth of the Gospel of Christ, and had resolved formally to quit the communion of Rome, and, in passing the convent of Port-Royal while on his journey to the Protestant countries of the North, had secured permission to address the nuns. With love and kindness, but with unyielding firmness and great wisdom, the converted young woman  restored the rule of the order in all its severity-as the strict observance of religious poverty, abstinence from meat, complete seclusion, and the most severe ascetic exercises. The abbey of Port-Royal des Champs had been erected for but a small number of nuns; in consequence, however, of the celebrity which it attained through the reforms and guidance of Mere Angelique, the number increased greatly, so that, instead of twelve, there were more than eighty; and thus the buildings of the abbey became overcrowded and unhealthy. In 1626 it was found necessary to make additional provisions. A house was purchased in Paris in the Faubourg St. Jacques (in great part at the expense of the Arnauld family), to which the nuns removed. This their next abode was called Port-Royal de Paris. In 1633 more spacious quarters were secured in the Rue de Boulai, near the Rue Coquilliere, where they also owned a church, which was dedicated with great solemnity by the archbishop of Paris.

In 1223 the pope had conferred on the convent the right of affording an asylum to such lay personages as, being disgusted with the world, and being their own masters, should wish to live in monastic seclusion without binding themselves by permanent monastic vows. Tills privilege had not availed the Port-Royalists much until now. But the gradual transformation of Mere Angelique, under the influence of St. Francis de Sales, with whom she had been brought in contact, and who led her to accept the doctrine of perfection in the form of the possibility of a complete transformation of the human heart even before death, had become so manifest in her influence over her nuns and the severity they reached, that, inspired by this example, a number of learned and pious men, desirous of living in religious retirement, sought in 1638 the privilege of occupying the deserted establishment of Port-Royal des Champs. The leader of this new movement was the inflexible St. Cyran, who had been first an examiner and later the spiritual director of the nuns of Port-Royal. SEE DUVERGIER DE HAURANNE.

He was a Jansenist, and a most intimate friend of the founder of these doctrines, and as the head of this new lay community instituted the new opinions and made Port-Royal des Champs the home of Jansenism in France. A whole colony of illustrious penitents joined him: the three brothers of La Mere Alngelique; her nephew, the celebrated advocate La Maitre, and his brothers Sericourt and De Sacy; Pierre Nicole; Claude Lancelot, the grammarian; Tillemont, the historian; Pascal, the philosopher; Racine, the poet, and Antoine Arnauld (q.v.), the “great Arnauld,” the youngest brother of the abbess, the learned and impetuous Doctor of the  Sorbonne, whose condemnation by that body occasioned Pascal's Provenals.

This religious movement of the 17th century in France is as remarkable as the philosophical for which that era is noted. Jansenists and Jesuits undertook the re-establishment of that spiritual power which had suffered from the attacks of philosophy; but between these two parties there was bitter strife. Port-Royal had now become the headquarters of Jansenism, which has been called “Calvinistic Catholicism.” The attempt of the Port- Royalists at reconstruction embraced exactly those parts of medieval religion which the Jesuits had neglected. Wholly abandoning what the Jesuits had taken hold of-the social and political side of Catholicism-they clung to its personal, mystical, and ascetic side. They did not quarrel with the Church; they desired to remain Catholic in spite of the pope, believing in the priesthood and the sacraments. They arrived at a metaphysical and moral reform, and pointed to St. Paul and St. Augustine as their inspirers. The Jesuits adopted directly antagonistic views on grace and predestination, and proclaimed the opinions of the Spaniard Molina, who had undertaken, in his De Concordia Gratice et Liberi Arbitrii, to reconcile free-will and predestination. The solitaires of Port-Royal now became the Jansenists of France, insisted upon predestination, and taught that good works were without merit; that grace alone, arbitrarily given or refused, made saints-a Christianity as terrible as the Fate of the ancients. They pursued human nature, corrupted by the fall, with an implacable hatred, and the logical conclusion of such a doctrine was the salvation of the few— i.e. the Church of Jansenism became an aristocracy of grace. SEE JANSENISM.

However much we may find in Jansenism to take exception to, the men who espoused its doctrines were actuated by the noblest of motives, and deserved success in their undertaking, which aimed principally at the freedom of France from the trammels of the papal devotees-the Jesuits-and the spread of practical piety among the French people.

The Jesuits, who were prominent at this time in the Church of France, and effectually controlled the court, obtained under the ministry of Richelieu, and especially of Mazarin, repeated condemnatory acts against the teachings of the Jansenists in general, and the Port-Royalists especially. Persecution, however, money stimulated the growth of the new opinions. Duvergier, a Port-Royalist, was thrown into prison. and kept there until the death of Richelieu, in 1642. But the very time of his liberation was marked  by a most note worthy production. Antoine Arnauld better known as “Le grand Arnauld then wrote his Frequent Communion, the first work of that scientific school of religious philosophy of which Port-Royal was the focus and Pascal the principal exponent. Indeed, the best claim which the community of Port-Royal has upon our notice is this literary war which it waged against the scholastic theology, and against the Jesuits in particular. The Society of Jesus had, ever be it said to its credit, devoted itself to the education of youth; but whatever danger there was in their general teaching was thus intensified in the eves of those who distrusted them. Port-Royal determined to meet them on this ground, by establishing schools and by issuing text-books of their own. The grammar, logic, and rhetoric of Port- Royal-the first by Arnauld, the second by Nicole— were the fruits of this resolve. They set themselves also, and not unsuccessfully, to countermine the power of the Jesuits in the confessional; for the integrity and piety which characterized the Port-Royalists caused them to be much sought after as confessors. They discovered and maintained the famous distinction offitit and droit in respect to papal infallibility. As to doctrine, the pope could not err; as to facts he might. SEE GALLICANISM; SEE INFALLIBILITY.

When required, they were willing to condemn, as doctrines, the five propositions which were said to comprise the Jansenistic heresy; but they denied that these conclusions were to be found in or inferred from Jansen's Augustinus. No papal bulls or persecution could make them recede from this position. In their maintenance of Jansen's real doctrines, in their refusal to acknowledge papal infallibility as to facts, in their continual warfare against the Jesuits, they were exposed to constant persecution. For the Jesuits were not inert in the face of this opposition and defiance. They plotted incessantly at Rome, in order to bring the thunders of the Holy See to bear upon the over-bold Jansenists.

The persecution brought about a result the Jesuits hardly anticipated. Blaise Pascal was induced to step into the arena in defense of the Port- Royalists. One of the most independent minds of his age, Pascal had never yet up to this point submitted himself to the actual guidance of Jansen, any more than he had frankly accepted the logical consequences of the discoveries of Descartes. He had felt the force of both these powerful influences; but a third feeling had exerted authority over his unwilling mind: he had been swayed by the skeptical influence of Montaigne. As a sort of refuge from the yawning abyss which had thus threatened to drown him, this stanch and devotional spirit threw him, as b- a sudden and  irresistible impulse, into the arms of the Jansenists, and he became a recluse at Port-Royal, and its champion against the world. SEE PASCAL.

In the meantime the number of nuns and novices of Port-Royal de Paris having greatly increased, the abbess Angelique Arnauld determined in 1648 to transfer part of them to Port-Royal des Champs. The school of Port- Royal was therefore removed from the latter place to Paris, Rue St. Dominique, Faubourg St. Jacques, but after three years the teachers were restored to Port-Royal des Champs, where they no longer occupied the monastic building, but a farm-house, called Les Granges, on the neighboring hill. In 1653, pope Innocent I having condemned five propositions in the book of Jansenius, Arnauld wrote to prove that these propositions did not exist in the book of Jansenius, at least not in the sense attributed to them. Upon this Arnauld was accused of Jansenism. The nuns of Port-Royal, with their abbess Angelique, having refused to sign the formulary acknowledging that the five alleged heretical propositions were contained in the work of Jansenius, preparations were begun by the Jesuits for scattering the community of Port-Royal, and placing them in close captivity, so as to bring them to submission. It seemed a strange spectacle that a body of women, and a few others who agreed with them in sentiment, should withstand the power of the decrees of Rome and all the pertinacity of the Jesuits in carrying out those decrees. On March 30, 1656, two months after the condemnation of Dr. Arnauld, the civil authorities proceeded to carry out an order in council that every scholar, postulant, and novice should be removed from Port-Royal. But, for some unknown reasons, the execution was suddenly interrupted and delayed several years. It is said that Mazarin's unpleasant relations with the papacy were the principal cause of this sudden suspense of procedure against the recluses. In 1660 the king himself ordered the school to be broken up. The nuns still continuing refractory, Perefixe, archbishop of Paris, sent a party of police officers in 1664, who arrested the abbess, her niece Angelique Arnauld the Younger, or Angelique de St. Jean, the mistress of the novices, and other nuns, and distributed them among several monasteries, where they were kept in a state of confinement. SEE ARNAULD, ANGELIQUE.

Previously some of the nuns who had remained at Port-Royal de Paris intrigued with the government in order to become independent of Port- Royal des Champs, and Louis XIV appointed a separate abbess to Port- Royal de Paris. In 1669 a compromise was made between the pope and the defenders of Jansenius, which was called “the Peace of Clement IX.” The  nuns of Port-Royal des Champs with their own abbess were then restored to their convent, but Port-Royal de Paris was not restored to them: a division of property was effected between the two communities, by order of the king, which was confirmed by a bull of Clement X dated 1671. Each convent retained its own abbess. Several disputes took place between the two communities, in which the archbishop of Paris and the Jesuits took an active part. At last, in March, 1708, a bull of pope Clement XI suppressed the convent of Port-Royal des Champs, and gave the property to Port- Royal de Paris. In 1709 Le Tellier had obtained from king Louis XIV a decree for the execution of the papal bull, and D'Argenson, the lieutenant of police of Paris, was sent with a body of men to Port-Royal des Champs, and he removed from thence the nuns, who were distributed among several convents. The convent and church of Port-Royal des Champs were stripped of all their valuables, which were transferred to Port-Royal de Paris, and the former building was leveled with the ground, by order of Louis XIV, as a nest of Jansenists and heretics. The sacred relics of the Church were borne from the altar, the bodies disinterred from the, cemetery, and every trace of the establishment destroyed, the very soil being abandoned to the plough.

Literature. — Besoigne, Racine (1767, 2 vols.), Clémencet, Du Fosse, Fontaine (Col. 1738, 2 vols.), and others have written of Port-Royal. Dr. Reuchlin has published one of the most elaborate treatises, entitled Geschichte von Port-Royal (Hamb. 1839-44, 2 vols.); and other and more recent works to be consulted are, Saint-Betuve, Hist. de Port-Royal (Paris, 1840-58, 4 vols.); Beard, Port-Royal (Lond. 1860, 2 vols.); Schimmelpenninck, Memoirs of Port-Royal (ibid. 1855). On Reuchlin's work, see Sir James Stephen, Essays, vol. 1; Wilkens, Port-Royal, oder der Jansenismus in Frankreich, in the Zeitschrift fiur wissenschaftliche Theologie. 1859; Meth. Quarterly, 1855. See also Jervis, Hist. Ch. of entrance (Lond. 1872), vol. 1 and 2, and his History of France (Student's Edition), p. 469-472; Ranke, Hist. of the Peptacy, 2, 251, 259; Tregelles, Hist. of the Jansenists, p. 11 sq. et al.; Martin, Hist. of France (age of Louis XIV); Bridges, France under Richelieu and Colbert, lect. 4; Villemain, Discours et Melanges Litteraires; Voltaire, Siecle de Louis XIV, ch. 36; Bridge, Hist. of French Literature, p. 172 sq.; Van Laun, Hist. of French Literature (see Index); Lond. Quar. Rev. Oct. 1871, p. 173; Brit. Quar. Rev. April, 1873, p. 284; Edinb. Rev. April, 1841; Amer. Theol. Rev. April, 1860, p. 162, 356.

## Porta, Baccio della[[@Headword:Porta, Baccio della]]

             more generally known as Frat Bartolomeo, an Italian monastic of the Dominican order, distinguished as a painter of the Florentine school, and much noted for his intimate relation to Raffaelle and the other Umrbrian painters of his time, was born at Savignano, not far from Florence, in 1469. He was a pupil of Cosimo Roselli in Florence, and lived near the gate of S. Piero, from which circumstance his name of: Della Porta” was derived. ‘We have no detailed narrative of his youthful life, except that he was early brought under Roselli's tuition, where he formed a close friendship with Mariotta Albertinelli, his associate student, and showed such natural and artistic proclivities towards “sweetness and light” that the beauty of his Madonna faces and the sunny fervor of his coloring won the approbation even of the critical Florentines. He acquired such great fame that he was commissioned to execute a fresco of The Last Judgment in the convent of S. Marco, about the time when Savonarola went to Florence to preach against the sinfulness of the city. Bartolomeo became the earnest friend of the preacher, and was so carried away by his influence that he burned all his studies and drawings of profane subjects, and those which represented  nude figures. He abandoned his art, and spent his time ill the society of the enthusiast. When, at length, Savonarola was seized, tortured, and burned, Bartolomeo took the vows of a Dominican friar, and left his unfinished pictures to be completed by Albertinelli. During four years he led a most austere life, never touching his pencil. His superior finally commanded his practice of the art, and he resumed it with languor and entire want of interest. About this time Raffaelle arrived in Florence. He was then but twenty-one years old, yet was already noted as a great painter.

He visited the friar's cell, and the consequence was a deep friendship between the two, to which the world owes the after works of Fra Bartolomeo. Raffaelle instructed his monastic friend in perspective, and he in turn gave new ideas of drapery to Raffaelle. Fra Bartolomeo was the first to employ lay figures in the study of drapery; he also imparted to Raffaelle his mode of coloring. The examination of the works of these painters will prove that from this time both of them produced more excellent pictures than they had done before; the friar had caught an intellectual grace from his young friend, and Raffaelle had advance in color and drapery. About 1508 Fra Bartolomeo was allowed to go to Venice, where his coloring was greatly improved, and in 1513 he went to Rome. This visit was doubtless a deep joy to him, but the beauties of what he saw so far exceeded his imaginations that he seems to have been stupefied; he made no attempt to equal or excel the artists about him, and only commenced two figures of SS. Peter and Paul, which Raffaelle finished after his return to Florence. When once more in his convent, Bartolomeo showed the benefit he had received. and executed some of his most important works, among which are a marriage of St. Catharine, now hanging in the Louvre, and the unfinished Conception of the Uffizi. But it is in his later days, when his mind had broadened and strengthened and his touch grown firm, that we find such masterpieces as the Pieth of the Pitti— the most purely beautiful Pieta ever painted; The Presentation in the Temple, at Vienna; and The Madonna della Misericordia, now at Lucca, and considered by many as his most important work. It had been said that he could do nothing grand: he now painted the St. Mark, which is in the Pitti Palace, and is so simply grand as to be compared to the remains of Grecian art.

He lived only four years after going to Rome, and died at a time when his powers seemed daily increasing. His character was impressed on all his works. When Savonarola was seized, Porta hid himself and vowed that if he escaped he would become a monk. This want of courage and energy in his nature we must admit; but he was enthusiastic, devout, and loving. His saints and virgins  are tender, mild, and full of sweet dignity, and if we characterized his pictures in one word, holiness is what we should use, for it is that which they most express. His boy-angels were beautifully painted, and his representations of architecture were rich and grand. His works are rare. The Louvre has two of his pictures, and the Berlin Museum one; but he is best studied in Florence, where the larger number of his works remain. See Mrs. Clement, Handbook of Plainters, Sculptors, etc., s.v.; Meehan, Lives of the Most Eminent Painters, etc., of the Order of St. Dominic (Dublin, 1852, 2 vols. 12mo), vol. 2, ch. 1-8; Radcliffe, Schools and Masters of Painting (N. Y. 1877), p. 120 sq., et al.; Schlegel. Esthetic and Miscellaneous Notes, p. 7 sq.; Taine, Travels in Italy (Florence and Venice), p. 158 sq. (II. W.)

## Porta, Conrad[[@Headword:Porta, Conrad]]

             a Lutheran divine, as born in 1541 at Osterwick, near Halberstadt having completed his studies, he was called in 1566 as rector to Osterwcick. In 1567 he went as conrector to Eisleben; in 1569 he was made deacon of St. Nicolai; in 1575, pastor of SS. Peter and Paul and assessor of the consistory, at the same time supplying the spiritual wants of the Church of the Holy Ghost and lecturing at the Gymnasium. When in 1572 the Flacian controversy took place, he sided with the Eisleben theologians against Spangenberg. Porta died in 1585. He wrote, Pastorale Luthern (Eisleben, 1582): — Oratio de assidua lectione operusm Lutheri (ibid.), etc. See Winer, Hundbuch der theolog. Literatur, 2, 29; Jocher, Gelehrten- Lexikon, s.v. (B. P.)

## Porta, Egidio di[[@Headword:Porta, Egidio di]]

             a Roman Catholic monastic, flourished in the period of the great Reformation movement of the 16th century. He had early taken the black cowl of the Augustinians, moved thereto, as he himself tells us, “under the impulse of a certain religious feeling, but not according to knowledge.” For seven years he discharged the office of a preacher of the Word of God in deep ignorance; then, enlightened by the writings of the Swiss reformer Zwingli, which Providence had thrown in his way, he imparted the knowledge of the truth to his brethren of the same convent. It is to be regretted that we can learn nothing of his personal history beyond this period.

## Porta, Guglielmo della[[@Headword:Porta, Guglielmo della]]

             an Italian sculptor of the 16th century, was a noted follower of Michael Angelo. His most important work was the monument to Paul III in the tribune of St. Peter's. Two statues, of Peace and Abundance, which formerly made a part of this work, are now in the Farnese Palace.

## Porta, Simon[[@Headword:Porta, Simon]]

             an Italian philosopher of the first half of the 16th century, was a pupil of Pomponatius, and is celebrated especially as the author of Magia Natureolis (Naples, 1589, and since). In 1512 the Lateran Council condemned both those who taught that the human soul was not immortal and those who asserted that the soul is one and identical in all men. It condemned also the philosophers who affirmed that these opinions, although contrary to faith, were philosophically true. It enjoined professors of philosophy to refute all heretical doctrines to which they might allude, and prohibited the clergy from studying philosophy for a course longer than five years. Indeed, Averroism as early as the 13th century had become hostile to the doctrines of the Church, and in 1271, and again in 1277, it was condemned by Stephen Tempier, archbishop of Paris, who caused its principles to be embodied in distinct propositions. Among these were the following: “Quod sermones theologici sunt funndati in fabulis. Quod nihil plus scitur propter scire theologiam. Quod fabulse et falsa sunt in lege Christiana, sicut et in allis. Quod lex Christiana impedit addiscere. Quod sapientes mundi slint philosophi tantum.” Notwithstanding the condemnation of the Church, these ideas seemed to have taken hold of the philosophical mind of the age, and long continued to find favor among teachers and students. Like his preceptor, Pomponatius, Porta wrote, in agreement with the Alexandrians on the question of immortality, a work entitled De rerum naturalibus principiis, de animat et mente summa (Flor. 1551). Among other works of Porta. we mention De humana mente disutatio (1551): — De dolore: — An homo bonus vel malus volens fiat (1551). He died in 1555. See Ueberweg, Hist. of Philos. 2, 14, 467.

## Porta-Leone[[@Headword:Porta-Leone]]

             (מַשִּׁעִר אִרְיֵה), ABRAHAM, also called Arje Abraham, a Jewish savant, was born in the year 1542. He belonged to a family which excelled in medical science to such a degree that one of the members of the family was  employed as physician in the service of king Ferdinand I of Naples and duke Galeazzo Maria Sforza of Mailand. Abraham received an excellent education, and attended the lectures at the University of Pavia, where he especially betook himself to the study of Aristotle, Hippocrates, Galenus, and the Arabic writers. In the year 1563 he received the doctorate and became a member of the medical college at Mantua. He died in the year 1612. Porta-Leone takes a prominent place in Jewish literature, as he is the author of the שַׁלְטֵי הִגַּבּוֹרַים, an extensive work on Jewish antiquities, in which he minutely treats on the Temple and its structure-the holy of holies, the altar, candlestick, table, music, etc. The whole is divided into ninety sections, to which is appended a list of ninety-eight works, which he perused for his work, and an essay on the use of the Hebrew language, etc. This excellent work, which is now very scarce, was first published in the year 1612. A Latin translation, which Wagenseil pronounced a “librum optimum,” “antiquitates Judaicas solide explicantem,” “librum aurelum,” and Menasseh ben-Israel as an “ingeniosum opus,” was published by Ugolino in his Thesatrus antiquitatuma sacrarum (vol. 9, 11, 13, 32). Iken used Leone's work in his antiquities to a great extent, and he promised a translation of the whole, which never appeared. See Fiirst, Bibl. Judaica, 3, 114 sq.; De Rossi, Dizionario storico degli Autori Ebrei (German transl.), p. 268 sq.; Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. 1, 3, 4:63; Jahrbuch für Geschichte der Judens u. des Judenthums, 2, 345 sq.; Wolf, Studien zur Jube feier der Wiener Universitat (Wien, 1865), p. 172; Delitzsch and Zuniz, Addit. ad Cod. Bibl. Senat. (Lips.), 27. (B. P.)

## Portable Altars[[@Headword:Portable Altars]]

             (viatica, gestatoria, itineraria). During the Crusades the bishops and ecclesiastics who took part in them carried an “itinerant altar.” The portable altar-stone or table was used on unconsecrated altars in private chapels. Bede mentions a consecrated table in lieu of an altar. The monks of St. Denis carried a table of wood, covered with a linen cloth. in Charlemagne's campaign against the Saxons. There were examples also of stone, metal, and terra cotta. The reposoir is used in the street to rest the Sacrament on in the procession of the Fete Dieu in France. One is preserved at Santa Maria, in the portico d' Campitelli; and another, of carved porphyry, at Conques, cir. 1106. SEE ALTAR.

## Portable Bells[[@Headword:Portable Bells]]

             Hand-bells were of Celtic origin, and were used in Brittany, in St. Patrick's time in Ireland, and in that of St. Selio in Wales. Unlike the small altar- bells, which were square, these wore hexagonal or oval, without clappers, like the original cloc, usually of bronze, and sometimes jeweled, being regarded as specially sacred, and possessed of miraculous powers, as St. Iltyd's, the bell of Armagh of the close of the 11th century, the golden bell of St. Senanus, St. Ewin's at Monastereven, which was tied with a chain to prevent its automatic flight, and used as an ordeal for swearing criminals by the justices of Munster. The cloc was cylindrical, and in the 8th, 9th, and 10th centuries often gemmed. At Caerleon, in Wales, the bangu was used at a funeral recently. Hand-bells are preserved at Perros, Guirec, and St. Symphorien's, Cotesdu-Nord. SEE BELL.

## Portail, Antoine[[@Headword:Portail, Antoine]]

             a French priest noted for his relation to the “Congregation of Priests of the Mission,” which body he joined immediately after their institution by Vincent de Paul, flourished in the first half of the 17th century. Nothing is known of his personal history, but he is reputed to have been not only Paul's first companion, but also his most devoted coadjutor. See Jervis, Hist. of the Church of France, 1, 320 sq.

## Portal[[@Headword:Portal]]

             (i.e. avant-portail), an architectural term, designates an external canopy raised in front of the principal doors of a church by way of shelter, whereas a porch is a projecting outwork independent of the door. SEE PORCH. There are fine examples of portals in the cathedrals of Rheims, Paris, St. Ouen's, and Rouen, Amiens, Sems, Senlis, anti Bourges, Westminster, and of smaller dimensions at churches in Salisbury, Lichfield, and Verona and other Italian towns. “Penniless porch,” the resort of beggars, was the local name of the cemetery-gate of Wells.

## Portas vestras aeternales[[@Headword:Portas vestras aeternales]]

             This is the beginning of one of the few Ascension hymns which we have in the Latin language. “Nothing is poorer,” says Trench, “throughout the whole Christian Church than the hymnology of the Ascension. Even the German Protestant hymnbook, so incomparably rich in Passion and  Resurrection and Pentecost hymns, is singularly ill furnished with these... The Latin forms no exception; it does not possess a single first-rate hymn on the Ascension.” This hymn, which strangely enough has never found its way into any of the more modern collections of Latin hymns, runs thus:

“Portas vestras asternales,

Triummphales, principales,

Angeli, attollite.

Eja, tollite actutum,

Venit Dominuis virntum,

Rex aeternae gloria.”

An English translation is given by Benedict in The Hymn of Hildebert, etc., p. 81 (N. Y. 1867); for the original copy, see Trench, Sacred Latin Poetry, p. 172 sq.

## Portatile Altare[[@Headword:Portatile Altare]]

             is the name of a square portable stone framed in wood, at the angles and in the middle of which there is a cross, and the cavity of which receives the relics. The portatile is consecrated by the bishop, and can be used after this ceremony for the purpose of saying mass in private chapels. SEE PORTABLE ALTARS.

## Portatives[[@Headword:Portatives]]

             is the technical term applied to candlesticks used in churches and carried by hand.

## Porte, Charles[[@Headword:Porte, Charles]]

             a noted French Jesuit, was born in 1675. He became a member of the Society of Jesus in 1692 and flourished as a trainer of youth all his life, and it is presumed that no man ever exceeded him in this work. Voltaire says of him that “he was eloquent after the style and taste of Seneca, a very beautiful poet; but that his greatest merit consisted in inspiring his pupils with the love of learning and virtue.” He died in 1741. His writings are of a secular character.

## Porteous Mob[[@Headword:Porteous Mob]]

             This tragical incident is introduced here from its connection with the ecclesiastical history of Scotland. Some new custom-taxes were felt to be odious and galling in Scotland, and revenue-officers were specially obnoxious in some of the seaports. Two men, named Wilson and Robertson, who had robbed the collector of Pittenweem, in Fife, were apprehended and condemned. Some attempts to break out of jail, after sentence had been passed upon them, had proved abortive. On the Sabbath before the execution the criminals, as usual, were taken to church, under custody of four soldiers of the city guard, when, as the congregation was dismissing, Wilson, laying hold of two of the soldiers, one in each hand, and seizing the third with his teeth, called on Robertson to run. ‘The latter  at once knocked down the remaining guard and fled, without any one trying to arrest him. The romantic pity of Wilson for his junior accomplice, and his successful deliverance of him, created great sympathy for him. At his execution, April 14. 1736, the mob became unruly, rushed to the scaffold, and cut down the dead man. Captain Porteous, of the city guard, who was at that time surly and excited, ordered his men to fire — nay, fired a musket himself on the crowd. Six or seven persons were killed by the first volley, and more by the second. Some respectable citizens were shot as they were looking out from their windows.

Captain Porteous was tried before the High Court of Justiciary, and condemned to death. Queen Caroline, in the absence of George II on the Continent, sent down a reprieve. The populace were filled with terrible indignation, and resolved to take the law into their own hands. On Sept. 7 a crowd assembled under some unknown command, secured all the military posts, locked the gates, opened the prison, took out captain Porteous, entered a shop, brought away a halter, leaving a guinea on the counter to pay for it, and hanged him on a diver's pole. The mob dispersed with perfect order, and did no other violence. The riot is enveloped in mystery— no one of the parties was ever apprehended. But a bill of great and vindictive penalties was prepared, and though shorn of many of its original terrors in passing through Parliament it contained the enactment that every minister ill the Church of Scotland was to read a proclamation against the rioters from the pulpit, during public worship, on the first Sabbath of each month during a whole year. If any minister refused, lie was, for the first offence, to be declared incapable of sitting and voting in any Church court, and, for the second, he was pronounced incapable of “taking, holding, or enjoying any ecclesiastical benefice in Scotland.” The majority of the ministers bowed to this edict, some used ludicrous shifts to evade it, and only a few pointedly refused. The act was felt by many to be a wanton infringement on the rights of the Church-a dictation to which none but an Erastian community could submit. The Parliament had assumed the power of declaring what ministers should do and of inflicting discipline if they should refuse. Compliance with the enactment raised commotion ill many parishes, and aided the spread of the first Secession. The seceders were accused of disloyalty, because they unanimously, and without hesitation, refused to read the edict. In Carlyle's Autobiography will be found a graphic account. Carlyle saw the rescue and witnessed the execution. — Scott, Heart of Mid-Lothian.

## Porter[[@Headword:Porter]]

             This word, when used in the A. V., does not bear its modern signification of a carrier of burdens, but denotes in every case a gatekeeper, from the Latin portarius, the man who attended to the porta. In the original the word is שׁוֹעֵרor שֹׁעֵר, shoer, from שִׁעִר, shaar, a gate; once (Ezr 7:24) Chald. תָּרָע, tara', the same (Sept. θυρωρός and πυλωρός; Vulg. portarius and janitor). This meaning is evidently implied in 1Ch 9:21; 2Ch 23:19; 2Ch 35:15; Joh 10:3. It is generally employed in reference to the Levites who had charge of the entrances to the sanctuary, but is used also in other connections in 2Sa 18:26 : 2Ki 7:10-11; Mar 13:34; Joh 10:3; Joh 18:16-17. In two passages (1Ch 15:23-24) the Hebrew word is rendered “doorkeeper,” and in Joh 18:16-17, ἡ θυρωρὸς is “she that kept the door.” Thus, in 2Ki 7:10-11, and 2Sa 18:26, we meet with the porter at the gates of a town. In the palace of the high-priest (Joh 18:17) the porter was a female, ἡ παιδισκη, ἡ θυρωρός. See also Act 12:13. A porter seems to have been usually stationed at the doors of sheepfolds (Joh 10:3). According to Stier and others, this θυρωρὸς corresponds to the Holy Spirit, who opens the way for the true ministers of Christ. SEE DOOR.

The porters of the Temple, who were guards as well as porters, were very numerous in David's time; for in 1Ch 23:5 no less than 4000 are mentioned. They were divided into courses (1Ch 26:1-19), and had their post assigned them by lot (1Ch 26:13). Besides attending to the gates and keeping order there, they seem, as Lightfoot says, to have had charge of certain treasures (1Ch 26:15, comp. with 2Ch 25:24, and Lightfoot's Prospect of the Temple, c. 5, § 6). Properly speaking, their office was in some respects military: they were the soldiers of Jehovah, and the guards of his Temple. The stations that were guarded were not all occupied by the same number-some being guarded by six, some by four, and others by two persons only. They were relieved every Sabbath-day by others who took their places (2Ki 11:5; 1Ch 9:17-29; 1Ch 16:42; 2Ch 8:14; 2Ch 23:4; 2Ch 31:14; 2Ch 35:15). Their service was required by night as well as by day, and a man called “the Man of the Mountain of the House” went round every night to see that all were in their places, and that none of them slept. If he found any one asleep he struck him, and had liberty to burn his clothes. To this Lightfoot thinks there is a  reference in Rev 16:15 : “Blessed is he that watcheth and keepeth his garments” (Temple Service, c. 7 § 1). SEE TEMPLE.

## Porter, Abner, D.D[[@Headword:Porter, Abner, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Ashville, N.C., in 1817. He graduated from Princeton College in 1836 or 1837, studied at the Theological Seminary in Columbus, S.C., in 1842 became pastor in Greene County. Alabama, in 1846 at Charleston, S.C., in 1851 at Selma, Alabama, and finally became a missionary agent in Texas until his death, December 8, 1872. See Nevin, Presb. Encyclop. s.v.

## Porter, David, D.D[[@Headword:Porter, David, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister of some note, was a native of Hebron, Conn., where he was born May 27, 1761. He was educated at Dartmouth College, class of 1784, and, having been duly ordained, became pastor of the Congregational Church at Spencertown, N. Y., in 1787. In 1803 he removed to Catskill, N. Y., as pastor of the Presbyterian Church, and retained is relation to this Church until 1831. lie died ill that place Jan. 7. 1851. He served nearly a year in the Revolutionary army. He published Dissertation on Baptism (1809), and some Sermons. He was, after his dissolution of the pastorate, the agent of several benevolent societies, member of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, and, though eccentric, a man of great influence. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 3, 496-506.

## Porter, Ebenezer, D.D[[@Headword:Porter, Ebenezer, D.D]]

             an eminent Congregational minister, was born Oct. 5, 1772, in Cornwall, Conn. After graduating at Dartmouth College in 1792, he taught school some months; then studied divinity, and entered the ministry in 1794, and was ordained pastor at Washington, Conn., Sept. 6, 1796, where he remained until April 1, 1812, when, his health becoming impaired, he removed to Andover to take the Bartlet professorship of pulpit eloquence in the theological seminary. In 1817 he was chosen professor of divinity in Yale College, but did not accept, and during the same year refused successively the presidency of Hamilton College, of Middlebury College, and of the University of Georgia. In 1827 he was made president of the seminary, and held that office until his death, April 8, 1834. As a theological instructor, Dr. Porter had few equals. He was remarkably well endowed for the training of young men intended for the holy ministry. Thus Dr. Dewey writes: “A friend of mine attended service in the (Andover) seminary one morning some years after I left it, and heard one of Dr. Porter's grand discourses; and, as the audience was leaving the chapel, professor Stuart in his deep tone said, ‘This is the majesty of the Gospel.' It was indeed the majesty of the Gospel!” Dr. Porter published, The Young Preacher's Manual (1819; 2d ed. 1829): — A Lecture on the Analysis of Vocal Infections (1824): — An Analysis of the Principles of Rhetorical  Delivery as applied in Reading and Speaking (1827): — The Rhetorical Reader (1831): — Lectures on Revivals of Religion (1832): — A Lecture on the Cultivation of Spiritual Habits and Progress in Study (1833): — Lectures on Homiletics, Preaching, and Public Prayer (1834): — and a large number of occasional Sermons. Since his death The Biblical Reader and Lectures on Eloquence and Style have also been published. Dr. Porter was a contributor to the Quarterly Register, and the translator of many sacred German poems. See notices of this excellent man and eloquent preacher in Sprague, Annals of the American Pulpit, 2, 351; Rev. Lyman Matthews, A Memoir of E. Porter, D.D. (Boston, 1837, 12mo); Amer. Quar. Reg. 9:1; Christ. Month. Spec. 1, 79; Lit. and Theolog. Rev. 5, 401 (by W. Lord); Meth. Rev. 53, 191; Ware, Biogr. of Unitarians, vol. 1. (J. H.W.)

## Porter, Eliphalet, D.D[[@Headword:Porter, Eliphalet, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister of Unitarian tendency, was born at North Bridgewater, Mass., June 11,1758. He was educated at Harvard University, class of 1779, and, after studying theology with his father, Rev. John Porter, minister of North Bridgewater from 1740 till 1802, he was ordained Oct. 2, 1782, over the Congregational Society of Roxbury, and there continued fifty-one years. In 1830 the Rev. George Putnam was settled with him as colleague. He died in that place Dec. 7, 1833. He was a member of the Academy of Arts and Sciences. He published a Eulogy of Washington (1800), and nine single Sermons. See Sprague, Annals of the American Pulpit, 8, 157.

## Porter, George D[[@Headword:Porter, George D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Juniata Co., Pa., March 1, 1815. He was educated for the medical profession, but subsequently felt called to the ministry. He graduated at the Western ‘Theological Seminary at Allegheny, Pa., was licensed in 1832, and for a time preached in Monongahela City. Pa., but afterwards removed to Newburg and Roxbury, Pa., and was ordained by Huntingdon Presbytery in Nov., 1833. When the questions which led to the disruption of the Church came up, he took a lively interest in the controversy, having a fondness for discussion. He subsequently became pastor of Center and Upper Millerstown churches; in 1851 he removed to the West, and engaged in the great missionary work there, locating at Tipton, Iowa, which, together with the Church at Red Oak,  adjoining, constituted his charge for nearly eight years. From this he moved to Crow Meadow Church, Ill., where he labored for four years, after which he returned to his former home in Tipton. For two years he now gave attention to his farm, and preached as an occasional supply; and in 1866 he arranged to supply statedly the churches of Blairstown and West Irving, where he labored more than his strength would justify, and died Dec. 17, 1867. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1868, p. 133. (J. L. S.)

## Porter, Herschel S., D.D[[@Headword:Porter, Herschel S., D.D]]

             a Cumberland Presbyterian minister, was born in Butler County, Kentucky, February 12, 1816. After studying at various academies, he was licensed to preach in May 1835, and in September 1837, was ordained at Glasgow, Kentucky. He spent about four years as an itinerant in Kentucky, travelled also for some time as an agent for Cumberland College; then served a year as pastor at Fayetteville, Tennessee; subsequently made an extensive preaching tour, passing through most of the Southern States, returning to Kentucky in 1843. He spent several months of that year in Western Pennsylvania, then went to Philadelphia to organize a congregation, and remained there until the spring of 1851. In the fall of that year he settled in Memphis, Tennessee, and labored there until the latter part of 1855. He died there October 5 of the same year, professor of natural history in the  Memphis Medical College. In 1853 he was moderator of the General Assembly. Dr. Porter was devoted to science, and was proficient in astronomy and geology. He published a series of Astronomical Sermons, 400 pp.: — The Atonement: — and a work on the Foreknowledge and Decrees of God. See Beard, Biographical Sketches, 1st series, page 307.

## Porter, Huntington, D. D[[@Headword:Porter, Huntington, D. D]]

             a Presbyterian minister of some note, was born in 1755, and was educated at Yale College. After having completed his theological studies, he was made minister at Rye, New Hampshire, from which place he removed to Lynn, Mass., where he died in 1844. He published, Century, a sermon (1802): — Funeral, a sermon: — New-Year, a sermon: — Sickness, a sermon (1803).

## Porter, James C[[@Headword:Porter, James C]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Abbeville District, S. C., in 1809. He was educated in Jefferson College, Canonsburg, Pa., studied theology for some time with his father, and then finished his course in the Allegheny Associate Reformed Seminary. In 1834 he was licensed, and in 1835 was ordained and installed by Ohio First Associate Reformed Presbytery as pastor of the Church at Piqua, Ohio. In 1841 he removed to Illinois, and took charge of the congregations of Cedar and Pope Creek, in Mercer Co., Ill.; in 1850 he surrendered his charge of the congregation of Pope Creek, and his labors were confined to the congregation of Cedar Creek till the year 1862, when he resigned on account of ill-health. He died Nov. 15, 1863. See Wilson. Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1866, p. 278. (J. L. S.)

## Porter, James, D.D[[@Headword:Porter, James, D.D]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Middleborough, Massachusetts, March 21, 1808. In 1830 he joined the New England Conference, and served as pastor until 1856, when he was elected one of the agents of the Methodist Book Concern. From 1852-5 he was a member of the Board of Overseers of Harvard College; from 1855-71, a trustee of Wesleyan University; and from 1868-82, secretary of the National Temperance Society. He died April 16, 1888. He was a member of every General Conference from 1844 to 1872. He published, Camp Meetings Considered: — Chart of Life: — True Evangelist: — The Winning Worker Compendium of Methodism: — Revivals of Religion: — Hints to Self- Educated Preachers: — Christianity Demonstrated by Experienice: — Self-Reliance Encouraged: — Commonplace Book. See Simpson's Cyclopaedia of Methodism: — Appletons' Cyclop. of Amer. Biography; Minutes of Annual Conferences (Spring), 1889, page 108.

## Porter, John[[@Headword:Porter, John]]

             a Congregational minister, father of Dr. Eliphalet Porter, was born about 1716, and was educated at Yale College. He was first minister of North Bridgewater, Mass., until his death, in 1802. He published, Sermon- (ordination of S. Brett): — Sermon on justification (1794): — Reply to Mr. Bryant's Remarks on Sermon on Justification (1751).

## Porter, John S., D.D[[@Headword:Porter, John S., D.D]]

             a Methodist, Episcopal minister, was born at Snow Hill, Maryland, August 23, 1805. He was trained as a Presbyterian, but became a Methodist, and joined the Philadelphia Conference in 1829, continuing to serve the church as pastor and presidiing elder until 1873, when he was obliged to retire from the active ministry. He died October 2, 1890. He was a member of several General Conferences. and a charter member of the Board of  Trustees of Drew Theological Seminary. See the Christian Advocate, October 9, 1890.

## Porter, Lemuel, D.D[[@Headword:Porter, Lemuel, D.D]]

             a Baptist minister, was born at Boston, Mass., May 1, 1809. His ministry extended over a period of thirty years, and included a long and successful pastorteat Lowell, Mass., and subsequently at Pittsfield, in the same state. He was a man of fine culture, an excellent preacher, and the author of several religious works. A short time previous to his death lie was appointed associate secretary of the Western Department of the American Tract Society, and during the brief period which he served in that capacity won the esteem of all with whom he was brought in contact. He died at Chicago, Ill., Oct. 17,1864. See Appleton's Am. Cyclop. 4, 620.

## Porter, Nathaniel (1), D.D[[@Headword:Porter, Nathaniel (1), D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born Jan. 14, 1745, at Topsfield, Mass. He graduated at Harvard College in 1768, and was ordained pastor in New Durham, N. H., Sept. 8, 1773. In 1776 he was chaplain to Col. J. Wingate's regiment, in which he served six months. Leaving Durham on account of inadequate support, he became pastor in Conway Oct. 20, 1778, which charge he gave up in 1814, and died Nov. 11, 1837. He published An Address at the Opening of an Academy at Fryeburg (1806), and a few occasional Sermons. See Sprague, Annals of the American Pulpit, 2, 53.

## Porter, Nathaniel (2)[[@Headword:Porter, Nathaniel (2)]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Worcester, Mass., A.D. 1800. He studied at the Wesleyan Seminary in New York, and in 1823 was admitted to the New, York Annual Conference, from which time till his death, in 1832, lie labored ill that and other fields, chiefly ill the Middle States. For two years of this time he was principal of the academy at Cazenovia, giving great satisfaction. Mr. Porter was an excellent preacher, and a zealous and consistent Christian. See Minutes of Conferences, 2, 161.

## Porter, Noah, D.D[[@Headword:Porter, Noah, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born December 15, 1781, at Farmington, Conn. After his graduation he taught for some time, and then studied theology; was ordained over the Congregational Church in his native town, November 5, 1806, where he had a long and successful ministry. From 1823 to 1862 he was a member: of the corporation of Yale College, and was long a member of the prudential committee. He died at Farmington, September 24, 1866. A number of his occasional discourses were published, and among them A Half Century Discourse, preached November 12, 1856. See Obituary Record of Yale College, 1867.

## Porter, Samuel[[@Headword:Porter, Samuel]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Ireland in 1760, came to this country in 1790, and accepted a pastorate at Poke Run in 1790, and in 1798 at Congruity, Pennsylvania. He published several Sermons (1793, 1805, 1811), which were reprinted with two dialogues in 1853, with a  biographical sketch of the author by Rev. David Elliott, D.D. he was also contributor to several periodicals. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 3, 539-550.

## Porter, Thomas[[@Headword:Porter, Thomas]]

             an English dissenting divine flourished in the second half of the last century. Scarcely anything is known of his personal history. He published, A Defense of Unitarianism; intended as an Answer to Dr. Hawker on his Reply (1793, 8vo): Serious Thoughts on the Birth of a Child (1805).

## Porter, Walter[[@Headword:Porter, Walter]]

             an English musician of some note, flourished in the first half of the 17th century as gentleman of the Chapel Royal of Charles I, and master of the choristers of Westminster. He was killed during the civil war. He published, Madrigals and Aires (Lond. 1632): — Aires and Madrigals (1639).

## Porter, William Henry[[@Headword:Porter, William Henry]]

             an American divine of some note, was born at Rye, New Hampshire, in 1817, and was educated at Yale College, class of 1841. After having studied theology he became pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Litchfield, N. J., in 1845. In 1851 he united with the Swedenborgians, and took a pastorate at Boston, Mass. He died at Roxbury, Mass., in 1861. He published, Commons and Scriptural Proverbs Compared (Bost. 1845, 12mo): — The Heavenly Union, or New Jerusalem on Earth (1850, 12mo).

## Porterfield, John[[@Headword:Porterfield, John]]

             a Scotch prelate, was bishop of Glasgow in 1571 and 1572. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 260.

## Portesse, Portasse, Porteus, or Portiforium[[@Headword:Portesse, Portasse, Porteus, or Portiforium]]

             are technical terms applied to the Breviary, or a portable book of prayer used in the Church of Rome, and containing the mass and the other parts of tie Church service to be said through the year at canonical hours, with the exception of the marriage service. The terms are derived from the Latin portiobrium (a portatndoforas), through the Frenchporte-hors, hence portasse, portas. The foreign breviaries were divided according to the four seasons, but in England into winter and summer parts.

## Porteus, Beilby[[@Headword:Porteus, Beilby]]

             an eminent English prelate, was born at York in 1731. He passed several years at a small school in his native city, and at the age of thirteen was sent to a school at Ripon, and entered at an earlier age than usual Cambridge University, where he was admitted a sizar of Christ's College. His personal worth, united with his superior attainments, both classical and mathematical, soon procured for him a fellowship in his college, and by the exertions of his friends he was made esquire-beadle of the university. This office he did not long retain, but chose rather to give his undivided attention to private pupils. In 1757, at the age of twenty-six, he was ordained deacon, and soon after priest; sand only a little while later was appointed lecturer at Whitehall. He first became known as a writer by obtaining Seaton's prize for the best English poem on a sacred subject.

On this occasion the topic was “Death,” and the production of Mr. Porteus was universally regarded as one of great merit. In 1761 his fame was still further increased by a sermon which he preached before his alma mater on the character of David, king of Israel. Archbishop Seeker was so much pleased with Porteus that he made him in 1762 his chaplain. Porteus's first preferments were two small livings in Kent, which he held a while and then took the rectory of Hunton in the same county. Hunton was his favorite residence. He delighted in the quiet of that rural retirement, and still more in exercising the duties of the ministry among its simple and attached people. He was most indefatigable in performing all the duties of the parish-preached in some district of it daily; and by his pastoral visits to the poor, as well as to the rich, secured the affections and esteem of all his parishioners. His high character for propriety and talents brought him into general notice, and he was soon appointed prebendary of Peterborough, and not long afterwards, in 1767, he became rector of Lambeth. In the same rear lie took the degree of D.D. at Cambridge, and in 1769 was made chaplain to king George III, and master of the hospital of St. Cross, near Winchester.

In 1773 Dr. Porteus, with a few other clergymen, joined in an unavailing application to the bishops, requesting that they would review the Liturgy and Articles for the purpose of making some slight alterations. In 1776 Dr. Porteus, without any solicitation on his part, was made bishop of' Chester; and in 1787, on the death of bishop Lowth, he was promoted to the diocese of London, over which he presided till his death. This appointment, with the new duties to which it called his attention, put a  temporary stop to the immediate prosecution of several important undertakings lie had contemplated; but they were resumed shortly after. The first of these was the publication of his excellent Summary of the Principal Evidences of the Truth and Divine Origin of the Christian Revelation, designed chiefly for the instruction of young persons. Besides. as a member of the Legislature, he pursued a long-formed plan for improving the condition of the Negro slaves in the West Indian islands, and particularly for their instruction in religious knowledge.

He was for many years one of the vice-presidents of the British and Foreign Bible Society, and took a lively interest, as well as an active part, in the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. In short, his public influence, as well as private patronage, were constantly exerted in devising or supporting measures for the diffusion of pure and undefiled religion. In 1798 lie began a course of lectures on St. Matthew's Gospel, which he delivered at St. James's Church on the Fridays in Lent. These lectures, which he afterwards published have been perhaps the most popular of all his works. He died May 14, 1808. Though bishop Porteus cannot be called a profound scholar or divine he was a man of considerable learning and ability; and he pursued through life a steady course of pious exertion for the benefit of his fellow- creatures, which procured him a high reputation among men of all parties.

He was a prelate of liberal and enlarged views, one proof of which may be adduced in the fact that when a bill was introduced into Parliament for the relief of dissenting ministers and schoolmasters, he pronounced it “a measure no less consonant to the principles of sound policy than to the genuine spirit of the Gospel.” He was in private life distinguished by a cheerful disposition, affable manners, great benevolence, and deep and unaffected piety. As a preacher, few in his day surpassed him either in eloquence or pathos. He is conspicuous for sound judgment, solid argument, great knowledge of the human heart, accurate observation of the world, all unshrinking reprobation of vice, the most persuasive exhortations to piety, and an unqualified avowal of all the essential, fundamental truths and doctrines of the Gospel. His works, consisting of sermons and tracts, with a Life of Archbishop Secker, and the poems and lectures already mentioned, were collected and published, with his Life, making another volume, by his nephew, the Rev. Robert Hodgason, afterwards dean of Carlisle (1811, 6 vols. 8vo, and often). There are a few letters, sermons, etc., not included in this collection (see Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. 1, 2425). Besides Hodgson's Life of Bishop Porteus (also published separately, 1810, 8vo), see Churchman's Magazine, vol. 8;  Jones, Christian Biogr. s.v.; Perry, Ch. list. of Enyl. 3, 428, 476; Clissold, Lamps of the Church, p. 69 sq.; Chambers, Cyclop. Eugi. Lit. 2, 654; Lond. Quar. Review, March, 1812, p. 3438; British Critic, 1811; North American Review, 10, 41, 396; Mathias, Pursuits of Literature (ed. 1812), p. 270 sq.

## Porthaise, Jean[[@Headword:Porthaise, Jean]]

             a French Franciscan monk of the 16th century, noted for his decided polemics against Protestantism, was born at Saint-Denis-de-Gatines, near the beginning of that era. In 1564 we find him in the monastery of Sables d'Olonne, where he probably made his profession. He was more than once conspicuous by the vehemence of his speeches and the extravagance of his conduct. A certain Jean Trioche, minister of the Reformed Church at Chateauneuf, near Sable, in Anjou, had distinguished himself by his preaching. Porthaise, as soon as informed of it, went to a place where he might meet his adversary; but Jean Trioche failed to put in an appearance. Porthaise forthwith drew up a list of questions, to which he requested the Calvinist minister to reply. The answers came two months afterwards. Porthaise's rejoinder to these declarations of his adversary are extant. Attached to the Church of Tours in 1566, Porthaise was meditating a great enterprise; it was nothing less than an assault upon heresy in the very stronghold of its power.

For this purpose he repaired to the Netherlands, and hurled from several pulpits the most virulent imprecations against the doctrines and practices of the ministers. But his success was not equal to his courage; he returned to Tours in 1568. His enemies quoted this amusing passage from one of his sermons. “We hear with sorrow that there are people abandoned enough to commit adultery while they have in their houses wives so good-looking that we, for our part, should be quite contented with them.” In 1582 a difference arose between the general of the Franciscans and the monks of the monastery of Paris on account of the election of the brother guardian. Porthaise had been appointed by the general to preside at this election; but his powers had been recognized neither by the king nor by the superior of the monastery; thus, in the absence of the commissary-president, the monks chose a certain T. Duret. The nuncio of the pope expressed his dissatisfaction, but the Parliament supported the Franciscans of Paris. Their superior was suspended. At last the general of the order came to Paris to conclude a compromise. But Porthaise continued in his violent protestations. He was summoned before Parliament, but did not appear. Summoned a second time, he appeared,  only to inveigh against the court. He was ordered to leave Paris. Nevertheless he was in the ensuing year elected provincial of his order.

In 1594 he was theological instructor at Poitiers. He mixed in the disorders of the League, which conduct he expiated subsequently by public penance. After the rendition of Paris he went to Saumur, solicited from Duplessis Mornay the pardon of his past errors, and obtained permission to celebrate in the church of St. Peter the virtues of the king against whom he had uttered such violent imprecations. He left, Les Catholiques, Demonstrations sur certains Discours de la Doctrine ecclsiastique (Paris, 1567, 8vo): — De Verbis Doinin: “Hoc facite in meam commemorationem” (Antwerp, 1567, 8vo), a pamphlet on the Lord's Supper: — Chretienne Declaration de l'Eglise et de l'Eucharistie (ibid. 1567, 8vo): — De la Vanite et Verite de la vraie et fminsse Astrolouie contre les Abuseurs de notre Siecle (Poitiers, 1578): — Defense a la Re Rponsefaie eaux Sterdits de Bernhard de Pardieu par les Ministres de la Religion pretendue reformnee (ibid. 8vo): — De l'imitation de l'Eucharistie (ibid. 1602, 8vo): — Paraseve géneralé a l'exact Examen de l'Institution de l'Eucharistie (ibid. 1602, 8vo): — Traite de l'Image et de l'Idole (ibid. 1608). See Wadding, Script. ord. Minorurn; Scaligerana (2nd ed.), p. 192; Liron, Singularites hist. et litter. 3, 84; Desportes, Bibliogr. du Maine; Haurealn, Hist. litt. du Maine, 1, 306. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.

## Portico[[@Headword:Portico]]

             is an architectural term designating a range of columns In the front of a building. When of for columns it is called tetrastyle; when of six, hexastyle; of eight, octostyle; of ten, decastyle. The Latin porticus, however, from which the Italian portico and the French portique are derived, has a more extended signification in mediaeval writers; comprehending, in fact, every kind of covered ambulatory of which one or more sides are, opened to the air, by rows of columns or arches, whether it be attached to the front of a building or to its sides, or to the inner sides of an area, so as to form a cloister in the strict sense of the word. In an ancient church the porticos were tile cloisters about the area, otherwise called the exterior narthex (q.v.), and the place of the mourners. SEE PORCH.

## Portier, Michael D.D[[@Headword:Portier, Michael D.D]]

             an American Roman Catholic prelate, was born near the opening of our century, and was of French descent. He was educated in this country and at the Propaganda at Rome, and was consecrated to the priesthood Nov. 5, 1826. After holding various ecclesiastical appointments, he was made bishop of Mobile. He died May 14, 1859. As an ecclesiastic he was greatly beloved by his own denomination, and as a citizen he was highly respected by all classes. He was more tolerant towards those who differed from him in religious belief than is apt to be the case among Romanists.

## Portiforium[[@Headword:Portiforium]]

             otherwise called the Pie (q.v.), is a book of rubrical directions to instruct the clergy as to the due performance of divine service and the administration of the sacraments. Sometimes, however, the word is used to signify a Breviary. This was made the title of the Breviary in England as soon as the latter title was used abroad. See Proctor, Comment. on Book of Common Prayer, p. 11. SEE PORTESSE.

## Portio Canonica[[@Headword:Portio Canonica]]

             is an ecclesiastic term applied to different things:

(1) the share which falls to the members of a congregation in the daily distributions in money or in kind;

(2) the funeral tax (quota Atneralis, or morutuarium) which, at the death of an ecclesiastic in office, must be paid to the bishop; finally

(3), the casualty paid to the curate for the funeral service of a parishioner. If the funeral has not taken place in the parochial church, part of the profit which by it has accrued to the church chosen by the deceased must be paid to the parochial church. This also is called poetio canonuica or Quarta funeraria.

## Portio Conlgrua[[@Headword:Portio Conlgrua]]

             the name given in the canon law to the suitable salary which was anciently allotted to the priest or minister of a parish.

## Portion[[@Headword:Portion]]

             (חְלֶק, chélek). In addition to the sense of dividing or allotting, this word is used in reference to a custom still prevalent among princes and rich people in the East, not only to invite their friends to feasts, but to send a portion of the banquet to those that cannot well come to it, especially their relations and those in a state of mourning. This sending of portions to those for whom nothing was prepared is alluded to in Neh 8:10, where it is said, “Go your way, eat the fat and drink the sweet, and send portions unto them for whom nothing is prepared, for this day is holy unto our Lord: neither be ye sorry; for the joy of the Lord is your strength.” Thee historian is here describing a national festival where every one was supposed to be equally concerned; those then for whom nothing was prepared, it would seem, means those that were in a state of mourning; mourning for private calamities being here supposed to take the place of rejoicing for public concerns. But it is not only to those that are in a state of mourning that provisions are sometimes sent; others are honored by princes in the same manner who could not conveniently attend the royal table, or to whom it was supposed not to be convenient. M. D'Arvieux mentions that in Syria, when the grand emir of the Druses, with whom he resided, found it incommoded him to eat with him, he politely desired him to take his own time for eating, sending him what he liked from his kitchen, and at the time he chose. Thus David it may be presumed did to Uriah, for it is recorded “there followed him a mess of meat from the king” (2Sa 11:8; 2Sa 11:10). We likewise read in the book of Esther (Est 9:19): “Therefore the Jews of the villages, that dwelt in the unwalled towns, made the fourteenth day of the month Adar a day of gladness and feasting, and a good day, and of sending portions to one another.” SEE INHERITANCE.

## Portion (2)[[@Headword:Portion (2)]]

             (PAROCHIAL) is the mediety of a parish which was divided into several vicarages or parsonages.

## Portionist[[@Headword:Portionist]]

             a term employed to designate a beneficed person in a cathedral who received only half or a moiety of his prebend, called in France a demiprebendary, and in Spain a rationero. Bulrsaerius, in Scottish  universities, and the German Buwsch were portions of money given to poor students, while the Cambridge pensioner lives at his own cost.

## Portiuncula, the Indulgence of[[@Headword:Portiuncula, the Indulgence of]]

             In the vicinity of Assisi there stood a little church Nostra Signora degli Angeli, called also Portimncula, which St. Francis, after his conversion, repaired, and soon afterwards received as a present for himself and his congregation, at the hands of the benedictine abbot of the Monastery of Monte-Subazio. A legend widely spread in the 14th century says that in this little church, the cradle of the Franciscan Order, Christ himself granted to the saint his prayer for plenary indulgence for all those who, after partaking worthily of the sacraments of penance and of the altar, should visit Portiuncula. Christ made it a condition of his absolution that the consent of him to whom he had committed the power of binding and unbinding should also be obtained. Honorius III, who was then at Perugia, was willing to grant one or a few years, but demurred at the request of a plenary indulgence, inasmuch as the practice of the Roman see did not warrant such a thing. But as soon as the pope was informed that the saint was speaking in the Savior's own name, he thrice exclaimed, “Thy will be done 1 The cardinals did not approve of the pope's decision, as this indulgence, which could be gained so easily, would put a check to the ultramontane pilgrimages and to the crusades, the only means by which, up to that time, a plenary indulgence could be obtained. Honorius, being made sensible of these dangers, compromised matters by making it a condition of the obtention of plenary indulgence that the visit to Portiuncula be made from the evening of August 1st to the evening of the 2nd, At this decision of the pope Francis bowed his head in humility, and was about to leave the room, when the pope called him back, saying, “Foolish man, whither art thou going? what security hast thou for that which has just been granted to thee?” Whereupon the saint replied, “Your word, holy father, is enough for me. Let Jesus Christ be the notary, the Virgin Mary the deed, and the angels the witnesses; I need no other document.” Some writers deem it a most doubtful matter that pope Honorius, contrary to the pontifical practice, which was not to grant indulgences for more than a few years, should have so liberally dealt with St. Francis, especially as no bull to that effect can be shown. But the testimonies of the 13th and 14th centuries in corroboration of the historical nucleus of the legend are too numerous to allow of any doubt. The Portiuncular indulgence was, besides, acknowledged not only by the popes of the 14th, but also by those of the  13th century; for instance, Alexander IV (1254-61) and others. Pope Innocent XII, in 1695, extended the indulgence to all days of the year. Besides, inasmuch as many Roman Catholics could not afford to visit Portiuncula, the popes extended said indulgence (obtainable from the 1st to the 2nd of Aug.) to all the churches of the Franciscans and Capuchins. In our time the Portiunciular indulgence can be obtained in some countries on the first Sunday of August, not only in the Franciscan, but in all churches where Catholic worship is held regularly on Sundays and holidays.

## Portugal   [[@Headword:Portugal   ]]

             the most westerly kingdom of Europe, a part of the great Spanish peninsula, lies in 36° 55'42° 8'N. lat., and 6° 15'-9° 3'0 W. long. Its greatest length from north to south is 368 miles, and its average breadth from east to west about 100 miles. The kingdom of Portugal proper is bounded by the Atlantic on the S. and W., and by Spain on the N. and E. Its distinctive subdivisions, with their several areas and populations, are given in the following table:

The insular appendages of Portugal are-the Azores, 1996 square miles, pop. (1871) 258,933; Madeira, etc., 315 square miles, pop. (1871) 118,379. Total home territories, 36,813, and the population (1871), 4,367,882. The colonial possessions of Portugal are-in Africa: Cape Verd Islands, 1630.02 square miles; pop. 67,347. Senegambia, 35,437.50 square miles; pop. 8500. Islands of San-Thome and Principe, off Guinea, 448.56 square miles; pop. (1868) 19,295. Angola, Benguela. 200,602.50 square miles; pop. 2,000,000. Mozambique and dependencies, 283,500 square miles; pop. 300,000. In Asia: Goa, Salcete, 1440.6 square miles; pop. 474,234. Damao, Diu, 94.08 square miles; pop. 53,283. In the Indian Archipelago, 2877 square miles; pop. 850,300. In China: Macao, 11.76 square miles; pop. (1866) 100,000. Total of colonies. 526,041.48 square miles; pop. 3,872,959.

Christianity was established in this country at the same time as in Spain, from which it is only politically separated: it therefore had its share of the misfortunes which, at the time of the great barbarian invasions, under the Alans, Sneves, Westgoths, and afterwards under the Arabs, came over the Christian Church. The weight of these calamities was made a little lighter for Portugal by the circumstance that, partly through the influence of the Roman bishops Anacletus and Anlicetus, partly through the decrees of Constantine, which made metropolitan seats of the chief cities of the provinces, the diocesan system had been developed at an early period. In the country now called Portugal, in the province Galicia, Bracara, now Braga, was the metropolis. We learn from Garcia Louisa, in his remarks on the Council of Luco, that the bishops of Astorica, Portucale (Porto), Colinmbria (Coimbra), Egitania (Idanha), Eminium (Agueda, in Estremadura), Lameco (Lamego, on the Douro), Loco (Lugo, on the sources of the Minho), Tria (El Padron, in Galicia), Veseo (Viseu), Auiria (Orense), Tude (Tuy), Magneto or Britonia (Mondonedo), and Dumio,  near Braga, were suffragans of Bracara. At the Council of Ltuco, A.D. 569, a second metropolis was established at Luco, but it remained dependent on Bracara. Veseo, Colombia, Egitania, Lameco, and Maagneto were then suffragan seats of Bracara, and Tria, Autria, Tude, Astorica, and Britonia formed the ecclesiastical province of Luco: it ceased to exist when the domination of the Sueves, in 585, was overthrown by the Westgoths. In Lusitania, Merida, on the Guadiana, was the metropolis; the ecclesiastical province included Niumantia. Pax Tulia, Ossonoba, Olysippo, Caurio, Avila, and Elbora. Calixtus II transferred the metropolitan dignity to the bishop of Compostella. In the 7th century some changes appear to have taken place. The beginning of the 8th century saw the downfall of the Westgothic empire, and the invasion of the Arabs, invited by the sons of the expelled king, and by their uncle, Oppas, archbishop of Hispalis, for the purpose of driving from the throne the newly elected king Roderick.

The land between the Douro and the Pyrenees, a small portion of the peninsula, remained under Christian rule. Ferdinand I (1038-65) wrenched from the Arabs Lamego, Veseo, Coimbra, etc. Though the Arabs had allowed the inhabitants the free exercise of their religion, many of them passed over to Mohammedanism, and thus, by degrees, bishoprics and monasteries disappeared. Even Bracara lost her metropolitan dignity; and when. in 1083, Alphonso VI took Toledo, which under the Alabian rule had continued still during two centuries to be the residence of an archbishop, there was scarcely a Christian to be found in the city. In consideration of these circumstances, and with the consent of pope John VIII, Oetum, in Galicia, was made a metropolis, including the bishoprics Anca, Legio, Astorica, Salmantica, Catlrio, Coimbria, Lamego, Veseo, Portucale, Bracara, Tude, Anria, Tria, Luco, Britonia, and Caesaraugunsta. Oviedo was the city of the bishops inpartibus infidelime; but the former suffragans of Taracona did not acknowledge the archbishop of Ovetum but that of Narbonne as their metropolitan.

The dignity of the metropolitan of Ovetum swas extinguished when Alphonso VI took Toledo and Castile, the old ecclesiastical provinces of Toledo, Braga, and Tarragona being then established anew by Gregory VII and Urban II. The long time during which the Spanish peninsula had stood under Mohammedan rule, Christianity being obliterated everywhere, justified. in the ideas of those times, the measures taken by the Church for the purpose of securing the rule and purity of the Roman Catholic religion. The complete expulsion of Mohammedans and Jews seemed commanded by the circumstances, and it was executed with pitiless energy. In 1536 a tribunal of Inquisition was  established in Lisbon, and special severity was displayed against the Jews accused of practicing their old worship under the garb of Christianity. They formed, under the name of New-Christians (q.v.), a suspicious class, and many of them, in 1506, had been victims to the hatred and prejudices of the multitude. The power of the Church increased rapidly, and smith it the pride of some of the bishops, for there soon arose between the crown and the clergy difficulties greatly detrimental to the influence of the latter, as it gave occasion to the people to get an insight into and speak freely of its sad condition, as well as of that of the Roman court. By the laws of 1822, 26 every naturalized foreigner was granted civil and political rights regardless of his religion; they authorized every kind of private worship, and prohibited every religious persecution. The Catholic clergy were treated with the greatest distrust, and their riches were seized upon to fill the treasure of the state.

It was not until 1843 that the government was reconciled with the pope, and the wounds of the Roman Church were long in healing even after that. The Portuguese Church is (since 1741) under the special jurisdiction of a patriarch, who is always a cardinal, and who is, to some extent, independent of Rome. Portugal is divided into three dioceses, which are presided over by the cardinal-patriarch of Lisbon. His suffragan seats are Castello-Branco, Guarda, Lamego, Leiria, and Portalegre. There are several colonial bishops: at Madeira, the Azores, and other islands. Besides the patriarchate or archbishopric of Lisbon, there is the archbishopric of Braga who is primate of the kingdom, and whose suffragan seats are Porto, Viseu, Coimbra, Bragana-Miranda, Aveiro, and Pinhel; and the archbishopric of Evora, with the bishoprics Elvas, Beja, and Algarve. The archbishops have the rank of a marquis, the bishops of a count. They all belong to the grandeza, or higher nobility. The bishops are appointed by the king, and confirmed by the pope. No bull can be published without the agreement of the king. The number of clergy holding cures is given at 18,000. The total number of parishes is 4086. The monasteries are dissolved in 1834, but a few religious establishments still exist. At the time of the dissolution Portugal was possessed of 360 monasteries, with 5760 monks, and 126 nunneries, with 2725 nuns.

There are six orders of knighthood, viz. the Order of Christ, founded in 1319; St. Benedict of Avis; the Tower and Sword, founded in 1459, and reorganized in 1808; Our Lady of Villa Vioçsa, established in 1819; and the Order of St. John of Jerusalem, which was separated in 1802 from that of Malta. In addition to these, there is one civil-service order, founded in  1288. Portugal stands below the other countries of Europe in regard to education. There is one university at Coimbra; there are military, naval, trade, and navigation schools, and many classical and higher schools; and ill 1861 there were 1788 public schools, with 79,172 pupils, uncontrolled by the Church. There is an Academy of Sciences and a School of Arts at Lisbon, the former of which has a library of 50,000 volumes. The other public libraries are the Central Library, with 300,000 volumes; various royal libraries, as that of Lisbon, with 86,000 badly preserved volumes and 8000 MSS.; that at the Necessidades Palace, with 28,000 volumes; and that at the Ajuda Palace, with 20,000 volumes; and the University Library at Coimbra, with 45,000 volumes. The administration of the management of general education is conducted by a superior council of education at Coimbra, under the supervision of the ministry of the Home Department. See Schäfer, Gesch. von Portugal (Hamb. 1836, 3 vols. 8vo); Schubert, Handbuch der Staatenkunde rcn Europa, 1, 3 sq.; Busk, Hist. of Portugal (1831); Dunham, Hist. of Portugal (1832); Andersen (H. C.), In Spain, and a Visit to Portugal (1870); Chambers's Cyclop. s.v.

## Portuguese Version[[@Headword:Portuguese Version]]

             The oldest known Portuguese version is that of the Psalms, which was published at Oxford in 1695, together with a translation of the English liturgy, under the title, O Livro da Oracac commune Administraçao dos Sacramentos e outros Ritos e Ceremonias da Igreja, conforme o Oso da Igreja de Inglaterra, iuxtamente como Salterio ou Salnos de David (Oxford, na estampa do Teatro, anno de Christo, 1695). This translation is said to be very defective.

Next in chronological order is the New Testament, or O Novo Testamento, istohe, todos os sacro sanctos Livros e Escritos evangelicos e apotolicos do novo Concerto de nosso Fiel Senhor Solvador e Redempltor Jesu Christo: traduzido em Portugues pelo Patre Joam Ferrsera a d'Almeida, Ministro Pregador do Sancto Evangelo. Con todas as Licencas necessarias (em Amsterdam, por Joam Crellius, 1712, 8vo). Seven years later the first part of the Old Testament, or the Pentateuch, was published under the title, Os cinco Livros de A Moyses, chamados: 1, Genesis 2, Exodus 3, Levitico; 4, Numeros; 5, Deuteronomio (con privilegio real; Tranquebar, em India Oriental, na costa del Coromandel, em a estampa da Real Missaon de Dennemark. No anno de 1719, 4to). Then followed: O Livro dos Salmos de David, corn toda diligentia tratduzido de Texto original na Lingua Portugueza, confeido com as outras Translaçoens e em multlos Passes declarado pelo Padre  Benjamin Schultze, Missionario del Rey de Dinamarca, e Ministro da Palavra de Deus (Trangambar, em India Oriental, na costa de Coromandel, na estampa da Real Mission, No anno de 1721, 12mo); Os doze Prophetats Menores, convern a saber, Hoseas, Joel, Amos, Obadias. Jonas, Micheas, Namhum, Habacuc, Sophonias, Haggeo, Zacharias, Malachias (com toda diligentia traduzido na lingoa Portugueza, pelos Padres Missionarios de Tranglambar. Trangambar, na officina da Real Missaon de Dinamarca, anno de 1732, 4to); and Os Livros historicos do Velho Testamento, convert a saber, o Livro de Josue, o Livro dos Juizes, o Livro de Ruth, o prireiro Livro dos Reys, o segundo Livro dos Reys, o primeiro Livro das Chronicas, o segundo Livro das Chronicas, o Livro de Esdras, o Livro de Nehemmias, o Livro de Esther, traduzido na Lingoa Portugueza, pelo Reverendo Padre Joam- Ferreitra d'Alneida, Ministro Pregador do Santo Evangelho na Cidade de Batavia (revistos e conferidos com o texto original pelos Padres Missionarios de Trangambar. Trangambar, na officina da Real Mission de Dinamarca, anno de 1738, 4to).

In the preface to the historical books, which is dated April 21, 1738, we are told that the ministers of Batavia sent this translation of Job. Ferreira d'Almeida to Tranquebar to have it printed there, which was done at the expense of the Dutch governor-general, Theodor van Cloon, and his widow, Antonia Adriana Lengele. The Pentateuch is not preceded by any introduction, but the translation is accompanied by notes. The same is the case with the historical books. The whole is preceded by a Latin preface, in which the translator says that his predecessors, the two missionaries Barthol, Ziegenbalg and Johann Ernst Gründler, translated the Pentateuch into Portuguese; but in continuing their work he did not follow the common order of the Biblical books, but rather preferred to translate first the Psalms, because, of all the books of the Old Testament, they are best adapted for public and private devotion. These are all the parts of the Bible, which were translated and known in the 18th century. A revised edition of Almeida's Bible under the joint editorship of R. Holden and the Rev. R. C. Girdleston was issued in 1876 (see the 73rd Report of the British and Foreign Bible Society” [Lond. 1877]. p. 89 sq.). Complete editions of the Bible in the Portuguese language were published by the American and British and Foreign Bible societies. See Rosenmüller, Handbuch der biblischen Literatfur, 4, 298 sq. (B. P.)

## Portuguese Version Of The Scriptures[[@Headword:Portuguese Version Of The Scriptures]]

             By way of supplement, we add the following: The first New Test. of Almeida was printed at Amsterdam in 1681; a second or revised edition was published at Batavia in 1693, and another again at Amsterdam in 1712. In 1744 were published at Tranquebar the books of Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Canticles, and in 1751 followed the four greater prophets; the first three of which were translated by Almeida, and the fourth (Daniel), by C.F. Walther, missionary at Tranquebar. A second edition of the entire Old Test. was published at Batavia in 1748. In this edition a version was given of the books left untranslated by Almeida, by Jacob op den Akker, one of the Dutch missionaries at Batavia. Between 1721 and 1757 two revised editions of the Pentateuch and of the Psalms, two revised editions of the New Test., and one of the four gospels, were printed at Tranquebar and Batavia. Another edition of the Old Test. was printed at the latter place between 1783 and 1804, and no further editions appear to have been given of this version until it was republished by the British and Foreign Bible Society.  A Catholic Portuguese version of the entire Scriptures, from the Vulgate, was published in twenty-three volumes, with annotations, at Lisbon, from 1781 to 1783, by Don Antonio Pereira de Figueiredo, a Portuguese ecclesiastic. An edition containing his latest corrections was commenced at Lisbon in 1794, but was not completed till 1815. On account of the numerous corrections, this edition may be regarded as a new version.

A third translation of the Scriptures was accomplished by the Reverend Thomas Boys, at the expense of the Trinitarian Bible Society. This version, based on Almeida's translation, but faithfully made in accordance with the original, was published in London; the New Test. in 1843 and the Old in 1847.

When the British and Foreign Bible Society undertook the publication of the Portuguese Scriptures, the version of Almeida, the only Protestant one, was selected. But this publication was not received as was anticipated, perhaps, because Almeida was a converted Protestant, but mostly because it was an antiquated version, many of the words being obsolete, and the style not idiomatic. The complaints against this version were laid before the society, and in 1818 an edition of Pereira's version of the New Test. was printed, which was followed by another edition of both the entire Bible and the New Test. in 1821, Mr. Cavalho correcting the press. Another edition of Pereira's New Test. was printed in 1823, and a revised edition of the whole Bible was given in 1824, under the care of Messrs. Da Costa and Green. In 1857 the American Bible Society published a Portuguese New Test., the version used being a translation made in London from the Greek. Of late the British and Foreign Bible Society has undertaken a revision of Almeida's Bible translation, the version and idiom being modernized. This edition was printed in Lisbon in 1874, the text being accompanied with occasional alternative renderings, and with the most important references from the Old to the New Test. The orthography and style have been modernized, and the translation has been compared with the original throughout by the society's editorial superintendent, who has been assisted by competent natives in completing the edition. The same society published, in 1879, an edition of the Portuguese Bible of Figueiredo, with alternative readings from the Hebrew and Greek, under the care of the Reverend Robert Stewart and the editorial superintendent. From the report of the British and Foreign Bible Society for 1885, we learn that steps have been taken, in connection with the American Bible Society, for the formation of translation committees in Spain and Brazil for the production  of a new version of the Scriptures, which will be acceptable on both sides of the Atlantic. (B.P.)

## Portumnalia[[@Headword:Portumnalia]]

             a festival celebrated among the ancient Romans in honor of Portumnus, the god of harbors. It was kept on the seventeenth day before the kalends of September.

## Portumnus[[@Headword:Portumnus]]

             (Lat. portus, “a harbor”), the deity supposed among the ancient Romans to preside over harbors. A temple was erected in honor of him at the port of the Tiber, and he was usually invoked by those who undertook voyages.

## Porubssky, Gustav[[@Headword:Porubssky, Gustav]]

             a Protestant theologian, was born at Presburg, March 13, 1812. He received his classical and. theological training at the Lyceum of his native place, which at that time was one of the most prominent Protestant schools of Austro-Hungary. To continue his studies he went, in 1833, to Vienna, and two years later to Berlin. In 1837 he was called as pastor of the German Slavic congregation at Tyrnau, and in 1840 he accepted a call to Vienna. In this important position he developed all his faculties. for the benefit of the Church, school, and. mission, and his efforts were acknowledged by the Vienna faculty, which honored him in 1871 with the doctorate of theology. He died July 17, 1876. He published, Evangelische Kanzelvortrage (Vienna, 1833): — Festandachten uber das Leiden und Sterben Jesu Chisti (1854): — Jacobus, der Zeuge vom lebendigen Glauben (1861): — Die Rechte der Protestanten in Oesterreich (1867). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:1005; Roskoff, Zur Erinnerung an Dr. Gustav Porubssky (Vienna, 1876). (B.P.)

## Posadas, Francisco[[@Headword:Posadas, Francisco]]

             a Spanish monk and preacher, was born at Cordova in 1644. He entered the Dominican Order, and, after teaching theology and exegesis, devoted himself to preaching with the greatest success. He was often prompted by his zeal to preach in public places and wherever he chanced to be, and even old age could not abate his fervor in teaching the poor of the country. Nothing equaled his charity and love of the degraded. He refused on several occasions the honors of the episcopate. He died at Cordova Sept. 20,1713. He was beatified in 1817 by Pius VII. He left some works of edification: The Triumph of Chastity, against the Errors of Molinos: — Life of St. Dominic: — Sermons (3 vols. 4to). — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.

## Poschel, Philipp F[[@Headword:Poschel, Philipp F]]

             a German Protestant divine, was born Sept. 23, 1769, at Ansbach. In 1797 he was minister at Bulenheim, and in 1817 city pastor in Augsburg, where he died, Feb. 6, 1838. He wrote, Meine Mussestunden, oder Resultate meines Nachdenkens über die wichtigsten Gegenstande aus dem Gebiete der Religionswissenschaft (Nuremb. 1804): — Freimüthige Gedanken zur Beantwortung der Frage: wie kann einzig u. alleibn dergesunkenen Achtung der Religion u. ihrer Lehrer aufgehlfen werden? (Ibid. 1803): — Wünsche u. Vorschläge zur kirchl. Veifassung in Baiern (Augsb. 1823): — Ideen über Statat u. Kirche. Kultus, Kirchenzucht u. Geistlichkeif, etc. (Nuremb. 1816): — Erhebungen des Herzes int Predigten (Augsb. 1825, 1826, 2 parts): — Predigten auf alle Feste des Jahres, etc. (ibid. 1826). See Winer, Handbuch der theolog. Literatur, p. 954.

## Poschel, Thomas[[@Headword:Poschel, Thomas]]

             a German religious enthusiast, was born March 2, 1769, at Horitz, in Bohemia. He entered the ministry, and was ordained Sept. 6, 1796. While he was vicar at Braunan he had to prepare for death the unfortunate bookseller Palm, and to accompany him to the place of execution (Aug. 26,1806). This incident seems to have exercised a detrimental influence on his mind, so naturally inclined to mysticism. When, in 1809, Braunau passed from Austria to Bavaria, Pöschel was placed under the dependency of the bishop of Salzburg; and in 1815, when the city became Austrian again, he returned to the diocese of Linz. Soon afterwards his insane behavior caused him to be sent from Braunau to a country place called Ampfelwang. He now considered himself a martyr of the faith, and preached his “new revelation.” Christ, he says, dwells in the hearts of such a rare pure, and directs all their actions.

To them appear God and the Virgin, and make them the recipients of their revelations. He who does not get purified incurs damnation, and deserves death, which alone can purify him. This doctrine must be obeyed even if it should exact the sacrifice of life itself, if the fruit of the new revelation is not to be lost and given to the Jews. For God has determined that the Jews shall be converted. Judaism and Christianity melted together into one general, catholic religion, the millennial kingdom is to commence when these events have taken place. The new doctrine found proselytes not only in Ampfelwang, but in the surrounding localities Azbach, Unkenach, Gampern, Schafling, etc. The Poschelians affected great piety, prayed with deeply bowed heads, some stretched on the ground; they made uncommon use of all religious practices, as pilgrimages, fasting, communion, with or without previous confession, solemn invocations of the Virgin and the saints. But the tide of extravagance rose apace.

Women heard confessions and gave absolution. They are said to have committed most indecent acts in their assemblies. The ceremony of purification preceded the admission of new members: a kind of oil or a powder which the proselyte was made to swallow produced dreadful convulsions, while a crowd of maddened females performed a savage dance around the sufferer, to expel the devil, who had hitherto held possession of the new member. The escape of Napoleon from Elba strengthened the belief that he was the Antichrist, and that, as a consequence, the millennium was at hand. Disorderly tramps roamed about, prophesying and preaching, held themselves for chosen members of the kingdom of God, and resisted both the ecclesiastical and civil  authorities. At last government took the matter in hand, nightly raids were made upon their assemblies, their doings were investigated, and Pöschel was put into custody at Salzburg. This intervention of the police did not appease the fanaticism of the sectarians, who were misled several times even to sanguinary excesses. A mother tried to torture her child to death, to honor the Lord; a father to kill his child in prison. The insanity of these people reached its pitch in the Holy Week of 1817. In the night that followed Palm Sunday it was resolved, in a meeting held near Ampfelwang, to offer a sacrifice to the Lord. A peasant, of the name of Haas, was to be the victim.

His mother and an old man were dragged to the scene of the holocaust: the woman was killed with one stroke, while the man died only a few days afterwards of his wound, the ceremony becoming by this postponement devoid of effect. Haas prevailed on his adopted daughter, a girl of nineteen years, to give her life for him. The monsters killed her most cruelly, and are even said to have drunk her blood, as being the blood of Christ. The scene of these horrors was on the ensuing day occupied by the militia and the actors arrested, but only six i f the leaders were kept in custody. The sect, which did not count over 126 members, thereafter disappeared rapidly. Pöschel, who had always condemned the horrors committed by his disciples, was transferred to Vienna, where, his insanity being clearly demonstrated, he was placed under severe ecclesiastical custody. He died in 1837. In a wider sense, the name of Pöschelians was for some time used to designate fanatics of Pöschel's and the Pöschelians' description. See Alzog, Kirchengesch. 2, 680; Giesebrecht, Kirchengesch. der neuesten Zeit (Bonn, 1855), p. 338 sq. (J. H. W.)

## Poschelians[[@Headword:Poschelians]]

             SEE POSCHEL.

## Poseidon[[@Headword:Poseidon]]

             the god who was considered among the ancient Greeks as presiding over the sea. He was the son of Chronos and Rhea, and had his palace at the bottom of the sea, where the monsters of the deep play around his dwelling. This deity was believed to be the author of storms, and to shake the earth with his trident or three-pronged spear. His wife was Amphitrite. When the universe was divided between the brothers, the sea was given to Poseidon. He was equal to Zeus in dignity, but not in power. He once conspired with Hera (Juno) and Athena (Minerva) to put Zeus in chains,  but usually he was submissive to the more powerful god. He rides over the waves in a chariot drawn by horses with brazen hoofs and golden manes, and the sea becomes smooth at his appearance, while the monsters of the deep gambol and play around him. Herodotus affirms that the Greeks derived the worship of Poseidon from Libya; but, from whatever quarter it was received, it spread all over Greece and Southern Italy. It prevailed more especially in the Peloponnesus. The usual sacrifices offered to this god were black and white bulls, and also wild boars and rams. At Corinth horse and chariot races were held in his honor. The Panionia, or festival of all the Ionians, was celebrated also in honor of Poseidon. The Romans identified him with their own sea-god Neptune. Troy was called Neptuna Peurgam, because Poseidon assisted Apollo to surround it with walls for king Laomedon, who refused to give them their promised reward, and Poseidon sent a sea-monster to ravage the country, which was killed by Hercules. He always hated the Trojans, and assisted the Greeks against them. He prevented the return of Ulysses, in revenge for his having blinded Polyphemus, the son of Poseidon. In art he is easily recognized by his attributes, which are the trident, horses, and dolphins. SEE NEPTUNE.

## Poseidonia[[@Headword:Poseidonia]]

             a festival celebrated annually among the ancient Greeks in honor of Poseidon. It was kept chiefly in the island of Egina.

## Poseidonius[[@Headword:Poseidonius]]

             SEE POSIDONIUS.

## Posen[[@Headword:Posen]]

             a Polish province, that portion of ancient Poland which fell to Prussia in the partition of the kingdom, has an area of 11,260 square miles, and a population (close of 1871) of 1,583,684. The territory is divided into two departments, that of Posen and Bromberg, and its principal cities are, besides the respective capitals named after the departments, Gnesen, Lissa, and Inowraclow. The principal river is the Wartha, which is navigable, but the commerce of the province is very light. For education little has been done as yet. The Prussian government is determined to force Germans culture. There are six gymnasia, several normal and training schools, a seminary for the training of priests, and about two hundred burgher or national schools. Nearly half the population belong to the Roman Catholic  Church, which is under the spiritual jurisdiction of the archbishop of Gnesen and Posen, while 74,000 of the remainder are Jews. The inhabitants may still be said to be Poles, more than 800,000 persons employing Polish as their mother tongue.

Posen formed an integral part of Poland till 1772, when. at the first partition of the Polish territory, the districts north of the Netze were given to Prussia. At the second and third partitions, which were made twenty years later, the remainder was incorporated in the Prussian kingdom under the name of South Prussia. In 1807 Posen was included in the duchy of Warsaw; but by the act of the Congress of Vienna it was separated in 1815 from Poland and reassigned to Prussia under the title of the Grand Duchy of Posen. In 1848 the Poles, who had never amalgamated with their new German compatriots, took advantage of the general political excitement of that period to organize an open rebellion, which gave the Prussian government considerable trouble, and was not put down till much blood had been spilled on both sides. On the cessation of disturbances, the German citizens of the province demanded the incorporation of Posen with those Prussian states which were members of the German Confederation, and the Berlin Chambers gave their approval of the proposed measure in 1850; but on the subsidence of revolutionary sentiment in Germany the subject was dropped, and Posen returned to its former condition of an extra German province of the Prussian monarchy. For the ecclesiastical history, SEE POLAND; see also SEE PRUSSIA.

## Poser[[@Headword:Poser]]

             is the term applied to the bishop's examining chaplain. The annual examiner at Winchester and Eton still bears this name.

## Posey, Alexander[[@Headword:Posey, Alexander]]

             a colored minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born about the year 1814. He came from the African Methodist Episcopal Church March 20, 1869, at, which time the Washington Conference was sitting in Winchester, Va. He was received into full connection, and the same year (1869) was appointed to Johnmann Street Chapel, Winchester, Va. He was reappointed in 1870 to Winchester, Va.; in 1871 to Harrisonburgh, Va., and in 1872-73 to Lexington, Va. In 1874 he was appointed to Abingdon, Va., but did not reach his work, he being sick at the time he received his  appointment. He never recovered, but died Aug. 1, 1874. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1875, p. 14.

## Posey, John Henderson[[@Headword:Posey, John Henderson]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born Sept. 17. 1819, in Breckinridge County, Ky.; emigrated with his parents in early life to Illinois, and settled in Morgan County. His first religious impressions were at about the age of seventeen. When he attained to the years of manhood he came to Missouri, and there connected himself with the Methodist Church. He was licensed to preach July 16, 1853, and retained the local relation for some time. In 1866 lie joined the Illinois Conference, and was appointed to Barry Circuit. In 1868 he was appointed to Lima Circuit. Shortly after the next year's Conference his health failed, and he died Nov. 13, 1869. He ever regarded the ministry as the most sacred vocation on earth. His high appreciation of its sanctity and responsibility was such at times as almost to overpower his own spirit. He was a true itinerant in heart and practice. See Minutes of the Annual Conferences, 1870, p. 518, 519.

## Posidonius[[@Headword:Posidonius]]

             (Ποσιδώνιος), an envoy of the Syrian general Nicanor to Judas Maccabeus (2Ma 14:19).

## Posidonius (2)[[@Headword:Posidonius (2)]]

             (Ποσειδώνιος), a distinguished Greek Stoic philosopher, was a native of Apameia in Syria, but a citizen of Rhodes, where he resided the greater part of his life (Strabo, 14:655; Athen. 6:252 e). The dates of his birth and death are unknown; but he must have been born during the latter half of the 2nd century before the Christian era, as he was a disciple of Panuetius, who probably died about B.C. 100, and whom he succeeded as the head of the Stoic school. He removed to Rome in the consulship of Marcus Marcellus (Suidas, Posidon.), B.C. 51, and probably died soon after. He lived, according to Lucian (Macrob. c. 20), to the age of eighty-four, and was one of the most celebrated philosophers of his day. Cicero, who had received instruction from him (Cicero, De Plato, c. 3; De Nat. Deor. 1 3; De Fin. 1, 2), frequently speaks of him in the highest terms. Pompey also appears to have had a very high opinion of him, as we read of his visiting him at Rhodes shortly before the war against the pirates, B.C. 67 (Strabo,  11:492) and again in B.C. 62, after the termination of the Mithridatic war (Plutarch, Pomp. c. 42; Pliny, Hist. Nam. 7, 30). He must have been a man of very extensive and varied information in almost all the departments of human knowledge. Strabo calls him, ἀνὴρ τῶν καθ᾿ ἡμᾶς φιλοσόφων πολυμαθέστατος.

Besides his philosophical treatises, he wrote works on geography, history, and astronomy; but none of them have come down to us, with the exception of their titles, and a few sentences quoted by Cicero, Diogenes Laertius, Strabo, and others. He seems to have traveled in different parts of the world for the purpose of collecting information. We learn incidentally from Strabo (13, 614; 3, 165; 4:197) that he had been in Spain, Liguria, and Gaul. Plutarch was also indebted to Posidonius, among others, for the materials of several of his lives. This is the case in the Lives of Marcellus, Paulus AEmilius, the Gracchi, and others; but particularly in the Life of Marius, with whom Posidonius had been personally acquainted (Plut. marius, c. 45). Posidonius wrote Meteorololoica. Cicero mentions (Natt. Deor. 2, 34) his artificial sphere, which represented the motions of the heavens. Posidonius was a much stricter Stoic than his master Pantius. He maintained that pain was not an evil, as we learn from an anecdote which Pompey frequently related respecting his visit to the philosopher at Rhodes (Cicero, Tusc. Disp. 2, 25). As a physical investigator he was greatly superior to the Stoics generally, attaching himself in this respect rather to Aristotle. Indeed, although attached to the Stoic system, he was far less dogmatical and obstinate than tile majority of that school, refusing to admit a dogma because it was one of the school if it did not commend itself to him for its intrinsic merits. His works on divination and the nature of the gods are referred to by Cicero, who probably made use of them in his works on the same subject (Cicero, De Div. 1, 3, 30, 64; De Nat. Deor. 1, 44). Strabo says (11, 492) that Posidonius wrote an account of the wars of Pompey, but did not pay much attention to accuracy. This account was, however, probably contained in his historical work, of which Athenmeus quotes (4, 168 d) the 49th book (comp. Athen. 4, 151 e). For further information respecting the opinions and writings of Posidonius, see Posidonii Reliquice Doctrinae; Collegit atque illustr-avit Janus Bake; Accedit D. Wyttenbachii Annotatio (Lugdugni Bat. 1810, 8vo). See also Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Ron. Biog. and Mythol. s.v.; Fabricius, Bibl. Graec. 3, 572; Vossius, De Hist. Graec. p. 193; Ritter, Gesch. der Philos. vol. 3, bk. 11, c. 6, p. 700; Ueberweg, Hist. of Philos. vol. 1.  There was another Posidonius of Alexandria, who was a pupil of Zeno, and consequently was prior to Polybius. Suidas, however, by mistake, ascribes to this Posidonius a continuation of Polybius in fifty-two books, which is evidently the work of the younger Posidonius.

## Positive Philosophy[[@Headword:Positive Philosophy]]

             a recent scheme of philosophy, on the basis of phenomenalism, founded by Auguste Comte of Paris. SEE COMTE; SEE POSITIVISM.

## Positivism[[@Headword:Positivism]]

             a distinct, scientific habit of mind, regulated by a characteristic principle, which was made the basis of an extensive and ambitious scheme of philosophy by Auguste Comte, SEE COMTE, and which has matured, according to the intention of its author, into a sect, a creed, and a church, since the article on Comte was written. The term is applied to the intellectual habit, the characteristic principle, the philosophical procedure, and the consequent body of doctrine. The English Positivists, who have latterly been the most zealous propagators of the positive philosophy, and have very recently issued a complete translation of the Systeme de la Politique Positive, revolt from some of the later speculations of their founder and hierophant, by rejecting his theological and ecclesiastical reconstructions, and all the sentimental mimicry of the papal organization, which was elaborated under the quaint influence of Mme. Chlotilde de Vaux. They adhere rigidly to the distinctive principle of the positive philosophy, which constitutes its sole ratio essendi and determines its consistent developments and applications. It is the first duty, then, to ascertain what this principle is.

The epithet Positive has been employed in various significations in the history of philosophy, as will be shown at the close of this notice. The term Positivism is employed by the school of the Positivists and by its founder to denote the strict confinement of speculation and the rigorous limitation of knowledge to observed facts, and to their habitual antecedences, concomitances, and sequences. It eschews all laws but those of recognized association. It involves the exclusion of causes and effects; of supernatural, spiritual, or metaphysical agencies; of hidden forces, latent qualities, and immaterial essences. It contracts the intelligible universe within the sphere of the phenomenal. It refrains from investigating the intrinsic constitution of things, and prohibits any expatiation beyond the reach of purely  scientific analysis and construction. It does not deny, but it ignores, extrudes, and repudiates as inaccessible and imaginary whatever transcends the observed facts and the logical deductions there from. It is the pure method of inductive science, accepted an practically sufficient and complete, though without asserting that it is necessarily exhaustive. Whatever lies beyond this circle is not only unknown, but incognizable and inapprehensible-not merely imperfect and uncertain, but impalpable and delusive.

It is impossible to give a sharp, precise, and formal definition of Positivism, because it is chiefly discriminated from other philosophical schemes by what it exfoliates, by its limitations rather than by its comprehension. One of the most eminent and earnest of living Positivists has within the late months given an explanation of the character of the doctrine, which it may be well to cite as an authoritative testimony:

“Suffice it that we mean by the positive method of thought (and we will now use the term in a sense not limited to the social construction of Comte) that method which would) base life and conduct, as well as knowledge, upon such evidence as call be referred to logical canons of proof, which would place all that occupies man in a homogeneous system of law. On the other hand, this method turns aside from hypotheses, not to be tested by any known logical canon familiar to science, whether the hypothesis claim support from intuition, aspiration, or general plausibility. And again, this method turns aside from ideal standards which avow themselves to be lawless, which profess to transcend the field of law. We say, life and conduct shall stand for us wholly on a basis of law, and must rest entirely in that region of science (not physical, hut moral and social science) where we are free to use our intelligence in the methods known to us as intelligible logic, methods which the intellect can analyze” (Frederic Harrison, The Soul and Future Life, in The Nineteenth Century, No. 4, June, 1877, art. 7, p. 624, 625).

Mr. Harrison's contemplation is here, as will be readily conjectured, directed specially to the ethical developments of Positivism; but such language so applied reveals the severity with which everything but the processes and products of scientific observation and logical conclusion is excluded from the arena of the Positivist. This accords perfectly with the determination of the dogmatic principle originally formulated in the Philosophie Positive (tome 1, p. 4, 5).  “In fine, in the Positive state the human mind, recognizing the impossibility of attaining absolute notions, renounces the investigation of the origin and destination of the universe, and inquiry into the intrinsic causes of phenomena, and attaches itself instead solely to the discovery, by judicious combination of reasoning and observation, of their effective laws-that is, to the discovery of their invariable relations of succession and resemblance. The explication of facts thus reduced to its real terms is, thenceforward, nothing more than the connection established between the diverse phenomena and certain general facts whose number tends to be constantly diminished by the progress of science.”

This procedure has long been regarded as alone appropriate in the domain of physical science, and as equally appropriate, within the limits of its applicability, in speculative science. It forms what is commonly regarded as the Baconian philosophy or the Baconian redintegration of philosophy. Positivism, however, both in the conception of the father of the system and in the doctrine and practice of his followers, extends its range so as to embrace and enclose all departments of knowledge and action, to profess itself the sole and exclusive method, and to stigmatize and repudiate whatever will not submit to its jurisdiction or remains beyond its reach. Indeed, in the elaboration of the system by Comte all its applications to the exact sciences were regarded as merely preliminary to social reconstruction, and to the establishment of a comprehensive and diversified ethical doctrine for public and private guidance. In this light it is still viewed by the existing school of Positivists, notwithstanding their rejection of much of the theological reverie of Comte.

It will readily be recognized that Positivism, as so understood, revives under strangely modernized aspects the old dogma of Protagoras that man is the measure of the universe. The ancient contrast and analogy of the macrocosm and the microcosm are reproduced in quaint disguise and more plausible form by limiting the intelligible uniterse (mundus intelligibilis) to its reflection from the mirror of the human mind so far, and so far only, as an image of it can be formed through the instrumentality of the bodily senses and of reasoning on the phenomena observed thereby. We will not be tempted into the easy misrepresentation of alleging that all is denied which is not so reflected, but the practical effect is nearly the same; for it is ignored, cashiered, and extruded from the field of speculation. Thus, the universe and all its marvels, the mind of man and its measureless potencies, the heart of man with its boundless duties, its multitudinous aspirations and  its unfathomable mysteries, are shriveled up into the narrow dimensions of the science of the day. Surely we require a philosophy of the unknown as well as of the known!

“Vere scire est scire per caulsas,” said Aristotle, and the schoolmen after him. The maxim was unquestionably pressed by the latter to hazardous uses, and employed to authenticate hallucinations which obstructed science for centuries. “Vere scire est scire apparentias” — true knowledge is the knowledge of appearances-is the shibboleth of the Positivists, and is even more dangerous than the misapprehension which it has undertaken to dethrone. It results in pure phenomenalism, and renders man and the universe alike hollow, deceptive, and spectral. This tendency of Positivism, and the length to which it may be and has been carried, are well illustrated by the remarkable and exquisitely written article of Mr. Frederic Harrison on The Soul and Future Life, from which we have already made a citation, and by the very recent discussions provoked by it. Mr. Harrison, like his Coryphleus, will not endure “thoughts that wander through eternity,” except it be a human eternity. He will not suffer them to travel “extra flammantia maenia mundi.” He compresses those flaming walls to the limits of the earth's horizon. He does not deny the existence of the human soul: he only starves it out and dissipates it into a technical abstraction. “The combined activity of the human powers,” he says, “organized around the highest of them we call the soul.” Again, “the consensus of human laculties, which we call the soul, comprises all sides of human nature according to one homogeneous theory.”

“She, mouldering with the dull earth's mouldering sod,

In wrapt tenfold in slothful shame,

Lay there, exiled from eternal God,

Lost to her place and name.”

The future life is still more vacant, unreal, and inapprehensible than even the sublimated soul. It is indeed the shadow of a shade. Mr. Harrison does not give such distinct utterance to his conception of the post-mortem existence as to enable us to grasp it firmly. He employs phrases which indicate his acceptance of the Panhumanistic immortality, by absorption into the aggregate humanity of subsequent generations, if he refuses to adore with Comte le Nouveau Grand-Etre-the New Supreme God- humanity itself. But the abstract term-the unsubstantial and unessential conception of humanity-does not become a more real being-a more capable receptacle of souls or extinct consensuses of human lowers-by being stripped of the tawdry trappings and tinsel fringes with which Comte had  decorated it, to set it up as an idol in place of Jehovah. Strange that the Positivists should reject as unphilosophlical and invalid all that religion teaches and our instincts accept as true, and should recur to such a factitious and fictitious abstraction as this humanity must be! Waiving the divine attributes of creation, ordination, and government, and regarding only the functions of the Divinity as a moral influence exerted over men-as “the rewarder of them that diligently seek him”—it may well be asked what restraint or encouragement could a deified and posthumous humanity exercise retrospectively on the conduct of men in society or as individuals. The fancy is as futile as it is absurd. Roche Boyle's comic exclamation would recur to every transgressor—” What has posterity done for us!”

It may be frankly conceded that the ideas of duty, of obligation, of justice, of temporal responsibility-perhaps even of right and wrong, of righteousness and sin, of beauty and of aesthetic emotion may be translated from the language of religious belief into the language of Positivism. Mr. Comte made a travesty of the rites and ceremonial of Catholic Christianity, and commended it to his devotees as the Positive religion. This invention has been abnegated, in form at least, by his followers, but it is a similar procedure by which Mr. Harrison and the rest profess and hope to retain the essential characteristics of a divine creed, after excluding from the universe all recognition of divinity. It is mistaking the shell for the organism, after the substance and life, which were enclosed by the shell, and which informed the shell, have perished out. We can see the very nice distinction demanded by Positivism between the absolute negation of the divine and the supernatural and the mere declaration of its incognizability, and of its consequent elimination from the domain of faith, as of knowledge. But the practical effect in both cases will be nearly the same. ‘The discrimination is very refined and theoretical, and may be perfectly valid in abstract reasoning. But it is only the purest and most intellectual natures which can perceive it and act upon it, and even they will forget it or lose their hold upon it in moments of passion and temptation. It cannot be adequately apprehended by dull minds, coarse temperaments, and undisciplined characters, and will consequently be wholly inoperative where most required. The defect — the fatal defect— is the absence of any imperative and extrinsic authority to secure effective responsibility and obedience to right. The injury to humanity thus portended is very evident; the advantage to be anticipated is indiscernible.

This notice proceeds on the same plane with that adopted by the Positivists, and the discussion of their principles does not travel beyond the domain of the human understanding. The danger of Positivism springs from the same source as that whence have issued the dangers of so many kindred schemes of philosophy in our daily disposition to regard a partial truth as the complete body of truth to make one principle the sufficient explanation of all things, and to render human knowledge co-extensive with all knowledge and, practically, with all truth. The unknown must always transcend the known: it must remain higher in dignity and in influence, as well as ampler in all dimensions. The temper of the present day, however, is to humanize the universe— to restrict all valid knowledge to purely scientific knowledge— to cramp the realm of the apprehensible within the narrow mould of the demonstrable. Positivism is true in its place and in its degree, as evolution is true under the like limitations, but it is not all-comprehending. It does not include all truth, and is far from embracing all reality. Its error and its pernicious consequences arise from the attempt to make it all-sufficient and exclusive. As a method of science it is true and valuable in all the applications of physical science, and of ethical science too, so far as the latter can appropriately employ observation and induction. But beyond all this stretch the unfathomable spaces of the unknown, including that which is known only by its effects; and we cannot wisely or safely leave this vast enclosing sphere out of our contemplation, for it is the main regulator of our conduct, by constant appeal to our highest sensibilities. If the hypothesis of the astronomer be true, that there is a mighty central sun in the unsounded depths of heavenly space, round which our sun, with all its attendant planets, revolves in a regular but measureless orbit, it would be neither logical nor prudent to deny the existence of such a centre of attraction, because it remains, and may forever remain, unattainable by human sense. It seems even more illogical and indiscreet to repudiate a moral centre of the universe, attracting and governing all things, and radiating its influences over the whole physical and rational world, because it lies beyond the limits of scientific observation, and cannot be measured, analyzed, or determined by the firms of science.

The factitious blindness or willful shortsightedness of the Positive dogma is strangely illustrated by the history of the term Positive, and of the philosophy which it has been employed to designate. St. Thomas Aquinas (Summo. Theol. 2. 57) employs Positive in accordance with its juridical  usage as opposed to Natural jus naturale et jus positivum.” Accordingly, he uses it to denote that which is commanded, laid down, postulated, taken for granted; hence, arbitrary, not in the sense of willful or fantastic, but of determined as a condition precedent. “Illud dicitur esse positivum quod ex voluntate humana procedit,” etc. This meaning is frequently given to it by others of the schoolmen, and is sufficiently accordant with its etymology and with its classical usage. “Est haec res posita, que ab adversario non negatur” (Cicero, Pro Coecin. 11). As in the scholastic reasoning the most absolutely determined principles-the starting-points of speculation-were the dogmas of revealed truth, the positions authoritatively determined by religion, the transition was natural to the acceptance of Positive in the sense of received as a command, established by faith, in contrast to that which was believed on sensible evidence or demonstration. Hence it is found with this signification, or with one closely analogous to it, in a remarkable passage of Bacon, which furnishes an apt censure for the Positive philosophy and for the misapplication of the term, though supplying a step in the direction of Positivism. “Nil enim philosophiam peraequo corrupit, ac illa inquisitio parentum Cupidinis: hoc est, quod philosophi principia rerum, quemadmodum in natura inveniuntur, non receperunt et amplexi sunt, nt doctrinam quandam positivam, et tamquam fide experimentali” (Patrmen. Teles. et Deomocr. Phil.).

There is here a coalescence and conciliation of both the earlier and the later meanings of the term— a restriction of investigation within the range of human observation, but an acceptance by faith of the principles beyond it, which must regulate human conduct and human speculation alike.

In like manner, Kant, while denying to the understanding the possibility of reaching any positive (demonstrable) knowledge in regard to things purely intelligible (νούμενα), asserts the determination of the moral law in a positive (conclusive, assured) manner, through the faculty of intuition (Kritik der reinen Vernunft, 1, 1).

This employment of the term in both its applications, while the conclusion is contradictory to the speculations of the Positive school, acquires peculiar significance from the fact that the scheme of Positivism had been indicated and condemned by the sage of Knigsberg as a possible but mutilated and delusive project of philosophy. The originality of Comte lay simply in the narrowness and defectiveness of his principles, and in the hardihood and vigor with which they were applied by him in his Systeme de la Philosophie  Positive. His exclusion of the largest and most important half of human knowledge and experience (undefined and often shadowy as that knowledge and that experience may be) constitutes the latent and deadly malady of Positivism, and is prefigured as such in the vaticinations of Kant.

But instead of referring to the numerous passages in the Critical Philosophy in which Positivism is anticipated and censured before its appearance, we may suitably close these remarks with a citation from a scientific writer, whom we may presume to have been Sir David Brewster:

“A third dogma, which has of late been placed in prominence, much, as we conceive, to the detriment of philosophy, is that of the so-called, or rather miscalled, positive philosophy — an extravagant and morphological transformation of that rational empiricism which professes to take experience for its basis, resulting from insisting on the prerogatives of experience in reference to external phenomena, and ignoring them in relation to the movements and tendencies of our intellectual nature; a philosophy which, if it do not repudiate altogether the idea of causation, goes far at least to put it out of view, and with it everything which can be called explanation of natural phenomena, by the undue predominance assigned to the idea of law; which rejects, as not merely difficult, not simply hopeless, but as utterly absurd, unphilosophical, and derogatory, all attempt to render any rational account of those abstract, equation-like propositions, in which it delights to embody the results of experience, other than their inclusion in some more general proposition of the same kind. Entirely persuaded that in physics, at least, the inquiry into causes is philosophy, that nothing else is so, and that the cause of causation upwards is broken by no solution of continuity, constituting a gulf absolutely impassable to human faculties, if duly prepared by familiarity with previous links, we are far from regarding the whole office of experimental philosophy as satisfactorily expressed by declaring it to consist in the discovery and generalization of laws” (Edinb. Rev. Jan. 1548, art. 5, p. 180,151).

Literature. — To the references given at the close of the article COMTE may now be added: Comte, System of Positive Polity, or Treatise upon Sociology, transl. by Bridges, Harrison, Beesly, Congreve, and Hutton (Lond. 1876, 4 vols. 8vo); Harrison, Order and Parogress (1 vol. 8vo); Congreve, Essays, Political, Social, and Religious (1 vol. 8vo); Estasen y Cortada, El Positivismo, Sistema de las Ciencias experimentales  (Barcelona, 1877, 8vo); Cordier. Expose et Critique du Positivisme prolonge (Par. 1877, 8vo); Adrian, Essais sur quelques Points de la Philosophie positive; The Nineteenth Century, No. 4, June, 1877, art. 7; No. 5, July, 1877, art. 6 (The Soul and Future Life, by Frederic Harrison); ibid. No. 7, Sept. 1877, art. 11 (A Modern Symposium, by R. H. Hutton, Prof. Huxley, Lord Blachford, Hon. Robert Noel; subj. “The Future Life”); ibid. No. 8, Oct. 1877, art. 9 (A Modern Synmposium, by Lord Selborne, Rev. Canon Barry, W. R. Greg, Rev. Baldwin Brown, Dr. W. G. Ward, Frederic Harrison; subj. [concluded] “The Soul and Future Life”). (G. F. H.)

## Posner, Augustus Siegmund[[@Headword:Posner, Augustus Siegmund]]

             (formerly Simon), a German minister of the Lutheran Church, a convert from Judaism, was born May 19, 1805, at Auras, in Lower Silesia. His early education he received at the public schools of Breslau. When seventeen years of age, he went to Berlin to continue his studies. There he became acquainted with a Hebrew Christian, who sowed the first seed of the Gospel. In the year 1828 he received public baptism, assuming the name of Augustus Siegmund. He betook himself to the study of theology, and upon its completion filled several situations as tutor in private families. In the year 1838 he received a call to proceed as a missionary to the East, and accordingly set out for Berlin to prepare for his journey. On the road his intention became the subject of conversation with a fellow-traveler, a gentleman holding a high situation under government, and to his no small surprise he was informed by the latter that he must relinquish the intention of becoming a missionary, as he had just been appointed by the government chaplain of the Penitentiary at Sagan (in Silesia), and the necessary documents respecting it were nearly completed. In September, 1838, he entered on his new charge, which he discharged as becoming a faithful disciple of Christ. In addition to the discharge of his heavy duties, Posner edited a monthly publication under the title The Prodigal Son, which became a great blessing to many readers. In the year 1840 he was formally ordained by the consistory. Seeing that his duties at Sagan were far beyond his strength, the government made the offer to him of another ministerial charge at Lebenthal-adding, however, that if it were practicable his remaining at his present post would be regarded with great satisfaction. The expression of such a wish was sufficient to lead Posner to consider it his duty to remain. Thus he labored and suffered on. In the beginning of the year 1846 Posner was invited by the congregation of a newly erected  church in Berlin to become their pastor; but the consistory refusing to comply with Posner's wishes to adhere to the formularies of the Lutheran Church instead of those of the Prussian National Church, Posner had to relinquish the appointment. Broken health, in connection with domestic afflictions, hastened his end, and on Monday, Jan. 22, 1849, he was called to his eternal rest, enunciating with a weak voice the words, “Make an end, make an end, O Lord! Come, Lord Jesus! come, come, come quickly! Lead my soul out of darkness.” See A. S. Posner, Der treue Zeuge Gottes, weiland Pastor an der königl. Strafnstalt zu Sagan; Von einen Freunde (Schreiberschau, 1851, 2nd ed.); and the biography prepared by a brother of the deceased in the Sontags-Bibliothek, vol. 4, pt. 3 (Bielefeld, 1850); Jewish Intelligencer (Lond. 1853); Zuchold, Bibliotheca Theologica, 2, 1201. (B. P.)

## Posselt, Augustus[[@Headword:Posselt, Augustus]]

             a German Lutheran theologian, was born Jan. 6, 1658, at Zittan, in the Oberlausitz, He studied at Wittenberg, Kiel, and Jena, and for a long time he preached in Hamburg. In 1688 he was appointed preacher at SS. Peter and Paul in his native place; in 1714 he was made archdeacon, and in 1718 pastor primarius of St. John, in which position he died, Nov. 23,1728. He wrote, Richtige Erklarung der Epistel St. Pauli an die Romner: — Nachricht von den in Hal'nden habenden biblischen Exeumplaren. See Jocher, Gelehrten Lexikon, s.v.

## Possessed with Devils[[@Headword:Possessed with Devils]]

             the usual rendering in the A.V. of the Greek δαιμονιζόμενοι (but also δαιμονισθέντες, Mar 5:18; comp. δαιμόνια ἔχειν, Luk 8:27; πνεῦμα δαιμονίου ἀκαθάρτου ἔχειν, 4:33), Mat 4:24; Mat 8:16; Mat 15:22; Act 8:7; Luk 8:2. These were persons afflicted with disease, as epilepsy (Mat 17:15; Luk 9:39), paralysis (Luk 13:11; Luk 13:16), dumbness (Mat 9:32; Mat 12:22), and especially with melancholy and insanity (Mat 8:28; Mar 5:2 sq.; Luk 8:27 sq.); whence the healed are said to be of sound mind (σωφρονοῦντες, Mar 5:15; Luk 8:35). It is not necessary to suppose that the epilepsy or the dumbness, when this was the main feature of the case, was complicated with peculiar physical disorders, although epilepsy is very commonly connected with something of the kind (see Farmer, Vers. p. 89; Hippocrat. Virg. Morb. c. 1; Esquirol, Path. u. Therap. d. Seelenstörungen  [Leips. 18271, p. 73; comp. p. 503) indeed, while these special disabilities of men in other respects in sound and vigorous health were naturally referred to a supernatural cause, this would be especially the case with the sudden attacks of epilepsy, falling at irregular intervals and without premonition. Everything of this kind the Jews, like the Greeks and Romans referred to evil spirits taking possession of men (see Act 10:38; Luk 13:16; comp. Josephus, Ant. 6, 8, 2, on 1Sa 16:14; 1Sa 16:23; see also Lightfoot, p. 388; Eisenmenger, Entdecktes Judenth. 2, 454; Maimonides, Schab. 2, 5; Erub. 3, 4; Creuzer, Symbolik, 3, 4 sq.). The case was the same among the ancients with those extraordinary events and achievements, accomplished by men, which seemed too great to proceed from the natural human powers-they were referred to the operation of a divinity. Not only hallucinations, melancholy, and epilepsy (called by Herodotus the sacred disease, 3, 33), but also the ravings of Bacchantes and Corvbantes were viewed as proceeding from superhuman inspiration (Herod. 4:79; Eurip. Brach. 298 sq.; Dion. Hal. De Demosthen. c. 22; see also Herod. 3, 33; Heliod. Eth. 4, 10; Bos, Exercit. Phil. p. 62 sq.). Hence to demonize (jatuoriav) is the common Greek expression meaning to be insane (AEsch. Choph. 564; Sept. c. Theb. 1003: Eurip. Phcn. 899; Aristoph. Thesmoph. 1060; Plutarch, Marsell. 20; Lucian, Philopseud. c. 16; and Wetst. 1, 282; esp. Aretaei Caussa Morb. diut. 1, 4).

But these demons were generally viewed as the spirits of the deceased (Philostr. Apoll. 3, 38; Horace, Epod. 5, 91; comp. Josephus, War, 7:6, 3; and on exorcising them, see Plutarch, Synpos. 7:5; Lucian, Philopseud. c. 16; on the Syriac and Arabic usage of speech a, see Jahn, chtreage, p. 173 sq.). The practice of exorcism upon such men, for the purpose of driving out the daemons, was very common (comp. Lucian, Philopseud. c. 16; and see Mat 12:37; Luk 9:49; Act 19:13 sq.; comp. Justin Mart. Apol. 2, 7). The exorcists made use of magical formulae, said to have descended from Solomon (Josephus, Ant. 8:2, 5), in connection with certain roots, stones, etc. (id. War, 7:6, 3; Mishna, Götting, 67:2; Plutarch, De Fluv. 16:2). Afterwards these men were found also in other countries (Lucian, Philopseud. c. 16). Many suppose that Jesus simply adopted the popular mode of speech in his age in speaking of daemonic possession, and healed the unfortunate sufferers without sharing in the view commonly taken of their disease (P. von Hemert, Accommodat in N.T. p. 51 sq.; Hase, Leben Jesu, p. 71 sq.), just as the physicians in the time of Origen, who did not at all believe in real possession by devils (comp. the principles of Maimonides; Jahn, Vachtraiti e, p. 185). On his method of healing,  comp. Paulus, 1, 423; 2, 621; and on Mar 9:29, against the view of Pautlus, Fritzsche on Mat 17:21. Where prayer and fasting are recommended to the apostles as means of exorcism, Porphyry (Abstinen. 2, 204, 417 sq.) may be compared. It was very natural that the sufferers, when healed, wished to remain in the vicinity of the Great Physician (Luk 8:38; comp. 8:2); for there they considered themselves most safe against the return of the daemons.

The symptoms recorded of individual demoniac agree with those which are noticed in diseases of the kinds mentioned above.

(a.) On Mat 17:15, comp. Paul. AEgin. 3:13, where he speaks of a morbus comlitialis, in which the whole body is convulsed; which affects chiefly boys, sometimes young men; and in which the convulsion is accompanied with a sudden inarticulate cry. The chief distinguishing mark, however, is a foaming at the mouth (comp. Luk 9:39; Lucian, Philopseud. c. 16). Coel. Aurelian (Morb. Chron. 1, 4) speaks of a class of diseased persons, epileptics, who fell in public places (from which the disease is still sometimes called falling-sickness, and in German Fallsucht; comp. Rabb. נוֹפֵלor נַכְפֶּהan epileptic), or even into rivers or the sea. Arettmus (De Morbo Epil. 5) speaks of some who fell in weakness into the river. It was early observed that this affliction seemed to have some connection with the changes of the moon (Dougtaei Anaect. 2, 5; Bartholin, Mor b. Bibl. c. 18; comp. Aret. Morb. Chronicles 1:4; Origen, in Matthew 3, p. 577; Lucian, Tox. c. 24; Isidor. Orig. 4:7). Hence the use of the world σεληνιάζεσθαι, Mat 4:24; Mat 17:15; comp. Suicer, Thesaur. 2, 946. In Latin, too, epileptics were called lunatici, or moonstruck. Again, epilepsy, in connection with partial insanity, was the disease of the man mentioned in Mar 1:23 sq.; Luk 4:33 sq.; comp. esp. Mar 1:26.

(b.) On Mat 8:28, comp. Wetstein, 1, 354 sq. The proofs of vast strength, and of a violent rage against himself (Mar 5:4-5; comp. Act 19:16), leave no doubt that this man was a maniac. The fact that he avoided society, and wished to dwell alone among tombs, point to the peculiar mania which Savages calls Mania misanathropica, or that which Keil (Rhapsodie über die Anwend. d. psych. Kurmethode, etc. LHalle, 1803], p. 363) calls Mania errabunda. Yet his mania was but temporary, though the delusion which it accompanied was permanent, showing itself in settled ideas (Mar 5:9; Luk 8:30). Thus, according to the  principles of Heinroth (Lehrbuch der Seelenstörungen, 1, 360 sq.), the case is one of delusion joined with melancholy, and sometimes heightened to mania. Mental as well as physical diseases are often thus complicated with each other (Esquirol, p. 73); comp. further, Targum Jerus Terumoth, 40, 2, where an insane man (שׁוֹטֶה) is thus described: “He goes forth and spends the night among the tombs; and tears his clothing, and destroys whatever is offered him.” The leaping down of the swine, perhaps a part only of the herd, was produced, as some think, by the violent running towards them of the demoniacs, under the fixed impression that the daemons could not leave them save by finding another dwelling-place in the unclean beasts (comp. Josephus, Ant. 8, 2, 5; see esp. Eichhorn, Bibl. 6, 835 sq.; (Grimm, Exeget. Aufs. 1, 123 sq.; Schmidt, Exeget. Beifr. 2, 85 sq.; Greiling, in Helne, Mus. 1, 620 sq.; Friedrich, Vers. einer Literaturgesch. d. Pathol. u. Therapie d. psych Krankh. [Würzb. 1830], p. 7 sq.; Schleiermacher, Predigten, 3, note 3, on Act 16:16). The view of the earlier theologians and physicians was that in the case of the demoniac healed ‘by Jesus there had been an actual bodily indwelling of evil spirits. From this view (set forth by J. Marckius, Textual Exercit. p. 257 sq.; Deyling, Observat. 2, 371 sq.; Ernesti, Neue theol. Bibl. 3, 799 sq.; Zeibich, Vetre. Betracht. 3, 306 sq.; Storr, Ousc. 1, 53 sq.; Eschenbach, Scriptor. Med. Bibl. p. 41 sq.) many dissented long ago, following a hint of St. Augustine, De Genesi ad lit. 12:17 (see Hobbes, Leviathan, c. 8 and 45; Bekker, Byzant. Welt, bk. 4, c. 7 sq.; Wetstein, 1, 279 sq.; Bartholin, De Morb. Bibl. c. 19). It was formally combated by Mead, Bibelkrankh. p. 63 sq. See Semler, Com. de Daeimoniacis quorum in N.T. fit mentio (Halle, 1760); Umständliche Untersuchung der Damon- Leute (ibid. 1762); Gruner, De Demoniacis a Chri. Percuratis (Jena, 1775); Lindlinger, in his Schr. de Ebraeor. yet. Arte Med. translated into German by Cölln, with preface by Semler (Brem; 1776) his Briefe iib. die Damonischen in d. Evang., with additions by Semler (Halle 1783); Zimmerman, Diatr. de Daemonicis Evang. (Rinteln, 1786); Medicin. — hermen. Untersuch. ip. 15 sq. Comp. Carmls, Psychol. d. ebr. p. 393 sq.; Baur, Bibl. Theol. d. N.T. 1, 213 sq; Jahn, Archaöl. I, 2, 400 sq. (omitted in the 2nd ed.; comp. Nachtiadge to Jalhn's Theol. Veike, p. 451 sq.). Additional literature is cited by Volbeding, Index Programmatum, p. 41; Hase, Leben Jesu, p. 99; Darling, Cyclop. col. 830, 923, 926, 182, 1882; Danz, Bibl. Theolo(qiwt, p. 125, 204. See also Woodward, Demoniacal Possession (Lond. 1839, 1856); Meth. Quar. Rev. July, 1857; Free-will Bapt. Quar. April, 1858; Heb. Rev. Oct. 1865. Comp. SEE DAEMONIAC.

## Possevino, Antonio[[@Headword:Possevino, Antonio]]

             a celebrated Italian Jesuit, noted for the diplomatic services he rendered the Church of Rome, was born at Manatova in 1534. He belonged to a noble but poor family. Sent to Rome at the age of sixteen, he was in a short time proficient in the classical languages and literature, and cardinal Ercole di Gonzaga made him his amanuensis, and entrusted to his hands the education of his nephews, Francis and Scipio di Gonzaga. Possevino followed his patron to Ferrara, then to Padua, and gained by his merit the esteem of Paolo, Manucci, Bartolomo Ricci, an Sigonio. Although he had been rewarded by the Gonzagas with the donation of the rich commander of Fossano, in Piedmont, he preferred to join the Jesuits. He had not finished his novitiate when he ‘was sent on a very delicate errand to the duke of Savoy, Emanuel Philibert (1560). The object of this mission was to stop the progress of heresy, which, coming from France, threatened to invade Italy through Savoy and Piedmont. The Ronan court, either to reward his services or to give full scope to his talents, employed him in several negotiations. The first of these missions was to Sweden. He arrived in Stockholm in December, 1577. The king received him with great favor, abjured severally all his heresies, made a general confession, and promised obedience to the apostolic see. The ensuing day, May 17, 1578, the mass was celebrated after the Roman rite in presence of the king. Possevino returned to Rome, and the queries and propositions of the king were examined by an ecclesiastical commission. The mass in the vulgar tongue, the chalice for the laymen, the marriage of priests the omission of the invocation of saints and of the prayers for the dead, the suppression in hot water and other ceremonies were rejected; seven of their proposals were accepted. On Possevino's return to Stockholm (July, 1579), the king, who was of a very fickle disposition, showed great dissatisfaction at the negative answer he had met with on the five points above mentioned, broke up all negotiations, and would not even consent to the establishment of a Church for Romanists. In February, 1580, the regsdag of Wadstena, at which Possevino was present, took a threatening attitude, and king John was compelled to publish an edict against the introduction of Roman Catholic olklis, and to promise to promote only Protestants to the professorships.

In the same year Possevino returned to -Rome. King John, having lost his wife Catharine in 1583, married in 1585 Gunilla Bjelke, who became for the Lutherans what the former queen had been for the Catholics.  Soon afterwards Possevino was sent on a similar errand to Poland and Russia. The czar, Ivan Vasilivitch II (1533-1584), called the Terrible, had vastly aggrandized his empire in all directions. In 1580 he had made the conquest of Livonia. Here he met Stephen Bathori, king of Poland (1575 - 1585), who defeated him and compelled him to retreat. To stop the Polish invasion the czar invoked the mediation of pope Gregory XIII. Possevino was sent to the headquarters of the king of Poland at Wilna. Bathori consented to receive the envoys of the czar, but rejected their conditions. Hereupon Possevino set on his way to tile interior of Russia under an escort of Cossacks. The czar received him at Stacilza, and gave him a solemn audience, Aug. 8. Ivan sat on his throne, surrounded with Oriental pomp, dressed in a long robe interwoven with golden threads and covered with pearls and jewels; he bore a kind of tiara on his head, and held a golden scepter in his left hand. Senators, bojars, and army officers filled the rooms; gold and precious stones glittered everywhere. The rest was in accordance. After five days of feasting the negotiations commenced; during the whole proceedings the czar gave frequent evidence of astuteness and duplicity.

Possevino subordinated his intervention to the following conditions: free passage through Russia for the apostolic nuncios and missionaries; free exercise of the Roman Catholic worship for foreign merchants, and admission of'Catholic priests to administer to them the sacraments. Finally, as the czar himself had proposed an alliance against the Turks, the papal envoy hinted at the fusion of the two churches as being the best means to bring it to pass. Possevino was brimful of hope, while the czar gave only evasive answers. Thus a month elapsed in resultless debate, when the news of the siege of Pleskau (Pskov), the possession of which city would have opened Russia to the Poles, brought matters to a rapid conclusion. Ivan consented to the admission of Roman Catholic merchants, and Possevino repaired to the Polish camp. Through his exertions a congress of plenipotentiaries of both belligerents was held at Porchau, in which the mediator presided. Bathori demanded the cession of the whole of Livonia, and as Possevino knew that the king of Poland would not swerve from his purpose, he prevailed on the Russians to consent. But when the Poles demanded also the town of Weliki, and the life of the Russian envoy was at stake, the papal legate had to pledge his own life to obtain their signature. At last peace was concluded, Jan. 15, 1582. When Possevino, after a truly triumphal journey, reached Moscow, he found the court in consternation and the czar beside himself: he had killed his son with a blow of his golden scepter. Five weeks after the conclusion of the peace a  conference was held in the Kremlin, when the czar declined the proposal of a fusion of the churches, but consented to the passage of the missionaries, and granted religious freedom to foreign merchants and priests. During these latter negotiations Ivan at one time had lifted his scepter, still red with his son's blood, against the Jesuit. Failing to intimidate Possevino, he laid a snare for him, trying to prevail on him to kiss the hand of the patriarch: his purpose was to make believe that the pope had submitted to the patriarch. But the clerical diplomatist remained faithful to his task, and succeeded.

He was scarcely returned when he was sent to Livonia and Transylvania to combat Protestantism, which was fast gaining ground in those provinces. Possevino held a conference with the sectarians at Hermannstadt. On the same occasion he increased the importance of the colleges of his order in those parts, and founded a seminary at Clausenburg. In 1583 he took his seat, in his quality of a papal nuncio, at the great Diet of Warsaw. As Possevino several times interposed his mediation between Poland and the German empire, he was, as could be expected, accused of partiality by both parties. The general of his order, Agnaviva, hereupon insisted on his being recalled, and Gregory XIII complied with the demand. Possevino was glad to leave his political toils. He journeyed about as a simple missionary in Livonia, Bohemia, Saxony, and Upper Hungary. While thus engaged lie was called to Padua to hold lectures: there he became acquainted with the young count of Sales, whom he prevailed upon to leave the law for the Church, and who became St. Francis de Sales.

After four years spent at Padua, he was called to Rome, where he took some pains in trying to reconcile Henry IV with the pope. This direction of his zeal displeased the Spanish party and his superiors, and he was sent to Bologna as rector of the college. He was at Venice when Paul V put the city interdict; and here was a new case of mediation for the old man. He died at Ferrara Feb. 26, 1611. Among his works are, Del Sacrifizio del Altare (Lyons, 1563, 8vo): — Il Soldato Cristicno (Rome, 1569, 12mo), written at Pius V's request, when this pontiff sent troops to Charles IX against the Huguenots: — Moscoria, seml de rebus Moscoviticis (Wilna, 1586, 8vo; Cologne, 1587- 95, fol.; Ital. transl. 1596, 4to): — Judicium de quatuor sciptoribtus (Rome, 1592, 12mo; Lyons, 1593, 8vo). The four authors are Le None, Jean Bodin, Duplessis-Mornay, and Machiavelli. Possevino was here misled by his zeal against the Protestants; and as to Machiavelli, he refuted him without reading his works: — Bibliothecau selecta de ratione  Studioruna (Rome, 1593, 2 vols. fol.; new ed. with correct. and addit., Cologne, 1607, 2 vols. fol.): — Apparatus sacer (Venice, 1603-6, 3 vols. fol.; Cologne, 1607, 2 vols. fol.); this is the greatest catalogue of ancient and modern authors that had been seen at that time. Although he had especially in view the interest of the Roman Catholic Church, yet he did not, like Bellarmin, Sixtus of Siena, and others, confine his task to the enumeration of ecclesiastical writers his plan includes the profane too. He treats of nearly eight thousand writers-their lives, works, influence, editions: — Vitac di Lodovico Gonzaga(, Ducer di Nevers, di Eleonora, Duchessa di Mantora (1604, 4to). See Ranke, Hist. of the Papacy. 1, 434 sq.; 2,21 sq.; Alzog, Kircheenfesch. 2, 341, 425, 466; Mosheim, Eccles. Hist. vol. 3; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.

## Possidius, St[[@Headword:Possidius, St]]

             a prelate of the early Eastern Church, flourished at the close of the 4th and the commencement of the 5th century. He was a disciple of St. Augustine, and lived on intimate terms with him all his life. On being raised in 397 to the episcopal see of Calamo, a town in Numidia, at no great distance from Hippo-Regius, he endeavored to oppose the assemblies which pagans and Donatists were continually holding in spite of the imperial decrees. The pagans avenged themselves by setting fire to his church and compelling him to flee to Hippo. Recalled after a few years, Possidius was a member of all important assemblies held in Africa about Church matters, especially of the famous conference at Carthage in 411, in which none after St. Augustine played a more prominent part than himself. He was also at the Councils of Carthage and of Miletus, where Pelasgus and Celestius were condemned. He was also sent abroad on important missions. Thus in A.D. 410 he was one of four prelates dispatched by the orthodox party in Africa to Honorius for the purpose of soliciting a repeal of the law which had been passed by their heretical opponents. Expelled from Calamo in 428 by Genseric, king of the Vandals, he assisted St. Augustine in his late moments, and wrote the life of the great saint, with a list of his works. He died after 431. The Roman Catholic Church has consecrated the 17th of May to his memory. Two tracts by Possidius, to which reference was made above, are still extant. They are entitled, Vita Augustina; Indiculus Scriptorum Augustini. These are attached to all the best editions of Augustine. The best edition of the Vita, in a separate form, is that of Salinus (Rome, 1731, 8vo) and Aug. Vindel (1768); of the Indiculus, that published at Venice (1735, 8vo). -  Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.; Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. s.v.

## Possinus, Pierre[[@Headword:Possinus, Pierre]]

             a French Jesuit, was born at Narbonne in 1590. He was an excellent Hebrew and Greek scholar, and died at Rome towards the end of the 17th century. He published, Thesaurus Asceticus, etc. (Paris, 1684): — Collationes Isidoranae, etc. (Rome, 1670): — Nili Opera (1639): — Nili Epistolae (1657), etc. See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:878, 880, 881,896, 897, 898; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Post[[@Headword:Post]]

             (courant) is the rendering of רָוֹ, râts (Sept. βιβλιοφόρος. Vulg. cursor, 2Ch 30:6; 2Ch 30:10; Est 3:13; Est 3:15; Est 8:10; Est 8:14; Job 9:25; Jer 51:31), a runner, or “glard,” as elsewhere rendered; a courier or carrier of messages, such as is common in Oriental countries. SEE ANGAREUO.

The term post is used to indicate primarily the person who conveyed with speed any message; and subsequently the means of regular postal communications. Some writers have thought that the use of posts as a system originated with the Persians. Diodorus Siculus observes that the kings of Persia, in order to have intelligence of what was passing through all the provinces of their vast dominions, placed sentinels at eminences at convenient distances where towers were built. These sentinels gave notice of public occurrences from one to another, with a very loud and shrill voice, by which news was transmitted from one extremity of the kingdom to another with great expedition. But as this could not be practiced except in the case of general news, which it was expedient that the whole nation should be acquainted with, Cyrus, as Xenophon relates, appointed couriers and places for post-horses, building for the purpose on all the high-roads houses for the reception of the couriers, where they were to deliver their packets to the next, and so on. ‘This they did night and day, so that no inclemency of weather was to stop them: and they are represented as moving with astonishing speed. Herodotus owns that nothing swifter was known for a journey by land. Xerxes, in his famous expedition against Greece, planted posts from the AEgean Sea to Shushan or Susa, to send notice thither of what might happen to his army; he placed also messengers from station to station, to convey his packets, at such distances from each other as a horse might easily travel. ‘The regularity and swiftness of the Roman posts were likewise admirable. Gibbon observes, “The advantage of receiving the earliest intelligence, and of conveying their orders with celerity, induced the emperors to establish throughout their extensive dominions the regular institution of posts. Houses were everywhere erected at the distance only of five or six miles; each of them was constantly provided with forty horses; and by the help of these relays it was easy to travel a hundred miles a day along the Roman roads.”

In the time of  Theodosius, Cesarius, a magistrate of high rank, went by post from Antioch to Constantinople. He began his journey at night, was in Cappadocia (165 miles from Antioch) the ensuing evening, and arrived at Constantinople the sixth day about noon. The whole distant was 725 Roman, or 665 English miles. This service seems to have been very laxly performed till the time of Trajan, previous to whose reign the Roman messengers were in the habit of seizing for the public service any horses that came in their way. Some regularity was observed from this time forward, as in the Theodosian code mention is made of post-horses, and orders given for their regulation. Throughout all this period posts were only used on special occasions. Letters from private persons-were conveyed by private hands, and were confined for the most part to business of sufficient urgency. Yet the correspondence of ancient times, if we may judge from the immense number of Egyptian, Babylonian, and Persian seals still in existence, must have been far from inconsiderable. The institution of posts disappeared from Europe with the breaking up of the Roman Empire, and its re-establishment is generally attributed to Louis XI of France, in the middle of the 15th century.

## Post (2)[[@Headword:Post (2)]]

             (stationary) is the rendering in the A. V. of the following words:

1. אִיַל, ayil (Sept. τὸ αἴθριον, Vulg. fronzs), properly a ram (as in Gen 15:9, and often); hence perhaps a pilaster or buttress (Eze 40:9-49; Eze 41:1; Eze 41:3; “lintel,” 1Ki 6:31). In the Sept. it is sometimes left untranslated (αἴλ, αἰλεῦ, αἰλάμ); and in the Chaldee version it is represented by a modification of itself. Throughout the passages of Ezekiel in which it occurs the Vulg. uniformly renders it byfirons: which Gesenius quotes as favorable to his own view, provided that byjfions be understood the projections in front of the building. The A. V. of 1Ki 6:31, “lintel,” is supported by the versions of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion of Eze 40:21; while Kimchi explains it generally by “post.” The Peshito-Syriac uniformly renders the word by a modification of the Greek παραστάδες, “pillars.” Jarchi understands by ayil a round column like a large tree; Aquila (Eze 40:14), having in view the meaning “ram,” which the word elsewhere bears. renders it κρίωμα, apparently intending thereby to denote the volutes of columns curved like rams horns. J. I). Michaelis (Supp. ad Lex. s.v.) considers it to be the tympanum or triangular area of the pediment above a gate supported  by columns. Gesenius himself, after reviewing the passages in which the word occurs, arrives at the conclusion that in the singular it denotes the whole projecting framework of a door or gateway, including the jambs on either side, the threshold, and the lintel or architrave, with frieze and cornice. In the plural it is applied to denote the projections along the front of an edifice ornamented with columns or palm trees, and with recesses or intercolumniations between them sometimes filled up by windows. Under the former head he places 1Ki 6:31, Eze 40:9; Eze 40:21; Eze 40:24; Eze 40:26; Eze 40:29; Eze 40:31; Eze 40:33-34; Eze 40:36-38; Eze 40:48-49; Eze 41:3; while to the latter he refers 40:10, 14, 16; 41:1. Another explanation still is that of Bittcher (quoted by Winer, Real. 2, 575), who says that ayil is the projecting entrance and passage wall-which might appropriately be divided into compartments by paneling; and this view is adopted by Furst (Handw. s.v.). Akin to this is אֵילָם, eylam, “an arch,” only used in the plur. (Eze 40:16, etc.), probably a portico, and so rendered by Symmachus and Syriac versions (Gesen. Thesaur. p. 48).

2. אִמָּה, ammâh (Sept. ὑπέρθυρον, Vulg. superliminare), literally, mother, or cubit, as the fundamental relation; foundation (Isa 6:4).

3. מְּזוּזָה, mezuzah (Sept. σταθμός, φλιά; Vulg. postis), the door-post (the usual term). SEE MEZUZAH. The ceremony of boring the ear of a voluntary bondsman was performed by placing the ear against the doorpost of the house (Exo 21:6; see Juven. Sat. 1, 103, and Plant. Paem. 5, 2, 21). The posts of the doors of the Temple were of olive-wood (1Ki 6:33).

4. סִ, saph (Sept. φλιά, πρόπυλον; Vulg. limen, superliniare), the threshold (2Ch 3:7; Eze 41:16; Amo 9:1; elsewhere “threshold,” “door,” or “gate”). SEE DOOR.

## Post, Christian Frederick[[@Headword:Post, Christian Frederick]]

             a distinguished but somewhat erratic Mioravian missionary, was born in 1710 at Conlitz, in Polish Prussia. He immigrated to America in 1742. He preached, after his arrival in this country, among the Indians, with whom he was connected by marriage, his first wife, Rachel, having been a baptized Womrpanoag, and his second wife, Agnes, a baptized Delaware. His earliest missionary labors extended over parts of New England and New York. In 1745, while among the Mohawks, he was arrested on the  false charge of being a French spy, sent to New York, and there confined for seven weeks in the jail of the City Hall. His companion, David Zeisberger (q.v.), shared the same lot. The protest of Governor Thomas and other influential Pennsylvanians at last secured their release. After the death of his second Indian wife-his third wife was a white woman— he returned to Europe, and thence, in 1752, sailed to Labrador, attempting to bring the Gospel to the Esqtinaunx. Having come back to Pennsylvania in 1754, lie established himself in the Wyoming Valley, where he instructed the Indians and entertained traveling missionaries until the breaking out of the French and Indian War. In the course of this war, in the summer of 1758, at the instance of the government of Pennsylvania, he undertook a perilous journey through the Indian country as far as Ohio, inducing the Western tribes which were in league with France to bury the hatchet and send deputies to a congress at Easton. This congress resulted in a general pacification, which embraced all the nations except the Twightwees. Undaunted by the dangers of his first tour, he thereupon visited the Indian country a second time, and induced the Twightwees also to conclude peace. Post thus conferred an incalculable benefit upon the colonies, and indirectly helped to bring the North American continent under the sway of the Anglo-Saxon race. The journal of his first tour, which caused a great sensation at the time, was published in London in 1759, in a work entitled An Enquiry into the Causes of the Alienation of the Delaware and Shawnee Indians from the British Interest, etc. It is also found in the Penn. Archives, 3, 520-544. After the war Post began (1761) an independent mission on the Tuscarawas, Ohio. The breaking out of the Pontiac conspiracy compelled him to retire. He went to the South, and in the beginning of 1764 sailed from Charleston to Mosquitia, where he preached to the natives. In 1767 he visited the colonies, but returned again to Mosquitia. After that we lose sight of him until 1784, when he is found residing in Germantown, Pa. There he died, April 29, 1785, and was buried in the Lower Graveyard of that place by the Rev. William White (afterwards bishop White), rector of Christ Church, Philadelphia. (E. de S.)

## Post, Henry Albertson[[@Headword:Post, Henry Albertson]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Brooklyn, N. Y., Sept. 2, 1835. He received careful parental training, enjoyed all the advantages of the academies of New England, and graduated at the New York Free Academy. He studied theology in the Union Seminary, New York, and subsequently in the Princeton Seminary, N. J., where he graduated in 1858,  and was licensed and ordained over the Church in Warrensburgh, N. Y., Jan. 10, 1860: this was his only charge, for he died Nov. 12, 1861. Mr. Post died in the very midst of his active work; still his short ministry gave full proof of his calling, and many souls were added to the Church. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1863, p. 308. (J. L. S.)

## Post, Reuben[[@Headword:Post, Reuben]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Cornwall, Vt., in 1792. He received a good academical training, and graduated with honor at Middlebury College, Vt., in 1814, and at the Theological Seminary at Princeton, N. J., in 1818. On leaving the seminary, he spent some time as a missionary in Virginia, then accepted a call from the First Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., and was ordained in 1819. In 1836 he accepted a call from the Circular Church, Charleston, S. C., where he labored faithfully for twenty-three years, when lie was taken ill, and died Sept. 24, 1858. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1860, p. 77. (J. L. S.)

## Post, Trutman Marcellus, D.D[[@Headword:Post, Trutman Marcellus, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born in Middlebury, Vermont, June 3, 1810; graduated from Middlebury College in 1829; was tutor there, 1829- 32; student at Andover, 1832; professor of languages and history at Illinois College, 1833-47; pastor, 1840-82; corporate member of the American Board from 1857, and its preacher at Salem, 1871; director A.H.M. Society, 1863-83. He was also lecturer on history at Washington University, St. Louis: on ecclesiastical history in Chicago Theological Seminary; and on congregationalism in Andover Theological Seminary. He died December 31, 1886. He published, The Skeptical Era in Modern History (1856), and several pamphlets.

## Post-Millennialists[[@Headword:Post-Millennialists]]

             the name applied to the large body of Christians belonging to all denominations who believe that the second coming of Christ will not precede, as the Pre-Millennialists allege, but follow after the Millennium (q.v.).

## Post-Pridie[[@Headword:Post-Pridie]]

             (or the COLLECTIO POST MYSTERIUM or POST SECRETA, as it is called in the Gallican office) is the prayer of the Anaphorae (q.v.) of the Mozarabic liturgy. Various opinions are entertained regarding the belief of the Eastern Church on the doctrine of the Invocation of the Holy Ghost (q.v.) in the consecration of the elements. These opinions may be summarized in the following three:

(1) That the Eastern Church gives it no effect in the act of consecration, believing that to take place solely, entirely, and properly in the words of institution.

(2) That it believes both the words of institution and those of invocation to be coordinately efficacious to the same end.

(3) That the whole force of the consecration is vested in the invocation. (For the history of the controversy, see Neale, Introd. 1, 493 sq.) Neale, than whom there is no better authority on the subject, believes “that the sense of the Oriental Church may be thus expressed: The bread and wine  offered on the altar are transmuted into the body and blood of Christ by the words of institution, and by the invocation of the Holy Ghost by the Church; and if either of these things be wanting, the Eucharist, so far forth as the orthodox Eastern Church is concerned, is not valid. I make the limitation because the Oriental Church has not condemned her Roman sister for the omission of the invocation” (Introd. 1, 496).

The Post-Pridie varies with the festival on which it is used. Thus, e.g, the prayer said on the first Sunday after apparition is as follows:

“Mindful, O Lord, of thy precepts, we earnestly pray thee that thou wouldst pour forth on these sacrifices the plenitude of thy Holy Ghost, that while we receive them blessed of thee, we may in all ways rejoice that we are filled with all manner of benediction, and are freed from the bonds of our sins. Amen. Through this gift, holy Lord, for thou createst all these things very good for us, thy unworthy servants, sanctifiest them, quickenest them, blessest them, and grantest to us that they may be blessed of thee, our God, to ages of ages. Amen.”

Cardinal Bona, who calls the belief of the Greeks a detestandus error, though he denies it to be more than an opinion held by some members of the Eastern Church, is rather baffled by the Mozarabic office. He tries to prove that it is only to be taken relatively to the receiver, and quotes the Mass for the first Sunday after Pentecost: “Be pleased to bless and sanctify to us the gifts,” etc. By parity of reasoning it might be argued that the Roman Church only believes in a relative change, because the prayer in the canon runs, respecting the yet unconsecrated bread and wine, “that to us they may become the body and blood of Jesus Christ.” The Post-Pridie in the Gotho-Hispanic rite seems always to have contained this invocation; but in the mutilation and changes to which that office has been subjected comparatively few masses have retained it in direct terms. The Post-Pridie for Easter-day, though not containing a direct invocation of the Holy Ghost, has a most remarkable prayer for change: “Ut hic tibi panis cum hoc calice oblatus in Filii tui Corpus et Sanguinem, te benedicente, ditescat.” This may be profitably compared with the Ximenian Post-Pridlie for Corpus Christi; the difference is astonishing: “Ut panis hic transmutatus in Carnem, et calix transformatus in Sanguinem,” etc. In some instances the prayer for the descent of the Holy Ghost is changed into a prayer for the descent of Christ; as, for example, in the first (=second) Sunday after Easter: “Christe . . . his sacrificiis propitius illabere, bisque benedicturus  descende.” The corruption sometimes takes a curious turn: thus on July 25 the Post-Pridie prays that by the intercession of St. Christopher the offerers may be filled with the Holy Ghost. We may gather on the whole that Ximenes, who (like Bona) must have considered the prayer for any change after the words of institution a detestable error, softened the expression in many cases, and omitted it in many others; though enough is still left to show us what the original design of the prayer was. SEE LITURGY. (J.H.W.)

## Post-Sanctus[[@Headword:Post-Sanctus]]

             SEE POST-PRIDIE.

## Postel, Guillaume[[@Headword:Postel, Guillaume]]

             one of the most learned Frenchmen of his time, is celebrated especially as one of the wildest religious visionaries the world has ever encountered. He was born May 28, 1505 (according to some historians, 1510), at Dolerie, near Barenton, in Normandy. He lost his parents early, and poverty compelled him to leave his country. At the age of thirteen years he found at Say, near Pontoise, a modest situation as schoolmaster. He saved some money, and went to Paris to pursue his studies. There he was the victim of a robbery, which reduced him to extreme misery, and he was confined by sickness to a hospital for two years. When he was restored to health, his poverty and the high price of living compelled him to leave Paris, and to support himself by gleaning in the Beauce. Afterwards he entered the College of Sainte-Barbe in the quality of a servant; there he became by private study one of the most learned Hebraists of his time. No less remarkable was his proficiency in the Greek language.

He lived successively in Amiens and Rouen, and then went back to Paris to become a tutor. He accompanied La Forest to Constantinople to transact some political business. He went a second time to the capital of Turkey with the heirs of a citizen of Tours, who had died leaving 300,000 ducats as a deposit in the hands of Ibrahim Pasha. Postel improved these occasions to study the Arabic language, and brought back with him a number of  manuscripts in Arabic and Syriac. The New Testament in Syriac, which he was the first to bring to Europe, was printed at the expense of the emperor Ferdinand I. Shortly after this Postel published an alphabet in twelve languages, and some other writings. His learning was now acknowledged by king Francis I, and he was given in 1539 a professorship of mathematics and Oriental languages, with a salary of 200 ducats, which allowed him much leisure to devote himself to linguistic studies; but he lost his chair when chancellor Poyet, his benefactor, fell into disgrace. Postel thereupon repaired to Vienna, where he helped Job. Alb. Widmanstadt in the publication of his New Testament in Syriac (printed in 1555). Compelled to leave that city for motives unknown, he was mistaken for a murderer who had some likeness to him, and arrested on the frontier of the Venetian territory. He succeeded in escaping his captors, and went to Rome in 1544.

He there made the acquaintance of Ignatius de Loyola, and determined to enter the Order of the Jesuits. But the head of the neophyte was full of fantastic ideas, due to the study of the rabbins, and also to the study of the stars. After a two-years' novitiate he was expelled from the order, and Ignatius prohibited all intercourse with him. Postel having exposed in some writings his mystical ideas, he was imprisoned. Escaping to Venice, he was denounced to the Inquisition but was dismissed by that tribunal, being considered more a fool than a heretic. He afterwards lived in Genoa and Basle. Beza asserts that Postel offered to abjure his errors and to enter one of the Protestant communities, which seems doubtful. It appears that in 1553 he was a teacher of mathematics at Dijon, when his obnoxious opinions compelled him again to flee. He lived for some time at the court of the emperor Ferdinand I, whence, after a public abjuration of his opinions, he was recalled to his former situation at the College of France by Francis I, but soon lost it again, and spent the last eighteen years of his life in the monastery of Saint-Martin des Champs. “In his old age,” says a contemporary, “princes and men of science paid their visits to the venerable recluse at Saint-Martin des Champs, where he lived. He there sat in his chair, his white beard falling down to his girdle; and in his deportment was such a majesty, such gravity in everything he said, that no one ever left him without a wish to see him again, and without astonishment at what he had heard.” He died Sept. 6,1581. It was during his life at the monastery that Postel published in 1572 his ideas about the comet which appeared in that year, and in 1575 a new edition of his Histoires Orientles, dedicated to Francis of Valois. He says in the dedication that Catharine de'Medici had made choice of him for preceptor  of her son Francis, and that lie declined the position on account of the dangers of the court, which he had painfully experienced in his own life. It is related by contemporaries that when he lectured at Paris, at the College of the Lombards, he drew such crowds that, the great room of the institute being too narrow, he caused his auditors to go down into the yard, and spoke to them from a window. Maldoniatus says that “there came out of his mouth as many oracles as words.” He may have been wrongly accused of atheism, but he entertained strange theological opinions. Among the wild and extravagant notions that he entertained, one was that he had died, and risen again with the soul of Adam; whence lie called himself “Postellmus restitutus;” he also maintained that women shall have the dominion over men, and that his writings were revealed to him by Jesus Christ. He was therefore confident of being able to explain by reason and philosophy all Christian dogmas, inclusive of the mysteries, his personal reason having become so superior to that of other men that by its means he would convert all nations to the Christian faith. “Christ has given,” he said, “the excellence of faith to the apostles; but faith being now almost extinct, he gave us, and especially to me, instead of the faith, nay, with the faith, Reason, so powerful and victorious, as never did the apostles have it. And thus innumerable things in the Scripture and in nature, which never were understood, by said victorious reason will be understood.”

He asserted that the human soul of Christ was created and united with the eternal Word before the creation of the world. He affirmed that everything that was in nature was described in the heavens in Hebrew characters, formed by the arrangement of the stars. The world was to subsist only for 6000 years, an opinion he had taken from the Jewish Cabala. The end of the world will be preceded by the restoration of all things into the state they were in before the fall of Adam. He dreamed of the fusion of all religions into one creed; and in his desire to reconcile Christians, Jews, and Mohammedan, undertook to explain the most extravagant opinions. But, whatever judgment we may pronounce on his opinions, justice compels us to recognize that all historians commend the purity of his life, the wisdom of his conduct, and the benevolence of his character: lie often neglected his own interests to take care of others'. He left, Linguarum XII charactemribus differentium alphabetuma introductio ac legendi methodus (Paris, 1538, 4to): — De or iginibus seu de Hebraicce linguce et gentis antiquitate atque variarum linguarum affitate (ibid. 1538, 4to): — Grammatica Arabica (ibid. 1538, 4to): — Syrie descriptio (ibid. 1540, 8vo): — De magistratibus Atheniensiun (Basle, 1543, 8vo; Leipsic, 1591,  8vo, with the notes of John Frederick Hekelius): — Alcoranti seue legis Mahometi et evangelistarum concordiae liber (Paris, 1543, 8vo): — Sactrarum aspodexeon, seu Euclidis Christiani libri 2 (ibid. 1543): — IV liborum de orbis terre concordia primus (ibid. 8vo): — De rationibus Spiritus Sancti (ibid. 1543, 8vo); in this work Postel endeavors to prove that there is nothing in religion that is not in accordance with nature and reason: — De orbis terrcs concordice libri 4 (Basle, 1544, 8vo); it is the best of Postel's works, and expounds with much talent his favorite ideas about the conversion of all the nations of the world: — De nativitate Mediatoris ultima, nunc fltura et toti orbi ferrarum ins singulis ratione preeditis manifestanda opus (ibid, 1547, 8vo): — Absconditorum at constitutione mundi clavis, qua mens humana tam in divinis quam in humanis pertinget ad interiora velamnina aetnae veritatis (ibid. 16mo; and with appendix, Amst. 1646, 16mo): — Candelabri typici in Mosis tabernamculo jussu divino expressi interpretatio (Venice, 1548-Hebrew, Latin, and French): — De Etruriae iregionis, que prima in orbe Europseo habitata est, originlibus, institutis, religione, et moribus (Florence, 1551, 4to): — Les Raisons de la Monarchie, et quels Moyens sont necessaire pour y parvenir (Paris, 1551, 8vo): — Abrahami patriarchae liber Jesirath, sive formationis mundi, patribus quidem Abrahami tempora precedentibus revelatur, etc. (ibid. 1552, 16mo): — De causis seu de principiis et originibus naturae utriusque (ibid. 1552, 16mo): — Eversiofaldsorum Aristotelis dogmatum (ibid. 1552. 16mo): — L'histoire memorable des Expeditions depuis le Deluge, foites par les Gauloys ou Francoys depuis la France jusques in Asie, ou en Thrace, et en l'orientale Partie de l'Europe (ibid. 1552, 16mo): — De Phoenicum- litteris, seut de prisco Latine et Graecae linguae charactere (ibid. 1552, 8vo): Tabule in astronomliaem, in arithmeticam theoricam et in musicam theoricam (ibid. 1552): — La Loi Salique, livret de la premiere humaine Veiite (ibid. 1552, 16mo; Lyons, 1559, 16mo): — Promto-Evangelium Jacobi, fratris et potissin eum orbi Latino ad hanc diem incognita aut inconsidoerata historiat (ibid. 1553, 8vo): — Descriptio Donini (Basle, 1552, 8vo): — De Originibus, seu de varia des Gaules (Paris, 1553, fol.): — Signoum caelestium vera cofiguratio et significationum expositio (ibid. 1553, 8vo): — La Doctrine du Siecle dore, ou de l'evangelique Regne de Jesus, Roy des Roys (ibid. 1551, 16mo; reprinted with the following): — Les tres marveilleuses Victoires es s Femmes du Nouveau-Monde; et comme, elles doivent a tout le Monde par Raison commander, et mome i ceux qui auront la Monarchie du Monde Vieil (ibid. 1553, 16mo). This book has  become very rare and precious. Postel declares that he speaks in the name and by the inspiration of a certain mere Jeanne, whom he had known in Italy, and whose substance has been absorbed by his own: — Des Merveilles des Indes et du Noveau-Monde ou est demontre le Lieu du Paridis terrestre (ibid. 1553, 16mo): — Description de la Terre-Sainte (ibid. 1553, 16 mo): — Le prime nove dell' altro mondo, eioi l'ammirabile storia intitolata: La Vergine Venetiana (1555, 12 mo); — De la Republique des Tures et des Maeurs et Loys de tous les Mahumedistes (Poiters, 1560, 4to):— Cosmographiae discipline Compendiu m, cum synopsi rerum toto orbe gestarum (Basle, 1561, 4to):— La Concordance des quatre Evangiles (Paris, 1562, 16 mo):— Les permiers Elements d'Euclide Chretien en Vers (ibid. 1562 8vo):— De universitate seu cosmographia (ibid. 1563 4to reprinted several times): — De raris histories et de admirandis rebus quae a quinquaginta amnis contegerunt (1553-83; Paris 1563, 4to). Postel is one of the authors to whom the celebrated work De tribus impostoribus has been attributed. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v. See Ittig. De Postello (Leips. 1704); Desbillons, Sur la Vie de Postel (Liege, 1773); Sainte-Marthe, Eloges; Thevet, Hist. des Hommes illustres; Desbillons, Noveaux Eclaircissements sur la Vie de Postel; Collmieo, Gallia Orientalis; De Thou, Eloges des Savants; Sallengre, Memoires de la Litterature, vol. 1 and 2; Marrier, Hist de Saint-Martin des Champs; Niceron, Memoires, vol 8; Chaufepie, Remarques sur Postel; Goujet, Mem. hist. sur le College Royal. Lelong also names a Vie de Postel by the abbé Joly, canon at Dijon. See also Brunet, Manuel du Libraire, 4, 822; Frere, Manuel du Bibliographie Normand; Hallam, Introd. to the Literature of Europe (Harper's ed.), 1, 240, 406.

## Postil[[@Headword:Postil]]

             (Latin postilla) originally designated in the ecclesiastical language of mediaevalism explanatory remarks accompanying the text of the Bible, mostly in the form of sermons or homilies. The name sprung from the fact that these were usually delivered immediately after the reading of the Gospel, and were explanatory of it. Its etymology is to be found in the words “post illa verba textus” or “sacrae scripturae,” the first two words being combined in one, which is used as noun and verb (postilla, postilla- re). Charlemagne ordered a homiliarium to be composed for the clergy of his empire, in which the pericopes or texts of the Sundays and holydays are followed by a homily from one of the celebrated ancient preachers. This  collection was long in use in the German empire, and was often called Postilla. But the meaning of the word became more comprehensive in the latter part of the Middle Ages, when a running commentary of Scripture was called Postilla, because the text was first exhibited, and post illa (after the words of the text) the comments of the writer. Thus we find “Postillavit evangelia, epistolas Pauli,” etc. The most remarkable of these postillae is that of the celebrated exegete Nicolas de Lyra (q.v.), under the title “Postillae perpetuae in Biblia,” or “Postills in universa Biblia.” Luther, by his well-known “Postilla,” introduced the word among the Protestant communions. It is still, but less frequently, employed, and only in the Church of Rome or of England, for collections of sermons connected with the pericopes of Sundays and holydays. See Siegel, Christliche Alterthibner (see Index in vol. 4); Wheatly, On the Book of Common Prayer, p. 272.

## Postmillenarians[[@Headword:Postmillenarians]]

             SEE PREMILLENARIANS.

## Postulate[[@Headword:Postulate]]

             (αἴτημα, postulatum, that which is asked or assumed to prove something else). “According to some, the difference between axioms and postulates is analogous to that between theorems and problems: the former expressing truths which are self-evident, and from which other propositions may be deduced; the latter, operations which may easily be performed, and by the help of which more difficult constructions may be effected.” There is a difference between a postulate and a hypothesis. When you lay down something which may be, although you have not proved it, and which is admitted by the learner or the disputant, you make a hypothesis. The postulate, not being assented to, may be contested during the discussion, and is only established by its conformity with all other ideas on the subject.

## Postulation[[@Headword:Postulation]]

             (Lat. i.e. an asking) is a term in ecclesiastical law designating a presentation or recommendation addressed to the superior to whom the right of appointment to any dignity belongs, in favor of one who has not a strict title to the appointment. Thus, if a chapter elect for bishop a person who wants one of the canonical requirements, or if there is a canonical impediment, the act of the chapter is not properly an election, but a request to the pope for dispensation and admission. It can only take place when the wanted requirements are of a trifling description. It is also used in the case of the presentation of candidates for the episcopacy as it exists in the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland. See Neller, De postulatione prelatorum, in Schmidt, Thes jur. can. 2, 733.

## Postures[[@Headword:Postures]]

             are the bodily attitudes assumed in the various parts of divine worship, whether public or private. No act whatever can be performed without the body taking some posture. This is the case in divine worship as well as in matters of less consequence. The only question, therefore, is whether all possible postures are equally appropriate in that worship and in its different departments. Reason, Scripture, and universal consent testify that they are not. Kneeling and prostration seem peculiarly expressive of penitent humility; bowling, of deep veneration; standing, of joy and thanksgiving. They are all the natural expressions of the feeling which accompanies or characterizes the particular devotion in which they are employed, and are used by supplicants to man as well as to God. The four postures above mentioned are found to have been used by the ancient Christians in their prayer-standing, kneeling, bowing, and prostration. Standing was the posture generally observed on the Lord's Day, and the fifty days between Easter and Pentecost, in memory of the Savior's resurrection. This custom is traced up to an early period, and the reason assigned by Justin Martyr is, “For as much as we ought to remember both our fall and our sin, and the grace of Christ by which we rise again from our fall, therefore we pray, kneeling, six days, as a symbol of our fall by sin; but our not kneeling on the Lord's day is a symbol of the resurrection, whereby, through the grace of Christ we are delivered from our sins, and from death that is mortified thereby.” Kneeling was the customary posture of devotion. Bowing down the head was chiefly used in receiving the bishop's or priest's benediction, and in all formal addresses to God for his mercy and favor on the people, whether catechumens, penitents, or others. In the paintings of the catacombs, and on the ancient enameled glasses found therein, the standing posture in prayer is accompanied by outstretched and upraised hands. The bowing posture was rather a special act of reverence accompanying a particular address or a particular part of an address than a sustained posture. It occurred at frequent intervals in the ancient liturgy, and is still used in the Roman mass as well as (even more profusely) in those of all the various rites, Greek, Syrian. Coptic, Armenian, and Russian. Prostration was taken from the Jewish Church, and was chiefly appropriated to deep humiliations and expressions of shame or sorrow on particular occasions, and was mainly used by the Penitents (q.v.), especially in that grade of public penance which was known under the name “prostration.” It is also used still in the solemn ordination of subdeacons, deacons, and priests. as  performed in the Roman Catholic Church. The question as to the use of particular postures was a subject of much controversy between the Puritans and the Church of England, and has recently been revived in the Presbyterian Church of Scotland. SEE ATTITUDE; SEE PRAYER.

## Postvorta[[@Headword:Postvorta]]

             a surname of the Roman goddess Carmenta, indicating her knowledge of the past, just as Altevorta denotes her knowledge of the future.

## Pot[[@Headword:Pot]]

             a term applicable to so many sorts of vessels that it can scarcely be restricted to any one in particular. SEE BASIN; SEE CUP, etc. But from the places where the word is used we may collect the uses, and also in part the materials of the utensils implied. This vessel, so necessary in cooking and serving up food (Num 11:8; Jdg 6:19; 1Sa 2:14; 2Ki 4:38 sq.; 2Ch 35:13; Isa 65:4; Mic 3:3; Eze 11:3; Eze 24:3 sq.), derives its ordinary names from its use in boiling. It was commonly, among the Israelites, made of clay (Heb. חֹמֶר, Gr. πήλος; comp. Isa 29:16; Isa 45:9; Jer 18:4). But there were also brazen pots (Lev 8:28), especially in the sanctuary (1Ki 7:45; 2Ki 25:14). The trade of the potters, called יֹצְרַים (comp. Gesenius, Monumenta Phoen. p. 161) or יֹצְדֵי חֶרֶשׁ(Jer 19:1), in Greek κεραμεῖς, was a separate pursuit, to whose mysteries allusions are often made (Jer 18:2 sq.; Sir 38:30; Sirach cf., 33 sq.). It was necessary first to work the clay with the feet, to make it plastic (Isa 41:25), and then to shape it with the hand (Jer 18:4; Jer 18:6; Sir 33:13; Sir 38:30) and the Oriental potter's wheel ( אָבְנִיַםJer 18:3; see Gesenius, Thesaur. 1, 16). The vessels were glazed (Sir 38:31; Pro 26:23), and then burned in the oven (κάμινος, Sirach , 1. c.). BAhr (Symbolik, 2, 293) and Sommer (Bibl. Abhandl. 1, 213) assume, indeed, that the Hebrews were ignorant of glazing, and explain the passages (Lev 6:21; Lev 11:33; Lev 15:12) which command the breaking of earthen vessels made unclean by this want of glazing. There are, indeed, no pots extant from Egyptian antiquity, but earthen figures show a glazing upon them; and it would be unreasonable to suppose that the Egyptians had failed to apply the art to their vessels. There is nothing inexplicable in the command to break the defiled vessels, inasmuch as they were of little value; and any of them might easily have lost part of its glazing, and so  taken in some of the unclean substance; so that breaking was the safest method of disposing of them. Such a command would also produce more care in housekeeping to avoid uncleanness (comp. Descript. de l'Egypte, vol. 2, pl. 87 sq.; 5, pl. 75; Wilkinson , 1, 164). SEE POTTERY.

The following are the words so rendered in the English Bible:

1. אָסוּךְ, asuk (Sept. ἀγγεῖον), applied to holding oil (2Ki 4:2), probably was an earthen jar, deep and narrow, without handles, apparently like the Roman and Egyptian amphora, inserted in a stand of wood or stone (see Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt. 1, 47; Sandys, Trav, p. 150). SEE PITCHER.

2. גָּבַיעִ, gabia (Sept. κεράμιον, Vulg. scyphaus, Jer 35:5; elsewhere “bowl” or “cup”), probably a bulging jar or bowl for liquids. SEE BOWL.

3. דּוּד, dud (Sept. κόφινος, Job 41:20; Psa 81:6; elsewhere “basket,” “caldron,” “kettle”), a vessel for culinary purposes, mentioned (1Sa 2:14) in conjunction with “caldron” and “kettle,” and so perhaps of smaller size. SEE KETTLE.

4. חֶרֶשׂ, cheres (“potsherd,” Job 2:8; Psa 22:15; Pro 26:23; Isa 45:9; elsewhere “earthen,” etc.), an earthen vessel for stewing or seething. Such a vessel was used for baking (Eze 4:9). It is contrasted in the same passage (Lev 6:28) with a metal vessel for the same purpose. SEE POTSHERD.

5. כְּלַי, keli (Sept. σκεῦος, Lev 6:28), a vessel of any kind (as usually elsewhere rendered). SEE VESSEL.

6. כַּיר, kir (only once and in the dual, Lev 11:35, “ranges for pots”). SEE RANGE.

7. סַיר, sir (Sept. λέβης, Vulg. olla, the most usual and appropriate word, Exo 38:3; 2Ki 4:38-41; 2Ki 25:14; 2Ch 4:11; 2Ch 4:16; 2Ch 35:13; Job 41:31; Psa 58:9; Ecc 7:6; Jer 1:13; Eze 24:3; Eze 24:6; Mic 3:3; Zec 14:10; Zec 14:21). It is also used, combined with other words. to denote special uses, as with נָפוּחִ(Jer 1:13), “a seething-pot;” with בָּשָׂר. “flesh” (Exo 16:3);

רָחִוֹ, “washing” (Psa 60:8) מִצְרֵ, “fining-pot” (Pro 27:21).  The blackness which such vessels would contract is alluded to in Joe 2:6. SEE CALDRON.

8. פָּרוּר, parir (Sept. χαλκεῖον, Vulg. cacabus, Jdg 6:19; 1Sa 2:14; “pan,” Num 11:8), apparently an open flat vessel. SEE PAN.

9. צַנְצֶנֶת, tsintse'neth (Sept. σταμνός, Vulg. vas, Exo 16:33), a covered vessel for preserving things (comp. Heb 9:4). SEE MANNA.

10. שְׁפִתִּיַם, shephatta'yim (Sept. κλῆρος, Psa 68:13; “hooks,” Eze 40:43), opposite rows, as of sheepfolds.

11. ξέστης (Mar 7:4; Mar 7:8), properly a sextarius or sixteenth part of the uiedius or “bushel,” =nearly one pint English; hence a cup generally. SEE MEASURE.

12. στάμνος (Heb 9:4), an earthen jug or jar, = No. 9 above.

13. ὑδρία (Joh 2:6-7; Joh 4:28), a “water-pot” for any liquid. The water- pots of Cana appear to have been large amphorae, such as are in use at the present day in Syria (Fisher, Views, p. 56; Jolliffe, 1, 33). These were of stone or hard earthenware; but gold, silver, brass, or copper was also used for vessels both for domestic and also, with marked preference, for ritual use (1Ki 7:45; 1Ki 10:21; 2Ch 4:16; 2Ch 9:20; Mar 7:4; Michaelis, Laws of Moses, § 217, 3, 335, ed. Smith). The water-pot of the Samaritan woman may have been a leathern bucket, such as Bedawin women use (Burckhardt, Notes, 1, 45). SEE WATER-POT.

POT, “HOLY-WATER POT” or “HOLY-WATER VASE,” and Sprinkle (=sprinkling brush), are implements used in Roman Catholic churches for sprinkling the altar and priest and people with the holy water on Sunday. Holy-water pots, such as is represented in the cut; are from five and a quarter to seven and a half inches in diameter.

## Potamiana[[@Headword:Potamiana]]

             a Christian martyr in the time of Severus, in the beginning of the 3rd century, was a slave of rare personal beauty; but for not reciprocating the passion of her master she was given up as a Christian to the prefect of  Egypt. She was scourged; and, unmoved by threats, was led to the fire and burned, together with her mother, Marcella. Scalding pitch was poured upon her body, which she bore with great patience. Basilides, her executioner, embraced Christianity, and suffered martyrdom. See Schaff, Church History, 1, 169.

## Potamius[[@Headword:Potamius]]

             an ecclesiastic of Spanish birth, flourished as bishop of Lisbon in the middle of the 4th century; and if the first of the pieces mentioned below be genuine, he must, in the early part of his career, have been a champion of the Catholic faith. Subsequently, however, he was a zealous Arian, and it is believed that he drew up the document known in ecclesiastical history as The Second Sirmian Creed. The writings usually ascribed to Potamieus are, Epistola ad Athanasiulm Episcopun Alexandrinum de Consubstactialitate Filii Dei, in some MSS. entitled Epistola Potainii ad Athanasium ab Aritais (impetitum?) posquam in Concilio Ariminensi subscripserunt, composed in the year A.D. 355, while the opinions of the author were yet orthodox. The authenticity of this piece, however, which is characterized by great obscurity of thought and of expression, and often half barbarous in phraseology, is very doubtful. It was first published by the Benedictine D'Achery, in his Spicilegium veterum aliquot Scripturm (Paris, 1661, 4to), 2, 366, or 3. 299 of the new edition by Baluze (1717, fol.), and will be foundn in its best form in Galland's Bibliotheca Patrum (Venice, 1769, fol.), 5. 96: — Sermo de Lazaro: — Sermo de Martyrio Essice Prophetae. These are two discourses resembling in style the epistle to Athanasius, long attributed to Zeno, bishop of Verona, and published, without suspicion, among his works, until the brothers Ballerini (S. Zenomis Sermones [ibid. 1739, fol.], p. 297-303) proved that they must be assigned to Potamius, whom however, they supposed to be a person altogether different from the bishop of Lisbon, and belonging to a different age. The arguments which they employ to demonstrate this last position are founded upon the second title of the Epistola ad Athanasium as given above, but this title Galland, Schonemann, and others told to be the blunder of an ignorant transcriber. The Sermones will be found in Galland, and the discussions with regard to the real author in the Prolegomena to the volume, ch. 10, p. 17. See Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Phil. s.v.; Ueberweg, Hist. of Philosophy, vol. 1; II fiele, Conciliengesch. vol. 1.

## Potamo[[@Headword:Potamo]]

             (Ποτάυων, a Greek philosopher of the Alexandrian school, lived in the 3rd century of the Christian era, and was a native of Alexandria. According to Suidas, under Αἵρεσις and Ποτάμεων, he was a contemporary of the emperor Augustus; but Porphyry, in his life of Plotinus, states positively that Plotinus delighted in listening to Potamo's exposition of a new philosophy, of which he was laving the foundations. What was the purport of this new philosophy? It was developed in two treatises, one of which was a commentary on Plato's Timaeuts, the other a treatise on the first principles, Στοιξειώσις Both works are lost; but something is known of the second by a passage of Diogenes Laertius in the introduction to his book On the Life and Doctrines of Illustrious Philosophers. “Of late.” says the biographer, “an eclectic school, ἐκλεκτική τις αἵρεσις, was founded by Potamo of Alexandria, which makes a choice among the doctrines of all sects. Two things, so he explains in his Treatise on the First Principles (Στοιχειώσις), are required to discern the truth: that which judges, reason (τὸ ἡγεμονικόν), and that by the means of which we judge, i.e. the accurate representation of the objects of our judgments. As to the principles of things, he recognizes four of them matter, quality, action, and place (τήν τε ὕλην, καὶ τὸ ποιόν, ποίησίν τε, καὶ τοπον); in other words, out of what, and by whom, how, and where a thing is done (ἐξ ου γάρ, καὶ ὑφ᾿ ου. καὶ πῶς, καὶ ἐν ῳ). The aim towards which everything should tend, according to him, is a life perfect in virtues, without discarding, however, the good of the body, nor general material interests.” It follows from this passage of Diogenes Laertius, combined with the testimony of Porphyry, 1st, that Potamo was the founder of the eclectic school at Rome; 2nd, that he combined the doctrines of Plato with the Stoical and Aristotelian, and was not without original views of his own; 3rd, that in ethics he attempted a kind of conciliation of Stoicism and Epicurism. — Hoefer. But Potamo had no followers in his peculiar combinations. They were supplanted by the school that endeavored to engraft Christianity upon the older system of philosophy. See Porphyry, Vita Plotini, e.g. in Fabricius, Bibl. Grae. 2, 109; Diogenes Laertils, I'Poem. § 21; but especially Brucker, Historia Criticc Philosophis, 2, 193 sq.; Glöckner. De Potamounis Alex. Philosophiac Eclectica, recentiorum Platonicorum Disciplinae admodum dissimili, Disput. (Leips. 1745, 4to), an abstract of which is in Fabricius, 3, 184 sq. For the statement that there  were two or three Potamos there is no ground. See the examination of this point in Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. 2, 513.

## Potent, Cross[[@Headword:Potent, Cross]]

             in heraldry, a cross crutch-shaped at each extremity. It is also called a Jerusalem cross, from its occurrence in the insignia of the Christian kingdom of Jerusalem, which are, Argent a cross potent between four crosslets. This coat is remarkable as being a departure from the usual heraldic rule which prohibits the placing of metal upon metal.

## Potential[[@Headword:Potential]]

             is opposed to actual. This antithesis is a fundamental doctrine of the Peripatetic philosophy. “Aristotle saith that divided they (i.e. bodies) be in infinitum potentially, but actually not” (Holland's Plutarch, p. 667). “Anaximander's infinite was nothing else but an infinite chaos of matter, in which were either actually or potentially contained all manner of qualities” (see Cudworth, Intellectual System, 1, 128).

## Pothier, Remi[[@Headword:Pothier, Remi]]

             a French theologian, was born at Rheims in 1727. After entering the service of the Church he was successively curate of Betheniville and canon of Laon. At the outbreak of the Revolution he retired to Belgium. After his return to his native country he did not again discharge any sacerdotal functions. He entertained original and often strangely bold opinions, and his obstinate character and polemical mania made him the terror of all who approached him. He was convinced that no one before him had made out the true meaning of the Bible; he undertook to make it known to the world, and started with his alleged Explication de l'Apocalypse, the plan of which, published in 1773, was burned by order of the Parliament of Paris at the requisition of the advocate-general Seguier, who pronounced it a masterpiece of human extravagance. Nevertheless Pothier had his work clandestinely printed ill extenso (Douai, 1773, 2 vols. 8vo); he translated it into Latin (Augsburg, 1797, 2 vols. and 1798, 12mo), and published an extract of it, with the title Les Trois Dernlieres Plaies-The Three Last Plagues (1798, 12mo), in which he calls Bonaparte the precursor of the Antichrist. In 1802 he published in Latin an Explanation of the Psalms of David (Augsburg, 8vo). Under the empire two of his pamphlets against the  four articles of the Gallican Church were confiscated by the police. Pothier died at Rheims June 23, 1812. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.

## Pothinus, St[[@Headword:Pothinus, St]]

             a prelate of the Church in the 2nd century, who died a martyr, was probably born at Smyrna in A.D. 87. He was a disciple neither of Peter nor of John, as some writers have asserted, but of Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna. He went to Rome with the latter while Anicetus was bishop of Rome, in 158, and was sent by that pontiff to evangelize the Gauls. Pothillus established himself at Lyons, and founded there a flourishing Church. He had presided over it twenty years when, in the reign of Marcus Aurelius, the persecutions against the Christians broke out with renewed violence. His hoary age did not protect the bishop from persecution. He was brought before the governor, and was asked who was the God of the Christians. “If you are worthy,” said the old bishop, “you will know him.” He was severely beaten, and dragged, half dead, to a dismal dungeon, where he expired two days afterwards, June 2, 177. At the same time with the apostle of Lyons, forty-seven faithful sealed their faith with their blood. These were the first martyrs of the Gauls: their remains were buried beneath the altar of a church built under the invocation of the holy apostles, now consecrated to St. Nizier. The Church celebrates on June 2 the memory of the martyrs of Lyons. Their history was written in Greek, in the name of the faithful of the churches of Lyons, and attributed to Irenaeus, successor of Pothinus. It is one of the most precious monuments of the first centuries of Christianity. We owe its preservation to Eusebius, who inserted it partly in his Hist. Eccles. (lib. 5, cap. 1). — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v. See Longueval, Hist. de l'Eglise Gallicane. liv. 1; Gallia Christiana, vol. 5; Colonia, Antiquites die Lyon, p. 38; Du Trems, Le Clerge de France, vol. 4; Schaff, Hist. of the Christian Church, 1, 167; Mosheim, Commentaries, and Eccles. Hist. vol. 1; Alzog, Kirchengesch. 1. 129, 138.

## Pothos[[@Headword:Pothos]]

             (Πόθος), a personification among tile ancient Greeks of love or desire, and usually regarded as a companion of Aphrolite.

## Potiphar[[@Headword:Potiphar]]

             (Heb. Potiphar', פּוֹטַפִר, contraction of פּוֹטַי פֶרִע, Potipherah [q.v.]; Sept. Πετεφρής), an officer of Pharaoh, probably the chief of his body- guard (Gen 39:1). B.C. cir. 1810. Of the Midianitish merchants he purchased Joseph. The keeper of the prison into which the son of Jacob was eventually cast treated him with kindness, and confided to him the management of the prison (Gen 27:36; Gen 39:1); and this confidence was afterwards sanctioned by the “captain of the guard” himself, as the officer responsible for the safe custody of prisoners of state (Gen 40:3-4). It is sometimes denied, but more usually maintained, that this “captain of the guard” was the same with the Potiphar who is before designated by the same title. It is possible that this “captain of the guard” and Joseph's master were the same person. It would be in accordance with Oriental usage that offenders against the court, and the officers of the court, should be in custody of the captain of the guard; and that Potiphar should have treated Joseph well after having cast him into prison is not irreconcilable with the facts of the case. After having imprisoned Joseph in the first transport of his choler, he might possibly discover circumstances which led him to doubt his guilt, if not to be convinced of his innocence. The mantle left in the hands of his mistress, and so triumphantly produced against him, would, when calmly considered, seem a stronger proof of guilt against her than against him; yet still, to avoid bringing dishonor upon his wife, and exposing her to new temptation, he may have deemed it more prudent to bestow upon his slave the command of the state prison than to restore him to his former employment. SEE JOSEPH.

Potiphar is described as “an officer of Pharaoh, chief of the executioners (סְרַים פִּרְעֹה שִׂר הִטִּבָּחַים), an Egyptian” (Gen 39:1; comp. 37:36). The word we render “officer,” as in the A. V., is literally “eunuch,” and the Sept. and Vulg. so translate it here (σπάδων, eunuchus); but it is also used for an officer of the court, and this is almost certainly the meaning here, as Potiphar was married, which is seldom the case with eunuchs, though some, as those which have the custody of the Kaaba at Mecca, are exceptions, and his office was one which would not usually be held by persons of a class ordinarily wanting in courage, although here again we must except the occasional usage of Muslim sovereigns, whose executioners were sometimes eunuchs, as Haruen er-Rashid's Mesrli, in order that they might be able to carry out the royal commands even in the  harems of the subjects. Potiphar's office was “chief of the executioners,” not, as the Sept. makes it, “of the cooks” (ἀρχιμάγειρος), for the prison was in his house, or, at least, in that of the chief of the executioners, probably a successor of Potiphar, who committed the disgraced servants of Pharaoh to Joseph's charge (Gen 40:2-4). He is called an Egyptian; and it is to be noticed that his name contains that of an Egyptian divinity. He appears to have been a wealthy man, having property in the field as well as in the house, over which Joseph was put, evidently in an important post (Gen 39:4-6). The view we have of Potiphar's household is exactly in accordance with the representations on the monuments, in which we see how carefully the produce of the land was registered and stored up in the house by overseers, as well as the liberty that women of all ranks enjoyed. When Joseph was accused, his master contented himself with casting him into prison (Gen 39:19-20), probably being a merciful man, although he may have been restrained by God from acting more severely. After this we hear no more of Potiphar, unless, which is unlikely, the chief of the executioners afterwards mentioned be he. If he were actually a eunuch, we may the more easily account for his wife's conduct. SEE EUNUCH.

## Potipherah[[@Headword:Potipherah]]

             (Heb. Potiphera, פּוֹטַי פֶרִע), the priest ot On, or Heliopolis, whose daughter Asenath became the witf of Joseph (Gen 41:45; Gen 41:50; Gen 46:20). B.C. cir. 1880. The name is Egyptian, and is in the Sept. accommodated to the analogy of the Egyptian language, being in the Cod. Vatican. Πετεφρῆ; Alex. Πεττεφρῆ, v. r. Πεντεφρή, Πεντεφρί; which corresponds to the Coptic Petephrah, belonging to the Sun, which is written in hieroglyphics thus: (Champollion, Precis, Tabl. General, p. 23). For the various forms, see Gesenius, Thesaur. p. 1094, from Rosellini, Monum. Storici, 1, 117. The name is the full form of that borne by Potiphar, Joseph's former master. SEE ASENATHON.

## Potitii[[@Headword:Potitii]]

             a distinguished family among the ancient Romans, who are said to have received Hercules when he went into Italy, and treated him hospitably on the very spot where Rome was afterwards built. The Potitii were in return invested with the honor of being in all future time the hereditary priests of the god. They continued accordingly to enjoy this privilege until B.C. 312,  when they sold their knowledge of the sacred rites for 50,000 pounds of copper. For this remuneration they instructed public slaves in the worship of Hercules; whereupon the deity was so enraged that the whole family of the Potitii perished within thirty days. See Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. s.v. Potitia Gens.

## Potken, Johann[[@Headword:Potken, Johann]]

             a German Roman Catholic ecclesiastic who flourished in the 16th century, is noted in the literary world as the editor of the first printed edition of the Psalms in the Ethiopic language. In 1511, while at Rome, he betook himself to the study of the Ethiopic language, and two years later, in 1513, he published the Psalms in quarto. The book has no title, but on the first page a likeness of David with the harp is given. On the second page of the book commences the preface in Gothic letters, in which he states the reason for the edition of the Psalter in Ethiopic, or, as he calls it, in the Chaldee language: “Quae res mihi biennio vix elapso Romae accidit. Nam cum nonnullos habitu et colore AEthiopes, qui se Indos appellabant, psallentes, ac Dei genetricem et sanctos quam plures, praesertim Apostolos, per eos inter psallendum nominari advertissem, non sine difficultate ab iis didici, ipsos in eorum sacris Chaldaeis liteis s uti quaerens itaque interpretem, per quem cumeis loqui plenius possem, nec illum in urbe gentium olim domina, etiam neque inter Hebraeos quidem reperiens idoneum, demum ab ipsis erudiri, quoquo mode fieri posset, statui. Nec me mea fefellit spes. Tantum namque me ab eis didicisse mihi persuadeo, ut deo duce Psalterium David in ipsa vera lingua Chaldeca imprimi curare, in eorum qui peregrinas linguas nosse cupiunt, oblectationem valeam.”

As to the edition itself, the text is printed on a very fine paper, which is very surprising for those times. The superscriptions over each psalm are printed with red color. At the end of the Psalter is printed, “Impressum est opusculum hoc ingenio et impensis Joannis Potken prepositi ecclesiae sancti Georgii Coloniensis; Romse per Marcellunm Silber, alias Franck, et finitum die ultima Junii, anno salutis MDXIII.” Then follows the Song of Songs on eight pages, and on four pages the alphabet of the language, together with a short grammar, is given. This edition is now very rare. In 1518 Potken, after having returned from Rome, published a new edition of the Psalter, with the Hebrew text and Greek and Latin translations, under the title Psalterium in quatuor limis, Hebraea, Graeca, Chaldaica, Latina. These two editions form the basis of the Ethiopic version of Walton's Polyglot, published in 1657. See Jicher, Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; Alter,  Bibliographische Nachrichten, p. 79; Le Long-Mash, Bibliotheca Sacra, 2, 146; Rosenmüller, Handbuch, 3, 66 sq.; Winer, Handbuch der theolog. Literatur, p. 714; Furst, Biblith Judaica, 3, 118; Steinschneider, Bibliogr. Handbuch, p. 112; id. Catalogus Librorum Hebr. in Bibl. Bodleiana, p. 8, n. 32 a. (B. P.)

## Potrimpos[[@Headword:Potrimpos]]

             is the name of an important deity of the Lithuanians and ancient Prussians previous to the conquest of their country by the Teutonic Order; the second person in the Northern triad — Perkunos, Potrimpos, and Pikollos. It was he who granted victory in war and fertility in time of peace: he also dispensed the bliss of domestic happiness. His image stood in a cavity of the holy oak at Romowe; it looked smilingly at Perkunos, and represented, as far as the rough art of those times would allow, the features of a cheerful youth. If Perkunos was the god of the warming and destroying fire, Potrimpos was the god of the fecundating and devastating water. Corn and incense were the offerings he preferred; a wreath of ears adorned his head. But he was not always content with these unbloody sacrifices: sometimes children had to be immolated in his honor, and reduced to ashes in burning wax. A snake was kept in his honor in an urn of clay, fed with milk, and allays covered with ears of corn. For this reason the snake was a holy animal among the ancient Prussians. Warriors, marching to the bloody encounter, if they chanced to meet a serpent, fancying they beheld in it Potrimpos himself, were hopeful of his assistance, and thought themselves invincible. When a solemn sacrifice was to be offered to him, the priests remained three days stretched on the ground, fasting, and at intervals throwing wax and incense into the flames. It does not appear that particular places, lakes and woods, were consecrated to him, nor can any trace of the expansion of his worship into other countries be ascertained unless we admit with Mone that he is one person with the priapic field-god Friygo worshipped at Upsala; but this is very doubtful. Some modern historians assert that it was a female deity, the wife of the thunder-god; they assimilate him with the mother of the gods mentioned by Tacitus as solemnly worshipped by the AEsthians. See Anderson, Northern Mythology, s.v.

## Potrimpos (2)[[@Headword:Potrimpos (2)]]

             in Lettish mythology, was a chief deity of the Lithuanuians and ancient Prussians before the occupancy of the country by the Germans, being the second person in the Northern trinity, which consisted of Perkunos, Potrimpos and Pikollos. He was the god of victory in war, and in peace the giver of fruitfulness, of blessing, and of domestic felicity. His image stood at Rome. It represented a friendly, laughing youth. As Perrkunos was a  god of the warming and destructive fire, so Potrimpos was a god of the fructifying anid destructive water. Ears of corn and wheat were offered to him, and his head was decorated with field products. Many children were also burned as sacrifices to him. In a large brass urn a snake was kept and fed in honor of him; therefore the snake was always a sacred animal among the Prussians. It seems possible that Potrimpos was a female deity, and the wife of Donnerer — at least, some modern writers affirm this. Perhaps this was the mother of the gods, whom Tacitus mentions as worshipped among the AEsthyans.

## Potsherd[[@Headword:Potsherd]]

             (חֶרֶשׂ, chires, from the root חָרִס, to scrape or scratch; Sept. ὄστρακον; Vulg. testa, vas fictile; “sherd” in two places, once “stone,” often “earthen vessel”), a bit of pottery ware (Job 2:8), is figuratively used in Scripture to denote a thing worthless and insignificant (Psa 22:15; Pro 26:23 : Isa 45:9). It may illustrate some of these allusions to remind the reader of the fact that the sites of ancient towns are often covered at the surface with great quantities of broken pottery, usually of coarse texture, but coated and protected with a strong and bright colored glaze, mostly bluish-green, and sometimes yellow. These fragments give to some of the most venerable sites in the world the appearance of a deserted pottery rather than of a town. The fact is, however, that they occur only upon the sites of towns which were built with crude brick; and this suggests that the heaps of ruin into which these had fallen being disintegrated, and worn at the surface by the action of the weather, bring to view and leave exposed the broken pottery, which is not liable to be thus dissolved and washed away. It is certainly remarkable that of the more mighty cities of old time, nothing but potsherds now remains visible at the surface of the ground. Towns built with stone, or kiln-burnt bricks, do not exhibit this form of ruin, which is therefore not usually met with in Palestine. SEE POTTER.

## Pott, David Julius, D.D[[@Headword:Pott, David Julius, D.D]]

             a German theologian, was born at Eimbeckhansen, in Hanover, in 1760. In 1787 he was appointed professor of theology at Helmsthidt, from which place he removed to occupy the same chair at Götting Genesis While professor at the former place he, with Ruperti, edited the Sylloge Commentatiom Theologicmarum (8 vols. 1800-7), and afterwards at Göttingen undertook, as joint continuator with Heinrich, an edition of Koppe's Testarmentum Novum, a commentary on the Catholic epistles (1810-16). He died about 1820. See Illgen, Zeitschrift für historische Theologie, 1868, p. 568.

## Pott, Joseph Holden[[@Headword:Pott, Joseph Holden]]

             an English divine, noted especially as a Biblical scholar, was born about 1759, and was educated at Eaton and at St. John's College, Cambridge, where he graduated B.A. in 1780, M.A. in 1783; was made prebendary of  Lincoln in 1785; rector of St. Olave, Jewry, and St. Martin, Ironmongers Lane, in 1787; archdeacon of St. Alban's in 1789; rector of Little Burstead, Essex, in 1797; rector of Northall, Middlesex, in 1806; vicar of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields in 1813; archdeacon of London in 1813; prebendary of London in 1822; vicar of Kensington in 1824, and chancellor of Exeter in 1826. He died in 1847. This exemplary divine published many separate sermons, collections of sermons, charges, theological treatises, and in early life some poems, etc., for a list of which we refer the reader to the Lond. Gent. Mag. Aug. 1847, p. 210-12, see also p. 659. We notice: Two Sermons for the Festivals and Fasts (Lond. 1790, 4to): — Elementary Discourses, etc., after Confirmation (1790, 16mo): — Three Sermons on the Festivals and Fasts (1794, 12mo): — Christian Covenants (1803, 8vo; 1807, 2nd ed.): — Controversies respecting Baptism (1810, 12mo): — Sermons for the Lord's Day (1817,2 vols. 8vo; 1818, 3rd ed.): -Course of Sermons for the Festivals and Fasts (1821, 8vo): Testimonies of St. Paul concerning Justification (1846, 8vo). (J. I. W.)

## Pottage[[@Headword:Pottage]]

             (נָזַיד, nazid, something boiled, Gen 25:29; Gen 25:34). The red pottage for which Esau profanely bartered his birthright was prepared, as we learn from this chapter, by seething lentiles in water, SEE LENTLE; but the common pottage in the East, at the present day, is made by cutting their meat into little pieces, and boiling them with flour, rice, and parsley, all which is afterwards poured into a proper vessel. See Thomson, Land and Book, 2, 397.

## Potter[[@Headword:Potter]]

             (יוֹצֵר, yotser, a fiashioner; Chald. פֶּחָר, pechdr; κεραμεύς). This artificer, and the produce of his labors, are often alluded to in the Scriptures. The fragility of his wares, and the ease with which they are destroyed, supply apt emblems of the facility with which human life and power may be broken and destroyed. It is in this figurative use that the potter's vessels are most frequently noticed in Scripture (Psa 2:9; Isa 30:14; Jer 19:11; Rev 2:27). In one place, the power of the potter to form with his clay, by the impulse of his will and  hand, vessels either for honorable or for mean uses, is employed with great force by the apostle to illustrate the absolute power of God in molding the destinies of men according to his pleasure (Rom 9:21). The first distinct mention of earthenware vessels is in the case of the pitchers in which Gideon's men concealed their lamps, and which they broke in pieces when they withdrew their lamps from them (Jdg 7:16; Jdg 7:19). Pitchers and bottles are indeed mentioned earlier; but the “bottle” which contained Hagar's water (Gen 21:14-15) was undoubtedly of skin; and although Rebekah's pitcher was possibly of earthenware (Gen 24:14-15), we cannot be certain that it was so. The potter's wheel is mentioned only once in the Bible (Jer 18:2); but it must have been in use among the Hebrews long before the time of that allusion; for we now know that it existed in Egypt before the Israelites took refuge in that country (Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt. 3, 165, large ed.). The art of pottery is one of the most common and most ancient of all manufactures. The modern Arab culinary vessels are chiefly of wood or copper (Niebuhr, Voy. 1, 188). The processes employed by the Hebrews were probably not in any way dissimilar to those of the Egyptians, from whom the use of the wheel may be supposed to have been adopted. They had themselves been concerned in the potter's trade in Egypt (Psa 81:6).

The clay, when dug, was trodden by men's feet so as to form a paste (Isa 41:25; Wis 15:7) SEE BRICK; then placed by the potter on the wheel beside which he sat, and shaped by him with his hands. It consisted of a wooden disk placed on another larger one, and turned by the hand by an attendant, or worked by a treadle (Isaiah 459; Jer 18:3; Sir 38:29-30; see Tennant, Ceylon, 1, 452). The vessel was then smoothed and coated with a glaze, and finally burned in a furnace (Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt. 2, 108). We find allusions to the potsherds, i.e. broken pieces of vessels used as crucibles, or burst by the furnace, and to the necessity of keeping the latter clean (Isa 30:14; Isa 45:9; Job 2:8; Psa 22:16; Pro 26:23; Sir 38:29). The materials, forms, and manufacture of earthenware vessels are still very similar throughout Western Asia, and are also the same which were anciently in use. This we know from the comparison of ancient paintings and sculptures with modern manufactures, as well as from the vast quantities of broken pottery which are found upon the sites of ancient cities. The ancient potters “frequently kneaded the clay with their feet, and after it had been properly worked up, they formed it into a mass of convenient size with the hand, and placed it on the wheel, which, to judge from that represented in the paintings, was of very simple  construction, and turned with the hand. The various forms of the vases were made by the finger during the revolution; the handles, if they had any, were afterwards affixed to them; and the devices and other ornamental parts were traced with a wooden or metal instrument, previously to their being baked. They were then suffered to dry, and for this purpose were placed on planks of wood; they were afterwards arranged with great care on trays, and carried, by means of the usual yoke, borne on men's shoulders, to the oven” (Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt. it, 107 sq.; Birch, Hist. of Pottery, 1, 152; Saalschütz, Archaöl. d. Hebr. 1, 14, 11). For a description of pottery as now, and from ancient times, practiced in Palestine, see Thomson, Land and Book, 2, 281 sq. Earthen vessels were used, both by Egyptians and Jews, for various purposes besides culinary. Deeds were kept in them (Jer 32:14). Tiles with patterns and writing were common both in Egypt and Assyria, and were also in use in Palestine (Eze 4:1). There was at Jerusalem a royal establishment of potters (1Ch 4:23), from whose employment, and from the fragments cast away in the process, the Potter's Field perhaps received its name (Isa 30:14). Whether the term ‘potter” (Zec 11:13) is to be so interpreted may be doubted, as it may be taken for “artificer” in general, and also “treasurer,” as if the coin mentioned were to be weighed, and perhaps melted down to be recoined (Gesen. Thesaur. 1. 619). See CLAY.

## Potter, Alonzo, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Potter, Alonzo, D.D., LL.D]]

             bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born in the town of Beekman (now La Grange), Duchess County. N. Y., July 10, 1800, this parents, who belonged to the Society of Friends, were country-people of good blood, honestly devoted to the best interests of home and friends. They were remarkably well educated for their times and surroundings, and highly esteemed in the vicinity. After securing a good elementary training at the district school, Alonzo went, at twelve years of age, to an academy in Poughkeepsie, and three years after was admitted to Union College, where he at once took the highest rank in his class. Upon the completion of his college course he connected himself with the Episcopal Church, and soon after decided to prepare for holy orders in that communion. He commenced his theological studies under the direction of the Rev. Dr. Samuel H. Turner, but before Potter was one-and-twenty years old he reluctantly accepted the appointment of tutor in his alma mater. Within a twelve month he was promoted to the professorship of mathematics and natural philosophy, and at the age of twenty-three first appeared in print as  the author of a treatise on Logarithms, which is said to have been a highly creditable scientific performance. He still continued his studies for the ministry, was admitted to deacon's orders by bishop Hobart, and was advanced to the priesthood by bishop Brownell in 1824. In the year 1826 he quitted the college to become rector of St. Paul's Church. Boston, a position in which he gained a wide influence by the simplicity and earnestness of his character, the fidelity of his ministrations, and the contagious fervor of his religious sympathies. The preaching of Dr. Potter opened a new era.

With no spirit of dogmatism or controversy, he set forth the cardinal doctrines of the Church, appealing equally to the intellect and the heart, and drawing many within a new circle of religious associations. “He was always ready,” says his biographer, “to aid in promoting the interests of education and sound learning. He was an advocate of scientific pursuits. He gave his influence both by precept and example to the cause of temperance. Each of these subjects he advanced with great ability, sometimes by a course of public lectures, sometimes by a written discourse, but more frequently an extempore address, in all which he was pre-eminently successful. His engagements in these various objects, with his incessant parochial duties, constituted a vast amount of labor too great to be borne for a long time. Exhaustion from this amount of work, together with other causes not under his control, compelled him to resign his rectorship in 1831. No rector was ever more deeply loved by the people of his charge, or mourned with a deeper sorrow when he left them. Taken in all its aspects, his ministry in Boston was a marked success. It gave an impetus to vital religion which is still felt and will extend to the distant future.”

In 1831 Dr. Potter accepted the chair of moral and intellectual philosophy in Union College, which was urged upon him as soon as it was known that he would consent to sever his pastoral relations. He at once identified himself with the college as one who looked for nothing beyond it. He applied himself to study and instruction with the cheerful earnestness which was an attribute of his nature. He was eminently an educator, calling out the power of thought and language in his pupils and exerting his own. He was distinguished for his rare power of analysis, and his peculiar terseness and felicity of expression. He had a wonderful power of impressing himself upon those with whom he had to do. He transfused himself into their nature, took possession of their minds and wills, and imbued them with his own ideas and principles of action. In 1838 he was appointed vice-president of the college, and, with the advanced age of Dr. Nott, who had become his father-in-law, Dr. Potter naturally took a  leading share in the administration. He had an inborn aptitude for government, and. though more rigid and uncompromising in his measures than president Nott, understood the art of graciously blending suavity with decision. On the suspension of bishop It. U. Underdonk (q.v.) in 1845, and after a protracted balloting between the supporters of the Rev. Drs. Boowman and Tyng, Dr. Potter was elected bishop of Pennsylvania on May 23, and consecrated in the month of September of the same year. Henceforth his life is thoroughly identified with the interests of the Church he served. Says bishop Stevens:

“His idea of the office and work of a bishop was very high; regarding him not merely as an ecclesiastical officer, but as one who, from his position and opportunities and influence, had vast means, within and around him, of guiding that Church and shaping great institutions of charity or learning, molding the clergy and being a leader of the Israel of God in its attacks upon the stronghold of sin, Satan, and death. Few men cared less for the honors of the episcopate; few used the office more as the instrument of largest good, and, as a necessary consequence following the divine law of God, who has said, ‘Them that honor me I will honor few men were more honored in their episcopate; not by his own Church alone, but by all denominations of Christians, and by all the good and intelligent classes of the state.' He made no show of power; it rather emanated from him than was wielded by him.”—Funeral oration.

By his prudence and discretion he fused together elements of strife that had long wrangled with each other. He inaugurated great schemes of Christian benevolence and education, and carried them forward to almost complete success. He was diligent in cultivating all portions of the diocese, laboring when he should have been resting, and not sparing himself when the providential warnings of God were calling to him to pause and recruit. Although endowed with an admirable physical constitution, he was at length compelled to abstain entirely from intellectual exertion, and decided to accept an invitation from the Pacific Steamship Co. to take passage in one of their vessels for San Francisco by the way of the Strait of Magellan.

He arrived in the harbor of that city on the 1st of July, 1865, but was already prostrate with a fever which he had contracted by landing on the Isthmus and passing a night at Aspinwall, and was too weak to be removed from the ship. He died July 4.  Sincerely attached to the Church in which he held a position of eminent honor and dignity, bishop Alonzo Potter was singularly free from ecclesiastical prejudice and narrowness. He was a man of no less conspicuous mark as a citizen than as a churchman. He was a friend of wholesome reforms, without the tenacious adherence to the past which dreads the progress of light in novel manifestations. He was a patriot of the purest type, a man of the antique virtue which seasoned our republic with salt in the days of her noblest development. In the darkest hours of our great national struggle he was always decided and hopeful. He took strong ground in behalf of the government, and never cherished a doubt of the justice or the success of the national cause. From his youth he took a lively interest in the welfare of the African race, and was ever ready to recognize the manhood of the Negro and his claims to advancement to a higher sphere, and he was forced to a public declaration of these principles in order to silence the pro-slavery assumptions of bishop Hopkins of Vermont. The zeal, however, which bishop Potter exhibited on these occasions for the extension of equal rights to all orders and conditions of men, was no sudden impulse of feeling, but a conviction which was formed in his early days, and strengthened by subsequent experience and reflection.

His influence, which extended to a wide circle, was due, in a great measure, to his weight of character rather than to any extraordinary brilliancy of intellectual endowment. He possessed talents of a solid and masculine order. His mind was eminently discriminating, clear in its perceptions, and sound in its deductions. He had great powers of reasoning, his judgment was almost unerring, and his habits of thought remarkable for justness and accuracy. His gifts of imagination were subordinate to the intuitive and logical faculty. He never sought to produce illusions by the pomp of words, but to generate convictions by the power of argument and illustration. But it was the singular probity of his nature, the temperate candor of his judgments, and the purity and elevation of his purposes which inspired such universal confidence in his character, and gave him such marked eminence among the eminent men of his day. Bishop Potter was especially identified with the organization of the hospital of the Protestant Episcopal Church and the establishment of the Divinity School of the Church in Philadelphia. He published, The Principles of Science applied to the Domestic and Mechanic Arts (1841): — Political Economy (1841): Handbook for Readers and Students (1847): — Discourses, Charges, Addresses, etc. (1858): — Religious Philosophy (1870): — Plan of Temperance Organization for Cities: — and, with Geo. B. Emerson,  The School and Schoolmaster (1844), which was widely distributed, especially in New York and Massachusetts, and greatly aided the cause of popular education. He edited six vols. of Harper's “Family Library;” Wilkes's Christian Essays (1829); Maria James's Poems (1839), and Fifteen Lectures on the Evidences of Christianity by Clergymen of the Protestant Episcopal Church (1855, 8vo). Between 1845 and 1853 he delivered five courses of “Lowell Institute Lectures” on subjects connected with natural theology. Of these efforts bishop Stevens takes occasion to say:

“As a philosopher he would have been known with a European reputation had he published but one of the unfinished volumes which lie in the seclusion of his library. I refer to his ‘Lowell Institute Lectures. These lectures showed that he had studied deeply the physiology and psychology of man; that he comprehended the varying forms of philosophy, and the profound ethics of the old masters of that science. They evinced his boldness and his -ability in grappling with the great questions that grow out of man's relations to God, to man, and to a fallen world. They were full of thoroughly digested thought, calm and logical reasoning, expressed with almost aphoristic terseness, illuminated by the most apt and forcible illustrations, and rose at times to a degree of eloquence which, even as read in the printed pages of a newspaper report, makes the mind glow and tingle with delight. These sixty lectures, ranking in the public mind as among the lest of the many good ones which that institution has called forth, were delivered without any written page, and only occasionally did he use brief notes to guide his course.”

See Memoirs of the Life and Services of the Rt. Rev. Alonzo Potter. D.D., LL.D., by M. A. De Wolfe Howe, D.D. (Phila. 1871, 12mo); Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. s.v.; Drake, Dict. of Amer. Biog. s.v.; Church Rev. 1865, p. 499, 500. (J. H. W.)

## Potter, Barnabas[[@Headword:Potter, Barnabas]]

             an English divine of note, was born in Westmoreland in 1578. He was educated at Queen's College, Oxford, where he was first chosen a scholar, then a fellow, and afterwards provost. After leaving college, he was for a time lecturer at Abington and at Totness, in Devonshire. In the following year he determined to enter the ministry, and was installed pastor at Devonshire. He was next unanimously elected provost of Queen's College, and also made chaplain in ordinary to prince Charles, and was called at  court “the penitential preacher.” He held this position for ten years, when he decided to return to his former charge at Devonshire. King Charles, who held him in high esteem, promptly nominated him bishop of Carlisle, in 1628. In the episcopate he was a man of few words, and a very affecting preacher; his custom was to write his sermons in parts and commit them to memory. He was a close student, and possessed a remarkable memory. He became very proficient in the Hebrew language. He preached at Westminster, and so strongly did he attack the corruptions which had sprung into the Church that he was censured as popish; and this accusation, it is said, he took so much to heart that he fell sick and died, in 1642. He published, The Baronet's Burial (Oxford, 1613), a sermon: — Easter Tuesday, another sermon: — Lectures on some Chapters of Genesis. See Wood, Athenae Oxon.; Fuller, Worthies of Westmoreland; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Middleton, Evang. Biog. 3, 152 sq. (J. H.W.)

## Potter, Christopher, D.D[[@Headword:Potter, Christopher, D.D]]

             a learned English Arminian divine, nephew of the preceding, was born in Westmoreland about 1591. He was admitted to Queen's College, Oxford, in 1606, where he took, ill due time, both the degrees in arts and divinity. He was first made fellow, and in 1626 succeeded his uncle in the provostship of his college. Though a zealous puritanical preacher, he became at length an adherent of Laud. In 1628 he preached a sermon at Ely House upon the consecration of his uncle, who, “though a thoroughpaced Calvinist,” says Wood (Athen. Oxon.), was made bishop of Carlisle by the endeavors of Laud. In 1633 Christopher Potter published, An Answer to a late Popish Pamphlet entitled “Charity Mistaken,” which he wrote by the special order of Charles I, whose chaplain he was. In 1635 he was promoted to the deanery of Worcester, and in 1640 became vice- chancellor of Oxford, in the execution of which office he met with some trouble from the members of the Long Parliament. Upon the breaking-out of the civil wars he sent all his plate to the king, and declared that he would rather, like Diogenes, drink out of the hollow of his hand than that his majesty should want; and he afterwards suffered much for the royal cause. He was nominated to the deanery of Durham January, 1646; but was prevented from being installed by his death, which happened at his college in the March following. He was learned, and of exemplary life and conversation. He published, Father Paul's Hist. of the Quarrels of Pope Paul V with the State of Venice (Lond. 1626 4to): — Sermons (1629,8vo):  — Want of Charitie (Oxf. 1633, 12mo); to this publication reference was made above: — Vindication of Myself touching the Doctrine of Predestination (1651, 12mo, and often since). See Hook, Eccles. Biog. 8:135; Fuller, Worthies of Westmoreland; Allibone, Dict. of B it. and Amer. Authors, s.v. (J. H.W.)

## Potter, Francis[[@Headword:Potter, Francis]]

             an English divine, was born in 1594 at Myre, in Wiltshire, and was educated at Trinity College, Oxford. He took holy orders, and, after successively filling various preferments, became in 1637 rector of Kilmington. He died in 1678. He was a man of learning and mechanical ingenuity. He published, An Interpretation of the Number 666, etc. (Oxf. 1642, 4to; in Latin, translated by Thomas Gibbet and others, Amst. 1677, 8vo; also translated into French and Dutch). It was attacked by Rev. Lambert Morehouse, to whom Potter wrote a reply; but neither the attack nor reply was ever published. A great authority (Joseph Mede) thus commends Potter's Interpretation: “This discourse of the Number of the Beast is the happiest that ever yet came into the world, and such as cannot be read (save of those that perhaps will not believe it) without much admiration.” See Athen. Oxon.; Aubrey's MSS., in Letters of Eminent Persons (1813, 3 vols. 8vo): — General Dictionary; Walker, Sufferings of the Clergy.

## Potter, Horatio, D.D., LL.D., D.C.L[[@Headword:Potter, Horatio, D.D., LL.D., D.C.L]]

             a Protestant Episcopal bishop, was born at Beekmans, N.Y., February 9, 1802. He graduated from Union College in 1826; was rector at Saco, Maine, 1828-33; rector of St. Peter's, Albany, 1833-54; provisional bishop of New York, 1854-61; bishop of New York in 1861; and died January 2, 1887. He took an active part in the Lambeth Conferences of 1867 and 1878. He was also influential in movements relating to city mission work. See Appletons' Cyclop. of Amer. Biography.

## Potter, Isaiah[[@Headword:Potter, Isaiah]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Plymouth, Conn., in 1746. He was educated at Yale College, class of 1767, studied theology with Dr. Smalley, of Berlin, Conn., and was the first settled minister at Lebanon, N. H., from July 6,1772, to his death, July 2, 1817. He published some occasional Sermons.

## Potter, John[[@Headword:Potter, John]]

             an Anglican prelate of much note, was born in 1674 of very humble parentage. He was, however, given all the educational facilities as if of superior rank, and, manifesting a more than usual aptitude for study, was sent at fourteen to the University College of Oxford; took the degree of B.A. in 1692, and in 1694 became fellow of Lincoln College. He had by this time made great attainments in classical learning, and, though still very young, was encouraged by Dr. Charlett, the master of University College,  to publish in 1694 a collection which he had made of various readings and notes on Plutarch's treatise De Audiendis Poetis, a work which he followed soon after by various readings and notes on an oration of Basil. His greater works appeared soon after: his edition of Lycophron, and his Archaeologia Graeca (1697), the former gaining him a world-wide reputation. In 1698 he entered into holy orders, and from that time his studies appear to have been almost exclusively professional, and he passed from one preferment in the Church to another, till at last he reached the highest dignity. Archbishop Tenison made him his chaplain, and gave him the living of Great Mongeham in Kent, and subsequently other preferment in Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire. He became chaplain to Queen Anne and regius professor of divinity in the University of Oxford in 1708. In the same year he published an excellent edition of the works of Clemens Alexandrinus (2 vols. fol.). His other publications were Sermons and Charges, and A Discourse on Church Government. In 1715 he was made bishop of Oxford, and in 1737 archbishop of Canterbury, which high station he supported with much dignity to the time of his death, Oct. 21, 1747. His theological works were published at Oxford (1753, 3 vols. 8vo). Archbishop Potter was a man of much industry, but hardly a great scholar; a compiler rather than an original investigator, and hence his works are of little value in our day. As an ecclesiastic he was haughty and overzealous, as well as excessively narrow. See Hook, Eccles. Biog. 8:142; Biog. Brit. s.v.; English Cyclop. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. s.v.; Perry, Eccles. Hist. of the Ch. of England, 3, 199, 360 sq. (J. H.W.)

## Potter, John W[[@Headword:Potter, John W]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Beaver Co., Pa., July 30, 1832. He was the child of pious parents, and early made a profession of religion. He graduated at Jefferson College, Canonsburg, Pa., in 1859; studied divinity in the Western Theological Seminary, Alleghany, Pa.; was licensed by Alleghany City Presbytery; and, after supplying some churches for a time, he accepted a call to the Church of Plains, Pa., and was ordained and installed Sept. 8, 1863. Subsequently he was earnestly solicited, and, after prayerful consideration, consented to take charge of Fairmount Church, Pa., in connection with that of Plains, which relation existed till he died, June 10, 1866. Mr. Potter was a favorite pastor and an excellent preacher. His preaching was plain, pointed, and scriptural. He always carefully prepared his sermons. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1867, p. 191. (J.L.S.)

## Potter, Louis Joseph Antoine De[[@Headword:Potter, Louis Joseph Antoine De]]

             a Belgian writer, was born at Bruges in 1786, and died at Brussels in 1859. He published, Considerations sur l'Histoire les Principaux Conciles, etc. (Brussels, 1816; Paris, 1818, 2 volumes): — Esprit de l'Elise, etc. (Paris, 1821, 6 volumes). These two works were republished under the title Histoire Philosophique, Politique et Critique du Christianisme et des Eglises Chretiennes (ibid. 1836-37, 8 volumes), and an abridged edition, entitled Resume de l'Histoire du Christianisme (1856, 2 volumes): — Vie de Scipion Ricci, Eveque de Pistoie (Brussels, 1825, 3 volumes; Paris, 1826, 4 volumes): — Lettres de Pie V, sur les Affaires Religieuses de Son Temps en Franuce (1827): — Catechisme Rationel (eod.; reprinted by baron de Pounat in 1862). But all of Potter's works, written in the philosophical spirit of the 18th century, were placed on the "Index" at Rome. See Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:543, 866. (B.P.)

## Potter, Robert[[@Headword:Potter, Robert]]

             an Anglican divine, noted somewhat as a poet, was born in 1721; was educated at Emanuel College, Cambridge, and was for some years vicar of Scarning, after which he obtained the livings of Lowestoft and Kessingland, and a prebend in the cathedral of Norwich. He died in 1804. His original poetry consists of a volume of Poems, and two Odes from Isaiah (a translation of The Oracle concerning Babylon and The Song of Exultation), and is much above mediocrity. But he is best known by his spirited versions of AEschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides. He also published A Sermon on the Thanksgiving for the Peace (1802).

## Potters Field[[@Headword:Potters Field]]

             (ἀγρὸς τοῦ κεραμέως; Vulg. ager figuli), a piece of ground which, according to the statement of Matthew (27:7), was purchased by the

priests with the thirty pieces of silver rejected by Judas, and converted into a burial-place for Jews not belonging to the city. In the narrative of the Acts (1:18, 19) the purchase is made by Judas himself, and neither the potter's field, its connection with the priests, nor its ultimate application is mentioned. That Matthew was well assured of the accuracy of his version of the occurrence is evident from his adducing it (Rev. 1865:9) as a fulfillment of an ancient prediction. What that prediction was, and who made it, is not, however, altogether clear. Matthew names Jeremiah; but there is no passage in the book of Jeremiah, as we possess it (either in the Hebrew or Sept.), resembling that which he gives; and that in Zechariah, which is usually supposed to be alluded to, has not a very perfect likeness to it.

Mat 27:9

Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremy the prophet, saying, And they took the thirty pieces of silver, the price of him that was valued, whom they of the children of Israel did value, and gave them for the potters field, as the Lord appointed me. Zec 11:12

And I said unto them, If ye think good, give my price; and if not, forbear. So they weighed for my price thirty pieces of silver. And Jehovah said unto me, Cast it unto the potter: a goodly price that I was prized at by them! And I took the thirty pieces of silver, and cast them to the potter in the house of Jehovah.  Even this coincidence is somewhat doubtful; for the word above translated “potter” (הִיּוֹצֶר) is in the Sept. rendered “furnace,” and by modern scholars (Gesenius, Fürst, Ewald, De Wette, Herxheimer-following the Targum, Peshito-Syriac, and Kimchi) “treasury” or “treasurer.” Supposing, however, this passage to be that which Matthew refers to, several explanations suggest themselves:

1. That the evangelist unintentionally substituted the name of Jeremiah for that of Zechariah, at the same time altering the passage to suit his immediate object, in the same way that Paul has done in Rom 10:6-9 (comp. with Deu 8:17; Deu 30:11-14), 1Co 15:45 (comp. with Gen 2:7). See Jowett, St. Paul's Epistles (Essay on Quotations, etc.).

2. That this portion of the book of Zechariah — a hook the different portions of which have been thought by some to be in different styles and by different authors-was in the time of Matthew attributed to Jeremiah.

3. That the reference is to some passage of Jeremiah which has been lost from its place in his book, and exists only in the evangelist. Some slight support is afforded to this view by the fact that potters and the localities occupied by them are twice alluded to by Jeremiah. Its partial correspondence with Zec 11:12-13, is no argument against its having at one time formed a part of the prophecy of Jeremiah; for it is well known to every student of the Bible that similar correspondences are continually found in the prophets. See, for instance, Jer 48:45, comp. with Num 21:27-28; Num 24:17; Jer 49:27, comp. with Amo 1:4. For other examples, see Dr. Pusey's Commentary on Amos and Micah.

4. The name “Jeremiah” may have been added by some later hand. This is the most probable view. SEE JEREMIAH, BOOK OF.

There are several potteries now in Jerusalem, as there seem always to have been. On the present spot shown as “the Potter's Field,” SEE ACELDAMA.

## PottersGate[[@Headword:PottersGate]]

             (שִׁעִר הִחִרְסַית), a gate in Jerusalem which led to the valley of Hinnom (Jer 19:2). It is therefore to be sought on the west side of the city,  and is perhaps the same with the Valley gate, so named from that valley; and with the Bethlehem or Jaffa gate of the present day, if not with the Dung gate (see Ewald, Gesch. Israsel's, 3, 66). The Hebrew name seems to be derived from חַרֶס, cheres, a pot (see Gesen. Thesaur. 1, 522). Perhaps the potteries were in the vicinity. Others, as Buxtorf and Ewald, would render the word East gate, but this would not lead to the valley of Hinnom. If the custom had obtained so early of casting useless things into the valley of Hinnom or Topheth, the word might be rendered accurately Potsherd gate, or Refuse gate. The reference in Zec 11:13 is probably not to this gate (Gesen. Thesaur. p. 619). SEE JERUSALEM.

## Pottier, Francois[[@Headword:Pottier, Francois]]

             a French missionary, was born at Loches in 1718. He was educated at Paris in the Seminary of Saint-Esprit. In 1753 he was sent as a missionary to the countries of Western China. His zeal was rewarded with the apostolic vicariate of Tsetchouan, and subsequently honored with the title of bishop in partibus of Agathopolis. In 1769 he visited the Chen-si (more to the north), and there made more than sixty thousand proselytes. He died Sept. 28,1792. Pottier wrote several letters on his peregrinations in the Celestial Empire. They abound in curious information about the principal Chinese provinces, about Southern Tartary, and even Thibet. The author describes the mountain-ranges of Sine-Ling, in which he often found a refuge in times of persecution. There is little flattery for the Chinese in his account of their manners, but he thinks that they are not incorrigible. It is to be regretted that Pottier neglected altogether to give us information about the natural history of those countries. His purpose was to write a journal of his life and of the progress of Romanism, rather than a work useful to the learned. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v. See Saint Martin, Eloge de P. F. Pottier; Nouvelles Lettres edifiantes, vol. 1 and 3.

## Potton, Richard De[[@Headword:Potton, Richard De]]

             a Scotch prelate, was made bishop of Aberdeen about 1256, and died in 1267. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 108.

## Potts, George, D.D[[@Headword:Potts, George, D.D]]

             an eminent Presbyterian divine, was born in Philadelphia, Pa., March 15, 1802. Inn his father's family he enjoyed some of the best opportunities for forming his mind and heart. These were derived not only from parental counsels and instructions, but also from the frequent presence in his father's hospitable dwelling of refined Christian society. He had a good training for college, and graduated at the University of Pennsylvania in 1819. He studied theology at Princeton Seminary, and was licensed even  before graduation in 1823, and ordained as an evangelist Oct. 7, 1823; was pastor of a Church in Natchez, Miss., 182335; of the Duane Street Church, New York, 1836-44; and of the University Place Church from 1845 till his death, Sept. 15, 1864. Dr. Potts was an eminent preacher. He was a man of fine presence, and possessed of great oratorical abilities. But his aim in preaching was practical rather than doctrinal; his style full, and bordering on the figurative; his executive ability was remarkable. He engaged at one time in a controversy with the Rev. Dr. Wainwright, on the rites and discipline of the Episcopal Church, in a pamphlet entitled No Church without a Bishop. Strongly attached to the doctrines of his own Church, and laboring zealously for the promotion of its interests, yet he ever cherished the most kindly and fraternal feelings for the followers of Christ in every communion. He was, during his ministry, connected with various literary, benevolent, and religious institutions, and rendered efficient service in the cause of humanity. He published single Sermons, Addresses, Letters, etc. (1826-54), and contributed two Discourses to The National Preacher, The Character of Jezebel to Dr. Wainwright's Women of the Bible, and Introductions to Potts's Mary, Nos. 1 and 2. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1866, p. 161; Appletons'Ann. Cyclop. 1864, p. 680; Wainwright, Women of the Bible; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. s.v. (J. L. S.)

## Potts, John[[@Headword:Potts, John]]

             an eminent minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, flourished near the opening of this century. He began to preach in 1812 within the bounds of the Philadelphia Annual Conference, of which body he became a member in the following year. For a quarter of a century he continued in this connection, filling many of the most important posts, and always giving great satisfaction. He died Sept. 22,1837, after a long and very painful illness. Mr. Potts was a man of varied talent, an efficient business man, an able and dignified presiding officer, a useful pastor, and a successful preacher. — Minutes of Conferences, 2, 577.

## Potts, William Stephens, DD[[@Headword:Potts, William Stephens, DD]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Northumberland County, Pa., Oct. 13,1802. His early education was limited. After learning the printer's trade in Philadelphia, he finally, in 1825, entered the Princeton Theological Seminary, which ill-health, the result of too close application to his studies,  compelled him to leave in November, 1827. He was, however, licensed by the Presbytery of Philadelphia, and went to St. Louis, laboring on the way as opportunity offered, and was finally ordained and installed pastor of the only Presbyterian Church then in St. Louis, Oct. 26, 1828. Here he labored faithfully and successfully for the extension of the Church until, Marion College having been organized, he was elected president of that institution by the trustees in 1835, and entered at once upon this new field of labor. After four years of intense labor, the success of the enterprise not being equal to his expectations, he accepted another call to St. Louis. In 1841 his health obliged him to travel, and he went to Europe, whence he returned in October of the same year, greatly invigorated. Early in 1852 sickness compelled him to discontinue his labors, and he died March 28,1852. He published a large number of occasional Sermons, Addresses, and controversial pamphlets. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 4, 723.

## Pou de logoi[[@Headword:Pou de logoi]]

             (Ποῦ δὲ λόγοι πτερόεντες) is the beginning of one of Gregory of Nazianzum's (q.v.) hymns, which he probably composed during the eight years that he spent in retirement. “When his work was done, the Church of the Anastasia had arisen, and father, mother, brother, and sister, all were dead. In the depths of its natural fears, and the firmness of the hope to which at last it rises, it tells the history of those solitary years, and echoes well the music of those ancient psalms which soar so often out of the depths into the light of God” (Mrs. Charles). Want of space does not allow us to give this beautiful hymn, of which the first stanza runs thus in Mrs. Charles's translation:

“Where are the winged words? Lost in the air.

Where the fresh flower of youth and glory ? Gone.

The strength of well-knit limbs? Brought low by care.

Wealth? Plumer’d; none possess but God alone.

Where those dear parents who my life first gave,

And where that holy twain, brother and sister? In the grave.”

Comp. Bassler, Auswahl altchristlicher Lieder, p. 11, 157; Fortlage, Gesänge christlichen Vorzeit, p. 360 sq.; Mrs. Charles, Christian Life in Song, p. 65 sq. (B. P.)

## Pouchen, Levin[[@Headword:Pouchen, Levin]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Kiinigsberg, October 26, 1594. He studied at the theological university of that city, was in 1621 professor, in 1623 second court-preacher, in 1626 professor of Hebrew, in 1640 doctor of theology, in 1645 attended the colloquy at Thoren, and died May 4, 1648. He wrote, Commentar. in Prophetiam Joel Explicatio Historiae Passionis Christi: — Disputat. de Usu Philosophiae in Theologia: — De Protevangelio Paradisiaco: — De Resurrsectione Jesu  Christi: — De Pia et Vera Philosophandi Ratione: — De Ecclesia: — De Baptismo: — De Resurrectione Mortuorum: — De Duabus in Christo Naturis, etc. See Arnold, Historie der konigsbergischen Universitat; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Pouget, Antoine[[@Headword:Pouget, Antoine]]

             a French Benedictine monk, was born in 1650 in the diocese of Beziers. He entered the Congregation of St. Maur in 1674, and devoted himself to the study of mathematics, in which he is said to have been very proficient, although he published nothing about that science. He was a professor of the Hebrew language, and taught distinguished pupils, among others Dom Guarin. While teaching this language, he composed a very easy method, under the title Institutiones linguae Hebraicae. The work was not printed, but there are numerous copies of it. Pouget published, in collaboration with Montfaucon, the Latin translation of a volume of Analecta Graeca (1688, 4to). He made, together with Dom Martianay, an edition of the works of Jerome, called the edition of the Benedictines (Paris, 1693-1706, 5 vols. fol.), of which he directed alone the first volume. He died at Soreze Oct. 14, 1709. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v. See Le Cerf, Bibl. des Auteurs de la Congreg. de St. Maur; Fisquet, Biog. (indite) de l'Ilerault.

## Pouget, Bertrand de[[@Headword:Pouget, Bertrand de]]

             a French cardinal, was born in 1280 at Le Pouget, now the commune of Aynac. If we may believe Villani and Petrarch, it was rumored in Italy that he was the natural son of pope John XXII, who was born in the same diocese (Cahors); others affirm that the pope was his uncle. A simple deacon of Castelnau Montratier and canon of Saint-Sauvemur d'Aix. he was comprised in the first promotion of cardinals, made Dec. 17, 1316, by John XXII, who, three years afterwards, sent him to Italy with the most unlimited powers for the purpose of retrieving the dominions of the Church. At the head of a small army, Bertrand, together with Philip of Valois, who afterwards became king of France, directed his first blows against Matteo Visconti, the nominal chief of the Lombard Ghibellines. He was, however, unsuccessful, and was obliged to resort to the anathemas of the Church, and to preach a crusade against Matteo. This attempt being unsuccessful also, he determined to unite with the Guelphs and oppose Galea Visconti, who had succeeded his father. Genoa and Piacenza took his part, Milan revolted, and the whole signoria was nearly lost to the Visconti, when the arrival of Louis of Bavaria, victorious at Miihldorf, changed the state of things. After some brilliant rather than real victories, Louis was compelled to return to Germany, leaving the field in possession of the cardinal, whom the pope had appointed bishop of Ostia and of Velletri. Parma and Reggio had surrendered to him in 1326; Bologna,  Modena, and the other cities of the Romagna followed their example. But as he had neither the virtues nor the talents requisite to preserve his conquests, Bertrand had in 1329 to repress at Parma and Reggio several revolts against his authority. Towards the close of 1330 John of Luxemburg took, in the name of the emperor Louis V, Cremona, Parma, Pavia, and Modena. An interview held by the cardinal with the king of Bohemia excited the distrust of the Italians, and Bertrand, who had recently obtained the titles of marquis of Ancona and count of Romagna, saw the tide of ill-will and hostility rise all around him. The marquis of Este, whom he had basely deceived, defeated his army near Ferrara, and Bologna expelled him in March, 1334. He was fain to accept the mediation of the Florentines, and retired to Avignon, where the death of John XXII (Dec. 4, 1334) deprived him of all hopes of being put at the head of a new expedition. From that time he devoted himself entirely to religious matters. He died at Avignon Feb. 3, 1352, and was buried in the church of the Clarisse Nuns, a congregation founded by him. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v. See Aubery, Hist. des Cardin. vol. 1; Sismondi, Hist. des Republiques Italiennes.

## Pouget, Francois-Aime[[@Headword:Pouget, Francois-Aime]]

             a French theologian, was born at Montpellier Aug. 28, 1666. Almost immediately after his ordination he was appointed vicar of Saint-Roche at Paris, and it was in this capacity that he administered the last sacraments to La Fontaine (see his account in the Mem. de Litter. of the P. Desmolets, vol. 1, pt. 2). He was made doctor, and entered in 1696 the Congregation of the Oratory. Colbert, bishop of Montpellier, gave him the direction of his seminary. He returned to Paris, and held at the Seminary of Saint Magloire public lectures on the conscience. He was appointed member of the commission charged with the liturgical reform of the diocese of Paris. The Catechisme de Montpellier, the principal work of Pouget, was published at Paris in 1702 (4to, or 5 vols. 12mo); it was at once adopted in all parts of France, has gone through many editions, and has been translated into several languages. At the time of his death Pouget was publishing a Latin edition of it, in which the passages merely indicated in the French work were extensively filled out. This edition, when in the printing office, was seized at the request of cardinal de Bissy, and was published after examination by doctor Clavel, with his comments. The work was completed by the P. Desmolets, and published under the title of Institutiones Catholicae (1725, 2 vols. fol., and Ven. 1768). There are few  works of this kind in which the Christian dogmas, the religious morals, the sacraments, prayers, ceremonies, and customs of the Church are set forth with greater distinctness and simplicity. The other writings of Pouget are some Letters to Colbert and to cardinal Noailles, Instructions sur les principaux Devoirs des Chevaliers de Malte (Paris, 1712, 12mo), and various manuscripts, especially a work on the Breviary of Narbonne, part of which had been printed in 1708. Pouget died at Paris April 4,1723.Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v. See Richard et Giraud, Bibliotheque Sacrae; Journal de Dorsanne, vol. 4; Dict. des Ecrivains eccles.; Fisquet, Biog. (inedite) de l'Herault; Haag, Hist. des Dogmes (see Index).

## Poujoulat, Jean-Joseph Francois[[@Headword:Poujoulat, Jean-Joseph Francois]]

             a Roman Catholic writer of France, was born at Fare, Bouches-du-Rhone, in 1800. He studied at Aix, and in 1826 went to Paris, and there published, conjointly with Michaild, the Bibliotieque des Croisards, whom he accompanied in 1830 to the East. Poujoulat died at Paris in 1880. He wrote, Histoire de Jerusalem, Tableau Religieux et Philosophique, (1811- 42, 2 volumes; 4th ed. 1856): — Histoire de S. Augustin (1844, 3 volumes; 3d ed. 1850, 2 volumes): — Lettres sur Bossuet (1854): — Le Cardinal Maury, sa Vie et ses OEuvres (1855; 2d ed. 1859): — Vie de Monseigneur Sibour, Acheveque de Paris: — Le Pere Ravignan, sa Vie, ses OEuuvres (1858): — Le Pape et la Liberti (1860): — Examen de la Vie de Jesuis de Mons. Renan (1863). See Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Poulain, Nicolas[[@Headword:Poulain, Nicolas]]

             a Reformed theologian, was born at Mesnils, near Luneray, Seine- Inlferieure, Jan. 13, 1807. He was pastor of Nanteuil-les-Meaux in 1832, in 1833 at Havre, in 1857 at Lalusanne, and in 1862 at Luneray. Poulain died at Geneva, April 3, 1868. He published, Qu'est-ce qu'un Christianisme sans Dogmes et sans Miracle? (1863): — Reponse a Trois Lettres de M. Albert Reville (1864): — L'OEuvre des Missions Evangeliques (1867), an apologetical work of great value. See Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Poulard, Thomas-Just[[@Headword:Poulard, Thomas-Just]]

             a French prelate, was born at Dieppe Sept. 1, 1754. He was ordained priest, and enjoyed an early renown as a preacher. His talents were rewarded by the Church with several prebendships, and a curacy in the diocese of Lisieux. Attached to the clergy of Saint-Roch, he submitted in 1791 to the law that exacted the oath to the civil constitution, and became episcopal vicar of the Orne. On the 27th Brumaire, an. 2 (Nov. 17, 1793), he renounced the Catholic faith in the presence of the Convention, but in spite of this abjuration he was, after the Reign of Terror, appointed constitutional curate of the parish of Aubervilliers, near Paris, and took his seat as a deputy of the Haute-Marne in the council held at Paris in 1797. The Constitutionals made him bishop of Sa6neet-Loire June 14, 1801, but he lost his see by the Concordat, and retired to Paris. Shortly before the Revolution of July he published a pamphlet under the title Moyen de nationaliser le. Clerge de France (Paris, 1830, 8vo). At that same epoch he conferred orders on two young men, and on three in 1831. Poulard persevered in his opinions, and chose to die un vrai constitutionne. He declined the assistance of the curate of his parish, and his body was carried directly to the cemetery. Poulard died at Paris March 9, 1833. The two following books have been most plausibly attributed to his authorship: Ephemerides religieuses pour servir a ‘Histoire ecclesiastique de la Fin du dix-huitieme Siecle et du Commencement du dix-neuvieme: — Sur l'Etat actuel de la Religion en France. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.

## Poulle, Nicolas-Louis[[@Headword:Poulle, Nicolas-Louis]]

             a French preacher, was born Feb. 10, 1703, at Avignon. He was destined to the magistracy, and studied law. But he did not allow those grave pursuits to interfere with his poetical tastes, and presented at the Jeux Floraux several poems which were crowned. Towards 1735 he received orders, and from that time devoted himself entirely to oratory. Encouraged by the favor some of his panegyrics and sermons had met with at the hands of his countrymen, he repaired to Paris in 1738, and preached in nearly all the great pulpits. In 1745 a life-rent of a thousand francs on the abbey of l'Argentiere was bestowed upon him; in 1748 he was nominated commendatory abbé of Nogent-sous-Coulcy, after pronouncing the panegyric of Saint-Louis before the French Academy. He was subsequently honored with the titles of ordinary preacher of the king and of grand vicar of Laon. Some writers have compared the abbé Poulle with Massillon: such a parallel can only be made by those who mistake brilliancy of style for eloquence. He might be more properly compared with the abbé De Boismont, his contemporary; they have the same qualities and the same defects. The abbé Poulle did not aspire to the honors of authorship: he was not in the habit of writing his sermons. In 1776, complying with the wishes of his nephew, Louis Poulle, grand vicar of Saint-Malo, he dictated to him eleven sermons which he had preserved in his memory for forty years, and these sermons were published, after he had corrected them himself, in Paris in 1778, 1781,1818, 1821 (2 vols. 12mo). This edition contains also his Panegyrique de Saint-Louis (1748, 4to) and a Discours pour la Prise d'Habit de Mme. de Rupelmonde aux Carmelites (1752, 12mo). The Bibliotheque das Orateulrs Chretiennes edited a volume of AEruvres Choisies of the abbé Poulle (1828, 18mo), preceded by a biographical notice. He died at Avignon Nov. 8, 1781. Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v. See De Sainte Croix, Eloge de Poulle (Avignon, 1783, 8vo).

## Pound[[@Headword:Pound]]

             (weight) is the rendering of one Heb. and one Greek word in the A. V.

1. מָנֶה, maneh (1Ki 10:17; Ezr 2:69; Neh 7:71-72). SEE MANESH.

2. Λίτρα, litra (Joh 12:3; Joh 19:39), is a Roman pound of twelve ounces, a libra. This pound, as used in trade and authorized by the Roman government, contained 6165 Paris grains, according to Boeckh (Metallurg.  Unters. p. 160 sq.). The word λίτρα was adopted in the Aramaean dialect, לַיִטְרא(Buxtorf, Lex. Rabb. col. 1138). SEE WEIGHT.

## Pound (2)[[@Headword:Pound (2)]]

             (money), a value (μνᾶ mina) mentioned in the parable of the Ten Pounds (Luk 19:12-27), as the talent is in the parable of the Talents (Mat 25:14-30), the comparison of the Savior to a master who entrusted money to his servants wherewith to trade in his absence being probably a frequent lesson in our Lord's teaching (comp. Mar 13:32-37). The reference appears to be to a Greek pound, a weight used as a money of account, of which sixty went to the talent, the weight depending upon the weight of the talent. At this time the Attic talent, reduced to the weight of the earlier Phoenician, which was the same as the Hebrew, prevailed in Palestine, though other systems must have been occasionally used. The Greek name doubtless came either from the Hebrew maneh or from a common origin; but it must be remembered that the Hebrew talent contained but fifty manehs, and that we have no authority for supposing that the maneh was called in Palestine by the Greek name, so that it is most reasonable to consider the Greek weight to be meant. SEE MINA.

## Pounds, John[[@Headword:Pounds, John]]

             an English philanthropist, flourished in the second half of last century. He was born at Portsmouth in 1766 of very humble parentage, and enjoyed himself no educational advantages worth mentioning. But, endowed with a remarkably active mind and generous disposition, he used his leisure hours from the busy trade he plied as a shoemaker for the amelioration of the poor children of his surroundings. He collected a number of them in his shop, and there taught them the elements of education he had been able to master successfully, and thus became the founder of what are now called the Ragged Schools. He died Jan. 1,1831.

## Pourchot, Edmonde[[@Headword:Pourchot, Edmonde]]

             a French philosopher of some note, was born at Poilly, near Sins, in 1651. About 1678 he became professor of philosophy in the University of Paris, of which he was chosen rector seven times. He was a friend of Racine and Boileau. He died in 1734. He published Institutiones Philosophicae (1695), which was highly esteemed by his contemporaries. Pourchot was really the first of modern philosophers who taught by a rational method.

## Poussin, Nicolas[[@Headword:Poussin, Nicolas]]

             a French painter of great celebrity, was born near Le Grand-Andely, in Normandy, in 1593 or 1594; was first a pupil of Quintin Varin, then painting pictures for the Church of Grand-Andely, but at the age of eighteen went to Paris, studied under Ferdinand Elle, the Flemish painter, and others; but chiefly improved himself by drawing from casts and drawings and prints after Raffaelle and Julio Romano in the collection of M. Courtois, who accorded him access to them. After a long and hard struggle, he attained the object of his desire-namely, the means of visiting Rome. He was thirty years of age when he arrived there, and a considerable period elapsed after that before he obtained much employment. At length, however, he received several important commissions from the cardinal Barberini which he executed so successfully that he afterwards rapidly acquired fame and fortune. After an absence of sixteen years he returned to Paris with M. de Chantelou, and was introduced by cardinal Richelieu to Louis XIII, who appointed him his painter in ordinary, and gave him apartments in the Tuileries. But while away at Rome, preparatory to removal to Paris, the king died, and Poussin abandoned the proposed return to France.

He died at Rome in 1665 after a most successful career. His pictures have been compared with colored bass-reliefs, a term not inexpressive of his style. His peculiar leaning to this sculpturesque treatment may in some measure be explained by his close intimacy with his friend Duquesnoy, the sculptor, known as Flammingo: they lived in the same house together at Rome. His coloring, compared with his drawing, is inferior and mannered, which is somewhat remarkable, considering that he studied in the school of Domenichino at Rome, whom he regarded as the best painter of his time. The Seven Sacraments, painted twice by Poussin, are among his most celebrated works, and both are now in England-one at Belvoir Castle, the other in the Bridgewater Gallery, London. His works are very numerous; the prints that have been engraved after his principal pictures only amount to upwards of two hundred. Some of his best works are in the British National Gallery, as, The Plague among the Philistines at Ashdod, The Bacchanalian Festival, No. 42, finely engraved by Doo, which constitutes an excellent exponent of his style, with all his merits and peculiarities in perfection. He was especially remarkable as a skilful landscape-painter. His sacred drawing entitled The Finding of Moses has been made popular by autotype, but it is by no means one of his best productions. Poussin has been called a classical painter by Sir Joshua  Reynolds, so successfully did he imitate the works of antiquity. See Mrs. Clement, Painters, Sculptors, Architects, etc., p. 467; Spooner, Biog. Dict. s.v.; Bellori, Vita di Nicolo Poussino, etc. (Rome, 1672); Wornum, Descriptive and Historical Catalogue of the National Gallery, etc.

His brother-in-law, GASPAR POUSSIN, also quite a celebrated painter, was born in 1613, and was a pupil of Nicolas. Gaspar devoted himself principally to secular art, but his Sacrifice of Isaac is a notable production. He died in 1675. (J. H. W.)

## Poussines, Pierre[[@Headword:Poussines, Pierre]]

             a French Jesuit, was born in 1609 at Laurac (diocese of Narbonne). After studying at Beziers, he entered the Society of Jesus at Toulouse in 1624, and was in the latter city and at Montpellier professor of humanities, of rhetoric, and of theology. Called to Rome in 1664 to continue The History of the Society, interrupted by the death of Sacchini, he devoted several years to that work, and was subsequently professor of exegetical theology at the Roman College. Many illustrious personages honored him with proofs of their esteem, among others queen Christina of Sweden and cardinal Barberini, who committed to him the interpretation of the works of Pachymeres. Poussines was chosen to give Greek lessons to the young prince Orsini and to the abbé Albani, who afterwards became pope under the name of Clement XI. He returned to Toulouse towards the end of 1682, and continued his literary activity in spite of his failing health. He died at Toullouse Feb. 2. 1686. He left, Nicetae Laudatio sanctorum archangelorum Michaelis et Gabrielis (Toulouse, 1637, 8vo): — Polemonis Sophistae Orationes (ibid. 1637, 8vo): — Annce Conneme Posphyrogenite Alexias (Paris, 1651, fol.): — Sancti Nili Opera quaedam (ibid. 1639, 4to): — Nicephori Bryennii Commlentarii de Rebus Byzantinis (ibid. 1661, fol.): — Georgii Pachymeris Michael Palesologus (Rome, 1666, fol.): — G. Puchimeri Andronicus Palaeologus (ibid. 1669, fol.): — Sancti Methodii Convivium Virginum (Paris, 1657, fol.): — Catena Grcecorum Patrum in Evangelium secundum Marcunt (Rome, 1673, fol.): — Thesaurus Asceticus (Paris, 1684, 4to): Theophylacti Institutio Regua (ibid. 1641, 4to). All these editions are accompanied with commentaries and notes full of erudition. Poussines is the author of a considerable number of lives of saints of Greece, of Languedoc, and of Gascoyne inserted in the collection of the Bollandists; of a Latin translation of the letters of St. Francis Xavier, and of a number of other works, the list  of which is given in the Biblioth. Soc. Jestu. See Lombard, Eloge hist. du P. Poussines, in the Menoires de Trevoux (Nov. 1750) and in the Dict. of Moreri (ed. 1759); De Baecker, Biblioth. des Ecrivains de la Compagnie de Jesus, vol. 1. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.

## Poverty[[@Headword:Poverty]]

             is that state or situation opposed to riches in which we are deprived of the conveniences of life. Indigence is a degree lower, when we want the necessaries, and is opposed to superfluity. Want seems rather to arrive by accident, and is opposed to abundance. Need and necessity relate less to the situation of life than the other three words, but, more to the relief we expect or the remedy we seek; with this difference between the two, that need seems less pressing than necessity. Poverty has been sanctified by our blessed Lord in his own person, and in that of his parents; in that of his apostles, and of the most perfect of his disciples. Solomon besought the Lord to give him neither poverty nor riches (Pro 30:8), regarding each extreme as a dangerous rock to virtue. Poverty of mind is a state of ignorance, or a mind void of religious principle and enjoyment (Rev 3:17). Poverty of spirit consists in an inward sense and feeling of our wants and defects, with a dependence on divine grace and mercy for pardon and acceptance (Mat 5:3). It is the effect of the operation of the Divine Spirit on the heart (Joh 16:8). It is attended with submission to the divine will; contentment in our situation; meekness and forbearance to others, and genuine humility as to ourselves. It is a spirit approved by God (Isa 66:2), an evidence of true religion (Luk 18:13), and terminates in endless felicity (Mat 5:3). SEE POOR.

## Poverty, Monastic[[@Headword:Poverty, Monastic]]

             The Roman Catholic Church exacts of its monastic orders, besides other privations, that of absolute abandonment of worldly possessions. SEE MONASTICISM.

To a certain extent this obligation was recognized even from the first origin of Monasticism; but it was enforced with far greater strictness than before by the two great Mendicant orders, the Franciscans ant Dominicans, which took their rise in the beginning of the 13th century; one of the fundamental rules of these orders being that their members must possess no property, but be wholly dependent on alms for their support. Until the rise of the Mendicants, the individual members of the various  monastic orders were bound to deny themselves the enjoyment of personal property, but the community to which they belonged might possess ample revenues. Even the Dominicans, though under a strict vow of poverty, allowed their convents to enjoy in common small rents in money. But St. Francis prohibited his monks from possessing either an individual or a collective revenue, and enforced a vow of absolute poverty. When asked which of all the virtues he thought was the most agreeable to God, he replied, “Poverty is the way to salvation, the nurse of humility, and the root of perfection. Its fruits are hidden, but they multiply themselves in was that are infinite.” In accordance with this view of the importance and value of poverty, the Franciscan monks for a time adhered strictly to the rule of their founder; but ere long a division broke out among them as to the precise interpretation of the rule, and in consequence a relaxation of its strictness was made, first by Gregory IX in 1231, and then by Innocent IV in 1245. About a century afterwards a dispute arose between the Franciscans and Dominicans in regard to the poverty of Christ and his apostles-the Franciscans alleging that they possessed neither private property nor a common treasure, while the Dominicans asserted the contrary opinion. The pope decided in favor of the followers of Dominic, and many of the Franciscans, still adhering to their opinions, were committed to the flames. SEE MENDICANTS.

For this practice there is not the least authority in the early practices of celibates (see Lea, Sacerdotam Celibacy, p. 104, 114); and, however rigidly it may have been accepted by the monastic orders at their first institution, it has in modern times existed only in name. Convents of monks and nuns have succeeded in becoming rich communities. In England they laid hold of the greater part of the riches of the kingdom; their possessions were so vast that the monopoly became the occasion to enact laws preventing the increase of their wealth or depriving them of their ill-gotten self. In the United States the monastics of Rome threaten to become the most powerful possessors of wealth. In New York they own property mounting up to several millions, and even in smaller cities are fast accumulating immense possessions low admirably their rules are adapted to seize upon the property of unsuspecting individuals and to transfer it to some rich fraternity! Already in several states civil enactments have become necessary in order to restrain the inordinate acquisition of landed and other property by Roman Catholic institutions, and to prevent an undue interference by priests in the bequests of the sick.  The Fakirs and Dervishes of Mohammedan countries are under a vow of poverty, and go about asking alms in the name of God, being wholly dependent for their support upon the charity of the faithful. The Mohammedan monks trace their origin to the first year of the Hegira; and it is said that there are no fewer than thirty-two different orders existing in the Turkish empire, all of them grounding their preference of the ascetic life upon a saying of Mohammed, “Poverty is my glory.”

The monks of the East, particularly those of Buddha, are not allowed to partake of a single morsel of food not received by them in alms, unless it be water or some substance used fir the purpose of cleaning the teeth. Hence the Buddhist monk is seen daily carrying his alms-bowl from house to house in the village near which he may happen to reside. The Aegyrte of the ancient Greeks were mendicant priests of Cybele, and their origin is supposed to have been Eastern. The same priests among the Romans went their daily rounds to receive alms with the sistrum in their hands. The institutes of Mallu lay down explicit rules for the Brahmin mendicant: “Every day must a Brahmin student receive his food by begging, with due care, from the houses of persons renowned for discharging their duties. If none of those houses can be found, let him go begging through the whole district around the village, keeping his organs in subjection and remaining silent; but let him turn away from such as have committed any deadly sin… Let the student persist constantly in such begging, but let him not eat the food of one person only; the subsistence of a student by begging is held equal to fasting in religious merit.... This duty of the wise is ordained for a Brahmin only; but no such act is appointed for a warrior or a merchant.” In the same sacred book the householder is enjoined to make gifts according to his ability to the religious mendicant, whatever may be his opinions. — Gardner, Faiths of the World, 2, 688, 689; Elliott, Delineation of Romanism, p. 744; Barnum, Romanism, p. 287, 293 sq.

## Poverty, Voluntary[[@Headword:Poverty, Voluntary]]

             SEE POVERTY, MONASTIC.

## Powel(l), David[[@Headword:Powel(l), David]]

             a British clergyman, was a native of Denbighshire, and was born about 1552. He was educated at Oxford, and took holy orders after 1576, the year he quitted the university. He was successively vicar of Ruabon and rector of Llanfyllin; in 1579 vicar of Mivod, and in 1588 rector of Llansaintfraid. He died in 1598. His studies were principally in British antiquities, and are of a secular character. See Biog. Brit. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. s.v.

## Powel(l), Gabriel[[@Headword:Powel(l), Gabriel]]

             an English clergyman, son of David (see above), was born in 1575, and was educated at Jesus College, Oxford. He became in 1609 prebend of Portpoole, in 1610 vicar of Northall, and died in 1611. He is noted as the author of several treatises against Romanism (1602 to 1607); but he is best known by Gabrielis Poweli, Ordovicis Britanni, Davidis F., Disputationum Theologicarum et Scholasticarum de Antichristo et ejus Ecclesia, Libri duo (Lond. 1605, 8vo). Bliss says that he was a zealot and a stiff Puritan, and-was esteemed a prodigy of learning in his time. — Wood, Athenae Oxon. q.v.

## Powell, Baden[[@Headword:Powell, Baden]]

             an Anglican divine, noted rather as a scientific student than as a theologian, was the son ,f a London merchant, and was born at Stamford Hill, near London, Aug. 22, 1796. He studied at Oriel College, Oxford, where he graduated M.A., with first-class mathematical honors, in 1817; took holy  orders in 1820, and was appointed vicar of Plumstead, in Kent, in 1821. In 1824 he was elected a fellow of the Royal Society; and three years later was appointed Savilian professor of geometry, a chair which he held till his death, which took place in London June 11, 1860.

As a professor, Powell's great aim was to bring about a larger recognition of the importance of physical and mathematical science in the curriculum of learned study at Oxford. To the “Philosophical Transactions,” the “Reports” of the British Association, and other vehicles of scientific instruction, he contributed numerous valuable papers: but he is perhaps best known by his strenuous exertions to obtain for modern science the right of modifying the views of nature and the origin of the world, regardless of the views expounded in the O.T. Scriptures, especially in The Study on Evidence of Christianity in Essays and Reviews (1860). In this perilous department of controversy he displayed great learning, logical power, moderation of tone, and philosophic urbanity; but his conclusions were too unmistakably rationalistic to be acceptable to orthodox Christianity. Powell does not exactly place himself on the same theoretical ground with Hume and Spinoza, but the moral effect of his attack upon miracles as an evidence of Christianity is not less antagonistic than the theories of either of these authors. “Spinoza,” says Dr. Hurst (Hist. of Rationalism, p. 487 sq.), “held that miracles are impossible, because it would be derogatory to God to depart from the established laws of the universe, and one of Hume's objections to them was their incapability of being proved from testimony (Replies to Essays and Reviews, p. 135).

Prof. Powell objects to them because they bear no analogy to the harmony of God's dealings in the material world; and insists that they are -not to be credited, since they are a violation of the laws of matter, or an interruption of the course of physical causes. The orthodox portion of the Church are laboring under the egregious error of making them an essential doctrine, when they are really a mere external accessory. Reason, and not ‘our desires,' must come to our aid in all examination of them. The keynote to Prof. Powell's opposition is contained in the following statement: ‘From the nature of our antecedent convictions, the probability of some kind of mistake or deception somewhere, though we know not where, is greater than the probability of the event really happening in the way and from the causes assigned (Essays and Reviews, p. 120). The inductive philosophy, to which great respect must be paid, is enlisted against miracles. If we only knew all about those alleged and held as such, we should find them  resolved into natural phenomena, just as ‘the angel at Milan was the aerial reflection of an image on a church; the balls of fire at Plausac were electrical; the sea-serpent was a basking shark on a stem of sea-weed. A committee of the French Academy of Sciences, with Lavoisier at its head, after a grave investigation, pronounced the alleged fall of aerolites to be a superstitious fable (ibid. p. 155). The two theories against the reality of miracles in their received sense are, first, that they are attributable to natural causes; and, second, that they may involve more or less of the parabolic or mythic character. These assumptions do away with any real admission of miracles even on religious grounds.” The animus of the whole essay may be determined by the following treatment of testimony and reason: “‘testimony, after all, is but a second-hand assurance; it is but a blind guide; testimony can avail nothing against reason.

The essential question of miracles stands quite apart from any consideration of testimony; the question would remain the same if we had the evidence of our own senses to an alleged miracle; that is, to an extraordinary or inexplicable fact. It is not the mere fact, but the cause or explanation of it, which is the point at issue” (ibid. p. 159). This means far more than Spinoza, Hume, or any other opponent of miracles, except the radical Rationalists of Germany, has claimed-that we must not believe a miracle, though actually witnessed. The different replies which this Essay on the Study of the Evidences of Christianity (in Essays and Reviews) elicited are: No Antecedent Impossibility in Miracles-some Remarks on the Essay of the late Rev. Baden Powell, etc. (1861, 8vo); An Answer to Mr. Baden Powell's Essay, etc., by William Lee, D.D. (1861, 8vo); Examination of Mr. Baden Powell's Tractate on Miracles (1861, 12mo); and are defended in, A Few Words of Apology for the late Prof: Baden Powell's Essay, etc., by a Lay Graduate (1861, 8so); The late Prof. Powell and Bishop Thirlwall on the Supernatural, etc., by the Rev. R. B. Kennard (1864, 8vo). See also Farrar, Crit. Hist. of Free Thought, lect. 4:5; Moberley, Sermons on the Beatitudes (1860), Preface; Young, Science Elucidated by Scripture (1863, fep. 8vo); Goodwin, American Theology (1861), p. 438; Christian Remembrancer, July, 1861; Brit. Quar. Rev. Nov. 1864; London Reader, 1865, 1, 77; Journ. of Speculative Philosophy, vol. 32; Christian Examiner, June to May, 1858; North Brit. Rev. Nov. 1859; Smith (H. W.), Essays Theol. and Philos., edited after his death (N. Y. 1877, 8vo).

Among Prof. Powell's other works may be mentioned, Revelation and Science (Oxf. 1833): — A Historical View of the Progress of the Physical  and Mathematical Sciences (Lond. 1834): — The Connection of Natural and Divine Truth, or the Study of the Inductive Philosophy considered as Subservient to Theology (ibid. 1838): — Tradition Unveiled, a Candid Inquiry into the Tendency of the Doctrines advocated in the Oxford Tracts: — A General and Elementary View of the Undulatory Theory as applied to the Dispersion of Light, etc. (ibid. 1841):The Unity of Worlds and of Nature: — Essays on the Spirit of the Inductive Philosophy, the Plurality of Worlds, and the Philosophy of Creation (ibid. 1855): Christianity without Judaism (1857): — The Order of Nature considered with Reference to the Claims of Revelation (1859). (J. H. W.)

## Powell, Edward, D.D[[@Headword:Powell, Edward, D.D]]

             a learned English Roman Catholic divine, who flourished early in the 16th century, was educated at Oxford, and considered one of the ornaments of the university. He was made fellow of Oriel College in 1495. After taking holy orders, divers prebendships were bestowed on him, and he was received among the canons of Salisbury and of Lincoln. So great was his fame that Henry VIII employed him to write, in refutation of Luther, the work Propugnaculum summi sacerdotii evangelici ac septenarii sacramentorum numeri (Lond. 1523, 4to). There is extant a letter addressed to the king by the University of Oxford to express their gratification at his excellent choice of a defender of the faith. But Henry could not forgive him for defending Catharine of Aragon in his book De non dissolvendo Henrici regis cum Catharina matrimonio (which was printed, but of which no copy is known); and for his advocacy of the supremacy of the Holy See he was arrested, and executed at Smithfield June 30, 1540. See Wood, Athenae Oxon.; Dodd, Church Hist.; Perry, Hist. of the Church of England.

## Powell, Griffith[[@Headword:Powell, Griffith]]

             an English educator and philosopher, was born in 1561, and was a native of Llansawell. He was educated at Jesus College, Oxford, and became its principal in 1613. He died in 1620. He wrote, Analysis Analyticorum Posteriorum seu Librorum Aristotelis de Demonstratione, cum Scholiis optimorum Interpretum (Oxon. 1594, 8vo): — Analysis Libri Aristotelis de Sophisticis Elenchis (1594; reprinted 1598, 1664). “Accounted by all a most noted philosopher or subtle disputant.”—Wood, Athenae Oxon. q.v.

## Powell, Howell[[@Headword:Powell, Howell]]

             a Welsh Presbyterian minister, was born about 1820, and was a native of Glamorgan, South Wales, where he was educated for the ministry. He came to this country with his wife, and, settling in Ohio, began preaching. In 1851 he became pastor of the Welsh Presbyterian Church in Cincinnati, Ohio, where he labored prosperously for nineteen years. Accepting the call of the Welsh Presbyterian Church in Thirteenth Street, New York, he came to that city in 1870, and was actively engaged in the duties of his pastorate until his death in 1875. He was greatly beloved by his Welsh coreligionists both in this country and at home. He discharged his pastoral duties with zeal and diligence, and did many generous acts for the humbler members of his flock.

## Powell, James, D.D[[@Headword:Powell, James, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born in Newtown, England, December 25, 1843; graduated from Dartmouth College in 1866, and from Andover Theological Seminary in 1869; was pastor at Newburyport, Massachusetts, 1869-73; district secretary of A.M.A., Chicago, 1873-83; assistant and associate corresponding secretary from 1883 until his death, December 27, 1887.

## Powell, Thomas[[@Headword:Powell, Thomas]]

             an Anglican divine, flourished in the 17th century. He was born about 1608, and after taking holy orders was canon of St. David's, London. He died in 1660. His publications are of a secular character.

## Powell, Vavasor[[@Headword:Powell, Vavasor]]

             a Welsh Puritan preacher, who was born in 1617, was educated at Jesus College, Oxford, but left the Establishment and became an itinerating minister. He was very zealous for the Church of God, was very outspoken and gave much annoyance to Churchmen, and was often in trouble. He died in Fleet Prison, London, in 1671. He published a number of Sermons, Theological Treatises, etc. (between 1646 and 1671), for lists of which and notices of their author, see Strena Vavasorensis (1654), Vavasoris Exammen et Purgamen (1654, 4to), and Life and Death of Vavasor Powell (1671, 8vo). His Concordance to the Bible, completed by N. P. and J. F., etc., was published in 1671 (8vo).

## Powell, William Samuel[[@Headword:Powell, William Samuel]]

             an English divine of remarkable ability, was born at Colchester Sept. 27, 1717; was admitted to St. John's College, Cambridge, in 1734; and, having taken the degree of bachelor of arts in 1738-9, was elected fellow of it in March, 1740. In 1741 he was taken into the family of lord Townshend as private tutor to his second son, Charles, afterwards chancellor of the Exchequer; was ordained deacon and priest at the end of the year, and instituted to the rectory of Colkirk, in Norfolk, on lord Townshend's presentation. He returned to college the year after, began to read lectures as an assistant to the principal tutor; but became himself principal tutor in 1744. He took the degree of bachelor of divinity in 1749, and of doctor in 1756. In 1765 he was elected master of his college, obtained the archdeaconry of Colchester the year after, and in 1768 was instituted to the rectory of Freshwater, in the Isle of Wight. He died Jan. 19, 1775. He published, Defense of the Subscriptions required in the Church of England (Lond. 1757, 4to):Observations on Miscellanea Analytica (1760): — Sermons on 1Co 1:23-24 (1767, 4to): — Charge (1772, 8vo; 1773): — Discourses on Various Subjects (published with Life by Thomas Bulguy, D.D., 1776, 8vo). Dr. Powell's and Thomas Fawcett's Discourses, thirty-four in all, delivered before the University of Cambridge, were republished in 1832 (8vo) in Divines of the Church of England. These discourses of Powell, says bishop Watson, “are written with great acuteness and knowledge of the several subjects.” “It would be impossible to produce a more eminent instance of the happy alliance of taste and genius with learning and good sense than in the sermons and charges of Dr. Powell; of whom, indeed, on every account, the whole society over which  he presided might justly join with me in saying, “Semper honos, nomenque tuum, laudesque manebunt” (Prof. Mainwaring). Powell's discourses are also highly commended by Mathias. See Pursuits of Literature (ed. 1822), p. 225, 371; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Genesis Biog. Dict, s.v.

## Power[[@Headword:Power]]

             or the ability of performing, is in an essential degree an attribute of Deity: God is emphatically styled All-powerful. Power signifies sometimes a right privilege, or dignity (Joh 1:12); sometimes absolute authority (Mat 28:18); sometimes the exertion or act of power, as of the Holy Spirit (Eph 1:19), of angels, or of human governments, magistrates, etc. (Rom 13:1), and perhaps it generally includes the idea of dignity and superiority. So, the body “is sown in weakness, it is raised in power” (1Co 15:43). The “prince of the power of the air” (Eph 2:2) is a figurative representation of Satan (q.v.). SEE AIR.

## Power, Francis Herron[[@Headword:Power, Francis Herron]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born ill Alleghany County, Pa., July 14, 1829. He received a careful academical training; graduated at Washington College, Washington, Pa.; studied theology in the Western Theological Seminary, Alleghany City, Pa., and was licensed by Redstone Presbytery. Being deeply interested in the efforts of the government to suppress the rebellion, he became a delegate of the United States Christian Commission. Joining the “Army of the Cumberland,” he was zealous in his efforts in the hospitals and in the field to administer to the personal and spiritual wants of the sick and wounded of the Republic; but the extraordinary exposure to which he subjected himself broke down his system, and he died in the hospital at Nashville, Tenn., Oct. 17, 1863. Mr. Power was never ordained, but he was an earnest and faithful missionary. Forgetful of self, in his zeal for the good of others he sacrificed even his life to a work that had enlisted his whole soul. See Wilson, Presb Hist. Alac, 1864. p. 190. (J. L. S.)

## Power, James, D.D[[@Headword:Power, James, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Nottingham, Chester County, Pennsylvania, in 1746. He graduated from Princeton College in 1766, was licensed to preach to the Presbytery of Newcastle June 24, 1772, and settled in the western part of Pennsylvania. In 1776 he became pastor of Mt. Pleasant congregation, and retained this position until 1817. He died August 5, 1830. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 3:326.

## Power, John H., D.D[[@Headword:Power, John H., D.D]]

             a noted minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Montgomery Co., Ky., March 15, 1798; was converted at a very early age; united with the Methodists in 1819; was licensed to preach two years after,  and joined the Kentucky Conference, where his appointments were, Mount Sterling and Hinkston circuits, in Kentucky; Little Kanawha, Charleston, and Parkersburgh, in Virginia; Columbus, Salt Creek, Brush Creek, Chillicothe, and Deer Creek, in Ohio; Burlington Circuit, Old Zion, Muscatine, and South Burlington, in Iowa-embracing a period of eighteen years. As presiding elder, he served on Norwalk, Wooster, Mount Vernon, Delaware, and Mansfield districts, in Ohio; Burlington, Muscatine, and Keokuk districts, in Iowa— filling up twenty-eight years. In 1848 he was elected assistant agent of the Western Book Concern, where he remained until 1852. Failing health then necessitated rest, and he maintained a supernumerary relation until 1856, when he resumed the pastoral work by transfer to the Iowa Conference, and there held appointments (as above mentioned) until his death, which occurred Jan. 19, 1873. In manner Dr. Power was reserved. He shrank instinctively from that general acquaintance and notoriety in which persons differently constituted find pleasure. His friendship, though not demonstrative, was strong and enduring. As a preacher he was successful: enlightening the mind, directing the judgment, and influencing the will of his auditors-thereby winning souls to Christ. He was a prudent legislator, and as an administrator of discipline he had but few equals. Notwithstanding the exhaustive labors of an itinerant fifty years ago, at the age of forty-two he had acquired a liberal education, including Greek and Hebrew, so as to make the original available in the literal rendering of the Word of Life. He had also completed a course in law, with the view of meeting every demand that might be made upon him as a servant of the Church. As an author he holds a reputable place. His writings (On Universalism—: — Doolittle land Power; a discussion on the same subject: — Domestic Piety: — and Letters to Dr. Smith on Slavery) are all attractive in style, and are models or logical clearness. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1873, p. 103, 104. (J. H. W.)

## Powers of the Mind[[@Headword:Powers of the Mind]]

             are those faculties by which we think, reason, judge, etc. SEE GOD; SEE SOUL.

“They are so various,” says Dr. Reid, “so many, so connected and complicated in most of their operations, that there never has been any division of them proposed which is not liable to considerable objections. The most common division is that of understanding and will. Under the will we comprehend our active powers, and all that lead to action, or influence the mind to act-such as appetites, passions, affections. The  understanding comprehends our contemplative powers, by which we perceive objects; by which we conceive or remember them; by which we analyze or compound them; and by which we judge and reason concerning them. Or, the intellectual powers are commonly divided into simple apprehension, judgment, and reasoning.” Locke divides powers into those “able to make, or able to receive, ally change; the one may be called active, and the other passive power” (Essay on Human Understanding, bk. 2, ch. 21). But Reid takes exception to this division, and passes the following stricture upon it: “Whereas he (Locke) distinguishes power into active and passive, I conceive passive power to be no power at all. He means by it the possibility of being changed. To call this power seems to be a misapplication of the word. I do not remember to have met with the phrase passive power in any other good author. Mr. Locke seems to have been unlucky in inventing it; and it deserves not to be retained in our language.” “This paragraph,” says Sir W. Hamilton (Reid's Works, p. 519, note), “is erroneous in almost all its statements.” ‘The distinction between power as active and passive is clearly taken by Aristotle. But he says that in one point of view they are but one power (Metaphys. lib. 5, c. 12), while in another they are two (ibid. lib. 9:c. 1). He also distinguishes powers into rational and irrational-into those which we have by nature, and those which we acquire by repetition of acts. These distinctions have been generally admitted by subsequent philosophers. Dr. Reid, however, only used the word power to signify active power. That we have the idea of power, and how we come by it, he shows in opposition to Hume (Act. Pow. ess. 1, ch. 2, 4).

According to Hume, we have no proper notion of power. It is a mere relation which the mind conceives to exist between one thing going before and another thing coming after. All that we observe is merely antecedent and consequent. Neither sensation nor reflection furnishes us with any idea of power or efficacy in the antecedent to produce the consequent. The views of Dr. Brown are somewhat similar. It is when the succession is constant-when the antecedent is uniformly followed by the consequent — that we call the one cause and the other effect; but we have no ground for believing that there is any other relation between them or any virtue in the one to originate or produce the other— that is, that we have no proper idea of power. Now, that our idea of power cannot be explained by the philosophy which derives all our ideas from sensation and reflection is true. Power is not an object of sense. All that we observe is succession. But  when we see one thing invariably succeeded by another, we not only connect the one as effect and the other as cause, and view them under that relation, but we frame the idea of power, and conclude that there is a virtue, an efficacy, a force in the one thing to originate or produce the other; and that the connection between them is not only uniform and unvaried, but universal and necessary. This is the common idea of power, and that there is such an idea framed and entertained by the human mind cannot be denied. The legitimacy and validity of the idea can be fully vindicated.

“In the strict sense, power and agency are attributes of mind only; and I think that mind only can be a cause in the strict sense. This power, indeed, may be where it is not exerted, and so may be without agency or causation; but there can be no agency or causation without power to act and to produce the effect. As far as I can judge, to everything we call a cause we ascribe power to produce the effect. In intelligent causes, the power may be without being exerted; so I have power to run while I sit still or walk. But in inanimate causes we conceive no power but what is exerted, and, therefore, measure the power of the cause by the effect which it actually produces. The power of an acid to dissolve iron is measured by what it actually dissolves. We get the notion of active power, as well as of cause and effect, as I think, from what we feel in ourselves. We feel in ourselves a power to move our limbs, and to produce certain effects when we choose. Hence we get the notion of power, agency, and causation in the strict and philosophical sense; and this I take to be our first notion of these three things” (Reid, Correspondence, p. 77, 78).

“The liability of a thing to be influenced by a cause is called passive power, or more properly susceptibility; while the efficacy of the cause is called active power. Heat has the power of melting wax; and, in the language of some, ice has the power of being melted” (Day, On the Will, p. 33). SEE CAUSE.

It is usual to speak of a power of resistance in matter, and of a power of endurance in mind. Both these are passive power. Active power is the principle of action, whether immanent or transient. Passive power is the principle of bearing or receiving. See Reid, On the Active Powers; Id. On the Human Mind, and the Intellectual Powers; Locke, On the Understanding; Stewart, Brown, and Abercrombie. SEE MIND.

## Powers, Grant[[@Headword:Powers, Grant]]

             a Congregational clergyman, was born at Hollis, N. H., May 31, 1784; was educated at Dartmouth College, class of 1810; studied theology; was minister at Haverhill in 1815-29, and at Goshen from Aug. 27,, 1829, to his death, April, 1841. He is the author of an Essay upon the Influence of the Imagination on the A Nervous System, contributing to False Hopes in Religion: — History of the Coos Country (1841, 12mo): — and Centennial Address at Hollis (1830, 8vo). — Drake, Dict. of Amer. Biog. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. s.v.

## Powers, Hiram[[@Headword:Powers, Hiram]]

             an American sculptor, son of a farmer, and the eighth of nine children, was born at Woodstock, Vt., July 29, 1805, and acquired the rudiments of education at a free district school. While still a boy, he went to Cincinnati, Ohio, where he became an apprentice to a clock-maker, and about the same time formed the acquaintance of a German sculptor, who taught him to model in plaster. Subsequently he was employed for several years making wax-figures, and fitting them with machinery, for the Cincinnati Museum, where his Infernal Regions horrified thousands of visitors. It is a hideous scene representing hell filled with terrific figures, moved by machinery, and acting the supposed agonies of the damned. In 1835 he went to Washington, where he executed the busts of several distinguished persons. By the aid of Mr. Nicholas Longworth, he went to Florence, Italy, in 1837, to continue his art-studies. He resided in that country until his death, which took place at Rome, June 27,1873. In 1838 Powers produced his statue of Eve, which excited the admiration of Thorwaldsen. His other works were of a secular character, but they gave him great renown. See H. F. Lee, Familiar Sketches of Sculpture and Sculptors (Boston, 1854, 2 vols. 12mo), vol. 2, ch. 27; Tuckerman, Book of the Artists, s.v.; Living Age, Oct. 1847.

## Powers, Jesse K[[@Headword:Powers, Jesse K]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in the county of Albemarle, Va., June 8, 1801. In May-, 1826, while engaged in teaching a classical school, he was converted, and united with the Methodist Episcopal Church. Shortly after he joined the traveling connection, at the session of the Virginia Conference (held at Raleigh in February, 1826). In 1830 he was admitted into full connection and  ordained deacon and in 1832 was ordained elder. He was a plain, faithful, earnest minister of the Gospel always conscientiously discharging the duties of a Methodist preacher. Being unencumbered with a family, he readily and cheerfully entered on whatever field of labor was assigned him, and everywhere endeared himself to the people whom he served by his unaffected and consistent piety. For upwards of two score years he gave full proof of his ministry. In the latter part of his life, through affectionate regard for his welfare, and in consideration of his infirmities, his brethren of the Conference placed him on the list of supernumeraries; but so anxious was he to be in the regular pastoral work that he appealed to the Conference to place him among the effective men, and he was appointed to the New Kent Circuit; but the work was beyond his strength; he soon began to fail in health, and died March 1, 1869. See Minutes of Annual Conferences of the M. E. Church, South, 1869, p. 303.

## Powers, John B[[@Headword:Powers, John B]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born May 16, 1814, in Union District, S. C.; as a boy, removed to Alabama, and shortly after was converted; and, feeling called of God to preach the Gospel, accepted license in 1845. In 1856 he entered the itinerant ranks of the Alabama Conference, and was appointed to the Weewokaville Circuit. He filled successively the Harpersville and the Moscow circuits. In 1861 he entered the Confederate army in command of a company. His health failed, however, and he returned. From 1863 to 1866 he was presiding elder of the Jasper District. In 1867 he served the Elyton Circuit; 1868-69, the Murfree's Valley Circuit; 1870, the Jonesborough Circuit. In 1871 he was appointed to the Monticello Circuit, but died March 30. He was a conscientious and pious man. His administration as presiding elder was marked by promptness and great faithfulness in the discharge of all the duties pertaining to his office. His broad common-sense and acquaintance with men gave him wisdom in council. As a preacher, he had great control over the emotions of men, and was eminently successful in seasons of revival. See Minutes of Annual Conferences of the M. E. Church, South, 1871, p. 565.

## Powtai[[@Headword:Powtai]]

             is the name of a Chinese divinity signifying contentment.

## Poya[[@Headword:Poya]]

             the day on which the moon changes, which is held sacred among the Buddhists. They reckoned four poya days in each month.

1. The day of the new moon.

2. The eighth day from the time of the new moon.

3. The day of the full moon.

4. The eighth day from the time of the full moon. It is said by Prof. H. Wilson that the days of the full and the new moon are sacred with all sects of the Hindus; but according to the institutes of Manu the sacred books are not to be read upon these days.

## Poydras, Julien[[@Headword:Poydras, Julien]]

             an American philanthropist of French descent, who flourished in the early days of our republic, and was first delegate to Congress from the territory of Orleans (1809-12), gave $100,000 for the founding of a French orphan asylum, and left $20,000 for a college at Point Coupee, La. He died there Jan. 25, 1824.

## Poynet (or Ponet), John[[@Headword:Poynet (or Ponet), John]]

             an English prelate of the Reformation period, was born about 1516 in Kentshire. He enjoyed a distinguished education, learned Italian and Flemish, was proficient in mathematics, and constructed in his youth a clock the complicated machinery of which was the admiration of Henry VIII's court. He graduated at King's College, Cambridge; was made doctor of theology and chaplain of archbishop Cranmer. At the age of thirty-three he was appointed bishop of Rochester (1549). In 1551 he succeeded at Winchester the deposed Gardiner, and was appointed to take a share in the redaction of the new code of ecclesiastical laws. He was indebted for these distinctions to his zeal for the cause of reform; he defended it in the pulpit and in his books, and explained its doctrines in his Catechismu, adopted under the name of “King Edward's Catechism.” At Mary Tudor's accession to the throne, he repaired to foreign parts, either dreading persecution for having had a share in Wyatt's Rebellion, or because he had been deprived of his see for having married. He died April 11, 1556, at Strasburg. He is spoken of as a man of great erudition and eminent piety. In his theology he was a decided Calvinist. Other works of his are, Defense for Marriage of Priests (1549, 8vo): — Short Treatise of  Politic Power (1556, 8vo; reprinted 1639 and 1642): — and De Eucharistia (1557, 8vo). See Strype, Life of Cranmer; Dodd, Church History; Fuller, Worthies of England; Muller, History of Winchester, 1, 346; Lecky, History of Rationalism, 2, 174; Hook, Eccles. Biography, 8, 158; Collier, Eccles. Hist. of England (see Index in vol. 8). (J.W.)

## Pozzi, Giovanni Battista[[@Headword:Pozzi, Giovanni Battista]]

             a Milanese painter who flourished in the latter part of the 16th century, was employed by Sixtus V in the palace of St. John of Lateran and in the library of the Vatican. In the Sistine Chapel he painted the Visitation of the Virgin and the Angel appearing to St. Joseph in his dream; in Gesiu, a Choir of Angels. He died in the pontificate of Sixtus V, aged twenty-eight, deeply lamented as the most promising young artist of his time. He was considered the Guido of his day; and had he survived to the time of the Caracci, it is impossible to say what degree of perfection he might have attained.

## Pozzi, Stefano[[@Headword:Pozzi, Stefano]]

             an Italian painter, born at Rome in the 18th century, studied first under Carlo Maratti and afterwards with Agostino Masucci. Lanzi says he was more noble in his design than Masucci, and more natural and vigorous in his coloring. He acquired considerable distinction, and executed several works for the churches at Rome, one of which, an altar-piece, represents the Death of St. Joseph. In the pontifical palace of Maonte Carallo is a fine picture by him representing St. Gregory. He died in 1768.

## Pozzo, Andrea[[@Headword:Pozzo, Andrea]]

             an eminent painter and architect, was born at Trent in 1642. While studying at Milan he fell into vicious company and became extremely dissolute, until, disgusted by his course of life, he joined the Society of the Jesuits, who placed him under the instruction of Scaramuccia. Afterwards, at Rome and Venice, he studied design and color, and the works of Raffaelle and other great masters. His oil and fresco works at Rome, Genoa, and other places gained him the reputation of one of the ablest artists of the time. His pictures are composed in grand style, and he is excelled by few artists in perspective and architecture, the principles of which he perfectly understood, and published a treatise on them. Among his best works in oil are, St. Francesco Borgia, in the church of II Gesh at Rome; the Wise  Men's Offering, at Vienna, and four pictures from the life of Christ, in the church at Genoa. The ceiling of the church of St. Ignazio at Rome is regarded as one of the ablest productions of his time, because of its animated execution. As an architect he gained some distinction, and executed, among other works, the altar of St. Ignazio in the church of II Gesil at Rome, which is said to be the richest altar in all Europe. He died at Venice in 1709.

## Pra Mogla[[@Headword:Pra Mogla]]

             is, in the mythology of the Siamese, a celebrated disciple of Sommonacodom, their great saint and protector. His statue, which represents two bodies, is often found beside the statue of his master. He was so compassionate and benevolent that he attempted to extinguish the fire of hell by turning the earth upside down, and gathering in his hand all burning things he found; but the fire destined to punish the lost for their sins was so violent that it burned to ashes everything that was near, and dried up rivers and seas. In his distress Pra Mogla recurred to his master himself. The saint could easily have fulfilled his wishes, but he feared lest mankind. free from that salutary terror, should fall into greater depravity, and the fire was suffered to keep burning. The wisdom of the god was admired, but the love of the disciple was memorialized by numberless images and statues.

## Pra Rasi[[@Headword:Pra Rasi]]

             are, in the mythology of the Siamese, hermits who live in complete seclusion, and, by many years of a contemplative existence, have acquired a knowledge of the most recondite mysteries of nature. Those mysteries are described on the wall which encircles the world, and thence the Pra Rasi gathered their knowledge. Thus they possess the secret of flying, of assuming any form at their pleasure, of making precious metals, etc. As they know also the means of giving their body indefinite duration, they could enjoy eternal life; yet every thousand years they make a voluntary sacrifice of their life by burning themselves on a heap of wood, with the exception of one, who awakens the saints again to renewed life. There are religious writings which indicate the means of getting to these hermits, but it is said to be a very dangerous enterprise.

## Pracrat[[@Headword:Pracrat]]

             is, in the Indian mythology, one of the revelations of divinity as the supreme original being, and especially as the cause of all phenomena of change in the visible world. Pracrat is the essence of the three gods Brahma, Vishnu, and Siva; he is three colored, because he is creative like Brahma (red); conservative like Vishnu (white); and destructive like Siva (black). Pracrat, in consequence, is also the being which unites and separates these three divinities, as through him there is a perpetual vicissitude of life and death, of birth and annihilation.

## Pracriti[[@Headword:Pracriti]]

             is the by-name of Parwati, the wife of the Indian god Siva: it means Nature. The Hindis make of her the wife of the destroyer, because, according to them, all life originates in death, there being no destruction, no annihilation, in the true sense of the word: matter only describes, in the course of its duration, an eternal circle, in which it undergoes a perpetual change of forms, while its substance remains the same.

## Practical Religion[[@Headword:Practical Religion]]

             is that department of practical theology which aims at the promotion of Christian practice, and the writings which are brought out to contribute to such an end are called Practical Works. They are from their very nature of a more temporary character than any other theological productions: Generally speaking, they are, and must be, adapted to the peculiar circumstances of their own age; they must be specially addressed to correct its prevailing evil tendencies; they must pre-eminently promote those parts of the Christian character which are least cultivated. Such as are founded on a deep knowledge of human nature, and animated with genuine piety, must indeed benefit other ages, since human nature remains essentially the same; but their most direct influence belongs to the age in which they are  written. Subsequently they may often form individuals: transfused into their minds, they are reproduced in other shapes, but are themselves withdrawn from circulation. Their body perishes; while the soul which gave it life migrates into another and another frame, and thus continues often to diffuse an extensive blessing, when the very name under which they originally appeared is forgotten. See Pusey, Historical Inquiry, p. 11-180. SEE PRACTICAL THEOLOGY; SEE RELIGION; SEE THEOLOGY. (J.H.W.)

## Practical Theology[[@Headword:Practical Theology]]

             is one of the departments of theology, and aims principally at the treatment of the functions of Church life. For centuries the term was abused and confused, and the sphere of practical theology in the organism of theological science was an ill-understood question until the proper conception of its nature and limits was given by that master-mind of German theology, Schleiermacher; and, thanks to his clear-sightedness, practical theology is no longer to be confounded with a diluted, popularized edition of scientific theology “for students incompetent to learn the theoretic science” (Planck), nor is it any longer used as a synonym of Christian ethics or pastoral theology, but it has taken its place in the circle of theological sciences as an independent department, coordinate with exegetical, historical, and systematic theology.

The Christian religion presents itself to the student under four aspects-as a divine revelation, as a history, as a system of doctrines and duties, and, finally, as a corporate life. As now the department of exegetical theology embraces all those sciences which in any way treat of the Holy Scriptures; that of historical theology, all which in any way treat of sacred or Church history; that of systematic theology, all which set forth the doctrinal and ethical systems of Christianity; so practical theology comprehends all the practices and hourly needs of the Church, and as such this department embraces the subordinate sciences of Church government, edification, and worship. It includes and covers such special branches as Pastoral Theology, Homiletics, Catechetics, Christian Paedagogics, etc. Being the science of the collective functions of the Church regarded in her unity, it is able to give due attention and prominence to each of those functions-the regulative, the educational, and the edifying, a thing impossible, under the old-fashioned arrangement, SEE THEOLOGY, to compass within the limits of a Pastoral Theology (q.v.). Says Dorner, “It is since the idea of the  Church, and of her essential functions and attributes, has been more clearly recognized that practical theology, which was formerly for the most part an aggregate of rules and regulations without any organic connection between its several precepts, has been reconstructed. Nitzsch's practical theology, in particular, brings forward its connection with the other branches of theology. Systematic theology, which is based upon exegetic theology and faith, and developed by the history of doctrines, exhibits Christian truth in the abstract, and therefore the ideal of faith and practice. Historical theology, finishing with a delineation of the present state of the Church, sets the empiric reality and its defects over against this ideal. The contrast between the two, the variance between the ideal and the real, produces the effort to reconcile this opposition by means of theological usages, in conformity with the requirements of the age. Thus practical theology, as a science, owes its origin to the ecclesiastical procedure of the times; and, as this is necessarily technical, practical theology is also a technical study.”

Schleiermacher called practical theology the crown of a theological course of study, and, as we have already said, was the first to bestow upon it a scientific organization. In this labor he was laudably followed by theologians of the most diverse schools, as, e.g., Roman Catholic Von Drey, Protestant Nitzsch, Hegelian Marheineke, compromising Hagenbach, Lutheran Harless, and such other noted men as Ehrenfeuchter, Moll, Palmer, and Schweizer. Most are agreed in describing practical theology as a science for the clergy, and thus not doing full justice to the vocation of the believing laity in Church work. Their rights in this respect have chiefly been made apparent by the hitherto much neglected theory of Church government, and by voluntary associations for domestic missions. On the other hand, the just notion that, since the Church's existence and increase are brought about by constant reproduction, it is necessary to start from the origin of the Church in individuals, to proceed to their gathering together, and thence to the Church, may be designated as the prevailing tendency in the construction of a practical theology. Hence the theory of missions (called also Halieutics) and catechisation, the aim of which is a preparation for confirmation, form the first or main division. The second embraces the doctrine of worship, or of the construction of the public services of the Church (liturgies, with hymnology and sacred music and homiletics), the superintendence of the spiritual interests of individuals (cure of souls), and the direction of the flock (the pastoral office); while the organization of the Church, and the entire system of Church law, by  which the activity, whether of the individual or of the community, must be limited, form a third division. See Nitzsch, Praktische Theologie; Dorner, Gesch. d. protestantischen Theologie; Bickersteth, Christian Student's Biblical Assistant, p. 498; and especially Moll. Das System der praktischen Theologie (Halle, 1864, 8vo), which is a compendious but very systematic and thorough treatise, covering the whole field of practical theology as now understood. See also M'Clintock, Encyclopaedia and Methodology of Theol. Science, pt. 4; Meth. Qu. Rev. Jan. 1864, p. 159 sq. The Germans support a Zeitschrift für praktische Theologie, which is printed at Leipsic and has a wide circulation.

## Prades, Jean Martin de[[@Headword:Prades, Jean Martin de]]

             a French theologian, was born about the year 1720 at Castel-Sarrasin. He was destined to the ecclesiastical career, studied first in the country, then went to Paris and lived there in several seminaries, among others in that of Saint-Sulpice. He became acquainted with the authors of the Encyklopèdie, and furnished several articles to their work. He came into repute by a thesis which he defended at the Sorbonne for the doctorate of theology (Nov. 18, 1751). It contained the boldest assertions concerning the nature of the soul, the origin of good and evil, the origin of society, natural and revealed religion, the miracles, etc. His parallel of the cures performed by Jesus and those of Esculapius seemed particularly scandalous. The thesis was condemned forthwith by several prelates and by pope Benedict XIV. The Sorbonne, after having at first approved it, reconsidered its action, and declared it impious. Parliament ordered the arrest of the author at the request of the advocate-general D'Ormesson, whereupon De Prades fled to Holland (1752), and there published his Apology (1752, 3 pts. 8vo), to which Diderot added a refutation of a mandement of the bishop of Auxerre. Voltaire recommended Prades to the king of Prussia, who appointed him his lector, and bestowed upon him a life-rent and two canonries, one at Oppeln, the other at Glogau. The bishop of Breslau finally prevailed upon him to retract solemnly the principles he had defended (April 6, 1754). He became archdeacon of the chapter of Glogau. He died in 1782. Prades left, besides, an Abrégé de l'Histoire ecclesiastique de Fleuri (Berlin, 1767, 2 vols. small 8vo), supposed to be translated from the English, and to which Frederick II wrote a preface. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v. See Brotier, Examen de l'Apologie de l'Abbé de Prudes (1753); Feller, Dict. Hist. s.v.; Jervis, Hist. of the Church of France, 2, 332-334.

## Pradier, Jacques[[@Headword:Pradier, Jacques]]

             a Swiss artist of note, was born at Geneva in May, 1792; went as a youth to Paris, and finally to Rome, where he studied for over five years, especially under Canova. He devoted himself principally to sculpture, and produced some remarkable works. In 1819 he settled at Paris, and died there in 1852. Satyrs, Bacchantes, Venuses, and the like, make up principally the list of his works; but he also devoted himself to sacred subjects, and produced, among others, a colossal figure of Christ on the Cross, a Pieta (now at Toulon), a Marriage of the Virgin (for the Madeleine, Paris), four Apostles, a Virgin (for the cathedral of Avignon), etc. One of his greatest works is the tomb of Napoleon I at the Hotel des Invalides in Paris. See Mrs. Clement, Handbook of Sculptors, Painters, etc., s.v.

## Pradjapat[[@Headword:Pradjapat]]

             is, in the Hindû mythology, the embodied creative desire of the original Being, or of that manifestation of this Being which includes the earthly elements.

## Prado, Blas del[[@Headword:Prado, Blas del]]

             a Spanish painter, was born at Toledo in 1544. He was a pupil of Francisco Comontes. Philip II sent him to Morocco, where he painted the emperor Maley-Abdallah, his favorites, his children, and principal officers. He returned to Spain a wealthy man. But, as he affected Oriental customs, and showed himself in public dressed in the Moorish attire, the Inquisition summoned him before her tribunal. He was discharged on condition of painting exclusively religious subjects. He died about 1605. Prado is distinguished by the purity of his design and the majesty of his compositions, which are simple, but carefully worked out in all their details. There are of his works at Madrid, in the royal palace, an Assumption; a Virgin with the Child; St. Anthony; St. Blasius; St. Maurice; a Descent from the Cross; St. Catharine. At Toledo, St. Blasius, bishop; St. Anthony; The Presentation; a Holy Family (in the monastery of Guadalupe), etc. Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v. See Palomino, El Museo Pittorico (Cordova, 1713, 3 vols.); Quilliet, Dict. des Peintres Espagnols, s.v.; Mrs. Clement, Handbook of Sculptors, Painters, etc., s.v.

## Pradt, Dominique Dufour de[[@Headword:Pradt, Dominique Dufour de]]

             a French prelate and diplomatist, was born at Allanches, in Auvergne, April 23, 1759. He studied for some time at the military school, but gave the preference to the ecclesiastical career, and gained in 1786 the degree of doctor of theology. Cardinal de la Rochefoucauld, archbishop of Rouen, bestowed upon him the title of vicar-general and one of the richest prebends of his cathedral. In 1789 the clergy of the diocese sent him to the Etats-Generaux, where he sided with the clerical and monarchical minority. He followed his patron into exile, and attended him at Munster, in 1800, in his last hours. In 1798 Pradt published anonymously his most celebrated work, L'Antidote au Congres de Rastadt (Hamburg, 8vo). In 1800 he published, again anonymously, La Prusse et sa Neutraliti (8vo). His opinion, as expressed in these writings, was that the Revolution would prove fatal to France. Cancelled from the roll of the emigrants, he returned to Paris, and was introduced by his relation, general Duroc, to the first consul. The latter was given to understand that military despotism could find no more faithful servant. De Pradt was appointed chaplain of the new emperor and bishop of Poitiers; he was, as such, consecrated by pope Pius VII himself, in the church of Saint-Sulpice, Feb. 2, 1805. The “chaplain of the god Mars,” as he called himself, followed his master to Milan. In 1808 he was at Bayonne as one of the negotiators of the convention which removed the Bourbons from the throne of Spain, and was rewarded with a bounty of fifty thousand francs and the archiepiscopal see of Mechlin (May 12, 1808).

He was one of the nineteen bishops who, March 25, 1810, solicited from the pope the dispensation which Napoleon wanted for his marriage with Maria Louisa. In 1811 he was a member of the second commission appointed for the purpose of preparing the questions to be proposed to the National Council, and the emperor, Aug. 20, appointed him member of the deputation sent to Savone to submit the decrees of that council for the pope's approbation. In the ensuing year he was sent as ambassador to Warsaw, where he opened with a speech the Polish diet, June, 1812. It was here that a spirit of opposition commenced to stir in the supple priest, and he was sent back to his diocese. He returned to France with the allies, who, he says, by his advice, “determined to break entirely with Napoleon and his dynasty, and re-establish the Bourbons on the throne.” De Pradt owed to his relations with Talleyrand his nomination as grand-chancellor of the Legion of Honor, and the dignity of grand-cross of the order. In 1815 he retired to Auvergne, and in 1816 he accepted a  liferent of 12,000 francs from William, king of the Netherlands, in exchange for his archbishopric. In the reign of Louis XVIII he was pleased to side with the opposition. He wrote some brilliant pamphlets against the government: one of them brought him before the Cour d'Assises of the Seine, where he was defended by the elder Dupin. In 1827 he was elected deputy of Clermont-Ferrand. After the revolution of July his opinions underwent a new change: he again declared for unmitigated royalty and against the liberty of the press. He died at Paris March 18, 1837. We mention, among his numerous writings, Histoire de l'Ambassade dans le Grand-Duchi de Varsovie (Paris, 1815, 1826, 8vo). In this amusing and witty composition he holds a review over the personages of the empire with uncommon satirical sharpness. We find in it the following regarding the principal figure: “The genius of Napoleon was fitted at the same time for the stage of the world and for that of the mountebanks; it was represented by royal attire mixed with the dress of a clown. The god Mars was nothing but a kind of Jupiter-Scapin, the like of which the world had never seen: — Memoires historiques sur la Revolution d'Espagne (Paris, 1816, 8vo): — Des Colonies, et de la Revolution actutelle de l'Amerique (ibid. 1817, 2 vols. 8vo): — Les Quatre Concordats (ibid. 1818-20, 3 vols. 8vo), one of his most curious writings: — L'Europe apres le Congres d'Aix-la-Chapelle (ibid. 1819, 8vo): Le Congres de Carlsbad (ibid. 1819, 8vo): — L'Europe et l'Amrique depuis le Congrses d'Aix - la- Chapelle (ibid. 1821-2, 2 vols. 8vo): — L'Europe et l'Amerique en 1821 et Ann. suiv. (ibid. 1821-4, 4 vols. 8vo): — Du Jesuitisme ancien et moderne (ibid. 1825-6, 8vo) etc. See L'Ami de la Religion (1837); Perennes, Biog. univ. supplem. au Dict. hist. de Feller; Jauffret, Mm. hist. sur les Affaires eccles. de France; Rabbe, etc., Biog. univ. et portat. des Contempoiains; Querard, La France litter. Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.; Lond. Qu. Rev. Jan. 1816 Monthly Rev. vol. 80 (1816).

## Praeadamites[[@Headword:Praeadamites]]

             SEE PREADAMITES.

## Praebend[[@Headword:Praebend]]

             SEE PREBEND.

## Praebenda, Richard de[[@Headword:Praebenda, Richard de]]

             a Scotch prelate, was consecrated bishop of the see of Dunkehl, in the Church of St. Andrews, August 9, 1169. He died in 1173. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 74.

## Praebenda, Robert de[[@Headword:Praebenda, Robert de]]

             a Scotch prelate, was elected bishop of Dunnblane in 1258. In 1268 he, with one other, was sent to protest against the contributions imposed upon the Scotch clergy by Ottobon. He was still bishop here in 1282. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 173.

## Praecentor[[@Headword:Praecentor]]

             SEE PRECENTOR.

## Praecones[[@Headword:Praecones]]

             (i.e. heralds) is a name sometimes given to deacons, because it was their duty to pronounce the usual formularies of exhortation, etc., during the celebration of divine service. The word praeco corresponds to the Greek κήρυξ, and gave rise to the English Church term bidding prayer. The deacons were required to bid prayer in the congregation, i.e. to dictate to the people the usual forms of prayer in which they were to join, and to act as their director and guide in all the other parts of divine service. The word praedico is used in a similar signification. SEE BIDDING PRAYER.

## Praefatio[[@Headword:Praefatio]]

             is, in the mass, the prayer which immediately precedes the canon, an exhortation to thankfulness, commencing with the words “Sursum corda.” In the Gothic or Mozarabic liturgy the Praefatio is called Illatio; in the Gallican, Immolatio and Contestatio. It is also called Hymnus Angelicus. Originally there was but one praefatio for all days and feasts (Praefatio Communis); since the 12th century a number of prefationes, adapted to the variety of the feasts, the use of which is indicated by the Directory of the Church, have been introduced. Every praefatio ends with the triple “Sanctus,” the introduction of which is attributed to Sixtus I. SEE MASS; PREFACES.

## Praefice[[@Headword:Praefice]]

             a name for the mourning-women of the ancients. They were hired to make lamentation at Roman funerals, and were so called because they generally preceded the funeral processions in order to lament and sing the praises of the deceased. The early Christians very earnestly condemned the imitation of this custom in their funerals. They deemed immoderate grief unbecoming the character and profession of a Christian whose conversation is in heaven, and whose hope and expectation was a crown of life that fadeth not away. Chrysostom inveighed with great indignation against the introduction of heathenish practices into the Christian Church, and threatened those who should persist in the imitation of the funeral customs of the heathen with the highest ecclesiastical censures.

## Praelati[[@Headword:Praelati]]

             (i.e. preferred), in the larger sense of the word, is the name of all higher officers of the Church with whose functions is connected a jurisdiction in their own name — jure ordinario— i.e. a jurisdiction belonging essentially to the office, not conferred by a higher dignitary of the Church. In this meaning of the word we distinguish between praelati primigenii and secundirii. In a more restricted sense, praelati is the name given to the local superiors or directors of the congregations and abbeys of many ecclesiastical orders, especially to those who enjoy, either by privilege or tradition, the right of wearing the pontifical ensigns.

Praelati nullius dioceseos is the title of abbots or other high dignitaries who are not amenable to the jurisdiction of the bishop, but enjoy themselves jurisdictionem quasi-episcopalem, which as a rule extends only to the a ecclesiastics subordinated to them, not to the laymen of their monastic district, except in cases where they may enjoy even such a spiritual jurisdiction in virtue of a special indult, as in consequence of prescription. SEE PRELATE.

## Praelector[[@Headword:Praelector]]

             is the ecclesiastical term for the divinity-reader in some cathedrals. Sometimes he is attached to the prebend (q.v.), and sometimes he lectures, as on saints' days, in Lent, and other important Church seasons. SEE LECTOR; SEE READER.

## Praemunire[[@Headword:Praemunire]]

             is a term used in English canon law as well as British common law to designate a species of offence of the nature of a contempt of the ruling power, for which enactments were passed, and was so called from the mandatory words with which the writ directing the citation of a party charged with the offence commences. The different statutes of praemunire were originally framed in order to restrain the encroachments of the papal power. They begin with the 27 Edward III, st. i, c. 1, and continue from that period down to the reign of Henry VIII, when the kingdom entirely renounced the authority of the Roman pontiffs. The exorbitant powers  exercised by the pope in presenting to benefices and in other ecclesiastical matters, and the privileges claimed by the clergy, who resisted the authority of the king's courts, and recognized no jurisdiction but that of the court of Rome, rendered some enactments absolutely necessary to uphold the law of the country and the independence of the nation. This, then, is the original meaning of the offence termed praemunire — viz., introducing a foreign power into the land, and creating an imperium in imperio by paying that obedience to the papal process which constitutionally belonged to the king alone. Its penalties have been subsequently applied to other heinous offences, some of which bear more and some less relation to this original offence, and some no relation at all, as a chapter refusing to elect as bishop the person nominated by the sovereign, neglecting to take the oath of allegiance, transgressing the statute of habeas corpus (by 6 Anne, c. 7), the asserting by preaching, teaching, or advisedly speaking that any person other than according to the Acts of Settlement and Union has any right to the British throne, or that the sovereign and parliament cannot make laws to limit the descent of the crown. The knowingly and willfully solemnizing, assisting, or being present at any marriage forbidden by the Royal Marriage Act is declared by 12 George III, c. 11, to infer a praemunire. The penalties for the offence are no less than the following, as shortly summed tip by Sir E. Coke (I Inst. p. 129): “That from the conviction the defendant shall be out of the king's protection, and his lands and tenements, goods and chattels, forfeited to the king, and that his body shall remain in prison during the king's pleasure, or (as others have it) during life.” The offender can bring no action nor recover damages for the most atrocious injuries. and no man can safely give him comfort, aid, or relief. (See Baxter, Ch. Hist. p. 291; Hardwick, Hist. of the Ref. p. 187, 361.) In very recent times the dissenters have labored for the abolition of the statute of praemunire (see London Globe, Nov. 1869).

## Praepositivus, Pietro[[@Headword:Praepositivus, Pietro]]

             an Italian theologian, who flourished near the opening of the 13th century, was a native of Cremona, taught theology in the schools of Paris, and was at the close of 1206 chancellor of the Church of Notre Dame. In 1209 we find Jean de Cantelis in his place. His chief work is a Summans Theoloix, of which two or three pages only were printed; they are in the Penitential of Theodore. There are numerous copies of it at Oxford and in the National Library at Paris. Praepositivus died at Paris in 1209 or 1217. See  Tiraboschi, Storia de la Letter. Ital. 4,120; Histoire litt. de la France, 16, 583-586. — Hoefer, Nouv, Biog. Géneralé, s.v.

## Praepositus[[@Headword:Praepositus]]

             (i.e. set over) is an ecclesiastical term usually employed to mean a bishop (q.v.), but also used to signify a presbyter. The same titles being applied to both is a proof that they were at one time considered of the same order. The corresponding titles in the scriptural appellations are προϊστάμενοι (1Th 5:12) and προεστῶτες (1Ti 5:17). In Spain, in the time of the Gothic kings, about the end of the 4th century, it was a custom for parents to dedicate their children at a very early age to the service of the Church, in which case they were taken into the bishop's family and educated under him by a presbyter whom the bishop deputed for that purpose and set over them by the name of praepositus or superintendent, his chief business being to inspect their behavior and instruct them in the rules and discipline of the Church. See Riddle, Christian. Antiquities, p. 211 Coleman, Anc. Christianity Exemplified, p. 130, 485. SEE PRELACY. (J.H.W.)

## Praepositus Domus[[@Headword:Praepositus Domus]]

             was the name applied to the person whose duty it was to manage the revenues of the Church. SEE AECONOMI.

## Praepositus, Jacobus[[@Headword:Praepositus, Jacobus]]

             SEE SPRENG.

## Praesanctificatio[[@Headword:Praesanctificatio]]

             is in the Roman Catholic Church the mass celebrated on Green-Thursday, when two hosts are consecrated, whereof the priest tastes one at the communion, reserving the other for the next day, when the missa praesanctificatorum is to be solemnized. In the Greek Church missapraesanctificatorum (mass of the loaves blessed in advance) is the mass celebrated on the Wednesdays and Fridays of Lent; it consists in the communion of the holy elements which have been consecrated on the preceding Sundays. SEE MASS. See Siegel, Christliche Alterthümer (Index in vol. 4).

## Praestimonia[[@Headword:Praestimonia]]

             were originally stipends derived from special foundations for theological candidates, to help them during their studies, or to give them the means, after their consecration, to enjoy the teachings of some distinguished theological establishment. The chapters, abbeys, universities, etc., in which such foundations existed, or which were possessed of the right of collation or presentation, granted these stipends, after examination of the testimonies with which the competitors accompanied their request, to the candidate who seemed to be the most worthy of such a favor, unless the deed of the foundation limited their choice to the individuals belonging to certain families. Sometimes the praestimonia were granted to ordained priests, as, for instance, in cathedral and collegiate churches to young ecclesiastics without prebend, but who, in the expectation of benefices to come, served in the choir and in other ecclesiastical ministries; in this case the praestimonia were sometimes considered as real benefices, and, like these, connected with determined functions. The question ventilated in more recent times, whether these praestimonia were rightly considered as prebends, can only in this latter case be answered in the affirmative, as no private foundation can be lawfully considered as a benefice before it has been admitted by the competent clerical authorities in titulm benficii. Allowances to ecclesiastics given otherwise than as beneficial revenue for ecclesiastical duties, or to laymen even fur ecclesiastical services, are no prebends in the canonic meaning of the word.

## Praetorium[[@Headword:Praetorium]]

             is the rendering in Mar 15:16 of the Greek notation Πραιτώριον of the Latin word prcetorinum, which properly meant the tent of the Roman general in the field, and hence the house of the Roman governor in his province (see Livy, 28:27; 45:7; Valer. Max. 1, 6, 4; Cicero, Verr. 2, 4, 28; 2, 5, 12, 35; comp. Walter, Gesch. d. Rum. Rechts, 1, 340). In Mat 27:27 the common version renders the same word common hall; in Php 1:13, palace; in Joh 18:28, hall of judgment; and  elsewhere, once in the same verse in John, in 5:33, in 19:9, and Act 23:35, judgment hall. It, is plainly one of the many Latin words to be found in the New Testament, SEE LATINISMS, being the word pretorium in a Greek dress, a derivative from praetor; which latter, from praeeo, “to go before,” was originally applied by the Romans to a military officer the general. But because the Romans subdued many countries and reduced them to provinces, and governed them afterwards, at first by the generals who subdued them, or by some other military commanders, the word puraetor came ultimately to be used for any civil governor of a province, whether he had been engaged in war or not; and who acted in the capacity of chief-justice, having a council associated with him (Act 25:12). Accordingly the word praetorium, also, which originally signified the general's tent in a camp, came at length to be applied to the residence of the civil governor in provinces and cities (Cicero, Verr. 2; 5, 12); and being properly an adjective, as is also its Greek representative, it was used to signify whatever appertained to the praetor or governor; for instance, his residence, either the whole or any part of it, as his dwelling-house, or the place where he administered justice, or even the large enclosed court at the entrance to the praetorian residence (Byneaes, De Morte Jesu Christi [Amsterd. 1696], 2, 407). There dwelt not only the commandant and his family (Josephus, Ant. 20:10, 1), but a division of the troops occupied barracks there, and the prisoners who awaited hearing and judgment from the chief were there detained (Act 23:35). The praetorium in the capital of a province was usually a large palace; and we see by Josephus (War, 2, 14, 8; comp. 15:5; Philo, Opp. 2, 591) that the procurators of Judaea, when in Jerusalem, occupied Herod's palace as a praetorium, just as in Caesarea a former royal residence served the same purpose. Yet the rendering of the Latin praetorium in general by the word palace (by Schleusner and Wahl) is wrong. The places in Suetonius misquoted refer only to the imperial palaces out of Rome. Verres as praeses or prmetor of Sicily resided in the donmus pretoria, which belonged to king Hiero (Cicero, Verr. 2, 5; 12:31). SEE JERUSALEM.

1. As to the passages in the Gospels referred to above, tradition distinguishes the judgment-hall of Pilate, which is pointed out in the lower city (Korte, Reisen, p. 75; Troilo, p. 234 sq.), from the palace of king Herod; and others have believed (as Rosenmüller, Alterth. II, 2, 228) that the procurator took up his quarters in Jerusalem in the tower of Antonia, and sat in judgment there. The tradition has no weight; yet on general  grounds we may believe, since the palace of Herod stood vacant and was roomy and suitable, that the procurators usually resided there, surrounded by a body-guard, while the troops with their officers occupied the tower of Antonia (comp. Faber, Archaeology, 1, 321 sq.). A description of that marble palace of Herod, which joined the north wall of the upper city, and was so large and well fortified, is given by Josephus (War, 5, 4, 4; comp. Ant. 15, 9, 3). The Roman procurators, whose ordinary residence was at Cassarea (Act 23:23, etc.; 25:1, etc.), took up their residence in this palace when they visited Jerusalem, their tribunal being erected in the open court or area before it. Thus Josephus states that Florus took up his quarters at the palace (ἐν τοῖς βασιλείοις αὐλίζεται); and on the next day he had his tribunal set up before it, and sat upon it (War, 2, 14, 8). Philo expressly says that the palace, which had hitherto been Herod's, was now called τὴν οἰκίαν τῶν ἐπιτρόπων, “the house of the practors” (Legat. ad Caium [ed. Franc.], p. 1033).

It was situated on the western or more elevated hill of Jerusalem, overlooking the Temple (Josephus, Ant. 20, 8, 11), and was connected with a system of fortifications the aggregate of which constituted the παρεμβολή, or fortified barrack. It was the dominant position on the western hill, and-at any rate on one side, probably the eastern— was mounted by a flight of steps, the same from which Paul made his speech in Hebrew to the angry crowd of Jews (Act 22:1 sq.). From the level below the barrack a terrace led eastward to a gate opening into the western side of the cloister surrounding the Temple, the road being carried across the valley of the Tyropoeon (separating the western from the Temple hill) on a causeway built up of enormous stone blocks. At the angle of the Temple cloister just above this entrance, i.e. the northwest corner, SEE TEMPLE, stood the old citadel of the Temple hill the βᾶρις, or Byrsa, which Herod rebuilt and called by the name Antonia, after his friend and patron the triumvir. After the Roman power was established in Judaca, a Roman guard was always maintained in the Antonia, the commander of which for the time being seems to be the official termed στρατηγός τοῦ ἱεροῦ in the Gospels and Acts.

The guard in the Antonia was probably relieved regularly from the cohort quartered in the παρεμβολή, and hence the plural form στρατηγοί is sometimes used, the officers, like the privates, being changed every watch; although it is very conceivable that a certain number of them should have been selected for the service from possessing a superior knowledge of the Jewish customs or skill in the Hebrew language. Besides the cohort of regular legionaries there was probably an equal number of local troops, who when on service acted as  the “supports” (δεξιόλαβοι, coverers of the right flank, Act 23:23) of the former, and there were also a few squadrons of cavalry; although it seems likely that both these and the local troops had separate barracks at Jerusalem, and that the παρεμβολή, or praetorian camp, was appropriated to the Roman cohort. The ordinary police of the Temple and the city seems to have been in the hands of the Jewish officials, whose attendants (ὑπήρεται) were provided with dirks and clubs, but without the regular armor and the discipline of the legionaries. When the latter were required to assist the gendarmerie, either from the apprehension of serious tumult, or because the service was one of great importance, the Jews would apply to the officer in command at the Antonia, who would act so far under their orders as the commander of a detachment in a manufacturing town does under the orders of the civil magistrate at the time of a riot (Act 4:1; Act 5:24). But the power of life and death, or of regular scourging, rested only with the praetor, or the person representing him and commissioned by him. This power, and that which would always go with it-the right to press whatever men or things were required by the public exigencies appears to be denoted by the term ἐξουσία, a term perhaps the translation of the Latin imperium, and certainly its equivalent. It was inherent in the practor or his representatives-hence themselves popularly called ἐξουσίαι ἐξουσίαι ὑπέρτεραι (Rom 13:1; Rom 13:3)— and would be communicated to all military officers in command of detached posts, such as the centurion at Capernaum, who describes himself as possessing summary powers of this kind because he was ὑπ᾿ ἐξουσίᾷ-covered by the privilege of the imperium (Mat 8:9). The forced purveyances (Mat 5:40), the requisitions for baggage animals (Mat 5:41), the summary punishments following transgression of orders (Mat 5:39) incident to a military occupation of the country, of course must have been a perpetual source of irritation to the peasantry along the lines of the military roads, even when the despotic authority of the Roman officers might be exercised with moderation. But such a state of things also afforded constant opportunities to an unprincipled soldier to extort money under the pretence of a loan, as the price of exemption from personal services which he was competent to insist upon, or as a bribe to buy off the prosecution of some vexatious charge before a military tribunal (Mat 5:42; Luke 3, 14). SEE ARMY.

The relations of the military to the civil authorities in Jerusalem come out very clearly from the history of the Crucifixion. When Judas first makes his  proposition to betray Jesus to the chief-priests, a conference is held between them and the στρατγηγοί as to the mode of effecting the object (Luk 22:4). The plan involved the assemblage of a large number of the Jews by night, and Roman jealousy forbade such a thing, except under the surveillance of a military officer. An arrangement was accordingly made for a military force, which would naturally be drawn from the Antonia. At the appointed hour Judas comes and takes with him “the troops” (called τὴν σπεῖραν, although of course only a detachment from the cohort), together with a number of police (ὑπηρέτας) under the orders of the high priests and Pharisees (Joh 18:3).

When the apprehension of Jesus takes place, however, there is scarcely any reference to the presence of the military. Matthew and Mark altogether ignore their taking any part in the proceeding. From Luke's account one is led to suppose that the military commander posted his men outside the garden, and entered himself with the Jewish authorities (Luk 22:52). This is exactly what might be expected under the circumstances. It was the business of the Jewish authorities to apprehend a Jewish offender, and of the Roman officer to take care that the proceeding led to no breach of the public peace. But when apprehended, the Roman officer became responsible for the custody of the offender, and accordingly he would at once chain him by the wrists to two soldiers (Act 21:33) and carry him off. Here John accordingly gave another glimpse of the presence of the military: “the troops then, and the chiliarch and the officers of the Jews, apprehended Jesus, and put him in bonds, and led him away, first of all to Annas” (Joh 18:12). The insults which Luke mentions (Luk 22:63) are apparently the barbarous sport of the ruffianly soldiers and police while waiting with their prisoner for the assembling of the Sanhedrim in the hall of Caiaphas; but the blows inflicted are those with the vine-stick, which the centurions carried, and with which they struck the soldiers on the head and face (Juvenal, Sat. 8, 247), not a flagellation by the hands of lictors. When Jesus was condemned by the Sanhedrim, and accordingly sent to Pilate, the Jewish officials certainly expected that no inquiry would be made into the merits of the case, but that Jesus would be simply received as a convict on the authority of his own countrymen's tribunal, thrown into a dungeon, and on the first convenient opportunity executed. They are obviously surprised at the question, “What accusation bring ye against this man?” and at the apparition of the governor himself outside the precinct of the praetorium.

The cheapness in which he had held the life of the native population on a former occasion (Luk 13:1) must have led them to expect a totally  different course from him. His scrupulousness, most extraordinary in any Roman, stands in striking contrast with the recklessness of the commander who proceeded at once to put St. Paul to torture, simply to ascertain why it was that so violent an attack was made on him by the crowd (Act 22:24). Yet this latter is undoubtedly a typical specimen of the feeling which prevailed among the conquerors of Judaea in reference to the conquered. The order for the execution of a native criminal would in ninety-nine instances out of a hundred have been regarded by a Roman magnate as a simply ministerial act— one which indeed only he was competent to perform, but of which the performance was unworthy of a second thought. It is probable that the hesitation of Pilate was due rather to a superstitious fear of his wife's dream than to a sense of justice or a feeling of humanity towards an individual of a despised race; at any rate, such an explanation is more in accordance with what we know of the feeling prevalent among his class in that age. When at last Pilate's effort to save Jesus was defeated by the determination of the Jews to claim Barabbas, and he had testified, by washing his hands in the presence of the people, that he did not consent to the judgment passed on the prisoner by the Sanhedrim, but must be regarded as performing a merely ministerial act, he proceeded at once to the formal imposition of the appropriate penalty. His lictors took Jesus and inflicted the punishment of scourging upon him in the presence of all (Mat 27:26).

This, in the Roman idea, was the necessary preliminary to capital punishment, and had Jesus not been an alien his head would have been struck off by the lictors immediately afterwards. But crucifixion being the customary punishment in that case, a different course becomes necessary. The execution must take place by the hands of the military, and Jesus is handed over from the lictors to these. They take him into the praetorium, and muster the whole cohort- not merely that portion which is on duty at the time (Mat 27:27; Mar 15:16). While a centurion's guard is told off for the purpose of executing Jesus and the two criminals, the rest of the soldiers divert themselves by mocking the reputed king of the Jews (Mat 27:28-30; Mar 15:17-19; Joh 19:2-3), Pilate, who in the meantime has gone in, being probably a witness of the pitiable spectacle. His wife's dream still haunts him, and although he has already delivered Jesus over to execution, and what is taking place is merely the ordinary course, he comes out again to the people to protest that he is passive in the matter, and that they must take the prisoner, there before their eyes in the garb of mockery, and crucify him (Joh 19:4-6). On their reply that Jesus had asserted  himself to be the Son of God, Pilate's fears are still more roused, and at last he is only induced to go on with the military execution, for which he is himself responsible, by the threat of a charge of treason against Cesar in the event of his not doing so (Joh 19:7-13). Sitting, then, solemnly on the bema, and producing Jesus, who in the meantime has had his own clothes put upon him, he formally delivers him up to be crucified in such a manner as to make it appear that he is acting solely in the discharge of his duty to the emperor (Joh 19:13-16). The centurion's guard now proceed with the prisoners to Golgotha. Jesus himself carrying the cross- piece of wood to which his hands were to be nailed. Weak from loss of blood, the result of the scourging, he is unable to proceed; but just as they are leaving the gate they meet Simon the Cyrenian, and at once use the military right of pressing (ἀγγαρεύειν) him for the public service. Arrived at the spot, four soldiers are told off for the business of the executioner, the remainder keeping the ground. Two would be required to hold the hands, and a third the feet, while the fourth drove in the nails. Hence the distribution of the garments into four parts.

The centurion in command, the principal Jewish officials and their acquaintances (hence probably John [Joh 18:15]), and the nearest relatives of Jesus (Joh 19:26-27), might naturally be admitted within the cordon-a square of perhaps one hundred yards. The people would be kept outside of this, but the distance would not be too great to read the title, “Jesus the Nazarene, the King of the Jews,” or at any rate to gather its general meaning. The whole acquaintance of Jesus, and the women who had followed him from Galilee- too much afflicted to mix with the crowd in the immediate vicinity, and too numerous to obtain admission inside the cordon-looked on from a distance (ἀπὸ μακρόθεν). The vessel containing vinegar (Joh 19:29) was set within the cordon for the benefit of the soldiers, whose duty it was to remain under arms (Mat 27:36) until the death of the prisoners, the centurion in command being responsible for their not being taken down alive. Had the Jews not been anxious for the removal of the bodies, in order not to shock the eyes of the people coming in from the country on the following day, the troops would have been relieved at the end of their watch, and their place supplied by others until death took place. The jealousy with which any interference with the regular course of a military execution was regarded appears from the application of the Jews to Pilate— not to the centurion to have the prisoners dispatched by breaking their legs. For the performance of this duty other soldiers were detailed (Joh 19:32), not merely permission given to the Jews to have the  operation performed. Even for the watching of the sepulcher recourse is had to Pilate, who bids the applicants “take a guard” (Mat 27:65), which they do, and put a seal on the stone in the presence of the soldiers, in a way exactly analogous to that practiced in the custody of the sacred robes of the high-priest in the Antonia (Josephus, Ant. 15, 11, 4). SEE CRUCIFIXION.

2. The praetorium in Rome, mentioned in Php 1:13 where Paul lay imprisoned, has occasioned much discussion among the interpreters. and formed the theme of a learned dispute between Jac. Perizonius and Ulrich Huber (see Perizonii Cum U. Hubero Disquisitio de Praetorio [Lugd. Bat. 1696]). It was not the imperial palace (ἡ οἰκία Καίσαρος, Php 4:22), for this was never called praetorium in Rome; nor was it the judgment hall, for no such building stood in Rome, and the name pletoria was not until much later applied to the courts of justice (see Perizonius, l. c. p. 63 sq.). It was probably (as Camerarius perceived) the quarters of the imperial body-guard, the praetorian cohort, which had been built for it by Tiberius, under the advice of Sejanus (Sueton. Tüb. 37). Before that time the guards were billeted in different parts of the city. It stood outside the walls, at some distance short of the fourth milestone, and so near either to the Salarian or the Nomentane road that Nero, in his flight by one or the other of them to the house of his freedman Phaon, which was situated between the two, heard the cheers of the soldiers within for Galba. In the time of Vespasian the houses seem to have extended so far as to reach it (Tacitus, Annal. 4, 2; Sueton. Ner. 48; Pliny, I. N. 3, 5). From the first, buildings must have sprung up near it for sutlers and others. An opinion well deserving consideration has been advocated by Wieseler, and by Conybeare and Howson (Life of St. Paul, ch. 26), to the effect that the praetorium here mentioned was the quarter of that detachment of the Praetorian Guards which was in immediate attendance upon the emperor, and had barracks in Mount Palatine. Thither, wherever the place was, Paul was brought as a prisoner of the emperor, and delivered to the praefect of the guard, according to the custom (Act 28:16; see Pliny, Ep. 10:65; Philostr. Soph. 2, 32), as the younger Agrippa was once imprisoned by this officer at the express command of the emperor Tiberius (Josephus, Ant. 18, 6, 6). This office was then filled by Burrhus Afranius (Tacitus, Annal. 12, 42; see Anger, Temp. Act. Ap. p. 100 sq.). Paul appears to have been permitted for the space of two years to lodge, so to speak, “within the rules” of the praelorium (Act 28:30), although still under the custody  of a soldier. See Olshausen, Topogr. des alten Jerusalen, § 3, p. 9; Perizonius, De Origine et Significatimone et Usu Vocum Prestoris et Prcetorii (Frank. 1690); Shorzins, De Prcetorio Pilati in Exercit. Phil. (Hag. Com. 1774); Zorn, Opuscula Sacra, 2, 699. SEE PAUL.

## Praetorius[[@Headword:Praetorius]]

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

1. ANDREAS, who died December 20, 1586, at Frankfort-on-the-Oder, doctor of theology, is the author of Propositiones de Jesu Christo, Dei et Maria Filio. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.

2. CHRISTIAN GOTTLIEB, born August 30, 1693, at Bertzdorf, Upper Lusatia, studied at Wittenburg, and died in 1738 at Bernstadt, in his native province. He wrote Amaenitates Biblicae, comprising only the Pentateuch (1724-29, 6 parts). See Doring, Die Gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.

3. EPHRAIM, was born at Dantzic, March 11, 1657. He studied at Wittenberg, was in 1685 preacher at Munsterberg, in 1698 at his native city, in 1705 at Thorn, and died February 14, 1723. He wrote, Exercitationes theol. de Jona: — Athemis Proprio Glidio Jugulatus ex Ecc 3:18-21 : — Bibliotheca Homiletica (Leipsic, 1691-98, 3 parts; 2d ed. 1711-19). See Doring, Die gelehrten Thleologen-Deutschlands, s.v.; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Pragaladen[[@Headword:Pragaladen]]

             a particular and holy worshipper of the Hindu god Vishnu, who was for a long time tortured by the demon Tronya, until Vishnu, in his fourth incarnation, as man-lion, killed the giant. SEE VISHNU.

## Pragmatic Sanction[[@Headword:Pragmatic Sanction]]

             was a general term (from παᾶγμα, business) for all important ordinances of Church or State-those perhaps more properly which were enacted in public assemblies with the counsel of eminent jurisconsults or pragmatici. The term originated in the Byzantine Empire, and signified there a public and solemn decree by a prince, as distinguished from the simple rescript which was a declaration of law in answer to a question propounded by an individual. But the most familiar application of the term is to the important articles decided on by the great assembly held at Bourges (q.v.) in 1438, convoked and presided over by Charles VII. These articles have been regarded as the great bulwark of the French Church against the usurpation of Rome. King Louis IX had drawn up a pragmatic sanction in 1268 against the encroachments of the Church and court of Rome. It related chiefly to the right of the Gallican Church with reference to the selections of bishops and clergy.

But the great articles of 1438 entirely superseded those of Louis IX; for though they reasserted the rights and privileges claimed by the Gallican Church under that monarch, the articles were chiefly founded on the decrees of the Council of Basle. Some of them relate to the periodical assembling and superior authority of general councils; some to the celebration of divine offices and other matters not connected with papal prerogation; but of the rest it has been truly said that the abuses of the papal prerogation against which they were directed were chiefly connected with its avarice. This was the most unpopular of the vices of the Holy See, and was at the bottom of more than half the grievances which alienated its children from it. Pope Pius II succeeded in obtaining the abrogation of this sanction for a time; but the Parliament of Paris refused to sanction the ignominious conduct of Louis XI in setting it aside, and he was compelled to restore it to its original influential position.  Accordingly the pragmatic sanction continued in force till Francis I's concordat in 1516 supplanted it. Although by the concordat privileges were given and received on both sides, yet the real advantages were on the side of Rome, which advantages it has ever since been her constant aim to improve. See Jervis, Hist. Ch. of France, 1, 23 sq.; Hist. of Popery, p. 202; Gieseler, Eccles. Hist. (see Index to vol. 3); Fisher, Hist. of the Ref. p. 48, 49; Mosheim, Eccles. Hist. vol. 3; Milman, Hist. Latin Christianity (see Index to vol. 8); Hardwick, Hist. of the Church in the Middle Ages, p. 272, 358, 362; id. Ref. p. 7, 353; Waddington, Eccles. Hist. p. 576; Ranke, Hist. of the Papacy, 1, 28 sq.; Aizog, Kirchengesch. 2, 48, 180, 189, 191; Ebrard, Dogmengesch. 4, 206; Brit. Quar. Rev. April, 1873, p. 273.

## Prague, Council of[[@Headword:Prague, Council of]]

             (Concilium Pragense), an important ecclesiastical gathering, was convened by archbishop Ernest of Prague in 1346, and passed among other regulations one relating to the proper observance of the Christian faith, the abuses arising from the use of rescripts from Rome, the impropriety of allowing strange priests to assist at communions without letters from their own bishop, the rights of Roman delegates upon subjects of interdicts, and the private life and morals of the clergy. (See Mansi, Concil. 3, col. 543 sq.; Hefele, Conciliengesch. vol. 6.) How little these efforts for the purifying of the Church and strengthening of the Christian cause availed is but too well known to the historical student of the Hussite movement which followed in the next century and finally brought about many strong reforms in Bohemia, besides preparing the way for the great Reformation. SEE HUSSITES.

## Praise[[@Headword:Praise]]

             an acknowledgment made of the excellency or perfection of any person or action, with a commendation of the same. “The desire of praise,” says an elegant writer, “is generally connected with all the finer sensibilities of human nature. It affords a ground on which exhortation, counsel, and reproof can work a proper effect. To be entirely destitute of this passion betokens an ignoble mind on which no moral impression Is easily made, for where there is no desire of praise there will also be no sense of reproach; but while it is admitted to be a natural and in many respects a useful principle of action, we are to observe that it is entitled to no more than our secondary regard. It has its boundary set, by transgressing which it is at  once transformed from an innocent into a most dangerous passion. When, passing its natural line, it becomes the ruling spring of conduct; when the regard which we pay to the opinions of men encroaches on that reverence which we owe to the voice of conscience and the sense of duty, the love of praise, having then gone out of its proper place, instead of improving, corrupts, and instead of elevating, debases our nature.” See Young, Love of Fame; Blair, Sermons, vol. 2, ser. 6; Jortin, Diss. No. 4 passim; Wilberforce, Praeft. View, ch. 4 § 3; Smith, Theory of Moral Sent. 1, 233; Fitzosborne, Letters, No. 18.

## Praise of God[[@Headword:Praise of God]]

             is a reverent acknowledgment of the perfections, works, and benefits of God, and of the blessings flowing from them to mankind, usually expressed in hymns of gratitude and thanksgiving, and especially in the reception of the Holy Eucharist, that “sacrifice of praise” and sublimest token of our joy, and which has received the name (εὐχαριστία) because it is the highest instance of thanksgiving in which Christians can be engaged. Praise and thanksgiving are generally considered as synonymous, yet some distinguish them thus: “Praise properly terminates in God, on account of his natural excellences and perfections, and is that act of devotion by which we confess and admire his several attributes; but thanksgiving is a more contracted duty, and imports only a grateful sense and acknowledgment of past mercies. We praise God for all his glorious acts of every kind that regard either his or other men— for his very vengeance, and those judgments which he sometimes sends abroad in the earth; but we thank him, properly speaking, for the instances of' his goodness alone, and for such only of these as we ourselves are some way concerned in.”-Buck, Theol. Dict. See Atterbury, Sermon on Psalms 1, 14; Saurin, Sermons, vol. 1, ser. 14; Tillotson, Sermons, ser. 146 (conclusion). SEE THANKSGIVING.

## Praise-meeting[[@Headword:Praise-meeting]]

             a meeting recently inaugurated in this country, first in New England, for a service of song by the congregation. The people gather, and, under the lead of some competent precentor, unite in a service which is wholly, or almost wholly, musical, and in which all participate.

## Prakriti[[@Headword:Prakriti]]

             SEE PRACRITI.

## Pran[[@Headword:Pran]]

             is, in Hindû mythology, the breath, the vital principle, which dwells in every man, and has its seat in the heart; it is the divine principle of motion that spreads everywhere life and activity, through which alone the whole nature can subsist, and which manifests itself in the animal world by the act of breathing.

## Pran Nathis[[@Headword:Pran Nathis]]

             a sect among the Hindis which was originated by Pran Nath, who, being versed in Mohammedan as well as Hindu learning, endeavored to reconcile the two religions. With this view he composed a work called The Mahitariyal, in which texts from the Koran and the Vedas are brought together, and shown not to be essentially different from each other. Bulndelkund is the chief seat of the sect, and in Punna they have a building in one apartment of which, on a table covered with gold cloth, lies the volume of the founder. “As a test of the disciple's consent,” says Prof. H. H. Wilson, “to the real identity of the essence of the Hindi and Mohammedan creeds, the ceremony of the initiation consists of eating in the society of members of both communions; with this exception, and the admission of the general principle, it does not appear that the two classes confound their civil or even religious distinctions; they continue to observe the practices and ritual of their forefathers, whether Mussulman or Hindu, and the union, beyond that of community or that of eating, is no more than  any rational individual of either sect is fully prepared for, or the admission that the God of both and of all religions is one and the same.”

## Pranzimas[[@Headword:Pranzimas]]

             a name for destiny among the Lithuanians, which, according to immutable laws, directs the gods, nature, and men, and whose power knows no limit.

## Pratensis, Felix[[@Headword:Pratensis, Felix]]

             is noted as the famous editor of the editio princeps of Bomberg's Rabbinic Bible. Little is known of his personal history beyond that he was born a Jew, was corrector of the press in Bomberg's famous printing-office, embraced Christianity in Rome in 1513, was created magister theologus in 1523, and that he died in 1539. The Rabbinic Bible, which immortalized him, was published in four parts (Venice, 1516-17) four years after his embracing Christianity; and, besides the Hebrew text, contains as follows:

1. In The Pentateuch, the Chaldee paraphrase of Oinkelos and the commentaries of Rashi.

2. The Prophets, the Chaldee paraphrase and the commentaries of Kirnchi.

3. The Hugiographa, the Chaldee paraphrase and Kimchi's commentary on The Psalms, the Chaldee paraphrase and Ibn-Jachja's commentary on Proverbs, the Chaldee paraphrase and Nachmanides's and Farissol's commentaries on Job; the reputed Chaldee paraphrases of Joseph the Blind  and Rashi's commentary on The Five Megilloth; Levi ben-Gershom's commentary on Juziel; Rashi's and Simon Darshan's (פי8 השמעוני) commentary on Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles, the latter consisting of excerpts from the Jalkut Shimoni. SEE CARA; SEE MIDRASH. Appended to the volume are the Targum Jerusalem on the Pentateuch, the Second Targum on Esther, the variations between Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali, the differences between the Eastern and Western Codd., Aaron b. — Asher's Dissertation on the Accents, Mainmonides's thirteen articles of faith, SEE MAIMONIDES, the six hundred and thirteen precepts, SEE PRECEPTS, a Table of the Parshoth and Haphtaroth, both according to the Spanish and German ritual. Considering that this was the first effort to give some of the Masoretic apparatus, it is no wonder that the work is imperfect, and that it contains many blunders. Pratensis also published a Latin translation of the Psalms, with annotations, first printed at Venice in 1515, then at Hazenau in 1522, and at Basle in 1526. See Wolf, Bibliotheca Hebraica, 2, 363; 3, 935 sq.; Masch's ed. of Le Long's Bibliotheca Sacra, 1, 96 sq.; Steinschneider, Catalogus L'br. Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana, col. b. 2111 sq.

## Prateolus, Gabriel[[@Headword:Prateolus, Gabriel]]

             a Romnan Catholic theologian of France, was born at Marcoussi in 1511, and died at Peronne, April 19, 1588, doctor of theology. His main works are, De Vitis, Sectis et Dogmatibus Omnium Haereticorum (Cologne, 1569): — Histoire de l'Etat et Succes de l'Eglise (Paris, 1585). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1L637; Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Pratilli, Francesco-Maria[[@Headword:Pratilli, Francesco-Maria]]

             all Italian ecclesiastic, noted especially as all antiquarian, was born November, 1689, at Capua. He received holy orders, and was at once provided with a canonry at the Cathedral of Capua. He died at Naples Nov. 29, 1763. Among his archaeological works we mention, Della Via Appia riconlosciuta e descritia da Roma a Brindisi (Naples, 1745, 4to); this work is ornamented with plans and maps, and is full of varied erudition: — Di una Moneta singolare del T'iranno Giovanni (ibid. 1748, 8vo); explanation of a medal, the only one of its kind, of a usurper who was proclaimed emperor in 423: — Della Origine della Metropolia ecclesiastica di Capoa (ibid. 1758, 4to). Pratilli published an edition, enriched with unpublished documents, dissertations, and a life of the author, of the Historia Principum Longobardorum of C. Pellegrini (ibid. 1749-54, 5 vols. 4to). He left in manuscript a History of the Norman Princes, in 6 vols. See Nomi illustri del Regno di Napoli, vol. 9. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.

## Pratje, Johann Henrich[[@Headword:Pratje, Johann Henrich]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born September 17, 1710. He studied at Helmstidt, was in 1735 preacher at Horneburg, his native place, in 1743 at Stade, and in 1749 general superintendent of Bremen and Verdlen. In 1787 his alma mater honored him with the doctorate of theology. He died February 1, 1791. His writings, comprising almost all departments of theology, are given in Doring, Die gelehrten Kanzelredner, pages 299-3015; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:119, 799; 2:282, 290. (B.P.).

## Pratorius, Abdias[[@Headword:Pratorius, Abdias]]

             a German theologian of some renown, was born in 1524 in the Brandenburg territory. He was master of many languages, and especially noted as a Greek scholar. He was at first rector of a school at Magdeburg, lived then at Frankfort-on-the-Oder, was called in 1560 to the electoral court of Brandenburg, and died in 1573 as professor of philosophy at Wittenberg. He attacked the Lutheran distinction between law and Gospel, and the definition of the latter as an unconditional message of grace. The most distinguished of his adversaries was Andrew Musculus, one of the authors of The Formula of Concord.

## Pratorius, Stephen[[@Headword:Pratorius, Stephen]]

             a German minister, flourished at Salzwedel towards the close of the 16th century. He was involved in various disputes in consequence of some doctrines professed or approved by Luther, or which seemed to him logical conclusions to be drawn from Luther's theory of justification. He asserted that between righteousness and beatitude there was no difference; that every man who received baptism and believed in Christ was saved, and could dispense with seeking the means to be saved; that the law was useless; that faith and justification obtained by it could be darkened and benumbed by sin, but never lost. John Arnd, the Fenelon of the Lutheran Church, published a collection of the writings of Pratorius, and Martin Statius (1655), minister at Dantsic, edited extracts from them under the title Ceistliche Schatzkammer der Gläubigen.

## Pratt, Albert L[[@Headword:Pratt, Albert L]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born at Wilmington, Vt., in 1828, and was converted and joined the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1851. He was licensed as a local preacher in 1853. In 1855 he was received into what was then the Oneida but is now the Central N. Y. Conference, and was stationed successively at Union Village, Bellows Falls, Brattleborough, Guilford, Woodstock, Bradford, Rochester, Windsor, and Colchester, where he finished his earthly work. Though constitutionally frail, his pastoral labors were prosecuted with great diligence until near his death, which occurred July 17, 1870, at Colchester, Vt. He was a good man, and succeeded well in the cause of his Master.

## Pratt, Almon Bradley[[@Headword:Pratt, Almon Bradley]]

             a Congregational minister, was born in North Cornwall, Conn., June 3, 1812, received his preparatory training at South Cornwall, Conn., and then entered Yale College. He was not however, able to complete his collegiate studies, as his health failed him. From 1839 to 1841 he was at the Union Theological Seminary in New York City. April 13. 1852, he was ordained as evangelist at Genesee, Mich., and acted in that place as pastor until 1865, when he removed to Flint, Mich. In 1868 he was called again to the work, and accepted the pastorate at Berea, Ohio. In 1873 he was made acting pastor at Camp Creek, Nebraska, and there he died, Dec. 28, 1875. See The Congreg. Quar. July, 1876, p. 432.

## Pratt, Enoch[[@Headword:Pratt, Enoch]]

             a Congregational minister of some note, was born at Middleborough, Mass.. in 1781, and was educated at Brown University, where he graduated in 1803. He taught for a while and studied theology, and was finally ordained to the work of the holy ministry Oct. 28, 1807, as pastor of the Congregational Church at West Barnstable, Mass., and held this position until 1837. He never took another pastorate, but preached and wrote occasionally. He devoted himself principally to secular historical studies, especially local subjects, and published in 1844 a Comprehensive History, Ecclesiastical and Civil, of Eastham, Wellfleet, and Orleans, Massachusetts (Yarmouth, 8vo). He died at Brewster Feb. 2,1860.

## Pratt, James C[[@Headword:Pratt, James C]]

             an Irish Wesleyan minister of some note, was born in Queens County, Ireland, in 1780. His parents were respectable members of the Church of England. In his twenty-first year he was converted, and joined the Wesleyans. He was licensed to preach in 1804, and four years later was accepted by the Conference as a traveling preacher and appointed to the Ballinamallard Circuit, in 1809 to Lisburn, in 1810 to Carrickfergus, and in 1811 to the city of Armagh, etc. He continued to travel regularly as a preacher, with “zeal, acceptance, and usefulness,” until 1842, when he took a supernumerary relation and settled in Enniskillen, where he had been twice before stationed. In 1846 he removed to Wexford; but as several of his children had settled in New York, he decided to come to this country, and obtained full permission from his Conference, held in Dublin in 1848, to emigrate. He came here in the fall of that year, and for nearly twenty-  two years resided in different places in this country, adorning by his holy life the religion of his Savior that he loved so well to preach. He died at Jersey City March 11, 1875.

## Pratt, James, D.D[[@Headword:Pratt, James, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was rector in Portland, Maine, for several years prior to 1858; then of the Church of the Covenant, in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, where he remained until 1860, when he took charge of Trinity Church, Chicago, Illinois. About 1864 he left that parish, and in 1866 was residing in New York city; in 1868 he removed to Philadelphia as the financial secretary of the Evangelical Knowledge Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church. During several years he resided in Philadelphia without assuming the duties of the regular pastorate, until 1873, when he became rector of St. Philip's Church. in that city. He died January 17, 1874, aged sixty-five years. See Prot. Episc. Almanac, 1875, page 144.

## Pratt, Job[[@Headword:Pratt, Job]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born about 1790, and was admitted in 1814 a member of the New England Annual Conference. At the organization of the Maine Conference he joined that body, and remained a member of it till his death, which occurred at Rumford Feb. 22, 1833. Mr. Pratt was a generally acceptable preacher. — Minutes of Conferences, 2, 216.

## Pratt, John Bennett, LL.D[[@Headword:Pratt, John Bennett, LL.D]]

             a Scottish Episcopal clergyman, antiquarian, and author, was born in the parish of New Deer in 1791. He took the degree of I.A. at Aberdeen, and, after his ordination as deacon in 1821, was sent to Stuartfield, where he served with acceptance four years, and was then chosen as pastor of St. James's Church, Cruden. There he became widely known for his theological learning, literary accomplishments, and professional zeal, and received from bishop Skinner the appointment of examining chaplain. He died at Cruden, Aberdeenshire, March 20, 1869. He was the author of several volumes, among which are, Old Paths- Where is the Good Way? (Oxford, 1840): Buchan, with illustrations (Aberdeen, 1858): — The Druids (Lond. 1861): — Letters on the Scandinavian Churches, their Doctrine, Worship, and Polity: — and several Sermons.

## Pratt, John, D.D[[@Headword:Pratt, John, D.D]]

             a Baptist minister and educator, was born in Windham County, Connecticut, October 12, 1800. After spending a few years in Columbian College, he graduated from Brown University in 1827. For a short time he was a professor in Transylvania University, Ketnucky, and then accepted a call to the pastorate of the First Baptist Church in New Haven,  Connecticut. In 1831 for six months, he had charge of the South Reading, Massachusetts (now Wakefield), Academy, and then was invited to preside over the Graliville, Ohio, Literary and Theological Institution. In 1837 he resigned, and accepted the professorship of ancient languages in that institution, and held this position, with occasional interruptions, for twenty- two-years (1837-59), when he retired to private life. He died January 4, 1882. See Cathcart, Baptist Encyclop. page 933. (J.C.S.)

## Pratt, Nathaniel Alpheus, D.D[[@Headword:Pratt, Nathaniel Alpheus, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Centre Brook, Connecticut, January 29, 1796. He graduated from Yale College in 1820, and from Princeton Theological Seminary in 1823, and was ordained February 25, 1824. From this time till 1826 he labored for the Shrewsbury Church, N.J. From 1827 to 1840 he was pastor of the Church at Darien, Georgia. He organized a Church in Roswell, in 1842, where he continued until his death, August 30, 1879. During the time at Roswell he taught, for five years, a boarding- school for boys. See Necrol. Report of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1880, page 11.

## Praxeans[[@Headword:Praxeans]]

             is the name of a sect of Monarchians, so called after Praxeas, the originator of their views. The heretical tenet that there is no distinction of persons in the Godhead, coupled with the acknowledgment of a divine nature in Jesus, leads logically to the conclusion that the Father was incarnate and suffered. Hence, although he himself shrank from the inference, Praxeas is reckoned with the Patripassians. He did not form a schismatical party. Philaster states that the Sabellians, called also Patripassians and Praxeans, were cast out of the Church (Haer. c. liv), but we cannot infer from this that Praxeas himself was excommunicated.

Our knowledge of Praxeas is derived almost entirely from Tertullian's treatise against him. Augustine, as well as Philaster, names him and his  followers under the heresy of Sabellius; and, excepting from Tertullian, we have only the bare mention of his name as a heretic. From Tertullian it appears that he went to Rome from Asia, and the words of Tertullian, “ceconomiam intelligere nolunt etiam Graeci,” appear to contain reference to his nation. It is probable that he learned his heresy from a school in Proconsular Asia which produced Noetus (q.v.). If Praxeas held his heresy while in Asia, he can scarcely have been, as he is often said to have been, a Montanist. There was a connection between the later Montanists and the Sabellians; but the earlier Montanists were free from Sabellianism. Tertullian's words imply no more than that Praxeas had in Asia become acquainted with the character of Montanist pretensions and doctrine. SEE MONTANISM. In Asia Praxeas had suffered imprisonment (“de jactatione martyrii inflatus, ob solum et simplex et breve carceris taedium,” is the polemical notice of it), and with the credit attaching to a confessor he preached his false doctrine at Rome.

Whether the doctrine met with resistance, toleration, or favor is not told, but that Praxeas's endeavors to propagate it had but little effect we are entitled to infer from the silence of Hippolytus. There is, however, very great difference of opinion regarding this point: Gieseler says that Praxeas appears to have been unmolested in Rome on account of his doctrine (Compend. 1, 218); Newman, that he met with the determined resistance which honorably distinguishes the primitive Roman Church in its dealings with heresy (Hist. of Arians, p. 130); Milman, that the indignation of Tertullian at the rejection of his Montanist opinions urged him to arraign the pope, with what justice, to what extent, we know not, as having embraced the Patripassian opinions of Praxeas (Hist. of Latin Christianity, 1, 49 [ed. 1867]). The two latter mention, as if inclined to it, Beausobre's supposition that, in the words of the continuator of the De Praescr. Heret., “Praxeas quidem haeresim introduxit, quam Victorinus corroborare curavit,” we should read Victor for Victorinus. One would be rather inclined to substitute Zephyrinus. The Refutation of Heresies was called forth by this very controversy, and Hippolytus details carefully the tenets of Noetus, and the action of the bishop of Rome with regard to them.

Had Praxeas prepared the way to any considerable extent for Noetus, some notice of his influence would surely have been given, whereas all that can be said is, that in the separate tract against Noetus the opening words will include, but without naming, disciples of Praxeas joining Noetus. It is easy to suppose that Victor, discovering the heresy of Praxeas, and not wishing, for his own sake, to disgrace one upon whose information he had acted, and by whom perhaps he had been influenced in  the matter of the Montanists, quietly sent Praxeas from Rome. From Rome Praxeas went into Africa. (We take “hic quoque” in Tertullian's “Fruticaverant avenae Praxeanse; hic quoque superseminatas,” etc., to mean Carthage; and that Tertullian speaks of himself in “per quem traductae,” etc.) The date at which Praxeas arrived at Rome, and the length of his stay there, are not accurately known, but he reached Africa before Tertullian became a Montanist (Tertull. Adv. Prax. c. 1). Different dates, from A.D. 199 to 205, are assigned for this latter event. The history of the Montanists is best understood by supposing Praxeas to have been at Rome in Victor's time, and the date of Tertullian's Montanism to have been the earlier date. In Africa Praxeas held a dispute, probably with Tertullian, acknowledged his error, and delivered to the Church a formal recantation. But he returned again to his errors, and Tertullian, now a Montanist, wrote his tract in confutation of them.

Praxeas taught that there is only one divine Person, that the Word and the Holy Ghost are not distinct substances; arguing that an admission of distinct Personalities necessarily infers three Gods, and that the identity of the Persons is required to preserve the divine monarchy. He applied the titles which in Holy Scripture are descriptive of deity to the Father alone; and urged particularly the words from the Old Testament, “I am God, and beside me there is no god,” and from the New Testament the expressions, “I and my Father are one,” “He who hath seen me hath seen the Father,” “I am in my Father, and my Father in me.” While Tertullian unhesitatingly charges Praxeas with holding Patripassian tenets as necessarily following from his principles, Praxeas himself appears not to have gone so far. “Ergo nec compassus est Pater Filio; sic enim directam blasphemiam in Patrem veriti, diminui earn hoc modo sperant, concedentes jam Patrem et Filium duos esse; si Filius quidem patitur, Pater vero compatitur. Stulti et in hoc. Quid est enim compati, quam cum alio pati? Porro, si impassibilis Pater, utique et incompassibilis. Aut si compassibilis, utique passibilis” (Tertull. Adv. Prax. c. 29).

The course of controversy brought out, in the example of the Praxeans, the second and altered position which Monarchians are obliged to assume when pressed by the difficulties of their original position. It is shown, as Tertullian remarks, that they are driven to conclusions involving the elements of Gnosticism. The Praxeans, when confuted on all sides on the distinction between the Father and the Son, distinguished the Person of Jesus from the Christ. They understood ‘ the Son to be flesh-that is, man-  that is, Jesus; and the Father to be spirit— that is, God— that is, Christ.” Thus Tertullian says, “They who contend that the Father and the Son are one and the same do in fact now begin to divide them rather than to unite them. Such a monarchy as this they learned, it may be, in the school of the Valentinus” (ibid. c. 27). Now this separation of Jesus from Christ was common to all the Gnostics. They were unanimous in denying that Christ was born. Jesus and Christ were to them two separate beings, and the eon Christ descended upon Jesus at his baptism. The difference between them and the Praxeans appears to be that they would not say that Jesus was the Son of God, whereas the Praxeans are represented as arguing from the angel's words to Mary that the holy thing born of her was the flesh, and that therefore the flesh was the Son of God. Tertullian shows in opposition to them that the Word was incarnate by birth. In Praxean doctrine, then, in its second stage, we have Jesus called the Son of God, solely, it will follow, on account of a miraculous birth: Christ, or the presence of the Father, residing in Jesus: Jesus suffering, and Christ (=the Father) impassibilemu sed compatienetem. The interval between this and Gnostic doctrine is easily bridged over; and we have the cause of the comparisons and identifications that are often made of Sabellianism with Gnosticism. SEE MONARCHIANS.

The heresy of Praxeas, as distinguished from that of Noetus, did not make much progress. It was almost unknown in Africa in the time of Optatus (1, 37). See Schaff, Church Hist. vol. 1; Neander, Church Hist. vol. 2: id. Hist. of Dogmas, 1, 161; Gieseler, Eccles. Hist. (see Index in vol. 3); Baur, Dreieinigkeitslehre, 1, 245-254; Liddon, Divinity of Christ (see Index); Allen, Ancient Church, p. 455; Alzog, Kirchengesch. 1. 182; Pressense, Church Hist. (Heresies), p. 139 sq.; Kaye, Tertullian, p. 493 sq.; Milman, Hist. of Latin Christianity, 1, 70; Ueberweg, Hist. of Philos. 1, 308; Moshelm, Commentary on Eccles. Hist. (see Index in vol. 1); Lardner, Works (see Index in vol. 8); Waterland, Works, vol. 6; Biblical Repository, 5, 339; and the other sources of information indicated in these authorities.

## Praxeas[[@Headword:Praxeas]]

             SEE PRAXEANS.

## Praxedes, St[[@Headword:Praxedes, St]]

             was an early convert to Christianity, according to some accounts, of the apostle Peter; but this is, of course, very doubtful, since we do not even  know whether Peter was ever at Rome. The acts of her life are so surrounded by traditions as to be almost entirely devoid of trustworthiness; but from these we learn that she was the daughter of St. Pudentius, a Roman senator, and sister of St. Pudentiana (q.v.). According to the legendary account, Praxedes, with her sister Pudentiana, devoted herself, after Peter had suffered martyrdom, to the relief and care of the suffering Christians, and to the burying of the bodies that were slain in the persecutions. They had the assistance of a holy man named Pastorus, who was devoted in their service. They shrank from nothing that came in the way of their self-imposed duties. They sought out and received into their houses such as were torn and mutilated by tortures. They visited and fed such as were in prison. They took up the bodies of the martyred ones which were cast out without burial, and, carefully washing and shrouding them, they laid them reverently in the caves beneath their houses. All the blood they collected with sponges, and deposited in a certain well.

Thus boldly they showed forth the faith which was in them, and yet, according to the most trustworthy accounts, they escaped persecution and martyrdom, and died peacefully and were buried in the cemetery of Priscilla. Pastorus wrote a history of their deeds and virtues. Their house, in which the apostle is reported to have preached, was consecrated as a place of Christian worship by pope Pius I. Their churches are among the interesting remains of ancient Rome. In the nave of the church of Santa Prassede is a well, in which she is said to have put the blood of those who suffered on the Esquiline, while the holy sponge is preserved in a silver shrine in the sacristy. In the church of St. Pudentiana there is a well, said to contain the relics of 3000 martyrs. In Christian art they have frequently been made the subject of the painter's brush, and the two sisters are usually represented together, richly draped. The sponge and cup are their especial attributes. They are commemorated on the days on which they are supposed to have died-July 21 and May 19, A.D. 148. See Schaff, Church History, vol. 2; Butler, Lives of the Saints. (J. H. W.)

## Praxidice[[@Headword:Praxidice]]

             a surname of Persephone among the Orphic poets, but at a later period she was accounted a goddess who was concerned with the distribution of justice to the human family. The daughters of Ogyges received the name of Praxidicae, and were worshipped under the figure of heads of animals.

## Praxiphanes[[@Headword:Praxiphanes]]

             (Πραξιφάνης), a Peripatetic philosopher, was a native either of Mytilene (Clem. Alex. 1, 3t;5, ed. Potter) or of Rhodes (Strabo, 14:655). He lived in the time of Demetrius Poliorcetes and Ptolemy Lagi, and was a pupil of Theophrastus, about B.C. 322 (Proclus, 1, In Timaeum; Tzetzes, Ad Hesiod. Op. et Dies, 1). He subsequently opened a school himself, in which Epicurus is said to have been one of his pupils (Diog. Laert. 10:13). Praxiphanes paid especial attention to grammatical studies, and is hence named along with Aristotle as the founder and creator of the science of grammar (Clem. Alex. 1. c.; Bekker, Anecdota, 2, 229, where Πραξιφάνους should be read instead of Ε᾿πιφάνους). The writings of Praxiphanes appear to have been numerous, but have no special interest today. See Preller, Disputatio de Praxiphane Peripatetico inter antiquissimos grammaticos nobili (Dorpat, 1842)..

## Pray, Georges[[@Headword:Pray, Georges]]

             a Hungarian Jesuit, noted as a historian, was born at Presburg in 1724. In 1740 he entered the Society of Jesus, taught in several of their schools, and became, after the suppression of his order, historiographer of the kingdom of Hungary, and conservator of the library of Buda. In 1790 he obtained a canonry at Grosswardein. He died near the close of the 18th century. Prav wrote, Annales veteres Hunnorum, Avarorum et Hungarorum ad annum Christ. MDXCVII deducti (Vienna, 1761, fol., followed by Supplementa, ibid. 1775, fol.): — Annales regum Hungariae ad mannum Chr. MDLXI V deducti (ibid. 1764-70, 5 pts. fol.): — De sacra dextera divi Stephani Hungaerice regis (ibid. 1771, 4to): — De Ladislao Hungariae rege (Pesth, 1774, 4to): — De Salomone rege et Emerico duce Hungariae (ibid. 1774, 4to): — Specimen hierarchine Hungariae, complectens seriem- chronologicam archiepiscoporuam et episcoporum Hungarice, cum diocesium delineatione (Presburg, 1778, 4to): — Index librorum rariorum bibliothecce universitatis Budensis (Buda, 1780-81, 2 pts. 8vo):Historia regum Hungariae, cum notitiis ad cognoscendum veterem regni stature (ibid. 1800-1, 3 pts. 8vo).— Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v. See Horanyi, Memoriae Hungarorum, vol. 3; Luca, Gelehrtes Oesterreich; Rotermund, supplement to Jicher, Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.

## Prayer[[@Headword:Prayer]]

             The words generally used in the O.T. are תְּחַנָּה, tchinnah (from the root

חָנִן, “to incline,” “to be gracious,” whence in Hithp. “to entreat grace or mercy;” Sept. generally, δέησις; Vulg. deprecatio), and ‘ תְּפַלָּה, tephillah (from the root פָּלִל, “to judge,” whence in Hithp. “to seek judgment;” Sept. προσευχή; Vulg. oratio). The latter is also used to express intercessory prayer. The two words point to the two chief objects sought in prayer, viz. the prevalence of right and truth, and the gift of mercy. A very frequent formula for prayer in the O.T. is the phrase יְהוָֹה

קָרָא בְשֵׁם,. to call upon the name of Jehovah. The usual Greek term is εὔχομαι, which originally signified only a wish; but δέομαι, to beg (properly to want), is a frequent expression for prayer.

I. Scriptural History of the Subject. —

1. That prayer was coeval with the fallen race we cannot doubt, and it was in all probability associated with the first sacrifice. The first definite account of its public observance occurs in the remarkable expression recorded in the lifetime of Enos, the son of Seth: “Then began men to call upon the name of the Lord” (Gen 4:26). From that time a life of prayer evidently marked the distinction between the pious and the wicked. The habit was maintained in the chosen family of Abraham, as is evident from frequent instances in the history of the Hebrew patriarchs. Moses, however, gave no specific commands with reference to this part of religious service (comp. Spanheim, Ad Callimach. Pallad. p. 139; Creuzer, Symbol. 1, 164 sq.), and prayer was not by law interwoven with the public worship of God among the Hebrews (but comp. Deu 26:10; Deu 26:13, and the prayer of atonement offered by the high-priest, Lev 16:21).

We do not know whether, before the exile, prayer was customarily joined with sacrificial offerings (Iliad, 1, 450 sq.; Odys. 14:423; Lucian, Dea Syr. 57; Curtius, 4:13, 15; Pliny, H. N. 28, 3; see Iamblich, Myster. 5, 26). Yet, at least in morning and evening worship, those present perhaps joined in prayer, either silently or with united voices (see Luk 1:10). About the time of the exile our records begin of the custom of the Levites reciting prayers and leading others (1Ch 23:30; comp. Neh 11:17; Berach. 26, 1; see Otho, Lex. Rab. p. 164). An extraordinary instance of public prayer occurs in 1Ki 8:22. We see that prayer as a religious exercise, in the outer court of the sanctuary, though not expressly  commanded, was yet supposed and expected. (Psa 141:2; Rev 8:3-4, seem to indicate that incense was a symbol of prayer; but see Baihr, Symbolik, 1, 461 sq.) As private devotion prayer was always in general use (comp. Isa 1:15; Credner, On Joel, p. 192, supposes from Joe 2:16, and Mat 18:3; Mat 19:14; Psa 8:3, that especial virtue was ascribed to the prayers of innocent children; but without ground). After the time of the exile prayer came gradually to be viewed as a meritorious work, an opus operatun. Prayer and fasting were considered the two great divisions of personal piety (Tob 12:9; Jdt 4:12). It was customary to offer prayer before every great undertaking (Jdt 13:7; comp. Act 9:40; Iliad, 9:172; 24, 308; Pythag. Carmen Aur. 48); as in war before a battle (1Ma 5:33; 1Ma 11:71; 2Ma 15:26; comp. 1Ma 8:29). Three times a day was prayer repeated (Dan 6:11; comp. Psalm 4:18; Tanchaum, 9, 4, in Schöttgen, Hor. Hebr. 1, 419): namely, at the third hour (9 A.M., Act 2:15, the time of the morning sacrifice in the Temple); at mid-day, the sixth hour (12 M., 10:9); and in the afternoon, at the ninth hour (3 P.M., the time of the evening sacrifice in the Temple; comp. Dan 9:21; Josephus, Ant. 14:4, 3; see also Acts 3, 1; Act 10:30; Thilo, Apocr. 1, 352; Schöttgen, Op. cit. p. 418 sq.; Wetstein, 2, 471). Compare the three or four fold repetition of songs of praise by the Egyptian priests each day (Porphyr. Abstin. 4, 8). The Moharnmedans, too, are well known to have daily hours of prayer. It was usual, too, before and after eating to utter a form of prayer or thanks (Mat 15:36; Joh 6:11; Act 27:35; Philo, Opp. 2, 481; Porphyr. Abstinen. 4, 12; see Kuinol, De precum ante et post cibum up. Judeos et Christ. faciendarum genere, antiquitate, etc. [Lips. 1764]). The Pharisees and Essenes especially ascribed great importance to prayer. The former, indeed, made a display of this form of devotion (Mat 6:5), and humored their own conceit by making their prayers very long. SEE PHARISEE.

Permanent forms of prayer were already customary in the time of Christ (Luk 11:1), perhaps chiefly the same which are contained in the Mishna, Berachoth (comp. Pirke Aboth, 2, 13). The Lord's Prayer, too, has several, though not very important, agreements with the forms in the Talmud (see Schöttgen, 1, 160 sq.; Vitringa, De Synag. Vet. p. 962; Otho, Lex. Rab. p. 539; Tholuck, Berypredigt, p. 337 sq.). Private prayer was practiced by the Israelites chiefly in retired chambers in their houses (Mat 6:6), especially in the “upper room” (Dan 6:11; Jdt 8:5; Tobit 3, 12; Acts 1, 13; Act 10:9), and on the roof. If in the open air, an eminence was sought for (Mat 14:23; Mar 6:46; Luk 6:12; comp. 1Ki 18:42). The inhabitants of Jerusalem were fondest of going to the court of the Temple (Luk 18:10; Act 3:1; comp. Isa 56:7; see Arnob. Adv. Gent. 6, 4; Lakealacher, Antiq. Gr. Sacr. p. 425). He, however, who was surprised by the hour of prayer in the street stood there and said his prayer on the spot. In every case the face was turned towards the holy hill of the Temple (Dan 6:11; 2Ch 6:34; 2 Chronicles 3 Esdr. 4:58; Mishna, Berach. 4, 5), hut by the Samaritans to Gerizim. In the court of the Temple the face was turned to the Temple itself (1Ki 8:38), to the Holy of Holies (Psalms 5, 8; see Thilo, Apocr. 1, 20). Thus the Jews praying then faced the west, while the modern Jews in Europe and America face the east in prayer. It was an early custom among Christians, too, to turn the face towards the east in praying (Origen, Hosea 2 n. 5, in Num., in Op. 2, 284; Clem. Alex. Strom. 7, 724; comp. Tertul. Apol. 16).

The Mohammedans turn the face towards Mecca (Rosenmüller, Morgenl. 4, 361). The usual posture in prayer was standing (1 Samuel 1, 26; 1Ki 8:22; Dan 9:20; Mat 6:5; Mar 11:25; Luk 18:11 comp. Iliad, 24:306 sq.; Martial, 12:77, 2; Al Koran, 5, 8; Mishna, Berach. 5, 1; Philo. Opp. 2, 481; Wetstein, 1, 321). But in earnest devotion, bending the knee, or actual kneeling, was practiced (2Ch 6:13; 1Ki 8:54; Esdr. 9:5; Dan 6:10; Luk 22:41; Act 9:40), or the body was even thrown to the ground (Gen 24:26; Neh 8:6; Jdt 9:1; Mat 26:39). The hands before prayer must be made clean. Says the Mishna, He that prays with unclean hands commits deadly sin (Sohar Deuteronomy f. 101, 427; comp. 1Ti 2:8; Odys. 2, 261; Clem. Alex. Strom. 4, 531; Chrysost. Hona. 43, in 1 Corinthians). The hands were then, in standing, often lifted up towards heaven (1Ki 8:22; Neh 8:7; Lamentations 2, 19; 3, 41; Psa 28:2; Psa 134:2; 2 Macc. 3, 20; 1 Timothy 2, 8; Philo, Opp. 2. 481, 534; Iliad, 1, 450; Virgil, En. 1, 93; Horace, Od. 3, 23, 1; Plutarch, Alex. p. 682; Aristotle, Mund. 6; Seneca, Ep. 41; Wetstein, 2, 323; Doughtoei Analect. 2 135); sometimes were spread out (Isa 1:15; Ezr 9:5); and in humble prayers of penitence were laid meekly on the breast, or sometimes the breast was struck with them (Luk 18:13). A posture peculiar to prayer was dropping the head upon the breast (Psa 35:13), or between the knees (1Ki 18:42). This was done in great sorrow. The former is still customary among the Mohammedans (see the figs. in Reland's De Relig. Muh. p. 87). SEE ATTITUDES.

Extensive treatises on the kinds of prayer, and their order andrconduct, are given in the Mishna (treatise Berachoth) and the  double Gemara (in German by Rabe [Halle, 1777]; see also Otho, Lex. Rab. p. 537 sq.). One species of prayer was intercession. Almost infallible virtue was ascribed to it when offered by a holy person (see James 5, 16; comp. Diod. Sic. 4, 61; Apollod. 3, 12, 6; Gen 20:7; Gen 20:17; Exo 32:11 sq.; 1Ki 17:20 sq.; Josephus, Ant. 14, 2, 1; 2Co 1:11; 1 Timothy 2, 1 sq.; Php 1:19). Hence it was common to request the prayers of others (1 Thessalonians 5, 25; 2 Thessalonians 3, 1; Heb 13:18; comp. Deyling, Observ. 2, 587 sq.). See Jonath. On Gen 26:27; and esp. Suicer, Observ. Sacr. p. 149 sq.; Schroder, Diss. de Precib. Hebrseorum [Marb. 1717]; Saubert, De Precibuts Heb.; and Poleman, De situ praecandi vet. Heb., both in Ugolini Thesaur. vol. 21; Carpzov, Appar. p. 322 sq.; Baur, Gottesd. Veuf. 1, 357 sq.; Rehm, Historia Precum Biblica (Götting. 1814); Hartmann, Verbind. d. A. u. N.T. p. 236 sq., 286 sq.; and on the whole subject, Brover, de Niedek, De populor. vet. et recent. Adorationib. (Amsterd. 1713). The Homeric prayers are treated in Naegelsbach's Homer. Theol. p. 185 sq. SEE PROSEUCHE; SEE SYNAGOGUE.

2. The only form of prayer given for perpetual use in the O.T. is the one in Denlt. 26, 5-15, connected with the offering of tithes and first-fruits, and containing in simple form the important elements of prayer. acknowledgment of God's mercy, self-dedication, and prayer for future blessing. To this may perhaps be added the threefold blessing of Num 6:24-26, couched as it is in a precatory form; and the short prayers of Moses (Num 10:35-36) at the moving and resting of the cloud, the former of which was the germ of the 68th Psalm.

Indeed, the forms given, evidently with a view to preservation and constant use, are rather hymns or songs than prayers properly so called, although they often contain supplication. Scattered through the historical books we have the Song of Moses taught to the children of Israel (Deu 32:1-43); his less important songs after the passage of the Red Sea (Exo 15:1-19) and at the springing out of the water (Num 21:17-18); the Song of Deborah and Barak (Judges 5); the Song of Hannah in 1Sa 2:1-10 (the effect of which is seen by reference to the Magnificat); and the Song of David (Psalms 18), singled out in 2 Samuel 22. But after David's time the existence and use of the Psalms, and the poetical form of the prophetic books, and of the prayers which they contain, must have tended to fix this psalmic character on all Jewish prayer.  The effect is seen plainly in the form of Hezekiah's prayers in 2Ki 19:15-19; Isa 38:9-20.

But of the prayers recorded in the O.T. the two most remarkable are those of Solomon at the dedication of the Temple (1Ki 8:23-53) and of Joshua the high-priest and his colleagues after the captivity (Neh 9:5-38). The former is a prayer for God's presence with his people in time of national defeat (Neh 9:33-34), famine or pestilence (Neh 9:35-37), war (Nehemiah 9:44, 45), and captivity (Nehemiah 9:46-50), and with each individual Jew and stranger (Nehemiah 9:41-43) who may worship in the Temple. The latter contains a recital of all God's blessings to the children of Israel from Abraham to the captivity, a confession of their continual sins, and a fresh dedication of themselves to the covenant. It is clear that both are likely to have exercised a strong liturgical influence, and accordingly we find that the public prayer in the Temple, already referred to, had in our Lord's time grown into a kind of liturgy. Before and during the sacrifice there was a prayer that God would put it into their hearts to love and fear him; then a repeating of the Ten Commandments, and of the passages written on their phylacteries. SEE FRONTLETS; next, three or four prayers and ascriptions of glory to God; and the blessing from Num 6:24-26, “The Lord bless thee,” etc., closed this service. Afterwards, at the offering of the meat-offering, there followed the singing of psalms, regularly fixed for each day of the week, or specially appointed for the great festivals (see Bingham, bk. 13:ch. 5, § 4). A somewhat similar liturgy formed a regular part of the synagogue worship, in which there was a regular minister, as the leader of prayer (שְׁלַיח הִצַּבּוּר, legatus ecclesiae), and public prayer, as well as private, was the special object of the Proseuchie. It appears, also, from the question of the disciples in Luk 11:1, and from Jewish tradition, that the chief teachers of the day gave special forms of prayer to their disciples, as the badge of their discipleship and the best fruits of their learning. SEE FORMS OF PRAYER.

All Christian prayer is, of course, based on the Lord's Prayer; but its spirit is also guided by that of his prayer in Gethsemane, and of the prayer recorded by St. John (John 17), the beginning of his great work of intercession. The first is the comprehensive type of the simplest and most universal prayer; the second justifies prayers for special blessings of this life, while it limits them by perfect resignation to God's will; the last, dwelling as it does on the knowledge and glorification of God, and the  communion of man with him, as the one object of prayer and life, is the type of the highest and most spiritual devotion. The Lord's Prayer has given the form and tone of all ordinary Christian prayer; it has fixed, as its leading principles, simplicity and confidence in our Father, community of sympathy with all men, and practical reference to our own life; it has shown, as its true objects, first the glory of God, and next the needs of man. To the intercessory prayer we may trace up its transcendental element, its desire of that communion through love with the nature of God which is the secret of all individual holiness and of all community with men.

The influence of these prayers is more distinctly traced in the prayers contained in the Epistles (see Eph 3:14-21; Rom 16:25-27; Php 1:3-11; Col 1:9-15; Heb 13:20-21; 1Pe 5:10-11, etc.) than in those recorded in the Acts. The public prayer, which from the beginning became the principle of life and unity in the Church (see Act 2:42; and comp. Act 1:24-25; Act 4:24-30; Act 6:6; Act 12:5; Act 13:2-3; Act 16:25; Act 20:36; Act 21:5), probably in the first instance took much of its form and style from the prayers of the synagogues. The only form given (besides the very short one of Act 1:24-25), dwelling as it does (Act 4:24-30) on the Scriptures of the O.T. in their application to our Lord, seems to mark this connection. It was probably by degrees that they assumed the distinctively Christian character.

3. In the record of prayers accepted and granted by God, we observe, as always. a special adaptation to the period of his dispensation to which they belong. In the patriarchal period they have the simple and childlike tone of domestic supplication for the simple and apparently trivial incidents of domestic life. Such are the prayers of Abraham for children (Gen 15:2-3); for Ishmael (Gen 15:17-18); of Isaac for Rebekah (Gen 25:21); of Abraham's servant in Mesopotamia (Gen 24:12-14); although sometimes they take a wider range in intercession, as with Abraham for Sodom (Gen 18:23-32), and for Abimelech (Gen 18:20; Gen 18:7; Gen 18:17). In the Mosaic period they assume a more solemn tone and a national bearing, chiefly that of direct intercession for the chosen people, as by Moses (Num 11:2; Num 12:13; Num 21:7); by Samuel (1Sa 7:5; 1Sa 12:19; 1Sa 12:23); by David (2Sa 24:17-18); by Hezekiah (2Ki 19:15-19); by Isaiah (2Ki 19:4; 2Ch 32:20); by Daniel (Dan 9:20-21): or of prayer for national victory, as by Asa (2Ch 14:11); Jehoshaphat (2Ch 20:6-12), More rarely are they for individuals, as in the prayer of Hannah  (1Sa 1:12); in that of Hezekiah in his sickness (2Ki 20:2); the intercession of Samuel for Saul (1Sa 15:11; 1Sa 15:35), etc. A special class are those which precede and refer to the exercise of miraculous power, as by Moses (Exo 8:12; Exo 8:30; Exo 15:25); by Elijah at Zarephath (1Ki 17:20) and Carmel (1Ki 18:36-37); by Elisha at Shunem (2Ki 4:33) and Dothan (2Ki 6:17-18); by Isaiah (2Ki 20:11); by St. Peter for Tabitha (Act 9:40); by the elders of the Church (Jam 5:14-16). In the New Testament they have a more directly spiritual bearing, such as the prayer of the Church for protection and grace (Act 4:24-30); of the Apostles for their Samaritan converts (Act 8:15); of Cornelius for guidance (Act 10:4; Act 10:31); of the Church of St. Peter (Act 12:5); of St. Paul at Philippi (Act 16:25); of St. Paul against the thorn in the flesh answered, although not granted (2Co 12:7-9), etc. It would seem the intention of Holy Scripture to encourage all prayer, more especially intercession, in all relations and for all righteous objects. SEE PRAYER.

II. Christian Doctrine on the Subject. —

1. Prayer is a request or petition for mercies; or it is “an offering-up of our desires to God, for things agreeable to his will, il the name of Christ, by the help of his Spirit, with confession of our sins, and thankful acknowledgment of his mercies.” Nothing can be more rational or consistent than the exercise of this duty. It is a divine injunction that men should always pray, and not faint (Luk 18:1). It is highly proper we should acknowledge the obligations we are under to the Divine Being, and supplicate his throne for the blessings we stand in need of. It is essential to our peace and felicity, and is the happy means of our carrying on and enjoying fellowship with God. It has an influence on our tempers and conduct, and evinces our subjection and obedience to God.

2. The object of prayer is God alone, through Jesus Christ as the Mediator. All supplications, therefore, to saints or angels are not only useless, but blasphemous. All worship of the creature, however exalted that creature is, is idolatry, and is strictly prohibited in the sacred law of God. Nor are we to pray to the Trinity as three distinct Gods; for though the Father. Son, and Holy Ghost be addressed in various parts of the Scripture (2Co 13:14; 2Th 2:16-17), yet never as three Gods, for that would lead us directly to the doctrine of polytheism: the more ordinary mode the Scripture points out is to address the Father through the  Son, depending on the Spirit to help our infirmities (Eph 2:18; Rom 8:26).

3. As to the nature of this duty, it must be observed that it does not consist in the elevation of the voice, the posture of the body, the use of a form, or the mere extemporary use of words, nor, properly speaking, in anything of an exterior nature; but simply the offering up of our desires to God (Mat 15:8). (See the definition above.) It has generally been divided into adoration, by which we express our sense of the goodness and greatness of God (Dan 4:34-35); confession, by which we acknowledge our unworthiness (1 John 1, 9); supplication, by which we pray for pardon, grace, or any blessing we want (Mat 7:7); intercession, by which we pray for others (James 5, 16); and thanksgiving, by which we express our gratitude to God (Php 4:6). To these some add invocation, a making mention of one or more of the names of God; pleading, arguing our case with God in a humble and fervent manner; dedication, or surrendering ourselves to God; deprecation, by which we desire that evils may be averted; blessing, in which we express our joy in God, and gratitude for his mercies; but as all these appear to be included in the first five parts of prayer, they need not be insisted on.

4. The different kinds of prayer are,

(1.) Ejaculatory, by which the mind is directed to God on any emergency. It is derived from the word ejaculor, to dart or shoot out suddenly, and is therefore appropriated to describe this kind of prayer, which is made up of short sentences, spontaneously springing from the mind. The Scriptures afford us many instances of ejaculatory prayer (Exo 14:15; 1 Samuel 1, 13; Rom 7:24-25; Gen 43:29, Jdg 16:28; Luk 23:42-43). It is one of the principal excellences of this kind of prayer that it can be practiced at all times, and in all places; in the public ordinances of religion; in all our ordinary and extraordinary undertakings; in times of affliction, temptation, and danger; in seasons of social intercourse; in worldly business; in traveling; in sickness and pain. In fact, everything around us, and every event that transpires, may afford us matter for ejaculation. It is worthy, therefore, of our practice, especially when we consider that it is a species of devotion that can receive no impediment from any external circumstances, that it has a tendency to support the mind, and keep it in a happy frame; fortifies us against the temptations of the world; elevates our affections to God; directs the mind into a spiritual  channel; and has a tendency to excite trust and dependence on Divine Providence.

(2.) Secret or closet prayer is another kind of prayer to which we should attend. It has its name from the manner in which Christ recommended it (Mat 6:6). He himself set us an example of it (Luk 6:12); and it has been the practice of the saints in every age (Genesis 28:32; Dan 6:10; Act 10:9). There are some particular occasions when this duty may be practiced to advantage, as when we are entering into any important situation; undertaking anything of consequence; before we go into the world; when calamities surround us (Isa 26:20); or when ease and prosperity attend us. As closet prayer is calculated to inspire us with peace, defend us from our spiritual enemies, excite us to obedience, and promote our real happiness, we should be watchful lest the stupidity of our frame, the intrusion of company, the cares of the world, the insinuations of Satan, or the indulgence of sensual objects, prevent us from the constant exercise of this necessary and important duty.

(3.) Family prayer is also another part not to be neglected. It is true there is no absolute command for this in God's Word; yet, from hints, allusions, and examples we may learn that it was the practice of ancient saints— Abraham (Gen 18:19), David (2Sa 6:20), Solomon (Pro 22:6), Job (Job 1:4-5), Joshua (Jos 24:15). (See also Eph 6:4; Pro 6:20; Jer 10:25; Act 10:2; Act 10:30; Act 16:15.) Family prayer, indeed, may not be essential to the character of a true Christian, but it is surely no honor to heads of families to have it said that they have no religion in their houses. If we consider what a blessing it is likely to prove to our children and our domestics; what comfort it must afford to ourselves; of what utility it may prove to the community at large; how it sanctifies domestic comforts and crosses; and what a tendency it has to promote order, decency, sobriety, and religion in general, we must at once see the propriety of attending to it. The objection often made to family prayer is want of time; but this is a very frivolous excuse, since the time allotted for this purpose need be but short, and may easily be redeemed from sleep or business. Others say they have no gifts; where this is the case, a form may soon be procured and used, but it should be remembered that gifts increase by exercise, and no man can properly decide unless he make repeated trials. Others are deterred through shame, or the fear of man: in answer to such, we refer them to the declarations of our Lord (Mat 10:37-38; Mar 8:38). As to the season for family  prayer, every family must determine for itself; but before breakfast every morning, and before supper at night, seems most proper: perhaps a quarter of an hour or twenty minutes may be sufficient as to the time.

(4.) Social prayer is another kind Christians are called upon to attend to. It is denominated social because it is offered by a society of Christians in their collective capacity, convened for that particular purpose, either on some peculiar and extraordinary occasions, or at stated and regular seasons. Special prayer-meetings are such as are held at the meeting and parting of intimate friends, especially churches and ministers: when the Church is in a state of unusual deadness and barrenness; when ministers are sick, or taken away by death; in times of public calamity and distress, etc. Stated meetings for social prayer are such as are held weekly in some places which have a special regard to the state of the nation and churches; missionary prayer meetings for the spread of the Gospel; weekly meetings held in most of the congregations, which have a more particular reference to their own churches, ministers, the sick, feeble, and weak of the flock. Christians are greatly encouraged to this kind of prayer from the consideration of the promise (Mat 18:20), the benefit of mutual supplications, from the example of the most eminent primitive saints (Mal 3:16; Act 12:12), the answers given to prayer (Act 12:1-12; Joshua 10; Isaiah 37 :etc.), and the signal blessing they are to the churches (Php 1:19; 2Co 1:11). These meetings should be attended with regularity; those who engage should study simplicity, brevity, Scripture language, seriousness of spirit, and everything that has a tendency to edification. We now come, lastly, to take notice of public prayer, or that in which the whole congregation is engaged, either in repeating a set form or acquiescing with the prayer of the minister who leads their devotions. This is both an ancient and important part of religious exercise; it was a part of the patriarchal worship (Genesis 4:56); it was also carried on by the Jews (Exo 29:43; Luk 1:10). It was a part of the Temple-service (Isa 56:7; 1Ki 8:59). Jesus Christ recommended it both by his example and instruction (Mat 18:20; Luk 4:16). The disciples also attended to it (Act 2:41-42), and the Scriptures in many places countenance it (Exo 20:24; Psa 63:1-2; Psa 84:11; Psa 27:4). See Wilkins, Henry, Watts, On Prayer; Townsend, Nine Sermons on Prayer; Paley, Moral Philosophy, 2, 31; Mather, Student and Pastor, p. 87; Wollaston, Religion of Nature, p. 122, 123; Hannah More, On Education, vol. 2, ch. 1;  Barrow, Works, vol. 1, ser. 6; Smith, System of Prayer; Scamp, Sermon on Family Religion; Walford, On Prayer. SEE WORSHIP.

III. Philosophical Diffculties. —

1. Scripture does not give any theoretical explanation of the mystery which attaches to prayer. The difficulty of understanding its real efficacy arises chiefly from two sources: from the belief that mall lives under general laws, which in all cases must be fulfilled unalterably; and the opposing belief that he is master of his own destiny, and need pray for no external blessing. The first difficulty is even increased when we substitute the belief in a personal God for the sense of an impersonal destiny; since not only does the predestination of God seem to render prayer useless, but his wisdom and love, giving freely to man all that is good for him, appear to make it needless.

The difficulty is familiar to all philosophy, the former element being far the more important: the logical inference from it is the belief in the absolute uselessness of prayer. But the universal instinct of prayer, being too strong for such reasoning, generally exacted as a compromise the use of prayer for good in the abstract (the “mens sana in corpora sano”); a compromise theoretically liable to the same difficulties, but wholesome in its practical effect. A far more dangerous compromise was that adopted by some philosophers, rather than by mankind at large, which separated internal spiritual growth from the external circumstances that give scope thereto, and claimed the former as belonging entirely to man, while allowing the latter to be gifts of the gods, and therefore to be fit objects of prayer.

The most obvious escape from these difficulties is to fall back on the mere subjective effect of prayer, and to suppose that its only object is to produce on the mind that consciousness of dependence which leads to faith, and that sense of God's protection and mercy which fosters love. These being the conditions of receiving, or at least of rightly entering into, God's blessings, it is thought that in its encouragement of them the entire use and efficacy of prayer consist.

Now, Scripture, while, by the doctrine of spiritual influence, it entirely disposes of the latter difficulty, does not so entirely solve that part of the mystery which depends on the nature of God. It places it clearly before us, and emphasizes most strongly those doctrines on which the difficulty turns. The reference of all events and actions to the will or permission of God,  and of all blessings to his free grace, is indeed the leading idea of all its parts, historical, prophetic, and doctrinal; and this general idea is expressly dwelt upon in its application to the subject of prayer. The principle that our “Heavenly Father knoweth what things we have need of before we ask him” is not only enunciated in plain terms by our Lord, but is at all times implied in the very form and nature of all Scriptural prayers; and, moreover, the ignorance of man, who “knows not what to pray for as he ought,” and his consequent need of the divine guidance in prayer, are dwelt upon with equal earnestness. Yet, while this is so, on the other hand the instinct of prayer is solemnly sanctioned and enforced in every page. Not only is its subjective effect asserted, but its real objective efficacy, as a means appointed by God for obtaining blessing, is both implied and expressed in the plainest terms. As we are bidden to pray for general spiritual blessings-in which instance it might seem as if prayer were simply a means of preparing the heart, and so making it capable of receiving them- so also are we encouraged to ask special blessings, both spiritual and temporal, in hope that thus (and thus only) we may obtain them, and to use intercession for others, equally special and confident, in trust that an effect, which in this case cannot possibly be subjective to ourselves, will be granted to our prayers: The command is enforced by direct promises, such as that in the Sermon on the Mount (Mat 7:7-8), of the clearest and most comprehensive character; by the example of all saints and of our Lord himself; and by historical records of such effect as granted to prayer again and again.

Thus, as usual in the case of such mysteries, the two apparently opposite truths are emphasized, because they are needful to man's conception of his relation to God; their reconcilement is not, perhaps cannot be, fully revealed; for, in fact, it is involved in that inscrutable mystery which attends the conception of any free action of man as necessary for the working out of the general laws of God's unchangeable will.

At the same time it is clearly implied that such a reconcilement exists, and that all the apparently isolated and independent exertions of man's spirit in prayer are in some way perfectly subordinated to the one supreme will of God, so as to form a part of his scheme of providence. This follows from the condition, expressed or understood in every prayer, “Not my will, but thine be done.” It is seen in the distinction between the granting of our petitions (which is not absolutely promised) and the certain answer of blessing to all faithful prayer; a distinction exemplified in the case of Paul's  prayer against the “thorn in the flesh,” and of our Lord's own agony in Gethsemane. It is distinctly enunciated by John (1Jn 5:14-15): “If we ask anything according to his will, he heareth us; and if we know that he hear us, whatsoever we ask, we know that we have the petitions that we desired of him.”

It is also implied that the key to the mystery lies in the fact of man's spiritual unity with God in Christ, and of the consequent gift of the Holy Spirit. All true and prevailing prayer is to be offered “in the name of Christ” (Joh 14:13; Joh 15:16; Joh 16:23-27), that is, not only for the sake of his atonement, but also in dependence on his intercession; which is therefore as a central influence, acting on all prayers offered, to throw off whatever in them is evil, and give efficacy to all that is in accordance with the divine will. So also is it said of the spiritual influence of the Holy Ghost oil each individual mind, that while “we know not what to pray for,” the indwelling “Spirit makes intercession for the saints, according to the will of God” (Rom 8:26-27). Here, as probably in all other cases, the action of the Holy Spirit on the soul is to free agents what the laws of nature are to things inanimate, and is the power which harmonizes free individual action with the universal will of God. The mystery of prayer, therefore, like all others, is seen to be resolved into that great central mystery of the Gospel, the communion of man with God in the incarnation of Christ. Beyond this we cannot go. SEE PROVIDENCE.

2. The discussion provoked by Prof. Tyndall's so-called “Prayer-test” (q.v.) has given a fresh interest to the question, How far are we entitled to expect the divine interference with the ordinary course of nature in answer to prayer? The question practically resolves itself into another and simpler one, Have miracles ceased in the present age of the Church? This latter is properly a question of fact; and it is very generally answered in the affirmative. The modern instances of miracle working are too few and uncertain to warrant any other conclusion. All those who of late years have come forward with claims to the power have sooner or later proved themselves miserable pretenders, and hence the world has justly abandoned all hope in this direction. Whether the power of working miracles was intended to be only a temporary grant to the apostolic age, and whether therefore it need have been lost out of the Church, is an entirely different question. For aught we can see, there is no limit set in the N.T. for its possession and exercise, save the implied one of its necessity; and whether this condition has yet wholly passed away admits of grave doubt, especially  in view of the fact that large portions of the earth are yet un-christianized. But it would be of little avail to argue this abstract question. Unless we can bring recent and well authenticated cases of miracles wrought publicly and indubitably, few, if any, will believe that we have now the right to look for them. This, we apprehend, is really the settled and universal conviction of Christian people of the present day-of Protestants at least. Hence to Prof. Tyndall's challenge that we should test the efficacy of prayer by a miraculous answer, we simply reply that we do not expect any such thing, nor do we feel ourselves authorized to pray for it. This is not now the legitimate scope or province of Christian prayer.

We are well aware that a certain class of well-attested and indeed not infrequent facts is commonly appealed to in order to maintain at least the vestiges of this power as still extant in the Church. Most striking, perhaps, among these occurrences are the remarkable cases of recovery from anl apparently incurable sickness, some of which have transpired within the knowledge of almost every one. These have sometimes taken place in a very marked manner in answer to the prayers of friends and congregations. Far be it from us to deny the efficacy of prayer in such cases, or to say a word that would discourage prayer in other like cases. But none of these cases-we mean those of which we have sufficient details and full authentication-at all come up to the idea and definition of a proper miracle. They all lack at least three of the essential circumstances of such an event: 1st. They are not obvious, palpable, direct, and instantaneous reversals of the established laws of nature. Many persons have been raised from a seeming bed of death as low as any of these, when all hopes and means of restoration had been abandoned, and yet no one thought of a miracle; perhaps no one had even prayed for recovery. The cases are not clearly supernatural. 2nd. These cures are not effected by any individual consciously and avowedly authorized to exercise the divine power in the case. In a miracle there must be no misgiving, no hesitation, no shifting of responsibility on the part of the operator. He must positively know and explicitly assert that he is “the finger of God;” otherwise his act becomes the most blasphemous assumption. 3d. Genuine miracles have only been wrought as an ocular demonstration of the commission of a divine messenger or teacher; they have in all instances been resorted to solely in personal attestation of sacred truth. No new doctrine or fresh communication from Heaven purports to be made in connection with the remarkable cases under consideration. The cures are besought as a  personal favor, out of regard for private feeling or public usefulness. But these were not the motives which induced our Lord or his apostles to work miracles. They simply wrought them to prove the truth of Christianity. Just here, if anywhere, may doubtless be discovered the reason why miracles have not been perpetuated. There remains no longer any fresh revelation of God's will to man; no new dispensation or even agencies are to be established on the divine part; and therefore no such special credentials are issued from the court of heaven. Its ambassadors have only the common seal of the Gospel-the fruits of their ministry.

The same kind of argument disposes of all the other special providences often cited in proof of a divine intervention in answer to prayer. These likewise are not miracles, nor are they commonly so regarded. There is, however, thus much of valuable truth in the assumption of their pertinency here, namely, that they are really and purposely interferences of God on behalf of those interested, and at the request of the petitioners. That God is able to introduce himself at any and every point in mundane affairs, whether great or small, is one of the clearest doctrines of the Bible; in fact, it is a necessary supposition in any religion. But that he is able to do this without disturbing the order usually styled “the laws of nature” is with equal certainty his prerogative as Creator and Preserver of all. To argue otherwise is either to dethrone him from the dominion of the universe, or to confound government with revolution. Providence is not miraculous; it may be special, or even extraordinary, but it is not therefore out of or contrary to fixed rule. Just here, on the other hand, we must be permitted to enter our protest against the specious reasoning in Bushnell's Nature and the Supernatural, which, in our judgment, virtually does away with all miracle by reducing it to an imaginary, higher, and hitherto unknown law of divine establishment, called “moral,” so as to save it from the odium of conflict with nature. A miracle, by its very definition, must be a supersedure-or a temporary violation, if you please of a well-known and fixed law of nature. It is upon precisely this point that its whole significance depends. Eliminate this element, and you destroy its entire moral force. That the laws of physical nature are administered in ultimate subservience to those of the moral universe is the economy approved no less by reason than by Scripture. But these must not be merged the one in the other, even if they should be imagined in any case to collide. Especially must we not assume the intrusion of a superior moral law into the domain of nature, supplanting it in that sphere, and so divesting a miracle of its real  miraculousness. When God works a miracle he sets aside, we must suppose, a certain law or series of laws of nature for the time being, and in that particular respect, by virtue of his own superior right as creator. It is not merely the spontaneous supervention of a mightier countervailing law up to that time held in abeyance for such conjunctions. The latter assumption is only an insidious form of modern rationalism, which would fain, at all hazard, divest the miracles of the Bible of their supernatural, character. We must never forget that a miracle is a physical fact, but one in its very nature abnormal from a scientific point of view.

Nor do we overlook the argument derived from the moral change effected by the Holy Spirit in regeneration and sanctification. These are often claimed as miracles of grace. That they are supernatural, in the sense of being wrought by a power beyond and superior to human nature, is certainly true; but the fact that they are specially, or even immediately, the work of God does not prove them to be properly miraculous. For, in the first place, in this respect they are merely analogous to any act of particular divine providence, and in like manner they lack all the essential characteristics of a miracle, namely, a point-blank contradiction of natural law, the authoritative behest of an operator and a moral truth to be sanctioned. They are answers to prayer which await the divine pleasure, on the performance of certain well-known and universally fixed conditions. They are in no sense special or arbitrary. On the contrary, they are most fully under the dominion of law, and can be counted upon with the most invariable certainty. They are as sure to follow the diligent use of the appointed means as any other effect is to flow from its appropriate cause. Indeed, all the healthful and legitimate influences of the Spirit are normal and in the regular line of our own mental action (Joh 3:8). Even the afflatus of inspiration is no exception to this rule (1Co 14:32). But, in the second place, the spiritual character of the revolution at conversion places it altogether outside the category of miraculous events. These latter always have reference, more or less intimately, to the realm of physics; they appeal to the senses; they must be susceptible of ocular, audible, tangible proof. This is their only security against imposition or self-delusion. If in any case, as in the instance of the miraculous “gift of unknown tongues” in the early Church, and the expulsion of demons from the possessed, they have their seat in the mind yet they exhibit palpable evidences through the organs and acts of the body, namely, the language of  the endowed, and the rational behavior of the dispossessed. In short, miracles are material evidences of a supernatural authority.

In the discussion of this whole question we would do well to see what Scripture says on the subject. There is a large class of passages, chiefly in the words of our Lord Jesus himself, which seem to give the believer the broadest privilege in this respect. For example, he said to his disciples on one occasion, “If ye have faith as a grain of mustard-seed, ye shall say unto this mountain, Remove hence to yonder place; and it shall remove: and nothing shall be impossible to you” (Mat 17:20); and on another occasion he told them, “If ye have faith, and doubt not, ye shall not only do that which is done to the fig-tree, but also if ye shall say unto this mountain, Be thou removed, and be thou cast into the sea, it shall be done; and all things whatsoever ye shall ask in prayer believing, ye shall receive” (Mat 21:21-22). Elsewhere he adds another condition to this grant: “Whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, that will I do, that the Father may be glorified in the Son. If ye shall ask anything in my name, I will do it” (Joh 14:13-14); and again, “Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give it you” (Joh 16:23). The force of these declarations is usually parried, as to the question under consideration, by the explanation that they were addressed to the apostles as such, and intended to apply in their full sense only to them in their official capacity or at furthest only to Christian teachers in the apostolic age. It is true there is nothing in the language that thus limits them, but it is claimed that the fact of the cessation of the miracle working power proves that such was the intention of the Grantor. We suggest the query whether this very interpretation has not clipped the wings of that faith upon which the believer is here authorized to soar into the higher region of Christian privilege. For aught that legitimately appears to the contrary, if the grant has been revoked, it has been precisely and solely in consequence of unbelief in these identical promises. But, be that as it may, in point of fact, we repeat, few it any sane and orthodox Christians nowadays profess to have the requisite faith to venture upon such acts; and therefore the question is narrowed down, whether rightly or wrongly, to the commonplace sphere of nonmiraculous subjects of prayer.

There is one passage of Scripture, however, that appears to have escaped the general attention of writers and speakers on this topic, but which is. as it seems to us, peculiarly apposite, if not conclusive of the whole ground of controversy. It is as follows in the ordinary English version: “The effectual  fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much” (Jam 5:16). The context shows that this language bears most appropriately on the points we have been discussing. The apostle had just been speaking of the prayer of the united Church on behalf of the sick, assuring them that these would be efficacious; and he goes on immediately to speak of the miracle-working prayers of Elias, taking care to observe that this noted prophet was after all only “a man subject to like passions as we are,” and hence obviously inferring that prayer was still as available as it had been in his case. Unfortunately the common rendering of the passage as above has confused, if not wholly perverted, its real meaning. As it now stands, it contains a palpable tautology, for “effectual prayer,” of course, “availeth much.” and the epithet “fervent” likewise thus becomes superfluous, as well as the qualification “of a righteous man.” The single Greek word translated by “effectual fervent” (ἐνεργούμενος) literally means inwrought. The only question among interpreters is whether it may not be reflexive (middle voice), and thus signify in working itself, that is, operative or effective. This was evidently the view of our authorized translators, and they have been followed by many scholars, including Robinson (Lexicon of the N.T.) and Alford (Greek Test.), the latter of whom renders the passage after the order of the Greek words, “‘The supplication of the righteous man availeth much in its working,” that is, as he explains it from Huther, “The prayer of the righteous can do much in its energy.” But this leaves the tautology about the same. Lange's note (Commentary, ad loc.), after reviewing the other instances of the use of the word in the N.T., approaches the true idea, “The full tension of the praying spirit under its absolute yielding to the divine impulse;” but Mombert's gloss (in the American edition), “Absolute submission to the will of God,” completely neutralizes its meaning.

The passire sense of the participle is required by its grammatical form, and is justified by every passage where this form occurs: e.g.sinful passions are inwrought (Rom 7:5); salvation is inwrought by endurance (2Co 1:6); death is in wrought (2Co 4:12); faith is inwrought by love (Gal 5:6); God's power is inwrought (Eph 3:20, precisely parallel with our text, as also in Colossians 1, 29), and similarly his word (1Th 2:13), and on the other hand the “mystery of iniquity” (2Th 2:7). The thought of the apostle James, therefore, is, as Michaelis (after the Greek fathers) interprets, that the saint's prayer prevails when its earnestness is divinely inspired. To this sense the illustration of Elijah is most apt, as we may see by referring especially to  the history alluded to (1Ki 18:42-45). The scene is graphically described by Stanley (Lectures on Jewish History, 2d series, p. 337, Amer. ed.), but as usual he misses the spiritual import. The seven-times bent form of the prophet, with his head between his knees, was not merely “the Oriental attitude of entire abstraction;” it denoted the intense struggle of his soul after the boon which Jehovah inwardly urged him to crave. It was an agony of prayer that would not be denied, similar, though less exhaustive to that of our Savior in the garden, which we learn (Heb 5:7) was effectual as to its main object (Luk 22:43). Another example of the same energized prayer for which Elijah is adduced by the apostle occurs earlier in the account of the raising to life of the son of the widow of Zerephath, where the praying prophet “stretched himself upon the child three times” (1Ki 17:21), as if he would infuse his own ardent soul into the lifeless form (compare the more detailed narrative in the parallel case of Elisha and the Shunammite's son, 2Ki 4:34). He has had a very shallow experience of “the deep things of God” (2Co 3:10, the passage having reference to this very point) who has not felt “the Spirit itself making intercession with groanings which cannot be uttered” (Rom 8:26). At such times the veil between the natural and the miraculous becomes thin indeed. See Cocker, Theism (N. Y. 1876, 12mo); Dawson, Nature and the Bible, p. 59, 66; Farrar, (Crit. Fist. of Free Thought, p. 395; Blackwood's Magazine, June, 1867, p. 680; Meth. Quar. Rev. Oct. 1854, p. 526; New Enlander, Oct. 1873, art. 1; Ch. Monthly, June, 1866, p. 330; Lond. Quar. Rev. Oct. 1854, p. 32; Presb. Rev. April, 1870; Bapt. Quar. Oct. 1873, art. 4; Brit. and Foe. Ev. Quar. Rev. Oct. 1873, art. 3; Theol. Medium, Jan. 1874, art. 3; Bibl. Sacra, Jan. 1870, p. 199; Jan. 1875, art. 5; Contenp. Rev. July, Aug., Oct. 1872; South. Quar. Rev. April, 1875, art. 4. Comp. SEE MIRACLE.

## Prayer for the Dead[[@Headword:Prayer for the Dead]]

             SEE DEAD, PRAYERS FOR THE; SEE PURGATORY.

## Prayer of Consecration[[@Headword:Prayer of Consecration]]

             is offered in the communion service for the elements served to the people as memorials of Christ's crucifixion. In the Church of Rome and other ritualistic bodies, this prayer is accompanied with much ceremony. In other Christia:n churches the form prescribed or adopted is in harmony with the grave occasion which it commemorates. SEE LORD'S SUPPER. Prayer- days. There can be no doubt that the service in the Book of Common Prayer is intended to be daily; yet in the United States this practice has never come to prevail. As a substitute for this, and the nearest approximation the times will allow to the original usage, certain days of the week are selected on which morning and evening service is publicly held. Such days are denominated “Prayer-days,” and are thus distinguished from the usual “holydays.” See the rubrics before the order of public baptism.— Staunton, Ecclesiastical Dictionary, p. 540.

## Prayer to Saints[[@Headword:Prayer to Saints]]

             SEE INVOCATION.

## Prayer, Christian Attitudes Of[[@Headword:Prayer, Christian Attitudes Of]]

             1. The first Christians prayed standing, with hands outstretched and raised towards heaven. Their face was turned towards the east. The proof of this appears everywhere in the primitive monuments. The frescos, sarcophagi, tombstones (especially those of the Roman catacombs), the painted glasses which are found there in abundance, the old mosaics with which the old basilicas were ornamented, etc., represent both sexes, especially women, in that attitude (Aringhi, passin, and especially 2, 285). These figures are generally called orantes. They are distinguished by the rich elegance of their garments; they wear long tunics or dalmatics with wide folding  sleeves, trimmed with embroideries and purple borders; they are adorned with collars, bracelets, and other jewelry (Bottari, tab. 19, 153). These splendid garments might at first seem in contradiction with the well-known modesty of the women of the early Church; but in thus adorning their image the aim of the artist was not to show what they had been in life, but what glory surrounded them in heaven. In the sepultures of all kinds, the orante, generally standing between two trees-the emblem of Paradise-was the symbol of the soul who had become the bride of Jesus Christ, and as such was admitted to the celestial banquet. This explains the magnificence of the garment of St. Priscilla, represented as an orante in the cemetery of her name (Perret, Catacombes, vol. 3, tab. 3). Thus we find St. Praxedis, in a beautiful Roman mosaic, covered from head to foot with precious stones (Ciampini, Vet. Monum. vol. 2, tab. 47). In a celebrated vision St. Agnes had appeared to her parents, a week after her marttyrdom, clothed in precious robes, and, to use the Bollandists' expression, autro textis cycladibus induta. This text became the type of most of the images of the young martyr: the most beautiful specimen is a gilded glass, published by Boldetti (Cémet. tab. 3, fig. 3, p. 194). Several of these female orantes, who were probably noble Roman matrons, as if fatigued by a prolonged prayer, have their arms supported by men, who, by their garments, must be supposed to be servants (Bosio, p. 389, 405; Aringhi, 2, 17), which reminds us of Moses supported by Aaron and Ilur in a similar manner (Exo 17:12).

We know this custom not only by the pictures, but also by the written monuments of Christian antiquity. The Christians, says Tertullian (Apol. 30), while praying, raise their eyes to heaven, stretch out their hands, because they are innocent; they pray bareheaded, because we have not to blush-” Illuc suspicientes (in caelum) Christiani manibus expansis, quia innocuis, capite nudo, quia non erubescimus.” To pray with uplifted hands is an attitude natural in the man who addresses himself to the Deity; it is a supplicatory posture which is found in all nations, even pagan, as among the Egyptians, where we meet it in funerary monuments; among the Etruscans there are in the Museo Campana two statues of Chiusi in terra- cotta, which have the arms raised in that way; among the Romans, as we see by the reverse of a number of imperial medals, especially those of Trebonianus Gallus, the praying figure is accompanied with the legend “Pietas Augg.” (Mionnet, Rarete des Medailles Romaines, 2, 13). But Tertullian remarks that the attitude as well as intention of the faithful was  quite different from those of the pagans. “As to us,” says this father, “we do not content ourselves with raising our hands, we stretch them in memory of the passion of our Lord.”

They meant to imitate the posture of Christ on the cross, as did several martyrs at their execution, for instance, St. Montanus, disciple of St. Cyprianus (Ruinart, p. 235), and SS. Fructuosus, Augurius, and Eulogius (Usuard. 12:Kal. Febr.): “Manibus in moldum crucis expansis orantes.” Several other fathers gave expression to the same idea. It is therefore easy t) tell the Christian orantes from similar pagan pictures. The latter raise their hands vertically, the curve of the elbow forming a right angle, while the arms of the Christians are almost in a horizontal position. Tertullian (De Orat. 13) describes this difference most minutely, to remove all idea of idolatrous imitation: “We do not raise our hands with ostentation, but with modesty, with moderation.” Now, the priest alone observes at mass this rite of venerable antiquity, which has preserved its primitive character in the liturgy of the Church of Lyons, for there the priest expands completely his arms in the form of a cross while reciting the oration which immediately precedes the elevation. It is to be observed that in the primitive Church the catechumens prayed standing like the rest of the congregation, with this difference, that the latter held their face somewhat raised to heaven (Tertull. De Coron. 3), while the former inclined slightly their heads, not having obtained yet, by baptism, the divine adoption, the title of children of the Father who is in heaven.

2. The practice of standing erect in prayer was not exclusive, and the first Christians sometimes prayed kneeling. We have an example of it in the Acts (Act 21:5): “And we kneeled down on the shore and prayed;” and another in the life of St. James Major, whose knees, by dint of prolonged praying, had become as callous as those of a camel; and another, of great celebrity, in the acts of the martyrdom of St. Ignatius (Ruinart, 7:10, ed. Veron.). In less ancient times this custom becomes more frequent. We know by the testimony of Eusebius (Vit. Constant. 4, 21, 61) that Constantine often bowed his knees to offer his praver to God. St. Jerome writes to the virgin Demetrias, “Frequently the solicitude of thy soul prompted thee to bend thy knees;” and to Marcella (Epist. 23: De aegrot. Blesillae), “She bends her knees on the naked soil.” It is likely that the custom of kneeling was borrowed by the Christians from the Hebrews. We read in the Scripture that Solomon, while dedicating his Temple to God, knelt down on both knees (1Ki 8:54), and that Daniel thrice a day knelt down in prayer (Dan 6:10). It is said also that St. Stephen,  while suffering martyrdom (Act 7:59), knelt down and prayed for his murderers. St. Luke tells us that our Redeemer in the garden of Gethsemane prayed in this humble posture (Luk 22:41). It is natural that. in conformity with this divine example, the Christians should have adopted this way of praying as a mark of affliction, a demonstration of sadness and sorrow. This is what we are led to conclude from these lines of Prudentius, one of the most trustworthy interpreters of Christian antiquity (Cathem. hymn. 2, 50):

“Te voce, te cantu pio Rogare curvato genu Flendo et canendo discimus.”

This is also shown by the custom of the primitive Church in the liturgical practice. The Church had directed from the earliest time that prayers should be said standing on Sundays and during the paschal period, in sign of joy, and kneeling all the rest of the year in sign of penitence. This rule was already in force at the time of Justin (Quaest. ad orthodox. resp. 115); it is mentioned by Tertullian (De Coron. milit. 3), and stated by St. Jerome in that curious passage where he speaks of St. Paul (Comment. Epist. ad Ephes. Prooem.): “St. Paul stayed at Ephesus until Pentecost, that time of joy and victory when we bend not our knees, nor bow to the ground, but when, resuscitated by the Lord, we raise ourselves to heaven.” The same custom became a canonic law at the Council of Nicaea (Can. ult.). It is interesting to read what Pamelius, in his notes on the treatise of Tertullian (De Coron. c. 3, n. 38), and Suicer (Thesaur. eccles. s.v. γόνυ) wrote on the subject of this manner of praying common to the Jews and Christians. We have no pictures at all representing Christians on their knees, which speaks in favor of those who assert that the or-antes are images of the glorified soul. In conformity with the apostolic prescriptions the men attended public prayers in the churches bareheaded and the women veiled. In some churches of Africa the virgins had exempted themselves from this custom. Tertullian recommends it anew to their observance in his treatise Do velandis virginibus.

We must add, as a general observation, that the fathers endeavored, with all their might, to exclude from the prayers of the faithful all gestures and exterior practices bearing some strong features of paganism. Thus Tertullian (De Orat. 12) blames sternly such Christians as, in imitation of  the pagans, thought fit to make their pravers acceptable to God by putting down their penulae. SEE ATTITUDES.

## Prayer, Formula of[[@Headword:Prayer, Formula of]]

             SEE FORMS OF PRAYER.

## Prayer, Lords[[@Headword:Prayer, Lords]]

             SEE LORDS PRAYER.

## Prayer-book[[@Headword:Prayer-book]]

             Since the article on this subject was written (vol. 2) the Church of England has considered the propriety of purging the Book of Common Prayer of the Athanasian Creed, which the American Church rejected. In the Irish Church (Protestant Episcopal), recently disestablished the Athanasian Creed is purged of the damnatory clauses, and retained in that modified form. Since the organization of the Reformed Protestant Episcopal Church, the Prayer-book originally framed for the (American) Protestant Episcopal Church was made the basis of another Book of Common Prayer, from which all language that seems to justify the ritualism of the High-Church party has been carefully expunged. Recent literature on this subject may be found in the Edinb. Rev. Oct. 1874, art. 6; Brit. Quar. Jan. 1875, p. 144; Church Journal (N. Y.), June 17, 1875; Blunt, Key to the Knowledge and Use of the Book of Common Prayer (Lond. 1869); Contemporary Rev. Dec. 1872, art. 7. SEE COMMON PRAYER.

## Prayer-test[[@Headword:Prayer-test]]

             This was a proposal anonymously put fomrth in the name of science in the Contemporary Review for July, 1872, with the strong endorsement of Prof. Tyndall, and couched in the following terms:

“I ask that one single ward or hospital, under the care of first-rate physicians and surgeons, containing certain numbers of patients afflicted with those diseases which have been best studied, land of which the mortality rates are best known, whether the diseases are those which are treated by medical or by surgical remedies, should be, during a period of not less, say, than three or five years, made the objects of special prayer by the whole body of the faithful; and that at the end of that time the mortality rates should be compared with the past rates, and also with the rates of other leading hospitals similarly well managed during the same period.”

This proposal is open to several grave objections.

1. It is not warranted by the Scriptures nor by the nature of prater. Neither religion nor science is under any obligation to accept all challenges. No system of truth does that. The true man of science comes to nature, not as a dictator, but as the humblest of learners. He does not invent, tests and demand that she shall accept them; he ingeniously finds out what tests she proposes to him. It is his office, not to alter nor to criticize, but to interpret her hieroglyphics.

In the same spirit we must study Christianity. The Bible is our text-book. We compare its parts with each other, and the whole with human consciousness and experience. We come to the book as learners. We are to accept and try the tests it offers, and not to set up tests of our own. It teaches a doctrine of prayer; it makes prayer to be a real and mighty  power-a power producing physical results-but efficient only under prescribed conditions. These conditions, so far as they relate to the special case before us, are sufficiently indicated in these words: “The fervent, effectual prayer of a righteous man availeth much;” “the prayer of faith shall save the sick.” The promise is attached only to the earnest, importunate supplication of a righteous man, offered with full faith in God. The prayer proposed to us vacates the essential conditions of prayer. It aims not directly at the result it asks, but indirectly to test God. It says, “Will he?” Faith says,” He will.” The thing it seeks is not really the healing of the sick, but “to confer quantitative precision on the action of the supernatural in nature.”

This sort of challenge is not new in substance, if it is in form. How do the Scriptures treat it? On a certain occasion a personage of very acute intellect and large intelligence conducted the perfect man to a precipitous height, and challenged him to prove his claims by casting himself down. trusting to be borne up on angels' wings; and he quoted Scripture to enforce the test. The reply was simply, “Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.” When that perfect and divine man hung on the cross the minions of the arch-tempter proposed another test, “Let him now come down from the cross, and we will believe in him;” but he came not down. When once a miracle was demanded of Jesus he said, “You have already more convincing proofs than sufficed for the Ninevites and for the queen of Sheba; an evil and an adulterous generation seeketh after a sign.” A lost spirit, himself convinced at last by the resistless argument of hell-torment, prayed for the resurrection of a dead man to convince his brothers, but was assured on the highest authority— “If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead.”

2. The test proposed would be nugatory. Suppose it were admissible, and that the Christian world should gladly accept it, and that the results should be all that believers could desire. The hospital is selected-St. Luke's, the west wing; one hundred patients of the kinds indicated are entered. The same surgeons, physicians and nurses have charge of both wings; the temperature, treatment, and diet are the same; there is perfect scientific exactness in all the conditions, except that the patients in the west wing are made the subjects of daily prayer wherever prayer to the God of the Bible is offered. After three or five years the hospital records are inspected and compared with other records, and it is found that twenty-nine and a half  percent more recoveries have taken place in the wards which prayer has overshadowed than, in similar cases, anywhere else in the world.

Now, what will the skeptical men of science say? “The Lord, he is the God; prayer is vindicated forever; we have found a new force?” Not at all. We should hear such suggestions as these: “It may be the morning sun is bad, or the clatter of wheels and hoofs on the avenue has injured the patients in the east wing;” “We more than suspect some of the nurses and physicians in the west wing have a bias towards Christianity;” “Probably some new remedy has been secretly used; at all events, though there is something mysterious about it, this we know, nothing can contravene the laws of nature.” Let not such a supposition be thought slanderous. The prototypes of such men were not convinced by miracles. Some of the persons who witnessed the resurrection of Lazarus went about from that very day to kill Jesus— yes, and to kill Lazarus too, lest the sight of him might convince others.

The test proposed would be nugatory for another reason-prayer could not be so offered. It is impossible so to dam up Christian sympathy. It would burst over all such artificial banks like a spring freshet. Such forms of prayer would be mere magical incantations, impious shams, which would either be dinned over with no thought of their scope, or else would paralyze the lips that uttered them. Imagine the whole Church on earth thus to pray, “Grant, O Lord, thy special mercy to the one hundred sick persons in the west wing of St. Luke's Hospital. New York, U. S. of America.” If any influence could move the Church to begin a three years' course of such prayer, long before the time was up the Spirit of God would be searching many hearts with questions like this. “Who taught you so to limit your petitions?” “Professor Tyndall.” “Why do you confine such supplications to one hundred of my needy millions, individuals towards whom you have no reasons for special sympathy?” “To prove thee, Lord, whether thou hearest prayers for the sick.” “If you doubt it, you cannot offer such prayers acceptably; and if you believe it, why test me thus at the dictation of unbelievers? Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.”

Answers are promised only to sincere, single-minded prayer, which looks simply for the object it asks. Such prayer must be double-minded-one eye resting faintly on the hospital, the other intently scanning the scientific world. Under such circumstances faith would be impossible; for faith rests  solely on God's promise, and God has nowhere promised to answer any prayer offered as a test of himself.

3. Our final objection to the proposition before us is that it proposes an unnecessary test. There are allowable experiments which afford abundant proof of the mooted point. What these are must be determined by the Word of God and the experience of praying men. For a scientific atheist, or pantheist, or deist, or mere nominal Christian to insist on other tests is as unscientific-we say not as irreligious, but as unscientific-as it would be for us to say, “If electricity be so powerful as you assert, let it run along this hempen cord as you claim it does along the telegraphic wires,” or, “Make your magnet attract copper.” The prompt reply would be, “The laws of nature forbid.” Our reply is, “The economy of grace forbids.”

We can conceive of a strictly scientific test which might have been proposed by the author of this inadmissible, nugatory test. He might have sent out a circular letter to ten thousand of the ablest, most experienced and most devout ministers of the Gospel and other Christians in all lands, explaining his object, and inviting careful answers to these questions: How many cases have you ever known of persons desperately sick who were made the subjects of fervent, importunate prayer? What were the particulars and what the results? The candid and unbiased collation of the facts so obtained from witnesses whose capacity and honesty would give their testimony on all other matters the highest credit, might or might not cast some light upon tie subject. But it would not convince unbelievers, for Unbelief is a matter of the heart more than of the intellect; and very probably the secret and unsearchable workings of the divine providence would remove the whole business beyond the range of the laws of induction. The scientists discard faith, while the Bible tells lus that only by faith can we know either the person or the providence of God. A scientific test, in whatever pertains to the divine action, is impossible and absurd-a truth that Christians need to understand scarcely less than skeptics. SEE PRAYER; SEE PROVIDENCE.

## Pre-eminence of Christianity[[@Headword:Pre-eminence of Christianity]]

             i.e. the higher power and honor due to Jesus the Christ. This doctrine is laid down in Col 1:18. In all things in nature, in person, in office, work, power, and honor, Christ has the pre-eminence above angels and men, or any other creature. But a man has no pre-eminence above a beast as to his body; he is liable to the same diseases and death (Ecc 3:19). See Bibliotheca Sacra, 1863, p. 681; Church Remembrancer, Jan. 1856, p. 132 sq.

## Pre-established Harmony[[@Headword:Pre-established Harmony]]

             SEE LEIBNITZ.

## Pre-existence of Jesus Christ[[@Headword:Pre-existence of Jesus Christ]]

             is his existence before he was born of the Virgin Mary. That he really did exist is taught plainly in Joh 3:13; Joh 6:50; Joh 6:62, etc.; 8:58; 17:5, 24; 1Jn 1:2; but there are various opinions respecting this existence. Some, acknowledging, with the orthodox, that in Jesus Christ there is a divine nature, a rational soul, and a human body, go into an opinion peculiar to themselves. His body was formed in the Virgin's womb; but his human soul-the first and most excellent of all the works of God-they suppose was brought into existence before the creation of the world, and subsisted in happy union in heaven with the second Person of the Godhead till his incarnation. The doctrine is thus clearly set forth by bishop Bull in his Defense of the Nicene Creed: “All the Catholic orators of the first three centuries taught that Jesus Christ, he who was afterwards so called, existed before he became man, or before he was born, according to the flesh, of the Blessed Virgin, in another nature far more excellent than the human nature; that he appeared to holy men, giving them an earnest, as it were, of his incarnation; that he always presided over and provided for the Church,  which in time to come he would redeem with his own blood, and of consequence that, from the beginning, the whole order or thread of the divine dispensation, as Tertullian speaks, ran through him; further yet, that he was with the Father before the foundation of the world, and that by him all things were made.”

Those who advocate this doctrine differ in their christological views from those called Arians, for the latter ascribe to Christ only a created deity, whereas the former hold his true and proper divinity. They differ from the Socinians, who believe no existence of Jesus Christ before his incarnation; they differ from the Sabellians, who only own a trinity of names; they differ also from the generally received opinion, which is, that Christ's human soul began to exist in the womb of his mother, in exact conformity to that likeness unto his brethren of which St. Paul speaks (Heb 2:17). The writers in favor of the pre-existence of Christ's human soul recommend their opinion by these arguments:

1. Christ is represented as his Father's messenger, or angel, being distinct from his Father, sent by his Father, long before his incarnation, to perform actions which seem to be too low for the dignity of pure Godhead. The appearances of Christ to the patriarchs are described like the appearance of an angel, or man really distinct from God; yet one in whom God, or Jehovah, had a peculiar indwelling, or with whom the divine nature had a personal union.

2. Christ, when he came into the world, is said, in several passages of Scripture, to have divested himself of some glory which he had before his incarnation. Now if there had existed before this time nothing but his divine nature, this divine nature, it is argued, could not properly have divested itself of any glory (Joh 17:4-5; 2Co 8:9). It cannot be said of God that he became poor: he is infinitely self-sufficient; he is necessarily and eternally rich in perfections and glories. Nor can it be said of Christ, as man, that he was rich, if he were never in a richer state before than while he was on earth.

3. It seems needful, say those who embrace this opinion, that the soul of Jesus Christ should pre-exist, that it might have an opportunity to give its previous actual consent to the great and painful undertaking of making atonement for man's sins. It was the human soul of Christ that endured the weakness and pain of his infant state, all the labors and fatigues of life, the reproaches of men, and the sufferings of death. The divine nature is  incapable of suffering. The covenant of redemption between the Father and the Son is therefore represented as being made before the foundation of the world. To suppose that simple Deity, or the Divine Essence, which is the same in all the three Personalities, should make a covenant with itself, is inconsistent.

Dr. Watts, moreover, supposes that the doctrine of the pre-existence of the soul of Christ explains dark and difficult Scriptures, and discovers many beauties and proprieties of expression in the Word of God, which on any other plan lie unobserved. For instance, in Col 1:15, etc., Christ is described as the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature. His being the image of the invisible God cannot refer merely to his divine nature, for that is as invisible in the Son as in the Father; therefore it seems to refer to his pre-existent soul in union with the Godhead. Again, when man is said to be created in the image of God (Gen 1:2), it may refer to the God-man, to Christ in his pre-existent state. God says, “Let us make man in our image, after our likeness.” The word is redouble, perhaps to intimate that Adam was made in the likeness of the human soul of Christ, as well as that he bore something of the image and resemblance of the divine nature. Dr. Samuel Clarke, it will be borne in mind by the well-read student of Christology, did not accept the general orthodox view of the Trinity doctrine, but endeavored to form a theory holding an intermediate place between the Arian and orthodox systems, neither allowing Jesus to be called a creature nor admitting his equality with the Father. He held that from the beginning there existed along with the Father a second Person, called the Word or Son who derived his being, attributes, and powers from the Father. The Jews uniformly maintained the pre-existence of the Messiah. In English theology, Dr. Watts was the ablest espouser of this doctrine. In American theology the Rev. Noah Worcester advocated Dr. Watts's theory, but with decided modifications founded on the title “Son of God,” which is so frequently applied to Christ in the N.T., and which Worcester alleged “must import that Jesus Christ is the Son of the Father as truly as Isaac was the son of Abraham; not that he is a created intelligent being, but a being who properly derived his existence and nature from God.” Mr. Worcester thus maintains that Jesus Christ is not a self-existent being, for it is impossible even for God to produce a self-existent son; but as Christ derived his existence and nature from the Father, he is as truly the image of the invisible God as Seth was the likeness of Adam. He is therefore a person of divine dignity, constituted the creator  of the world, the angel of God's presence, or the medium by which God manifested himself to the ancient patriarchs. According to this theory the Son of God became mall, or the Son of man, by becoming the soul of a human body.

Those who object to the doctrine of the pre-existence of the human soul of Christ do so on the principle that such a doctrine weakens and subverts that of his divine personality, and assign as grounds for such a position that—

1. A pure intelligent spirit, the first, the most ancient, and the most excellent of creatures, created before the foundation of the world, so exactly resembles the second Person of the Arian Trinity that it is impossible to show the least difference except in name.

2. This pre-existent Intelligence, supposed in this doctrine, is so confounded with those other intelligences called angels that there is great danger of mistaking this human soul for an angel, and so of making the person of Christ to consist of three natures.

3. If Jesus Christ had nothing in common like the rest of mankind except a body, how could this semi-conformity make him a real man?

4. The passages quoted in proof of the pre-existence of the human soul of Jesus Christ are of the same sort with those which others allege in proof of the pre-existence of all human souls.

5. This opinion, by ascribing the dignity of the work of redemption to this sublime human soul, detracts from the deity of Christ, and renders the last as passive as the first is active.

6. This notion is contrary to the Scripture. St. Paul says, “In all things it behooved him to be made like unto his brethren” (Heb 2:17): he partook of all our infirmities except sin. St. Luke says, “He increased in stature and wisdom” (Luk 2:52). Upon the whole, this scheme, adopted to relieve the difficulties which must always surround mysteries so great, only creates new ones. This is the usual fate of similar speculations, and shows the wisdom of resting in the plain interpretation of the Word of God. See Robinson, Claude, 1, 214, 311; Watts, Works, 5, 274, 385; Gill, Body of Divinity, 2, 51; Robinson, Plea, p. 140; Fleming, Christology; Simpson, Apology for the Trinity, p. 190; Hawker, Sermon on the Divinity of Christ, p. 44, 45; Haag, Histoire des Dogmes Chret.; Martensen,  Dogmatics; Miller, Doctrine of Sin; Liddon, Divinity of Christ; Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines; Studien u. Kritiken, 1860, No. 3. Comp. SEE INDWELLING SCHEME; SEE JESUS CHRIST.

## Pre-existents[[@Headword:Pre-existents]]

             (or Preexistiani) is the name given to those who hold the hypothesis of the preexistence of souls, or the doctrine that, at the beginning of creation, not that of this world simply, but of all worlds, God created the souls of all men, which, however, are not united to the body till the individuals for whom they are destined are begotten or born into the world. According to this theory, says Schedd, “Men were angelic spirits at first. Because of their apostasy in the angelic sphere, they were transferred, as a punishment for their sin, into material bodies in this mundane sphere, and are low passing through a disciplinary process, in order to be restored, all of them, without exception, to their pre-existent and angelic condition. These bodies to which they are joined come into existence by the ordinary course of physical propagation; so that the sensuous and material part of human nature has no existence previous to Adam. It is only the rational and spiritual principle of which a preadamic life is asserted.”

The doctrine of pre-existence first found its advocates In the Christian Church in the 2nd century. The fathers Justin Martyr, Origen, and others espoused it, particularly Origen, who became its principal exponent and advocate. It was a belief very prevalent anciently, and is still widely spread throughout the East. The Greek philosophers, too, especially those who held the doctrine of transmigration (q.v.), as the Pythagoreans, Empedocles, and even Plato-if with him pre-existence is not simply a symbolical myth-were familiar with the conception; and so were the Jews, especially the cabalists. It is generally received by the modern Jews, and is frequently taught in the writings of the rabbins. One declares that “the soul of mall had an existence anterior to the formation of the heavens, they being nothing but fire and water.” The same author asserts that “the human soul is a particle of the Deity from above, and is eternal like the heavenly natures.” A similar doctrine is believed by the Persian Sofis (q.v.). With the pre-existents should also be classed the metempsychosis, for pre-existence is connected with the idea of metempsychosis (q.v.), according to which doctrine the soul was, in a former life, in punishment for sin, united with a human body, in order to expiate, by the miseries of earthly existence, anterior transgressions. Therefore St. Augustine, invoking Cicero's  authority, says (Contrat Julianu. 4, 15): “Ex quibus humanae vitae erroribus et aerumnis fit, ut interdlum veteres illi sive vates sive in sacris initiisque tradendis divinae mentis interpretes, qui nos ob aliqua scelera suscepta in vita superiori paenarum luendarum causa esse natos dixerunt, aliquid vidisse videantur.” Nemesius, as a philosopher, and Prudentius, as a poet, seem to have been the only defenders of the pre-existence theory, which was condemned formally in the Council of Constantinople, in A.D. 540. But the doctrine has been embraced by mystics (q.v.) generally, both in ancient and modern times; and has since been revived, in a modified form, in German theology, by Julius Muller, and forms the basis of his work on The Christian Doctrine of Sin, one of the deepest works in modern theology. In American theology it has its able advocate in Dr. Edward Beecher (The Conflict of Ages), but the Christian Church generally has thus far failed to give its assent to it. In the domain of philosophy, direct intellectual interest in this doctrine has nearly ceased in modern times; yet the dream-for, whether true or false, it is and can be nothing but a dream in our present state, and with our present capabilities of knowledge-has again and again haunted individual thinkers. Wordsworth has given poetical expression to it in his famous ode, Intimations of Immortality from Recollections of Early Childhood:

“Our birth is but a sleep and a forgetting.

The soul that rises with us— our life’s star,

Hath had elsewhere its setting,

And cometh from afar.

Not in entire forgetfulness,

And not in utter nakedness,

But trailing clouds of glory do we come

From God, who is our home.”

The latest philosophy of Germany-that of Hegel and of the younger Fichte (Psychologie [1864])-has moderately revived the doctrine, and, with the alliance of such theologians as Muller, may crowd it into prominent consideration upon the Church. It remains for us to say here that the name Preexistianti was given to the advocates of this belief to distinguish them from the Creaticaii, those who hold to the immediate creation of the human soul at the moment of the production of the body; and to distinguish them from the Traducianists, who held that children received soul as well as body from their parents. See Cudworth, Intellectual Development of the Universe; Delitzsch, Biblical Psychol. p. 41-43;  Lawson, Church of Christ; Goodwin, Works; Register, Studien un. Kritiken, 1829-37, s.v. Seele; Westminster Rev. April, 1865; Bibliotheca Sancta, Jan. 1855, p. 156; Methodist Rev. Oct. 1853, p. 567. (J. H. V.)

## Preachers, Local[[@Headword:Preachers, Local]]

             SEE LOCAL PREACHERS.

## Preaching[[@Headword:Preaching]]

             is usually and with literal correctness defined as the act of delivering religious discourses. But this definition fails to suggest the most important signification of the term. That can only be reached by considering it as designating the objective idea of a great and peculiar appointment of the Lord Jesus Christ. In this broad but legitimate sense, preaching means more than an individual act or series of acts. It represents an institution of Christianity which has been in existence some nineteen centuries, and an agency of religious influence destined to continue in action throughout the whole period of human affairs.

I. The Proper Chcaracter and Design of Preaching. As Christ himself was the Divine Word made flesh, so, lessening to employ human agency for the promotion of his kingdom among men, he made a special appropriation of man's distinguishing faculty of speech by appointing it as the primary and principal means of diffusing God's word of truth and message of salvation throughout the world. Having chosen disciples from among his own earliest hearers, “he ordained twelve, that they should be with him, and that he might send them forth to preach” (Mark 3, 14). To those disciples he said, “What I tell you in darkness that speak ye in light: and what ye hear in the ear that preach ye upon the house-tops” (Mat 10:27). As had been foreshadowed in prophecy, so Christ represented the preaching of the Gospel to the poor as the distinguishing characteristic of his kingdom. The great Preacher himself, having completed his earthly mission, crowned it with the ever-binding command given to his disciples, “Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature” (Mar 16:15). Christian preaching, therefore, implies not only preachers, but hearers. It presupposes a personal conviction and a deep sense of truth in the mind of the preacher, accompanied by a purpose to transfer his convictions to the minds and hearts of his hearers. Although preaching is designed to embody an important element of instruction yet, if properly executed, it rises in character superior to lecturing, or any (If the forms of didactic discourse. It resembles the best forms of demonstrative address, but transcends all secular oratory in the moral grandeur of its themes, and especially in its specific design of enlightening and quickening the consciences of men as a means of affecting their earthly character and their eternal destiny.

II. Historical Development. — Prior to Christ, preaching was but little more known among the Jews than among the Gentiles. It had been to some  extent anticipated by several of the prophets, the greatest and last of whom was John the Baptist; but, from the time that Christ began his public ministry, preaching became common and constant. Following our Lord's ascension, the apostolic ministry of preaching was elevated and vitalized by the gift of the Holy Ghost. The gift of tongues and the manifestation of the tongues of fire were alike designed to aid and encourage them in their work of evangelization. Hence, whether in the Temple, in synagogues, or in prisons, they preached Christ and him crucified as the power of God and the wisdom of God; and, when scattered abroad by persecution, “they went everywhere preaching the Word” (Act 8:4). It was thus that the Gospel became rapidly diffused throughout the Roman empire, which, in an important sense, represented “all the world” of that period.

It seems safe to believe that, had the apostolic zeal and fidelity in preaching been maintained without interruption, the triumphs of the Gospel would have been continuous, and perhaps ere this coextensive with the habitable world. But, unfortunately, the 2nd and 3rd centuries witnessed the introduction into the Church of two classes of influences which had a tendency to reduce the number of preachers and limit the work and influence of preaching. The first was that of asceticism (q.v.), which, by a powerful but mistaken impulse, sent into deserts and caves, and afterwards into monasteries, thousands of earnest men, whose lives were thus withdrawn from evangelical activity and wasted in penances and self- torture. The second was that of ceremonialism, SEE CEREMONY, by which the preaching office was taken away from the majority of the clergy, and for the greater part limited to bishops. Bingham states the limitation in these words:

“Preaching anciently was one of the chief offices of a bishop; insomuch that in the African churches a presbyter was never known to preach before a bishop in his cathedral church till Austin's time, and St. Austin was the first presbyter in that part of the world that ever was allowed to preach in the presence of his bishop.... It is true, in the Eastern churches presbyters were sometimes allowed to preach in the great church before the bishop; but that was not to discharge him of the duty, for still he preached a sermon at the same time after then… 11 the lesser churches of the city and country about, this office was devolved upon presbyters as the bishop's proper assistants; 1and the deacons, except in the aforementioned cases (of reading the homilies of the liathers, and when the presbyter was sick or  infirm), were not authorized to perform it” (Antiq. Christian Church, bk. 14 ch. 4).

Not only was preaching shorn of its aggressive power by being thus limited and subordinated under the influence of a growing ceremonialism, but in some places it was for long periods scandalously neglected. Sozomen, the historian, “relates of the Church of Rome in his time that they had no sermons either by the bishop or any other.” Some have thought Sozomen mistaken; but Cassiodorus, who was a senator and consul at Rome, quotes the same out of Sozomen in his Historia Tripartita, without correction, and further says that no one can produce any sermons preached to the people by any bishop of Rome before those of Leo. The revival of preaching by Leo appears to have been but temporary; for, according to Surius, a Roman writer, it was afterwards discontinued for five hundred years together, till Pius Quintus, like another Leo, revived the practice. Not merely at Rome, but through large portions both of the Latin and Greek churches, preaching, instead of being a constant custom, was rare and exceptional during the long period between the 6th and 16th centuries. It ceased to be a regular part of the services of the Sabbath, although it was retained as a part of the ceremonial of ordinations, while on festival days it took the form of panegyrics or eulogies upon the Virgin and the saints.

The preaching of the Crusades (q.v.) by Peter the Hermit, St. Bernard, and others, and the organization of the Dominicans (q.v.) as a preaching order of monks, may be considered as exceptional to the usual practice of the mediteval Church. Some other exceptions, however, of a far better character, and followed by better results, are also to be credited to the Church of the Middle Ages, while on the other hand it was disgraced by Tetzel and others, who used preaching as an agency for the sale of indulgences. But preaching never again became general till after the Reformation. It was seized tupon by Luther and the other reformers as a means of propagating scriptural truth and exposing the corrupt doctrines and practices which had crept into the Church, and from that time forward preaching became frequent and universal among Protestants. Its influence in the Protestant world has reacted upon Romanism, so that long since, in all Protestant countries, and to some extent elsewhere, preaching has become a regular Sunday service in Roman Catholic churches, performed not only by bishops, but by presbyters and deacons, as well as by monks of several different orders.

III. Preaching-places and Customs. — In New Testament times our Lord and his apostles found places for preaching wherever people could be assembled. The mountain-side, the shores of seas and rivers, the public street, private houses, the porch of the Temple, the Jewish synagogue, and various other places were found available for the proclamation of the Gospel. So far as the preaching customs of the first period of Christianity can be inferred from authentic records, they were simple in the extreme. Sometimes the message of the preacher was communicated in conversation, and when delivered in a more formal manner it rarely had any other accompaniments than the reading of the Sacred Word and prayer. For a considerable time there could have been no Church edifices adapted to the convenient preaching and hearing of the Word; but the earliest structures erected for Christian worship doubtless had that design in view. It was, therefore, a corruption in practice when churches began to be constructed for ceremonial display-as with altars for the celebration of mass, niches for images, and long-drawn aisles for processional parades. The conversion of heathen temples and basilicas into Christian churches, which in the 4th century became common, tended largely to foster and extend that form of corruption. At the period named, the most common form of preaching was that of the exhortation and the homily. A few of the great preachers, like Cyril, Chrysostom, and Augustine, delivered courses of homilies in daily succession, especially during Lent. More commonly short exhortations, sometimes two, three, or even four in succession, were delivered either at morning or evening prayer, or both. This was more particularly true in cities and the large churches, and it was only when presbyters and deacons were authorized to preach that preaching could be furnished with frequency or regularity in villages or country-places. Sometimes large assemblies were gathered at the graves of martyrs to hear panegyrics upon the virtues of those who had suffered death in persecution.

The custom of preaching extempore was at first general, but after a time yielded, in the case of ordinary preachers, to that of reciting discourses not infrequently composed by others. Preachers frequently preceded their discourses by a brief prayer for divine assistance. Following prayer was the salutation “Peace be unto you,” or “The Lord be with you;” to which the people responded, “Peace be with thy spirit.” Sometimes the salutation gave place to a benediction, as may be seen in several of Chrysostom's homilies. Sometimes a text of Scripture was taken as a basis of the  discourse, sometimes several were taken for the same object, and sometimes none. Generally the discourse was concluded with a doxology. It was usual for preachers to sit and the people to stand during the delivery of the discourse. It was common for the people when pleased by the utterances of a preacher to give applause by clapping their hands and by vocal acclamations. Sometimes handkerchiefs were waved and garments tossed aloft. At other times groans and sobs and tears were the responses made by sympathetic hearers. So great value was attached to the discourses of some of the more venerable and eloquent preachers that ready writers were employed to report the words they uttered. Copies of reported discourses were circulated among those who prized them, and were held for reading to other assemblies. In this way the homilies of the fathers descended to later times, when they could be better preserved and more rapidly multiplied by printing. During the medieval period, where preaching was not wholly abandoned, sermons and homilies were to a great extent substituted by postils (q.v.), which were very brief addresses delivered at the conclusion of the mass, and holding about the same relation to the preceding ceremonies of worship that a postscript holds to a letter, or a marginal note to the text of a book.

The preaching customs of modern times differ in minor particulars somewhat with reference to differences of national habits, but more with reference to the predominance of the idea of worship or of religious address. In a certain class of churches the services are conducted with primary reference to forms of worship. In churches of that class, by whatever name designated, preaching is made subordinate. In other churches the leading idea of a Sabbath assembly is that of an audience gathered together to receive instruction from the Word of God, both as read from the sacred page and as declared by his appointed messengers. In the latter, preaching is regarded as of principal importance, prayer and psalmody being auxiliary to it.

The principal places for preaching in modern times are churches constructed with primary reference to that object. It may be here remarked that even in Europe church architecture has been greatly modified since the period of the Reformation, in a perhaps unconscious adaptation to the more general practice of preaching. Few large cathedrals have been built, but many churches of smaller proportions, and more available as auditoriums. Protestant churches in all countries are supplied with permanent seats for audiences, and, with rare exceptions, the pulpit  occupies the central position allotted in Roman Catholic countries to the principal altar. On the continent of Europe movable seats only are used in the Roman Catholic churches, but in countries distinctively Protestant, pews or fixed sittings are generally introduced to accommodate hearers during the preaching services. But preaching, especially among Protestants, has by no means been limited to churches. While maintained with regularity in them, it has been extended as a missionary agency to highways and market places, to public commons, to natural amphitheatres, to groves, to ships' decks, to extemporized tabernacles, and even to music-halls and theatres. In short, zealous evangelists show themselves ready, both in civilized and heathen countries, to preach wherever and whenever their fellow men can be gathered to hear them.

IV. Literature. — The literature of preaching may be divided into two classes-the first embracing publications relating to the art and science of preaching, and t he second embracing the printed products of preaching, whether postils, homilies, or sermons. Of the first class, an extensive list is given in connection with the article on HOMILETICS SEE HOMILETICS (q.v.). Of the second, it would be easy to enumerate authors and books by hundreds. For select and classified lists, SEE PULPIT ELOQUENCE; SEE SERMONS. Of recent books of the first class. the following may be named: Mullois (M. l'Abbé Isidore; translated by George Percy Badger), The Clergy and the Pulpit in their Relations to the People (N. Y. 1867, 12mo); Hood, Lamps, Pitchers, and Trumpets: Lectures on the Vocation of the Preacher (1James , 2 d series, ibid. 1869, 2 vols. 12mo); Parker, Ad Clerum: Advices to a Young Preacher (Bost. 1871, 12mo); Broadus, Preparation and Delivery of Sermons (Phila. 1871, 12mo); Beecher, Yale Lectures on Preaching (1James , 2 nd, and 3rd series, N. Y. 1872-74, 3 vols. 12mo); Storrs, Preaching without Notes (ibid. 1875, 12mo); Hall, God's Word through Preaching (ibid. 1875 12mo); Broadus, Lectures on the History of Preaching (ibid. 1876, 12mo); Taylor, The Ministry of the Word (ibid. 1876, 12mo); Brooks, Lectures on Preaching (ibid. 1877, 12mo); Dale, Nine Lectures on Preaching (ibid. 1878, 12mo). (D. P. K.)

## Preaching Friars[[@Headword:Preaching Friars]]

             SEE DOMINICNS.

## Preadamite [[@Headword:Preadamite ]]

             Under this head we propose to consider, first, the question of the existence of men older than the Biblical Adam; second, Prehistoric tribes in general.

I. Preadamic Men. — Whether men existed upon the earth before Adam is a question first made prominent in Europe by Isaac Peyrerius (La Peyrere). His reasoning in support of the affirmative is embodied ill a work published anonymously in Paris, in 1655, and entitled Praeadamitae: sive Exercitatio super versibus duodecimo, decimotertio et decimoquarto capitis quinti Epistolce S. Pauli ad Romanos, quibus inducuntur Prini honmines anzte Ademum conditi. Very soon afterwards appeared, from the same author, the following: Systema Theologicum ex Praeadamitaru Hypothesi: Pars primae. Both works are now very rare (see Solgeri Bibl. 2, 94; Freytag, Anal. p. 671; Bibl. Feuerlin, p. 588; Brunet, Manuel, et al.). The most accessible edition embraces the two works bound in one volume, 18mo, and published, without place, “anno salutis MDCLV.” A work appeared in English the next year with the following title: Man before Adam, or a Discourse upon the Twelfth, Thirteenth, and Fourteenth Verses of the Fifth Chapter of the Epistle of Paul to the Romans: by which are proved that the First Men were created before Adam (Lond. 1656, 18mo, pp. 351. It purports to be a “First Part”). The novel teaching of Peyrerius was at once bitterly denounced, and a considerable number of treatises were written in opposition. A list of these has been compiled by Ebert (Dictionnaire, No. 16,555). The following are the most important: Animadversiones in Librun Praecdanitarum in quibus confutatur nuperus scriptor, et primurn omnium fuisse, Adamunm defenditur, authore Eusebio Romano (Philippians Priorio, Paris, 1656, 8vo, and in Holland in the same year, sm. 12mo); Non ens Praeadamiticum: sive Confutatio van2i cujusdam somnii, quo Sacrae Scripturae preitex u incautioribus nuper imponere conatus est quidam anonymusfingens, ante Adamum primum fuisse homines in mundo; authore Ant. Hulsso (Lugd. Bat. apud Joan. Elzevir. 1656, sm. 12mo); Responsio exetastica ad tractatum cui titulus Praeadamitae libri duo, auctore J. Puthio (Lugd. Batavor. apud Johan. Elzivirium, 1656, sm. 12mo). The argument on both sides, as might be supposed, was almost wholly Biblical and dialectic. The nature of the proofs employed by Peyrerius, and of his “theological system” built upon the fundamental doctrine of preadamic men, may be condensed in the following propositions:

1. The “lone man” (Rom 5:12) by whom “sin entered into the world” was Adam, for in Rom 5:14 that sin is called “Adam's transgression.”

2. “Transgression” is a violation of “law;” therefore “the law” (Rom 5:13) signifies the law given to Adamnatural law, not that given to Moses.

3. The phrase “until the law” (Rom 5:13) implies a time before the law — that is, before Adam; and as “sin was in the world” during that time, there must have been men in existence to commit sin.

4. The sin committed before the enactment of the natural law was “material,” “actual;” the sin existing after Adam, and through him, was “imputed,” “formal,” “legal,” “adventitious,” and “after the similitude of Adam's transgression.”

5. Death entered into the world before Adam, but it was in consequence of the imputation “backwards” of Adam's prospective sin — “peccatum Adami fuisse retro imputatum primis hominibus ante Adamum conditis;” and this was necessary, that all men might partake of the salvation provided in Christ — “oportuerat primes illos homines peccavisse in Adamo, ut sanctificarentur in Christo” (Pread. cap. 19). Nevertheless, death before Adam did not “reign.” “Peccatum tune temporis erat mortuum; mors erat mortua, et nullus erat sepulchri aculeus” (ibid. cap. 12).

6. Adam was the “first man” only in the same sense as Christ was the “second man,” for Adam “was the figure of Christ” (Rom 5:14).

7. All men are of one blood in the sense of one substance — one “matter,” one “earth.” The Jews are descended from Adam, the Gentiles from Preadamites (System. Theol. lib. 2, cap. 6-11). The first chapter of Genesis treats of the origin of the Gentiles, the second of the origin of the Jews (ibid. lib. 3, cap. 1, 2). The Gentiles were created aborigines “in the beginning,” by the “word” of God, in all lands; Adam, the father of the Jews, was formed of “clay” by the “hand” of God (ibid. lib. 2, cap. 11). Genesis, after chap. 1, is a history, not of the first men, but of the first Jews (ibid., lib. 4:cap. 2).

8. The existence of Preadamites is also indicated in the Biblical account of Adam's family, especially of Cain (ibid. lib. 2, cap. 4).

9. Proved, also, by the “monuments” of Egypt and Chaldaea, and by the history of the astronomy, astrology, theology, and magic of the Gentiles  (ibid. lib. 3, cap. 5-11); as well as by the racial features of remote and savage tribes, and by the recently discovered parts of the terrestrial structure (ibid. Prooem.).

10. Hence the epoch of the creation of the world does not date from that “beginning” commonly figured in Adam. “Videtur enim altius et a longissime retroactis seculis petend illud principium (ibid. Prooem.).

11. The deluge of Noah was not universal, and it destroyed only the Jews (ibid. lib. 4:cap. 7-9); nor is it possible to trace to Noah the origin of all the races of men (ibid. lib. 4:cap. 14). Some of these positions were far in advance of the age, and it ought to be said were defended with knowledge and candor which were not appreciated by the adversaries of Peyrerius.

The question of Preadamites admits of discussion in our day from quite another standpoint. Recognizing it as a question of scientific fact, we should unhesitatingly appeal to anthropology for a final answer. Ethnologists are generally agreed that the civilized nations of Europe, Northern Africa, and Western and Southern Asia belong to one race, which was designated Caucasian by Blumenbach, but which, with recent authorities, is known under the name of the Mediterranean Nations. They are recognized as constituting three groups of peoples, commonly called Ilamites, Shemites, and Indo Europeans or Japhetites. These designations are derived from the names of the three sons of Noah, to whom, through the invaluable aid of the Biblical ethnology, the learned have traced the pedigree of these three types of people. They may, therefore, be designated collectively as Noachites.

(1.) The Hamites are known to have distributed themselves through the north of Africa, the Nile valley, and the east of the continent as far as the Strait of Bat el-Mandeb. The ancient Egyptians are pure Hamites, and are generally regarded as the founders of the oldest civilization. They are still more or less perfectly represented by the Fellahin, or peasantry of the lower Nile, and especially by the Coptic Christians of the towns. The Hamitic Berbers, including Libyans, Moors, Numidians, and Gaetulians are spread, intermingled with Shemites and Europeans, through the countries south of the Mediterranean and through the Sahara. Other Hamitic nations, possessing a civilization far beyond that of any of the purely black races, occupy some of the regions about' the Nile, especially in Nubia, and are scattered in distinct tribes, united by common linguistic elements, through Abyssinia, and in one direction as far as the heart of Africa, from 80 north  to 30 south, and in the other direction from near Babel-Mandeb to Juba on the Indian Ocean, The antiquity of the Hamitic civilization in Egypt is indicated by the evidence in our possession that the heliacal rising of Sirius must have been observed (apparently) as early as B.C. 4242 (Lepsius, Chronol. der Aegypter, pt. 1, p. 165 sq.).f1

(2.) The Shemites, from tile date of earliest records, have inhabited Western Asia, whence they have taken possession of parts of Eastern Africa. They are represented by the Jews, the Arabs, the Abyssinians, the Arameans, the Canaanites, and the Assyrio-Babylonians. Linguistic researches lead to the belief that the Hamiles and Shemites developed their languages in a common primeval home, and hence are nearly related. This view ks favored by Genesis, where (Shemitic) Sidon is described as the eldest son of Canaan, who was descended from Cush, and thus from Ham (Gen 10:1-15), the father of the Hamites.

(3.) The Indo-European (Japhetic) family appear to have dwelt originally, according to the conclusions of Peschel, along the slopes of the Caucasus, and through the gorge of Dariel, within reach of both the Euxine and the Caspian Sea (Races of Man, Amer. ed. p. 507). Hence a migration westward of a portion of them led to the separation into Asiatic and European Aryans. Some of the Asiatic Aryans crossed the HiduKush, according to Max Müller and others, and dispossessed the aboriginal population of the territory along the Ganges, transplanting there the religion of Brahminism, while those left behind developed the Zoroastrian religion. The European Aryans swept over Europe in successive waves. The Celts displaced in Spain and France an older population, the Basques- perhaps also Aryans-and were succeeded by the other nations of southern Aryans-Greeks, Albanians, and Italians. The northern Aryans are represented by the Letts, the Slavonians, and the Germanic nations.

f1: In our article MANETHO SEE MANETHO we have shown the untrustworthiness of many of these astronomical data as foundations for Egyptian chronology. The English Egyptologists in general reduce the beginning of the first dynasty to B.C. 2717 (Lane, Poole, Wilkinson), and even this is unnecessarily far back. There is good reason for dating the reign of Menes from B.C. 2417. — ED.

We thus discover the posterity of Noah in all their ramifications; but in this survey the Mongoloid nations and the black races do not seem to be  embraced. The Mongoloids are spread widely over the earth's surface. The best modern authorities unite here the Malay tribes which are dispersed over South-eastern Asia and many of the islands of Polynesia; certain southern Asiatics, embracing Chinese, Siamese, Burmese, and races in Thibet and the Himalayas; Coreans and Japanese; the Ural-Altaic race in several European and Asiatic divisions; the tribes on both sides of Behring's Strait and the aborigines of America-including as well civilized nations of both parts of the continent as the wild hunting tribes. The Dravida, also, according to modern ethnology, should be recognized as a race distinct from the posterity of Noah. These aborigines of western India have dark skins, long, black, curly hair, somewhat intumescent lips, but nothing of the prognathism of some of the black races. They linger in some parts of Beluchistan, in the extreme south and south-west of Hindostan, and in the northern half of Ceylon. One of their languages is the Tamul, spoken by not less than ten millions, and possessing an ancient literature. Other tribes occupy a belt along the east coast of Hindostan, and even stretching into the interior. The Mongoloids and the Dravida, which may be designated as the Dusky Races, cannot be very far removed from the Noachites. Their common ancestor was an antediluvian— perhaps Seth or some one of his descendants older than Noah. It is open to conjecture that their father was Cain, the brother of Seth, or some other son of Adam. In any event, as Noah was the parent of the White Races, and as these are so closely allied to the Dusky (including copper-colored) Races, it seems quite possible that the Biblical Adam was removed sufficiently far in the past to be the progenitor of both the White and the Dusky Races.

The name Adam, signifying red, would imply that he was not the parent of the Black Races. Cain, moreover, as he went out from his native country, found other nations already in existence. The natural inference from these considerations would be that the Black Races existed before Adam.f2 Such a conclusion is sustained by other anthropological considerations. The Black Races-a term used only for present convenience maybe regarded as comprising (1) Negroes, (2) Hottentots and Bushmen, (3) Papuans, (4) Australians. They possess in common a dark or black skin and a marked degree of dolichocephalism, as well as much greater prognathismn than the White and Dusky races. They are further characterized by long thigh- bones, sometimes long arms, lean shanks, oblique pelves, and deficiency of secondary sexual characters. The Negroes are distinguished generally by short crisped hair, with a flattened section, scanty or absent beards, thick lips, flattened nose, retreating forehead, and projecting jaws; and they  inhabit Africa from the southern border of the Sahara to the territory of the Hottentots and Bushmen, stretching from ocean to ocean save where the Hamites have intruded on the extreme east. The Bantmu or southern Negroes embrace the Zanzibar and Mozambique nations, and the well- known Betchuans and Kaffirs. The Soudan or northern Negroes embrace the tribes speaking a variety of languages, and stretching from the coast well into the interior. The Hottentots and Bushmen occupy the southern parts of Africa nearer the Atlantic Ocean, and are characterized by the tufted matting of their hair, and among the women by the peculiar formation known as steatopygy.

The Bushmen have a leathery-brown skin, which becomes much wrinkled with age. The Koi-Koin (Hottentot) language possesses great ethnological interest, as it has been thought by Moffat, Lepsius, Pruner Bey, Max Müller, Whitney, and Bleek to present affinities with the ancient Egyptian. Though other authorities have pronounced against any relationship, it is certain that we find among these savages linguistic elements which belong to a refined civilization, and which leave the question open whether they have lived in contact with the Egyptians or have descended from them, or from some common stock not very remotely removed. But even if it should appear probable that the Hottentots (and, inferentially, the Bushmen) are descended from the Hamitic Egyptians, we are not in possession of evidence indicating any immediate relationship between the other black races and the Adamites; so that the residual probability remains that these races are more ancient than the (perhaps Adamic) father of the White and Dusky races. The Papuans are intermingled with the population of Australia, and inhabit New Guinea, the Pelew Islands, New Hebrides, New Caledonia, the Loyalty Islands, and the Fiji Archipelago. They possess peculiarly flattened, abundant long hair, which grows in tufts surrounding the head like a crown eight inches high. The beard is abundant, the skin very dark, varying to chocolate color in New Guinea and blue-black in Fiji. The jaws are less projecting than in Negroes, and the nose is broad and aquiline, giving the features a Jewish cast. The Australians occupy the continent of Australia and the islands contiguous, including Tasmania. Their body is thickly pilose; the hair of the head is black, elliptical in section, and stands out around the head in a shaggy crown less striking than that of the Papuans. Though less gifted than the Papuans, they are higher in the psychic scale than formerly represented. They were, indeed, found living in the age of rude stone implements, and used simple tree trunks for boats; but their language reflects a considerable degree of refinement and grammatical perfection.  Viewing the Black races from either a psychic, a zoological, or an archaeological standpoint, we discover evidence that they diverged from the White and Dusky races at a period which, compared with the epoch of Egyptian and Assyrian civilization, must be exceedingly remote. The conclusion is indicated, therefore, that the common progenitor of the Black and the other races was placed too far back in time to answer for the Biblical Adam. This view has been maintained by M'Causland (Adam andthe Adamite [Lond. 1872]; The Builders of Babel, ch. 5), and was recently favored by Dr. Whedon (Meth. Quar. Rev. Jan. 1871, p. 153, and July, 1872, p. 526). See also an article entitled Was Adam the First .1an? in Scribner's Monthly, Oct. 1871; and Pozzy, La Terre et le Recit Biblique de la Creation, liv. 3, c. 12. f3

f2 We call the attention of the reader to the fact that these positions of our respected contributor are inferences from the presumption that the ethnographical list in Genesis 10 is intended to specify all the posterity of Noah as now or historically known to exist on the earth, whereas it is evidently meant only as a catalogue of those triles with which the Hebrews were more or less acquainted. The black races were certainly included under the Cushites (q.v.), and this disposes at once of the argument that Noah is the progenitor of the whites only. Indeed, if anything is to be inferred from the meaning of the name Adam, it would go to make him the parent, not of the Caucasian, but of the copper-colored or Tartar tribes. — ED.

To those who think the language of the Bible contemplates Adam as “the first being who could be called a man” — not alone the progenitor of the races which figure in Biblical history — it may be conceded that such is its meaning, in case it shall appear allowable, on Biblical grounds, to carry back the advent of man sufficiently far; and provided, further, that a progenitor having the complexion which seems to be indicated by the term Adam can be reasonably regarded as the progenitor also of races of black color, and seemingly much lower in the organic and intellectual scale than the father of Seth and his civilized posterity not far removed.f4 The time- question involved is admittedly serious. In reference to the difficulty presented by the color of Adam's skin, it will be borne in mind that color alone is one of the most untrustworthy of ethnological characters (Peschel, Races of Man, p. 88). In reference to the inferior psychic and bodily endowments of the Black races, it may also be observed that degradation  and deterioration of tribes are phenomena familiar to ethnology.

But there are strong objections to the assumption that the Black races represent, in general, a degeneracy. We have no knowledge of the degeneracy of entire races, but only of tribes and fragments of tribes. Nor has tribal degeneracy taken place, except where the oppression of superior tribes has driven the weaker into the midst of natural conditions unfriendly to existence. But the Black races have been free to roam over entire continents in search of the most congenial conditions. Yet, on the healthful and luxuriant tablelands of Central Africa the black man is marked by an inferiority as real and almost as great as along the pestilential borders of the west coast, or in the least- favored regions of Australia and New Guinea. The structural peculiarities of the Black races, moreover, are inheritances of lower grade rather than reminiscences of a higher. The black man is not on a descending grade, but is ascending, according to the organic and psychic law of existence. His remotest progenitor was lower rather than higher. All these considerations militate against the idea that Adam, the father of the Noachian races, was low enough in the scale of organization, and remote enough in the genealogical line, to be the father also of the Melanic races. Thus, while the conflicting nature of the insufficient evidences forbids our dogmatism, the balance of proof seems rather to sustain the apinion that the Melanic races are descendants of real Preadamites.f5

f3: Such a conclusion, however, has in our judgment a very slender foundaltion, and cannot for a moment stand in comparison with the arguments in favor of the common origin of man adduced under our article SEE ADAM.—Ed.

f4: The question rather is simply a philological one. The statemients of Scripture must stand or fall by themselves, wshen fairly expounded by the usual nlaws of exegesis, and we are not at liberty to warp them into an accommodation with discoveries in other fields. — Ed.

f5: From this conclusion we beg leave to dissent toto ecelo, and we especially disagree with the view that the Black races are in any essential point inferior to the others. We judge it far more philosophical to argue that their unfavorable surroundings have produced their present degradation, rather than to make it an evidence of inherent lack of capacity. Had the latter been the real  cause, it must forever operate; whereas we know that under better auspices they have been able to surmount it.

II. Prehistoric Men. — By prehistoric peoples we commonly understand the ancestors of the historic peoples; and, in a still stricter sense, the ancestors of the Aryan nations. In fact, most that has been directly learned respecting prehistoric men concerns the predecessors of the historic nations of Europe. It should be borne in mind, however, that questions respecting primeval man-his antiquity, endowments, condition, and birthplace-are to be clearly distinguished from similar questions concerning the Caucasian race-the race with which, as we have seen, our revealed Scriptures are primarily concerned. What may be true of this race may be very wide of the truth respecting mankind at large. SEE SPECIES.

In discussing prehistoric man we are constrained to confine ourselves to the predecessors of the modern Caucasians, both because discoveries of prehistoric monuments have been chiefly restricted to Caucasian countries, and because the non- Caucasian races (especially if we except the Mongoloids) can hardly be said to possess any indigenous history; so that their prehistoric period reaches to the present. This circumstance, nevertheless, is fortunate for anthropological research, since it enables us, by comparison, to draw inferences respecting the prehistoric conditions of the Caucasian race.

1. Sources of Information. —

(1.) Caverns. — Nearly every country of Europe contains caverns in which have been discovered either the bones of human beings or the relics of their industry. More than forty of these were explored by Dr. Schmerling in Belgium (Recherches sur les Ossemens fossiles decouverts dans le, Cavernes de la Province de Liege [1833-34]), and others, more recently, by M. E. Dupont (Les Temps Prehisto riques; see also Le Hon, L'Homme Fossile [2nd ed. 1877]) The most important Belgian caverns are those of Engis Engihoul, Chokier, Naulette, and Frontal (or Furnoz) Dr. Buckland published in 1823 (Reliquie Diluviacre) accounts of the contents of several English caverns; and, in later times, further details have been given by Evans (Ancient Stone Implements of Great Britain [1872]), Owen (History of British Fossil Mammals and Birds [1846]), Dawkins (Cave Hunting [1875]), Lubbock (Prehistoric Times [Lond. 1865]), Lyell (The Geological Evidences of the Antiquity of Man [4th ed. 1873]), Sanford, Falconer, Austen, Pengelly, and others whose works are scattered through the publications of the geological and palaeontological societies and  periodicals. The most important English caverns are those of Kent and Brixham (near Torquay), Wokey Hole in Somersetshire, Kirkdale in Yorkshire, and those in the Gower Peninsula of South Wales. The British caverns have afforded thirty-seven species of mammals, of which eighteen are extinct. A large number of French caverns and “rock-shelters” have proved fruitful in archaeological and anthropological remains. As early as 1826 M. Tournal, and in 1829 M. Christol, had announced discoveries in the south of France. Later investigations have been made by Lartet and Christy (Reliquiae Aquitanicae [Lond. 1865-69]), Desnoyers, Mortillet. Riviere, Garrigou, and many other French and English anthropologists. Nearly a hundred bone and flint-producing caverns have been described in France, the greater number of which are situated in the Department of the Dordogne (e.g. Moustier, Eyzies, Madeleine, LaugerieHaute, and Laugerie-Basse) and the north flanks of the Pyrenees (e.g. Aurignac, Lourdes, Izeste, and Lortet). M. Garrigou states that he has explored two hundred and seventy-five caverns in the Pyrenees. Others equally important, however, occur in the departments of Herault (Pondres), Ariege (Massat, Bouicheta), Aude (Bize), Tarn-et-Garonne (Bruniquel), and on the Mediterranean coast (Mentone). The most celebrated caverns of Germany are those of Gailenreuth in Bavaria, Rabenstein in Francomia (Bav.), Eggisheim (near Colmar), and Neanderthal (near Dusseldorf [respecting the Engis, Neanderthal, and Borreby skulls, see Lyell, 1. c. pt. 1, ch. 5]). Other ossiferous caverns occur in Denmark, Switzerland (near Geneva), Italy (il the north. and along the north coast of Sicily), Spain (southern flanks of the Pyrenees), Portugal, Austria, Algeria, Egypt, Syria, Australia, and other countries. Dr. Lund explored eight hundred caverns in Brazil.

Human remains occur in caverns promiscuously intermingled with the bones of wild animals. Very rarely is a human skeleton found complete. Bones are often associated with implements of stone, bone, or reindeer's horn, and with traces of ancient fires. The bones of animals useful for food are frequently marked by the teeth of carnivorous quadrupeds, and the long ones are generally split and broken, as if for the extraction of the marrow. In some cases human bones have been similarly treated. All these relics are found imbedded, sometimes in beds of stalagmitic material, and sometimes in deposits of loam and of pulverulent material known as bone-earth. The aggregate depth of the various accumulations reaches, in some cases, ten  to twenty feet, or even more. The deposits in Kent's Cavern may serve as an illustration. We find here, beneath the fragments fallen from the roof

1. “Black mould,” consisting mainly of vegetable matter, and containing various articles of mediaeval, Roman, and pre-Roman date, three to twelve inches deep;

2. Stalagmite, varying from a mere film to upwards of five feet in thickness, containing fragments of limestone, a human jaw, and the remains of extinct animals;

3. A “black band.” in a certain place about thirty-two feet from the entrance, consisting mainly of charcoal, and containing bone and flint implements;

4. Red “cave earth,” with stone implements and bones and teeth of extinct animals, including the cave-lion.

5. Stalagmite, three to twelve feet, and enclosing only bones of the cave-bear;

6. Cave-earth, known as “breccia” being a dark-red sandy loam, and containing bears' bones.

Three flint implements and one flint chip have been found also in the lowest layer. Another example may be taken from the rock-shelter of Aurignac, a shallow grotto opening on a hill-side which seems to have been employed for burial. Until 1852 the opening was concealed by materials washed down the hill-slope. When uncovered, the cavity within afforded the remains of seventeen human beings. In 1860 M. Lartet discovered outside of the grotto, underneath the sloping talus, a layer containing the remains of extinct animals and some works of art; and beneath this, resting on a sloping terrace, a layer of ashes and charcoal, about six inches thick, covering an area of six or seven square yards, and terminating at the entrance of the grotto. In the midst of this were fragments of a sandstone, reddened by heat, and resting on a leveled surface of limestone, which appears to have been used as a hearth. From the ashes and the overlying layer was obtained a great variety of bones and implements, including two hundred flint articles-knives, projectiles, sling-stones, and chips, as well as a curious tool for working flints. The bone instruments embraced arrows without barbs, other tools of reindeer's horn, and a bodkin of the same. In the stratum overlying the ashes were found numerous bones of carnivora,  also of reindeer, ox, rhinoceros, one hundred and sixty-eight human bones, and many fragments of sun-dried or half-baked and hand-made pottery. The extinct species found here were the cave bear, cave-lion, cave-hyena, mammoth, two-horned rhinoceros, and stag; but the remains of living species, especially of the fox, horse, reindeer, and aurochs were much more abundant. Within the grotto, after the removal of the skeletons, there remained only about two feet of earth, with a subjacent band of lighter tint, and a bottom layer of yellowish color.

(2.) River-drifts. — These are thick beds of sand and gravel lining the valleys of certain rivers, and containing a great variety of stone implements, chiefly of flint, with occasional occurrences of human bones, and more abundant remains of extinct quadrupeds of the species just cited, together with a smaller proportion of remains of living mammals; and, along the valley of the Somme, of fresh-water and marine shells, of species still living in France and along the contiguous coast. The river-valleys most celebrated for. such discoveries are those of the Somme, Seine, and Oise in France, and the Thames, Ouse, and Avon in England. The facts respecting the valley of the Somme have been chiefly developed by M. Boucher de Perthes (Antiquites Celtiques et Antediluviennes [1847]), M.M. Rigollot, Pouchet, Gandry, Hebert, and the English savans Falconer, Prestwich. Evans, and Lyell. We should mention here the delta of the Tiniere on the Lake of Geneva, investigated and described by Morlot, and more lately by Dr. Andrews of Chicago (Amer. Jour. Sci. [2] 45, 180). In the deeper parts of these deposits remains of extinct quadrupeds predominate; at higher levels, those of living quadrupeds. Rude flint implements abound below, improved forms above, and still higher occur sometimes relics of Gallo- Roman times.

(3.) Loess and Moraines. — In the loess or loam, as well as in other deposits overlying the glacial drift, have been found occasional remains of man — as at Lahr, near Strasburg; at Maestricht, where human bones were associated with those of the mammoth and other extinct -animals; at Kreuzberg, in the suburbs of Berlin; at Bournemouth, England, on the top of a sea-cliff one hundred feet high, where flints occur in gravel; in the drift-covered cliffs of Hampshire, and many other localities. At the bottom of an ancient glacier-moraine at Ravensburg, near Lake Constance, was found, in 1866, a great quantity of bones and broken instruments. Of the bones ninety-eight hundredths were those of reindeer. The moraine, therefore, dates apparently from the “second glacial epoch.”

(4.) Volcanic Tuff: — In 1844 an account was published by M. Aynard of the discovery of the remains of two human beings imbedded in a volcanic tuff ejected, during its last eruption, by the mountain of Denise, in Le Puy, Central France. In ejections of the same age have been found remains of the cave-hyena and a hippopotamus.

(5.) Peat Bogs. — The peat bogs of Denmark, ranging from tenl to thirty feet in depth, have afforded a large quantity of' human remains, mingled with those of animals contemporary with man (Morlot, Etudes Geologico archeologiques en Danemark et en Suisse). In the lowest portion of the bogs are found remains of the Scotch fir, a tree no longer growing in Denmark; and with these are associated implements of flint. Above are found remains of the common oak, now very rare in Denmark, and associated therewith implements and ornaments of bronze, as well as stone; while in the still newer peat occur remains of the existing beechen forest, mingled with relics of an age of iron. The bogs of Ireland have been similarly productive, affording, among other things, many skeletons of the great Irish elk. From the bogs of the Somme, newer than the river-drifts, many human relics have been exhumed, as well as from those in the neighborhoods of Brussels and Antwerp.

(6.) Kitchen - middens (Danish kjökkenmödding). These are heaps of earth and human relics occurring along the Baltic shore of Denmark. They vary in height from three to ten feet, and some are 150 to 200 feet wide, and 1000 feet long. They are largely made up of the shells of the oyster, cockle, and other edible mollusks, but plentifully mixed with the bones of various quadrupeds. birds, and fish, which seem to have served as food for rude sea-side inhabitants. Interspersed with the animal remains are flint knives, hatchets, and other instruments of stone, horn, wood, and bone, with fragments of coarse pottery mixed with charcoal and cinders, but never with implements of bronze or iron. The stone hatchets and knives, nevertheless, have been polished and sharpened by grinding, and are thus less rude than those of the river-drifts and many of the caverns. Kitchen- middens also occur in England, Scotland, France, the United States, and other countries.

Very similar are the refuse-heaps (“terramares”) farther inland, accumulated (according to a custom still prevailing in Ecuador, Mexico, and other Spanish countries) upon the outskirts of ancient palustrine villages in the north of Italy. They embrace, naturally, relics of everything  pertaining to the life of the ancient villagers, including implements for weaving, mill-stones, and spear-heads, hatchets, and ornaments of bronze. They occur especially over the plain bounded by the Po, the Apennines, the Adda, and the Reno (Strobel and Pigorini, Les Teraramares et les Pilotages du Parmezsan, Milan, 1864). Similar palustrine settlements have recently been discovered in Moravia and Mecklenburg. They are said to exist also on the coasts of Africa and Brazil. Certain mounds along the coasts of Holland, containing Roman and Carthaginian antiquities, seem to have served as earthworks, or places of refuge.

(7.) Megaliths and Tumuli. — Rude structures of huge rough stones, whose origin is fixed in the night of prehistoric times, are known to exist in nearly all the countries of Europe, and even of Asia, and were long regarded as druidical remains. Those called ‘“dolmnens” consist of a huge more or less flattened rock, resting on stones planted upright in the ground-the supposed stone-altars of the Gauls. Sometimes a series of massive slabs rests on two lines of upright stones, so arranged as to form a covered passage. In other cases the entire dolmen is covered to the depth of several feet by earth, and thus becomes a tumulus-dolmen. Some tumuli enclose two or more stone-covered passages. The passages seem to have been burial-crypts, for we often find within them human skeletons placed originally in a sitting posture. In one tomb hundreds of skeletons were discovered. Sometimes the crypts are divided into numerous compartments, each containing a skeleton. With the skeletons were deposited weapons and implements (generally of stone) and earthen vessels. The pottery was of a finer character than that of the kitchen- middens (Leguay, Sepultures de l'Age de la Pierre, 1865). Some of the tumulusdolmens attain colossal proportions. That of Silbury Hill, England, is nearly 200 feet high. The Egyptian pyramids belong properly in this connection. SEE STONE.

The structure known as a “cromlech” is a dolmen surrounded by one or more circles of stones planted like posts in the ground. Cromlechs occur singly or in groups. These erect, roughly hewn stones are known as “menhirs,” and also occur either singly or in long parallel ranges, as at Carnac, in Brittany. Thousands of the various sorts of megalithic structures are known in Brittany and the south and south-west of France, in England, in Denmark, and, in less abundance, in all the other countries of Europe, except Southern Germany, Spain, Italy, Greece, the Danubian principalities, and Russia.

(8.) Lake-dwellings. — The pile-habitations (Palafittes, Pjfahbauten) were cabins erected on piles in the bottoms of lakes. First discovered and most abundant in the lakes of Switzerland (Desor, Palafittes, ou Constructions Lacustres du Lac de Neuchdtel; Troyon, Habitations Lacustres des Temps anciens et modernes), they are now known in the existing and the peat- filled lakes of several other countries (the Italian lakes Varese and Mercurago are especially rich); and Herodotus (lib. 4:cap. 16) states that such habitations were anciently employed by a tribe dwelling in Paeonia, now a part of Roumelia. By dredging the lakes which contained the Swiss lake-dwellings an enormous quantity of relics has been brought to light, embracing the different varieties of stone weapons and implements, industrial and ornamental articles in bronze, remains of plaited cloth, stores of wheat and barley-in one instance baked into flat, round cakes- carbonized apples and pears, and the stones of the wild plum, and seeds of the raspberry and blackberry, together with the nuts of the beech and hazel. In a few instances implements of iron have been discovered; and in one instance bronze and silver coins and medals of Greek production, and some iron swords, but all of pre-Roman origin. The bones of twenty-four species of wild mammals have been dredged up, besides eighteen species of birds, three of reptiles, and nine of fish, all of which have lived in historic times (Rütimeyer, Die Fauna der Pjahlbauten in der Schweiz, Basel, 1861).

In some instances, as on the north bank of Lake Neuchatel, where the bottom was rocky, heaps of stones were thrown down, among which piles were fixed. The piles thus served to retain further supplies of stones, and by this means artificial islands were formed, on which cabins were built. These are designated as tenevieres. The transition from these to the “crannoges” of Ireland is easy, for the latter are simply artificial islands formed of piles, stones, and earth, or sometimes of a framework of oaken beams mortised together, and made to serve as a crib for the retention of masses of stones (Wylie, Archaeologia, vol. 38:1859). The buildings erected on these islands are now sometimes covered with peat, as in the Drumkellin bog, to the depth of fourteen feet. The Irish crannoges have afforded vast quantities of bones of domestic animals, and works of human industry in stone, bronze, and iron.

(9.) Modern Savages. — Since, beyond controversy, prehistoric man existed in a condition similar to that of rude and primitive peoples of historic times, it appears that the study of modern savages should afford important aids in the interpretation of prehistoric monuments, and the  determination of the condition and capacities of prehistoric peoples. For instance, the flint arrowheads of the American Indian are fashioned precisely like some of those found in European caverns and lake- habitations. To understand the ancient lake dwellings and their occupants, we have not only the historical account of Herodotus, but D'Urville's narrative of the lake-dwellers of New Guinea. As illustrative of the kitchen- middens, we may turn to the modern shell-heaps on the north-west coast of Australia, and the city-border offal-heaps of Guayaquil and Mexico. In India some of the hill-tribes still erect cromlechs. Prehistoric monuments even receive a light shed from the accounts of early historic times. Thus “Jacob took a stone and set it up for a pillar” (Gen 31:45; see further, Gen 31:46-52); and at Mount Sinai, Moses erected twelve pillars- menhirs (Exo 24:4; see also Jos 4:21-22). In connection with tumuli, it may be remembered that Semiramis raised a mound over her husband; stones were piled up over the remains of Laicus; Achilles raised to Patroclus a mound more than 100 feet in diameter; Alexander erected one over the ashes of Hephaestio which cost $1,200,000; and in Roman history we meet with several similar instances. So, finally, the small bronze chariot exhumed from a tumulus of Mecklenburg recalls the wheeled structures fabricated for Solomon by Hiram of Tyre (1Ki 7:27-37).

2. Interpretation of the Facts. —

(1.) Divisions of Prehistoric Time. — The voice of all civilized nations has given expression to the belief in the existence of three great ages in the unwritten history of mankind: the ages of Stone, of Bronze, and of Iron. The concurrent indications from the relics of prehistoric times sustain this belief. In the Age of Stone the metals were unknown and all implements, weapons, utensils, and ornaments were of stone, bone, horn, shells, or molded and unbaked clay. In the Age of Bronze, arms and cutting instruments were made largely of that alloy, though stone continued long in use. In the Age of Iron that metal had superseded bronze for arms, axes, and knives, though bronze continued in use for ornaments, and often for the handles of weapons. This succession, which is confidently traced for European populations, probably holds good, modified by various circumstances, for mankind at large. It must not by any means be supposed, however, that the social condition implied by the Stone Age, or either of the others, answers to any particular period of absolute time in the history of the world. One race or nation has emerged from the condition of its Stone Age at a much earlier period than another, and some races and  tribes still remain in their Stone Age. These three conditions of society are generally regarded as prehistoric, and it is certain that bronze and iron were already known to the northern nations of Europe when the Roman armies invaded them; but it appears also that the weapons used in the Trojan War, at the dawn of history, were mostly of bronze, though iron was beginning to appear, and that in the time of Joshua knives of stone were in use.

A closer examination of the relics of the Stone Age indicates a division into three epochs. In the Palaeolithic, or Rude Stone Epoch, all implements were of stone, and shaped by chipping, without grinding. In the Reindeer Epoch, bone and reindeer's horn displaced flint to a large extent: while in the Neolithic, or Polished Stone Epoch, multitudes of stone implements were ground to an edge (“Celts”). Mortillet makes the following classification, based on implements from the cairns of France:

A. Flint implements predominant (Paleolithic). (a.) Epoch of Moustier-the flints chipped only on one side, and having somewhat an almond shape. (b.) Epoch of Solutré — the flints chipped on both sides, and the extremities brought to a good point. The almond shapes wanting.

B. Bone implements predominant. (c.) Epoch of Aurignac (Early Reindeer) — the lance — and arrow-heads slit at the base, so that the tapering shaft enters the bone. (d.) Epoch of the Madeleine (Late Reindeer)— the lower extremity of the lance — or arrow-head enters the shaft. Many implements of flint still remain. Some recognize three divisions of Palaeolithic flints: (a) the type of St. Acheul — large, thick, oval, roughly chipped on both sides; (b) the type of Moustier-thinner, and wrought on one side; (c) the type of Solutré-smaller, finely wrought, with thin borders and symmetrical form.

The Palaeolithic Epoch is further characterized by a nearly complete absence of pottery and of attempts at ornamentation or artistic delineation, as also by the contemporaneous existence of several quadrupeds now extinct-especially the cave-bear, the cave-hyena, cave-lion, tichorhine rhinoceros, and hairy elephant, or mammoth. The Reindeer Epoch, with a colder climate, witnessed the disappearance of these animals, and the advent of several species now native in the north of Europe or at Alpine elevations — such especially as the reindeer, musk-ox, elk, chamois, ibex, hamster, rat, lemming, grouse, and snowy owl. With them existed the horse, the urus, the deer, and various rodents. The Neolithic Epoch was marked by the presence of many species of domesticated animals-especially the dog, sheep, goat, ox, horse, and hog. The domestic cat and fowl, and  the crooked-horned sheep, did not appear till the epoch of the very latest lake-dwellings (Noville and Chavannes), generally referred to the 6th century.

The Palaeolithic Epoch is illustrated chiefly by the finds of the river- gravels, the caverns of Belgium and England, the volcanic tuff of Denise, and a few of the caverns and rock-shelters of France; the Reindeer Epoch by a majority of the French caverns and rock-shelters; and the Neolithic Epoch by a few caverns in the south of France, the kitchen-middens, crannoges, dolmens, the lowest portion of the Danish bogs, and the lake- dwellings of Eastern Switzerland. The Bronze Age is represented by the finds of the lake-dwellings of Western Switzerland, many of the tumuli and the middle portion of the Danish bogs; and the Iron Age by the upper portion of the Danish bogs, and some of the latest Swiss lakes (as Bienne and Neuchatel).

(2.) Geological Conditions. — The physical conditions of Europe have changed to a remarkable extent since the first advent of man. At the epoch of the oldest finds Europe was just emerging from a secular winter, which had buried all the mountains and plains beneath a mantle of glacier material, as far south, probably, as the Pyrenees. England and Scandinavia had been connected with the Continent; the English Channel and the German Ocean had been dry land, and the Thames had been a tributary of the Rhine. A subsidence now took place, which made Great Britain an island. An amelioration of' the climate caused a rapid melting of the glaciers; the land was extensively flooded, and the drainage of the Continent now began to mark out and excavate the river-valleys of the modern epoch. The cave-bear, mammoth, and other quadrupeds of Pliocene time still survived; and now man appeared in Europe to dispute with them the possession of the forests and the caverns. The swollen rivers flowed at elevations of twenty to fifty feet above their present levels, and the relics of the stone-folk were mingled with the deposits along their borders. The Reindeer Epoch witnessed another elevation, and a new invasion of cold. England was again joined to the Continent. The cave bear and mammoth dwindled away. The reindeer and other northern quadrupeds were driven south over the plains of Languedoc and through the valleys of Perigord. The hyena went over to England and took possession of the caverns. But the men of' Europe had made a slight advance in their industries. Next, another subsidence resulted in the isolation of England and the Scandinavian Peninsula; the climate was again ameliorated, and the  reindeer and other arctic species retreated to Alpine elevations and northern latitudes. Now the modern aspects of the surface of the land began to appear, and now appeared various species of mammals destined to domestication-or, more probably, already domesticated in their Oriental home. The age of Bronze, Iron, and authentic history succeeded.f6

f6: The reader should note the conjectural character of these changes, especially of the cause of the climatic reverses; these may have been due to far more ordinary and recent vicissitudes than geological subsidence and elevation. — Ed.

(3.) Character of Prehistoric Europeans. — Physically, the men of the Palaeolithic Epoch, judging from the few skeletons and skulls discovered ill Belgium and England, were of rather short stature, and of a Mongoloid type, like modern Finns and Lapps. In the Reindeer Epoch, the remains of Southern Europe indicate men nearly six feet in stature; but the men of Belgium were still small and round-headed, and such they continued to be to the end of the Stone Age. The Neolithic men of the Swiss lakes were much like the modern Swiss. The Paleolithic men were not decidedly divergent from the Caucasian type, but a jaw-bone found at Naulette has several marks of inferiority, being somewhat thick and small in height, and having molar teeth increasing in size backwards, the wisdom teeth being largest instead of smallest, and having, moreover, five fangs instead of two, while the chin also is deficient in prominence. The famous Neanderthal skull has a low forehead and prominent brow-ridges; but the cranial capacity was seventy-five cubic inches — about the average of modern races, and “in no sense,” as Huxley says, “to be regarded as the remains of a human being intermediate between man and the apes.” The Engis skull exhibits no special marks of inferiority. The Cro-Magnon skull of the Reindeer Epoch had a capacity of ninety-seven cubic inches-far above the human average. There was no prominence of the jaws or the cheek-bones, but the tibia was much flattened (platycnemic), as in most primitive men. The Neolithic Borreby skull belonged to the type of Neanderthal.

Socially and intellectually, Paleolithic man, in the regions in question, seems to have existed in a most primitive condition. Dwelling in wild caverns, he hunted the beasts with the rudest stone implements, and clothed himself in their skins. We find no evidence of the use of fire, though probably known, and there are some indications that he made food of his own species (on anthropophagy, see Congrés International,  d'Anthropologie et d'Archéologie Prehistoriques, 1867, p. 158; Fliegier, Zur Prahistorischen Ethnologie Italiens, Wien, 1877, p. 7, 8). Few attempts at pottery have been discovered, and in these the product was rude, hand-made, and simply sun-dried. In the Reindeer Epoch fire was ill general use, and it was employed in baking (imperfectly) a better style of hand-made pottery, and in cooking food employed in funeral, and quite possibly cannibalistic, feasts. Many pieces of highly ornamented reindeer's horn, pierced with one, two, or three holes, discovered in Perigord, are regarded as staves of authority, either civil or priestly. Here also occur numerous phalangeal bones of the deer so pierced with a hole as to serve for whistles. Bone and reindeer's horn were now wrought into barbed harpoons and arrowheads. On one of the bones from the cavern of La Vache (Ariege) were graven some peculiar characters, which, as suggested, may have been a first attempt at writing, though this is very questionable. In the Neolithic Epoch cereals were cultivated, and ground into flour for cakes; cloth was formed for clothing, and bone combs for the hair; stores of fruits were preserved for winter's use; garden-tools were fashioned from stag's horn; log canoes were employed in navigation; planks and timbers of oak were made by splitting tree-trunks with stone wedges; log cabins were constructed on piles or artificial islands; fortifications were employed in war; fish-nets, well made from flaxen cords, have been dredged at Robenhausen, and the abundant debris of numerous flint-workshops, implying a degree of division of labor, have been discovered at Grand-Pressigny and other places in Belgium and France. As to intelligence and manual dexterity, a surprising amount is developed in the working of flint implements, especially in the north of Europe.

AEsthetically, Palmeolithic man had advanced no further than the use of necklaces formed of natural beads, consisting of fossil foraminifera from the chalk. Some flints from the river-drift of St. Acheul present rough sketches which, it has been conjectured, may have been prompted by the artistic feeling. Some of them bear remote resemblances to the human head, in profile, three-quarter view, and full face; also to animals, such as the rhinoceros and mammoth. If the cavern of Massat (Ariege) is Palaeolithic, it affords us the most ancient known successful attempt at portraiture, for M. Fontain found there a stone on which was graven a wonderfully expressive outline of the cave-bear. In the Reindeer Epoch the taste for personal adornment had become considerably developed. They  manufactured necklaces, bracelets, and pendants, piercing for these purposes both shells and teeth, and the bony part of the ear of the horse. Amber also came into use. The aesthetic feeling was specially developed in the south. Some of the curious pieces of reindeer's horn supposed to be staves of authority are handsomely enchased. Some remarkable illustrations of primeval art belonging to this epoch are the following:

(a.) Sculptures. Handsomely wrought spoons of reindeer's horn; hilt of a dagger carved in the form of a reindeer; two ivory laggers, artistically executed, representing reindeer; a harpoon in the shape of an animal's head; the head of a staff of authority, consisting of reindeer's horn carved into a faithful representation of a pair of steers; another representing the head of a mammoth; a pair of pieces representing the chase of the aurochs- on one a rude aurochs fleeing from a man casting a lance (remarkably well done), on the other piece a figure of a bovine animal different from the first; a serpent in relief on reindeer's horn. Many of these from Laugerie- Basse.

(b.) Carvings on slate, ivory, horn, and bone. — A staff of authority, with representations of a man, two horses, and a fish; a stag graven on reindeer's horn; part of a large herbivorous animal; head of lion on a staff of authority; reindeer-fight on slate; some horned animal on reindeer's horn; slates bearing other unknown animals; a young reindeer at full gallop; a hare; a curious animal with feline characteristics; a spirited profile of a horse on bone; human head in profile on a bone spatula, in the style of a child's work; finally, the entire outline of a mammoth on ivory (Madeleine), and another on reindeer's horn, forming the hilt of a poniard (Bruniquel). Most of these from Laugerie-Basse. The Neolithic Epoch seems to have been marked by a decline of the artistic feeling. The ornamentation of the pottery is more elaborate, and the finish of the stone and bone implements more symmetrical and neat, but we discover few relics of carving and engraving.

Religiously, there is little to be affirmed or inferred of the Paleolithic tribes. Some of the curiously wrought flints may have served as religious emblems; and occasional discovery of deposits of food near the body of the dead may very naturally be regarded as evidence of a belief in the future life. In the Reindeer Epoch this class of evidences becomes very greatly augmented, as shown in the systematic and carefully provided burials in some of the tumulus-dolmens and in the traces of funeral repasts in these  and the rock-shelters of Aurignac, Bruniquel, and Furfooz. The numerous specimens of bright and shining minerals found about many settlements— as of hydrated oxide of iron, carbonate of copper, fluor-spar-may have been used as amulets, and thus testify to the vague sense of the supernatural which characterizes the infancy of human society: The Neolithic people add to such indications the erection of megalithic structures, some of which, surrounded by their cemeteries, as at Abury, England, must naturally be considered as their sacred temples.

Prehistoric man, in brief, represented, in Europe, the infancy of his race. All his powers were undeveloped and uneducated. Every evidence sustains us in the conclusion that he was not inferior in psychic endowments to the average man of the highest races; but he was lacking in acquired skill, and in the results of experience accumulated through a long series of generations, and preserved from forgetfulness by the blessings of a written language.

(4.) Antiquity of Proehistoric Europeans. — In debating this question, social and intellectual considerations signify, nothing, since all conditions have existed in all ages. As to the geological antiquity of European man, we have stated that he dates from some part — probably an early part— of the Champlain period. It has been earnestly maintained, however, and is still believed by some, that man appeared in Europe before the epoch of the last general glaciation. The following are the grounds on which the opinion has been based:

(a.) Pre-glacial remains erroneously supposed human. — Some bones found at Saint-Prest (Loir-et-Cher) in stratified sand and gravel bore cuts, notches, and scratches supposed to indicate the use of flint implements. The bones, however, were associated with those of Elephas meridionalis, which ranged from the Later Pliocene to the beginning of the Quaternary age. But it was proven by experiment that very similar markings are made upon bones by porcupines; while in the beds containing the bones in question were abundant remains of a large rodent, quite capable of causing the supposed human markings. Again, the shell-marls (faluns) of Leognan, near Bordeaux, enclose bones of an extinct manatee and of certain cetaceans and cheloneans, which bear marks appearing to have been made by human implements. The manatee in question is of Miocene age. But in the same deposits occur the remains of a carnivorous fish (Sas-gus serratus) whose serrated teeth fit exactly the markings on the fossil bones.  A similar explanation probably awaits the furrowed Halitherium bones of Pouancé (Maine-et-Loire), as well as the notched and scratched bones of a cetacean (Balcenotus) described from Pliocene deposits in Tuscany by Prof. Capellini (L'Uomo pliocenico in Toscana [1876]). Finally, at Thenay (Loir-et-Cher) occur flints in certain Lower Miocene limestone's, which were at first declared to be the works of human hands (Congrés International [1867], p. 67); but that opinion is scarcely entertained at present.

(b.) Human remains erroneously supposed pre-glacial. — A human skeleton found in volcanic breccia near the town of Le Puy-en-Velay, in Central France, was for a time supposed to have been enclosed by the same eruption that buried, in the same neighborhood, the remains of the Pliocene Elephas neridionalis. The elephant-bearing lava, nevertheless, was of a different character; and exactly the same lava as that containing human remains was subsequently observed at another point. This enclosed the bones of the mammoth and other animals of the Champlain period, and thus demonstrated that the “man of Denise” was post-glacial. Again, the river-drifts of the Somme have been set down as glacial or pre-glacial; but that opinion is now almost wholly abandoned, for abundant localities are known in which it appears to a demonstration that the river-valley was excavated after the glacial drift was laid down; while the flint-bearing drifts have been subsequently deposited along the chalk-slopes of the valley. Examples are seen in the sections at Menchecourt and other places; and the same is shown in England at Biddenham and Summerbonn Hill, in the valley of the Ouse, and at Icklingham, in the valley of the Lark. In 1856 a human skull and numerous bones of the same skeleton were exhumed (but now mostly lost) from the Colle del Vento, in Liguria (Issel, Congrés International [1867], p. 75, 156), said to be associated with extinct species of oyster of the Pliocene age. The age of the bones is questioned by Pruner Bey; and as no naturalist saw the remains in situ, we must candidly await further investigation. Similarly, the celebrated pelvic bone of Natches, in Mississippi, once thought to have been derived from a pre-glacial deposit, is now generally believed to save fallen down the bluff from an Indian grave at the surface; and the human remains of California reported to have come from beneath a bed of Tertiary lava are perhaps not sufficiently well authenticated to form the subject of speculation (Blake, Congrés International [1867], p. 101; Whitney, Geological Survey of California, 1, 243-252). As, however, prehistoric men in America were non-Caucasian,  and therefore probably of preadamic origin, we must expect to find their remains attaining a much higher antiquity than those of Europe.

As to the absolute measure of the time, which separates Paleolithic man from the present, it is likely that a medium judgment will be reached at last. (Consult on this question Southall, The Recent Origin of Man [1875]; and Andrews, Amer. Journ. of Science [2], 45, 180; Trans. of the Chicago Acad. of Science, 2, 1; Meth. Quar. Rev. Dec. 1876, and Jan. 1877.) The impression of his high antiquity has been derived from the magnitude of the geological changes which have transpired since his advent. But the time required for these, in the judgment of the writer, has by some been greatly exaggerated. The contemporaneous existence of man with animals now extinct has little bearing on the question, since it has been ascertained that extinctions have been occurring throughout historic periods, even down to the present century. The disappearance of the glaciers does not seem enormously remote when we remember that their stumps are still visible in the valleys of the Alps, in the gulches of the Sierra Nevada, and even in the ice-wells of Vermont and Wisconsin. The elevation requisite to join England to the Continent cannot be thought to require a vast period after learning the rate of oscillations in actual progress upon various shores, and the enormous changes in the hydrographical features of China within 3000 years (Pumpelly, Smithsonian Contributions to Knowledge, vol. 15:art. 4). The calculations based on the rate of erosion of modern river-valleys, and the growth of sphagnous peat are very misleading, since it is certain that these processes went forward with indefinitely greater rapidity in the pluvial and palustrine conditions of the Champlain period. (For the results of sundry calculations, see Le Hon, L'Homme Fossile, p. 247.) Furthermore, the extreme opinions entertained within a few years on all these points have more recently been greatly modified (see King, Catastrophism and Evolution, in the Amer. Naturalist, Aug. 1877). At the same time, the evidences seem to tend towards the conclusion that the advent of man in Europe occurred from 5000 to 7000 years ago; still more, that the Oriental stock from which he had descended came first into existence more than 6000 years ago.f7 Such a conclusion would not be alarming on Biblical grounds, since it does not appear that the absolute age of Adam is stated either directly or by clear inference; and there is room to suspect that, in those singular cases in which the ages of the patriarchs as given in the Hebrew text differ as they do from the Septuagint, the integrity of the Greek text has been better preserved than that of the Hebrew, since  the Jews had a direct interest in the abbreviation of the time before Christ, to make it appear that the epoch always assigned by their rabbins for the advent of the Messiah had not yet arrived.f8 Moreover, there are some indications that Palaeolithic man in Europe was not of the Adamic (Caucasian) type, though it is pretty certain that he was succeeded, probably as early as the Reindeer Epoch, by an Eastern tide of Caucasian immigration.

f7: These figures are evidently little more than guesses, not to be placed in comparison with the definite data of Bible chronology. — ET).

f8: A careful examination leads to the opposite conclusion. SEE CHRONOLOGY; SEE SEPTUAGINT. — ED.

We must remind the reader, in conclusion, that our condensed discussion of prehistoric peoples relates only to the European continent, and that the primitive history of the men of other quarters of the world may have differed in some important respects; while it is certain, since European man seems to have immigrated from the east, that the first appearance of his Oriental ancestors must have been considerably more remote; and still further, in view of the probable common origin of the Adamic and the other races of man, the first advent of the human species upon the earth must have taken place at an epoch removed perhaps into the Tertiary age of the world's history. SEE GEOLOGY.

In addition to the works already cited, see Figuier, L'Homme Primitif; translation, Primitive Man (N. Y. 1870); Quatrefages, Rapport sur le Progres de l'Anthropologie (1868); Ran, Early Man in Europe (N.Y. 1876); Tylor, Researches into the Early History of Mankind and the Development of Civilization (Lond. 1865); Nilsson, Les Habitans Primitifs de la Scandinavie; Vogt, Lectures on Man (ibid. 1864), translation of Vorlesungen iiber den Menschen; Pozzy, La Terre et le Recit Biblique de la Creation, bk. 1, ch. 6-9; bk. 3, ch. 11:12; Lubbock, The Origin of Civilization and the Primitive Condition of Man (Amer. ed. 1871); Morgan, Ancient Society (N. Y. 1877, 8vo); Caspari, Die Urgeschichte der Menschheit (Leips. 1873); Tylor, Primitive Culture (Lond. 1871, 2 vols.); Evany. Quar. Rev. April, 1866. Figuier, Quatrefages, and Pozzy oppose the doctrine of the derivative origin of man. For information respecting America, see Foster, Prehistoric Races of the United States (3d ed.  Chicago, 1874); B. C. Y., The Remote Antiquity of Man not Proven (Lond. 1882). (A. W.)

## Preadamites[[@Headword:Preadamites]]

             is the name of a Christian sect which was originated in the 17th century by Isaac La Peyrère (q.v.) upon the publication of two small treatises of his in 1655, the chief object of which was to show that Moses had not recorded the origin of the human race, but only of the Jewish nation; and that other nations of men inhabited our world long before Adam. His views were espoused by many people, especially at Groningen and other places in Holland. At Brussels, however, he was seized as a heretic, and only escaped punishment by renouncing the Reformed opinions and embracing the Roman Catholic faith; and at the same time he, of course, also retracted his Preadamite views. SEE PREADAMITE.

## Prebend[[@Headword:Prebend]]

             (from the Lat. praebenda, provender, i.e. an allowance of food, from praebere, to furnish), in its common acceptation signifies an allowance or provision of any sort. As an ecclesiastical term it denoted originally any stipend or reward given out of the ecclesiastical revenues to a person who had by his labors procured benefit to the Church. SEE BENEFICE. When, in the course of the 10th century, the cathedral churches having then become well endowed — left off receiving the income of their lands into one common bank, and the members of most cathedral and collegiate churches ceased living in common and separated from the episcopal mensal property, certain shares or portions fell to all those so entitled. Besides, the lands were parceled out in shares, and the income thus obtained was used for the support of all the clergymen within the cathedral territory. After the definite constitution of chapters for the maintenance of the daily religious services in the bishop's church, or in other churches similarly established, endowments were assigned to them, which were to be distributed (praebendae) in fixed proportions among the members. These portions were called portiones canonicae or prebendae.

Hence arose the difference between a prebend and a canonry (q.v.). A canonry was a right which a person had in a church to be (deemed a member thereof, to have the right of a stall therein, and of giving a vote in the chapter; but a prebend was a right to receive certain revenues appropriated to his place. The number of prebends in the several cathedral churches is increased by the benefit of the  revenues of the rural clergy, and oftentimes by exonerating the lands of prebends from paying tithes to the ministers of the parishes where they lay. To the prebend was commonly attached a residence; and when an insufficient number of houses existed, the oldest prebendaries enjoyed their advantages in exchange for a fixed tax, until it became the practice to pay small indemnities to those who had no houses, and these payments were called distributiones. In England there is a trace, previous to the arrival of William I, of the tenure of distinct lands, afterwards made prebendal, at St. Paul's; but the definite name of prebends is not much earlier than the time of Edward I. In the time of Henry III the bursaries, prebends paid out of the bishop's purse, were reconstituted at Lichfield, and endowed with lands. It is a separate endowment impropriated, as distinguished from the communua, manors or revenues appropriated to maintain all the capitular members. At Lincoln, in the 11th century, forty-two prebends were founded; in the 12th century, at Wells, the prebends were formally distinguished and the dignities founded; in the 13th century fourteen prebends were founded at Llandaff. At York archbishop Thomas divided the lands of the common fund into separate prebends; these were augmented by archbishops Grey and Romaine, who added the last stall in the 13th century. In the 16th century bishop Sherborne founded four stalls at Chichester, the latest endowed in England. The prebends were divided into stalls of priests, deacons, sand sub deacons, a certain number coming up to reside in stated courses; but in 1343 all the stalls of York were declared to be sacerdotal. Dignitaries almost invariably held a prebend attached to their stall.

## Prebendary[[@Headword:Prebendary]]

             is the name applied to a clergyman who is attached to a cathedral or collegiate church and enjoys a prebend (q.v.), in consideration of his officiating at stated times in the church. SEE DEAN and SEE CHAPTER.

## Precarium[[@Headword:Precarium]]

             (from the Lat. precari, to request, beseech), in the language of civil law, is a compact by which one leaves to another by request the use of a thing, or the exercise of a right, without compensation, but the grantor reserving to himself the power of a reclaimer. The receiver, as a rule, obtains thus the judicial use of the object in question; but the giver can regain possession at any time; and he can, if the surrender be refused, recur to the interdict De  precario, or to the Acio prcescriptis verbis. Hence the expression, Precarie possidere, to possess precariously. In canonic law, precarium has not exactly the same meaning. Here the word is feminine (precaeria, ae), and is never applied to movable goods, but always to real estate, which is not necessarily bestowed gratuitously, but generally for the obligation of paying certain taxes, or rendering certain services, and as a consequence it cannot be taken away at pleasure. The origin of the ecclesiastical precaiae is found in the 6th century, when the custom began to prevail, especially in the country, of giving the priests the use of portions of land. Pope Gelasius, in 496, had disapproved of this custom, yet a few years afterwards we find it widely spread. This transfer of real estate to the priest at first depended on the bishop, and was entirely personal, not essentially connected with the office. The ecclesiastical usufructuary had sometimes to recognize its revocability by a special deed, this declaration being accompanied with the promise of paying interest. But little by little the Frankish legislation made these cessions permanent, and the possession of the land was so intimately connected with the performance of duties that it passed uninterruptedly from every occupant to his successor. Thus the precariae took in the course of time the character of real benefices. SEE BENEFICE. It was not of rare occurrence that ecclesiastical property of that kind was given for services rendered, or to be rendered, or against payment of a tax, even to laymen. These possessions also were called precariae, for not only did their collation depend on the bishop, but the deed had to be renewed every five years. But this also took in course of time the character of a real lease. Still another meaning given to the word precaria is that of deed— an instrument donating property to the Church, but stipulating for the grantor the use of it during the remainder of his life. The deed of consent given by the other side was called praestaria. Formularies of precaries and prestaries may be found in Marculfi Formul. lib. 2, no. 5, 40, and in the Append. Formul. no. 27, 28, and 41, 42. See Walter, Corp. jum. Germ. antiq. vol. 3.

## Precedence[[@Headword:Precedence]]

             a recognition of superiority in certain acts due to one person over another. Thus in the ecclesiastical order recognized in the hierarchies of Rome, England, and Russia, or wherever such distinctions of clergy exist, priests precede deacons; and rectors, vicars; and vicars, perpetual curates; and incumbents, assistant-stipendiary curates. Rectors rank with each other according to the size and importance of their livings or the date of their  induction; bishops according to the precedence of their sees, as in the Anglican establishment, e.g.in the case of London, Durham, and Winchester, and of Meath in Ireland, where the incumbent bears the title of Most Reverend; or, otherwise, of the date of consecration, by the councils of Milevi (416), Braga (573), Toledo (633), and London (1075), unless their sees were privileged by ancient custom. Priests and deacons rank according to the date of their ordination. For a cathedral of the old foundation in England the order runs-dean, praccentor, chancellor, treasurer, archdeacons, canons residentiary (subdean, subchanter of canons), and canons non-resident. In chapter the bishop sits with the dean, chancellor, archdeacon, and residentiaries on the right, and the praecentor, treasurer, archdeacon, and residentiaries on the left; the rest of the canons in order of installation. At Salisbury two extra archdeacons sat on either side of the entrance. In all processions the members walked two and two, at regular distances — dignitaries in copes, canons priests in chasubles, canons, deacons, and subdeacons in dalmatics, with one pace between collaterals, and three paces between each rank; juniors first and seniors last in going, but in reverse order on their return; the right-hand side is the place of honor. At St. Paul's the dean walked last, between two dignitaries. The parish clergy go first, then follow vicars, catons, dignitaries, the dean, the bishop, and last the lay persons. Each parish had its cross or banner. Abbots took precedence according to the date of their benediction; Glastonbury, St. Alban's, and Westminster at various times challenged the first place among those who were mitered. Rural deans and honorary canons have only local precedence in a ruridecanal meeting or cathedral respectively.

## Precentor[[@Headword:Precentor]]

             (Gr. πρωτοψάτης, κανονάρχα; Lat. domesticus cutorum; Fr. gruand chant-re; Sp. chantre, or capis col) was in the ancient and mediaeval churches the person who led the singing. He generally commenced the verse of the psalm, and the people joined him in the close. The versicles were divided into two parts, and sung alternately, the singers answering to one another; but ordinarily the precentor commenced, and the people joined in the middle, and sometimes at the end of the verse. This was called singing acrostics. SEE ACROSTICS. The precentor was the dignitary collated by the diocesan and charged with the conduct of the musical portion of divine service, and required on great festivals and Sundays to commence the responses, hymns, etc., to regulate processions, to distribute  the copes, to correct offences in choir, and to direct the singers. In France, England, Germany, and Spain he ranked next to the dean. He gave the note at mass to the bishop and dean as the succentor did to the canons and clerks. He superintended the admission of members of the choir and tabled their names for the weekly course on waxen tablets. He corrected and had charge of the choir books. In England when he ruled the choir he wore a rochet, cantel or cantor's cope, ring, and gloves, and carried a staff; and the rectors followed him in soutanes (often of red color), surplices, and copes. He installed canons at Exeter, at York the dean and dignitaries, and at Lichfield the bishop and dignitaries. He attended the bishop on the left hand, as the dean walked on the prelate's right hand. At Paris he exercised jurisdiction over all the schools and teachers in the city and respondents in the universities. In French cathedrals, upon high festivals he presides over the choir at the lectern, and carries a baton of silver as the ensign of his dignity. At Rodez, Puy-en-Velay, and Brionde he, like the other canons, wears a miter at high mass, and at Cologne was known as chorepiscopus. At Chartres during Easter week all the capitular clergy go to the font, with the subchanter preceding the junior canons, carrying white Wands, in allusion to the white robes of the baptized. At Rouen the chanter carries a white wand in certain processions, and no one without his leave could open a song-school in the city. In England his stall faces the dean, being on the northwest. In foreign cathedrals he occupied either the same position or sat next to the dean. The Greek precentor at Christmas wore white, and the singers violet. The exarch was the imperial protospaltes. The dignity of precentor was founded at Amiens in 1219; at Rouen in 1110; at Exeter, Salisbury, York, Lincoln, in the 11th century; at Chichester, Wells, Lichfield, Hereford, in the 12th; and at St. Paul's in the 13th century. The precentor was required to be always resident, and usually held a prebend with his dignity. The Clugniac precentor was called armaius because he was also librarian the treasurer being aprocrisiarius. The singers of the primitive Church were regarded as a minor order by pope Innocent III, by the Council of Laodicea (360), and by that of Trullo. When the service of song was entrusted to lay persons in course of time, the title (‘. chanter was preserved in cathedral chapters and collegiate churches as that of a capitular dignitary, having precedency, rights, and duties.

In modern times the name is applied to those who, in non-ritualistic churches, lead the congregation in singing. This office, lately revived, appears, from Bingham's Antiquities, to be of a very early date; the  precentor, or phonascus (q.v.), as he was called in the early Church, either leading the congregation, or singing one part of the verse, the other part being sung by the congregation in response. See Music. In the mediaeval churches the precentor was one of the officers belonging to the old religious houses, whose office was afterwards continued in collegiate and cathedral churches in the capacity above first referred to. In Scotland the duties of the precentor have been greatly curtailed. He seems to have succeeded to the reader (q.v.) of earlier times. It was the habit of the precentor to repair to church about half an hour before the minister came, and read to the people several passages of Scripture. When the minister entered the precentor gave out a psalm and led the singing. After the beginning of last century he ceased by degrees either to read the Scriptures or prescribe the psalm. But his desk is still, from its original use, called by the old people the lectern-that is, reading desk. — Walcott, Sacred Archaeology, s.v.; Hook, Eccles. Dict. s.v.; Eadie, Eccles. Dict. s.v. SEE DESK; SEE LECTERN; SEE SINGING; SEE STAFF; SEE WORSHIP.

## Precept[[@Headword:Precept]]

             is a direction, command, or rule enjoined by a superior. Religious precepts are divided into moral and positive. The precepts of religion, says Saurin, are as essential as the doctrines; and religion will as certainly sink if the morality be subverted, as if the theology be undermined. The doctrines are only proposed to us as the ground of our duty. A moral precept derives its force from its intrinsic fitness; a positive precept from the authority which enjoins it. Moral precepts are commanded because they are right; positive are right because commanded. The duty of honoring our parents and of observing the Sabbath are instances, respectively, of each kind of precept. SEE LAW.

## Preceptories[[@Headword:Preceptories]]

             (or Commanderies) are estates or benefices anciently possessed by the Knight Templars. On these lands they erected churches for religious service and convenient houses for habitation, ant placed some of their fraternity, under the government of one of those more eminent Templars who had been by the grand-master created preceptores templi, to take care of the lands and rents in that neighborhood. All the preceptories of a province were subject to a provincial superior, called Grand Preceptor; and there were three of these who held rank above all the rest-the grand preceptors  of Jerusalem, Tripolis, and Antioch. Other houses of the order were usually called commanderies.

## Precepts, the Six Hundred and Thirteen[[@Headword:Precepts, the Six Hundred and Thirteen]]

             or תריג מצות. In the preface to his Jad Hachezaka (fol. 2, Colossians 2), Moses Maimonides (q.v.) writes thus: “The number of the precepts of the law is 613, of which there are 248 affirmative precepts, or precepts of commission, מצות עשה, corresponding to the 248 members of the human body, and 365 negative precepts, or precepts of omission, מצות לא תעשה, corresponding to the number of days of the solar year.” The rabbins assert that the multiplicity of precepts which God has given to the nation of Israel in preference to all others is a sign of his predilection for them, for, says rabbi Chanania ben-Akashiah, “The Holy One (blessed be he!) has been pleased to render Israel meritorious; therefore he multiplied to them the law and the commandments, as it is said, “The Lord is well pleased for his righteousness' sake; he will magnify the law, and make it honorable” (Isa 42:21). If we may believe Jewish notions, we also learn that the patriarchs already fulfilled the 613 precepts. The Jewish commentator Rashi (q.v.) thus comments very gravely on Gen 32:5 : לבן גרתי עם, ‘I have sojourned with Laball' the word גרתי, to the Gematria [comp. the art. SEE CABALA, vol. 2, p. 4], amounts to 613 (i.e. י=10, ת= -400, ר=-200, = ג3, or 10+400+200+3= 613), by which he (i.e. Jacob) wished to communicate (to his brother Esau), ‘It is true I have sojourned with the wicked Laban, but still I observed the 613 precepts, and I have not been infected with his evil deeds;' or, as the original reads, תריג כלומר עם חרעים לבן הרשע גרתי ותריג מצות שמרתי וכא למרתי גרתי בגי ממעשיו;” the same is the remark of Baal Haturim, ad loc. Strictly orthodox Jews make their children commit to memory all the 613 precepts, as they consider a thorough knowledge of them to be a key to the oral law, though the majority of them are unintelligible to a child. Rabbi Gedaliah, of Amsterdam, published a catalogue of them in 1745, which he designated תורת קטן, Toerath Katon, or The Lawin Miniature. He says in his preface, “Which children are to learn in their infancy, to know them off by heart; which will be a great introduction for them to learn the oral law; and also that what they have learned in their youthful days they may remember in their old age; that they may know to do them, and live by them in this  world and in the world to come.” The arrangement of these precepts is different. Some, as Maimonides, arrange them according to the matter, and the same has been followed by Jon Eybenschütz, who put them in verse (Prague, 1765). Another is that by Gedaliah, of Amsterdam, who gives them according to the order of the Pentateuch, which is by far more preferable. As it would be tedious and fruitless to enumerate them, we will refer the reader who may feel interested to Jost, Geschichte d. juden u. s. Sekten, 1, 451 sq.; Bodenschatz, Kirchliche Verfassung der heuiten Juden (Erlangen, 1748), 4:181 sq. (where the Helrew is also given); Margoliouth, Modern Judaism Investigated (Lond. 1843), p. 115 sq.; and The tome and the Synagogue of the Modern Jew (ibid. 1843), p. 202 sq. (B. P.)

## Preces[[@Headword:Preces]]

             (i.e. prayers) are the verses and responses said in the Roman Catholic, English, and other churches at the beginning of matins and even-song.

## Preces Dominicales Feriales[[@Headword:Preces Dominicales Feriales]]

             The preces Dominicales, so called from the Dominica or Lord's Day, when they are usually recited, are those prayers which are added as a complement of devotion to prim and complet foriumo, after the regular psalms. These preces are not recited at all duplices (double feasts), nor within the “octaves.” nor in the “vigil of Epiphany,” in theJtrice sexttf, nor in sabbato, after the “octave of Ascension.” The pieces feriales take place in penitential times, and on the days of penitence. They are prayed kneeling at laudes, and at every single hora (time of the day) at all ferial offices in Advent, in the forty days of Lent, in the Ember days, and vigils connected with a day of fast; with the exception of the vigil of Christmas, the vigil of Pentecost, and the ensuing Ember days. These preces are also omitted on the vigils of Epiphany and Ascension, as these feasts have no day of fast. The preces feriales begin with the “Kyrie eleison” and a whispered “Pater noster;” then, at laudes and vespers, follow, “in versicles” and “responsories,” prayers for the clergy, sovereign and people, for the community, for the deceased, for the absent brethren, the oppressed, and prisoners. Then follows the psalm “De profundis,” so full of abnegation and contrition (at laudes), or “Miserere” (at vespers), with some suitable final versicles and the oration of the day.

## Prechtl, Maximillian[[@Headword:Prechtl, Maximillian]]

             a German Benedictine, noted as a theologian and renowned as a student of canon law, was born Aug. 20, 1757, at Hahnbach, in the Bavarian Palatinate; he studied first under the Jesuits at Amberg, and was at the age of eighteen years admitted to the college of the Benedictines at Michaelfeld, where he studied philosophy and theology, and was consecrated in 1781. In 1782 his monastery sent him to Salzburg, where he acquired a knowledge of the law, which served in good stead to his congregation in several lawsuits. He was then a professor of dogmatics and morals; in 1790 he was called to Amberg as teacher of dogmatic and ecclesiastical history, and in 1798 then was rector in the same city. Jan. 14, 1800, he was elected abbot of the monastery of Michaelfeld. After the suppression of his monastery he lived at Vilseck, entirely devoted to study and to acts of benevolence. He died Jan. 13, 1832. The following are his works: Positiones juris ecclesiastici universi, Germaniae ac Huvarice accommodati (Amberg, 1787): — Succincta seo ies theologiae theoreticae, quam inm monasterio Michaelfeld de Jetndenlt, etc. (ibid. 1791): — Histoesia Monaszterii Michaelfeld feldensis: — Trauerrede auf dmas linascheiden Carl Theodors: — Wie sind die oberfälzischen Abteien inm Jahm e 1669 abermal an die geistlichen Ordensstcinde gekommeen ? (1802): — Friedensworte emn die katholische und protestsantische Kirche für ihre Wiedervereinigumg (Salzb. 1810): — Seitenstiicke zur Weisheit Di. Martin Luther an den neuesfen Herausgeber seiner Streitschrift: Das Papstthum zu Rom vom Teifel gestiftet (ibid. 1817): — Abged rugenee Antwort auf das zweite Sendschreiben Dr. Martin Luthers an den eraussgebe, etc. (ibid. 1818): — Kritischer Rickblick auzf Hrmn. Chr. Buberts kritische Beleuchtumg der Seitenstücke zur Weisheit Di. L. Luthers (ibid. 1818). Prechtl, it will be noticed from the list of his works, entered into a controversy on the questions at issue between Romanists and Protestants. His own desire was a union of all Christians, and he first wrote for this purpose; but, like all Romanists, he was unwilling to acknowledge the corrupt condition of his own ecclesiastical body, and was therefore assailed by the Lutherans. The result was a decided polemical cast in his later writings, and a proportionate ‘decline of scholarship and increase of haste and acrimony. (J. H. W.)

## Precipiano, Humbert William, Count Of[[@Headword:Precipiano, Humbert William, Count Of]]

             a Spanish prelate of French birth, was a native of Besançon, where he was born in 1626. He came from an ancient family, originally from Genoa. He was canon at Besançon, counselor-clerk at the Parliament of Dole, and abbé of Bellevaux in 1649. In 1661 he was elected high-dean of the chapter, but the validity of his election was contested by the Holy See. He found a compensation in the confidence of king Philip IV of Spain. In 1667 he was delegated by the states of Burgundy, with his brother Prosper- Ambroise, to the Diet of Ratisbon. The talents which he displayed on that occasion were rewarded five years later by his nomination to the dignity of supreme counselor of Charles II for the affairs of Burgundy and the Netherlands. His nomination to the episcopal see of Bruges in 1682, whence he passed in 1689 to the archiepiscopal see of Mechlin, was the reward of his devotion to Don Juan of Austria. His zeal for the consolidation of the ultramontane doctrines was so great that he imagined a formulary more exacting than that of Alexander VII. Two decrees of the Inquisition (Jan. 28 and Feb. 6. 1694) condemned the new formulary. The prelate refused to submit to the decrees. Innocent XII enjoined all bishops of Belgium to abandon those quarrels, which had already lasted too long, and which the fanaticism of Precipiano endeavored to revive. In 1696 he recommended, somewhat harshly, a little more moderation to the archbishop of Mechlin. The great blot in Precipiano's life is his consent to the Jesuits for the arrest of Quesnel (q.v.), May 30,1703, at Malines. The cities of Bruges, Besanon. Brussels, Mechlin, and the abbey of Bellevaux are in possession of monuments of the magnificence and piety of this prelate. He died at Brussels June 9, 1711. See Hist. eccls. du 18me Sikcle, vol. 1; Calundrier ecclus. ann. 1757; Fuller, Dict. Hist. s.v. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.

## Precisians[[@Headword:Precisians]]

             one of the names given to the Puritans, or those who, about the time of the Commonwealth, evinced by their conduct that they were in earnest on the subject of religion. They were called precise because they condemned swearing, plays, gaming, drinking, dancing, and other worldly recreations on the Lord's day, as well as the time-serving, careless, and corrupt religion which was then in fashion.

## Precist[[@Headword:Precist]]

             (from the Latin precista) is the name of a candidate who applies, by means of the primae praeces, for a vacant spiritual prebend. SEE PREBEND.

## Preconization[[@Headword:Preconization]]

             (i.e. publication, from praeco, “a herald”). The appointments to all higher offices of the Church, especially episcopal and archiepiscopal sees, whether they be made by canonical election or by nomination, are subject as causae majores to the papal confirmation. This confirmation, according to the resolutions of the Council of Trent, and the closer directions given by pope Gregory XIV in 1591, is preceded by a double examination, called informative process and definitive process. The latter is gone through with at Rome by the congregation of cardinals established by Sixtus V pro erectione ecclesiarum et provisionibus apostolicis; the cardinal protector of the nation in which the appointment is to be made acts as referent, and is assisted by three other cardinals. The opinion, written by the protector, and signed by the three assessors, is brought immediately before the “S. Congregatio Consistorialis,” where it is prepared for the consistory in which the confirmation is to take place. In one of the ensuing secret consistories the cardinal referent repeats his complete account of the matter, whereupon all the cardinals present give their vote as to the worthiness of the elected or nominated bishop. If the majority pronounces in his favor, the pope passes, in the same assembly, his solemn confirmation in the customary formula. This declaration of the pope is called praeconisatio; it is posted ad valvos ecclesie, and a deed of it, “the bull of preconization,” or confirmation, is sent to the confirmed nominee. In France, where the promotion of an ecclesiastic to a bishopric is by nomination of the king, the person nominated, after receiving his warrant from the crown, is furnished with three letters — one from the king to the pope, another to the cardinal protector of France at home, and the third to his majesty's ambassador at the pope's court. When this is done, a certificate of the life and behavior of the person nominated is given in to the pope's nuncio. He likewise makes profession of his faith, and gives in a schedule of the condition of the bishopric to which he is nominated. The letters being transmitted to Rome, the cardinal protector declares in the first consistory that at the next consistorial meeting he intends to propose such a person for such a see, which declaration is called preconization. SEE BISHOP. (J. H. W.)

## Predestinatians[[@Headword:Predestinatians]]

             A sect which arose in Gaul shortly after the time when the Pelagian and Semi Pelagian disputes commenced. They held that God not only predestinated the wicked to eternal punishment, but also to the guilt and transgression for which they are punished; and that thus all the good and bad actions of men are determined from eternity by a divine decree, and fixed by an invincible necessity. In the 9th century the tenets of this sect were revived by Gottschalk, a German, whose followers were termed Predestinatians. They taught what Gottschalk himself termed a double predestination— that is, a predestination of some from all eternity to everlasting life, and of others to everlasting death. On promulgating this doctrine in Italy, Gottschalk was charged by Rabanus Maurus with heresy, and thereupon hastened to Germany to vindicate his principles.

A council accordingly assembled at Mentz in A.D. 848, when Maurus procured his condemnation and his transmission as a prisoner to Hincmar, archbishop of Rheims, to whose jurisdiction he properly belonged. On the arrival of Gottschalk, Hincmar summoned a council at Quiercy, in A.D. 849, when, although his principles were defended by the learned Ratramnus, as well as by Remigius, archbishop of Lyons, he was deprived of his priestly office, ordered to be whipped, and afterwards to be imprisoned. Worn out with this cruel treatment, and after languishing for some years in the solitude of a prison, this learned and thoughtful man died under excommunication, but maintaining his opinions to the last While Gottschalk was shut up within the narrow walls of a prison his doctrines were the subject of a keen and bitter controversy in the Latin Church. Ratramnus and Remigius on the one side, and Scotus Erigena on the other, conducted the argument with great ability. The contention was every day increasing in violence, and Charles the Bald found it necessary to summon another council at Quiercy, in A.D. 853, when, through the influence of Hincmar, the decision of the former council was repeated, and Gottschalk again condemned as a heretic. But in A.D. 855 the three provinces of Lyons, Vienne, and Aries met in council at Valence, under the presidency of Remigius, when the opinions of Gottschalk were approved, and the decisions of the two councils of Quiercy were reversed. Of the twenty-three canons of the Council of Valence, five contain the doctrinal views of the friends and defenders of Gottschalk. Thus in the third canon they declare, “We confidently profess a predestination of the elect unto life, and a predestination of the wicked unto death. But in the election of those to be saved, the mercy of God  precedes their good deserts; and in the condemnation of those who are to perish, their ill-deeds precede the righteous judgment of God. In his predestination God only determined what he himself would do, either in his gratuitous mercy or in his righteous judgment.” “In the wicked he foresaw their wickedness, because it is from themselves; he did not predestine it, because it is not from him. The punishment, indeed, consequent upon their ill-desert he foresaw-being God, he foresees all things-and also predestined, because he is a just God, with whom, as St. Augustine says, there is both a fixed purpose and a certain foreknowledge in regard to all things whatever.” “But that some are predestinated to wickedness by a divine power, so that they cannot be of another character, we not only do not believe, but if there are those who will believe so great a wrong, we, as well as the Council of Orange, with all detestation, declare them anathema.” The five doctrinal canons of the Council of Valence were adopted without alteration by the Council of Toul, in A.D. 859, which last council was composed of the bishops of fourteen provinces. But on the death of Gottschalk, which happened in A.D. 868, the contention terminated. SEE PREDESTINATION.

## Predestination[[@Headword:Predestination]]

             a doctrine upon which great division of opinion prevails among Christians.

I. Definition. — The word predestinate properly signifies to destine (i.e. to set apart, or devote to a particular use, condition, or end) beforehand. It therefore denotes a mere act of the will, and should be carefully distinguished from that exercise of power by which volitions are actualized or carried into effect. Etymologically it would be proper to say that God before the foundation of the world predestinated the sun to be luminous, the loadstone to attract, the atmosphere to perform its varied ministries. In theological language, however, God would be said to have “foreordained” or “decreed” these things, the term “predestinate” being restricted to God's supposed determinations respecting the destinies of men in the future world. The early Lutheran divines generally distinguished praedestinatio stricte dicta, or predestination in its narrower sense, and praedestinatio late dicta, or predestination in its wider signification. The former was God's decree to save all persevering believers in Christ; the latter was that original redemptive volition in which he “will have all man to be saved” (1 Timothy 2, 4). In the Reformed Church the word has sometimes been employed as synonymous with election (q.v.), sometimes as covering both  election and reprobation (q.v.). Arminius, in his 15th Pub. Disputation, seems to prefer the former usage as more scriptural, but he is not followed in this respect by his remonstrant successors. Calvin and most of his followers employ the term as applying to the reprobative decrees of God as much as to the elective (see this point discussed under CALVINISM SEE CALVINISM in vol. 2, p. 43, Colossians 2).

II. Is Predestination Absolute or Conditional? — The cardinal point of the predestination controversy has always been this question: Are the decrees by which certain individuals are elected to eternal life and other individuals doomed to everlasting misery respective or irrespective— that is, were these decrees based upon God's foreknowledge (q.v.) of the different use individuals would make of their moral agency, or were they not? The Arminian takes the affirmative, the Calvinist the negative. The former reasons in this wise: Divine predestination in its widest sense is God's free and perfect foreplanning of creation and providence. It was antecedent to the production of the first created thing. So viewed, it must be evident to any rational theist that predestination was objectively absolute but subjectively conditioned-absolute objectively because there existed nothing extraneous to the divine mind to limit its action; conditioned subjectively because the essential perfections of God demand that his will should always act in strict conformity with the dictates of his own infinite wisdom, justice, and benevolence. But though predestination, regarded as the complete, all- embracing plan of God, was objectively absolute, it is obvious that the various individual decrees which are conceived of as components of that plan must mutually limit and condition each other. Thus the divine determination that “while the earth remaineth seed-time and harvest shall not cease” was not an absolute decree, but one conditioned upon the divine determination, antecedent to it in the order of nature, that there should be an earth with planetary motion, etc.

Were not each decree adjusted to every other they could not conspire to the attainment of a common end. Instead of being integrating elements of one wise and self-consistent plan, some might be found superfluous, some perhaps in direct collision. Hence no individual decree can be regarded as irrespective or unconditioned; each is conditioned on the one hand by the perfections of God on the other by the whole system of divine pre-volitions of which it forms a part. Now an absolute, irreversible decree, continues the Arminian, either electing an individual to eternal life or dooming him to everlasting death, fails to answer to either of these essential conditions or characteristics of a divine  decree. It would be palpably inconsistent with the divine perfections on the one hand, and absolutely irreconcilable with known determinations of God on the other. Such an elective decree would be incompatible with God's rationality and impartiality, while such a reprobative one would directly conflict not only with his benevolence, but even with his justice. Both would be at open war with the known design of the Creator that men should enjoy the endowment of moral agency and shape their own eternal destinies. Hence an unconditional, irrespective election of some unto life, and an unconditional, irrespective reprobation of others unto death, cannot be maintained. If any are individually elected or reprobated, they must have been elected or reprobated with reference to the foreseen use they would make of their moral agency, for only on this principle can any theory of predestination be constructed which shall not compromise the divine character or conflict with known determinations respecting man.

So just and conclusive is this reasoning that the long task of the absolute predestinarians has been to devise some expedient by which unconditional election and reprobation may be shown to be compatible with the divine attributes and with all known divine decrees. Several have been tried.

(1.) Perhaps the most legitimate of them all is that adopted by those divines who consider the divine will the ground of all rational and moral qualities and distinctions. If, as these divines affirm, nothing is rational or irrational, just or unjust, right or wrong, except that for the time being it is God's will that it should be so, then evidently an arbitrary damnation of innocent beings may be just as right and proper an act as any other. If he wills it to be right, then it is right, however it may seem to us. Hence, on this scheme, we have only to suppose that God wills an act to be right to render it perfectly proper and consistent for him to perform it. Only on this hypothesis can irrespective predestination be successfully defended.

(2.) Another class of divines, unable to adopt this bold principle (according to which God is able to abrogate the moral law as easily as the old ceremonial one of the Jews), yet forced to mitigate in some way the revolting horrors of an irrespective reprobation, have sought relief in the following scheme: Men, considered isnpuris naturalibus, in themselves only were incapable of anything supernatural. Only by the aid of supernatural and divine grace could their nature be confirmed and strengthened if it should remain in its integrity, or restored if it should become corrupt. To illustrate his grace, God determined by an immutable  decree to elect certain men, so viewed, to participancy in his grace and glory. To show his sovereign freedom, he determined to pass by the remainder (preterition), and not communicate to them that divine aid requisite to keep them from sin; then, when the persons passed by become sinners, he proposes to demonstrate his justice by their damnation. How much real relief this device affords may be seen by consulting Arminius, Declaration of Sentiments, or Watson, Institutes, pt. 2, ch. 28.

(3.) Another expedient sometimes employed in the construction of a predestinarian theodicy is to regard sin as a mere negation. As brought forward by Dr. Chalmers (Institutes, pt. 3, ch. 5), it might be viewed as a modification of the last-mentioned. Both fail to vindicate even the justice of God, since in each case the finally damned are damned solely for failing to do what they have no ability, natural or vouchsafed, to perform.

(4.) A fourth scheme is called sublapsarianism. In this the fall of man was antecedent in the order of the divine decrees to election and reprobation. All men are viewed as personally guilty of Adam's sin and justly obnoxious with him to eternal death. From this mass God sovereignly and graciously elected some unto life for a demonstration of his mercy; the rest he reprobated to everlasting woe for a demonstration of his justice. In all this it is claimed that there was nothing inconsistent with God's character, since all might justly have been damned. It happens, however, that few are ready to acquiesce in this all-important premise, to wit, that all the descendants of Adam are justly obnoxious to eternal death on account of his sin, hence the conclusion avails nothing to most men. Failing in all these ingenious contrivances to harmonize unconditional predestination with God's known attributes and principles of administration as moral governor, the abettors of the doctrine usually come finally

(5) to bare assertions. They maintain the unconditionality of election and reprobation on the one hand, and on the other the perfect justice and benevolence of God and adequate agency of man, without attempting to reconcile the two. They resolve the palpable contradiction into a mere “mystery,” and imperiously shut every opponent's mouth with the misemployed Scripture, “Who art thou that repliest against God?”

As our limits do not admit of a methodical examination of the various passages of Scripture in which Calvinists find their doctrine asserted or assumed, we shall be obliged to refer the reader to Watson, and to those commentators who have not devoted themselves to Biblical interpretation  merely as an advantageous polemical agency. We only remark, in passing, that no fact is more striking or significant in the whole history of Scripture exegesis than the steady gravitation of all sound expositors to the exegetical views of the early Remonstrants. Tholuck gratefully acknowledges his obligation to them and even Prof. Stuart quite as often follows Grotius as Calvin. Indeed, he confesses that he cannot find irrespective election in Rom 8:28-30, nor can he see “how it is to be made out” on rational grounds (Corn. Excursus, 10, 477). In like manner he adopts the interpretation of Rom 7:5-25, which it cost Arminius so much to establish, and believes the time is coming “when there will be but one opinion among intelligent Christians about the passage in question, as there was but one before the dispute of Augustine Aith Pelagius” (Excursus, 7).

III. History of the Doctrine. — The unanimous and unquestioned doctrine of the Church on this point for more than four hundred years was, so far as developed into distinctness, precisely identical with that which owes its scientific form and name to Arminius (q.v.). The early fathers often expressed themselves unguardedly, and, in so doing, sometimes laid themselves open to the charge of a leaning towards the erroneous views afterwards systematized by Pelagius (q.v.) and his coadjutors, SEE PELAGIANISM; but their general sentiment was soundly evangelical and capable of an enunciation entirely free from every suspicion of consanguinity with that heresy. “In respect to predestination,” says Wiggers, “the fathers before Augustine differed entirely from him… They founded predestination upon prescience . . . Hence the Massilians were entirely right when they maintained that Augustine's doctrine of predestination was contrary to the opinion of the fathers and the sense of the Church” (Auqustinisn and Pelagianism, transl. by Prof. Emerson). Justin Martyr, Irenoeus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and Chrysostom- all in clear and decisive statements-gave their adherence to the theory of conditional predestination, rejecting the opposite as false, dangerous, and utterly subversive of the divine glory. It is evident that they did not investigate the subject to the depth to which it is requisite for the full discussion of it to go, and that various questions, which must be put before it can be brought completely before us, they either did not put or hastily regarded as of very little moment; but it is enough to dwell upon the fact that they did employ their thoughts upon it, and have so expressed themselves as to leave no doubt of the light in which it was contemplated  by them. Justin, in his dialogue with Trypho, remarks, that “they who were foreknown as to become wicked, whether angels or men, did so not from any fault of God, αλρια ρο εο, but from their own blame;” by which observation he shows that it was his opinion that God foresaw in what manner his intelligent creatures would act, but that this did not affect their liberty, and did not diminish their guilt. A little after lie says more fully that “God created angels and men free to the practice of righteousness, having planted in them reason, through which they knew by whom they were created and through whom they existed; when before they were not, and prescribed to them a law by which they were to be judged, if they acted contrary to right reason. Wherefore we, angels and men, are through ourselves convicted as being wicked, if we do not lay hold of repentance. But it the Logos of God foretells that some angels and men would go to be punished, he does so because he foreknew that they would certainly become wicked; by no means, however, because God made them such.” Justin thus admits that man is wholly dependent upon God, deriving existence and everything which he has from the Almighty; but he is persuaded that we were perfectly able to retain our integrity, and that, although it was foreseen that we should not do so, this did not abridge our moral power, or fix any imputation on the Deity in consequence of our transgression. Tatian, in his oration against the Greeks— an excellent work, which, although composed after the death of Justin, was written, in all probability, before its author had adopted the wild opinions which he defended towards the conclusion of his life-expresses very much the same sentiments avowed by Justin. He says, “Both men and angels were created free, so that man becoming wicked through his own fault may be deservedly punished, while a good man, who, from the right exercise of his free will, does not transgress the law of God, is entitled to praise; that the power of the divine Logos, having in himself the knowledge of what was to happen, not through fate or unavoidable necessity, but from free choice, predicted future things, condemning the wicked and praising the righteous.” Irenaeus, in the third book of his work against heresies, has taken an opportunity to state his notions about the origin of evil. The seventy-first chapter of that book is entitled, “A proof that man is free, and has power to this extent, that of himself he cal choose what is good or the contrary.” In illustration of this he remarks, “God gave to mail the power of election, as he did to the angels. They, therefore, who do not obey are justly not found with the good, and receive deserved punishment, because God, having given them what was good they did not keep it, but despised  the riches of the divine mercy.” The next chapter is entitled, “A proof that some men are not good by nature and others wicked, and that what is good is within the choice of man.” In treating on this subject, Irenetus observes that “if the reverse were the case, the good would not merit praise nor the wicked blame, because, being merely what, without any will of theirs, they had been made, they could not be considered as voluntary agents. But,” he adds, “since all have the same nature, and are able to retain and to do what is good, and may, on the other hand, lose it and not do it, some are, even in the sight of men, and much more in that of God deservedly praised and others blamed.” In support of this he introduces a great variety of passages from Scripture. It appears, however, that the real difficulty attending the subject had suggested itself to his mind, for he inquires in the seventy-third chapter why God had not from the beginning made man perfect, all things being possible to him. He gives to this question a metaphysical and unsatisfactory answer, but it so far satisfied himself as to convince him that there could not, on this ground, be any imputation justly cast on the perfections of the Almighty, and that, consequently, a sufficient explanation of the origin of evil and of the justice of punishing it was to be found in the nature of man as a free agent, or in the abuse of that liberty with which man had been endowed (see Irenteus, 4:392; Justin, c. Trypho, c. 140).

In the Western Church all the early theologians and teachers were equally unanimous. While the Alexandrian theologians laid special stress on free will, those of the West dwelt more on human depravity and on the necessity of grace. On the last-named point all agreed. It was conceded that it was conditioned by free will. Unconditional predestination they all denied. ‘This stage of Church doctrine is represented by Hilary of Poitiers and Ambrose of Milan, as well as by Tertullian (Adv. Macrcion, 2. 6), who, much as he sometimes needed the doctrine of irresistible grace, would never so much as adopt an unconditional election, much less an unconditional reprobation. Tertullian had also speculated upon the moral condition of man, and has recorded his sentiments with respect to it. He explicitly asserts the freedom of the will; lays down the position that, if this be denied, there can be neither reward nor punishment; and in answer to an objection that since free will has been productive of such melancholy consequences it would have been better that it had not been bestowed, he enters into a formal vindication of this part of our constitution. In reply to another suggestion that God might have interposed to prevent the choice which was to be productive of sin and misery, he maintains that this could  not have been done without destroying that admirable constitution by which alone the interests of virtue can be really promoted. He thus thought that sin was to be imputed wholly to man, and that it is perfectly consistent with the attributes of God, or rather illustrates these attributes, that there should be a system under which sin was possible, because without this possibility there could have been no accountable agents. From what has been stated on this subject, it seems unquestionable that the apostolic fathers did not at all enter upon the subject of the origin of evil; that the writers by whom they were succeeded were satisfied that, in the sense in which the term is now most commonly used, there was no such thing as predestination; that they uniformly represented the destiny of man as regulated by the use or abuse of his free will; that, with the exception of Irenaeus, they did not attempt to explain why such a creature as man, who was to fall into sin, was created by a Being of infinite goodness; that the sole objection to their doctrine seemed to them to be that prescience was incompatible with liberty, and that, when they answered this, they considered that nothing more was requisite for receiving, without hesitation, the view of man upon which they often and fondly dwelt, as a free and accountable agent, who might have held fast his integrity, and whose fall from that integrity was to be ascribed solely to himself, as it did not at all result from any appointment of the Supreme Being.

So Hilary of Poitiers declares that the decree of election was not indiscretus, and emphatically asserts the harmonious connection between grace and free will the powerlessness of the latter, and yet its importance as a condition of the operation of divine grace. “As the organs of the human body,” he says (De Trinit. 2, 35), “cannot act without the addition of moving causes, so the human soul has indeed the capacity for knowing God, but if it does not receive through faith the gift of the Holy Spirit it will not attain to that knowledge. Yet the gift of Christ stands open to all, and that which all want is given to every one as far as he will accept it.” “It is the greatest folly,” he says in another passage (Psalms 2, § 20), “not to perceive that we live in dependence on and through God, when we imagine that in things which men undertake and hope for they may venture to depend on their own strength. What we have, we have from God; on him must all our hope be placed.” Accordingly he did not admit an unconditional predestination; he did not find it in the passages in Romans 9 commonly adduced in favor of it respecting the election of Esau, but only a predestination conditioned by the divine foreknowledge of his determination of will; otherwise every man would be born under a necessity of sinning (Psalms 57, § 3). Neander,  in portraying his system, says: “Hilary considered it very important to set forth distinctly that all the operations of divine grace are conditioned on man's free will, to repel everything which might serve to favor the notion of a natural necessity, or of an unconditional divine predestination” (2, 562). So Ambrose, who lived a little later, and even Jerome, who exhibited such zeal in behalf of Aulgustinism, declares, without reservation, that divine election is based upon foreknowledge. True, Augustine cites two passages (De Dono Perseveraniae, 19) from Ambrose as favoring his scheme, but all commentators upon this father assure us that these passages by no means give ground for attributing to him the Augustinian view of election. Ambrose carries the approximation to Augustine a step further. He says (Apol. David, 2, § 76): “We have all sinned in the first man, and by the propagation of nature the propagation of guilt has also passed from one to all; in him human nature has sinned.” A transfer of Adam's guilt may seem to be here expressed, but in other expressions it is disowned (Psalms 48, § 9). Ambrose admitted neither irresistible grace nor unconditional predestination; he made predestination to depend on prescience (De Fide, lib. 5, § 83). In other places, however, his language approaches more nearly to that of Augustine (see Hase, Dogmatik, § 162; Gieseler, Dogmengesch. § 39; Neander, History of Dogmas, 1, 343, 344). To quote Neander again: “Although the freedom of the divine election and the creative agency of grace are made particularly prominent in these passages, still they do not imply any necessary exclusion of the state of recipiency in the individual as a condition, and accordingly this assertion of Ambrose admits of being easily reconciled with the assertion first quoted. In another place, at least (De Fide, lib. 5, § 83), he expressly supposes that predestination is conditioned by foreknowledge (ibid. 2, 564).” The substantial doctrines of the fathers as to the extent of grace before Augustine was that Christ died, not for an elect portion of mankind, but for all men, and that if men are not saved the guilt and the fault are their own (Gieseler, Dogmengeschichte, § 72).

Thus we see that for more than four hundred years not a single voice was heard, either in the Eastern or Western Church, in advocacy of the notion of an unconditional divine predestination. At this point Augustine, already in very advanced old age, and under controversial pressure, took the first step towards Calvinism by pronouncing the decree of election unconditional. In explaining the relation between man's activity and decisive influence, Pelagiuus had denied human depravity, and maintained  that, although God gives man the power to do good, the will and the act are man's. He denied that there was any divine energy in grace that could impair the operations of free will. Augustine, on the other hand, maintained that grace is an internal operation of God upon those whom he designs to save, imparting not only the power, but also the will to do good. The fact that some are saved and others lost he attributed to the will of God. Hence his doctrines of unconditional predestination, of particular redemption, and of special and irresistible grace. Reprobation, he granted, was based upon foreseen guilt, but apparently unconscious of the inconsistency, he denied the applicability of the same principle to election. In 529 the system of Augustine was established as Church doctrine by the Council of Arausio (Orange), but the reaction against the strictly logical yet essentially immoral nature of his dogma has been perpetually manifested. SEE AUGUSTINE.

Four hundred years more passed away before a man could be found bold enough to complete Augustine's theory by declaring that, as God has sovereignly and immutably elected whomsoever he has pleased unto life, without any foresight of faith and obedience, so he has of his own good pleasure freely and unchangeably predestinated whomsoever he has pleased unto everlasting misery, without any reference to foreknown sin and guilt on their part. This anticipator of Calvin was a Saxon monk named Gottschalk (Godeschalcus). His novel view brought down upon him not merely ecclesiastical censure, but even persecution. His doctrine was condemned by a council which archbishop Rabanus Maurus had called at Mavence, A.D. 848 (Mansi, Concil. 14, 914), and Gottschalk, who was then travelling, was sent to his metropolitan, archbishop Hincmar of Rheims, who called another council at Quiercy in 849. Here he was defended by Ratramnus, the opponent of Paschasiuls Radbertus in the Eucharistic controversy, and also by Remigitus, afterwards archbishop of Lyons; but notwithstanding these powerful supporters, he was condemned a second time, and ordered to undergo the penalty of flogging, which the rule of St. Benedict imposed upon monks who troubled the Church. After this condemnation he was imprisoned in the monastery of Hautvillers, where he died, without having recanted his opinions, about the year 868. SEE GOTTSCHALK.

While the friends of Gottschalk were endeavoring to obtain his absolution and release, Hincmar put forward Johannes Scotus Erigena (q.v.) to answer his predestination theory, which Erigena did in 851, in his treatise  De Praedestinatione, in which he raised up a cloud of adversaries by the freedom with which he contradicted the established doctrines of the Church as to the nature of good and evil. Further controversy being thus aroused, Hincmar summoned a second council at Quiercy in 853, which confirmed the decision as to the real doctrine of the Church arrived at by the previous council (Mansi, Concil. 14, 995). A rival council was called by the opposite party from the provinces of Lyons, Vienne, and Arles, which met at Valence in 855. But instead of fully confirming the opinion of Gottschalk, this council considerably modified it by declaring that although sin is foreknown by God, it is not so predestined as to make it inevitably necessary that it should be committed (ibid. 15, 1). Hincmar now wrote two works on the subject, one of which is not extant; the other is entitled De Praedestinatione Dei et Libero Arbitrio adversus Gottschalcum et caeteros Praedestinatianos. Having thus explained his views at length, they were substantially accepted, in the form of six doctrinal canons, by the Synod of Langres and by that of Toul (A.D. 859), held at Savonieres a few days afterwards (Mansi, Concil. 15, 525-27), and thus the controversy terminated. See Manguin, Collect. auctor. de Proedest. et Gratia (1650); Ussher, Gotteschalci et Praedest. Controv. Hist.; Cellot, Hist. Gotteschalci Praedest. (1655).

No authoritative or influential teacher appeared to support Gottschalk's views for seven hundred years. The most conspicuous of those who did so was Thomas Bradwardine (A.D. 1290-1349), warden of Merton College, and afterwards archbishop of Canterbury. His work on the subject is entitled De Cautsa Dei contra Pelagium et de Virtute cautsaruam ad suos Mertonenses and in this he gave free will so low a place that he may be almost called a necessitarian. Thomas Aquinas, who flourished during the 13th century, wrote largely upon the nature of grace and predestination. His opinions upon these subjects were nearly the same with those of Augustine: and so much, indeed, was he conceived to resemble in genius and understanding that distinguished prelate, that it was asserted the soul of Augustine had been sent into the body of Aquinas. He taught that God from all eternity, and without any regard to their works, predestinated a certain number to life and happiness; but he found great delight in endeavoring to reconcile this position with the freedom of the human will. His celebrated antagonist, John Duns Scotus, an inhabitant of Britain, surnamed, from the acuteness and bent of his mind, the Subtile Doctor, also directed his attention in the following century to the same thorny  speculations, but he took a different view of them from Aquinas; and we find in the works of these two brilliant lights of the schoolmen all that the most learned in the dark ages thought upon this question.

In the midst of the ferment of the Reformation, the subject of predestination was revived by a controversy between Erasmus and Luther, the former writing an able Diatribe de Libero Arbitrio in 1524, and Luther following it up with his halting treatise De Servo Arbitrio, in which he went so near to the predestinarians as to deny that any free will can exist in man before he has received the gift of faith. But at this stage stepped forth John Calvin (q.v.) as the champion of predestinarianism. He found the Reformed churches in a perfectly chaotic state as respects doctrines. They possessed no coherent creed or system. They were held together by agreement in mere negations. They needed nothing so much as a positive system. Calvin, a stripling of twenty-five, gave them one. It answered all the essential conditions. It was anti-popish, anti-Lutheran, anti-Socinian. In the pressing exigency it was seized upon, and Calvin became the dictator of all the Reformed churches. Scotland sent her young men to him to be educated, so also did Hollanid, the Puritans of England, and the Protestants of France. Among the Romanists, the Molinists (q.v.), and Jansenists (q.v.), in their controversy on the subject of free will, carried on with great acrimony, the opinions of Gottschalk were discussed anew, but without lessening the majority of the Arminianists (see Sismondi, list. Praedest. in Zacharius's Thesaur. Theol. 2, 199).

In the Church of England the later Low-Church party have tempered down the opinions of their Puritan predecessors, and are not often disposed to go beyond the doctrine of “predestination to life” as stated in the seventeenth of the Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion, which carefully excludes the double predestination of Gottschalk and the predestinarians. This article of the Church of England is often adduced by Calvinists as favorable to their peculiar views of absolute predestination; but such a representation of it is rendered plausible only by adding to its various clauses qualifying expressions to suit that purpose. In our articles, SEE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, SEE CONFESSIONS, and SEE CALVINISM, have been exhibited the just and liberal views of Cranmer and the principal English reformers on this subject, the sources from which they drew the Articles of Religion and the public formularies of devotion, and some of the futile attempts of the high predestinarians in the Church to inoculate the public creed with their dogmas. Cartwright and his followers, in their second  “Admonition to Parliament” in 1572, complained that the Articles speak dangerously of “falling from grace;” and in 1587 they preferred a similar complaint. The labors of the Westminster Assembly at a subsequent period, and their abortive result, in relation to this subject, are well known. Long before Arminius had turned his thoughts to the consideration of general redemption, a great number of the English clergy had publicly taught and defended the same doctrine.

It was about 1571 that Dr. Peter Baroe, “a zealous anti-Calvinian,” was made Margaret professor of divinity inl the University of Cambridge, and he went on teaching in his lectures, preaching in his sermons, determining in the schools, and printing in several books diverse points contrary to Calvinism. And this he did for several years, without any manner of disturbance or interruption. The heads of the university, in a letter to lord Burleigh, dated March 8, 1595, say he had done it for fourteen or fifteen years preceding, and they might have said twenty; for he printed some of his lectures in 1574, and the prosecution he was at last under, which will be considered hereafter, was not till 1595. In 1584 Mr. Harsnet, afterwards archbishop of York, preached against absolute reprobation at St. Paul's Cross, the greatest audience then in the kingdom; as did the judicious Mr. Hooker at the Temple in the year following. In the year 1594 Mr. Barret preached at St. Mary's in Cambridge against Calvinism, with very smart reflections upon Calvin himself, Beza, Zanchi, and several others of the most noted writers in that scheme. In the same year Dr. Baroe preached at the same place to the same purpose. By this time Calvinism had gained considerable ground, being much promoted by the learned Whitaker and Mr. Perkins; and several of the heads of the university being in that scheme, they complained of the two sermons above mentioned to lord Burleigh their chancellor. Their determination was to bring Barret to a retraction. He modified his statements, but it may reasonably be doubted whether he ever submitted according to the form they drew up. When the matter was laid before archbishop Whitgift, he was offended at their proceedings, and wrote to lord Burleigh that some of the points which the heads had enjoined Barret to retract were such as the most learned Protestants then living varied in judgment upon, and that the most ancient and best divines in the land were in the chiefest points in opinion against the heads and their resolutions.

Another letter he sent to the heads themselves, telling them that they had enjoined Barret to affirm that which was contrary to the doctrine held and expressed by many sound and learned divines in the Church of England, and in other churches likewise men of best account; and that which for his  own part he thought to be false and contrary to the Scriptures; for the Scriptures are plain that God by his absolute will did not hate and reject any man. There might be impiety in believing the one, there could be none in believing the other; neither was it contrary to any article of religion established by authority in this Church of England, but rather agreeable thereto. This testimony of the archbishop is very remarkable; and though he afterwards countenanced the Lambeth Articles, that is of little or no weight in the case. The question is not about any man's private opinion, but about the doctrine of the Church; and supposing the archbishop to be a Calvinist, as he seems to have been at least in some points, this only adds the greater weight to his testimony, that the English Church has nowhere declared in favor of that scheme. The archbishop descended to the particulars charged against Barret, asking the heads what article of the Church was contradicted by this or that notion of his; and Whitaker in his reply does not appeal to one of the articles as against Barret, but forms his plea upon the doctrines which then generally obtained in pulpits. His words are, “We are fully persuaded that Mr. Barret hath taught untruth, if not against the articles, yet against the religion of our Church, publicly received, and always held in her majesty's reign, and maintained in all sermons, disputations, and lectures.” But even this pretence of his, weak as it would have been though true, is utterly false, directly contrary, not only to what has been already shown to be the facts of the case, but also to what the archbishop affirmed, and that too, as must be supposed, upon his own knowledge. As to Dr. Baroe, he met with many friends who espoused his cause. Mr. Strype particularly mentions four — Mr. Overal, Dr. Clayton, Mr. Harsnet, Dr. Andrews — all of them great and learned men, men of renown, and famous in their generation. How many more there were nobody can tell. The heads in their letter to lord Burleigh do not pretend that the preaching against Calvinism gave a general offence, but that it offended many which implies that there were many others on the opposite side; and they expressly say there were divers in the anti-Calvinistic scheme, whom they represent as maintaining it with great boldness.

But what put a stop to this prosecution against Baroe was a reprimand from their chancellor, the lord Burleigh, who wrote to the heads that as good and as ancient were of another judgment, and that they might punish him, but it would be for well-doing.” But Dr. Whitaker, regius professor of divinity in Cambridge, could not endure the further prevalence of the doctrines of general redemption in that university; he therefore, in 1595, drew up nine affirmations, elucidatory of his views of predestination, and  obtained for them the sanction of several Calvinian heads of houses, with whom he repaired to archbishop Whitgift. Having heard their ex parte statement, his grace summoned bishops Flecher and Vaughan, and Dr. Tyndal, dean of Ely, to meet Dr. Whitaker and the Cambridge deputation at his palace in Lambeth, on Nov. 10, 1595; where, after much polishing and altering, they produced Whitaker's affirmation, called the “Lambeth Articles” (q.v.). Dr. Whitaker died a few days after his return from Lambeth with the nine articles to which he had procured the patronage of the primate. After his demise, two competitors appeared for the vacant king's professorship Dr. Wotton, of King's College, a professed Calvinist, and Dr. Overal of Trinity College, “almost as far,” says Heylin, “from the Calvinian doctrine in the main platform of predestination as Baroe, Harsnet, or Barret are conceived to be. But when it came to the vote of the university, the place was carried for Overal by the major part; which plainly shows that though the doctrines of Calvin were so hotly stickled here by most of the heads, yet the greater part of the learned body entertained them not.” “The Lambeth Articles,” it is well observed, “are no part of the doctrine of the Church of England, having never had any of the least sanction either from the parliament or the convocation. They were drawn up by Prof. Whitaker; and though they were afterwards approved by archbishop Whitgift, and six or eight of the inferior clergy, in a meeting they had at Lambeth, yet this meeting was only in a private manner, and without any authority from the queen; who was so far from approving of their proceedings that she not only ordered the articles to be suppressed, but was resolutely bent for some time to bring the archbishop and his associates under a praemunire, for presuming to make them without any warrant or legal authority.” Such, in brief, was the origin and such the fate of the Lambeth Articles, without the countenance of which the defenders of Calvinism in the Church of England could find no semblance of support for their manifold affirmations on predestination and its kindred topics. At the census of 1851 two congregations calling themselves “Predestinarians” were returned.

Through the Puritans the Calvinistic notions were spread all over New England, and by the Reformed Dutch and other Presbyterian bodies carried through most of the Middle and Western States of America. In some quarters they have been either outgrown, SEE OBERLIN THEOLOGY, or so modified by outside Arminian influences as to be scarcely discernible; still, in the creeds and standards of several large denominations of the  world the peculiar doctrines of Calvinism are unequivocally enunciated. From that celebrated synod known as the Westminster Assembly came forth the Calvinistic Confession and its catechisms, and its form of Church government. These wonderful documents have been preserved unchanged to the present time. The formulas of the Presbyterian Church of America at this time are essentially the same that were promulgated by the Westminster Assembly of Divines more than to hundred years ago. These forms of doctrine must be assented to, at least tacitly, by all the members of that Church. They must be distinctly professed by all its ministers and office-bearers. They are taught from the chairs of its theological schools, and they are elaborately systematized and ably defended in its noble “bodies of divinity” — of which the best and ablest, by Dr. Hodge, of Princeton, has recently been issued. That these teach the doctrines of predestination nobody denies; that to unsophisticated minds they exalt the divine sovereignty at the expense of his justice and his grace has seemed to be the case to Arminianists, who hold that, to make them agree with the language of Holy Scripture, entirely illegitimate methods of accommodation have had to be resorted to. SEE ARMINIANISM; SEE CALVINISM.

IV. Connection of Predestination with other Doctrines. — Much confusion and obscurity has arisen in the progress of the predestinarian controversy from failing to keep the real issue always distinctly in view. The point in controversy is not whether or not God had a plan when he entered upon creation. SEE FOREKNOWLEDGE; SEE PROVIDENCE.

Neither is it whether or not that plan embraced a positive preappointment of every individual event in the whole range of futurity. Nor yet is it whether or not an exercise of divine energy is inseparably connected with any or all of God's predeterminations so that they are “effectual” decrees. SEE CALLING; SEE GRACE.

The real question is: Has God by an immutable and eternal decree predestinated some of the human family unto eternal life, and all the others unto everlasting perdition, without any reference whatever to the use they may make of their moral agency? This the Calvinist affirms, usually basing his affirmation solely on what he regards as Scripture authority, and often admitting that the human mind cannot reconcile it with the character of God or the dictates of human reason. Among the deniers, some have repudiated the supposition of any “decrees” at all respecting individual salvation, maintaining only the general ones, “He that believeth shall be saved, he that believeth not,” etc.  Others allow al individual or personal election, but, like Watson, understand by it “an act of God done in time subsequent even to the administration of the means of salvation” (Inst. 2, 338). Others, as the older Arminians generally, suppose that specific individuals were eternally predestinated to life and death, but strictly according to their foreknown obedience or disobedience to the Gospel.

V. Literature. — The bibliography of this subject is blended with that of SEE ARMINIANISM, SEE ELECTION, SEE FREE WILL, SEE GRACE, SEE REMONSTRANTS, SEE REPROBATION, and will be found under these titles. In addition to the works there cited, the following may be referred to as treating specifically of predestination: respecting the views of the Reformers, consult the symbolic writings of Mohler and Buchmann; Staudenmayer, In Behalf of the Religious Peace of the Future (Freib. im Br. 1846, 1 Peter 1 vol.); id. Theol. Encycl. (Mientz, 1840, fol.), p. 622; Vatke, Die menschliche Freiheit in ihrem Verhältniss zur Sünde und zur göttlichen Gnade (Berl. 1841); Muller, Die christliche Lehre von der Sünde, 2, 241-301; Dühne, De praescientiae divine cum libertate humana concordia (Leips. 1830); Braun, De Sacra Scriptura prescientiamum docente, etc. (Mogunt. 1826); Anselm, De concordia praescieltiae et praedestinactionis maec non Dei cum lib. arbit. etc.; Augustine, De Pre destitnatione Sanctorum, and De Dono Perseverantiae; Wiggers, Augustinism and Peliagianism, and art. in Illgen's (Niedner's) Zeitsch. für hist. Theol. pt. 2, 1857; Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines, § 183 (Leips. 1857); the works of Calvin, Beza, Zanchi, Perkins, Gomar, Turretin; Arminius, Declaration of Sentiments, Friendly Discussion with Prof. Junius, and Review of Perkins; id. Scripta Synodalia Remonsstrantium; the works of Episcopius, Curcellmeus, Limborch; Plaifere (early Eng. Armin.), Apello Evangeliusm; id. Tracts on Predestination (Camb. 1809); Womack, Calvinistic Cabinet Unlocked (very rare); Examinations of Tilenus, printed in Nicholl's Calvinism and Arminianism Compared (Lond. 1824); Wesley, Predestination Calmly Considered; Fletcher, Checks; Mozley, Augustinian Doctrine of Predestination (ibid. 1857). A curiosity of the subject is Henry Bleby's Script. Predest. not Fatalism; Two Conversations on Rom 8:29-30, and Eph 1:5, designed to show that the Predestination of the Bible refers chiefly and primarily to the Restoration and Perfection of the Physical Nature of the Saints at the Last Day (ibid. 1853 16mo). The best exposition of Calvinistic predestination is of course by Dr. Hodges, the Nestor of American  theology of that type. See, therefore, his Systematic Theology, and compare Pope, Compendium of Christian Theology (ibid. 1875, 8vo); Raymond, Systematic Theology (Cincinnati. 1877, 2 vols. 8vo). See also Bibl. Sac. Oct. 1863; Oct. 1865, p. 584; North British Rev. Feb. 1863; Journal Sac. Lit. vol. 16, 18; Contemp. Rev. Aug. 1872, art. 7; Meth. Quarm. Rev. July, 1857, p. 352; Oct. 1867; July, 1873; Studien it. Kritiken, 1838-47; Theol. Medium, July, 1873, art. 4-; Brit. Quar. Rev. Dec. 1871, p. 202 sq.; Jahrb. für deutsche Theologie, 1860, 2, 313; Christian Remembrancer, Jan. 1856, p. 132; 1861, p. 188.

## Predet, Pierre, D.D[[@Headword:Predet, Pierre, D.D]]

             a Roman Catholic priest, was born at Sehasat, France, about 1801; educated at Clermont; became a member of the Society of St. Sulpice, and came to Baltimore in 1831, where, till his death, January 1, 1856, he was attached to St. Mary's Seminary. He is said to have been a diligent and thor ough student, and a voluminous writer. See Hough, Amer. Biog. Notes, page 149. (J.C.S.)

## Predicable[[@Headword:Predicable]]

             is a term of scholastic logic, and connected with the scheme of classification. There were five designations employed in classifying objects on a systematic plan: genus, species, difference (differentia), property (proprium), and accident (accidens). The first two-genus and species-name the higher and lower classes of the things classified; a genus comprehends several species. The other three designations — difference, property, accident — express the attributes that the classification turns upon. The difference is what distinguishes one species from the other species of the same genus; as, for example, the peculiarities wherein the cat differs from the tiger, lion, and other species of the genus felis. The property expresses a distinction that is not ultimate, but a consequence of some other peculiarity. Thus “the use of tools” is a property of man, and not a difference, for it flows from other assignable attributes of his bodily and mental organization, or from the specific differences that characterize him. The accident is something not bound up with the nature of the species, but chancing to be present in it. For instance, the high value of gold is an accident; gold would still be gold though it were plenty and cheap. It was by an arbitrary and confusing employment of the notion of predication that these various items of the first attempt at a process of systematic classification were called predicables, or attributes that might be “predicated,” that is, affirmed, of things. All that is needful to affirm is that a certain thing belongs to a given species or genus; and that to belong to the species is to possess the specific differences; and to belong to the genus is to possess the generic differences. We may also, if we please, affirm (or predicate) that the thing does belong to the species, or does possess the specific difference; but this power of affirming has no need to be formally proclaimed, or made the basis of the whole scheme. The allied term “‘predicament” is another case where an abusive prominence is given to the  idea of predication. The predicaments, or categories, were the most comprehensive classes of all existing things — under such heads as substance, attribute, quantity, quality, etc.; and it could be predicated of anything falling under any one head that it does so fall under. Thus, “virtue” is an attribute: and therefore we might say that “attribute” can be predicated of “virtue.” But the notion of predicating does not indicate the main fact of the process in this case, any more than “predicable” in the foregoing. Classification, and not predication, is the ruling idea in each.

## Preemonstrants[[@Headword:Preemonstrants]]

             SEE PREMONSTRATENSIANS.

## Prefaces[[@Headword:Prefaces]]

             (Immolatio; the Gallican Contestatio missae; the priest's witness to the vere dignum of the people; the Mozarabic and Gallican illatio or inlatio), certain short occasional forms in the communion-service of the Church of England, which are introduced in particular festivals, more especially Christmas, Easter, Ascension, and seven days after; also Whit-Sunday and six days after, together with Trinity-Sunday. They are introduced by the priest immediately before the anthem beginning, “Therefore with angels, archangels,” etc. “This anthem is a song of praise, or an act of profound adoration,” says dean Comber, “equally proper at all times; but the Church calls upon us more especially to use it on her chief festivals, in remembrance of those events which are then celebrated. Thus, on Christmas-day, the priest, having said ‘It is very meet, right, and our bounden duty that we should at all times, and in all places, give thanks unto thee, O Lord [Holy Father] Almighty, everlasting God,' adds the proper preface which assigns the reason for peculiar thankfulness on that particular day, viz.: ‘Because thou didst give Jesus Christ, thine only Son, to be born as at this time for us; who, by the operation of the Holy Ghost, was made very man, of the Virgin Mary his mother, and that without spot of sin, to make us clean from all sin; therefore, with angels,' etc.

“The antiquity of such prefaces may be estimated from the fact that they are mentioned and enjoined by the 103d canon of the African code, which code was formed of the decisions of many councils prior to the date of 418. The decay of devotion let fall the apostolical and primitive use of daily and weekly communions, and the people in the later ages did not receive but at the greater festivals; upon which custom there were added to the general preface mentioned before some special prefaces relating to the peculiar mercy of that feast on which they did communicate, the Church thinking it fit that, since every festival was instituted to remember some great mercy, therefore they who received on such a day, besides the general praises offered for all God's mercies, should at the Lord's table make a special memorial of the mercy proper to that festival; and this seemed so rational to our reformers that they have retained those proper prefaces which relate to Christmas, Easter, Ascension-day, Whit-Sunday,  and Trinity-Sunday, so as to praise God for the mercies of Christ's birth, resurrection, and ascension, for the sending of the Holy Ghost, and for the true faith of the holy Trinity. On the greater festivals there are proper prefaces appointed, which are also to be repeated, in case there be a communion, for seven days after the festivals themselves (excepting that for Whit-Sunday, which is to be repeated only six clays after, because Trinity-Sunday, which is the seventh, hath a preface peculiar to itself); to the end that the mercies may be the better remembered by often repetition, and also that all the people (who in most places cannot communicate all in one day) may have other opportunities, within those eight days, to join in praising God for such great blessings.” “The reason,” says bishop Sparrow, “of the Church's lengthening out these high feasts for several days is plain; the subject-matter of them is of so high a nature, and so nearly concerns our salvation, that one day would be too little to meditate upon them, and praise (God for them as we ought. A bodily deliverance may justly require one day of thanksgiving and joy; but the deliverance of the soul by the blessings commemorated on those times deserves a much longer time of praise and acknowledgment. Since, therefore, it would be injurious to Christians to have their joy and thankfulness for such mercies confined to one day, the Church, upon the times when these unspeakable blessings were wrought for us, invites us, by her most seasonable commands and counsels, to fill our hearts with joy and thankfulness, and let them overflow eight days together.” “The reason of their being fixed to eight days,” says Wheatley (Book of Common Prayer), “is taken from the practice of the Jews, who by God's appointment observed their greater festivals, some of them for seven, and one— namely, the Feast of Tabernacles— for eight days. And therefore the primitive Church, thinking that the observation of Christian festivals (of which the Jewish feasts were only types and shadows) ought not to come short of them, lengthened out their higher feasts to eight days.”

These prefaces are very ancient, though there were some of them as they stood in the Latin service of later date. For as there are ten in that service, whereof the last, concerning the Virgin Mary, was added by pope Urban (1095), so it follows that the rest must be of a more remote antiquity. The Church of Rome holds that they were composed by Gelasius in memory of Christ's singing a hymn with his disciples after the Last Supper, the Jews at their Paschal supper singing seven Psalms (Psalms 113-119). Pope Sixtus added to them the Ter Sanctus. Pope Victor calls them capitula. From the  6th to the 11th century the Western Church had prefaces for every festival, but after that date they were reduced to nine, and are enumerated by pope Pelagius and Alexander as Easter, the Ascension. Pentecost, Christmas, the Apparition of Christ (Epiphany), the Apostles, Holy Trinity, Cross, and Quadragesima. The eucharist of Paul (1Co 14:16) and St. Justin is probably the germ of the Western preface and the long thanksgiving prayer corresponding to it in the Greek Church. Tile Greeks, by the way, use only one preface. The Church of England has retained five, and those upon the principal festivals of the year, which relate only to the Persons of the Trinity, and not to any saint. “In this preface a distinction is made between ceremonies which were introduced with a good design, and in process of time abused, and those which had a corrupt origin, and were at the beginning vain and insignificant. The last kind the Reformers entirely rejected, but the first were still used for decency and edification. Some well-disposed Christians were so attached to ancient forms that they would, on no account suffer the least deviation from them; others were fond of innovation in everything. Between these extremes a middle way had been carefully observed by the Reformers. Many ceremonies had been so grossly abused by superstition and avarice that it was necessary to remove them altogether; but since it was fit to use some ceremonies for the sake of decency and order, it seemed better to retain those that were old than to invent new. Still, it must be remembered that those which were kept rested not on the same foundation as the law of God, and might be altered for reasonable causes; and the English Reformers, in keeping them, neither condemned those nations which thought them inexpedient, nor prescribed them to any other nation than their own” (Carwithen, Hist. of the Church of England). See, besides the authorities already referred to, Walcott, Sacred Archeology, s.v.; Hook, Church Dictionary, S. V.

## Prehistoric Man[[@Headword:Prehistoric Man]]

             SEE PREADAMITE.

## Preissler, Johann Justinus[[@Headword:Preissler, Johann Justinus]]

             a German painter and engraver of repute, was born at Nuremberg Dec. 4, 1698. His father, Johann Daniel, was his early master; then he spent eight years in Italy, and after his return to Germany succeeded his father in the direction of the Academy of the Fine Arts at Nuremberg (1742). Among his works, several of which were engraved, we mention the Burial of the  Lord, the Ark of the Covenant, the Transfiguration, Christ crowned with Thorns, Christ before Herod, the Cure of the Lamue. He engraved the paintings of Rubens in the church of the Jesuits at Antwerp, twenty drawings (Nuremberg, 1734, fol.); a collection of fifty of the most beautiful statues of Rome, after the drawings of Bouchardon (ibid. 1732, fol.); and Ornanmenti d' Architetura. He died at Nuremberg Feb. 17, 1771. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.

## Preissler, Johann Martin[[@Headword:Preissler, Johann Martin]]

             an engraver, brother of the preceding, was born at Nuremberg March 14, 1715. After learning, under the direction of his father and his brothers, the arts of drawing and engraving, he went to Paris in 1739, where he made several engravings for the Galerie de Versailles. In 1744 he was called as professor of the art of engraving to Copenhagen, was subsequently honored with the title of engraver to the court, and received other honorable distinctions. Among his numerous and much esteemed engravings we mention, of sacred subjects and ecclesiastical historic interest, the Cardinal of Bouillon; J. Andrea Cranmer; Bath. Munter; Struensee; M. Luther; Gellert; Juel's Klopstock; Raffaelle's Madonna of the Chair, a work in which we find in the highest degree all the excellent qualities of Preissler; Paul Veronese's Carrying of the Cross; Rosa's Jonah preaching to the Ninevites; Guido's Ninus and Seniramis; Rubens's Mary, Mother of Grace, and St. Cecilia; the Adoration of the Shepherds, after Vanloo; the Judgment of Solomon and the Happy Meeting, after his own sketches; the Inoculation of the Countess of Bernstorf; Moses, after Michael Angelo. Preissler made several engravings for the Museum of Florence and for the antique marbles of Dresden. He died at Copenhagen Nov. 17, 1794. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v. See Will, Nürnbergisches Lexikon, and Supplement of Nopitsch. — Fuessli, Allgeum. Kuinstlet lexikon; Nagler, Neues Allyem. Kunstle lexikon.

## Preiswerk, Samuel, Dr[[@Headword:Preiswerk, Samuel, Dr]]

             a Swiss theologian, was born Sept. 19, 1799, at Rümlingen, Switzerland. After having completed his theological studies at Basle, he was appointed in 1824 a minister at the Orphan-house, and in 1828 he succeeded R. Stier (q.v.) as professor at the Mission-house. He had hardly entered upon a new field of ministerial labors in 1830 at Muttellz, when the revolution broke out, which compelled him to leave the place, and two years afterwards he  was appointed professor of Old-Testament exegesis and Oriental languages at the École de Theologie of the Evangelical Society at Geneva. In 1837 he returned to Basle, was appointed deacon in 1840, and in 1845 pastor of St. Leonard, occupying at the same time the chair for Old-Testament exegesis at the university. From 1859 he occupied the position as antistes, or superintendent, of the Church at Basle, till he was called to his rest in 1871. Preiswerk was an excellent preacher and poet, and his fine missionary hymn, “Dies ist der Gemeindcle Starke,” has been translated into English by Mrs. Winkworth (Lyrac Germs. 2, 88— “Hark! the Church proclaims her honor”). He also published, Das alte cand neue Morgenland für Freunde der heiligen Schrift (Basle, 1834-40): — Die Nestorianer oder die 10 Stäeme Israels (ibid. 1843); this is a translation of The Nestorians, or the Lost Tribes, by A. Grant (q.v.): — Grammaire Hebraique, precedee d'un Precis historique sur la Langue Hebraique (3ad ed. 1871). See Fürst, Bibliotheca Judaica, 3, 120; Zuchold, Bibliotheca Theologicai, 3, 1012; Steinschneider, Bibliogr. Handbuch, p. 112; Peck, Samuel Preiswerk, in the “Evangel. Messeiner” (Cleveland, Ohio, 187 7); Koch, Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes, 7:99 sq.; Knapp, Evangelischer Liederschatz, s.v. (B. P.)

## Prejudice[[@Headword:Prejudice]]

             (praejudico, to judge before inquiry) is a prejudging, that is, forming or adopting an opinion concerning anything before the grounds of it have been fairly or fully considered. The opinion may be true or false; but in so far as the grounds of it have not been examined, it is erroneous or without proper evidence. “In most cases prejudices are opinions which, on some account, men are pleased with, independently of any conviction of their truth; and which, therefore, they are afraid to examine, lest they should find them to be false. Prejudices then, are unreasonable judgments, formed or held under the influence of some other motive than the love of truth. They may therefore be classed according to the nature of the motives from which they result. These motives are either, 1, pleasurable, innocent, and social; or, 2, they are malignant (Taylor, Elements of Thought). Dr. Reid (Intell. Powers, essay 6, ch. 8) has treated of prejudices, or the causes of error, according to the classification given of them by lord Bacon, under the name of idols. Locke (Essay on the Human Understanding, bk. 4, ch. 20) has treated of the causes of error. Some excellent observations on the prejudices peculiar to men of study may be seen in Malebranche (Search after Truth). See Christian Examiner and Gen. Revelation 4 (1830), 280.

## Prelacy[[@Headword:Prelacy]]

             The organization of the Christian Church was in the beginning eminently simple, free, and popular. The government of the Church was at first a pure democracy, allowing to all its constituents the most enlarged freedom of voluntary religious association. Prelacy takes its name and character from the assumed prerogatives of the bishop as a distinct order or rank— praelati, preferred, promoted over others. It began in the 2nd century with the distinction between presbyter and bishop, which were originally identical, merely different names for the same office. In the New Test. the appellations as titles of bishops and presbyters are the same. They are required to possess the same qualifications and to perform the same official duties; neither was there in the apostolical churches any ordinary and permanent class of officers superior to the presbyters.

I. In the Early Church. — Various circumstances conspired to give certain of the clergy influence and distinction over others. The pastors of churches founded by the apostles took precedence of presbyters of later and subordinate churches. The churches of Jerusalem, Antioch, Ephesus, Corinth, etc., became central points of influence which gave importance to their incumbents. They were the principal agents in appointing new stations for the extension of the Christian Church and in the organization of new churches dependent on the parent institution. With the increase of these chapels a parochial system of churches arose, more or less relying on the central Church for support and spiritual instructors-all of which gave to the prelate of the metropolis importance and pre-eminence over his subordinate presbyters.

In their persecutions the feebler churches relied for relief and protection on the parent Church. In their ecclesiastical assemblies the bishop of the metropolitan Church was of course the leading spirit, the moderator of the assembly, giving direction to their deliberations and the results of the council. He was still only primus inter paeres, foremost among his equals in rank in the ministry. Prelacy had not yet taken form and character by asserting the rights and prerogatives of the bishop, but the concessions granted began in time to be claimed as an official right. Baptism was one of the rights of the bishop in the 2nd century (“Dandi baptismum quidem habet summus sacerdos qui est episcopus,” Tertullian, De Cap § 7). The imposition of hands by the bishop in baptism and ordination soon followed as a prescriptive right of the bishop. This right was soon accorded to the  presbyters and deacons by the authority of the bishop— non tamen sine episcopi auctoritate. In the unity of the Church and its officers Cyprian sought safety and defense both from the schismatic efforts of Felicissimus and Novatian and the persecution of Decius, A.D. 251. “No safety but in the Church” — extra ecclesiam nulla salus. As is the branch to the tree, the stream to the fountain, and the members to the body, so is the constituency to the Church. Moreover, the bishop is the embodiment of the Church, and there can be no Church without a bishop (Cyprian, De Unit. Ecclesiastes Ephesians 4, 5). The bishop is appointed of God and invested with inviolable authority to rule over the Church, Such are the divine rights which were assumed by Cyprian as prelate of the Church, invested with divine authority and power over the Church of Christ. The bishop now claimed affinity with the Jewish priesthood, a daysman of the laity, the medium of grace from God to man, and the recipient of spiritual illumination and divine guidance. The synodical letter of the Council of Carthage contains similar pretensions (“Placuit nobis, Sancto Spirito suggerente, et Domino per visiones multas et manifestas admouente”). A sacerdotal caste was formed by Cyprian about A.D. 250, who claimed the prerogative of a distinct order of the priesthood, separate from and superior to the presbyters. Praelati, bishops, diocesan bishops were the titles designating the assumed prerogatives.

Provincial synods began now to be held, in which the presbyters were for a time admitted, but the predominant influence of the bishops directed the deliberations and enacted the laws of the synod. Thus they became the law- makers of the Church by the exercise of their prelatical authority under the guidance of the Divine Spirit— Spiritu Divino suggerente. Gradually they constituted themselves at once the enactors and the executors of the ordinances of the Church.

The rule of the priesthood was made more stringent over private members of the Church. In their travels they were required to have letters of recommendation literae formnatae, clericae, canonicae— from the bishop of the diocese. A long course of catechetical instruction and probation was required for admission to the Church. Rigorous and relentless was the discipline of offending constituents. Subordinate orders of the clergy were created — subdeacons, acolytes, readers, exorcists, doorkeepers, etc. — all having the effect to exalt the rank of the prelate as prominent above all. But the prelatical aspirations of bishops were restricted by the controlling influence which the laity still retained over the elections of the Church. This  was gradually restricted by a crafty policy of having the candidates nominated by the subordinate clergy and their election confirmed by the bishop.

But a masterstroke of policy was requisite to obtain control of the revenues of the Church. It was accomplished by successive expedients through a period of considerable time. The apostolic injunction was carefully urged on the Church to lay aside for charitable purposes “on the first day of the week or of the month a store as God had prospered them” (1Co 16:2). At their love feasts and sacramental seasons contributions were required as voluntary offerings-indeed, as late as Tertullian (“Nam nemo compellitur, sed sponte confert,” Apol. § 39). Tithes began to be urged upon the members of the Church as early as the 3rd century, but to the honor of the Church the offerings and contributions continued to be voluntary on the part of its members. Whatever taxes were imposed in later times for the maintenance of public worship and of the clergy were effected by the relations of the Church to the State under the Christian emperors. On the rules of the Church requiring the gratuitous performance of religious offices the following references may be consulted: Concil. Illiber. c. 48; Gelasius, Epist. 1, al. 9, c. 5; — Gregorius Naz. Orat. 40; Gratian, Decr. c. 1, qu. 1, c. 8; Concil. Trullan. 2, c. 23; Jerome, Quaest. Hebr. in Genesis 23.

The Council of Braga, in Portugal, A.D. 563, ordered a tripartite division of the property of the Church-one for the bishop, one for the other clergy, and the third for the lighting and repairs of the church. According to another authority four divisions were made, of which one portion was for the poor.

II. Under the Emperors. — When Christianity was the religion of the State, various other revenues accrued to the Church and the bishop. Upon the abolition of the heathen rites, under Theodosius the Great and his snls, the property of the heathen temples and priests which fell to the State was delivered over to the Christian clergy, or at least was appropriated to ecclesiastical uses (Cod. Theodos. lib. 16, tit. 10, leg. 19-21; comp. Sozom. Hist. Eccl. lib. 5, c. 7, 16). On the same principle the ecclesiastical property of heretics was confiscated and made over to the Catholic Church, as, for instance, in the case of the Novatians (Cod. Theodos. lib. 16, tit. 5, leg. 52; Socrat. Hist. Eccl. lib. 7:c. 7). It was also enacted that the property of such of the clergy as died without heirs, and of those who had relinquished their  duties without sufficient cause, should lapse to the Church funds (Cod. Theodos. lib. 5, Titus 3, leg. 50; Cod. Justin. lib. 10:Titus 3, leg. 20, 53; Cod. Nov. 5, c. 4; 123, c. 42). The Church was also made the heir of all martyrs and confessors who died without leaving any near relatives (Euseb. Vit. Const. lib. 2, c. 36). The clergy enjoyed many privileges by which on the one hand they were in a measure shielded from the operations of the law, and on the other were entrusted with civil and judicial authority over the laity. Three particulars are stated by Planck:

1. In certain civil cases they exercised a direct jurisdiction over the laity.

2. The State submitted entirely to them the adjudication of all offences of the laity of a religious nature.

3. Certain other cases, styled ecclesiastical, causae ecclesiasticae, were tried before them exclusively. The practical influence of these arrangements and their effects upon the clergy and the laity are detailed by the same author, to whom we must refer the reader (Gesell. — Verfass. 1, 308 sq.). The laity were ultimately separated from the control of the revenues which they contributed for the maintenance of the government of the Church and for charitable purposes. All measures of this nature, instead of originating with the people, as in all popular governments, began and ended with the priesthood (Conc. Gan. Song of Solomon 7, 8; Bracar. 11:c. 7; the canons alluded to clearly indicate the unjust and oppressive operations of this system). The wealth of the laity was now made to flow in streams into the Church. New expedients were devised to draw money from them. (It was a law of the Church in the 4th century that the laity should every Sabbath partake of the sacrament, the effect of which law was to augment the revenues of the Church, each communicant being required to bring his offering to the altar. Afterwards, when this custom was discontinued, the offering was still claimed [Cong. Agath. A.D. 585, c. 4]). Constantine himself contributed large sums to enrich the coffers of the Church, which he also authorized, A.D. 321, to inherit property by will (Cod. Theodos. 4, 16, Titus 2, leg. 4; Euseb. lib. 10:c. 6; Sozomen, lib. 1, c. 8; lib. 5, c. 5). This permission opened new sources of wealth to the bishops, while it presented equal incentives to their cupidity. With what address they employed their newly acquired rights is apparent from the fact stated by Planck, that “in the space of ten years every man at his decease left a legacy to the Church, and within fifty years the clergy in the several provinces, under the color of the Church, held in their possessions one-tenth part of the entire property of  the province. By the end of the 4th century the emperors themselves were obliged to interpose to check the accumulation of these immense revenues- a measure which Jerome said “he could not regret, but he could only regret that his brethren had made it necessary” (Planck, Gesell. — Verfass. 1, 281; comp. Pertsch, Kirchengesch. c. 9, § 11).

Prelacy also gained great power from the Church by controlling the elections f the clergy. The sovereign rights of the people in their free elective franchise began at an early period to be invaded. The final result of these changes was a total disfranchisement of the laity and the substitution of an ecclesiastical despotism in the place of the elective government of the primitive Church. Of these changes one of the most effective was the attempt, by means of correspondence and ecclesiastical synods, to consolidate the churches into one Church universal, to impose upon them a uniform code of laws, and establish an ecclesiastical polity administered by the clergy. The idea of a holy Catholic Church and of an ecclesiastical hierarchy for the government of the same was wholly a conception of the priesthood. Whatever may have been the motives with which this doctrine of the unity of the Church was first promulgated, it prepared the way for the overthrow of the popular government of the Church.

Above all, the doctrine of the divine right of the priesthood aimed a fatal blow at the liberties of the people. The clergy were no longer the servants of the people, chosen by them to the work of the ministry but an independent and privileged order, like the Levitical priesthood, and, like them, by divine right invested with peculiar prerogatives. This independence they began by degrees to assert and to exercise. The bishop began in the 3rd century to appoint at pleasure his own deacons and other inferior orders of the clergy. In other appointments, also, he endeavored to disturb the freedom of the elections and to direct them agreeably to his own will (Pertsch, Kirchengesch. des drit. Jahrhund. p. 439-454; Planck, Gesell. — Verfass. 1, 183). Against these encroachments of ecclesiastical ambition and power tie people continued to oppose a firm but ineffectual resistance. They asserted, and in a measure maintained, their primitive right of choosing their own spiritual teachers (Gieseler, 1, 272; for a more full and detailed account of these changes of ecclesiastical policy and of the means by which they were introduced, the reader is referred to the volume of J. G. Planck, Gesch. der christ. — Kirchl. Gesellschaftsverfassung, 1, 149-212, 433 sq.). There are on record instances in the 4th, and even in the 5th century, where the appointment of a bishop was effectually resisted by  the refusal of the people to ratify the nomination of the candidate to a vacant see (Gregorius Naz. Orat. 10; comp. Orat. 19, p. 308; 21, p. 377; Bingham, bk. 4, ch. 1, § 3; Planck, 1, 440, n. 10). The rule had been established by decree of councils, and often repeated, requiring the presence and unanimous concurrence of all the provincial bishops in the election and ordination of one to the office of bishop. This afforded them a convenient means of defeating any popular election by an affected disagreement among themselves. The same canonical authority had made the concurrence of the metropolitan necessary to the validity of any appointment. His veto was accordingly another efficient expedient by which to baffle the suffrages of the people and to constrain them into a reluctant acquiescence in the will of the clergy (Conc. Nic. c. 4: Cone. Antioch. c. 16; Carthag. A.D. 390, c. 12; Planck, 1, 433-452).

Elections to ecclesiastical offices were also disturbed by the interference of secular influence from without, in consequence of that disastrous union of Church and State which was formed in the 4th century under Constantine the Great. During this century

(1) the emperors convened and presided in general councils;

(2) confirmed their decrees;

(3) enacted laws relative to ecclesiastical matters by their own authority;

(4) pronounced decisions concerning heresies and controversies;

(5) appointed bishops;

(6) inflicted punishment on ecclesiastical persons.

Agitated and harassed by the conflict of these discordant elements, the popular assemblies for the election of men to fill the highest offices of the holy ministry became scenes of tumult and disorder that would disgrace a modern political canvass.

To correct these disorders various but ineffectual expedients were adopted at different times and places. The Council of Laodicea (A.D. 361, c. 13) denied to the multitude—τοῖς ὄχλοις, the rabble — any vote in the choice of persons for the sacred office. Justinian in the 6th century sought. with no better success, to remedy the evils in question by limiting the elective franchise to a mixed aristocracy composed of the clergy and the chief men of the city. These were jointly to nominate three candidates, declaring under oath that in making the selection they had been influenced by no sinister motive. From these three the ordaining person was to ordain  the one whom he judged best qualified (Justin. Novell. 123, c. 1; 137, c. 2; Cod. lib. 1. Titus 3; De Episcop. leg. 42). The Council of Arles (A.D. 452, c. 54) in like manner ordered the bishops to nominate three candidates, from whom the clergy and the people should make the election; and that of Barcelona (A.D. 599, c. 3) ordered the clergy and people to make the nomination, and the metropolitan and bishops were to determine the election by lot. But even these ineffectual efforts to restore measurably the right of the people show to what extent it was already lost.

The doctrine that to the clergy was promised a divine guidance from the Spirit of God had its influence also in completing the subjugation of the people. Resistance to such an authority under the infallible guidance of God's Spirit was rebellion against High Heaven, which the laity had not the impiety to maintain. The government and discipline of the Church by the priesthood was but the natural result of their control of the elective franchise. It established and commemorated the independence, the supremacy of prelacy. The bishops, no longer the ministers and representatives of the Church, are the priests of God to dictate the laws and administer the discipline of the Church (Mosheim, De Rebus Christ. saec. 2, § 23). By the middle of the 4th century prelacy, by various expedients, acquired the control of the whole penal jurisdiction of the laity, opening and closing at pleasure the doors of the Church, inflicting sentence of excommunication, prescribing penances, absolving penitents, and restoring them to the Church by arbitrary authority (Planck, Gesell. — Verfass. 2, 509).

III. Under the Papacy. — Such are the various causes — influential in different degrees, perhaps, in the several organizations — in supplanting the popular government of the primitive Church and substituting in its place prelacy, which, under different forms of centralization, finally culminated in the pope of Rome. This culmination, and the craft by which it was accomplished, require a fuller detail than our limits will allow. We can only affirm that this important period in history; when the foundation was laid for rendering the hierarchy independent both of clerical and secular power, has not been noticed by historians so particularly as its importance requires. They seem not to have noted the fact that Hildebrand, who A.D. 1073 became Gregory VII, concerted measures for the independence of the Church. “It was the deep design of Hildebrand, which he for a long time prosecuted with unwearied zeal, to bring the pope wholly within the pale of the Church, and to prevent the interference in his election of all secular  influence and arbitrary power. And that measure of the council which wrested from the emperor a right of long standing, and which has never been called in question, may deservedly be regarded as the masterpiece of popish intrigue, or rather of Hildebrand's cunning. The concession which disguised this crafty design of his was expressed as follows: That the emperor should continue to hold, as he ever had held, the right of confirming the election of the pope derived from him. The covert design of this clause was not perceived, but it expressed nothing less than that the emperor should ever receive and hold from the pope himself the right of confirming the appointment of the pope” (Voigt, Hildebrand [Weimar, 1815, 8vo], p. 54, cited by Augusti, 1, 209).

As might have been expected, the lofty claim of the pope was resisted; but he had the address to defend his usurped authority against all opposition, and proudly proclaimed himself “the successor of St. Peter, set up by God to govern, not only the Church, but the whole world.” The gradations of ecclesiastical organization through which prelacy has passed are from congregational to parochial, parochial to diocesan, diocesan to metropolitan, metropolitan to patriarchal, patriarchal to papal-from the humble pastor of a little flock to the pope of Rome, the supreme and universal prelate of the Church of Christ on earth. See Coleman, Prelacy and Ritualism; National Repository, Feb. 1878 (Ex Cathedra). (L.C.)

## Prelate[[@Headword:Prelate]]

             (Lat. praelatus, i.e. pronoted) is an ecclesiastic who has direct authority over other ecclesiastics. The term is a general one, and includes not merely bishops of various degrees, but also in Roman Catholic countries the heads of religious houses or orders and other similar ecclesiastical dignitaries. These, for the most part, are privileged to wear the insignia of the episcopal rank. In the Roman court many of the officials, although not possessing episcopal or quasi-episcopal jurisdiction, have the insignia and the title of prelate. They are of two classes-the higher, called del mantelletto (“of the little mantle”), and the secondary, called del mantellone (“of the great mantle”), from the robe which they respectively bear. The same root underlies other ecclesiastical terms in which all the clergy are on an equality, and are governed by a representative body or by the local church; prelatic and prelatical. i.e. pertaining to a prelacy or a prelate, as prelatical authority. Prelates are confined to those churches which recognize in the bishop (q.v.) a distinct and superior order of clergy. SEE PRELACY.

## Premare, Joseph-Henri[[@Headword:Premare, Joseph-Henri]]

             a French Jesuit, was born about 1670 in Normandy. March 7, 1698, he embarked with several other Jesuits at La Rochelle to preach the Gospel in China. He arrived Oct. 6 at Suneian, and addressed, Feb. 17, 1699, a relation of his journey to pere La Chaise, with a descriptive notice of the countries he had visited. As soon as lie had mastered the Chinese language he made a careful study of the antiquities and literature of the country. Though he expressed some strange ideas, it cannot be denied that his erudition was considerable, and that he thoroughly knew the philosophical works of the Chinese. He died at Peking about 1735. He left, Recherches sur les Temps anterieurs a ceux dont parle le Chou-King et sur la Mythologie Chinoise, published by Deguignes in the translation of the Chou-King, by pere Gaubii, in the form of a preliminary discourse (Paris, 1770, 4to): — a number of other works, three of them in Chinese: — The Life of St. Joseph, the Lou-chou-chii, or true sense of the six classes of characters, and a small treatise on the attributes of God, inserted in the Notitia linguae sinicae, which is the best of all those composed hitherto by Europeans on this subject: — several other treatises in Latin and in French, preserved among the manuscripts of the National Library of Paris, where we find also the originals of several letters of pere Premare. Three letters of  this missionary were published in the Lettres edifiantes, and a fourth in the Annales encyclopediques of Klaproth. He translated also a drama, Tchao chi Kou-cul (the Orphan of the House of Chao) which furnished to Voltaire some ideas for his Orphelin de la Chine. See Lettres edifiantes, vols. 16 and 21; Catalogue de Fourmont l'aine. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.

## Premice[[@Headword:Premice]]

             (primitiae or prima missae) is the first mass celebrated by the newly ordained priest (neomysta), with the help of an assistant. The solemnity begins thus: the new priest sings on the steps of the altar “Veni Sancte Spiritus,” performs the corresponding ovation, and then distributes the holy water, if this is prescribed by the rubrics of the day. It is an open question among the rubricists if at a premice the mass of the day or a votival mass is to be read. The probable solution of the difficulty is that, on simple Sundays and ordinary “festis duplicibus,” a votival mass may be said, such a mass being permitted on such days pro re gravi et publica, to which a premice solemnity may be said to belong; but the mass of the day must be preserved on high feasts, and on such Sundays on which votive masses are never admissible. The solemnity ends with the sacerdotal benediction, given by the new priest to the people by the imposition of hands (Lohner, Instructio practica de SS. Missae saccrificio, pt. 4:tit. 5; and Vogt, Instructio practica de Missis votivis, p. 197 sq.). The festivities connected with a premice, and not belonging directly to the ecclesiastical celebration, vary with the customs of countries and places, and are not seldom regulated by special prescriptions of the ecclesiastical authorities.

## Premice Sermons[[@Headword:Premice Sermons]]

             are discourses preached on the occasion of the first mass of an incipient priest. Their aim is to call the attention of both ecclesiastics and laymen to the dignity and importance of the sacerdotal state, and the duties which it imposes on both classes. Therefore the object of the sermon can only be some truth which relates to the clerical state: e.g. the dignity, the importance, of the priestly career; the priesthood of the Romish Church, its destination, or the duties arising from it, etc. According to the theme chosen, the sermon enlarges upon the object of the priestly functions, or the qualities, conditions, mode of action of the priesthood, or its duties and  beneficial influences, etc. At the end of the sermon there may be a prayer, or an exhortation to prayer.

## Premillenarians[[@Headword:Premillenarians]]

             is a popular designation of a class of theologians who understand "the first resurrection," spoken of in Rev 20:5, as predicting a separate and literal revivification of the saints previous to the millennium, and their personal reign with Christ on earth during that period, in opposition to the usual or post-millenarian view, which explains it in a figurative and spiritual sense. Among the advocates of the premillennial scheme have been counted, with more or less reserve, such eminent names as those of Mede, Jurieu, Daibuz, Sir Isaac Newton, archbishop Newcome, bishops Newton, Horsley, and Heber, doctors Gill, Toplady, Bengel, Dorner, Nitzsch, Delitzsch, Van Oosterzee, Hofmann, Aubelen, Ebrard, Roothe, Lange, Christlieb, Luthardt, Gaussen, Godet, Trench, Ellicott, Ryle, Hoare, Tregelles, Elliott, Allord, Bickersteth, Bonar, Tyng, Lord, and many other learned and pious divines, especially among Protestants, while the great majority of scholars and writers of Christendom, in all ages and denominations, have been ranged on the opposite, or postmillennial side, of whom we need mention only, among moderns, Whitby, Faber, Brown, Barnes, Hengstenberg, Stuart, and Worsworth. The history of the Chiliastic doctrine, both Jewish and Christian, is well summarized in the  Speaker's Commentary, excursus at the end of Revelation 20. SEE RESURRECTION, THE FIRST.

## Preminet, Martin[[@Headword:Preminet, Martin]]

             an eminent French painter, was born at Paris in 1567. He produced a fine picture of St. Sebastian, at Paris, when very young; afterwards visited Rome and studied the works of Michael Angelo; spent fifteen years in Italy, then returned to Paris in the reign of Henry IV, who appointed him his painter, and employed him in the chapel at Fontainebleau, the ceiling of which represents subjects from the Old and New Testaments, among them Noah and his Family Entering the Ark, and The Annunciation. He died at Paris, June 16, 1619. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.; Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v.

## Premonstratensians or Premonstrants[[@Headword:Premonstratensians or Premonstrants]]

             is the name of a monastic order which was founded at Premontre (Lat. Praemomstratum), in the diocese of Laon, France, about 1120, by St. Norbert of Cleves, afterwards archbishop of Magdeburg, with a view to restore the discipline of the regular canons, which had greatly deteriorated. The order followed the rule of St. Augustine, and was confirmed by popes Honorius II and Innocent III. The ground on which the order was established was given to St. Norbert by the bishop of Laon, with the approbation of Louis the Gross, king of France, who gave the Premonstratensians a charter of privileges. The place was called Praemonstratum, because it was pretended that the Blessed Virgin herself pointed out (praemonstravit) beforehand the site for the principal house of the order. According to these legendary authorities, the members of the order were at the same time commanded to wear a white habit, and consequently the White Canons wore a white cassock and rochet and a long white cloak.

The abbots never wore pontificals; and any member promoted to the cardinalate or popedom retained his habit. At the time of the founding of the order St. Norbert had thirteen companions, but as the popes and kings of France granted it many privileges, and were very liberal to the Premonstratensians, they rapidly increased, and counted among their number many persons of distinguished birth, deep piety, and great scholarship. In the early history of the order there was such strict adherence to the rule of poverty that they had nothing they could call their own but one ass, which served them to carry wood, cut down by them every morning and sent to Laon, where it was sold to purchase bread; but in a short time they received so many donations, and built so many monasteries, that thirty years after the foundation of this order they had above a hundred abbeys in France and Germany. The order has likewise given the Church a great number of archbishops and bishops. It once had 1000 abbeys and 500 nunneries (until 1273 their monasteries were double, a house of women always adjoining the convent of men), but it is now the mere skeleton of what it was. Of the sixty-five abbeys which they had in Italy not one now remains. These monks, vulgarly called White Canons, went first to England in the year 1146, where the first monastery, called  Newhouse, was built in Lincolnshire by Peter de Saulia, and dedicated to St. Martialif. In the reign of Edward I, when that king granted his protection to the monasteries, the Premonstratensians had twenty-seven houses in different parts of the country. They were commonly called “White Friars.” They had six monasteries in Scotland-four in Galloway, one at Dryburgh, and one at Ferne, in Ross-shire. They had also several houses in Ireland. In England their churches and conventual buildings were at Eastby, Leiston, Bayham, Wendling, and Eggleston. They were very irregular in plan, the greater portion of the minster being aisleless and the transept unimportant, as they eschewed all processions. There is a fine ruin at Ardaines, near Caen which gives a vivid illustration of the farming arrangements of the order-homely and retired lovers of the country, and enterprising farmers. The principal houses were Torre, East Dereham, and Hales Owen. They carried the almuce over the right arm; the Canons of St.Victor wore it like a tippet round the neck. See Fosbroke, Ancient Monachism (see Index); Herzog, Real-Encykl. 12:82 sq.; Helyot, Hist. des Ordres, s.v.

## Premord, Charles-Leonard[[@Headword:Premord, Charles-Leonard]]

             a French priest, was born at Honfleur July 30, 1760. lie obtained in 1790 a canonry in the college of St. Honore at Paris. Deprived of it soon afterwards, he retired to England, where he began by giving French lessons. Madame de Levis-Mirepoix went with some French Benedictine nuns to establish herself at Cannington Court, and entrusted Premord with the spiritual direction of the community. In 1816 he established himself at Paris, where cardinal Talleyrand - Perigord appointed him honorary canon of Notre Dame and chaplain of Charles X (1825). Premord was also appointed vicar-general of Strasburg and of Quimper. After the Revolution of July he returned to England to rejoin the Benedictine community which he had so long directed. He left an English edition of Rules of a Christian Life, and a publication of the Aeuvres choisies de Al. Asseline, eveque de Boulogne (Paris, 1823, 6 vols. 12mo), accompanied with an incomplete notice. He died Aug. 26, 1837, at Colwich, Staffordshire. See L'Ami de la Religion, 1837. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.

## Prenorman Architecture[[@Headword:Prenorman Architecture]]

             In a large class of English ecclesiastical structures reared anterior to the Norman invasion the style is so peculiar that it should be classified as  distinctively Prenorman. The walls are of rag or rubble, frequently of herring-bone work, and unbuttressed; the quoins present long and short work; strips of stone or pilasters bisect or relieve the towers; the imposts of the shafts are rude, massive, and ornamented either with classical moldings or rude carvings; the arches are round or angled, and sometimes constructed of bricks; and baluster-like pillars are introduced in the windows, which are often deeply splayed within and without.

Two pillars from Reculver Basilica are standing in the Green Court of Canterbury. The churches of Lyminge, Barnack, Bosham, Bradford (Wilts), Brixworth (the oldest remaining church in England, and possessing a basilican type), Stanton Lacy, Dover Castle, Brytford, Corhampton, Dunham Magna, Caversfield, and part of the crypt of York, those of Ripon and Hexham, the towers of Deerhurst, Barton, St. Benet's (Cambridge and Lincoln), Cholsey, St. Mary (York), Bolam, Brigstock, Earl's Barton, and the steeples of Bosham and Sompting, and portions of many other churches, exhibit some or other of these peculiarities. The base story of the tower of Barnack formed a judicial and council chamber, with an angle-headed sedile on the west, with stone benches for the assessors on either side. They were erected either by the English, or possibly by the Danes under Canute, as that king ordered churches of stone and lime to be built in all places where the minsters had been burned by his countrymen, and out of the hundred, which is the number of these buildings, two thirds are in the eastern counties and Lincolnshire, where the compatriots of the French Normans settled before the latter arrived. Ill the first half of the 1lthi century churches so rapidly multiplied in France and Italy that a chronicler says the world seemed to be putting on a new white robe. Westminster Abbey was built by the Confessor in the Norman style; while in Lincolnshire the Prenorman mode was preserved late in the 11th century, just as the Perpendicular lingered in Somerset in the time of Elizabeth, and produced Wadham College chapel by the aid of west country masons.

## Prentice, William S., D.D[[@Headword:Prentice, William S., D.D]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Saint Clair County, Illinois, May 21, 1819. In 1849 he was admitted into the Illinois Conference. He served as a presiding elder and pastor until 1884, when he took a supernumerary relation, which he held until his death, June 28, 1887. He  was a delegate to the General Conferences of 1860, 1872, 1876, 1880, 1884. See Minutes of Annual Conferences (Fall), 1887, page 366.

## Prentiss, Erastus L[[@Headword:Prentiss, Erastus L]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born at New London, Conn., in 1825, was converted at the age of fifteen, and, after joining the Methodists, was licensed to preach in 1848. Seeing the necessity of thorough educational training for the great work of the Gospel, he prepared for college at Amenia Seminary, and then entered Wesleyan University. Failing health interrupted his studies for a time, but he finally graduated at Amherst College in 1855. The following year he entered New  York Conference, and took a position from the first which he ever maintained, as will be seen in reviewing his fields of labor. His first appointment, 1856, was the Second Methodist Church in Kingston; the next year, 1857, at St. Paul's, New York City, as assistant to the lamented Dr. John M'Clintock, the late editor of this Cyclopaedia. In 1858 and the following year Prentiss was stationed at the Second Methodist Church in Newburgh; in 1860 and 1861 at Chester; in 1862 and 1863 at Matteawan; in 1864, 1865, and 1866 at Tuckahoe; in 1869 and 1870, Cannon Street Church, Poughkeepsie; in 1870 and 1871, St. Paul's Church at Peekskill. In the spring of 1872 he received his last appointment, which was Warwick. There he was received with open arms, engaged in his ministerial duties with great delight, and was exceedingly useful, as his name was “like ointment poured forth,” until the day of his death, Feb. 28, 1873. Prentiss possessed rare outward attractions. His fine and delicate form, his noble brow, his bright eye, and his genial features made him a beautiful specimen of humanity that ii was refreshing to behold; but they were far surpassed by the inward adorning, his childlike spirit, the kindness of his heart, the gentleness of his disposition, the warmth of his affections, and his pure and unspotted life. His ministry was evangelical and practical in its character to a pre-eminent degree, and was a success. Heaven put the broad seal of its approbation upon his labors. See Christian Advocate (N. Y. May 8, 1873); Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1873.

## Prentiss, Thomas, D.D[[@Headword:Prentiss, Thomas, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born Oct. 27, 1747, at Holliston, Mass. He graduated at Harvard College in 1766, entered the ministry in 1769, and was ordained Oct. 30, 1770, pastor in Medfield, where he continued until his death, Feb. 28, 1814. During the Revolutionary struggle he was for a time chaplain in the army. He was also identified with different reform movements, and was a leader in temperance reform. He established a public library in the place of his pastorate, and greatly benefited the community in many ways. He published, A Sermon on the Duty of Offending and Offended Brethren (1773): Religion and Morality United in the Duty of Man, two sermons (1802): — Professed Christians Cautioned, and Evil Speakers Admonished, a sermon (1804): — The Sin and Danger of Strengthening the Hands of Evil-doers, a sermon (1805); and several occasional Sermons. Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 1, 678.

## Preparation[[@Headword:Preparation]]

             (Παρασκευή) in Mar 15:42; Luk 23:54; Joh 19:42, and Mat 27:62, is doubtless the day or evening before the commencement of the Sabbath, with which, at that time, according to the Synoptical Gospels, coincided the first day of the Passover. (But Schneckenburger [Beitrage Zür Einleit. ins N.T. p. 1 sq.] supposes the “preparation” in Matthew to mean the feast-day of the Easter period, and which was viewed as a preparatory festival to the Passover.) This day was devoted to preparation for the holyday -especially preparing food for the Sabbath. Mark explains the word by “the day before the Sabbath” (προσάββατον; comp. Jdt 8:6; Josephus, Ant. 16:6, 2). The Jewish expression for it is ערובתא(see Buxtorf, Lex. Talm. col. 1660). So, too, the Peshito renders in the places quoted above. Every feast, like the Sabbath, had a preparation-day before it, which is often mentioned by the Talmudists (Deyling, Observ. 1, 162; with this may be compared παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα, Joh 19:14; Preparation for Easter, the 14th of Nisan; comp. Bleek, Beiträge zur Evangelienkritik, p. 114 sq.). See Passover.

## Prepon[[@Headword:Prepon]]

             an early Marcionite, was a native of Assyria, and flourished at the close of the 2nd century. The Marcionites were then divided into several factions, some of which admitted two original principles, as Potitus and Basilicus; others three (Rhodon, in Eusebius, Hist. Ecclesiastes 5, 13). To the latter belonged Prepon, who held that, besides what is good and evil, there is what constitutes a third principle, viz. what is just. This intermediate principle Hippolytus identifies with the “Musa,” or impartial Reason of Empedocles, a myth to whom is attributed the restoration to the good power Unity of what is disturbed by the wicked power Discord (Hippol. Haer. Refut. 7:19). A letter from Prepon to the Armenian Bardesanes is mentioned (Philos. I. 8:253).

## Prerogative Court[[@Headword:Prerogative Court]]

             of the archbishop is, in Roman Catholic countries where the Church is granted extraordinary privileges, a court of that ecclesiastic wherein all testaments are proved and all administrations granted, when a party dying within the province has bona notabilia in some other diocese than where  he dies; and is so called from having a prerogative throughout his whole province for the said purposes.

## Presanctified[[@Headword:Presanctified]]

             SEE PRAESANCTIFICATIO.

## Presburg, Council of[[@Headword:Presburg, Council of]]

             (Concilium Presoniense), an ecclesiastical gathering which convened on Nov. 10, 1309, and was presided over by the papal legate cardinal Gentil, of Hungary. Nine canons of discipline were published, of which the eighth forbids Christian women to marry infidels, heretics, or schismatics. See Labbé, Concil. 9:2453.

## Presbyter[[@Headword:Presbyter]]

             (Gr. πρεσβύτερος) is the title of an office or dignity in the Jewish synagogue (זקן). It was introduced into the Christian Church, and designated an officer whose functions in the apostolic period are disputed by different ecclesiastical bodies. In the Roman Catholic and in the English hierarchy, the title has been the occasion of a protracted controversy as to the respective claims of the bishop (q.v.) and the presbyter. Those who maintain the presbyter as on equality with the episcopes argue as follows: With respect to the successors of the apostles, they seem to have been placed on a footing of perfect equality, the διάκονοι, or deacons, not being included among the teachers. They were inferior officers, whose province it originally was to care for the poor, and to discharge those secular duties arising out of the formation of Christian communities which could not be discharged by the ministers without interfering with the much higher duties which they had to perform.

These ministers are sometimes in the New Testament styled πρεσβύτεροι, or presbyters, at other times ἐπίσκοποι, or bishops; but the two appellations were indiscriminately applied to all the pastors who were the instructors of the different churches. Of this various examples may be given from the sacred writings. The apostle Paul, upon a very affecting occasion, when he was convinced that he could never again have an opportunity of addressing them, sent for the elders, or presbyters, of Ephesus the persons to whom the ministry in that Church had been committed; and after mentioning all that he had done, and intimating to them the sufferings which awaited him, he addressed to them what may be considered as his dying advice, and as comprehending in  it all that he judged it most essential for them to do: “Take heed, therefore, unto yourselves, and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you bishops or overseers, to feed the Church of God” (Act 20:17; Act 20:28). Here they whose duty it was to feed the Church of God, as having been set apart through the Holy Spirit for that interesting work, are termed by the apostle presbyters and bishops, and there is not the slightest reference to the existence of any other ἐπίσκοπος, or bishop, superior to those ἐπισκοποι, or bishops, to whom he gives the moving charge now recorded. In his epistle to Titus, Paul thus writes: “For this purpose I left thee in Crete,” where, as yet, it is probable that no teachers had been appointed,” that thou shouldest ordain elders, or presbyters, in every city.”

He then points out the class of men from which the presbyters were to be selected, adding, as the reason of this, “for a bishop must be blameless as the steward of God” (Tit 1:5; Tit 1:7). It is quite plain that the term bishop is here applicable to the same persons who were a little before styled elders, and both are declared to be the stewards of God, the guardians and instructors of his Church. The apostle Peter, in his first epistle addressed to the Jewish converts, has these words: “The elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder, ὁ συμπρεσβύτερος , and a witness of the sufferings of Christ: feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight of it, ἐπισκοποῦντες, being bishops of it, not by constraint, but willingly” (1Pe 5:1-2). This passage is a very strong one. The apostle speaks of himself in his extraordinary capacity, a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and in his ordinary capacity as a teacher; showing, by the use of a very significant term, that as to it he was on a footing of equality with the other pastors or presbyters. He gives it in charge to them to feed the flock of God; the charge which, under most particular and affecting circumstances, he had received from the Lord after the Resurrection, and which includes in it the performance of everything requisite for the comfort and the edification of Christians; and he accordingly expresses this by the word ἐπισκοποῦντες, being bishops over them. It cannot, with any shadow of reason, be supposed that the apostle would exhort the elders, or presbyters, to take to themselves the office, and to perform the duties, of a bishop, if that term really marked out a distinct and higher order; or that he would have considered the presbyters as fitted for the discharge of the whole ministerial office, if there were parts of that office which he knew that it was not lawful for them to exercise. SEE ELDER.

It seems, by the passages that have been quoted, to be placed beyond a doubt, that, in what the apostles said respecting the ministers of Christ's religion, they taught that the ἐπίσκοποι and the πρεσβύτεροι were the same class of instructors; and that there were, in fact, only two orders pointed out by them, bishops or presbyters, and deacons. This being the case, even although it should appear that there were bishops, in the common sense of that term, recognized in the apostolic age, all that could be deduced from the fact would be, that the equality at first instituted among the teachers had, for prudential reasons, or under peculiar circumstances, been interrupted; but it would not follow either that the positive and general declarations on the subject by the inspired writers were not true, or that it was incumbent at all times, and upon all Christians, to disregard them. It has been strenuously contended that there were such bishops in the infancy of the Church, and that allusion is made to them in Scripture; but, without directly opposing the assertion, this much must be admitted, that the proof of it is less clear than that bishops and presbyters were represented as the same in rank and in authority. Indeed, there does not appear to have been any occasion for this higher order. To presbyters was actually committed the most important charge of feeding the Church of God, that is, of promoting the spiritual improvement of mankind; and it is remarkable that their privilege of separating from the people by ordination the ministers of religion is explicitly acknowledged in the case of Timothy, whom the apostle admonishes not to neglect the gift that was in him, and which had been given by prophecy, and by the laying-on of the hands of the presbytery; by which can be meant only the imposition of the hands of those who were denominated presbyters or bishops. But although all the parts of the ministerial duty had been entrusted to presbyters, it is still contended that the New Testament indicates the existence of bishops as a higher order. There has, however, been much diversity of opinion in relation to this point by those who contend for the divine institution of EPISCOPACY SEE EPISCOPACY (q.v.).

Some of them maintain that the apostles, while they lived, were the bishops of the Christian Church; but this, and upon irrefragable grounds, is denied by others. Some urge that Timothy and Titus were, in what they call the true sense of the term, bishops; but many deny this, founding their denial upon the fact that these evangelists did not reside within the bounds, and were not limited to the administration, of any one church, but were sent wherever it was resolved to bring men to the knowledge of divine truth. Many conceive that the question is settled by the epistles in the book of Revelation being addressed  to the angels of the respective churches named by the apostle. But it is far from being obvious what is implied under the appellation angel. There has been much dispute about this point, and it is certainly a deviation from all the usual rules by which we are guided in interpreting Scripture to bring an obscure and doubtful passage in illustration of one about the import of which, if we attend to the language used, there can be no doubt.

It may, therefore, be safely affirmed that there is nothing clear and specific in the writings of the New Testament which qualifies the positive declarations that bishops and presbyters were the same officers; that the ground upon which the distinction between them is placed is, at least, far from obviously supporting it; and that there is not the slightest intimation that the observance of such a distinction is at all important, much less absolutely essential, to a true Christian Church, insomuch that where it is disregarded the ordinances of divine appointment cannot be properly dispensed. If, therefore, it be established-and some of the most learned and zealous advocates for the hierarchy which afterwards arose have been compelled to admit it — that Scripture has not recognized any difference of rank or order between the ordinary teachers of the Gospel, all other means of maintaining this difference should be with Protestants of no force. Says Coleman, “Even the most zealous advocates of the episcopal system in the Greek, Roman, and English Church are constrained to recognize and admit the identity of the terms ἐπίσκοπος and πρεσβύτερος, according to the usus loquendi of the ancient Church.

They are constrained to admit that the distinction between the office of bishop and presbyter, which prevailed about the 3rd and 4th centuries, and to a period still later, was unknown in the first two centuries.” It may be shown that the admission of the distinction is not incompatible with the great ends for which a ministry was appointed, and even in particular cases may tend to promote them; but still it is merely a matter of human regulation, not binding upon Christians, and not in any way connected with the vital influence of the Gospel dispensation. The whole of the writers of antiquity might be urged in support of it, if that could be done; and, after all, every private Christian would be entitled to judge for himself, and to be directed by his own judgment, unless it be maintained that where Scripture has affirmed the existence of equality, this is to be counteracted and set at naught by the testimonies and assertions of a set of writers who, although honored with the name of fathers, are very far, indeed, from being infallible, and who have, in fact, often delivered sentiments which even they who, upon a  particular emergency, cling to them must confess to be directly at variance with all that is sound in reason or venerable and sublime in religion. It also follows, from the Scriptural identity of bishops and presbyters, that no Church in which this identity is preserved can on that account be considered as having departed from the apostolic model, or its ministers be viewed, at least with any good reason, as having less ground to hope for the blessing of God upon their spiritual labors; because if we admit the contrary, we must also admit that the inspired writers, instead of properly regulating the Church, betrayed it into error by omitting to make a distinction closely allied with the essence of religion.

What is this but to say that it is safer to follow the erring direction of frail mortals than to follow the admonitions of those who, it is universally allowed, were inspired by the Holy Spirit, or commissioned by him to be the instructors of the world? It is to be observed, however, that although bishops and presbyters were the same when the epistles of the New Testament were written, it would be going too far to contend that no departure from this should ever take place; because, to justify such a position, it would be requisite that a positive injunction should have been given that equality must at all times be carefully preserved. There is, however, no such injunction. Unlike the Old Testament, which specified everything, even the most minute, in relation to the priesthood, the New only refers in general terms, and very seldom, to the ministry; and the reason probably is, that, being intended for all nations, it left Christians at liberty to snake such modifications in the ecclesiastical constitution as in their peculiar situation appeared best adapted for religious edification. The simple test to be applied to the varying or varied forms of Church government is that indicated by our Lord himself: “By their fruits ye shall know them.” Wherever the regulations respecting the ministry are such as to divert it from the purposes for which it was destined, to separate those who form it from the flock of Christ, to relax their diligence in teaching, and to destroy the connection between them and their people, so as to render their exertions of little or of no use, there we find a Church not apostolical. But wherever the blessed fruits of Gospel teaching are in abundance produced, where the people and the ministers are cordially united and where every regulation is calculated to give efficacy to the labors of those who have entered into the vineyard, we have an apostolical Church, or, to speak more properly, a Church of Christ built upon a rock, because devoted to the beneficent objects for, which our Savior came into the world.  Schaff, in his Hist. of the Christian Church (1, 418 sq.), adduces, in favor of the view which denies the apostolic origin of the episcopate as a separate office or order, the following facts:

“1. The undeniable identity of presbyters and bishops in the New Testament, conceded even by the best interpreters among the Church fathers, by Jerome, Chrysostom, and Theodoret.

2. Later, in the 2nd century, the two terms are still used in like manner for the same office. The Roman bishop Clement, in his first epistle to the Corinthians, says that the apostles, in the newly founded churches, appointed the first fruits of the faith, i.e. the first converts. ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακονους. He here omits the πρεσβύτεροι, as Paul does in Philippians 1, 1, for the simple reason that they are in his view iden. tical with ἐπίσκοποι; while, conversely, in ch. 57, he enjoins subjection to presbyters, without mentioning bishops. Clement of Alexandria distinguishes, it is true, the deaconate, the presbyterate, and the episcopate; but he supposes only a twofold official character, that of presbyters and that of deacons-a view which found advocates so late as the Middle Ages, even in pope Urban II, A.D. 1091. Lastly, Irenseus, towards the close of the 2nd century, though himself a bishop, makes only a relative difference between episcopi and presbyteri; speaks of successions of the one in the same sense as of the other; terms the office of the latter episcopatus; and calls the bishops of Rome πρεσβύτεροι. Sometimes, it is true, he appears to use the term πρεσβύτεροι, in a more general sense, for the old men, the fathers. But, in any case, his language shows that the distinction between the two offices was at that time still relative and indefinite.

3. The express testimony of the learned Jerome is that the churches originally, before divisions arose through the instigation of Satan, were governed by the common council of the presbyters, and not till a later period was one of the presbyters placed at the head to watch over the Church and suppress schisms. He traces the difference of the office simply to ecclesiastical custom as distinct from divine institution.

4. The custom of the Church of Alexandria was, from the evangelist Mark down to the middle of the 3rd century, that the twelve presbyters elected one of their number president and called him bishop. “This fact rests on the authority of Jerome, and is confirmed independently by the Annals of the Alexandrian patriarch Eutychius of the 10th century.”  Killen, in his Ancient Church, asserts: “Though the senior presbyter presided in the meetings of his brethren, and was soon known by the name of bishop, it does not appear that he originally possessed any superior authority. He held his place for life; but as he was sinking under the weight of years when he succeeded to it, he could not venture to anticipate an extended career of official distinction. In all matters relating either to discipline or the general interests of the brotherhood, he was expected to carry out the decisions of the eldership; so that, under his presidential rule, the Church was still substantially governed by ‘the common council of the presbyters.' The allegation that presbyterial government existed in all its integrity towards the end of the 2nd century does not rest on the foundation of obscure intimations or doubtful inferences. It can be established by direct and conclusive testimony. Evidence has already been adduced to show that the senior presbyter of Smyrna continued to preside until the days of Irenaus, and there is also documentary proof that meanwhile he possessed no autocratical authority. The supreme power was still vested in the council of the elders. This point is attested by Hippolytus, who was now just entering on his ecclesiastical career, and who, in one of his works, a fragment of which has been preserved, describes the manner in which the rulers of the Church dealt with the heretic Noetus. The transaction probably occurred about A.D. 190.” It shows that the presbyters then exercised episcopal functions, even to excommunication.

Says Dr. Blakie (The Presbyterian Churches throughout the World [Edinb. 1877], p. 1): “It is admitted even by many Episcopalians that, so far as Scripture indicates, the primitive Church constituted under the apostles was governed by elders. The office of apostle was temporary, and some other temporary arrangements were resorted to in the peculiar circumstances of the Church. But everywhere in settled churches there was a body of presbyters or elders; the terms presbyter and bishop were applied freely to the same individuals; and when the presbyters were addressed together, as those of Ephesus were addressed at Miletus, there was no hint of one of them having authority over the rest; they were called equally to feed and care for the Church over which the Holy Ghost had made them overseers.”

The offices of presbyter and bishop, according to the Roman Catholic theory, belong both, though in different degrees, to what Roman Catholics regard as the priesthood of the New Law. They teach that the presbyter is, in the sacerdotal order, an intermediate degree between the deacon and the  highest functionary of the hierarchy, the episcopos. They also maintain stoutly that Scripture and tradition attest alike the divine institution of the presbyteriate. “Besides the apostles, the Lord marked out of the troop of his followers seventy (according to the Vulg. seventy-two), whom he sent out before him, two by two, into the cities and towns he intended to visit, with the mission of healing the sick and proclaiming the kingdom of God. These seventy men were, in consequence, the assistants of the apostles, but subordinated to them. Soon their number proved insufficient, and the apostles established in every city of some importance, at the foundation of the community, or when it had reached a certain degree of development, besides the bishop, whom they intended for their permanent representative and successor, a number of presbyters, who assisted the bishop in his functions.” The Roman Catholic Church, as she considers the bishops the successors of the apostles, so she holds the presbyters to be the successors of the seventy assistants chosen by Christ himself. Inasmuch as they are entitled to perform the highest function of the priesthood, the administration of the Eucharist, they are called also sacerdos (ιΕπΕ'χ); yet this denomination, if not specified, applies only to the bishop: therefore we find frequently the summus sacerdos, or sacerdos primi ordinis. i.e. the bishop, thus distinguished from the simple priest, who is sacerdos secundi ordinis. The presbyters of an episcopal church had a share in the government, not individually, but as a college, presided over by the bishop; they had no jurisdiction of their own, and were merely assistants to the bishop. The bishop took their advice on the admission of higher clerical functionaries, on the management of discipline, especially of penitence, etc. They were themselves amenable to the spiritual jurisdiction of the bishop, and depended on him in the discharge of their duties as teachers and as priests. According to Roman Catholics, the bishop alone possesses the priesthood in its fullness, while the presbyter possesses it only in part. The functions, however, which belong to that part are discharged alike by the bishop and the presbyter. What those functions are will be detailed under the head PRIEST SEE PRIEST (q.v.).

It is, of course, an easy matter for the prelatical churchmen to prove that by the end of the 2nd century the bishop was above the presbyter. Even before the end of the 2nd century the Church had departed from her early simplicity, and soon the episcopacy became the only prevalent government of the Church, although in some cases, as among the Culdees or the Waldenses, government by presbyters continued to prevail during the Middle Ages. The Church fathers of the 3rd and 4th centuries point to the superiority of the episcopos. Thus Clement  of Rome points out clearly three different hierarchical degrees; bishops, priests, and deacons; and Ignatius of Antioch lays particular stress on the superior power of the bishops (Epist. ad Magnes. c. 6; Smyrn. c. 8, etc.). Affirmations of the same kind are given by Tertullian, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Cyprian, etc. “It is true,” say the Romanists, “that the bishops, in the fathers as well as in Scripture, are sometimes called merely priests, but there is not one passage in which a simple priest is called bishop.” Those who accept the authority of St. Jerome for the equality of the bishop and presbyter because he says (Comment. on the Epistle to Titus), “Noverint episcopi, se magis consuetudine quam dispositione Dominica presbyteris esse majores, et in commune debere ecclesiam regere, imitantes Moysen, qui cum haberet solus praeesse populo Israel, septuaginta elegit, cum quibus populum judicaret,” are replied to by Romanists that (1) “even this parallel between Moses and his seventy, and the bishop and his presbyters, implies the pre-eminence of the bishop,” and (2) that, “in the passage in question, St. Jerome is upbraiding a number of deacons who, in several places, and especially at Rome, had committed several encroachments on the rights of the presbyters in the administration of the ecclesiastical possessions. He, on this occasion, exalts the presbyters as much as he can, and in such cases where an abuse is to be eradicated, it frequently happens to this father to fall into the opposite extreme, as he does in his treatise De Virginitate adv. Jovinianum, in which, as an encomiast of virginity, he deems fit to treat matrimony with the most cruel contempt. He shows in other places his sense of the superiority of the episcopate: ‘Quod Aaron et filii ejus atque Levitoe in temple, hoc sibi episcopi et presbvteri et diaconi vindicant.'

The bishops have the same authority over priests and deacons that Aaron had over his sons and Levites. He speaks still more pointedly in his work against the Luciferians: ‘Ecclesiae salus in summi sacerdotis (i.e. episcopi) dignitate pendet, cui si non exsors qubedam et ab omnibus eminens detur potestas, tot in ecclesiis efficientur schismata, quot sacerdotes.' But even if Jerome's opinion were contrary to the episcopal supremacy, what could it avail against the uninterrupted and unanimous tradition of so many fathers and ecclesiastical writers of the early centuries? If really the episcopate had not been originally distinct from the presbyteriate, we should then have to understand that a sudden and uniform change in the constitution of the Church took place in the whole extent of its expansion-that in all the communities, and at the same time, some ambitious and proud individualities set themselves above their colleagues.” “But how,” ask  Romanists, “could this have come to pass without a long and desperate struggle; and how could this struggle, if it did take place, end so uniformly, in all the churches without exception, with the victory of the usurpers? History does not mention the least fact that anything of that kind ever took place. When several presbyters were attached to a single church, of which there were some instances, one of the number received the title of proto- presbyter, or arch-presbyter; but it is quite certain that this office bore no analogy to that of the bishop.” To these arguments of Roman Catholics it is readily replied that the New Testament (as above seen) does explicitly refer to the original equality of presbyters and bishops, and that history contains not a few nor obscure indications of the usurpation of exclusive prerogatives by the latter. See, for Roman Catholic views, Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon; for High Church Anglican views, Blunt, Dict. Hist. Theol.; for Low-Church views, Herzog, Real-Encyklop., the authorities already quoted, and the Lond. Quar. Rev. Jan. 1878, art. 5; Princeton Rev. Jan. 1878, art. 4. SEE PRELACY.

## Presbyterial Consecration[[@Headword:Presbyterial Consecration]]

             in the Roman Catholic Church, comprises the ceremonies and religious acts by which a deacon is invested with the presbyterial power-the power over the true and the symbolic body of Christ. The exterior apparatus of the ceremony consists in the oil of the catechumens, a chalice with wine and water, a paten with a host, some crumbs of bread, a vessel for the washing of the hands, some linen towels. The ceremony performed is as follows: The bishop, after consecrating the deacons, reads the Tractus (and the Sequence) to the last verse, exclusively. Then he advances with the infula to the middle of the altar, where he sits down on the faldistorium (chair). At this moment the archdeacon calls all to be ordained priests with the words. “Accedant qui ordinandi sunt ad ordinemr presbyterats.” The notary reads their names; they proceed, each with taper in hand, to form a half-circle (in modum coronae) in front of the bishop, to whom they are introduced by the archdeacon with the words, “Reverend father, the holy Catholic Church requires that you consecrate the deacons here present for the burdensome office of priesthood.” Whereupon the bishop asks, “Doest thou know that they are deserving of it?” The archdeacon answers. “So far as human weakness allows me a knowledge of it, I know and declare that they are worthy to take upon them the burden of that office.”

The bishop says, “God be thanked!” and turns to the clergy and people with these words: “Beloved brethren! as the pilot of a ship and those who travel on it  share together both security and danger, they must in matters concerning their common interest share the same convictions. Not without good reason, the fathers have directed that the people also should be consulted on the choice of those who are to be admitted to the service of the altar; for sometimes a few can give information about the way of life and habits of those who present themselves for consecration not known to the masses, etc. If, therefore, any one have objections of importance, let him step out before God, and for God's sake speak fearlessly; yet let him not forget that he is only a man (that he may err).” After a short, expectant pause, the people assenting by their silence the bishop turns to the candidates and addresses them thus: “Consecrandi, filii dilectissimi, in presbyteratas officium, illud digne suscipere, ac susceptum lautabiliter exequi studeatis,” etc. In the course of this allocution, mention is made of the high purpose of the New-Testament priesthood, and after a comparison with the priesthood of the Old Covenant, follow these words: “Hac certe mira varietate ecclesia sancta circumdatur ornatur et regitur: cum alii in ea pontifices, alii minoris ordinis sacerdotes, diaconi et subdiaconi, diversorum ordinum viri consecrantur, et ex multis et alternae dignitatis membris unum corpus efficitur.” If no deacons or subdeacons have been consecrated, the Litany of All Saints is recited, while the ordinands are on their knees. Hereupon they step, in pairs, into the presence of the bishop, who, standing erect (with the infula), lays both his hands on the head of each of them, without speaking or singing.

The same is done by all the priests present, dressed in the stola, and of whom there must be at least three. Then the priests and the bishop hold their right hands extended over the ordinands, and the bishop, standing with the infula, thus addresses the clergy: “Beloved brethren! let us implore God Almighty that he may pour over these, his servants, whom he has chosen for the office of priesthood, heavenly gifts in abundance, so that, with his help, they may be able to perform the duties which they have been deemed worthy of assuming. Amen.” The bishop lays down the infula, turns towards the altar, and says, “Oremus.” The ministri add, “Flectamus genua.” The responsorium is “Levate!” Then he turns to the ordinands, saying, “Exaudi nos, queesumus, Domine Deus noster.” After the conclusion — “in unitate ejusdem spiritils sancti Deus”— he extends his hands, saying, “Per omnia soecula,” etc. Now follow long prayers, after which the bishop sits down with the miter, seizes that part of the stola which hangs backwards from the left shoulder of the ordinand lays it over his right shoulder, and puts both parts crosswise over each other on the chest, saying, “Take the yoke of the Lord  upon thee; for his yoke is easy and his burden is light.” Hereupon the bishop dresses each of them in the missal garment, which hangs loose in front, but is rolled or pinned up behind, saving, “Take the priestly garment, which means love; for God is mighty to increase love in thee and make thy work perfect.” Response, “Thanks to God.” Now the bishop rises, lays down the infula, and prays, while all kneel, “Deus sanctificationum omnium auctor,” etc. After this the bishop kneels, facing the altar, and begins the hymn, “Veni Creator Spiritus,” etc., which the choir sings.

As soon as the first verse is sung the bishop rises, sits down on the chair, with the infula on his head, pulls off his gloves, puts on his ring, takes a white linen towel on his knees, and anoints the hands of each of the ordinands kneeling before him with the oil of the catechumens, passing with his thumb dipped into the holy oil crosswise from the thumb of one hand to the index of the other, with this prayer: “Consecrate and sanctify, O Lord, these hands by this anointment and our blessing.” Then, with his right hand, he makes the sign of the cross over the hands of the candidate whom he consecrates, and continues: “In order that everything that they bless may be blessed, and what they consecrate may be consecrated and sanctified, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ.” Each of the ordinands says “Amen.” (From this anointment the thumbs and forefingers of a priest are called the canonic fingers; and as this anointment is performed on the inner side of the hand, the priests to whom the last sacraments are administered are anointed on the outside of the hand.) Then the bishop joins the hands of each of them, and one of the ministrants ties them together with a piece of linen. When all hands are anointed, the bishop wipes his thumb with crumbs of bread; then he presents to each of them a chalice with wine and water, with the paten placed over it, and containing a host. The ordinands touch the top of the chalice and the paten with the index and middle finger, and the bishop says to each in particular, “Receive the power of offering God the sacrifice and to say mass for the living as well as for the dead, in the name of the Lord.” Response: “Amen.” Now the bishop washes his hands, returns to his chair, and reads the last verse of the Tractus, and then the Gospel. Meanwhile one of the newly consecrated deacons steps in front of the altar with the book of the Gospels, prays the “Munda cor meum,” and reads the Gospel, after receiving the benediction thereto. The newly consecrated priests wipe their hands with breadcrumbs, wash them, and dry them with the linen with which they were bound. The water used for washing is poured into the piscina.

As all consecrated receive the Eucharist at the hands of the bishop, there must be as many hosts prepared as there are candidates for  ordination. After the reading of the offertorium (short prayer preceding the sacrifice of the bread and wine), all those who have been consecrated-first the priests, then the deacons, then the others according to their rank-step in pairs into the presence of the bishop, who sits on his chair with the infula on his head, kneel down, kiss his hand, and present a burning taper as an offering. The bishop, after receiving the offerings, washes his hands, lays down the infulla, rises, and, the chair being removed, continues the ceremony of the mass. The consecrated priests kneel down behind the bishop on the prie-dieus prepared for them, each his mass-book open before him; they say with the bishop the prayers accompanying the offering of the bread and the wine, and the whole mass. The bishop speaks slowly and somewhat loud, so that the consecrated priests can at the same time pronounce the same words, especially the words of consecration. The “secreta” (silent prayer) for the consecrated ones is pronounced with the secreta of the mass of the day under one formula of conclusion: “Per Dominum nostrum,” etc. The secreta pro ordinandis is, “We ask thee, O Lord! let thy holy mysteries effect that we offer thee these offerings with a worthy disposition, through our Lord Jesus Christ, thy Son,” etc. After the paternoster and the prayer “Domine Jesu Christe, qui,” etc., which follows the “Agnus Dei,” the bishop kisses the altar; and after the first of the newly consecrated has done the same, he kisses him at each step, with the words “Peace be with you.” The new priest answers, “And with your mind.” Each of the consecrated ones gives the kiss of peace to the other person ordained to the same rank and standing next. After the communion of the bishop, the deacons and subdeacons (if there are any) pray “Confiteor” in a subdued voice, the bishop, facing them, pronouncing the “Misereatur vestri” and “Indulgentiam.” If priests only have been ordained, they do not receive absolution, as they perform the sacrifice together with the bishop. All proceed, two by two, to the highest step of the altar, and receive the sacrament in the form of the bread. The bishop says, “The body of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve you for eternal life.” Each answers “Amen.” When all have partaken of the communion, the bishop removes the paten from his chalice, moistens his fingers, takes the ablution, puts on the infula, and washes his hands.

Then he lays down the infula again, and, standing at the epistle side of the altar, sings the responsorium, “Henceforward I shall no more call you my servants, but my friends, because you have known everything which I have done among you. Alleluia,” etc. Then the bishop, with the infula, turns to the newly consecrated priests, who recite the credo. This done, the bishop sits down on his chair in the middle of the  altar, and puts both hands on the head of each of them, who kneel before him, saying, “Take the Holy Spirit; they whom thou shalt forgive their sins, they shall be forgiven; and they,” etc. Then he pulls down the missal garment, saying, “In the garment of innocence the Lord dresses thee.” Then each of the young priests approaches again, kneels before the bishop, puts his folded hands into the bishop's hands; and he, if he is the diocesan bishop, says to each, “Doest thou promise to me and my successors reverence and obedience?” Answer: “I promise.” If the newly consecrated belongs to another diocese, the bishop says, “Doest thou promise to the bishop,” etc. After the answer “I promise,” the bishop kisses each of them, holding still his hands in his, and says, “‘The peace of the Lord be with thee always.” Now the bishop takes his cross and gives, sitting, the following admonition to the new priests: “Quia res quam tractaturi estis satis periculosa est,” etc. Finally he pronounces, standing, the triple benediction over the kneeling priests: “The blessing of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost come upon you, that you may be blessed in your priesthood, and offer expiatory sacrifices for the sins and transgressions of the people of God, to whom glory and praise be given in all eternity. Amen.” The bishop continues the mass, and connects with the last missal prayer the prayer for the consecrated ones: “Quos tuis, Domine, reficis sacramentis,” etc., under one formula of conclusion. Then follows the “Ite, missa est” or the “Benedicamus Domino,” as the time may require. This is followed by the “Placeat tibi sancta Trinitas;” and the bishop, the infula on his head and the cross in his hand, pronounces the benediction in the usual manner: “The name of the Lord be blessed.” etc. Response: “Now and in all eternity.” “Our help comes in the name of the Lord.” Response: “Who hath created heaven and earth.” “The blessing of the Almighty God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost descend upon you and remain with you. Amen.”

Then the bishop holds a parting address to the newly consecrated: “Beloved sons, consider earnestly what consecration you have received and what burden has been put on your shoulders. Let it be your foremost endeavor to lead a holy, godly life, and to please God Almighty,” etc. Finally the archdeacon turns to the clergy and people and announces an indulgence. Hereupon the bishop reads the last Gospel, returns to his seat, and lays down the pontifical robes. The consecrated priests repair to the vergery and put down the missal garments. It must not be overlooked that the ordained priests, after the offertorium, from the sacrificial act, “Suscipe, sancte Pater,” say all the missal prayers with the bishop — concelebrate with him. This concelebration is in use also in the Greek Church. It is difficult to  ascertain the age of this custom. It seems to have been adopted at different times in different places. The Synod of Carthage, in 398, in the accurate description it gives of the consecration, does not mention the anointment, neither does Isidore of Spain; but the rite was known to Theodulph of Orleans and Amalarius of Treves. The rite of the consecration differs considerably in the Eastern Church from the account given above; but the imposition of the hands is also the essential part of it. According to Goar's description, the principal parts of the Greek rite are the following: Two deacons lead the ordinand to the church-door; here they leave him; he is received by two priests, who walk thrice with him around the communion- table, singing, “Sancti martyres praeclare praeliati.” Passing before the bishop, they bow, and the ordinand kisses his knee.

The bishop rises, the ordinand approaches, and the bishop makes three times the sign of the cross over the candidate's head. The deacon exclaims, “Attendants!” and the bishop lays his right hand on the candidate's head, saying, “Divina gratia, quoe semper infirma curat, et ea quie desunt adimplet, promovet N. devotissimum diaconum in presbyterum: oremus pro eo, ut veniat super eum sanctissimi Spirituis gratia.” The people present say thrice, “Domine, miserere.” The bishop makes again the sign of the cross and puts his right hand on the candidate, saying, in an undertone, while the deacon exclaims “Dominum precemur,” the prayer, “Deus principio et fine carens, omni creatura antiquior . . . ipse omnium Domine, istum quem tibi a me promoveri complacuit, in conversatione inculpati, et fide indeficiente ingentem etiam hane gratiam Sancti tui Spirituis recipere complaceat,” etc. Again the bishop implores the gift of the Holy Ghost for the newly consecrated, extending his hand over him with the words, “Deus in virtute magnus, intellectu investigabills . . . ipse Domine, etiam et istum, quem tibi presbyteri gradum subire complacuit, dono sancto tui Spiritus adimple, ut inculpate sancto tuo altari assistere dignus fiat,” etc. This short extract shows that the Greek rite resembles greatly the Latin ceremony and diverse from it specially in this, that it prescribes only the imposition of one hand. The traoditio instrumentorum is not part of the Greek rite. — Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen Lexikon, s.v. Presbyteriatsweihe. See Foye, Romish Rites (Lond. 1851).

## Presbyterian Alliance[[@Headword:Presbyterian Alliance]]

             is the popular name of "The Alliance of the Reformed Churches throughout the World Holding the Presbyterian System," which was formed in London, England, in July 1875, on the plan of voluntary association, by those bodies that chose to send delegates, and which held its first general council, so composed, at Edinburgh, Scotland, July 3 to 10, 1877, and its second in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, September 23 to October 2, 1880. At these meetings topics of general fraternal interest were discussed in papers formally prepared by divines appointed for this purpose, and the proceedings of each were published in full.

## Presbyterian Churches[[@Headword:Presbyterian Churches]]

             The different bodies into which the Presbyterians are divided will here be treated as nearly in the historical relation which they sustain towards each other as it is possible to place them. We begin with the Presbyterians of  Scotland, because they are, among all English-speaking nations, the only ones directly allied with the state by establishment, and because it is from Scotland that English and American Presbyterianism has obtained nourishment and succor, rather than from the Continent, however true it be that Presbyterianism had there its origin. SEE PRESBYTERIANISM; SEE PRESBYTERIANS.

1. PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN SCOTLAND. — A history of the Presbyterian Church in Scotland would be, in effect, a history of that country; for since its establishment by the Reformation its political and religious history have flowed on in one and the same channel. Christianity was planted in Scotland about the beginning of the 3rd century; and it is claimed that the early churches, particularly those of the ancient Culldees, were non-prelatical. Under the vigorous missions of Palladius and Augustine they were, however, reduced to conformity with the rule of Rome, and so remained until the period of the Reformation. At that time the corruption of the hierarchy, its encroachments on the civil power, and its greedy appropriation of the right of patronage to benefices, had created a wide-spread dissatisfaction, and prepared the way for the favorable reception of the principles of the Reformation. For twenty years persecution followed, and many were burned at the stake, among whom were Patrick Hamilton and George Wishart. The first general and public movement leading to the organization of the Presbyterian Church of Scotland was the drawing-up of a common bond or covenant, known as “The First Covenant,” and subscribed at Edinburgh, Dec. 3,1557, by several of the most powerful of the Scotch nobility and a large number of lesser barons and influential country gentlemen, known subsequently (on account of their frequent use of the word congregation to designate those for whom they professed to act) as lords of the congregation.

The signing of the covenant was followed by a proclamation from the queen regent forbidding any one to preach or administer the sacrament without the authority of the bishop. At length, however, the party of the Reformers triumphed, and in the year 1560 (Aug. 17-24) the Parliament abolished the Roman Catholic worship, adopted a confession of faith agreeing with the confessions of the Reformed churches on the Continent, appointed ministers of the Protestant religion in eight principal towns, and assigned the remaining portions of the country to five other ministers as superintendents who were to take temporary charge of the interests of religion in their several districts.  On Dec. 20, 1560, the first General Assembly of the Church of Scotland was constituted in Edinburgh, consisting of six ministers and thirty-four laymen. Up to this period, the Scottish Reformers had followed, as their rule of worship and doctrine, the Book of Common Order used by the English Church at Geneva. In April, 1560, however, the Privy Council appointed a committee of five persons, including Knox, “to commit to writing their judgments touching the reformation of religion.” This First Book of Discipline, setting forth a polity adapted to the existing condition of affairs, though adopted by the Church, was rejected by the nobles, who wished to appropriate to themselves the patrimony of the old Church. In 1581 the Second Book of Discipline, drawing its system directly from the Scriptures, was adopted by the Assembly, and this-confirmed in 1592 by King James, along with the Westminster documents-is still in force. Nothing but the undaunted perseverance of those two eminent men, John Knox and Andrew Melville, succeeded at last in procuring the complete recognition of the Calvinistic faith and the Presbyterian form of government as the established religion of Scotland, which was finally and formally effected by act of Parliament and with the consent of king James (I of England and VI of Scotland) in the year 1592.

The duplicity of the king, however, soon became apparent, for within a few years he intrigued to bring about the establishment of Episcopacy, and to assimilate the two national churches of Scotland and England. In this he was followed by his successors, Charles I, Charles II, and James II. The resistance of the people, the bloody persecutions that ensued, the civil turmoil, and the subsequent downfall of the Stuart dynasty, are matters of history. From 1660 to 1688, the Church was in the wilderness, scourged by such men as Claverhouse (q.v.) and Dalziel (q.v.), but leaving the record of many noble martyrdoms-as given in the story of the Scots Worthies and the Cloud of Witnesses. SEE COVENANT AND SOLEMN LEAGUE.

Under William and Mary, Presbyterianism again became ascendant. In 1690 an “Act of Settlement” was passed, prelacy was abolished, and the Westminster Confession recognized as the creed of the Church. But the settlement of the Church on this basis was objected to by a small body of earnest men, the “Reformed Presbyterians,” who had already distinguished themselves in zeal for the “Covenants” as securities alike for the freedom of the Church and the Christianity of the State, and who now felt unable either to enter into the Church or to give their unqualified adherence to the constitution of the State. Many of the more earnest descendants of the  Covenanters (q.v.) protested against the reception of such men into the Church, and, finding their protest in vain, withdrew, and organized the Reformed Presbyterian Church. (See below.) Though this secession took place in 1681, the churches were not finally organized into a presbytery till 1743. Upon the union of the two kingdoms in 1707, Presbyterianism obtained every guarantee that could be desired. Since that time it has continued to be the established religion of Scotland, as much as Episcopacy is that of England.

The only confession of faith legally established before the Revolution of 1688 was that which is published in the History of the Reformation in Scotland, attributed to John Knox. It consists of twenty-five articles, and was the confession of the Episcopal as well as of the Presbyterian Church. The Parliament, however, during the Commonwealth, adopted the Westminster Confession. At the Revolution this confession was declared to be the standard of the national faith; and it was ordained by the same acts of Parliament which settled Presbyterian Church government in Scotland, “that no person be admitted or continued hereafter to be a minister or preacher within this Church unless he subscribe the [that is, this] confession of faith, declaring the same to be the confession of his faith.” By the act of union in 1707 the same is required of all professors, principals, regents, masters, and others bearing office.

The Westminster Confession of Faith, then, and what are called the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, contain the publicly recognized doctrines of this Church; and it is well known that these formularies are an embodiment of the Calvinistic faith. No liturgy or public form of prayer is used in the Church of Scotland, the minister's only guide being the Directory for the Public Worship of God. The administration of the Lord's Supper, as a general thing observed four times a year, is conducted with simple forms, but is accompanied, usually preceded and followed, by special religious services, consisting of prayers and exhortations. A metrical version of the Psalms on the basis of that of Rous (died 1659) is used, and supplementary hymns have recently been introduced.

The provision which has been made by the law of Scotland for the support of the clergy of the Established Church consists of a stipend, a small glebe of land, and a manse (parsonage house) and office houses. By an act of Parliament passed in 1810, £10,000 per annum were granted for augmenting the smaller parish stipends in Scotland. By this act the lowest  stipend assigned to a minister of the establishment is £150 sterling, with a small sum, generally £8 6s. 8d., for communion elements. Patronage, in part abrogated at the Revolution, was restored in 1712 by act of Parliament. Scottish independence rebelled at this, the people claiming the right to elect their own clergy, or at least to exercise a veto over the appointment of an unsatisfactory one; and the controversy which ensued led to secession, which was ushered in first by indifference, and was helped on by the renewal of the old interest. From that time a worldly spirit crept into the Church; men of talents, but lax in principle, obtained possession of influential positions; the leaven of moderatism— ridiculed in Dr. Witherspoon's Characteristics— set extensively to work; and in the course of time Arminian, Pelagian, and even Socinian tenets were propagated, with little attempt at concealment. The result was the secession of several important bodies from the Church. The first who formally withdrew were the Covenanters, or Cameronians, who objected to the interference of the state authorities in Church affairs, and to the Erastian principle involved in the existing establishment, as inconsistent with the covenant to which the Church had sworn. SEE CAMERONIANS.

A few faithful men, led by Ebenezer Erskine, endeavored to breast the tide; but, being deposed by the commission of the Assembly, who were Moderates, they seceded in 1733, and formed themselves into a distinct body, called the Associated Presbytery, more commonly known as Seceders. They became known as the Secession Church. This secession proved a severe blow, and shook the establishment to its foundations. Another secession arose in 1760, and from it was formed the Presbyterians of Relief, better known as “The Relief Synod.” These bodies have since been united, and constitute the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland. Those who remained in the Established Church were divided in opinion on the subject of lay patronage. The sentiment against it continued to grow because of the indifference of the clergy. For a while moderatism held the upper hand, but its reign was dreary. Under the dominant influence of principal Robertson, whose studies were more devoted to elegant literature than to the Holy Scriptures, the preaching of tie Gospel was superseded by moral essays, and Dr. Blair's cold and polished sermons were regarded as models of the highest excellence. This state of things continued till near the close of the 18th century, when Christians in Scotland began to share in that general reviving of evangelical principles which then pervaded Great Britain. A positive reaction set in, and gradually new life began to animate the frozen limbs of the Established Church. The evangelical party took heart, and  constantly increased in strength. Dr. Andrew Thomson, Dr. Chalmers, and others came upon the stage of action, and under their vigorous lead a new era was inaugurated. The Assembly entered with zeal into the subject of foreign missions, while it multiplied churches to supply the need at home. The burden of patronage was felt to be a great hindrance to the progress of vital piety and active effort, and the autonomy or independent jurisdiction of the Church became a topic of earnest debate.

In 1834 the General Assembly passed the celebrated “Veto Act,” giving to the Church courts the power of rejecting a presentee if judged by them unfit. This act was set aside by the civil court, and subsequently, on appeal, by the House of Lords, in the Auchterarder case, in 1839. The Assembly yielded so far as the temporalities were concerned, but at the same time unequivocally maintained the principle of non-intrusion as one that could not be given up consistently with the doctrine of the headship and sovereignty of Christ. The Strathlbogie case next occurred, bringing the civil and ecclesiastical courts into direct collision, which ended at last in the Disruption of 1843, under the lead of Chalmers, Cunningham, Welsh, Candlish, and Dunlop; 470 members signed an “Act of Separation and Deed of Demission,” and the Free Church of Scotland was organized. Soon after the separation of 1843 an act of Parliament was passed, called “Lord Aberdeen's Act,” to define the rights of congregations and presbyteries in the calling and settlement of ministers. But in 1874 this was suspended by another act, whereby patronage was abolished, and the right of electing ministers was vested in the people. Government still reserves, however, the appointment of theological professors. The Free Church carried off about one half the communicants of the Established Church, and became a rival communion in most of the parishes of Scotland. The three denominations-the Established Presbyterian Church, the United Presbyterian Church, and the Free Church (in which the Reformed Presbyterian Church merged in 1876) -constitute the chief Presbyterian churches of Scotland at the present time. SEE SCOTLAND, PRESBYTERIAN CHURCHES OF.

The government, discipline, and worship of the Established Church of Scotland are in all respects the same as those of other Presbyterian churches. According to the constitution of the Church, there is a kirksession in every parish, consisting of the minister and a body of lay elders. All the ministers within a certain district, with one lay elder from each session, constitute the Presbytery of that district. The next higher  court is the Provincial Synod, which embraces several neighboring presbyteries. The highest court of all is the General Assembly. It is a representative court, consisting of 247 members and 178 elders, the greater part chosen by the presbyteries, but a considerable number of elders chosen by the town-councils and universities. It meets early in May, is presided over by its moderator, and has the presence of a lord high commissioner, appointed by the crown, who, however, is not a member, and has no authoritative voice in the court. A “Commission of Assembly” meets in August, November, and March, consisting of the members of Assembly, and a minister named by the moderator, to attend to matters remitted to it by the Assembly, or that may arise in the intervals. In consequence of the connection with the state, there are certain peculiarities connected with the support of the ministers which it may be proper to notice.

Dr. Jamieson, in his interesting sketch of the “Church of Scotland” contributed to the Cyclopaedia of Religious Denominations, thus describes these peculiarities: — “The provision made for parish ministers by the law of Scotland consists of a stipend arising from a tax on land. It is raised on the principle of commuting tithes or teinds into a modified charge-the fifth of the land produce, according to a method introduced in the reign of Charles I, ratified by William III, and unalterably established by the treaty of union. To make this intelligible, we may observe that at the Reformation the teinds were appropriated by the crown, with the burden of providing for the minister. In after-times they were often bestowed as gifts on private individuals totally unconnected with the parish, and who thus came so far in place of the crown. These persons received the name of titulars, from being entitled to collect from the heritors the unappropriated teinds; but they were also bound on demand to sell to any heritor the titularship to his own teinds at nine years' purchase.

From the collective land-produce of a parish the court of teinds determines how much is to be allotted for the support of the minister. This general decree having fixed the amount, a common agent, appointed by the court, proceeds to divide it proportionally among the landholders, and this division, when fully made, is sanctioned by the court. It is called a decreet of modification, and forms the authority or rule according to which alone the minister collects his stipend. According to this system, which has proved a very happy settlement of a quaestio vexata, the burden falls not on the farmer or tenant, as in other countries where tithing exactions are made, but on the landholder or titular of the teinds, to whom a privilege of relief is opened by having them fixed. He may value them that is, to use the words of principal Hill, ‘lead a proof of  their present value before the Court of Session, and the valuation, once made by authority of that court, ascertains the quantity of victual or the sum of money in the name of teind payable out of his lands in all time coming.' The advantage of this system is that it enables proprietors to know exactly the extent of the public burdens on their estate; and the teind appropriated to the maintenance of the minister or to educational and other pious uses, being sacred and inviolable, is always taken into account, and deducted in the purchase or sale of lands. But that would not be so advantageous to the minister by fixing his income at one invariable standard were it not that provision is made for an augmentation of stipend every twenty years in parishes where there are free teinds.

This is done by the minister instituting a process before the judges of the Court of Session. who act as commissioners for the plantation of kirks and valuation of teinds; and in this process the act of 1808 requires that he shall summon not only the heritors of the parish, but also the moderator and clerk of presbytery as parties. In the event of the minister being able to prove a great advance in the social and agricultural state of the parish, the judges grant his application, allocating some additional chalders; but where the arguments pleaded appear to them unsatisfactory, they give a small addition, or refuse altogether. In many parishes, however, from the teinds being exhausted, ministers had no prospect of augmentation in the ordinary way; but redress was afforded through the liberality of Mr. Percival's government in 1810, who used his influence in procuring an act of Parliament to be passed according to which all stipends in the Establishment should, out of the exchequer, be made up to £150. This, though but a poor and inadequate provision for men of a liberal profession, was felt and gratefully received at the time as a great boon. But such is the mutability of human society that these stipends, which in 1810 formed the minimum, are now greatly superior to many which at the same period were considered, for Scotland, rich benefices; but which, being wholly paid in grain, have, through the late agrarian law, fallen far below that standard. The incomes of city ministers are paid wholly in money. Besides the stipend, every parish minister has a right to a manse or parsonage-house, garden, and offices-the style as well as the extent of accommodation being generally proportioned to the value of the benefice and the character of tie neighborhood. According to law, the glebe consists of four acres of arable land, although, in point of fact, it generally exceeds that measure; and, besides, most ministers have a grass glebe, sufficient for the support of a horse and two cows. All these, by a late decision of the Court of Session,  are exempt from poor-rates and similar public burdens. Ministers in royal burghs are entitled to manses only.”

The statistics of the Established Church of Scotland vary very slightly from year to year. The number of parish churches was in 1877, 1222. In addition to these there are forty-two Parliamentary churches, and a considerable number of chapels of ease and quoad sacra churches, which, under a scheme efficiently organized by the Rev. Prof. Robertson, are in course of being endowed and erected into new parishes in the terms of Sir James Graham's Act, passed in 1846. Altogether there are about 1500 congregations and 1384 ministers.

The following are the chief missionary and other benevolent undertakings of the Church:

1. The Home Mission Scheme. — It has three departments:

(1.) Church Extension. Local efforts in places requiring additional church accommodation are supplemented by grants from the funds of the scheme. In 1876, thirty-three churches, providing nearly 32,000 sittings, were thus aided.

(2.) Mission Churches, designed to be centers of mission work in destitute localities or in the more populous parishes of Scotland. These churches or chapels number ninety-three, with upwards of 22,000 worshippers. The Home Mission Committee insist that they shall be served with invariable regularity.

(3.) Mission Stations, not having the permanent character of churches, intended as points of evangelical work among the lapsed, non-church- going, or far-scattered people. There are seventy-seven such stations supplied by licentiates, or students in divinity, or qualified evangelists. Besides these operations, aid is given in certain cases towards the employment of Scripture-readers in the Highlands and Islands. The revenue of the scheme in 1876 from church-collections and legacies amounted to £11,780.

2. Of undertakings more especially affecting the clergy of the Church may be noticed the Association for Augmenting the Smaller Livings, i.e. livings under £200 per annum. For this purpose the sum of £7305 was reported to last General Assembly. Also the Ministers and Professors Widows Fund, to which every parish minister and every professor in the national  universities is bound to subscribe. The capital sum of the fund amounts to upwards of £212,000. Ministers and professors may subscribe according to one or other of four rates, viz. £3 3s., £4 14s. 6d., £6 6s., or £7 17s. 6d.

3. A report is yearly presented to the Assembly as to the condition of the Sabbath-schools in connection with the Church. Between 15,000 and 16,000 persons are engaged in the work of teaching 167,000 juvenile scholars, and upwards of 24,000 adults of both sexes.

4. Colonial Missions seek to provide means of grace for Scottish colonists in the various British dependencies and elsewhere. When the scattered communities are organized into churches-some large and influential, as in the dominion of Canada-the aid given by the Home Church is curtailed, if not wholly withdrawn. But the committee have a great sphere of labor in the ever-enlarging and developing colonial empire of Great Britain. Agents of the mission report from British Columbia, the South American continent, Fiji, New Zealand, Australia, Ceylon, India. Under the Colonial Mission are also included European stations, such as Paris and Dresden, where ministrations are maintained for the benefit of resident Presbyterians. The total income of the scheme in 1877 was upwards of £15,000.

5. Jewish Missions. — The efforts put forth in connection with this mission are concentrated on Turkey and Egypt. It has agents in Constantinople, Smyrna, Alexandria, Beyrut, and Salonica. The sum of the charge on which it operates is upwards of £7000.

6. Missions to the Heathen. — The scenes of these missions, comprehended under the word “Foreign Missions,” are India, Africa, and China. It can scarcely, indeed, be said that a mission exists in China; but steps have been taken to originate a Christian work in that vast empire. The agency in Africa is not yet complete. A station has been formed and is partly occupied by a company of Christian artisans, headed by a medical missionary, in the Highlands of East Africa-the station having received the name of Dr. Livingstone's birthplace, Blantyre. The Indian missions retain the mixed character which Scotch missions in India have hitherto borne- educational and evangelistic. In the three great Presidency towns, the educational institutions are still maintained, and are at present in a state of efficiency. Evangelical efforts are also carried on in connection with the institutions and in native churches. In the Punjab there are stations at Sealkote, Gûjrat, and Wazirabad. An interesting work is also promoted among the Highlanders of India at Darjeeling, and outside the British  territory an agency is maintained at Chumba, whose feature is that the mission, conducted by Europeans, is kept apart from the Church, presided over by natives. The income of these foreign missions for the year ending January, 1876, was upwards of £19,000.

7. Two other agencies may be briefly noted:

(1.) Continental and Foreign Churches Committee. — Established as the medium of communication between the churches and other Reformed churches of Christendom. It is charged with the duty of cultivating friendly relations with such churches, and administering such sums as the liberality of the Church bestows on societies and agencies abroad seeking to spread the pure Gospel of Jesus Christ. For many years the committee have been able to aid the Central Society of the French Reformed Church, and the Evangelization Commission of the Waldensian Church in Italy. From time to time it has aided other agencies. The care of certain chaplaincies on the Continent intended for the benefit of Presbyterians temporarily resident there also devolves on this committee. Its income in 1876 was £1205.

(2.) The Army and Navy Chaplains Committee are entrusted with the oversight of chaplains laboring in garrison towns or at the camps. The convener of the committee communicates, in behalf of the Church, with the naval and military authorities.

No Church in Europe has taken more prompt and energetic steps for the general diffusion of school education than the Presbyterians of Scotland. As early as 1695 it was enacted “that there be a school founded and a school-master appointed in every parish by advice of the presbyteries, and to this purpose that the heritors do, in every congregation, meet among themselves, and provide a commodious house for a school, and modify a stipend to the school-master, which shall not be under ten merks (£6 13s. 4d.) nor above twenty merks.” As almost all the population of the country is Presbyterian, the common-school system long sustained a parochial character. When, in 1843, the Free Church of Scotland was organized, it was resolved to erect schools in connection with the congregations of the Free Church, and the educational scheme which in consequence sprang up was co-extensive with the parochial system of the Established Church. In 1873, of 2108 schools inspected by the government inspectors, 1379 belonged to the Established and 577 to the Free Church; while of non- Presbyterian schools there were eighty-six belonging to the Episcopal and sixty-six to the Catholic Church. The introduction of the new national  system of education has in a great measure superseded the operations of the educational scheme of the Church of Scotland. Few schools now remain in relation to it. The care of the committee is now chiefly occupied with providing religious instruction in all schools desiring it, and giving grants for excellence in religious instruction. The Scottish universities of Edinburgh, Glasgow, and Aberdeen are in organic connection with the Church of Scotland by means of theological professorships; while at St. Andrew's an entire college, St. Mary's, is appointed solely to the teaching of theology and the languages connected with it. The theological institutions are the theological faculties of the several national universities. The number of professors is, at Edinburgh, four; Glasgow, four; St. Andrew's, three; Aberdeen, four. Students, 198. Students of divinity are required to attend a full course of arts at the university, and three years more at the Divinity Hall. The sessions in both cases last about five months. Students in this and the other Presbyterian churches of Scotland have often assistance from bursaries or scholarships, which are allotted chiefly by competition. See Hetherington, Hist. of the Church of Scotland; M'Crie, Lives of Knox and Melville; id. Sketches of Church History, and Review of Scott; Fessenden, Encycl. of Relig. Knowledge; Cyclop. of Relig. Denominations (Lond. and Glasg.); Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac; Schem, Ecclesiastes Year Book.

2. UNITED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH. — In 1732 the Rev. Ebenezer Erskine, as retiring moderator of the Synod of Stirling and Perth, preached a sermon on Christ as the Cornerstone, in which he sharply inveighed against the corruptions and abuses that had crept into the Scottish Church. His sermon gave great offence, and incurred the censure of the synod. He appealed to the General Assembly, who condemned and rebuked him. Upon entering his protest, they handed his case over to the Commission. The Commission summarily suspended Erskine and three other ministers — Wilson, Moncrieff, and Fisher, who had joined in his protest cast them out of ministerial communion. The four brethren, deeming this treatment unconstitutional and unscriptural, immediately organized themselves into a presbytery, to which they gave the name of the Associate Presbytery, and published their testimony. or vindication. of their secession. The next Assembly showed a disposition to make concessions, but the seceders refused to listen. How far they were right in this has been debated. That they were not satisfied to return to the bosom of the Establishment is clear, for they went on to gather congregations and appoint a professor of  theology; and, in consequence of their activity and the popular sympathy, they increased rapidly. The Assembly next proceeded to harsher measures, and in 1740 deposed the seceding ministers, now eight in number. The doors of the churches were closed against them, and some of them, as Moncrieff, preached all winter in the open air. Great difficulty was found in procuring sites for houses of worship. Still they grew, and in 1745 the presbytery expanded into a synod with thirty settled congregations and sixteen vacancies. But now a dissension arose about the burgess oath, and in 1747 they split into two synods. The General Associate Synod, or Anti- burghers, denounced the oath as sanctioning the Establishment with all its corruptions; the Associate Synod maintained that it only referred to the true Protestant faith, in opposition to popery. After seventy-three years of separation, during which each throve and sent offshoots to other parts of the world, both branches reunited (a few only standing aloof) in 1820, under the name of the United Secession Church, when the new body embraced 373 congregations.

The Relief Church was the result of Mr. Gillespie's deposition by the General Assembly in 1752. He had refused to assist in intruding an obnoxious presentee over the parish of Inverkeithing. After his deposition he continued to preach in Dunfermline, but labored alone for several years. At length, being joined by Messrs. Boston and Colier, the three constituted the Relief Presbytery. Soon after another presbytery was necessary, and in 1775 (Eadie says 1773) the two met at a synod. It was characteristic of the Relief Church to maintain free communion with all true Christians, and to disapprove of the very principle of establishments. They founded a divinity hall, and increased to seven presbyteries, 114 congregations, and 45,000 communicants.

These two bodies, the United Secession and the Relief, having so much in common, for some time contemplated a union, which was at last consummated in Edinburgh, May 10, 1847, in Tanfield Hall, Canonmills. They took the title of the United Presbyterian Church. In common parlance, they are often familiarly spoken of as the “U. P. Church.” They constitute a very popular and powerful body of Christians in Scotland, reporting, as the statistics of May, 1876: number of congregations, 620; of elders, 5075; members, 190,242; Sunday-school teachers, 12,129; Sunday- school scholars, 92,502; total income for 1875, £419,965. In the synod held at Edinburgh May 11, 1876, its sanction was given by a vote of 373 to 45 for the union of the United Presbyterian congregations in England with  the English Presbyterian Church; and an animated discussion took place in advocacy of separation of the Church from the State. The following are the articles of the basis as adopted by the two synods:

“1. That the Word of God contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments is the only rule of faith and practice.

“2. That the Westminster Confession of Faith, and the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, are the confession and catechisms of this Church, and contain the authorized exhibition of the sense in which we understand the Holy Scriptures, it being always understood that we do not approve of anything in these documents which teaches, or may be supposed to teach, compulsory or persecuting and intolerant principles in religion.

“3. That Presbyterian government, without any superiority of office to that of a teaching presbyter, and in a due subordination of Church courts, which is founded on and agreeable to the Word of God, is the government of this Church.

“4. That the ordinances of worship shall he administered in the United Church as they have been in both bodies of which it is formed; and that the Westminster Directory of Worship continue to be regarded as a compilation of excellent rules.

“5. That the term of membership is a credible profession of the faith of Christ as held by this Church-a profession made with intelligence, and justified by a corresponding character and deportment.

“6. That with regard to those ministers and sessions who think that the second section of the twenty-sixth chapter of the Westminster Confession of Faith authorizes free communion (that is, not loose or indiscriminate communion, but the occasional admission to fellowship in the Lord's Supper of persons respecting whose Christian character satisfactory evidence has been obtained, though belonging to other religious denominations), they shall en)joy what they enjoyed in their separate communions— the right of acting on their conscientious convictions.

“7. That the election of office-bearers of this Church, in its several congregations, belongs, by the authority of Christ, exclusively to the members in full communion.  “

8. That this Church solemnly recognizes the obligation to hold forth, as well as to hold fast, the doctrine and laws of Christ; and to make exertions for the universal diffusion of the blessings of his Gospel at home and abroad.

“9. That as the Lord hath ordained that they who preach the Gospel, should live of the Gospel; that they who are taught in the Word should communicate to him that teacheth in all good things: that they who a e strong should help the weak; and that, having” freely received, they should freely give the Gospel to those who are destitute of it— this Church asserts the obligation and the privilege of its members, influenced by regard to the authority of Christ, to support and extend, by voluntary contentions, the ordinances of the Gospel.

“10. That the respective bodies of which this Church is composed, without requiring from each other an approval of the steps of procedure by their fathers, or interfering with the right of private judgment in reference to these, unite in regarding as still valid the reasons on which they have hitherto — maintained their state of secession and separation from the judicatories of the Established Church, as expressed in the authorized documents of the respective bodies; and in maintaining the lawfulness and obligation of separation from ecclesiastical bodies in which dangerous error is tolerated, or the discipline of the Church or the rights of her ministers or members are disregarded.

“The United Church, in their present most solemn circumstances, join in expressing their grateful acknowledgment to the great Head of the Church for the measure of spiritual good which he has accomplished by them in their separate state, their deep sense of the many imperfections and sills which have marked their ecclesiastical management, and their determined resolution, in dependence on the promised grace of their Lord, to apply more faithfully the great principles of Church-fellowship, to be more watchful in reference to admission and discipline, that the purity and efficiency of their congregations may be promoted, and the great end of their existence as a collective body may be answered with respect to all within its pale land to all without it, whether members of other denominations or ‘the world lying in wickedness.'  “And, in fine, the United Church regard with a feeling of brotherhood all the faithful followers of Christ, aid shall endeavor to maintain the unity of the whole body of Christ by a readiness to co-operate with all its members in all things in which they are agreed.”

The United Presbyterian Church is a voluntary Church. The doctrine of its voluntary condition is not formally contained in any portion of her standards, but it is distinctly implied. She holds to the theology of the Westminster Confession of Faith, and of the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, but she objects to every part of the Westminster Confession “which teaches, or is supposed to teach, compulsory or persecuting and intolerant principles in religion.” “Her creed,” says Eadie, “is that the exalted Jesus is the only King and Head of his Church, and that this headship wholly supersedes the patronage and endowment of the Church by civil rulers. She believes, indeed, that Christ is King of nations, and that therefore nations should serve God, and that all rulers and magistrates are bound to glorify him in their respective spheres and stations. But such service and such glorification of God must be in harmony with the revealed mind of Christ; and the duty of endowing Christianity nowhere appears among the statutes of the New Testament States which establish Christianity venture beyond divine enactment, and contravene the spirituality of that kingdom which ‘is not of this world.' It is plain, too, from recent events in Scotland and England, that neither purity nor freedom can exist as it ought in an established Church. Spiritual independence can flourish only in a Church which has no connection with the State.” Ebenezer Erskine said in his day, “There is a great difference to be made between the Church of Scotland and the Church of Christ in Scotland; for I reckon that the last is to a great extent drawn into the wilderness by the first; and since God in his adorable providence has led us into the wilderness with her, I judge it our duty to tarry with her for a while there, and to prefer her afflictions to all the advantages of a legal establishment.” Christ's house, according to Ebenezer Erskine, is “the freest society in the world.” It should bear no trammels, and it bore none for 300 years. Accordingly the United Presbyterian Church is a free Church, and will not submit to any law of patronage. The Relief Church had its origin in this grievance; and the Secession Church, while it had a special struggle for doctrine, no less distinctly vindicated the rights of the people. Pastors are therefore chosen by the united voice of the members in  full communion; for Christ's ordinances are meant solely for Christ's people. The Presbytery exercises no control whatever over the popular suffrage. It sends one of its members to moderate in the call, and sees that the call is gone about in a regular way.

No canvassing is allowed, and the whole work of the Presbytery is, in fact, to guard and preserve purity of election. The Presbytery sustains the call after being convinced- that there is nothing to vitiate it as a free expression of the mind of the people. The minister so called may either be one who is or has been in a charge, or he may be what is called a probationer. The vacant churches are supplied by these probationers— a body of men who have finished the educational curriculum appointed by the Church, been examined by their respective presbyteries, and licensed as persons qualified to preach the Gospel, and fit, if they shall be called, to take the pastoral charge of a congregation. The probationers are thus a body of lay preachers, authorized candidates for the ministry. They are sent among the vacant churches without partiality and by rotation, that their gifts may be tried, and sometimes they are located for months together at a missionary station. When a probationer is called, and accepts the call, he appears before the Presbytery in whose bounds the Church calling him is situated, and preaches what are called trial discourses. Such appearance in the Presbytery on the part of the pastor elect is to win the confidence of his brethren.

After all the prescribed trials have been gone through and sustained, a day for the ordination is fixed. One of the ministers of the Presbytery is appointed to preside and ordain, and another is appointed to preach. An edict is at the same time appointed to be publicly served in the congregation by the officiating minister or preacher at least ten days before the day of ordination. Upon the day fixed, the Presbytery meets at the appointed time and place, and is constituted by the moderator. The officer is then sent to the assembled congregation to intimate that the Presbytery has met, and requiring all who have any valid objections to the ordination being proceeded with immediately to appear before the Presbytery and state them. The officer having returned, and no objectors appearing, the Presbytery then proceeds to the place of worship. If objections are made, they must be decided upon before the ordination takes place. After sermon, the moderator gives a brief narrative of the different steps of procedure regarding the call. He then calls on the candidate for ordination to stand up, and in presence of the congregation puts to him the questions of the formula. But before proposing the ninth question, he asks the members of the congregation to signify their adherence to the call by holding up their right hands. These  steps being taken, the moderator comes down to the platform, where the candidate kneels, and, surrounded by the other brethren of the Presbytery, he engages in solemn prayer, and towards the conclusion of the prayer, or after it is concluded, he, by the imposition of hands (in which all the brethren of the Presbytery join), ordains him to the office of the holy ministry, and to the pastoral inspection of the congregation by whom he has been chosen and regularly called, commending him for countenance and success to the grace of God in all the duties incumbent upon him as a minister of the Gospel. After the ordination is thus completed, the members of Presbytery give to the newly ordained pastor the right hand of fellowship, and appropriate addresses are then delivered to minister and people. These services being concluded, the moderator accompanies the newly ordained pastor to some convenient place, where the members of the congregation may acknowledge him as their minister by taking him by the right hand. The Presbytery then returns to its place of meeting, when the newly ordained minister's name is entered on the roll, and he takes his seat as a member of the Presbytery, on which the commissioners for the congregation crave extracts. A member of Presbytery is also appointed to constitute the session of the congregation and introduce the minister to his seat there. The whole procedure of the dar is entered on the Presbytery's record.

\*1: The form of edict is as follows: “Whereas the Presbytery of — of the United Presbyterian Church have received a call from this congregation, addressed to A. B., preacher (or minister) of the Gospel, to be their minister, and the said call has been sustained as a regular Gospel call, and been accepted by the said A. B., and he has undergone trials for ordination; and whereas the said Presbytery, having judged the said A. B. qualified for the ministry of the Gospel and the pastoral charge of this congregation, have resolved to proceed to his ordination on the day of , unless something occur which may reasonably impede it. Notice is hereby given to all concerned that if they, or any of them, have anything, to object why the said A. B. should not be ordained pastor of this congregation, they may repair to the Presbytery which is to meet at on the said day of with certification that, if no valid objection be then made, the Presbytery will proceed without further delay. By order of the Presbytery. A. B., Moderator. C. D., Clerk.”

The formula put to ministers on their ordination is as follows:  “

1. Do you believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the Word of God, and the only rule of faith and practice?

“2. Do you acknowledge the Westminster Confession of Faith, and the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, as an exhibition of the sense in which you understand the Holy Scriptures; it being understood that you are not required to approve of anything in these documents which teaches, or is supposed to teach, compulsory or persecuting and intolerant principles in religion?

“3. Are you persuaded that the Lord Jesus Christ, the only King and Head of the Church, has therein appointed a government distinct from and subordinate to civil government? And do you acknowledge the Presbyterian form of government, as authorized and acted on in this Church, to be founded on and agreeable to the Word of God?

“4. Do you approve of the constitution of the United Presbyterian Church as exhibited in the Basis of Union and while cherishing a spirit of brotherhood towards all the faithful followers of Christ, do you engage to seek the purity, edification, peace, and extension of this Church?

“5. Are zeal for the glory of God, love to the Lord Jesus Christ, and a desire to save souls, and not worldly interests or expectations, so far as you know your own heart, your great motives and chief inducements to enter into the office of the holy ministry?

“6. Have you used any undue methods, by yourself or others, to obtain the call of this Church?

“[The members of the Church being requested to stand up, let this question be put to them:

“Do you, the members of this Church, testify your adherence to the call which you have given to Mr. A. B. to be your minister? And do you receive him with all gladness, and promise to provide for him suitable maintenance, and to give him all due respect, subjection, and encouragement in the Lord?

“An opportunity will here be given to the members of the Church of signifying their assent to this by holding up their right hand.]  “

7. Do you adhere to your acceptance of the call to become minister of this Church?

“8. Do you engage, in the strength of the grace that is h in Christ Jesus, to live a holy and circumspect life, to rule well your own house, and faithfully, diligently, and cheerfully to discharge all the parts of the ministerial work to the edifying of the body of Christ?

“9. Do you promise to give conscientious attendance on the courts of the United Presbyterian Church, to be subject to them in the Lord, to take a due interest in their proceedings, and to study the things which make for peace?

“10. All these things you profess and promise through grace, as you shall be answerable at the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ with all his saints, and as you would be found in that happy company?”

The Church has one theological institution, with a staff of seven professors, including the principal. The number of students for 1876-77 was 107, and the average for the ten preceding years 136. Students have to pass through a full course of arts at the university before joining the theological hall and the theological curriculum is over three years, with a session each year from the beginning of November to the middle of April. Very recently a change was made in the management of the theological hall, with a view to the more efficient training of the students. It was agreed that the means of maintaining the hall should be partly by a capital fund and partly by annual contributions, and the capital fund of £40,000 has already been nearly realized. In connection with the theological hall there is a scheme of scholarships, and a committee who have charge of the distribution of these on competitive examination of applicants. In 1876 eleven special scholarships were awarded of the aggregate value of £275; and from the ordinary fund two of £20 each, ten of £15, and forty-one of £10. In 1876 the number of young people under religious instruction in Sabbath-schools and Bible classes was 103,750.

The following are among the other undertakings of the United Presbyterian Church:

Home Mission Fund. — This fund is under the direction more immediately of the Home Committee of the Board of Missions. Its object is to supplement the stipends of the weaker congregations, to support  missionary stations, to aid in the support of catechists, and maintain a scheme of home evangelization.

By the Stipend Augmentation Scheme and its Surplus Fund, including arrangements which have been made with certain congregations in reference to allowances for house-rent where manse accommodation has not been provided, the following general results in regard to the stipends of ministers for the year 1877 have been obtained:

104 Stipends have been raised to £200 per annum, with manse or allowance for rent of £20.

38 Stipends are less than £200           but not under £197 108.

37““19710s.,““19032““190““18014““180““17010““170““1608““160““157 10s13 Stipends are under the former minimum of 157 10s.

All the other Stipends in the Church are upwards of £200 per annum.

In evangelistic effort and home evangelization £5047 were expended in 1876 under the direction of the Home Committee of the Board of Missions.

The Aged and Infirm Ministers Fund has a capital fund of £35,593, with a reserve fund of £1000, and provides an annuity of not less than £50 per annum to aged and infirm ministers and missionaries of the Church.

Manse Fund. — For this scheme £52,772 have been raised by subscriptions and donations up to December, 1876, and £49,449 expended up to April, 1877, in grants to 232 congregations; and the conditions on which these grants were offered required the congregations to raise not less than £90,341, as it is stipulated where grants are given that the manse shall be free of debt when the last installment of the grant has been paid.  The Foreign Mission Fund is to defray the expenses of the foreign missionary operations of the Church. The missions supported out of the find, nine in number, are situated in Jamaica, Trinidad, Old Calabar, Kaffraria, India, China, Spain, Japan, and Algeria. In these nine missions there are 61 ordained missionaries, 7 European medical missionaries, 2 European male teachers, 21 European female teachers, 22 ordained native missionaries, 91 native evangelists, 212 schoolmasters, 44 native female teachers, 86 other agents, 84 principal stations, 13-l out-stations, 13.212 communicants, 2033 inquirers, 197 week-day schools, 13,387 pupils, with a total educated agency of 384. The income of the Foreign Mission Fund for 1887 was £56,872 17s. 4d.

Under the direction of the synod, the Foreign Mission Board voted, during 1876, the following grants, viz.:

(1) To the Union of Evangelical Churches of France, £500;

(2) to the Evangelical Society of Lyons, £150;

(3) to the Evangelical Society of Geneva, £250;

(4) to the Belgian Missionary Society, £200;

(5) for evangelical work in Bohemia. £150;

(6) to the Waldensian Church, £350 (including £100 towards the salary of the Rev. J. Simpson Kay of Palermo);

(7) to the Free Church of Italy, £100;

(8) for evangelical work at Aix-les-Bains, Savoy, £50;

(9) to the French Canadian Missionary Society, £100;

(10) for Rev. Ferdinand Cesar's work in Moravia, £75;

(11) for outfit and passage of two ministers to Australia, £340;

(12) to Rev. David Sidney, Napier, New Zealand, for salary of evangelist (three years), £150; and

(13) salary of Rev. Dr. Laws, of the Nyassa mission of the Free Church.  These grants amount in all to £2715. Besides these special grants made directly by the Foreign Committee, the following special contributions by individuals were sent through the hands of the synod's treasurer:

(1) £1530 from the Theological Hall Students' Missionary Society, for pastor Yakopian's work in Cesarea, Cappadocia;

(2) £5 for Protestant churches in Bithynia;

(3) £1 6s. 3rd. for Mount Lebanon Schools;

(4) £100 for Protestant Church in Bohemia;

(5) £50 5s. for Rev. F. Cesar's work in Moravia;

(6) £20 for the Union of Evangelical Churches in France;

(7) £45 4s. 4d. for evangelical work at Aixles-Bains, Savoy;

(8) £44 for Christian work in Paris;

(9) £25 for Reformed Church in the Netherlands;

(10) £131 2s. 4d. for the Waldensian Church;

(11) £50 for the Free Italian Church;

(12) £4 2s. for Rev. J. S. Kay, Palermo;

(13) £5 for Mrs. Boyce's Orphanage, Bordighera;

(14) £33 6s. 8d. for Freedmen's Missions Aid Society; and

(15) £606 18s. 7d. for the Agra Medical Mission (Dr. Valentine's scheme).

These donations, destined by the donors for the objects specified, amounted in all to £2631 5s. 2nd., which, added to the grants administered by the Board-viz., £2715-make the total contribution of the Church during 1876, for objects outside the Foreign Mission, £5346 5s. 2nd. The ordinary congregational income of the Church for the year 1876 was £233,114; the missionary and benevolent income £82,927; and the benevolent income not congregational £62,226 -the total, including the English congregations, up to June, 1876, being £406,204. See Hetherington, Hist. of the Church of Scotland; Cyclop. of Religious Denominations (Lond. and Glasgow); Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac. SEE UNITED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

3. FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND. — This large and useful body of Christians, now numbering nearly a million of people, was organized into a separate religious denomination in May, 1843. The circumstances which led to its formation as a Church distinct from the Establishment have already been detailed in a previous article. The conflict which at length terminated in the Disruption had its origin in the two reforming acts passed by the General Assembly of 1834, the one of which, the Act on Calls, asserted the principle of non-intrusion, and the other, usually called the Chapel Act, asserted the right of the Church to determine who should administer the government of Christ's house. Both of these acts gave rise to lawsuits before the civil tribunals, thus bringing into discussion the whole question as to the terms of the connection between the Church and the State. As the various processes went forward in the courts of law, it became quite plain to many, both of the Scottish clergy and laity, that attempts were made by the civil courts to coerce the courts of the Church in matters spiritual. Every encroachment of this kind they were determined to resist, as being contrary to the laws and constitution of the Church of Scotland, as well as an infringement on the privileges secured to her by the Act of Security and Treaty of Union.

Matters were evidently fast hastening onward to a crisis, and in the Assembly of 1842 a Claim of Rights was agreed upon to be laid before the Legislature, setting forth the grievances of which the Church complained in consequence of the usurpations of the courts of law, and declaring the terms on which alone she would remain in connection with the State. This important document was adopted by a majority of 131. The claim, however, which it contained, was pronounced by government to be “unreasonable,” and intimation was distinctly made that the government “could not advise her majesty to acquiesce in these demands.” This reply on the part of the supreme branch of the legislature was decisive, and put an end to all hope of averting the impending catastrophe. At the next meeting of Assembly, accordingly, the moderator, instead of constituting the court in the usual form, read a solemn protest, which he laid upon the table, and withdrew, followed by all the clerical and lay members of Assembly by whom it was subscribed. This document protests against the then recent decisions of the courts of law on the following grounds:

“1. That the courts of the Church by law established, and members thereof, are liable to be coerced by the civil courts in the exercise of their spiritual functions; and in particular in the admission to the office  of the holy ministry, and the constitution of the past moral relation, and that they are subject to be compelled to intrude ministers on reclaiming congregations in opposition to the fundamental principles of the Church, and their views of the Word of God, and to the liberties of Christ's people.

“2. That the said civil courts have power to interfere with and interdict the preaching of the Gospel and administration of ordinances as authorized and enjoined by the Church courts of the Establishment.

“3. That the said civil courts have power to suspend spiritual censures pronounced by the Church courts of the Establishment against ministers and probationers of the Church, and to interdict their execution as to spiritual effects, functions, and privileges.

“4. That the said civil courts have power to reduce and set aside the sentences of the Church courts of the Establishment deposing ministers from the office of the holy ministry and depriving probationers of their license to preach the Gospel, with reference to the spiritual status, functions, and privileges of such ministers and probationers— restoring them to the spiritual office and status of which the Church courts had deprived them.

“5. That the said civil courts have power to determine on the right to sit as members of the supreme and other judicatories of the Church by law established, and to issue interdicts against sitting and voting therein, irrespective of the judgment and determination of the said judicatories.

“6. That the said civil courts have power to supersede the majority of a Church court of the Establishment, in regard to the exercise of its spiritual functions as a Church court, and to authorize the minority to exercise the said functions, in opposition to the court itself, and to the superior judicatories of the Establishment.

“7. That the said civil courts have power to stay processes of discipline pending before courts of the Church by law established, and to interdict such courts from proceeding therein.

“8. That no pastor of a congregation can be admitted into the Church courts of the Establishment, and allowed to rule, as well as to teach, agreeably to the institution of the office by the Head of the Church, nor  to sit in any of the judicatories of the Church, inferior or supremeand that no additional provision call be made for the exercise of spiritual discipline among the members of the Church, though not affecting any patrimonial interests, and no alteration introduced in the state of pastoral superintendence and spiritual discipline in any parish, without the sanction of a civil court.

“All which jurisdiction and power on the part of the said civil courts severally above specified, whatever proceeding may have given occasion to its exercise, is, in our opinion, in itself inconsistent with Christian liberty, and with the authority which the Head of the Church hath conferred on the Church alone.”

The document goes on to protest that in the circumstances in which the Church was thereby placed, “a free Assembly of the Church of Scotland, by law established, cannot at this time beholden, and that an Assembly in accordance with the fundamental principles of the Church cannot be constituted in connection with the State without violating the conditions which must now, since the rejection by the Legislature of the Church's Claim of Right, be held to be the conditions of the Establishment.”

At the close of this solemn protest, the subscribers claim to themselves the liberty of abandoning their connection with the State, while retaining all the privileges and exercising all the functions of a section of Christ's visible Church. “And finally,” they declare, “while firmly asserting the right and duty of the civil magistrate to maintain and support an establishment of religion in accordance with God's Word, and reserving to ourselves and our successors to strive by all lawful means, as opportunity shall in God's good providence be offered, to secure the performance of this duty agreeably to the Scriptures, and in implement of the statutes of the kingdom of Scotland and the obligations of the Treaty of Union as understood by us and our ancestors, but acknowledging that we do not hold ourselves at liberty to retain the benefits of the Establishment while we cannot comply with the conditions now to be deemed thereto attached— we protest that, in the circumstances in which we are placed, it is, and shall be, lawful for us, and such other commissioners chosen to the Assembly appointed to have been this day holden as may concur with us, to withdraw to a separate place of meeting, for the purpose of taking steps for ourselves and all who adhere to us— maintaining with us the Confession of Faith, and standards of the Church of Scotland as heretofore understood-for separating in an orderly way from the Establishment, and  thereupon adopting such measures as may be competent to us, in humble dependence on God's grace and the aid of the Holy Spirit, for the advancement of his glory, the extension of the Gospel of our Lord and Savior, and the administration of the affairs of Christ's house, according to his holy Word; and we do now, for the purpose foresaid, withdraw accordingly, humbly and solemnly acknowledging the hand of the Lord in the things which have come upon us, because of our manifold sins, and the sills of this Church and nation; but, at the same time, with an assured conviction that we are not responsible for any consequences that may follow from this our enforced separation from an Establishment which we loved and prized, through interference with conscience, the dishonor done to Christ's crown, and the rejection of his sole and supreme authority as King in his Church.”

This document, embodying the protest against the wrongs inflicted on the Church of Scotland by the civil power, was signed by no fewer than 203 members of Assembly. When the moderator had finished the reading of the protest, he retired, followed by a large majority of the clerical and lay members of the court; and the procession, joined by a large body of ministers, elders, and others who adhered to their principles, moved in solemn silence to Tanfield Hall, a large building situated at the northern extremity of the city, in the valley formed by the Water of Leith. Here was constituted the Free Church of Scotland, which, while renouncing the benefits of an Establishment, continues to adhere to the standards and to maintain the doctrine, discipline worship, and government of the Church of Scotland. Dr. Chalmers was chosen as their first moderator, and the ordinary business was proceeded with according to the usual forms. On Tuesday, the 23d of May, the ministers and professors, to the number of 474, solemnly subscribed the Deed of Demission, formally renouncing all claim to the benefices which they had held in connection with this Establishment, declaring them to be vacant, and consenting to their being dealt with as such. Thus, by a regular legal instrument the ministers completed their separation from the Establishment; and the Free Church of Scotland assumed the position of a distinct ecclesiastical denomination, holding the same doctrines, maintaining the same ecclesiastical framework, and observing the same forms of worship as had been received and observed in the National Church. In fact, they had abandoned nothing but the endowments of the State, and even these they had abandoned, not from any change in their views as to the lawfulness of a Church Establishment, but solely because in their view the State had  altered the terms on which the compact between the Church and the State had been originally formed.

The Free Church, strong in the conviction that her distinctive principles were sound and scriptural, entered upon her arduous work with an humble but confiding trust in her great and glorious Head. In the course of her history she has become united with two other bodies. In 1852 the majority of the Original Seceders, with whom the name of Dr. Thomas M'Crie, father and son, was so honorably connected, joined the Free Church; and in 1876 a union was formed with the Reformed Presbyterian Church, consisting of thirty-six ministers and thirty-six congregations. The General Assembly of the Free Church consists of 730 members, half being ministers and half ruling elders, and all appointed by the presbyteries. Each Presbytery returns one third of its ministers, and an equal number of ruling elders. The temporal affairs of each congregation are managed by a body called “The Deacons' Court.” This court is composed of the minister, the ruling elders, and a body of deacons chosen, like the elders, by the members of the congregation. The spiritual interests of each congregation are attended to by the kirk-session, consisting only of the minister and elders.

In preparation for the new position in which the Church would be placed when deprived of state support, Dr. Chalmers had made arrangements some months previous to the Assembly of 1843 for establishing associations throughout the country with the view of collecting funds for the support of the ministry. With such energy and activity had these preparations been carried forward that before the day of the Disruption came 687 separate associations had been formed in all parts of the country. So extensive and ardent was the sympathy felt with the movement, not in Scotland only, but throughout the kingdom, and even throughout the world, that funds were liberally contributed from all quarters in support of the cause, and at the close of the first year of the history of the Free Church her income amounted to the munificent sum of £366,719 14s. 3rd. Nor has the source of her supply afforded the slightest symptoms of being exhausted even after the lapse of thirty-five years. On the contrary, she raised £10,250,000 in her first thirty years and has now an annual income of over £500,000.

The Sustentation Fund for the support of the ministry reached in 1877 the gratifying sum of £172,641 13s. 3rd., yielding an annual salary to nearly 800 ministers of about £150 each. The Building Fund for the erection of churches and manses amounted in 1877 to  £41.179 2s. 0 ¼ d. This year (1878) a Church Extension scheme of £100,000 has been entered upon with spirit. The Congregational Fund, composed of ordinary collections at the church-doors on Sabbaths, and a great part of which goes to supplement the ministers' stipends, is £94,481 19s. 6d. The Fund for Missions in 1887-8 amounted to £83,813. There are various other objects connected with the Free Church which it is unnecessary to detail, but the sum total of the contributions for the last year was £565,195 10s. 4d., an amount which plainly indicates that its friends and supporters are still animated with an intense and undiminished attachment to the principles on which this peculiar section of the Christian Church is based. Upwards of 800 churches have been reared by the liberality of her people, who are calculated to amount to somewhere about 1,000,000. To the large majority of the churches, manses, or parsonage- houses, have also been added. The Free Church has established a divinity school in Edinburgh, called the New College, which was completed at a cost approaching £40,000, is provided with a more complete staff of professors than any similar institution in Scotland, and with more effectual means of training an educated ministry than is to be found elsewhere in Great Britain. The Free Church has also built a divinity hall in Aberdeen, and a third in Glasgow. The number of theological students in attendance on these colleges amounts in 1878 to 230.

In connection with the Free Church, a fund was instituted in 1848 for Aged and Infirm Ministers, which already exceeds £39,000. In addition to the home ministry, which in 1878 numbered 1059, there are nearly 300 settled ministers belonging to this Church in the different departments of the colonial field.

The Widows and Orphans Funds are chiefly made up of yearly contributions (compulsory) from each minister otf£5 to the Widows and £2 to the Orphans fund. At present the fund gives an annuity of £42 to each widow and £15 to each child under eighteen. Larger sums are given to the children when their mother is dead. The accumulated fund of the two schemes is upwards of £224,000. There is a society for sons and daughters of the clergy, not under the General Assembly, designed to aid ministers in the education of their families. In 1876 it paid £1758 in 125 grants, from £10 to £18 each.

The Home Mission and Church Extension Scheme. Its purpose is to keep stations supplied by preachers or catechists in thinly peopled districts; also  to foster missions in mining and manufacturing localities, and other populous places, and form them into regular charges; to aid such charges until they are taken on the equal dividend platform to maintain lay evangelists, and send out ministerial evangelists from time to time; and to encourage the employment of students and others as missionaries in necessitous districts in large towns. To encourage ministers of experience to undertake mission congregations in populous places, grants of £200 a year are given for a limited time; the grant diminishing gradually from year to year, till it is extinguished. In other cases the grants are smaller. The income of the fund, derived from a church-door collection thrice in two years, donations, legacies, etc., is between £9000 and £10,000 a year. This year a special Church Extension Fund, amounting to £100,000, is being raised, and the greater part of it has been contributed in a few months.

Highland Mission. — This is a somewhat similar scheme, managed by a separate committee of the General Assembly, for districts of the country where Gaelic is spoken. It has a collection every second year. Its average revenue is about £3000.

Church and Manse Building Fund. — This is intended to help congregations in their building operations. At first it was very large, Dr. Guthrie having raised for a General Manse Fund alone about £100,000, but of late years its income has been only about £1500. A special Building Fund is contemplated for new charges.

Education Scheme. — Till recently a large proportion of the congregations had day-schools, for which grants were given. Most of these are now absorbed in the national scheme of education. There are still some schools receiving grants; but the chief remaining part of the scheme is the Normal Schools of which there are two at Edinburgh and Glasgow. The instructors receive a salary from a general fund, which is raised by monthly contributions in all the congregations, and which is divided at the end of the year according to a certain scale, proportioned to the qualifications of the respective teachers. The number of normal students, male and female for 1876-77 was 494.

College Scheme. — This provides for the support of the three theological institutions, partly by interest of endowments and partly by an annual collection at church door, donations, legacies, etc. For 1876-77 the revenue was a total of £8995. There are large Bursary and Scholarship Funds for the encouragement of students, from £10 to £100 annually.  Continental Scheme. — For aiding stations, societies, and churches on the continent of Europe. Revenue about £4000.

Colonial Scheme. — For sending out ministers to the colonies and aiding colonial churches, especially in their earlier stages. Revenue about £4000.

The Foreign Missions Scheme. — The late Rev. Dr. Duff; tile first missionary to the heathen from the Church of Scotland, went to Calcutta in 1829, and founded the India Mission of the Church of Scotland. In the previous year Dr. Wilson went to Bombay, and later, the Rev. John Anderson to Madras. In 1843 all the missionaries in India adhered to the Free Church and the old localities were continued. The Foreign Missions of the Free Church embrace India, Africa, Syria, and New Hebrides. In India, there are 6 principal and 12 branch stations in Bengal; 3 principal and 10 branch stations in Western India; 2 principal and 3 branch stations in Central India; and 1 principal and 7 branch stations in Southern India. Ill South Africa there are 6 principal and 31 branch stations in Kaffraria; 2 principal and 2 branch stations in Natal; and 1 principal station at Livingstonia. In New Hebrides, where the Reformed Presbyterians (who joined the Free Church in 1876) had their field, are 4 stations, on three islands; and in Syria, the headquarters are at Shweir, about twenty miles from Beyrut. In all, the Free Church missions embrace 107 stations, 38 European missionaries, 3 European medical missionaries, 21 European teachers, 19 European artisans, 15 native missionaries, 327 Christian teachers, and Christian laborers of various sorts. In the native churches are 3350 communicants, and about 3000 baptized adherents. The number of institutions and schools is 223, and the total number of scholars is 13,109. In the principal Indian stations many of the pupils are undergraduates of the universities. The revenue of this scheme for 1876-77 was £51,217.

Mission to Jews. — This mission was begun in 1839, and in 1843, it was continued by the Free Church, all the missionaries having adhered. At present it has stations at (l) Amsterdam, (2) Prague, (3) Pesth, (4) Breslau, (5) Constantinople. The Pesth mission has been especially blessed. The amount raised for the scheme in 1876-77 was £13,468.

The following is a summary of the contributions of the Free Church for 1876-77:

Sustentation fund .....................£.170,209

Local buildings fund ..................... 86,291

Congregational fund ....................176,290

Missions and education ............... 104,325

Miscellaneous .........................…… 28079

Total .........................……..….... 565,194

In all its operations, indeed, whether at home or abroad, the Free Church exhibits a vitality and energetic power which have gained for it a high place among Christian churches. SEE SCOTLAND, CHURCHES IN.

4. REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF SCOTLAND. — This is the only Church which claims to be legitimately descended from the Covenanted Church of Scotland in her period of greatest purity, that of the Second Reformation. It was that memorable period of Scottish history between 1638 and 1650 which formed the sera of the Solemn League and Covenant, of the Westminster Assembly, of the revolution which dethroned the first Charles and asserted those principles of civil and religious liberty which all enlightened Christians and statesmen are now ready with one voice to acknowledge and to admire. For their strict adherence to these principles Cameron, Cargill, and Renwick shed their blood, and to these principles the Reformed Presbyterian Church gloried in avowing her attachment. As has already been noticed in the article COVENANTERS SEE COVENANTERS , on the day after the execution of Charles I was known at Edinburgh, his son, Charles II, was proclaimed king at the public cross by the Committee of Estates, with this proviso, however, that “before being admitted to the exercise of his royal power, he shall give satisfaction to this kingdom in the things that concern the security of religion according to the National Covenant and the Solemn League and Covenant.” This condition or proviso was considered as so necessary to the maintenance of the constitution of the country, as well as the promotion of the great principles of civil and religious liberty, that it was enacted both by the Parliament and the General Assembly. The document issued by the latter body exhibits, in the clearest manner, their design in insisting upon the subscription by the king. It is dated July 27, 1649, and contains the following important statements: “But if his majesty, or any having or pretending power and commission from him, shall invade this kingdom upon pretext of establishing him in the exercise of his royal power-as it will be a high provocation against God to be accessory or assisting thereto, so it will be a necessary duty to resist and oppose the same. We know that  many are so forgetful of the oath of God, and ignorant and careless of the interest of Jesus Christ and the Gospel, and do so little tender that which concerns his kingdom and the privileges thereof, and do so much dote upon absolute and arbitrary government for gaining their own ends, and so much malign the instruments of the work of reformation, that they would admit his majesty to the exercise of his royal power upon any terms whatsoever, though with never so much prejudice to religion and the liberties of these kingdoms, and would think it quarrel enough to make war upon all those who for conscience' sake cannot condescend thereto. But we desire all those who fear the Lord, and mind to keep their Covenant, impartially to consider these things which follow:

“1. That as magistrates and their power is ordained of God, so are they inl the exercise thereof not to walk according to their own will, but according to the law of equity and righteousness, as being the ministers of God for the safety of his people; therefore a boundless and unlimited power is to be acknowledged in no king or magistrate; neither is our king to be admitted to the exercise of his power as long as he refuses to walk in the administration of the same according to this rule and the established laws of the kingdom, that his subjects may live under him a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty.

“2. There is one mutual obligation and stipulation betwixt the king and his people; as both of them are tied to God, so each of them is tied one to another for the performance of mutual and reciprocal duties. According to this, it is statute and ordained in the eighth act of first Parliament of James VI, ‘That all kings, princes, or magistrates whatsoever, holding their place, which hereafter shall happen in any time to reign and bear rule over this realm, at the time of their coronation and receipt of their princely authority, make their faithful promise by oath, in the presence of the Eternal God, that during the whole course of their lives they shall serve the same Eternal God to the utmost of their power, according as he hath required in his most holy Word, contained in the Old and New Testaments; and, according to the same Word, shall maintain the true religion of Christ Jesus, the preaching of his most holy Word, and due and right ministration of his sacraments now received and preached within this realm; and shall abolish all false religion contrary to the same; and shall rule the people committed to their charge according to the will and the command of God revealed in his Word, and according to the laudable laws and  constitutions received within this realm; and shall procure to the utmost of their power to the Kirk of God, and the whole Christian people, true and perfect peace in all time coming, and thus justice and equity be kept to all creatures without exception;' which oath was sworn first by king James VI, and afterwards by king Charles at his coronation, and is inserted in our National Covenant, which was approved by the king who lately reigned. As long, therefore, as his majesty who now reigns refuses to hearken to the just and necessary desires of State and Kirk propounded to his majesty for the security of religion and safety of his people, and to engage and to oblige himself for the performance of his duty to his people, it is consonant to Scripture and reason, and the laws of the kingdom, that they should refuse to admit him to the exercise of his government until he give satisfaction in these things.

“3. In the League and Covenant which hath been so solemnly sworn and renewed by this kingdom, the duty of defending and preserving the king's majesty, person, and authority, is joined with, and subordinate unto, the duty of preserving and defending the true religion and liberties of the kingdoms; and therefore his majesty, standing in opposition to the just and necessary public desires concerning religion and the liberties of the kingdoms, it will a manifest breach of Covenant, and preferring of the king's interest to the interest of Jesus Christ, to bring him to the exercise of his royal powers which he — walking in a contrary way, and being compassed about his malignant counsels, cannot but employ to the prejudice and ruin of both.”

The stipulation was made known to Charles while he was still in Holland, where he had been for some time residing, but he refused to accede to it. The following year (1650) he set sail for Scotland, and before landing on its shores he consented to subscribe the Covenant, and the test was accordingly administered to him with all due solemnity. On the following August he repeated an engagement to support the Covenant. Yet the unprincipled monarch was all the while devising schemes for the subversion not only of Presbyterianism, but even of Protestantism in Scotland. Again, when crowned at Scone on Jan. 1, 1651, Charles not only took oath to support and defend the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, but, the National Covenant and the Solemn League and Covenant having been produced and read, the king solemnly swore them.

The imposing ceremonial, however, was only designed, on the part of the profligate Charles, to deceive his Scottish subjects. Nor did the calamities in which he was subsequently  involved — his dethronement and exile for several years in France — produce any favorable change upon his character. No sooner was he restored to his throne in 1660, than he forthwith proceeded to overturn the whole work of reformation, both civil and ecclesiastical, which he had solemnly sworn to support. The first step towards the execution of this project was the passing of the Act of Supremacy, whereby the king was constituted supreme judge in all matters civil and ecclesiastical. To this was afterwards added the Oath of Allegiance, which declared it to be treason to deny the supremacy of the sovereign both in Church and State. The crowning deed of treachery, however, which Charles perpetrated, was his prevailing upon his Scottish counselors to pass the Act Rescissory, by which all the steps taken from 1638 to 1650 for the reformation of religion were pronounced rebellious and treasonable; the National Covenant and the Solemn League and Covenant were condemned as unlawful oaths; the Glasgow Assembly of 1638 was denounced as an illegal and seditious meeting; and the right government of the Church was alleged to be the inherent prerogative of the crown. The result of these acts was, that the advances which the Church and the country had made during the period of the Second Reformation were completely neutralized, and the Church of Scotland was subjected for a long series of years to the most cruel persecution and oppression.

With such flagrant and repeated violations of the solemn compact into which Charles had entered with his subjects, it is not to be wondered at that, on high constitutional grounds, this body of the Covenanters, headed by Cameron, Cargill, and others, should have regarded the treacherous sovereign as having forfeited all title to their allegiance. They felt it to be impossible to maintain the principles of the Reformation, and yet own the authority of a monarch who had trampled these principles under foot, and that, too, in violation of the most solemn oaths, repeated again and again. The younger M'Crie, in his Sketches of Scottish Church History, alleges that the principle laid down by Cameron's party was, “that the king, by assuming an Erastian power over the Church, had forfeited all right to the civil obedience of his subjects-a principle which had never been known in the Church of Scotland before.' Such a view of the matter, however, is scarcely fair to the Cameronians. It was not because Charles had usurped an Erastian authority over the Church that they deemed it their duty to renounce their allegiance, but because he had broken the solemn vows made at his coronation. On that occasion he had entered, as they held, into a deliberate compact with his subjects, and yet, in the face of all his vows, he had openly, and in the most flagrant manner,  broken that compact, thus setting his subjects free from all obligation to own him as king. It is quite true, as the Westminster Confession of Faith alleges, that “infidelity or difference in religion doth not make void the magistrate's just and legal authority, nor free the people from their due obedience to him;” but this remark does not meet the case as between Charles and the Cameronian party. They renounced their allegiance not because the sovereign was an infidel, or differed from them in matters of religion, but solely and exclusively because he had broken a civil compact entered into between him and his Scottish subjects on receiving the crown, and confirmed by a solemn religious vow. By his own deliberate deeds the traitorous monarch had forfeited his right to rule before they had renounced their obligation to obey. Such were the simple grounds on which Cameron, Cargill, Renwick, and their followers considered themselves justified in disowning the authority of the king, and bearing arms against him as a usurper of the throne and a traitor to the country.

This earnest and intrepid band of Covenanters brought down upon themselves, by the fearless avowal of their principles, the special vengeance of the ruling powers. One after another their leaders perished on the scaffold, and thus the people who held Cameronian principles found themselves deprived of religious instructors, and wandering as “sheep without a shepherd.” In these circumstances they resolved to form themselves into a united body, consisting of societies for worship and mutual edification, which were formed in those districts where the numbers warranted such a step. To preserve order and uniformity, the smaller societies appointed deputies to attend a general meeting, in which was vested the power of making arrangements for the regulation of the whole body. The first meeting of these united societies was held on Dec. 15, 1681, at Logan House, in the parish of Lesmahagow, Lanarkshire, where it was resolved to draw up a public testimony against the errors and defections of the times. The name which this body of Covenanters took to themselves was that of the “Persecuted Remnant,” while the societies which they had formed for religious improvement led them to be designated the “Society People.” “They had taken up no new principles,” as Dr. Hetherington well remarks: “the utmost that they can be justly charged with is, merely that they had followed up the leading principles of the Presbyterian and Covenanted Church of Scotland to an extreme point, from which the greater part of Presbyterians recoiled; and that in doing so they had used language capable of being interpreted to mean more than  they themselves intended. Their honesty of heart, integrity of purpose, and firmness of principle cannot be denied-and these are noble qualities; and if they did express their sentiments in strong and unguarded language, it ought to be remembered that they did so in the midst of fierce and remorseless persecution, ill adapted to make men nicely cautious in the selection of balanced terms wherein to express their indignant detestation of that unchristian tyranny which was so fiercely striving to destroy every vestige of both civil and religious liberty.”

The first manifestation of the views held by the Society People took place during the dissensions at Bothwell Bridge, when a body of the Covenanters refused to make a public avowal of their allegiance to the king in their declaration. A rude outline of the declaration was drawn up by Cargill, assisted by Henry Hall, of Haughhead, who was mortally wounded at Queensferry, and the document, being found on his person, received the name of the “Queensferry Paper.” It contained some of the chief points held by the Society People; but it unfortunately embodied in it an avowal of dislike to a hereditary monarchy, as “liable to inconvenience, and apt to degenerate into tyranny.” Though the paper in question emanated from only a few persons, and its errors, therefore, could not be charged upon the whole of the strict Presbyterian party, yet it was quoted without reserve by their enemies as a proof of disloyal and even treasonable intentions. To counteract the prejudices thus excited against them, the leaders of the Society People drew up deliberately a statement of their principles, which is usually known by the name of the “Sanquhar Declaration.” This document, which carefully excluded all reference to a change in the form of government, was, nevertheless, classed by the persecutors along with the Queensferry Paper in all their proclamations, as if they had been identical, and made an excuse for issuing to the army the most ruthless and cruel commands to pursue to the death all who were suspected of being connected with these bold declarations.

Cameron, Cargill, and ten other persons were proclaimed traitors, and a price was set upon their heads. Nothing daunted, Cargill in 1630 boldly pronounced what is known as the Torwood Excommunication. In a meeting held at Torwood, in Stirlingshire, the intrepid Covenanter, after divine service, solemnly excommunicated Charles and his chief supporters, casting them out of the Church, and delivering them up to Satan. This bold act of a Christian hero roused the government to greater fury, and a series of civil and military executions followed, down to the Revolution in 1688.  In the persecutions of this eventful period, the Society People had been subjected to painful discouragement by the loss of their able and devoted leaders. Cameron and Cargill, and many others, had sealed their testimony with their blood, but in this time of sore trial Providence graciously raised up one admirably calculated to take a prominent part in promoting Christ's cause in days of bloody persecution. The individual to whom we refer was Mr. James Renwick, who, having himself witnessed the execution of Mr. Donald Cargill, resolved from that moment to engage with his whole soul in the good cause. Having studied for the ministry in Holland, and received ordination, he returned to his native land that he might share with his persecuted brethren in their trials, and preach among them the unsearchable riches of Christ. Often, accordingly, were the Society People encouraged amid their severe hardships by his faithful instructions. Danger and persecution everywhere awaited him, but he was ready to endure hardness as a good soldier of Jesus Christ. In 1683, at the early age of twenty-six, he died on the scaffold with a heroism and unflinching fortitude worthy of the last of that noble band of martyrs who sealed with their blood their devoted attachment to the work of Covenanted Reformation in Scotland.

The deeper the darkness, the nearer the dawn. On the death of Charles II in 1685, his brother James ascended the throne. At heart a bigoted adherent of the Church of Rome, he sought to restore popery to the ascendant both in England and Scotland. In making the attempt, however, he rushed upon his own ruin. He fell a victim to his own infatuated policy. After bearing for a time with his tyranny, an indignant people rose as one man, and hurled him from his throne, substituting in his place William and Mary, prince and princess of Orange, who, in the Revolution of 1688, restored civil and religious liberty to an oppressed and persecuted people, tc a greater extent than had ever before been enjoyed.

The arrival of the prince of Orange in England was hailed by all classes of Presbyterians in Scotland as an event likely to be fraught with blessings to their distracted country. Lord Macaulay, in his History of England, indeed, strangely accuses the Society People of eagerness to disown William. So far is this charge from being well founded, that they were the first to own and hail him as their deliverer. Thus in the “Memorial of Grievances” issued by the societies, they declare, “We have given as good evidence of our being willing to be subject to king William as we gave before of our being unwilling to be slaves to king James. Upon the first report of the prince of Orange's expedition, we owned his quarrel, even while the  prelatic faction were in arms to oppose his coming. In all our meetings we prayed openly for the success of his arms, when in all the churches prayers were made for his ruin; nay, when, even in the indulged meetings, prayers were offered for the popish tyrant whom we prayed against, and the prince came to oppose. We also associated ourselves, early binding ourselves to promote his interest, and were the first who openly armed and declared our desire to join with him.” But while the Society People welcomed William as an expected deliverer, they openly dissented from the Revolution settlement as detective in various points. In particular, the Covenant, so far from being adopted either in the letter or in the spirit by the State, was not even owned by the Church; and the monarch took oaths in express contradiction to it. Presbyterianism, so far from being established in all his majesty's dominions, was only established in Scotland, and that under Erastian conditions, while prelacy was established in England and Ireland, and the king himself became an Episcopalian. The establishment of these different forms of Church government in different parts of the British dominions was effected by the sole authority of the king and Parliament, even before the Assembly of the Church was permitted to meet; and thus the principle of the royal supremacy over the Church continued to be asserted, and was even incorporated with the Revolution settlement. The principal objections, then, which the Society People alleged against the Revolution settlement were.

(1) that as it left the Acts Rescissory in full force, it cancelled the attainments of the Second Reformation together with the Covenants; and

(2) that the civil rulers usurped an authority over the Church which virtually destroyed her spiritual independence, and was at variance with the sole headship of the Redeemer himself.

The defects of the Revolution settlement were due partly to William's Erastian policy, and his desire to retain the prelatic clergy within the Established Church of Scotland, but partly also to the temporizing policy of the Church itself. “‘Though the acts of Parliament,” as Dr. Hetherington justly remarks, “made no mention of the Second Reformation and the National Covenants, it was the direct duty of the Church to have declared her adherence to both; and though the State had still refused to recognize them, the Church would, by this avowal, have at least escaped from being justly exposed to the charge of having submitted to a violation of her own  sacred Covenants. In the same spirit of compromise, the Church showed herself but too ready to comply with the king's pernicious policy of including as many as possible of the prelatic clergy within the National Church. This was begun by the first General Assembly, and continued for several succeeding years, though not to the full extent wished by William, till a very considerable number of those men whose hands had been deeply dyed in the guilt of the persecution were received into the bosom of that Church which they had so long striven utterly to destroy. It was absolutely impossible that such men could become true Presbyterians; and the very alacrity with which many of them subscribed the Confession of Faith only proved the more clearly that they were void of either faith or honor. Their admission into the Presbyterian Church of Scotland was the most fatal event which ever occurred in the strange, eventful history of that Church.” It was not to be expected that the Society People could approve of the conduct either of the king or of the Church in the matter of the Revolution settlement. They occupied, accordingly, an attitude of firm and decided protest against the principles avowed by William and acted on by the Church; and they maintained that there had been a decided departure on the part of both the one and the other from the principles of the Second Reformation and the obligations of the Covenant.

Holding such views, it was impossible for the Society People to incorporate themselves with the Established Church of Scotland. They were compelled, therefore, to occupy a separate position as Dissenters from a Church whose constitution was radically vitiated, and as protesters against a professedly national government which had violated the most solemn national obligations. Three Cameronian ministers, it is true— Messrs. Shields, Linning and Boyd— applied for admission into the National Church for themselves and their people, on condition that they might acknowledge breach of Covenant, and purge out the ignorant and heterodox and scandalous ministers who had taken part in shedding the blood of the saints. But every proposal of this nature was rejected. After unsuccessful efforts to obtain redress, they at last submitted and the people who had adhered to them remained in a state of dissent.

For upwards of sixteen years after the avowal of their peculiar principles, the strict Presbyterians had remained without a stated ministry, or without any separate organization as a Church. In 1681, however, societies were formed which, though exercising no ecclesiastical functions, tended to give unity to the body, and to make such arrangements as were necessary for  the maintenance of worship and ordinances, encouraging at the same time among the people a devoted attachment to Reformation principles. Availing themselves of these praying societies for nearly twenty years after the Revolution, the people waited patiently until the Lord should send them pastors. At length, in 1707, their wishes and prayers were answered, the Rev. John M'Millan, of Balmnaghie, having resigned connection with the Established Church, and joined himself to their body. For a few years before, he had been contending within the pale of the Church for the whole of the Covenanted Reformation; but instead of meeting with sympathy from his brethren, he was hastily and irregularly deposed. Having joined the Society People, he labored for many years in the work of the ministry among them with indefatigable earnestness and zeal, maintaining the principles of the Second Reformation till his dying day.

Soon after the secession of Mr. M'Millan from the Established Church. he was joined by Mr. John M'Neil, a licentiate, who, having adopted Cameronian views, had also seceded. These two faithful and zealous servants of Christ traversed the country, preaching everywhere, and encouraging the adherents of the Covenant. In 1712 the Covenants were renewed at Auchensaugh. Amid many trials and persecutions the cause went steadily forward; and in 1743 Mr. M'Millan, who had hitherto stood alone as an ordained minister, Mr. M'Neil never having been ordained for want of a presbytery, was joined by the Rev. Thomas Nairn, who had left the Secession Church in consequence of his having embraced Cameronian views. There being now two ministers, a meeting was held at Braehead on Aug. 1, 1743, when a presbytery was for the first time formed under the name of the “Reformed Presbytery.”

One of the first acts of the newly organized Church was to dispatch missionaries to Ireland, and by the blessing of God upon the labors of these men, and others who speedily followed, a fully organized and independent section of the Reformed Presbyterian Church was formed in the sister isle.

In Scotland a Declaration and Testimony was published in 1741, and the Covenants were renewed in1 1745, at Crawford-John, in Lanarkshire; but notwithstanding these steps, which were so well fitted to promote unity of sentiment and feeling, a few years only had elapsed when a division took place in the Reformed Presbytery, two of the brethren, Messrs. Hall and Innes, having separated from their communion in consequence of their having imbibed heretical opinions on the subject of the atonement. The two  brethren, after seceding from the Presbytery, forted themselves into a new presbytery at Edinburgh, which at length became extinct. The Reformed Presbytery, in reply to their misrepresentations, found it necessary to issue a treatise in defense of their proceedings in the case of the erring brethren, as well as in refutation of the doctrine of an indefinite atonement. In 1761 a very important step was taken by the Reformed Presbytery, the emission of a Testimony for the whole of the Covenanted Reformation as attained to and established in Great Britain and Ireland, particularly between the years 1638 and 1649 inclusive.

From this time the Reformed Presbyterian Church went steadily forward, adhering to their peculiar principles with unflinching tenacity; and amid much obloquy, misunderstanding, and even misrepresentation, from the other religious denominations around them, witnessing boldly, and without compromise, for a Covenanted Reformation. Their numbers in many parts of Scotland increased beyond the means of supplying them with ministers. This was unhappily the case, for a considerable time, in various districts of the country. But at length such was the increase of ministers connected with the body that in 1810 three presbyteries were formed, and in the year following a general synod was constituted for the supervision of these presbyteries. Since that time so rapidly has the denomination advanced in numbers that in tile year 1859 the synod included six presbyteries, which consisted in all of thirty-six ordained ministers and eight vacant congregations. The synod met annually either in Edinburgh or Glasgow. The Divinity Hall met during the months of August and September, when the students, in five sessions, received the instructions of two professors, one for systematic theology, and the other for Biblical literature and Church history.

In the year 1830 the synod resolved to commence the prosecution of missionary operations. Their attention was first directed to the colonial field, particularly to Canada. Nor have they been unmindful of foreign missions, three missionaries in connection with the synod being employed in New Hebrides. There has also been a missionary laboring since 1846 among the Jews in London.

These Presbyterians have been sometimes called Cameronians, from Richard Cameron; but they are otherwise called M'Millans,” or “M'Millauites,” from the name of the first minister who espoused their cause after the Revolution. But these, as well as the terms “Whigs” and  “Mountain Men,” which are also occasionally applied to them, they regard as accidental epithets. They are sometimes also called “Covenanters,” from their adherence to the National Covenant of Scotland, and to the Solemn League and Covenant of the three kingdoms. Their proper designation, however, or that which they themselves adopt, is that of “Reformed Presbyterians.” They hold the Holy Scriptures to be the absolute rule of faith and conduct, and to contain the standard of these both in Church and State. Next to this they adopt the early standards of the Church of Scotland, the Westminster Confession of Faith, the Larger and Shorter Catechisms of the Church, the Books of Discipline, and the Westminster Directory for Public Worship. And, lastly, they regard the National Covenant of Scotland as a continuing obligation. To these are to be added the documents published by the body itself in explanation of their principles: namely, their Judicial Act and Testimony, the 5th edition of which was published at Glasgow in 1818; A Short Account of the Old Presbyterian Dissenters, published by authority of the Presbytery in 1806; and an Explanation and Defense of the Terms of Communion adopted by the Reformed Presbyterian Church. According to the statistical report made at the Synod in Glasgow, March 13, 1876, the Church included 42 congregations with 7500 members, and its annual contributions were £14,000. The synod then, by a vote of 57 to 6, adopted a resolution in favor of union with the Free Church, and such union was finally consummated in the General Assembly of that body, May 25, 1876.

The residuary Reformed Presbyterian Church musters in 1878 eight ministers who held back, and are still contending about their Church property. Thus the Original Seceders, popularly known as “Auld Lichts” (Old Lights), are a more considerable body. Though most of these joined the Free Church (as the true Church of Scotland free) in 1852, they have still some thirty congregations of poor but very worthy people, who consider it their mission to hold up the banner of the Covenants, and to protest against the all but universal defection of their time and country. At the union in 1852, Drs. Candlish and Thomson, of Edinburgh, White, of Haddington, and the younger M'Crie (whose father had been in former days the great pillar of the Old-Light community) were added to the Free Church. The present Old Lights are notably strict both in doctrine and practice. Unlike the New Lights, who ultimately went to form the United Presbyterian Church in 1847, they are stanch supporters of the Establishment principle, which the Free Church also upholds in theory. It is  chiefly the faithlessness of the latter with respect to the Covenants which prevents the residuary “Auld Lichts” from joining the communion. SEE SCOTLAND, CHURCHES IN; also Nos. 12 and 13 below.

5. UNITED ORIGINAL SECESSION CHURCH. — In common with all true Protestants, the Synod of United Original Seceders acknowledges the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the supreme and only rule of faith and practice. They claim to be a branch of the Reformed and Covenanted Church of Scotland, and adhere to the whole of the Westminster standards as these were received by the Church of Scotland as standards of union and uniformity for the churches in the three kingdoms, and feel themselves bound by the sacred pledge given in the Solemn League and Covenant to adhere to them as such. They thus take their stand upon the principles of the first and particularly of the second Reformation, which took place between the year 1638 and 1650, and which embodied in its proceedings and settlement all the valuable attainments of the first Reformation and carried them to a greater extent. They own the morality of public covenanting, and the continued and perpetual obligation of the National Covenant of Scotland, and of the Solemn League and Covenant, upon all ranks and classes in these lands, and acknowledge the duty of renewing these covenants in a bond suited to the circumstances. As Presbyterians, they hold that the Lord Jesus Christ, the alone king and head of his Church, has appointed a particular form of government to take place therein, distinct from civil government and not subordinate to the same, and that Presbyterial Church government is the only form laid down and appointed by the Lord Jesus Christ in his Word. As they believe that Church communion consists in the joint profession of the truths and observance of all the ordinances which Christ has appointed in his Word, and that the visible unity of the Church lies in the unity of her visible fellowship, they regard free communion as an obvious violation of that unity, and hold it to be unscriptural, and that the practice encourages persons to continue in corrupt communions, by leading them to conclude that there is no conscientious ground of difference between them and the persons who make no scruple of occasionally joining with them in the intimacies of Church fellowship. In the worship of God they make use of the Psalms of David only, believing that they were delivered to the Church by the Holy Spirit to be used as the matter of public praise, and they regard hymns of human composition as unsuitable to the worship of God, and  tending to endanger the purity both of the worship and the doctrines of the Church.

The Original Secession Synod dates its rise from 1733, and claims to represent the first seceders who in their testimony published in 1737 were careful to make it known that they were not dissenters from the National Church because of her civil establishment, but seceders from a corrupt and prevailing party in her judicatories, who carried on a general course of defection from the reformed and covenanting principles. The Original Secession Testimony, published in 1827, applies the principles of the Judicial Testimony to public events that had occurred up to the date of its publication, and like it was designed to be a declaration of the sense of the standards, and of the way in which they were received by the Reformed and Covenanted Church of Scotland. It is a term of ministerial and Christian communion in the body-that is, office-bearers are required to signify their approval of its principles, and members to accede to them, so far as they know and understand them.

The synod has from time to time been lessened by the separation of brethren. At present it consists of 41 congregations in Scotland, England, and Ireland; of these 29 (including one in England) are in connection with the synod in Scotland, and 12 constitute the Secession Synod in Ireland, in full communion with the Scottish Synod. The members and adherents are estimated at 6500. The income of the Scottish Synod last year amounted to about £5400.

The synod has several Home Mission stations, and also a prosperous Foreign Mission agency at Seoni, in India, under the immediate charge of Rev. George Anderson, who is assisted by two catechists. There is an orphanage in connection with the mission, having eleven children, who are well fed, clad, and educated, and it is expected that the number will shortly be materially increased. A school is also carried on, having 170 scholars, and four teachers in addition to the missionary, and one catechist; the children are instructed in English, Urdu, and Hindi. The synod is desirous of obtaining, and has ample funds for maintaining, another ordained missionary in India. The synod supports a divinity hall, which is carried on under the superintendence of the Rev. Prof. W. F. Aitken, A.M., and the Rev. Prof. James Spence. The library in connection with the hall has 1400 volumes. Under the editorship of the Rev. John Sturrock a bimonthly magazine is published having a circulation of 1200 copies.

6. PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN ENGLAND. — In the reign of queen Elizabeth there were two well-defined parties—the Prelatists, favored by the queen, who were satisfied with the reforms begun by king Edward; and the Presbyterians, who desired a simpler form of worship and government, like that set up by Calvin in Geneva. The first adherents of this form of Church government in England were those Protestants who returned from Frankfort, to which place they had fled for refuge in the reign of queen Mary. There they became acquainted with the Geneva platform, and, returning to their native country in the time of Elizabeth, they at first met in private houses, and afterwards more publicly, on which occasions the worship was conducted agreeably to the forms of the Geneva service- book. These latter were called Nonconformists, from their aversion to the established liturgy and hierarchy, and Puritans, from their anxiety for purity of life and worship. At the Convocation in 1562, the proposition to dispense with all ceremonies that had not the clear warrant of Scripture was lost by only one vote. Hallam says that the Puritan party outnumbered either the Roman Catholic or the Church of England, and that they composed the majority of Parliament under Elizabeth and her two successors (Const. Hist. Engl. ch. 4, n.). SEE PURITANS.

They were taken up at the time with questions of doctrine and discipline, and with resistance to power exercised, as they believed, contrary to the Word of God. But they felt so much the constraint of circumstances, that they paid little heed to the development of their principles in Church government, and certainly had no thought of attempting to constitute a Church on the principles which they maintained, resting satisfied in giving effect to these principles by mere resistance in particular cases in which their consciences were aggrieved. Yet in 1572 a presbytery was formed at Wandsworth, in Surrey, by ministers of London and its neighborhood, separating from the Church of England; and other presbyteries were soon formed notwithstanding the extreme hostility of queen Elizabeth. Synods were now held occasionally. The court, looking to the episcopate as the support of its own supremacy, strove with all its might to maintain it unweakened, and enforced with reckless energy the bloody laws enacted against the Catholics on one side and the radical Protestant sects on the other. The king having established a liturgy calculated to set limits to the arbitrary freedom of Puritan worship, the Presbyterians set it down as a “worship of Baal” and a quenching of the Spirit of God. The dissension threatened to take the form of civil war, for the Presbyterians of England united with those of Scotland. On July 1, 1643, in obedience to a summons from  Parliament (which summons had been issued in consequence of a remonstrance of the Presbyterian divines against prelacy), the Westminster Assembly met in Westminster Abbey. This Assembly was composed of 121 English divines, 10 lords, 20 commoners, with 5 ministers and 5 elders representing the Church of Scotland.

They drew up a Confession of Faith, commonly known as the Westminster Confession, a Form of Church Government, a Directory for Public Worship, and two Catechisms, the Larger and the Shorter, which were all approved by Parliament in 1648. Parliament then enacted an ordinance making Presbyterianism the established religion of England, but without attaching any penalties to nonconformity. A loud cry has been raised against the English Presbyterians on the alleged ground that, at this period of their history, their whole efforts were directed towards the attainment of Church power. “Now, what was this Church power,” says the younger M'Crie, “which the Presbyterians were so anxious to secure, and which Neal would represent as ‘a civil authority over men's persons and properties? Will it be believed that it was neither more nor less than the power of keeping back scandalous and unworthy persons from the ordinances of baptism and the Lord's Supper? This was, in fact, the great point in dispute between them and the Parliament; for the Parliament had insisted on having the supreme power in ecclesiastical matters, and had passed a law to the effect that if any person were refused admission to sealing ordinances by the Church courts, he might appeal to Parliament, which might, by virtue of its authority, compel the Church courts to receive him, whatever his character might be. The Presbyterians, as Neal himself admits, ‘were dissatisfied with the men in power, because they would not leave the Church independent of the State.' And would Mr. Neal, himself an Independent, have had the Church to be dependent on the State? Would he have had the Presbyterians tamely submit to see the royal prerogatives of Christ assumed by a Parliament, after they had succeeded in wresting them out of the hands of a monarch against whom, for this very reason, the nation had long been engaged in a bloody war?”

The ordinance which they had secured from Parliament in 1648, however, never ‘went into practical operation, for as soon as Cromwell and the Independents rose into power, they showed an uncompromising hostility to the Presbyterians. This was partly owing to the resistance the latter had made to the trial and execution of Charles I, insomuch that they had to be driven out of the House of Commons by force before those measures could  be effected. London and its neighborhood were, meanwhile, formed into twelve presbyteries, constituting the Provincial Synod of London, which continued to hold regular half-yearly meetings till 1655, the meetings of presbyteries being continued till a later date; but the whole Presbyterian system was overturned by Cromwell's Committee of Triers composed of thirty-eight persons of different sects, who were appointed in place of the Assembly for the examining and approving of all persons elected or nominated to any ecclesiastical office. Cromwell's policy aimed at bringing all ecclesiastical matters under the immediate control of the civil power.

On the Restoration. Charles II no sooner found himself firmly seated on the throne than he proved false to the Solemn League and Covenant which he had sworn to observe, restored prelacy to its former power, and gave ip the Presbyterians, who had exerted themselves for his return to persecution. The fruitless Savoy Conference (q.v.) was followed by the Act of Uniformity, which was carried into effect on St. Bartholomew's Day, Aug. 24, 1662. Two thousand conscientious ministers who would not consent to be episcopally re-ordained, to assent to the Book of Common Prayer, or to abjure the Solemn League and Covenant, were then ejected from their benefices, and wandered forth to a life of poverty. Sixty thousand of the laity were imprisoned or fined, 5000 of whom died in prison, and the fines, confiscations, and other consequent losses of property amounted to £2,000,000 sterling. SEE NONCONFORMISTS.

After the Revolution, and the passage of the Act of Toleration in 1689, Presbyterianism revived, chapels sprang up in every part of the kingdom, and within twenty-five years the Presbyterians numbered 800 congregations. They became one of the “three denominations” who received the recognition of the State and were permitted to petition the crown in a corporate capacity, and in the business meetings of deputies from these denominations the Presbyterians had two representatives for one Baptist and one Independent.

Prosperity, however, proved more injurious than persecution, and there was an abatement of zeal and spirituality. Besides this, another cause operated disastrously. In 1691 the Presbyterians were induced to enter into Articles of Agreement with the Independents. As a consequence, Presbyterian discipline began to be relaxed, the system was not carried out, the office of ruling elder was allowed to be dropped, the disuse of Church sessions naturally followed, presbyteries and synods were given up, the  churches became virtually independent, and finally Arian and Socinian errors infected the ministers and congregations to such all alarming extent that the name Presbyterian became synonymous in England with Socinian or Unitarian; old endowments, legacies of Presbyterians, being in many instances enjoyed by Unitarians. Notwithstanding the numerous Presbyterian houses of worship which had been erected, the organization of Presbyterianism was very imperfectly kept up. The “discipline” which has flourished so well in Scotland under the form of” Kirk Session” never obtained a firm footing in England, nor have the English Presbyterians ever possessed a completely organized system of presbyteries, synods, and General Assembly. Along with the extensive deviation from sound doctrine among the English Presbyterians there arose a strong feeling of discontent with the compulsory subscription of the Thirty-nine Articles which the Toleration Act required from all Dissenters.

The subject was discussed in various pamphlets; and at length, constrained by the force of public opinion, government passed an act in 1779 by which every preacher or teacher of any congregation who scrupled to declare and subscribe his assent to any of the articles was allowed to make and subscribe instead thereof the declaration of Protestant belief, and was thereby entitled to similar exemptions. A subsequent statute renders qualifying in the case of Dissenters for the exercise of ministerial functions unnecessary, except in obedience to a legal requisition. But although forced subscription to the Articles was no longer required, the Protestant Dissenters, including the Presbyterians, still retained their own symbolic books which coincided in doctrine with the Thirty-nine Articles. Up to this time both Presbyterians and Congregationalists were in the habit of requiring confessions of faith at ordinations, and on such occasions ministers of both denominations frequently took part in the religious services. At the present day numbers of churches exist in England originally planted on a Presbyterian foundation, which are only Presbyterian in name, being, in fact. Socinian in faith and Independent in government. Probably there are not less than 170 such churches; but, protected by acts of Parliament and decisions of the lord-chancellors, they remain unmolested in the enjoyment of their endowments.

There existed, however, for some time in England a few congregations connected with the Church of Scotland and with the Scottish Secession Church. The former organized into a separate ecclesiastical body in 1836, but in 1843 a portion of this adhered to the Scottish Established Church,  while a portion, in sisterly alliance with the Free Church of Scotland, prosecuted its work in England on the footing of a Church with separate and independent jurisdiction. In 1872 the two bodies into which the English Presbyterians finally divided-the one then called The Presbyterian Church in England, the other United Presbyterians-presented the following relative strength:

Presbyteries Churches Seitted ministers Ruling elders Communicants Missionary and benevolent collections StipendsEnglish Pres'b. 7 132 123 546 23,966 £7,308

£27,525United Presb. 5 105 90 560 17,861 £7,781

£18,487Total. 12 237 213 1,106 41,827 £15,0S9

£46,012In 1876 the statistics presented at the fortieth meeting of the Synod of the English Presbyterian Church showed that the number of communicants was 29,045, the total amount of receipts for the year £98,484, and the amount of stipends paid £38,069. The income for home missions had been £2133. Seven new fields of labor had been occupied. The expenditures of the Foreign Mission Committee had been £8268 for the support of 12 missionaries in China, besides 3 at home for rest, 56 native evangelists, and 23 students. On June 18, 1876, the first Synod of The Presbyterian Church of England was constituted by the union of the two bodies. The United Church then consisted of 11 presbyteries, with 263 congregations; 50,000 members, with a yearly income of £160.000. Il 1877 the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of England comprised 258 congregations, distributed into 10 presbyteries, with a membership of 43,434 communicants. The entire income of the Church during that year, both congregational and synodical, inclusive of £6210 2s. from special sources, was £157,455 12s.  The schemes of the Church, placed under the charge of standing committees, are as follows:

1. Home Missions, including Church Extension, Evangelization, Temperance.

2. Foreign Missions. — Principally in China, where there are 15 European missionaries and 85 native evangelists, and 35 students in training. There are 106 stations in all, many of which have been organized as churches, situated in the districts of Amoy and Swatow and the island of Formosa. In connection with these there were, at the close of 1888, 3553 communicants. There is one missionary station in India. Many of the late United Presbyterian congregations maintain more or less their connection meanwhile, as was understood at the union, with the foreign missions ot their former Church. The committee aids missions in Germany, France, Belgium, Spain, Portugal, Italy, Bohemia, and Russia.

3. Jewish Mission. — The sphere of this work, with one missionary, the Rev. Thomas Meyer, is London, There is a mission-hall, with reading- room. The means used are domestic visitations, public meetings in the hall, prayer-meetings, and meetings with inquirers. Thirty-seven Jews, besides casual inquirers, were more or less under regular instruction in 1877. There were three baptisms.

4. Education. — A theological seminary is maintained in London. It has three professors: the Revs. Dr. Lorimer, Dr. Chalmers, and the Rev. Mr. Gibb (resident). A generous member of the Church, R. Barbour, Esq., of Manchester, having made provision for the endowment of an additional chair, the Church is taking steps for making appointment of another professor in 1878. The committee also takes charge of superintending and aiding a number of schools, especially in rural districts.

5. Sabbath-schools. — The committee reported to the Synod in 1877 348 schools, 5382 teachers, 51,185 scholars on the roll, of whom 20,271 are children of parents belonging to the Church, and 4510 are in senior classes. Much Christian work is done among the young by other means.

6. Sustenation Fund. — This was a scheme in operation, at the date of the union, in the Presbyterian Church in England only-the United Presbyterian Church aiding its weaker congregations by another plan. This necessitates now some transitional and imperfect action. The equal dividend for last  year to the congregations on the fund was £200, raising the minimum ministerial stipend to that amount. The whole sum paid as salaries was £63,214, of which forty percent passed through this fund.

7. Publications. — This committee issues the Messenger and Children's Messenger, monthly periodicals of the Church, and during the past year has prepared a memorial volume containing records of the union. It contemplates the continuance of instructive manuals, of which two have been published for the use of the Church.

Other provisions are: (a) Widows and Orphans Fund; (b) Church Building Committee; and (c) Aged and Infirm Ministers Fund. See Hume, Hist. of England; Neal, Hist. of the Puritans; Sketch of the History and Principles of the Presbyterian Church in England (Lond.); Hallam, Constitutional History of England; Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac; M'Crie, Annals of English Presbyterianism (1872).

7. PRESBYTERIAN CHURCIH IN IRELAND. — In Ireland as well as in England there was a strong Puritan section of the clergy holding Presbyterian principles during the earlier years of the 17th century, and the party was considerably strengthened by the settlement of Ulster by Scottish colonists during the reign of James I. Scottish ministers also carried over to Ireland their peculiar views. But the Presbyterian party was not consolidated into a separate community until the civil war broke out. The first Presbyterian minister who appeared in Ireland after the Reformation was the Rev. Walter Travers, the first regular provost of Trinity College, Dublin. He entered on his official duties in 1594; but, owing to the civil war in which the country was then involved, he did not remain long at the head of the university. Of those ministers who went to Ireland in the reign of James I, the earliest was Mr. Edward Brice, who became rector of Templecorran, near Carrickfergus, in the county of Antrim. About that time a number of Scotchmen obtained bishoprics in Ulster. These prelates, who had been brought up in the Presbyterian Church, and who had themselves been originally ordained by presbyters, were not at first disposed to exact conformity to the Episcopal ritual from the Scottish ministers settled around them. Thus it was that the ministers, though refusing to use the Liturgy, were permitted to preach in the parish churches and enjoy the tithes. But when the imperious Wentworth was placed at the head of the government of Ireland, a new policy was inaugurated. All the clergy were obliged to strict conformity; and in a few years all the  Presbyterian ministers were driven into exile. At the time of the horrid massacre in 1641, not one of them was in the country. Thus they most providentially escaped that catastrophe.

In 1642, when a Scottish army arrived in Ulster to put down the rebellion, Presbyterianism obtained a permanent footing in Ireland, and, after various struggles, a Presbyterian Church was founded by the formation of a presbytery at Carrickfergus on the 10th of June, 1642. The Presbyterian population of Ulster was greatly increased in number by immigration from Scotland about the middle of the 17th century; and notwithstanding many difficulties, from the opposition of prelates and of the civil power, the Church continued to increase. While the civil war was going on in Scotland great numbers of the Scotch emigrated to the north of Ireland, and these made a still larger addition to the Presbyterian population, a strong bond being also established between the two communicants. For a time their ministers in Ireland were silenced by Cromwell because they refused to take the “engagement” of fidelity to the commonwealth; but for the last five or six years of his administration he treated the Irish Presbyterians with less severity, and at the Restoration they numbered nearly eighty congregations, with seventy ministers. Sixty- one of these were obliged to give up the benefices into which they had been placed (Jeremy Taylor deprived thirty-six in one day), and only seven out of the seventy conformed to the Episcopal establishment. Within a few years, however, the Presbyterians organized into a compact body as the Synod of Ulster, and it is a curious fact that the Presbyterian ministers received a pension from government, under Charles II, in 1672, which regium donum (q.v.), however, was not regularly paid, and soon ceased to be expected by the Presbyterian ministers. In the reign of William the regium donum was augmented, although only to the paltry amount in all of £1200 a year. The sum has since, however, been repeatedly augmented. With the disestablishment of the Episcopal Church of Ireland, under Gladstone's ministry, the regium donum was discontinued, and the Presbyterian Church of Ireland is entirely relieved from State dependence.

It was valued at fourteen years' purchase, and the sum of nearly £600,000 was paid over therefore, thus securing the division among the ministers of nearly £30,000 a year of interest. In 1710 the synod of the Presbyterian Church resolved to institute the preaching of the Gospel to the Irish in their own language. During this period of its history the Irish Presbyterian Church experienced the utmost opposition from the High-Church party. Afterwards dissensions sprang up within it, and these with reference to the most important doctrines. Irish Presbyterians could not escape the  influence of the latitudinarian spirit which prevailed during the 18th century. Early in the reign of George I, some of their ministers began to speak ambiguously on doctrinal subjects, and to oppose subscription to the Westminster Confession of Faith. In consequence, in 1726, a schism took place among them, and the non-subscribers formed themselves into what was called “The Presbytery of Antrim.” The separatists did not obtain much support from the mass of the Presbyterian population; but not a few who remained connected with the larger body, known as “The Synod of Ulster,” exhibited very little zeal in upholding and propagating the sound theology of their forefathers. Meanwhile the Scotch Seceders, who appeared in Ireland shortly before the middle of the 18th century, did much to maintain purity of doctrine in the Northern province. Their congregations rapidly multiplied, and within little more than sixty years after the organization of their first church, there were upwards of ninety Secession ministers in Ulster.

In 1761 the Rev. Matthew Lynd, the first Irish Covenanting minister, was ordained at Vow, near Rasharkin, in the county of Antrim. Owing very much to the growing laxity of doctrine and discipline in the Synod of Ulster, the Covenanters, or Reformed Presbyterians, continued, from this date till the close of the century, to make steady progress; and in 1792 their first Irish Presbytery was constituted. But early in the present century indications of a religious revival appeared in the Synod of Ulster, and when Arianism was openly avowed an earnest protest was raised against it. In 1829 the Arian controversy issued in the separation of the Unitarians from the great Northern Synod and immediately afterwards the Irish Presbyterian Church, as if invigorated with new life, commenced a prosperous career. Its congregations rapidly increased; its ministers exhibited new zeal and enterprise; and some of them attracted attention all over the empire as platform-speakers and pulpit orators. In 1835 the Synod of Ulster adopted an overture requiring unqualified subscription to the Westminster Confession of Faith from all its licentiates and ministers; and as the grounds of separation between this body and the Secession Synod were now removed, a union between them was happily consummated in 1840. The united body, which assumed the designation of “The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland,” consisted, at the time of its incorporation, of 433 congregations. Ever since the date of this union, the Irish Presbyterian Church has occupied a more commanding position in the country. It has at present under its care about half a million of people, including a large proportion of the substantial farmers and merchants of  Ulster. Very few of the aristocracy were ever attached to it; but of late its members have been advancing steadily in social position; and at the present time it has in its communion seven members of Parliament, several considerable landed proprietors, and many gentlemen holding the commission of the peace.

The Remonstrant or Arian body has not increased in like proportion. After their withdrawal from the orthodox majority in 1829, the Unitarians formed themselves into an association which assumed the name of “The Remonstrant Synod of Ulster.” This body has since maintained a lingering existence in the north of Ireland; but doctrinal laxity does not flourish among Presbyterians; and though the Unitarians call reckon some forty congregations in the island, their numbers, including the adherents of the Presbytery of Antrim, amount, according to the government census of 1871, only to 9373 individuals.

The Covenanters, or Reformed Presbyterians, who are all strict Calvinists, are considerably more numerous. There are besides a few congregations in Ireland connected with the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland, as well as a few others known by the designation of Seceders; but they form a very small item in the national census. The Irish Presbyterian Church now consists of about 600 congregations, and has not only displayed much zeal for the advancement of Protestantism in Ireland, but also of Christianity in other parts of the world. Immediately after its formation, the General Assembly inaugurated a Foreign Mission. India was selected as the scene of its missionary operations, and its agents have ever since been laboring there with encouraging success in Gujarat and Kattiawar. Connected with it there are now 10 ordained European missionaries, assisted by a staff of native catechists, colporteurs, and schoolteachers. Within the year 1888 there were 201 baptisms, and the total number connected with the native Church amounted to 2158 individuals. The mission has been maintained during the year 1888 at an expense of £13,054. Its operations have been recently extended to China, where three mission stations have been established. In addition to this mission the Presbyterian Church of Ireland supports a Jewish mission, a Continental and Colonial mission, and a mission for Soldiers and Sailors. In 1876 the Presbyterian Church in Ireland reported five synods, thirty-six presbyteries, 639 ministers, 78,445 families, and 107.262 communicants. The sustentation fund amounted to £122,000; the total ministerial income for the previous year was £513,000. The average salary of the ministers was £870. In the schools of the  National Board of Education, the Presbyterian children, in 1874, numbered 115,258, equal to about 11 per cent. A Presbyterian college (Magee College) was opened at Londonderry Oct. 10, 1865.

In 1846, Mrs. Magee, widow of the Rev. William Magee, a Presbyterian minister, left £20,000 in trust for the erection and endowment of a Presbyterian college. This sum was allowed to accumulate for some years, until eventually the trustees were authorized, by a decree of the lord-chancellor, to select a convenient site at or near Londonderry. The Irish Society have granted an annual endowment of £250 to the chair of natural philosophy and mathematics, and £250 for five years towards the general expenses of the college. The Rev. Richard Dill, who died in 1858, bequeathed £5000 to establish two professorships. The appointment of the trustees is vested in the General Assembly. The professors are required to sign the Westminster Confession of Faith, but no religious test is prescribed for students. The majority of the Irish Presbyterian ministers are educated in the General Assembly's Theological College at Belfast. It has a faculty of six professors, but provides only a theological curriculum. The students attending it receive their undergraduate education in the adjoining Queen's College. The Assembly College has an attendance of from 70 to 150 students; the students of the younger college are not yet nearly so numerous. Previous to the passing of the Irish Church Act in 1869, a parliamentary grant of £1750 per annum sufficed for the maintenance of six professors, at £250 each, leaving £250 to defray the expense of management. The government, on the passing of the act, granted a sum of £43,976 as compensation; and the interest of this sum together with that on £5000 subscribed by friends of the institution, and the fees of the students, make up the annual income. Patrons have recently added prizes, worth from £20 to £50 per annum. A most valuable agency sustained by the Church and of comparatively recent establishment is the Orphan Society, which already supports 2400 poor children deprived of one or both of their parents, and has an annual revenue of about £9000. SEE IRELAND.

8. PRESBYTERIAN SYNOD OF SECEDERS IN IRELAND. — This denomination of Christians was formed by a union, which was effected in 1818, between the two sections of the Secession Church in Ireland, the Burghers and Antiburghers. From the commencement of the present century negotiations had been carried on with a view to the accomplishment of this most desirable object; but such negotiations had uniformly failed, from the circumstance that the Antiburghers, who were  subject to the general synod in Scotland, had been prevented by that court from taking effective steps in the matter. At length, however, they resolved to act independently of the Scottish judicatory, and the two synods of Seceders in Ireland, having agreed upon a basis of union, met at Cookstown July 9,1818, and formed themselves into one body under the designation of “The Presbyterian Synod of Ireland, distinguished by the name Seceders.” The ministers of the united synod at this period amounted in number to 97. The basis on which the union rested consisted of the six following points:

“1. To declare their constant and inviolable attachment to their already approved and recognized standards; namely, the Westminster Confession of Faith, Larger and Shorter Catechisms, Directory for Worship, and Form of Presbyterian Church government, with the Original Secession Testimony.

“2. That, as they unite under the banner of a testimony, they are determined, in all times coming, as their forefathers have set them the example, to assert the truth when it is injured or opposed, and to condemn and testify against error and immorality whenever they may seem to prevail.

“3. To cancel the name of Burgher and Antiburgher forever, and to unite the two synods into one, to be known by the name ‘The Presbyterian Synod of Ireland, distinguished by the name Seceders.'

“4. To declare their insubordination to any other ecclesiastical court, while, at the same time, they do hereby signify their hearty inclination to hold a correspondence with their sister Church in Scotland or elsewhere, for their mutual edification; but think it expedient not to lay themselves under any restrictions as to the manner of said correspondence.

“5. To allow all the presbyteries and congregations in their connection to bear the same name, and, in the meantime, stand as they were before the coalescence.

“6. Carefully to preserve all the public records of the two synods from their formation in this kingdom till the present day.”

This union was the means of imparting considerable strength and vigor to the Secession Church in Ireland. A home mission was now commenced,  and the cause of Presbyterianism began to flourish in various towns and villages where it had been hitherto unknown. The whole proceedings of this Church were characterized by a high regard to purity of doctrine and the advancement of vital religion. The Irish Presbyterian Church, on the contrary, had long been hindered in its progress by the prevalence of Arian and Socinian doctrines, both among its ministers and people. By the divine blessing, however, they were at length enabled to rid themselves of the New-Light party; and, to secure uniformity of teaching in the Church, they passed an overture requiring absolute subscription to the Confession of Faith. The general synod was now, in almost all respects, assimilated to the Irish Secession Church, and the proposal of a union between the two was seriously entertained. An arrangement in regard to the regium donum made in 1838 paved the way for its completion, government having in that year agreed to equalize the bounty, and on certain conditions to grant £75, late Irish currency, per annum, to every minister connected with the two synods. Being thus placed on an equal footing by the government, and agreed both in doctrine and Church polity, the great obstacles to a complete incorporation of the two churches were thus removed.

The first movement towards union had taken place among the theological students of both churches attending the Belfast Academical Institution, who had established among themselves a united prayer-meeting. The desire for union, and a strong feeling of its propriety, rapidly spread both among ministers and people. Memorials on the subject, accordingly, were presented to the Synod of Ulster, and the Secession Synod, at their respective meetings in 1839. Committees were appointed by the two synods, and, the matter having been fully considered and preliminaries adjusted, the final act of incorporation took place at Belfast on July 10, 1840, the united body taking to itself the name of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland. SEE IRELAND.

9. WELSH CALVINISTIC METHODISTS. — This body of believers is sometimes ranked among Presbyterians, because its form of Church government is a modified Presbyterianism. Each Church manages its own affairs, admits or expels members by the vote of the majority of those who belong to it, but this is rather Congregational than Presbyterian. It, however, allows an appeal from the decision of the individual Church to the monthly meeting of the county or presbytery to which it belongs, and then there is an appeal from the monthly meeting to the quarterly association of the province. Matters are finally disposed of as follows:  those relating to South Wales by the South Wales Association, and so of the North; but a few years ago a General Assembly of the whole connection was established, and the two associations may agree to refer matters to that body, which meets once a year, for final decision. Its Confession of Faith is, of course, strictly Calvinistic. SEE METHODISM (vol. 6:p. 156, col. 6).

10. PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES. — The denomination commonly known by this name, both on account of its numerical superiority and its priority of organization, derived its origin from the Presbyterians of Scotland and Ireland, and particularly the latter, with a considerable infusion of French Huguenots, Dutch and German Reformed emigrants. Many fugitives from persecution in the mother country took refuge in the more liberal colonies of Pennsylvania, Maryland, New Jersey, Virginia, and the Carolinas. Francis Makemie, who may be called the founder of American Presbyterianism, was an Irishman, who several years before the close of the 17th century had gathered churches in Maryland. For several years before the organization of the first presbytery, his most intimate ministerial friend was Jedediah Andrews. The earliest traces of Church organizations of a trustworthy character indicate a congregation gathered in Upper Marlborough, Md. in 1690, and others collected by Mr. Makemie in the same colony about the same date, if not as early as 1684-one in Freehold, N. J., called the Scotch Meeting-house, in 1692; and one in Philadelphia, under the care of Mr. Andrews, in 1698. The Presbytery of Philadelphia is supposed to have been formed about the year ‘1705, if not before, this uncertainty arising from the first page of the manuscript minutes being lost. It was composed of seven ministers-Samuel Davis, John Hampton, Francis Makemie, and George M'Nish, from Ireland; Nathaniel Taylor and John Wilson, from Scotland; and Jedediah Andrews, from New England. The growth of the body was so rapid as to justify, in 1716, the formation of the Synod of Philadelphia, consisting of three presbyteries. The presbytery of Philadelphia had six ministers and six churches; that of Newcastle six ministers and churches; that of Snowhill three ministers and churches; and that of Long Island two ministers and several churches — in all twenty-three ministers and more than that number of congregations.

The Adopting Act was passed in 1729, designed to announce the Westminster Confession and Catechisms as the standards of the Church more formally than had ever yet been done. The bearing of this act has  been of late years sharply discussed. It may be found in the printed minutes. It was a compromise measure accepted in consequence of the agitation which had been occasioned by the Irish presbyters. These had been in the midst of an exciting controversy against the intrusion of Arian principles into the Presbyterian Church of Ireland, and had come over determined to suffer no looseness of subscription to the standards of faith. The Adopting Act occasioned, therefore, not a little controversy. The non- subscribers in sentiment disliked even the general terms of the Adopting Act, while the others desired the adoption of the ipsissima verba of the standards. Though the measure was finally a compromise, it failed to set differences at rest. They continued to develop, and became manifest in connection with certain synodical action on ministerial education, and ripened until they resulted in one or two secessions, which prepared the way for the establishment in this country of a branch of the Associate Presbyterian Church. In 1739, party feelings were revived by the visit of Whitefield, and the synod was divided into those who were known as friends or enemies of the revival.

By 1741 the controversy resulted in a schism, by which the body was rent into two synods-that of the Old Side party, called the Synod of Philadelphia; that of the New, called the Synod of New York. The principal cause of the division was the insisting of the Old Side on a thoroughly educated ministry, while the New laid more stress on piety and zeal. There was no difference of opinion as to doctrine or discipline. Gilbert Tennant, the friend of Whitefield, was the leader and master spirit of the New branch, and published several sermons and pamphlets, very severe in their tone. After a separation of thirteen years, passion and party feeling cooled down, the leaders were disposed to make mutual concessions, past errors and mistakes were frankly confessed, and the two synods became again united, May 29, 1758, under the style and title of “the Synod of New York and Philadelphia,” comprising ninety-four ministers. During the half century of existence that had now closed, the Church had taken some important steps. It had committed itself, for instance, to a polity distinctly Presbyterian, it had adopted Calvinistic doctrinal standards, and had set up a high standard of ministerial education. Nor were these things needless, or done too soon.

A stream of population was rapidly flowing westward, having on its front line settlers of very diverse characters. Some were men of such lawless habits that they could no longer stay in orderly communities; others loved the wild excitements of frontier life, and others thought only of bettering their temporal condition by obtaining homes in the new lands. All classes were very poor. Indians  were numerous, causing the preacher to carry his rifle as well as his Bible- while State Church opposition added to the difficulties of the Presbyterian evangelist. Only men of education-men of energy, fill of zeal and of varied resource, could have even held their own in the face of such hindrances. Such men the Presbyterian Church desired to have in its ministry, nor desired in vain. Many of its early preachers-the Tennants of New Jersey, Brainerd of the Indian Mission, Davies of Virginia, and a host of others, have been pre-eminent for ministerial efficiency, and will assuredly be held in everlasting remembrance. While the Church was thus supplying the Gospel in sparsely peopled districts and forming new presbyteries in every direction, it was led to enter into such relations with the Congregationalists as materially influenced its after-course. For some years before the Revolution, the Colonial Episcopal Church had sought to obtain a legal Establishment. Fearing the success of its efforts, the synod agreed in 1766 to meet in annual convention with the General Association of Connecticut, “to unite their endeavors and counsels for spreading the Gospel and preserving the religious liberties of the churches.” This arrangement was carried out until the outbreak of I war in 1776 interrupted the intercourse.

When the war of the Revolution broke out, the Presbyterians, to a man, arrayed themselves on the side of the patriots-which may, at least in part, be explained by the fear, which they shared in common with the Congregationalists of New England, that there was a design to introduce bishops and establish an oppressive and odious hierarchy in the colonies. During the Revolutionary war, in common with all religious interests, the Presbyterian Church suffered greatly. Many of its church buildings were destroyed, and not a few congregations disorganized, yet its vitality remained unbroken. Rallying quickly on the return of peace new interest in religious ordinances was manifested by the people, and synodical meetings were better attended by the ministers.

In 1785, steps were taken for revising the standards of the Church and organizing a General Assembly. A committee consisting of Drs. Witherspoon, Rodgers, Robert Smith, Patrick Allison, Samuel Stanhope Smith, John Woodhull, Robert Cooper, James Latta, George Duffield, and Matthew Wilson, was appointed “to take into consideration the constitution of the Church of Scotland and other Protestant churches,” and to form a complete system for the organization of the Presbyterian Church in the United States. In May, 1788, the synod convened and resolved itself into a General Assembly, which had its first meeting the following year,  embracing four synods (New York and New Jersey, Philadelphia, Virginia, and the Carolinas), 17 presbyteries, 419 congregations, and 180 ministers. By this assembly the Westminster Confession of Faith was adopted with three slight alterations (in chapters 20:23:and 31), and the Larger and Shorter Catechisms with but a single alteration, while the form of government and discipline of the Scottish Church was so modified as to discountenance the right of the civil magistrate to interfere in the affairs of the Church except for the purpose of protection alone. Shortly after the war, the Presbyterian ministers renewed their friendly relations with the Congregationalists. In 1792 the General Assembly and the Association of Connecticut agreed that each denomination should be represented in the annual meetings of the other by three commissioners, an agreement that afterwards embraced the general associations of Vermont, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts.

In 1794 these representatives were allowed to vote on all matters under discussion. All these measures prepared the way for the adoption, in 1801, by both parties of the “Plan of Union.” Under this arrangement a congregation, Congregational in polity, might have installed as its pastor a Presbyterian minister who still retained his seat in the presbytery, and was personally responsible thereto, and be itself represented in that court not by an elder, but by a committeeman or delegate chosen from its membership. On the other hand, a congregation Presbyterian in its polity, connected with a presbytery and represented therein by an elder, might have installed over it as pastor a Congregational minister who remained a member of some Congregational association. This procedure was the fruit partly of the co-operations of the previous years, but it made Presbyterianism less systematic in its movements and less authoritative in its administration, as we shall see presently. During the earlier years of the present century, there appeared in the southern and western portions of the Church striking manifestations of religious interest, having, in many cases, singular physical accompaniments. In connection with these, zeal outran discretion; strange doctrines were soon taught; presbyterial order was violated, and confusion became widespread. Ultimately these things led to the withdrawal of some of the offenders and the removal of others from the Presbyterian Church, and the formation in 1811 of what is now known as “The Cumberland Presbyterian Church.” (See No. 11 below.)

The increase of the Church was rapid, and by 1834 it contained 22 synods, 111 presbyteries, and about 1900 ministers. But only four years later (in  1838) Presbyterianism suddenly encountered a severe reverse by a widespread schism, for which the materials had been gathering for several years. In 1822, the Synod of the Associate Reformed Church having been brought, under the lead of Dr. John M. Mason, to favor union with the Presbyterian Church, that union took place; but a very considerable minority refused to acquiesce in the measure, and retained a separate existence. During the fifteen years that followed, the growth of the Church was unprecedentedly rapid. New churches and presbyteries were multiplied in the Middle and Western States, Already measures had been adopted (1812) which re suited in establishing Princeton Seminary, Union Seminary in Virginia, and, though unendowed, the Southern and Western at Marysville, Tenn. Auburn followed in 1816; the Western at Allegheny City and Lane at Cincinnati in 1726-27; Columbia, S. C., and Danville, Ky., in 1828; and Union at New York in 1836. The accessions from New England, at the time in full theological sympathy with the Presbyterian Church, were provided for by the “Plan of Union” agreed to by the General Association of Connecticut and the General Assembly in 1801. It aimed to secure the rights and the harmonious co-operation of two denominations entering the same field. For nearly a quarter of a century no fault was found with it; but it led to the representation in Presbytery and General Assembly of committeemen from Congregational churches, and these were found to favor voluntary missionary societies not under the Assembly's control. Of these societies, that for home missions, within a few years after its organization in 1826, had several hundred missionaries under its patronage. Most of these were from New England, and many of them were alike opposed to Church boards and in sympathy with “New Haven theology.” Parties were thus formed in the Church, and the agitation on the subject of slavery, springing up at that time, tended to increase the alienation.

The crisis came in 1837. Two parties were arrayed against each other, known as the Old and New Schools. In general, it may perhaps be said that the division was one of sentiment between the more progressive and the more conservative members of the Church. In the Old there was more of a leaning to the strict views of the Scotch Church on doctrine and discipline; in the New, the preference was as decidedly in favor of the laxer and more latitudinarian practice of New England, from which region many of the party had originally come. The New Lights wished to bear a decided testimony against slavery; the Old Lights thought that duty did not require any action of the Church on that subject; the former wished to unite with  other denominations in Christian work through voluntary societies; the latter believed that such work could be more efficiently and economically conducted by their denomination through boards which should be under its own control. Instead of brotherly love, bickerings and heart-burnings now prevailed; the General Assembly was an arena of constant strife; each party, as it obtained an accidental majority, set itself to work to nullify the measures of its opponents. The Old School made ineffectual attempts to try and condemn Drs. Barnes, Beecher, and Duffield for publishing heterodox opinions; the New School stood up for “substance of doctrine,” and for the Great Voluntary or National Societies in opposition to denominational action. Confident in superior numbers and strategy, the latter anticipated an easy victory, and refused any concessions.

The Old School, crippled on every side, and chagrined at being cast into the shade, held conventions to decide upon their future course. In 1834 appeared “The Act and Testimony,” drafted by Rev. Robert J. Breckinridge, complaining of the prevalence of doctrinal errors, the relaxation of discipline, and the violation of Church order. The signatures amounted to 2075. In 1837 another convention, meeting a week before the General Assembly, prepared a testimony and memorial to be laid before the Assembly, in which they testified against sixteen doctrinal errors, ten variations from Presbyterian order, and five declensions in Christian discipline, and proposed a method of reform. The Old-School party, finding themselves that year (the first for five years) in the majority, adopted the suggestions of the memorial as a basis of action, and pressed matters to a speedy issue. They established a Board of Foreign Missions, dissolved the Elective Affinity Presbytery, abrogated the Plan of Union of 1801 with the Congregational bodies, and disowned (or, as the New- School party termed it, exscinded) the four synods of Genesee, Geneva, Utica, and Western Reserve as un-Presbyterian in their composition. The next year (1838) both parties made strenuous exertions for the ascendency in the Assembly. Upon calling the roll, it was found that the delegates from the four synods were not recognized, nor would the moderator, Dr. Elliott, entertain any motion in their behalf. Hereupon, according to a concerted plan, the commissioners from the four synods and those who sympathized with them protested against the moderator's decision, and proceeded to make a new organization and elect new officers, after which they withdrew in a body to another place, and there held their sittings as the true Constitutional Assembly, and, among other things, elected several trustees of the property of the corporation. These trustees, being subsequently  refused admission into the board, instituted legal proceedings, and received a verdict in their favor.

The case being taken up to the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, chief justice Gibson ordered a new trial. This, however, was never had, the rulings being such as to completely set aside the decision of judge Rogers in the inferior court, and after a few years the suit was withdrawn. The New School declared themselves satisfied with the moral effect of the trial, and with a later decision of the chief justice in the York case. The two bodies went on as separate denominations, though each claimed to have the genuine constitutional succession, and employed the same style and title, “The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.” Both of these churches were extended over the whole of the United States, and both of them had missions in different parts of the heathen world, their collections for missions forming a large part of the contributions for that object from the United States of America. The Old-School Presbyterians possessed the following theological seminaries: Princeton (Princeton, N. J.), Western (Allegheny City, Pa.), Columbia (Columbia, S. C.), Danville (Danville, Ky.), and Northwest (Chicago, Ill.). The New- School Presbyterians held the Union (New York City), Auburn (Auburn, N.Y.), Lane (near Cincinnati, O.), Blackburn (Carlinville, Ill.), and Lind (Chicago, Ill.). The Old and New School Presbyterian churches were reunited in 1871. At that time the former comprised 2381 ministers, 2740 churches, and 258,903 communicants; and the latter, 1848 ministers, 1631 churches, and 172,560 communicants.

The theological history of the Old-School Presbyterian Church for the thirty-two years of its separate existence may be presented in a very few words. It was left by the separation in a state of almost unprecedented doctrinal homogeneity. One may well doubt whether any other Christian communion of equal size has ever excelled it as to unity in the reception of an evangelical creed of such extent as the Westminster Confession and Catechisms. Differences of opinion, even among its ministers, have, of course, existed; but these differences were comparatively trifling, or of very little prominence or prevalence. If in any quarter serious error was adopted, for the most part it must have been kept secret, or have been known to but a few. No agitating discipline on this ground was exercised, or, to the knowledge of the Church at large, needed. “Princeton theology,” as it has often been called, was, beyond question, almost universally prevalent among the Old-School Presbyterians. If opposing systems must take a modern nomenclature, there may be no harm in making Princeton  and New Haven respectively the synonyms of the Old and the New Divinity; but it should be remembered that the text-books of Princeton have constantly been the simple Westminster symbols, and such long and generally approved systematic presentations of the reformed theology as the Institutio Theologic Eclenchticae of Franciscus Turretin.

Old-School men have been slow to admit the idea of any possible improvement in the generally received system of Gospel truth. Recognizing fully the recent progress made in Biblical criticism and exegesis—the fact, too, that from time to time fuller and more exact statements of Christian doctrine may be, as they have been, elaborated—and by no means maintaining that any uninspired man has been wholly free from error, they have, nevertheless, rejected with singular unanimity the assumption that any part of the substance of the Gospel had lain hidden in Holy Scripture until modern times, or that the Church of Christ has new discoveries to make as to the system of truth in Jesus. A well-known Presbyterian quarterly publication- one identified with it from the beginning -has lately said, “It has been the honest endeavor of its conductors to exhibit and defend the doctrines of our standards, under the abiding conviction that they are the doctrines of the Word of God. They have advanced no new theories, and have never aimed at originality. Whether it be a ground of reproach or of approbation, it is believed to be true that an original idea in theology is not to be found on its pages from the beginning until now.” And this praise or blame may be said to belong to the Old-School Church in general as distinctively as to the publication from which it has been quoted. The interval of separation was one of very marked literary activity in the Old-School body. Some thirty original volumes, from this source, of comment upon various portions of Holy Scripture appeared; and a very large number of important works, biographical, historical, dogmatical, practical, and miscellaneous. Probably no other denomination in the United States has produced within the same period so many theological books of standard value.

A deep conviction of the Church's duty to carry on, through strictly ecclesiastical agencies, the work of foreign missions, had led the Synod of Pittsburgh, as early as 1831, to organize itself for this purpose as the Western Foreign Missionary Society. The New School had refused to consummate the desires and plans of the Old, by taking this enterprise under the care of the whole Church; but the Assembly of 1837 accepted the trust, establishing in New York City the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions. By the Assembly of 1838 a Board of Publication was appointed,  to which were transferred the property and business of the Presbyterian Tract and Sabbath-school Book Society, organized by the Synod of Philadelphia a few years before. The Assembly of 1839, the fiftieth year having now been completed since this supreme judicatory had first convened, recommended the second Sabbath of December for a semi- centenary celebration, a day of jubilee and thanksgiving for past mercies, and the offering at that time, by all the members of the Church, of gifts for the endowment of the new board. The fund raised reached the sum of $40,000. This sum, with about $28,000 donated for building purposes a few years later, has been the nucleus of all that board's permanent property. Before the division, two boards had been organized the Board of Missions, now of Domestic Missions, for the home work, in 1816; and, in 1819, the Board of Education, to aid candidates for the ministry; both located in Philadelphia. These had been fostered by the Old School, while, as a party, the New School had preferred the American Home Missionary Society and the American Education Society, voluntary associations, in which Congregationalists participated. The Board of Missions had, in 1844, the business of church extension or church erection added to its other operations. This was carried on by a special committee, which, ten years afterwards, for greater effect, was enlarged. But in 1855 an independent committee of church extension was established at St. Louis, the name of which was changed, in 1860, to that of the Board of Church Building, then the Board of Church Extension. Two other departments of Christian liberality and effort have been committed to similar agencies. For more than a century and a half the Presbyterian Church has systematically raised funds for the relief of disabled ministers and their families. But in 1849 the General Assembly ordered collections for this purpose to be disbursed by the Board of Publication, a business transferred in 1852 to its own trustees; and in 1861 a secretary was appointed to devote his time mainly to this enterprise, which has since more prosperously advanced. In 1864, the condition of the freedmen at the South demanding immediate attention, two committees — one in Philadelphia, the other in Indianapolis- were appointed to take charge of educational and general evangelistic work among this class; and the next year, in place of the two, a single committee on freedmen was established and located at Pittsburgh. Various arrangements and changes have been made to secure to the boards the advantage of periodical publications to disseminate intelligence of their work through the churches. The latest accounts show a circulation of 16,000 copies of the Monthly Record; nearly 100,000 of the Sabbath-  School Visitor of the Month; and 3500 of the pamphlet, with almost 52,000 of the newspaper edition, both monthly, of the Foreign Missionary; besides many thousands of the several yearly reports and of various occasional issues. From about 1849 the project of a weekly religious paper, like the Methodist Advocate, was pressed upon the Assembly for several years successively, but without effect. Yet the Church has always acknowledged the unspeakable importance of religious papers, many of which have been established by private enterprise.

The several departments of self-development in the New-School section at the time of union were as follows:

(1.) “The Presbyterian Committee of Horne Missions.” It steadily increased in efficiency. Its receipts the first year were $27,244, and the number of its missionaries 195. In 1889 it had 1592 missionaries and an income of $885,518. Its missionaries reported 160 new churches formed during the year; 12,000 hopeful conversions, and 10,490 added to the churches on profession of their faith. The freedmen's department, organized in 1865, received and expended during the year 1888 $113,082; and reported 375 teachers employed and 20 others under appointment, all in the Southern States.

(2.) The “Trustees of the Church Erection Fund”, appointed in 1854 were incorporated by the Legislature of the State of New York in the year following. The original basis of their operations was the permanent fund of $100,000, raised by contributions from the churches, most of it in the year 1854, the interest to be employed in promoting the object chiefly in the way of loans. The establishment of this fund operated as a strong bond of union in the Church. In the year 1866 the basis was enlarged and an annual contribution and freer disbursements were ordered. Since that time this organization has been rapidly growing in importance, and now stands in the very first rank of the evangelizing agencies of the Church. In 1889 it reported an income of $125,202, and number of churches aided 185.

(3.) The “Permanent Committee on Education for the Ministry,” organized in 1856, came slowly into operation, molding its plans gradually and embarrassed by the remains of the old voluntary system. In 1889 its income amounted to $155,843, and the number of its beneficiaries to 772-viz., 326 in the theological, 387 in the collegiate, and 59 in the preparatory department.

(4.) The “Committee on Doctrinal Tracts,” organized in 1852, became the “Presbyterian Publication Committee.” In 1889 its income from all sources was $337,787, of which $37,057 was expended in its purely benevolent work.

(5.) The “Trustees of the Presbyterian House,” located in Philadelphia, and incorporated by the Legislature of Pennsylvania to care for a valuable property purchased chiefly by donations made by individuals in the city of Philadelphia, now estimated to be worth more than $100,000. Under their charge has been placed the Ministerial Relief Fund, managed by an executive committee which commenced its operations in 1864. In 1889 they reported $127,502 received from ordinary sources, and $595,734 as a special donation towards a permanent fund; also 223 disabled ministers, 341 widows, and 33 families of orphans aided. The average age of the ministers was 76 years, and the time of their ministry 40 years. The Assembly sustained also a Permanent Committee on Foreign Missions, whose functions were not the raising and distributing of funds or the conducting of missions, but the supervising of the work and reporting the results to the Assembly. From their report in 1889 it appears that contributions for that year to the American Board were, in money, about $709,735, and in laborers 71-viz. 52 male and 19 female missionaries. In 1867 the contributions were $110,725; in 1868, $110,602.

The beginning of a theological school for the education of ministers for the Germans, in which instruction is to be given both in German and English, has been made at Bloomfield, N. J., with encouraging success. The periodical literature of the New-School Church deserves honorable mention. Besides other local papers, the American Presbyterian, at Philadelphia, has shown a warm zeal for Church interests, and the New York evangelist has done excellent service. Much credit is due to the Presbyterian Reporter, a monthly published at Alton, Ill., for the ability and faithfulness with which it served the interests of the Church in the Northwest. During the ten critical years from 1852 to 1862, the Presbyterian Quarterly Review, ably conducted by an association of ministers in Philadelphia, defended the Church's cause and was an honor to Christian intelligence. The American Theological Review, founded in 1859 on a basis not distinctly denominational, united with the Presbyterian Review in 1863, combining the names and objects of both, under the charge of the late Prof. H. B. Smith. It was merged in the Princeton  Review, published since 1878 in New York City. The New Presbyterian Review was founded in 1890.

Prior to tile separation of the Church in 1838, a secession had taken place from it in Kentucky (1810), in consequence of a dispute between the Presbytery of Cumberland, in that state, and the Kentucky Synod of the Presbyterian Church in America, concerning the ordination of persons who had not passed through the usual educational curriculum, but whose services the Presbytery regarded as demanded for the ministry by the exigencies of the times. In doctrine this branch of the Church does not very materially differ from the New-School Presbyterian Church, but its symbols of faith are a modification of the Westminster Confession of Faith. It still exists as a separate organization. (See No. 11 below.)

In 1858 the New School experienced a defection of its Southern adherents. In 1857 the commissioners from the Southern section, who had attended the Assembly at Cleveland, O., proposed to withdraw and constitute the United Synod. This was organized at Knoxville, Tenn., April 2, 1858. In connection with the synod were over 100 ministers and about 200 churches, widely scattered over the Southern States. This body continued a separate organization until Aug. 24,1864, when it was merged in the General Assembly formed by Southern ministers and churches previously in the Old-School connection. In 1861 the Old School suffered a like defection by the outbreak of the civil war. The entire Southern body of Old-School Presbyterians, aggrieved by the Assembly's resolution on the state of the country, withdrew their connection and united to the organization of a “General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America,” Dec. 4, 1861, at Augusta, Ga. The Second Assembly convened at Montgomery, Ala., May 1, 1862, since which time the meetings of the Assembly have been annually held contemporaneously with those of the Northern assemblies. In 1876 fraternal relations were sought for the first time between the two bodies. (See No. 17 below.)

Presbyterianism has never prevailed extensively in New England; but it has had such a distinct and independent existence there from a very early period that we speak of it here by itself. The French Church in Boston, formed of Huguenots about 1687, was the first Church organized on a Presbyterian basis, but was continued no longer than while its service was conducted in the French language. The first Presbyterian organization in  New England of any permanence dates back to about the year 1718, when a large number of Presbyterians, with four ministers, emigrated to this country from the north of Ireland. For some time, in cases of difficulty, the ministers and elders were wont to assemble informally, and hold what might be called pro re nata meetings; and where they were unable to reach a satisfactory result, they sometimes asked advice of the Synod of Ireland. On April 16, 1745, the Rev. Messrs. John Morehead, of Boston; David M'Gregor, of Londonderry, N. H.; and Ralph Abercrombie, of Pelham, with Messrs. James M'Keen, Alexander Conkey, and James Hughes, met in Londonderry, and “constituted themselves into a presbytery, to act, as far as their present circumstances will permit them, according to the Word of God and the constitution of the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, agreeing to that perfect rule.” The body was called the Boston Presbytery, and met, according to adjournment, in that town Aug. 13,1745. From the close of the year 1754 till October, 1770, there is a chasm in the records; but at the last-mentioned period the Presbytery consisted of twelve congregations and as many ministers. At a meeting held in Seabrook, N.H., on May 31, 1775, the Presbytery resolved to divide itself into three distinct bodies, viz., the presbyteries of Salem, of Londonderry, and of Palmer: these were then formed into the Synod of New England, which held its first meeting at Londonderry Sept. 4, 1776.

At Boothbay, Me., on June 27, 1771, a new presbytery was erected called the Presbytery of the Eastward, consisting of three ministers and four ruling elders, representing four churches. It had no connection with the Boston Presbytery, and its origin is said to have been in some way connected with the removal of the Rev. John Murray to Boothbay. It never exhibited on its roll more than eight ministers. Its last recorded adjournment now known was to meet at New Boston, N. H., on the first Wednesday of October, 1792. The only relic of this presbytery known to exist is a curious volume printed in 1783, with the following title: Bath-Kol. A Voice from the Wilderness. Being an humble Attempt to support the sinking Truths of God against some of the principal Errors raging at this time. Or a joint Testimony to some of the Grand Articles of the Christian Religion, judiciously delivered to the Churches under their care. By the First Presbytery of the Eastward. In September, 1782, the Synod of New England, finding their numbers considerably reduced in consequence of existing difficulties, agreed to dissolve and form themselves into the Presbytery of Salem. For two succeeding years this Presbytery met regularly in Massachusetts proper, but after this its meetings were held in the district of Maine. Its last meeting was held at  Gray Sept. 14, 1791. The Third Associate Reformed Presbytery, afterwards called the Associate Reformed Presbytery of Londonderry, was formed in Philadelphia Oct. 31, 1782, and held its first meeting at Londonderry on Feb. 11, 1783. It ceased to belong to its original denomination in 1802, and was thereafter an independent presbytery till 1809, when it was received into the Synod of Albany, and has since continued under the name of the Presbytery of Londonderry. The Presbytery of Newburyport was formed by the concurrent action of the Presbytery of Londonderry and the Synod of Albany. It held its first session in Boston on Oct. 27, 1826, and its last on Oct. 20, 1847, when it became reunited to the Presbytery of Londonderry. The Presbytery of Connecticut, consisting of several ministers and churches previously belonging to the Presbytery of New York, was constituted by the Synod of New York Oct. 15, 1850, and held its first meeting at Thompsonville, Oct. 29.

Missions. —

(a.) Home Missions. — The home mission work of the Presbyterian Church may date from the year 1707, when it was resolved “that every minister of the Presbytery supply neighboring destitute places where a minister is wanting and opportunity of doing good offers.” Since that period this work has continued to be one of its most important enterprises. At the beginning in the hands of the presbyteries, the Assembly took charge of it in 1802, appointing a “Standing Committee of Missions,” to which the presbyteries were to report. During the fourteen years that followed this appointment the Church sent out 311 missionaries, and collected $49,349. In 1816 this committee was changed into a board, “with full power to transact all the business of the missionary cause,” reporting annually to the General Assembly. Under this arrangement the home missions of the Church entered on a new course of prosperity, congregations multiplying till presbyteries were formed, and these in turn growing into synods. So vigorous was the Church life now developed that even the great division of 1838 was unable to hinder its continuous activity. During these twenty-two years the board collected $231,504, and sent out 2486 missionaries, while during the years 1838 to 1870 the Old- School Church alone collected $2,805,375, and sent out 16,113 missionaries. For a few years after the division of 1838, the New-School Assembly continued to carry on its mission work through the American Home Missionary Society. In 1852 the Assembly appointed a “Church  Extension Committee,” following this up in 1862 by assuming “the responsibility of conducting the work of home missions within its bounds,” forming “The Presbyterian Committee on Home Missions.” During the years 1838 to 1869 the New-School Church is considered to have sent out 8800 missionaries. After the reunion, the agencies of both churches were united under the name I of “The Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church,” by which, since that period, the whole home mission and church-extension work of the Church has been conducted, $1,840,997 having been collected and 6529 missionaries sent out, making a total since 1802 of $6,132,167 contributed for home missions and of 37,968 missionaries sent out. During the year 1875-76, 1035 ministers (or missionaries, as they are called) were aided to the extent, on an average, of $250 each.

Closely connected with this home mission is the Sustentation Scheme, organized in 1871 for the purpose of increasing the number of pastors in the Church, and of securing to these a larger measure of support. Under this plan, congregations paying not less than $700 a year of salary, and at the rate of $750 per member annually, and increasing their pastor's salary at the rate of $50 a year, receive grants-in-aid, so that the salary may be raised to $1000 a year.

(b.) Foreign Missions. — As early as 1742 the Church commenced her great work of preaching the Gospel to the heathen, in the ordination, by the Presbytery of New York, of a missionary to labor among the Indians. This work engrossed all her means and sympathies until 1817. In that year the General Assembly united with the Dutch Reformed and Associate Reformed Churches in forming “The United Foreign Missionary Society,” a society whose object was “to spread the Gospel among the Indians of North America, the inhabitants of Mexico and South America, and in other portions of the heathen and anti-Christian world.” In 1826 this society made over all its missions and property to the American Board, which thus became almost the National Foreign Mission Society of America. In 1831 the Synod of Pittsburgh formed itself into “The Western Foreign Missionary Society,” and invited the co-operation and support of such as preferred Church action to that of so-called union societies. Before eighteen months had elapsed, twelve missionaries had been appointed to different fields of heathen labor. Ill the following year sixteen more were sent out, while $16,246 had been contributed towards their expenses. In 1837, mission stations in Northern India, West Africa, Smyrna, China, and  among the Indian tribes of the West were under its charge, conducted by forty-four agents, for whose support $40,266 were contributed during that year. Such results strengthened the hands of those in the Church that desired denominational agencies. In 1837, therefore, the Assembly severed its connection with the American Board, and established its own “Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church,” to which the Western Society at once transferred all its agencies and property. During the period of the division, the Old- School Assembly extended its foreign mission staff, forming, on heathen soil, synods and presbyteries by means of native converts. The New-School Church at first continued to send its contributions of men and money to the American Board, but in 1854 appointed a standing committee on missions, changing this in 1855 into a permanent committee, who should “superintend the whole course of foreign missions in behalf of the Assembly.” On the reunion, in 1869, these agencies were brought together, while the reunited Church received from the American Board a number of mission stations that previously it had sustained.

SUMMARY VIEW OF THE FOREIGN MISSION OPERATIONS OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

The Presbyterian Church, from the earliest period, has been an earnest worker and strenuous advocate for education; and one of the chief causes of the secession of the Cumberland branch was the tenacity with which the General Assembly insisted on high educational qualifications for ministers. As early as 1739, a proposition was brought before the Synod of Philadelphia for the erection of a school or seminary of learning. The synod approved of the design and appointed a committee to carry it into effect, and in 1744 a synodal school was established. The College of New Jersey at Princeton. chartered in 1746 and opened in 1747, was founded under the auspices of the Synod of New York. Other institutions have been organized under Presbyterian auspices, as follows: Washington and Jefferson College (Washington, Pa., 1802), Hamilton College (Clinton, N. Y., 1815), Maryville College (Maryville, Tenn., 1819), Center College (Danville, Ky., 1823), Hanover College (Hanover, Ind., 1827), Lafayette College (Easton, Pa., 1831), Wabash College (Crawfordsville, Ind., 1832), Lincoln University (Oxford, Pa., 1853), University College (San Francisco, Cal., 1859), Blackburn University (Carlinville, ll., 1867), King College (Bristol, Tenn., 1868), University of Wooster (Wooster, Ohio, 1870), Evans University (Evans, Col., 1874), and Parsons College (Fairfield, la.,  1875). Three colleges are jointly under Presbyterian and Congregational control: namely, Knox, at Galesburg, Ill., 1841; Beloit, at Beloit, Wis., 1847; and Olivet, at Olivet, Mich., 1828. The academies and ladies' colleges under the auspices of the denomination are numerous.

Not until 1812 did the Presbyterian Church make any provision for the theological education of persons seeking the ministry. In that year it organized its first theological seminary, locating it at Princeton, N. J., already well known for its college, which had been founded in 1746. Since then seminaries have been established in different parts of the country by presbyteries or by synods. Of these institutions the appointing the professors, the arranging the length of the curriculum, and the prescribing the course of study-the entire control, in fact-has remained in the hands of their founders. This state of things was so unsatisfactory and so unpresbyterian that, on the reunion in 1869, the directors of the different seminaries agreed that, while reserving to themselves the general control, the Assembly should in future have a veto power over the appointment of every professor, and should receive from the directors an annual report of their administration.

The Church has thirteen theological seminaries, as follows: at Princeton, N. J., 1812; at Auburn, N. Y., 1820; Western, Allegheny City. Pa., 1827; Lane, Cincinnati. O., 1832; Union, New York City, 1836; at Danville, Ky., 1853; Theological Seminary of the Northwest, Chicago, Ill., 1859; Blackburn University (theological department), 1867; at San Francisco, Cal., 1871; German, Bloomfield, N. J., 1869; German, Dubuque, Ia., 1870; Lincoln University (theological department), 1871; and Biddle Memorial Institute (theological department), Charlotte, N. C., 1867. Of these, the last two are for colored people, and the two immediately preceding them for Germans. In 1875-76 they had, in all, 56 professors and 578 students. The number graduating that year was 134. The board of education of the Church in 1876 received $72,040, and gave financial aid to 458 students (222 theological, 218 collegiate, and 18 academical). In the same year the Church maintained, for freedmen, 39 day schools, with 65 teachers and 3176 pupils and 5 higher schools, with 903 students, of whom 43 were preparing for the ministry. See Gillett, Hist. of the Presb. Church (2 vols. 12mo, rev. ed., Phila. 1875); Hodge, Constitutional Hist. of the Presb. Church (terminates in 1788; Phila. 1840-41, 2 vols.); Webster, Hist. of the Presb. Church till 1758 (Phila. 1857, 8vo); Presb. Reunion Memorial Volumae, 1837-71 (N. Y. 1871, 8vo); Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac;  Minutes of the General Assembly (ibid. 1877, new series, vol. 4); Blaikie, Sketch of the Presb. Churches throughout the World (Edinb. 1877), p. 38 sq.

11. CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH. — In the beginning of the present century there was a very extensive revival of religion in the south-western part of Kentucky, within the bounds of the Presbytery of Transylvania. It is frequently called “the Great Western Revival of 1800,” and is regarded by some as one of the most important religious movements in the history of the Protestant Church of the United States, as it firmly fixed the people of the valley of the Mississippi in the Christian faith. The supply of preachers being inadequate, the Presbytery appointed at different times a number of lay exhorters, and, after trial of their gifts, licensed some to preach. They did not require of them the usual course of classical studies, and permitted them to except to the doctrine of the divine decrees as involving the idea of Fatalism. In October, 1802, the Presbytery was divided, and the Presbytery of Cumberland was formed, covering the region just named. In April, 1803, the new Presbytery met, and ordained two of the licentiates— Finis Ewing (who had formerly been an elder) and Samuel King— and licensed other persons. In 1805, the synod, finding complaints laid before them of irregularity on the part of the Presbytery, appointed a commission of tell ministers and six elders, clothed with full synodical powers, to visit this remote region and investigate the whole matter. Accordingly the commission, when convened, summoned the Presbytery and the irregularly licensed or ordained persons, and endeavored to induce the latter to submit to an examination. This, with the sanction of the Presbytery, they refused; whereupon the commission prohibited them from preaching or administering ordinances in virtue of any authority derived from Cumberland Presbytery until they should submit. It was afterwards contended that, as the authority to preach had been originally conferred by the Presbytery of Transylvania, this prohibition was technically powerless in the case. It may also be observed that it seems now generally agreed by writers on both sides that the main objection was not to the illiterate character of the licentiates, but to their alleged unsoundness in doctrine. The Revival members (as they were called) of the Cumberland Presbytery after this met as a council and abstained from presbyterial acts. They memorialized the General Assembly, but in vain. The assembly sustained the synod, and exhorted the recusants to submit and act regularly. The synod, being directed to review their proceedings,  complied, and on review confirmed all that had been done, and further dissolved the Cumberland Presbytery and re-annexed its members to the Presbytery of Transylvania. The council made an ineffectual effort to bring about a reconciliation, and offered to submit the licentiates to an examination; but as they required that all should be received in a body, the proposal was not accepted by the synod. On Feb. 4, 1810, Finis Ewing and Samuel King (ordained ministers, but silenced by the commission), and Samuel M'Adow, an aged minister, met and organized themselves into a presbytery under the name of the Cumberland Presbytery. In April following the Presbytery of Transylvania suspended Mr. M'Adow for his schismatical conduct.

The progress of the new body was rapid. In three years a synod was necessary, with 3 presbyteries and 60 congregations, and in 1829 a General Assembly was constituted. The statistics of 1859 reported in the connection 96 presbyteries, 927 ministers, 1188 churches, 82,158 communicants, and 24 educational institutions. In 1814 the synod published an edition of the Westminster Confession and Catechisms, altered to suit their system, which is understood to be an attempt to steer between Calvinism and Arminianism. It rejects eternal reprobation, limited atonement, and special grace, teaching that the atonement was made for all mankind, and that the operation of the Spirit is coextensive with the atonement. Other points of Calvinism, as the necessity of the Spirit's work in regeneration and the perseverance of the saints, are retained. The Cumberland Presbyterians are warm advocates of revivals and camp- meetings.

As an evidence of the altered state of feeling towards this body of Christians as contrasted with the deliverance of the General Assembly of 1814-to the effect that they could be treated with not as a body, but only as individuals-it may be added that first the New-School General Assembly entered into correspondence with the Cumberland Presbyterian General Assembly, and in 1860 the Old-School Assembly also took this step. The Cumberland Presbyterians have increased very rapidly. The minutes of the forty-sixth General Assembly, 1876, show 26 synods, including nearly 125 presbyteries, extending over the territory between the Great Lakes and the Gulf of Mexico, and reaching from the Appalachian Mountains, on the east, to the Pacific Ocean, on the west. The following statistical summary is approximately correct: Ministers, 1275; licentiates, 280; candidates, 220; congregations, 2000; elders, 6750; deacons, 2000; total communicants,  100,000; persons in the Sabbath-schools, 55,000; value of church property, $2.250,000; contributed during the year, $350,000. The following are the principal institutions of learning under the control of this Church: Cumberland College (Princeton, Ky., founded in 1829, discontinued in 1861), Cumberland University (Lebanon, Tenn., founded in 1842, which has the leading law-school in the South), Bethel College (M'Kenzie, Tenn., 1847), Waynesburg College (Waynesburg, Pa., 1850), M'Gee College (College Mound, Mo., 1853, now suspended), Lincoln University (Lincoln, Ill., 1866), Trinity University (Tehuacana. Texas, 1876), Cane Hill College, Boonsborough, Ark., 1852). The General Assembly, in 1876, approved the establishment of a Union Medical College, in connection with the three universities of the Church: namely, Cumberland, Lincoln, and Trinity. It is to be located at St. Louis, or some other large city. Waynesburg, Lincoln and Trinity admit young ladies on equal terms with young men. There are also several institutions exclusively for girls, owned by, or under the patronage of, the Church.

The Colored Cumberland Presbyterian Church has been formed by the amicable separation of colored members from the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, and their organization into an independent body. The first number of their newspaper organ, The Ba3nner of Light, was published in September, 1876. It stated that the number of members of the Colored Cumberland Presbyterian Church in the states of Kansas, Missouri, Illinois, Mississippi, Tennessee, Alabama, and Kentucky was, in May, 1874, 3925; that the number of ministers at that time was seventeen; and that the value of church property was $12,550. Since that time the Presbytery of Missouri had added 240 members, and the same presbytery had raised $529.25 in 1874. Later reports than for 1874, had not been received from the other states.

12. THE REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN SYNOD. — During “the persecuting times,” some members of the Covenanting or Reformed Presbyterian Church of Scotland settled in Pennsylvania. In 1743 these met at Middle Octorara, and again solemnly subscribed the Old Scottish Covenant. In 1752 the Scottish Church sent the Rev. John Cuthbertson to be their minister. In 1774 he was joined by the Rev. Messrs. Linn and Dobbit, from the Reformed Presbytery of Ireland, when a Reformed Presbyterian Presbytery was formed. In 1782 these three ministers and a portion of the people joined with the Associate Church in forming “The Associate Reformed Church.” The members who were opposed to this  union kept together as praying societies until 1792, when the Scottish Church had appointed a committee of their number to take the oversight of them judicially. In 1798 a presbytery was organized at Philadelphia, and in 1800 the question of slavery forced itself upon the consideration of the newly organized “Reformed Presbytery of the United States of America,” when it enacted that no slaveholder should be retained in its communion, a position since then faithfully maintained. In 1806 it issued a Testimony defining its position on several points not mentioned in the Westminster Confession. In the following year it undertook the theological education of its ministry by opening a seminary at Philadelphia, and in 1809 organized itself into “The Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church in America,” with three constituting presbyteries. Subsequent to the war of 1812 the relations of the Covenanting Church to the national government were much discussed. A variety of sentiments was apparent as to the extent to which the severance between the Church and that other ordinance of God-the State-should be carried. The result of these discussions was a rending of the Church in 1833, and the formation of an independent synod. The large losses which the synod-a representative, not delegated court-sustained in 1833 no ways disheartened it. More homogeneous than ever through the separation, it thenceforth proceeded rigidly to enforce the principles and practices that have at all times been accepted by the Church. Members of this Church therefore neither become nor act as American citizens: they neither vote at political elections, enlist in the army, accept of government situations, serve on juries, nor in any way identify themselves with the political system of the United States. In 1871 this Church, in accordance with its principle of the moral duty of religious covenanting, by its ministers and members entered into a solemn covenant with God and with each other to serve faithfully the great God and to keep his commandments, and to adhere to the Reformed Presbyterian principles and testimony. The theological seminary of the synod was organized in 1840, and is situated at Allegheny City, Pa., having at present a faculty of three professors.

Missions. — In 1856 the synod commenced a foreign mission at Latakiyeh, in Syria. Since then stations and schools have been opened in different localities. The missionary and benevolent contributions for the year 1876- 77 were as follows:

Foreign missions ... $8,522

Home Missions...... 3,068

Freedmen ................ 3,409

Education ...............2,565

Church election .....27,391

Total ....................$44,955

13. THE GENERAL SYNOD OF THE REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH. — The minority of the Reformed Presbyterian Church at the disruption of 1833 is now known by this name. (See No. 12 above.) Steadily adhering to the other distinctive principles of the Covenanters, it yet allows its members to discharge the duties and enjoy the privileges of citizens, and is popularly known as the New-Light Covenanting Church. The theological seminary, organized in Philadelphia in 1809, adhered to this portion of the Church at the time of the separation, and is still in connection with it. Recently a number of its ministers and congregations have withdrawn from its fellowship, leaving the General Synod greatly enfeebled. SEE REFORMED PRESBYTERIANS.

14. UNITED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF NORTH AMERCA. — This body is composed of the Associate and the Associate Reformed churches which were united in 1858. We give here an outline of the history of each of these bodies up to the time of their union.

1. Associate Church. — This Church in the United States had its origin from a number of Scotch and Irish Covenanters exiled for conscience' sale to the American colonies, where they maintained worship in a distinct form to the best of their ability. In 1680 Lord Cardross took measures for the establishment of a colony in South Carolina, with a view to furnish a place of refuge to his persecuted brethren. This was formed at Port Royal; but, in consequence of an invasion by the Spaniards, the colony was abandoned inm 1688. Many, however, remained in Carolina, who were gathered into congregations under the care of a presbytery, which existed until about the close of the 18th century. The only one of these churches now remaining is the old Scots' Church in Charleston. From 1660 to 1688 a large number of Presbyterians (amounting, according to Wodrow, to about 3000) were transported to the American plantations and sold as slaves. ‘hey were for the most part sent to Virginia, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey; but scarcely any traces of their history now remain. As early as 1736 those American Presbyterians who sympathized with the Scottish Seceders applied to them for a minister, but at that time none could be sent. The application was renewed in 1750, but the first minister sent to this country by the Secession  Church of Scotland, the Rev. Alexander Gelatly, did not arrive until 1753. In 1753 a presbytery was organized under the name of “The Associate Presbytery of Pennsylvania, subordinate to the Associate Synod of Scotland.” While heartily accepting the Westminster standards as their symbolical books, this Presbytery gave prominence to the distinctive doctrines of the Marrow divines. SEE MARROW CONTROVERSY.

Its members held the Gospel offer to be a free grant and promise of Christ and his salvation to sinners of mankind as such — all having a common interest in him-faith to be a person's real persuasion that Jesus Christ is his-that he shall have life and salvation by Christ, and that whatever Christ did for the redemption of mankind he did for him. Stress was also laid on the doctrine of the binding obligation of the Scottish covenants-National and Solemn League. While the origin and doctrinal views of the Associate Presbytery restricted its sphere of labor, inside of that sphere it grew rapidly, congregations being formed in New York, Virginia, and the Carolinas. In 1776 a second presbytery, that of New York, was formed -like that of Pennsylvania, in subordination to the Scottish Synod. In 1764 the Rev. Thomas Clark, minister of Ballybay in Ireland, belonging to the Burgher Synod of Scotland, with the greater part of his congregation, emigrated to this country, and settled in Salem, Washington County, N. Y. Two other ministers of the same communion followed them two years after, though one of them subsequently returned to Scotland. The Burgher ministers, not being disposed to keep up a separate organization on this side of the Atlantic, united with their brethren; but the union was disturbed by the refusal of the Scottish synod to approve of it. The revolution of 1776 was chiefly instrumental in bringing about the existence of the Associate Reformed Church.

During the progress of the war several conventions were held between the members of the Associate and the Reformed presbyteries with a view to union. Their three presbyteries met in Philadelphia in October, 1782, and formed themselves into a synod, under the name of “The Associate Reformed Synod of North America,” on a basis consisting of the following articles:

“1. That Jesus Christ died for the elect.

“2. That there is an appropriation in the nature of faith.

“3. That the Gospel is addressed indiscriminately to sinners of mankind.

“4. That the righteousness of Christ is the alone condition of the covenant of grace.

“5. That civil government originates with God the Creator, and not with Christ the Mediator.

“6. The administration of the kingdom of Providence is given into the hand of Jesus Christ the Mediator: and magistracy, the ordinance appointed by the moral Governor of the world to be the prop of civil order among men, as well as other things, is rendered subservient by the Mediator to the welfare of his spiritual kingdom, the Church, and has sanctified the use of it and of every common benefit, through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ.

“7. That the law of nature and the moral law revealed in the Scriptures are substantially the same, although the latter expresses the will of God more evidently and clearly than the former, and therefore magistrates among Christians ought to be regulated by the general directory of the Word as to the execution of their office.

“8. That the qualifications of justice, veracity, etc., required in the law of nature for the being of a magistrate, are also more explicitly revealed as necessary in the Holy Scriptures. But a religious test, any farther than an oath of fidelity, can never be essentially necessary for the being of a magistrate, except when the people make it a condition of government.

“9. That, both parties, when united, shall adhere to the Westminster Confession of Faith, the Catechisms, the directory for worship, and propositions concerning Church government.

“10. That they shall claim the full exercise of Church discipline without depending upon foreign judicatories.”

On this basis all the members of the Reformed presbytery, and all the Associate ministers with the exception of two members of the presbytery of Pennsylvania, united. A small minority of the people in the two communions also declined to enter into it; and in these minorities have been preserved the Covenanter or Reformed Presbyterian denomination, on the one hand, and the Associate, on the other. (See No. 12 above.) From 1782, the period of the formation of the Associate Reformed Church, the Associate Church was gradually increased by ministers sent out from  Scotland, and also by the return of a considerable part of those who had previously joined the union. In 1784 this Church put forth a Testimony intended to supplement the Westminster Confession, and containing special articles in favor of close communion, public covenanting, the exclusive use of the Psalms in praise, and against private oaths, that is, secret societies. The first institution for the purpose of educating students in theology by this body was established in 1793, under the care of the Rev. John Anderson, D.D., of Beaver County, Pa. The Presbytery of Pennsylvania, being unable to meet the applications for preaching which were made from Kentucky and Tennessee, directed the applicants to apply directly to the Synod of Scotland for missionaries. They did so; and Messrs. Armstrong and Andrew Fulton arrived in Kentucky in the spring of 1798, and in November formed the Presbytery of Kentucky. This accession of strength enabled these presbyteries to form themselves into a synod; and accordingly the synod, or court of review, designated as “The Associate Synod of North America” was constituted at Philadelphia in May, 1801.

The synod consisted of seventeen ministers, who were divided into the presbyteries of Philadelphia, of Chartiers, of Kentucky, and of Cambridge. Until the year 1818 appeals might be taken from the synod to that of Scotland; but at that time it was declared a coordinate synod by the General Associate Synod of Scotland. Between the years 1838 and 1840 serious ecclesiastical difficulties arose, and several ministers were deposed or suspended. These, with a number of ministers and congregations in sympathy with them, at once organized separately, having several presbyteries, who constituted a synod and claimed to be the true Associate Synod. This painful division was afterwards adjusted, and a reunion was effected in 1854. To the Associate Church belongs the distinction of being one of the earliest churches on the American continent to take up a decided position on the subject of slavery. As early as the year 1800 the Presbytery of Pennsylvania issued a warning on the subject to the members of its churches, declaring slaveholding to be a moral evil and unjustifiable. This declaration was repeated in 1811, while in 1831 the synod judicially excluded slaveholders from its communion— an action which cost it all its congregations in the Southern States. The loss thus sustained was made up by the formation of new congregations and new presbyteries in Indiana, Illinois, and the far West. In 1858, previous to the union with the Associate Reformed Church, the Associate Synod comprised 21 presbyteries, 231 ministers and licentiates, 293 congregations and 23,505 communicants.

2. Associate Reformed Church. — The earliest settlements of the Associate Reformed Church were in Pennsylvania, within the Cumberland valley; but colonies from these emigrated to South Carolina and Georgia, New York, Kentucky, and even to New Hampshire and Maine. One of the first acts of the synod, after its organization in 1782, was the adoption of a series of articles, afterwards published under the name of The Constitution of the Associate Reformed Church; but these articles were severely attacked both by the Seceders and Covenanters, and were finally laid aside for a fuller exposition of the Church's faith. The result was that the Westminster Confession and Catechisms, after a careful revision at several successive meetings of synod, in the articles relating to the power of the magistrate, were published in a volume in 1799, entitled The Constitution and Standards of the Associate Reform Church in North America. In 1802 the synod organized itself into a general synod, with four subordinate synods New York, Pennsylvania, Scioto and the Carolinas. In 1804 the plan of the theological seminary was framed. Dr. John M. Mason was chosen professor of theology; and the sessions of the seminary began in the autumn of the same year in the city of New York. This was the second theological seminary established in the United States. Dr. Mason's work on Catholic Communion, published in 1816, was regarded as being in conflict with the Church's principles and practice; and this, in connection with some other grounds of complaint, led the entire synod of Scioto in 1820 to withdraw from the superintendence of the General Synod. In 1821 the Synod of the Carolinas petitioned the General Synod to be erected into an independent synod, on the ground that they were so distant from the place at which the General Synod usually assembled that it was impossible that they should be represented in it. The request was granted. For many years after that the Southern Synod gained but little in numbers, though in later years it became more prosperous; while the Scioto Synod rapidly extended itself and became more vigorous every year.

About the time of the separation of this Western Synod, an unsuccessful attempt was made to unite the Associate Reformed and the Reformed Dutch churches, under the name of” The Reformed Protestant Church of North America.” Immediately after this, that is, in 1821, a union was effected between the Associate Reformed and the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church; the consequence of which was that a portion of the former Church became incorporated with the latter, and the library of the Associate Reformed Church was immediately removed from New York to Princeton; though, as the result of a legal process, it ultimately fell back into the hands of its  original owners. The act of union by the General Synod of the Associate Reformed Church was irregular, being contrary to the express will of a majority of the presbyteries. However, many of the ministers and congregations who had remained under the care of the General Synod went into this union. The Synod of Pennsylvania with but few exceptions was merged in it, and that synod never met again. The Synod of New York, however, survived the dissolution of the General Synod, becoming separate and independent, like its two sister synods of the West and South. But its interests languished till 1829, when it resolved to revive the seminary, whose operations had been suspended in 1821, and to establish it at Newburgh, under the care of the Rev. Joseph M'Carroll, D.D., who was at the same time chosen professor of theology. An attempt was made in 1827 to revive the General Synod on the old footing, but it proved a failure. However, the Synod of the West, having divided into two, erected a General Synod, which first met in 1841, and under which a union was formed with the New York Synod in 1855. This united body numbered 4 synods, 28 presbyteries, 253 ministers and licentiates. 367 congregations, and 31,284 communicants. Its name then became “The General Synod of the Associate Reformed Church.” They adhered to the Westminster standards as adopted in the Testimony of 1799, and held the doctrines of close communion, anti-slavery, and the exclusive use of the Psalms in praise.

In May, 1858, the Associate Reformed and the Associate churches, having been separated for more than three quarters of a century, were reunited upon a common basis, under the name of “The United Presbyterian Church in North America,” a Church which is now the largest representative of those distinctive Views for which all the preceding churches have more or less contended. In addition therefore to its acceptance of the Westminster standards, which it modified, it has issued a Testimony whose adoption is a condition of communion both with ministers and members. In this Testimony are articles adverse to slavery and to secret societies, and in favor of close communion, the exclusive use of the Psalms, and of the moral duty of covenanting. A few years ago a new metrical version of the book of Psalms was adopted by this body. A small number protested against the union, and have since then continued under the name of” The Associate Synod of North America.” (See No. 15 below.) In 1890, “The United Presbyterian Church of North America” embraced a General Assembly, 8 synods, 56 presbyteries, 753 ministers, 866 congregations,  and 101,858 communicants. It has theological seminaries at Newburgh, N.Y.; Allegheny, Pa.; and Xenia, O.; and missionary seminaries at Osioot and Ramleh, Egypt. Westminster, Monmouth, and Ohio Central colleges are also under its charge. It has boards of Foreign Missions, of Home Missions, of Publication, of Church Extension, of Freedmen, and of Education, with mission stations in India, Egypt, and Syria. The Mission to China, which was instituted as a memorial of the “‘union “of the different bodies in 1858, has been transferred to California. Its missionary contributions were, in 1876-77, for foreign, $77,126; home, $29,750. Its periodical publications are one monthly, one semimonthly, and two weekly newspapers.

The Associate Reformed Synod of the South has still its separate organization. Cordial in its relations with the United Presbyterian Church it has one missionary now laboring together with the missionaries of the latter Church in Egypt; and, slavery having ceased to be an object of contention, is now considering the propriety of organic union with that body. In 1875 a plan of co-operation was proposed between this Church and the United Presbyterian Church, North, which provides that ‘“the presbyteries of each Church shall sustain the same relation to those of tile other that they do to the co-ordinate courts of their own body, and that the ministers and licentiates of each shall be eligible to appointments and settlements in congregations of the other;” that the courts of each shall respect the discipline of the other; that ministers and members of the two bodies be recommended to cultivate friendly relations and Christian fellowship with each other; that the existing relations of the two churches (actual cooperation) in the work of foreign missions be continued; that a friendly co-operation of help and non-interference be practiced in the fields of home missions and Church extension; that the two bodies co-operate in building and sustaining the Normal or Training School of the United Presbyterian Church for the Freedmen, established at Knoxville, Tenn.; and that in the work of publication the Associate Reformed Synod co-operate with the Board of Publication of the United Presbyterian Church. These provisions were adopted by the synod. The committee on correspondence with the United Presbyterian Church was reappointed, but was instructed to take no direct steps towards union without further instruction. The Southern Church has a literary institution named Erskine College and a theological school, both at Due West, S. C. It numbers about 70 ministers,  nearly one third of whom are in South Carolina, the rest in other Southern states.

15. THE ASSOCIATE SYNOD OF NORTH AMEMRICA is composed of some who declined to enter into the union with the Associate Reformed Synod in 1858 (see No. 14 above), and consists of the presbyteries of Iowa, Clarion, Muskingum, and Northern Indiana; and had, in 1876, 12 ministers, 2 licentiates, 34 congregational charges or stations, and 1115 communicants. The total contributions were $679.85.

16. THE UNITED SYNOD OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, SOUTH. — In 1857 the New-School Presbytery of Lexington affirmed slavery to be right and scriptural in principle. The Assembly (1857) replied by condemning the position, and refused to allow either the principle or the practice. The delegates from the Southern churches protested, and, declaring this action to be an “indirect excision” of their congregations, withdrew, and in 1858, at Knoxville, Tenn., organized themselves as “The United Synod of the Presbyterian Church, South,” consisting of some 100 ministers and about 200 congregations. A proposal for union with the Old School Presbyterian Church was declined by this latter body because coupled with the condition that the Assembly set aside its doctrinal decisions of 1838. In 1859 the United Synod reported 14 presbyteries, 118 ministers, 187 churches, and 12,125 communicants, of whom 323 were colored. In 1864 the synod joined the Presbyterian Church, South.

17. THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, SOUTH, dates its organization from Dec. 4, 1861, when the commissioners from all the presbyteries of the Presbyterian Church within the Confederate States met in Augusta, Ga., and organized as a General Assembly. The style and title then chosen was, The Presbyterian Church of the Confederate States of America; but after the overthrow of the Confederacy the word united was substituted for Confederate, and of America was dropped. The Presbyterian Church, South, disavows all connection with political matters, and holds to strictly ecclesiastical labor. In 1876, at the Assembly held in Savannah, Ga., when the appointment of delegates to the Pan-Presbyterian Council of Edinburgh in 1877 was considered, all expressions used in the different courts during the exciting times of the civil strife were rescinded as inconsistent with the platform of 1862. The report then adopted closed with the following declarations: the time of the organization of our General Assembly in 1861, in an ‘Address to the Churches of Jesus Christ throughout the Earth.' This document clearly and forcibly details our position concerning the nature and functions of the Church as a spiritual body, and, therefore, ‘non-secular and 1non-political.'

“2. Inasmuch as some incidental expressions, uttered in times of great public excitement, are found upon our records, and have been pointed out in the report of the committee aforesaid, which seem to be ambiguous or inconsistent with the above declarations and others of like import, this Assembly does hereby disavow them wherever found, and does not recognize such as forming any part of the well - considered, authoritative teachings or testimony of our Church.”

At that time this Church consisted of 12 synods, 62 presbyteries, 1821 churches, 1079 ministers, and 112,183 communicants. Their contributions amounted to $1.138,681. The Assembly conducts its benevolent operations through three general committees (the work of foreign missions and of sustentation being united under the same committee), viz. the Executive Committee of Foreign Missions and Sustentation, of Education, and of Publication. Foreign missions are maintained in the Indian Territory, Mexico, South America, Greece, Italy, India, and China, and domestic missions in new and destitute localities in the South, at an annual cost of $71,121, supporting 75 missionaries in foreign fields, of whom 26 are ordained ministers, 4 licentiates, and 21 assistant missionaries, all from the United States; 9 ordained ministers and 25 assistant missionaries are natives of the countries in which they labor. With these foreign missions are connected 22 churches, with 1200 communicants; also 13 training schools of various grades, containing 250 pupils.

The Sustentation Board extends aid to the amount of $20,000 in support of their ministers to 185 churches in 57 presbyteries; $6000 to the support of evangelistic labor, and $10,000 to relieve disabled ministers and families of deceased ministers. A publishing house is maintained at Richmond, Va., and, with a capital of about $40,000, issues Presbyterian books for ministers and congregational and Sunday school libraries. It also aids in the education for the ministry of young men of limited means, and in the publication and dissemination of a religious and doctrinal literature. held very advanced ground. It declares in its constitution that “because it is highly reproachful to religion, and dangerous to the Church, to entrust the holy ministry to weak and ignorant men, the Presbytery shall try each candidate as to his knowledge of the Latin language and the original languages in which the Holy Scriptures were written. They shall also examine him in the arts and sciences.” The first written test required of the candidate is “a Latin exegesis on some common head in divinity.”

The common requirement in its presbyteries is equal to the curriculum in most American colleges. The demands of the Church for the education of its ministry and its own youth have everywhere made it the patroness of learning and engaged it in the founding of institutions for higher education. It has been the pioneer of education in nearly all the older Southern communities. During the civil war, many of the institutions of learning founded and endowed by the Presbyterian Church in the South perished by the loss of endowments in the general financial wreck. Among them were Oglethorpe University, Ga.; Oakland College, Miss.; La Grange College, Tenn.; and other valuable institutions of less prominence. Center College, Ky., was lost through decisions of the United States courts in favor of a minority adhering to the old Assembly. Others were suspended by the enlistment of the students in the armies, and were crippled by the partial loss of endowments. The following, founded and endowed by Presbyterians, survived the disasters of the war, and now, under Presbyterian control or auspices, are rendering valuable service to the country: Hampden Sidney College, Va.; Davidson College, N.C.; Stewart College, Tenn.; Westminster College, Mo.; King College, Tenn.; and Austin College, Texas. Central University, at Richmond, Ky., has been founded and successfully opened since the war. The synods of Nashville, Memphis, Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, and Texas, conjointly, have also projected a university (the South-western) to be strictly under Presbyterian control, for which they are now soliciting an endowment. It has been located at Clarkesville. Tenn. Stewart College has been merged in it.

The financial prostration of the South since the war has rendered the endowment of its institutions of learning slow and difficult. Of academies and schools competent to prepare boys for college or young men for the university, or to give a good mathematical and classical education, thorough so far as it goes, to those whose means do not admit of more elaborate courses, there is a great insufficiency throughout the South. Those which had previously acquired success and reputation were  generally broken up through the disastrous effects of the war, and the poverty and depression of the people have operated to the discouragement of efforts to establish others. Of such institutions there are some of a high character, maintained under Presbyterian auspices; as the Bingham School, Mebanesville, N. C.; Pleasant Ridge Academy, Green County, Ala.; Edgar Institute, Paris, Ky.; Military and Classical Institute, Danville, Ky.; Finlay High School, Lenoir, N. C.; and Kemper Institute, Booneville, Mo. The Southern Presbyterian Church has two theological seminaries, each endowed and furnished with buildings, libraries, and four professors of eminent ability and learning -Union Seminary, at Hampden Sidney, Va.; and Columbia Seminary, at Columbia, S. C. It has recently established a third, at Tuscaloosa, Ala., for the education and training of colored men for the ministry; and for this it is now gathering an endowment. There are no Presbyterian schools or colleges for girls in the South endowed beyond the provision of buildings, apparatus, and libraries; but there are many institutions under Presbyterian control or auspices in which every reasonable comfort is combined with advantages for the thorough education and accomplishment of girls. Among these are many colleges, collegiate institutes, and seminaries which afford a high grade of instruction to young ladies, and are widely esteemed for general excellence and efficiency.

The work of education for the ministry is conducted by the General Assembly, through an executive committee located at Memphis, Tenn. In the last ecclesiastical year, the committee received from the churches, for this purpose, $15,131, from which 95 young men, prosecuting their studies at various colleges and theological seminaries, received assistance.

The standards of the Southern Presbyterian Church are the Westminster Confession (with the chapter “Of the Civil Magistrate” amended), the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, and the Westminster Form of Government and Directory, somewhat altered to suit the circumstances of the Church, with “Rules of Discipline,” or “Forms of Process,” gathered from the usages and laws of the Scottish Church. These standards are adopted by every minister at his ordination, in answer to the questions put to him publicly by the presiding minister, but are not required to be adopted by subscription to any written formula.

Anterior to the division of the Church into Northern and Southern churches, the Southern churches were disposed to adhere more closely to  the standards, and were more churchly in their ideas, after the fashion of the Westminster Era, than a large portion of the Northern churches, who came nearer the Congregational influence of New England. It was the united opposition of the Southern churches to what claimed to be a more liberal Presbyterianism which in large part caused the division of 1837 into Old and New School bodies. Since the separation in 1861, the Southern body has grown even more strict in its views of the standards, and the jure divilo character of Church government.

But, with all their zeal for a strict construction of the standards of doctrine and order, the Southern churches have ever been distinguished for their interest in protracted meetings and services of religion. The custom is almost universal of holding protracted services of several days or weeks duration in the churches at one or more communion services in the year, as the indication of the special presence of the Holy Spirit may suggest; and most frequently at such meetings there is a revival in the hearts of God's people, and awakenings of greater or less extent among the unconverted. The special labors of evangelists such as Moody and Sankey, and Whittle and Bliss, have not been enjoyed to any great extent in the Southern churches. It is an opinion generally accepted among the Southern ministry that there is great advantage, especially in a sparsely populated region but partially supplied with the means of grace, in bringing the Gospel to bear for successive days upon the minds of men. In this way their thoughts can be more effectually withdrawn from their worldly connections and pleasures, and fixed more intently upon the great matter of salvation. Hence the evangelists found that neither their methods nor their preaching of the Gospel of salvation by grace only, through faith, was much of a novelty to the Southern Presbyterian churches.

It has proved to be a great drawback to the proper influence of the Southern Presbyterian Church that, owing partly to its poverty, partly from lying out of the chief lines of the travel and commerce with Europe, and partly from lack of great commercial cities with their accumulated capital, its learned men are able to publish very little, and its journals are of necessity provincial in their character, and therefore the world at large knows little of them. Besides, so vast is the territory covered by this Church, and so diverse the local interests, that instead of patronage being concentrated upon one or two great religious journals, it is divided between some seven or eight, none of which has power enough to make itself felt abroad. The Southern Presbyterian Review, a quarterly journal of thirty years' standing, now published under the supervision of the  professors in the two theological seminaries, compares most favorably in learning and ability with any theological quarterly in this country; yet, being published in the interior of South Carolina, without the aid of the machinery of a great publishing-house to bring it before the world, it is little known outside the circle of its local patrons and admirers.

In view of the calamities which have befallen this body of Presbyterians during the sixteen years of its history, bringing poverty and distress upon so large a part of its people, its success, so far, has been remarkable. In view of the vast territory to be evangelized which is covered by it, and the hundreds of thousands of poor ignorant Negroes, ever tending backward to heathenism, who must depend upon this Church very largely for a form of the Gospel that will enlighten and civilize them, no body of Presbyterians in the world has a greater work to do, or, in proportion to the work to be done, less financial ability to sustain it.

18. PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN CANADA. — In this British dominion the Presbyterians are in point of numbers the third among the religious denominations, being only exceeded by the Roman Catholics and the Church of England. Presbyterianism dates in Canada at least from the conquest, in 1759. Its first exponent is supposed to have been the Rev. George Henry. He appeared in Quebec as early as 1765, and was the chaplain of a British regiment stationed there. In 1784 the Rev. Alexander Spark went there, and in 1787 the first Presbyterian congregation was organized. It was composed principally of soldiers. In 1780 the Rev. Thomas Bethune, a minister of the Kirk who had come from Scotland as chaplain of a Highland regiment, preached first in Montreal, and afterwards organized several congregations in the county of Glengary. In Montreal itself, the first Presbyterian Church was organized in 1790. They built St. Gabriel Street Church, which is still used as a Presbyterian church, and is the oldest Protestant church in Canada. Previous to the completion of their own structure they worshipped, by permission of the Recollet Fathers, in a Roman Catholic Church. In recognition of these kind offices. “The Society of Presbyterians,” as they were then called, presented the good fathers with “two hogsheads of Spanish wine and a box of candles,” which were “thankfully accepted” — a manifestation of friendly feeling between Romanists and Protestants which continues to this day. In 1803 the first Presbytery of Montreal was organized by two ministers and one elder; and for years after the development of Presbyterianism was slow. In Upper Canada, now known as the Province of Ontario, the pioneers of  Presbyterianism were sent out by the Reformed Dutch Church. One of the principal laborers thus sent was the Rev. Robert M'Dowell, who was appointed by the classis of Albany as their missionary to Canada in 1798. He itinerated throughout the greater part of Upper Canada, forming and fostering congregations in various places.

 He (died at a very advanced age in 1841. The Rev. W. Smart, who was sent out from England in 1811, and who labored long and faithfully in Brockville; the Rev. W. Bell, sent out from Scotland in 1817; the Rev. William Jenkins, originally from Scotland, who went to Canada from the United States in 1817; the Rev. Robert Boyd, from the Synod of Ulster, ordained in 1821; and the Rev. James Harris, also from Ireland, who began his labors in 1820 as pastor of the first Presbyterian church in York (now Toronto), were among the founders of the Presbyterian Church in Canada. To Kingston and a few other places ministers were, on application, sent out by presbyteries in Scotland, the Rev. John Barclay being the first minister of Kingston. In 1825, the Glasgow Colonial Society was formed, which sent out many ministers to Lower and Upper Canada, as well as to Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. These ministers were all of the Church of Scotland. In 1827 bishop Strachan, of Toronto, published an ecclesiastical chart of Upper Canada, in which the Church of England was said to have thirty ministers, while two only belonged to the Church of Scotland-” one of whom,” it was further alleged, “had made application to be received into the Anglican Communion.” A change, however, was at hand. The tide of immigration had begun to flow in the direction of Canada, bringing large numbers of Presbyterians from Scotland and the north of Ireland. Societies also began to be formed in Scotland “for promoting the religious interests of Scottish settlers in British North America.” Presbyterianism had taken root in Canada; it now began to make rapid progress. The supply of Scottish ministers being necessarily cut off, owing to the ecclesiastical condition of the country, these provinces were at this time thrown almost entirely on their own resources. In 1831 was formed “The Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland.”

On its first roll were 25 ministers. “The United Synod of Upper Canada,” consisting chiefly of ministers of the Associate Church of Scotland, with some from Ireland, had formed about 1819, but in 1840 was amalgamated with the synod in connection with the Church of Scotland, and then numbered 82 ministers. Several ministers from the Secession Church of Scotland came to Canada about 1832, and the number was increased from time to time. They were organized as the Missionary Synod of the United Secession  Church, and known afterwards as the Synod of the United Presbyterian Church in Canada. In 1844, the year after the disruption of the Church of Scotland, a division took place in the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland; 25 ministers agreeing with the Free Church of Scotland withdrew, and formed themselves into ‘The Presbyterian Church of Scotland.” The synod formed immediately founded a theological hall at Toronto under the name of “Knox College.” The United Presbyterians also instituted a theological hall at London. The synod in connection with the Church of Scotland, having in 1841 obtained a royal charter for Queen's University and College at Kingston, set themselves to work for its better equipment. Then began a struggle for pre- eminence between three vigorous branches of the Church. With varying success, each maintained a separate existence for seventeen years. To Nova Scotia and New Brunswick the first Presbyterian ministers were sent from Scotland by the Burgher and Antiburgher synods. A missionary was also sent in 1768 by the united synods of New York and Philadelphia. About 1769 the real work of building up a Presbyterian Church in Nova Scotia may be said to have begun the Rev. David Smith and the Rev. Daniel Cock having been sent out by the Burgher or Associate Synod of Scotland. Seventeen years afterwards, the Rev. James M'Gregor was sent out by the Antiburgher or General Associate Synod. From these beginnings grew up the Presbytery of Truro (Burgher), established in 1786, and the Presbytery of Pictou (Anti-Burgher), in 1795. In 1817 these united, forming “The Presbyterian Church of Nova Scotia.” This was the first colonial union of which there is any record. Ministers from the Church of Scotland came at a later date. This Church Was first represented in these provinces by the Rev. Samuel Russel, called to be minister of St. Matthew's Church, Halifax, in 1784. But thirty-two years intervened before it could be said to have effected a permanent lodgment. In 1833 seven ministers of the Church of Scotland formed themselves into the Synod of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward's Island (the Presbytery of New Brunswick, however, declined to enter into the compact, and in 1835 constituted itself the Synod of New Brunswick). The Synod of Nova Scotia grew apace, and when the division came, in 1844, it had outnumbered its elder sister. But now it was well-nigh extinguished.

Some of its ministers returned to Scotland, others joined the Free Church in these provinces. Three only maintained their former connection. The synod became defunct in 1843, and was not resuscitated till 1854, when it again put forth energetic efforts to recover its lost ground. In Canada the new  body, founded in 1844, in sympathy with the Free Church of Scotland, took, as we have said, the name of “The Presbyterian Church of Canada.” In 1861, after several years spent in negotiations, this body and the United Presbyterian Church in Canada united under the designation of “The Canada Presbyterian Church,” the corresponding bodies in the Lower Provinces uniting under the name of “The Presbyterian Church of the Lower Provinces.” “The Synod of the Canada Presbyterian Church” entered on a prosperous career, with a roll of 226 ministers, of whom 128 had belonged to the Canada Presbyterian Church and 68 to the United Presbyterian Church. In 1870 the supreme court of this Church was for the first time constituted as a General Assembly. In 1868 the synods of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick in connection with the Church of Scotland were united into one synod. The synods of the United Presbyterian Church and the Free Church had already united, namely, in 1860. Thus the way was prepared throughout the Dominion of Canada for comprehensive union. In September, 1874, there were (omitting a few congregations connected with organizations in the United States) four Presbyterian bodies in the Dominion of Canada, viz.: the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland; the Canada Presbyterian Church; the Church of Scotland in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and adjoining provinces; and the Presbyterian Church of the Lower Provinces. In the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland there were 11 presbyteries and 122 ministers; in the Canada Presbyterian Church, 19 presbyteries and 329 ministers; in the Church of Scotland in Nova Scotia, etc., 6 presbyteries and 31 ministers; and in the Presbyterian Church of the Lower Provinces, 10 presbyteries and 124 ministers. There were theological colleges in Toronto and Montreal belonging to the Canada Presbyterian Church; at Kingston and Quebec, to the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland; and at Halifax, to the Presbyterian Church of the Lower Provinces.

Nearly one half of the ministers in the several provinces have been supplied by the theological colleges of the country. From the date of the union above referred to, overtures having reference to a yet more comprehensive union began to engage the attention of the supreme courts of all the churches in British North America. Increased facilities for intercommunication helped to make the proposal at least possible of accomplishment. The confederation of the provinces which now form the Dominion of Canada having been consummated in 1867, there naturally followed a strong desire for that ecclesiastical union which had long been contemplated. This desire  was shared by many who had previously opposed such a union. Formal negotiations were commenced in 1870 in all the provinces, culminating in the union which was happily consummated June 15, 1875, in the city of Montreal, when the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, the Canada Presbyterian Church, the Church of the Maritime Provinces in connection with the Church of Scotland, and the Presbyterian Church of the Lower Provinces, declaring their belief that it would be for the glory of God and the advancement of the cause of Christ that they should unite, and thus form one Presbyterian Church in the Dominion, were formally united under the name of “The Presbyterian Church in Canada.” The aggregate of the United Church at that date was 634 ministers, 1119 congregations, 90,658 communicants, and a population under its instruction of about 650,000. Statistics of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, as they were reported to the General Assembly in June. 1876, then showed it to contain 4 synods, 33 presbyteries, 1076 congregations, 664 ministers, 82,186 communicants, and 59,949 Sabbath scholars. The contributions for all purposes amounted to $939,690; of this sum $418,058 were paid for the support of the ministry, $25,472 for home mission work, $16,173 for foreign missions, and $11,219 for missions among the French Canadians.

1. The home missions of the Church are co-extensive with this vast dominion. Their history is simply the history of the Church itself-one of continuous, steady progress. In the early years of Presbyterianism in Canada, owing chiefly to the lack of ministers, many cast in their lot with those branches of the Church whose missionaries first supplied them with the means of grace. Others, filled with romantic attachment to the Church of their fathers, waited long and patiently, and instances are not wanting of “vacant congregations” assembling themselves for public worship for years together to hear sermons read by one of their elders, or to be exhorted by “the men” whom they recognized as their temporary leaders. The work divides itself into two distinct departments: 1, the opening up of new fields, and supplying ordinances to purely mission stations; 2, to aid weak congregations in the support of their ministers.

The number of purely mission fields occupied in the western section in 1876 was 130, including 300 preaching-stations, with 3000 communicants. The average Sabbath attendance at these stations was about 16,000 in the aggregate. There were also 78 supplemented congregations with settled pastors receiving grants from $50 to $300 each per annum from the home mission fund. The  number of missionaries employed was as follows: 35 ministers and licentiates; 59 theological students; 44 catechists; 12 lay catechists — in all 150 missionaries. The grants made for 1877 to home mission fields amounted to about $20,000, to supplemented congregations $10,000, and for contingencies $2500, making in all $32,500. The eastern sections, although small in comparison with the immense territory assigned to the Western Committee, have a mission field which is neither very limited, very compact, nor very easily wrought. It embraces some nine or ten groups of stations requiring missionary services. The greater part of the work is done by student catechists, of whom many were employed in 1877. In addition to these, eight Gaelic catechists are employed in Cape Breton, and other parts of Nova Scotia. An interesting mission field was recently entered upon in New Brunswick. It is known as “The New Kincardine Colony,” and is described as “a little bit of Scotland transplanted bodily into the forests of New Brunswick.” Another has been opened in a long-neglected part of Newfoundland. “The annual expenditure for home missions in this section is about $3500, and for supplementing the stipends of ministers in weak congregations about $4000.

In addition to the work above mentioned, missions of a special character are maintained. Of such is the mission to the lumbermen, instituted seven years prior to the union by the branch of the Church in connection with the Church of Scotland. The object of this mission is to supply the ordinances of religion to the large number of men employed in the forests during the winter. These are visited by ministers, and supplied with copies of the Scriptures, tracts, and other literature in French and English. The average number annually employed in this branch of industry, in the valley of the Upper Ottawa, is about 5000 men. The amount expended on their behalf is about $650 per annum.

Perhaps in no department of Church work are there more hopeful and encouraging signs of progress than in that under the care of the Assembly's Board of French Evangelization, which has for its Herculean task the emancipation of 1,250,000 French Roman Catholics. Previous to 1875 missionary efforts in this direction had been conducted on a limited scale by the several churches. Since the union a great impetus has been given to the work, which is now assuming large proportions. In the service of the board there are at present forty missionaries, colporteurs, and teachers. several of whom were at one time priests of the Church of Rome. In Nova Scotia an ordained missionary labors in a wide field with a fair measure of success.  He reports 125 Romanists having embraced Protestantism through his instrumentality during the year 1876. In the province of New Brunswick there are three French missions, each making steady progress. In the province of Quebec there are twelve rural missions, maintaining Sabbath schools, besides the ordinary services. In Ottawa, the capital of the Dominion, the board employs two missionaries, who minister to about 250 persons. In Quebec city-the stronghold of popery in Canada-a church was erected in 1876, the first French Protestant church built in the city.

2. The staff of foreign missionaries consists at present of ten ordained ministers, one catechist, who acts as superintendent of schools, and three female missionaries. These are assisted by a large number of trained native teachers. The salaries of the ordained missionaries average about $1200 each; their assistants receive from $400 to $600 each per annum. The Church contributes annually towards the expenditure, in connection with the mission-ship Day-spring, $1200. The fields are four in number:

(1.) The New Hebrides. — This is the oldest and most distant. It originated with the late Dr. John Geddie, formerly a minister of the United Presbyterian Branch of the Church at Cavendish, Prince Edward Island, who landed on the island of Aneityum on July 13, 1848. This is no place to enter upon the details of Dr. Geddie's life's work. Few missionaries have been more successful, and no higher encomium need be associated with his name than these touching words inscribed on a tablet recently erected to his memory on the wall of the chapel where he was wont to preach: “When he came here there were no Christians, and when he went away there were no heathens.” Since the commencement of this mission twelve missionaries, with their wives, have gone from Nova Scotia to labor in this field.

(2.) Trinidad. — The mission to the Coolies of Trinidad was begun in 1869 by the Revelation John Morton, also a minister of the Church of the Lower Provinces. In 1871 he was joined by the Rev. R. J. Grant, and more recently by the Rev. Thomas Christie. Fifteen schools have been opened. Churches have also been built, and a number of native assistants take part in the work, which, notwithstanding many difficulties, is making satisfactory progress. The number of Coolie children under instruction is 500, and the missionary reports that 15 in one school can repeat the whole of the Shorter Catechism. The number of Coolies on the island is about 15,000.

(3.) Formosa. — This is one of the Church's most promising foreign mission fields. It was begun in 1872 by the Rev. G. L. M'Kay, of the Canada Presbyterian Church. In 1875 he was joined by the Rev. J. B. Fraser, M.D., as a medical missionary. In these five years there have been erected ten chapels and two mission houses. Five hundred of the natives have renounced idolatry, and regularly attend Christian services. Seventy- five have, after careful preparation and examination, been admitted as communicants. There are five schools with native teachers, and nine native students are under training for missionary work.

(4.) India. — Previous to the union the Canada Presbyterian Church and the Church in the Maritime Provinces in connection with the Church of Scotland had each broken ground in India by sending female missionaries. In 1874 the Rev. J. F. Campbell, a minister of the last-named Church, offered himself for foreign mission work. He has since proceeded to Madras as a missionary of the Presbyterian Church in Canada. At the same time the Rev. James Douglas also accepted an appointment to labor at Indore.

Next to the New Hebrides, the Juvenile Mission to India, instituted by the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, is the oldest foreign mission of the Church. It was originated twenty-five years ago, and has always been supported by a number of Sabbath-schools and the voluntary offerings of a few friends. The annual contributions received by the treasurer have been steadily increasing for some years. Besides supporting four Zenana day schools and a Bible-woman, this juvenile agency provides for the education of about forty orphan children in India.

3. Colleges. — Queen's University and College at Kingston, founded in 1840, is the oldest. It was projected by the branch of the Church formerly in connection with the Church of Scotland, and is the only one that possesses the power of granting degrees. It combines the faculties of arts and theology. Since its establishment Queen's has educated more than 100 ministers for the Presbyterian Church. The combined resources and equipment of the Canadian Presbyterian colleges may be summed up as follows:

The General Assembly authorizes an annual collection to be made in all the congregations on behalf of its theological colleges. In addition to the above-mentioned theological colleges, there is a collegiate institute at  Winnipeg, the capital of the province of Manitoba; it is controlled by the General Assembly, and supported by the Church at large. This institution has two professors-one of science and literature, and one of classics; also a lecturer in philosophy.

4. Periodicals. — Each of the churches previous to 1875 published a monthly magazine for the diffusion of missionary information and general religious intelligence. So that at the time of the union there were four such magazines-two in the maritime provinces, one in the province of Ontario, and one in the province of Quebec. Three of these had outlived more than a quarter of a century. The General Assembly agreed that there should be but one periodical for the whole Church, issued under its sanction, to be called The Presbyterian Record, and to be published monthly in the city of Montreal, at the rate of twenty-five cents per copy per annum. The first number of this periodical was published in January, 1876. Before the close of the year it had attained a circulation of 36,000 copies monthly.

5. A few ministers of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland refused to enter into the union with the Canada Presbyterian Church, and, after the union was consummated, declared themselves to constitute the Synod in connection with the Church of Scotland. This synod met in Montreal in June, 1876. The Rev. David Watson was appointed moderator. Trustees were appointed for the various funds of the synod, and the usual committees were also appointed. A petition was presented from the congregation of West King, praying for ordinances in connection with the Church of Scotland, and complaining of the proceedings which had resulted in their being deprived of their Church property. A list was presented of congregations in similar circumstances. It was agreed that a commission with synodical powers be appointed to watch such cases, and if that were called for, to appoint a deputation to proceed to Edinburgh and attend the next General Assembly, or the meetings at any time of the Colonial Committee of the Church of Scotland. See, besides the article in Blaikie, Sketch of the Presb. Church throughout the World, p. 49 sq., the references at the end of the article SEE PRESBYTERIANISM.

19. PRESBYTERIAN CHURCHES OF COLONIES OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE. — Besides the above in Canada, there are the following. In the account of these we chiefly follow the report of the late Pan-Presbyterian Council of Edinburgh, which we have largely used in the preceding details:

1. Australian Presbyterian Church. — In 1836, while this country was still used for penal colonization, the Presbyterian doctrine found its exponent in Victoria in the person of the Rev. Mr. Clow, a retired chaplain of a Highland regiment. In 1838 a missionary preacher was sent by the Church of Scotland to Melbourne, and soon others went over, and, until 1846, Presbyterianism in this colony was wholly dependent on the Kirk. After the discovery of gold in 1851, and the consequent rapid settlement of the colony, the Irish Presbyterian Church sent a number of ministers; and, by 1859, when a union of the different Presbyterian churches was proposed, there were congregations representing the regular Kirk, the Free Church, and the United Presbyterian, besides many smaller bodies. A complete union of all these various Presbyterians was finally effected in 1867, on the abolition of state aid.

The Presbyterian Church in Victoria has been formed on the Scottish model. In all its distinctive principles it remains loyal to the parent Church. While it has asserted an independent position for itself, it has adopted the Westminster Confession and Catechisms, and the Second Book of Discipline, as its standards. Some variations have been admitted on administration. For example—

(1.) The General Assembly is not a representative body.

(2.) The Commission, which meets six months after the Assembly, deals not only with matters sent to it, but with all matters of which due notice has been given; but its decisions in these latter are subject to review by the next General Assembly.

(3.) It has no synods.

(4.) And no deacons courts. The secular affairs are entrusted to a committee elected by the congregation, one half of whom retire every year.

(5.) Adherents as well as communicants are allowed to vote for the first minister of a newly formed congregation.

(6.) The use of hymns and of instrumental music has been allowed, and congregations have almost without exception, and with wonderful unanimity, availed themselves of the allowance. The hymnbook of the English Presbyterian Church has been sanctioned and recommended.

(7.) Further, the Assembly has sanctioned a “Book of Prayers for Social Worship,” which has been compiled with the view of assisting Christian men in the bush to hold service where a minister is not available.

The following statistics will give an approximate view of the present numerical and financial state of the Church:

Presbyterian population......…………………………….…..….130,000

Pastoral charges .........................…………………………..….......145

Ministers settled in pastoral charges……………………………......122

Unattached ministers supplying vacancies and new stations………...19

Elders ....………………………………………………….....…..... 400

Attending divine service ........………………………...........….. 60,000

Communicants.............…………………………................….... 15,000

Churches (besides halls and school-houses)……………………..... 234

Sittings in churches...................…………………………......... 38,000

Sabbath-schools................…………………………….................. 264

Teachers..............................………………………………….... 2,100

Scholars..............................……………………………............ 23,000

Bible classes ... ............………………………………..................... 73

Scholars ...............…………………........………………............ 1,800

Income for all purposes, 1875-76 ............……………………..£80,000

Capital funds held in trust for various schemes…………..…... £60,632

The schemes of the Church embrace two departments, ministerial and missionary:

(I.) Ministerial. — In order to make suitable provision for the ministry, the following funds have been established—

(a.) A capital fund for the endowment and support of a theological hall, established in 1865, with four chairs-Systematic Theology, Apologetics, Church History, and Exegetics-held provisionally by four ministers of the Church, and attended by fifteen students, of whom five are studying with a view to mission work. £50,000 will be required for the endowment of these four chairs. £14,000 are now in the hands of the Church, yielding an annual revenue of £900. Two university scholarships of £50 and £25 respectively have been founded for intending theological students, and two theological scholarships of the same amounts. But the larger of these is not confined to  Presbyterian students. It is open to all denominations. The Assembly raises additional scholarships, when needed, by subscription.

(b.) A sustentation fund, for the more adequate support of the ministry, aims at securing a minimum stipend of £300 to every minister. Congregations lodge their moneys monthly in the post office savings bank. Their ministers draw the deposits once a quarter to the extent of £300 a year. The balance that remains undrawn, if any, accrues to the general sustentation fund, which is distributed among ministers whose stipend falls short of the minimum, with the proviso, however, that no congregation receives more than £50. Last year 38 out of 122 ministers participated in the fund. The income was derived from the following sources: Congregational subscriptions, £866; donations of £100 each from eight gentlemen, £800; small donations and legacy, £374; interest from savings bank, £35, in all £2075.

(c.) A capital fund, for the support of aged and infirm ministers; instituted not only in the interest of ministers, but as emphatically of congregations, to relieve them, in some measure, at least, from a very painful burden, and to insure their enjoying the ministrations of men in the prime and vigor of life. It is raised by voluntary contributions, and by a payment of £25, spread over five years, from every minister. The allowance is £50 per annum, with £2 for every year beyond five that the annuitant has hell a charge.

(d.) A fund for the support of the widows and orphans of deceased ministers, raised by a minister's rate of £5 per annum, and an annual congregational collection. In 1876 these two sources of income yielded £990. Interest on capital, £1063; in all £2053. Annuities to twenty widows and twenty four orphans, £965. The annuity is £50, with £10 for each child below eighteen. The latter sum is doubled when both parents are dead. By these respective agencies provision is made for the ministry in its four stages -when training for work, when at work, when past work, and when finally done with work.

(II.) Missionary. — Comprised under two branches home and heathen missions:

(a.) The home mission is charged with—

(1) securing a supply of ministers;

(2) admitting accredited ministers from other churches;

(3) assisting presbyteries in supplying vacancies; and

(4) fostering mission-stations.

As the Church, in planting itself in a new land, is essentially a home mission, and as the demand for ministers has always been ahead of the supply, little has been attempted outside its own community. One or two of the larger congregations have, however, been vigorously prosecuting, while others are commencing, territorial work at their own hand. The committee have received generous assistance from the home churches in the way of ministerial supply. But the need is by no means abated. At this moment at least twelve men are urgently required.

(b.) The heathen mission embraces three departments:

(1.) The Chinese, of whom there are about 17,000 in Victoria. They are scattered in groups of two or three hundred over the colony. They are generally of an inferior type, but are very accessible to the teachings of the Gospel, which are given them at various points by the Christian churches. The Presbyterian Mission has taken the form for the present of a seminary for training Chinese catechists. It is conducted by one of the ministers of the Church, assisted by Mr. Cheong, a Chinese student.

(2.) The Aborigines, now reduced to about 1600. Charles Kingsley and others have put the natives of Australia at the bottom of the scale of rational beings, “if indeed they are entitled to be called men.” It seemed as if they were likely to furnish a link in the ascending development of humanity. The Presbyterian Mission at Rosmali has exploded this notion. It is under the charge of two Moravian brethren, and furnishes delightful proofs of the elevating influence of Christianity even upon the most degraded savage, while the children of the school have outstripped all their competitors in the State schools of Victoria.

(3.) The New Hebrides, in conjunction with other churches in Scotland, Canada, and Nova Scotia. The Presbyterian Church of Victoria maintains a contingent of two missionaries on this interesting field. The children of the Sabbath-schools are pledged to collect £500 per annum for the maintenance of the Day-spring, mission-ship. The total contributions to the home and heathen missions in 1876 amounted to £2220. The capital invested funds of the Church, Sept. 30, 1876, were as follows:

1. Theological Hall endowment ..........…….......£14,220

2. Ornmond and Patrick Hamilton scholarships….. 2,000

3. Rokewood Church endowment...........………... 1,000

4. Infirm Ministers' Fund .................…………...... 8,209

5. Widows and Orphans' Fund .........…….......... 18,203

6. Brodie Bequest (Home-mission work)......…... 2,000

7. Loan Fund for church and manse building (being the accumulation of five years' state aid).

15,000 Total ..........….........……………........... £60,612

There are two colleges in connection with this Church -one for boys, under the principalship of Dr. Morison, which has run a long and prosperous career; the other for girls under the charge of the Rev. George Tait, was but recently opened.

2. Presbyterian Church of New South Wales. — In 1802 about a dozen Presbyterian families, living on the banks of the Hawkesbury River, resolved to meet for the worship of God according to the forms of their fathers, though they had no minister. A Mr. James Mein ministered to them as catechist. At a cost of £400 they built a church, which bears the appropriate name of Ebenezer. In 1823 Dr. Lang went to the colony, the first Presbyterian minister. Considerable additions were made thereafter, but the history of the Church was not harmonious, and various divisions took place. At length, in 1865, a general union took place, through the amalgamation of separate bodies corresponding to the Church of Scotland, the Free Church, and the United Presbyterian; the new body being called “The Presbyterian Church of New South Wales.”

According to the articles of union the Word of God is the supreme and only authoritative rule of faith and practice for the Church; the Westminster Confession of Faith, Larger and Shorter Catechisms, the Form of Presbyterial Church Government, the Directory for the Public Worship of God, and the Second Book of Discipline, are the subordinate standards of this Church; explanations are then given as to the relative authority of the subordinate standards, the renunciation of intolerant principles, and the recognition of the spiritual independence of the Church;  the jurisdiction of the Church is declared to be independent of other churches, and ministers and probationers from other Presbyterian churches are admissible if they afford satisfactory evidence of their qualifications and eligibility, and on their subscribing the formula. The Church has prospered since the union, but not in proportion to the growth of the colony. It now consists of 7 presbyteries, 68 ministers, 70 charges, and 108 church- buildings. It has schemes for Church Extension, Foreign Missions, Sabbath-schools, Sustentation Fund, and Church and Manse Fund; its foreign missions are to the New Hebrides and the Chinese; it has three theological tutors, and its estimated total income for 1875 was £15,000. The minimum stipend is £200 with, or £250 without, a manse. It is expected that £300 will now be reached through the Sustentation Fund. The legislature having passed an act for the establishment of denominational colleges affiliated to the University of Sydney, St. Andrew's Presbyterian College has sprung into existence. It affords a home for young men attending the university. and the means of theological education for students of divinity. The General Assembly has enacted that after 1878 none but graduates shall be admitted as candidates for the office of the ministry.

Mission Work. — Three classes are recognized: the aborigines, the Polynesian tribes, and the Chinese in the gold-fields. The aborigines are so widely scattered that efforts among them have been chiefly desultory. A devoted Chinese catechist labors successfully among his countrymen at Sydney. The New Hebrides Mission has a share of support from this Church, which at one time supported the Rev. James D. Gordon, who, after returning to Eromanga, was murdered in 1872.

3. The Synod of Eastern Australia is formed of those who stood aloof from the general union of 1865, on the ground that Free-Church principles were not sufficiently maintained. It consists of two presbyteries, having nine ministers and charges.

4. Presbyterian Church of Queensland. — In 1859 the district of Moreton Bay was declared a separate colony, called Queensland. The first Presbyterian minister had arrived in 1847. In 1863 the separate congregations belonging to the different sections of Presbyterianism united as “The Presbyterian Church of Queensland.” The basis of union was the Westminster Confession, and all the Presbyterian congregations in the colony were embraced. There are 3 presbyteries, 24 charges, and 20  ministers. The General Assembly meets the first Monday of May. There are committees for Sabbath-schools (2410 scholars), Home Mission and Church Extension, Sustentation, Training Young Men for the Ministry, and the Support of Aged and Infirm Ministers. The Presbyterian population of the colony is 22,090. The annual contributions are about £9000.

5. Presbyterian Church of Tasmania. — The first Presbyterian minister arrived at Hobart Town in 1822 or 1823. In 1835 there was constituted the Presbytery of Van Diemen's Land, and the Scotch Church was placed on an equality with the English. In 1845 an attempt was made by the bishop of the English Church in Van Diemen's Land to obtain authority over all the inhabitants, but the Presbyterians succeeded in checking this, and in getting a rule recognized limiting the power of the English bishop in these colonies to the superintendence of his own clergy. The Presbyterian Church has not been equally prosperous in this as in other colonies, and there is still a division in the ranks. The Presbytery of Tasmania and the Free Presbytery of Tasmania indicate this division. There are 17 charges in all, and 13 ministers.

6. Presbyterian Church of South Australia. — The first Presbyterian Church began in Adelaide in 1839, and for some years ministers from the different Presbyterian bodies continued to drop in. In 1865 a union was effected. There are now 11 ministers and 13 charges. Union College is supplied by an Independent professor of Church history; a Baptist, of the Greek Testament; and a Presbyterian, of theology.

7. New Zealand Presbyterian Church. — Presbyterianism was first planted here about the year 1840; at least the first minister went there then. The Church has made good progress, and has been geographically divided into The Presbyterian Church of New Zealand and The Presbyterian Church of Otago. In 1876 the Church in the northern section had 7 presbyteries, 57 ministers in charges, and 4 unattached. The Otago branch, founded in 1848 by a Free Church colony from Scotland, had 45 ministers, but in both sections there is a great demand for more. Besides the ministers there are a considerable number of evangelists who strive in some degree to make up for the want of a stated ministry. The New Zealand Churches present the same interesting spectacle as other young colonial churches, striving after an organization on the model of Scotland, and having committees and schemes organized for that purpose. Much has been done by the Presbyterian Church for general education, and the chair of moral  philosophy in the University of Otago was endowed by them. The effort to obtain a well-educated ministry is conspicuous in its struggles, and in Otago a beginning has been made of a theological institution, and a professor of divinity and various tutors appointed. In other parts of the colony efforts have likewise been made to supply an educated ministry. But the difficulties in this direction have been great; many Presbyterians have joined other churches, and little has been done by the churches at home. Much is done in the way of Sunday-schools. Young Men's Christian Associations abound. Some congregations do little or nothing for missions; others are much interested in them. The New Hebrides Mission receives a good share of help, and recently something has been attempted for Fiji. There are committees for Sustentation, Church Extension, Mission, Temperance, Psalmody, and similar objects in both sections of the Church, betokening no small amount of activity and earnestness.

8. Presbyterian Church it South Africa. — When the Cape became an English colony in 1804, an application was made to the Church of Scotland for ministerial supply, and in 1822 and following years eleven ministers joined the Cape Church. In 1860 eight more Scotch ministers joined this Dutch Reformed body. There are, besides, nine Independent Presbyterian congregations in Cape Colony and Natal, numbering about 1000 members.

9. Other Colonial Churches. — In connection with the Church of Scotland, there are:

                  Congregations.          Ministers.

In South America .......………....... 14 …………..13

In West Indies .......……….…......... 4  ……………4

In Ceylon ......…………….............. 9 …………….8

Connected with the Free Church of Scotland are:

                  Congregations.          Ministers.

In South Africa ....…………........... 5 …………….3

In Natal ....................…………...... 4 ……………..3

In other places .............………..... 10 ……………..9

10. Presbyterian Church in Japan. — This body was organized in 1878 by a union of all Presbyterian missionaries in Japan. For doctrine, the Westminster Catechism, the canons of the Synod of Dort, the Shorter Catechism, and the Heidelberg Catechism were adopted. The constitution of the American Presbyterian Church was chosen as the model for administration.

See, besides the works already quoted in different sections of this article, Smith, Tables of Church History; Gardner, Faiths of the World, vol. 2; The American Cyclop. 13:809 sq.; Schem, Cyclop. of Education, s.v.; Marsden, History of Christian Churches and Sects, 2, 109 sq.; and Blaikie's Report, all of which we have freely used.

## Presbyterianism[[@Headword:Presbyterianism]]

             in its narrowest sense, is commonly understood as the synonym of Anti- Prelacy. But, in truth, there are three systems of religious opinion, by no means necessarily affiliated, which are, with a noticeable uniformity, found in combination under this name. These are, a Calvinistic theology, the Parity of the Clergy, and Paedobaptism. SEE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCHES. All branches of Presbyterianism organized themselves into a Presbyterian Alliance in London in 1875 on the basis of the Consensus of Reformed Confessions and Presbyterian government, and held the first council at Edinburgh in 1877. The next will convene in Philadelphia in 1880.

I. Doctrines. — The doctrines espoused by Presbyterians, in Great Britain and America, are found in the Confession of Faith of the Westminster Assembly of Divines, together with the Catechisms, Larger and Shorter, thereto appended. As a system, they are the doctrines generally known as Augustinian or Calvinistic. Presbyterians coincide with other orthodox bodies in the reception of the Apostles Creed, the Trinity, Redemption through Christ, Regeneration by the Holy Spirit, the Resurrection, and Eternal Judgment. They are distinguished specifically by opposition to Arminian, Pelagian, and semi-Pelagian tenets. The decisions of the Synod of Dort on the “five points” of Predestination, Particular Atonement, Original Sin, Special Grace, and the Perseverance of the Saints, have usually been acknowledged as setting forth their views. But while there is a substantial unity on these points, there are shades of difference, from High or Hyper Calvinism to Moderate Calvinism; from Supralapsarianism to  Sublapsarianism; from Hopkinsianism to Baxterianism; from the unbending Covenanters to the laxer Cumberlands; from the strict Old School with Scottish predilections to the more flexible New School with New England leanings. Though consenting to be called Calvinistic for purposes of convenience, Presbyterians do not receive all Calvin's views without qualification; neither do they admit that they owe their system to the Genevese reformer, for they claim for it a higher antiquity, reaching even beyond the great champion Augustine to no less an authority than St. Paul. They assert that the Reformers of the 16th century were agreed upon the points named, as appears from the harmony of the Augsburg Confession, the Heidelberg Catechism, tile Helvetic Confession, the Scotch Confession, the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, the French Confession presented to Francis II, the Belgic Confession, and the Decrees of the Synod of Dort in 1618.

The Westminster Confession, rejecting the Apocrypha, recognizes Holy Scripture as the only infallible rule of faith and practice. Hence every position is supported by proof-texts. The Confession teaches that there are in the godhead three persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, the same in substance, equal in power and glory. To God are ascribed the works of creation, providence, and redemption. Man having fallen, the Covenant of Works is replaced by the Covenant of Grace, of which Christ is the Mediator and Administrator for his elect people. Divine sovereignty and man's free agency are both fully and equally admitted, without attempting to explain this high mystery, but rather requiring it to be handled with special providence and care. The doctrine of the Divine Purpose, Decree, Predestination, or Fore-ordination, is guarded from fatalism or perversion in several ways: it is explicitly stated that neither is God the author or approver of sin; nor is violence offered to the will of the creature; nor is the liberty or contingency” of second causes taken away, but rather established; and they who perish are punished for their sins. The Covenant of Works having been broken by the first man, who was the federal head, representative, and root of his race, a consequent corruption of nature, a disability of the will to spiritual good, and a liability to suffering and death, temporal and eternal, were conveyed to all his posterity. Effectual calling consists in the special grace of God operating on the minds and hearts of all those whom he has predestinated to eternal life, in the reception of which grace men are passive, yet submit most freely, being made willing by his power. Elect infants dying in infancy, and  other elect persons who are incapable of the outward call, are nevertheless regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit, who worketh when, where, and how he pleaseth. That all infants dying in infancy come under the above conditions and are saved is a general sentiment of Presbyterians, so far as can be collected from their published writings. (See Chalmers, Rom. lect. 14:26; Cumming, Infant Salv. p. 25; Smyth, Bereaved Parents, p. 13; Junkin, Justificatitio, p. 143; Hodge, System of Theology [see Index].) Justification consists, not in inherent righteousness, nor in imputing the act of faith or any other act as righteousness, but in the pardon of sin for Christ's sake, and the accepting as righteous by imputing the righteousness of Christ received by faith. Adoption and sanctification accompany justification. Saving faith is a fiducial belief of the truth, and is shown to be sincere and active by repentance and good works, as evidential of regenerating grace. The perseverance of the saints is not owing to anything in them, but to the grace of God, which will not suffer them finally to fall away. Personal assurance does not belong to the essence of faith, and may be dimmed or lost, but it is a high privilege, and every believer should strive to attain it. It does not lead to laxity of morals, for the law, though no longer a covenant of works, is still binding as a rule of life and conduct.

II. Worship. — The Presbyterian forms of worship are extremely simple. The reading of a portion of Scripture, extemporaneous prayers, the singing of two or three psalms or hymns, a sermon or exhortation, and the pronouncing of the apostolic benediction at the close by the minister, comprise the entire service.

When no preacher is present, the people conduct the meeting themselves, an elder presiding and directing the several parts of reading, prayer, and praise. Nothing can be simpler or more flexible, capable of adapting itself to the necessities of the missionary or the street preacher, as well as to the wants of the most cultivated audiences. But while the Presbyterian Church neither uses nor condemns a liturgy, she provides for the dignity and propriety of divine service by means of a Directory for Public Worship as a guide, and by requiring ministers to qualify themselves for this duty, no less than for that of preaching, by reading, premeditation, and habitual communion with God in secret.

Presbyterians keep the Sabbath-day strictly as a day of rest and devotion; but they have conscientious scruples against the obligatory observance of  such days as Christmas, Good Friday, and Easter. The key to their practice in this and other respects (as declining to bow at the name of Jesus, avoiding the sign of the cross in baptism and its form in church architecture, refusing sponsors and confirmation, not marrying with a ring, discountenancing clerical vestments, etc.) is to be found in the adoption by the early Presbyterians of the principle that nothing is allowable in divine worship but what is divinely commanded, in opposition to the principle that everything is allowable except what is forbidden, and only two sacraments are recognized as of divine warrant-baptism and the Lord's Supper. Dipping or immersion is not in so many words forbidden, but is pronounced not necessary, and the ordinance is considered to be rightly administered by pouring or sprinkling -purification, not burial, being the idea symbolized thereby. The infant children of one or both believing parents have a right to baptism in virtue of the Abrahamic covenant, which, being anterior to Moses, was unaffected and unrepealed by the abrogation of the Mosaic law. Baptism being regarded as a public Church ordinance, private baptisms, except in cases of absolute necessity, are discouraged. The Lord's Supper is only a commemoration with bread and wine, and the idea of a sacrifice or of the real presence is carefully repudiated. At the same time, the spiritual presence of Christ, his special nearness to worthy receivers, and a peculiar blessing are as strongly maintained. To avoid the appearance of adoration of the elements, as well as better to conform to the supposed original posture of the apostles, this sacrament is taken sitting, either in the adjacent pews or around long tables provided for the purpose. To this ordinance such only are admitted as have on profession of their faith in Christ been received into the membership of the Church by the session, or such other persons as are known to be in good Church standing elsewhere. During the field preaching of the Scottish Reformation period and subsequently, several neighboring congregations often joined together to observe the communion. On such occasions there were several successive celebrations of the Supper, called the first, second, or third “table,” and so on. A small pewter token bearing a certain number was given to each worshipper, and specified the table or service at which its bearer was expected to communicate. Settled congregations thus came to employ the token in their own services. Latterly the token has been replaced by a card on which the communicant writes his name and address, keeping in this manner the pastor aware of his residence. This using of a card at the same time exhibits the Presbyterian opposition to open or indiscriminate communion, while the welcome given to members of other  evangelical churches shows equally opposition to close communion, so that the doctrine of the Church is that of restricted communion, restricting or confining this privilege to brethren of known Christian character.

III. Government. — Presbyterianism is the government of elders, being derived from the Greek πρεσβύτερος, presbyter, or elder. It is conceived to be analogous to the eldership of the Hebrews, the δημογεγόντες of the Greeks, the senatus of the Romans, and the aldermen or eldermen of the Anglo-Saxons, and, so, to be founded in the necessities, instincts, and common-sense of human nature as well as in Scripture itself. Presbyterians acknowledge no other head of the Church than Christ. Instead of recognizing, like episcopacy, a bishop as different from and superior to presbyter, and maintaining a distinction of ranks among the ministers of religion, it holds, on the contrary, that both in Scripture and the constitution of the Primitive Church bishop and presbyter are convertible terms and that there is complete equality in point of office and authority among those who preach and administer the sacraments, however they may differ in age, abilities, or acquirements. The argument as between the Presbyterians and Episcopalians is treated in the articles BISHOP SEE BISHOP and PRESBYTER SEE PRESBYTER , and as between the Presbyterians and Congregationalists, or Independents, in the articles ELDER SEE ELDER and ORDINATION SEE ORDINATION .

According to the views of Presbyterians, there ought to be three classes of officers in every completely organized Church -viz. at least one teaching elder, the bishop or pastor, a body of ruling elders, and deacons. The first is designed to minister in word and doctrine and to dispense the sacraments, the second to assist in the inspection and government of the congregation, and the third to manage its financial affairs. They disallow all jurisdiction or interference on the part of the civil magistrate, except for protection. They are no less jealous of ecclesiastical encroachments, and boldly assert that synods and councils may err, and have erred; that all Church power is only ministerial and declarative; that no Church judicatory has the right to make laws to bind the conscience by virtue of its own authority; that God alone is lord of the conscience; and that the right of private judgment is universal and inalienable. They maintain the parity of the clergy, and protest against prelacy or episcopacy, or the one-man power, as a usurpation finding no warrant in the writings of the apostles or of those of the early fathers nearest to their time. They no less disapprove of the opposite extreme of Independency, or the complete autonomy of  each separate congregation. They view the whole collection of believers as one body, constituting the universal or catholic Church (meaning by “catholic” not confined to one nation, as before under the law), though distributed into particular congregations for the purpose of meeting together more conveniently.

Though Presbyterian churches hold the doctrine of a parity of ministers, they have, when fully organized, a gradation of Church courts for the exercise of government and discipline, and the Presbyterian system is thus further distinguished from others by this ascending series of appellate courts. The first or lowest court is the Church Session, consisting of the pastor and ruling elders chosen by a particular congregation. The elders are chosen and ordained for life, although, either of their own motion or that of the people, they may resign and cease to be acting elders. The next court above is the Presbytery, which is the only ordaining body, meeting twice or oftener in the year, and consisting of all the ministers and one elder from each Church session within a given district. The Synod, which meets but once a year, comprises a number of adjacent presbyteries (those within a state, for instance), and is composed of all the ministers, and one elder from each Church session, within those bounds. (For the peculiar authority and character of the synods in the state establishments of the Continent, see the article SEE SYNOD.) The General Assembly, which meets annually, is the fourth and highest court in order, and embraces all the presbyteries in the connection. It is entirely a delegated body, composed of an equal proportion of ministers and ruling elders elected by the presbyteries to represent them, the ratio being determined by the size of the body, and care being taken to prevent its becoming unwieldy. Each superior court or judicatory has the constitutional right of reviewing and controlling, confirming or reversing, the doings and decisions of the court below. A mooted question or a judicial case may thus be removed successively from one court to another, till the collective wisdom of the whole Church, represented in the court of final resort, free from local prejudices or partialities, has an opportunity of deciding upon it. The General Assembly enjoys also, through its trustees, directors, boards, or committees, a general jurisdiction over the common finances, theological seminaries, foreign and domestic missions, education for the ministry, publication, church building, and correspondence with foreign churches.

It only remains to add that though Presbyterians maintain that truth is in order to goodness, and are tenacious of what they understand to be the  teaching of Scripture, they are, at the same time, neither bigoted nor exclusive, and to represent them as such they consider unfair in the extreme. They do not unchurch other denominations, but are ready to extend the hand of fellowship wherever they discern substantial truth and the image of Christ. Their standards explicitly say, “We embrace in the spirit of charity those Christians who differ from us, in opinion or practice, on these subjects.... There are truths and forms with respect to which men of good character and principles may differ; and in all these they think it the duty, both of private Christians and societies to exercise mutual forbearance towards each other” (Form of Gov. bk. 1, ch. 1, p. 8). See Hagenbach, Hist. of Doct. 2, 178; Schaff, Harm. of the Ref. Conf. (1877); Lewis, Presb. Manual, containing Forms for the Records of the Session Presbytery and Synod, and the Judicial and other Ecclesiastical Proceedings required by the Polity of the Presb. Church; Shedd, Hist. of Doctrines (see Index); Neander, Hist. of Dogmas (see Index); Hist. of the Westminster Assembly; Hist. of Confessions; Miller, on Presbyterianism; Smyth, Works and Tracts on Presbyterianism; Schaff, Creeds of Christendom, vol. 3; and the Theol. Index by Malcom, p. 378-380. (E.H.G.)

## Presbyterians    [[@Headword:Presbyterians    ]]

             a name derived from the peculiar Church government which is advocated ( SEE PRESBYTER and SEE PRESBYTERIANISM ), designates a large body of Protestant Christians not bound together in one large denomination, but associated in independent churches. As, however, the term Congregationalist embraces not merely the denomination which assumes that title, but also those whose principles of government are the same though their doctrines may be diverse, as the Baptists, the Christians or Campbellites, the Unitarians, etc., so the term Presbyterian properly embraces all those that accept the Presbyterian principles of government, even though there be some differences in their theological beliefs. All Protestant or Reformed churches may in general be said to be divided into three classes-those who hold to government by or through bishops, i.e. to an Episcopal government; those who hold to government directly by the members of the Church without the mediation of any representatives, i.e. to a Congregational or Independent form of government; and those who hold to government by a board of elders or presbyters, i.e. to a Presbyterian form of government. Presbyterianism, variously modified, is the form of Church government observed by many Protestant churches, but  is most perfectly developed in Britain and America. In Britain it prevails chiefly in Scotland, although during the Commonwealth in the 17th century it was for a very short time in the ascendant in England also.

In the “General Presbyterian Council” held at Edinburgh in July, 1877, the German state establishments and the French and Dutch Reformed churches, as well as other bodies that admit of certain features of Presbyterianism in government, were represented; and Dr. Blaikie, in his Report on Presbyterian Churches, which was submitted and approved by the Pan-Presbyterian Council at Edinburgh, treats of all these churches as Presbyterian bodies. In most, if not all of those churches, while there is a consistorial system that connects them with the state, giving the latter considerable control, there is also a true Presbyterian and synodal constitution. In virtue of the former, these churches have in some cases a general oversight of all matters affecting the moral and religious well being of the community, and in the exercise of the latter they deal more especially with spiritual questions. This was substantially the system advocated by the Scottish Reformers, and still exhibited to some extent by the presence in the General Assembly of the Scottish Established Church of a representative of the sovereign called the lord high commissioner, authorized to bring its sessions at any time to a close should the proceedings conflict with the royal prerogatives — by the presence as members of the Assembly not only of elders chosen by the churches, but of elders appointed to be there by the town councils of such places as are possessed of royal charters, and hence called royal burghs, and by the wide range of social as well as of religious questions that it considers. In Presbyterian churches not connected with the state, whether in Great Britain, on the continent of Europe, in this country or elsewhere, the jurisdiction being over only their own members and civil representatives unknown, the discussions are confined to matters directly affecting the interests of religion, and a more purely spiritual type of Presbyterianism in consequence prevails. SEE BELGIUM; SEE BOHEMIA; SEE FRANCE; SEE HOLLAND; SEE HUNGARY; SEE ITALY; SEE PRUSSIA; SEE RUSSIA; SEE SPAIN; SEE SWITZERLAND.

The French consistorial system is more nearly Presbyterian than the German, and is not perfectly so only from the pressure of the civil power. In other churches, also, as well as in the Protestant Church of France, Presbyterianism is more or less modified by the relations of the Church to the State. SEE REFORMED CHURCHES.

The Presbyterians are for the most part Calvinistic in doctrine. They generally accept the Westminster Assembly's Confession of Faith as their symbol of belief, and every minister in the Presbyterian Church of the United States is required to declare his personal belief in it as an embodiment of the truths taught in the Scriptures. I hey do not agree, however, in their interpretation of that standard, and are divided into strict Calvinists and moderate Calvinists. SEE CALVINISTS. This division in sentiment, combined with other circumstances, divided the Presbyterian Church of the United States into two bodies for a time, as we have already seen; but the division has been healed and a reunion effected, the theological differences having abated. SEE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCHES.

The chief Presbyterian Church in America not Calvinistic is the Cumberland Presbyterian. There was at one time, however, a serious defection in England, many of the churches becoming Socinian in doctrine; but the Unitarian churches in England at the present day are nearly all Congregational in their polity. Calvin is generally regarded as the founder of Presbyterianism; but it should be borne in mind that government by a board of elders was maintained by certain bodies, as the Waldensians, from a very early age. Of course, we are ready to grant that he adopted the form known as Presbyterianism because he believed it to be “founded on and agreeable to the Word of God.” Calvin may be regarded as the founder of Presbyterianism in the sense that he was the first to organize the Reformed Church on a Presbyterian model, just as he was the first to frame the Reformed faith of Southern Europe in a clear, distinct, and affirmative form. Says Blaikie: “It is not correct to say that Calvin originated the Presbyterian system. But in connection with it he rendered very essential service both in theory and in practice; he unfolded the idea more lucidly than it had been set forth before, and with much struggle he set it in actual operation in Geneva. What he thus established became the model on which the Reformed Church in France and other countries was formed” (Report, p. 7).

The tables on the following page are from Blaikie's Report.

## Presbyterium[[@Headword:Presbyterium]]

             (1.) A name sometimes given to the bema, or inner portion of an ancient church, because it was the place in which the presbyters sat and discharged their functions. SEE CHANCEL.

(2.) The name also of the senate formed by the presbyters and deacons of the episcopal residence, with whom the bishop deliberated about the most important affairs of his diocese. Although the government of the Church was claimed by the episcopate, as inherited from the apostolate, yet the spirit of community, κοινωνία, which prevailed in the Church required that the bishop, when important business was to be transacted, should take the advice of the presbyters and deacons. The limits of the respective attributes, however distinctly they might be traced, were neglected where the common care of the interests of the Church made it desirable, and the superiority of the episcopal dignity stood the less in the way, as even the apostles, in their humility, had called themselves presbyters (1Pe 5:1, ὁ συμπρεσβύτερος; 2Jn 1:1; 3Jn 1:1, ὁ πρεσβύτερος). Irenaeus gives the name of presbyters not only to the disciples of the apostles (Papias, in Eusebius, Hist. Ecclesiastes 3, 39, even the apostles), but also to the bishops of his time (Iren. Ep. ad Florin. ap. Euseb. 5, 20): ταῦτα τὰ δόγματα οί πρὸ ἡμῶν πρεσβύτεροι, οἱ καὶ Α᾿ποστόλοις συμφοιτήσαντες, οὑ πρέδωκάν σοι (Πολυκάοπος) ὁ μακάριος καὶ ἀποστόλικος πρεσβύτερος. Id. Ep. ad Victor. ep. Rom. (ap. Euseb. 5, 24): Οἱ πρὸ Σωτῆρος πρεσβύτεροι, οἱ προστάντες τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἡς νῦν ἀφήγη Α᾿νίκητον λέγομεν καὶ Πίον, ῞Υγινόν τε καὶ Τελέσφορον καὶ Ξύστον. According to the literal meaning of presbyter, it applies to men rather advanced in years. The languages of all nations show us that the members of such assemblies were chosen from among persons of a certain age. (Xenophon [Cyropned. 1, c. 2] speaks of οἱ γεραίτεροι ὄντες τε καὶ καλούμενοι. Livy [34, 49] says of the Carthaginians, “Seniores ita senatum vocabant.” The Greeks had γερουσία, συνέδριον ἐν Σμύρνα, γερόντων; the Romans had their senatus; the Germans their aldermen. We find this counsellorship of the elders in the Greek translation of the Old Testament: [Deu 11:16] Sept. πρεσβύτεροι τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ γραμματεῖς; [Jer 19:1] ἀρὸ πρεσβυτέρων τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ πρεσβυτέρων τῶν ἱερέων; [Eze 8:11] ἑβδομήκοντα ἐκ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων οικου Ι᾿σραήλ; [1Ki 12:6; 1Ki 12:8] τὴν βουλὴν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων; [1Ki 20:8] οἱ πρεσβύτεροι καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαός.) The Jewish synedrium was also taken as a model (συνέδριον, i.e. college of judges, Sanhedrin); and it is expressly stated that the presbyterium is a copy of the “synedrium” of the apostles (εἰς τόπον συνεδρίου τῶν ἀποστόλων).

St. Ignatius (110), who, more than any other writer, insists upon the distinction between the episcopate and presbyterate, and the superiority of the former, points out most  decidedly the connection of the presbyterium, as an episcopal council, with the episcopate. We read in the Ep. ad Smmyrn. c. 8: Πάντες τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ἀκολουθεῖτε ὡς Ι᾿ησοῦ Χριστὸς τῷ πατρὶ καὶ τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ ὡς τοῖς ἀποστόλοις τοὺς δὲ διακόνους ἐντρέπεσθε ὡς θεοῦ ἐντολήν. Ad Magnes. c. 2: ὑποτάσσεται (ὁ διάκονος) τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ὡς Χάριτι θεοῦ καὶ τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ ὡς νόμῳ Ι᾿ησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Ad Philad. c. 4: μία γὰρ σὰρξ τοῦ κυρίου-καὶ ἑν ποτήριον εἰς ἕνωσιν τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ, ἑν θυσιαστήριον, ὡς εἱς ἐπίσκοπος ἃμα τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ καὶ διακόνοις. Ibid. c. 8: Πᾶσιν μετανοούσιν ἄφιει ὁ κύριος, ἐὰν μετανοησώσιν εἰς ἑνοτήτα θεοῦ καὶ συνέδριον τοῦ ἐπισκόπου. In all these passages we find the name πρεσβυτέριον; in other passages the father uses πρεσβύτεροι, although he means the presbyters united in a college, and not the same as individuals (Ep. ad Polycarp. c. 6): τῶν ὑποτασσομένων τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ, πρεσβυτέριος, διακόνοις. Ad Philad. p-roomn: ἐὰν ἐν ἑνὶ ὠσὶν σὺν τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ καὶ τοῖς σὺν αὺτῷ πρεσβυτέροις καὶ διακόνοις ἀποδειγμένους ἐν γνώμῃ Ι᾿ησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Ad Magnes. c. 6: ἑνωθήτε τῷ ἐπισκόπω καὶ τοῖς προκαθημένοις . Ad Triall. c. 3: Πάντες ἐντρεπεσθῷσαν τοὺς διακόνους ὡς ἐντολὴν Ι᾿ησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ὡς Ι᾿ησοῦν Χριστὸν τοὺς δὲ πρεσβυτέρους ὡς συνέδριον θεοῦ καὶ ὡς συνδεσμὸν ἀποστόλων. Ad Magnes. c. 6: Σπουδάζετε πάντα πράσειν προκαθημένου τοῦ ἐπισκόπου εἱς τόπον θεοῦ καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων εἰς τόπον συνεδρίου τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τῶν διακόνων—πεπιστευμένων διακονίαν Ι᾿ησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Thus a natural want led to the foundation of the presbyterium, as a college of presbyters and deacons of the episcopal city, to advise the bishop in the most important ecclesiastical affairs of the diocese.

The form of this college had a positive model in the “synledrium” of the Old Testament, the judiciary competenlcy of which was, in the presbyterium, increased by the addition of the most important questions of administration. Chrysostom (De Sacerdot. lib. 3, c. 15) calls the presbyterium τὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων συνέδριον. The purpose of the institution was to secure efficiency in the workings of the Church, as is proved by the phrase βουλὴ ἐκκλησίας θεοῦ, by which Origen (In Joann.) designates the presbyterium. In this simple constitution the presbyters and deacons of the archiepiscopal city formed in the first five centuries the higher clergy, which, with its bishops, was considered as one body, as Thomassin says, Vetus et Nova Ecclesice Disciplina (Mogunt. 1787), 3, 32: “Ergo presbyteri diaconique civitatum episcopalium, qui  clerus erat superior dioeceseos in unum corpus, in unum senatum consiliumque cum episcopo coibat, cum eoque principe et capite suo, clericis populisque dioeceseos omnibus moderabatur.” As this presbyterium forms the council of the bishop, it is said to be at the head of the Church, along with the bishop. Thus, in the Council of Antiochia, Song of Solomon 1 : “Si quis eorum, qui praesunt ecclesiae, aut episcopus, aut presbyter, aut diaconus, εἴ τις τῶν προεστώτων.”

The Council of Sardica, can. 13, prohibits the elevation of neophytes to the highest dignities: to the episcopate, presbyterate, and diaconate; consequently to the governing clergy. In the ecumenical Council of Ephesus, pt. 1, c. 31, 34, and Acts 1, we find several letters of the bishop Cyril of Alexandria, addressed to the presbyters and deacons, and to the people of Alexandria. When pope Siricius prepared to condemn the heresy of Jovinian, he took the advice of his priests and deacons: “Facto ergo presbyterio constitit Christianas legi esse contraria. Omnium nostrum, tam presbyteroruum quam diaconorum, quam etiam totius cleri una suscitata fuit sententia.” Pope Felix proclaimed his sentence against Petrus Enopheus, the unlawful bishop of Antioch, under the formula: “Firma sit hec tua depositio a me et ab his, qui mecuom apostolicum thronum regunt.” The presbyters and deacons of Rome deliberated in the Roman synods with the bishops who happened to be at Rome on all matters which were of interest to the Roman see. In a Roman council under pope Hilary, the transmutation of a Spanish bishop being in question, the account says: “Residentibus etiam universis presbyteris, adstantibus quoque diaconibus;” and at the end of the council: “Ab universis episcopis et presbyteris acclamattm est, ut disciplina servetur, ut canones custodiantur, rogamus.” The college of the cardinals is by the Romanists claimed to be a true picture of these presbyteries of the apostolic Church. If in the transaction of affairs concerning the Church in general the advice of the presbyteries was requested, this was still more natural where the special business of the several bishoprics was concerned. The fourth Council of Carthage prescribes, can. 22: “Ut episcopus sine consensu clericorum suorum clericos non ordinet;” and in can. 23: “Ut episcopus nullius causam audiat absque pr esentia clericorum suorum. Alioqui irrita erit sententia episcopi, nisi clericorum suorum majorumn sententia cofirmetur.” St. Jerome says (In Jesa, 1, 3): “Et nos habeamus senatum nostrum, ccetum presbyterorum;” and Basil, Ep. 310, calls this senate τὸ συνέδριον τοῦ πρεσβυτερίου τοῦ κατὰ τὴν πόλιν . St. Cyprian transacted no business of any consequence without consulting his presbytery. In the matter of the fallen ones, he says: “Deinde sic collatiole  consiliormum cum episcopis, presbyteris. diaconis, confessoribus pariter astantibus laicis facta, lapsorum tractare rationem.” In lib. 3, ep. 10: “Ad id vero, quod scripserunt compresbyteri nostri, solus rescribere nihil potui, cum a primordio episcopats mei statuerim, nihil sine consilio vestro et sine consensu plebis, me privatim sententia gerere. St. Ignatius (Ep. cad Trallianos) calls the presbyters the counselors of the bishop: σύμβουλοι καὶ συνεδρεύται τοῦ ἐπισκόπου εἰς τόπον συνεδρίου τῶν ἀποστόλων. The difference between the presbyteries and the cathedral chapters, which were of later institution, is thus defined by Thomassin (c. I, p. 36, nr. 8 sq.):

“1. Non constabat clerus ille nisi presbyteris et diaconis.

2. Presbyteri et diaconi hi, parochi ipsi erant et pastores omnium civitatis ecclesiarum, aut si necdum essent divulsae a cathedrali parochiae, in eo ipsi parochorum munia omnia implebant.

3. Ipsa sua ordinatione hlunc gradum et hunc dignitatem consequebantur. Nam presbyteratus et diaconatus peraeque ac episcopatus beneficia erant, non ordines tantum; et id genus erant beneficia, quibus incumberet salutis animarum cura, pro suo certe modo.

4. Clerus etiam nunc Romanae ecclesiae formam proe se fert splendidissimam expressissimamque ejus cleri, qui olim singulis in cathedralibus ecclesiis episcopo copulabatur. Constat enim Romani pontificis clerus presbyteris, diaconisque cardinalibus, seu titularibus ecclesiarum omnium Romoe parochialium parochis, cum pontifice, et sub pontifice conspirantlbus et collaborantibus Romano in consistorio, de negotiis omnibus, quae ex pontifioia spirituali ditione, ex universo, inquam, christiano orbe referuntur.”

A consequence of the participation of the presbyters in the administration during the lifetime of the bishop was that they governed alone during the vacancy of the see. After the death of pope Fabian, the clergy of Rome wrote to the clergy of Carthage (Ep. 29 ap. Cypr.): “Omnes nos decet, pro corpore totius ecclesiae, cujus per varias quasque provincias membra digesta sunt, excubare.” Oilly the decisions about the most momentous concerns were postponed till after the new occupancy of the see. Thus the clergy of Rome say (Ep. 31): “Quanquam nobis differendoe hujus rei major necessitas incumbat, quibus post excessum Fabiani nullus est episcopus propter rerum et temporum difficultates constitutus;” and in another  passage: “Ante constitutionem episcopi nihil innovandum putavimus, ut interim, dum episcopus dari a Deo nobis sustinetur, in suspensu eorum causa teneatur, qui moras possunt dilatione sustinere.” It was the same when the bishop was for a longer period of time absent from his residence. Thus St. Ignatilus says: “Pascite presbyterieum, qui in vobis est, gregem, usquequo Dominus ostendat eum qui vobis principabitur.” And St. Cyprian (Ep. 10) says to his presbyters and deacons: “Hortor et mando, ut vos vice mea, quem abesse oportet, fungamini circa ea gerenda quse administratio religiosa deposcit;” and lib. 4 Ephesians 6 : “Officium meum diligigentia vestra praesentet, et faciat omnia, quae fieri oportet circa eos,” etc. Thus St. Hilarius, in his petition to the emperor Constanitus, states that he has administered his diocese through his presbyters: “Licet in exilio permanens et ecclesiae adhuc communioner per presbyteros meos distribuens.” But at an early period the bishops commenced to appoint vicars for the dispatch of all their business at the time of their absence. The institution of the old presbyteries melted organically into the cathedral chapters. St. Eusebius of Vercelli and St. Augustine, to promote Christian life in their presbyteries. had already given them monastical constitutions.

Other cathedral churches imitated this arrangement; and in the empire of the Franks the institution of common life, after the model of the institutions founded by bishop Chrodegang of Metz, spread rapidly. In consequence of the confirmation of the rule proposed by the deacon Amalarius at the Council of Aix-la- Chapelle (816), the innovation was accepted in all episcopal churches. The bishops of those times, in imitation of those of the first centuries, did nothing of importance without their canons. We have an example of it in the business transacted concerning the lease of some real estate between Hincmar of Rheims and a Thuringian abbot. But if the cathedral chapter was the privileged part of the clergy in this respect, yet the bishop was free to take the advice of the other members both of the secular and regular clergy. Thus bishop Jonas of Autun, who wished to raise the income of his canons, insured the “consensum presbyterorum, diaconorurn, ac totius sequentis ordinis ejusdem ecclesie.” When, in the 10th century, the canonic common life was given up, the canons continued to form the senate of the bishop. According to the decretals, the canons are the born counselors of the bishops. Calixtus II forbids archpriests and archdeacons to interdict clerks: “‘Preter episcopi et totius capituli commune consilium.” Alexander III blames the patriarch of Jerusalem for appointing and deposing abbots and other prebendaries without consulting his chapter, and upon the mere advice of foreigners. Yet, as a rule, the bishop is not bound by the vote of  the chapter, although there are questions which cannot be decided without its consent. The Council of Trent also, in sess. 24, c. 13, calls the cathedral chapter the senate of the bishop. He has to take its advice for the appointment of a lector oh the Holy Scriptures (Cone. Trid. sess. 5, c. 1); for the fixing of the holy orders, to be requested in those who are to be promoted to the dignities and canonries of the cathedrals (sess. 24:c. 12); for the establishment of seminaries (sess. 23:c. 18); for any addition to the number of the canonries (sess. 24:c. 15), etc.

But the presumption is always in favor of the episcopal independence. Thus, when the chapters of the ecclesiastical province of Milan endeavored to increase to an unlawful extent the number of the causse majores, in which the bishop has to obtain the consent or take tie advice of the canons, St. Borromaeus declared, in the fourth Council of Milan, that the bishop was bound to have the approbation or to take the advice of his chapter only in such cases as are stated by law. The litigations about these cases had become of quite frequent occurrence since the dissolution of the community of goods I n the chapters, and the latter had often conducted themselves in regard to the bishop as independent corporations. In many places the bishop had become a simple member of the chapter. Up to the year 1803 the chapters of Germany held at the same time two sharply defined positions: they constituted, first, as of old the senate of the bishop, and subordinate to him; and, secondly, they were independent corporations. The secularization of 1803 destroyed this latter position. The reorganization of the Church in Germany makes the chapter simply an episcopal council. The papal see has resolutely set its face against all pretensions of binding the bishops to the consent of the chapters. Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. s.v. See Buss, Gesch. des National u. Territorial-Kirchenthums in der Katholischen Kirche (Schaff. 1851).

## Presbytery[[@Headword:Presbytery]]

             is (1) the space in the choir of a church in which the high-altar is placed; the name is sometimes extended to the whole choir. SEE CHANCEL. It is (2), in Scotch law, an ecclesiastical division of the country, as well as a court. (On the Continent this is known as the classis.) In its local sense it includes a combination of parishes, varying from four to thirty, and the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland has power to vary the size. — Chambers, s.v. SEE SCOTLAND, CHURCH OF.

The presbytery is composed of the teaching elders of the churches of a given geographical district, together with one of the ruling elders elected for that purpose by  the Session from each church. Besides being a court of appeal from the inferior judicatory, it is bound to inspect carefully the personal conduct and pastoral labors of every minister within its bounds, and, when necessary, to admonish, suspend, or even depose. It belongs to presbyteries to grant licenses to preach the Gospel, to take cognizance of all preachers within its borders, to give certificates of character, etc., to those removing, and to furnish supplies where needed for the pulpit. Ally Church member who feels himself aggrieved by the act of the Session may appeal from its decisions to the Presbytery. Superior in authority to the Presbytery is the Synod, which is composed of the teaching elders and one ruling elder from each church of a larger district than that represented by the Presbytery. Still above the Synod is the General Assembly.

This embraces representatives, both lay and clerical, from every Presbytery, and is the supreme authority in all ecclesiastical matters. To it an appeal lies from the Presbytery in all ecclesiastical proceedings of a disciplinary character, and its decision is final. Its authority, however, though supreme, is not unlimited. In legislating for the churches it is required to refer the laws which it passes to the presbyteries for their approval; and the law does not become of binding force upon the churches until it receives the sanction of at least a majority; in certain cases two thirds are required. The Presbytery holds frequent and stated meetings, according as circumstances may require. In any emergency it is in the power of the moderator (q.v.), on his own responsibility, or on receiving a written requisition from several members, to call a pro re nata meeting of the Presbytery. In Presbyterian churches, where the supreme court consists of delegates, it belongs to each Presbytery to elect ministers and elders to represent them in that court. All the proceedings of the Presbytery must be duly minuted by the clerk, and are subject to the review of the Provincial Synod. SEE PRESBYTERIANISM.

## Presbytis[[@Headword:Presbytis]]

             (presbytress). This word, in the various forms πρεσβύτερα, presbytera, presbyterissa, is of frequent occurrence in ancient writers, and denotes either the wife of a presbyter or a deaconess in the Church. Sometimes it denotes the matron of a cloister, and an abbess. SEE DEACONESS.

## Prescience[[@Headword:Prescience]]

             (Lat. praescio, to know before it happens) is all attribute of God popularly known under the term Foreknowledge, and ascribed to him in different  degrees and extent by Arminians and Calvinists. The doctrine is deduced from the perfection of God's nature. But as man has no analogous faculty, it is difficult, if not impossible for us to conceive of God's prescience. Man's knowledge of what is future is so obscure and inferential that it is in vain to fathom God's beholding of all things. Yet in the attempt made there arises the great question, how to reconcile the prescience of God with the liberty of man; and hence the doctrine becomes of vast importance to theologians of both the Arminian and the Calvinian schools.

I. False Theories. — Three leading theories have been resorted to in order to evade the difficulties which are supposed to be involved in the opinion commonly received.

1. Chevalier Ramsay (Philosophical Principles of Natural and Revealed Religion [Glasgow, 1748, 2 vols. 4to]) among his other speculations, holds it a matter of choice in God to think of finite ideas; and similar opinions, though variously worded, have been occasionally adopted. In substance these opinions are that though the knowledge of God be infinite as his power is infinite, there is no more reason to conclude that his knowledge should be always exerted to the full extent of its capacity than that his power should be employed to the extent of his omnipotence; and that if we suppose him to choose not to know some contingencies, the infiniteness of his knowledge is not thereby impugned. To this it may be answered

(1) that the infinite power of God is in Scripture represented, as in the nature of things it must be, as an infinite capacity, and not as infinite in act; but that the knowledge of God is, on the contrary, never represented there to us as a capacity to acquire knowledge, but as actually comprehending all things that are and all things that can be.

(2) That the notion of God's choosing to know some things and not to know others supposes a reason why he refuses to know ally class of things or events, which reason, it would seem, can only arise out of their nature and circumstances, and therefore supposes at least a partial knowledge of them, from which the reason for his not choosing to know them arises. The doctrine is therefore somewhat contradictory. But

(3) it is fatal to this opinion that it does not at all meet the difficulty arising out of the question of the consistency of divine prescience and tile free actions of men, since some contingent actions-for which men have been made accountable, we are sure-have been foreknown by God, because by  his Spirit in the prophets they were foretold; and if the freedom of man can in these cases be reconciled with the prescience of God, there is no greater difficulty in any other case which can possibly occur.

2. A second theory is that, the foreknowledge of contingent events being in its own nature impossible, because it implies a contradiction, it does no dishonor to the divine Being to affirm that of such events he has, and can have, no prescience whatever, and thus the prescience of God as to moral actions being wholly denied the difficulty in question is got rid of. To this the same answer must be given as to the former. It does not meet the case so long as the Scriptures are allowed to contain prophecies of rewardable and punishable actions. The great fallacy in the argument that the certain prescience of a moral action destroys its contingent nature lies in supposing that contingency and certainty are the opposites of each other. It is, perhaps, unfortunate that a word which is of figurative etymology, and which, consequently, can only have an ideal application to such subjects, should have grown into common use in this discussion, because it is more liable, on that account, to present itself to different minds under different shades of meaning. If, however, the term contingent in this controversy has any definite meaning at all, as applied to the moral actions of men, it must mean their freedom, and stands opposed, not to certainty, but to necessity. A free action is a voluntary one; and an action which results from the choice of the agent is distinguished from a necessary one in this, that it might not have been, or have been otherwise, according to the self- determining power of the agent. It is with reference to this specific quality of a free action that the term contingency is used: it might have been otherwise-in other words, it was not necessitated. Contingency in moral actions is, therefore, their freedom, and is opposed, not to certainty, but to constraint.

The very nature of this controversy fixes this as the precise meaning of the term. The question is not, in point of fact, about the certainty of moral actions-that is, whether they will happen or not-but about the nature of them, whether free or constrained, whether they must happen or not. Those who advocate this theory care not about the certainty of actions simply considered, that is, whether they will take place or not; the reason why they object to a certain prescience of moral actions is this: they conclude that such a prescience renders them necessary. It is the quality of the action for which they contend, not whether it will happen or not. If contingency meant uncertainty, the sense in which such theorists take it, the dispute would be at an end. But though an uncertain action  cannot be foreseen as certain, a free, unnecessitated action may, for there is nothing in the knowledge of the action in the least to affect its nature. Simple knowledge is in no sense a cause of action, nor can it be conceived to be causal, unconnected with exerted power: for mere knowledge, therefore, an action remains free or necessitated, as the case may be. A necessitated action is not made a voluntary one by its being foreknown; a free action is not made a necessary one. Free actions foreknown will not, therefore, cease to be contingent. But how stands the case as to their certainty? Precisely on the same ground. The certainty of a necessary action-foreknown does not result from the knowledge of the action, but from the operation of the necessitating cause, and, in like manner, the certainty of a free action does not result from the knowledge of it, which is no cause at all, but from the voluntary cause-that is, the determination of the will. It alters not the case in the least to say that the voluntary action might have been otherwise. Had it been otherwise, the knowledge of it would have been otherwise; but as the will which gives birth to the action is not dependent upon the previous knowledge of God, but the knowledge of the action upon foresight of the choice of the will, neither the will nor the act is controlled by the knowledge, and the action, though foreseen, is still free or contingent.

The foreknowledge of God has then no influence upon either the freedom or the certainty of actions, for this plain reason, that it is knowledge, and not influence; and actions may be certainly foreknown without their being rendered necessary by that foreknowledge. But here it is said, “If the result of an absolute contingency be certainly foreknown, it can have no other result, it cannot happen otherwise.” This is not the true inference. It will not happen otherwise; but it may be asked, Why can it not happen otherwise? Can is an expression of potentiality-it denotes power or possibility. The objection is that it is not possible that the action should otherwise happen. But why not? What deprives it of that power? If a necessary action were in question, it could not otherwise happen than as the necessitating cause should compel; but, then, that would arise from the necessitating cause solely, and not from the prescience of the action, which is not causal. But if the action be free, and it enters into the very nature of a voluntary action to be unconstrained, then it might have happened in a thousand other ways, or not have happened at all; the foreknowledge of it no more affects its nature in this case than in the other. All its potentiality, so to speak, still remains, independent of foreknowledge, which neither adds to its power of happening otherwise nor diminishes it. But then we are told that “the  prescience of it in that case must be uncertain.” Not unless any person can prove that the divine prescience is unable to dart through all the workings of the human mind, all its comparison of things in the judgment, all the influences of motives on the affections, all the hesitances and haltings of the will, to its final choice. “Such knowledge is too wonderfuil for us,” but it is the knowledge of him “who understandeth the thoughts of man afar off.” “But if a contingency will have a given result, to that result it must be determined.” Not in the least. We have seen that it cannot be determined to a given result by mere precognition, for we have evidence in our own minds that mere knowledge is not causal to the actions of another. It is determined to its result by the will of the agent; but even in that case it cannot be said that it must be determined to that result, because it is of the nature of freedom to be unconstrained: so that here we have an instance in the case of a free agent that he will act in some particular manner, but it by no means follows from what will be, whether foreseen or not, that it must be.

3. The third theory amounts, in brief, to this: that the foreknowledge of God must be supposed to differ so much from anything of the kind which we perceive in ourselves, and from any ideas which we can possibly form of that property of the divine nature, that no argument respecting it can be grounded upon our imperfect notions, and that all controversy on subjects connected with it is idle and fruitless. But though foreknowledge in God should be admitted to be something of a “very different nature” from the same quality in man; yet as it is represented as something equivalent to foreknowledge, whatever that something may be, since in consequence of it prophecies have actually been uttered and fulfilled, and of such a kind, too, as relate to actions for which men have, in fact, been held accountable, all the original difficulty of reconciling contingent events to this something, of which human foreknowledge is a “kind of shadow,” as “a map of China is to China itself,” remains in full force. The difficulty is shifted, but not removed.

II. Extent of Prescience. — It may, therefore, be certainly concluded, if, at least, the Holy Scriptures are to be our guide, that the omniscience of God comprehends his certain prescience of all events, however contingent; and if anything more were necessary to strengthen the argument above given, it might be drawn from the irrational, and, above all, the unscriptural consequences which would follow from the denial of this doctrine. These are forcibly stated by president Edwards: “It would follow from this notion  (namely, that the Almighty doth not foreknow what will be the result of future contingencies) that as God is liable to be continually repenting what he has done, so he must be exposed to be constantly changing his mind and intentions as to his future conduct-altering his measures, relinquishing his old designs, and forming new schemes and projections. For his purposes, even as to the main parts of the scheme (namely, such as belong to the state of his moral kingdom), must be always liable to be broken through want of foresight, and he must be continually putting his system to rights, as it gets out of order, through the contingence of the actions of moral agents: he must be a Being who, instead of being absolutely immutable, must necessarily be the subject of infinitely the most numerous acts of repentance and changes of intention of any being whatsoever, for this plain reason, that his vastly extensive charge comprehends an infinitely greater number of those things which are to him contingent and uncertain. In such a situation he must have little else to do but to mend broken links as well as he can, and be rectifying his disjointed frame and disordered movements in the best manner the case will allow. The supreme Lord of all things must needs be under great and miserable disadvantages in governing the world which he has made and has the care of, through his being utterly unable to find out things of chief importance which hereafter shall befall his system, which, if he did but know, he might make seasonable provision for. In many cases there may be very great necessity that he should make provisions in the manner of his ordering and disposing things for some great events which are to happen of vast and extensive influence and endless consequence to the universe, which he may see afterwards, when it is too late, and may wish in vain that he had known beforehand, that he might have ordered his affairs accordingly. And it is in the power of man, on these principles, by his devices, purposes, and actions thus to disappoint God, break his measures, make him continually to change his mind, subject him to vexation, and bring him into confusion.”

III. Speculations on the Subject. — Some of the ancient philosophers denied that God could foreknow events depending on free will (see Cicero, De Divinate, 2, 5, 7; answered by Augustine, De Civitate Dei, 5, 9, 10). Socinus (Praelect. Theol. c. 8-11) and his early followers would not allow that God possesses any knowledge of future contingencies. The schoolmen, in reference to this species of knowledge in God, invented that called scientia media (q.v.; SEE FONSECA and SEE MOLINI ), which they define as “that by which God knows, sub conditione, what men or  angels will do according to the liberty which they have when they are placed in these or those circumstances, or in this or in that order of things.” When Gomarus, the opponent of Arminius, found that his opinion concerning the object of reprobation was clogged with this absurdity — that it made God to be the author of Adam's sin — he very astutely took refuge in this conditional foreknowledge, and in his corrected theses on predestination, published after the death of Arminius, he describes it as “that by which God, through the infinite light of his own knowledge, foreknows some future things, not absolutely, but as placed under a certain condition.”

Waleas, the celebrated antagonist of Episcopius, had recourse to the same expedient. This distinction has been adopted by very few of those who espouse the doctrines of general redemption, and who believe that every event, how contingent so ever to the creature, is, with respect to God, certainly foreknown. An old English divine thinks that “in the sacred Scriptures certain not obscure vestiges are apparent of this kind of knowledge of things that will happen thus or otherwise, on the supposition of the occurrence of this or that circumstance. Omitting the well-known example of David in Keilah (1Sa 22:12), and of Chorazin and Bethsaida (Mat 11:21; Luk 10:13), consult, among other sayings of the same description, Christ's answer to the chief priests and scribes who had asked ‘Art thou the Christ? Tell us.' And he said unto them, ‘If I tell you, ye will not believe.' In the subsequent verse he adds, ‘If I also ask you, ye will not answer me, nor let me go' (Luk 22:67-68). You have here three events specified which yet will not occur even on the supposition of Christ our Lord himself.”

This kind of knowledge might very well be included in that of scientia visionis, because the latter ought to include, not what God will do and what his creatures will do under his appointment, but what they will do by his permission as free agents, and what he will do, as a consequence of this, in his character of Governor and Lord. But since the predestinarians had confounded scientia visionis with a predestinating decree, the scientia media well expressed what they had left quite unaccounted for, and which they had assumed did not really exist-the actions of creatures endowed with free will and the acts of Deity which from eternity were consequent upon them. If such actions do not take place, then men are not free; and if the rectoral acts of God are not consequent upon the actions of the creature in the order of the divine intention, and the conduct of the creature is consequent upon the foreordained rectoral acts of God, then we reach a necessitating eternal decree, which, in fact, the predestinarian contends for; but it unfortunately  brings after it consequences which no subtleties have ever been able to shake off-that the only actor in the universe is God himself, and that the only distinction among events is that one class is brought to pass by God directly and the other indirectly, not by the agency, but by the mere instrumentality, of his creatures. — Watson. See also Watson, Theol. Institutes, 1, 375; 2, 357, 429; Works, 7:298,309; Pope, Compendium of Christian Theology (Lond. 1875), p. 145-149,191 sq.; Raymond, Systematic Theology (see Index in vol. 2); Knapp, Theology, § 22; Fletcher, Works; Presbyterian Confession; Church Remembrancer (Jan. 1856); B1ulletimz Theol. (Oct. 1868), p. 26 sq.; Hodge, Systematic Theology (see Index); Bromley, Divine Prescience; Clarke, Boyle Lectur- es for 1705; King, Sermons on the Divine Prescience; Tillotson, Sermons; Waterland, Works, vol. 6; Haag, Histoire des Dogmes (see Index in vol. 2; Graves, Works, vol. 4; Bib. Sacra, July, 1868, p. 455; Neander, Dogm. p. 568 sq.; Callisen, Essay with a View to bring into Harmony the Doctrine of the Omniscience of God and the Freedom of Man, in Schmidt u. Schwarz, Theol. Bibliothek, vol. 8; Reid, On the Active Powers, essay 4: ch. 11; Pye Smith, First Lines of Christian Theology, p. 148, 149. SEE ELECTION; SEE PREDESTINATION.

## Prescription[[@Headword:Prescription]]

             I. This expression, borrowed from the civil law, has in the Roman Catholic Church a canonistic meaning. In order to put limits to the contests about mine and thine in rights, obligations, and possessions, that Church has fixed terms which invest with legality the possession of rights and goods, unless proof be produced that these rights or goods are of an alienable kind, or have been acquired by illegal means (usurpation or theft time does not consecrate). If the lawful term be elapsed, the possessor is confirmed in the possession of said rights or goods, and he who is bound by certain obligations cannot call them in question. ‘The term of prescription varies with the nature of the object: movable property prescribes quicker than immovable, the property of adults quicker than that of minors, the property of those present quicker than that of absentees; ecclesiastical property is prescribed only after forty years. According to the rules of the papal chancery, the possessor of an ecclesiastical office, after a three years' possession, if it be not obtained by violence or simony, cannot be lawfully expelled from it. There is prescription in his favor.

II. Tertullian transplanted this expression to the theological domain by his work on prescriptions against heretics, a kind of argument against erroneous doctrine. This is what he means: The Catholic Church enjoys, in her doctrines and discipline, the right of prescription; what she teaches and practices at the present hour she has taught and practiced from times immemorial-learned it from the apostles, as the apostles learned from Christ, as Christ had it from the Father. The catholic doctrine is the true one, because it is the old and original one, and rests on the divine revelation; the doctrines of heretics and sectarians, on the other side, are false, because new, because they have not prescription in their favor, and consequently are not founded on divine revelation. Irenaeus taught similarly. It is easy to see that this proof by prescription is much the same as the proof by tradition, and that this mode of arguing can have no acceptability in Protestantism, where the Bible alone is regarded as the true test, and the apostolic or early Church practices have only an advisory influence, not authority. Of course, High-Churchmen, by their ritualistic tendency, can hardly be said to come under the full influence of Protestantism, and are therefore not to be considered as included in the exponents of evangelical Christianity. See Elliott, Delineation of Roman Catholicism, p. 61, 95, 407. SEE AUTHORITY.

PRESCRIPTION is also a law adopted in Presbyterian churches. If a scandal is not noticed for five years after it happens, it cannot be revived, but is then said to be prescribed.

## Presence[[@Headword:Presence]]

             means, in canonical law, the uninterrupted personal residence of every regularly prebended ecclesiastic at the seat of his office; a duty emphatically imposed on him by the laws of the Church. It means also the personal attendance at the common choral prayer, to which the laws of the Church obligate all members of a monastic community, as well as the canons and choir-vicars of the cathedral and collegiate congregations.

## Presence, Real[[@Headword:Presence, Real]]

             SEE TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

## Presence-money[[@Headword:Presence-money]]

             is the small daily payment in specie made by Roman Catholics to the canons for their presence in the choir at defunct cathedral or collegiate churches. After the dissolution of the communal life of those ecclesiastics, the bulk of the revenue of the chapters was divided into individual portions, to be distributed partly as daily stipends, called distributiones  quotidiance, or quotidiana stipendia, in opposition to the prebends, which went by the name of fructus grossi or annui. The purpose of this daily distribution was to induce the canons to a stricter obedience to the law of residence, and to more assiduous attendance to the public choir-prayers, as only those canons came in for their share who were either present in the choir or officiated during the service. Yet there were some grounds on which their absence could be excused without loss of their share. (These legal exceptions are formulated in the canonic regulations in De cler. aegr. 3, 6; De cler. non resid. 3, 3; Conc. Trid. sess. 22:c. 3, and sess. 24:c. 8 fin. De ref.) The Council of Trent directed that in those cathedral or collegiate congregations where there existed no presence-money, or where it reached but an insignificant amount, a third of the whole revenue of the chapter should be set apart and used for such distributions (Conc. Trid. sess. 21:c. 3, De ref.). The portions of the canons absent without reasonable excuse were to be divided among the members present pro rata, or given to the fabric of the church, if it stood in need of such help, or employed for any pious purpose the bishop might devise (sess. 22:c. 3, De ref.). It was not always the negligence of the canons, but also the peculiar- and partly abusive-composition of the chapters, which was the cause that their members so frequently dispensed with personal service in the choir, and were represented in it by simple vicars. The personal obligation of the canons has been insisted upon by the most ancient canonic rules, by the Council of Trent, and by the last circumscription bulls for the reorganization of the German bishoprics. Special presence-money is no more in use; for as the dotation of the restored bishoprics and chapters is not founded on immovable property, as the prebends flow, in the form of fixed salaries, out of the public treasure, the direction of the Council of Trent that a part of the revenue should be set apart and used for such distributions is not acted upon. See Schmidt, Thesaurus jut. Ecclesiastes 4:195 sq.

## Present[[@Headword:Present]]

             SEE GIFT.

## Presentation[[@Headword:Presentation]]

             in ecclesiastical law, is,

I, in the state-established churches, one of those forms of canonic collation of the prebends by which the rights of the bishop are limited, inasmuch as he cannot himself nominate an occupant to the vacant office, but must be content with confirming the nominee of the patronus beneficii. The right of presentation is therefore the right of the patron to designate to the bishop the successor elected by him of a deceased beneficiary, the bishop being obliged to confirm the candidate if he be worthy, capable, and proposed according to canonical rules. This right of presentation is the first and most important of all patronal rights. The patron, in the exercise of his right, is bound by the general conditions of a canonical provision: he has to propose a capable and worthy person gratuitously, and within the legal limits of time. If the patronate be an ecclesiastical or a mixed one, the time is six months; if it be a worldly one, four months: yet there are departures from this rule. In Austria the patron must choose his nominee out of a list drawn up by the ordinariate: if he be at home, within six months; if he be abroad, within three months, from the day of the receipt of the list. In Prussia six months are allowed to the lay patron, as well as to the ecclesiastical patron, from the day of the vacation of the office; or, if the beneficiary die abroad, from the day on which the news of his death is received.

In Baden the time is limited to three months, except in the case of insurmountable hindrances. If the right of presentation belong to several persons individually, they can agree upon a common choice, or designate each his own candidate, leaving the choice to the bishop; or the matter may be decided by the majority of the votes; and in case of an equality of votes in favor of each candidate, the decision may be left again to the bishop. The same rules obtain when the right of a patron has been transmitted to several heirs, in which case, of course, the heirs of one patron can give only one vote. If the right of presentation belong to a college or a juridical person, the case is settled by the statutes of the corporation; or if regulations on the subject be wanting, by a collegiate vote. In the remainder, the right of the patron is unlimited: he can propose his nearest relation, but not himself, although he could, “via gratiae,” present a request for his own admission (gratiosam petere admissionem). He can submit several candidates to the choice of the bishop; if he be a layman, he can, so long as the legal term is not elapsed and the canonic collation has not taken  place, propose successively several other names. This jus variandi is not allowed to an ecclesiastical patron. Here the first presentation, according to the principle “Tempore prior potior jure,” makes null and void all subsequent nominations. If the legal term is passed without presentation, or if the presentation has not been made gratuitously, the nomination in that case is lost to the patron, and belongs exclusively to the collator. The same happens when an ecclesiastical patron wittingly proposes an unworthy subject, while the lay patron is allowed another presentation in the legal four months. But if the patron, whether layman or ecclesiastic, have unwittingly proposed an unworthy candidate, he obtains a new term of four or of six months. The Prussian law allows, after the expiration of the primitive term, only a supplementary term of six weeks. In Baden the patron, if his proposition have been rejected by the ordinariate, is allowed another presentation, to be made in the space of four weeks, and the same term is allowed him a second time, but not further. The presentation is made by letter, for which many ordinariates prescribe fixed formulas to the private patrons.

The contests about the patronal rights are, according to decretal law, subject to the ecclesiastical courts; but modern legislation has almost everywhere added it to the competency of the worldly tribunals. If the patronal right itself be contested, the actual possessor has the “jus prasentandi,” and the nomination resulting from the use he makes of it is not invalidated by his being afterwards defeated in the lawsuit. But if the right to hold the goods with which the patronate is connected should itself' be questioned, then the right of presentation is suspended, and the bishop in this case enjoys a free right of collation. The winner of the suit may then, to insure his privilege, confirm the nomination made by the bishop; but if he should refuse his consent, this can have no influence on the situation of the nominee. See Schulte, Kirchenrecht, p. 67 sq.; Rosshirt, Kanonisches Recht, p. 437 sq.; Pachmann, Kirchenrecht, 1, 268 sq.; Richter, Kirchenrecht, § 193; Gerlach, Das Prisentationsrecht (Regensb. 1855).

II. In the Established Church of Scotland the minister intended for a living by a patron must be presented to the presbytery for inquiry into his qualifications, and for induction if these are satisfactory. If the patron fail to present within six months, the right then devolves on the presbytery, tanquam jure devoluto. SEE JUS DEVOLUTUM. When a presentee was objected to by the major part of the congregation, whether with or without reason, the General Assembly of the Church formerly claimed the right to declare that he should not be inducted or entitled to the benefice. This  declaration was contained in an act of Assembly, dated 1835, called the Veto Act. But after much litigation it was decided by the courts of law that such Veto Act was ultra vires and void; and this decision led to a secession of many ministers and people from the Established Church, and to the formation of a new dissenting Church, called the Free Church (q.v.). The law is now settled that it is the presbytery, and not the people, who are to judge of the reasonableness of any objections made to the presentee, for which purpose reasons and objections are heard on both sides, and a wide discretion is exercised by the presbytery. If the presbytery dismiss the objections, they then proceed to the trial and induction (q.v.) of the presentee. The following is the form of a Scotch presentation, and is a copy, indeed, of the one which led to the disputes and processes that ended in the disruption of the Scottish Church:

“The right honorable Thomas Robert Drummond Hay, earl of Kininoull, undoubted patron of the parish church and parish of Auchterarder, lying within the presbytery of Alchterarder and sheriffdom of Perth, considering that the said church and parish is now vacant and become at my gift and presentation by and through the death of the Rev. Charles Stewart, late minister of the Gospel at the said church of Auchterarder and I being sufficiently informed of the literature, loyalty, qualifications, good life and conversation of Mr. Robert Young, preacher of the Gospel, residing at Seetield Cottage, Dundee, do therefore, by these presents, nominate and present the said Robert Young to lie minister of the said parish and church of Auchterarder during all the days of his lifetime, giving, granting, and dispensing to him the constant, localled, and modified stipend, with the manse and glebe, and other profits and emoluments belonging to the said church, for the crop and year 1835, and during his lifetime, and his serving the cure of the said church, requiring hereby the reverend moderator and presbytery of Auchterarder to take trial of the qualifications, literature, good life, and conversation of the said Robert Young; and having found him fit and qualified for the function of the ministry at the said church of Auchterarder, to admit and receive him thereto, and give him his act of ordination and admission in due and competent form, recommending hereby to the lords of council and session, upon sight of this presentation and the said presbytery's act of ordination and admission, to grant letters of holming, on a simple charge of two days only, and other executorials necessary at the instance of the said Robert Young, against all and sundry the heritors, life-renters, felars, tacksmen, tenants, possessors, and  occupiers of lauds within the said parish, subject and liable in payment of the said localled and modified stipend, for causing the said Robert Young, and others in his name, be readily answered and paid thereof in such due and competent form as effeirs. And I consent to the registration thereof in the Books of council and session, or others competent, therein to remain

for preservation: and for that effect I constitute   my procurators. In witness whereof, etc., (signed) Drummond Kinnoul. R. A. Yates, witness. Thomas Neatham, witness.”

SEE PATRONAGE.

## Presentation of the Virgin, Feast of[[@Headword:Presentation of the Virgin, Feast of]]

             a Romish festival held on Nov. 21. It is not older than the 13th century. SEE MARY.

## President[[@Headword:President]]

             (סָרִךְ, sarák, or סָרְכָ‹, sareka; Sept. τακτικός; Vulg. princeps), only used in Daniel 6; the Chaldee equivalent for Hebrew shotêr, probably from Sara, Zend. a “head” (see Strabo, 11:331). Σαραπάρας -κεφαλοτόμος is connected with the Sanskrit siras or çiras, and is traced in Sargon and other words (Eichhoff, Vergl. Spr. p. 129, 415; see Her. 3, 89, where he calls satrap a Persian word). — Smith. SEE GOVERNOR.

## President in Choir[[@Headword:President in Choir]]

             is the name given to the English dean's deputy, usually the senior residentiary or vice-dean, who in his absence corrects offences, besides acting as president in chapter (q.v.), and choragus, or director of the services, when there is no dignitary; also the precentor.

## Presides, or Presidents[[@Headword:Presides, or Presidents]]

             was the name sometimes applied to bishops of the early Church, after the word πρόεδροι, derived from προεδρία, the elevated seat which the bishop occupied in the synod and in the religious assemblies of the people. See Coleman, Anc. Christianity Exemplified, p. 131.

## Presiding Elder[[@Headword:Presiding Elder]]

             is the name given in the Methodist Episcopal Church to an officer whose functions are those of a superintendent within limited jurisdiction. These elders serve under the bishops, and, together with them, constitute in their respective conferences a cabinet, in which resides the appointing power over the membership of itinerant preachers. The office is one of very great responsibility and far-reaching influence. Within the territory over which such an elder presides every minister is amenable to this officer, who visits the different charges three or four times during the year, usually at what is  called the holding of the Quarterly Conference (q.v.), over which he presides, and by which all the business of the charge is disposed of. He also presides at the District Conferences, where literary and ecclesiastical culture is aimed at, and the licensing of candidates for the ministry takes place. Usually the territory is confined to an eighth or sixth of the Conference boundaries, and corresponds somewhat in extent to the average county in an Eastern state.

The office of presiding elder was created in the early history of Methodist economy in this country, and appears to have had its origin in the assistants whom John Wesley employed as helps. He had what we might call junior preachers at the circuits or districts into which he divided his work, and an assistant in charge of the whole. These assistants were then invested with nearly the same authority over the helps which the great founder of Methodism himself exercised, and hence they had an authority akin more to the bishopric of American Methodism. When, in 1784, Mr. Wesley caused the election of Asbury and Coke as superintendents or bishops, there were several assistants in office thus made subject to these two general superintendents. The question has arisen whether the twelve elders who were elected at the Christmas Conference of 1784 were simply traveling elders or assistants of the superintendents. SEE METHODISM.

As the presiding elders are now episcopal appointees, the answer to this query becomes important. There are two opinions. One party, advocating the elective eldership, insist that these twelve men were then elected by the Conference for the assistants work, and base their decision on Dr. Emory's interpretation. He says, in his History of the Discipline, p. 125, “All elders were at first presiding elders,” and the distinction between presiding elders and “traveling elders” was not made until 1792. Section 5, of 1789, it would seem, proves the correctness of Dr. Emory's statement. The following is a part of the section on elders:

“Ques. 2. What is the duty of an elder?

“Ans.

1. To travel through his appointed district.

“2. To administer baptism land the Lord's Supper, and perform all parts of divine service.

“3. In the absence of a bishop to take charge of all the deacons, traveling and local preachers, and exhorters.  “

4. To change, receive, or suspend preachers.

“5. To direct in the transaction of the spiritual business of his circuit. “

6. To take care that every part of our discipline be enforced. “

7. To aid in public collections.

“8. To attend his bishop when present, and give him, when absent, all necessary information by letter of the state of his district.”

That every elder, in the absence of the bishop, was equal in point of supervisory office and duty is evident also from the fact that the third duty in this section gives an elder no authority to take charge of elders, but simply of deacons traveling, and local preachers, etc., seeing they were equal in authority. It was not until 1792 that a distinction was made between presiding elders and traveling elders, and these were then put under the charge of presiding elders. It was at this date that presiding elders were chosen by the bishop from the body of elders, and those elders not chosen by the bishops were disrobed of office as presiding elders, and placed for the first time under the care of presiding elders (see p. 126, 1792).

“Ques. By whom are the presiding elders to be chosen?

“Ans: By the bishop. Among the duties of the presiding elder, one is to take charge of all the elders, deacons, etc., of his district.”

At this date, then, there was made a distinction between presiding elders and traveling elders, and not before. All the elders previous to 1792, therefore, were elected and appointed to the office and duties of presiding elder by the Conference, and each had equal authority in charge in the absence of the bishop.

Against this position, those who approve of the existing practice of the appointing of presiding elders by the bishop urge, first, that from 1785 to 1792 there were each year more elders than presiding elders; secondly, that the presiding elders were appointed to their districts, and that the appointment was by the bishop; and, thirdly, that if the bishops did appoint elders to preside over other elders, the Conferences not calling the bishops to account consented to the change, and thereby made it valid; and that it was the practice of the Church from 1784 to 1792, notwithstanding the disciplines required otherwise (see letter by Dr. D. Sherman in Zion's  Herald, March, 1876); and that Dr. Emory and others interpreted falsely the action of the early Methodist Church in America (comp. Stevens. Hist. of the M. E. Church, 2, 222, 224). The presiding duties which made of an elder a presiding elder did not, in the practice of the Church, belong to this new order in the ministry as soon as it was constituted. They belonged to the assistants, and were gradually transferred to the elders; and when, after the practice of nearly two years, they were actually transferred, the custom was legalized, the office of assistant was abolished, and the word disappeared from the minutes (see the Minutes and Discipline, A.D. 1786). The idea of this transfer originated in the mind of bishop Asbury, who found, after the eldership was instituted, as he says in his Notes on the Discipline, “that this order was so necessary” that he would make them rulers. Even his idea of the presiding eldership was not contemporaneous with the instituting of the order of elders, but came, as he says, when he “afterwards found that” they would be useful in ruling (see Notes on the Discipline, by Coke and Asbury).

His idea was not put in practice until the Annual Conferences of 1785, when, as Lee (History, p. 120) states, the presiding eldership originated, but only in an inchoate form. This was months after the order of elders had been instituted. When, in 1786, the first law was made relative to the presiding eldership, it was made possible by the Discipline for every elder to become a presiding elder, so far as the duties were concerned, and here is where Emory and others have been misled. But as the bishop always appointed the ruling or presiding elders from the order of elders (Lee, History, p. 150), the practice was never to make all the elders ruling or presiding elders. Hence, from 1786 to 1792, the law of the Discipline never entirely agreed with the practice in the appointments, for there were hosts of elders who were never presiding elders. In the Conference of 1702, however, the law was made to harmonize with the practice. In the ancient Church the chorepiscopi (περιοδευταί) filled an office which must have given Mr.Wesley the suggestion for the assistant he called into office. See Emory, Hist. of the Discipline, p. 136 sq.; Sherman, Hist. of the Discipline, p. 153; Bingham, Ecclesiastes Antiquities, 1, 56, 69; Porter, Compendium of Methodism; Jeth. Quar. Rev. Jan. 1875, art. 4; April, 1876, art. 4; National Repository, May, 1876, Editor's Study. See also Rural Deans, in the article DEAN SEE DEAN of this Cyclopaedia, 2, 711.

## Press[[@Headword:Press]]

             (פּוּרָה, purâh; ληνός). Among the Israelites this was a large trough, usually hewn out of stone (Isa 5:2; Mat 21:33; comp. Nonni, Dionys. 12:330) or dug in the earth and walled up (Harmer, 3, 117). It had a trellised opening below. This trough was called gath, גִּת (in the Talmud also גתה), or purâh, פּוּרָה(Isa 63:3); and in it the grapes were trodden by men (five usually work together in Persia still; Kämpfer, Aemen. p. 377). Hence the phrase to tread the wine-press (Job 24:11; Lam 1:15; Isa 63:2). The juice (Heb. tirôsh, תִּירשׁ) flowed through the opening into a vat, usually in the earth (called yekeb, יֶקֶב Gr. προλήνιον , Isa 5:2, or ὑπολήνιον, Isa 16:10, and simply ληνός, Mat 21:33; Lat. lacus vinarius, Colum. 12:18: in Job 24:11, this word means, however, the trough or press itself). From this it is taken for fermentation in earthen vessels. These presses, which are still common in the East and the Levant (Arvieux 4:272 sq.; Kämpfer, ut sup.), were almost always outside of the towns, either in the vineyards or on mountains (Zec 14:10; Isa 5:2; Mat 21:33; Mar 12:1; Rev 14:20). The slaves must usually have trodden the press, as it was hard labor (Isa 63:1 sq.). They were cheered in it by singing and music (see Isa 16:10; Jer 25:30; Jdg 9:27; Jer 25:30; Jeremiah 48, 33). See Ugolino, De Re Rust. Vet. Heb 6:14 sq., in his Thesaur. 29. SEE OIL; SEE WINE.

## Pressense, Edmond DE, D.D[[@Headword:Pressense, Edmond DE, D.D]]

             an eminent French Protestant minister, was born in Paris, January 24, 1824. He studied at the University of Paris, and theology with Vinet, Tholuck, and Neander. He was pastor of the Free Evangelical Congregation of the Taitbout at Paris, 1847-70; deputy to the National Assembly from the Department of the Seine, 1871-76; elected life senator of Paris in 1883. After 1854 he was editor of the Revue Chreietienne, Which he founded. He was president of the Synodical Commission of the Free Church of France also a chevalier of the Legion of Honor. He died April 7, 1891. As an author he was very voluminous, having written many books relating to the Reformation and the life of Christ.

## Pressly, Ebenezer Erskine, D.D[[@Headword:Pressly, Ebenezer Erskine, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian divine, was born near Cedar Spring, Abbeville District, S. C. in 1808. His parents, of the good old Scotch-Irish stock. were remarkable for their piety and intelligence, and early dedicated their only son to the work of the Christian ministry. He pursued his preparatory studies at Union Academy, graduated at Miami University, Ohio, in 1826, was received as a student of theology by the Second Associate Reformed Presbytery, and studied under John T. Pressly, D.D., who was then professor of theology for the Southern Synod, was licensed at Due West in 1829, and on Aug. 7,1830, was settled as pastor of Due West and Generostee churches. In 1837 he resigned the latter charge, and continued pastor of Due West alone; in 1838 he was chosen the successor of Dr. John T. Pressly. In 1839 he was elected president of the Clark and Erskine Seminary, which  afterwards took the name of Erskine College, in which position he remained until the spring of 1848. He died July 26, 1860. Dr. Pressly was a man of more than ordinary talent, and a good general scholar. In the position of president of the college he was greatly beloved by his pupils. Possessed of excellent executive ability, and of special aptness to teach, much of the success of the college and seminary, in the early periods of their history, was traceable to his influence. Though an interesting writer, he had a singular aversion to appearing before the public as an author, and hence he never published anything except an occasional sermon. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1861, p. 226. (J.L.S.)

## Pressly, John S[[@Headword:Pressly, John S]]

             a Presbyterian minister, noted also as a classical teacher, was born in Abbeville District, S. C., in 1794. His means for acquiring the rudiments of a literary education were very limited. Until the years of manhood he had not enjoyed very fully the advantages of the common school. In 1812, however, he moved to the State of Ohio, and during a stay of three years in the Northwestern States he underwent much privation and hard labor in his endeavors to acquire knowledge. About the close of the year 1815 he was prostrated on a bed of suffering with a painful illness; a kind Providence brought him the medical services of Dr. Joseph Gilbert, who. on his recovery, suggested to him the desirableness of a classical education, and proposed to furnish him with the necessary books. Thus encouraged, and accepting the doctor's kind offer, he entered Church Hill Academy June 19, 1816; in 1819 he entered South Carolina College, and spent two years there. In 1822 his career of classical teacher began, and in this field of usefulness, in which he labored during the balance of his life, he attained an enviable reputation. His first charge was Union Academy, in the southern part of Abbeville District, S. C. Among his pupils here were the late Rev. E. E. Pressly, D.D., Re. J. T. Pressly, D.D., Hon. T. C. Perrin, and J. A. Calhoun, Esq. In 1824-27 he taught at Cambridge and Beaver Dam — the latter in Laurens District. In 1828 he took charge of Church Hill Academy, but his labors there were soon interrupted by his being elected to the State Legislature of South Carolina by the people of Abbeville District. In 1835, at the close of his political career, he was invited to tale charge of the high school at Due West, S. C., just founded by the Associate Reformed Synod of the South, where he continued to labor till 1839 with great success. At last released from all engagements connected with teaching, he turned his attention to the study of theology; studied one session in the seminary of  the Associate Reformed Church at Oxford, Ohio; was licensed in 1840; and after attending during the ensuing session in the Associate Reformed Seminary at Alleghany City, Pa., he was employed until 1842 as a missionary to destitute churches within the bounds of the synod. Subsequently he was settled for five years as pastor of Bethel and Ebenezer churches, Ga.; the remainder of his life until 1851 was spent in teaching and missionary work. He (lied June 1. 1863. Mr. Pressly as a man wuas social and companionable; as a teacher he was a strict disciplinarian, and in the capacity to impart classical knowledge had few superiors. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Alm. (1867), p. 398. (J. L. S.)

## Pressly, John T., D.D[[@Headword:Pressly, John T., D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, noted as a professor in divinity and an author, was born in Abbeville District, S. C., in 1803. He studied for the ministry at the Theological Seminary in New York under Dr. John Mason. His first pastorate was in his native village, from which he was called to a professorship in the Theological Seminary, and the charge of the First Associate Reformed (now United Presbyterian) Church in Alleghany, Pa., both of which stations he filled with distinguished ability and success for nearly forty years. He died at Alleghany Aug. 13, 1870. — Appletons' Annual Cyclopaedia, 10, 573.

## Pressy, Francois-Joseph-Gaston de Partz de[[@Headword:Pressy, Francois-Joseph-Gaston de Partz de]]

             a French prelate, was born in 1712 at the castle of Ecuire (diocese of Boulogne). He was one of the most distinguished pupils of Saint-Sulpice. He was called, Dec. 25, 1742, to the episcopal see of Boulogne. He administered his diocese during nearly forty-seven years with unremitting zeal, and spent considerable sums for the ransom of the Christians captive among the Mohammedans, and for the expansion of the faith by foreign missions. In 1752 he joined a protestation addressed to the king (June 11), by twenty-one bishops, against parliamentary encroachments on ecclesiastical authority. A mandement which he subsequently published on the subject was suppressed. He died at Boulogne Oct. 8, 1789. His principal writings are, Statuts synodaux (1746, 4to): — a collection of Instructions pastorales and Dissertations theologiques (2 vols. 4to): — a Rituel du Diocese de Boulogne (Boulogne, 1780, 4to): — and a prayer- book in French, under the title of Heures (Lille, 1820, 8vo). See Gallia  Christiana, t. 10; Gazette de France, 1742-89; Fisquet, France Pontifcale (not published). Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.

## Prester, John[[@Headword:Prester, John]]

             SEE JOHN, PRESTER.

## Preston, John, D.D[[@Headword:Preston, John, D.D]]

             a noted English Puritan divine, was born at Heyford, Northamptonshire, in 1587, and educated at King's College and Queen's College, University of Cambridge, was made fellow and tutor of Queen's College, and finally became chaplain to Prince Charles. In 1622 he was appointed preacher of Lincoln's Inn, and subsequently lecturer in Trinity Church, Cambridge. He became so celebrated as a speaker that the towns-people went to his lectures on week-days as they would to his sermons on Sunday, and he was complained of by those who looked with envy upon his fast-growing reputation. He also became noted as an able advocate of Calvinism, and in a controversy with the famous Arminian, Dr. Montague, sustained the elective theory with much adroitness and boldness. He was certainly a man of great learning, a popular preacher, and a powerful writer. He died in 1628, greatly lamented not only by Calvinists, but by all lovers of the good cause. He wore himself out with work; and when his friends would remonstrate, his answer was always, “Our life, like iron, consumes with rust, as much without as by employment; that every one cannot be said to have lived long that is old, as seven years in the life of some men are as much as seventy in others; and therefore the question is not so much How long I have lived as How I have lived.”

He was naturally reserved and only figured in public because his zeal for the doctrines of Calvin would not suffer him to let go unanswered those who maintained the opposite theories. Of his works (published 1615-58) which have never been collected, an abridgment by William Tennent was published in 1658 (1648 also [?]), 12mo. The best-known of his publications are, The New Covenant, fourteen sermons (Lond. 1629, 4to; ninth ed. 1639, 4to; again in 1655, 4to): — The Breastplate of Faith and Love, eighteen sermons (1630, 4to; 5th ed. 1634, 4to): — Life Eternal, eighteen sermons (1631, 4to; 4th ed. 1634, 4to): — The Saint's Daily Exercise, five sermons on Prayer (1633, 4to; 9th ed. 1635, 4to): — The Saint's Qualifications, ten sermons on Humiliation, nine on Sanctification, and three on the Sacrament (1634, 4to; 3rd ed. 1637, 4to). — Four Treatises (sermons): 1.  Covetousness; 2, Spiritual Death and Life (separate in 1633, 4to); 3, Self Denial (separate in 1632, 4to); 4, Lord's Supper (together in 1635, 4to; 4th ed. 1636, 4to): — Sermons before his Majesty, etc. (5th ed. 1637, 4to): — Sinner's Overthrow, or Mortification (1635, 4to; 4th ed. 1641, 4to): — Remacins (three treatises): 1, Judas his Repentance; 2, Saint's Spiritual Strength; 3, Paul's Conversion and Sermons, etc. (2nd ed. 1637,4to): — The Golden Sceptre, etc. (1638, 4to): — Doctrines of the Saints' Infirmities, a sermon (1638, 4to): — A Lifeless Lie, a sermon (4th ed. 1641, 4to): — Fullness of Christ for Us, a sermon (1640, 4to): Divine Love of Christ, five sermons (1640, 4to): — Two Treatises (1641, 4to): — Thesis de Gratice Convertendis Irresistibilitate (1652, Svo; in English, 1654): — Riches of Mercy to Men in Misery (1658, 4to). See Dr. R. Sibbs's preface; Middleton, Evangel. Biog. 2, 460 sq.; Perry, Hist. Ch. of England (see Index); Clark, Lives; Neal, Hist. of the Puritans; Burnet, Own Times; Fuller, Worthies; Darling, Cyclop. Bibl.; Jonathan Edwards, Works; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v. (J. H. W.)

## Preston, Willard, D.D[[@Headword:Preston, Willard, D.D]]

             an eloquent American divine and noted educator, was born at Uxbridge, Mass., May 29, 1785, and was educated at Brown University, where he graduated in 1806. After having studied law and practiced in that profession for a few years, he studied for the ministry, and was in 1811 ordained and became pastor of a church at Providence, R. I., where lie preached until 1825, when he was chosen president of the University of Vermont. In 1829 he removed South for the benefit of his health, and in 1831 accepted the pastorate of the Presbyterian Church in Savannah, Ga., and there remained until his death in 1856. He published, Farewell Sermon at St. Alban's (1815): — Sermons (1817). — Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.: Drake, Dict. of Amer. Biog. s.v.

## Preston, William, D.D[[@Headword:Preston, William, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal minister, was born at Woodbury, Connecticut, August 26, 1801. He graduated from Yale College, was first a clerk in New York city. then studied theology in Alexandria, Va., was tutor in Kenvyon College for a year, and on October 12, 1828, was admitted to deacon's orders by bishop Chase of Ohio. He began his ministry in the town of Worthiungton, but soon removed to Trinity Church, Columbus, where he remained for twelve years. In 1841 he accepted a call from the parish of St. Andrew's, in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, where he continued ten years. He was then called to his former parish in Columbus, owing to ill- health, removed some four years later to Christ Church, Bridgeport, Connecticut, where he labored until 1856, when he went back to his old charge in Pittsburgh. In 1873 he resigned this post, and after a time removed to Bedford, Pennsylvania, where he was rector of St. James's Church. He died there, April 25, 1875. See, Obit. Rec. of Yule College, 1875.

## Presumption[[@Headword:Presumption]]

             as it relates to the mind, is a supposition formed before examination. As it relates to the conduct or moral action, it implies arrogance or irreverence. As it relates to religion in general, it is a bold and daring confidence in the goodness of God, without obedience to his will.

Presumptuous sins must be distinguished from sins of infirmity, or those failings peculiar to human nature (Ecc 7:20; 1Jn 1:8-9); from sins done through ignorance (Luk 12:48); and from sins into  which men are hurried by sudden and violent temptation (Gal 6:1). The ingredients which render sin presumptuous are knowledge (Joh 15:22), deliberation and contrivance (Pro 6:14; Psa 36:4), obstinacy (Jer 44:16; Deu 1:13), inattention to the remonstrances of conscience (Act 7:51), opposition to the dispensations of Providence (2Ch 28:22), and repeated commission of the same sin (Psa 78:17). Presumptuous sins are numerous, such as profane swearing, perjury, theft, adultery, drunkenness, Sabbath-breaking, etc. These may be more particularly considered as presumptuous sins, because they are generally committed against a known law, and are so often repeated. Such sins are most heinous in their nature and most pernicious in their effects. They are said to be a reproach to the Lord (Num 15:3); they harden the heart (1Ti 4:2); draw down judgments from heaven (Num 15:31); and even when repented of, they are seldom pardoned without some visible testimony of God's displeasure (2Sa 12:10). As respects professors of religion, one observes, they sin presumptuously

(1) when they take up a profession of religion without principle;

(2) when they profess to ask the blessing of God and yet go on in forbidden courses;

(3) when they do not take religion as they find it in the Scriptures;

(4) when they make their feelings the test of their religion, without considering the difference between animal passion and the operations of the Spirit of God;

(5) when they run into temptation;

(6) when they indulge in self-confidence and self-complacency;

(7) when they bring the spirit of the world into the Church;

(8) when they form apologies for that in some which they condemn in others;

(9) when, professing to believe in the doctrines of the Gospel, they live licentiously;

(10) when they create, magnify, and pervert their troubles;

(11) when they arraign the conduct of God as unkind and unjust.  See Walker, Sermons, vol. 1, ser. 3; South, Sermons, vol. 7:ser. 10, 11, 12; Tillotson, Sermons, ser. 147; Saurin, Sermons, vol. 1, ser. II; Goodwin, On the Aggravations of Sin; Fuller, Works; Paley, Sermons; Bishop Hopkins, On the Nature, Danger, and Cure of Presumptuous Sins.

## Pretas[[@Headword:Pretas]]

             sprites or hobgoblins among the Buddhists in Ceylon. They are believed to inhabit a hell called Lokantarika. In appearance they are extremely attenuated, like a dry leaf. There are some pretas that haunt the places near which they once lived as men; they are also found in the suburbs of cities, and in places where four ways meet. Their bodies are represented as being twelve miles high, and they have very large nails. On the top of the head there is a mouth about the size of a needle's eye. They continually think with sorrow on their fate, from not having acquired merit in former births; they are now tormented without ceasing by hunger and thirst, and have not the power of obtaining merit.

## Preternatural[[@Headword:Preternatural]]

             stands generally for supernatural, because we suppose that that which is praeter naturam is also supra naturam. Yet the former stands sometimes for unnatural, praeter naturam being the synonym of contraa nacturam. Neither praeternaturale nor supernaturale, or, as some say, supernaturale, is a good Latin word. They are, at least, not to be found in the classics.

## Pretextatus, St[[@Headword:Pretextatus, St]]

             a Gallic prelate of the 6th century, occupied towards 555 the metropolitan see of Rouen, and was godfather to Mérovée, the second son of Chilleric. Towards 576 Brunehaut, the widow of Sigebert, was exiled to Rouen by Chilperic, who was under the influence of Frédégonde. Mérovée, who was in that city, fell violently in love with the charms of the queen of Austrasia, his aunt, and Pretextatus was induced to grant a dispensation for their union, and married them. At this intelligence Chilperic repaired to Rouen, transported with wrath, and ordered the bishop to be arrested. A council assembled at Paris in 577, and in spite of the exertions of Gregory of Tours, who ventured alone to defend him, Pretextatus was deposed by the vote of forty-four prelates. He was banished to the island of Jersey. where he devoted his time to prayer and study. In the meantime a creature of Frédégonde, the Gaul Melantius, was established in the episcopal see of  Rouen. After the murder of Chilperic, September, 584, a deputation of the clergy and people of Rouen repaired to Jersey to request Pretextatus to resume the administration of his diocese. On the 5th of May an assembly of Frankish noblemen, held at Rouen, pronounced his rehabilitation.

Frédégonde, who lived in a kind of retirement at Loiuviers, went often to Rouen; she found herself frequently face to face with the bishop, whom she accused of not showing her much deference. In her wounded pride she once let escape some threatening allusions to the past: Pretextatus improved the occasion to exhort her to repentance and reformation. The enraged queen avenged herself in a manner worthy of her past life. She, Melantius, and an archdeacon of the cathedral, gave two hundred gold dollars to one of the serfs of the domain of the church, and promised him his own emancipation and that of his wife and children, for the murder of Pretextatus. On Easter-Sunday, while in prayer at the foot of the altar, he was stabbed, and died an hour afterwards in a chamber contiguous to the church, whither a few of the faithful had carried him, and where Frédégonde, in the company of the dukes Beppolen and Ansowald, enjoyed the spectacle of his last moments, April 14, 586. Pretextatus had attended the third Council of Paris in 557, the second Council of Tours in 566, and the second Council of Macon in 585. During his exile he composed some writings, which have not reached us. His name is inscribed in the Martyrologium under the date of the 24th of February, although he did not shed his blood for the faith. See Gallia Christiana, t. 11; Pommeraye, Hist. des Archeveques de Rouen; Fisquet, France Ponfficale (not published). — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.

## Preti, Mattia[[@Headword:Preti, Mattia]]

             called il Calabrese, a painter of the Neapolitan school, was born in 1613 at Taverna, in Calabria. His brother Gregorio, about whom very little is known, who was honored in his life-time with the title of prince of the Academy of St. Luke, was Mattia's first master; subsequently he studied with Lanfranc and Guerino. Preti took from Caravaggio those dark and violent hues, which impair the charm of his compositions. He delighted in retracing martyrdoms, murders, and other scenes of desolation. He painted with prodigious rapidity: a contemporary says that to see him handle the brush one would have thought that he was drumming. He painted the frescos of the church of Carmine in Modena, which are in a very good state of preservation. In 1657 he returned to Rome, but was compelled to flee, having killed one of his rivals. At Naples, again, whither he repaired, he  killed a soldier who had stopped him on some forbidden ground, and was ordered for his punishment to paint the patron saints of Naples on the doors of the city. From Naples he went to Malta, where his works were rewarded with the title of knight and the commandery of Syracuse. In his last years he worked only, but with unremitting diligence, for the poor. He died at Malta in 1699. His works are met with in great number in Italy. The Louvre has his Martyrdom of St. Andrew, St. Paul, and St. Anthony the Hermit; the Museum of Dresden the Martyrdom of St. Bartholomew, the Incredulity of St. Thomas, and the Deliverance of St. Peter; the Pinakothek of Munich a Repenting Magdalen; the Museum of Vienna an Incredulity of St. Thomas, etc. See Spooner. Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v. (J. H. W.)

## Pretorium[[@Headword:Pretorium]]

             SEE PRAETORIUM.

## Prevent[[@Headword:Prevent]]

             (some form of קָדִם, φθάνω, both meaning to precede or anticipate) is understood, in our translation of the Scriptures, only in the old Latin sense, as denoting—

1. To come before one is expected or sought (Job 30:27);

2. To go before, or be sooner (Psa 119:147). One is happily disappointed when favors come unasked (Job 3:12; Psa 18:18), or unhappily, when snares and afflictions come unexpectedly (2Sa 22:6).

## Prevention[[@Headword:Prevention]]

             is an ecclesiastical term denoting the right of a superior dignitary of the Church to interfere in the business of his subordinate; but it is more specially the right of the pope, in the nomination to ecclesiastical offices, to pass over the proper collators and give away the benefices himself. The Gallican Church has never recognized this papal prerogative. SEE PROVISORS.

## Prevost, Claude[[@Headword:Prevost, Claude]]

             a French monk, was born at Auxerre Jan. 22,1693. He taught philosophy and theology in the abbey of Sainte-Genevieve, and the care of the library was afterwards entrusted to him. In this employment, which he retained to the end of his life he made use of the knowledge which he had acquired in the Greek, Italian, and English languages, and collected abundant materials, which he did not, however, publish. They were prepared for the instruction of Louis, duke of Orleans, son of the regent, who lived at the abbey of Sainte-Genevieve. The principal MSS. which this monk has left concerning the history of the regular canons, of which he had made a special study, are, Library of Regular Canons: — Lives of Holy Canons, both Secular and Regular: — and History of all the Houses of Regular Canons. His last work was A History of the Abbey of Sainte-Genevieve. It is from this last work that the Benedictines have extracted nearly all that they have said of this house in vol. 7 of the new Gallia Christiana. Prevost furnished the material to the abbot Lebeuf, his countryman, for the catalogue of the writers of Auxerre inserted in Tile History of A uxerree. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.

## Prevost, Pierre Robert le[[@Headword:Prevost, Pierre Robert le]]

             a French pulpit orator of some note, was born at Rouen in 1675. From his youth he displayed a marked propensity for preaching, and proceeded to Paris to improve himself after the model of celebrated orators. Sought after with eagerness in the city, he was no less a favorite at court, where he preached statedly during Advent from 1714 to 1727, and in 1718 during Lent. At this last date he was provided with a canonship at Chartres. The record of his funeral sermons, published by Lottin (Paris, 1765), contains those of the cardinal of Fürstenberg (of which Flechier speaks with eulogy), of Godet of Marais, bishop of Chartres, of Louis XIV and of the duke of Berri; sermons, and a panegyric of St. Louis. He died in 1736 at Chartres. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v. See Vinet, French Lit. p. 116 sq.

## Priapus[[@Headword:Priapus]]

             in Greek mythology, was the son of Bacchus and Venus. The angry Juno touched the body of the pregnant Venus so that she gave birth to a hideous child with unnaturally large genital organs. The older writers do not know him. He was worshipped as the god of country fruitfulness, and his statues were placed in gardens.

## Price, Henry[[@Headword:Price, Henry]]

             a minister of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Ireland, was born in Dromore, Antrim County, Ireland, Jan. 30, 1802; was converted at seventeen, was made a local preacher about the year 1821, and entered the itinerant ministry at the Conference of 1823. He soon became an able and  judicious preacher; “he was mighty in the Scriptures,” reasoning out of them, and having a remarkable talent for apposite and convincing quotations from Holy Writ. He was a zealous and effective advocate for Christian missions, a section of evangelical work to which British and Irish Methodists pay more attention and devote more labor than does any other Christian Church. While Mr. Price adorned the Gospel of God our Savior in all things, there were especially noticeable in him a childlike simplicity, a transparent sincerity, an uprightness which scorned to countenance anything low or mean, a charity “which thinketh no evil,” and an unselfishness “which seeketh not its own.” Sweeping revivals occurred on many of the circuits on which he was stationed. He was especially attentive to the sick and afflicted, and his visits to them were frequent, sympathizing, and consolatory. He was truly “a brother beloved,” and his brethren in the ministry manifested their high appreciation of his character and talents by electing him repeatedly to fill the highest offices in their gift, and on all occasions he proved himself worthy of their esteem and confidence. He was cautious and practical, always ready to carry out every arrangement entrusted to his care with punctilious exactness. Never had Irish Methodism a more faithful son, or a minister of more perfect singleness of aim, purity of intention, or exemplary fidelity. Mr. Price died in the sixty- eighth year of his age.

## Price, John (1)[[@Headword:Price, John (1)]]

             an English scholar of much renown, was born about the year 1600, and was educated at Christ Church, Oxford. He was of Protestant parentage, but after leaving college he joined the Romanists and went to Italy during the civil ‘wars, as he found himself the object of much hatred and persecution. He settled in Florence, after having resided for a while in Paris; but when a professorship was offered him at Pisa. he removed thither, and there lived for some time. He subsequently retired to the St. Augustine Convent at Rome, where he died in 1676. He was the author of the following works: Notae et Observationes in Apologitam L. Apuleii Madcaurensis Philosophi Platonici (Paris, 1635, 4to; very rare, but republished in the Gouda ed. of Apuleius, 1650, 8vo): — Matthaeus ex Sacra Pagina, Sanctis Patribus, etc., illustratus (Paris, 1646, 8vo): — Adnotationes in Epist. Jacobi (1646, 8vo): Acta Apostolorum, ex Sacra Pagina, Sanctis Patribus, etc., illustrata (1647, 8vo): — Commentarii in Vaitios Novi Testamenti Libros; his accesserunt Adiotafiones in Psalmorun Librum (Lond. 1660, fol. The notes on the New Testament, or  some of them, had been published before separately [suprac], and Orme says that those on the Psalms had also appeared before). Price brought to his expositions of the Scriptures an extensive knowledge of classical literature, and, imitating Grotius's method, frequently illustrated by profane authors, especially the Greek and Roman. See Orme, Bibl. Biblica. s.v.; Crit. Sacri, vol. 5; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. s.v.:

## Price, John (2), D.D[[@Headword:Price, John (2), D.D]]

             an English clergyman, flourished in the second half of the 17th century, and was chaplain to general Monk during the civil wars. Dr. Price published, Serm. of Thanksgiving for the Success of General Monk (Lond. 1660, 4to): — Serm. on Mat 5:47 (Oxon. 1661, 8vo): — Serm. on Gal 4:16 (1661, 8vo): — Serm. on Ecc 10:17 (1661, 8vo): — Serm. on Heb 13:16 (1661, 8vo): — Serm. on Php 4:5 (1663, 4to): — The Mystery and Method of his Majesty's Happy Restauration laid open to Publick View (Lond. 1660, 8vo).

## Price, Jonathan D[[@Headword:Price, Jonathan D]]

             a physician and missionary to Burmah in the first half of this century, was ordained in Philadelphia May 20, 1821, and immediately after set out for his field of labor. He arrived early in the next year at Rangoon. When his medical knowledge became known at court, he was ordered to repair to Ava, the capital, where he was introduced to the king, who gave him a house. When the British invaded Burmah he and Mr. Judson were thrown into prison June 8, 1824. He was confined and subjected to dreadful sufferings till February or March, 1826, when he was released and employed to negotiate a treaty with the British, who had advanced near to the capital. After the war he resided at Ava, and was in favor with the emperor. Price taught several native scholars, and by his lectures hoped to shake the foundation of Buddhism. He fell a victim to pulmonary consumption Feb. 14, 1828, dying in the hope of that precious Gospel he wished to impart to the heathen. See Amer. Bapt. Mtg.; Memoir of Mrs. Judson; Allen, Biog. Dict. s.v.

## Price, Rice[[@Headword:Price, Rice]]

             SEE PRICE, THOMAS.

## Price, Richard, D.D[[@Headword:Price, Richard, D.D]]

             an eminent English divine noted for his scholarly attainments, his philosophical and mathematical contributions, his general devotion to truth in its highest forms, and a most consistent life, was born at Tynton, Glamorganshire, Wales, Feb. 23, 1723. His father, of whose second marriage Richard was the sole offspring, was a rigid Calvinistic minister, remarkable for his intolerance, who spared no pains to imbue his son with sound Calvinistic doctrine. Richard, however, began early to claim the privilege of free opinion, and by his scruples often incurred the anger of his parent. The latter died in 1739, and by his will the bulk of the property, which appears to have been considerable, came into the possession of one son; the widow and six other children being left in straitened circumstances to provide for their own maintenance. The widow and her eldest son lived, however, only a few months longer, and shortly after their death Richard, then in his eighteenth year, set out for London in the hope of qualifying himself for the clerical profession.

The heir of his father's fortune provided him with both horse and servant as far as Cardiff, but left him without the means of performing the rest of the journey except on foot or in a wagon. He chose the former as the most ready means, and thus made his wav to the metropolis of England. His education during his father's lifetime had been superintended by several Dissenting ministers, and on reaching London he obtained, through the kindness of a paternal uncle, admission to a Presbyterian academy, where he pursued studies in mathematics, philosophy, and theology. In 1743 he was engaged as chaplain and companion to the family of Mr. Streathfield, of Stoke-Newington, where he resided for thirteen years, the death of his employer only terminating the engagement, but not without a recognition of faithful service rendered. In the disposition of Mr. Streathfield's property Price came in for a share, and by this aid and his appointment as morning preacher of the chapel at Newington-Green, he was placed in independent circumstances. He had previously been made pastor of a congregation at Hackney, but he preferred the appointment at Newington-Green, married in 1757, and lived there until the death of his wife (in 1786), when he removed again to Hackney. Meanwhile his life had been one of considerable literary and scientific activity. His Review of the Principal Questions and Difficulties in Morals (Lond. 1758), though somewhat heavy, and designated by Brown as “very elaborate, very tedious, and not very clear,” seems to have established his reputation as a metaphysician and a moralist. It is  considered the ablest defense of the system of Cudworth and Clarke. It is an attempt to revive the intellectual theory of moral obligation, which seemed to have fallen under the attacks of Butler, Hutcheson, and Hume, and was made before that of Smith. Sir J. Mackintosh has briefly noticed it in his Preliminary Dissertation to Encyclop. Brit. (republished in his Works [ed. 1854], 1, 158, 159).

In 1769 Price published his Treatise on Reversionary Payments; this was followed by the compilation and publication of the celebrated Northampton Mortality Tables, and various other works relating to life-assurance and annuities, forming most valuable contributions to the branch of science to which they refer. In 1776 appeared his Observations on Civil Liberty and the Justice and Policy of the War with America. Of this work 60,000 copies are said to have been sold in a few months. So greatly was it admired in the United States that, in 1778, the American Congress, through Franklin, communicated to him their desire to consider him a fellow-citizen, and to receive his assistance in regulating their finances-an offer declined principally on the ground of age. On the termination of the war with the colonies, Mr. Pitt sought Mr. Price's advice as to the best mode of liquidating the British national debt, the result of which, it is said, was the adoption of the sinking fund. When the French revolution broke out, the doctor distinguished himself by a sermon, “On the Love of Country,” in which he hailed that event as the commencement of a glorious era. This drew upon the preacher some strong animadversions from Mr. Burke in his celebrated Reflections. Besides many papers in the Transactions of the Royal Society, of which he was a fellow, he published sermons and pamphlets, which established his character as a sound advocate for civil liberty and a profound master of financial calculation. He died April 19, 1791. One other of his publications of interest to our readers is his Four Dissertations on Providence. Prayer, the State of Virtuous Men after Death, and Christianity (1766-68). His views respecting the Son of God were what was called Low or semi-Arian. Mr. Price was a believer in the immateriality of the soul, holding that, according to the teaching of the Sacred Scriptures, it remains in a dormant state between death and resurrection; and because of these opinions he was led into a controversy of some celebrity with his friend Dr. Priestley, maintained by correspondence in 1778, and given to the public by the latter under the title of A Free Discussion of the Doctrine of Materialism and Philosophical Necessity.

This friendly controversy shows how decided were his views on the philosophical aberration of the age, and how earnestly he desired to place moral and metaphysical truth upon a deeper  and truer foundation. “Almost the only writer,” says Morell, “of this (the rationalistic) school whose works are likely to form a part of our standard philosophy is Dr. Richard Price.” In this high estimate of the merits of Price's philosophical writings, Mr. Morell is not alone. “Price investigated with acuteness and ability many important questions relative to morals, and controverted the doctrine of a moral sense as irreconcilable with the unalterable character of moral ideas, which, as well as those of substance and cause, he maintained to be eternal and original principles of the intellect itself, independent of the divine will” (Tennemann). “If, in England, you only look at London in the 18th century, you will doubtless there see little else than sensualism. But even at London you would find, by the side of Priestley, Price, that ardent friend of liberty-that ingenious and profound economist, who renewed and brilliantly sustained the Platonic idealism of Cudworth. I know that Price is an isolated phenomenon at London, but the whole Scotch school is more or less spiritualistic” (Cousin). But Mackintosh (ut sup.) by no means shares in this enthusiasm; nor can it be expected that the admirers of Locke should discover much merit in his opponent. Sir James's estimate of the characteristics of Price will be found in the Edinburgh Review, June, 1815, p. 171, 172. See also The London Mon. Rev. 83, 77; and Boston Christ. Disciple, 2, 134. Dr. Price's moral character appears to have been a singularly beautiful one. “Simplicity of manners,” says Dr. Priestley, “with such genuine marks of perfect integrity and benevolence, diffused around him a charm which the forms of politeness can but poorly imitate.” See Morgan, Memoirs of the Life of Richard Price, D.D. (Lond. 1815); Hook, Ecclesiastes Biog. 8:162; Stephen, Hist. of Engl. Thought (1877, 2 vols. 8vo), vol. 1 and 2, especially 2, 3 sq.; Leckey, Hist. of the 18th Century (1878, 2 vols. 8vo), vol. 2. See also Tennemann, Hist. of Philos. (Johnson's transl. 1832) p. 384; Cousin, Hist. of Mod. Philos. (Wright's transl. 1854) 2, 132; Morell, Hist. of Mod. Philos. (2nd ed. 1848) 1, 215; Blakey, Hist. of the Philos. of Mind (1850) 3, 313-15; Blackwood's Magazine, 39:803.

## Price, Thomas[[@Headword:Price, Thomas]]

             one of the most distinguished Welsh scholars of his age, was born Oct. 2, 1787, at Pencaerelin, in the parish of Llanafan Fawr, near Builth, in Brecknockshire. His father, the Rev. Rice Price, originally a stonemason, at the age of seventeen formed an attachment to Mary Bower, the descendant of a long line of clergymen; acquired, by incessant diligence and frugality, the means of attending the college-school at Brecknock; and finally  obtained ordination from the bishop of St. Davids, and, in 1784, the hand he sought, after a courtship of twenty years. He was so fortunate as afterwards to be presented to three livings; but his income, like that of some other Welsh pluralists, was never believed to exceed fifty pounds a year. He had two sons, both of whom were brought up to the Church, the elder taking his degree at Oxford, while the second, Thomas, was obliged to finish his studies at the college of Brecknock.

Welsh was the language the two boys heard constantly in the family; English they acquired at their second school; the elements of Latin and Greek were learned subsequently; and, from some French officers who were prisoners of war at Brecknock, Thomas acquired an excellent knowledge of French. In 1812 he received holy orders, and in 1825, after performing for thirteen years the duties of various curacies near Crickhowel, he was appointed to the vicarage of Cwmdu. This was his last preferment. The rest of his life was passed in historical and archaeological studies of his country. He was regarded by his countrymen as one of the most accomplished champions of the Welsh language and literature. He died at Cwmdu Nov. 7, 1848. His writings are not of special interest to theological readers. Many of his English compositions are collected under the title of Literary Remains of the Rev. Thomas Price, with a Memoir by Jane Williams (Llandovery, 1854-55, 2 vols. 8vo). A memoir of Price is found in the Lond. Gentleman's Mag. Feb. 1849, p. 212; see also Engl. Cyclop. s.v.

## Price, Thomas, LL.D[[@Headword:Price, Thomas, LL.D]]

             an English Baptist minister, was born at Bristol, April 21, 1802. He was converted at fifteen, and baptized in Broadmead Chapel by Dr. Ryland. In 1820 he studied in the Bristol Academy, and afterwards at the Glasgow and the Edinburgh universities; was ordained in 1824 copastor of the Devonshire Square Church, London, and in 1826, became pastor. He delivered popular lectures, which he published in two volumes in 1836, with the title, A History of Protestant Nonconformity. He resigned his pastorate the same year, and became one of the founders of the Anti-State Church Association, now the Liberation Society; he was appointed treasurer, and was one of the society's most zealous advocates. A disease  in his throat utterly incapacitated him from public speaking, so he devoted his energies to the founding of the Dissenters and General Fire and Life Assurance Company. He also became proprietor and editor of the Eclectic Review, which he conducted for nineteen years. In 1848 he became a confirmed invalid, and died May 29, 1867. See (Lond.) Baptist Hand- book, 1868, page 125.

## Prichard, John, D.D[[@Headword:Prichard, John, D.D]]

             a Welsh Baptist minister, was born near Amlwch, Wales, in March 1796. He pursued his studies in the College of Abergavenny, and was ordained as pastor of the Church at Llangollen, which was his only settlement. Through his exertions a college was established in the place where he resided, in 1862, for training young men for the ministry, of which he was for a time the president. He died Sept. 7,1875. See Cathcart, Baptist Encyclop. page 939. (J.C.S.)

## Pricked Song[[@Headword:Pricked Song]]

             is, in music, a term applied to a composition used in ecclesiastical service. It is divided into descant, pricksong, counterpoint, and faburden, the last being a highly pitched key.

## Pricket[[@Headword:Pricket]]

             an ecclesiastical term designating a spike on which candles were fixed. There are specimens from Kirkstall Abbey in the collection of the Society of Arts, London; and another, of Limoges enamel of the 13th century, is in the British Museum.

## Prickett, Marmaduke[[@Headword:Prickett, Marmaduke]]

             an English clergyman, was born about the year 1805. He was educated at Cambridge University, and held the appointment of chaplain to Trinity College, where he died in 1839. He published, Some Account of Barnwell  Priory, in the Parish of St. Andrew the Less (Camb. 1837, 8vo): — A Historical and Architectural Descriptions of the Priory Church of Bridglington (Lond. 1831, 8vo; 1846, 8vo). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Pricks[[@Headword:Pricks]]

             (Num 33:55; Act 9:5). SEE GOAD; SEE THORN.

## Pridden, John[[@Headword:Pridden, John]]

             an English clergyman, was born in the vear 1758 in London, and was edulcated at Queen's College, Oxford. After filling various appointments, he finally became rector of St. George's, Botolph Lane, London. He died in 1825. His publications are of a secular character only, and those interested may consult Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, 2, 1681.

## Pride[[@Headword:Pride]]

             is inordinate and unreasonable self-esteem, attended with insolence and rude treatment of others.

1. “It is sometimes,” says a good writer, “confounded with vanity, and sometimes with dignity; but to the former passion it has no resemblance, and in many circumstances it differs from the latter. Vanity is the parent of loquacious boasting, and the person subject to it, if his pretences be admitted has no inclination to insult the company. The proud man, on the other hand, is naturally silent, and wrapped up in his own importance, seldom speaks but to make his audience feel their inferiority.” Pride is the high opinion that a poor, little, contracted soul entertains of itself. Dignity consists in just, great, and uniform actions, and is the opposite of meanness.

2. Pride manifests itself by praising ourselves, adoring our persons, attempting to appear before others in a superior light to what we are; contempt and slander of others; envy at the excellences others possess; anxiety to gain applause; distress and rage when slighted; impatience of contradiction, and opposition to God himself.

3. The evil effects of pride are beyond computation. It has spread itself universally in all nations, among all characters; and as it was the first sin, as some suppose, that entered into the world, so it seems the last to be  conquered. It may be considered as the parent of discontent, ingratitude, covetousness, poverty, presumption, passion, extravagance, bigotry, war, and persecution. In fact, there is hardly an evil perpetrated but pride is connected with it in a proximate or remote sense.

4. To suppress this evil, we should consider what we are. “If we could trace our descents,” says Seneca, “we should find all slaves to come from princes, and all princes from slaves. To be proud of knowledge is to be blind in the light; to be proud of virtue is to poison ourselves with the antidote; to be proud of authority is to make our rise our downfall.” The imperfection of our nature, our scanty knowledge, contracted powers, narrow conceptions, and moral inability are strong motives to excite us to humility. We should consider, also, what punishments this sin has brought on mankind. See the cases of Pharaoh, Haman, Nebuchadnezzar, Herod, and others; how particularly it is prohibited (Pro 16:18; 1 Peter 5, 5; Jam 4:6; Pro 29:23); what a torment it is to its possessor (Est 5:13); howl soon all things of a sublunary nature will .end; how disgraceful it renders us in the sight of God, angels, and men; what a barrier it is to our felicity and communion with God; how fruitful it is of discord; how it precludes our usefulness, and renders us really contemptible. Comp. Blackie, Morals, p, 244; Edwards, Works; Robert Hall, Works; Bates, Works; Brown, Philosophy of the Mind; Wesl. Mag. 1846, p. 1113; 1847, p. 548 sq.; Malcom, Theol. Index, s.v. See Humility.

## Prideaux, Humphrey, D.D[[@Headword:Prideaux, Humphrey, D.D]]

             a learned English divine, noted as a historian, was born at Padstow, in Cornwall; May 3, 1648. He was educated first at Westminster School and later at Christ Church, Oxford, where he took his degree in 1672. While at the university he published the ancient inscriptions from the Arundelian Marbles, under the title of Marmorett Oxoniensia, which recommended him to the patronage of the lord chancellor Finch, afterwards earl of Nottingham, who gave him in 1679 a living near Oxford, and afterwards a prebend in Norwich cathedral. While there he became engaged in some severe contests with the Roman Catholics, the result of which was the publication of his work The Vallidiy of the Orders of the Church of England made out (1688). He also took an active part in resisting the arbitrary proceedings of James II which affected the interests of the Established Church. In 1688 he was promoted to the archdeaconry of Suffolk; but it was not without much consideration that he could bring  himself to take the oath of allegiance to William and Mary.

But when once decided, he acted in good faith, and treated all non-jurors with kindness and respect. In 1691, upon the death of Dr. Pococke, the Hebrew professorship at Oxford was offered to Dr. Prideaux, but lie refused it, though he afterwards repented of his refusal. In 1697 he published The Life of Mahomet, which was so well received that three editions of it were sold the first year. This Life was only a part of a greater work which he had long designed to write, and that was A History of the Saracen Empire, and with it The Decay and Fall of Christianity in the East; but, for certain reasons, lie dropped this design, and only published that part which contained The Life of Mahomet, to which lie annexed A Letter to the Deists, wherein he undertook to prove the truth of Christianity by contrasting it with the impostures of Mohammedanism.

In 1702 he was made dean of Norwich. He died Nov. 1, 1724. He published, The Original Right of Tythes: — Directions for Church-wardens, and other small pieces for the service of the Church; also two tracts of Maimonides, with a Latin version and notes, under the title of De Jure Pauperis is et Peregrini apud Judaeos, as an introduction for Hebrew students to Rabbinical language. But Dr. Prideaux's great work was The Connection of the History of the Old and New Testament, the first part of which was published in 1715, the second in 1718. Both parts were received with the greatest approbation, and went through eight editions in London, besides two or three in Dublin, before the end of 1720. The best of the many excellent editions which have appeared of this work since the death of its author are probably the 22nd, with An Account of the Rabbinical Authorities by Rev. A. M'Caul, D.D. (1845, 2 vols. 8vo), and the 25th, which in addition, has An Account, etc., with notes and analysis, and Introductory Review by J. Talboys Wheeler (Lond. 1858, 2 vols. 8vo). The last named is by far the most desirable of all, as it contains, in addition to the excellent work done by M'Caul, the notes, etc. by Wheeler, who also edited Shuckford's Connection of Sacred and Profane History (1858, 2 vols. 8vo) and Russell's Collection of Sacred and Profane History (1865, 2 vols. 8vo), the three embracing the entire period from the Creation to the time of Christ. Prideaux's Co0nnection was translated into French (Amst. 1728, 6 vols. 12mo), and, with John Dierberghe's annotations, into Dutch. Le Clerc published a critical examination of it, which appeared in English (Lond. 1722, 8vo). “The Connection,” says Orme, “contains a large mass of erudition, and accurate information on every topic of Jewish history and antiquities, and on all the links which connected that peculiar people with the surrounding  nations. It is indispensable to the Biblical and interesting to the general scholar… Le Clerc's exceptions are not of great importance” (Bibl. Bib. s.v.). ‘This history takes in the affairs of Egypt, Assyria, and all the other Eastern nations, as well as of the Jews; and likewise those of Greece and Rome, so far as was necessary for giving a distinct view of the completion of the prophecies which relate to the times comprehended in it. The author has also set in the clearest light some passages of profane history which before lay dispersed and buried in confusion, and there appears throughout the whole work such an amiable spirit of sincerity and candor as sufficiently atones as well for the few mistakes which escaped his diligence as for some weaknesses arising from his individual temperament. About three years before his death he presented his collection of Oriental books, more than three hundred in number, to the library of Clare Hall, Cambridge. Several of his posthumous Tracts and Letters, with a Life of Dr. Prideaux, the author of which is not named, were published in 1748 (8vo). Dr. Prideaux was tall, well-built, and of a strong and robust constitution. His qualities were very good, solid rather than lively, and his judgment excellent. He possessed great moral worth, and more ardent piety than was usual in his generation. As a writer he is clear, strong, intelligent, and learned. See, besides the works above mentioned, Biog. Brit. s.v.; Gentleman's Magazine, vol. 70; and especially the excellent article in Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, 2, 1681, 1682.

## Prideaux, John, D.D[[@Headword:Prideaux, John, D.D]]

             an English prelate of much note, was born of humble parentage at Stowford, near Ivybridge, in Devonshire, Sept. 17,1578. While yet in his boyhood he was a candidate for the office of parish clerk at Ugborough, a neighboring village; but he did not succeed, and to his failure he used to attribute his elevated position in after-life. He was then noticed by a lady of the parish, who, seeing that a boy of only common educational training attempted so much, felt persuaded that he would surely rise if given greater facilities; and she supported him at school till he had acquired a knowledge of Latin, and was ready to go to Oxford, where he was admitted a poor scholar at Exeter College in 1596. He was elected probationer fellow of his college in 1602, being then a B.A. In the following year he received holy orders, and, having become noted for his profound knowledge of divinity as well as his great learning in general, he was elected rector of his college upon the death of Dr. Thomas Holland in 1612. In 1615 he succeeded Dr. Robert Abbott, then promoted to the see of Salisbury, as regius professor  of divinity, canon of Christ Church, and rector of Ewelme. He afterwards held the office of vice-chancellor for several years. “In the rectorship of his college,” says Wood, “he carried himself so winning and pleasing by his gentle government and fatherly instruction that it flourished more than any house in the university with scholars, as well of great as of mean birth; as also with many foreigners that came purposely to sit at his feet to gain instruction.” He no less distinguished himself in the divinity chair, which he occupied for twenty-six years.

Although he maintained his decided convictions against the Socinians and Arminians, and was a most stout defender of the Calvinistic tendency, he was yet popular with all his hearers, and none failed to do him reverence, however widely they might differ from him. Though the university was agitated deeply by the controversy of those times, Prideaux happily escaped all partisan imbroglio, and in 1641 was elevated to the bishopric of Worcester. On account of his adherence to the king, he found his dignity neither pleasant nor profitable. He became so impoverished as to be compelled to sell his books, and so was, as Dr. Gauden says, “verus librorum helluo.” “Having,” continues Wood, “first, by indefatigable studies, digested his excellent library into his mind, he was afterwards forced again to devour all his books with his teeth, turning them, by a miraculous faith and patience, into bread for himself and his children, to whom he left no legacy but pious poverty, God's blessing, and a father's prayers.” He died at Bredon, in Worcestershire, July 12, 1650. He was a man of most unassuming and gentle manners; of excellent conduct, and great integrity and piety of mind; quite regardless of worldly concerns, and careless and often imprudent in worldly matters. He was an excellent linguist, possessing a wonderful memory, and so profound a divine that some have called him “Columna Fidei Orthodoxae et Malleus Haereticorum,” “Patrum Pater,” and “Ingens Scholue et Academiae Oraculum.” His works were as much esteemed as his learning. They were numerous, and mostly written in Latin— upon grammar, logic, theology, and other subjects. Those specially interested will find a list in Middleton's Evangel. Biog. 3, 203 sq. Though he died before the publication of the London Polyglot, he was well known to the editor, Brian Walton, who appeals to Prideaux's authority, on the nicer points of Hebrew criticism, in vindicating the Polyglot from certain cavils that had been raised against it. See Hook, Ecclesiastes Biog. 8:163; Perry, Hist. of the Church of England, 3, 239; English Cyclopaedia, s.v.; Wood, Athenae Oxoniensis (Bliss ed.), 3, 267; Fuller, Worthies, 1, 408 sq.; Nicholls, 2, 456; and Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Prie, Rene de[[@Headword:Prie, Rene de]]

             a French cardinal, was born in Touraine, in 1451, of a noble family. He was successively, by the favor of cardinal George D'Amboise, his cousin, grand archdeacon of Bourges, archdeacon of Blois, dean of St. — Hilaire-de- Poitiers, apostolic prothonotary, abbot commendatory of Landais, of Loroux, of Issoudun, etc., and, at last, almoner to the king. He was raised to the bishopric of Bayeux, on the express recommendation of Louis XII, Sept. 17, 1498. He was shortly after sent to Staples to subscribe to the treaty concluded in 1499 with Henry VII, king of England. He accompanied, a little while after this, Louis XII in his expedition against the Genevese, and was promoted to the cardinalate by Julius II (May 17,1507). When that pope took up arms against Louis XII, he prevented De Prie from leaving Rome, under pain of being deprived of his livings (1509). In spite of the pontifical interdict, the cardinal quitted Rome, and, together with some other prelates attached to the interests of France, opened at Pisa (Nov. 1, 1511) a council against Julius II, who, on Oct. 24, had declared him deposed from the cardinalate. In the interval he had been raised to the bishopric of Limoges (in 1510), and two years after he was provided with the bishopric of Lectoure. Seeing the chair of Limoges contested, De Prie made an arrangement with his competitors (Aug. 18,1513) by which he relinquished his rights to the bishopric of Lectoure to William of Barton, who in his turn waived in De Prie's favor his claim to the chair of Limoges; Foucauld de Bonnival then obtained the bishopric of Soissons. Rene de Prie, who had in the meantime been created cardinal by pope Leo X, celebrated at St. Denis the funeral ceremonies of Anne of Brittany (Jan. 20, 1514); blessed the marriage of Louis XII and Mary of England (Sept. 14); held at Bayeux a diocesan synod, where he published the laws (April 15, 1515); and resigned his two bishoprics of Limoges and of Bayeux Sept. 1516. While at Milan, in 1512, whither the Council of Pisa had been transferred, the University of Paris declared against him in a work of Thomas de Vio (cardinal Cajetan), On the Authority of the Pope, wherein the doctrine of Gerson was attacked, which he had espoused. Cardinal De Prie died at Lyre Sept. 9, 1519. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.

## Prie-Dieu[[@Headword:Prie-Dieu]]

             is a term in ecclesiastical architecture designating a small lectern (q.v.), or book-desk, which was introduced in the 15th century.

## Prierias, Sylvester[[@Headword:Prierias, Sylvester]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian of the time of the Reformation, and noted for his antagonism to the new movement, was born in 1460. His family-name was Mazolini, but he was called De Prierio, or Prierias, from the place of his birth (Prierio, in the county of Asti, in Piedmont). At the age of sixteen he entered the Dominican order, and was soon received as baccalaureate. As he had the gift of a singularly clear and ready exposition, he was surrounded by a crowd of pupils at the Gymnasium of Bologna, of which he had become the director. At the request of the Senate of Venice he accepted for a few years a professorship of theology at Padua, and was then prior at Milan, Verona, and Como. In 1508, in an assembly of the members of his order from both Lombardys, held at Mantua, he was elected vicar-general; two years later he was elected prior at Bologna. His renown and the recommendation of Dominico Grimani, bishop of Porto, induced pope Julius II to call him to Rome in 1511 as public lecturer on theology. Upon the death of the Magister Sacrti Palatii, Frater Joannes de Rafanellis (generally called De Ferraria), in 1515, Prierias was promoted to the vacant dignity by pope Leo X. Prierias died in 1523, and was buried in the church of St. Mary ad Minervam. He was the first non-German theologian who took up the pen against Luther. In 1518 he published Dialogus it praesumptuosas Alarstini Lutheri conclusiones de potestate Papee and his Replica in Lutherum; then in the following years his Errata et Argumenta Lutheri recitata, detecatat, et copiosissimn trita, and his Epitona Responsionis cad eundem Lutherum. The style is quite scholastic, and his defense of the papal primacy not without ability from a Romanist standpoint. But Luther, in his blunt and telling manner, laid so bare all the weaknesses of papal pretension as to make the defense of Prierias contemptible. The pope himself saw the inferiority of his defender in the contest, and admonished Prierias to silence; though he appointed him one of the judges of Luther at a later time. Some writings attributed falsely to Prierias are the works of a later magister of the order, Franciscus Sylvester. After his death appeared under his name some satires, composed after the fashion of the Epistolce obscur. — viz., Modus solennis et authenticus ad inquirendum et convincendum Lutheranos valde necessartits, and the Tractatus de arte et modo inquirendi haereticos. See Echard and Quetif, Bibliotheca Pradicatorum; Pressel (in Herzog), Real-Encyklopädie, for the Protestant, and Aschbach, Kirchen-Lexikon, for the Roman Catholic  estimate of this man. See also Fisher, Hist. of the Reformation, p. 96; Alzog, Kirchengesch. 2, 262. (J. H. W.)

## Pries[[@Headword:Pries]]

             a name common to several Lutheran theologians.

1. JOACHIM HEINRICH (1), was born November 12, 1714, at Rostock, where he began his theological studies, which he continued at Jena. At the university of his birthplace Pries commenced his academical career in 1739. In 1745 he was appointed professor, in 1749 he took the degree of doctor of theology, and died August 1, 1763. He is the author of, De noni Consummatis Patribus Veteris Testamenti ad Dictum Pauli Ebr. 11:39, 40 (Rostock, 1749): — Quo Sensu AEternuitas Dei Fixa sit Momentum? (1752): — De Jona, Christi hypo (1753): — De Praexistentia Dei Ante Abraham (1755): — De Prophetis et Apostolis (1757): — De Infallibilitate Apostolorum (1760), etc. See Doringr, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.

2. JOACHIM HEINRICH (2), son of the preceding, was born at Rostock, September 24, 1747. He studied at the universities of his native place and Jena. For some time preacher at Ribnitz, he was appointed professor of theology at Rostock in 1779, took the degree of doctor of theology in 1791, and died October 24, 1796. He wrote, Progr. in Deu 18:15 (Rostock, 1779): — Sapientia Redemptoris in Apparitionibus Post Resurrectionem (1780): — Nature Jesu Christi Divina (1782): — Mortuorum Resurrectio Teteris Foedere non Incognita (1783): — De  Personis quibus Epistola ad Galatas Scripta est (1786): — De Mort e Chiristi Vicaria (1788): — De Numero Paschatum a Christo Post Baptismum Celebratorum (1789). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.

3. JOHANN GABRIEL, who died at Gustrow in 1788, rector, wrote, Progr. in Genes. 41:43 (Rostock, 1754): — De Divina Leguni Mosaicarum Praestantia (1755): — De Divina Legum Mosaicarum Indole (1756): — De Divina Lege, etc., Warburtonom Opposita (1757): — De Israelitarum Theocratic Praestantia (1759): — De LXX Intepretibus (1768). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:121. (B.P.)

## Priest, Hebrew[[@Headword:Priest, Hebrew]]

             (כֹּהֵן, koh, ἱερεύς ). We base the following article upon the Scriptural information, with important additions from other and more modern sources.) SEE SACERDOTAL ORDER.

I. General Considerations. —

1. The Name.

(1.) The English word priest is generally derived from the New Test. term presbyter (πρεσβύτερος, elder), the meaning of which is, however, essentially different from that which was intended by the ancient terms. It would come nearer if derived from προϊvστημι or προϊvσταμαι “to preside,” etc. It would then correspond to Aristotle's definition of a priest, “presiding over things relating to the gods” (Polit. 3, 14), and with the very similar one in Heb 5:1 : “Every high-priest taken from among men is constituted on the behalf of men, with respect to their concerns with God, that he may present both gifts and sacrifices for sins.” It would then adequately represent the ἱερεύς (ὁ ἱερὰ ῥέζων) of the Greeks, and the sacerdos (a sacris faciundis) of the Latins. SEE PRESBYTER.

(2.) It is unfortunate that there is nothing like a consensus of interpreters as to the etymology of the above Hebrew word kohên. Its root-meaning, uncertain as far as Hebrew itself is concerned, is referred by Geseniuls (Thesaurus, s.v.) to the idea of prophecy. The kohên delivers a divine message, stands as a mediator between God and man, represents each to the other. This meaning, however, belongs to the Arabic, not to the Hebrew form, and Ewald connects the latter with the verb הֵכִין(hekin), to array, put in order (so in Isa 61:10), seeing in it a reference to the primary office of the priests as arranging the sacrifice on the altar (Alterthüm. p. 272). According to Saalschütz (Archaöl. der Hebr. c. 78), the primary meaning of the word is to minister, and he thus accounts for the wider application of the name (as below). Bahr (Symbolik, 2, 15) connects it with an Arabic root=קרב, to draw near.

Of these etymologies, the last has the merit of answering most closely to the received usage of the word. In the precise terminology of the law, it is  used of one who may “draw near” to the Divine Presence (Exo 19:22; Exo 30:20) while others remain afar off, and is applied accordingly, for the most part, to the sons of Aaron, as those who were alone authorized to offer sacrifices. In some remarkable passages it takes a wider range. It is applied to the priests of other nations or religions, to Melchizedek (Gen 14:18), Potipherah (Gen 41:45), Jethro (Exo 2:16), to those who discharged priestly functions in Israel before the appointment of Aaron and his sons (Exo 19:22). A case of greater difficulty presents itself in 2Sa 8:18, where the sons of David are described as priests (kohanim), and this immediately after the name had been applied in its usual sense to the sons of Aaron. The writer of 1Ch 18:17, as if reluctant to adopt this use of the title, or anxious to guard against mistake, gives a paraphrase, “the sons of David were first at the king's hand” (A. V. “chief about the king”). The Sept. and A.V. suppress the difficulty by translating kohanim into αὐλάρχαι and “chief officers.” The Vulg. more honestly gives “sacerdotes.” Luther and Coverdale follow the Hebrew strictly, and give “priests.” The received explanation is that the word is used here in what is assumed to be its earlier and wider meaning, as equivalent to rulers, or, giving it a more restricted sense, that the sons of David were Vicarii Regis, as the sons of Aaron were Vicarii Dei (comp. Patrick, Michaelis, Rosenmüller, ad loc., Keil on 1Ch 18:17).

It can hardly be said, however, that this accounts satisfactorily for the use of the same title in two successive verses in two entirely different senses. Ewald accordingly (Alterthüm. p. 276) sees in it an actual suspension of the usual law in favor of members of the royal house, and finds a parallel instance in the acts of David (2Sa 6:14) and Solomon (1 Kings 3, 15). De Wette and Gesenius, in like manner, look on it as a revival of the old household priesthoods. These theories are in their turn unsatisfactory, as contradicting the whole spirit and policy of David's reign, which was throughout that of reverence for the law of Jehovah and the priestly order which it established. A conjecture midway between these two extremes is perhaps permissible. David and his sons may have been admitted not to distinctively priestly acts, such as burning incense (Num 16:40; 2Ch 26:18), but to an honorary, titular priesthood. To wear the ephod in processions (2Sa 6:14), at the time when this was the special badge of the order (1Sa 22:18), to join the priests and Levites in their songs and dances, might have been conceded, with no deviation from the law, to the members of the royal house. There are some indications that these functions (possibly this  liturgical retirement from public life) were the lot of the members of the royal house who did not come into the line of succession, and who belonged, by descent or incorporation, to the house of Nathan, as distinct from that of David (Zec 12:12). The very name Nathan, connected as it is with Nethinim, suggests the idea of dedication. SEE NETHINIM.

The title kohên is given to Zabud, the son of Nathan (1Ki 4:5). The genealogy of the line of Nathan in Luke 3 includes many names-Levi, Eliezer, Malchi, Jochanan, Mattathias, Heli-which appear elsewhere as belonging to the priesthood. The mention in 1 Esdras 5, 5 of Joiakim as the son of Zerubbabel, while in Neh 12:10 he appears as the son of Jeshua, the son of Josedek, indicates either a strange confusion, or a connection, as yet imperfectly understood, between the two families. The same explanation applies to the parallel cases of Ira the Jairite (2Sa 20:26), where the Sept. gives ἱερεύς. It is noticeable that this use of the title is confined to the reigns of David and Solomon, and that the synonym “at the king's hand” of 1Ch 18:17 is used in 25:2 of the sons of Asaph as “prophesying” under their head or father, and of tie relation of Asaph himself to David in the choral service of the Temple.

2. Essential Idea of the Hebrew Priesthood. — This may be called mediation; hence the fact that in the epistle to the Hebrews mediator and priest are considered as synonymous. Yet by this the specific object of the priesthood, in contradistinction to the two other theocratical offices of prophet and king, is by no means sufficiently expressed. The prophet is also a mediator between God and man, since he speaks to the latter in the name of tie former; while the king is the mediator of the judicial and executive power of God among his people, acting in the name of Jehovah. The priest also was clothed with representative power (Deu 18:5); but this power was mainly directed to represent the people as a holy people in the presence of Jehovah, and to prepare a way by which they themselves might approach God.

Israel was the full-grown family of God, and the domestic priesthood was to become a nation of priests, a royal priesthood (Exo 19:3-6; Deu 7:6; Num 16:3). But that Israel was chosen to be the royal priesthood with respect to other nations, like many other things, was only expressed in idea, and not actually realized in fact. Israel was incapacitated by its natural sinfulness, and by its incessant transgressions of the very law through the fulfillment of which it was to be sanctified, to  penetrate into the immediate presence of God (Exo 19:21). Hence the necessity of the nation having individual representatives to mediate between them and Jehovah. As a separate element the priesthood represented the nation as yet unfit to approach God. The people offered their gifts to God by means of a separated class from among themselves, and in connection with the propitiatory sacrifices this was calculated to keep alive the consciousness of their estrangement from God. The very place assigned to the priests in the camp was expressive of this idea, that they keep “the charge of the sanctuary for the charge of the children of Israel” (Num 3:38).

The insufficiency of the priesthood was expressed by their being excluded from the most holy place. Only the high-priest, in whom the idea of this typical institution concentrated, could penetrate thither; and he only as the type of the future Mediator who was absolutely to lead us into the most holy of the world of spirits. Because the priests were not altogether removed from the sins of the people, even the chief-priest had access only once a year to the most holy, and that just on the day when the entire guilt of the nation was to be atoned for. He had on that occasion to confess his own sin, and bring a sin-offering; to lay aside his magnificent robes of office, and to officiate in a plain linen garment. Moreover, when he entered the dark, narrow space of the most holy, the cloud of incense was to cover the mercy-seat “that he die not” (Lev 16:13).

The idea of mediation between God and the people is expressed by the priest presenting the atonement for the congregation, and the gifts of a reconciled people (הקְרִיב, Lev 21:7; Num 16:5; Num 17:5). Again, he brings back from God's presence-the blessing of grace, mercy, and peace (Leviticus 9:27, etc.; Num 6:22-27). In the earliest families of the race of Shem the offices of priest and prophet were undoubtedly united; so that the word originally denoted both, and at last the Hebrew idiom kept one part of the idea and the Arabic another (Gesenius, Hebraisches und Chalddisches Handworterbuch [Leips. 1823]). It is worthy of remark that all the persons who are recorded in Scripture as having legally performed priestly acts, but who were not strictly sacerdotal, come under the definition of a prophet, viz. persons who received supernatural communications of knowledge generally, as Adam, Abraham (Gen 20:7), Isaac, Jacob, Moses, Job, Samuel, Elijah (comp. Luk 1:70). The following definition of a priest may be  found sufficiently comprehensive: A man who officiates or transacts with God on behalf of others, statedly, or for the occasion.

3. Origin of the Sacerdotal Order. — The idea of a priesthood connects itself, in all its forms, pure or corrupted, with the consciousness, more or less distinct, of sin. Men feel that they have broken a law. The power above them is holier than they are, and they dare not approach it. They crave for the intervention of some one of whom they can think as likely to be more acceptable than themselves. He must offer up their prayers, thanksgivings, sacrifices. He becomes their representative in “things pertaining unto God.” He may become also (though this does not always follow) the representative of God to man. The functions of the priest and prophet may exist in the same person. The reverence which men pay to one who bears this consecrated character may lead them to acknowledge the priest as being also their king. The claim to fill the office may rest on characteristics belonging only to the individual man, or confined to a single family or tribe. The conditions of the priesthood, the office and influence of the priests, as they are among the most conspicuous facts of all religions of the ancient world, so do they occupy a like position in the history of the religion of Israel.

No trace of a hereditary or caste priesthood meets us in the worship of the patriarchal age. (For its occasional appearance in a general form, see § 3.) Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob perform priestly acts, offer sacrifices, “draw near” to the Lord (Gen 12:8; Gen 18:23; Gen 26:25; Gen 33:20). To the eldest son, or to the favored son exalted to the place of the eldest, belongs the “goodly raiment” (Gen 27:15), the “coat of many colors” (Gen 37:3), in which we find perhaps the earliest trace of a sacerdotal vestment (comp. Blunt, Script. Coincid. 1, 1; Ugolino, 13:138). Once, and once only, does the word kohên meet us as belonging to a ritual earlier than the time of Abraham. Melchizedek is “the priest of the most high God” (Gen 14:18). The argument of the Epistle to the Hebrews has a historical foundation in the fact that there are no indications in the narrative of Genesis 14 of any one preceding or following him in that office. The special divine names which are connected with him as the priest of “the most high God, the possessor of heaven and earth,” render it probable that he rose, in the strength of those great thoughts of God, above the level of the other inhabitants of Canaan. In him Abraham recognized a faith like his own, a life more entirely consecrated, the priestly character in its perfection. SEE MELCHIZEDEK.

In the worship of the  patriarchs themselves, the chief of the family, as such, acted as the priest. The office descended with the birthright, and might apparently be transferred with it. As the family expanded, the head of each section probably stood in the same relation to it. The thought of the special consecration of the first-born was recognized at the time of the Exodus (see below). A priesthood of a like kind continued to exist in other Shemitic tribes. The Book of Job, whatever may be its date, ignores altogether the institutions of Israel, and represents the man of Uz as himself “sanctifying” his sons, and offering burnt-offerings (Job 1:5). Jethro is a “priest of Midian” (Exo 2:16; Exo 3:1). Balak himself offers a bullock and a ram upon the seven altars on Pisgah (Num 23:2, etc.).

In Egypt the Israelites came into contact with a priesthood of another kind, and that contact must have been for a time a very close one. The marriage of Joseph with the daughter of the priest of On — a priest, as we may infer from her name, of the goddess Neith (Gen 41:45) SEE ASENATH the special favor which he showed to the priestly caste in the years of famine (Gen 47:26), the training of Moses in the palace of the Pharaohs, probably in the colleges and temples of the priests (Act 7:22)—all this must have impressed the constitution, the dress, the outward form of life upon the minds of the lawgiver and his contemporaries. Little as we know directly of the life of Egypt at this remote period, the stereotyped fixedness of the customs of that country warrants us in referring to a tolerably distant past the facts which belong historically to a later period, and in doing so we find coincidences with the ritual of the Israelites too numerous to be looked onl as accidental, or as the result of forces which were at work independent of each other, but taking parallel directions. As circumcision was common to the two nations (Herod. 2, 37), so the shaving of the whole body (ibid.) was with both part of the symbolic purity of the priesthood, once for all with the Levites of Israel (Num 8:7), every third day with those of Egypt. Both are restricted to garments of linen (Herod. 2, 37, 81; Plutarch, De Isid. 4; Juven. 6:533; Exo 28:39; Eze 44:18). The sandals of byblus worn by the Egyptian priests were but little removed from the bare feet with which the sons of Aaron went into the sanctuary (Herod. 2, 37). For both there were multiplied ablutions. Both had a public maintenance assigned, and had besides a large share in the flesh of the victims offered (ibid. 1. c.). Over both there was one high-priest. In both the law of succession was hereditary (ibid.; comp. also Spencer, De Leg. Hebrews 3, 1, 5, 11; Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt. 3, 116). They were exempt from taxes. Wine was allowed to them only in the strictest moderation, and entire abstinence from it was required during the fasts, which were frequent (Plutarch, De Isid. 6). Each grade of the priests was distinguished by its peculiar costume. The high-priests, who, among other official duties, anointed the king, wore a mantle made of an entire leopard-skin; as did the king, when engaged in priestly duties. The sacerdotal order constituted one of the four principal castes, of the highest rank, next to the king, and from whom were chosen his confidential and responsible advisers (comp. 2Sa 8:18; 1Ch 18:17; Isa 19:11; Diodorus, 1, 73); they associated with the monarch, whom they assisted in the performance of his public duties, to whom they explained from the sacred books those lessons which were laid down for his conduct (Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt. 1, 237, 257-282). SEE EGYPT.

Facts such as these leave scarcely any room for doubt that there was a connection of some kind between the Egyptian priesthood and that of Israel. The latter was not, indeed, an outgrowth or imitation of the former. The faith of Israel in Jehovah, the one Lord, the living God, of whom there was no form or similitude, presented the strongest possible contrast to the multitudinous idols of the polytheism of Egypt. The symbolism of the one was cosmic, “of the earth earthy,” that of the other, chiefly, if not altogether, ethical and spiritual. But looking, as we must look, at the law and ritual of the Israelites as designed for the education of a people who were in danger of sinking into such a polytheism, we may readily admit that the education must have started from some point which the subjects of it had already reached, must have employed the language of symbolic acts and rites with which they were already familiar. The same alphabet had to be used, the same root-forms employed as the elements of speech, though the thoughts which they were to be the instruments of uttering were widely different. The details of the religion of Egypt might well be used to make the protest against the religion itself at once less startling and more attractive.

At the time of the Exodus there was as yet no priestly caste. The continuance of solemn sacrifices (Exo 5:1; Exo 5:3) implied, of course, a priesthood of some kind, and priests appear as a recognized body before the promulgation of the Law on Sinai (Exo 19:22). It has been supposed that these were identical with the “young men of the children of Israel” who offered burnt-offerings and peace-offerings (Exo 24:5) either as the first-born or as representing in the freshness of their youth the  purity of acceptable worship (comp. the analogous case of” the young man the Levite” in Judges 17 :and Ewald, Alterthümer, p. 273). On the principle, however, that difference of title implies in most cases difference of functions, it appears more probable that the “young men” were not those who had before performed priestly acts, but were chosen by the lawgiver to be his ministers in the solemn work of the covenant, representing, in their youth, the stage in the nation's life on which the people were then entering (Keil, ad loc.).

There are signs that the priests of the older ritual were already dealt with as belonging to an obsolescent system. Though they were known as those that “come near” to the Lord (Exo 19:22), yet they are not permitted to approach the Divine Presence on Sinai. They cannot “sanctify” themselves enough to endure that trial. Aaron alone, the future high-priest, but as yet not known as such, enters with Moses into the thick darkness. It is noticeable also that at this transition-stage, when the old order was passing away, and the new was not yet established, there is the proclamation of the truth, wider and higher than both, that the whole people was to be “a kingdom of priests” (Exo 19:6). The idea of the life of the nation was that it was to be as a priest and a prophet to the rest of mankind. They were called to a universal priesthood (comp. Keil, ad loc.). As a people, however, they needed a long discipline before they could make the idea a reality. They drew back from their high vocation (Exo 20:18-21). As for other reasons, so also for this, that the central truth required a rigid, unbending form for its outward expression, a distinctive priesthood was to be to the nation what the nation was to mankind. The position given to the ordinances of the priesthood indicated with sufficient clearness that it was subordinate, not primary, a means and not an end. Not in the first proclamation of the great laws of duty in the Decalogue (Exo 20:1-17), nor in the application of those laws to the chief contingencies of the people's life in the wilderness, does it find a place. It appears together with the ark and the tabernacle, as taking its position in the education by which the people were to be led towards the mark of their high calling. As such we have to consider it.

II. Personal Characteristics of the Hebrew Priesthood, -

1. Consecration. — The functions of the HIGH-PRIEST, the position and history of the LEVITES as the consecrated tribe, have been fully discussed under those heads. It remains to notice the characteristic facts connected with “the priests, the sons of Aaron,” as standing between the two. Solemn  as was the subsequent dedication of the other descendants of Levi, that of the priests involved a yet higher consecration. A special word (קָדִשׁ, kadásh) was appropriated to it. Their old garments were laid aside. Their bodies were washed with clean water (Exo 29:4; Lev 8:6) and anointed with the perfumed oil, prepared after a prescribed formula, and to be used for no lower purpose (Exo 29:7; Exo 30:22-33). The sons of Aaron, it may be noticed, were simply sprinkled with the precious oil (Lev 8:30). Over Aaron himself it was poured till it went down to the skirts of his clothing (Lev 8:12; Psa 133:2). The new garments belonging to their office were then put on them (see below). The truth that those who intercede for others must themselves have been reconciled was indicated by the sacrifice of a bullock as a sin-offering, on which they solemnly laid their hands, as transferring to it the guilt which had attached to them (Exo 29:10; Lev 8:18). The total surrender of their lives was represented by the ram slain as a burnt- offering, a “sweet savor” to Jehovah (Exo 29:18; Lev 8:21). The blood of these two was sprinkled on the altar, offered to the Lord. The blood of a third victim, the ram of consecration, was used for another purpose. With it Moses sprinkled the right ear, that was to be open to the divine voice; the right hand and the right foot, that were to be active in divine ministrations (Exo 29:20; Lev 8:23-24). Lastly, as they were to be the exponents, not only of the nation's sense of guilt, but of its praise and thanksgiving, Moses was to “fill their hands” with cakes of unleavened bread and portions of the sacrifices, which they were to present before the Lord as a wave-offering. This appears to have been regarded as the essential part of the consecration; and the Heb. “to fill the hand” is accordingly used as a synonym for “to consecrate” (Exo 29:9; 2Ch 13:9). The whole of this mysterious ritual was to he repeated for seven days, during which they remained within the Tabernacle, separated from the people, and not till then was the consecration perfect (comp. on the meaning of all these acts, Bähr, Symbolik, vol. 2, ch. 5, § 2). Moses himself, as the representative of the Unseen King, is the consecrator, the sacrificer throughout these ceremonies; as the channel through which the others receive their office, he has for the time a higher priesthood than that of Aaron (Selden, De Synedr. 1, 16; Ugolino, 12:3). In accordance with the principle which runs through the history of Israel, he, the ruler, solemnly divests himself of the priestly office and transfers it to another. The fact that he had been a priest was merged in his work as a  lawgiver. Only once in the language of a later period is the word kohên applied to him (Psa 99:6).

The consecrated character thus imparted did not need renewing. It was a perpetual inheritance transmitted from father to son through all the centuries that followed. We do not read of its being renewed in the case of any individual priest of the sons of Aaron. Only when the line of succession was broken, and the impiety of Jeroboam intruded the lowest of the people into the sacred office, do we find the reappearance of a like form (2Ch 13:9) of the same technical word. The previous history of Jeroboam and the character of the worship which he introduced make it probable that, in that case only, the ceremonial was, to some extent, Egyptian in its origin. In after-times the high-priest took an oath (Heb 7:23) to bind him, as the Jews say, to a strict adherence to established customs (Mishna, Yoma, 1, 5).

2. Dress. — The “sons of Aaron” thus dedicated were to wear during their ministrations a special apparel at other times apparently they wore the common dress of the people. The material of the sacred garments was to be linen, and not wool (Ezekiel 44, 17; Lev 21:1-10); but Ewald (Alterthümer, p. 317), Josephus (Ant. 4:8), and the rabbins (Mass. Kilaim, p. 9) maintain that the holy garments were made of a mixture of wool and linen, called שִׁעִטְּנֵז(shaatnez); and a typical meaning is found in this by Braun (Vest. Sac. Hebr. § 30), as if it was to signify the imperfection of the Levitical priesthood; while Eze 44:17, which restricts the material to linen, was considered significant of the simplicity of the New Test. SEE HETEROGENEOUS.

The prohibition in Lev 19:19; Deu 22:11 against the people generally wearing any garments of such “mingled” material was hence explained by Josephus that they might not assume what was characteristic of the priests (Ant. 4:11). But the more satisfactory and natural view is that the priests only wore linen, and that the Israelites were prohibited from wearing the mixture to teach them that even in garments they should avoid all needless artificiality, and to respect the creation of God in the simplicity of the material. SEE LINEN.

It is well known that the Roman poets speak of the Egyptian priests as the linigeri, the wearers of linen (Juvenal, Sat. 6; Ovid, Met. 1). The reason for fixing on this material is given in Eze 44:18; but the feeling that there was something unclean in clothes made from the skin or wool of an animal was common to other nations. Egypt has already been mentioned. The Arab priests in the time of Mohammed wore linen only  (Ewald, Alterthüm. p. 289). As there were some garments common both to the priests and the high priest, we shall begin with those of the former, taking them in the order in which they would be put on. SEE APPAREL.

(1.) The first was be מִכְנְסֵי בָד, “linen breeches,” or drawers (Exo 28:42; Sept. περισκελῆ λινά; Vulg. feminalia linea). These extended from the loins to the thighs, and were “to cover their nakedness.” The verecundia of the Hebrew ritual in this and in other places (Exo 20:26; Exo 28:42) was probably a protest against some of the fouler forms of nature-worship, as e.g. in the worship of Peor (Maimonides, Moreh Nebochim, 3, 45; Ugolino, 13:385), and possibly, also, in some Egyptian rites (Herod. 2, 60). According to Josephus, whose testimony, however, of course relates only to his own time, they reached only to the middle of the thigh, where they were tied fast (Ant. 3, 7, 1). Such drawers were worn universally in Egypt. In the sculptures and paintings of that country the figures of workmen and servants have no other dress than a short kilt or apron, sometimes simply bound about the loins and lapping over in front; other figures have short loose drawers; while a third variety of this article, fitting closely and extending to the knees, appears in the figures of some idols, as in the cut. This last sort of drawers seems to have been peculiar in Egypt to the gods, and to the priests, whose attire was often adapted to that of the idols on which they attended. The priests, in common with other persons of the upper classes, wore the drawers under other robes. No mention occurs of the use of drawers by any other class of persons in Israel except the priests, on whom it was enjoined for the sake of decency. SEE BREECHES.

(2.) Over the drawers was worn the “coat of fine linen” (כְּתֹנֶת שֵׁשׁ, kethôneth shesh, tunica byssina, Exo 39:27), a close-fitting shirt or cassock, such as was worn by men in general (Gen 37:3), also by women (2Sa 13:18; Song of Solomon 5, 3), next to the skin. It was white, but with a diamond or chess-board pattern on it (Bahr, Symb. vol. 2, ch. 3, § 2). This came nearly to the feet (ποδήρης χιτών, Josephus, Ant. 3, 7, 1), and was to be woven in its garment-shape (not cut out and then sewed together), like the χιτὼν ἄῤῥαφος of Joh 19:23, in which some interpreters have even seen a token of the priesthood of him who  wore it (Ewald, Gesch. 5, 177; Ugolino, 13:218). Here also modern Eastern customs present an analogy in the woven, seamless ihram worn by the Mecca pilgrims (Ewald, Alterthüm. p. 289). Josephus further states that it sat close to the body, and had sleeves, which were tied fast to the arms, and was girded to the breast a little above the elbows by a girdle. It had a narrow aperture about the neck, and was tied with certain strings hanging down from the edge over the breast and back, and was fastened above each shoulder (Ant. 3, 7, 2). But this garment. in the case of the priests and high priest, was to be broidered (Exo 28:4), כְּתֹנֶת תִּשְׁבֵּוֹ, “a broidered coat,” by which Gesenius understands a coat of cloth worked in checkers or cells. Braun compares it to the reticulum in the stomach of ruminant animals (De Vestitu, 1, 17). The Sept. gives χιτὼν κοσυμβωτός, which seems to refer to the tassels or strings; Vulg. linea stricta, which seems to refer to its close fitting.

(3.) The whole tunic was gathered at the waist by the “girdle” (אִבְנֵט, abnet, Exo 28:40; Sept. ζώνη; Vulg. balteus; comp. Eze 44:17-19). This was also worn by magistrates (Isa 22:21). The girdle for the priests was to be made of fine twined linen, and blue and purple and scarlet of needlework (Isaiah 39:29). Josephus describes it as often going round, four fingers broad, but so loosely woven that it might be taken for the skin of a serpent; and that it was embroidered with flowers of scarlet and purple and blue, but that the warp was nothing but linen. The beginning of its circumvolution was at the breast, and when it had gone often round it was there tied, and hung loosely down to the ankles while the priest was not engaged in any laborious service, for in that position it appeared in the most agreeable manner to the spectators; but when he was obliged to assist at the offering of sacrifices and to do the appointed service, in order that he might not be hindered in his operations by its motion, he threw it to the left hand and bore it on his right shoulder (Ant. 3. 7, 2). The mode of its hanging down is illustrated in Fig. 4, where the girdle is also richly embroidered, while the imbricated appearance of the girdle (רֹקֵם מִעֲשֵׂה) may be seen very plainly in Fig. 1. The next cut (Fig. 3), of a priestly scribe of ancient Egypt, offers an interesting specimen of both tunic and girdle. SEE GIRDLE.

(4.) Upon their head they were to wear a turban (מִגְבְּעָה, migbeâh; Exo 28:40; Sept. κίδαρις; Vulg. tiara; A… “cap” or “bonnet,” which two words are there synonymous) in the form of a cup-shaped flower, also of fine linen (Exo 39:28). In the time of Josephus it was circular, covering about half the head, something like a crown, made of thick linen swathes doubled round many times and sewed together, surrounded by a linen cover to hide the seams of the swathes, and sat so close that it would not fall off when the body was bent down (Ant. 3, 7, 3).

These garments they might wear at any time in the Temple, whether on duty or not, but they were not to sleep in them (Josephus, War, 5, 5, 7). When they became soiled they were not washed or used again, but torn up to make wicks for the lamps in the Tabernacle (Selden, De Synedr. 13:11). In Eze 42:14; Eze 44:17-19, there are directions that the priests should take off their garments when they had ministered, and lay them up in the holy chambers, and put on other garments; but these directions occur in a visionary representation of a temple, which all agree has never been realized, the particulars of which, though sometimes derived from known customs, yet at other times differ from them widely. The garments of the inferior priests appear to have been kept in the sacred treasury (Ezra 2, 69; Neh 7:70). They had besides them other “clothes of service,” which were probably simpler, but are not described (Exo 31:10; Ezra 42, 14). In all their acts of ministration they were to be barefooted. This is inferred

(a) from the absence of any direction as to a covering for the feet;

(b) from the later custom;

(c) from the universal feeling of the East. Shoes were worn as a protection against defilement. In a sanctuary there was nothing that could defile.

Then, as now, this was the strongest recognition of the sanctity of a holy place which the Oriental mind could think of (Exo 3:5; Jos 5:15), and throughout the whole existence of the Temple service, even though it drew upon them the scorn of the heathen (Juven. Sat. 6, 159), and seriously affected the health of the priests (Ugolino, 8:976; 13:405), it was scrupulously adhered to.

The dress of the high-priest was precisely the same with that of the common priests in all the foregoing particulars; in addition to which he had

(1.) a robe, מְעִיל, meil (Exo 28:4, ποδήρη, tunica). This was not a mantle, but a second and larger coat without sleeves; a kind of surtout worn by the laity, especially persons of distinction (Job 1:20; Job 2, 12, by kings; 1Sa 15:27; 1Sa 18:4; 1Sa 24:5-12). This garment, when intended for the high-priest, and then called “the robe of the ephod,” was to be of one entire piece of woven work, all of blue, with an aperture for the neck in the middle of the upper part, having its rim strengthened and adorned with a border. The hem had a kind of fringe, composed of tassels, made of blue, purple, and scarlet, in the form of pomegranates; and between every two pomegranates there was a small golden bell, so that there was a bell and a pomegranate alternately all round (Exo 28:31-35). The use of these bells may have partly been that by the high-priest shaking his garment at the time of his offering incense on the great day of expiation, etc., the people without might be apprised of it, and unite their prayers with it (comp. Sir 45:9; Luk 1:10; Act 10:4; Rev 8:3-4). Josephus describes this robe of the ephod as reaching to the feet, and consisting of a single piece of stuff parted where the hands came out (Joh 19:23). He also states that it was tied round with a girdle embroidered with the same colors as the former, with a mixture of gold interwoven (Ant. 3, 7, 4). It is highly probable that this garment was also derived from Egyptian usage. There are instances at Thebes of priests wearing over the great-coat a loose sleeveless robe, which exposes the sleeves of the inner tunic. The fringe of bells and pomegranates seems to have been the priestly substitute for the fringe bound with a blue ribbon, which all the Israelites were commanded to wear. Many traces of this fringe occur in the Egyptian remains. The use assigned to it, “that looking on this fringe they should remember the Lord's commandments,” seems best explicable by the supposition that the Egyptians had connected some superstitious ideas with it (Num 15:37-40).

(2.) The ephod, אֵפוֹד, ἐπωμίς, superhumerale (Exo 28:4). This was a short cloak covering the shoulders and breast. It is said to have been worn by Samuel while a youth ministering before the Lord (1 Samuel 2, 18); by David while engaged in religious service (2Sa 6:14); and by inferior priests (1Sa 22:18). But in all these instances it is  distinguished as a linen ephod, and was not a sacred but an honorary vestment, as the Sept. understands it in 2Sa 6:14, στολὴν ἔξαλλον. The ephod of the high priest was to be made of gold, of blue, of purple, of scarlet, and fine twined linen, with cunning work, חשֵׁב. Though it probably consisted of one piece, woven throughout, it had a back part and a front part, united by shoulder-pieces. It had also a girdle; or, rather, strings went out from each side and tied it to the body. On the top of each shoulder was to be an onyx stone, set in sockets of gold, each having engraven upon it six of the names of the children of Israel, according to the precedence of birth, to memorialize the Lord of the promises made to them (Exo 28:6-12; Exo 28:29). Josephus gives sleeves to the ephod (Ant. 3, 7, 5). It may be considered as a substitute for the leopard-skin worn by the Egyptian high-priests in their most sacred duties, as in Fig. 4, where the ephod appears no less plainly. In other figures of Egyptian priests, the shoulder-pieces were equally apparent. They are even perceptible in Fig. 1. The Egyptian ephod is, however, highly charged with all sorts of idolatrous figures and emblems, and even with scenes of human sacrifices. The Sept. rendering of חשֵׁב, “cunning work,” is ἔργον ὑφαντὸν ποικιλτοῦ, a woven-work of the embroiderer, a word which especially denotes a manufacturer of tissues adorned with figures of animals (Strabo, 17 p. 574, Sieb.). In the earlier liturgical costume, the ephod is mentioned as belonging to the high-priest only (Exo 28:6-12; Exo 39:2-5). At a later period it is used apparently by all the priests (1Sa 22:18), and even by others, not of the tribe of Levi, engaged in religious ceremonial (2Sa 6:14). SEE EPHOD. Then came

(3.) the breastplate, חשֶׁן, chôshen (Sept. περιστήθιον; Vulg. rationale); a gorget ten inches square, made of the same sort of cloth as the ephod, and doubled so as to form a kind of pouch or bag (Exo 29:9), in which were to be put the Urim and Thummim, which are also mentioned as if already known (Exo 28:30). The external part of this gorget was set with four rows of precious stones-the first row a sardius, a topaz, and a carbuncle; the second, an emerald, a sapphire, and a diamond; the third, a ligure, an agate, and an amethyst; and the fourth, a beryl, an onyx, and a jasper-set in a golden socket. Upon each of these stones was to be engraven the name of one of the sons of Jacob. In the ephod, in which there was a space left open sufficiently large for the admission of this pectoral, were four rings of gold, to which four others at the four corners of the breastplate corresponded; the two lower rings of the latter being  fixed inside. It was confined to the ephod by means of dark-blue ribbons, which passed through these rings; and it was also suspended from the onyx stones on the shoulder by chains of gold, or, rather, cords of twisted gold threads, which were fastened at one end to two other larger rings fixed in the upper corners of the pectoral, and by the other end going round the onyx stones on the shoulders, and returning and being fixed in the larger ring. The breastplate was further kept in its place by a girdle, made of the same stuff, which Josephus says was sewed to the breastplate, and which, when it had gone once round, was tied again upon the seam and hung down. Here is another adaptation and correction of the costume of the higher Egyptian priests, who wore a large, splendid ornament upon the breast, often a winged scarabaeus, the emblem of the sun, as in the cut, Fig. 5, which exhibits the connecting ring and chain to fasten it to the girdle.

(4.) The remaining portion of dress peculiar to the high-priest was the mitre, מִצְנֵבֶת, mitsnebeth (Sept. χιΣαπλχ; Vulg. cidaris, Exo 28:4). The Bible says nothing of the difference between this and the turban of the common priests. It is, however, called by a different name. It was to be of fine linen (Exo 28:39). Josephus says it was the same in construction and figure with that of the common priest, but that above it there was another, with swathes of blue, embroidered; and round it was a golden crown, polished, of three rows, one above another, out of which rose a cup of gold, which resembled the calyx of the herb called by Greek botanists hyoscyamus lie ends a most labored description by comparing the shape of it to a poppy (Ant. 3, 7, 6). Upon comparing his account of the bonnet of the priests with the mitre of the high-priest, it would appear that the latter was conical. The cut, Fig. 6, presents the principal forms of the mitres worn by the ancient priests of Egypt, and affords a substantial resemblance of that prescribed to the Jews, divested of idolatrous symbols, but which were displaced to make way for a simple plate of gold, bearing the inscription, “Holiness to Jehovah.” This plate (צִיוֹ, tsits; Sept. πέταλον; Vulg. lamina) extended from one ear to the other, being bound to the forehead by strings tied behind, and further secured in its position by a blue ribbon attached to the mitre (Exo 28:36-39; Exo 39:30; Lev 8:9). Josephus says this plate was preserved to his own day (Ant. 8:3, 8; see Reland, De Spol. Templi, p. ]32). Such was the dress of the high priest: see a description of its magnificence in corresponding terms in Sirach 1, 5-16.

Josephus had an idea of the symbolical import of the several parts of the pontifical dress. He says that being made of linen signified the earth; the blue denoted the sky, being like lightning in its pomegranates, and in the noise of its bells resembling thunder. The ephod showed that God had made the universe of four elements, the gold relating to the splendor by which all things are enlightened. The breastplate in the middle of the ephod resembled the earth, which has the middle place of the world. The girdle signified the sea, which goes round the world. The sardonyxes declare the sun and moon. The twelve stones are the twelve months or signs of the zodiac. The mitre is heaven, because blue (Ant. 3, 7, 7). He appears, however, to have had two explanations of some things, one for the Gentiles, and another for the Jews. Thus in this section he tells his Gentile readers that the seven lamps upon the golden candlesticks referred to the seven planets; but to the Jews he represents them as an emblem of the seven days of the week (War, 7:5, 5; Whiston's notes ad loc.). It was not always worn by the high-priest. It was exchanged for one wholly of linen, and therefore white, though of similar construction, when on the day of expiation he entered into the holy of holies (Lev 16:4; Lev 16:23); and neither he nor the common priests wore their appropriate dress, except when officiating. It was for this reason, according to some, that Paul, who had been long absent from Jerusalem, did not know that Ananias was the high-priest (Act 23:5). Bahr (Symbolik, vol. 2, ch. 3, § 1, 2) finds a mystic meaning in the number, material, color, and shape of the priestly vestments, discusses each point elaborately, and dwells in § 3 on the differences between them and those of the Egyptian priesthood. According to Fairbairn (Typol. of Script.), the garments represent the office, and the person who was officially invested was to have them sprinkled with a mixture of oil and sacrificial blood (Kurtz, Opfercultus, p. 292).

These garments, which were first worn at the consecration, and which were preserved in the Temple when not actually required, were not allowed except to such as were legally consecrated for service, though they belonged to the house of Aaron. These garments were “holy garments” (Exo 28:4), made ‘for glory and for beauty;” but they were not only for a glorious ornament, for the whole of the vestments bore a symbolical meaning, and the inscription on the golden plate which adorned the brow of the high-priest, “Holiness to Jehovah,” might be properly applied to all the holy garments. The four pieces of the priestly attire were each and all  of them required none was to fail; nor was it permitted to wear more than was prescribed; and the warning— “that he die not” (Exo 28:35; Exo 28:43) seems to bear upon an exact fulfillment of the divine command in this, no less than in other things. The shining white of the linen garments typified that the servants of him who covers himself with light as with a garment (Psa 104:2; Dan 2:22; Dan 7:9), and who dwelleth “in light which no man can approach unto” (1Ti 6:16), are clothed typically in light (Exo 34:29); so that the ministers should minister in the earthly sanctuary in the same livery as his ministers wear in the heavenly sanctuary (Dan 12:6; Eze 10:2; Eze 10:7; Mat 17:2; Mat 28:3; Act 10:30). But light (consequently white, as the most perfect reflection of light) is universally the type of salvation (Job 18:5, etc.; Psa 27:1; Isa 59:9), of righteousness (Psa 37:6; Mal 4:2), of purity and holiness (1 John 1, 5, 7); just as darkness, black, is the type of wickedness, uncleanness, etc. (Isaiah 5, 20; Lam 4:7-8; Joh 3:19; Rom 3:12; 2Co 6:14). It is not without meaning that the priests, like the angels, are specially called the holy ones.

3. Regulations. — The idea of a consecrated life, which was thus asserted at the outset, was carried through a multitude of details. Each probably had a symbolic meaning of its own. Collectively they formed an education by which the power of distinguishing between things holy and profane, between the clean and the unclean, and so ultimately between moral good and evil, was awakened and developed (Ezekiel 44, 23). Before they entered the tabernacle the priests were to wash their hands and their feet (Exo 30:17-21; Exo 40:30-32). During the time of their ministration thiey were to drink no wine or strong drink (Lev 10:9; Ezekiel 44, 21). Their function was to be more to them than the ties of friendship or of blood, and, except in the case of the nearest relationships (six degrees are specified, Lev 21:1-5; Ezekiel 44, 25), they were to make no mourning for the dead. The high-priest, as carrying the consecrated life to its highest point, was to be above the disturbing power of human sorrow even in these instances. Public calamities seem to have been an exception, for Joacim the high-priest, and the priests, in such circumstances, ministered in sackcloth with ashes on their mitres (Jdt 4:14-15; comp. Joe 1:13). Customs which appear to have been common in other priesthoods were (probably for that reason) forbidden them. They were not to shave their heads. They were to go through their ministrations with the serenity of a reverential awe, not with the orgiastic wildness which led the  priests of Baal, in their despair, to make cuttings in their flesh (Lev 19:28; 1Ki 18:28), and carried those of whom Atys was a type to a more terrible mutilation (Deu 23:1).

The same thought found expression in two other forms affecting the priests of Israel. The priest was to be one who, as the representative of other men, was to be physically as well as liturgically perfect. The idea of the perfect body, as symbolizing the holy soul, was, as might be expected, wide-spread among the religions of heathenism. “Sacerdos non integri corporis quasi mall ominis res vitanda est” (Seneca, Controv. 4:2). As the victim was to be without blemish, so also was the sacrificer (comp. Bahr, Symbol. vol. 2. ch. 2, § 3). The law specified in broad outlines the excluding defects (Lev 21:17-21), and these were such as impaired the purity, or at least the dignity, of the ministrant. The morbid casuistry of the later rabbins drew up a list of not less than 144 faults or infirmities which involved permanent, and of twenty- two which involved temporary deprivation from the priestly office (Carpzov. App. Crit. p. 92, 93; Ugolino, 12:54; 13:903); and the original symbolism of the principle (Philo, De Vict. and De Monarch. 2, 5) was lost in the prurient minuteness which, here as elsewhere, often makes the study of rabbinic literature a somewhat repulsive task. If the Christian Church has sometimes seemed to approximate, in the conditions it laid down for the priestly character, to the rules of Judaism, it was yet careful to reject the Jewish principles, and to rest its regulations simply on the grounds of expediency (Constt. Apost. 77, 78). The marriages of the sons of Aaron were, in like manner, hedged round with special rules. There is, indeed, no evidence for what has sometimes been asserted, that either the high priest (Philo, De Monarch. 2, 11; 2, 229, ed. Mang.; Ewald, Alterthüm. p. 302) or the other sons of Aaron (Ugolino, 12:52) were limited in their choice to the women of their own tribe, and we have some distinct instances to the contrary. It is probable, however, that the priestly families frequently intermarried, and it is certain that they were forbidden to marry an unchaste woman, or one who had been divorced, or the widow of any but a priest (Lev 21:7; Lev 21:14; Ezekiel 44, 22). The prohibition of marriage with one of an alien race was assumed, though not enacted in the law; and hence the reforming zeal of a later time compelled all who had contracted such marriages to put away their strange wives (Ezr 10:18), and counted the offspring of a priest and a woman taken captive in war as illegitimate (Josephus, Ant. 3, 10; 11:4; c. Apion. 1, 7), even though the priest himself did not thereby lose his function (Ugolino, 12:924).

The high-priest was to carry the same idea to a yet higher point, and was to marry none but a  virgin in the first freshness of her youth (Lev 21:13). Later casuistry fixed the age within the narrow limits of twelve and twelve and a half (Carpzov. App. Crit. p. 88). It followed, as a matter of necessity, from these regulations that the legitimacy of every priest depended on his genealogy. A single missing or faulty link would vitiate the whole succession. To those genealogies, accordingly, extending back unbroken for 2000 years, the priests could point, up to the time of the destruction of the Temple (Josephus, c. Apion. 1, 7). In later times, wherever the priest might live-Egypt, Babylon, Greece-he was to send the register of all marriages in his family to Jerusalem (ibid.). They could be referred to in any doubtful or disputed case (Ezr 2:62; Neh 7:64). In them was registered the name of every mother as well as of every father (ibid.; comp. also the story already referred to in Suidas, s.v. Ι᾿ησοῦς). It was the distinguishing mark of a priest, not of the Aaronic line, that he was ἀπάτωρ, ἀμήτωρ, ἀγενεαλόγητος (Heb 7:3), with no father or mother named as the ground of his title.

The age at which the sons of Aaron might enter upon their duties was not defined by the law, as that of the Levites was. Their office did not call for the same degree of physical strength; and if twenty-five in the ritual of the Tabernacle (Num 8:24) and twenty in that of the Temple (1Ch 23:27) was the appointed age for the latter, the former were not likely to be kept waiting till a later period. In one remarkable instance, indeed, we have an example of a yet earlier age. The boy Aristobulus at the age of seventeen ministered in the Temple in his pontifical robes, the admired of all observers, and thus stirred the treacherous jealousy of Herod to remove so dangerous a rival (Josephus, Ant. 15:3, 3). This may have been exceptional, but the language of the rabbins indicates that the special consecration of the priest's life began with the opening years of manhood. As soon as the down appeared on his cheek the young candidate presented himself before the Council of the Sanhedrim, and his genealogy was carefully inspected. If it failed to satisfy his judges, he left the Temple clad in black, and had to seek another calling; if all was right so far, another ordeal awaited him. A careful inspection was to determine whether he was subject to any one of the 144 defects which would invalidate his priestly acts. If he was found free from all blemish, he was clad in the white linen of the priests, and entered on his ministrations. If the result of the examination was not satisfactory, he was relegated to the half-menial office of separating the sound wood for the altar from that which was decayed and  worm-eaten, but was not deprived of the emoluments of his office (Lightfoot, Temple Service, ch. 6).

4. Functions. — The work of the priesthood of Israel was, from its very nature, more stereotyped by the Mosaic institutions than any other element of the national life. The functions of the Levites-less defined, and therefore more capable of expansion-altered, as has been shown, SEE LEVITE, from age to age; but those of the priests continued throughout substantially the same, whatever changes might be brought about in their social position and organization. The duties described in Exodus and Leviticus are the same as those recognized in the books of Chronicles, and those which the prophet- priest Ezekiel sees in his vision of the Temple of the future. They, assisting the high-priest, were to watch over the fire on the altar of burnt-offerings, and to keep it burning evermore both by day and night (Lev 6:12; 2Ch 13:11); to feed the golden lamp outside the veil with oil (Exo 27:20-21; Lev 24:2); to offer the morning and evening sacrifices, each accompanied with a meal-offering and a drink offering, at the door of the tabernacle (Exo 29:38-44). These were the fixed, invariable duties; but their chief function was that of being always at hand to do the priest's office for any guilty, or penitent, or rejoicing Israelite. The worshipper might come at any time. If he were rich and brought a bullock, it was the priest's duty to slay the victim, to place the wood upon the altar, to light the fire, to sprinkle the altar with the blood (Lev 1:5). If he were poor and brought a pigeon, the priest was to wring its neck (Lev 1:15). In either case he was to burn the meal- offering and the peace offering which accompanied the sacrifice (Lev 2:2; Lev 2:9; Lev 3:11).

After the birth of every child, the mother was to come with her sacrifice of turtle-doves or pigeons (Lev 12:6; Luk 2:22-24), and was thus to be purified from her uncleanness. A husband who suspected his wife of unfaithfulness might bring her to the priest, and it belonged to him to give her the water of jealousy as an ordeal, and to pronounce the formula of execration (Num 5:11-31). Lepers were to come, day by day, to submit themselves to the priest's inspection, that he might judge whether they were clean or unclean, and when they were healed perform for them the ritual of purification (Lev 13:14; comp. Mar 1:44). All the numerous accidents which the law looked upon as defilements or sins of ignorance had to be expiated by a sacrifice, which the priest of course had to offer (Lev 15:1-33). As they thus acted as mediators for those who were laboring under the sense of guilt, so  they were to help others who were striving to attain, if only for a season, the higher standard of a consecrated life. The Nazarite was to come to them with his sacrifice and his wave-offering (Num 6:1-21). In the final establishments at Jerusalem it belonged to the priests to act as sentinels over the holy place, as to the Levites to guard the wider area of the precincts of the Temple (Ugolino, 13, 1052).

Other duties of a higher and more ethical character are hinted at, but were not and probably could not be, the subject of a special regulation. They were to teach the children of Israel the statutes of the Lord (Lev 10:11; Deu 33:10; 2Ch 15:3; Eze 44:23-24). The “priest's lips” (in the language of the last prophet looking back upon the ideal of the order) were to “keep knowledge” (Mal 2:7). Through the w hole history, with the exception of the periods of national apostasy, these acts, and others like them, formed the daily life of the priests who were on duty. The three great festivals of the year were, however, their seasons of busiest employment. The pilgrims who came up by tens of thousands to keep the feast came each with his sacrifice and oblation. The work at such times was, on some occasions at least, beyond the strength of the priests in attendance, and the Levites had to be called in to help them (2Ch 29:34; 2Ch 35:14). Other acts of the priests of Israel, significant as they were, were less distinctively sacerdotal. They were to bless the people at every solemn meeting, and that this part of their office might never fall into disuse, a special formula of benediction was provided (Num 6:22-27).

During the journeys in the wilderness it belonged to them to cover the ark and all the vessels of the sanctuary with a purple or scarlet cloth before the Levites might approach them (Num 4:5-15). As the people started on each day's march they were to blow “an alarm” with long silver trumpets (Num 10:1-8)-with two if the whole multitude were to be assembled, with one if there was to be a special council of the elders and princes of Israel. With the same instruments they were to proclaim the commencement of all the solemn days, and days of gladness (Num 10:10); and throughout all the changes in the religious history of Israel this adhered to them as a characteristic mark. Other instruments of music might be used by the more highly trained Levites and the schools of the prophets, but the trumpets belonged only to the priests. They blew them (but in that case the trumpets were of rams' horns) in the solemn march round Jericho (Jos 6:4), in the religious war which Judah waged against Jeroboam (2Ch 13:12), when they summoned the people to a solemn penitential fast (Joe 2:1; Joe 2:15). In the service of the second Temple there were never to be less than twenty-one or more than eighty-four blowers of trumpets present in the Temple daily (Ugolino, 13:1011). The presence of the priests on the field of battle for this purpose, often in large numbers, armed for war, and sharing in the actual contest (1Ch 12:23; 1Ch 12:27; 2Ch 20:21-22), led, in the later periods of Jewish history, to the special appointment at such times of a war-priest, deputed by the Sanhedrim to be the representative of the high-priest, and standing next but one to him in the order of precedence (comp. Ugolino, 12:1031 [De Sacerdote Casfrensi]; 13:871). Jost (Judenth. 1, 153) regards the war- priest as belonging to the ideal system of the later rabbins, not to the historical constitution of Israel. Deu 20:2, however, supplies the germ out of which such an office might naturally grow. Judas Maccaboeus, in his wars, does what the war-priest was said to do (I Mace. 3, 56).

Other functions are intimated in Deuteronomy which might have given them greater influence as the educators and civilizers of the people. They were to act (whether individually or collectively does not distinctly appear) as a court of appeal in the more difficult controversies in criminal or civil cases (Deu 17:8-13). A special reference was to be made to them in cases of undetected murder, and they were thus to check the vindictive blood-feuds which it would otherwise have been likely to occasion (21, 5). It must remain doubtful, however, how far this order kept its ground during the storms and changes that followed. The judicial and the teaching functions of the priesthood remained probably for the most part in abeyance through the ignorance and vices of the priests. Zealous reformers kept this before them as an ideal (2Ch 17:7-9; 2Ch 19:8-10; Ezekiel 44, 24), but the special stress laid on the attempts to realize it shows that they were exceptional. The teaching functions of the priest have probably been unduly magnified by writers like Michaelis, who aim at bringing the institutions of Israel to the standard of modern expediency (Comm. on Laws of Moses, 1, 35-52), as they have been unduly depreciated by Saalschütz and Jahn.

At first Aaron was to burn incense on the golden altar every morning when he dressed the lamps, and every evening when he lighted them, but in later times the common priest performed this duty (Luk 1:8-9); to offer, as the Jews understand it, daily, morning and evening, the peculiar meal-  offering he offered on the day of his consecration (Exodus 29); to perform the ceremonies of the great day of expiation (Leviticus 16); to arrange the shewbread every Sabbath, and to eat it in the holy place (Lev 24:9); but he must abstain from the holy things during his uncleanness (Lev 22:1-3); also if he became leprous, or contracted uncleanness (Lev 22:4-7). If he committed a sin of ignorance, he must offer a sin offering for it (Lev 4:3-13); and so for the people (Lev 4:12-22). He was to eat the remainder of the people's meal offerings with the inferior priests in the holy place (Lev 6:16); to judge of the leprosy in the human body or garments (Lev 13:2-59); to adjudicate legal questions (Deu 17:12). Indeed, when there was no divinely inspired judge, the high-priest was the supreme ruler till the time of David, and again after the Captivity. He must be present at the appointment of a new ruler or leader (Num 27:19), and ask counsel of the Lord for the ruler (Num 27:21). Eleazar, with others, distributes the spoils taken from the Midianites (Num 21:21; Num 21:26). To the high-priest also belonged the appointment of a maintenance from the funds of the sanctuary to an incapacitated priest (1Sa 2:36, margin). Besides these duties, peculiar to himself, he had others in common with the inferior priests. Thus, when the camp set forward, “Aaron and his sons” were to take the tabernacle to pieces, to cover the various portions of it in cloths of various colors (1Sa 4:5-15), and to appoint the Levites to their services in carrying them; to bless the people in the form prescribed (1 Samuel 6:23-27), to be responsible for all official errors and negligences (1Sa 18:1), and to have the general charge of the sanctuary (1Sa 18:5).

5. Maintenance. — Functions such as these were clearly incompatible with the common activities of men. At first the small number of the priests must have made the work almost unintermittent, and, even when the system of rotation had been adopted, the periodical absences from home could not fail to be disturbing and injurious, had the priests been dependent on their own labors. The serenity of the priestly character would have been disturbed had they had to look for support to the lower industries. It may have been intended (see above) that their time, when not liturgically employed, should be given to the study of the law, or to instructing others in it. On these grounds, therefore, a distinct provision was made for them. The later rabbins enumerate no less than twenty-four sources of emolument. Of these the chief only are given here (Ugolino, 13:1124). They consisted,

(1) of one tenth of the tithes which the people paid to the Levites— i.e. one percent on the whole produce of the country (Num 18:26-28).

(2.) Of a special tithe every third year (Deu 14:28; Deu 26:12).

(3.) Of the redemption-money, paid at the fixed rate of five shekels a head, for the first-born of man or beast (Num 18:14-19). It is to be noticed that the law, by recognizing the substitution of the Levites for the first-born, and ordering payment only for the small number of the latter, in excess of the former, deprived Aaron and his sons of a large sum which would otherwise have accrued to them (Num 3:44-51).

(4.) Of the redemption-money paid in like manner for men or things especially dedicated to the Lord (Leviticus 27).

(5.) Of spoil, captives, cattle, and the like, taken in war (Num 31:25-47).

(6.) Of what may be described as the perquisites of their sacrificial functions, the shewbread, the flesh of the burnt-offerings, peace-offerings, trespass-offerings (Num 18:8-14; Lev 6:26; Lev 6:29; Lev 7:6-10), and, in particular, the heave-shoulder and the wave-breast (Lev 10:12-15).

(7.) Of an undefined amount of the first-fruits of corn, wine, and oil (Exo 23:19; Lev 2:14; Deu 26:1-10). Of some of these, as “most holy,” none but the priests were to partake (Lev 6:29). It was lawful for their sons and daughters (Lev 10:14), and even in some cases for their home-born slaves, to eat of others (Lev 22:11). The stranger and the hired servant were in all cases excluded (Lev 22:10).

(8.) On their settlement in Canaan the priestly families had thirteen cities assigned them, with “suburbs” or pasture-grounds for their flocks (Jos 21:13-19.) While the Levites were scattered over all the conquered country, the cities of the priests were within the tribes of Judah, Simeon, and Benjamin, and this concentration was not without its influence on their subsequent history. SEE LEVITE. These provisions were obviously intended to secure the religion of Israel against the dangers of a caste of pauper-priests, needy and dependent, and unable to bear their witness to the true faith. They were, on the other hand, as far as possible removed from the condition of a wealthy order. Even in the ideal state  contemplated by the book of Deuteronomy, the Levite (here probably used generically, so as to include the priests) is repeatedly marked out as an object of charity, along with the stranger and the widow (Deu 12:12; Deu 12:19; Deu 14:27-29). During the long periods of national apostasy, tithes were probably paid with even less regularity than they were in the more orthodox period that followed the return from the Captivity (Neh 13:10; Mal 3:8-10). The standard of a priest's income, even in the earliest days after the settlement in Canaan, was miserably low (Jdg 17:10). Large portions of the priesthood fell, under the kingdom, into a state of abject poverty (comp. 1Sa 2:36). The clinging evil throughout their history was not that they were too powerful and rich, but that they sank into the state from which the law was intended to preserve them, and so came to “teach for hire” (Mic 3:11; comp. Saalschütz, Archäologie der Hebriaer, 2, 344-355).

It will be noticed that neither the high-priest nor common priests received “any inheritance” at the distribution of Canaan among the several tribes (Num 18:20; Deu 18:1-2), but were maintained, with their families, upon certain fees, dues, perquisites, etc., arising from the public services, which they enjoyed as a common fund. Perhaps the only distinct prerogative of the high-priest was a tenth part of the tithes assigned to the Levites (Num 18:28; comp. Neh 10:38); but Josephus represents this also as a common fund (Ant. 4:4, 4).

6. Classification and Statistics. — The earliest historical trace of any division of the priesthood and corresponding cycle of services belongs to the time of David. Jewish tradition indeed recognizes an earlier division, even during the life of Aaron, into eight houses (Gem. Hieros. Taanith, in Ugolino, 13:873), augmented during the period of the Shiloh-worship to sixteen, the two families of Eleazar and Ithamar standing in both cases on an equality. It is hardly conceivable, however, that there could have been any rotation of service while the number of priests was so small as it must have been during the forty years of sojourn in the wilderness, if we believe Aaron and his lineal descendants to have been the only priests officiating. The difficulty of realizing in what way the single family of Aaron were able to sustain all the burden of the worship of the tabernacle and the sacrifices of individual Israelites may, it is true, suggest the thought that possibly in this, as in other instances, the Hebrew idea of sonship by adoption may have extended the title of the “Sons of Aaron” beyond the limits of lineal descent, and, in this case, there may be some foundation for the Jewish  tradition. Nowhere in the later history (to we find any disproportion lile that of three priests to 20.000 Levites.

The office of supervision over those that “kept the charge of the sanctuary,” entrusted to Eleazar (Num 3:32), implies that some others were subject to it besides Ithamar and his children, while these very keepers of the sanctuary are identified in Num 32:38 with the sons of Aaron who are encamped with Moses and Aaron on the east side of the tabernacle. The allotment of not less than thirteen cities to those who bore the name, within little more than forty years from the Exodus, tends to the same conclusion, and at any rate indicates that the priesthood were not intended to be always in attendance at the tabernacle, but were to have homes of their own, and therefore, as a necessary consequence, fixed periods only of service. Some notion may be formed of the number on the accession of David from the facts (1) that not less than 3700 tendered their allegiance to him while he was as yet reigning at Hebron over Judah only (1Ch 12:27), and (2) that one twenty- fourth part were sufficient for all the services of the statelier and more frequented worship which he established. To this reign belonged, accordingly, the division of the priesthood into the four-and-twenty “courses” or orders מִחְלְקוֹת (Sept. διαιρέσεις, ἐφημερίαι, 1Ch 24:1-19; 2Ch 23:8; Luk 1:5), each of which was to serve in rotation for one week, while the further assignment of special services during the week was determined by lot (Luk 1:9) under a subordinate prefect (2Ki 11:5; 2Ki 11:7), but all attended at the great festivals (2Ch 5:11). The first of these courses was that which had Jehoiarib at the head of it. It was reckoned the most honorable. Josephus values himself on his descent from it (Life, § 1). Mattathias, the father of the Maccabees, descended from it (1Ma 2:1). Abijah was the head of the eighth course, to which Zacharias, the father of the Baptist, belonged (Luk 1:5). Each course appears to have commenced its work on the Sabbath, the outgoing priests taking the morning sacrifice, and leaving that of the evening to their successors (2Ch 23:8; Ugolino, 13:319). In this division, however, the two great priestly houses did not stand on an equality. The descendants of Ithamar were found to have fewer representatives than those of Eleazar (a diminution that may have been caused partly by the slaughter of the priests who accompanied Hophni and Phinehas [Psalms 78, 64], partly by the massacre at Nob), and sixteen courses accordingly were assigned to the latter, eight only to the former (1Ch 24:4; comp. Carpzov. App. Crit. p. 98). The division thus instituted was confirmed by Solomon, and continued to be  recognized as the typical number of the priesthood.

It is to be noted, however, that this arrangement was to some extent elastic. Any priest might be present at any time, and even perform priestly acts, so long as he did not interfere with the functions of those who were officiating in their course (Ugolino, 13:881), and at the great solemnities of the year as well as on special occasions like the opening of the Temple, they were present in great numbers. On the return from the Captivity there were found but four courses out of the twenty-four, each containing, in round numbers, about a thousand (Ezr 2:36-39). The causes of this great reduction are not stated, but large numbers must have perished in the siege and storm of Jerusalem (Lam 4:16), and many may have preferred remaining in Babylon. Out of these returning exiles, however, to revive, at least, the idea of the old organization, the four-and twenty courses were reconstituted, bearing the same names as before, and so continued till the destruction of Jerusalem (Josephus, Ant. 7:14, 7). If we may accept the numbers given by Jewish writers as at all trustworthy, the proportion of the priesthood to the population of Palestine during the last century of their existence as an order must have been far greater than that of the clergy has ever been in any Christian nation. Over and above those that were scattered in the country and took their turn, there were not fewer than 24,000 stationed permanently at Jerusalem and 12,000 at Jericho (Gemar. Hieros. Taanith. fol. 67, in Carpov. App. Crit. p. 100). It was a Jewish tradition that it had never fallen to the lot of any priest to offer incense twice (Ugolino, 12:18). Oriental statistics are, however, always open to some suspicion those of the Talmuld not least so; and there is, probably, more truth in the computation of Josephums, who estimates the total number of the four houses of the priesthood, referring apparently to Ezr 2:36, at about 20,000 (c. Apion. 2, 7). Another indication of number is found in the fact that a “great multitude” could attach themselves to the “sect of the Nazarenes” (Act 6:7), and so have cut themselves off, sooner or later, from the Temple services, without any perceptible effect upon its ritual. It was almost inevitable that the great mass of the order, under such circumstances, should sink in character and reputation. Poor and ignorant, despised and oppressed by the more powerful members of their own body, often robbed of their scanty maintenance by the rapacity of the high-priests, they must have been to Palestine what the clergy of a later period has been to Southern Italy dead weight on its industry and strength, not compensating for their unproductive lives by any services rendered to the higher interests of the  people. The rabbinic classification of the priesthood, though belonging to a somewhat later date, reflects the contempt into which the order had fallen. There were

(1) the heads of the twenty-four courses, known sometimes as ἀρχιερεῖς;

(2) the large number of reputable officiating but inferior priests;

(3) the plebeii, or (to use the extremest formula of rabbinic scorn) the “priests of the people of the earth,” ignorant and unlettered;

(4) those that, through physical disqualifications or other causes, were non-efficient members of the order, though entitled to receive their tithes (Ugolino, 12:18; Jost, Judenth. 1, 156).

Prideaux (Connection, 1, 129), following the Jewish tradition, affirms that only four of the courses returned from Babylon— Jedaiah, Immer, Pashur, and Harim (for which last, however, the Babylonian Talmud has Joiarib)— because these four only are enumerated in Ezr 2:36-39; Neh 7:39-42. He accounts for the mention of other courses, as of Joiarib (1 Maccabees 2, 1) and Abiah (Luk 1:5), by saying that those four courses were subdivided into six each, so as to keep up the old number of twenty- four, which took the names of the original courses, though not really descended from them. But this is probably an invention of the Jews, to account for the mention of only these four families of priests in the list of Ezra 2 and Nehemiah 7. However difficult it may be to say with certainty why only those four courses are mentioned in that particular list, we have the positive authority of 1Ch 9:10, and Neh 11:10, for asserting that Joiarib did return; and we have two other lists of courses, one of the time of Nehemiah (Neh 10:2-8), the other of Zerubbabel (Neh 12:1-7); the former enumerating twenty-one, the latter twenty-two courses; and the latter naming Joiarib as one of them, and adding, at Neh 12:19, the name of the chief of the course of Joiarib in the days of Joiakim. Thus there can be no reasonable doubt that Joiarib did return. The notion of the Jews does not receive any confirmation from the statement in the Latin version of Josephus (c. Apion. 2, 8) that there were four courses of priests, as it is a manifest corruption of the text for twenty- four, as Whiston and others have shown (note to Life of Josephus, § 1). The preceding table gives the three lists of courses which returned, with the original list in David's time to compare them by. The courses which  cannot be identified with the original ones, but which are enumerated as existing after the return, are as follows:

For some account of the courses, see Lewis, Orig. Hebr. bk. 2, ch. 7.

III. Historical Review of the Hebrew Priesthood. —

1. In Patriarchal Times. —

(1.) We accede to the Jewish opinion that Adam was the first priest. The divine institution of sacrifices, immediately after the fall, seems connected with the event that “the Lord God made coats of skins to Adam and his wife, and clothed them” (Gen 3:21)-that is, with the skins of animals which had been offered in sacrifice, for the permission to eat animal food was not given till after the Deluge (Gen 1:29; Gen 9:3)—expressive of their faith in the promise of the victorious yet suffering “seed of the woman” (Gen 9:15); and judging from the known custom of his immediate descendants, we infer that Adam, now also become the head and ruler of the woman (Gen 9:16), officiated in offering the sacrifice as well on her behalf as his own. Judging from the same analogy, it seems further probable that Adam acted in the same capacity on behalf of his sons, Cain and Abel (and possibly of their children), who are each said to have “brought” his respective offering, but not to have personally presented it (Gen 4:3-5). The place evidently thus indicated would seem to have been the situation of “the cherubim,” at the east of the garden of Eden (Gen 3:24), called “the face” (Gen 4:14), and “the presence of the Lord” (Gen 4:16; comp. Hebrew of Exo 34:24; Lev 9:5), and from which Jehovah conferred with Cain (Gen 4:9): circumstances which, together with the name of their offering, מִנְחָה, which, sometimes at least, included bloody sacrifices in after-times (1Sa 2:17; 1Sa 26:19; Mal 1:13-14), and the appropriation of the skins to the offerer (comp. Lev 7:8), would seem like the rudiments of the future Tabernacle and its services, and when viewed in connection with many circumstances incidentally disclosed in the brief fragmentary account of things before the Exodus-such as the Sabbath (Gen 2:2-3), the distinction observed by Noah, and his burnt- offerings upon the altar of clean and unclean beasts (Gen 8:20), the prohibition of blood (Gen 9:4), tithes (Gen 14:20), priestly blessing (Gen 14:19), consecration with oil, and vows (Gen 28:18-22), the Levirate law (Gen 38:8), weeks (Gen 29:27), distinction  of the Hebrews by their families (Exo 2:1), the office of elder during the bondage in Egypt (Exo 3:16), and a place of meeting with Jehovah (Exo 5:22; comp. exo 5:25)-would favor the supposition that the Mosaic dispensation, as it is called, was but an authoritative re- arrangement of a patriarchal Church instituted at the fall. The fact that Noah officiated as the priest of his family, upon the cessation of the Deluge, is clearly recorded in Gen 8:20, where we have an altar built, the ceremonial distinctions in the offerings already mentioned, and their propitiatory effect, “the sweet savor,” all described in the words of Leviticus (Lev 1:9; Lev 11:47). These acts of Noah, which seem like the resumption rather than the institution of an ordinance, were doubtless continued by his sons and their descendants, as heads of their respective families. Following our arrangement, the next glimpse of the subject is afforded by the instance of Job, who “sent and sanctified his children” after a feast they had held, and offered burnt-offerings, עֹלוֹת, “according to the number of them all,” and “who did this continually,” either constantly or after every feast (Job 1:5).

A direct reference, possibly to priests, is lost in our translation of Job 12:19, “he leadeth princes (כֹּהֲנִים; Sept. ἱερεῖς;' Vulg. sacerdotes; a sense adopted in Dr. Lee's Translation [Lond. 1837]) away spoiled.” May not the difficult passage, Job 33:23, contain an allusion to priestly duties? A case is there supposed of a person divinely chastised in order to improve him (Job 19:22): “If then there be a messenger (מָלָאךְ, which means priest, Ecc 5:6; Mal 2:6) with him,” “an interpreter” (מֵלִיוֹ, or mediator generally, 2Ch 32:31; Isa 43:27, one among a thousand, or of a family, Jdg 6:15, “my family,” literally “my thousand,” comp. Num 1:16, “to show to man his uprightness,” or, rather, “duty,” Pro 14:2, part of the priest's office in such a case, Mal 2:7; comp. Deu 24:8), then such an individual “is gracious,” or, rather, will supplicate for him, and saith, “Deliver him from going down into the pit,” or grave, for “I have found a ransom,” a cause or ground in him for favorable treatment, namely, the penitence of the sufferer, who consequently recovers (deu 25:29). The case of Abraham and Abimelech is very similar (Gen 20:3-17), as also that of Job himself, and his three misjudging friends, whom the Lord commands to avert chastisement from themselves by taking to him bullocks and rams, which he was to offer for them as a burnt-offering, and to pray for them (Job 42:8). The instance of Abram occurs next in historical order, who upon his first entrance into  Canaan, attended by his family, “built an altar, and called upon the name of the Lord” (Gen 12:7-8). Upon returning victorious from the battle of the kings, he is congratulated by Melchizedek, the Canaanitish king of Salem, and “priest of the most high God” (Gen 14:18). For the ancient union of the royal and sacerdotal offices, in Egypt and other countries, see Wilkinson's Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians (Lond. 1842), 1, 245. Abram next appears entering into covenant with God as the head and representative of his seed; on which occasion those creatures only are slain which were appointed for sacrifice under the law (Gen 15:9-21). Isaac builds an altar, evidently as the head of his family (Gen 26:25), his younger son Jacob offers a sacrifice, זֶבָח (Gen 31:54), and “calls his brethren to eat of it” (comp. Lev 7:15); builds an altar at Shalem (Gen 33:20), makes another by divine command, and evidently as the head of his household, at Bethel (Gen 35:1-7), and pours a drink-offering, נֶסֶךְ(comp. Num 15:7, etc.), upon a pillar (Num 15:14).

(2.) We next find Jethro, priest of Midian, the father-in-law of Moses, probably a priest of the true God (Exo 3:1), and possibly his father also (Exo 2:16), in the same capacity. In Exo 5:1; Exo 5:3, the whole nation of the Israelites is represented as wishing to sacrifice and to hold a feast to the Lord. The first step, though very remote, towards the formation of the Mosaic system of priesthood was the consecration of the first-born, in memory of the destruction of the first-born of Egypt (Exo 13:2; Exo 13:14-16); for, instead of these, God afterwards took the Levites to attend upon him (Num 3:12). As to the popular idea, both among Jews and Christians, that the right of priesthood was thus transferred from the first-born generally to the tribe of Levi, or, rather, to one family of that tribe, we consider, with Patrick, that it is utterly groundless (Commentary on Exo 19:22; Num 3:12; see Vitringa, Observationes Sacrae, 2, 33; Outram, De Sacrificiis, 1, 4). The substance of the objections is that Aaron and his sons were consecrated before the exchange of the Levites for the first-born; that the Levites were afterwards given to minister unto them, but had nothing to do with the priesthood; and that the peculiar right of God in the first-born originated in the Exodus. The last altar, before the giving of the law, was built by Moses, probably for a memorial purpose only (Exo 17:15; comp. Jos 22:26-27). At this period the office of priest was so well understood, and so highly valued, that Jehovah promises as an inducement  to the Israelites to keep his covenant, that they should be to him “a kingdom of priests” (Exo 19:6), which, among other honorable appellations and distinctions originally belonging to the Jews, is transferred to Christians (1Pe 2:9).

The first introduction of the word priests, in this part of the history, is truly remarkable. It occurs just previous to the giving of the law, when, as part of the cautions against the too eager curiosity of the people, lest they should “break through unto the Lord and gaze” (Exo 19:21), it is added, “and let the priests which come near unto the Lord sanctify themselves, lest the Lord break through upon them” (Exo 19:22). Here, then, priests are incontestably spoken of as an already existing order, which was now about to be remodified. Nor is this the last reference to these anti-Sinaitic priests. Selden observes that the phrases “the priests the Levites” (Deu 17:9) and “the priests the sons of Levi” (Deu 21:5), and even the phrase “the Levites alone” (Deu 18:6; comp. 1), are used to include all others who had been priests before God took the sons of Aaron peculiarly to serve him in this office (De Synedr. 2, 8, p. 2, 3). Aaron is summoned at this juncture to go up with Moses unto the Lord on Mount Sinai (Exo 19:24). Another remarkable circumstance is then recorded. Moses, now acting as “mediator,” and endued with an extraordinary commission, builds an altar under the hill, and sends “young men of the children of Israel, who offered burnt-offerings, and sacrificed peace-offerings of oxen unto the Lord”: (24, 5). Various interpretations are given to the phrase “young men;” but, upon a view of all the circumstances, we incline to think that they were young laymen, purposely selected by closes for this act, in order to form a complete break between the former priesthood and the new, and that the recommencement and re-arrangement of the priesthood under divine authority might be made more palpably distinct. In the same light we consider the many priestly acts performed by Moses himself, at this particular time, as in Exo 29:25; Exo 40:25; Exo 40:27; Exo 40:29; like those of Gideon (Jdg 6:25-27), of Samuel (1Sa 7:9), and of David (1Ch 21:26). Yet these especial permissions, upon emergencies and extraordinary occasions, had their limits, as may be seen in the fate of “the men of Bethshemesh” (1Sa 6:19), and of Uzzah (2Sa 6:7).

2. The Aaronic Priesthood. —

(1.) Early Period. — The next event in the history of the subject is the public consecration of Aaron and his sons, according to the preceding  regulations (Leviticus 8). At their first sacerdotal performances (Leviticus 9) the divine approbation was intimated by a supernatural fire which consumed their burnt-offering (Lev 9:24). The general satisfaction of the people with these events was, however, soon dashed by the miraculous destruction of the two elder sons of Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, for offering strange fire (Lev 10:1), probably under the influence of too much wine, since the prohibition of it to the priests when about to enter the Tabernacle seems to have originated in this event (Lev 10:9). Moses forbade Aaron and his sons to uncover their heads, or to rend their clothes on this occasion; but the whole house of Israel were permitted to bewail the visitation (Lev 10:6). The inward grief, however, of Eleazar and Ithamar caused an irregularity in their sacerdotal duties, which was forgiven on account of the occasion (Lev 10:16-20). Aaron now appears associated with Moses and the leading men of the several tribes in taking the national census (Numbers 1, 3, etc.), and on other grand state occasions (Num 26:2-3; Num 31:13-26; Num 32:2; Num 34:17).

The high-priest appears ever after as a person of the highest consequence. The dignity of the priesthood soon excited the emulation of the ambitious; hence the penalty of death was denounced against the assumption of it by any one not belonging to the Aaronic family (Num 34:10), and it was soon after miraculously inflicted for this crime. This instance proves that the Aaronic line did not establish itself without a struggle. The rebellion of Korah, at the head of a portion of the Levites as representatives of the first-born, with Dathan and Abiram as leaders of the tribe of the first-born son of Jacob (Num 16:1), showed that some looked back to the old patriarchal order rather than forward to the new, and it needed the witness of “Aaron's rod that budded” to teach the people that the latter had in it a vitality and strength which had departed from the former. It may be that the exclusion of all but the sons of Aaron from the service of the Tabernacle drove those who would not resign their claim to priestly functions of some kind to the worship (possibly with a rival tabernacle) of Moloch and Chiuti (Amo 5:25-26; Eze 20:16). The death of Aaron introduces the installation of his successor which appears to have simply consisted in arraying him in his father's pontifical garments (Num 20:28). Thus also Jonathan the Asmonaean contented himself with putting on the high-priest's habit, in order to take possession of the dignity (1Ma 10:21; comp. Josephus, Ant. 13:2, 3). The high esteem in which the priesthood was held may be gathered from the fact that it was promised in perpetuity to Phinehas and his family as a reward for his zeal (Num 25:13). Prominent as was  the part taken by the priests in the daily march of the host of Israel (Num 10:8), in the passage of the Jordan (Jos 3:14-15), in the destruction of Jericho (Jos 6:12-16), the history of Micah shows that within that century there was a strong tendency to relapse into the system of a household instead of an hereditary priesthood (Judges 17). The frequent invasions and conquests during the period of the Judges must have interfered (as stated above) with the payment of tithes, with the maintenance of worship, with the observance of all festivals, and with this the influence of the priesthood must have been kept in the background. If the descendants of Aaron, at some unrecorded crisis in the history of Israel, rose, under Eli, into the position of national defenders, it was only to sink in his sons into the lowest depth of sacerdotal corruption. For a time the prerogative of the line of Aaron was in abeyance.

The capture of the ark, the removal of the Tabernacle from Shiloh, threw everything into confusion, and Samuel, a Levite, but not within the priestly family, SEE SAMUEL, sacrifices, and “comes near” to the Lord; his training under Eli, his Nazaritish life, his prophetic office, being regarded apparently as a special consecration (comp. Augustine, c. Faust. 12:83; De Civ. Dei, 17:4). For the priesthood, as for the people generally, the time of Samuel must have been one of a great moral reformation; while the expansion, if not the foundation, of the schools of the prophets at once gave to it the support of an independent order, and acted as a check on its corruptions and excesses, a perpetual safeguard against the development from it of any Egyptian or Brahminic caste-system (Ewrald, Gesch. Isr. 2, 185), standing to it in much the same relation as the monastic and mendicant orders stood, each in its turn, to the secular clergy of the Christian Church. Though Shiloh had become a deserted sanctuary, Nob (1Sa 21:1) was made for a time the center of national worship, and the symbolic ritual of Israel was thus kept from being forgotten. The reverence which the people feel for the priests, and which compels Saul to have recourse to one of alien blood (Doeg the Edomite) to carry his murderous counsel into act, shows that there must have been a great step upwards since the time when the sons of Eli “made men to abhor the offerings of the Lord” (1Sa 22:17-18).

The reign of Saul was, however, a time of suffering for them. He had manifested a disposition to usurp the priest's office (1Sa 13:9). The massacre of the priests at Nob showed how insecure their lives were against any unguarded or savage impulse. (It is to be noticed that while the Hebrew text gives eighty-five as the number of priests slain, the Sept. increases it to 305, Josephuus [4 nt. 6:12] to 385.)  They could but wait in silence for the coming of a deliverer in David. One at least among them shared his exile, and, so far as it was possible, lived in his priestly character, performing priestly acts, among the wild company of Adullam (1Sa 23:6; 1Sa 23:9). Others probably were sheltered by their remoteness, or found refuge in Hebron as the largest and strongest of the priestly cities. When the death of Saul set them free, they came in large numbers to the camp of David, prepared apparently not only to testify their allegiance, but also to support him, armed for battle, against all rivals (1Ch 12:27). They were summoned from their cities to the great restoration of the worship of Israel, when the ark was brought up to the new capital of the kingdom (1Ch 15:4). For a time, however (another proof of the strange confusion into which the religious life of the people had fallen), the ark was not the chief center of worship; and while the newer ritual of psalms and minstrelsy gathered round it under the ministration of the Levites, headed by Benaiah and Jahaziel as priests (1Ch 16:5-6), the older order of sacrifices was carried on by the priests in the Tabernacle on the high-place at Gibeon (1Ch 16:37-39; 1Ch 21:29; 2 Chronicles 1, 3). We cannot wonder that first David and then Solomon should have sought to guard against the evils incidental to this separation of the two orders, and to unite in one great temple priests and Levites, the symbolic worship of sacrifice and the spiritual offering of praise.

The reigns of these two kings were naturally the culminating period of the glory of the Jewish priesthood. They had a king whose heart was with them, and who joined in their services dressed as they were (1Ch 15:27) while he yet scrupulously abstained from all interference with their functions. The name which they bore was accepted (whatever explanation may be given of the fact) as the highest title of honor that could be borne by the king's sons (2Sa 8:18). They occupied high places in the king's council (1Ki 4:2; 1Ki 4:4), and might even take their places, as in the case of Benaiah, at the head of his armies (1Ch 12:27; 1Ch 27:5), or be recognized, as Zabud the son of Nathan was, as the “king's friends,” the keepers of the king's conscience (1Ki 4:5; Ewald, Gesch. 3, 334).

The account here given has been based on the belief that the books of the Old Test. give a trustworthy statement of the origin and history of the priesthood of Israel. Those who question their authority have done so, for the most part, on the strength of some preconceived theory. Such a  hierarchy as the Pentateuch prescribes is thought impossible in the earlier stages of national life, and therefore the reigns of David and Solomon are looked upon, not as the restoration, but as the starting-point of the order (Von Bohlen, Die Genesis, Einl. § 16). It is alleged that there could have been no tribe like that of Levi, for the consecration of a whole tribe is without a parallel in history (Vatke, Bibl. Theol. 1, 222). Deuteronomy, assumed for once to be older than the three books which precede it, represents the titles of the priest and Levite as standing on the same footing, and the distinction between them is therefore the work of a later period (George, Die älteren Jüd. Feste, p. 45, 51; comp. Bahr, Symbolik, bk. 2, ch. 1, § 1, whence these references are taken). It is hardly necessary here to do more than state these theories.

(2.) Middle Period. — The position of the priests under the monarchy of Judah deserves a closer examination than it has yet received. The system which has been described above gave them for every week of service in the Temple twenty-three weeks in which they had no appointed work. Was it intended that they should be idle during this period? Were they actually idle? They had no territorial possessions to cultivate. The cities assigned to them and to the Levites gave but scanty pasturage to their flocks. To what employment could they turn?

1. The more devout and thoughtful found, probably, in the schools of the prophets that which satisfied them. The history of the Jews presents numerous instances of the union of the two offices. SEE LEVITE. They became teaching-priests (2Ch 15:3), students, and interpreters of the divine law. From such as these, men might be chosen by the more zealous kings to instruct the people (2Ch 17:8), or to administer justice (2Ch 19:8).

2. Some, perhaps, as stated above, served in the king's army. We have no ground for transferring our modern conceptions of the peacefulness of the priestly life to the remote past of the Jewish people. Priests, as we have seen, were with David at Hebron as men of war. They were the trumpeters of Abijah's army (2Ch 13:12). The Temple itself was a great armory (2Ch 23:9). The heroic struggles of the Maccabees were sustained chiefly by their kindred of the same family (2Ma 7:1).

3. A few chosen ones might enter more deeply into the divine life, and so receive, like Zechariah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, a special call to the office of a prophet.

4. We can hardly escape the conclusion that many did their work in the Temple of Jehovah with a divided allegiance, and acted at other times as priests of the high-places (Ewald, Gesch. 3, 704).

Not only do we read of no protests against the sins of the idolatrous kings, except from prophets who stood forth, alone and unsupported, to bear their witness, but the priests themselves were sharers in the worship of Baal (Jer 2:8), of the sun and moon, and of the host of heaven (Jer 8:1-2). In the very Temple itself they “ministered before their idols” (Eze 44:12), and allowed others, “uncircumcised in heart and uncircumcised in flesh,” to join them (ibid. 7). They ate of unclean things and polluted the Sabbaths. There could be no other result of this departure from the true idea of the priesthood than a general degradation. Those who ceased to be true shepherds of the people found nothing in their ritual to sustain or elevate them. They became as sensual, covetous, and tyrannical as ever the clergy of the Christian Church became in its darkest periods; conspicuous as drunkards and adulterers (Isa 28:7-8; Isa 56:10-12). The prophetic order, instead of acting as a check, became sharers in their corruption (Jer 5:31; Lam 4:13; Zep 3:4).

For the most part, the few efforts after better things are not the result of a spontaneous reformation, but of conformity to the wishes of a reforming king. In the one instance in which they do act spontaneously-their resistance to the usurpation of the priest's functions by Uzziah— their protest, however right in itself, was yet only too compatible with a wrong use of the office which they claimed as belonging exclusively to themselves (2Ch 26:17). The discipline of the Captivity, however, was not without its fruits. A large proportion of the priests had either perished or were content to remain in the land of their exile; but those who did return were active in the work of restoration. Under Ezra they submitted to the stern duty of repudiating their heathen wives (Ezr 10:18-19). They took part-though here the Levites were the more prominent-in the instruction of the people (Ezr 3:2; Neh 8:9-13). The root- evils, however, soon reappeared. The work of the priesthood was made the instrument of covetousness. The priests of the time of Malachi required payment for every ministerial act, and would not even “shut the doors” or “kindle fire” for naught (Mal 1:10). They “corrupted the covenant  of Levi” (Mal 2:8). The idea of the priest as the angel, the messenger, of the Lord of Hosts was forgotten (ibid. 7; comp. Ecc 5:6). The inevitable result was that they again lost their influence. They became “base and contemptible before all the people” (Mal 2:9). The office of the scribe rose in repute as that of the priest declined (Jost, Judenth. 1, 37, 148). The sects that multiplied during the last three centuries of the national life of Judaism were proofs that the established order had failed to do its work in maintaining the religious life of the people. No great changes affected the outward position of the priests under the Persian government. When that monarchy fell before the power of Alexander they were hearty enough to transfer their allegiance. Both the Persian government and Alexander had, however, respected the religion of their subjects, and the former had conferred on the priests immunities from taxation (Ezr 6:8-9; Ezr 7:24; Josephus, Ant. 11:8).

The degree to which this recognition was carried by the immediate successors of Alexander is shown by the work of restoration accomplished by Simon the son of Onias (Sirach 1, 12-20); and the position which they thus occupied in the eyes of the people, not less than the devotion with which his zeal inspired them. prepared them doubtless for the great struggle which was coming, and in which, under the priestly Maccabees, they were the chief defenders of their country's freedom. Some, indeed, at that crisis were found among the apostates. Under the guidance of Jason (the heathenized form of Joshua) they forsook the customs of their fathers; and they who as priests were to be patterns of a self-respecting purity left their work in the Temple to run naked in the circus which the Syrian king had opened in Jerusalem (2Ma 4:13-14). Some, at an earlier period, had joined the schismatic Onias in establishing a rival worship (Josephus, Ant. 12:3, 4). The majority, however, were true-hearted; and the Maccabean struggle which left the government of the country in the hands of their own order, and, until the Roman conquest, with a certain measure of independence, must have given to the higher members of the order a position of security and influence. The martyr-spirit showed itself again in the calmness with which they carried on the ministrations in the Temple, when Jerusalem was besieged by Pompey, till they were slain even in the act of sacrificing (Josephus, Ant. 14:4, 3; War, 1, 7, 5). The reign of Herod, on the other hand, in which the high-priesthood was kept in abeyance, or transferred from one to another at the will of one who was an alien by birth and half a heathen in character, must have tended to depress them.

(3.) Closing Period. — It will be interesting to bring together the few facts that indicate the position of the priests in the New-Testament period of their history. The division into four-and-twenty courses is still maintained (Luk 1:5; Josephus, Life, 1), and the heads of these courses, together with those who have held the high priesthood (the office no longer lasting for life), are “chief priests” (ἀρχιερεῖς) by courtesy (Carpzov. App. Crit. p. 102), and take their place in the Sanhedrim. The number scattered throughout Palestine was, as has been stated, very large. Of these the greater number were poor and ignorant, despised by the more powerful members of their own order, not gaining the respect or affection of the people. The picture of cowardly selfishness in the priest of the parable of Luk 10:31 can hardly be thought of as other than a representative one, indicating the estimate commonly and truly formed of the character of the class. The priestly order, like the nation, was divided between contending sects. The influence of Hyrcanus, himself in the latter part of his life a Sadducee (Josephus, Ant. 13:10, 6), had probably made the tenets of that party popular among the wealthier and more powerful members, and the chief-priests of the Gospels and the Acts, the whole ἀρχιερατικὸν γένος (Act 4:1; Act 4:6; Act 5:17), were apparently consistent Saddlucees, sometimes combining with the Pharisees in the Sanhedrim, sometimes thwarted by them, in persecuting the followers of Jesus because they preached the resurrection of the dead. The great multitude (ὄχλος), on the other hand, who received that testimony (6, 7) must have been free from or must have overcome Sadducean prejudices. It was not strange that those who did not welcome the truth which would have raised them to a higher life should sink lower and lower into an ignorant and ferocious fanaticism. Few stranger contrasts meet us in the history of religion than that presented in the life of the priesthood in the last half century of the Temple — now going through the solemn sacrificial rites and joining in the noblest hymns, now raising a fierce clamor at anything which seemed to them a profanation of the sanctuary, and rushing to dash out the brains of the bold or incautious intruder, or of one of their own order who might enter while under some ceremonial defilement, or with a half-humorous cruelty setting fire to the clothes of the Levites who were found sleeping when they ought to have been watching at their posts (Lightfoot, Temple Service, ch. 1). The rivalry which led the Levites to claim privileges which had hitherto belonged to the priests has already been noticed. SEE LEVITE. In the scenes of the last tragedy of Jewish history the order passes away, without honor, “dying as a fool dieth.” The high-priesthood is given to the lowest  and vilest of the adherents of the frenzied Zealots (Josephus, War, 4:3, 6). Other priests appear as deserting to the enemy (ibid. 6:6, 1). It is from a priest that Titus receives the lamps, and gems, and costly raiment of the sanctuary (ibid. 6:8, 3). Priests report to their conquerors the terrible utterance “Let us depart” on the last Pentecost ever celebrated in the Temple (ibid. 6:5, 3). It is a priest who fills up the degradation of his order by dwelling on the fall of his country with a cold-blooded satisfaction, and finding in Titus the fulfillment of the Messianic prophecies of the Old Test. (ibid. 6:5, 4). The destruction of Jerusalem deprived the order at one blow of all but an honorary distinction. Their occupation was gone. Many families must have altogether lost their genealogies. Those who still prided themselves on their descent were no longer safe against the claims of pretenders. The jealousies of the lettered class, which had been kept under some restraint as long as the Temple stood, now had full play, and the influence of the rabbins increased with the fall of the priesthood. The position of the priests in mediaeval and modern Judaism has never risen above that of complimentary recognition. Those who claim to take their place among the sons of Aaron are entitled to receive the redemption- money of the firstborn, to take the law from its chest, and to pronounce the benediction in the synagogues (Ugolino, 12:48).

IV. Relation of the Jewish Priesthood to the Christian Ministry. — The language of the New-Test. writers in relation to the priesthood ought not to be passed over. They recognize in Christ the first-born, the king, the Anointed, the representative of the true primeval priesthood after the order of Melchizedek (Heb 7:8), from which that of Aaron, however necessary for the time, is now seen to have been a deflection. But there is no trace of an order in the new Christian society bearing the name and exercising functions like those of the priests of the older Covenant. The synagogue, and not the Temple, furnishes the pattern for the organization of the Church. The idea which pervades the teaching of the Epistles is that of a universal priesthood. All true believers are made kings and priests (Rev 1:6; 1Pe 2:9), offer spiritual sacrifices (Rom 12:1), may draw near, may enter into the holiest (Heb 10:19-22), as having received a true priestly consecration. They, too, have been washed and sprinkled as the sons of Aaron were (Heb 10:22). It was the thought of a succeeding age that the old classification of the high priest, priests, and Levites was reproduced in the bishops, priests, and deacons of the Christian Church. The history of language presents few  stranger facts than those connected with these words. Priest, our only equivalent for ἱερεύς, comes to us from the word which was chosen because it excluded the idea of a sacerdotal character. Bishop has narrowly escaped a like perversion, occurring as it does constantly in Wiclif Häersion as the translation of ἀρχιερεύς (e.g. Joh 18:15; Heb 8:1). The idea which was thus expressed rested, it is true, on the broad analogy of a threefold gradation, and the terms “priest,” “altar,” “sacrifice,” might be used without involving more than a legitimate symbolism; but they brought with them the inevitable danger of reproducing and perpetuating in the history of the Christian Church many of the feelings which belonged to Judaism, and ought to have been left behind with it. If the evil has not proved so fatal to the life of Christendom as it might have done, it is because no bishop or pope, however much he might exaggerate the harmony of the two systems, has ever dreamed of making the Christian priesthood hereditary. We have perhaps reason to be thankful that two errors tend to neutralize each other, and that the age which witnessed the most extravagant sacerdotalism was one in which the celibacy of the clergy was first exalted, then urged, and at last enforced.

V. Literature. — For the similarity in the religion of ancient Greece, see Potter, Archaeologia (Lond. 1775), 1, 202; of ancient Rome, Adam, Antiquities (Edinb. 1791), p. 293, § Ministri Sacrorum. For the resemblances between the religious customs of the ancient Egyptians and those of the Jews, we refer especially to Kitto, Pictorial History of Palestine (Lond. 1844). On the Hebrew priesthood in general, see Kiper, Das Priesterthum des Alten Bundes (Berl. 1865). For particular topics, see Kiesling, De Leibus Mos. circa Sacerd. Vitio Corporis laborantes; Kall, De Morbis Sacerdot. V. T. ex Ministerii eor. Conditione oriundis (Hahn. 1745); Jablonskii Pantheon, Proleg. § 29, 41, 43; Munch. De Matrimonio Sacerd. V. T. cum Filiab. Sacer. (Nuremb. 1747); Kohl, De State, etc. (Lips. 1735); Rechenberg, id. (ibid. 1760); Stiebritz, De Sacerdotum Vitiis Corpore (Hal. 1742); Curtiss, The Levitical Priests (Lond. 1877). For the theology of the subject, see Dr. J. P. Smith, Discourses on the Sacrifice and Priesthood of Christ (Lond. 1842); Jardine, Christian Sacerdotalism (ibid. 1871). See also the works cited by Danz, Wörterbuch, s.v. Priester; Darling, Cyclopaedia Bibliographica, vol. 1, col. 1812.

PRIEST is a contraction of the word presbyter (Greek πρεσβύτερος), and is derived probably from the old French or Norman prestre. It was in the Saxon, first preost, later prest. The German and Dutch words are priester;  the modern French, prêtre; the Italian, prete; but the Spanish is most like the original form it is presbitero. In its most general signification, the word is the title of a minister of public worship, but is specially applied to the minister of sacrifice or other mediatorial offices. In the early history of mankind, the functions of the priest seem to have commonly been discharged by the head of each family; but, on the expansion of the family into the state, the office of priest became a public one, which absorbed the duties as well as the privileges which before belonged to the heads of the separate families or communities. It thus came to pass that in many instances the priestly office was associated with that of the sovereign, whatever might be the particular form of sovereignty. But in many religious and political bodies, also, the orders were maintained in complete independence, and the priests formed a distinct, and, generally speaking, a privileged class. SEE EGYPT; SEE HINDUISM. The priestly order, in most of the ancient religions, included a graduated hierarchy; and to the chief, whatever was his title, were assigned the most solemn of the religious offices entrusted to the body. Compare the preceding article.

In the Christian Church the word has been used in place of the two Greek words (1) πρεσβύτερος, which really signifies an elder, and (2) ἱερεύς, which corresponds to the Latin sacerdos, i.e. one who offers sacrifice- words which are exceedingly dissimilar in meaning, but, used in this indiscriminate manner, convey a false idea as to the respective offices of priest and preacher. The Christian preacher or minister answers rather to the ancient prophet than to the Old-Testament priest. As ἱερεύς; means one who offers sacrifices, and as sacrifices have been abolished since the offering of the one perfect and all-sufficient Sacrifice, it follows that, in the strict and official sense, there are no “sacrificers” under the New- Testament or Christian dispensation. If, therefore, the claims of the ministers of the Church are made to rest upon a precise analogy to those founded upon the priestly functions of an abrogated dispensation, it surely becomes the advocates of such claims to prove from the Christian Institute that the conceived analogy exists. But where is the proof? There is not a single passage in “the book” of apostles and evangelists to support the assumption. Nowhere are the ministers of the Gospel represented as “sacrificers;” nowhere is provision made for such a succession, as in any respect similar to the Levitical, and still less the Aaronical priesthood. To the prophets, and rulers of the synagogues, it is admitted that there are allusions descriptive of ministerial duties; for the work of instruction was  the appropriate business of these ecclesiastical functionaries, and not performing the services of a prescribed ritual. But sacerdotal dignities are nowhere ascribed to Christian presbyters.

The priesthood, as a religious order, perished with Judaism. The priesthood was the shadow, and disappeared when the substance came. As a mediator, Jesus Christ is the only priest; as a servant of God, whose duty it is to consecrate his full time and energies and thoughts to the divine service, every Christian is a “priest unto God.” The New Testament, therefore, contains no hint of any priest, nor of any officer answering to a priest, in the early Church; and, on the contrary, contains many passages which teach more or less directly and distinctly that the priesthood of the class is merged in the priestly character of Jesus Christ and that of the whole discipleship (comp. Heb 2:17; Heb 3:1; Heb 4:14; Heb 5:5-10; Heb 7:27-28; Heb 10:11-12; Rev 5:10). It is very clear that the apostles, when they so plainly assert the abolition of sacrifices since the offering of the one perfect and all-sufficient Sacrifice, could never intend to institute such an office as a sacrificing priest. When they use the term, they apply it to Christ alone. The office of a Christian pastor is not to atone, but to preach the atonement. In Rom 15:16 the application of the term by the apostle Paul is figurative. The modern minister answers rather to the ancient prophet than to the ancient priest. At least this is the universal opinion of nearly all Protestant Christendom, though some relics of the old priestly idea of a special sacerdotal order, with peculiar privileges and prerogatives, and possessing peculiar holiness, still linger in the Church.

The advocates of hierarchical claims, whether Romish, Greek, or Protestant Christians, assume that ministers are entitled to be regarded as succeeding to the same relation to the Church with that which was sustained by the priesthood under the Jewish economy. Hence the terms and offices peculiar to the ancient priests are conceived to be analogous to the functions and designations of the Christian ministry. On this assumption, it is contended that the duties performed and the authority exercised under the direct sanction of the Most High are now transferred to those who are duly qualified, by a certain order of succession, to discharge the offices of the ministry under the present dispensation. In the grades of the hierarchy the priesthood is second in order only to that of bishop. Bishops and priests possess the same priestly authority, but the bishop has the power of transmitting it to others, which an ordinary priest cannot do. ‘he priest is regarded as the ordinary minister of the Eucharist,  whether as a sacrament or as a sacrifice; of baptism, penance, and extreme unction; and although the contracting parties are held in the modern schools to be themselves the ministers of marriage, the priest is regarded by all schools of Roman divines as at least the normal and official witness of its celebration. The priest is also officially charged with the instruction of the people and the direction of their spiritual concerns, and, by long established use, special districts, called parishes (q.v.), are assigned to priests, within which they are entrusted with the care and supervision of the spiritual wants of all the inhabitants. The holy order of priesthood can only be conferred by a bishop, and he is ordinarily assisted by two or more priests, who, in common with the bishop, impose hands on the candidate. The rest of the ceremonial of ordination consists in investing the candidate with the sacred instruments and ornaments of his order, anointing his hands, and reciting certain prayers significant of the gifts and the duties of the office. Dens defines the priesthood as “a sacred order and sacrament, in which power is conferred of consecrating the body of Christ, of remitting sins, and of administering certain other sacraments.” Accordingly, at the consecration of a priest, after unction and prayer, the chalice, with wine and water, and the paten upon it with the host, are given to him, with these awful words, “Receive power to offer the sacrifice of God, and to celebrate mass for the living and the dead.” Moreover, he receives formally the power to forgive sins. The distinguishing vestment of the priest is the chasuble (Lat. plareta). In Roman Catholic countries, priests wear even in public a distinctive dress.

In some portions of the Episcopal Church the idea is maintained that the modern clergyman is the successor of the ancient priest, because this term is used in the Prayer-book to designate the clerical office. Says Fluyter: “The Greek and Latin words which we translate ‘priest' are derived from words that signify holy; and so the word priest, according to the etymology, signifies him whose mere charge and function are about holy things, and therefore seems to be a most proper word to him who is set apart to the holy public service and worship of God, especially when he is in the actual ministration of holy things. If it be objected that, according to the usual acceptation of the word, it signifies him that offers up a sacrifice, and therefore cannot be allowed to a minister of the Gospel, who hath no sacrifice to offer, it is answered that the ministers of the Gospel have sacrifices to offer (1Pe 2:5): ‘Ye are built up a spiritual house, an  holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices of prayer, praises, thanksgiving,' etc. In respect of these, the ministers of the Gospel may safely, in a metaphorical sense be called priests; and in a more eminent manner than other Christians, because they are taken from among men to offer up these sacrifices for others. But besides these spiritual sacrifices mentioned, the ministers of the Gospel have another sacrifice to offer, viz. the unbloody sacrifice, as it was anciently called, the commemorative sacrifice of the blood of Christ, which does as really and truly show forth the death of Christ as those sacrifices under the law did; and in respect of this sacrifice of the Eucharist the ancients have usually called those that offer it up priests.” See Killen, Ancient Church, p. 644; Martensen, Dogmatics; Fairbairn, Typology; Calvin, Institutes; Coleman, Manual on Prelacy and Ritualism, p. 167 sq.; Stratten, Book Of the Priesthood; Howitt, On Priestcraft; Dwight, Theology; Schaff, Hist. of the Apost. Church; Elliott, Delineation of Romanism (see Index); Sumner, Principles at Stake (Lond. 1868, 8vo), ch. 3; Christian Quar. April, 1873, art. 4; Meth. Quar. Rev. July, 1873, art. 2; Studien u. Kritiken, 1862, No. 1; Bapt. Quar. Oct. 1870; Christian Monthly, Feb. 1865, p. 188. SEE BISHOP; SEE CLERGY; SEE PREACHER.

## Priestley, Joseph, LL.D[[@Headword:Priestley, Joseph, LL.D]]

             one of the most noted of the English deists of the 18th century, and a scientist of great celebrity, was born of humble but honorable parentage at Fieldhead, March 13. 1733, old style. His mother dying when he was six years of age, he was adopted by a paternal aunt, Mrs. Keigihley, by whom he was sent to a free grammar-school in the neighborhood, where he was taught the Latin language and the elements of the Greek. Hs vacations were devoted to the study of Hebrew under a dissenting minister; and when he had acquired some proficiency in this language he commenced and made considerable progress in the Chaldee, Syriac, and Arabic. Ill-health, however, led him to abandon for a while his classical studies, land he gave himself to mercantile pursuits. Though obliged to leave school, he yet continued his studies. Without the aid of a master, he acquired some knowledge of French, Italian, and German. At the age of nineteen (1752) he resumed work as a theological student in the dissenting academy at Daventry. His parents, who were both of the Calvinistic persuasion, as well as his aunt, had omitted no opportunity of inculcating the importance of the Calvinistic doctrine. At the academy he found both the professors and students greatly agitated upon most theological questions which were  deemed of much importance, such as liberty and necessity, the sleep of the soul, etc., and kindred articles of orthodoxy and heresy. These were the topics of animated and frequent discussion. The spirit of controversy thus excited was in some measure fostered by the plan for regulating their studies, drawn up by Dr. Doddrige. It specified certain works on both sides of every question which the students were required to peruse and form an abridgment of for their future use. Before the lapse of many months Priestley conceived himself called upon to renounce tile greater number of the theological and metaphysical opinions which he had imbibed in early youth and thus, he himself observes, “I came to embrace what is generally called the heterodox side of the question; . . . but notwithstanding the great freedom of our debates, the extreme of heresy among us was Arianism, and all of us, I believe, left the academy with a belief, more or less qualified, of the doctrine of the Atonement.” His waywardness did not interfere with his graduation, and in 1755 he became assistant minister to an Independent congregation at Needham-Market, in Suffolk. Here he made himself unpopular by renouncing the doctrine of the Atonement, and in three years left, in rather bad repute because of his heresy. He found a temporary engagement at Nantwich, in Cheshire, but was again unpopular, and next engaged in teaching with some success, and was finally chosen professor of belles-lettres in Warrington Academy. During the ten years following he produced half a dozen thoughtful works on widely varying subjects-works which of themselves would have given him enduring fame. He busied himself in politics, too, and became known as a vigorous lecturer. He was still poor, but by dint of strict economy he had secured an air pump and an electrical machine, and had already begun his scientific researches.

While at Needham he composed his work entitled The Scripture Doctrine of Remission, which shows that the Death of Christ is no proper Sacrifice nor Satisfaction for Sin; but that Pardon is dispensed solely on account of a Personal Repentance of the Sinner. It was published in 1761. He seems to have rejected all theological dogmas which appeared to him to rest solely upon the interpretation put upon certain passages of the Bible by ecclesiastical authority. It does not, however, appear that these doctrinal errors produced any morally evil results. A visit to the metropolis was the occasion of his introduction to our own celebrated countryman, Dr. Franklin, Dr. Price, and others. To the first of these he communicated his idea of writing a historical account of electrical discoveries, if provided with the requisite books. These Dr. Franklin undertook to procure, and  before the end of the year in which Priestley submitted to him the plan of the work he sent him a copy of it in print, though five hours of every day had been occupied in public or private teaching, besides which he had kept up an active philosophical correspondence. The title of this work is The History and Present State of Electricity, with Original Experiments (1767; 3rd ed. 1775). By his devotion to learning and his persistent scrutiny of nature, Priestley now unraveled many a tangled web of science, and it was his to make the most valuable discovery in science of the last century; but as he drew nearer natural truth, he became more and more, though perhaps unconsciously, estranged from revealed truth, and by a hot temper and hasty utterances alienated his best friends. A disagreement between the trustees and professors of the academy led to his relinquishing the appointment at Warrington in 1767. His next engagement was with a large congregation at Mill-Hill Chapel, Leeds, where his theological inquiries were resumed, and several works of the kind composed, chiefly of a controversial character. The vicinity of his dwelling to a public brewery was the occasion of his attention being directed to pneumatic chemistry, the consideration of which he commenced in 1768, and subsequently prosecuted with great success. His first publication on this subject was a pamphlet on Impregnating Water with Fixed Air (1772); the same year he communicated to the Royal Society his Observations on Different Kinds of Air, to which the Copley medal was awarded in 1773. He originated other modes of investigation now pursued, and, indeed, nearly ail that is known of the gases has its foundation in the discoveries he made. He discovered oxygen gas, nitrous gas, nitrous-oxide gas, nitrous vapor, carbonic-oxide gas, sulfurous-oxide gas, fluoric-acid gas, muriatic gas, and ammoniacal gas. The discovery of oxygen alone rivaled in importance the great discovery of gravitation by Newton in the preceding century. The pneumatic trough, a vessel by means of which chemists collect gas, was also in good part invented by Priestley. He experimented untiringly, and gave to the world a detailed account of almost every observation he made. For a time he was the idol of men of science. All Europe did him honor. At the height of his reputation he became companion to the earl of Shelburne, with whom he traveled extensively on the Continent. He remained with that nobleman seven years, at the end of which, in 1789, receiving a pension, he settled in Birmingham where he proceeded actively with his philosophical and theological researches, and was also appointed pastor to a dissenting congregation. Having been told by certain Parisian savans that he was the only man they had ever known, of any understanding, who  believed in Christianity, he wrote, in reply, the Letters to a Philosophical Unbeliever (1780), and various other works containing criticisms on the doctrines of Hume and others.

His public position was now rather a hard one; for while laughed at in Paris as a believer, at home he was branded as an atheist. To escape the odium arising from the latter imputation, he published his Disquisition relating to Matter and Spirit. In this work, while lie partly materializes spirit, he at the same time partly spiritualizes matter. He holds, however, that our hopes of resurrection must rest solely on the truth of the Christian revelation, and that scientifically they have no demonstration whatever. The doctrines of a Revelation and a Resurrection appear with him to have supported one another. He believed in a Revelation, because it declared a Resurrection; and he believed in a Resurrection, because he found it declared in the Revelation. Yet in his Introductory Dissertation to Hartley's Observations on Man he expressed doubts again concerning the immateriality of the sentient principle in man; and in the Doctrine of Necessity-another elucidation of Hartley (q.v.)— published about the same time, largely denied the Christian doctrine of Revelation. But among the many points of Church dogma called in question or altogether repudiated, Dr. Priestley thus far had not openly touched the doctrine of the Trinity. In 1782 he published his History of the Corruptions of Christianity (2 vols. 8vo). A refutation of the arguments contained in this work was proposed for one of the Hague prize essays; and in 1785 the work itself was burned by the common hangman in the city of Dort. Next came a History of Early Opinions concerning Jesus Christ (1786, 4 vols. 8vo), but it failed to make any impression in the literary or theological world. His previous writings, however, gave rise to a lively literary warfare between Priestley and Dr. Horsley. The principal subjects discussed were the doctrines of Free Will, Materialism, and Unitarianism. The victory in this controversy will probably be awarded by most men in accordance with their own preconceived views on the questions at issue.

In a letter to Dr. Price, dated Jan. 27,1791, Priestley says: “With respect to the Church, with which you have meddled but little, I have long since drawn the sword and thrown away the scabbard, and am very easy about the consequences.” While it was a source of wonder to the savans of the Continent that such a man could believe in a God at all, his want of belief shocked the better class of his countrymen, who, although at the time sadly lax in morals, were scrupulous in their adherence to orthodoxy. But he did not confine himself  to dealing with churchmen: his object was to obtain for the dissenters what he considered to be their rights, and in the pursuit of which he published about twenty volumes. He attacked certain positions relating to the dissenters in Blackstone's Commentaries with a vigor and acrimony which seems to have surprised his adversary. At the same time he was avowedly partial to the French Revolution, and as he was a man of strong speech and stinging pen, he soon excited the hatred of the High-Church and Tory party. The agitation of the populace had already found vent in riots, and in the month of July Dr. Priestley's house, library, manuscripts, and costly apparatus were committed to the flames by an angry mob. His papers, torn in scraps, carpeted the roads around his desolated home, and he was exposed to great personal danger. He quitted Birmingham foe Hackney, where he became the successor of his deceased friend Dr. Price (q.v.), and so far as money could restore what he had lost, it was liberally given. But his sentiments were unchanged, and he was none the less outspoken because of misuse; and at last, conceiving himself to be insecure against popular rage, he embarked for America.

In the United States he was received with enthusiasm as a martyr to republican principles. He was offered a professor's chair in Philadelphia, which, however, he declined-for, notwithstanding his unparalleled attainments, he modestly felt the want of an early systematic training in the sciences-and, retiring to Northumberland, he was soon again absorbed in his studies. But even here before long he was in the midst of bitter controversy. He had contemplated no difficulty in forming a Unitarian congregation in America; but in this he was greatly disappointed. He found that the majority disregarded religion, and those who paid any attention to it were more afraid of his doctrines than desirous of hearing them. By the American government, the former democratic spirit of which had subsided, he was looked upon as a spy in the interest of France. The democracy he espoused was unpalatably French, the inconsistency of his religious doctrines laid him open to ridicule, and, as he could not long remain silent, a host of critics was soon arrayed against him. His later writings were mostly in defense of his doctrines and discoveries, and his experiments in America did not prove as successful as those of his earlier years. To the day of his death he continued to pursue his literary and scientific pursuits with as much ardor as he had shown at any period of his active life. He died Feb. 6, 1804, expressing the satisfaction he derived from the consciousness of having led a useful life and the confidence he felt in a  future state in a happy immortality. When his death became known in Paris, his éloge was read by Cuvier before the National Institute.

Priestley has given us his autobiography down to March 24,1795. He was a man of irreproachable moral and domestic character, remarkable for zeal, for truth, patience, and in his maturer years for serenity of temper. He appears to have been fearless in proclaiming his convictions, whether theological, political, or scientific. Few men in modern times have written so much, or with such facility; yet he seldom spent more than six or eight hours a day in any labor which required much mental exertion. A habit of regularity extended itself to all his studies. He never read a book without determining in his own mind when he would finish it; and at the beginning of every year he arranged the plan of his literary pursuits and scientific researches. He labored under a great defect, which, however, was not a very considerable impediment to his progress. He sometimes lost all ideas both of persons and things with which he had been conversant. He always did immediately what he had to perform. Though he rose early and dispatched his more serious pursuits in the morning, yet he was as well qualified for mental exertion at one time of the day as at another. All seasons were equal to him, early or late, before dinner or after. He could also write without inconvenience by the parlor fire, with his wife and children about him, and occasionally talking to them. In his family he ever maintained the worship of God. See the Memoirs, continued by his son, with observations by T. Cooper; also Life by John Corry (1805); and by Rutt (1832).

Rarely has a man been more variously estimated than Priestley. In Blackwood (1835) he was characterized as “a shallow scholar, an empirical philosopher — who stumbled on his discoveries and lacked the logical capacity to usefully apply them-a malcontent politician, and a heretical religionist.” Dr. Parr, on the contrary, speaks of Priestley's attainments as numerous without a parallel, his talents as superlatively great, and his morals as correct without austerity and exemplary without ostentation. These estimates are certainly diverse, but possibly they are equally near the truth. Priestley was much more of an experimentalist than a philosopher. In religion as well as in science he sought novelties. Facts, and facts only, could satisfy him. But his caprice was as noticeable as his positiveness, and his logical inconsistencies were gross. A queer instance of this is found in his adherence to the theory of “phlogiston” — the supposed principle of inflammability, or the matter of fire in composition with other bodies, the  absurdity of which was shown by his own discovery of oxygen. In theology, as we have seen, while maintaining the immortality of the soul, he denied its immateriality. He was never widely trusted as a religious leader; although, because of his ability and unimpeachable morality, and his eminence in science, his pulpit services were eagerly sought. His fame rests principally on his pneumatic inquiries. But he was encyclopedic in the range of his writings, which extend to between seventy and eighty volumes. Among them are works on general and ecclesiastical history and biography, on language, on oratory and criticism, on religion and metaphysics.

Although many of his opinions were fanciful and manifestly erroneous, there was hardly a subject touched by his pen that was not the brighter and shapelier because of his genius. It is not now, — however, for the first time remarked that the minds best fitted for prosecuting the labors of experimental philosophy are by no means those from which we expect light to be cast into the more obscure region of metaphysical analysis. “Priestley's mind was objective to an extreme; he could fix his faith upon nothing which had not the evidence of sense in some way or other impressed upon it. Science, morals, politics, philosophy, religion, all came to him under the type of the sensational. Tile most spiritual ideas were obliged to be cast into a material mould before they could commend themselves to his judgment or conscience. His intellect was rapid to an extraordinary degree; lie saw the bearings of a question according to its principles at a glance, and embodied his thoughts in volumes, while many other men would hardly have sketched out their plan. All this, though admirable in the man of action, was not the temperament to form the solid metaphysician; nay, it was precisely opposed to that deep, reflective habit, that sinking into one's own inmost consciousness, from which alone speculative philosophy can obtain light and advancement.” As a man of science, he has left his mark upon the intellectual history of the century; but besides being a man of science, he aimed at being a metaphysician, a theologian, a politician, a classical scholar, and a historian. With an amazing intrepidity he plunged into tasks the effective performance of which would have demanded the labors of a lifetime. With the charge of thirty youths on his hands, he proposes to write an ecclesiastical history, and soon afterwards observes that a fresh translation of the Old Test. would “not be a very formidable task” (Rutt, Life, 1, 42). He carried on all manner of controversies upon their own ground with Horsley and Badcock, with his friend Price, with Beattie and the Scotch philosophers, with Gibbon and the skeptics, and yet often labored for hours a day at his  chemical experiments. So discursive a thinker could hardly do much thorough work, nor really work out or co-ordinate his own opinions. It would be in vain, therefore, to anticipate any great force or originality in Priestley's speculations. At best he was a quick reflector of the current opinions of his time and class, and able to run up hasty theories of sufficient apparent stability to afford a temporary refuge amid the storm of conflicting elements. With such tendencies of mind, therefore, and living in an age the whole bearing of which was away from the ideal to the sensational, it is not surprising that Priestley entered with energy into those principles of Hartley from which he hoped to reduce all mental science to a branch of physical investigation.

The metaphysical position he assumed may be fully seen in his Examination of Reid, Beattie, and Oswald: in fact, it is summed up in one extraordinary sentence, where he affirms that” something has been done in the field of knowledge by Descartes, very much by Mr. Locke, but most of all by Hartley, who has thrown more useful light upon the theory of the mind than Newton did upon the theory of the natural world.” Priestley rested the truth of materialism upon two deductions. The first was that thought and sensation are essentially the same thing— that the whole variety of our ideas, however abstract and refined they may become, are, nevertheless, but modifications of the sensational faculty. This doctrine had been more fully maintained in France by Condillac, and is a crude anticipation of the positive view. The second deduction was that all sensation, and, consequently, all thought, arises from the affections of our material organization, and, therefore, consists entirely in the motion of the material particles of which the nerves and brain are composed. It is but justice, however, here to add that Priestley did not push his materialism so far as to evolve any conclusions contrary to the fundamental principles of man's natural religion, or to invalidate the evidence of a future state; for in the full conviction of these truths he both lived and died. And instead of distinctly inferring with modern positivists that we can show nothing of the ultimate nature either of mind or body, Priestley adopted the view that the soul is itself material. According to his quaint illustration, it resembles a razor. The power of thought inheres in it as the power of cutting in the razor. The razor dissolved in acids is annihilated; and, the body destroyed by putrefaction, the power of thinking ceases. But the particles remain in each case; and the soul, like the razor, may again be put together (Price and Priestley On Materialism, p. 82). The advantage of this doctrine,  according to Priestley, was that it confirmed bishop Law's theory of the seat of the soul. The soul being, in fact, a piece of mechanism, is taken to pieces at death, and though it may afterwards be put together again by divine power, there is no ground for the superstitions embodied in the doctrine of purgatory. Moreover, it strikingly confirms the Socinian doctrine by removing all pretext for a belief in the pre-existence of Christ. To sum up, then, the precise influence of Priestley upon the progress of sensationalism in a few words, we may say that he succeeded in cutting the last tie which had held Hartley to the poor remains of spiritualism; that he reduced the whole phenomena of mind to organic processes-the mind itself to a material organization, and mental philosophy to a physical science. The whole existing order of things being an elaborate piece of mechanism, we infer the Almighty mechanist by the familiar watch argument (Disquisitions, 1, 187). Indeed, the Deity himself becomes almost phenomenal, and Priestley has considerable trouble in saving him from materiality he denies that a belief in his immateriality would increase our reverence for him (ibid. 1, 185), and declares that he must be in some sense extended, and have some common property with the matter upon which he acts. It would seem, indeed, that God is rather matter of a different kind from the ordinary than in any strict sense immaterial.

Priestley's History of the Corruptions of Christianity led to the most exciting controversy in the latter half of the 18th century. His position may be easily defined. He writes as a Protestant, and, charging the papacy with corrupting tendencies, he pushes one step farther the arguments already familiar in the great controversy of the Protestant world of Christianity with Rome. He is by no means original in his position. Zwicker and Episcopius had anticipated his main theory. There is but a question of degree between Priestley and other Protestant writers upon the early ages of Christianity. He endeavors to draw the limits of the supernatural still more closely than his predecessors. All Protestants admitted that at some early period Christianity has been corrupted. Priestley includes among the corruptions the Trinitarian doctrines, which, as he argues, showed themselves, though in a comparatively undeveloped state, among the earliest of the post-apostolic writers. He continues the attack upon the authority of the Church fathers, as begun by David, and which had then been recently carried on by Middleton and Jortin. He makes Christ a mere man, and places the writers of the New Test. on the same level with Thucydides or Tacitus, while he still believes in the miracles, and quotes  texts after the old unhistorical fashion. He is compelled, moreover, to accept the Protestant theory that there was in the earliest ages a body of absolutely sound doctrine, though, in the effort to identify this with Unitarianism he is driven to great straits, and forced to discover it in obscure sects, and to make inferences from the negative argument of silence rather than from positive assertions. Though he makes free with the reasoning of the apostles, he cannot give up their authority; and, accepting without question the authenticity of the Gospels, labors to interpret them in the Unitarian sense. He did not see that the real difficulty is the admission of supernatural agency, and that to call a miracle a very little one is only to encounter the whole weight of rationalistic and of orthodox hostility. His aim, as he explains in his Preface, is to show “what circumstances in the state of things” (notice this slipshod style), “and especially of other prevailing opinions and prejudices,” favored the introduction of new doctrines. He hopes that this “historical method will be found to be one of the most satisfactory modes of argumentation” (Corruptions, vol. 1, Preface, p. 14).

Priestley asserts that corruptions appeared, but in practice seems to attribute them to perverse chances rather than to the influence of contemporary opinion, which he professes to trace. Thus in discussing theories of grace, he says, ‘It is not easy to imagine a priori what could have led men into such a train of thinking” (ibid. 1, 284), as is exhibited in the speculations about grace, free will, and predestination. After some vague handling of the problem, he remembers that the “principal parts” of the system “were first suggested in the heat of controversy” (ibid. p. 285)— an explanation which seems to him to throw some light upon the question. Obviously, a writer thus incompetent to appreciate the bearings of the most vital doctrines of Christianity was not a very competent historian of thought. Priestley, however, perceives, what was indeed sufficiently palpable, that Platonism had played a great part in the development of Christian dogma. The Platonists, he tells us, “pretended to be no more than the expositors of a more ancient doctrine;” which he traces through Parmenides, the Pythagoreans, and Orpheus, to “the secret lore of the Egyptian priests.” Another stream of tradition had reached the Romans from “their Trojan ancestors,” who had received it from Phrygia, where it had been planted by Dardanus “as early as the 9th century after Noah's flood.” Dardanus brought it from Samothrace, where the “‘Three Mighty Ones” were worshipped under the name of the Cabirim. Thus the  Platonic Trinity, and the Roman Jupiter, Juno, and Minerva, were shown to be simply faint reflections of an early revelation communicated to the patriarchs before the days of Moses (Horsley, Tracts, p. 43-45). See, besides the works above referred to, Brougham, Lives of Philosophers of the Time of George III, p. 83 sq.; De Quincey, Philosophical Writers, 2, 262; Mackintosh, Miscell. Works. 3, 170; Lond. Gentlemaln's Magazine, April, 1804, p. 375 sq.; Edinb. Rev. 1806, p. 136 sq.; Norton, Views of Christian Truth, Piety, and Morality (Lond. 12mo); Lond. Qu. Rev. Dec. 1812, p. 430; Lindsey, Vindiciae Priestleianae (1785, 2 vols. 8vo); Christian Examiner, 12:257 sq.; Stevens, Hist. of English Thought in the 18th Century, 1, 429 sq.; Leckey, Hist. of Rationalism, and his Hist. of the 18th Century; Morell, Hist. of Modern Philosophy, p. 101 sq.; Taylor, Retrospect of Religious Life in England (1845); Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines, 2, 441 sq.; N. Y. Christian Advocate, 1877; Perry, Hist of the Church of England, 3, 432-434; Blakey, Hist. of the Philosophy of Mind, 3, 230 sq., 302 sq.; Cousin, Hist. of Modern Philosophy, lect. 13:14.

## Priestley, Thomas[[@Headword:Priestley, Thomas]]

             an English divine of the Independent body, flourished near the close of the last century. He was the brother of Joseph Priestley (q.v.), but their theological tenets differed widely. Thomas was the editor of the Christian Magazine, and published, Evangelical Bible, or Paraphrase, Exposition, and Commentary, with copious Notes and suitable Reflections (1791, fl.): — Rev. Mr. Scott's Life and Death (1791, 8vo): — a Funeral Sermon (1791, 8vo): — Family Exercises (1792, 8vo; 1793, 8vo).

## Priests Rooms[[@Headword:Priests Rooms]]

             The chaplains in Great Britain frequently had chambers over porches or sacristies, as at St. Peter's-in-the-East. Oxford; in Ireland, over the vault of the church, as at Cashel, Mellifont, Holy Cross, and Kilkenny; in Scotland, at Iona, over the aisles.

## Priests, Marriage of[[@Headword:Priests, Marriage of]]

             The obligation of perpetual virginity imposed by the Church of Rome upon those who receive higher orders has been spoken of in another article. SEE CELIBACY. In the ancient Church married men (but no bigamists) were sometimes received into priesthood, without dissolution of their matrimony; but it was never allowed to one who had received higher orders to marry. If such a case occurred, the service of the Church had to be renounced. In the West we find, in the middle of the 10th century (Conc. August. Song of Solomon 1), the ordinance that the bishops, priests, deacons, and subdeacons who contract marriage are to be deposed from their functions. Hence it would seem plain that the orders were not then considered as an impediment to marriage, while the solemn vow was  considered as such (Conc. Troisliens, cap. 1, a, 909). The Lateran Council of 1123 declares the matrimony contracted by a priest, etc., as one to be dissolved (disjungi, can. 21); that of 1139 declares it not existing at all (matrimonium non esse censemus, Song of Solomon 7). The Council of Trent (sess. 24:can. 9) repeated the same declaration, and, in virtue of the powers of the Church (Song of Solomon 4, 1. c.), puts the orders again into the number of the dissolving impediments to matrimony. The same council decreed, further, that sons of clergymen cannot discharge a clerical function in a place where their father is or was in office (sess. 25:cap. 15, De ref.). ‘The Greek Church imposes celibacy on the higher dignitaries-the bishops-but not on the priests and lower functionaries of the Church. The latter cannot, it is true, marry after receiving the orders, but are allowed to continue in the matrimonial relations contracted before ordination. But no second marriage is tolerated. The Russian Church, however, refuses ordination to her priests as long as they are unmarried, i.e. ordains only married men. If the priest becomes a widower, he retires to monastic life. In the Greek Oriental Church there are unmarried priests: they remain in office after the death of their wives, unless they prefer to marry again. In Greece married priests are distinguished from the unmarried ones by their head-gear: the former wear very low round hats. See Lea, Sacerdotal Celibacy (Index, under Marriage).

## Prileszky, John Baptist[[@Headword:Prileszky, John Baptist]]

             a learned Hungarian Jesuit, was born at Priless March 16, 1709, and, after attaining to the doctorate in philosophy and theology, taught in several colleges of his order. He was for five years chancellor of the University of Tyrnau. He died after 1773. He wrote, Acta Sanctorum Hungarics (Tyrnau. 1743-44, 8vo): — Notitia Sanctorum, Patrum trium priorum Saeculorum (ibid. 1759): — Acta et Scripta S. Cypriani (ibid. 1761, fol.): — Acta et Scripta S. Theophili, Patriarchae Antiocheni et Minutii Felicis (Vienna, 1764, 8vo): — Acta et Scripta S. Irencei (Kaschau, 1765, 8vo):  — Acta e Scripta S. Gregorii Neo-Caesariensis, Douyeii Alexandrini et Methodii Lycii (ibid. 1766, 8vo) Hoefer. Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.

## Primacy[[@Headword:Primacy]]

             is the office held

(1) by him who is the pope of Rome, and therefore highest in the Christian Church, according to those who accept the assertions of the papacy; and

(2) by him who is next in rank to the patriarch (1. 5.). SEE PRIMATE. The primacy of Peter, as the pope's office is sometimes styled, Romanists claim to be of divine appointment. They assert that the apostle Peter, by Christ's authority, had a primacy or sovereign authority and jurisdiction over the other apostles. Since the Godman Jesus the Christ, they say, has himself willed the continuance of the Church and her fundamental unity, Peter and his successors were also established by the will of God. The power to bind and to loose, SEE KEYS, POWER OF THE, was given to the apostles in a body (Mat 18:8); but, in order to preserve their power and unity, Peter was put at their head and endowed with higher honors (Mat 16:16-18; Mat 17:4, etc.). He became the primus inter pares, not so much for his own sake as for a precedent; “for it would be unreasonable,” says Sauter, “to consider the primacy he held to have died with him, in view of the end for which Christ had appointed him to it. It appears, on the contrary, that Christ instituted the primacy more in view of the future than to meet the requirements of the apostolic times, when the personal purity of each of the apostles rendered such a measure less necessary” (Fundamenta juris ecclesiastici Catholicorum [3(1 ed. Rotwile, 1825], § 62; see also Zeitschrift für Phil. und kath. Theologie [Cologne, 1832], 4:121, 122).

By the example of Peter, Christ showed, in a general way, that some one of the bishops was always to be considered as primate by the others; but, add those who put a liberal interpretation on the Romish assertion of supremacy, it is by no means clear from the writings of the primitive fathers that the primacy was attached to a particular bishopric. Circumstances favored Rome, whose bishop was acknowledged by the other bishops as the successor of Peter (in the primacy). The bishops of Rome cannot have the primacy by divine appointment, but in a mediate manner, so that, when the good of the Church demands it, it can be transferred to another of the bishops (Sauter, § 63, 64). But the  Ultramontanes maintain that by the same authority by which Peter was set apart for the supremacy his own successors were also established. Peter, it is true, founded different communities and provided them with bishops, yet no other can be considered as his true successor than he who succeeded him after his death, and this is the bishop of Rome. The Roman bishop had, by his Roman episcopal dignity, a right similar to that in virtue of which the next relation succeeds in worldly principalities, and the Ultramontanes assert that Peter himself chose for his successor, in all his dignities, the same Linus mentioned by Paul in his Second Epistle to Timothy, 4:21 (Phillips, Kirchenrecht, 1, 146).

This system of ideas, so simple in appearance, has only by degrees developed itself and obtained dogmatical sanction in the Latin Church. It is based on facts which have been variously appreciated, and on decisions which have by no means received the same interpretation at all hands. The whole deduction is founded on arbitrary declarations, inasmuch as the bishops were, and are still, party and judge in the same cause; they, whose title is in question, claim the exclusive right of explaining words and facts, and consider any one who doubts their assertions as being disobedient to Christ and to God. Impartial thinkers of the Roman Church itself cannot help acknowledging that before the middle of the 3rd century there was no primacy perceptible in the Church (see Mohler, Die Einhteit der Kirche, oder das Principe des Katholicismmus, dargestellt im Geiste der Kirchenvelfaissung der drei ersten Jahrhunlderte [2nd ed. Tübingen, 1843]); while others, by arbitrary arrangement of historical facts, arrive at the conclusion “that the Roman bishops not only claimed the highest authority in all ecclesiastical matters since the first times of Christianity, but that these pretensions, founded on Christ's declarations were acknowledged by the whole Church, especially by the episcopate” (see Phillips, Kirchenrecht, p. 156). This is not the place to show, by the history of the Roman bishops of the first centuries, how indefensible such an assumption must appear: we must leave this to the special articles of this work, contenting ourselves with calling the attention of the reader to the principal features of the development of the primacy.

Among the numerous works written on the subject, we mention in favor of it: Bibliotheca maximan Pontificica, in qua authores melioris notce qui hactenus pro S. Romanall Sede scripserunt, fere omnes continentur, promovente Fr. H. Tom. de Roceaberti (Romae, 1689. 21 vols. fol.); A. Daude, Majestas Hierarchicea cul. Sulmmi Pontificis (Bamb. 1761, 2 vols. 4to); Peter Ballerini, De Tiac Ratione Primatuus, etc. (Augsb. 1770,  2 vols. 4to; ed. nov. by Westhoff); J. Roskovany, De Primatu Romani Pontficis ejusque Juribus (ibid. 1834, 8vo); Rothensee, Der Primat des Papsles in allen Jahrhunderten, herausgegeben von Räss und Weiss (Mainz, 1836, 4 vols. 8vo). Against it: Ellendorf, Der Primlat der romischen Päpste (Darmst. 1841 and 1846, 2 vols. 8vo); Barrel, Du Pape et ses Droits religieux (Paris, 1803); Le Maistre, Du Pope (ibid. 1820); Gosselin, Pouvoir due Pape au Moyen Age (Louvain, 1845, 2 vols. 8vo). These and other works have been extensively used by Phillips in his Canon Law, the fifth volume of which (Ratisbon, 1857) is entirely devoted to the subject of primacy.

Generally the testimony of Irenaeus (d. 202) and of Cyprian (d. 258) are specially invoked to show that the primacy of the Roman bishops was accepted in the 21 century. But the former (Adversus Haeres. lib. 3, cap. 3), in order to demonstrate the truth of the Catholic doctrine, appeals to the tradition of all the sees founded by the apostles; for Italy and the West, he names especially Rome as being the only Occidental see of undisputed apostolic foundation. The potior principalitas mentioned by Irenieus designates the political situation of the city, which could not fail to enhance its ecclesiastical importance. In the same way, Constantinople, at a later period, took the second place in the hierarchy, as being a second Rome (Concil. Constantinop. ann. 381, Song of Solomon 3; comp. Bickell, Geschichte des Kirchenrechts, 1, 209 sq.). The ideas of Cyprian about the unity of the Church logically led to primacy, yet the relations lie himself maintained to the Roman bishop do not imply the acknowledgment of a prerogative like that which is supposed to be advocated in his book De Unitate Ecclesiae, and in his letters in favor of Rome. Its foundation by an apostle, and the authority of the first metropolis of the Roman Empire, gave at an early period a great importance to the see of Rome; but the same importance is attributed to the bishop of Alexandria and of Antioch, in the 3rd canon of the Council of Nice, in 325. At that council the Roman bishop did not exercise a higher authority than the other bishops. This is clearly shown by the acts of the council, signed by two presbyters, “instead of our pope,” i.e. bishop (see Analecta Nicceana— fragments relating to the Council of Nice-by Harris Cowpers [London and Edinburgh, 1857]). It was at a later period attempted to give Song of Solomon 6 Nic. Cone., another form than the primitive by adding at the beginning the words “Quod ecclesia Romana semper habuit primatum” (see Gieseler, Kirchengeschichte, 1, § 91).

The struggle for the maintenance of the orthodox doctrine o as extremely advantageous  to the bishops of Rome, and the Council of Sardica (343) emphasized most decidedly the pre-eminence of the Roman see in the Western Church: the Oriental bishops on that occasion protested and left the assembly. lThe resolutions of Sardica were not at once accepted even in the Western Church. At the request of the bishop Damasus, and of a Roman synod of 378, the emperor Gratian issued a rescript in favor of Rome (Gieseler, 1. c. § 92, n. 1). In 445 an edict of Valentinian III proclaims the primacy of the bishop of Rome over the whole Church— a primacy which, besides the higher rank over the bishops, includes a supreme ecclesiastical legislation and jurisdiction. The emperor founds this preference on the primacy of Peter (“sedis apostolicee primatum, sancti Petri meritum, qui princeps est episcopalis coronae”), on the political importance of Rome (“Romanae dignitas civitatis”), and on the Synod of Sardica (“sacrae synodi auctoritas”) (comp. Richter, Kirchenrecht [6th ed.], § 22, n. 3). But the Church of the East was by no means subordinated to the Roman see; the Council of Chalcedon, 451, in can. 28, declares that the see of Constantinople has the same privileges in the Eastern Church which in the Western Church belong to Rome (τὰ ἴσα πρεσβεῖα ἀπέμειναν τῷ τῆς νέας ῾Ρώμης ἁγιωτάτῳ θρόνῳ). If, in later times, the first place in the Roman empire is acknowledged to belong to Rome (c. 7, pr. c. 8, C. de Summa Trinitate [1, 1]; Justinian, a. 533, No. 9, 131, c. 2, a. 535, 545, etc.), this was only a distinction of honor without any practical consequences; for the patriarch of Constantinople was also the highest instance (c. 29, C. de Episcop. Audientia [1, 4], a. 530, No. 137, c. 5, a. 564, etc.). The ecclesiastical authority of Rome was not contested after that, but its relation to the worldly powers passed through many vicissitudes. Its connection with the newly founded Germanic churches was at first prevented by their Arianism, but became the closer after their conversion to the orthodox faith. The Roman principles about the relations of the Church to the apostolic see prevailed in the Frankish empire by the exertions of Boniface, although their practical consequences were impeded by the independent exercise of the rights of the State in Church matters.

With Charlemagne the pope was nothing but the first metropolitan, over whom the emperor had jurisdiction. The king is the supreme judge and legislator, a protector and ruler given to the Church by God, who corrects or approves the resolutions of the synods, and issues himself ecclesiastical ordinances, after taking the advice of the clergy. The proof of this is afforded by a large number of capitularies. Under the weak successors of the great emperor there was a change, which the decretals of Pseudo-  Isidore turned to the advantage of Rome. It was in conformity with these principles that Nicholas I administered the Church (from 858). The German kings of the house of Saxony regained the lost power, and the Roman bishops were again reduced to the primacy of honor. We see the German bishops, under Otto I, appointed by the emperor himself, governing their dioceses independently, and the episcopate, in their synods, presided over by the emperor, exercise jurisdiction over the Roman bishop (deposition of John XII, in 963, by the Roman council). These principles were in force until the middle of the 11th century. The bishop of Rome was then subordinated to the emperor and to the body of the episcopate (in 1046, at the Synod of Sutri, by which Benedict VIII, Sylvester III, and Gregory VI were deposed). Under Gregory VII a reaction took place, and the papacy was enabled to obtain the whole extent of authority which Pseudo-Isidore claimed as its own.

The hierarchical system of papacy was completed by this Gregory and his successors-Alexander III (1159-1181), Innocent III (1198-1216), Gregory IX (1227-1241), Innocent IV (1243-1254), and Boniface VIII (1294-1303). The so-called Dictatus Hildebrandini, the authenticity of which is proved by the regests of Gregory VII (comp. Gieseler, Kirchengesch. II 1, § 47, n. d; Giesebrecht, De Gregorii VII registro emendando [Regimont. 1858], p. 5), and the decretals of the popes mentioned, contain the propositions peculiar to this system, the most essential of which are: The bishop of Rome is the vicar of Christ on earth (“Romanus Pontifex vicarius Jesu Christi, quod non puri hominis, sed veri Dei vicem gerit in terris” [Innoc. III, in c. 2, 3, 10:De Translat. Episcop. 1, 7]), the universal bishop (“solus universalis” [Gregorii Dict. No. 2]), to whom alone belongs the title of pope (“quod unicum est nomen in mundo” [ibid. c. 11]). He is possessed of full powers, and he grants parts of them to the rest of the clergy, as his assistants (“Quia diversitatem corporum diversitas saepe sequitur animorum, ne plenitude ecclesiasticae jurisdictionis in plures dispensata vilesceret, sed in uno potius collata vigeret, apostolicae sedi Dominus in B. Petro universam ecclesiarum et cunctorum Christi fidelium magistrium contulit et primatum, quae, retenta sibi plenitudine potestatis, ad implendum laudabilius officium pastorale, quod omnibus eam constituit debitricem, multos in partem sollicitudinis evocavit, sic suum dispensans onus et honorem in alios, ut nihil suo juri subtraheret, nec jurisdictionem suam in aliquo minoraret” [Innoc. III, in c. 5, 10: De Concess. Praebendae, 3, 8]). It is, of course, his own business how he chooses his assistants; the rights of appointing, deposing, permuting bishops belong to him exclusively; he can draw every cause  before the apostolic see, judge it himself, or take it back from the judge he had appointed, and give it to another one, especially to his personal lieutenant, a legate, who, of course, has pre-eminence over all other dignitaries (‘Quod ille solus possit deponere episcopos vel reconciliare. — Quod legatus ejus omnibus episcopis preesit in concilio, etiam inferioris gradus, et adversus eos sententiam depositionis possit dare. — Quod illi liceat de sede ad sedem necessitate cogente episcopos transmutare.Quod de omni ecclesia, quacunque voluerit, clericum valeat ordinare. — Quod majores causue cujuscunque ecclesiae ad sedem apostolicam referri debeant” [Dictatus Gregorii VII, Nos. 3, 4, 13, 14, 21, 25, etc.]). The Roman bishop is the legislator of the Church (“Quod illi soli licet pro temporis necessitate novas leges condere,” etc. [1. c. No. 7]). Without his consent, no synod can take place (“Quod nulla synodus absque praecepto ejus debet generalis vocari” [1. c. 16]). He is infallible, and decides what is true (“Quod nullum capitulum nullusque liber canonicus habeatur absque illius auctoritate. — Quod Romana ecclesia nunquam erravit, nec in perpetuum, scriptura testante, errabit” [1. c. 17, 22]). He recognizes no authority, while all are subordinated to his authority (“Quod sententia illius a nullo debeat retractari, et ipse omnium solus retractare possit.Quod a nemine ipse judicari debeat. — Quod nullus audeat condemnare apostolicam sedem appellantem” El. c. 18-20]).

The papal system, a product of feudalism, according to which all authority rests in the sovereign, involves, in its last consequence, the political domination. The Dictatus Gregorii contain the following declarations: “Quod solus Papa possit uti imperialibus insigniis” (No. 8); “Quod solius Papae pedes omnes principes deosculentur (No. 9); “Quod illi libeat imperatores deponere” (No. 12); “Quod a fidelitate iniquorum subjectos possit absolvere” (No. 27). Boniface VIII, trying to act up to these principles, involved himself in a terrible conflict with France, which ended in the defeat of the Roman see. Now people began to bethink themselves again of the principles which had prevailed before Gregory VII, on the relations of the Church, and the council which represents her, to the bishop of Rome, and the old principles were reinstated in vigor. The result of the war which has since been waged, with many interruptions and vicissitudes, between the pope and the bishops is a modification and practical attenuation of the strict papal or curial system; yet the latter has been victorious, and is now generally acknowledged. The consequences of this system in regard to the relations of the Roman Catholic Church to the  State, the right of granting royal titles (Phillips, 1. c. 5, 684 sq.), and other prerogatives, by which the rights of sovereigns were limited or even denied, have long disappeared from practice; yet the pope never retracted the principle, and never failed to avail himself of such circumstances as allowed him to proclaim it and to apply it to special cases (see A. de Roskovany, Monunmenta Catholica pro Independentia Potestatis Ecclesiasticae ab Imperio Civili [Quinque Ecclesiis, 1847], vol. 2). The Austrian Concordat of Aug. 18, 1855, art. 2, says: “Cum Romanus pontifex primatum tam honoris quam jurisdictionis in universam, qua late patet, ecclesiam jure divine obtineat, episcoporum, cleri, et populi mutuo cum Sancta Sede communicatio in rebus spiritualibus et negotiis ecclesiasticis nulli placetum regium obtinendi necessitas suberit, sed prorsus libera erit;” and the allocution of Pius IX, at the publication of the Concordat, says: “Cum Romanus pontifex Christi his in terris vicarius et beatissimi apostolorum principis successor primatum . . . divino obtineat jure, tumr Catholicum hoc dogma in ipsa conventione luculentissimis fuit verbis expressum, ac propterea simul de medio sublata et radicitus evulsa peccatusque deleta falsa perversa illa et funestissima opinio eidem divino primatui ejusque juribus plane adversa et ab hac Apostolica Sede semper damnata atque proscripta, de habenda scilicet a civili gubernio venia, vel executione eorum, quee res spirituales et ecclesiastica negotia respiciunt.” The principle is also saved in those cases where it is allowed to the State, only in consideration of the circumstances (temporum tratione habita). to decide by worldly procedure, in merely civil affairs of the clergy, or even in criminal matters in which they are involved (Austr. Conc. art. 12:etc.).

The papal rights relate to the supreme government of the Roman Catholic Church, and to the honors derived from it. Distinction is made between rights essential to the existence of the primacy (jura essentialia, primigenia, natulalia) and those which have been gradually added to the others, but are not absolutely indispensable to the primacy (jura accidentalia, acquisita, secundaria) (Sauter, § 466; Droste-Hiilshoff, Grundsistze des gemeinen Kirchenrechts, 2, pt. 1, § 132 sq.; Eichhorn, Kirchenrecht, 1, 579 sq.; Roskovany, De Primatut Pontiflcis Romani [Augustae Vindelicor. 1834]. § 44 sq.; § 54 sq.). As essentials we find, first, the primacy of honor and of jurisdiction, of the highest consideration and of general government, including discipline, the right of legislation, devolution, and protection. Among the additional rights or privileges are  the jurisdiction in causae arduae ac majores, the decision in last resort of the reserved cases, etc. The primacy of the papal jurisdiction comprises

(1.) The Representation of the Roman Catholic Church. — As the representative head, the pope has, partly in proper person, partly in co- operation with the cardinals, to defend the general interests and special concerns of the Church with the exterior powers. He has to make conventions with the different states concerning the clerical institutions existing in them and directly subordinated to the papal see.

(2.) The Supreme Ecclesiastical Legislation. — The pope issues decrees as well about subjects of discipline as of doctrine, and secures the approbation of the Church by the convocation of a council or by other means. The necessity of the approbation of the council is not recognized by the pope. As the pope, speaking ex cathedra, cannot err according to the doctrine of the Church, all members of the Catholic Church are bound in such case to submit to the decision of the sovereign pontiff. This principle was solemnly recognized at the proclamation of the dogma of the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary. But the papal infallibility does not extend to matters of fact. Bellarmine himself says (De Romano Pontifice, lib. 4, cap. 2), “Conveniunt omnes posse Pontificem, et cum ccetu consiliorum vel cum generali concilio, errare in controversiis facti particularibus, quue ex informatione testimoniisque hominum pruecipue pendent.” Appeals from Pontifice male informnato ad melius imfoirmnandum have always been in use. In virtue of his legislative powers, the pope can dispensate and authentically interpret; and in virtue of the same he orders the resolutions of the provincial synods to be re-examined and approved by the Congregatio Concilii (Benedict XIV, De Synodo Dioecesana, lib. 13:cap. 3, No. 6).

(3.) The Highest Ecclesiastical Supervision. — Reports from all dioceses are regularly sent to the pope. The bishops, by the oath they have to take before their consecration, are bound to appear in person (“Limina apostolorum singulis annis aut per me aut per certum nuntium visitabo, nisiabsolvar”); but the visitatio liminum can be replaced by a relatio status diceceseos, which must take place in conformity with an instruction of Benedict XIV (De Synodo Diaecesana, lib. 13, cap. 7 sq.).

(4.) The Highest Ecclesiastical Administration (Regimen Ecclesiae). — It comprises the decision in the causae arduce ac majores. To these belong the causae episcopoani—namely, the confirmation of elected, the  admission of postulated bishops; the consecration, permutation, deposition; acceptation of resignations; appointment of coadjutors; foundation, division, fusion of dioceses; collation of the pallium; confirmation and suppression of clerical orders and ecclesiastical institutions; beatification and canonization; the acknowledgment of relics; the establishment and abrogation of general religious feasts; the right of decision in reserved cases. In virtue of his supremacy, the pope has also a right, in case of insufficient, faulty administration of the clerical dignitaries, to take the government in his own hands, and do everywhere what is wanted. On the right of administration is also founded the right of imposing ecclesiastical taxes.

I. Primacy of Honor. —

(1.) The pope has not only preeminence over the clerical dignitaries, but is traditionally recognized even by the worldly powers. The political authorities, in their conventions with him, allow his name to stand first.

(2.) The title and the qualifications connected with it underwent some changes. The name of pope belongs, since Gregory VII's time, exclusively to the bishop of Rome; likewise the designation of Summus Pontifex. Pontifex Maximus was only at a later period reserved for him. Gregory I declined the title of Patriarcha Universalis (see cap. 4, 5, (list. 99), and preferred being called Servus Servorum Dei, a designation which has since become official (comp. Thomassin, Vetus ec Nova Ecclesie Disciplina, lib. 1, pt. 1, cap. 4, 50. No. 14; Ferraris, Bibliotheca Canonica, s.v.; Papa, art. 2, No. 33-35; Phillips, 1. c. 5. 599 sq.). The qualification of sanctus is also, in early times, specially applied to the Roman bishops. In the Dictatus Greqorii VII, No. 23, we read, “Quod Romanus Pontifex, si canonice fuerit ordinatus, meritis B. Petri indubitanter efficitur sanctus, testante S. Ennodio Papiensi Episcopo, ei multis SS. Patribus faventibus. sicut in decretis B. Svmmachi P. continetur.” Therefore the usual address is “sanctissime pater” (holy father). (For the homage formerly paid him and his pastoral ensigns, SEE POPE; for the supremacy of the pope over councils, SEE SUPREMACY; for the relation of the papacy to temporal possessions, SEE TEMPORAL POWER OF THE POPE; SEE ROMANISM. )

In answer to the Roman Catholic doctrine of the primacy we here subjoin the heads of Barrow's famous argument against it in his treatise On the  Supremacy (Works [Lond. 1841], vol. 3). He says there may be “a primacy of worth or personal excellency; a primacy of reputation; a primacy of order or bare dignity and precedence; a primacy of power and jurisdiction.

1. The first — a primacy of worth — we may well grant to Peter, for probably he did exceed the rest of his brethren in personal endowments and capacities.

2. A primacy of repute, which Paul means when he speaks of those who had a special reputation, of those who seemed to be pillars of the supereminent apostles (Gal 2:6; Gal 2:9; 2Co 11:5; 2Co 12:11). [This advantage cannot be refused him, being a necessary consequence of those eminent qualities resplendent in him, and of the illustrious performances achieved by him beyond the rest. This may be inferred from that renown which he has had from the beginning; and likewise from his being so constantly ranked in the first place before the rest of his brethren.]

3. As to a primacy of order or bare dignity, importing that commonly, in all meetings and proceedings, the other apostles did yield him the precedence, it may be questioned; for this does not seem suitable to the gravity of such persons, or their condition and circumstances, to stand upon ceremonies of respect; for our Lord's rules seem to exclude all semblance of ambition, all kind of inequality and distance between his apostles. [But yet this primacy may be granted as probable upon divers accounts of use and convenience; it might be useful to preserve order, and to promote expedition, or to prevent confusion, distraction, and dilatory obstruction in the management of things.]

4. As to a primacy importing a superiority in command, power, or jurisdiction, this we have great reason to deny upon the following considerations:

(1.) For such a power it was needful that a commission from God, its founder, should be granted in absolute and perspicuous terms; but no such commission is extant in Scripture.

(2.) If so illustrious an office was instituted by our Savior, it is strange that nowhere in the evangelical or apostolical history there should be any express mention of that institution.

(3.) If Peter had been instituted sovereign of the apostolical senate, his office and state had been in nature and kind very distinct from the common  office of the other apostles, as the office of a king from the office of any subject [and probably would have been dignified by some distinct name, as that of arch-apostle, arch-pastor, the vicar of Christ, or the like; but no such name or title was assumed by him, or was by the rest attributed to him].

(4.) There was no office above that of an apostle known to the apostles or primitive Church (Eph 4:11; 1Co 12:28).

(5.) Our Lord himself declared against this kind of primacy, prohibiting his apostles to affect, to seek, to assume, or admit a superiority of power, one above another (Luk 22:14-24; Mar 9:35).

(6.) We do not find any peculiar administration committed to Peter, nor any privilege conferred on him which was not also granted to the other apostles (Mat 20:23; Mar 16:15).

(7.) When Peter wrote two catholic epistles, there does not appear in either of them any intimation or any pretence to this arch-apostolical power.

(8.) In all relations which occur in Scripture about controversies incident to doctrine or practice, there is no appeal made to Peter's judgment or allegation of it as decisive, no argument is built on his authority.

(9.) Peter nowhere appears intermeddling as a judge or governor paramount in such cases [yet where he does himself deal with heretics and disorderly persons, he proceeds not as a pope, decreeing, but as an apostle, warning, arguing, and persuading against them].

(10.) The consideration of the apostles proceeding in the conversion of people, in the foundation of churches, and in administration of their spiritual affairs will exclude any probability of Peter's jurisdiction over them. [They went about their business, not by order or license from Peter, but according to special direction of God's Spirit.]

(11.) The nature of the apostolic ministry-their not being fixed in one place of residence, but continually moving about the world-the state of things at that time, and the manner of Peter's life, render it unlikely that he had such a jurisdiction over the apostles as some assign him.

(12.) It was indeed most requisite that every apostle should have a complete, absolute, independent authority in managing the duties and concerns of the office, that he might not anywise be obstructed in the  discharge of them, not clogged with a need to consult others, not hampered with orders from those who were at a distance.

(13.) The discourse and behavior of Paul towards Peter are evidence that he did not acknowledge any dependence on him, or any subjection to him (Gal 2:11).

(14.) If Peter had been appointed sovereign of the Church, it seems that it should have been requisite that he should have outlived all the apostles; for otherwise the Church would have wanted a head, or there must have been an inextricable controversy who that head was. But Peter died long before John, as all agree, and perhaps before divers others of the apostles.”

From these arguments we must see what little ground the Church of Rome has to derive the supremacy of the pope from the supposed primacy of Peter. SEE POPE.

## Primas[[@Headword:Primas]]

             SEE PRIMATE.

## Primat, Claude-Francois-Marie[[@Headword:Primat, Claude-Francois-Marie]]

             a French prelate, was born at Lyons July 26, 1747. He studied, at the expense of the Chapter of St. John, at Lyons, and entered the brotherhood of the Oratorians. From the college at Marseilles he went to that of Dijon, where he became professor of rhetoric and theology. At the age of twenty- eight he was ordained a priest, and became a successful preacher. In 1786 he was made curate of St. James at Douai. During the revolutionary agitation he gave his support to the republican cause by taking the required oath. He was made constitutional bishop of the North March 27, 1791, and established the seat of his episcopacy at Cam bray. He resigned office Nov. 13, 1793, and had even the weakness to return to the convention his letters of priesthood. But this step did not prevent him from presiding over a diocesan synod held at Lille in 1797. He assisted at the council held at Paris at the end of that year, and was transferred by his associates to the bishopric of Rhone and Loire Feb. 1798. At this time he composed a paper to justify his oath of hatred to royalty, which was found in the actions of that council. After the Concordat, he was chosen, April 9, 1802, archbishop of Toulouse, where by his mild measures he triumphed over all obstacles. As primate he was present at the coronation of Napoleon I, and the pallium was conferred upon him Jan. 16, 1805. He was finally chosen  senator and count of the empire May 19, 1806; and during the Hundred Days he was called to a seat in the Chamber of Peers, June 4,1815. He died at Toulouse Oct. 10, 1816. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.

## Primate[[@Headword:Primate]]

             (Lat. primus; Fr. primat, first) is the title of a grade in the hierarchy immediately below the rank of patriarch (q.v.). In point of jurisdiction the primacy was, historically, developed out of the episcopate by papal communication of primatial rights. The primates, in this sense of the word, are more particularly an institution of the West; for although the Greek denomination ἔξαρχος is generally translated by primuus, there are unmistakable differences. The exarchs of the East were subordinated to no patriarch, and were, so far as rights are concerned, their equals in their dioceses and only in rank were they their inferiors. Such relations were out of the question in the Western Church, where the patriarchate was held by the papal primate in the person of the bishop of Rome, who was recognized as possessing universal supreme jurisdiction. The primates, as such, were metropolitans who enjoyed a preeminence of jurisdiction over the other bishops of a country. This pre-eminence was founded on their right of consecrating the other metropolitans and bishops, of convoking national councils, of receiving appeals, etc. Originally this dignity was connected with the nomination to a pontifical vicariate, as was the case with the bishop of Arles, and it rested, in general, on an explicit appointment by the pope. There was one exception to that in the person of the bishop of Carthage, who, though not assuming the primatial title, exerted all the rights implied by it in Africa. The relation in which the primacy almost everywhere stood to the national interests, which obliged its bearers, as the first bishops of the State, to take some share in the political concerns, exercised a detrimental influence, and led some of them to assert overbearing pretensions contrary to the authority of the head of the Church. The importance of the primacy has melted away in the course of time, and in most cases nothing remains of it but some exterior distinctions. The chief primatial sees of the West were: in Spain — Seville and Tarragona (afterwards united in Toledo); in France-Arles. Rheims, Lyons, and Rouen (among whom the archbishop of Lyons claims the title of primat des primats, “primate of the primates”); in England-Canterbury; in Germany — Mainz, Salzburg, and Trier; in Ireland — Armagh, and for the Pale, Dublin; in Scotland — St. Andrews; in Hungar — Gran; in Poland-Gnesen; and in the Northern kingdoms-Lund.  In the Church of England the archbishop of Canterbury is styled primate of all England; the archbishop of York, primate of England. In Ireland, the archbishop of Armagh is primate of all Ireland, and the archbishop of Dublin, primate of Ireland. The title of primate in England and Ireland confers no jurisdiction beyond that of archbishop. The name prinus is applied in the Scottish Episcopal Church to the presiding bishop. He is chosen by the bishops out of their own number, without their being bound to give effect to seniority of consecration or precedency of diocese.

## Prime[[@Headword:Prime]]

             (Lat. prima, the first—i.e. hour), the first of the so-called “lesser hours” of the Roman Breviary (q.v.). It may be called the public morning prayer (of that Church, and corresponds in substance with the morning service of the other ancient liturgies, allowance being made for Latin peculiarities. Prime commences with the beautiful hymn of Prudentius. Joam luais oato sidere, which is followed by three and occasionally four psalms (22, 26:54, 118); but the last portion consists of the opening verses of the 118th (in the A.V. the 159, 1-3-2) Psalm, which is continued throughout the rest of the “lesser hours.” Prime concludes with prayers appropriate to the beginning of a Christian's day. See Procter, Commentary on the Book of Common Prayer, p. 187. SEE CANONICAL HOURS.

## Prime, Ebenezer[[@Headword:Prime, Ebenezer]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Milford, Conn., July 21, 1700, graduated at Yale College in 1718, and at the age of nineteen was assistant of the Rev. Eliphalet Jones, pastor at Huntington, L.I., whose colleague he became four years after. He remained in charge of this congregation until his death, Sept. 25, 1779 (according to another account, Oct. 3). For a period of nearly seven years, from 1766 to 1773, he had an assistant, but during the troubled times of the Revolution the whole charge rested with him, and he was even obliged at one time to flee from his dwelling, and live in retirement for a season in a solitary neighborhood of his congregation. He is the progenitor of a family of eminent Presbyterian divines. Mr. Prime published a Discourse on the Nature of Ordination. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 3, 30 sq.

## Prime, Edward Dorr Griffin, D.D[[@Headword:Prime, Edward Dorr Griffin, D.D]]

             an eminent Presbyterian minister was born at Cambridge, N. Y., November 2, 1814. Graduating from Union College in 1832, he spent some tinme in teaching, then studied medicine for a time, but finally studied for the ministry, graduating from Princeton Seminary in 1838, serving as pastor for some time. From 1856 he was associated with his brother in editorial labor on the New York Observer. He died April 7, 1891. Besides contributing much to periodical literature, he was the author of several works on missions.

## Prime, John[[@Headword:Prime, John]]

             an English divine of some note, flourished in the second half of the 16th century. He was educated at Oxford University, and held at one time a fellowship. He published, The Sacraments (Lond. 1582, 8vo): — Nature and Grace (ibid. 1583, 8vo): — Sermons (Oxon. 1585, 8vo): — Exposition and Observations upon St. Paul to the Galatians (Lond. 1587, 8vo): — The Consolations of David, a sermon on Psa 23:4 (ibid. 1588, 8vo): — Sermons (ibid. 1588, 8vo).

## Prime, Nathaniel Scudder, D.D[[@Headword:Prime, Nathaniel Scudder, D.D]]

             an American divine, was born at Huntington. L. I., April 21, 1785, and educated at Princeton, where he graduated in 1804. He was licensed to preach in the following year in the Presbyterian Church, and was subsequently stationed at Sag Harbor, Freshpond, Smithtown, Cambridge, New York, and other places. He also acted as principal of literary institutions at Cambridge, Sing Sing, and Newburgh, and gained distinction as a teacher. He died suddenly at Mamaroneck, N. J., March 27,1856. Dr. Prime published three single Sermons (1811, 1817, 1825), an Address (1815), and a Charge to the Rev. Samuel Irenaeus Prime (1837), many statistical and other articles in periodicals, and the two following works, Familiar Illustration of Christian Baptism (1818.12mo), in which lie defends infant baptism: — A History of Long Island from its first Settlement by the Europeans to the Year 1845 (N.Y. and Pittsburgh, 1845, 12mo). “He had a mind of uncommon force and discrimination, a noble and generous spirit, simple and engaging manners, an invincible firmness in adhering to his own convictions, an earnest devotion to the best interests of his fellowmen, an excellent talent for the pulpit, great tact at public business, and a remarkably graceful facility at mingling in a deliberative body.”—Sprague. Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 3, 32: Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Prime, Samuel Irenaeus, D.D[[@Headword:Prime, Samuel Irenaeus, D.D]]

             an eminent Presbyterian divine, son of Dr. N.S. Prime, was born at Ballston, Saratoga County, N.Y., November 4, 1812. He graduated from Williams College in 1829, and from Princeton Theological Seminary in 1835; was ordained the same year as pastor at Ballston Spa, in 1837 assumed the same relation at Matteawan, but on account of failing health resigned in 1810, and became editor of the New York Observer; in 1841 one of the secretaries of the American Bible Society; in 1849 editor of the Presbyterian, but the next year resumed the editorship of the Observer, with which he remained connected until, his death, July 18, 1885. Dr. Prime was a fine scholar, a genial Christian, and a facile writer. Besides numerous anonymous works, he published many popular writings, the chief of which are enumerated in Allibone's Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v., the most important being travels and biographies, and several volumes on prayer.

## Prime, Samuel Irenicus, D.D[[@Headword:Prime, Samuel Irenicus, D.D]]

             a noted Presbyterian minister, was born in Ballston, N.Y., November 4, 1812. He graduated from Williams College in 1829; taught for three years, and then entered Princeton Theological Seminary, but before the first year was completed he was attacked by a severe illness, and was never able to resume his studies. He was pastor at Ballston Spa, 1833-35; at Matteawan, 1837-40. Thereafter he was editor of the New York Observer; except in 1849, when he acted as secretary of the American Bible Society, and a few months in 1850, when he edited the Presbyterian. In 1853 he visited Europe, and again in 1866-67, and 1876-77. In 1867 he attended the fifth General Conference of the Evangelical Alliance at Amsterdam. On his return he was elected a corresponding secretary of the American Evangelical Alliance, which position he held until 1884. He was vice-  president and director of the American Tract Society, and of the American and Foreign Christian Union; president of the New York Association for the Advancement of Science and Art; a trustee of Williams College, and president and trustee of Wells College for Women; also a member of a large number of religious, benevolent, and literary societies. He died July 18, 1885. Dr. Prime was the author of over forty volumes, besides pamphlets, addresses, and scattered articles.

## Primer, Kings[[@Headword:Primer, Kings]]

             is an English ecclesiastical document published in 1545, containing the Calendar, the Ten Commandments, the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, the Salutation of the Virgin, the seven penitential psalms, a litany, and prayers for various occasions. It was edited by the authority of King Henry VIII, and hence derives its title. A prefatory admonition to the reader complains of several books calculated to mislead the people in their application to the  saints, and to set God and his creatures on the same level. Though many divines had made a special distinction between λατρεία and δουλεία, and appropriated the first only to God, yet in practice this distinction was too often forgotten.

Besides the King's Primer, there is also the Goodly Prymer of 1535, drawn up by Marshal, archdeacon of Nottingham, and the Manual of Prayers or the Primer in English, of 1539. Primer means first book, and was used often as analogous to the term prayer-book, though it contained selections of services made according to the discretion of the compiler. The Prymer of Salisbury Use bears the date of various years, the first edition being published in 1527. — Eadie, s.v. See Collier, Eccles. Hist. pt. 2, bk. 2; Procter, Commentary on the Book of Common Prayer, p. 12, 75; Wheatly, On the Book of Common Prayer, p. 23.

## Primerose, Gilbert, D.D[[@Headword:Primerose, Gilbert, D.D]]

             a Scotch divine, flourished in the first half of the 17th century, first as minister of the French Church in London, later as chaplain to James I, and still later as canon of Windsor. He died in 1642. His works are, La Trompette de Sion, etc., en XVIII Sermons (Berger, 1610, 8vo; and in Latin by Joan Anchoranum Dantis, 1631, 8vo): — Le Veu de Jacob oppose aux Voeux de Moines (ibid. 1610, 4 vols. 8vo; in English by John Buteel, Lond. 1617, fol.): — La Defense de la Religion reformee contre M. François Blovin (Berger, 1619, 8vo): — Panegyrique au tres-grand Prince Charles, Prince de Galles (Paris, 1624, 8vo): Nine Sermons on Psa 34:19 (Lond. 1625, 4to): Two Sermons on Mat 5:4, and Luk 6:21 (1625, 8vo).

## Primicerius[[@Headword:Primicerius]]

             i.e. the chief of his order (from Lat. primus, first, and cera, wax), one whose name was first inscribed on the tablet of the church, which was covered with wax. The word does not always signify priority of power or jurisdiction; sometimes only priority of time, or precedency of honor or dignity in respect of place. Augustine calls Stephen primicerius martyirum. Bernard calls many primiceria virginitatis. The word is frequently met with in mediaeval Latin, and designates an officer in monasteries. In the Liber Ronmani Ordinis the duties of the office are thus described: Primicerius sciat se esse sub archidiacono, etc.: “The primicerius must understand that he is subordinate to the archdeacon; and to his office it  specially belongs to preside over the deacons during the time that they are communicating instruction; to maintain proper discipline, as one who must render account to God; to furnish the deacons with subjects on which they must discourse,” etc. Du Cange gives various meanings of the term, dependent on the word with which it happens to be connected; as prinicesrius subdiaconorumn, notariorum, lectorum, etc. But in a more restricted sense, primicerius designates the holder of a chapter dignity, andis employed with this specific meaning in Chrodegang's rule, and in the statutes of Amalarius, confirmed by the Synod of Aix-la-Chapelle in 817, where the primicerius appears at the head of the capitulary register, immediately after the archdeacon and archpresbyter. The functions of the primicerius were specially to instruct the deacons, subdeacons, and minorists in the choral song (hence his name of Praecentor; De consuet. 1, 4), in the liturgy, and in the functions of the Church; to inform the canons of the order of the office in the choir; to explain to the younger ones the management of the Breviary, etc. There is a very circumstantial enumeration of the duties of the primicerius in the Epistola Isidori Spal. ad Landefredum Cordub., “De omnibus eccl. gradibus” (comp. c. 1, § 13. Dist. 25 and the fragment of the Ordo Ronanus in c. un. 10: De off. primicerii,” 1, 25). When the archdeacons, in the progressive extension of their importance, obtained the lower jurisdiction over the priests and archpriests, the primicerius obtained also the full disciplinary power over the minorists. His situation in the chapter was therefore one of importance; it is sometimes called a dignity (De consuet. 1, 4), sometimes a personale (De constit. 1, 2), sometimes it is put simply among the offices (officia nudu). There was, in general, no unliform distribution of ranks in the different chapters. When the institution of the Minorites was suppressed, the office of the primicerius was also extinguished.

## Primitiae, Premices[[@Headword:Primitiae, Premices]]

             Primitise is, with the ancient pagans, the name given to the first-fruits of the fields and gardens, which were annually brought as offerings to the temples or abodes of the priests. We find this custom among almost all nations of antiquity and also among the Israelites. Like many other religious customs and institutions of the Jews, this kind of exterior worship, considered as a tribute of gratitude for God's blessings, was adopted by the Christian Church, and urgently recommended by the fathers, the kind and quantity of the gifts being left to be determined by the pious feelings of the individual: “Non erant speciali nomine diffinitae, sed  offerentium arbitrio derelictae” (De decim. et prim. 3, 30). They certainly bore the character of free offerings, while the tithe-with the Jews always, since Moses's time; with the Christians at least since Charlemagne's time- represents a strict right; for, that the premises should not remain below the sixtieth part, and not exceed a fortieth of the complete harvest, is only an approximate indication, to be found in Jerome, Comment. in Ezech. c. 46. With the more general and stricter execution of the laws about the tithe, in the Carlovingian age, the premises disappeared, little by little, or were preserved only in part, and in a changed form.

## Primitive Christianity[[@Headword:Primitive Christianity]]

             is the religion of the New Testament as first exemplified after the establishment of the new faith by that ecclesiastical organization called the Church, under State patronage. SEE PRIMITIVE CHURCH. In distinction from this, we have apostolic Christianity, the period that immediately succeeded the labors of the founder of the New-Testament dispensation. SEE APOSTOLIC CHURCH; SEE CHRISTIANITY.

## Primitive Church[[@Headword:Primitive Church]]

             An expression used to denote the condition of the Church, as respects doctrine and discipline, in the early stages of its history. Though this term is employed with little precision by ecclesiastical writers, it most frequently refers to the Church of the first three centuries. SEE CHURCH.

## Primitive Doctrine[[@Headword:Primitive Doctrine]]

             It is the opinion of some persons that there is a “primitive doctrine,” independent of Scripture, “always to be found somewhere in the Catholic traditions;” by which language, apparently, they mean to teach that the whole doctrine of the Church is not to be found in the Scriptures, nor yet in the writings of the early fathers; but they seem to suppose that some part of the oral teaching of the apostles might, though in an unwritten form, be yet in the possession of the' Church, so that the Church might at any time declare a doctrine not opposed to Scripture, on what is called the unanimous consent of antiquity, to have come down by successive oral delivery from the apostles. The opponents of such views consider that they are incapable of abiding the test of sober examination, because it is not possible for us, at this distance of time from the days of the apostles, to know what they did or did not teach orally, or how far what they really did  teach may not since have been corrupted. They contend, therefore, that to the ancient apostolical writings alone can we look for that which is without doubt to be regarded as ancient apostolical teaching. SEE DOCTRINE; SEE TRADITION.

## Primitive Methodist Connection[[@Headword:Primitive Methodist Connection]]

             is the name of a Wesleyan body of believers principally in England and the British colonies.

During the first decade of the present century stirring reports floated across the Atlantic of the power of God marvelously displayed in the camp meetings of America. The practice of holding religious services in the open air had much declined among British Methodists, as in all the large towns and many of the villages they now had commodious chapels, and the tidings of Pentecostal gatherings in Western forests renewed the memory of the days of Wesley and Whitefield. This renewed interest was increased by the visits of Lorenzo Dow to England and Ireland. On the threshold of this period, a young man of studious habits, named Hugh Bourne, was suffering intensely through an agonizing conviction of sin. From his sixth to his twenty-sixth year, he seldom went to bed without a dread of being in hell before morning; and morning brought him no relief, for he thought he would be in hell before night. He pursued his studies, year after year, with intense zeal, but nowhere in his learning did he find saving knowledge. In 1799, when twenty-seven years of age, there fell in his way a volume containing the Life of Fletcher, some of Wesley's Sermons, Alleine's Alarm, and Baxter's Call to the Unconverted. In one of Wesley's sermons he found “more real light than in anything else he had ever read.” It taught him that “opinion is not religion; . . . even right opinion is as distant from religion as east is from west.” The time of his redemption drew nigh. As he read Fletcher's letters on the manifestation of the Son of God, light flooded his soul. He rapturously tells us, “I was born in an instant; yea, passed from death unto life.... I was filled with joy, love, and glory, which made full amends for the twenty years' suffering.” Soon after his conversion he joined the Wesleyans, and zealously sought the salvation of the rough lumbermen who were in his employment. On May 31, 1807, Mr. Bourne, assisted by Messrs. William Clowes, Thomas Cotton, and others afterwards prominent in the Primitive Methodist Connection, held a camp meeting at Mow Cap, a mountain on the borderline between Staffordshire and Cheshire. Though the Connection did not really exist till three years  later, this is looked upon as the initial point in its history, and its annalists delight to quote the lines,

“The little cloud increases still

Which first began upon Mow Hill.”

The immediate spiritual results of this meeting more than equaled the hopes of its founders, and during the following summer several meetings of a like character were held in the same neighborhood. The novelty of these proceedings roused much opposition among the Wesleyan Methodists, who feared the rise of a fanaticism that might throw ridicule on true religion; and the preachers of the surrounding circuits issued handbills disclaiming all connection with the movement. At the next session of the Wesleyan Methodist Conference the following resolution was passed: “It is our judgment that, even supposing such meetings to be allowed in America, they are highly improper in England, and likely to be productive of considerable mischief; and we disclaim all connection with them.” This declared judgment of the conference had naturally much weight with the societies in general, and most of the leading Methodists held aloof from the camp-meeting movement. Bourne and a few others, however, held on firmly, having their meetings recognized by civil authority and taking precautions for preserving order.

Matters now came to a crisis. The Church authorities felt they could no longer bear with such contumacy, and Bourne and Clowes were expelled from the Connection. The untrammelling of these men from Church bonds, so far from silencing them, had rather the effect of increasing their active zeal. At this time there lived in Cheshire an old man, named James Crawfoot, “noted as a man of extraordinary piety and faith.” He believed himself called to the ministry, and had prayed and watched for the leading of Providence. In 1809 Hugh Bourne and his brother James hired him to preach in neglected places, for three months, at a salary of ten shillings a week. “This is generally looked upon as the commencement of the Primitive Methodist ministry.” In the spring of 1810 several persons were converted in meetings held by Hugh Bourne, and formed into a class. ‘“This class was offered to the Burslem Circuit (Wesleyan); but as they declined to accept them unless they pledged to sever their connection with Hugh Bourne, and as they respectfully declined acceding to this demand, their application was refused.” Bourne then took it under his charge as a distinct society, and the formation of this class may be considered the birth  of the Connection. The camp-meeting agency was now more extensively employed, and numerous societies were formed. In September, 1810, there were 10 preachers, 13 preaching places, and 136 members. Next year the first general meeting was held, composed probably of preachers and leaders. This conference resolved that money should in future be regularly collected in the societies, in order to meet the necessary expenses; “and if this should prove insufficient, recourse should again be had to the benevolence of private individuals. The two traveling preachers, Messrs. Crawfoot and Clowes, were to receive their salaries from the societies, and Mr. James Steele was appointed the circuit steward, the first officer of that kind in the Connection.” In 1812 the Connection, then employing 23 preachers, formally took the title of Primitive Methodist, and two years later a comprehensive body of rules was for the first time adopted. From that time till the present the increase of the denomination has been very rapid, being from 1851 to 1872, in the 108 towns of Great Britain, over 108 per cent.

The three following extracts, from John Angell James, Dr. Beaumont, and Dr. Campbell, respectively, explain the peculiar genius of this denomination:

“In cottages, in barns, and in theatres, and in public houses, in market-places, in streets, in lanes, and in fields, they (Primitive Methodist preachers) held meetings for prayer and exhortation. They were assailed by personal violence, and put in peril of their lives; but they persevered, in meekness and in gentleness, and have conquered by their passive power.”

“The Primitive Methodists are a laborious, and not an idle community; they are a plain, and not an artificial community; they are a useful community.”

“Every day serves but to confirm us that it is less talents, less culture, less intelligence that is required than a thorough knowledge of the Gospel-a perfect acquaintance with the Word of God- simplicity, affection, fervor, activity, tact, and flexibility, facility in adapting actions to circumstances, and such other things as these imply.”  The latest statistics of the Connection are, 17,000 ministers and local preachers, 10,000 class-leaders, 59,000 Sunday - school teachers, and 180.000 Church members. They publish several periodicals.

The doctrine of the Connection may be said to be identical with that of other Methodist churches. The form of Church government is substantially Presbyterian, but with a larger mixture of the lay element than is found in Presbyterian or in other Methodist denominations. The official business is transacted by the leaders' meeting, composed of the class-leaders, the society steward, and the traveling preachers of the circuit. No such meeting “can be legally held without the presence of the minister or traveling preacher, extraordinary cases excepted.” As in other Methodist bodies, there are traveling and local preachers. The latter usually follow some worldly occupation for a maintenance, “and preach on the Sabbath as opportunities permit, but receive no pecuniary remuneration for their services. They are chosen to their office by the representatives of the united societies to which they minister; and should their labors prove unacceptable to the people generally, their services are discontinued.” “In the transaction of the business of the circuit's quarterly meeting, traveling and local preachers are equal.” Between the quarterly meetings, the ordinary business of the circuit is transacted by the “circuit committee,” composed of such local preachers, class-leaders, or stewards as are appointed by the preceding quarterly meeting to represent the respective societies. The traveling preachers are ex-oficio members of this court. Circuits are sometimes divided into branches, each having its own officials and its regular meetings for business, but subordinate to the quarterly meeting. “Places visited through missionary labors, and united in one station, are called a ‘mission,'” most of which are under the control of the general missionary committee. A “district” consists of a number of circuits, branches, and missions. Its court, called a “district meeting,” has an annual session. It is composed of one delegate from each circuit, the circuits sending a traveling preacher one year and a layman the two following years, so as to secure, as nearly as possible, two laymen to one traveling preacher. This meeting receives statistical reports of all the circuits, inquires into the state of each, and stations the traveling preachers within the district, “subject, however, to appeals from the stations or preachers, and to alterations at conference.”

“The ‘conference' is a yearly meeting of delegates from all the districts in the Connection, of twelve permanent members, and of four persons  appointed at the preceding conference in the proportion of two laymen to one traveling preacher. This is the highest court in the Connection, from whose decisions there is no appeal.”

A “general committee,” composed of ministers and laymen, holding its sessions in London, is appointed to transact the business of the Connection in the intervals of the sessions of conference. A district committee, subordinate to the general committee, is appointed for each district, and adjudicates on certain cases submitted to its examination by the stations within the district.

The Connection is represented in the United States by two Conferences, Eastern and Western, having, for the last six years, only fraternal relations with the parent Conference in Great Britain. There are also separate conferences in Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, strictly associated with England. The statistics for the American Conferences for 1876 are as follows:

The foreign work is chiefly in British colonies and among English-speaking people. The missionary income for the year was £45,234. The most striking peculiarities of the Connection are lst, the vast amount of unpaid labor performed by laymen; 2nd, the influence of the laity in Church government; 3rd, the devoted and zealous attention paid to the lower classes. In the United States also, the Primitive Methodist Connection has established itself, and has, especially near the borders of Canada and in the Eastern States, gained a strong footing, so that the American Church is about of equal strength with the Canadian. They support a paper called the Primitive Methodist and the Christian Patriot, a semi-monthly journal. See Petty, History of the Primitive Methodist Connection; Church, History of the Primitive Methodists (3rd ed., revised and enlarged); Herod, Sketches of Primitive Methodist Preachers: Memorial of the Centenary of Hugh Bourne; Barran, Gallery of Deceased Ministers; Articles by Rev. W. H. Yarrow, in Primitive Methodist Record for 1877.

## Primitive Wesleyan Methodist Church of Ireland[[@Headword:Primitive Wesleyan Methodist Church of Ireland]]

             This body was formed in 1816, and was the result of a division in the Wesleyan Methodist Connection in Ireland. In that year tile Irish Conference, by a majority of thirty-six in a house of eighty-eight, resolved to authorize the preachers of the Connection to administer the sacraments. As a result of this decision, most of the minority separated from the parent  body, and, being followed by a large section of the lay members, organized the Primitive Wesleyan Methodist Connection. Until a few years ago they did not assume to be a Church, but merely a society composed of members of the Established Church of Ireland. The great changes produced by the disendowment and disestablishment of this Church in 1870, together with an increasing desire in the society for the administration of the sacraments at the hands of their own preachers, led to a complete change in the constitution of the body, and the members have now the option of partaking of the ordinances from their own ministers in their churches. The statistics printed in the Conference minutes of 1876 are, 58 effective ministers, 13 superannuates, 144 churches, and 7518 members of society. An annual missionary income of $70,000 in gold is now devoted to the support of the ministers on the poorer circuits. Over $75,000 in gold is invested as a fund for the support of superannuated ministers. Negotiations are at present in progress to effect a union with the Wesleyan Methodist Church of Ireland, the constitution pf the two churches being now almost identical.

## Primogeniture[[@Headword:Primogeniture]]

             (denoted in Hebrews by בְּכיֹרָה: Sept. πρωτοτόκια, Gen 25:31; Gen 25:34; Gen 27:26; Deu 21:17; 1Ch 5:1; in the New Test. only in Heb 12:16; A. V. “birthright”). Πρωτότοκος, always rendered “first-born” in the English version, is found in the Sept. in Gen 4:4; Deu 21:17, and several other passages of the Old Test., as the representative of the Hebrew בְּכוֹר, signifying “one who openeth the womb,” whether an only child, or whether other children follow. “Primogenitus est, non post quem alii, sedl ante quem nullus alius genitus” (Pareus). Πρωτότοκος is found nine times in the New Test. — viz. Mat 1:25 (if the passage be genuine, and not introduced from the parallel passage in Luke); Luk 2:7; Rom 8:29; Col 1:15; Col 1:18; Heb 1:6; Heb 11:28; Heb 12:23; Rev 1:5. Except in the Gospels, and Heb 11:28, the word always bears a metaphorical sense in the New Test., being generally synonymous with heir or lord, and having, in Heb 1:6, an especial reference to our Lord's Messianic dignity. In Heb 12:23, “the assembly of the first-born,” it seems to be synonymous with “elect,” or “dearly beloved,” in which sense it is also used on one occasion in the Old Test. (Jer 31:9).

In the 4th century, Helvidius among the Latins, an. Eunomius among the Greeks,  wished to attach a signification to πρωτότοκος, in Matthew 1 and Luke 2, different from the Old-Test. usage, maintaining, in order to support their hypothesis-viz. that Joseph and Mary had children after the birth of our Lord-that the word πρωτότοκος, by reason of its etymology, could not be applied to an only child. Jerome replied to the former by appealing to the usage of the word in the Old Test. (Adv. Helvid. in Mat 1:9). The assertion of Eunomius was equally refuted by the Greek fathers Basil (Hom. in Nat.), Theophylact (in Luke 2), and Damascenus (De Fid. Othod. 1. 4). In reference to this controversy, Drusius (Ad difficiliora loca Num c. 6) observes: “Sic sane Christus vocatur Πρωτότοκος, licet mater ejus nullos alios postea liberos habuerit. Notet hoc juventus propter Helvidium, qui ex ea voce inferebat Mariam ex Josepho post Christum natum plures filios suscepisse.” “Those entitled to the prerogative” (viz. of birthright), observes Campbell (On the Gospels), “were invariably denominated the first-born, whether the parents had issue afterwards or not.” Eunomius further maintains, from Col 1:15, that our Lord was “a creature;” but his arguments were replied to by Basil and Theophylact. Some of the fathers referred this passage to Christ's pre-existence, others to his baptism. In Isa 14:30, the ‘“first-born of the poor” signifies the poorest of all; and in Job 18:13. the “first-born of death” means the most terrible of deaths. It is noteworthy that in our Lord's genealogy the line is frequently- carried through a younger son (Seth, Shem, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Judah, David, Solomon, Nathan, etc.). SEE FIRST-BORN.

## Primum Mobile[[@Headword:Primum Mobile]]

             the primitive moveable element, is, in its proper signification, the original matter of the world (primae materia). The ancients understood by it the exterior hollow sphere, which was supposed to include and put in motion the remainder of the universe (fixed stars and planets): a quite arbitrary supposition. Primal mover would l)e the principle of all motion, or the first moving cause. According to Aristotle, this cause is God, who, while motionless himself, puts all the rest in motion, and is therefore called by the philosopher τὸ πρῶτον κινοῦν. See Aristotle, Phys. 8:5; De generat. et corrupt. 1, 7: 2, 7.

## Prince[[@Headword:Prince]]

             is the rendering of several Heb. and Gr. words in the A. V. Sar, שִׂר (from שָׂרִר, to rule, to have dominion; Sept. ἄρχων; Vulg. princts), the chief of  any class, the master of a company, a prince or noble; used of Pharaoh's chief butler and baker (Gen 40:2 sq.); of the taskmasters set over the Israelites in Egypt (Exo 1:11); even of chief herdsmen (Gen 47:6). It is frequently used for military commanders (Exo 18:21 [“rulers”]; 2Ki 1:9 [“captain”]; Isa 3:3, etc.), and or princes both supreme and subordinate (1Sa 29:3; Job 29:1; Job 29:9; Isa 49:7; Jer 51:59, etc.). In Dan 8:11 God is called שִׂר הִצָּבָ (Sar hatstaba), Prince of the host; and in Dan 8:25 the title שָׁרִים שָׂר(Sar sarim), Prince of princes, is applied to the Messiah. The “princes of the provinces” (הִמְּדִינוֹת שָׁרֵו, sarey ham-medinoth, 1Ki 20:14) were probably the district magistrates who had taken refire in Samaria during the invasion of Benhadad, and their “young men” were their attendants, παιδάρια, pedisseqiui (Thenius, Ewall. Gesch. 3, 495). Josephus savs, υἱοὶ τῶν ἡγεμόνων (Ant. 8:14, 2).

There is a peculiar sense in which the term “prince” is used by the prophet Daniel: thus, “Prince of the kingdom of Persia” (Dan 10:13), “Michael your prince” (Dan 10:21). In these passages the term probably means a tutelary angel; and the doctrine of tutelary angels of different countries seems to be countenanced by several passages of Scripture (Zec 3:1; Zec 6:5; Jud 1:9; Rev 12:7). Michael and Gabriel were probably the tutelary angels of the Jews. These names do not occur in any books of the Old Test. that were written before the captivity; and it is suggested by some that they were borrowed from the Chaldaeans, with whom and the Persians the doctrine of the general administration and superintendence of angels over empires and provinces was commonly received. SEE ANGEL.

2. Nagid, נָגִיד: (from, נָגִדto be in front, to precede; Sept. ἄρχων or ἡγούμενος; Vulg. dux), one who has the precedence, a leader, or chief, used of persons set over any undertaking, superintending any trust, or invested with supreme power (1Ki 14:7; Psalm 76:13; 1Ch 26:24 [“ruler”]; 1Sa 9:16 [“captain”], etc.). In Dan 9:25 it is applied to the Messiah; and in Dan 11:22 to Ptolemy Philometor, king of Egypt.

3. Nadib, נָדִיב(from נָדִב, which in Hithp. signifies to volunteer, to offer voluntarily or spontaneously; chiefly in poetry; Sept. ἄρχων; Vulg. princeps), generous, noble-minded, noble by birth (1Sa 2:8; Psa 107:40; Psa 113:8; Psa 118:9; Pro 27:7, etc.). This word is the converse of the preceding; נָגִיד means primarily a chief, and  derivatively what is morally noble, excellent (Pro 8:6); נדיב means primarily what is morally noble, and derivatively one who is noble by birth or position.

4. Nasi, נָשִׂיץ(from נָשָׂץ, to lift up, Niph. to be elevated; Sept. ἄρχων, ἡγούμενος, ἡγεμών, βασιλεύς Vulg. princeps, dux), one exalted; used as a general term for princes, including kings (1Ki 11:24; Eze 12:10, etc.), heads of tribes or families (Num 1:44; Num 3:24 [A. V. “chief”]; Num 7:10; Num 34:18; Gen 17:20; 1Ch 7:40, etc.). In the A.V. it is often rendered “ruler” or “captain.” In Gen 23:6 Abraham is addressed by the sons of Heth as נָשִׂיץ אֵֹלהִים(nasi Elohim), a prince of God, i.e. constituted, and consequently protected, by God [A.V. “mighty prince”]. This word appears on the coins of Judas Maccableus (Gesenius, Thesaur. p. 917).

5. Nasik, נָסִיךְ(from נָסִךְ, to pour out, anoint; Sept. ἄρχων; Vulg.princeps; Psa 83:11; Eze 32:30; Dan 11:5; “duke,” Jos 13:8; “principal,” Mic 5:5).

6. Katsin, קָצִין(from קָצָה, to cut, to decide; Sept. ἀρχηγός, ἄρχων; Vulg. princeps; Pro 25:15; Dan 11:18; Mic 3:1; Mic 3:9; elsewhere “captain,” “guide,” “ruler”).

7. Rab, רִב(usually an adj. great; Sept. ἄρχων, ἡγεμών; Vulg. optimus); only occasional; but used in compounds, e.g. Rab-mag, Rab-saris (q.v.). So its Chald. reduplicature Rabreban, רִבְרְבָן, in the plur. (Dan 5:2-3; elsewhere “lords”).

8. Rozen, רֹזֵן(participle of רָזִן, to rule; Sept. (σατράπης, δυνάστης; Vulg. princeps, legum conditor), a poetical word (Jdg 5:3; Pro 8:15; Pro 31:4; Isa 40:23; Hab 1:10 “ruller,” Psa 2:2).

9. Shalish, שָׁלִישׁ(apparently from שָלוֹשׁ, three; only Eze 23:13; elsewhere “captain” [q.v.]).

10. Achashdarpenaya (Chald. plur. אֲחִשְׁדִּרְפְּנִיָּ‹, Dan 3:2; Dan 3:27; Dan 6:1-7; Sept.; ὕρατοι), a Persian word. Those mentioned in Dan 6:1 (see Esther 1, 1) were the predecessors, either in fact or in place, of the satraps of Darius Hystaspis (Herod. 3, 89). SEE SATRAP.

11. Chashmannim, חִשְׁמִנִּים(plur. literally rich, only in Psa 68:13).

12. Segen, סֶגֶן(a Persian word, used only in the plur. Isaiah 11:25; elsewhere “rulers”).

13. Partemim, only in the plur. פִּרְתְּמִים(another Persian word, Dan 1:3; elsewhere “rulers”).

14. ῎Αρχων, which in the Sept. appears as the rendering of all the Hebrew words above cited, in the New Test. is used of earthly princes (Mat 20:25; 1Co 2:6), of Jesus Christ (Rev 1:5), and of Satan (Mat 9:34; Mat 12:24; Mark 3, 22; Joh 12:31; Joh 14:30; Joh 16:11; Eph 2:2). On the phrase “prince of the power of the air” in this last passage, see AIR.

15. Α᾿ρχηγός, which in Theodotion is the rendering of נָשִׂיא(Num 13:3; Num 16:2); and in the Sept. is the rendering of שִׂר(Judges 5, 15; Nehemiah 2, 9; Isa 30:4), in the New Test. is applied only to our Lord (Act 3:15; Act 5:31; Heb 2:10 [A. V. “captain”]; Heb 12:2 [A. V. “author”]).

16. ῾Ηγεμών is used (Mat 2:6) in a general sense for a chief or ruler. SEE GOVERNOR; SEE KING; SEE RULER.

## Prince, John (1)[[@Headword:Prince, John (1)]]

             an English divine, was born at Axminster, Devonshire, in 1643; was educated at Brazenose College, Oxford, and became successively curate of Bideford, minister of St. Martin's Church, Exeter, vicar of Totnes, and vicar of Berry-Pomeroy. He died in 1723. He published, Sermons (Lond. 1674, 4to): The Beauty of God's House, a Discourse on Psa 84:1 (1710, 4to): — Dammonii Orientales Illustres (1810, 4to): — Sermons on Psa 134:1 (1722, 8vo).

## Prince, John (2)[[@Headword:Prince, John (2)]]

             an American minister of the Congregational Church, was born at Boston, Mass., in 1751; was educated at Harvard College, where he graduated in 1776; was ordained minister of the Congregational Church in Salem, Mass., in 1779, and retained that post until his death in 1836. He published, Fast Sermon (Salem, 1798): — Sermons before a Charitable Society (1806): — Sermon on the Death of Dr. Barnard (1814): — Sermon before the Bible Society (1816). See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 8:128 sq.; and for other references, Allibone, Dict. Brit. and Amer. Auth. s.v.

## Prince, Nathan[[@Headword:Prince, Nathan]]

             an American clergyman of the Church of England, was a native of Massachusetts, and was born about the beginning of the last century. He was educated at Harvard College, where he graduated in 1719, in: 1723 was made a tutor in his alma mater, in 1727 fellow, and held that honor until 1742. Subsequently he took orders in the Church of England, was sent as a missionary to the Mosquitos, and died in the island of Ruatan, Bay of Honduras, in 1748. Dr. Chauncey, in his Sketches of Eminent Men in New England, says that “Prince deserves a place among the great men in this country.” He is the author of an Essay to Solve the Difficulties attending the several Accounts given of the Resurrection, etc. (Boston, 1734, 4to). See Elliot, Biog. Dict. p. 393. n.; Report of the Mass. Hist. Society, 10:165; Pierce, Hist. of Harvard University, p. 191-196; Allibone, Dict. Brit. and Amer. Auth. s.v.

## Prince, Thomas (1)[[@Headword:Prince, Thomas (1)]]

             an American Congregational minister, was born May 15, 1687, at Sandwich, Mass. He graduated at Harvard College in 1707, and after traveling for some years in Europe, during which time he preached in England and was invited to take a station, he returned home in 1717, and was ordained, Oct. 1, 1718, colleague pastor of the Rev. Joseph Sewall at the Old South Church, Boston, where he remained until his death, Oct. 22, 1758. He was an eminent preacher, for his sermons were rich in thought, perspicuous, and devotional, and he inculcated the doctrines and duties of religion as one who felt their importance. In private life he was amiable and exemplary. It was his constant endeavor to imitate the perfect example of his Master and Lord. He was ready to forgive injuries and return good for  evil. He published, An Account of the First Appearance of the Aurora Borealis: — A Chronological History of New England in the Form of Annals (1736): — Ditto, vol. 2, Nos. 1, 2, 3 (1755): — Account of the English Ministers on Martha's Vineyard (1749): — An Improvement of the Doctrine of Earthquakes, containing an Historic Summary of the most renmarkable Earthquakes of New England (1755): — The New England Psalm-book, revised and improved (1756): — and a number of occasional Sermons; besides which there were six Sermons published from his MSS. by Dr. Erskine, of Edinburgh (1785); and twenty-nine single Sermons which Prince published from 1717 to 1756. For an extended notice of his publications, see Sewall, Funeral Discourse. A large portion of his most valuable library is now in the Boston Public Library. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 1, 304; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Prince, Thomas (2)[[@Headword:Prince, Thomas (2)]]

             an American writer and editor, son of the preceding, was born in 1722, and was educated at Harvard College, where he graduated in 1740. He edited the earliest American periodical, The Christian History, containing Accounts of the Revival and Propagation of Religion in Great Britain and America for 1743 (Boston, 1744-45, 2 vols. 8vo), which was published weekly. He died in 1748. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Princeps Sacerdotum (Chief Of Priests)[[@Headword:Princeps Sacerdotum (Chief Of Priests)]]

             This is a title sometimes applied by Tertullian, Augustine, and others to a bishop, but used in the same sense as archiepiscopus, pontifex maximus, that is, high -priest. SEE BISHOP; SEE PRIEST.

## Princess[[@Headword:Princess]]

             (שָׂרָה, sarah) occurs but seldom in the Scriptures (1Ki 11:3; Lam 1:1; elsewhere “lady.” SEE SARAH ); but the persons to whom it alludes, the daughters of kings, are frequently mentioned, and often with some reference to the splendor of their apparel. Thus we read of Tamar's “garment of divers colors” (2Sa 13:18), and the dress of the Egyptian princess, the wife of Solomon, is described as “raiment of needlework,” and “clothing of wrought gold” (Psa 45:13-14). SEE EMBROIDERY.

## Princeton Theology[[@Headword:Princeton Theology]]

             SEE PRESBYTERIANISM; SEE THEOLOGY.

## Principalities and Powers[[@Headword:Principalities and Powers]]

             SEE POWER.

## Prindle, Cyrus, D.D[[@Headword:Prindle, Cyrus, D.D]]

             a noted Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Canaan, Litchfield County, Connecticut, April 11, 1800. He was converted in 1816, licensed to preach in 1821, and the same year joined the New York Conference, was appointed to the Plattsburgh Circuit, and thereafter for over half a century continued with but a single month's intermission the active duties of the ministry: twenty-one years in New York, nineteen in Vermont, six in Massachusetts, and ten in Ohio, when he retired in 1877, in the full possession of his bodily and mental powers. In 1843 he was a chief leader in the formation of the Wesleyan Methodist connection in America, which seceded from the Methodist Episcopal Church on account of. its alleged  connection with slavery; but this being removed by the war of the Rebellion, he returned to his former church in 1867. He died at Cleveland, Ohio, December 1, 1885. Dr. Prindle was a man of great pulpit power and singular purity of character.

## Pringle, Francis[[@Headword:Pringle, Francis]]

             a minister of the Associate Presbyterian Church, was a native of Ireland, and was born about the year 1750. He came to this country some time near the close of the last century, and died in New York City in 1833. He preached a Sermon on the Qualifications and Duties of the Ministers of Christ before the Associate Synod of Ireland (1796), which was published in Ireland and America; and a sermon of his on Prayer for the Prosperity of Zion appeared in the Religious Monitor after his death. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 9:64 sq.

## Pringle, Sir John[[@Headword:Pringle, Sir John]]

             a Scotch philosopher and physician, was born in Roxburghshire in 1707. He settled in Edinburgh about 1734, and after 1748 resided in London, where he distinguished himself greatly, and became president of the Royal Society in 1773. He was for a time professor of pneumatology and ethical philosophy in Edinburgh University. He died in 1782. He divided pneumatics into the following parts:

1. A physical inquiry into the nature of such subtle and material substances as are imperceptible to the senses, and known only from their operations.

2. The nature of immaterial substances connected with matter, in which is demonstrated, by natural evidence, the immortality of the human soul.

3. The nature of immaterial created beings not connected with matter.

4. Natural theology, or the existence and attributes of God demonstrated from the light of nature. Ethics, or moral philosophy, he divided into the theoretical and practical parts, in treating of which the authors he chiefly uses are Cicero, Marcus Antonius, Puffendorf. and lord Bacon. Carlyle describes him as “an agreeable lecturer, though no master of the science he taught.” “His lectures were chiefly a compilation from lord Bacon's works; and had it not been for Puffendorf's small book, which he made his text,  we should not have been instructed in the rudiments of the science.” Nevertheless, we see that he discussed topics which must issue, sooner or later, in a scientific jurisprudence and political economy. See M'Cosh, Scottish Philosophy, p. 109.

## Pringle, William[[@Headword:Pringle, William]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Perth, Scotland, in 1790. His parents paid great attention to his early culture, and, after a successful study at the best schools and at the Academy in Perth, he finished his collegiate studies at the University of Edinburgh. He then studied medicine, and, as soon as admitted to practice, emigrated to Canada; but, concluding not to practice, he returned to Scotland, studied theology in Glasgow under the Rev. John Dick, D.D., was licensed April 15,1823, and entered upon his labors as a probationer, and as such preached for some time in Scotland, when he again left his native land, and came to the United States in the year 1827, and soon after joined the Associate Presbytery of Cambridge. In June, 1830, he was ordained and installed pastor of the Associate Congregation of Ryegate, Vt. He labored faithfully in behalf of this his only charge, and when his health failed him he resigned, June 21, 1852, after a ministry of twenty-two years. He died Dec. 14, 1858. Mr. Pringle was a good writer, and some of his sermons bear marks of scholarly attainments. He was engaged during the last few years of his life upon a work called The Cosmography of Scripture. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1860, p. 159. (J. L. S.)

## Prior, Matthew[[@Headword:Prior, Matthew]]

             an English poet, writer of verse both sacred and profane, whose period of authorship was contemporary with the last years of Dryden and the earliest stage of Pope, was possessed of little vigor or originality, but was remarkable for his skill in versification and his gay and easy grace of imagery and diction. His occasional epigrams, and his lively but indecent tales, are his best productions; though there is merit, also in his semi- metaphysical poem Alma, or the Progress of the Soul, and in his attempt at religious poetry in Solomon, a work which has been compared to Pope's Essay on Man. It was greatly preferred to Pope's poem by John Wesley, because more consistent with the orthodox theory of human corruption. The design is certainly more poetical, because less tending to the argumentative; though the inferior execution has prevented Prior from attaining the occasional success which redeems parts of Pope's poem from oblivion. Prior's poems were only the recreations of a man actively engaged in public life. He was born July 21,1664, and was the son of a joiner in London. Accident having directed the attention of lord Dorset to the boy's studious habits, education was procured for him; and, on leaving Oxford, he distinguished himself, under the government of king William, as a dexterous diplomatist in several foreign missions. Deserting his political party, like so many men of higher rank in that slippery time, he shared, in the latter part of his life, the vicissitudes and danger of the Tories. He died Sept. 18,1721. See the excellent article in Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v., and the references there given. (J. H. W.)

## Prior, Prioress[[@Headword:Prior, Prioress]]

             are, according to the constitution of several ecclesiastical orders, the heads of their monasteries and nunneries. The prior is either the first or sole authority in the monastery, or he is subordinated, as second leader, to a higher officer of the same monastery, the abbot (q.v.). The latter case happens when the abbot makes use of his right to appoint in his place an assistant, a temporary vicar (q.v.), who is trusted with part of the prelate's attributes. Sometimes the statutes of the order prescribe that the prior shall be as the second head of the monastery, elected by the members, they assigning him a power of his own more or less independent (De Stat. Monast. 3, 35). In other orders, as in that of the Benedictines, and even in some regular congregations, we find only one, or a few, principal monasteries-the mother abbeys, to which the others owe their origin, or  whose subsequent reform they have adopted-subject to the direction of abbots or prelates, i.e. local superiors of the first rank, while the inferior monasteries are administered by priors: the latter exercise the regular jurisdiction over the monks, and are bound only in important matters to obtain the consent of the prelate of the mother abbey. The same distinction subsists in the nunneries. — Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. s.v.

## Priory[[@Headword:Priory]]

             is a religious house occupied by a society of monks or nuns, the chief of whom is termed a prior (q.v.) or prioress; and of these there are two sorts: first, where the prior is chosen by the convent, and governs as independently as any abbot in his abbey; such were the cathedral priors, and most of those of the Augustine order. Secondly, where the priory is a  cell subordinate to some great abbey, and the prior is placed or displaced at the will of the abbot. There was a considerable difference in the regulation of these cells in the mediaeval times; for some were altogether subject to their respective abbots, who sent what officers and monks they pleased, and took their revenues into the common stock of the abbeys; while others consisted of a stated number of monks, under a prior sent to them from the superior abbey; and those priories paid a pension yearly, as an acknowledgment of their subjection, but acted in other matters as independent bodies, and had the rest of the revenues for their own use. The priories or cells were always of the same order as the abbeys on which they depended, though sometimes their inmates were of a different sex; it being usual, after the Norman Conquest, for the great abbeys to build nunneries on some of their manors, which should be subject to their visitation.

Alien priories were cells, or small religious houses, in one country dependent on large foreign monasteries. When manors or tithes were given to distant religious houses, the monks, either to increase the authority of their own order, or perhaps rather to have faithful stewards of their revenues, built convenient houses for the reception of small fraternities of their body, who were deputed to reside at and govern those cells. — Hook, s.v. In the fourth year of Henry V, during the war with France, all the alien priories (that is, those cells of the religious houses in England which belonged to foreign monasteries) which were not conventual were dissolved by act of Parliament and granted to the crown. About the year 1540 the cathedrals founded for priories were turned into deaneries and prebends.

## Prisca[[@Headword:Prisca]]

             (2Ti 4:19). SEE PRISCILLA.

## Priscilla[[@Headword:Priscilla]]

             (Πρίσκιλλα, dim. from Prisca, Lat. ancient), the wife of Aquila, and probably, like Phoebe, a deaconess. She shared the travels, labors, and dangers of her husband, and is always named along with him (Rom 16:3; 1Co 16:19; 2Ti 4:19), A.D. 55-64. The name is Prisca (Πρίσκα) in 2Ti 4:19, and (according to the true reading) in Rom 16:3, and also (according to some of the best MSS.) in 1Co 16:19. Such variation in a Roman name is by no means unusual. We find that the name of the wife is placed before that of  the husband in Rom 16:3; 2Ti 4:19, and (according to some of the best MSS.) in Act 18:26. It is only in Act 18:2 and 1Co 16:19 that Aquila has unequivocally the first place. Hence we should be disposed to conclude that Priscilla was the more energetic character of the two; and it is particularly to be noticed that she took part, not only in her husband's exercise of hospitality, but likewise in the theological instruction of Apollos. Yet we observe that the husband and the wife are always mentioned together. In fact, we may say that Priscilla is the example of what the married woman may do, for the general service of the Church, in conjunction with home duties, as Phoebe is the type of the unmarried servant of the Church, or deaconess. Such female ministration was of essential importance in the state of society in the midst of which the early Christian communities were formed. The remarks of archdeacon Evans on the position of Timothy at Ephesus are very just. “In his dealings with the female part of his flock, which, in that time and country, required peculiar delicacy and discretion, the counsel of the experienced Priscilla would be invaluable. Where, for instance, could he obtain more prudent and faithful advice than hers in the selection of widows to be placed upon the eleemosynary list of tie Church, and of deaconesses for the ministry?” (Script. Biog. 2, 298). It seems more to our purpose to lay stress on this than on the theological learning of Priscilla. Yet Winer mentions a monograph De Priscilla, Aquilae uxore, tamquam feminarum e gente Judaica eruditarum specimine, by G. G. Zeltner (Altorf, 1709). SEE AQUILA.

## Priscillian[[@Headword:Priscillian]]

             the noted originator or propagator of a heretical body of Christians who bore his name, was the first heretic who was executed after the establishment of Christianity by the Roman state. He was a native of the Iberian Peninsula, and of noble birth. He flourished in the second half of the 4th century, possessed much wealth, had great reputation for learning, and was generally revered for his severe austerity. ‘What his early occupation was is not known. He first figures in history as the propagator of the heretical dogmas which a certain Egyptian called Marcus, from Memphis, came to Spain to teach there. Priscillian, by his personal influence, succeeded in spreading the heresy of Marcus all over Spain, making a number of proselytes of the female sex, convincing many priests, and even some bishops; among others, two bishops, Instantius and Salvianus, who became zealous defenders of the imported doctrines, which  were substantially those of the Manicheans (q.v.). He taught expressly the Dualism and the Docetism of that sect, and it is charged that he adopted the strictest ascetic austerities in regard to celibacy, etc., by which they had rendered themselves obnoxious even to the civil authorities in the East and in Africa.

There is some doubt as to the precise doctrines which Priscillian taught. As reported, his dogmas are a strange mixture of Gnostic and Manichean absurdities combined with allegorical interpretations and mystical rhapsodies. He was also Sabellian in tendency in his rejection of a personal distinction in the Godhead, for he denied the reality of Christ's birth and incarnation. Among other things, he maintained that the visible universe was not the production of the Supreme Deity, but of some demon or malignant principle who derived his origin from chaos or darkness; he adopted the doctrine of aeons, or emanations from the divine nature; he considered human bodies as compounded according to the twelve signs of the zodiac, and as prisons formed by the author of evil to enslave the mind; he also condemned marriage, and denied the resurrection of the body. The rule of life and manners which the Priscillianists adopted was so rigid and severe that the charges of dissolute conduct brought against them by their enemies appear to be groundless. That they were guilty of dissimulation, and deceived their adversaries by cunning stratagems in order to accomplish what they deemed a sacred purpose, is true. Their doctrine was, according to St. Augustine, that deception is allowed to hide one's faith, and to simulate Catholic belief (“jura, perjura, secretum prodere noli”). Neander (Ch. Hist. 2, 711) observes that the reproach of immorality rests on insufficient proofs. It is, however, a fact that at least a part of the Priscillianists were addicted to unnatural turpitudes, to which such a system must logically lead; but there is no evidence that they avowed that lying and perjury were lawful under all circumstances.

The bishop Hyginus of Cordova was the first to enter the lists against this heresy, and he strove, although without success, to gain back to the orthodox Church the bishops Instantius and Salvianus. Hyginus apprised Idacius, the bishop of Merida, of the Priscillianic disorders; but the hot- blooded zeal of this prelate was still more unsuccessful, and so were the efforts of all the other Catholic bishops. The boldness of the heretics increased every day, and bishop Hyginus himself, displeased with the severe measures inaugurated against them, became their protector. To arrest their progress, a synod was held in October, 380, at Saragossa, to which Instantius, Salvianus, Elpidius, and Priscillian were also invited. The  heresiarchs failed to appear. The synod condemned their doctrines and resolved upon measures to stop their expansion. Catholic women were prohibited from attending the Priscillianist meetings; fasting on Sundays was interdicted; the anathema was launched against such as stayed from Church during the forty days of Lent and the three weeks of Epiphany, or received the Eucharist in the Church without partaking at once of the sacrament: the same penalty was pronounced against those who should assume the name and functions of teachers without episcopal approbation; and every clerk who should, out of pride and vanity, clothe himself in the monastical garment, was put under ban. The execution of the decrees against Priscillianists was committed to the bishop Ithacius of Sosuba. No worse choice could possibly have been made. He was a mere voluptuary, and utterly destitute of all sense for spiritual things.

Excluded from the Church, the Priscillianists now took more decided measures for establishing themselves, and they had the boldness even to cause the consecration of Priscillian as their bishop of Avilla by the bishops Instantius and Salvianus. Of course, by this step the Spanish Catholic prelates were greatly embittered, and the Idacius above mentioned, together with Ithacius, bishop of Ossonova, who is represented by Sullpicius Severus as a troublesome zealot, were dispatched to the emperor Gratian for the purpose of obtaining an order of banishment against Priscillian, Instantius, and Salvianus. Gratian having issued the rescript thus demanded, the three heresiarchs repaired to Rome, in order to vindicate themselves before pope Damasus. But the pope refused to justify them. Salvianus died at Rome, and his two companions went to Milani, where they tried, as unsuccessfully, to persuade St. Ambrose of their innocence. However, they succeeded in bribing an influential functionary (magister officiorum) named Macedonius, who obtained for them an imperial decree which allowed them to return to Spain and take possession of their sees, and ordered Volventius, vicar of Spain, to examine further into the matter.

Priscillian and Instantius returned to Spain, as in triumph; and Ithacius, now in turn accused as a disturber of the public peace, was driven out of Spain. The latter was even on the very point of being arrested in Treves, where he had established himself, and of being transported back to tie peninsula for trial, when things assumed, under the usurping emperor Maximus, a different aspect. As soon as this new Caesar arrived at Treves, Ithacius appeared before him against the Priscillianists. Maximus, who desired the whole matter to be disposed of as a purely ecclesiastical affair,  ordered a synod to be held, in 384, at Bordeaux, to which the heresiarchs were summoned. Instantius was deposed by the vote of the assembly, and Priscillian, foreseeing a similar fate, tried to prevent it by appealing to the emperor. This step was the cause of his ruin. The emperor now took the matter in hand: Priscillian and his associates were brought to Treves, where Maximus resided at the time, and the most violent adversaries of the sect, Idacius and Ithacius, appeared as accusers. The latter of these two prelates, if Sulpicius Severus is to be trusted, suspected of Priscillianism any man whom he saw studying and fasting much; and, against all precedents, appeared as anl impassioned accuser, before a worldly tribunal, in a religious affair. St. Martin, bishop of Tours. a truly pious man, also at the time at the imperial court, held it to be an unspiritual innovation that an ecclesiastical matter should be tried by a secular court-that heretics should become liable to punishment with torture and death— and besought the emperor to leave the affair in the hands of the bishop, or, at least, to decide it without bloodshed. As long as Martin was present, the trial was delayed; on his departure, Maximus promised there should be no bloodshed, but he was induced by Ithacius and two other Spanish bishops, Rufus and Magrnus, to break his word. The prefect who tried the case probably employed tortures to obtain avowals. Priscillian, the rich widow Euchrocia, and several others were accused of criminal disorders, and condemned not only as false teachers, but also as violators of the civil laws. They were either beheaded or punished with confiscation and exile (365).

The execution of Priscillian by the sword, and of several of his associates, did not ruin the sect, but seemed rather to give it new life and vigor. The Priscillianists got possession of the bodies of their dead, and brought them to Spain, where Priscilla was honored as a martyr. People swore by his name. The most distinguished bishops, Martin of Tours, St. Ambrose, Theognistus, and pope Siricius, sternly blamed the cruelty with which Ithacius and his friends had treated the heretics, and marked their abhorrence of the cruelty by separating from the communion of Ithacius and the other bishops who had approved the death penalty for heresy in the Christian Church. But the emperor Maximus went on until his death (387) persecuting the Priscillianists as criminal Manichueans, and was even on the point of sending to Spain a military commission with unlimited powers to pursue the accused and punish the guilty with confiscation and death; and only abandoned this project by intercession of St. Martin.  The gravity of the measures adopted for the punishment of heresy at the time to which we here refer obliges us to turn aside to remark

(1.) that heresy was declared against by the State for the first time under Theodosius the Great, the first emperor who was baptized in the Nicene faith. He was determined to put an end to the Arian interregnum, and therefore proclaimed the exclusive authority of the Nicene Creed, and at the same time enacted the first rigid penalties not only against the pagan idolatry, the practice of which was thenceforth a capital crime in the empire, but also against all Christian heresies and sects. The ruling principle of his public life was the unity of the empire and of the orthodox Church. In the course of fifteen years this emperor issued at least fifteen penal laws against heretics (comp. Cod. Theodos. 16, tit. 5, leg. 6-33), by which he gradually deprived them of all right to the exercise of their religion, excluded them from all civil offices, and threatened them with fines, confiscation, banishment, and in some cases (as the Manicheans, the Audians, and even the Quarto decimanians) with death. From Theodosius, therefore, dates the State-Church theory of the persecution of heretics and the embodiment of it in legislation. His primary design, it is true, was rather to terrify and convert than to punish the refractory subjects (so Sozomen asserts, Hist. Ecclesiastes lib. 7 c. 12). From the theory, however, to the practice was a single step; and this step his rival and colleague, Maximus, took when he inflicted capital punishment on Priscillian and some of his followers. This was the first shedding of the blood of heretics by a Christian prince for religious opinions.

(2.) We wish to note also that, while the execution of the Priscillianists is the only instance of the bloody punishment of heretics in this period, as it is the first in the history of Christianity, the propriety of violent measures against heresy was thenceforth vindicated even by the best fathers of the Church (see on this point Augustine's position as marked out by Neander, Ch. Hist. 2, 217 sq.; Schaff, Ch. Hist. 2, 144,145), and soon none but the persecuted parties were heard to protest against religious persecution. We need hardly add that in due time the Church of Rome, with Leo the Great as its first and clearest representative, became the advocate and executioner of the death penalty for heresy. SEE HERESY; SEE INQUISITION; SEE ROMANISM.

After the death of Maximus, the emperor Theodosius ordered a synod to be held in 389, to settle the difficulties that had arisen among the bishops of  Gaul Spain, and Italy on account of Ithacius. The latter and bishop Idacius were deposed by that assembly. But the disputes which had been called up by them continued in some parts of Spain, fostered especially by the Priscillianists, who were still numerous. In the year 400 the sect appears in a decaying condition. At the synod held in that year at Toledo, several Priscillianist bishops, among others Symphosius and Dictinnlius, returned to the Church. The latter wrote a work entitled the Scules, in which the principles of the Priscillianists are expounded, but as he was an apostate he can hardly be regarded as a safe expositor of Priscillianism. The sect revived iu the middle of the 5th century, especially in Gallicia. The active exertions of bishop Turibius, of Astorga, succeeded in extinguishing it gradually. He punished and imprisoned heretics, etc., but he was also busy in their instruction, both orally and by his writings. The same bishop sent to Leo the Great a refutation of Priscillianism, which Leo honored with an answer, praising his zeal and recommending the holding of a Spanish synod, which he consequently convened in Gallicia in 448. Leo's letter is important for the refutation of Priscillianism contained in it. Among the most noteworthy literary attacks upon Priscillianism in the first half of the 5th century, we may mention here, besides, Ad Paulum Orsium contra Priscillinistas et Origenistas (411); Costra mendacium, addressed to Consentius (420); and in part the 190th Epistle (alias Ep. 157), to the bishop Optatus, on the origin of the soul (418), and two other letters, in which he refutes erroneous views on the nature of the soul, the limitation of future punishments, and the lawfulness of fraud for supposed good purposes. The Priscillianists, notwithstanding the severest measures inaugurated against them and the polemics that were written against them, continued to exist, and at all times during the mediaeval period we find their traces under various names and forms, especially in the north of Spain, Languedoc (France), and Northern Italy. The Synod of Braga, in 563, condemned several Priscillian errors, about which we owe to this assembly most interesting information. See Sulp. Severus, Hist. Sacra, 2, 46-51; Dial. 3, 11 sq.; Orosius Comumitorium de Errore Priscillianistarum, etc.; Leonis Magni Ep. 15, ad Turibium; Walch, Ketzerhistorie, 3. 378 sq.; Alex. Natalis, Hist. Ecclesiastes; Fleury, Hist. Eccl.; Van Fries, Dissertatio Critica de Priscill. (Ultraj. 1745); Lübkert, De Haeresi Priscill. (Havn. 1840); Mandernach, Gesch. des Priscillianismus (Treves, 1851); Hefele, Conciliengesch. 1, 719; 2, 27 sq.; 3, 13 sq.; Milman, Lat. Christianity, 1, 276-78; Pusey, Hist. of the  Councils A.D. 51-381 (1875); Alzog, Kirchengesch. 1, 372 sq.; Neander, Ch. Hist. 2, 710, 718.

## Prison[[@Headword:Prison]]

             is represented in the A. V. by the following Heb. and Gr. words:

1. אֵסוּר, Aramaic for אסֵוּר, “a chain,” is joined with בֵּית, and rendered a prison (Sept. οῖκος δεσμῶν; Vulg. carcer).

2. כְּלוּא כֶלֵא, and כְּלִיא, with בֵּית (Sept. οῖκος φυλακῆς; Jer 37:15).

3. מִהְפֶּכֶת, from הָפִךְ, “turn,” or “twist,” the stocks (Jer 20:2).

4. מִטָּרָה and מִטָּרָא; φυλαςή; carcer (Gesenius, Thesaur. p. 879).

5. מִסְגֵּר; δεσμωτήριον; carcer.

6. מִשְׁמָר; φυλακή; custodia; also intens. מִשְׁמֵרֶת; A.V. “hard.”

7. עֹצֶר; angustia; ταπείνωσις (Gesenius, p. 1059).

8. — פְּקִהאּקיֹח(Isa 61:1), more properly written in one word; ἀνάβλεψις; apestio (Gesenius, p. 1121).

9. סֹהִר; ὀχύρωνα; carcer: properly a tower.

10. בֵּיתאּהִפְּקֻדֹּת; οἰκία μύλωνος; domus carceris. בִּיִתis also sometimes “prison” in the A.V. as Gen 39:20.

11. צִינֹק; καταῤῥάκτης; carcer; probably “the stocks” (as in the A.V.) or some such instrument of confinement; perhaps understood by the Sept. as a sewer or underground passage.

12. In the N.T. δεσμωτήριον, οἴκημα, τήρησις, usually φυλακή.

In Egypt it is plain both that special places were used as prisons, and that they were under the custody of a military officer (Gen 40:3; Gen 42:17). During the wandering in the desert we read on two occasions of confinement “in ward” (Lev 24:12; Num 15:34); but as imprisonment was not directed by the law, so we hear of none till the time of the kings, when the prison appears as an appendage to the palace, or a special part of it (1Ki 22:27). Later still it is distinctly described as being in the king's house (Jer 32:2; Jer 37:21; Neh 3:25). This was the case also at Babylon (2Ki 25:27). But private houses were  sometimes used as places of confinement (Jer 37:15), probably much as Chardin describes Persian prisons in his day, viz. houses kept by private speculators for prisoners to be maintained there at their own cost (Voy. 6:100). Public prisons other than these, though in use by the Canaanitish nations (Jdg 16:21; Jdg 16:25), were unknown in Judaea previous to the captivity. Under the Herods we hear again of royal prisons attached to the palace, or in royal fortresses (Luk 3:20; Act 12:4; Act 12:10; Josephuts, Ant. 18:5, 2; Machzerus). By the Romans Antonia was used as a prison at Jerusalem (Act 23:10), and at Caesarea the praetorium of Herod (Act 23:35). The sacerdotal authorities also had a prison under the superintendence of special officers, δεσμφύλακες (Act 5:18-23; Act 8:3; Act 26:10). The royal prisons in those days were doubtless managed after the Roman fashion, and chains, fetters, and stocks were used as means of confinement (see 16:24, and Job 13:27). One of the readiest places for confinement was a dry, or partially dry, well or pit (see Gen 37:24, and Jer 38:6-11); but the usual place appears, in the time of Jeremiah, and in general, to have been accessible to visitors (Jer 36:5; Mat 11:2; Mat 25:36; Mat 25:39; Act 24:23). — Smith. From the instance of the Mamertine Prison at Rome (q.v.), in which the apostle Paul (q.v.) is said to have been confined, many have rashly assumed that the Roman prisons generally were subterranean; but at Thessalonica at least, even “the inner prison” (Act 16:24) seems to have been on the ground-floor (“doors,” Act 16:26; “sprang in,” Act 16:29). SEE DUNGEON.

## Prison Reform[[@Headword:Prison Reform]]

             Prison discipline has in recent times become a matter of so much moment that its consideration is forced upon every philanthropist, especially the believer of the new dispensation — the law of love. Under the silent influences of Christianity, torture, exposure in the pillory, and other like dedications of the offender to public vengeance have long been abandoned as barbarous practices. Death-punishment has been much narrowed in its application; and transportation, apart from any question of effectiveness, has been rendered impracticable, except within a very narrow compass.

The movement for the alleviation of the horrors of imprisonment by physical and moral improvement of the conditions of prisoners may be said to be not only Christian, but modern. We get nothing from the practice of the times anterior to Christianity, nor yet from the Middle Ages, that accounts for much in the modern systems of prison discipline. In Greece and Rome punishments were inflicted in other ways. It must be borne in mind that among the ancients the institution of slavery rendered the prison system unnecessary. It kept the functions of punishing ordinary criminals from the public administration of the affairs of a state, and placed it in private hands. Hence there was no criminal law, properly speaking. The corpus juris, so full of minute regulations in all matters of civic right, SEE JUSTINIAN, has very little criminal law, because the criminals became slaves, and ceased to be objects of the attention of the law. In the Roman empire there were houses, called ergastula, for the incarceration of criminal and refractory slaves. The feudal barons had towers in their castles, called donjons (whence our word dungeon), for the confinement of  their captive foes or refractory retainers. Sometimes the prison vaults were cut in the solid rock below the surface of the earth.

When imprisonment became a function of the State in the administration of justice, it was often carelessly, and hence tyrannically, exercised, because the practice of awarding it as a punishment arose more rapidly than the organization for controlling its use. In the 15th and 16th centuries the Society of the Brothers of Mercy in Italy paid much attention to the incarcerated unfortunate trespassers of society, and so greatly alleviated their forlorn condition that many of the Brothers of Mercy are reverently spoken of to this day. St. Carlo Borromeo and St. Vincent de Paul are to be especially mentioned. But the earliest instance of a prison managed on any principles of policy and humanity seems to be that of the Penitentiary at Amsterdam in 1595, an example which was soon followed by some of the German towns, especially Hamburg and Bremen. In England, on several occasions, grave abuses have been exposed by parliamentary inquiries and otherwise in the practice of prison discipline. It is well known that the real impulse to prison improvement was first communicated by the celebrated Howard (q.v.), whose sufferings, when taken by a privateer and imprisoned at Brest, during the Seven Years' War are said to have first directed his attention to this subject. The fruits of his observations in his repeated visits to most of the prisons of Europe were given to the world partly in his publications and partly on examination before Parliament. Howard's exertions, and those of Mrs. Fry and other investigators, awakened in the public mind the question whether any practice in which the public interest was so much involved should be left to something like mere chance to the negligence of local authorities and the personal disposition of jailers. As in other reform movements, so in this, our own country has been most progressive, and Europe has willingly taken lessons from America. The reports made of our prison systems by the French visitors, Messrs. Beaumont and De Tocqueville (in 1834), De Metz and Blouet (in 1837), Dr. Juliers (sent from Prussia), and Mr. Crawford (from England), have certainly contributed very largely to the present state of public opinion on the subject. In 1834, inspectors were appointed to report annually on the state of English and Scottish prisons-a measure which had been earlier adopted with reference to Ireland; and their reports may be consulted with advantage.

“The tendency lately has been to regulate prison discipline with extreme care. The public sometimes complain that too much pains is bestowed on it  — that criminals are not worthy of having clean, well-ventilated apartments, wholesome food, skilful medical attendance, industrial training, and education, as they now have in this country. There are many arguments in favor of criminals being so treated, and the objections urged against such treatment are held by those who are best acquainted with the subject to be invalid; for it has never been maintained by any one that a course of crime has been commenced and pursued for the purpose of enjoying the advantages of imprisonment. Perhaps those who chiefly promoted the several prominent systems expected from them greater results, in the shape of the reformation of criminals, than have been obtained. If they have been disappointed in this, it can, at all events, be said that any prison in the now recognised system is no longer like the older prisons, an institution in which the young criminals advance into the rank of proficients, and the old improve each other's skill by mutual communication. The system now received is that of separation, so far as it is practicable. Two other systems were tried — the silent system and the solitary system. The former imposed entire silence among the prisoners even when assembled together; the latter endeavored to accomplish their complete isolation from sight of or communication with their race. By the separate system, the criminals are prohibited from communicating with each other; but they are visited by persons whose intercourse is more likely to elevate than to debase — as chaplains, teachers, Scripture readers, the superior officers of the prison, and those who have the external control over it.” SEE PENITENTIARY.

The Prison Association in the State of New York is regarded as the most perfect organization of the kind in the world. According to the annual report, the objects of this society are threefold:

1. Humane attention to persons arrested, protecting them from legal sharpers, and securing their impartial trial.

2. Encouragement and aid of discharged convicts.

3. Careful study of prison discipline, observation of the causes of crime, and inquiry as to the proper means of its prevention.

The last is considered the most important of its objects. The statistics of the work of the society during the quarter of a century just ended show the following figures under the first object named above: 93,560 friendless persons visited in the detention prisons of New York and Brooklyn, all of them counselled, and many of them assisted; 25,290 complaints carefully  examined; 6148 complaints withdrawn at the instance of the society as trivial, or founded on mistake or passion; 7922 persons discharged by the courts on recommendation of the society, who were young, innocent, committed their offences under mitigating circumstances, or were evidently penitent; a total of 133,922 cases in which relief of some kind has been offered by the association. During the last twenty-five years the assistance given to discharged convicts is summed up as follows: 18,309 persons of this class aided with board, clothing, tools, railroad tickets, or money; 4139 provided with permanent situations; a total of 22,448. Aid has also been extended to thousands of persons connected with the families of the prisoners. For some years a few hundred dollars have been annually distributed on New-year's-day among indigent families. By its act of incorporation it is made the duty of the Prison Association to “visit, inspect, and examine all the prisons of the State of New York, and annually report to the Legislature their condition.” In 1876 the fourth National Prison Reform Congress was held in New York City, and very advanced ground was taken. Those especially interested in this subject will do well to consult the minutes of these proceedings, and the annual reports of the New York State Prison Association; also those of the Boston Prison Discipline Society, an organization to which is due the introduction of religious exercises into American prisons, as well as the appointment of chaplains. Prison congresses have been held in Europe since 1845. In 1872 an international congress was held in London, likewise in 1877.

While the principle of prison reform is universally recognised, it is found in practice to work with different results in different cases. This comes from the impossibility of having uniformity in the actual management of the prisons, personal tact and influence having much to do in the case. The prison at Columbus, O., has the reputation of being one of the best in the country for this reason; it enjoys superior supervision, and is wholly free from political interference. The movers in reform hope to achieve still better results in all the institutions. Their principal business is with the criminal after he is caught — to reform him, restore his manhood, and return him to society a new individual. The question how to prevent crime in the first instance is another and more important question. See the excellent article on Prisons and Prison Discipline in the Amer. Cyclop. 14:6, 17, and the literature there quoted. See also Revue Chretienne, Aug. 1873, art. 1; Robin, La Question Penitentiaire (Paris, 1873); Edinb. Rev.  54, 159 sq.; Meth. Quar. Rev. July, 1873, art. v; New-Engl. Jan. 1873, art. 4; Christian Union, May 31, 1876; New York Evening Post, 1878.

## Prison, Ecclesiastical[[@Headword:Prison, Ecclesiastical]]

             A bishop was required to have one or more prisons for criminous clerks in 1261. That of the bishop of Chichester remains over his palace gate; and the bishop of London's gate-house stood at the west side of Westminster Abbey. The southwestern tower of Clugny was used as a prison. There were various names for prisons: 1, Little Ease, in which the prisoner could neither sit, lie, nor stand; 2, Bocardo, as over the gate near St. Michael's at Oxford; 3, Hell, as at Ely; and, 4, the Lying House at Durham. At Durham, Berne, and Norwich the conventual cells adjoined the chapter-house; at Durham the term of imprisonment lasted sometimes during a year, and was often attended with chains, food being let down by a rope through a trap- door. In all cases solitary confinement was practiced, and in some cases the guilty were immured after the pronunciation of the sentence Vade in pace, “Go in peace.” At Thornton the skeleton of abbot De Multon (cir. 1445), with a candlestick, chair, and table, was found built up within a recess in  the wall; and a cell, with a loop-hole looking towards the high-altar, remains at the Temple, in which William le Bachelor, grand preceptor of Ireland, died. At Clugny the prison had no stair, no door, and no window. At Hirschau the prisoner could barely lie down; at St. Martin-desChamps the cell was subterranean; at St. Gabriel, Calvados, under a tower. The prisons remain at St. Gabriel, Calvados, Rebais, St. Peter-sur-Dives, and St. Benet-sur-Loire; at Caen, near the great gate; and over it at Tewkesbury, Binham, Hexham, Bridlington, and Malling. The prison was under the charge of the master of the infirmary. “Criminous priests” were imprisoned in 740 in England, and in 1351 their meager fare was prescribed. — Walcott, Sacred Archaeology, s.v.

## Prisoner[[@Headword:Prisoner]]

             (אִסַּיר, assir, δέσμιος). Imprisonment does not appear to have been imposed by Moses as a punishment among the Hebrews, though he describes it as in use among the Egyptians (Gen 39:20-21; Gen 40:1-4). He seems to have used it merely for the purpose of keeping the culprit safe until judgment was given (Lev 24:12). As execution immediately followed the sentence, there was little occasion for incarceration. The great variety in the names of prisons in the Hebrew would lead us to imagine that they were more frequently used in the latter than in the earlier periods of the Hebrew nation; and that they were not only used in the detention of criminals, but as a means of punishment and correction (2Ch 16:10; 1Ki 22:27; 2Ki 25:29; Jer 37:15; Jer 37:21; Jer 52:31; Isa 24:22; Isa 42:7; Mat 4:12; Act 12:4). Prisoners were often confined in stocks, or with chains (Job 33:11; Jer 40:4); and the keepers of the prisons often had a discretionary power to treat their prisoners as they pleased. The torture was often applied to extort a confession from the accused. In later periods the Jews confined those in prison who failed in the payment of their debts. They had the liberty to punish the debtor with stripes (Wisdom of Solomon Jer 2:19; Mat 5:26; Mat 18:28-34). The Romans, in some instances, fastened their criminals by one or both hands to a soldier: such appear to have remained in their own houses (Act 28:16). It was not unfrequently the case that the keepers of prisons, when those who were committed to their charge had escaped, were subjected to the same punishment which had been intended for the prisoners (Act 12:19; Act 16:27). SEE PRISON.

## Pritchard, Martin[[@Headword:Pritchard, Martin]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church of some standing, was born in Ohio April 23, 1827; was converted and joined the Church at the age of seventeen. He obtained a good elementary education, and for a number of years was engaged as a school-teacher. He was licensed as an exhorter when about twenty-three, and as a local preacher at the age of twenty-five. He joined the Nebraska Conference in 1857, and at once entered upon his duties as an itinerant with that energy and devotion to his work which so signally characterized his whole career as a minister, and the fruits of his  labor gave abundant proof that he was indeed called of God. He preached successively at Mount Pleasant, Peru, Belleview, Platte Valley, Pawnee City, Falls City, and a second time at Peru. In 1870 he was appointed presiding elder of the Lincoln district, and at the next annual conference he was appointed presiding elder of the Nebraska district. At the Conference of 1875 he was appointed presiding elder of the Lincoln district, where he continued his earnest and faithful labors until about ten days before his death. which occurred on March 24,1877. He was a member of the Book Committee four years, and was twice elected reserve delegate to the General Conference. See Minutes of the Annual Conferences, 1877, p. 142; N. Y. Christian Advocate, April 19, 1877.

## Pritchard, Samuel[[@Headword:Pritchard, Samuel]]

             a Wesleyan missionary, was born in the first quarter of our century. He was converted in 1843, and feeling called of God to preach the glad tidings, he entered the itinerant ranks in 1852, and was sent to Biabou Circuit. in the island of St. Vincent. He was there only two years when he was seized with malignant yellow fever, and died Feb. 28, 1853. During the brief period of his ministerial labors he gained the affectionate regard of the community in which he resided. See Wesleyan Mag. 1853, p. 872.

## Prithu[[@Headword:Prithu]]

             is the name of several legendary kings of ancient India. It is, however, especially one king of this name who is the favorite hero of the Pusrdnas. His father was Vena, an embodiment of the Hindui divinity Vishnu (q.v.). Vishnu perished through his wickedness; for when he was inaugurated monarch of the earth, he caused it to be everywhere proclaimed that no worship should be performed, no oblations offered, and no gifts bestowed upon the Brahmins. The Rishis, or Saints, hearing of this proclamation, entreated the king to revoke it, but in vain; hence they fell upon him and slew him. But the kingdom now being without a king, as Vena had left no offspring, and the people being without protection, the sages assembled, and consulted how to produce a son from the body of the dead king. First, then, they rubbed his thigh; from it, thus rubbed, came forth a being called Nishada; and by this means the wickedness of Vena having been expelled, they proceeded to rub the right arm of the dead king, and by this friction engendered Prithu, who came forth resplendent in person, and in his right hand appeared the mark of the discus of Vishnu, which proved him to be a  universal emperor, one whose power would be invincible even by the gods. The mighty Prithu soon removed the grievances of the people; he protected the earth, performed many sacrifices, and gave liberal gifts to the Brahmins.

On being informed that in the interval in which the earth was without a king all vegetable products had been withheld, and that consequently the people had perished, he in great wrath marched forward to assail the earth. The earth, assuming the figure of a cow. fled before him, but seeing no escape from the power of the king, at last submitted to him, and promised to renew her fertility, provided he made all places level. Prithu therefore uprooted mountains, levelled the surface of the earth, established boundaries of towns and villages, and induced his subjects to take up their abode where the ground was made level. Then Prithu caused the earth to appear before his throne in the shape she had assumed, and commanded that any one who should apply to her with a wish, and bring a calf with him to milk her, should be granted his wish. This is the celebrated wonder-cow, about which the Brahmins and the Kshatrias fought such tremendous battles that the gods found it necessary to intervene. Now the earth resumed her former liberality, the people were relieved of their want, and the young god, presented by Vishnu and Shiva with never-missing weapons, by the sun-god with an all-illuminating crown, by the sea-god with a parasol trimmed with pearls, walked through the world a conqueror in every battle, bestowing rain or sunshine at his will. He now prepared for invading the empire of India, and for that purpose offered ninety-nine great sacrifices of horses; but when he was going to offer the hundredth, Indra managed to steal the horse, as the last performance would have secured victory. Prithu's son pursued the robber, who could not otherwise escape him than by changing himself into the form of a penitent strewed with ashes and hung all round with bones. Indra succeeded in stealing the horse a second time, and only escaped the unerring weapons of his foe by the intervention of Brahma. Prithu resigned power in favor of his son, and retired to a solitude, where he was absorbed by the divinity. The legend of Prithu evidently records some historical fact regarding the civilizing influences exerted by a great king of Hindu antiquity.

## Pritz, Johann Georg[[@Headword:Pritz, Johann Georg]]

             a German theologian, was born at Leipsic in 1662. After having been an evangelical minister at Leipsic and at Zerbst, he became superintendent at Schleitz. He was made professor of theology at Greifswalde, and in 1711 was called to Frankfort-on-the-Main as senior minister. He died in the year  1732. Among his numerous writings we cite the following: De contemptu divitiarumn apud antiquos philosophos (Leipsic, 1693, 4to): — De prceroigativa sexus masculini prce femineo (4to): — De immortalitate hominis, contora Asgilium (ibid. 1702, 4to): — Proben der Beredtsamkceit (noted for eloquence) (ibid. 1702, 8vo): — Introductio in Novun Testamentumn (ibid. 1709, 8vo). He also edited a work of opuscules of St. Macaire, and translated some of the writings of Burnet and other English authors. — Hoefer. Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Private Baptism[[@Headword:Private Baptism]]

             The Church, even in her most ritualistic periods, has always held that, in case of danger or sickness, baptism might be administered at any time or in any place. In Thessaly, when baptism was restricted to Easter, many died without it, and in consequence the old prohibitions were mitigated, the font being hallowed at Easter and Pentecost for occasional use. Children, if in danger, might be baptized on the day of their birth, by a decree of the councils of Gerona, 517, and Winchester, 1071; and the Constitutions of Othobon, 1268. According to Roman Catholic teachings, the vessels in which any have been baptized are to be carried to church and there applied to some necessary use, and not to any common purpose, out of reverence to the sacrament (Langton's Constitutions, 1223); and the water with which baptism was ministered was to be thrown into the fire, or carried to the church to be put into the font. The vessel, Lyndwood says, was to be large enough to permit immersion, and was to be burned or deputed to the use of the Church, by Edmund's Constitutions of 1236; that is, as Lyndwood explains, “for washing the church linen.” Wooden vessels were burned. In England, in the Anglo-Saxon period, children, if sick, were brought to the priest, by Elfric's Canons, 957, who was to baptize them, from whose district soever they were brought, without delay.

## Private Confession[[@Headword:Private Confession]]

             SEE CONFESSION.

## Private Judgment[[@Headword:Private Judgment]]

             is the right the Protestants claimed in the Reformatory movement of the 16th century, and has since become the corner-stone of Protestantism (q.v.). The term signifies the right of man to read the Bible for himself and form his own judgment of its meaning under the enlightenment of the Holy  Spirit. In the view of Protestantism, man does not only enjoy this privilege, but is bound to exercise it. But, on the other hand, the Romish Church steadfastly denies this right to any man, amid holds the Church alone authority and guide in Scripture interpretation. On this point the Council of Trent thus decrees: “In order to restrain petulant minds, the council further decrees that in matters of faith and morals, and whatever relates to the maintenance of Christian doctrine, no one, confiding in his own judgment, shall dare to wrest the Sacred Scriptures to his own sense of them, contrary to that which hath been held, and still is held, by holy mother Church, whose right it is to judge of the true meaning and interpretation of Sacred Writ, or contrary to the unanimous consent of the fathers, even though such interpretation should never be published. If any disobey, let them be denounced by the ordinaries, and punished according to law.” From the terms of this decree, it is plain that Romanists hold that their Church alone is entitled to judge of the true meaning and interpretation of Sacred Scripture. To the same effect the creed of pope Pius IV declares: “I also admit the Holy Scriptures according to that sense which our holy mother the Church has held, and does hold, to which it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Scriptures. Neither will I ever take and interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the fathers.” In opposition to such doctrines as these, the Word of God explicitly teaches that every man is bound to judge for himself of the true meaning of Scripture. Thus 1Th 5:21, “Prove all things; hold fast that which is good.” Act 17:11, “These were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the Word with all readiness of mind, and searched the Scriptures daily, whether those things were so.” Mar 12:24, “And Jesus answering said unto them, Do ye not therefore err, because ye know not the Scriptures, neither the power of God?” Luk 16:29, “Abraham saith unto him, “they have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them.” Isa 8:20, “To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.”

The popish theory goes to destroy individual responsibility; but in alleging herself to be the appointed interpreter of Scripture the Church of Rome is obliged to concede the right of private judgment so far as to enable us to determine for ourselves from the Divine Word that we are bound to submit our understandings to her guidance in spiritual things. But by any concession of the exercise of private judgment to any extent whatever, her  theory falls to the ground. Dr. Whately shows this in a very striking manner in a passage which we extract from his Cautions for the Times: “A man who resolves to place himself under a certain guide to be implicitly followed, and decides that such and such a Church is the appointed infallible guide, does decide, on his own private judgment, that one most important point which includes in it all other decisions relative to religion. Thus, by his own showing, he is unfit to judge at all, and can have no ground for confidence that he has decided rightly in that. If, accordingly, he will not trust himself to judge even on this point, but resolves to consult his priest, or some other friends, and be led entirely by their judgment thereupon, still he does in thus resolving exercise his own judgment as to the counsellors he so relies on. The responsibility of forming some judgment is one which, however unfit we may deem ourselves to bear it, we cannot possibly get rid of, in any matter about which we really feel an anxious care. It is laid upon us by God, and we cannot shake it off. Before a man can rationally judge that he should submit his judgment in other things to the Church of Rome, he must first have judged,

1, that there is a God;

2, that Christianity comes from God;

3, that Christ has promised to give an infallible authority in the Church;

4, that such authority resides in the Church of Rome.

Now, to say that men who are competent to form sound judgments upon these points are quite incompetent to firm sound judgments about any other matters in religion is very like saying that men may have sound judgments of their own before they enter the Church of Rome, but that they lose all sound judgment entirely from the moment they enter it.” See Elliott, Delineation of Romanism; North Brit. Rev. 34:260; Daubigne, Hist. of the Ref. i, 281; Congre,. Quar. 8:2, 66; Lee, Right and Responsibility of Private Judgment (N. Y. 1855); Rogers, Reason and Faith.

## Privatio Comunionis[[@Headword:Privatio Comunionis]]

             (deprival of the Communion), one of the punishments inflicted on offending members of the clerical body during the earlier centuries. Those punishments included suspension, degradation, privatio communionis, or deprivation, corporal chastisement, and excommunication. Privatio was of two kinds, namely, a restriction to conmmunio peregrina, or to  comnmunio laica. The former had reference to the mode in which strangers were treated who did not bring with them letters testimonial, by which they might be ascertained to be members of some Christian Church: they were looked upon with suspicion, and till they could clear themselves were not allowed to come to the Lord's table, nor to receive any temporal support from the Church funds. In this way delinquent clergymen were treated even in their own Church: they were deprived of means of support, and prevented from officiating or being present at the Lord's Supper. Communico laica was a punishment which required a clergyman to communicate as a layman, and among the lay members of the Church. SEE COMMUNIO LAICA AND COMMUNIO PEREGRINA.

## Privation[[@Headword:Privation]]

             is a philosophical term which, according to Plato, is limitation, imperfection, the inherent condition of all finite existence, and the necessary cause of evil. Leibnitz (Causa Dei, § 69, 72; Essai suo la bonte de Dieu, 1iere partie, § 29, 31; 3ieme partie, § 378), after Augustine, Aquinas, and others, held similar views.

## Privation, Ecclesiastical[[@Headword:Privation, Ecclesiastical]]

             is one of the vindictive, i.e. positive, penalties (in opposition to the censures) which the ecclesiastical laws inflict in the Church of Rome on prebendaries for grave and repeated offences against the discipline of the Church. It is the suspension of an ecclesiastic from his office and prebend. It differs from the disciplinary transfer by which the delinquent receives, in place of the prebend which is taken from him, another, though inferior one; it also differs from absolute deposition, by which an ecclesiastic is deprived forever of his office and official income, and declared unfit for any further employment, while the privation does not forbid him the hope of getting some time another prebend. The privation, as long as it lasts, deprives its object of the power of performing the ecclesiastical functions of consecration or jurisdiction, without unfitting him for life for any further employment. This penalty — even because it is a positive penalty — cannot be inflicted for merely administrative reasons, like the transfer, for instance; or for delinquencies which remained secret, and are only known to the bishop, like the suspension; but only in consequence of canonic examination and by judiciary sentence. The canons name among the transgressions which, if proved, are punished with privation: continued  negligence in the performance of the official duties (c. 4, Dist. 91), addiction to lucre (c. 8, 10 Ne clen. vel monach. 3, 50), repeated infrinlgements of the law of residence (Conc. Tid. sess. 24 c. 12, De ref:), immoral and scandalous conduct, etc.; if admonitions and gradual corrections have proved unavailing (id. sess. 21 c. 6, De ref; c. 13, 10 De vit. et hon. cler. 3, 1). There are, of course, other transgressions and vices, which can be visited with indefinite suspension; drunkenness, for instance. Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, s.v. SEE PRIVATIO COMMUNIONIS.

## Privilege[[@Headword:Privilege]]

             (Lat. privilegium, from privata lex, a private law), in general, is a special ordinance or regulation in virtue of which an individual or a class enjoys certain immunities or rights from or beyond the common provisions of the general law of the community. In ancient and medieval legislation, the law of privilege formed an important branch; and, in truth, the condition of the so-called “privileged classes” was in all respects different, socially, civilly, and even religiously, from that of the non-privileged.

In canon law, there were two privileges enjoyed by the clergy, which deserve especial notice, from the frequency of the historical reference to them — the “privilege of the canon” (privileyium canonis) and the “privilege of the forum” (privilegiumnfori). By the former, the person of the clergyman, of whatever degree, was protected from violence by the penalty of excommunication against the offender; by the latter — in England called “benefit of clergy” (q.v.) — the clergyman was exempted from the ordinary civil tribunals, and could only be tried in the ecclesiastical court. — Chambers, s.v. This privilege from the civil power is now generally abrogated, or at least modified. It comprehended the independent jurisdiction of the clergy (privilegium fori), according to which not only all litigious concerns among the clergy themselves, but all personal, and most of the real complaints of laymen against clerks, were brought before, and decided by, ecclesiastical courts; likewise. not only their official transgressions, as functionaries of the Church, but also their civil crimes, were tried and punished by clerical tribunals. To the same class of privileges belongs the benefit of competence, in consequence of which, in matters of debts and substation, the clerical person must be left the means of living according to his station. Finally, the clergy obtained at an early period a number of immunities. which were gradually increased. They were, in consideration of the spiritual pursuits to which they have to  devote themselves, exempted from the administration of governmental or communal functions, from tutorships and guardianships, from military and other services to which all other citizens of the State are bound (ismunitras personalis). With these was connected the immunity from extraordinary taxes (imnunitas realis); from presentations for the building of roads, bridges, channels; from lodging soldiers; from surveyances in times of war (immunitas mixta). Many of these immunities were granted to the clergy by the emperors Theodosius (Cod. Theodos. 2, 3, 11, 14-17, 24, 36, De episc. eccl. et cler. 16:2) and Justinian (1, 1, 2, 6, 52, Cod. De episc. et cler. 1, 3) in the times of the Roman empire; afterwards by the Frankish kings (Cupp. Reg. From cc. lib. 7:c. 185, 290, 467); consolidated by the ecclesiastical legislation (c. 69, c. 12 qu. 2; c. 40, c. 16:qu. I; c. 4, 7, 10 De immun. eccl. 3, 49; Sextus, c. 1, 3, cod. 3, 23; Sextus, c. 4, De censibus, 3, 20: Clem. c. 3, cod. 3, 13, etc.), and urgently recommendled by the Council of Trent to the worldly rulers (Conc. Trid. sess. 25:c. 20, De ref.). In our times most of the civil legislations impose the same regular taxes on all citizens, without exception, and regardless of former immunities. But in many European states the clergy are unconditionally exempted from communal functions, guardianships, and personal prestations, and are also exempted from military service. — Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon.

## Privileged Days[[@Headword:Privileged Days]]

             those signalized by peculiar ceremonies or commemorating particular events: the first, fourth. and fifth Saturdays in Lent, and Easter Eve, Ash- Wednesday, first and fourth Sundays in Lent, Palm-Sunday, Good-Friday, and Holy Week. — Walcott, Sacred Archaeology, s.v.

## Privileged Sundays[[@Headword:Privileged Sundays]]

             those on which, in some churches of mediaeval times, “histories” (lessons from Holy Writ) were read.

## Privilegium Altaris[[@Headword:Privilegium Altaris]]

             is a privilege granted by the pope that masses for the dead said before a certain altar may procure an indulgence to the deceased. Forever and for all days (privilegium perpetuum et quotidi (anum) this privilege has been granted by Benedict XIII (de dat. 20 Julii, 1724, “omnium saluti”) to all patriarchal, metropolitan, and cathedral churches for the high altar. Generally it is granted for seven years only (septennium), running from the  day of the grant. The indulgence can be obtained for the dead if a mass of requiem (called sometimes a black mass) be said before the privileged altar; but if the rite do not allow of a votive mass, nor, in consequence, of a requiem (i.e. in fest. displici, coram exposito, etc.), the application or intention “pro defuncto” is sufficient, as in such a case no mass of requiem can be said even at the privileged altar. On the Day of Al-Souls all priests before altars can use this privilege (Decret. Congreg. Sacr. Indulg. 19 Maii, 1761). — Aschbach, Kirchen-Lex. s.v. SEE ASYLUM.

## Privilegium Canonis[[@Headword:Privilegium Canonis]]

             (1.) Certain exemptions of the clergy from the State. SEE PRIVILEGE.

(2.) That privilege of ecclesiastics which makes a real injury to a member of the clergy punishable by excommunication, this taking place de ipso facto. After several former canons had established the principle that such real injuries must, after examination, be punished with excommunication (for instance, can. Si quis deinceps, 22; De presbyterorum, 23, c. 17, qu. 4), the heresy of Arnold di Brescia gave occasion to the Council of Rheims, in 1131, to sanction that extreme penalty. The canon then decreed, commencing with “Si quis suadente diabolo,” was made by Innocent II, in 1139, a general law of the Church; and this is the reason why the privilege mentioned above is called Privilegium canonis. In Gratian's decree this ecclesiastical law is given as can. 29, c. 17, qu. 4. It contains some further dispositions, for it states that it is applicable also to real injuries perpetrated against monks, and that absolution, except in the dying hour, can only be obtained if the excommunicated person applies for it personally in Rome.

This canon has received in the course of time an enlarged interpretation for some cases and a restricted one for others. As a matter of course, the term “ecclesiastic” includes all those who received the tonsure; but the term “monk” has also a very extensive signification, as it includes every member of an order approved by the Church, even the novice. The law is, moreover, applicable to cases where the dead body of a clergyman has been the object of some wanton outrage. On the other side, there are cases where a person, though belonging to the clergy, has no share in the privilege; for instance, the ecclesiastic who is degraded acti, especially when he is sentenced to hard labor; the clergyman who dresses in worldly clothes, or persists in a sinful way of life. The canon Si quis suadente speaks only of that kind of real injury which consists in “assault upon an ecclesiastic,” but we have, of course, to take a more extensive view of the  case: not only he who strikes, etc., the clergyman is to be punished by excommunication, but also the intellectual originator of such an outrage, or he in whose name it is committed, and who approves of it, or he who, being a witness to it, fails to do what is in his power to prevent it. It is necessary that the delinquent should have acted with the intention of injuring a clergyman; he who, animo injuriandi, strikes another person, ignorant that he is a member of the clergy, is not excommunicated; but he is who strikes a layman whom he mistakes for a member of the clergy. If the quarrel originated with the ecclesiastic, the law cannot be applied to the person who is in the case of legitimate defence against him; this is also admitted in favor of a woman who defends her chastity against the assaults of a clergyman. An exception is also admitted in favor of the husband, son, father, or brother of a woman found in criminal conversation with an ecclesiastic. The rule that absolution must be personally applied for in Rome has been restricted in some cases: it is not applicable to women, to monks, and other clerks living in community, when they have assaulted each other, or to sick and ailing persons. A report sent to Rome is sufficient in such cases. Sometimes, when the injury is a trifling one (levis percussio), the bishop may grant a dispensation. In general the modern practice has become milder: it imposes the voyage to Rome as a penance only for injuries against the offender's own curate or bishop; absolution is bestowed on his return by the bishop. — Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen- Lexikon, s.v.

## Prize[[@Headword:Prize]]

             (βραβεῖον, 1Co 9:24) signifies the honorary reward bestowed on victors in the public games of the Greeks, such as a wreath, chaplet, garland, etc., and is metaphorically used of the rewards of a future life: “I press,” says the apostle, “towards the mark, for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus” (Php 3:14). SEE GAME.

## Pro-Hegoumenos[[@Headword:Pro-Hegoumenos]]

             the ex-superior of a Greek convent who has completed his term of office, which is two years, and retires divested of nothing but his authority. — Gardner, Faiths of the World, s.v.

## Proal, Pierre Alexis, D.D[[@Headword:Proal, Pierre Alexis, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal minister, was born at Newark, N.J., in 1796. He was ordained deacon in New York, September 18, 1818, his first parish being St. John's Church, Johnstown, where he remained for a short time; then he took charge of St. George's Church, Schenectady; in 1836 he became rector of Trinity Church, Utica, a position which he retained until the spring of 1857, when, on account of impaired health, he resigned. He died in that city September 15 following. Dr. Proal was one of the most prominent clergymen of the diocese of Western New York, from its organization held the post of secretary of the convention, and was deputy to the General Convention. He was an earnest and forcible preacher See Amer. Quar. Church Rev. 1857, page 465.

## Proast, Jonas[[@Headword:Proast, Jonas]]

             an English divine, flourished in the closing half of the 17th and the early part of the 18th century. He is noted as a controversialist, and wrote, among other things, Letters on Toleration (169091, and since). There is nothing accessible regarding his personal history. Leckey (Hist. of Rationalism, 2, 87) is the only writer of note who has considered Proast;  neither Leslie Stephen (Hist. of English Thought in the 18th Century) nor Tulloch (Rational Theology in the 18th Century) mentions him.

## Probabilionists[[@Headword:Probabilionists]]

             are those who oppose the doctrine of Probabilism and assert that man is obliged, on pain of sinning, always to take the more probable side. The Jansenists and the Port-Royalists are of this class. SEE PROBABILISM.

## Probabilism[[@Headword:Probabilism]]

             The Roman Catholic Church recognises no standard of ethics except that of her own construction. Protestants look to the Bible as the source of all doctrines of morality. The Church of Rome accords autlority also to tradition, and to the writers of her own communion who have kept within the list of the faithful ones. SEE MORAL THEOLOGY. The expressed opinion of a Church doctor forms a sufficient basis for a legitimate moral decision. ‘The eternal and objective foundations of the moral law are thus exchanged for the subjective view of individual persons of eminence (see Wuttke, Christian Ethics, 1, 261-263). Not only is the deciding element the individual, instead of the Church, but that individual whose decision best suits the inquirer (see Sanchez, Op. Mor. i, 9, n. 12 sq., n. 24; Laymann, Theol. Mor. [1625] i, 11). Probabilism is a term used in philosophic parlance, as we may SEE IN THE ARTICLE PROBABLE, but in Christian theology it has become synonymous with Roman Catholic ethics. Though its principal source and advocacy are in the Order of the Jesuits, the whole Church of Rome has by its tacit acceptance of this doctrine become identified with it.

Definition. — Probabilism designates, in the domain of morals, an object so comprehensive, and including so many different branches, that we shall scarcely be able to delineate it here, even in its fundamental features. In order to define it we must depart from that moral idea which is the centre of the domain in which it moves: this centre is the certitude and firm conviction of the moral subject about the legitimacy of his acts. It is the opposite of this subjective consciousness which forms the object of all probabilistic questions. As the ground of the doctrine, it is assumed, then, that in human actions absolute certainty is not always attainable as to their lawfulness or unlawfulness. Short of this certainty, the intellect passes through the stages of “doubt” and of “probability.” Probability is a state of consciousness intermediate between certitude and incertitude, but  approaching more or less to certitude, without reaching it entirely. Consciousness, in the state of probability, has risen above incertitude. Doubt is a wavering state between two judgments, between negation and affirmation of the goodness or permissibility of an action; it excludes every positive approbation, every positive consent, every permanent decision in favor of either term of the moral antithesis. Probability has passed this uncertain wavering; it does not move hesitatingly to and fro; it has found a point of support, though the latter may not be absolutely trustworthy. In consequence, a more or less positive decision in favor of one or the other term of the question is possible. Such a decision must not originate in any subjective whim; it must be founded on sufficient objective reasons. This gives us the true idea of the probable conscience: “Probabile est id quod probari potest, hoc est, quod rationibus nititur.” We may, then, define probability in matters of conscience thus: it is the decision or consent of conscience in regard to the moral permissibility of an action, a decision founded on sufficient reasons, but not excluding all misgivings to the contrary. To the probaeble conscience, then, corresponds, as its foundation, the probable opinion (opinio probubilis). An opinion as to the legitimacy or illegitimacy of an action is the more probable the stronger the reasons on which it rests. These reasons are either intrinsic, a part of the thing itself and its objective nature, or extrinsic, owing their weight to human authorities. The extrinsic probability of an opinion contents itself with the repute and confidence enjoyed by the authorities which support it, while the intrinsic probability endeavors to conceive the rational foundation of the opinion in question. But whichever of these forms probability may assume, it can never be at variance with the decisions and doctrines of the Church. Absence of intrinsic and extrinsic contradictions is the negative condition of probability. To establish true and real probability (probabilitas vera), a positive element is required, to wit, a more or less evident accord with the objective law, either with its spirit or with its more or less clearly expressed dispositions. It results from the nature of opinion that a variety and diversity of opinions be conceived, which, in regard to their legitimacy, are of equal or unequal value. Moreover, in the conflict of views another element will arise as to their comparative “safety;” that is, the greater or less danger of moral culpability which they involve; and this greater or less moral “safety” of a view may or may not coincide with its greater or less “probability.” Hence the gradual scale of probable opinions, the highest degree being the opinio probabilissima, but the opinio tenuiter probabilis being entirely excluded. The ascending degrees of the concurrent probable  opinions are marked by the opinio mere probabilis, ceque probabilis, and probabilior.

The doctrine of probabilism is founded upon these distinctions. It is taught, with some variations, by four different schools, all of which agree in professing that it is lawfiul. in certain cases, to act upon opinions which are merely probable. These four schools of probabilism are called: Probabilism Simple, Equiprobabilism, Probabiliorism (from probabilior, more probable), and Tutiorism (from tutior, more safe). The first holds that it is lawful to act upon any probable opinion, no matter how slight its probability. The second requires that the opinion shall be “solidly probable,” but holds that, provided it be really probable, it is lawful to act upon it, even though the conflicting opinion should be equally probable. The third narrows much more the limits of what is allowed in the conflict of probable opinions, and only permits action on the more probable of the two; but permits this even when the less probable adverse opinion is the “more safe.” The fourth requires that in all cases the more safe opinion shall be followed, even when the less safe opinion is much the more probable. The extreme rigorism which the last class requires has caused its division into absolute and mollified tutiorism. “By the certainty of an opinion,” says Fuchs, “we are to understand the more or less considerable remoteness of the danger of sin, or of error, or of encroachment on other persons' rights. The more an opinion removes him who chooses it for his guide from the danger of actual sin, the more certain it is. The opinio tutior is that which declares that an action is not allowed; the opinio minus tuta is that which asserts the legitimacy of the action in question. As the being allowed and the not being allowed of an action stand together in the same relation as liberty and law, it may be said that in the first case liberty, in the second law, is favored (libertati favet, legi favet).”

To these probabilistic systems is opposed a system espoused by the more consistent of Romish theologians of the Old Catholic type. It is called Antiprobabilism, and in its austere severity does not allow any influence on man's actions, even to the most probable opinion. It reouires that an opinion shall be absolutely morally certain, in order that it may be lawful for a man to act upon it in the light of Christian truth. But this system has been rejected by papal authority, declaring erroneous the assertion “Non licet sequi opinionem vel inter probabiles probabilissimam.”  History of Probabilism. — It is commonly said that the system of probabilism is modern; but this is only true of the discussions regarding it, for the doctrine itself, in some of its forms, is as old as the study of ethics, even considered as a moral science. The disputes regarding it arose with the science of casuistry, when men, in the 16th and 17th centuries, began to reduce morals to a system. It formed a leading subject of the controversy between the Jesuits and the Jansenists; but even in its modern form probabilism dates back to the close of the scholastic period. At the Council of Constance, in A.D. 1415, a debate had arisen on the subject of the murder of the duke of Orleans, assassinated in Paris Nov. 23, 1407, at the instigation of his political rival, the duke of Burgundy. The Franciscan Jean Petit had endeavored to justify this crime in an assembly of French noblemen held at Paris March 8, 1408; but his proposition had been condemned, at the request of chancellor Gerson, by the university and the bishop of Paris. When the matter was brought before the council, Martin Porree, bishop of Arras, speaking in behalf of the duke of Burgundy, tried to prevent any conclusions unfavorable to Jean Petit, asserting that several authorities were in favor of Petit, and that, in consequence, his opinion was at least probable, and ought not to be peremptorily disposed of by way of rejection and condemnation. Gerson defended a contrary view of the matter, and the council condemned as heretical the doctrine of the legitimacy of murder committed on the persons of tyrants, and stamped with the name of heretic all those who should pertinaciously maintain it (comp. Mansi, Coll. Conc. 27:705, and 28:868). This resolution left probabilism untouched, and condemned only a false application of its principles in a particular case.

The Dominican Bartolomeo de Medina is considered as the founder of probabilism in its usual signification. Through his commentary on the theological Summa of St. Thomas de Aquinas it entered the schools: “Si est opinio probabilis,” he says (quaest. 19, art. 6, concl. 3), “licitum est eam sequi. licet opposita probabilior.” Many Thomist theologians adopted this proposition; among them, Bannez, Alvarez, Ledesma, Martinez, and Lopez. Among the Jesuits, the celebrated Vasquez was the first who (1598) positively took sides with the probabilists, and a number of members of his order followed in his footsteps. From this time forth the Jesuits did much for the expansion of the probabilistic doctrines, and the aberrations to which they led. Probabilism came to be synonymous with Jesuitism, so largely were the Jesuits identified with the advocacy of this  pernicious dogma. This is, however, easily accounted for. The Jesuits had come on the stage at a time when the Church of Rome was in danger of being broken up, if not of being entirely dismembered. The Reformation had struck her heavy blows, and in some countries she was felled to the ground. Loyola's order aimed at her recovery and restoration. The bride of Christ they saw endangered, and their mission was the salvation of the Romish Church at any price. In a struggle of life and death, as has been aptly said, one is not very careful in the use of measures; and in all warfare the sentiment holds good, though involving manifold violations of ordinary right, that the end sanctifies the means. The Jesuits were well aware that they were an essentially new phenomenon of the churchly lifethat they stood upon purely human invention and power; it need not surprise us, therefore, that they felt called by their fundamental principles to the development of a special system of morality — a system the highest end of which is the glory of God through the exaltation of the visible Church, which, of course, is to them the Romish Church.

The purpose — zealously pursued by the Jesuits in the interest of Romish domination — of becoming soul-guarding fathers and conscience-counsellors, especially for men and women of eminence, required, on the other hand, that the Jesuits should acquire for themselves the highest possible repute in ethics — and hence it was requisite that they should become the literary representatives thereof; and, on the other, that this ethics should be moulded in adaptation to this end — should make itself not disagreeable and burdensome, but should become as elastic as possible in view of different wants — should be a “golden net for catching souls,” as the Jesuits themselves were wont to call their own pliableness. The more ramified and complex the network of casuistic ethics became, so much the more indispensable were the practiced conscience-counsellors, or, more properly, conscience-advocates; the more stairways and back doors they were able to turn attention to in conscience affairs, so much the more prized and influential they became. This explains the great compass and the peculiar character of Jesuitic ethics. They were but too well aware that it did not harmonize with the moral consciousness of the ancient Church, and they hesitated not to admit that they did not recognise earlier Church tradition as a criterion for morality, but wished rather to lay the foundations for a new tradition. The sophistical artifices in the doctrine of right and morality were not then first thought out and invented by Jesuitism; but it learned them by listening to weak, corrupt human nature, as others had here and there done before it. Jesuitism, moreover, was the first to set up these sophisms as rules; first brought  them into an organized system of doctrine, and formed them as methods of the Christian doctrine of morals; first scientifically constituted, authorized, and sanctioned them as leading principles of Catholic morality; and — what is not to be overlooked — has first applied them to the allotment of the moral life to the natural weaknesses of the different ranks and classes, in order that “the kingdom of heaven henceforth may suffer no violence.”

We will not forget, however, that after the Theatines, in a general assembly of their order, in 1598, had formally renounced probabilism, several members of the Society of Jesus likewise raised their voice against the abuses of the system: we mention among them the Portuguese Ferdinand Rebelle and the Italian Comitolus. A short time afterwards the general of the order. Mutius Vileteschi, expressed similar opinions in a series of writings. We read in one of them: “Nonnullorum ex societate sententise, in rebus praesertim ad mores spectantibus, plus nimio liberae non modo periculum est ne ipsam evertant, sed ne ecclesise etiam Dei universae insignia afferant detrimenta. Omni itaque studio perficiant tit qui docent scribuntne minime hac regula et norma in delectu sententiarum utantur: Tueri quis potest, probabilis est, auctore non caret. Verum ad eas sententias accedant quse tutiores, quee graviores majorisque nominis doctorum suffragiis sunt frequentatae; quae bonis moribus conducunt magis; quee denique pietatem alere et prodesse queunt, non vastare, non perdere.” The Sorboluie, too, opened fire upon the probabilistic aberrations with the condemnation of the Magntos director curatorun, vicariorum, et confessariorum of P. Milhard, and the clergy of France continued the battle with praiseworthy zeal. The University of Louvain made similar declarations. In 1653 the Dominicans, in a general chapter held at Rome, joined their voice to these authorities. Again, some Jesuits, among others Candidus Philalethes (Andre Leblanc), censured those of their order who were advocates of probabilism.

Yet these antagonistic elements within Jesuitism were the exceptions, not the rule. The rank and file of the Society of Jesus were wedded to their new idols; and as the Jesuits were the chief representatives of Romish ethics in the 16th and 17th centuries, those who chose to attack Romanism levelled their guns directly at probabilism; while those who favored Romanism, or were themselves its supporters, but desired the downfall of Jesuitism, directly charged on this particular body of probabilists. Thus, e.g., Jansenism lifted up its voice against probabilism in order to destroy by this detour their enemies the Jesuits. Pascal, the great, if not immortal, advocate of the Port-Royalists, adopted this method.  In his Lettres Provinciales he puts together these aberrations of members of the Jesuitic Order; and as he represents the doctrine of probability, it is a curious perversion of the principle of authority the application of it to legitimatize doubt and license. He stigmatized probabilism as the “morals of the Jesuits.” The great publicity which the Provincial Letters owed to the splendid talent of their author became, especially among the educated classes, an inflexible opinion against Jesuits, which continues to this day. A number of refutations of the Provincial Letters appeared, some of them very awkward. The Jesuit Pirot, in his Apologie pour les Casuistes (Paris, 1657), made the following assertion: If an opinion is probable, it is sure, and can be followed; surety has no degrees, but is indivisible, so far as the moral action connected with a probable opinion is concerned; in consequence, a less probable opinion is as sure as a more probable (Apol. p. 46). Similar opinions were sustained by the Jesuits Matthew de Mova, Honord Lefevre, and Etienne des Champs (Quaestio Facti de Sententia Theologorum Societatis circa Opiniones probabiles, Paris, 1659). The ablest refutation, Riponse aux Lettres provinciales de L. de Montalte; ou Entretiens de Cleandre et Eudoxe, is due to the Jesuit Daniel, the well- known French historian, who gives a very elaborate account of probabilism. He observes that, according to the doctrine of the Jesuits, two conditions are required for the probability of an opinion: first, it can contradict neither the dogmas and truths taught by the Church, nor any evident reason; secondly, it must be founded on sound judgment, and not set up wantonly against the prevailing doctrine of the competent teachers.

Among these tumultuous contests in the domain of Catholic morals, the Apostolic See could not remain silent. The pope condemned the Provincial Letters (Sept. 6. 1657) on one side, and Pirot's Apology on the other (August, 1659). Pope Alexander VII declared against the dangerous excrescences of probabilism in a decree of Sept. 24, 1665; and his successor, Innocent XI, strictly defined its limits by his bull of 1679. The first-mentioned decree commences with these memorable words: “Our most holy father has heard, not without great sorrow, that several opinions, which weaken Christian discipline and prepare destruction to the souls, have been partly revived and partly started for the first time, and that the unbridled license of some extravagant minds increases every day, whereby a way of thinking has crept into the Church which is altogether at variance with Christian simplicity and the doctrine of the holy fathers, and which, should the believers make it the rule of their life, would produce a great  moral corruption.” Among the moral propositions censured by these two papal decrees, the following concern probabilism: from the first decree, Prop. 27 — “Si liber sit alicujus junioris et moderni, debet opinio censeri probabilis, dum non constet rejectam esse a Sede apostolica tanquam improbabilem;” from the latter, Prop. 1 — “Non est illicitunm in sacramentis conferendis sequi opinionem probabilem de valore sacramenti, relicta tutiore, nisi id vetet lex, conventio ant periculum gravis damni incurrendi. Hinc seenertia probabili tantum utendnm non est in collatione baptismi, ordinis sacerdotalis aut episcopalis.” Prop. 2 — “Probabiliter existimo judicem posse judicare juxta opinionem etiam minus probabilem.” Prop. 3 — “Generatim, dum probabilitate sive intrinseca sive extrinseca, quantumvis tenui, modo a probabilitatis finibus non exeatur, confisi aliquid agimus, semper prudenter agimus.” Prop. 4 — “Ab infidelitate excusabitur infidelis non credens, ductus opinione minus probabili.” The antiprobabilistic extreme, represented by the rigorism of the Jansenists, was met by pope Alexander VIII with the condemnation of the proposition referred to above, a condemnation which is contained in the decree of 1690.

The first consequence of the papal declarations was a sharper separation of the parties. Probabilism found its most redoubtable adversaries in the Carmelite Henry of St. Ignatius, the two Dominicans Daniel Concina (Delia Storia del Probabilismo) and Vincent Patuzzi, and in Franzoja and Pet. Ballerini. But all these efforts did not annihilate probabilism whether inside or outside the Order of the Jesuits. though it had to submit to many restrictions. In their fifth general assembly the Jesuits only protested against making probabilism the doctrine of their order. Oliva, the general of the order (in a letter of Feb. 3, 1669), speaks plainly enough in favor of probabilism; and while he declares certainly and truly probable opinions fit to engender a certain conscience (conscientia certa), he asserts, on the other side, that the requirement “sequendi semper in omnibus probabilioremn partem” would be too heavy a burden upon mankind. It was shown, however, much more clearly how deeply probabilism was rooted in the Jesuitic Order when the Spaniard Gonzalez, the general of the order, took with great decision, in 1694, the defence of the opposite system. In his work he dissents from the principle that man, in moral matters, must suffer himself to be guided by a sincere love of truth. Hence he draws the inference that we must always choose what we think to be nearest to truth; if objective truth cannot be obtained, we must at least  cling to that which, according to our subjective conviction, is nighest to it. For that reason we can follow even the less sure opinion, if we are convinced of its greater probability. The work written from this stand- point, and which the author meant to dedicate to the general of the order, Oliva, found its way into publicity only after many years. Perhaps Gonzalez would not have ventured, even while general of the order, to publish it if the same work which the casuists of the order wished to suppress had not been greatly approved of by pope Innocent XI. Many of the Jesuits claimed that Gonzalez had, by his disapproval of probabilism, made himself unworthy of his place, and pronounced him self-deposed. Only the protection of the pope saved him (see Wolf, Gesch. der Jesuiten, 1, 173). In his Fundamentum Theologioe Moralis (Rome, 1684) Gonzalez put in the background the authority system hitherto so predominant by giving the preference to the ethical province as the more appropriate judgment-seat of the appellate court. Two other theologians followed in his footsteps, Gilbert and Camarillo, representing the probabilioristic tendency. Gilbert, professor at Toulouse, did not in his work attack the principle of probabilism, only its vulgar form. He asserts that we are certain not to sin if we stick to the absolute probability either of law or of liberty; if we judge sensibly that something is allowed, after examining it sufficiently, taking the circumstances into account, and satisfying ourselves of the soundness of our judgment. While Gilbert treated the subject in a more speculative way, Camarillo, professor at Salamanca, in his treatise De Requla Hontestatis Moralis (Naples, 1702), takes a more historical view of the matter, and shows that modern probabilism has not the testimony of antiquity in its favor, and that since its first appearance the most considerable authorities were against it.

While the probabilists continued in their attempts to again turn the scales — we shall only mention the Tractatus Probabilitatis by Gabriel Gualdus (under the assumed name of Nicolaus Peginletus, Louvain, 1708) and the “Criticisms” of Cardenas (Opp. Carden. Ven. 1710) — and while the party of the probabiliorists grew in strength every day, mediating tendencies appeared. Ammon the works written in this spirit, the Sententia Medio of Alfonzo de Liguori is the best. This distinguished Romanist developed a system of morals which may be described as a kind of practical probabiliorism, in which, by the use of what are called reflex principles, an opinion which objectively is but probable is made subjectively the basis of a certain and safe practical judgment. Liguori teaches that we are bound to  keep our actions, as much as possible, in accordance with truth; or at least, as in the case of a more probable opinion, as near to truth as possible. If it should appear that of two opinions one is more favorable to liberty, the other to law, the latter being at the same time more probable, it must be admitted without hesitation. Liguori, in the case where equally strong reasons speak for law and liberty, professes a somewhat different opinion from Gilbert and the rigid probabiliorists — he decides for liberty. Liguori starts in his demonstration from the proposition that a doubtful law is not binding (“lex dubia non obligat”). A dubious law, he further says, is an uncertain law, and a law of this description cannot engender any obligation (“lex incerta non potest certam inducere obligationem”); for in this case of doubt, of uncertainty, liberty is in possession, and in consequence has the right on its side, according to the axiom “In dubio melior est conditio possidentis.” This is the strongest point of Liguori's argumentation, but also the point with which it stands and falls; here it has to fight a decisive battle against probabiliorism, or against refined tutiorism. Rassler, in his Norma Recti (Ingold. 1713), takes a similar stand-point between the contending parties, while Charles Emanuel Pallavicini, in his letters on the administration of the sacrament of penitence, claims for the confessors the right to choose between probabilism or probabiliorism, both with proper restrictions.

The maxims of the Jesuits disseminated themselves, like an infectious disease, far beyond the circle of their own order, as is shown by the comprehensive works of the Sicilian Antony Diana (Resolutiones Morales, Antv. 1629-37, 4 vols. fol.; Lugd. 1667; Venet. 1728), who taught, under the express approval of his ecclesiastical superiors, and also of the Jesuits, the doctrine of probabilism in its worst forms. One may act according to a probable opinion, and disregard the more probable one; man is not under obligation to follow the more perfect and the more certain, but it suffices to follow the simply certain and perfect; it would be an unendurable burden were one required to hunt out the more probable opinions (Res. Mo. [Antv. 1637] vol. ii, tract. 13; vol. 4, tract. 3; Summanz [1652], p. 214). The most of the Jesuits taught the same thing. In relation to murder, Diana teaches like Escobar: I am at liberty to kill even him who assails my honor if my honor cannot otherwise be rescued (Res. Mor. 3, 5, 90; Summa, p. 210, 212). When some one has resolved upon a great sin, then one is at liberty to recommend to him a lesser one, because such advice does not relate absolutely to an evil, but to a good, namely, the avoiding of the  worse; for example, if I cannot otherwise dissuade a person from an intended adultery than by recommending to him fornication instead thereof, then it is allowable to recommend this to him; not, however, in so far as it is a sin, but in so far as it prevents the sin of adultery. Diana appeals in this connection to many like-judging Jesuit doctors (Res. Mol. [Antv. 1637] vol. 3, tract. 5, 37). If a priest commissions Peter to kill Caius, who is weaker than Peter, but nevertheless Peter comes out second best and gets killed himself, still the priest incurs no guilt, and may continue in the administration of his office (ibid. vol. 3, tract. 15,17). He who resolves upon committing all possible venial sins does not thereby involve himself in any mortal sin (ibid. vol. 3, tract. 6, 24).

He who, ex aliqua justa cause, rents a house to another for purposes of prostitution commits no sin (ibid. vol. 3, tract. 6, 45). To eat human flesh, in case of necessity, he holds, with the majority of the Jesuits, as allowable (ibid. tract. 6, 48). He who, in virtue of a promise of marriage, induces a maiden to yield to him is not bound by his promise in case he is of higher rank or richer than she, or in case he can persuade himself that she will not take his promise in serious earnest (ibid. [Antv.] vol. 3, tract. 6, 81; in the spirit of Sanchez and Less). Marriage between brother and sister can be made legitimate by papal dispensation (ibid. vol. 4, tract. 4, 94; sanctioned by several Jesuits). In such moral perversity of view Diana seems only to have been surpassed by the Spanish Netherlander Cistercian Lobkowitz (Theol. Mor. 1645, 1652; comp. Perrault, i, 331 sq.), who, in his scepticism, entirely breaks down the moral consciousness, and declares that nothing is evil per se, but only because it is positively forbidden; hence God can dispense even with all the commandments (comp. the views of Duns Scotus, p. 34) (ibid. 1626); can e.g., allow whoredom and other like sins, for none of these are evils per se. Monks and priests are at liberty to kill the female misused by them when they fear, on her account, for their honor. This writer declares himself expressly and decidedly in favor of the views of the Jesuits. Also the Franciscan Order became infected with the maxims of the Jesuits, as is proved by the very voluminous work of Barthol. Mastrius de Mandula (ibid. 1626), which was published under the express sanction of the officers of the order, and who justifies restrictiones mentales even in oaths (Disp. 11:52, 171, 172, 183, ed. Ven. 1723), and also the murder of tyrants (ibid. 8:27), the murder of the slanderers by an important person, castration, and similar things (ibid. 8:25, 28; 11:110 sq.), as well as probabilism.  The moral system of the Jesuits is, we grant, not, strictly speaking, that of the Romish Church; many of their more extreme maxims the Church has condemned, and the more recent Jesuits themselves find it advisable no longer fully to avow their former principles. Nevertheless Jesuitism, together with its system of morals, is, as has been well said by Wuttke (1, 271, 272), “the ultimate consequential goal of the Church in its turning aside from the Gospel, just as (though in other respects widely different therefrom) Talmudism was the necessary goal of Judaism in its rejection of the Saviour. The error consists in the placing of human discretion and authority in the stead of the unconditionally valid, revealed will of God. Even as earlier Catholicism had intensified the divine command by self- invented, ascetic work-holiness into a seemingly greater severity-had aimed at a higher moral perfection than that required by God — so Jesuitism, with like presumption, lowered the moral law, out of consideration to temporal relations, to a merest minimum requirement; contented itself with a much lower moral perfection than the divine law calls for, and sought out cunning means for lightening even this minimum.”

Probabilism, moreover, is not a merely fortuitously discovered expedient, but it is in fact an almost inevitable consequence of the historical essence of Jesuitism. The order itself arose neither on the basis of Scripture nor of ancient Church tradition, but sprang absolutely from the daring inventive power of a single man breaking through the limits of ecclesiastical actuality. It is not therefore at all unnatural that it should make the authority of a single spiritually pre-eminent man its highest determining power, and subordinate to this the historical objective form of the moral consciousness. This, then, is the distinguishing characteristic of Jesuitical ethics-that in the place of the eternal objective ground( and criterion of the moral it substitutes subjective opinion, and in the place of an unconditional eternal end a merely conditionally valid one, viz. the defending of the actual, visible Church against all forms of opposition that in the place of the moral conscience it substitutes the human calculating of circumstantial and fortuitous adaptation to the promotion of this its highest end; that it attempts to realize what is per se and absolutely valid by a wide-reaching isolating of the means, and by so doing subordinates morality to the discretion of the single subject. “Though the ethics of the Jesuits are lax and quite too indulgent towards worldly, sinful proclivities and fashions, yet this is only one phase of the matter. A merely worldly-lax moral system, in the usual sense, seems but little applicable to the members of a  brotherhood the first rule of which is a perfect renunciation of personal will and personal opinion and self-determination, in a word, unconditional obedience to every command of superiors. and which has actually accomplished in the missionary field the grandest of deeds, and numbers among its members multitudes of heroic martyrs. This lack of strictness in one direction rests by no means on mere worldliness, on pleasure in the delights of this life, but follows, on the one hand, of necessity (as well as does also the rigor of obedience), from the subjectively arbitrary presupposition of the entire order, from the lack of an objective, unshaken foundation, and rests, on the other hand, strictly on calculation; is itself a cunningly devised means to the end; is intended to awaken, especially in the great and mighty of the earth (and the masses of the people are such under some circumstances), a love to the Church, to the mild, friendly, indulgent mother.”

Jesuitical ethics is the opposite pole of monastic ethics; where the latter requires too much, the former exacts too little. Monastic morality strives to win God for the sinful world, Jesuitical morality seeks to win the sinful world, not indeed for God, but at least for the Church. Monasticism says to God, though not in an evangelical sense, “If I have only thee, then I ask for nothing else in heaven or earth.” Jesuitism says about the same thing, but says it to the world, and particularly to the distinguished and powerful. The former turns away in indignant contempt from the worldly life because the world is immersed in sin; the latter generously receives the same into itself, and turns attention away from guilt by denying it. It is true the Jesuits represent also a monastic order, but this order is also a means to an end, and resembles the other nobler orders about as much as wily Reynard resembles the pious pilgrim; and the well-known hostility of the older orders to this brilliantly rising new one was not mere jealousy, but a very natural, and, for the most part, moral protest against the spirit of the same. See Wuttke, Christian Ethics (transl. by Prof. J. P. Lacroix, N. Y. 1874, 2 vols. 12mo), i, 255-272; Staudlin, Gesch. der Sittenlehre Jesu (Gdtting. 1799), i, 441; Schrockh, Kirchengesch. 9:343 sq.; Cotta, De Prob. Morali (Jena, 1728); Rachel, Examen Prob. Jes. (Helmst. 1664, 4to); De Wette, Christl. Sittenlehre, II, ii, 334 sq.; Perrault, Morale des Jesuites (1667, 3 vols.); Ellendorf, Die Moral u. Politik der Jesuiten (1840); Pragmatische Gesch. der Minchsorden (1770), vols. 9 and 10; Deutsches Kirchenblatt, 1875 (review of Gury's Compendium Theologioe Moralis, new ed. Ratisbon, 1874; one of the worst probabilistic advocates); Mosheim,  Eccles. Hist. 4:230; v, 190; Christian Remembrancer, July, 1852, p. 191 sq.; Amer. Quar, Rev. 11:473; Edinb. Rev. 23:320; 92, art. i.

## Probable[[@Headword:Probable]]

             (Lat. probabilis), a barbarous technical word which serves to designate the philosophic dogma that anything which does not admit of demonstration may admit the probable as proof, if such a course does not involve absurdity or contradiction. “As demonstration,” says Locke, “is the showing the agreement or disagreement of two ideas, by the intervention of one or more proofs, which have a constant, immutable, and visible connection one with another; so probability is nothing but the appearance of such an agreement or disagreement by the intervention of proofs whose connection is not constant and immutable, or at least is not perceived to be so, but is, or appears for the most part to be so, and is enough to induce the mind to judge the proposition to be true or false, rather than the contrary ... The entertainment the mind gives this sort of propositions is called belief, assent, or opinion, which is admitting or receiving any proposition as true upon arguments or proofs that are found to persuade us to receive it as true, without certain knowledge that it is so. And herein lies the difference between probability and certainty, faith and knowledge, that in all the parts of knowledge there is intuition; each immediate idea, each step, has its visible and certain connection; in belief not so. That which makes us believe is something extraneous to the thing we believe; something not evidently joined on both sides to, and so not manifestly showing the agreement or disagreement of, those ideas that are under consideration” (Essay on the Human Understanding, bk. 4, ch. 15; comp. Reid, Intel. Powers, essay 7, ch. 3). “The word probable,” — says Mr. Stewart, “does not imply any deficiency in the proof, but only marks the particular nature of that proof, as contradistinguished from another species of evidence. It is opposed not to what is certain, but to what admits of being demonstrated after the manner of the mathematicians.

This differs widely from the meaning annexed to the same word in popular discourse; according to which, whatever event is said to be probable is understood to be expected with some degree of doubt... But although, in philosophical language, the epithet probable be applied to events which are acknowledged to be certain, it is also applied to events which are called probable by the vulgar. The philosophical meaning of the word, therefore, is more comprehensive than the popular; the former denoting that particular species of evidence of which contingent truths admit; the latter  being confined to such degrees of this evidence as fall short of the highest. These different degrees of probability the philosopher considers as a series, beginning with bare possibility, and terminating in that apprehended infallibility with which the phrase moral certainty is synonymous. To this last term of the series the word probable is, in its ordinary acceptation, plainly inapplicable” (Elements, pt. 2, ch. 2, § 4).

Archbishop Butler, in his treatment of the evidences of Christianity, has had frequent recourse to this theory of the probable, and in consequence has at times laid himself open to severe attacks from the deistical and infidel schools of philosophy. By dwelling exclusively upon the absence of direct contradiction, and sinking the absence of confirmation, the learned author of the Analogy not unfrequently converts absolute ignorance into the likeness of some degree of positive knowledge. So Campbell, who borrowed from Butler, constructed most ingenious arguments on this paradox. Both these English thinkers seem to have had a confused notion that the improbability is an actual thing which still exists. Thus Campbell, after Butler, says, e.g., “The chances that a comet will not appear at a given instant in a given place are infinite. The presumption against the statement is therefore as strong as experience can afford; and yet when an astronomer announces the appearance of the comet you unhesitatingly believe him.” The object in this statement is to prove that we must depend largely upon testimony built up from experience, and that therefore knowledge is built upon the parobable. The result is, of course, a delusive appearance of independent scientific grounds for what is really a purely a prioni deduction. Like methods are now adopted in scientific circles, and what Hume and consorts once condemned the theologians for, the latter now have to contend with in the application of scientific queryings to the positive in divine laws, and institutions. See Ueberweg, Hist. of Philos. (Index in vol. 2); The (Lond.) Quatr. Rev. Jan. 1875, p. 31 sq.; London Academy, Nov. 15, 1873, p. 435, Colossians 1; Stephen, Religious Thought in England in the 18th Century, vol. 1.

## Probation, Ecclesiastical[[@Headword:Probation, Ecclesiastical]]

             in the Methodist Episcopal Church and other Methodist bodies, is the period, usually six months, for the candidate for Church membership to determine whether the organization is such as is likely to aid him in his Christian life, and for the Church to determine whether he is a proper person to be received.

## Probation, Ministerial[[@Headword:Probation, Ministerial]]

             signifies among some English dissenters the state of a student or minister while supplying a vacant church, with a view, on their approval of his character and talents, to his taking the pastoral oversight of them.

## Probation, Monastic[[@Headword:Probation, Monastic]]

             is the year of a novitiate, which a religieux must pass in a convent to prove his virtue and vocation, and whether he can bear the severities of the rule.

## Probation, Moral[[@Headword:Probation, Moral]]

             is a term used in Christian morals to denote that state of man in which his character is formed and developed in action preparatory to judgment (q.v.). It is the state antecedent to a state of retribution (q.v.). “More strictly speaking, moral probation is that experimental trial which lays the foundation for approbation or disapprobation, praise or blame, reward or punishment. It involves obligations to obedience, exposure to temptations, commands and prohibitions; promises, on the one hand, to encourage to duty; threatenings, on the other, to deter from sin; with a certainty of final retributions according to the character produced under these various means, and visibly proved by the course of action pursued by the individual. This is the state which is denominated moral probation; and in such a state is mankind under the law of God and the mediatorial reign of Christ; or, in the customary language of the New Test., under the kingdom of heaven (Mat 13:10-52).” It is the principal or rather essential doctrine in the independent system of those Christian moralists who wish to prove metaphysically the truth of Christian ethics. It is the favorite basis of Butler in his Analog. See Butler, Works, 1, 109. 128 sq., 382; Christian Rev. 16:541; Harlan, Ethics (see Index). The question whether there be a period of probation after death is more properly a part of the articles SEE FUTURE PUNISHMENT; SEE PURGATORY. Comp. the Meth. Quart. Rev. April, 1876, p. 355 sq., 357 sq.

## Probationer[[@Headword:Probationer]]

             is, in the Church of Scotland, a student in divinity, who, bringing a certificate from a professor in a university of his good morals, and his having performed his exercises to approbation, is admitted to undergo  several trials before the presbytery, and upon his acquitting himself properly in these, receives a license to preach. SEE PROBATION.

## Probity[[@Headword:Probity]]

             honesty, sincerity, or veracity. “It consists in the habit of actions useful to society, and in the constant observance of the laws which justice and conscience impose upon us. The man who obeys all the laws of society with an exact punctuality is not, therefore, a man of probity; laws can only respect the external and definite parts of human conduct; but probity respects our more private actions. and such as it is impossible in all cases to define; and it appears to be in morals what charity is in religion. Probity teaches us to perform in society those actions which no external power can oblige us to perform, and is that quality in the human mind from which we claim the performance of the rights commonly called imperfect.”

## Probst [[@Headword:Probst ]]

             SEE SPRENG.

## Probus[[@Headword:Probus]]

             a Christian martyr under Diocletian and Maximian, in the beginning of the 4th century, was born at Sida, in Pamphylia. He was repeatedly called up before Maximus, the governor of Cilicia, and commanded to sacrifice to the heathen deities. But he invariably refused, and his conduct was marked by the strongest decision. He was on one occasion scourged, both on his back and belly, which only called forth from the intrepid man the remark, ‘ The more my body suffers and loses blood, the more my soul will grow vigorous and be a gainer.” After an ineffectual attempt to destroy him by means of wild beasts, he was finally slain by a sword, rejoicing to suffer persecution for righteousness' sake. See Fox, Book of Martyrs, p. 43.

## Probus Lector[[@Headword:Probus Lector]]

             an Irish monastic, flourished in the Monastery of Slane, Ireland, A.D. 949. His original name was Ceanchair, but, like many Irish scholars and missionaries of that period, he Latinized it. He wrote the first Life of St. Patrick about 600 years after the saint's death. Piacre had previously written some verses on the saint, and Muirchu had alluded to him in another work, but the first Life of St. Patrick was from the pen of Probus. He gives no authorities for his statements in this Life, and we know of  none then extant that he could have given. He wrote in a dark period, the midnight of the Dark Ages. He seems to have written from his own fancy, viewing the ecclesiastical affairs of the infant Church of Ireland in the 5th century through the medium of his own times. Bishop Lanigan, the Roman Catholic historian, admits that his facts cannot be distinguished from his fancies. He became a devotee and a high ritualist, and was esteemed in his day a very holy and learned man. When the pagan Danes set fire to the Monastery of Slane, he refused to be separated from the precious MSS. and relics in it, and rushed into the flames and perished with them. His Life of St. Patrick, and still more that of Jocelin, who wrote about 150 years after him, have ever since been the store-house from which the material of every Roman Catholic Life of the Irish saint has been drawn. Jocelin lived in an age of fiction in regard to Ireland, and seems to have written according to the liveliness of his fancy or to the supposed credulity of his readers. He asserted many things about St. Patrick which had never been heard of before and for which he gives no authority, and which intelligent Catholics now indignantly reject. Dr. Colgan, the Irish antiquarian, says that the fable of the expulsion of the venomous serpents from Ireland was for the first time put forth by Jocelin. This and similar fabrications being thus boldly and dogmatically asserted in a dark age, and remaining for centuries uncontradicted, thousands afterwards received them as historical facts. Dr. Johnson says somewhere, “One may tell a bona-fide lie, and if he shall tell it over ten times, and no one shall contradict him, he will begin to believe it himself.” This has been really true in regard to Ireland. Fables and monstrosities remaining thus uncontradicted have been credited by thousands, while others who could not receive them have foolishly and sceptically thrown aside well-attested truths and regarded nearly all Irish history as fabulous. Perhaps the real life and character of no one, so long and so thoroughly incorporated in history, are so little known as those of St. Patrick. See Moore, Hist. of Ireland; Usher, Religion of the Early Irish. (D. D.)

## Procaccini, Camillo[[@Headword:Procaccini, Camillo]]

             an Italian painter who contributed to sacred art, was born in 1546. He received his first instruction in the school of his father, and afterwards visited Rome, where some biographers say that he studied the works of Michael Angelo and Raphael. Procaccini wrought uninterruptedly, and produced paintings at such a rate that his works, though they charm the eye by the simplicity and spirit which characterize them, are greatly  deficient in the higher power of impressing the mind and moving the affections. His St. Roch Administering to the Sick of the Plague, which is at Dresden, is one of his best works. He died in 1626.

## Procaccini, Ercole[[@Headword:Procaccini, Ercole]]

             the elder, was the head of the celebrated family of artists of that name. He was born in 1520 at Bologna, where the greater number of his works still exist. He died about 1591. Authors are divided in opinion respecting his merit: Baldinucci and Malvasia call him a painter of moderate talent, while Lontazzo esteems him to be a happy imitator of the coloring and grace of Correggio. His design is too minute and his coloring too languid, but he possessed far more taste than most of his contemporaries, and precision free from mannerism, which eminently qualified him for an instructor of youth. Several eminent artists, among whom were Sammacchini, Sabbatini, Bertoja, and his own three sons, were his disciples. — English Cyclop. s.v. Those interested in his works may consult Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, vol. 2.

## Procaccini, Giulio Cesare[[@Headword:Procaccini, Giulio Cesare]]

             the best artist of the family, was born in 1548. He renounced sculpture, in which he had made considerable progress, for painting, which he studied in the school of the Caracci. ‘The works of Correggio were the principal object of his studies, and many judges are of opinion that no painter ever approached nearer to the style of that great artist. In some of his easel pictures and works of confined composition he has been mistaken for Correggio. A Madonna of his at San Luigi de' Francesi has been engraved as the work of that master; and some paintings still more closely approximating to this style are in the palace of Sanvitali at Rome and in that of Carrega at Genoa. Of his altar-pieces, that in the church of Santa Afra in Brescia is perhaps most like the style of Correggio: it represents the Virgin and Child amid a smiling group of saints and angels, in which dignity seems as much sacrificed to grace as in the mutual smile of the Virgin and the Angel in the Nunziata at San Antonio of Milan. He is sometimes blamable for extravagance of attitude, as in the Executioner of San Nazario, which is otherwise a picture full of beauties. Notwithstanding the number and extent of his works, his design is correct, his forms and draperies select, his invention varied, and the whole together has a certain grandeur and breadth which he either acquired from the Caracci, or, like  them, derived from Correggio. He died in 1626. There are many of his works in Milan.

## Procedure, Ecclesiastical[[@Headword:Procedure, Ecclesiastical]]

             or the rules to be followed in the Church of Rome in disciplinary actions. They owe their regulation to pope Innocent III. Previous to his time, it is true, the official vindication had assumed a more definite form in the synodal jurisdiction of the archdeacon. But he perfected them, and there are now in the Romish Church five kinds of penal procedures in use: the trial may be instituted in consequence of accusation, inquisition, denunciation, exception, and on account of notoriety. The first and last had existed at a much earlier period. There was no need of a formal accusation in the case of notorious transgressions, and the bishop punished them in virtue of his office; of course, after the matter had been sufficiently proved and avowed. The proceedings were of a more formal kind when there was an accusation. Here the proceedings of the Roman law were taken for models. The inquisition or official examination took place when an ecclesiastic was accused of a transgression by a public and plausible rumor, which acted, as it were, as accusator. To complete the official examination, the judge could, if he thought fit, exact the oath of purgation (purgatio canonica). The former custom of purgation by ordeals now came into disuse. If a plausible denunciation was made, an official examination must take place. If the fault was avowed, the penalty was only the imposition of a penance. Cases of exception were those where a man who was on the point of appearing as a witness or accuser, or a person who applied for ordination or for an ecclesiastical office, was stopped by an accusation, which, if proved, unfitted him for bearing witness or office. This was also an occasion for canonical purgation. In these cases punishment was out of the question, and there could only follow an exclusion from the witness- stand, from the right to accuse, from the orders or the function in question. In those parts where the Church is still possessed of a penal jurisdiction, she has to conform to the laws and customs which regulate the penal procedure of the country. See Biener, Beit. zur Gesch. des Inquisitions- processes (Leips. 1827); Hildenbrand, Die Purgatio Canonica und Civilis (Munich, 1841); Walter, Kirchelnrecht, § 200; Richter, Kirchenrecht, § 211. — Aschbach, Kirchen-Lex . s.v

## Process[[@Headword:Process]]

             the formal act, instrument, bull, or enict of canonization (q.v.) in the Romish Church.

## Procession[[@Headword:Procession]]

             the Hebrew term הֲלַיכָה, htlikka/h, rendered “going” in Psa 78:25, means a religious procession, as described in the context, headed by the phylarchs, who preceded the sacred ark, while the instrumental musicians followed it, and a line of females with timbrels accompanied it on either side. On the general subject see the monographs in Volbeding, Index Programmatum, p. 159. SEE PROCESSIONS.

## Procession of the Holy Ghost[[@Headword:Procession of the Holy Ghost]]

             that doctrine regarding the Third Person of the Blessed Trinity which teaches that as the Son proceeds (or is born) from the Father, so the Holy Ghost proceeds (or emanates) from the Father and from the Son, but as from one principle. The subject has been fully discussed in its historical relations in the art. FILIOQUE CONTROVESY SEE FILIOQUE CONTROVESY , and as a theological question in the art. HOLY GHOST SEE HOLY GHOST.

But since the writing of those articles the subject has been revived and taken a new historical form-the formation of a new religious body from the ranks of the Romish Church, now known as the Old Catholics (q.v.). At their second annual conference or synod held in Bonn, Germany, in 1875, preparations were made for a “Union Conference” of the Old Catholic, Oriental, and Anglican churches, and such a conference accordingly convened at Bonn on Aug. 12 of that year and lasted five days. (Those interested in the character and nationality of its distinguished attendants will do well to consult the Methodist Quar. Oct. 1875, p. 673-675.) In the last session of that conference a common formula was adopted respecting the doctrine of the Procession, which Westerns and Orientals alike agreed to; and though it did not finally settle the question, and the controversy is still alive as we write, it is yet a very hopeful sign of an early union of different branches of the Church of Christ which have so little at variance and so much in common. The discussions regarding the subject were long and animated, and for some time the Orientals held out against the adoption of ¶ 3, but by their final adoption of it an enormous  step towards completer understanding has been made. The following are the resolutions:

“PRELIMINARY RESOLUTIONS.

“1. We agree together in receiving the cecumenical symbols and the doctrinal decisions of the ancient undivided Church.

“2. We agree together in acknowledging that the addition of the Filioque to the Creed did not take place in an ecclesiastically regular manner.

“3. We acknowledge on all sides the representation of the doctrine of the Holy Ghost, as it is set forth by the Fathers of the undivided Church.

“4. We reject every proposition and every method of expression in which in any way the acknowledgment of two principles or ἀρχαί or αὶτίαι in the Trinity may be contained.

“ON THE PROCESSION OF THE HOLY GHOST.

“We accept the teaching of St. John of Damascus respecting the Holy Ghost, as the same is expressed in the following paragraphs, in the sense of the teaching of the ancient undivided Church:

“1. The Holy Ghost goes forth out of the Father (ἐκ τοῦ πατρός) as the Beginning (ἀρχή), the Cause (αὶτία), the Source (πηγή) of the Godhead (De recta Sententia, n.1; Contra Manich. n. 4).

“2. The Holy Ghost goes not forth out of the Son (ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ), because there is in the Godhead but one Beginning (ἀρχή), one Cause (αὶτία), through which all that is in the Godhead is produced (De Fide orthod. i, 8: ἐκ τοῦ νἱοῦ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα οὐ λέγομεν, πνεῦμα δὲ υἱοῦ ὀνομάζομεν).

“3. The Holy Ghost goes forth out of the Father through the Son (De Fide orthod. i, 12: τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα τὸ ἃγιον ἐκφαντορικὴ τοῦ κρυφίου τῆς θεότητος δύναμις τοῦ πατρός, ἐκ πατρὸς μὲν δἰ υίοῦ ἐκπορευομένη. Ibid.: υἱοῦ δὲ πνεῦμα, οὐχ ὡς ἐξ αὐτοῦ, ἀλλ᾿ ὡς δἰ αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον. C. Manich. n. 5: διὰ τοῦ λόγου αὐτοῦ ἐξ αὐτοῦ τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ  ἐκπορευόμενον. De Hymno Trisag. 1. 28: πνεῦμα τὸ ἃγιον ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ λόγου προϊόν. Hom. in Sabb. s. n. 4: τοῦτ᾿ ἡμῖν ἔστι τὸ λατρευόμενον...πνεῦμα ἃγιον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρός ὡς ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἐκπορευόμενον, ὅπερ καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ λέγεται, ὡς δἰ αὐτοῦ φανερούμενον καὶ τῆ κτίσει μεταδιδόμενον, ἀλλ᾿ οὐκ ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἔχον τὴν ὕπαρξιν).

“4. The Holy Ghost is the Image of the Son, who is the Image of the Father (De Fide orthod. i, 13: εἰκών τοῦ πατρὸς ὁ υἱός. καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ τὸ πνεῦμα), going forth out of the Father and resting in the Son as the force beaming forth from Him (τοῦ πατρὸς προερχομένην καὶ ἐν τῷ λόγε ἀναπανομένην καὶ αὐτοῦ οὔσαν ἐκφαντικὴν δόναμιν. Ibid. i, 12: πατίρ...διὰ λόγου προβολεὺς ἐκφαντορικοῦ πνεύματος).

“5. The Holy Ghost is the personal Production out of the Father, belonging to the Son, but not out of the Son, because he is the Spirit of the Mouth of the Godhead, which speaks forth the Word (De Hymno Trisag. n. 2S: τὸ πνεῦμα ἐνυπόστατον ἐκπόρευμα καὶ πρόβλημα ἐκ πατρὸς μέν, υἱοῦ δέ, καὶ μὴ ἐξ υἱοῦ, ὡς πνεῦμα στόματος θεοῦ, λόγον ἐξαγγελτικόν).

“6. The Holy Ghost forms the mediation between the Father and the Son, and is bound together to the Father through the Son (De Fide orthod. i, 13: μέσον τοῦ ἀγεννήτου καὶ γεννητοῦ καὶ δἰ υἱοῦ τῷ πατρὶ συναπτόμενον).

“N. B. — It is to be noted here that the German preposition aus (out of) equals ἐκ or ex. as denoting out of a cause or origin: whereas the word von (from) is equivalent to ἀπό or ab; while drwch (through) denotes Stin or per, through the instrumentaelity of.”

Since that conference the Filioque question has been much agitated in England, and it has been asserted, by High-Churchmen especially, that the exclusion of the Filioque from the Creed was granted by Dr. Dollinger and canon Liddon at Bonn. What the conference did may be stated as follows: It declared, as bishop Pearson had already admitted, that the Filioque was inserted in an cecumenical creed by an inadequate authority, and therefore irregularly. It formulated certain propositions which might serve to show that when the Latins accept and the Easterns reject the Filioque they do  not differ, as has been too generally supposed; since the Latins reject any assertion of two principles or causes in the Godhead, and the Easterns admit a μεσιτεία of the Son, in the eternal procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father. Whatever may have been the hopes and fears of individual members of the conference, no proposition was brought forward respecting the exclusion of the Filioque from the Creed of the Western Church. See Schaff, Creeds (Index in vol. 3); Forbes, Nicene Creed; Neale, Eastern Church (Introd.), 1095-1168; Stanley, Eastern Church; Mag, Hist. des Dogmes (Index in vol. 2); Martensen, Dogmqatics (see Index); Meth. Quar. Jan. and April, 1876; New-Englander, July, 1870. See also Pusey's Letter to Liddon On the Clause “And the Son” (Lond. 1876, 8vo).

## Processional[[@Headword:Processional]]

             (Lat. processionale), the servicebook which contains the prayers, hymns, and general ceremonial of the different processions. Many ancient books of this class have been preserved. The processional approved for common use is that of Rome, of which many editions have been published.

## Processional Cross[[@Headword:Processional Cross]]

             or CROSS OF THE STATION (crux gestatoria, or stationaria), is the cross carried in the ecclesiastical processions spoken of under PROCESSIONS. It was carried as early as the 4th century and in the 5th century both in the East and in the West. It is mentioned by Socrates, Nicephorus, Cassiodorus, in the Life of St. Porphyry by Durand, and by Baronius under the year 401, and in the Canons of Cleveshoe in 747, when regulating the rogations. A cross made of ash, silver-plated, engraved or enamelled, without a crucifix, was at an early date, after the introduction of the labarum of Constantine, carried in processions by the staurophoros. The evangelistic symbols were usually set at the ends of the arms, which terminated in fleurs-de-lys. In the 4th century it had short handles, and candles were attached to the arms. Charlemagne gave such a cross, of pure gold, to the church of Constantine at Rome. In the 12th century at Rome a subdeacon (regionarius) carried down the cross, inclined so that the faithful might kiss it, from the altar to the porch, where he held it upright in his hands during the processions. In England, at Durham, the chief cross was of gold, with a silver staff, and the cross used on ordinary days was of crystal. A novice followed it, carrying a benitier. A cross of the 15th  century is still preserved in St. John's Lateran; another, of the time of St. Louis, is at St. Denis; a third, of silver and beautiful designs, with statues and evangelistic symbols, at Conques; and another at Burgos. In England, no doubt, many were destroyed during the War of the Roses and at the Reformation. At Chichester the ambry for the cross remains. In England, from Easter to Ascension, the cross was of crystal or beryl, but in Lent of wood. painted blood-red. No parish could carry its cross into a monastic church; and in funerals, in a collegiate church, the cross of the latter only is set before the bier. We append an illustration of the cross now usually carried by Romanists in their processions.

## Processional Path[[@Headword:Processional Path]]

             (spatium vel via processionum a retro altaris; latus pone chorum; Fr. partour de chaeur, i.e. behind a choir). The transverse aisle in square- ended churches is commonly doubled, as at Lichfield, or even tripled, as at Winchester and at St. Mary Overge, in order to provide room for chapels as well as a passage for processions. At Hereford this aisle resembles a low transept. The eastern screens at Fountains, the Lady chapel of Hexham, and the Nine Altars of Durham seem to have been further developments of the same idea, which appears also in the longitudinal new walk of Peterborough. At Canterbury, pilgrims to the martyrdom passed up the south aisle of the nave, and through the passage under the platform of the crossing.

## Processions[[@Headword:Processions]]

             These, as solemn and religious rites, are of very great antiquity, but evidently of pagan origin. With the Greeks and Romans, they took place chiefly on the festivals of Diana, Bacchus, Ceres, and other deities; also before the beginning of the games in the Circus; and in spring, when the fields were sprinkled with holy water to increase their fertility. The priests used to head them, carrying images of the gods and goddesses to be propitiated, and either started from certain temples or from the Capitol. The Romans, when the empire was distressed, or after some victory, used constantly to order processions, for several days together, to be made to the temples, to beg the assistance of the gods or to return them thanks. Among the Jews, processions were introduced for public prayers when the faithful people went in order to implore the divine help (Jos 6:15; 2Sa 6:15; Ezr 2:12-30; 1Ki 8:45; Num 10:33-36), with a form at setting out and when halting; or when rendering thanks to God (2Ch 20:21; 2Ch 20:27-28; Mat 21:9). Certain processions around the altar were (and still are to a certain extent) usual on the Feast of Tabernacles; and from them the Mohammedans have adopted their mode of encompassing the sanctuary seven times at Mecca (q.v.). Processions form a prominent part of the Buddhist worship. SEE PROCESSION.

In the Christian Church the practice was early introduced and has maintained itself to this day among the Romanists. In the earliest ecclesiastical phraseology the word processio denotes merely the act of requesting a religious assembly, and taking part in public worship. It is distinguished from private offices of devotion, and includes the idea of social worship, but without any additional idea of public ceremony, pomp, or the like. Procedere then meant to go to church, and is, in short, synonymous with sacris interesse, sacra. frequentare. This was the meaning given to the word by Tertullian (Ad Uxor. lib. ii, c. 4) and Jerome (Commentar. in Ephesians 1 ad Cot. c. 11). In many canons and other ecclesiastical writings we also find the word procession, without any explanation or addition, used in the sense of a religious assembly (conventus et coetus populi in ecclesia). The Greek word σύναξις (as well as συναγωγή, σύλλογος, conf. Suiceri Thesauru.) is translated sometimes by collecta, sometimes by conventus, and sometimes by processio. When Christian worship began to be conducted openly, and churches were publicly frequented, the meaning of the word processio was exactly equivalent to our term church-going. After the 4th century, especially in later mediaeval times, the word was applied to processions usual at funerals, marriages, baptisms, as well as to the line of communicants at the Lord's Supper. Processions at festivals and on other occasions were, in course of time, quite common. Laws to protect such processions from interruption were passed, and any persons found guilty of disturbing them were subject to severe punishment. The first processions mentioned in ecclesiastical history are those set on foot at Constantinople, in the time of Chrysostom. The Arians of that city being forced to hold their meetings without the town, went thither night and morning, singing anthems. Chrysostom, to prevent their perverting the Catholics, adopted counter- processions, in which the clergy and people marched by night, singing hymns, and carrying crosses and torches. From this period the custom of processions was introduced both into the Eastern and Western churches  (Chrysost. Or. contr. lud. et theatr .; Basil, Ep. 207, al. 63; Ambrose, Ep. 40 ad Theodos. n. 14; Augustine, De Civ. Dei, i, 22, c. 8; Rufin. Hist. Eccl. i, 2, c. 33). Even during the persecutions of the emperors there were at least some funeral processions (Act. S. Cypr. ap. Rom. Act. S. Bonifac.).

Various ceremonies were observed, according to the objects for which these processions were instituted, the spirit of the times in which they were celebrated, and the countries wherein they took place. The clergy usually attended: if the occasion was one of joy or thanksgiving, they were attired in the most splendid vestments. The laity put on their best attire, and were adorned with garlands and other ornaments; and the sound of bells and music was heard through the whole line. On occasions of mourning or penitence, the procession was distinguished by plain vestments, bare feet, deep silence, or sounds of lamentation and prayer, and sometimes by the exercise of flagellation. Men and women walked apart; and the line of procession was ranged with reference to the various ranks and classes of the persons who composed it. Lighted wax tapers were often carried in procession, especially on the festival of the Purification of the Virgin Mary, which was hence called festum or missa candelarum SEE CANDLEMAS. Litanies composed for the occasion were sung in Latin as the procession moved. The penitential psalms and the psalms of degrees were employed on the occasion, as well as many Latin hymns.

These processions have always been more common in the Western than in the Eastern Church. The Reformation greatly lessened them even in the Roman Catholic Church, and, especially in mixed countries, processions are less frequent or popular nowadays. They are there either supplicatory processions or cross processions, and are either directed to a certain distant place, to some miraculous image or object, or they are confined to the streets of the cities and the churches. Banners, crosses, and images are generally carried in front; the clergy follow; and the people make up the rear, singing hymns or reciting prayers. In some Protestant states they are still permitted, under certain restrictions. The Protestants themselves rarely practice them, excepting the Ritualists (q.v.).

In the mediaeval Church the name procession was given to the ritual march, at the time of the celebration of the host, of the celebrant, and especially the bishop and his assistants, from the church door or the sacristy to the altar. In a narrower sense, the procession is now a ritual walk, the purpose of which is thanksgiving or supplication, or an honor  paid to a person either living or dead. For the walks of the first kind alone, the purpose of which is thanksgiving, the term “procession” is employed without any more special determination; those of the second kind are usually called by Romanists “litaniae,” “rogationes,” “supplicationes,” and also “exomologeses,” “stationes,” which were their former names. Among the walks of the third kind we mention the solemn entrance, attended with ecclesiastical ceremonies, of a bishop, pope, or sovereign into a place; the funeral, and even the bridal procession. Another distinction between different processions is this, that in some of them the host is carried about, in others it is not; the former are called theophoric processions (θεός and φορέω). All these processions are either prescribed on certain days of the year and on certain occasions, or simply allowed in certain circumstances. Among the prescribed processions, the most important are the Corpus- Christi procession. Candlemas-day, the procession on Palm-Sunday, the litany of St. Mark's Day, the litany on the three days of the Week of Prayer, and. finally, the funeral procession. Curates or ecclesiastics of a higher rank may organize processions on the harvest festival, in great distresses, etc.

Each procession has (and here we depend on Roman Catholic writers) a leader, who is either a priest or a bishop. The priestly leader wears the chasuble and stole, and often the pluvial besides; his head is covered with a barret. The episcopal leader wears chasuble, stole, and pluvial; his head is covered with the mitre; he holds the pastoral staff in his left hand, with his right hand he blesses the people before whom the procession passes. The color of the stole, pluvial, and mitre is suited to the purpose of the procession. If (as is the case in the theophoric processions and when a particle of the cross is carried about for public veneration) the head must be uncovered, the bishop has the staff carried in front of him and the mitre behind him. In theophoric processions the blessing with the right hand is also omitted. In this case the leader carries the venerable thus: he holds the ostensorium with both hands before his face, while his hands are covered with the vellum hanging down from both his shoulders.

The organization of the Catholic Church, as a community presided over by the clergy, requires this leadership by ecclesiastics. If the leader wears the chasuble and stole, he declares by his dress that unceasing efforts to attain purity of heart (alba) and a childlike trust in the merits of Jesus Christ (stola) are the festive robes which every Christian, but more especially every priest, should wear in and outside of the house of God. If, besides, the bishop  carries the staff and wears the mitre, it is for the purpose of reminding the Christians that he is their highest pastor, whose care surrounds and whose benediction follows them everywhere. If the leader (unless prevented by his veneration of the body of Christ or his reverence for the beam of the cross) have his head covered, this is a hint given to the faithful that it is their duty to revere the priest as their father in Christ. If the priest cover with a vellum the hands that hold the ostensorium, he confesses therewith his unworthiness of carrying, under the form of the bread, the body of him who created heaven and earth. The leader of the procession has generally assistants and a suite of honor. If the leader be a priest, he is assisted, if possible, by two levites, one walking to his right, the other to the left, and dressed, according to the color of the leader, as deacon and subdeacon, or at least by two acolytes. If the leader be a bishop, a few canons of his cathedral, at least, should walk before him, dressed in the pluvial. If the procession be theophoric, two acolytes, walking immediately before the leader, incense the venerable uninterruptedly with their censers; in this case, also, a baldachin is generally extended over the leader, and borne by four, six, or eight laymen of distinction. It seldom happens that the leader of a non-theophoric procession walks beneath the baldachin: it is then a personal honor, only bestowed on bishops on extraordinary occasions, as on their solemn entrance into a church. In countries where the custom has hitherto existed, it is allowable to spread the baldachin over particles of the cross or other instruments of Christ's passion. The faithful who participate in the procession walk two by two.

This may find an analogy in Christ's sending out his disciples two by two to preach the Gospel. Gregory the Great (Horn. 17 in Evang.) declares this to be a symbol of the two commandments of love-the love of God and the love of our fellow-man. Though the non-observance of this prescription is attended with much inconvenience, it is neglected in many processions in the cities and country. Mabillon saw even in Rome a procession where the faithful walked partly two by two, partly three by three, and even in larger numbers (Iter Ital. v. 152). The faithful who participate in the procession (monks who are not bound by their rule to entire seclusion can be compelled by the bishops to attendance) are disposed with respect to the class and sex they belong to. This is a requirement of good order. We find this arrangement mentioned by the oldest writers. St. Augustine speaks of a procession which took place near Hippo, where the bishop walked in the middle, the people before and after him (De Civ. Dei, i, 22, c. 8, n. 11). Porphyry of Gaza made the people precede, and followed himself with his clergy (Sur. 26 Feb.). The  great procession held by Gregory the Great indicated seven different churches, as starting-points for seven different classes of people (clerks, monks, female servants of God, married women, widows, poor, and children).

In our times the procession is generally (the custom is not the same everywhere) opened by the children: they are put, as it were, in the first line of battle, in order that God may be moved by their innocence to listen favorably to the prayers of the community. The children are followed by the clergy, with the chanters and musicians; among the clergy the leader of the procession walks the last, behind him the men, the prominent citizens taking the lead, followed by the women. The promiscuous walking of persons of both sexes is nowhere allowed. The order, as described, places the leader, as pastor of the community, in the middle of the procession: he is the shepherd of the children as well as of the adults, of the innocent as well as of the penitent, of the married people as well as of the unmarried: he must always in life be near to all of them. If brotherhoods, societies of mechanics, and members of religious orders are present, the two first mentioned open the cortege, the latter walk before the chanters and musicians. In front of the procession and between its different divisions, crosses or crucifixes, flags, and, if the procession is a very solemn one, images, relics, statues, etc., are carried. The bearer of the principal crucifix has two acolytes — one to his right, the other to his left — each with a lighted taper in his hand. The carrying of the images, statues, etc., is committed to the care of the brotherhoods, associations, and partly to the young men and girls of the community; the relics are carried by the clergymen, or, if the procession is held in honor of the relics, by the leader of the procession.

The principal crucifix SEE PROCESSIONAL CROSS is generally carried (if possible) by a subdeacon; subdeacons also carry the crucifixes before the chapters, the archbishops, and the pope. The crosses are carried before the pope and archbishops in such a way that the image of the crucified one is turned towards those dignitaries. The principal crucifix opens the procession, unless a flag has been preferred, in which case the crucifix follows at some distance. Brotherhoods and corporations are in the habit of having flags carried before them. The most important of these customs are very old. Sozomen (Hist. Eccl. i, 8, c. 8) and the biographer of St. Caesarius of Arles (Sur. 27 Aug.) knew already of the carrying of crosses or crucifixes (during many centuries naked crosses were alone in use) and of lighted tapers. In former times the book of the Gospels was  sometimes carried along with the cross (Vit. S. Porphyr. Ep. Sur. 26 Feb.). Flags, which, it must be observed, are not prescribed, but only allowed, are mentioned by Gregory of Tours (Hist. Franc. i, 5, c. 4). Gregory the Great ordered an image of Mary to be carried about as early as 590 (Baron. Annal. ad a. 590). In the 4th century, we find processions held for the purpose of transferring relics solemnly to the churches (Socrat. Hist. Eccl. i, 3, c. 16; Augustine, Confess. i, 9, c. 7). The Synod of Braga in 572 (ibid. c. 6) calls this a solemn custom (see Conc. Clovesh. a. 747, c. 16). The faithful walk (ibid. c. 6) quietly and devoutly. Idle talk, forward looking around, laughing, showy suits, luxury of dress, etc., shock the pious mind. The men walk bareheaded; the clergy and magistrates alone are, with some restrictions, allowed to cover their heads. The clerks wear the chasuble; only on most sacred occasions, as at the procession of the Corpus Christi, we find the custom that at least some of the subdeacons wear the tunica, some of the deacons the dalmatica, several priests the planeta, and the ecclesiastics of higher rank the pluvial. The subdeacons who carry the crosses wear the tunica, besides the amictus, alba, and cingulum. For the laymen there are no longer any rules in this respect. Sozomen (Hist. Eccl. i, 8, c. 8) speaks of all the faithful bearing burning tapers; we hear of them in other places appearing barefooted, in sack and ashes (Conc. Mogunt. a. 813, c. 33); Charlemagne himself, according to the narrative of a monk of St. Gall, set the example of walking barefooted in procession at Ratisbon (Mart. De Ant. Ecclesiastes Rit. i, 4, c. 27, a. 7); but these are things of the past. The purport of the prayers is in accordance with the purpose of the procession. Yet the Church has given some rules. At theophoric processions, especially that of the Corpus Christi, the hymns in honor of the Eucharist must be sung in preference (Pange lingua, Sacris solemniis, Verbum supernum prodiens); special songs are also prescribed for the procession at Candlemas and on Palm-Sunday; for the litanies of St. Mark's Day and of the Week of Prayer, the litany of All-saints' and the versicles and orations which follow it in the breviary are prescribed. At the funeral procession of full-grown persons, prayers of intercession; at. the funerals of children, thanksgiving prayers are in use.

As extraordinary processions are generally undertaken for a purpose that must be submitted to God in special prayers, regulations have been made for these cases too. The Roman ritual mentions expressly the processio ad petendam pluviam, the processio ad postulandam serenitalten, the procession in time of famine, in time of epidemic and plague, in time of  war, in any other great distress, the thanksgiving procession, and, finally, that for the translation of relics. Originally the people sang psalms on such occasions (Jerome, Ep. 108, al. 27; Gregor. Nazianz. Or. 10; Vit. S. Potphyr. Ep. Sur. 26 Feb.); only when the purpose of the procession was to obtain some favor from God, it was an early custom to exclaim quite frequently, “Kyrie eleison,” or recite other prayers of penitence (Chrysost. Orat. contr. lud. et theatr.). This is the way the litany of Allsaints' has been little by little composed. The common Roman Ordo says: “Omnes in commune ‘ Kyrie eleison' decantent, et cum contritione cordis Dei misericordiar exorent pro peccatis, pro pace, pro peste, pro conservatione frugum et pro caeteris necessitatibus.” Mabillon (Comment. in Ord. Rom. p. 34) saw an old Roman ritual according to which a hundred “Kyrie eleison.” a hundred “Christe eleison,” and again a hundred “Kyrie eleison” were to be said kneeling, in such a propitiatory procession. As the psalms ceased little by little to be known by heart, rosary-praying, which has become of so general use in our day, took their place. The procession comes out of a place of worship, and, its walk performed, returns to it. If (as at funerals) not all the participants, the clergy, at least, with the chanters and the bearer of the principal cross, always return. Even if a bishop or pope is received outside of the doors of the city, it is customary for the clergy to start from the church and return thither with that high personage.

The procession on Candlemas-day and Palm-Sunday starts at the call of the leader, “Procedamus in pace” (the choir answering, “In nomine Christi, amen”). In theophoric processions the leader or the chanters give the signal by commencing the hymn Pcnge lingua; if it is a supplication, the assembly kneel down a few minutes praying, the chanters commence to sing the litany of All-saints', and the procession starts, singing the hymn Sancta Maria, which is a part of that litany. If in supplications (which is often the case in rural communities) the litany of All-saints' is not recited in Latin, the procession commences thus: the ecclesiastic leader kneels on the lowest step of the high-altar, begins to say the rosary aloud, rises at the first Ave of the first decade, and therewith gives the signal for starting. The litany procession stops frequently at one, or two, or even more places of worship. The clergy (or at least the superiors) of the church where it stops receive it in chasuble and stole, with two acolytes, at the gate of the churchyard, or at the portal of the church, and offer holy water to the clerks and distinguished laymen of the procession. In such places of worship it is customary to sing an antiphony, and a versicle and oration in honor of the patron of the church; sometimes  a high-mass, with or without sermon, is held in one of them. The laymen like at such occasions to sing three times the song of triumph and the little doxology. This stopping, which, especially in Milan, is so extensively in use (luring the rogations celebrated there in the week that follows Ascension that the procession stops on the first day at twelve, on the second at nine, and on the third at eleven churches (comp. Mabill. Lit. Gaullic. p. 153), is a custom of great antiquity. The Gallican liturgy mentions it as a well- known matter (Missale Gothic.; Missale Gallic. Vet.; Cod. 306). Gregory of Tours speaks of it as an established custom (Hist. Franc. i, 9, c. 6). The seven bodied procession of Gregory the Great started from seven churches and stopped at the Church of Our Lady (Greg. Tur. Hist. Franc. i, 10, c. 1). The reception by the clergy of the church where the procession stops is also a very old custom (Leo III in Libr. Pontif.); it was called “Occurrere.” As processions in such cases, especially in the country, have often to walk an hour or more before they reach another place of worship, the Church has found it necessary, from time to time, to warn the faithful not to make of these intervals an occasion for feasting and tippling (Rit. Rom.; comp. Conc. Clovesh. a. 747, c. 16). When the procession walks inside of the places of worship, or in their immediate neighborhood, the bells of the steeple are rung. This reminds one of the procession which followed the body of St. Anastasius, and at which a noise was produced by striking on consecrated woods (Conc. Nicoen. a. 787, Acts 4). Processions of less importance move only inside the walls of the house of worship. Such is the case with all processions in countries where the Catholic religion does not enjoy complete freedom of worship. According to the rules, processions should precede the high-mass, but this is practically the case with very few (comp. the Rit. Romn., the Coerem. epp., and the Rubricists). — Aschbach, Kirchen-Lex. s.v.

The origin of processions may have been an imitation of the motion of the heavenly spheres, the courses of the stars, and the revolutions of seasons, and more immediately of ancient religious dances. They were always accompanied by singers, and generally by musicians. Procession is progression, says Durand, when a multitude, headed by the clergy, goes forth in regular order and ranks to implore the divine grace. It represents the pilgrimage of man upon earth on his way to the better land, from the cradle to the grave, as St. Paul says that we are pilgrims and sojourners in this world. Processions round cloisters and cemeteries still more vividly brought before the mind the thought of the last home to which man must  come at length, as waters, after the most devious course, are lost in the great sea. In a procession to the altar, in reverse order to that of the recession, first went the verger, the crossbearer, attended on either side by acolytes carrying candlesticks and lighted tapers; then came the censers, or thurifers, the chanters in copes and carrying batons, the subdeacon, deacon, and celebrant; then choir boys, clerks of the second grade, and the more honorable following. In the cathedral the precentor, the sub-chanter of canons (prechcantre), and the succentor of vicars (souschantre), each with his chanter's baton, preceded the bishop, carrying his cross, or staff. In the middle of the 15th century the capitular tenants went in procession on St. Peter's Eve at Exeter, preceded by the choristers carrying painted shields of arms.

In England processions were made with litanies and prayers,

(1) for the prosperity of the king;

(2) for the wealth of the realm;

(3) for pureness of the air;

(4) for the increase of the fruits of the earth.

Two processions for the good success of a king were made on Sundays about the church and churchyard, by English canons, in 1359 and 1398. On Ash-Wednesday, after confession in church, there was a solemn procession for ejecting the penitents, who were not readmitted until Maundy Thursday. On Easter-day was a grand procession in memory of the disciples going to meet our Lord in Galilee, and in imitation of it there was a humbler procession on every Sunday. The other great procession was annual, on Palm-Sunday. Bishops were also met with processions of the chapter and vicars, or a convent, at the west door of the church and the cemetery gate, by decree of Honorius 3, 1221. In 1471 all curates of the diocese were required to visit the high-altar of Lincoln Cathedral in procession, and make their offerings. In the nave the great processions were arranged. At Canterbury two parallel lines, and at Fountains, Lincoln, Chichester, and York two rows of circular processional stones were arranged at proper intervals, and specifically allotted. At Exeter the antiphon was sung daily at the screen, and the procession passed through the north gate of the choir to the vestibule of the Lady Chapel, and then by the south gate of the choir near the throne to the high-altar. It afterwards traversed the nave and cloisters, concluding before the rood-loft; and if there was no sermon, the procession returned to the altar. Carpets were  strewn along the way on great festivals. Bishop Edyngdon desired to be buried at Winchester, where the monks stood in procession on Sundays and holydays. These monks, being aggrieved by a bishop, on one occasion went round their cloisters from west to east, out of their usual manner, in order to show that all things were out of order.

At Chichester at Epiphany an image “of the Spirit” was carried round the church by the dean or senior canon and two vicars. On Whitsun-Monday the parishioners in the diocese often came to blows about right of precedence, so that bishop Storey made injunctions (1478) for order on this occasion, when the shrine of St. Richard was visited annually. Crosses and banners were permitted, but the long painted rods with which the contending parties had hitherto belabored each other were proscribed, as well as laughing, crowding, and noise. The pilgrims entered by the great south porch and assembled in the choir at 10 A. M. and left the building by it, having duly visited “the chancel and church.” In 1364 the primate forbade such dangerous contentions throughout England. As late as 1551 the city companies of London went in procession — the Fislmongers to St. Michael's, Cornhill, with three crosses, a hundred priests, and the parishioners and members of the guild carrying white rods; and the parish of St. Clement Danes displayed eighty banners and streamers, and was preceded by the city waits. On Easter- Monday at Kinnersley and Wellington the parishioners, adult and children, joined hand-in-hand, surrounded the church and touched it with a general simultaneous embrace, called “clipping the church.” They afterwards attended divine service. The procession at Wolverhampton on Monday and Tuesday in Rogation week. in which the children bore poles dressed with flowers and the clergy chanted the Benedicite, only ceased in 1765. Some of the Gospel trees or holy oaks where the stations were formed still remain. — Walcott, Sacred Archceol. s.v. See Middleton, Letters from Rome; Willet, Synops. Pap.; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, 8:803- 809; Martigny, Dict. des Anitiquites Chet. s.v.; Siegel, Christliche Alierthiimer; Riddle, Christian Antiquities, p. 757, 758, 771-774,833; Barnum, Romanism, p. 468.

## Prochazka, Francis Faustin[[@Headword:Prochazka, Francis Faustin]]

             a Bohemian monastic, noted as a writer, was born at Neupaka, Bohemia, Jan. 13, 1749. He studied with the Jesuits of Gischin and at the University of Prague. In 1767 he entered the Order of Barnabites, where he had for his master the celebrated Durich, who taught him Hebrew and encouraged him in his predilections for the Slavonic literature. When the Barnabites  were suppressed in Bohemia (1788), he became successively theological censor, professor and director of the Gymnasium at Prague, and librarian of the university of that city. He published the New Testament in Bohemian with commentaries, an edition of the Bible in that dialect, a reprint of the Chronique de Bunzlau: — Commentarius de Secularibus Artium Liberaliunm in Moravia Falis (1782): — Melanges de Litteratulre Boheme (Prague, 1784, 8vo). This religious man also assisted on the Barnabite Bible, and at the moment of his death was occupied on the valuable Bibliotheca Slavica of Durich. Prochazka died at Prague in 1809. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Prochet, Matteo[[@Headword:Prochet, Matteo]]

             a noted modern Italian Protestant theologian, was born in Piedmont in 1836. He was afforded by his Waldensian parents all the educational and religious advantages that might properly fit him for Church service, but on the outbreak of the Franco-Italian-Austrian war in 1859 he took up arms for his country's freedom and greatly distinguished himself by his bravery. After his return from the field of battle he continued his theological studies, and in 1862 was ordained minister in the Church of the Vaudois. He soon rose to positions of distinction, and was repeatedly honored by his ecclesiastical associates in missions to the sister churches of the Continent and of England, Scotland, and Ireland. He finally became the president of the Waldensian missions in Italy, and in 1873 was sent to represent his Church in the Evangelical World Alliance at New York. While in this country he spoke frequently and greatly impressed that distinguished body by his learning and wisdom. He was at the time pastor in Geneva and also professor of theology. On his return voyage from this country he was accompanied by the much-lamented Carrasco, the Spanish convert to Protestantism, who was one of his most intimate friends, and with whom he had planned several important polemical treatises against Romanism and her relations to the State. Prochet has a fine, commanding presence-tall in figure, broad-chested, quick in movement and speech, like most of the sons of the South; keen in perception, and accurate in his scholarship. His influence is great not only in Italian Protestantism, but in evangelical Christianity. See Report of the Alliance, (1873). (J. H. W.)

## Prochorus[[@Headword:Prochorus]]

             (Πρόχορος), one of the seven deacons, being the third on the list, and named next after Stephen and Philip (Act 6:5), A.D. 30. No further mention of him is made in the N.T. There is a tradition that he was consecrated by St. Peter bishop of Nicomedia (Baron. 1, 292). In the Magna Bibliotheca Patrum (Colon. Agripp. 1618, 1, 49-69) will be found a fabulous “Historia Prochori, Christi Discipuli, de Vita B. Joannis Apostoli.”

## Proclamation[[@Headword:Proclamation]]

             (קוֹל, רַנָּה, etc., or some form of שָׁמִע, as in 1Ki 15:22; Jeremiah 1, 29), the edict of any governing power, published in a solemn manner. The laws of Moses, as well as the temporary edicts of Joshua, were communicated to the people by means of the genealogists, or “officers,” as in the English version; but the laws and edicts of those who subsequently held the office of kings were proclaimed publicly by criers (Jer 34:8-9; Jonah 3, 5-7), a class of persons mentioned by Daniel (3, 4; 5:29), under the word כְּרוֹזָא, keroza, which our translators have rendered “herald” (q.v.).

## Proclamations, Royal[[@Headword:Proclamations, Royal]]

             These documents in former times were almost equal in authority to an act of the constitutional legislature. They often interfered with religion, and dealt largely in reformation of manners. In 1529 king Henry VII issued a proclamation “for resisting and withstanding of most damnable heresyes sowen within the realme by the discyples of Luther and other heretykes, perverters of Christes relygyon.” In June, 1530, this was followed by the proclamation “for dampning (or condemning) of erroneous bokes and heresies, and prohibitinge the havinge of holy scripture translated into the vulgar tonges of englishe, frenche, or dutche.” “And that having respect to the malignity of this present tyme, with the inclination of people to erronious opinions, the translation of the newe testament and the old into the vulgar tonge of englysshe, shulde rather be the occasion of conltynuance or increase of errours amonge the said people, than any benefit or commodite towards the weale of their soules.” It was therefore determined that the Scriptures should only be expounded to the people as heretofore, and that these books “be clerely extermynate and exiled out of  this realme of Englande for ever.”

Under Edward VI there is a proclamation against such “as innovate any ceremony,” and who are described as “certain private preachers and other laiemen, who rashly attempt of their own and singular wit and mind, not only to persuade the people from the old and accustomed rites and ceremonies, but also themselves bring in new and strange orders according to their phantasies. The which, as it is an evident token of pride and arrogancy, so it tendeth both to confusion and disorder.” There is a proclamation also to abstain from flesh on Fridays and Saturdays; enforced on the principle, not only that “men should abstain on those days, and forbear the pleasures and the meats wherein they have more delight, to the intent to subdue their bodies to the soul and spirit, but also for worldly policy.” Charles II issued a proclamation against “vicious, debauched, and profane persons,” i.e. “a sort of men of whom we have heard much, and are sufficiently ashamed; who spend their time in taverns, tippling-houses, and debauchery; giving no other evidence of their affection to us but in drinking our health, and inveighing against all others who are not of their own dissolute temper; and who, in truth, have more discredited our cause, by the license of their manners and lives, than they could ever advance it by their affection or courage.

We hope all persons of honor, or in place and authority, will so far assist us in discountenancing such men, that their discretion and shame will persuade them to reform what their conscience would not; and that the displeasure of good men towards them may supply what the laws have not, and, it may be, cannot well provide against; there being by the license and corruption of the times, and the depraved nature of man, many enormities, scandals, and impieties in practice and manners, which laws cannot well describe, and consequently not enough provide against, which may, by the example and severity of virtuous men, be easily discountenanced, and by degrees suppressed.” Some parties in Scotland who had no objection to national fasts, or even to the royal recommendation of them, yet objected to royal command and dictation as worded in the usual form, they being charged to keep the fast “as they tender the favor of Almighty God, and would avoid his wrath and indignation.” According to counsel learned in the law, obedience to such mandate is not imperative, for it is affirmed —

“1. That in England, where by statute the sovereign is head of the Church as well as of the State, that headship applies only to the clergy and members of the National Church, and does not include those who are not of her communion.

2. That in Scotland-where seceding or dissenting churches (except it be the nonjurors) stand not upon any statute of toleration, but upon the free basis and constitution of the country-no such relation exists, but is excluded by the act of 1690 (c. 5), ratifying the Confession of Faith; whereby an antagonistic principle is established, it being declared that ‘there is no other Head of the Church but the Lord Jesus Christ,' and that he, ‘as King and Head of the Church, hath therein appointed a government in the hand of church-officers distinct from the civil magistrate,' who ‘may not assume to himself the administration of the Word and sacrament, or the keys of the kingdom of heaven.'

3. That, in point of fact, proclamations for the observance of national fasts and thanksgivings in Scotland were, for a considerable period after the date of that act, and until the union between England and Scotland, passed by the three estates of the Scottish Parliament, and not by the sovereign alone. And,

4. That no statute can be found authorizing such proclamations in Scotland; and the phraseology used in them seems to have grown out of the practice in England, or to be founded on what appears to be an unwarranted extension of the two statutes cited in the proclamation of June, 1857, which refer exclusively to prayers for royal personages, and apply at most to ministers and preachers of two denominations.”

## Proclianites (Or Proclianists)[[@Headword:Proclianites (Or Proclianists)]]

             is the name of the followers of Proclus (q.v.). They were extreme Montanists (q.v.), and were spread more especially in Phrygia, where, about the close of the 4th century, they formed a most dangerous sect, and greatly disturbed the peace of the churches.

## Proclus[[@Headword:Proclus]]

             surnamed Διάδοχος, i.e. the Successor, because he replaced Syrianus (q.v.) as the head of that Athenian school of philosophers who were Neo- Platonists, has been called “the Scholastic among the Greek philosophers.” Indeed, according to M. Cousin, Proclus is the Greek philosopher; the flower and crown of all its schools; in whom, says the learned Frenchman, “are combined, and from whom shine forth, in no irregular or uncertain rays, Orpheus, Pythagoras, Plato, Aristotle, Zeno, Plotinus, Porphyry, and Jamblichus,” and who “had so comprehended all religions in his mind, and  paid them such equal reverence, that he was, as it were, the priest of the whole universe!” This is a compliment, but a compliment ill warranted and bestowed only because M. Cousin perceived in this Neo-Platonist more of kinship with that extravagant class of philosophizers, of whom Cousin himself is one, whose method consists in putting forth strings of brilliant propositions, careless about either their consistency or cohereuce. Indeed, Cousin's adoration for Proclus shows, if we may use the words of one of their own class, “what things men will worship in their extreme need!” (Thomas Carlyle).

With the beginning of Christianity in its aggressive movements, the heathen world saw itself faced with immediate danger of a prostration that could only end in death. Philo the Jew, anxious to revive the power of the old dispensation, rallied all extraneous forces, determined to build, by the aid of what antiquity had shaped, a structure that should rival, if not outshine, the simple edifice the Son of the Carpenter of Nazareth and the fishermen of Galilee had reared. What Philo failed to accomplish, Ammonius Saccas, also of Alexandria (near the beginning of the 3d century), and aided by Plotinus his pupil, attempted to effect. SEE PLOTINUS.

But both master and pupil left their work ere it was fairly begun, and though Porphyry (q.v.) zealously applied himself to bring out the mystical rationalism of Plotinus, the six Enneades in which these teachings were set forth failed to show even a marked progress in the work so long attempted, and it remained for Jamblichus (q.v.) in the 4th and Proclus in the 5th century to give any appearance whatsoever to the edifice the Neo-Platonists had been so long in constructing. If we wish to see Neo-Platonism in its incipiency, we must go to Philo the Jew. But if we wish to see it in its ripest growth, we must study it in the writings of Proclus the Athenian. The Neo- Platonism he presents to us is no longer the outgrowth of Judaism intermixed with Hellenism, but paganism illumined by the spirit and light of the Gospel of Christ — that very religion with which it was struggling for the empire of the world (see Ullmann, Der Einfluss des Christenthums, in Studien u. Kritiken, 1832, No. 2).

The bewildering conflict of philosophical theories which these five centuries had been fostering had resulted in the growth of scepticism, and left no resting place for minds of a religious turn. The Neo-Platonists of the 4th and 5th centuries most naturally took their refuge in mysticism, where feeling and intuition supersede the slow and doubtful process of the intellect (comp. Fisher, Beginnings of Christianity, p. 178, 179). Plotinus  was the first to take this refuge. So did from this time forth all the successors of the Platonists, of whom Gibbon sneeringly says that “Plato would have blushed to acknowledge them.” They discarded philosophy, though they claimed to be philosophers. They played upon the superstitious tendencies of their age rather than upon the intellectual strength that still remained. They sought to persuade by the aid of magic rather than by the clear force of logic. They turned prophets and seers. Though they took part in the higher discussions and conclusions of philosophy, they nevertheless stood opposed to all philosophy, since they did not even profess to rest upon careful inquiries into eternal laws of the Spirit, but claimed to have a revelation from God. Thus exalted above all such investigations, Neo-Platonism became the poetry as well as the religion of philosophy. It was attached more especially to the system of Plato, and was professed to be an explanation and a development of his views, but it was aimed to bring together the fundamental principles of all philosophical schools, and the ideas which constitute the basis of all popular religions. It was the work of man, and, however ambitious the scheme, it failed absolutely in its mission. Superstition was the centre and support; magic and sorcery the basis and top-stone of the new structure. It had both philosophy and religion in its composition, and yet it was neither the one nor the other. “The divinity which it presents is exalted above all human apprehension, and was called simply the Self-sufficient One (τὸ ἕν).

From his overflowing fulness proceeded the Divine Intelligence, and from this the World-soul, by which the material universe is pervaded with divine life. Evil is only that which is imperfect, and is the most distant reflection of Deity upon matter. The human soul which had been produced by the Divine Intelligence fell, in consequence of its longing after earthly things, from its original divine life to its present temporal existence. It therefore belongs to the sensual as well as to the intellectual world. But the souls of the good and wise, even in this world, are in their happiest moments reunited with the Deity, and death is to such a complete restoration to their home. From a pious veneration for an ancestry far back in antiquity, the Grecian gods especially were regarded as the personal manifestations of the divine life in nature. Some of them were celestial beings, and some ruled here on earth. These earthly powers were the national gods (μερικοί, ἐθνάρκαι), subordinate to the Deity, and exalted above all passion. The myths were therefore, of course, to be explained allegorically. The arts of divination and magic were justified on the ground of the necessary connection of all phenomena by virtue of the unity of the world-  principle” (Hase, Church Hist. § 50). While, then, Neo-Platonism was a new power, it was nevertheless a reformation of the old faith. Though it extended itself over the whole Roman empire, it embraced within itself contradictory elements, and could maintain its existence only long enough to witness and embellish the downfall of heathenism. The last school to minister to Neo-Platonism in these her last hours was that founded by Proclus.

Life. — Proclus was of Lycian origin, and was born in Constantinople in 412. He received his first instruction at Xanthus, in Lycia (whence his surname “Lycius”). His philosophic training he enjoyed at Alexandria, where he studied under Arion, Leonaras, Hero, and especially under Olympiodorus, with whom he applied himself chiefly to Aristotelian and Platonic philosophy. Thence he went to Athens, where a certain Plutarch, a philosopher, and his daughter, and later Syrianus, became his instructors. Asclepigieneia, a priestess of Eleusis, instructed him chiefly in theurgic mysteries. The vivid imagination and enthusiastic temperament which in his childhood had led him to believe in apparitions of Minerva and Apollo, naturally convinced him, when all the influences of the Mysteries (q.v.) were brought to bear upon him, still more of his immediate and direct intercommunication with the gods; and he distinctly believed himself to be one of those through whom divine revelation reaches mankind. His soul, he thought, had once lived in Nicomachus the Pythagorean, and, like him, he had the power to command the elements to a certain extent, to produce rain, to temper the sun's heat, etc. The Orphic poems, the writings of Hermes, and all that strangely mystical literature with which the age abounded, were to him the only source of true philosophy, and he considered them all more or less in the light of divine revelations.

That same cosmopolitan spirit in religious matters which pervaded Rome towards her end had spread throughout all the civilized “pagan” world of those days, and Proclus distinctly laid it down as an axiom that a true philosopher must also be a hierophant of the whole world. Acquainted with all the creeds and rites of the ancient Pantheons of the different nations, he not only philosophized upon them in an allegorizing and symbolizing spirit, as many of his contemporaries did, but practiced all the ceremonies, however hard and painful. More especially the practice of fasting in honor of Egyptian deities, while on the one hand it fitted him more and more for his hallucinations and dreams of divine intercourse, on the other hand more than once endangered his life. Of an impulsive piety, and eager to win  disciples from Christianity itself, he made himself obnoxious to the Christian authorities at Athens, who, in accordance with the spirit of religious intolerance and fanaticism which then began to animate the new and successful religion against which Proclus waged constant war, banished him from that city. On being permitted to return, he acted with somewhat more prudence and circumspection, and only allowed his most approved disciples to take part in the nightly assemblies in which he propounded his doctrines. He died in 485, in his full vigor, and in the entire possession of all his mental powers, for which he was no less remarkable than for his personal beauty and strength. As a philosopher he enjoyed the highest celebrity among his contemporaries and successors. Marinus does not scruple to call Proclus absolutely inspired, and to affirm that when he uttered his profound dogmas his countenance shone with a preternatural light. Besides his other philosophical attainments, he was a distinguished mathematician, astronomer, and grammarian. In style Proclus is much more perspicuous and intelligible than his predecessor Plotinus; indeed, he is on the whole a good writer, and occasionally is almost eloquent. But the matter of his works has not much to recommend it: his propensity to allegorize everything, even the plainest and simplest expressions in the authors on whom he comments, must deduct largely from his merits as an expounder of other men's thoughts; and but for the interest which attaches to him as the last of a school of philosophy, it is not much to be regretted that his works have slumbered so long in the dust of libraries, and have been either wholly neglected or imperfectly edited.

His Philosophical System. — In the writings of Proclus there is collated, arranged, and dialectically elaborated the whole body of transmitted philosophy, augmented by large additions, and the whole combined into a sort of system, to which he succeeded in giving the appearance of strict logical connection. He professed that his design was not to bring forward views of his own, but simply to expound Plato, in doing which he proceeded on the idea that everything in Plato must be brought into accordance with the mystical theology of Orpheus. He looked upon the Orphic poems and Chaldaean oracles, which he had diligently studied, as divine revelations, and capable of becoming instrumental to philosophy by means of an allegorical exposition. He therefore wrote a separate work on the coincidence of the doctrines of Orpheus, Pythagoras, and Plato. It was in much the same spirit that he attempted to blend together the logical method of Aristotle and the fanciful speculations of Neo-Platonic  mysticism. He called himself, as we have already had occasion to say, the last link of the Hermaic chain, that is, the last of men consecrated by Hermes, in whom, by perpetual tradition, was preserved the occult knowledge of the Mysteries. Where reasoning fails him, he takes refuge in the πίστις of Plotinus, which is superior to knowledge. He conducts us to the operations of theurgy, which transcends all human wisdom, and comprises within itself all the advantages of divinations, purifications, initiations, and all the activities of divine inspiration. Through it we are united with the primeval unity, in which every motion and energy of our souls comes to rest. It is this principle which unites not only men with gods, but the gods with each other, and with the one — the good, which is of all things the most credible.

Proclus “held, in all its leading. features the doctrine of emanations from one ultimate, primeval principle of all things, the absolute unity, towards union with which again all things strive. This union he did not, like Plotinus, conceive to be effected by means of pure reason, as even things destitute of reason and energy participate in it, purely as the result of their subsistence (ὕπαρξις, Theol. Plat. i, 25; ii, 1, 4). In some unaccountable way, therefore, he must have conceived the πίστις, by which he represents this union as being effected, as something which did not involve rational or thinking activity. All inferior existences are connected with the highest only through the intermediate ones, and can return to the higher only through that which is intermediate. Every multitude, in a certain way, partakes of unity, and everything which becomes one, becomes so by partaking of the one (Inst. Theol.c. 3). Every object is a union of the one and the many: that which unites the one and the many is nothing else than the pure, absolute one — the essential one, which makes everything else partake of unity. Proclus argued that there is either one principium, or many principia. If the latter, the principia must be either finite or infinite in number. If infinite, what is derived from them must be infinite, so that we should have a double infinite, or else finite. But the finite can be derived only from the finite, so that the principia must be finite in number. There would then be a definite number of them. But number presupposes unity. Unity (ἑνάς) is consequently the principium of principia, and the cause of the finite multiplicity and of the being of all things (Theol. Plat. ii, 1). There is therefore one principium which is incorporeal, for the corporeal consists of parts. It is immovable and unchangeable, for everything that moves, moves towards some object or end, which it seeks after. If the principium were  movable it must be in want of the good, and there must be something desirable outside of it. But this is impossible, for the principium has need of nothing, and is itself the end towards which everything else strives. The principium, or first cause of all things, is superior to all actual being (οὐσία), and separated from it, and cannot even have it as an attribute (l.c.).

The absolutely one is not an object of cognition to any existing thing, nor can it be named (l.c. p. 95). But in contemplating the emanation of things from the one and their return into it we arrive at two words, the good, and the one, of which the first is analogical and positive, the latter negative only (l.c. p. 96). The absolutely one has produced not only earth and heaven, but all the gods which are above the world and in the world: it is the god of all gods, the unity of all unities (l.c. ii, 110). Everything which is perfect strives to produce something else; the full seeks to impart its fulness. Still more must this be the case with the absolute good, though in connection with that we must not conceive of any creative power or energy, for that would be to make the one imperfect and not simple, not fruitful through its very perfection (l.c. p. 101). Every emanation is less perfect than that from which it emanates (Inst. Theol. c. 7), but has a certain similarity with it, and, so far as this similarity goes, remains in it, departing from it so far as it is unlike, but as far as possible being one with it, and remaining in it (ibid. 31). What is produced from the absolutely one is produced as unity, or of the nature of unity. Thus the first produced things are independent unities (αὐτοτελεῖς ἑνάδες). Of these independent unities some are simple, others more composite. The nearer the unities are to the absolute unity the simpler they are, but the greater is the sphere of their operation and their productive power. Thus out of unity there arise a multitude of things which depart further and further from the simplicity of the absolute one; and as the producing power diminishes, it introduces more and more conditions into things, while it diminishes their universality and simplicity. His whole system of emanations seems, in fact, to be a realization of the logical subordination of ideas. The simplest ideas which are contained in those which are composite being regarded by him as the principles of things.”

The emanations proceeded in a curious triadic manner. That which precedes all power, and emanates immediately from the primal cause of all things, is limit. Unity, duality, he considered as identical with limitation (πέρας) and boundlessness (ἀπειρία), and from the mixed compound of these two principia arises a third, a compound of the two — substance (as  a sort of genus of all substances), that which in itself is absolutely an existing thing and nothing more (Theol. Plat. 3, 133 sq.). Everything, according to Proclus, contains in itself being (οὑσία), life (ζωή), and intelligence (νοῦς). The life is the centre of the thing, for it is both an object of thought and exists. The intelligence is the limit of the thing, for the intellect (νοῦς) is in that which is the object of intellect (νοητόν), and the latter in the former; but the intellect or thought exists in the thing thought of objectively, and the thing thought of exists in the intellect productively (νοερῶς). This accordingly is the first triad-limit, infinitude, and the compound of the two.

Proclus distinguished the divinities (making these also descend from unity and give birth to triads) into intelligible and intelligent, supernatural and natural; attributed a supernatural efficacy to the name of the Supreme Being, and, like his predecessors, exalted theurgy above philosophy. The first triad — viz. the limit — Proclus taught, is the deity who advances to the extreme verge of the conceivable from the inconceivable, primal deity, measuring and defining all things, and establishes the paternal, concatenating, and immaculate race of gods. The infinite is the inexhaustible power of this deity. The “mixed” is the first and highest world of gods, which in a concealed manner comprehends everything within itself. Out of this first triad springs the second. As the first of the unities produces the highest existing thing, the intermediate unity produces the intermediate existent thing, in which there is something first — unity, divinity, reality; something intermediate — power; and something last — the existence in the second grade, conceivable life (νοητὴ ζωή); for there is in everything which is the object of thought being (τὸ ειναι), life (τὸ ζῆν), and thought (τὸ νοεῖν). The third of the unities. the “mixed,” produces the third triad, in which the intelligence or thinking power (νοῦς) attains to its subsistence. This thinking power is the limit and completion of everything which can be the object of thought. The first triad contains the principle of union; the second of multiplicity and increase by means of continuous motion or life, for motion is a species of life; the third, the principle of the separation of the manifold, and of formation by means of limit.

In his treatise on Providence and Fate, Proclus seeks to explain the difference between the two, and to show that the second is subordinate to the first in such a manner that freedom is consistent with it. Both providence and fate are causes — the first the cause of all good, the second the cause of all connection (and connection as cause and effect). There are  three sorts of things — some whose operation is as eternal as their substance, others whose substance does not exist, but is perpetually coming into existence, and, between these, things whose substance is eternal, but whose operation takes place in time. Proclus names these three kinds intellectual, animal, and corporeal. The last alone are subjected to fate, which is identical with nature, and is itself subject to providence, which is nothing else than the deity himself. The corporeal part of man is entirely subject to fate. The soul, as regards its substance, is superior to fate; as regards its operation, sometimes (referring to those operations which require corporeal organs and motions) beneath, sometimes superior to fate, and so forms the bond of connection between intellectual and corporeal existence. The freedom of the soul consists in its living according to virtue, for this alone does not involve servitude. Wickedness, on the other hand, is want of power, and by it the soul is subjected to fate, and is compelled to serve all that ministers to or hinders the gratification of the desires. Proclus strongly distinguished the soul from that which is material, pointing out its reflective power as a mark of difference; the corporeal not being able to turn back in that way upon itself, owing to its consisting of separable parts. He founded on this also an argument for the immortality of the soul (Inst. Theol. c. 15). The human soul he considered wrapped up in various more or less dense veils, according to the degree of perfection attained; and he further assumed a certain sort of solidarity between the souls of those who naturally, or by certain immutable circumstances, were linked together, such as children and parents, rulers and subjects; and he carried this doctrine so far as to assert that the children must naturally participate in their parents' faults. Faith alone, he further held, was essential to the attainment of theurgy, which, comprising mantic and supernatural inspiration, is preferable to all human wisdom; and in this he chiefly differs from Plotinus (q.v.). Some of the topics touched upon in this treatise are carried out still further in the essay on Ten Questions about Providence. In the treatise on the Origin of Evil (Περὶ τῆς τῶν κακῶν ὑποστάσεως), Proclus endeavors to show that evil does not originate with God, or with the daemons, or with matter. Evil is the consequence of a weakness, the absence of some power. As with the total absence of all power activity would be annihilated, there cannot be any total, unmixed evil. The good has one definite, eternal, universally operating cause — namely, God. The causes of evil are manifold, indefinite, and not subject to rule. Evil has not an original, but only a derivative existence.  His Works. — The following of Proclus's writings are still extant:

(1.) Εἰς τὴν Πλάτωνος θεολογίαν, in six books.

(2.) Στοιχείωσις θεολογική (Institutio Theologica). This treatise was first published in the Latin translation of Franciscus Patricius. The Greek text, with the translation of AEm. Portus, is appended to the edition of the last-mentioned work (Hamb. 1618).

(3.) A commentary on the First Alcibiades of Plato.

(4.) A commentary on the Tinceus of Plato. Of this commentary on the Timnaus five books remain, but they only treat of about a third of the dialogue. It is appended to the first Basle edition of Plato.

(5.) Various notes on the Πολιτεία of Plato, printed in the same edition of Plato as the last-mentioned work.

(6.) A commentary on the Πολιτεία of Plato, published in Stallbaum's edition of that dialogue.

(7.) Portions of a commentary on the Cratylus of Plato, edited by Boissonade (Leips. 1820).

(8.) A paraphrase of various difficult passages in the Τετράβιβλος σύνταξις of Ptolemaeus: first published, with a preface, by Melancthon (Basle. 1554).

(9.) A treatise on motion (Περὶ κινήσεως), a sort of compendium of the last five books of Aristotle's treatise Περὶ φυσικῆς ἀκροάσεως.

(10.) ῾Υποτύπωσις τῶν ἀστρονομικῶν ὑποθέσεων (ibid. 1520).

(11.) Σφαῖρα, frequently appended to the works of the ancient astronomers. There are also several separate editions of it.

(12.) A commentary on the first book of Euclid's Elenents (attached to various editions of the text of Euclid).

(13.) A commentary on the ῎Εργα καὶ ἡμέραι of Hesiod, in a somewhat mutilated form ( ῾Υπόμνημα εἰς τὰ ῾Ησιόδου ἔργα καὶ ἡμέρας) (first published at Venice in 1537). A better edition is that by Heinsius (Leyden, 1603).

(14.) Χρηστομάθεια γραμματική, or, rather, some portions of it preserved by Photius (cod. 239), treating of poetry and the lives of various celebrated poets. The short life of Homer which passes under the name of Proclus was probably taken from this work.

(15.) Ε᾿πιχειρήματα ιή κατὰ Χριστιανῶν. The object of this work was to maintain the eternity of the universe against the Christian doctrine on the subject. The work of Proclus has not come down to us in a separate form, but we still possess his arguments in the refutation of them by Joannes Philoponus (De Eternitate Mundi).

(16.) De Providentia et Fato, addressed to Theodorus, a mechanician.

(17.) Decemn Dubitationes circa Providentiam (Περὶ τῶν δέκα πρὸς τὴν Πρόνοιαν ἀπορημάτων).

(18.) De Malorum Subsistentia (Περὶ τῆς τῶν κακῶν ὑποστάσεως). This and the two preceding treatises only exist in the Latin translation of Gulielmus de Morbeka. They are printed entire by Fabricius in his Bibliotheca Graeca, 9:373, etc.

(19.) A little astrological treatise on the effect of eclipses, in a Latin translation.

(20.) A treatise on poetry, also in a Latin translation, printed together with a treatise by Choeroboscus (Paris, 1615).

(21.) Five hymns.

(22.) Some scholia on Homer. The following works have perished:

(1.) A commentary on the Philebus of Plato (Procl. in Tim. p. 53,222).

(2.) A commentary on the Phoedrus of Plato (Procl. l.c. p. 329).

(3.) A defence of the Timoeus of Plato against the Α᾿ντιῤῥήσεις of Aristotle (ibid. p. 226: Βιβλίον ἰδιᾷ ἐκδεδωκὼς οιδα τῶν πρὸς τὸν Τίμαιον Α᾿ριστοτέλους ἀντιῤῥήσεων ἐπισκέψεις ποιουμένων).

(4.) Καθαρτικὸς τῶν δογμάτων τοῦ Πλάτωνος, against Domninus (Suid. s.v. Δομνῖνος).

(5.) A commentary on the Thecetetus of Plato (Marinus, l.c. cap. ult.).

(6.) Νόμοι, a commentary apparently on the Laws of Plato (Procl. in Tim. p. 178).

(7.) Notes on the Ε᾿ννεάδες of Plotinus.

(8.) Μητρωακὴ βίβλος, on the mother of the gods (Suid. s.v. HpocX.).

(9.) Εἰς τὴν Ο᾿ρφέως θεολογίαν (Suid. l.c.; Marin. c. 27).

(10.) περὶ τὰ λόγια, in ten books (Suid. Marin. c. 26).

(11.) A commentary on Homer (Suid.).

(12.) Περὶ τῶν παῤ ῾Ομήρῳ θεῶν (ibid.).

(13.) Συμφωνία Ο᾿ρφέως, Πυθαγόρου καὶ Πλάτωνος (Suid. Marin. c. 22).

(14.) On the three ἑνάδες νοηταί — namely, ἀλήθεια, καλλονή, and συμμετρία (Procl. in Polit. p. 433).

(15.) Εἰς τὸν λόγον τῆς Διοτίμας περὶ τῆς τῶν κακῶν ὑποστάσεως.

(16.) Περὶ ἀγωγῆς, on the theurgic discipline, in two books (Suid.).

(17.) Various hymns and epigrams.

There is no complete edition of the extant works of Proclus. The edition of Cousin (Paris, 1820-27, 6 vols. 8vo) contains the treatises on Providence and Fate, on the Ten Doubts about Providence, and on the Nature of Evil, the commentary on the Alcibiades, and the commentary on the Parmnenides. This learned Frenchman has since brought out Procli Philos. Platonici opera inedita (Paris, 1864). There are English translations of the commentaries on the Tiinceus, the six books on the Theology of Plato, the commentaries on the first book of Euclid, and the Theological Elements, and the five Hymns, by Thomas Taylor. See Fabricius, Bibl. Graec. 9:363- 445; Brucker, Historia Critica Philosophice, ii, 319-336; Tennemann, Geschichte der Philosophie, vol. 6; Ritter, Geschichte der Philosophie, bk. 13, c. 3, vol. 4:699, etc.; Dr. Burigny, Life of Proclus, in Memoirs of the Academy of Inscriptions, vol. 31; Marinus, Vita Procli (Gr. and Lat. ed. by  Fabricius [Hamb. 1740, 4to]; ed. by Boissonade [Leips. 1814, 8vo]); Baur, Christl. Jahrbiicher (Tubing. 1846, p. 29-72); Cudworth, Intell. Universe (see Index); Hunt, Pantheism, p. 117 sq.; Lewes, Hist. of Philos. vol. ii; Simon, Ecole Alex. vol. ii; Tennemann, Man. of Philos. p. 190 sq.; Gibbon, Decline and Fall, c. 20:§ 12; Hase, Ch. Hist. p. 48 etc.; Ueberweg, Hist. of Philos. i, 255-258; Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. cand Mythol. s.v. (from which a part of the above has been taken); Kingsley, Alexandria, p. 116-124, 128; Alzog, Patrol. § 57; Nourisson, Pensees Humaines, p. 161 sq.

## Proclus (2)[[@Headword:Proclus (2)]]

             ST., an Eastern ecclesiastic of the 5th century. He was at a very early age appointed reader in the church at Constantinople. He was also engaged as secretary or amanuensis to St. Chrysostom, and was employed in a similar capacity by Atticus (who succeeded Arsacius as patriarch of Constantinople), by whom he was invested successively with the orders of deacon and presbyter. He was raised to the rank of bishop of Cyzicus by Sisinnius, the successor of Atticus, but did not exercise the functions of his office, the people of Cyzicus choosing another in his place. On the death of Sisinnius (A.D. 427) there was a general expression of feeling in favor of Proclus as his successor, but Nestorius was appointed. Proclus contended zealously against the heresies which the latter strove to introduce into the Church, combating them even in a sermon preached before Nestorius himself. On the deposition of Nestorius, Proclus was again proposed as his successor; but his elevation was again opposed, though on what grounds does not appear very clearly ascertained. But on the death of Maximianus, who was appointed instead, Proclus was at last created patriarch. In A.D. 438 Proclus gained a great deal of honor by having the body of St. Chrysostom brought to Constantinople.

There is still extant a fragment of a Latin translation of a eulogy on St. Chrysostom, by Proclus, delivered probably about this time. It was in the time of Proclus that the custom of chanting the Trisayion was introduced into the Church. While in office, Proclus conducted himself with great prudence and mildness. For further details respecting his ecclesiastical career, the reader is referred to Tillemont's Melmoies Ecclesiastiques (14, 704-718). His extant writings are enumerated by Fabricius (B. G. ix. 505-512). One of the most celebrated of his letters (Περὶ πίστεως) was written in A.D. 435, when the bishops of Armenia applied to him for his opinion on certain propositions which had been disseminated in their dioceses, and were  attributed to Theodorus of Mopsuestia. The discussion that ensued with respect to these propositions made a considerable stir in the East. Proclus bestowed a great deal of pains upon his style, which is terse and sententious, but is crowded with antitheses and rhetorical points, and betrays a labored endeavor to reiterate the same sentiment in every possible variety of form. From the quotations of subsequent authors, it appears that several of the writings of Proclus are lost. The Platonic Theology of Proclus Diadochus has sometimes been erroneously described as a theological work of St. Proclus. The 24th of October is the day consecrated to the memory of St. Proclus by the Greek Church. See Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol. s.v.; Neander, Ch. Hist. ii, 496 sq.; Riddle, Hist. of the Papacy, i, 160 sq., 170 sq.

## Proconsul[[@Headword:Proconsul]]

             The Greek word ἀνθύπατος, for which this is the true equivalent, is rendered uniformly “deputy” in the A.V. of Act 13:7-8; Act 13:12; Act 19:38, and the derived verb ἀνθυπατεύω in Act 18:12 is translated “to be deputy.” At the division of the Roman provinces by Augustus, in the year B.C. 27, into senatorial and imperial, the emperor assigned to the senate such portions of territory as were peaceable and could be held without force of arms (Sueton. Oct. 47; Strabo, 17:840; Dio Cass. 53:12), an arrangement which remained with frequent alterations till the 3d century. Over these senatorial provinces the senate appointed by lot yearly an officer who was called “proconsul” (ibid. 13), who exercised purely civil functions, had no power over life and death, and was attended by one or more legates (ibid. 14). He was neither girt with the sword nor wore the military dress (ibid. 13). He was chosen out of the body of the senate; and it was customary, when any one's consulate expired, to send him as a proconsul into some province. He enjoyed the same honor with the consuls, but was allowed only six lictors with the fasces before him. Such provinces were in consequence called “proconsular.” With the exception of Africa and Asia, which were assigned to men who had passed the office of consul, the senatorial provinces were given to those who had been praetors, and were divided by lot each year among those who had held this office five years previously. Their term of office was one year. The proconsuls decided cases of equity and justice, either privately in their palaces, where they received petitions, heard complaints, and granted writs under their seals; or publicly in the common hall, with the formalities generally observed in the courts at Rome. These duties were, however,  more frequently delegated to their assessors, or other judges of their own appointment. As the proconsuls had also the direction of justice, of war, and of the revenues, these departments were administered by their lieutenants, or legati, who were usually nominated by the senate. The expense of their journeys to and from their provinces was defrayed by the public. Livy (8 and 26) mentions two other classes of proconsuls — those who, being consuls, had their office continued beyond the time appointed by law; and those who, being previously in a private station, were invested with this honor, either for the government of provinces or to command in war. Some were created proconsuls by the senate without being appointed to any province, merely to command in the army, and to take charge of the military discipline; others were allowed to enter upon their proconsular office before being admitted to the consulship, but having that honor in reserve.

Among the senatorial provinces in the first arrangement by Augustus were Cyprus, Achaia, and Asia within the Halys and Taurus (Strabo, 17:840). The first and last of these are alluded to in Act 13:7-8; Act 13:12; Act 19:38, as under the government of proconsuls. Achaia became an imperial province in the second year of Tiberius, A.D. 16, and was governed by a procurator (Tacit. Ann. i, 76), but was restored to the senate by Claudius (Sueton. Claud. 25), and therefore Gallio, before whom St. Paul was brought, is rightly termed “proconsul” in Act 18:12. SEE GALLIO.

Cyprus also, after the battle of Actium, was first made an imperial province (Dio Cass. 53:12), but five years afterwards (B.C. 22) it was given to the senate, and is reckoned by Strabo (17:840) ninth among the provinces of the people governed by στρατηγοί, as Achaia is the seventh. These στρατηγοί, or propraetors, had the title of proconsul. Cyprus and Narbonese Gaul were given to the senate in exchange for Dalmatia, and thus, says Dio Cassius (54:4), proconsuls (ἀνθύπατοι) began to be sent to those nations. In Bockh's Compus Inscriptionurm, No. 2631, is the following relating to Cyprus: ἡ πόλις Κοϊντον Ι᾿ούλιον Κόρδον ανθύπατον ἁγνείας This Quintus Julius Cordus appears to have been proconsul of Cyprus before the twelfth year of Claudius. He is mentioned in the next inscription (No. 2632) as the predecessor of another proconsul, Lucius Annius Bassus. The date of this last inscription is the twelfth year of Claudius, A.D. 52. The name of another proconsul of Cyprus in the time of Claudius occurs on a copper coin, of which an engraving is given under CYPRUS SEE  CYPRUS. A coin of Ephesus (q.v.) illustrates the usage of the word ἀνθύπατπκ in Act 19:38.

## Procop The Younger[[@Headword:Procop The Younger]]

             SEE PROCOP, ANDREW.

## Procopius[[@Headword:Procopius]]

             OF GAZA, a very respectable Greek sophist of the 6th century, and the first who suffered martyrdom in Palestine, under the reign of Diocletian. The precise time of his birth or death is not recorded. lie wrote commentaries on the Octoteuch (ed. C. Clauser, Tigur. 1555, fol.), the books of Kings, the Chronicles (ed. J. Meursius, Lugd. Bat. 1620, 4to), Isaiah (ed. J.  Curterius, Paris, 1580, fol.), etc., and opened among the Greeks the list of the Catenic writers. See Mosheim, Eccles. Hist. (Index in vol. 3); Alzog, Patrologie, § 76.

## Procopius Of Caesarea[[@Headword:Procopius Of Caesarea]]

             a noted character in the history of the East in the 6th century, is especially distinguished as the writer of a history in which he dwells at large on the ecclesiastical condition of the periods of which he treats. He was born at Cesarea, in Palestine, about the end of the 5th or beginning of the 6th century. After studying rhetoric in his native country, he went to Constantinople, where he gave lessons in rhetoric, and appears to have been also a lawyer. His reputation for learning and ability reached the court; and the emperor Justin the elder, in the last year of his reign, appointed him assessor (συγκάθεδρος) to Belisarius, who was about that time sent as governor to Dara, on the frontiers of Armenia. Procopius afterwards accompanied that commander in his first war against the Persians (530), afterwards in that against the Vandals in Africa (533-535), and lastly against the Goths in Italy (536-539). During these campaigns he appears to have rendered himself very useful by his ability and activity, and to have been intrusted by Belisarius with important commissions connected with the service of the army. In his capacity of assessor, he was the general's legal adviser, and he was also his private secretary. In 538 he assisted Antonina, the wife of Belisarius, in raising troops in Campania, and in sending some by sea to Rome, which was then besieged. On his return to Constantinople, about 540, the emperor Justinian made him a senator, as a reward for his services. In 562 he was made prefect of Constantinople, unless perhaps it was another of the name who obtained this dignity in that year. He died in that city at an advanced age, but the precise year of his death is not ascertained. It was during his extensive travels that he gathered the materials for the History of his Own Times (in eight books), translated into Latin by Claude Mattret, a Jesuit, under the title Procopii Caesariensis Historiurum sui Temporis Libri Octo (Paris, 1662, fol.; with the Greek text in English, Lond. 1653, fol.).

His descriptions of the manners of the various barbarous nations which invaded the Roman empire are vivid and interesting. The first two books of his history concern the Persian wars. He begins his narrative with the death of Arcadius, and briefly relates the wars between the Romans and Persians under Theodosius the younger, Anastasius, and Justinus, and lastly Justinian. As he comes down to contemporary times, his history is more diffuse. He closes with the twenty-third year of Justinian's reign (A.D. 550). Books 3 and 4 treat of the wars of the Vandals in Africa, and the reconquest of that province by Belisarius. The 5th, 6th, and 7th books are concerned with the  history of the Gothic kingdom in Italy founded by Theodoric, and the expedition of Belisarius against Totilas. The 8th book is of a mixed character; it resumes the account of the Persian wars, then speaks of the affairs of the Roman empire in other quarters — in Africa, on the Rhine, and in Thrace — and at last resumes the narrative of the Gothic war in Italy, the expedition of Narses, the defeat and death of Teia, and the final overthrow of the Gothic kingdom. — English Cyclop. s.v. As a historian, Procopius took Herodotus for his pattern, and even resembles his master's fatalism in the material conception of history. Procopius assumes the role of a sceptic, and as such regards himself as above all positive religion and dogmatic disputes. On account of the cold, unsympathetic manner in which he writes of Christianity, some have not believed him a Christian, but a deist, Jew, or even a heathen. He was, however, at least in outward confession, a Christian, as appears from his second work, Περὶ Κτισμάτων, De Edificiis, which contains a history of all churches, convents, and other public buildings reared under Justinian at the public expense in the Roman empire. Another of his writings, entitled Ανέκδοτα, or Secret History, in thirty chapters, is a sort of complement to the books De Bellis. Justinian and Theodora are here painted in the darkest colors. Procopius says that he wrote it because in his first work he could not, through fear of torture and death, speak of living persons as they deserved. Some grossly obscene passages concerning Theodora, who was evidently a very bad woman, have been expunged in most editions. There seems little doubt that Procopius is the author of the work. The Paris edition of Procopius, already quoted, is enriched with copious historical notes, prefaces, and an index. The works of Procopius, with valuable notes, are included in the Bonn edition of the Byzantine historians (1833-38, 3 vols. 8vo), which is, of course, the best. See Fabricius, Bibl. Graeca, 7:555 sq.; Hanke, De Scriptor. Byz. p. 145 sq.; Tueffel, in Schmidt's All geem. Zeitschrift fur Gesch. 8:38-79; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.; Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol. s.v.; Piper, Mon. Theol. § 204: Dahn, Procopius v. Ccesarea (Berl. 1865).

## Procopius, Friedrich P[[@Headword:Procopius, Friedrich P]]

             a Roman Catholic monastic noted especially for his valuable contributions to Christian song, was born in the year 1608, of Protestant parents, at Templin, in Brandenburg. At a very early age he joined the Roman Catholic Church, and when eighteen years old he entered the Order of the Capuchins of the Austro-Bohemian province. Having completed his studies. he visited many cities as a preacher and missionary. He soon became known as a famous pulltit orator, but more so by his poetical productions, which gave him the name of “Catholic Meistersinger.” Procopius (died at Linz in 1680. He wrote, Der Gross Wunderthdtigen Mutter Gottes Marite Hulf'Lob-Gesang (Passow, 1659): — Iertzen-Freud unid Seelen- Trost (ibid. 1660, 1661): — Mariale Concizanotorium rythmlo-nelodicum (2d ed. Salzburg, 1667), a collection of sermons oni St. Mary: — Triemale Donminicale primum (ibid. 1676), sermons for the Christian year: — Catechismale (ibid. 1674). Comp. Bernardus a Bononia, Bibliotheca Script. Capucinorun, p. 217-219; Brihl, Geschichte der Literatur des Kathol. Deutschlands, p. 20 sq.; Kehrein, Geschichte der Kathol. Kanzelberedsunikeit der Deutscihe1 (Regensburg, 1843), vol. i, § 36; Schletterer, Uebersichtliche Darstellung der Geschichte der kirclchiche Dichtunqg . geistlichen Musik (Nordlingen, 1866), p. 217 sq.; and the notice of the latter work in Hauck's Theolog. Jahrmesbericht, ii, 1866, p. 191 sq. (B. P.)

## Procopm, Andrew[[@Headword:Procopm, Andrew]]

             (also known as Procop the greater, the elder, or the holy, or the shaven, in allusion to his having received the tonsure in early life), was one of the greatest of the Hussite leaders, and ranks only second to Ziska, whose successor he was among the Taborites. Procop was born of a noble family towards the close of the 14th century. He owed his education to an uncle, a nobleman of Prague. After having travelled for some years through France and Spain, Procop returned to his native country just as the religious wars were breaking out. He had taken holy orders, but instead of entering the ministry he joined the ranks of the insurgent Hussites, and, by his military genius, rapidly rose to the first rank. In 1424 Ziska died, and the Taborites elected Procop as their leader. Palacky, in comparing the two great Hussites, says of Procop that if he did not equal Ziska in warlike ability, he surpassed his predecessor in mind and political farsightedness. Procop's history from this time till 1427 presents an almost unbroken series of daring attacks upon the Austrians.

At the same time, a larger body of Taborites, who called themselves Orphans, and had been overrunning Lausitz and had burned Lauban, under the leadership of a man subsequently known as Procop the lesser (or younger), now, in concert with the more distinguished Procop, attacked Silesia, and took part in those internal feuds of the Hussite factions by which Bohemia was almost wholly ruined. The threatened approach of three German armies, which had been levied by the neighboring states to carry on an exterminating crusade against the heretics, was alone able to restore unanimity to the divided Hussites, who, under the leadership of the two Procops, offered a desperate and successful resistance to the larger numbers of the Germans, subsequently pursuing their enemies with fire and sword through Silesia, Moravia, and Hungary as far as Presburg. In 1429 Procop made inroads into the German states as far as Magdeburg, and returned to Bohemia laden with spoil, and followed by a numerous band of captive nobles and knights; and in the following year, at the head of 50,000 men-at-arms, and half as many horsemen, he again broke into Misnia, Franconia, and Bavaria, and after having burned 100 castles and towns, destroyed 1400 villages and hamlets, and carried off a vast amount of treasure, turned his arms against Moravia and Silesia.

The emperor Sigismund at this crisis offered to treat with him, but the imperial demand, that the Hussites should  submit to the decision of a council, afforded Procop a pretext for breaking off all negotiations with the imperial court. A second German crusading army now advanced in 1431, but was thoroughly defeated at Riesenburg. These successes, which were followed by others of nearly equal importance in Silesia, Hungary, and Saxony, where the princes had to purchase peace at the hands of the two Procops on humiliating terms, induced the Council of Basle to propose a meeting between the Hussite leaders and ten learned Catholic doctors. The meeting lasted fifty days, but was productive of no good result. Procop himself went before that learned body, and defended, with much spirit, the creed of his party. But failing to receive such treatment as he felt himself entitled to, he finally refused further to attend the council, and returned to Bohemia, where, combining his forces with those of Procop the lesser, he laid siege to Pilsen. The Calixtines, who came here in force, had offended Procop by the peace treaty they had made with a delegation of the Council of Basle. The council, on this, passed an act known as the Basle Compact, by which the Hussites were allowed the use of the cup in the Lord's Supper, and the Bohemians were designated by the title of the First Sons of the Catholic Church. The Taborites and Orphans, under the leadership of the two Procops, refused, however, to have anything to do with the pope, and hence dissensions arose between them and the more moderate of the Hussites. After many lesser encounters between these factions, a decisive battle was fought near Lipaum in 1434, in which Procop was induced, by a feint of the enemy, to leave his intrenchments. His followers at first fought desperately against the troops of the Bohemian nobles, who were commanded by Meinhard of Neuhaus; but at length. under the influence of a sudden panic, they gave way, and took to flight. Procop, after vainly striving to re-form their broken lines, threw himself into the midst of the enemy, and was killed. Procop the lesser, following in his steps, was also slain, and with these two brave Hussite leaders the cause of the Taborites perished. Milman says, “with Procop fell the military glory, the religious inflexibility, of Bohemia.” See Gillett. Life and Times of John Huss, vol. 2, ch. 17 sq.; Leben des Procop (Prague, 1789); Milman, Hist. of Latin Christianity, 7:545-568; Palacky, Gesch. von EBomen, 3, 91 sq.

## Procopovitsch[[@Headword:Procopovitsch]]

             SEE PROKOPOVITCH.

## Procrastination[[@Headword:Procrastination]]

             the postponement of a matter from one day to another; according to the maxim of the lazy and of the men of pleasure, “Seria in crastinum (diem or tempus).” Generally, in such cases, time wears on, and things are not done, at least not in the right time or in the right way: “Cras, eras et semper eras, et sic dilabitur setas.” The system of procrastination, therefore, is to be commended in no respect; but least of all in moral, or, better, religious matters. Every day lost in our moral amendment is an irreparable loss, a  loss for eternity, as reformation becomes the more difficult the more it is delayed.

## Proctor[[@Headword:Proctor]]

             (formed by a contraction from the Latin procurator) designates an officer commissioned to take care of another person's cause in ecclesiastical courts, in the stead of the party whom he represents. It corresponds to attorney or solicitor in the other courts. In the Church of Rome there are extra-proctors, a class who settle in the name of another a legal business of no litigious character; a more accurate title is mandatory. The title of proctor has been preserved only in some kinds of procurations concerning ecclesiastical affairs. These proctors may act instead of,

1. Bride and bridegroom for the conclusion of the betrothal. For not only the acts which prepare the betrothal (tractatus sponsalitii), and the suit (pactum de ineundis sponsalibus), which, after its acceptation, takes the lawful nature of a betrothal, but the betrothal itself, or the actual contract about the future matrimony, can be performed by the parties either in person or by procturation (sponsalia per procuratorem). Only the proctor must have special powers for the conclusion of a promise of marriage with a determined person (fr. 34, Dig De Rit. Rupt. 23:2).

2. Either party at the marriage act itself (matrimonium per procuratorem). Should the powers given to the mandatary have been recalled before the copulation, the marriage-act would be void. even if the proctor at that time had no knowledge of the revocation. The mandatary must be present in person, and cannot be represented by a substitute (Sext. c. 9. De Procur. i, 19); and the bride and bridegroom thus united must afterwards give their consent in person. These dispositions of canon law are preserved in the Austrian and Bavarian legislation. Protestant matrimonial law rejects marriage by procuration, but admits an exception in favor of royal persons.

3. Godfathers and godmothers, in baptisms or confirmation, may, if sick or otherwise prevented, choose third persons for their representatives at the holy ceremony (procurator patrini). As, according to the decision of the Council of Trent, the person to be baptized must have a godfather and a godmother (unus et unca), each of the parties .can make choice of a substitute, either male or female, but both mandataries cannot belong to the same sex. The real godfather, not his representative, contracts in this case  the cognatio spiritualis, and the prohibition of marriage founded on it (Duclar. S. Conyr. Conc. Trid. May 16, 1630, Aug. 23 and Sept. 1, 1721). 4. Absent electors, if they can sufficiently- justify their absence, and are prepared to swear to it (c. 42, § 1, 10, De Elect. i, 6), cannot declare their vote by writing, but may give their mandate to a colleague. Ecclesiastics are prohibited from being proctors in strictly secular affairs. In the English ecclesiastical constitution, proctors are those clergymen who are chosen in each diocese to represent their brethren in convocation.

In the universities the name refers to those officers who, as representatives of the whole body of masters of arts, maintain the discipline of the university. The proctors are chosen out of the several colleges by turn. The pro-proctors are the deputies of the proctors.

## Proctor, David C.[[@Headword:Proctor, David C.]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in New Hampshire in 1792. He graduated at Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H., in 1818, studied divinity in the Andover Theological Seminary, Mass.. was licensed by a Congregational association, and in 1822 was ordained by a Congregational council, and went West under the auspices of the Connecticut Home Missionary Society. His first field of labor was Indianapolis, Ind.; subsequently he moved to Kentucky, and took charge of the Church in Springfield and Lebanon. In 1826 he was temporarily called to the presidency of Centre College, Danville, Ky., after which he was without charge for a number of years. He died Jan. 18, 1865. Mr. Proctor was an able preacher, and had considerable reputation as a scholar. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1866, p. 167. (J. L. S.)

## Procuration[[@Headword:Procuration]]

             Different meanings have been applied to this word. 1. An entertainment given to the archdeacon with provision for seven horses and six men. 2. An equivalent in money; according to Lyndwood, 7s. 6d. to the archdeacon and 1s. to each of the other six at his visitation, to commute for the provision or entertainment which was formerly expected to be provided at the time of visitation. 3. An entertainment made at a visitation for a bishop. In 1336 a money composition was permitted to be offered by pope Benedict XII, but only one procuration could be demanded if several churches were visited in one day. The amount varied in different countries.  In England an archbishop received 220 turons, a bishop 150, an archdeacon 50, and an archpriest or rural dean 10. SEE SYNODAL.

## Procurator[[@Headword:Procurator]]

             This word does not occur in the Vulgate or in the A.V., nor is its accurate Greek equivalent, ἐπίτροπος (though used by Philo, Leg. ad Ceiium, and by Josephus. Ant. 20:6, 2, 8, 5; comp. 20:5,; his office is called ἐπιτροπή [ibid. 20:5, 1]), found in this sense in the Greek Testament, where it is represented by the vaguer term ἡγεμών, rendered by our translators “governor” (Luk 2:2; Mat 27:2; Mat 28:14, etc.). ῾Ηγεμών also occurs in a perfectly general sense (Mat 10:18; 1Pe 2:14). In Mat 2:6 it is rendered “prince,” and corresponds to the Hebrew אִלּוּ. “Governor” in the A.V. is also used for ἐθνάρχης (2Co 11:32). Διοικητής is another Greek term for procurator. The word ἡγεμών, or procurator, is generally applied, both in the original and in our version, to the procurators of Judaea, Pontius Pilate (Matthew 27 etc.), Felix (Acts 23), and Festus (Act 26:30); but it is also used of Cyrenius (Quirinus), who held the more responsible and distinguished office of praeses or leqatus Caesaris over the province of Syria (Luk 2:2). Procurators were chiefly despatched to the imperial, and not to the senatorial provinces. SEE PROVINCE.

The revenues of the latter flowed into the merarium, or exchequer, while those of the former belonged to the fiscus, or privy purse. The procuratore Caesoris were specially intrusted with the interests of the fiscus, and therefore managed the various taxes and imposts, performing similar duties to those exercised by the quaestors in the provinces administered by the senate. Procurators were, however, sometimes sent as well as quaestors to the senatorial provinces (Tacit. Ann. 13:1: Dio Cass. 53:15); but these were doubtless offices of less dignity, though bearing the same title. Procurator is also used for steward (Plautus, Pseud. 2, 2, 14), attorney (Ulpian, Dig. 3, 3), regent (Cesar, B. C. 3, 112), etc. They were selected from among men who had been consuls or praetors, and sometimes from the inferior senators (Dio Cass. 53:13-15). They were attended by six lictors, used the military dress, and wore the sword (ibid. 13). No quaestor came into the emperor's provinces, but the property and revenues of the imperial treasury were administered to the rationales, procucratores, and actores of the emperor, who were chosen from among his freedmen, or from among the knights (Tacit. Hist. v, 9; Dio Cass. 53:15).

Sometimes the procurators were invested with the  dignity of legati, or procuratores cum jure gladii (τῇ ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἐξουσίᾷ, Josephus, War, ii, 8, 1), and this was the case with the procurators of Judaea, which had been made a sub-province of Syria (προσθήκη τῆς Συρίας; id. Ant. 13:1, 1) since the deposition of the ethnarch Archelaus, A.D. 6. There is therefore no inaccuracy in the use of ἡγεμών in the New Test., since we find from inscriptions that preeses and procurator were often interchangeable (Gruter, p. 493, b). In one respect, indeed, the ἡγεμόνες were even more powerful than the proconsuls themselves (ἀνθύπατοι); for, being regarded as the immediate emissaries and representatives of the Caesar, by whom they were appointed to an indefinite tenure of office (Dio Cass. 53:13-15), they had the power of inflicting capital punishment at their own discretion (Joh 19:10; Josephus, War, ii, 8, 1). They also governed the province when the proconsul was dead or absent, “vice proconsilium,” as we see from many inscriptions (Murat. p. 907, 4, etc.). In a turbulent and seditious province like Judaea, their most frequent functions were of a military or judicial character. The first procurator was Coponius, who was sent out with Quirinus to take a census of the property of the Jews and to confiscate that of Archelaus (Josephus, Ant. 18:1, 1). His successor was Marcus Ambivitus, then Annius Rufus, in whose time the emperor Augustus died. Tiberius sent Valerius Gratus. who was procurator for eleven years, and was succeeded by Pontius Pilate (ibid. 2, 2), who i called by Josephus (ibid. 3, 1) ἡγεμών, as he is in the New Test. He was subject to the governor (praeses) of Syria, for the council of the Samaritans denounced Pilate to Vitellitus, who sent him to Rome and put one of his own friends, Marcellus, in his place (ibid. 4, 2). The headquarters of the procurator were at Cesarea (Josephus, War, ii, 9, 2; Act 23:23), where he had a judgment-seat (25:6) in the audience-chamber (Act 23:23), and was assisted by a council (Act 23:12) whom he consulted in cases of difficulty, the assessores (Suieton. Gelb. 14), or; ἡγεμόνες, who are mentioned by Josephus (War, ii, 16, 1) as having been consulted by Cestius, the governor of Syria, when certain charges were made against Florus, the procurator of Judaea. More important cases were laid before the emperor (Act 25:12; comp. Josephus, Ant. 20:6, 2). The procurator, as the representative of the emperor, had the power of life and death over his subjects (Dio Cass. 53:14; Mat 27:26),which was denied to the proconsul. In the New Test. we see the procurator only in his judicial capacity. Thus Christ is brought before Pontius Pilate as a political offender (Mat 27:2; Mat 27:11), and the accusation is heard by the procurator, who is seated on the  judgmentseat (Mat 27:19). Felix heard St. Paul's accusation and defence from the judgment-seat at Caesarea (Acts 24), which was in the open air in the great stadium (Josephus, War, 2, 9, 2), and St. Paul calls him “judge” (Act 24:10), as if this term described his chief functions. The procurator (ἡγεμών) is again alluded to in his judicial capacity in 1Pe 2:14.

He was attended by a cohort as body-guard (Mat 27:27), and apparently went up to Jerusalem at the time of the high festivals, and there resided in the palace of Herod (Josephus, War. ii, 14, 3; Philo, De Leg. ad Caiunz, § 37, ii, 589, ed. Mang.), in which was the pretoriium, or “judgment-hall,” as it is rendered in the A.V. (Mat 27:27; Mar 15:16; comp. Act 23:35). Sometimes, it appears, Jerusalem was made his winter quarters (Josephus, Ant. 18:3, 1). The high- priest was appointed and removed at the will of the procurator (ibid. 2, 2). Of the oppression and extortion practiced by one of these officers, Gessius Florus, which resulted in open rebellion, we have an account in Josephus (Ant. 20:I, 1; War, ii, 14, 2). The same laws held both for the governors of the imperial and senatorial provinces, that they could not raise a levy or exact more than an appointed sum of money from their subjects, and that when their successors came they were to return to Rome within three months (Dio Cass. 53:15). The pomp and dignity of the procurators may be inferred from the narrative of these trials, and from the titles of “most excellent” and “most noble” (κράτιστε), applied to them by such different lips as those of Claudius Lysias, Tertullian, and St. Paul; yet they were usually chosen from no higher rank than that of the equites, or even the freedmen of the emperor; and the “most noble Felix,” in particular, was a mere manumitted slave (Tacit. Hist. 5, 9; Ann. 12:54; Sueton. Claud. 28). It is satisfactory to find that even in the minutest details the glimpses of their position afforded to us by the New Test. are corroborated by the statements of heathen writers. The violence (Luk 13:1), the venality (Act 24:26), the insolence (Joh 19:22), and the gross injustice (Act 24:27), which we see exemplified in their conduct towards our Lord and his apostles, are amply illustrated by contemporary historians (Josephus, Ant. 18:3, 1; War, ii, 9; Cicero, in Veterem, passim); and they weighed so heavily on the mind of the emperor Trajan that he called the extortions of provincial governors “the spleen of the empire” (comp. Aurel. Vict. Epist. 42). Vespasian (mnore suo) took a more humorous view of the matter, and said that the procurators were like sponges (Sueton. Vesp. 16). The presence of the wives of Pilate (Mat 27:19) and Felix (Act 24:24) reminds us of the famous debate on the proposition of Caecina to  forbid the proconsuls and procurators to be accompanied by their wives (Tacit. Ann. 3, 33, 34). This had been the old and perhaps the wise regulation of earlier days, since the cruelty, ambition, and luxury of these ladies were often more formidable to the provincials than those of the governors themselves. But the rule had often been violated, and had of late been deliberately abandoned. We see, too, in the ready handing-over of the prisoner from one authority to another (ἀνέπεμψεν, remisit, Luk 23:7; Act 26:32), some trace of that salutary dread of being denounced after their term of office was over, which alone acted as a check upon the lawlessness of even the most unscrupulous governors. Even the mention made of things at first sight so trivial as the tribunal (βῆμα), and the tessellated pavement (λιθόστρωτον) on which it was elevated, derives an interest and importance from the fact that they were conventional symbols of wealth and dignity, and that Julius Caesar thought it worth while to carry one about with him from place to place (Sueton. Jul. c. 46). See Sibranda, De Statu Judaeoe Provinc. (Franc. 1698; also in Iken, Thes. Nov. ii, 529); Deyling, Observat. ii, 429; Grossmann, De Procuratore (Lips. 1823); Langen, in the Theol. Quartalschr. (1862) iii; Bible Educator, 3, 180. SEE GOVERNOR.

## Prodicians[[@Headword:Prodicians]]

             a body of Antinomian Gnostic heretics, took their name from their founder, Prodicus, a heretic of the 2d century, who instituted the sect of the Adamites. Prodicus maintained that he and his followers were the sons of the most high God, a royal race (εὐγενεῖς), and therefore, in crazy self- conceit, thought themselves bound by no laws. They rejected the Sabbath; dispensed with prayer and all ordinances of external worship, which they considered to be necessary only for those who were under the power of the Demiurge. They indulged in open profligacy, calling themselves Adamites, because they professed to imitate the condition of bodily life which marked our first parents before their fall. Their maxim was that they were restored by Christ to a state of innocence equal to that which characterized Adam before his transgression; and that, therefore, whenever they appeared together, they should not be ashamed to appear as Adam did in the time of his innocence. They were in the habit of appealing to the authority of certain apocryphal books which were attributed to Zoroaster. Prodicus is placed by Baronius in A.D. 120, before Valentinus. His followers are sometimes identified with the Adamites, and sometimes with the Origenists. See Clement Alex. Strom. i, 304; 3, 438; 7:722; Theodoret,  Fab. Hoeret. i. 6; Farrar, Ecclesiastes Dict. s.v.; Neander, Church Hist. i, 451.

## Prodicus[[@Headword:Prodicus]]

             (1), an Athenian philosopher of the school of the Sophists, was a contemporary of Socrates, and forerunner of the latter in the domain of philosophy, inasmuch as he prepared the way for the logical and ethical efforts of Socrates. Prodicus was a native of Sulis, in the island of Ceos. He went frequently to Athens for the purpose of transacting business on behalf of his native city, and even attracted admiration in the senate as an orator (Plato, Hipp. Maj. p. 282; comp. Philost. Vit. Soph. i, 12), although his voice was deep and apt to fall (Plato, Protag. p. 316, a; Philost. l.c.). Plutarch describes him as slender and weak (Plut. an seni ger. sit Resp. c. 15); and Plato speaks of a degree of effeminacy which resulted therefrom (Protag. p. 315, d). Philostratus is the first who taxes him with luxury and avarice (l.c.; comp. Welcker, Kleine Schriften, ii, 513, etc.). In the Protagoras of Plato, which points to the eighty-seventh Olympiad (any more exact determination is disputable) as the time at which the dialogue is supposed to take place, Prodicus is mentioned as having previously arrived in Athens. Still later, when Isocrates (born 01. 86, 1) is mentioned as his disciple (see Welcker, Prodikos von Keos, Vorgangeer des Socsrates, published first in the Rheinisches Museum der Philologie, von Welcker and Nake, i, 1-39, 533-545, afterwards in Welcker's Kleine Schriften, ii, 392-541), and in the year of the death of Socrates, Prodicus was still living (Plato, Apol. p. 19, c).

The dates of his birth and death cannot be determined. The statement of Suidas (s.v.; comp. Schol. on Plato De Rep. 10:600, c) that he was condemned to the hemlock cup as a corrupter of the youth in Athens sounds very suspicious (comp. Welcker, p. 582). According to the statement of Philostratus (p. 483 — comp. p. 496, ed. Olearius), on which little more reliance can be placed, he delivered his lecture on virtue and vice in Thebes and Sparta also. The Apology of Plato unites him with Gorgias and Hippias in the statement that into whatever city they might come, they were competent to instruct the youth. Lucian (Vit. Herod. c. 3) mentions him among those who had held lectures at Olympia. In the dialogues of Plato he is mentioned or introduced, not indeed without irony, though, as compared with the other Sophists, with a certain degree of esteem (Hipp. Maj. p. 282; Thoet. p. 151, b; Phaedo, 60; Protag. p. 341, a; Charmid. p. 163, d; Meno, p. 96; Cratyl. p. 384, b; Symp. p. 177; Euthyd. p. 305). Aristophanes, in the Clouds (1. 360), deals  more indulgently with him than with Socrates; and the Xenophontic Socrates, for the purpose of combating the voluptuousness of Aristippus, borrows from the book of the wise Prodicus (Πρόδ. ὁ σοφός) the story of the choice of Hercules (Memor. ii, 1, § 21, etc.). This separation of Prodicus from the other Sophists has been pointed out by Welcker in the above-quoted treatise (p. 400, etc.). Like Protagoras and others, Prodicus delivered lectures in return for the payment of contributions (ἐπιδείκνυται — Xenoph. Meme. ii, 1, § 21; comp. Philost. p. 482; Diog. Iaert. 9:50; ‘ἠρανίζοντο-τιμή, Plato, Prot. 314, b) of from half a drachma to fifty drachms, probably according as the hearers limited themselves to a single lecture, or entered into an agreement for a more complete course (Axrich. 6; Cratyl. p. 384, b; Aristot. Rhet. 3, 14, § 9; Suid. s.v.; comp. Welcker, p. 414). Prodicus is said to have amassed a great amount of money (Hipp. Me(j. p. 282, d; Xenoph. Symp. 4:62; i, 5; on the practice of paying for instruction and lectures, comp. again Welcker, l.c. p. 412, etc.).

As Prodicus and others maintained with regard to themselves that they stood equally on the confines of philosophy and politics (Euthyd. p. 305, c), so Plato represents his instructions as chiefly ethical (Meno, p. 96, d; comp. De Rep. 10:p. 600, e), and gives the preference to his distinction of ideas — as of those of courage, rashness, boldness — over similar attempts of other Sophists (Lach. p. 197. c). What pertained to this point was probably only contained in individual show-orations (Biog. Laert., Philost. 11. cc.), which he usually declined (Philost. p. 482). Though known to Callimachus, they do not appear to have been much longer preserved (Welcker, p. 465, etc.). In contrast with Gorgias and others, who boasted of possessing the art of making the small appear great, the great small, and of expatiating in long or short speeches, Prodicus required that the speech should be neither long nor short, but of the proper measure (Plato, Phoed. p. 267, a; comp. Gorg. p. 449, c; Prot. p. 334, e, 335, b, 338, d; Aristot. Rhet. 3, 17), and it is only as associated with other Sophists that he is charged with endeavoring to make the weaker cause strong by means of his rhetoric (Cicero, Brut. c. 8). He paid especial attention to the correct use of words (Plato, Euthyd. p. 187, e; Cratyl. p. 384, b; comp. Galen, In Hippocr. de Articul. 4:p. 461, 1), and the distinction of expressions related in sense (Lach. p. 197, d; Prot. p. 340, a, 341, a; Charmid. p. 163, d; Meno, p. 75, c; comp. Themist. Orat. 4:p. 113). But he deserves greater remembrance for his parenetical discourses on moral subjects, among  which one of the best known is Hercules at the Cross Roads (Philost. p. 496; Xenophon, Mem. ii, 1, § 21, only quotes the σύγγραμμα περὶ τοῦ ῾Ηρακλέους). It was entitled Ωραι (Suid. s.v. Ωραι and Πρόδ).; Schol. ad Aristoph. Nub. 1.360. Respecting the different explanations of this title, see Welcker, p. 466, etc., who refers it to the youthful bloom of Hercules). To Hercules, as he was on the point, at his entrance on the age of youth, of deciding for one of the two paths of life — that of virtue and that of vice — there appear two women, the one of dignified beauty, adorned with purity, modesty, and discretion, the other of a voluptuous form and meretricious look and dress.

The latter promises to lead him by the shortest road, without any toil, to the enjoyment of every pleasure. The other, while she reminds him of his progenitors and his noble nature, does not conceal from him that the gods have not granted what is really beautiful and good apart from trouble and careful striving. The one seeks to deter him from the path of virtue by urging the difficulty of it; the other calls attention to the unnatural character of enjoyment which anticipates the need of it, its want of the highest joy, that arising from noble deeds, and the consequences of a life of voluptuousness, and how she herself, honored by gods and men, leads to all noble works, and to true well-being in all circumstances of life. Hercules decides for virtue. This outline in Xenophon probably represents, in a very abbreviated form, and with the omission of all collateral references, the leading ideas of the original, of which no fragments remain (comp. Welcker, p. 469, etc., who also shows that the amplifications in Dio Chysostomus and Themistius belong to these rhetoricians, and are not derived from the Horce of Prodicus, p. 488, etc. Respecting the numerous imitations of this narrative in poets, philosophers, rhetoricians, and in works of art, see, in like manner, Welcker, p. 467, etc.). In another speech, which treated of riches, and the substance of which is reproduced in the dialogue Eryxias, Prodicus undertook to show that the value of external goods depends simply upon the use which is made of them, and that virtue must be learned. (Welcker endeavors to point out the coincidence of the former doctrine with that of Socrates and Antisthenes, p. 493, etc.) Similar sentiments were expressed in Prodicus's Praise of Agriculture (Themist. Orat. 30, p. 349; comp. Weicker, p. 496, etc.). His views respecting the worthlessness of earthly life in different ages and callings, and how we must long after freedom from connection with the body in the heavenly and cognate eather, are found represented in the dialogue Axiochus, from a lecture by Prodicus; as also his doctrine that death is not to be feared, as it affects neither the living nor the departed  (comp. Stob. Serm. 20:35). Whether the appended arguments for immortality are borrowed from him, as Welcker (p. 500) endeavors to show, is doubtful. The gods he regarded as personifications of the sun, moon, rivers, fountains, and whatever else contributes to the comfort of our life (Sext. Emp. Adv. Math. i, 52; Cicero, De Nat. Deor. i, 42), and he is therefore, though hastily, charged with atheism (ibid. 55). Prodicus declared death to be desirable as an escape from the evils of life. His moral consciousness therefore certainly lacked philosophical basis and depth. See, besides the authorities already quoted, Hummel, De Prodico Sophista (Leyden, 1847); Cougny, De Prodico Ceio, Socratis magistro (Paris, 1858); Diemer, De Prod. Ceio (Corbach, 1859); Kramer, Die Allegorie des Prodikos u. der Traunt des Lukianos, in the Neue JahrbiicherJuir Phil. u. Padagogik, 94 (1866), 439-443; Blass, Die alte Beredsanzkeit (Leips. 1868), p. 29 sq.; Ueberweg, Hist. of Philosophy, i, 78; Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. and Mythol. s.v.

## Prodicus(2)[[@Headword:Prodicus(2)]]

             SEE PRODICIANS.

## Prodigies[[@Headword:Prodigies]]

             Wonderful appearances which were supposed among the ancient heathens to be taken some impending misfortune or calamity. These being regarded as marks of the anger of the gods, they were considered as calling for prayers and sacrifices. Whenever prodigies were seen, the pontifices, or priests, proceeded to perform certain public rites by way of expiation. The fall of meteoric stones was accounted a prodigy, and almost all the others might be explained by peculiar natural phenomena which in those ancient times were not understood.

## Prodymna[[@Headword:Prodymna]]

             (or Pradymnea or Pradyumna) was, in the Indian mythology, an avatar of Kama (q.v.), the love-god.

## Proedri[[@Headword:Proedri]]

             (πρόεδροι , Lat. presides, prcesidentes) is one of the titles which were given in the ancient Church to the bishops, and was used in close connection with the word πρεσβύτερος. SEE PRESBYTER. It is derived from the προεδρία, the elevated seat which the bishop occupied in the  synod and in the religious assemblies of the people. See Coleman, Ancient Christianity Exemplified (Phila. 1856, 8vo), p. 131, and the references quoted on p. 601; Siegel, Christliche Alterthiiumer (see Index in vol. 4); Riddle, Christ. Antiquities, p. 211.

## Proedrosia[[@Headword:Proedrosia]]

             sacrifices, or, as some allege, a festival offered to Demeter or Ceres at seed-time, with the view of securing a bountiful harvest. — Gardner, Faiths of the World, s.v.

## Proestos[[@Headword:Proestos]]

             (προεστώς), one of the names by which the early Church distinguished the teachers or preachers from the “brethren” (1Ti 5:17). Justin Martyr uses the term as synonymous with ἱεράρχης, when he speaks of the προεστώς as the person whose duty it is to consecrate the elements in the administration of the Lord's Supper (Apolog. 2, 67), a duty subsequently performed only by the bishop except in his absence. (Pepin's decree, A.D. 755, is as follows: “Nullus presbyter praesumat missas celebrare sine jussione episcopi in cujus parochia est.” The Council of Arles laid similar restrictions upon deacons [canon 15].) The title Proestos was translated into Latin by Praepositus, whence the English word Provost (q.v.). See Coleman, Ancient Christianity Exemplified, p. 102 et al.; Siegel, Christ. Alterthiimer (see Index in vol. iv); Riddle, Christ. Antiquities, p. 211.

## Profane[[@Headword:Profane]]

             (חָנִ, chandph, Jer 23:11; βέβηλος, Heb 12:16). To profane is to put holy things to vile or common uses; as the money- changers did the Temple, by converting a part of it into a place of business (Mat 21:12), and as those do who allow secular occupations to engross any part of the Sabbath under the old, or of the Lord's day under the new dispensation (Exo 20:8-10). Esau, for despising his birthright and its privileges, is styled by the apostle “a profane person” (Heb 12:16). The term is also used in opposition to holy. Thus the general history of ancient nations is styled profane, as distinguished from that contained in the Bible; profane writings are such as have been composed by heathens, in contradistinction from the sacred books of Scripture, and the writings of Christian authors on sacred subjects.

## Professio Fidei, Tridentinae[[@Headword:Professio Fidei, Tridentinae]]

             is the form of the Roman Catholic profession of faith in which it took shape at the Council of Trent and in which it was afterwards published by pope Pius IV, so that it is sometimes called the Creed of Pius IV (q.v.). The general Christian confession of faith had been renewed in the third session of the Council of Trent on Feb. 3, 1546 (decretum de symbolofidei), but there was need of something for general use in the Church at large, so that all its members might become obligated to the Church and its teachings, not only for their own faithfulness, but for their arrayal against heretics. Hence Pius IV in 1556 ordered to be prepared a Formulae Christiuane et Catholicce Fidei, and on Sept. 4,1560, presented it for consideration to the cardinal college. In 1564 it was finally promulgated, and persons on becoming members of the Church of Rome are expected to recite the creed. This profession of faith runs as follows:

“I most steadfastly admit and embrace apostolical and ecclesiastical traditions; and all other observances and constitutions of the same Church.

“I also admit the holy Scriptures, according to that sense which our holy mother the Church has held and does hold, to which it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Scriptures: neither will I ever take and interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the fathers.

“I also profess that there are truly and properly seven sacraments of the new law, instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord, and necessary for the salvation of mankind, though not all for every one-to wit: baptism, confirmation, the Eucharist, penance,\* extreme unction, holy orders,† and matrimony: and that they confer grace; and that of these, baptism, confirmation, and order cannot be reiterated without sacrilege. I also receive and admit. the received and approved ceremonies of the Catholic Church, used in the solemn administration of the aforesaid sacraments.

“I embrace and receive all and every one of the things which have been defined and declared in the holy Council of Trent concerning original sin and justification.  “I profess, likewise, that in the mass there is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead; and that in the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist there is truly, really, and substantially the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ: land that there is made a change of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole sublstlance of the wine into the blood, which change the Catholic Church calls transubstantiation. I also confess that under either kind alone Christ is received whole and entire, and a true sacrament.

“I firmly hold that there is a purgatory, and that the souls therein detained are helped by the suffrages of the faithful.

“ Likewise, that the saints reigning with Christ are to be honored and invocated, and that they offer up prayers to God for us; and that their relics are to be had in veneration.

“I most firmly assert that the images of Christ, of the mother of God, and also of other saints, ought to be had and retained, and that due honor and veneration are to be given them.

“I also affirm that the power of indulgences was left by Christ in the Church, and that the use of them is most wholesome to Christian people.

“I acknowledge the holy Catholic Apostolic Roman Church for the mother and mistress of all churches; and I promise true obedience to the bishop of Rome, successor to St. Peter, prince of the apostles, and vicar of Jesus Christ.”

Then follow clauses condemnatory of all contrary doctrines, and expressive of adhesion to all the definitions of the Council of Trent.

It is obvious that the Confessio Fidei Tridentinae was framed in accordance to the decrees of that council, and has chiefly in view the opinions of those who followed the Reformation. See Mihler, Symbolics; Kollner, Die Symbolik der romischen Kirche, p. 141 sq.; Schaff, Creeds of Christendom (see Index in vol. iii); Fisher, Hist. of the Reformation, p. 402.  \* Under penance is included confession, as the Catholic sacrament of penance consists of three parts — contrition or sorrow, confession, and satisfaction.

† The clerical orders of the Catholic Church are divided into two classes, sacred and minor orders. The first consists of subdeacons, deacons, and priests, who are bound to celibacy, and the daily recitation of the Breviary, or collection of psalms and prayers, occupying a considerable time. The minor orders are four in number, and ale preceded by the tonsure, an ecclesiastical ceremony in which the hair is shorn, initiatory to the ecclesiastical state.

## Profession[[@Headword:Profession]]

             Among the ceremonies of baptism in the early Church, one of great importance was the profession of faith and vow of obedience. The catechumens first renounced the devil, and then professed to live in obedience to the laws of Christ. SEE PACTUM.

Christians are required to make a profession of their faith —

1, boldly (Rom 1:16);

2, explicitly (Mat 5:16);

3, constantly (Heb 10:23);

4, yet not ostentatiously, but with humility and meekness.

Among the Romanists, profession denotes the entering into a religious order, whereby a person offers himself to God by a vow of inviolably observing obedience, chastity, and poverty.

## Professor[[@Headword:Professor]]

             a term commonly used in the religious world to denote any person who makes an open acknowledgment of the religion of Christ, or who outwardly manifests his attachment to Christianity. All real Christians are professors, but all professors are not real Christians. In this, as in all other things of worth and importance, we find counterfeits. There are many who become professors, not from principle, from investigation, from love to the truth, but from interested motives; prejudice of education, custom, influence of connections, novelty, etc., as Saul, Jehu, Judas, Demas, the foolish virgins, etc. SEE CHRISTIAN.

## Profesti Dies[[@Headword:Profesti Dies]]

             Days without any special service, in distinction from solemn or officiating days, which include stations, litanies, fasts, and feast-days or festivals.

## Profiat Duran[[@Headword:Profiat Duran]]

             whose Jewish name was Isaac ben Moses (surnamed Ephodeus from his principal work מעשה אפור), is noted as a gifted poet, philosopher, and astronomer. He flourished between 1360 and 1412. In the bitter persecution of 1391 he was driven outwardly to embrace Christianity to save his life. In order to throw off the mask of a religion which in the name of love nearly exterminated all his co-religionists, Protiat and a friend, who had become an apostate for like reasons, concluded to go to Palestine to confess Judaism. Profiat Duran left first and went to a seaplace in the south of France, awaiting the arrival of his friend. Meanwhile Ben-Giorno met with Paul of Burgos (q.v.), who persuaded him to remain steadfastly in his Christian faith. Ben-Giorno wrote a letter to Duran in full praise of the bishop of Burgos, expounding his religious belief and exhorting him at the same time to be also true to Christianity. This imbittered Duran not only against his friend, but especially against the bishop of Burgos, and he answered in a polemical epistle, full of bitter sarcasm and irony, entitled כאבתיאִל תהי(Be not like thy Fathers), called by Christians Alteca Boteca, who, misunderstanding its purpose, took it as a defence of Christianity, while in reality aimed against it.

The whole letter was equivocal. It was believed at first reading that it was an exhortation to stand fast in the religion he had embraced, but the mystery was easily discovered, and it appeared by an attentive consideration that Duran meant to oblige his friend to return to Judaism. This celebrated work was first published at Constantinople in 1577 in a collection of other treatises. It was then republished by A. Gunzburg in the collection קבוֹ וכוחים (Breslau, 1844). Geiger published a German translation in his Wissenscha (Jl/iche Zeitschrift, 4:452-458 (Stuttgard, 1839), and an English translation was published in the Jewish Messenger (N. Y. Sept. 12, 1873). Besides, Duran wrote כלימת הגוים(The Reproach of the Gentiles), in 12 chapters, which has not as yet been published. An extract of it, as well as the contents of the chapters, is given in the Catalogue of Michael's Library, p. 364, 365 (Hamb. 1848) 1: — מעשה אפד(The Work of Ephod), a Hebrew grammar, divided into 32 chapters, with an interesting and  elaborate introduction. Endowed with remarkable grammatical tact, he was the first to demonstrate the reflexive or reciprocal instead of the passive meaning of Niphal. His important grammar, which he finished in 1403, of which fragments are printed in the notes to Goldberg's edition of Ibn- Ganach's (q.v.) Sepher Harikmah (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1856); in Filipowski's edition of Menachem Ibn-Saruk's Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon, p. 76 (Lond. 1854), and by Jacob C. Chajim in his Introduction to the Rabbinic Bible, p. 42, 43 (ed. Ginsburg, Lond. 1865), has lately been published by Dr. Jonath. Friedlander and J. Kohn, with an introduction, notes, and elucidations (Vienna, 1865):a Commentary on two sections of Ibn-Ezra's commentary on the Pentateuch (De Rossi, No. 835): — a Commentary on Ibn-Ezra's enigma on the quiescent letters: — Comment on The Guide of the Perplexed: — and האפד חשב on astronomy, in 29 chapters. See First, Bibl. Jud. i, 215; Steinschneider. Catalogus Librorum Hebr. in Biblioth. Bodlej. col. 2112-2119; De Rossi, Dizionario Storico degli Autori Ebrei, p. 260 sq. (Germ. trans. by Hamberger); Ginsburg in Kitto's Cyclop. s.v.; Grhtz, Gesch. der Julen, 8:94, 403, etc. (Leips. 1864, p. 8689; ibid. 1875, p. 381 sq.); Basnage, Histoire des Juifs, p. 690 (Taylor's transl.); Lindo, History of the Jews, p. 195; Finn, Sephardimt, p. 386; Kalisch, Hebrew Grammar, ii, 31; Geiger, Judische Zeitschrift (1866), p. 212; Steinschneider, Jewish Literature, p. 127, 137 sq.; Etheridge, Introduction to Hebrew Literature, p. 268; Jost, Gesch. des Judenth. u. s. Sekten, 3, 100; Gronemann. De Profiatii Durani (Efodali) vita ac studiis cum in alias literas turn in grammaticam collatis (Breslau, 1869). (B. P.)

## Profitt, George Marion[[@Headword:Profitt, George Marion]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Yancey County, N. C., about 1835. He professed religion and joined the Church in 1849. He was admitted into the Holston Conference in 1858. His first appointment was to the Cleveland circuit as junior preacher; his second year was spent on Spencer mission; his third, on Sulphur Springs circuit; his fourth, on Newport circuit. His health having failed, he went to Florida. where he died on Sunday, June 5, 1864. He led an exemplary and pious life.

## Prognosticator[[@Headword:Prognosticator]]

             The phrase “monthly prognosticators” occurs in the A.V. as a rendering of לֶחַדָשַׁים מוֹדַיעַים, making known as to the months, in Isa 47:13, where the prophet is enumerating the astrological superstitions of the Chaldaeans. It is known that the Chaldaean astrologers professed to divine future events by the positions, aspects, and appearances of the stars, which they regarded as having great influence on the affairs of men and kingdoms; and it would seem, from the present text, that they put forth accounts of the events which might be expected to occur from month to month, like our old almanac-makers. Some carry the analogy further, and suppose that they also gave monthly tables of the weather; but such prognostications are only cared for in climates where the weather is uncertain and variable; while in Chaldea, where (as we know from actual experience) the seasons are remarkably regular in their duration and recurrence, and where variations of the usual course of the weather are all but unknown, no prognosticator would gain much honor by foretelling what every peasant knows. SEE ASTROLOGY; SEE DIVINATION.

## Prohle, Heinrich Andreas[[@Headword:Prohle, Heinrich Andreas]]

             Dr., a Lutheran minister, who died April 19, 1875, at Hornhausen, near Oschersleben, in Germany, is best known by his writings in the department of homiletics, liturgy, and poedagogics. He published, Malteritalien zu Homilien isn katechetischer Form (Halberstadt, 1846): — Die korperliche, christliche und biirgerliche Schulerziehung (Magdeburg, 1846): — Leitfcden bei denm KonfirmandenUnterrichte, mit einemn Vorlworte von Clans iHarms (q.v.) (Halberstadt, 1851): Litourgischer Festring (Wernigerode, 1856): — Predigt-Entwuii fe iiber die Evanqelien tt. Episteln, etc. (ibid. 1856): — Das Ialberstadtische Kichen- und Haus- Gesangbuch in seiner erneueten Gestalt (Oschersleben, 1856): — Kirchliche Sitten. Ein Bild aus demn Leben evangelischer Gemneinen (Berlin, 1858). This latter work is the most important of his writings. See  Zuchold. Bibliotheca Theologica, 3, 1015; Liternarischer Handweiser (1875), p. 222; Hauck, Theol. Jahresbericht (1866), ii, 734. (B. P.)

## Proistameni[[@Headword:Proistameni]]

             (προιστάμενοι) is only another title which was given to the preacher of the early Church. SEE PROESTOS.

## Prokimenon[[@Headword:Prokimenon]]

             (προκειμένον, something that lies before) is, in the Greek liturgy, the short anthem pronounced previous to the reading of the epistle from the Holy Scriptures. consisting of verse and response usually taken from the Psalms. The purpose is to give a hint as to the way in which the day ought to be celebrated. Such phrases are, for instance, “Praise ye the Lord.” “Give ear to my prayer, O Lord,” “‘Thy mercy, O Lord,” “God help me through thy name,” “My help comes from the Lord,” “O Lord, thou art my protector.” Previous to the calling-out of the prokimenon the deacon exclaims, “Let us listen!” — Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. s.v.

## Prokopovitch, Teophan[[@Headword:Prokopovitch, Teophan]]

             a Russian prelate of great renown, especially as a pulpit orator, and therefore called the Chrysostom of the Russo-Greek Church, was born at Kief June 8, 1681. Baptized Eleazar, he exchanged it for Elisha, with the dress of St. Basil, in a United Greek monastery of that order in Lithuania. He was sent to Rome to finish his studies, and there had remained three years when he suddenly removed, by force of circumstances not known, and went to Potcherif, in Volhynia, where he renounced his faith, and was transferred, under the new name of father Samuel, to the chair of rhetoric in the Academy of Kief.

When Peter I passed through the city, after the victory at Pultava, the duty of complimenting him was confided to Prokopovitch. He accompanied the czar in his unlucky campaign on the Pruth, and was made abbot of the monastery of Kief. In 1715 he was promoted to the seat of Pskopf, although he avowed that he had expressed heretical doctrines at the court and in his writings. The doctors of the Sorbonne, wishing to profit by the visit Peter I had paid to them in 1717, attempted to enter into friendly relations with the Russian Church. Appointed to reply to their address to the czar, Prokopovitch frustrated this attempt; and, yielding himself to all the views of the despot, he composed an ecclesiastical constitution which made of the Church a civil  institution, and the clergy servants employed by the State — a condition which remains unaltered in the Russian Church to this day. He also, at the emperor's instigation, consented to the sequestration of the Church domains, and apportioned to the clergy a share of the income proportionate to their several ranks. He received from Catharine, whom he had crowned empress, the presidency of the synod and the archbishopric of Novgorod, founded by Theodosius. Prokopovitch crowned Peter II, whose right to the throne he had attacked in a work condemned by a ukase of July 26, 1727, by the then empress Anna, and encouraged the latter to commit in 1730 the stroke of policy from the effects of which Russia yet suffers the most deplorable consequences. He died at St. Petersburg Sept. 8, 1736. He left a great number of panegyrics and expositions of all sorts, some in impure Russian, some in Latin Oustrailif admits that the works of this prelate were specimens of the basest adulation. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v. See Tchistovitch, Theophane Prokopovitch et Theophilacte Lopatinski (St. Petersb. 1861); Otto, Russ. Lilt. s.v.; Meth. Quar. Rev. July, 1873, p. 499.

## Prolocutor[[@Headword:Prolocutor]]

             the chairman or president of convocation in England. SEE CONVOCATION.

## Promater[[@Headword:Promater]]

             SEE SPONSOR.

## Prometheus[[@Headword:Prometheus]]

             in Greek mythology, was the son of the Titan Japetus and the Oceanid Clymene, full of wisdom, art, and might, a friend and companion of the gods, who loved him for his gifts, but in whom he awakened hatred when he doubted their omniscience. He once sought to prove Jupiter's knowledge, and the latter never forgot his audacity, but planned his destruction. Vulcan nailed him to the Caucasus, and the eagle of Jupiter daily came down and devoured his liver, which grew again at night. For a long time he bore these tortures with patience, for he knew a mortal would eventually liberate him. This Hercules did by shooting the eagle. According to others Chiron liberated him. A third myth makes Jupiter himself the liberator of the great Titan. Prometheus was married to Asia, and was the father of Deucalion. According to the ancient story, he provoked the gods by forming a man, and then stealing fire from heaven to animate the form.

## Promise[[@Headword:Promise]]

             (some form of אָמִר, to say, or דָּבִר, to speak; ἐπαγγελία) is a solemn asseveration, by which one pledges his veracity that he will perform, or cause to be performed, for the benefit of another, the thing which he mentions. A promise, in the scriptural sense of the term, is a declaration or assurance of the divine will, in which God signifies what particular blessings or good things he will freely bestow, as well as the evils which he will remove. Promises differ from the commands of God, inasmuch as the former are significations of the divine will concerning a duty enjoined to be performed, while the promises relate to mercy to be received. The “exceeding great and precious promises” are applicable to all believers; they appertain to the present and the future life (2Pe 1:4). Some particular promises are predictions, as the promise of the Messiah, and the blessings of the Gospel (Rom 4:13-14; Gal 3:14-29). Hence  the Hebrews were called the “children of the promise” (Rom 9:8). So all the true believers in the Lord Jesus Christ are called “children” and “heirs of the promise” (Gal 4:20; Heb 6:12; Heb 6:17). There are four classes of promises mentioned in the Scriptures, particularly in the New Test.:

1, promises relating to the Messiah;

2, promises relating to the Church;

3, promises of blessings, both temporal and spiritual, to the pious; and,

4, promises encouraging the exercise of the several graces and duties that compose the Christian character.

The first two of these classes, indeed, are many of them predictions as well as promises. SEE PROPHECY. The consideration of the others should prove.

1, an antidote to despair;

2, a motive to patience under affliction;

3, an incentive to perseverance in well-doing;

4, a call for prayer.

PROMISE is a solemn asseveration by which one pledges his veracity that he shall perform, or cause to be performed, the thing which he mentions. The obligation of promises arises from the necessity of the well-being and existence of society. “Virtue requires,” as Dr. Doddridge observes, “that promises be fulfilled. The promise, i.e. the person to whom the promise is made, acquires a property in virtue of the promise. The uncertainty of property would evidently be attended with great inconvenience. By failing to fulfil my promise, I either show that I was not sincere in making it, or that I have little constancy or resolution, and either way injure my character, and consequently my usefulness in life. Promises, however, are not binding,

1, if they were made by us before we came to such exercise of reason as to be fit to transact affairs of moment; or if by any distemper or sudden surprise we are deprived of the exercise of our reason at the time when the promise is made;

2, if the promise was made on a false presumption, in which the promiser, after the most diligent inquiry, was imposed upon, especially if he were deceived by the fraud of the promise;

3, if the thing itself be vicious, for virtue cannot require that vice should be committed;

4, if the accomplishment of the promise be so hard and intolerable that there is reason to believe that, had it been foreseen, it would not have been an accepted case;

5, if the promise be not accepted, or if it depend on conditions not performed.” But really this question concerning the validity and obligation of a promise given or obtained under false views is a matter that falls within the Casuistry of Ethics — a very uncertain ground. See Grotius, De Jure, lib. ii, cap. xi; Paley, Moral Philosophy, vol. i, ch. v; Grove, Moral Philosophy, vol. ii. ch. 12:p. 2; Watts, Sermons, ser. 20; Dymond, Essays; Verplanck, On Contracts. SEE OBLIGATION; SEE PROBABILISM.

## Promises Of God[[@Headword:Promises Of God]]

             are the kind declarations of his Word, in which he hath assured us he will bestow blessings upon his people. The promises contained in the sacred Scriptures may be considered,

1, divine as to their origin;

2, suitable as to their nature;

3, abundant as to their number;

4, clear as to their expression;

5, certain as to their accomplishment. The consideration of them should,

1, prove an antidote to despair;

2, a motive to patience;

3, a call for prayer;

4, a spur to perseverance.

See Clark, On the Promises; Buck, Sermons, ser. 11.

## Promissum[[@Headword:Promissum]]

             SEE PACTUM.

## Promotio per saltum[[@Headword:Promotio per saltum]]

             is, in the Church of Rome, the intentional disregard of the legal scale of the different orders. It is the collation or the obtention of a higher order by way  of skipping one or several other orders, which. according to rule, ought to precede. In consequence, he who has been ordained per saltum cannot perform the functions of the order thus unlawfully bestowed until the next inferior order has been subsequently obtained also (c. un. Dist. 52); this inferior degree the bishop can confer on him, and allow him at once to perform the duties of the higher degree (Conc. Trid. sess. 23:c. 14, De Ref.). But if the promoted ecclesiastic officiates according to the higher order thus illicitly conferred on him without the episcopal dispensation, he becomes irregular, and needs papal dispensation (c. un. 10, De Cler. per salt. proma. v, 29). The consecration of a bishop, with omission of the presbyterate, would not only be illicit, but utterly void (Arg. c. 10, fit. 10, De excess. proel. v, 31). — Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, s.v.

## Prompsault, Jean Henri Romain[[@Headword:Prompsault, Jean Henri Romain]]

             a French ecclesiastical writer, was born April 7, 1798, at Montalembert. He was the eldest of twelve children. After he had finished his classical studies in the little seminary, he was received into the large seminary of Valence, and was admitted to the priesthood two years before the required age, Nov. 5, 1821. At first employed to do curate's duty in the office of his parish, he taught dogmatic theology in the great seminary of Valence, and ended in doing parochial duty. Having been appointed in 1827 to the chair of philosophy in the College of Tournon, he refused, without being authorized by his bishop, to take the oath required by the professors by the ordinance of 1828. and was deposed. At the end of 1829 he went to Paris, and was attached to M. de Croi, then head chaplain to the hospital of Quinze Vingt, in the capacity of chaplain. He saved that establishment from downfall in 1831. In this humble position the abbe Prompsault, although scrupulously fulfilling the obligations of priest and chaplain, had yet considerable time to give to study. He put aside the largest share of the receipts of his publications and of his literary pension to buy books, and he formed an ecclesiastical library of 25,000 volumes. He began his literary career by publishing a critical edition of the works of Villon in 1832, and in 1835 he published a criticism of an edition of French literature published by Crapelet. This last work engaged him in a lively controversy with Crapelet, in which he defended himself with a calm and witty sarcasm which was afterwards the characteristic of his polemical writings. He occupied himself for many years with the Latin and Romance languages. In 1837 he published many translations of ascetic works. His principal study was canon law and the civil and ecclesiastical jurisprudence of France. Himself  a thorough Gallican, he discarded the ultramontane tendencies of the French episcopacy, and advocated the liberties of the Gallican Church. In this spirit he attacked the encyclical of pope Pius IX, and brought such odium upon himself that he was led to retract much that he had uttered against ultra-Romanism, though at heart he always felt his first course to have been the true and proper one. His last years were imbittered by remorse, and he died Jan. 7, 1858, neglected by those for whom he had sacrificed his honor. Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v. See Christian Renmembrancer, 44, 340; Vapereau, Dict. des Contemporains, s.v.

## Promulgation Or Publication[[@Headword:Promulgation Or Publication]]

             i.e. proclamation — usually of a law by the competent legislative power — is, in the Church of Rome, an absolute condition of its binding character (“lex non promulgata non obligat,” c. i, 9; Cod. De Legib. i, 14). In consequence, an ecclesiastical law, like any civil law, in order to become obligatory inforo externo must be promulgated in the customary way by the competent authorities of the Church. The binding power of the law rests entirely on the will of the legislator publicly expressed, and begins at the very moment of the promulgation (“lex promulgata statim obligat,” c. 1. 10; De post. proel. 1, 5), unless some future period is expressly indicated when it shall be enforced (f. inst. Sext. c. 32; De Preb. 3, 4; Conc. Trid. sess. 24 c. l, fin. De Ref. Matrim.). A law has generally no retroactive power (“lex non retro agit,” c. 2, 10; De Constit. i, 2), unless it be merely all explanation or reiteration of a former disposition, or unless retroactive power be expressly given to it. From the moment of the promulgation takes effect also the juridical presumption of the general knowledge of the law, which excludes every excuse of igzorarntia legis (Sext. c. 13; De R. T. v, 13), unless the legislator subordinates the validity of the ordinance to the observation of a certain form of promulgation, and this form has not been observed. Every one whom the law may concern is bound to conform to it as soon as he has obtained, no matter by what means, a knowledge of it. The diocesan ordinances of archbishops and bishops are, as a rule, communicated to the deaconries, and through them, by circular letters, to the curates, etc., who publish them from the pulpit, or by placards at the church doors. The papal see used in former times to address its ordinances to the chief ecclesiastical dignitaries of the countries, provinces, or dioceses which they concerned, and had them communicated by them to the subordinate clerical authorities, for further publication, by way of synods and circular letters. Afterwards the custom prevailed of  publishing the general prescriptions of the papal see only at Rome, in acie campi Florae, and of posting them at the door of the Vatican.

Thus the principle was adopted, publicatio Urbi et Orbi. which was acknowledged without contest until the 17th century. It was only after the times of De Marca (De Concordia Sacerdotii et Imperii, lib. ii, c. 15) and Van Espen (De Promulgatione Legumn Eccl., etc., Lovan. 1712) that the necessity of a more special promulgation was from many quarters insisted upon. But the passages of the Roman and canon law quoted to support these views are all of them misunderstood or purposely distorted (Seitz, Zeitschriift fiir Kirchelnrecht u. Pastoral- Tissenschaft, vol. i, § 1, No. 5, p. 90 sq.). It must strike every one that a really universal publication, which would be sure not only to reach every individual, but to be intelligible to him, is utterly impossible, and could not be obtained even by inserting the law in all official and local papers. The binding power of the law cannot depend on that circumstance that it was really made known in all places and to every individual, but on this sole condition that the legislator have publicly expressed his will in the customary way. This act of the legislator must not be confounded with the means and ways that are resorted to in order to insure the widest publicity to the law promulgated by the legislative authority. The latter is no concern of the legislator, but of the executive authorities; and it is not the power of the law that depends on it, but this other and quite different question, to be decided by the judge. whether in a given concrete case transgression of the law may be charged or not. However, the different modern civil legislations insist on a special publication of the ecclesiastical statutes as a condition of their validity, and subordinate this publication to the previous approbation of the civil power. If the Church is content to submit to the worldly governments her ordinances, so far as they affect in some way the civil and political relations of her members, it would be only fair if such papal and episcopal decrees which concern exclusively the dogma and the dogmatic side of the discipline should be independent of the civil placet, and left to the clerical functionaries for free publication. — Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, s.v.

## Pronaos[[@Headword:Pronaos]]

             is the ante-temple of Greek churches, and corresponds to the narthex (q.v.).

## Prone[[@Headword:Prone]]

             (praeconium) is the publication in the pulpit of banns of marriage, pastoral letters, coming fasts and feasts, and a sermon (the dominicale, or homily for Sunday) after the Gospel, in the Romish Church.

## Pronier, Cesar Louis[[@Headword:Pronier, Cesar Louis]]

             a Swiss theologian, was born at Plainpalais, near Geneva, Oct. 19, 1834. I- e was in early life in business in the United States, but returning in 1853,  studied theology at Geneva and Berlin. In 1860 he assisted professor Gaussen in his academical duties at Geneva, and in 1863 became his successor. In 1870 Pronier founded the Liberte Chretienne, a journal designed to plead the separation of the Church from the State. In 1873 he went as a delegate to the Evangelical Alliance, held at New York city, never to return again to Geneva, for the "Ville du Havre," upon which he embarked with two other members of the alliance, Antonio Carrasco of Madrid, and Cook of Paris, collided with the "Loch Earn," and went down, November 22, 1873. Pronier published, Questions Indiscretes Adressees a. Mme. Armengaud et a M. Ed. Kruger (Geneva, 1857): — La Suisse Romande et le Protestantisme Liberal (Lausanne, 1869): — La Liberte Religieuse et le Syllabus (Geneva, 1870). See Ruffet, Vie de Cesar Pronier (Geneva, 1875); Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Prono[[@Headword:Prono]]

             an idol of the ancient Sclavonians, worshipped at Altenburg, in Germany. It was a statue erected on a column, holding in one hand a ploughshare, and in the other a spear and a standard. Its head was crowned, its ears prominent, and under one of its feet was suspended a little bell. Gerold, Christian bishop of Altenburg, destroyed this idol with his own hand, and cut down the grove in which it was worshipped.

## Pronuba[[@Headword:Pronuba]]

             a surname of Juno (q.v.) among the Romans of antiquity, because she was the goddess who presided over marriage.

## Propaganda[[@Headword:Propaganda]]

             is a name appropriate to any institution intended for the propagation of a doctrine, but it is especially applied in ecclesiastical language to an institution for the propagation of the Roman Catholic faith. The chief institution of this kind is at Rome, and it consists of a congregation and a college. Its full title is De Propaganda Fide, i.e. “concerning the propagation of the faith.” Its object is to direct and forward the propagation of the Roman Catholic religion, especially among the heathen. Gregory XIII (1572-1584), one of the popes who exerted themselves most zealously for the expansion of the Christian faith, had directed that a number of cardinals should be intrusted with the direction of the Oriental missions, and caused catechisms and other religious books to be printed for the use of Oriental Christians. But as the resources required for such a purpose were wanting, the matter could not have its proper development. Pope Gregory XV, desirous that this good work, so well begun, should be continued, established, by a bull of June 22, 1622, a congregation of cardinals, under the name above mentioned, and intrusted to it the direction of the whole Catholic missionary system. Every month they assembled once in the Vatican, and twice at the residence of the eldest. Besides some stipends of less importance, the pope presented the new institution with the  500 ducats which at the death of a cardinal accrue to the pontifical treasure.

His successor, Urban VIII (1623-1644), increased its privileges and income, and founded the Seminarium (or Collegium) de Propaganda Fide, to which young men from all nations are brought at an early age and gratuitously instructed and fitted out for the missionary work. This college was subordinated entirely to the Congregation, and a splendid palace was built for both institutions. Through the provident care of the popes, and pious foundations made by the cardinals and other benefactors, the seminary grew to a most flourishing condition; and even in our days, when the income and foundations which support it have been considerably diminished by the State, under the new order of things, it entertains, instructs, and trains for missionary life nearly 200 young men from all quarters of the world. The alumni pledge themselves to serve the Church among the heathen, and are consecrated to this function. All rites actually subsisting in the Catholic Church (besides the Latin rite, the Armenian, Greek-Melchitic, Syrian, Coptic, Maronitic, and Chaldaic rites) are represented in the seminary by alumni from the corresponding provinces, and present every year, at the feast of Epiphany (Jan. 6), an imposing spectacle, called the Feast of the Languages. This feast is celebrated by an exhibition of exceeding interest and curiosity, in which are delivered recitations in every language represented in the college or its missions, amounting often to fifty or sixty. Of this festival the celebrated cardinal Mezzofanti (q.v.) used to be the guiding spirit, as well as to strangers its chief centre of attraction. It continues to be one of the chief literary sights of the Roman winter. In 1873 the college at Rome was deprived of its landed estate and made dependent upon private contributions.

With the congregation and college are connected,

1, a library rich in precious works, especially translations of all kinds of important works in Chinese and Oriental manuscripts;

2, a printing-office (richer formerly than it is now), in which the books required by the missionaries and the missionary work are printed in all foreign languages (“Ha questa congregazione una famosa stamperia co caratteri di tutte le nazione; ne si trovera altra stamperia che nella varieti di tanti caratteri l' agguagli,” says Zaccaria, in his book Della Corte di Roma [Rome, 1774]);

3, a remarkable museum, filled with a great variety of objects and monuments, mostly from countries visited and converted by the  missionaries. The congregation, which answers somewhat to a Protestant missionary board, consists of a president, managing secretary (all of cardinal's rank), an apostolic prothonotary, twenty-four cardinals appointed for life, one of whom is prefect, and who are assisted by a number of consulters (partly monastics and partly clergy), clerks (minutanti), and other officials. Originally their meetings were held weekly, and in the presence of the pope; now they are monthly, there being, however, weekly conferences (congressi) of the prefect, secretary, and consulters; and all important business is submitted to the pope in person by the prefect or the secretary. This congregation conducts the affairs not only of the missionary countries, properly so called, but also of those-as England, the northern kingdoms, the United States, Canada, South America, etc. — in which the hierarchical organization is not, or has not been, full and formal.

To the Propaganda no small part of the aggressive power of the Church of Rome is due. It has complete military power, under the pope, over the whole missionary field, not only to send missionaries wherever it is the interest of the Church to send them, but to give them special training adapted to their special work. There are nowhere to be found better modern maps of the newly settled states of the United States than in the college of the Propaganda, and nowhere men better informed as to the probable points of future importance than the cardinals who compose the congregation of the Propaganda. The work of this congregation is greatly aided by several subordinate associations for the propagation of the fiith, among the most important of which are those at Lyons (France), Vienna, and Bavaria. It supports, besides, another similar institution for the Chinese at Naples. The founder of this seminary was a prelate of the house of Urban VIII, Ion.Vives, born in Spain. It is part of the duties of the pope to superintend this vast and complicated work, and to invite all nations to the communion of the Church. See Erectio S. Congregationis de Fide Cath. Propagandd (Bullar. 3, 441 sq.); Bullar. Pontif. S. Congr. de Prop. Fide (Rome, 1839-41, 5 vols. 4to); Boyer, Congr. de Prop. Fide (Regiom. 1721, 4to); Mejer, Die Propaganda (Getting. 1852-53, 2 vols. 8vo; a most valuable treatise); Hase, Church Hist. p. 470; Alzog, Kirchengesch. ii, 410, 429, 574; Church Rev. vol vii; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. s.v.; Aschbach, Kirchen-Lex. s.v.; Barnum, Ronmanism (see Index); Marsden, Hist. of Christ. Churches and Sects, ii, 202. (J. H.W.)

## Propagation of the Faith, Associations For[[@Headword:Propagation of the Faith, Associations For]]

             ROMAN CATHOLIC. The earliest and the highest in dignity of these has been already described under the head PROPAGANDA SEE PROPAGANDA (q.v.); but the present century has produced several private associations, the resources of which arise entirely from voluntary annual contributions, and the organization of which is most complete and most extensive. The first of these is that founded at Lyons in 1822, under the title “OEuvre de la Propagation de la Foi,” with a branch at Paris, and subordinate branches in the other Catholic kingdoms. It is under the direction of a council, which communicates as well with the local associations through which the funds are supplied by small weekly, monthly, or yearly contributions, as with the missions to the aid of which the fund so raised is applied, by an apportionment regulated according to the necessities of each. The piety of contributors is stimulated by the exhortations of the popes, and the granting of indulgences to those who, with the other requisite dispositions, shall aid in the work. The journal of the society, entitled Annales de la Propagation de lat Foi, is a very interesting bimonthly collection of letters and reports from the different missions connected with the central body. The receipts of this association for the year 1863 were 4,788,496 fr. 86 c. Of this sum, by far the largest proportion was raised in France-3,307,248 fr. Italy came next, though at a long interval, contributing 420,653 fr.; Belgium gave 271,597 fr.; Germany, 251,873 fr.; the British islands, 127,000 fr. Spain, once the great propagator of the Gospel in the New World, contributed but 12,549 fr.; but it is to be observed that Spain maintains for her own missionary enterprises a large and liberal establishment in connection with the mission of the Philippines and the South Sea. Another association of somewhat later date is the “Leopoldiner Verein,” established at Vienna in 1829, the chief object of which is to assist the missions of German origin, especially in America.

This association also has its own journal, entitled Berichte der Leopoldiner Stiftung. It is under the presidency of the archbishop of Vienna. A third is that established in Bavaria as an offshoot of the Lyons association, under the name “Ludwigs Missions-Verein.” Like that of Vienna, its chief; although not exclusive, object is the support of German missions. The Ludwigs Verein is conducted under the auspices of the archbishop of Munich. All these associations, although quite independent in their management and direction, nevertheless maintain close relations with the  Propagandla of Rome, and are often guided by the recommendations of the cardinal prefect in the distribution of their funds to particular missions.

## Propater[[@Headword:Propater]]

             SEE GODFATHER.

## Proper Names[[@Headword:Proper Names]]

             chiefly of the Old Testament. It is interesting, as well as useful, to know the original signification of proper names. The chief use which accrues from an accurate knowledge of them is that we are by their means enabled to attain a more lively apprehension of the truth of ancient history; for in ancient, especially Scriptural, times they were employed with greater discrimination than they are at present.

I. Form of Proper Names. — The first fact that strikes us, on a general view of them all, is that the ancient Hebrews always retained the greatest simplicity in the use of names. In reality there is always only one single name which distinguishes a person. Where it is necessary, the name of the father is added; sometimes that of the mother instead, in case she happens to be more celebrated (thus the three heroic brothers, Joab, Abishai, and Asael, are always called after their mother Zerujah [1Ch 2:16]); or the line of descent is traced further back, often to the fourth generation, or even further. Mere epithets, like “David the king,” “Isaiah the prophet,” always express the actual and significant dignity of a man. The instances in which a person receives two names alternately, as Jacob-Israel, Gideon- Jerubbaal (Judges 6-9), are casual and rare, and are not to be ascribed to a general custom of the people.

1. The simple names exist in great abundance; and their signification, as to the mere word itself, is generally evident: as דָּן, Dan, “judge;” יָמַין, Janmin, the Latin dexter, an ancient name, according to Gen 46:10; 1Ch 2:27; שָׁאוּל, Saul, “desired,” also an ancient name, according to Gen 46:10; comp. Gen 36:37; גֶּבֶר, Geber, “hero” (1Ki 4:19). Thus most of them express an honorable sense; although examples are not wanting of the direct contrary, as עַקֵּשׁ, Ikkesh, “crooked” (2Sa 23:26). With what ease also feminine words become names for men is shown by cases like אִיָּה, Aiah, “vulture” (2Sa 3:7; 2Sa 21:8; comp. Gen 36:24); יוֹנָה, Jonah, “dove,” which are just as  applicable to men as the masculine שׁוּעָל, Shual, “fox” (1Ch 7:36). Diminutives, which are so frequently used as proper names by the Arabs, are rare among the Hebrews; but are by no means wanting, as is proved by זְבוּלוּןor זְבוּלֻן, Zebulun, the name of the son of Jacob, and יְדוּתוּןor יְדַיתוּן, Jedithun, the name of the singer of David. All those names which are formed with a prefixed yod are to be considered as especially ancient, because this nominal formation became entirely obsolete in the language, and recurs almost only in proper names, as is shown not only by the well known names יעקב, Jacob, יוס, Joseph, יהודה, Judah, יצחק, Isaac, but also by a number of less common ones, as יָשׁוּב, Jashub (Num 26:24); יָרַיב, Jarib (1Ch 4:24);: יִמְלֵךְ, Jamlech (1Ch 4:34); יִעְכָּן, Jachan (1Ch 5:13); יַצְהָר, Izhar (Exo 6:18); יבְחָר, Ibhar (2Sa 5:15); יְפֻנֶּה, .Jephunneh (Num 13:6; 1Ch 7:38); יְרחָם, Jeroham (1Sa 1:1; 1Ch 8:27); and others. There is an ancient adjectiveending, that in iam or unm, which has fixed itself most firmly in proper names, as אֲחֻזָּם, Ahuzzam (1Ch 4:6); גִּזָּם, Gazzam (Ezr 2:48); מַרְיָם, Miriam, the sister of Moses, and גֵּרְשׁוֹם, Gershom, his son; כַּמְהָם, Chimham (2Sa 19:38), which not only exists also in the form כַּמְהוֹם, Chimhom (Jer 42:17), but in כַּמְהָן, Chinzhan (2Sa 19:40), according to customary changes.

2. The compound names, however, are more important for history, because they express more complete and distinct ideas than the simple names. Some of them are altogether isolated, as פַּינְהָס, Phinehas, properly “serpent's mouth,” the grandson of Aaron; יַשָשְׂכָר, Issachar, the son of Jacob; Oholiab (Exo 31:6), “father's tent,” a name resembling the Greek Patroclus. But most of them bear a general resemblance to each other, and follow in shoals certain dominant opinions and customs; and these last are what we must particularly consider here.

A great number of them owe their origin to the relations of the house, as the sense of the first word of the compound shows. Most of these have the word אֲבַי, abi, “father,” for their first member, as Abiezer, Abital, Abigail. Fuirst (Handworterbuch, p. 7, 50) regards these words as names for the Divine Being, rendering such a name as Abimelek, Ab (i.e. God) is king; Abidan, Ab (God) is judge; and so Achitub, Ach (God) is good. Others  deny any reference to the Deity in these words, but cannot agree whether they are to be taken literally or figuratively. The Easterns use the word ab (father), etc., to express the possession of any quality. The fox is abu ‘lhusain (“father of the little fort,” i.e. the burrower). The mosquito is abu ‘lha ‘s (“ father of the axe”), from its sharp instrument of incision. The camel is cbu aeyyub (“father of Job”), from his patience. Many therefore think that such a name as Abinoam (“father of kindness”) means merely very kind. Others, as Ewald, regard the words ab, ach, ben, etc., as at least at one time expressive of real relationship, and think such names exhibit an approach to our family names. It sometimes happens that a person appears with the name both in its simple as well as its compound state. For example, Nadab, as well as Abinadab, Ezer and Abiezer, and Abner (“father of Ner”) was son of Ner. This seems to imply that something like the present Arabic practice had begun to prevail among the Hebrews. Certain names become hereditary in a family, and a man is expected to name his son by the traditional name. To such an extent is this custom carried that a man whose son should have been called “Yusuf” is styled “Abu Yusuf,” even if he has no son; and a woman who is childless rejoices in the name Umm Musa (“Mother of Moses”), because, had she had a son, he would have borne the name “Musa.” In all likelihood these words, ab, etc., have not always the same meaning; the connective vowel i is not always a sign of the genitive, but merely of the construct or state of composition. We could more easily admit a metaphorical sense in the compounds with son, since בן is really often used in a highly metaphorical sense. Bathsheba is certainly not the daughter of a man named Sheba (2Sa 11:3). Such compound names with son, however, are, on the whole, rare, and are only found in some frequency in 1Ki 4:7 sq. SEE AB-; SEE BEN-.

Under this class we may also include אישׁ, Ish, “man,” with which several names are compounded. Another, but a smaller, class consists of names compounded with עִם, Am, “people,” resembling the many Greek compositions with λαός and δῆμος; and just as in Greek δῆμος is placed first or last (Demosthenes, Aristodemos), so also Am is at one time found in the first, and at another in the last place; only that, according to the laws of the Shemitic language, the sense of one of these positions is exactly the reverse of the other. As all these compounds must be conceived to be in the state construct, so likewise we are probably to take the names י רָבְעָם, Jeroboam, properly “people's increaser,” a suitable name for a  prince, and י שָׁבְעָם, Jashobeam, “people's turner” or “leader;” for, as was observed above, the simple names are often formed with a prefixed jod; and we actually find יָשׁוּב, Jashub, as a simple name in Num 26:29; 1Ch 7:1.

Many compound names endeavor to express a religious sense, and therefore contain the divine name. Here we at the same time find a new law of formation: as these compounds are intended to express a complete thought, such as the religious sentiment requires, a name may consist of an entire proposition with a verb, but of course in as brief a compass as possible; and indeed shorter compounds are made with a verb than with a passive participle, as נְתִנְאֵל, Nathanael (in the New Test. Ναθαναήλ, properly “God-gave,” i.e. whom God gave, given by God, θεόδοτος or θεόδωρος), sounds shorter than נְתוּנַיאֵל, Nethuniel, with the participle, which would certainly express the same sense. But since the finite verb, as also any other predicate, can just as well precede as follow, accordingly a great freedom in the position of the divine name has prevailed in this class; and this peculiarity is preserved, in the same case, in the following period: but indeed the Greeks use Δωροθεός as well as θεόδωρος. Thus נְתִנְאַל, Nethaneel (1Ch 2:14), or אֶלְנָתִן, Elnathan (Jer 36:12). The two names are there generally assigned to two different persons; nevertheless, both combinations may form names for the same person, as עִמַּיאֵל, Amnmiel (1Ch 3:5), and אֵַליעָם, Eliam (2Sa 11:3), belong to the same individual.

3. Lastly, many proper names have assumed the derivative syllable – ι, or - ai (which appears to be only dialectically different from — ι, and is chiefly frequent in the later periods); and we must certainly consider that, in some cases, this syllable may possibly form mere adjectives, and therewith simple names, as אֲמַתִּי, Amittai, “trueman,” from אֵֶמת, Emeth, “truth,” and Barzillai, “Iron,” or “Ironman,” the name of a celebrated Gileadite family (Ezr 2:61; 2Sa 17:27); or that it is derived from a place, as בְּאֵרַי, Beeri (Hos 1:1; 1Ch 7:36), “he of the well,” or he of a place known as the well. But it undoubtedly very often also expresses a genealogical relation, like the Greek ending - ιδης and presupposes a previous proper name from which it is derived; thus the name הוּרַי, Houri (1Ch 5:14), as surely presupposes the above-mentioned Char, as the Greek Philippides does Philippos, and as Ketubai (2:9), one of the  descendants of Judah, is connected with the Ketul in 4:11. It is remarkable that the genealogical relation appears to be sometimes expressed by the mere אָּהof motion, as יִעֲקְֹבָה, Jaccobah (v. 36), which would be equivalently expressed by a German name, Zu-Jacob; יְשִׁרְאֵלָה, Isharelah, De Israel (25:14; comp. 1Ch 5:2); and most distinctly in חִשְׁבִּדּ נָה, Hashbadanah, “reckoned to Dan” (Neh 8:4; comp. יָשְׁבְּק שָׁה, Joshbekashah, in 1Ch 25:4).

Among the names of women, the oldest as well as the simplest which are found are actually only suited for women, as Rachel, “Ewe;” Deborah, “Bee;” Tamar, “Palm-tree;” Hannah, “Favor,” the mother of Samuel. Those which express such a delicate and endearing sense as Qeren Happuk, “box of eye-ointment” (Job 42:14), and חֶפְצַיבָה, Hephzibah, “my delight is in her” (2Ki 21:1), betray that they were generally formed in much later times. It appears indeed to have been customary, at an early period, to form names for women from those of men, by means of the feminine termination; as חִגַּית, Haggith (2Sa 3:4), besidesחִגַּי, Haggai (Num 26:15); מְשֻׁלֶּמֶת, Meshullemeth, i.e. Pia (2Ki 21:19), besides מַשֻׁלָּם, Meshullam, Pius (1Ch 5:13; 1Ch 8:17), and שְׁלֹמַית, Shelomith, Friederike (Num 24:11), besides שְׁלֹמֹה, Shelomoh, Friederich. But we must not overlook the fact that all these are instances of simple names; or of those also in which the masculine has already dropped the second member; for Chanani and Zabdi, as is shown below, are. shortened from Chananjah, Zabdijah: no single example occurs from a compound man's name. As the same compound names, however, are sometimes used both for men and women, and as even those very names are applied to women which could not originally have been applicable to any but men, as Abigail, Achiznoam, accordingly we must assume that the plastic power of the language had already exhausted itself in this remote province, and that, for that reason, the distinction of the feminine was omitted.

II. Symbolical Import of Proper Names. — As the name was the “sign” of the thing, it expressed as nearly as possible its character; it was the expression of the impression which was produced by the thing named on the beholder. The truer the expression was to the impression, and the truer the impression was to the object, the more nearly did the name represent the thing named. Hence the name in Hebrew is used to signify the collected  attributes or characteristics of the object named. This is particularly the case with the divine name. “The Lord descended in the cloud and proclaimed the name of the Lord. And the Lord passed by him and proclaimed, The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious,” etc. (Exodus 34), where all these terms furnish but the exegesis of the word name. The use is similar in the New Test. Our Lord says, “I have manifested thy name unto the men which thou gavest me out of the world” (Joh 17:6); where name embraces the whole divine nature revealed by the Son, who hath “declared” the Father. In general the name was the result of an effort to embody in language as nearly as possible the nature of objects. When the whole nature could not be taken in, the chief characteristic was seized upon-what struck the eye or any of the senses mainly -and hence arose such names as Esau (“hairy”). When there was no outstanding attribute to seize and embody, some incident was laid hold of connected with the object named, e.g. Moses (“drawn out” of the water); or some feeling in the mind of the namer at the moment of imposing the name, as Benoni (“my son of sorrow”). Even the names of natural objects are full of meaning, often full of poetry, often having reminiscences of ancient times and deeds floating about them. The river names are very suggestive. The Jordan (Yarden, yarad, “to come down” [comp. Ganges, Rhenus]) is the two rapids, one into the Sea of Galilee, and one into the Dead Sea. The Arnon is the stream that “sings” (ranan, to “make a tremulous sound”) among the mountains. Jabbok, that which “belches” (“byoks”) through the rocky gorge. The Cherith, that which “cuts” its way. So are the names of mountains. Lebanon is the Mont Blanc of Syria, but perhaps named less from its snowy mantle than its bare white ribs of naked stone. Sirion, the “breastplate” of rock. The whole land is full of Abels (grassy meads), Beers (wells), Ayins (fountains); and in the evening the maidens danced in the meads, and called them Abel-meholah (Jdg 7:22); and the kids around the fountain, and it was named En-gedi (Jos 15:62); and the scorpions basked in the sunny slopes, and their haunts were named Akrabbim; and the gazelles bounded across the heights, and men called their favorite resorts Ajalon. See each of the above terms in its place.

For the philological questions involved in the above examination, see the Hebrew lexicons. More special treatises are the following: Redslob, Die alttestam. Namen (Hamb. 1846); Farrar, Proper Names of the Bible  (Lond. 1844); Jones, Names in the Old Test. (ibid. 1856); Wilkinson, Names in the Bible (ibid. 1865). SEE NAME.

## Proper Psalms[[@Headword:Proper Psalms]]

             i.e. psalms adapted by their contents to the subjects of particular Sundays or festivals and holydays. St. Chrysostom refers to ancient prescription in this matter, and St. Augustine mentions as an old custom the use of Psalms 22 on Good Friday. Cassian informs us that Psalms 63 was sung at matins, and the 141st at evensong. St. Athanasius and St. Augustine appointed special psalms on certain occasions.

## Prophecies[[@Headword:Prophecies]]

             is the name given to the Biblical texts which are read in the Church of Rome on the day before Easter-Sunday, after the consecration of the paschal taper. They are the following: Gen 1:1; Gen 2:2; Gen 5:31; Gen 8:21; Gen 22:1-19; Exo 14:24; Exo 15:1; Isa 54:17; Isa 55:11; Bar 3:9-37; Eze 37:1-14; Isaiah 4; Exo 12:1-11; Jonah 3; Deu 31:22-30; Dan 3:1-24. They are called prophecies, inasmuch as they are symbols of the redemption of mankind through Jesus Christ, and have a direct bearing upon the mysteries which the Church is at that period solemnly commemorating. The first prophecy relates the creation of the world: we are to remember here that Christ, by his death on the cross, became the originator of a new, spiritual creation. The second prophecy is about the flood, about Noah saved with his family in the ark: it must remind the faithful that the Redeemer saves through the waters of baptism all those who believe in him. The third prophecy brings before our eyes Abraham, whose faith was as firm as a rock, and invites to similar confidence in our Lord. The fourth prophecy relates the exodus from Egypt and the passage through the Red Sea, showing how Christians should leave the bondage of sill and follow their own god-sent leader. The fifth and sixth prophecies recommend constancy in our purpose, teaching — the former — that the Lord bestows eternal bliss upon such as follow him; the latter, that ruin awaits the sinner. To give us the necessary forces for the struggle we are to go through, God sends us the Holy Ghost: this is what we are reminded of by the vision of Ezekiel in the seventh prophecy. The eighth prophecy points out the eternal glory which awaits those who fight under the cross. The ninth prophecy is about the Jewish passover, the tenth about Jonah's preaching in Nineveh, the eleventh about the respect to  be paid to the Pentateuch, and the twelfth about the three young men in the oven. The custom of extraordinary readings on Saturday before Easter is very ancient; it was made necessary by another custom which consisted in spending several hours of the Easter-night in the place of worship, more especially to await midnight there. Gregory of Nyssa (Orat. ii, De Resurr. Christi) speaks of these readings, only their number was not the same at all times. The Ordo Rom. i speaks of four lections, each of which was read in Latin and in Greek. According to Beleth (c. 106), there were at Rome twelve Greek and as many Latin lections; in other places twelve, or only seven. William Durand (1. 6, c. 81) knows of four, six, twelve, and fourteen of them. In some churches five were read, in others eight. Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. s.v. See Siegel, Christliche Alterthuner (Index in vol. 4); Riddle, Christian Antiquities (see Index).

## Prophecy[[@Headword:Prophecy]]

             Under this head we propose to treat of certain general aspects of the subject of permanent interest, reserving for the head of PROPHET what relates more personally to the organs or media of true prophecy, as found in the Bible. In doing so we combine the Biblical elements with the best results of modern criticism and discussion.

I. Design of Prophecy. — In this respect we would define prophecy as “God's communication to the Church, to be her light and comfort in time of trouble and perplexity.” Vitringa defines it as “a prediction of some contingent circumstance or event in the future received by immediate or direct revelation.” Dr. Pye Smith speaks of it “as a declaration made by a creature under the inspiration and commission of the omniscient God relating to an event or series of events, which have not taken place at the time the prophecy is uttered, and which could not have been certainly foreknown by any science or wisdom of man.” Other writers say, “Prophecy is nothing but the history of events before they come to pass.” Dean Magee dissents from this popular but erroneous view. In a lecture on the uses of prophecy he defines a prophet as “the religious teacher of his age, whose aim is the religious education of those whom he addresses.” To have received a call and message direct from God, and to deliver it, is the essence of prophetism. The Jewish lawgiver in delivering moral and ceremonial precepts received from God, and our blessed Lord in the Sermon on the Mount, were prophets just as much as when they predicted the future of Israel (M'Caul, Aids to Faith). As a reaction from the general  body of writers on prophecy, who exalt the predictive and neglect the moral element of God's communication to man, there have arisen in Germany, and to some extent in our own land, writers who speak exclusively of the moral stream of light flowing through prophecy, and deny altogether its predictive character. Both errors will be avoided by bearing in mind that the word of prophecy was profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction, to the first recipients of the message, as well as for succeeding ages.

The usual view of prophecy as anticipated history virtually excludes from the roll the great Prophet who was its theme and author, Moses his distinguished prototype, John the Baptist his eminent forerunner, Elijah, Samuel, under the old covenant, as well as the apostles and prophets under the new. According to this view, prophecy is virtually limited to what the Spirit saith unto the churches in the four hundred years between Hosea and Malachi. and by the beloved John, the writer of the Apocalypse. But if we agree to regard the prophet as the forthteller, possessing the munus praedicandi — rather than the foreteller, possessing only the munus praedicendi — we see at once how the very highest place is assigned to our Lord and to Moses; how John the Baptist was more than a prophet, as he stood within the actual dawn of the day of Christ, and as a religious teacher did really more for the religious training of those whom he addressed than any of the prophets of the old covenant. We see, too, how naturally and clearly the earlier prophets were subordinate to Moses, so that the test of their commission was conformity to the lawgiver; and how appropriately the term is applied to the apostles of our Lord and Saviour, as charged by Christ with the whole ordering and establishing of the Church in its institutions, government, and progress. In fact, students of prophecy perpetually use the word in a non-natural sense. Hence the variety and discordancy of their interpretations. Our attention must be rigidly fixed on the natural and proper sense of the terms, if we would gain any satisfactory results.

In all communications from God to man two elements may be traced, the moral and the predictive. Neither element must be pressed or insisted on, so as to depress and exclude the other. Yet the moral element is the fundamental, to which the predictive is always subsidiary. The moral element occupies the highest place in the communications made by our Lord, by Moses, by the apostles; the predictive element prevails in those who had the more ordinary gifts, as all their announcements appealed to  the revelations made by Moses and by Christ. The testimony of Jesus as the author, and the testimony borne to Jesus as the theme, is the spirit of prophecy. According to this view prophecy is always didactic; the moral element is fundamental, the predictive is entirely subsidiary. All who bore testimony to Jesus before his incarnation were preachers of righteousness, and all who testify that Jesus is come in the flesh exercise the prophetical function.

II. Value of Prophecy as Evidence of the Truth of Revelation. — Davison, in his Discourses on Prophecy, fixes a “Criterion of Prophecy,” and in accordance with it he describes “the condition is which would confer cogency of evidence on single examples of prophecy” in the following manner: first, “the known promulgation of the prophecy prior to the event; secondly, the clear and palpable fulfilment of it; lastly, the nature of the event itself — if, when the prediction of it was given, it lay remote from human view, and was such as could not be foreseen by any supposable effort of reason, or be deduced upon principles of calculation derived from probability and experience” (Disc. 8:378). Applying his test, the learned writer finds that the establishment of the Christian religion and the person of its Founder were predicted when neither reason nor experience could have anticipated them; and that the predictions respecting them have been clearly fulfilled in history. Here, then, is an adequate proof of an inspired prescience in the prophets who predicted these things. He applies his test to the prophecies recorded of the Jewish people, and their actual state, to the prediction of the great apostasy and to the actual state of corrupted Christianity, and finally to the prophecies relating to Nineveh, Babylon, Tyre, Egypt, the Ishmaelites, and the Four Empires, and to the events which have befallen them; and in each of these cases he finds proof of the existence of the predictive element in the prophets.

In the book of Kings we find Micaiah, the son of Imlah, uttering a challenge, by which his predictive powers were to be judged. He had pronounced, by the word of the Lord, that Ahab should fall at RamothGilead. Ahab, in return, commanded him to be shut up in prison until he came back in peace. “And Micaiah said, If thou return at all in peace” (that is, if the event do not verify my words), “the Lord hath not spoken by me” (that is, I am no prophet capable of predicting the future) (1Ki 22:28). The test is sound as a negative test, and so it is laid down in the law (Deu 18:22); but as a positive test it would not be sufficient. Ahab's death at Ramoth-Gilead did not prove Micaiah's  predictive powers, though his escape would have disproved them. But here we must notice a very important difference between single prophecies and a series of prophecy. The fulfilment of a single prophecy does not prove the prophetical power of the prophet, but the fulfillment of a long series of prophecies by a series or number of events does in itself constitute a proof that the prophecies were intended to predict the events, and, consequently, that predictive power resided in the prophet or prophets. We may see this in the so far parallel cases of satirical writings.

We know for certain that Aristophanes refers to Cleon, Pericles, Nicias (and we should be equally sure of it were his satire more concealed than it is), simply from the fact of a number of satirical hits converging together on the object of his satire. One, two, or three strokes might be intended for more persons than one, but the addition of each stroke makes the aim more apparent; and when we have a sufficient number before us, we can no longer possibly doubt his design. The same may be said of fables, and still more of allegories. The fact of a complicated lock being opened by a key shows that the lock and key were meant for each other. Now the Messianic picture drawn by the prophets as a body contains at least as many traits as these: That salvation should come through the family of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Judah, David; that at the time of the final absorption of the Jewish power, Shiloh (the tranquilizer) should gather the nations under his rule; that there should be a great Prophet, typified by Moses; a King descended from David; a Priest forever, typified by Melchizedek; that there should be born into the world a child to be called Mighty God, Eternal Father, Prince of Peace; that there should be a Righteous Servant of God on whom the Lord would lay the iniquity of all; that Messiah the Prince should be cut off, but not for himself; that an everlasting kingdom should be given by the Ancient of Days to one like the Son of man. It seems impossible to harmonize so many apparent contradictions. Nevertheless, it is an undoubted fact that at the time seemingly pointed out by one or more of these predictions there was born into the world a child of the house of David, and therefore of the family of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Judah, who claimed to be the object of these and other predictions; who is acknowledged as Prophet, Priest, and King, as Mighty God and yet as God's Righteous Servant who bears the iniquity of all; who was cut off, and whose death is acknowledged not to have been for his own, but for others' good: who has instituted a spiritual kingdom on earth, which kingdom is of a nature to continue forever, if there is any continuance beyond this world and this life; and in whose doings and sufferings on earth a number of specific predictions were  minutely fulfilled. Then we may say that we have here a series of prophecies which are so applicable to the person and earthly life of Jesus Christ as to be thereby shown to have been designed to apply to him. If they were designed to apply to him, prophetical prediction is proved.

Objections have been urged:

(a.) Vagueness. — It has been said that the prophecies are too darkly and vaguely worded to be proved predictive by the events which they are alleged to foretell. This objection is stated with clearness and force by Ammon. He says, “Such simple sentences as the following: Israel has not to expect a king, but a teacher; this teacher will be born at Bethlehem during the reign of Herod; he will lay down his life under Tiberius, in attestation of the truth of his religion; through the destruction of Jerusalem, and the complete extinction of the Jewish state, he will spread his doctrine in every quarter of the world-a few sentences like these, expressed in plain historical prose, would not only bear the character of true predictions, but, when once their genuineness was proved, they would be of incomparably greater worth to us than all the oracles of the Old Test. taken together” (Christology, p. 12). But to this it might be answered, and has been in effect answered by Hengstenberg:

1. That God never forces men to believe, but that there is such a union of definiteness and vagueness in the prophecies as to enable those who are willing to discover the truth, while the willfully blind are not forcibly constrained to see it.

2. That, had the prophecies been couched in the form of direct declarations, their fulfilment would have thereby been rendered impossible, or, at least, capable of frustration.

3. That the effect of prophecy (e.g. with reference to the time of the Messiah's coming) would have been far less beneficial to believers, as being less adapted to keep them in a state of constant expectation.

4. That the Messiah of Revelation could not be so clearly portrayed in his varied character as God and Man, as Prophet, Priest, and King, if he had been the mere “teacher” which is all that Ammon acknowledges him to be.

5. That the state of the prophets, at the time of receiving the divine revelation, was (as we shall presently show) such as necessarily to make  their predictions fragmentary, figurative, and abstracted from the relations of time.

6. That some portions of the prophecies were intended to be of double application, and some portions to be understood only on their fulfilment (comp. Joh 14:29; Eze 36:33).

(b.) Obscurity of a Part or Parts of a Prophecy otherwise Clear. — The objection drawn from “the unintelligibleness of one part of a prophecy, as invalidating the proof of foresight arising from the evident completion of those parts which are understood” is akin to that drawn from the vagueness of the whole of it. It may be answered with the same arguments, to which we may add the consideration urged by Butler that it is, for the argument in hand, the same as if the parts not understood were written in cipher, or not written at all: “Suppose a writing, partly in cipher and partly in plain words at length; and that in the part one understood there appeared mention of several known facts — it would never come into any man's thought to imagine that, if he understood the whole, perhaps he might find that these facts were not in reality known by the writer” (Analogy, pt. 2, ch. 7). Furthermore, if it be true that prophecies relating to the first coming of the Messiah refer also to his second coming, some part of those prophecies must necessarily be as yet not fully understood.

It would appear from these considerations that Davison's second “condition,” above quoted, “the clear and palpable fulfilment of the prophecy,” should be so far modified as to take into account the necessary difficulty. more or less great, in recognizing the fulfilment of a prophecy which results from the necessary vagueness and obscurity of the prophecy itself.

(c.) Application of' the Several Prophecies to a more Immediate Subject. — It has been the task of many Biblical critics to examine the different passages which are alleged to be predictions of Christ, and to show that they were delivered in reference to some person or thing contemporary with, or shortly subsequent to, the time of the writer. The conclusion is then drawn, sometimes scornfully, sometimes as an inference not to be resisted, that the passages in question have nothing to do with the Messiah. We have here to distinguish carefully between the conclusion proved and the corollary drawn from it. Let it be granted that it may be proved of all the predictions of the Messiah (it certainly may be proved of many) that they primarily apply to some historical and present fact: in that case a  certain law, under which God vouchsafes his prophetical revelations, is discovered; but there is no semblance of disproof of the further Messianic interpretation of the passages under consideration. That some such law does exist has been argued at length by Mr. Davison. He believes, however, that “it obtains only in some of the more distinguished monuments of prophecy,” such as the prophecies founded on, and having primary reference to, the kingdom of David, the restoration of the Jews, the destruction of Jerusalem (On Prophecy, disc. 5). Dr. Lee thinks that Davison “exhibits too great reserve in the application of this important principle” (On Inspiration, lect. 4). He considers it to be of universal application; and upon it he founds the doctrine of the “double sense of prophecy,” according to which a prediction is fulfilled in two or even more distinct but analogous subjects: first in type, then in antitype; and after that perhaps awaits a still further and more complete fulfilment. This view of the fulfilment of prophecy seems necessary for the explanation of our Lord's prediction on the Mount, relating at once to the fall of Jerusalem and to the end of the Christian dispensation. It is on this principle that Pearson writes: “Many are the prophecies which concern him, many the promises which are made of him; but yet some of them very obscure... Wheresoever he is spoken of as the anointed, it may well be first understood of some other person; except one place in Daniel, where Messiah is foretold ‘to be cut off'“ (On the Creed, art. 2).

Whether it can be proved by an investigation of Holy Scripture that this relation between divine announcements for the future and certain present events does so exist as to constitute a law, and whether, if the law is proved to exist, it is of universal or only of partial application, we do not pause to determine. But it is manifest that the existence of a primary sense cannot exclude the possibility of a secondary sense. The question, therefore, really is, whether the prophecies are applicable to Christ: if they are so applicable, the previous application of each of them to some historical event would not invalidate the proof that they were designed as a whole to find their full completion in him. Nay, even if it could be shown that the prophets had in their thoughts nothing beyond the primary completion of their words (a thing which we at present leave undetermined), no inference could thence be drawn against their secondary application; for such an inference would assume what no believer in inspiration will grant — viz. that the prophets are the sole authors of their prophecies. The rule Nihil in scripto quod non pius in scriptore is sound;  but the question is, who is to be regarded as the true author of the prophecies-the human instrument or the divine author? See Hengstenberg, Christology, appendix 6:p. 433. SEE DOUBLE SENSE.

(d.) Miraculous Character. — It is probable that this lies at the root of the many and various efforts made to disprove the predictive power of the prophets. There is no question that if miracles are, either physically or morally, impossible, then prediction is impossible; and those passages which have ever been accounted predictive must be explained away as being vague, as being obscure, as applying only to something in the writer's lifetime, or on some other hypothesis. This is only saying that belief in prediction is not compatible with the theory of atheism, or with the philosophy which rejects the overruling providence of a Personal God. See Maitland, Argument from Prophecy (Lond. 1877); Row, Bampton Lecture for 1877, p. 219. SEE MIRACLE.

For a copious list of treatises on Scripture prophecy in general, see Darling, Cyclopoedia Bibliographica, col. 1785 sq.; and Malcolm, Theological Index, s.v. Comp. Kurtz, Gesch. d. Alten Bundes, ii, 513 sq.; Hardwick, Christ and other Masters, vol. i, ch. 3, esp. p. 135 sq.; Smith, (Bampton Lecture) On Prophecy (Bost. 1870, 12mo); Brit. and For. Ev. Rev. 1863. art. 8; Bibl. Repos. p. 11, 138, 217; Westm. Rev. Jan. 1868, p. 106; Kitto, Journ. of Sac. Lit. 30:1 sq., April, 1853, p. 35; Aids to Faith, essay 3; E Rsgl. Rev. 8:181; Fisher, The Beginninigs of Christianity, p. 8, et al.; Stanley, Lectures on the Jewish Church, 1st series, lect. 17-20; Fairbairn, Prophecy Viewed in respect to its Distinctive Nature, its Special Function, and Proper Interpretation (Edinb. 1856); and for the vast field of German literature on the subject, see Keil, Introd. to the Old Test. (ibid. 1869), i, 265 sq.

## Prophecy, Jewish Interpretation Of[[@Headword:Prophecy, Jewish Interpretation Of]]

             The Hebrew and the Christian alike recognise the reality of the predictive element in the chosen oracles of the great I am. The two religionists, however, differ widely in their manner and sense of interpretation and in the application of the oracular utterances. This difference regarding a portion of Scripture accepted alike by both is easily accounted for. The divergence is in the two religions themselves, and is called out by the question whether the predictions for a Messiahship to the “chosen race” have ever been fulfilled. Upon this query all turns. The Israelite, refusing to recognise in Christ the long-promised divine messenger, either declares it a  vain attempt to decipher the prophetic images, if he be a rationalist; or, if he be more faithfully wedded to the canon of the synagogue, patiently sits back, awaiting the final solution of the problem of God's salvation of his people. SEE JEWS; SEE MESSIAH; SEE PHARISEE; SEE RATIONALISM.

In the early and mediaeval days of Christianity, the Jews did not deny the facts of the Christian miracles, but explained them away, and so nothing remained for settlement but the verity of the prophecies and the question of their fulfilment. The first of these the Jew conceded to the Christian, but on the last point a somewhat rich literature of polemics is preserved to us. It begins with the New Test. itself. Paul and other apostles were frequently called upon to argue the Messiahship of Christ. We have the same phase of the contest in the apology of Justin Martyr (q.v.) against Trypho, to which a new kind of objection expressive of prejudice is added in the discourse which Celsus, as preserved in Origen (Contr. Cels. bk. i and ii), puts into the mouth of the Jew whom he introduces. (In reference to this contest, these Church fathers, and especially Semisch's work on Justin Martyr and the works on the Jewish Talmudic literature and philosophy, may be consulted. See also, for later continuations of this con test, Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctr. i, § 144, and the art. POLEMICS, JEWISH.) The Jew contends with the Christian not only for a special spiritual elevation in the prophet — an intenser degree of the same divine intuition which God gives to all who worship him in love and reverence-but for a gift of light vouchsafed to him different from any ordinary endowment. Maimonides remains the chief of the Jewish hermeneutists. “This sage of mediseval Judaism thus teaches: Prophecy signifies the communication of verities to the human mind from God by the medium of the active reason, with or without the power to foretell future events or to perform miracles. The first point is essential, the other is merely accidental. Prophecy is a capacity of the human mind.

All possess it more or less. Like other human capacities, it may remain dormant in this or that mind, or be developed partially or perfectly. In the development of this capacity, it is necessary, in the first place, to cultivate and purify the imagination, i.e. the ability of beholding internally, clearly, and truly things external and distant, either in space or time, and to place the imagination under the control of mental judgment. In the second place, the moral nature of the individual must be trained to purity, goodness, love of the true and the sublime, and the desire to understand the voice of the eternal Deity. This cannot be done outside of  society, but within it and in its active service. It cannot be done by asceticism and the renunciation of the world and its charms; it must be done in gladness and joy, by chastity, temperance, and a life of moderation, governing and controlling the lower passions and developing the nobler, finer, and higher ones to a harmonious moral character. Passionate, immoral, and wicked persons bewilder their imagination, pervert their judgment, and benight their reason. In the third place, reason must be fully developed to control all other powers of the individual, without weakening them or disturbing the harmony of the soul, and to elevate him to universal reason, which Maimonides calls the ‘active reason,' which enables him to grasp universal truth and to depict it clearly to himself or others by the power of his imagination. Man so prepared, so developed and trained, is a prophet, although he still may receive no special messages from on high, either because his age requires none, or outer influences, climatical or social, disturb the mind. But the man so prepared, and he only, can be a prophet of the Lord. So the ancient prophets were prepared for their messages and their missions. Others, also, may conceive original ideas and prophecies; but if the reason predominates over the imagination, they cannot realize or reproduce their own internal visions.

If the imagination predominates, they produce phantasmagorias-wild, disconnected, and confused images. If the moral character supports not both, falsehood, deception, imposition, and even self-delusion spring from reason's light and imagination's vision. If one profess to be a prophet of the Lord, says Maimonides, we would first be obliged to investigate whether his education, his learning, his character, and his antecedents warrant such a presumption. If this be not the case — if he be a vulgar, uncultivated, or an impious man, but maintains that God or an angel spoke to him this or that, we should be bound to declare him a deluded fantasy or a wilful impostor. The genuine prophets, Maimonides further maintains, are not all of the same category. They are as different as are their natural capacities and the development thereof. With the one reason and with the other imagination may predominate, and another, again, may be influenced by moral deficiencies. Therefore, while one prophet, like Moses, is always ready and prepared to receive prophecies in a sound, waking, and clear state of mind, and in words perfectly prosaic and perfectly definite and accurate, others can receive visions in a state of dream, in eccentric agitation, or hallucination only. Then they see phantasms which are expounded to them or which they themselves must expound; or they see an angel or a person — in themselves, of course — who speaks to them; or they hear a voice  without seeing any vision, in which they suppose they have heard God speak. Therefore the prophetical style varies so much with the various writers of Scriptures, and the oracles of some are announced in different poetical forms. The prophet knows how to distinguish divine visions from vulgar ones by the profound impression which the former make upon him, carrying conviction into his mind, and we must know it by the test of reason to which the matter revealed is subjected. All visions recorded in the Bible, Maimonides advances, were subjective, psychological processes. Wherever it is said God appeared, an angel appeared, this or that vision was seen, it must always be understood to have appeared so in the prophet's imagination. Only one prophet received his revelations through and to reason directly, without poetical garbs or visionary assistance, and that was Moses. Only one divine manifestation of this nature did actually come to pass, and that was the revelation on Mount Sinai, and this, also, Maimonides rationalizes in his own way. In all these rational expositions of prophecy, Maimonides refers to the Bible and the Talmud for support” (comp. his Yesodai Haftorah, which forms the Introd. to his Yad- Hachazakah). SEE MAIMONIDES.

Another sage, whose authority the ultra-orthodox prefer to depend upon, is Joseph Albo (q.v.). He has expressed his opinion on the various grades of prophets in his book on Princinples (Sepher Ikkarim, ch. 10:§ 3). It differs materially from that of Maimonides. Albo has four grades of prophets; the first class consists of prophets with whom the understanding has no dominion over the phantasy. They receive the prophetical vision in a state of slumber and dream, after an attack of pain and terror. The second class consists of prophets in whom the understanding and the phantasy are well balanced; they receive the prophetical visions without pain or terror, in quiet dreams. The third class consists of prophets with whom the understanding predominates over the phantasy; they see no imaginary visions, as the above two classes do, which must be expounded; they see real objects in their visions, and hear them speak intelligible words; there is neither pain nor terror, nor doubtful visions in the prophetical ecstasy of this class. The fourth class consists of prophets with whom phantasy has no influence whatever upon the understanding; they see no visions, no symbols whatever, but hear prophetical words addressed to them, not in a dream or vision-not merely sometimes and in a state of ecstasy — but waking, intelligent, and whenever they wish. Albo adds, “If a man has elevated himself to this high state of mind, he should no longer be called  man — he should be called angel. None of us mortals has ever reached this perfection, except our teacher Moses.” See Dr. Wise, Lectures on the Philosophy and Philosophers of the Jews as reported in the Israelite (Cincinnati, 1873); Rothschild (Miss), Hist. and Lit. of the Israelites, vol. 2; Geiger, Judaism, vol. 1; M'Caul, Old Paths. (J. H. W.)

## Prophesyings[[@Headword:Prophesyings]]

             Religious exercises of the Puritan clergy in the reign of queen Elizabeth, instituted for the purpose of promoting knowledge and piety. The ministers of a particular division, at a set time, met together in some church of a market or other large town, and there each in his order explained, according to his ability, some portion of Scripture previously allotted to him. This done, a moderator made his observations on what had been said, and determined the true sense of the place, a certain space of time being fixed for despatching the whole. These institutions, borrowed evidently from the Conventicles (q.v.) of Scotland, like all others, however, it seems, were in England soon marked by irregularity, disputations, and divisions. Archbishop Grindal endeavored to regulate the prophesyings and cover them from the objections which the court made against them, by enjoining the ministers to observe decency and order, by forbidding them to meddle with politics and Church government, and by prohibiting all nonconformist ministers and laymen from being speakers. The queen, however, seeing that they spread the religious notions of the Puritans and estranged the people from all Romanistic tendency, was resolved to suppress them; and having sent for the archbishop, told him she was informed that the rites and ceremonies of the Church were not duly observed in these prophesyings; that persons not lawfully called to be ministers exercised in them; that the assemblies themselves were illegal, not being allowed by public authority; that the laity neglected their secular affairs by repairing to these meetings, which filled their heads with notions, and might occasion disputes and sedition in the State; that it was good for the Church to have but few preachers, three or four in a county being sufficient. She further declared her dislike of the number of these exercises, and therefore commanded him peremptorily to put them down. The archbishop, however, instead of obeying the commands of his royal mistress, thought that she had made some infringement upon his office, and wrote the queen a long and earnest letter, declaring that his conscience would not suffer him to comply with her commands. The queen was so inflamed with this letter that the archbishop was sequestered from his office, and he never afterwards  recovered the queen's favor. Thus ended the prophesyings. See Neal, Hist. of the Puritans.

## Prophet[[@Headword:Prophet]]

             a person who acts as the organ of divine communication with men, especially with regard to the future. He differs from a priest in representing the divine side of this mediation, while the priest rather acts from the human side. The following article therefore discusses chiefly the personal relations of the prophet himself. SEE PROPHECY.

I. The Title in Scripture. — The ordinary Hebrew word for prophet is נָבַיא (nabi), derived from the verb נָבָא, connected by Gesenius with נָבִע, “to bubble forth,” like a fountain. If this etymology be correct, the substantive would signify either a person who, as it were, involuntarily bursts forth with spiritual utterances under the divine influence (comp. Psa 40:1, “My heart is bubbling up of a good matter”), or simply one who pours forth words. The analogy of the word נָט ִ (natdph), which has the force of “dropping” as honey, and is used by Mic 2:6; Mic 2:11, Eze 21:2, and Amo 7:16 in the sense of prophesying, points to the last signification. The verb נָבָא is found only in the niphal and hithpael, a peculiarity which it shares with many other words expressive of speech (comp. loquifari, vociferari, concionari, φθἑγγομαι , as well as μαντεύομαι and vaticinari). Bunsen (Gott in Geschichte, p. 141) and Davidson (Intr. Old Test. 2, 430) suppose nabi to signify the man to whom announcements are made by God, i.e. inspired. Exo 4:1-17 is the classical passage as to the meaning of this word. There God says to Moses, “Aaron shall be thy נָבַיא(nabi) unto the people, and thou shalt be unto him instead of God.” The sense is. “Aaron shall speak what thou shalt communicate to him.” This appellation implies, then, the prophet's relation to God: he speaks not of his own accord, but what the Spirit puts into his mouth. Thus נָבַיא (nabi) is an adjective of passive signification: he who has been divinely inspired, who has received from God the revelations which he proclaims. But it is more in accordance with the usage of the word to regard it as signifying (actively) one who announces or pours forth the declarations of God. The latter signification is preferred by Ewald, Havernick, Oehler, Hengstenberg, Bleek, Lee, Pusey, M'Caul, and the great majority of Biblical critics. We have the word in Barnabas (בִּרנָבַיא), which is rendered υἱὸς παρακλήσεως (Act 4:36), one whom  God has qualified to impart consolation, light, and strength to others. Augustine says, “The prophet of God is nothing else nisi enunciator verborum Dei hominibus. So Heidegger, “Nabi is properly every utterer of the words of another, not from his own, but from another's influence and will.”

Two other Hebrew words are used to designate a prophet-— רֹאֶה (nre/b) and חֹזֶה(chozeh)-both signifying one who sees. They are rendered in the A.V. by “seer;” in the Sept. usually by βλέπων or ὁρῶν, sometimes by προφήτης (1Ch 26:28; 2Ch 16:7; 2Ch 16:10). The three words seem to be contrasted with each other in 1Ch 29:29. “The acts of David the king, first and last, behold they are written in the book of Samuel the seer (roeh), and in the book of Nathan the prophet (nabi), and in the book of Gad the seer (chozeh).” Roeh is a title almost appropriated to Samuel. It is only used ten times, and in seven of these it is applied to Samuel (1Sa 9:9; 1Sa 9:11; 1Sa 9:18-19; 1Ch 9:22; 1Ch 26:28; 1Ch 29:29). On two other occasions it is applied to Hanani (2Ch 16:7; 2Ch 16:10). Once it is used by Isa 30:10 with no reference to any particular person. It was superseded in general use by the word nabi, which Samuel (himself entitled nabi as well as roeh [1Sa 3:20; 2Ch 35:18]) appears to have revived after a period of desuetude (1Sa 9:9), and to have applied to the prophets organized by him. The verb רָאָה, from which it is derived, is the common prose word signifying “to see:” חָזָה— whence the substantive חֹזֶה (chozeh) is derived-is more poetical, q.d. “to gaze.” Chozeh is rarely found except in the books of the Chronicles, but חָזוֹןis the word constantly used for the prophetical vision. It is found in the Pentateuch, in Samuel, in the Chronicles, in Job, and in most of the prophets. In 1Sa 9:9 we read, “He that is now called a prophet (nabi) was beforetime called a seer (roeh);” from whence Stanley (Lect. on Jewish Church) has concluded that roeh was “the oldest designation of the prophetic office,” “superseded by nabi shortly after Samuel's time, when nabi first came into use” (ibid. 18, 19). This seems opposed to the fact that nabi is the word commonly used in the Pentateuch, whereas roeh does not appear until the days of Samuel. The passage in the book of Samuel is clearly a parenthetical insertion, perhaps made by the nabi Nathan (or whoever was the original author of the book), perhaps added at a later date, with the view of explaining how it was that Samuel bore the title of roeh, instead of the now  usual appellation of nabi. To the writer the days of Samuel were “beforetime,” and he explains that in those ancient days — that is, the days of Samuel — the word used for prophet was roeh, not nabi. But that does not imply that roeh was the primitive word, and that nabi first came into use subsequently to Samuel (see Hengstenberg, Beitrage zur Einleitung ins A. T. 3, 335). Stanley represents chozeh as “another antique title;” but on no sufficient grounds. Chozdh is first found in 2Sa 24:11; so that it does not seem to have come into use until roeh had almost disappeared. It is also found in the books of Kings (2Ki 17:13) and Chronicles (frequently), in Amo 7:12, Isa 19:10, Mic 3:7, and the derivatives of the verb chazah are used by the prophets to designate their visions down to the Captivity (comp. Isa 1:1; Dan 8:1; Zec 13:4). The derivatives of raah are rarer, and, as being prose words, are chiefly used by Daniel (comp. Eze 1:1; Dan 10:7). On examination we find that nabi existed before and after and alongside of roeh and chozeh, but that chozehl was somewhat more modern than roeh.

Whether there is any difference in the usage of these three words, and, if any, what that difference is, has been much debated (see Witsius, Miscell. Sacra, i, 1, § 19; Carpzovius, Introd. ad Libros Canon. V T. 3, 1, §2; Winer, Real-Wortenbuch, art. “Propheten”). Havernick (Einleitung, Th. i; roeh. i. § 56) considers nabi to express the title of those who officially belonged to the prophetic order, while roeh and chozeh denote those who received a prophetical revelation. Dr. Lee (Inspiration of Holy Scripture, p. 543) agrees with Hivernick in his explanation of nabi, but he identifies roeh in meaning rather with nabi than with chozeh. He further throws out a suggestion that chozeh is the special designation of the prophet attached to the royal household. In 2Sa 24:11, Gad is described as “the prophet (nabi) Gad, David's seer (chozeh),” and elsewhere he is called “David's seer (chozeh)” (1Ch 21:9), “the king's seer (chozeh)” (2Ch 29:25). “The case of Gad,” Dr. Lee thinks, “affords the clew to the difficulty, as it clearly indicates that attached to the royal establishment there was usually an individual styled “the king's seer,” who might at the same time be a nabi.” The suggestion is ingenious (see, in addition to places quoted above, 1Ch 25:5; 1Ch 29:29; 2Ch 29:30; 2Ch 35:15), but it was only David (possibly also Manasseh, 2Ch 33:18) who, so far as we read, had this seer attached to his person; and in any case there is nothing in the word chozeh to denote the relation of the prophet to the king, but only in the connection in which it  stands with the word king. On the whole, it would seem that the same persons are designated by the three words nabi, roeh, and chozeh the last two titles being derived from the prophets' power of seeing the visions presented to them by God; the first from their function of revealing and proclaiming God's truth to men. When Gregory Naz. (Or. 28) calls Ezekiel ὁ τῶν μεγάλων ἐπόπτης καὶ ἐξηγητὴς μυστηρίων, he gives a sufficiently exact translation of the two titles chozeh or roeh, and nabi.

Sometimes the prophets are called צוֹפַאַים(tsophiim), i.e. those who espy. explore for the people, a “watchman” (Jer 6:17; Eze 3:17; Eze 33:7). Such also is the usage of שׁוֹמֵר(shomer), i.e. “a watchman” (Isa 21:11; Isa 62:6); and roiim, i.e. shepherds (Zec 11:5; Zec 8:16), in reference to the spiritual care and religious nurture of the people. Other names, as “man of God,” “servant of Jehovah,” and now and then “angel,” or “messenger of Jehovah,” etc., do not belong to the prophets as such, but only in so far as they are of the number of servants and instruments of God. The phrase “man of the Spirit” (רוִּח, Hos 9:7) explains the agency by which the communication came. In the appointment of the seventy elders the Lord says to Moses, “I will take of the Spirit which is upon thee, and will put it on them” (Num 11:17). So with regard to Eldad and Medad, “the Spirit rested upon them,... and they prophesied in the camp.” The resting of the Spirit upon them was equivalent to the gift of prophecy (see 2Pe 1:21).

The word nabi is uniformly translated in the Sept. by προφήτης, and in the A.V. by “prophet.” In classical Greek, προφήτης signifies one who speaks for another, specially one who speaks for a god, and so interprets his will to man (Liddell and Scott, s.v.). Hence its essential meaning is” an interpreter.” Thus Apollo is a προφήτης, as being the interpreter of Zeus (Eschylus, Eum. 19). Poets are the Prophets of the Muses, as being their interpreters (Plato, Phcedr. 262 d). The προφῆται attached to heathen temples are so named from their interpreting the oracles delivered by the inspired and unconscious μάντεις (Plato, Tim. 72 b; Herod. 7:111, note [ed. Bahr]). We have Plato's authority for deriving μάντις from μαίνομαι (l.c.). The use of the word προφήτης in its modern sense is post-classical, and is derived from the Sept.

From the mediaeval use of the word προφητεία, prophecy passed into the English language in the sense of prediction, and this sense it has retained as its popular meaning (see Richardson, s.v.). The larger sense of  interpretation has not, however, been lost. Thus we find in Bacon, “An exercise commonly called prophesying, which was this: that the ministers within a precinct did meet upon a week-day in some principal town, where there was some ancient grave minister that was president, and an auditory admitted of gentlemen or other persons of leisure. Then every minister successively. beginning with the youngest, did handle one and the same part of Scripture, spending severally some quarter of an hour or better, and in the whole some two hours. And so the exercise being begun and concluded with prayer, and the president giving a text for the next meeting, the assembly was dissolved” (Pacification of the Church). This meaning of the word is made further familiar to us by the title of Jeremy Taylor's treatise On Liberty of Prophesying. Nor was there any risk of the title of a book published in our own days, On the Prophetical Office of the Church (Oxf. 1838), being misunderstood. In fact, the English word prophet, like the word inspiration, has always been used in a larger and in a closer sense. In the larger sense our Lord Jesus Christ is a “prophet,” Moses is a “prophet,” Mohammed is a “prophet.” The expression means that they proclaimed and published a new religious dispensation. In a similar, though not identical sense, the Church is said to have a “prophetical,” i.e. an expository and interpretative, office. But in its closer sense the word, according to usage, though not according to etymology, involves the idea of foresight. This is and always has been its more usual acceptation. The different meanings, or shades of meaning, in which the abstract noun is employed in Scripture have been drawn out by Locke as follows: “Prophecy comprehends three things: prediction; singing by the dictate of the Spirit; and understanding and explaining the mysterious, hidden sense of Scripture by an immediate illumination and motion of the Spirit” (Paraphrase of 1 Corinthians 12, note, p. 121 [Lond. 1742]). It is in virtue of this last signification of the word that the prophets of the New Test. are so called (1 Corinthians 12); by virtue of the second that the sons of Asaph, etc., are said to have “prophesied with a harp” (25:3), and Miriam and Deborah are termed “prophetesses.” That the idea of potential if not actual prediction enters into the conception expressed by the word prophecy, when that word is used to designate the function of the Hebrew prophets, seems to be proved by the following passages of Scripture: Deu 18:22; Jer 28:9; Act 2:30; Act 3:18-21; 1Pe 1:10; 2Pe 1:19-20; 2Pe 3:2. Etymologically, however, it is certain that neither prescience nor prediction is implied by the term used in the Hebrew language. But it seems to be incorrect to say that the English word  was “originally” used in the wider sense of “preaching,” and that it became “limited” to the meaning of “predicting” in the 17th century, in consequence of “an etymological mistake” (Stanley, Lect. 19, 20). The word entered into the English language in its sense of predicting. It could not have been otherwise, for at the time of the formation of the English language the word προφητεία had, by usage, assumed popularly the meaning of prediction. We find it ordinarily employed by early as well as by late writers in this sense (see Polydore Virgil, Hist. of England, 4:161 [Camden ed. 1846]; Coventry Mysteries, p. 65 [Shakespeare Soc. ed. 1841]). It is probable that the meaning was “limited” to “prediction” as much and as little before the 17th century as it has been since.

II. The Prophetical Order. —

1. Its Historical Development. — Generally speaking, every one was a prophet to whom God communicated his mind in this peculiar manner. Thus, e.g. Abraham is called a prophet (Gen 20:7), not, as is commonly thought, on account of general revelations granted him by God, but because such as he received were in the special form described; as, indeed, in chap. 15 it is expressly stated that divine communications were made to him in visions and dreams. The patriarchs as a class are in the same manner called prophets (Psa 105:15). Moses is more specifically a prophet, as being a proclaimer of a new dispensation, a revealer of God's will, and in virtue of his divinely inspired songs (Exodus 15; Deuteronomy 32, 33; Psalms 90); but his main work was not prophetical, and he is therefore formally distinguished from prophets (Num 12:6) as well as classed with them (Deu 18:15; Deu 34:10). Aaron is the prophet of Moses (Exo 7:1); Miriam (Exo 15:20) is a prophetess; and we find the prophetic gift in the elders who “prophesied” when “the Spirit of the Lord rested upon them,” and in Eldad and Medad, who “prophesied in the camp” (Num 11:27). At the time of the sedition of Miriam, the possible existence of prophets is recognised (Num 12:6).

When the Mosaic economy had been established, a new element was introduced. The sacerdotal caste then became the instrument by which the members of the Jewish theocracy were taught and governed in things spiritual. Feast and fast, sacrifice and offering, rite and ceremony, constituted a varied and ever-recurring system of training and teaching by type and symbol. To the priests, too, was intrusted the work of “teaching  the children of Israel all the statutes which the Lord hath spoken unto them by the hand of Moses” (Lev 10:11). Teaching by act and teaching by word were alike their task. This office they adequately fulfilled for some hundred or more years after the giving of the law at Mount Sinai. But during the time of the Judges the priesthood sank into a state of degeneracy, and the people were no longer affected by the acted lessons of the ceremonial service. They required less enigmatic warnings and exhortations. Under these circumstances a new moral power was evoked- the regular Prophetic Line. Special functionaries of this kind had from time to time already appeared. In the days of the Judges we find that Deborah (Jdg 4:4) was a prophetess; a prophet (Jdg 6:8) rebuked and exhorted the Israelites when oppressed by the Midianites; and in Samuel's childhood “a man of God” predicted to Eli the death of his two sons, and the curse that was to fall on his descendants (1Sa 2:27). But it was now time for a more formal institution of the prophetic order. Samuel, himself a Levite, of the family of Kohath (1Ch 6:28), and certainly acting as a priest, was the instrument used at once for effecting a reform in the sacerdotal order (1Ch 9:22), and for giving to the prophets a position of influence which they had never before held. So important was the work wrought by him that he is classed in Holy Scripture with Moses (Jer 15:1; Psa 99:6; Act 3:24), Samuel being the great religious reformer and organizer of the prophetical order, as Moses was the great legislator and founder of the priestly rule. Nevertheless, it is not to be supposed that Samuel created the prophetic order as a new thing before unknown. The germs both of the prophetic and of the regal order are found in the law as given to the Israelites by Moses (Deu 13:1; Deu 18:20; Deu 17:18), but they were not yet developed, because there was not yet the demand for them. Samuel, who evolved the one, himself saw the evolution of the other. It is a vulgar error respecting Jewish history to suppose that there was an antagonism between the prophets and the priests. There is not a trace of such antagonism. Isaiah may denounce a wicked hierarchy (Isa 1:10), but it is because it is wicked, not because it is a hierarchy. Malachi “sharply reproves” the priests (Mal 2:1), but it is in order to support the priesthood (comp. 1, 14). Mr. F. W. Newman even designates Ezekiel's writings as “hard sacerdotalism,” “tedious and unedifying as Leviticus itself” (Hebr. Monarch. p. 330). The prophetical order was, in truth, supplemental, not antagonistic, to the sacerdotal. SEE SAMUEL.

Samuel took measures to make his work of restoration permanent as well as effective for the moment. For this purpose he instituted companies, or colleges of prophets. One we find in his lifetime at Ramah (1Sa 19:19-20); others afterwards at Bethel (2Ki 2:3), Jericho (2Ki 2:5), Gilgal (2Ki 4:38), and elsewhere (2Ki 6:1). Their constitution and object were similar to those of theological colleges. Into them were gathered promising students, and here they were trained for the office which they were afterwards destined to fulfil. So successful were these institutions that from the time of Samuel to the closing of the Canon of the Old Test. there seems never to have been wanting a due supply of men to keep up the line of official prophets. There appears to be no sufficient ground for the common statement that after the schism the colleges existed only in the Israelitish kingdom, or for Knobel's supposition that they ceased with Elisha (Prophetismus, 2, 39), nor again for Bishop Lowth's statement that “they existed from the earliest times of the Hebrew republic” (Sacred Poetry, lect. 18), or for M. Nicolas's assertion that their previous establishment can be inferred from 1 Samuel 8, 9, 10 (Etudes Critiques sur la Bible, p. 365). We have, however, no actual proof of their existence except in the days of Samuel and of Elijah and Elisha. The apocryphal books of the Maccabees (1, 4:46; 9:27; 14:41) and of Ecclesiasticus (36:15) represent them as extinct.

The colleges appear to have consisted of students differing in number. Sometimes they were very numerous (1Ki 18:4; 1Ki 22:6; 2Ki 2:16). One elderly, or leading prophet, presided over them (1Sa 19:20), called their father (1Sa 10:12), or master (2Ki 2:3), who was apparently admitted to his office by the ceremony of anointing (1Ki 19:16; Isa 61:1; Psa 105:15). They were called his sons. Their chief subject of study was, no doubt, the law and its interpretation; oral, as distinct from symbolical, teaching being henceforward tacitly transferred from the priestly to the prophetical order. Subsidiary subjects of instruction were music and sacred poetry, both of which had been connected with prophecy from the time of Moses (Exo 15:20) and the Judges (Jdg 4:4; Jdg 5:1). The prophets that meet Saul “came down from the high place with a psaltery and a tabret, and a pipe and a harp before them” (1Sa 10:5). Elijah calls a minstrel to evoke the prophetic gift in himself (2Ki 3:15). David “separates to the service of the sons of Asaph and of Heman and of Jeduthun, who should prophesy with harps and with psalteries and with cymbals.... All these were under the hands of their father for song in the house of the Lord with cymbals, psalteries, and  harps for the service of the house of God” (1Ch 25:16). Hymns, or sacred songs, are found in the books of Jon 2:2, Isa 12:1; Isa 26:1, Hab 3:2. It was probably the duty of the prophetical students to compose verses to be sung in the Temple (see Lowth, Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews, lect. 18). Having been themselves trained and taught. the prophets, whether still residing within their college or having left its precincts, had the task of teaching others. From the question addressed to the Shunamite by her husband, “Wherefore wilt thou go to him to-day? It is neither new moon nor Sabbath” (2Ki 4:23), it appears that weekly and monthly religious meetings were held as an ordinary practice by the prophets (see Patrick, Conmm. ad loc.). Thus we find that “Elisha sat in his house” engaged in his official occupation (comp. Eze 8:1; Eze 14:1; Eze 20:1), “and the elders sat with him” (2Ki 6:32), when the king of Israel sent to slay him. It was at these meetings, probably, that many of the warnings and exhortations on morality and spiritual religion were addressed by the prophets to their countrymen. SEE PROPHETS, SCHOOLS OF.

The schools of the prophets were thus engaged in what we may call pastoral functions, rather than in the disclosure of things to come; their office was to bring home to men's business and bosoms the announcements already made. Selected from the Levitical and priestly classes, they performed services chiefly of a priestly character (1Sa 9:13), but presided over devotional exercises and gave spiritual instruction. We may regard Elijah as the type of the whole prophetical order at this period; “a man of heroic energy in action, rather than of prolific thought or excellent discourse. Power was given him to smite the earth with plagues (Rev 11:6). When an impression had been made by these extraordinary displays of power, a still small voice was heard to quicken the people to newness of life.” If we pass on to the religious teachers who are associated with the name and age of David — Nathan, Solomon, and others, who composed the Psalms — we shall see that these aimed at the religious education of their contemporaries by a pure stream of didactic and devotional poetry. Their object was to advance the members of the ancient economy to the highest degree of light and purity which was attainable in that state of minority. The predictive element crops out most distinctly in the Messianic psalms, which point to the ultimate completion of the kingdom in David's Lord, and the universal reign of righteousness, truth, and peace. When these efforts failed to stem the tide of corruption  and to rescue the chosen people from disorder, ancient prophecy assumed the form of specific prediction. The moral element is chiefly seen in denouncing the iniquity and unrighteousness of the age, but the distinctive characteristic is that, in exposing the evils which prevailed, they directed the eye to the future. This band of religious teachers who are popularly spoken of as “the prophets” commenced with Hosea soon after the ministry of Elijah and Elisha. Hosea's labors commenced in the days of Uzziah, king of Judah, and Jeroboam II, king of Israel, and were prolonged to the time of Hezekiah, comprising more than sixty years, so that with him were contemporary Amos, Jonah, Joel, Obadiah, Isaiah, Micah, Nahum. Next to these in order of time cane Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Habakkuk, Zephaniah. The last three were Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi. From these we derive our amplest materials for comparing the anticipations of prophecy with the subsequent events of history. Thus the prophets of the Old Covenant form a regular succession; they are members of an unbroken continuous chain, of which one perpetually reaches forth the hand to the other. SEE PROPHETS, MAJOR, AND MINOR

In the first book of the Maccabees (9:17) the discontinuance of the prophetic calling is considered as forming an important era in Jewish history (see Stemann, De TerDmino Prophetarum [Rost. 1723]), while at the same time an expectation of the renewal in future ages of prophetic gifts is avowed (1Ma 4:46; 1Ma 14:41). After the Babylonian exile the sacred writings were collected, which enabled every one to find the way of salvation; but the immediate revelations to the people of Israel were to cease for a while, in order to raise a stronger longing for the appearance of the Messiah, and to prepare for him a welcome reception. For the same reason the ark of the covenant had been taken away from the people. The danger of a complete apostasy, which in earlier times might have been incurred by this withdrawal, was not now to be apprehended. The external worship of the Lord was so firmly established that no extraordinary helps were wanted. Taking also into consideration the altered character of the people, we may add that the time after the exile was more fit to produce men learned in the law than prophets. Before this period, the faithful and the unbelieving were strongly opposed to each other, which excited the former to great exertions. These relaxed when the opposition ceased, and pious priests now took the place of prophets. The time after the exile is characterized by weakness and dependence; the people looked up to the past as to a height which they could not gain; the earlier writings obtained  unconditional authority, and the disposition for receiving prophetic gifts was lost. About a hundred years after the return from the Babylonian exile, the prophetic profession ceased. The Jewish tradition uniformly states that after Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi no prophet arose among the Jews till John the Baptist woke afresh the echoes of a long lost inspiration as the prelude to a new dispensation. For its resumption under the New Test. economy, see § 10 below.

2. Manner of Life of the Prophets.— The prophets went about poorly and coarsely dressed (2Ki 1:8), not as a mere piece of asceticism, but that their very apparel might teach what the people ought to do; it was a “sermo propheticus realis.” Comp. 1Ki 21:27, where Ahab does penance in the manner figured by the prophet: “And it came to pass, when Ahab heard these words, that he rent his clothes, and put sackcloth upon his flesh and fasted” (see Nicolai, De Prophetarum Vestitu [Magdeb. 1746]; Zacharia, De ProphetaTumn labitu [Sodin, 1756]). The general appearance and life of the prophet were very similar to those of the Eastern dervish at the present day. His dress was a hairy garment, girt with a leathern girdle (Isa 20:2; Zec 13:4; Mat 3:4). He was married or unmarried as he chose; but his manner of life and diet were stern and austere (2Ki 4:10; 2Ki 4:38; 1Ki 19:6; Mat 3:4). Generally the prophets were not anxious to attract notice by ostentatious display; nor did they seek worldly wealth, most of them living in poverty and even want (1Ki 14:3; 2Ki 4:1; 2Ki 4:38; 2Ki 4:42; 2Ki 6:5). The decay of the congregation of God deeply chagrined them (comp. Mic 7:1, and many passages in Jeremiah). Insult, persecution, imprisonment, and death were often the reward of their godly life. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews says (Heb 11:37): “They were stoned, they were sawn asunder, were tempted, were slain with the sword; they wandered about in sheep-skins and goat-skins, being destitute, afflicted, tormented” (comp. Christ's speech, Mat 23:29 sq.; 2Ch 24:17 sq.). The condition of the prophets, in their temporal humiliation, is vividly represented in the lives of Elijah and Elisha in the books of the Kings; and Jeremiah concludes the description of his sufferings in the 20th chapter by cursing the day of his birth. Repudiated by the world in which they were aliens, they typified the life of him whose appearance they announced, and whose spirit dwelt in them. They figured him, however, not only in his lowness, but in his elevation. The Lord stood by them, gave evidence in their favor by fulfilling their predictions, frequently proved by miracles that  they were his own messengers, or retaliated on their enemies the injury done them. The prophets addressed the people of both kingdoms: they were not confined to particular places, but prophesied where it was required. For this reason they were most numerous in capital towns, especially in Jerusalem, where they generally spoke in the Temple. Sometimes their advice was asked, and then their prophecies take the form of answers to questions submitted to them (Isaiah 37; Ezekiel 20; Zechariah 7). But much more frequently they felt themselves inwardly moved to address the people without their advice having been asked, and they were not afraid to stand forward in places where their appearance, perhaps, produced indignation and terror. Whatever lay within or around the sphere of religion and morals formed the object of their care. They strenuously opposed the worship of false gods (Isa 1:10 sq.), as well as the finery of women (3, 16 sq.). Priests, princes, kings, all must hear them — must, however reluctantly, allow them to perform their calling as long as they spoke in the name of the true God, and as long as the result did not disprove their pretensions to be the servants of the invisible King of Israel (Jer 37:15-21).

As seen above, there were institutions for training prophets; the senior members instructed a number of pupils and directed them. These schools had been first established by Samuel (1Sa 10:8; 1Sa 19:19); and at a later time there were such institutions in different places, as Bethel and Gilgal (2Ki 2:3; 2Ki 4:38; 2Ki 6:1). The pupils of the prophets lived in fellowship united, and were called “sons of the prophets;” while the senior or experienced prophets were considered as their spiritual parents, and were styled fathers (comp. 2Ki 2:12; 2Ki 6:21). Samuel, Elijah, and Elisha are mentioned as principals of such institutions. From them the Lord generally chose his instruments. Amos relates of himself (Amo 7:14-15), as a thing uncommon, that he had been trained in no school of prophets, but was a herdsman, when the Lord took him to prophesy unto the people of Israel. At the same time, this example shows that the bestowal of prophetic gifts was not limited to the school of the prophets. Women also might come forward as prophetesses, as instanced in Miriam, Deborah, and Huldah, though such cases are of comparatively rare occurrence. We should also observe that only as regards the kingdom of Israel we have express accounts of the continuance of the schools of prophets. What is recorded of them is not directly applicable to the kingdom of Judah, especially since, as stated above, prophecy had in it an  essentially different position. We cannot assume that the organization and regulations of the schools of the prophets in the kingdom of Judah were as settled and established as in the kingdom of Israel. In the latter, the schools of the prophets had a kind of moastic constitution: they were not institutions of general education, but missionary stations; which explains the circumstance that they were established exactly in places which were the chief seats of superstition. The spiritual fathers travelled about to visit the training-schools; the pupils had their common board and dwelling, and those who married and left ceased not on that account to be connected with their colleges, but remained members of them. The widow of such a pupil of the schools of prophets who is mentioned in 2Ki 4:1 sq., considered Elisha as the person bound to care for her. The offerings which, by the Mosaic law, were to be given to the Levites were by the pious of the kingdom of Israel brought to the schools of the prophets (4:42). The prophets of the kingdom of Israel thus in some sort stood in a hostile position to the priests. These points of difference in the situation of the prophets of the two kingdoms must not be lost sight of; and we further add that prophecy in the kingdom of Israel was much more completed with extraordinary events than in the kingdom of Judah: the history of the latter offers no prophetical deeds equalling those of Elijah and Elisha. Prophecy in the kingdom of Israel not being grounded on a hierarchy venerable for its antiquity, consecrated by divine miracles, and constantly flavored with divine protection, it needed to be supported more powerful, I and to be legitimized more evidently. In conclusion, it may be observed that the expression “schools of the prophets” is not exactly suited to their nature; as general instruction was not their object. The so-called prophets' schools were associations of men endowed with the spirit of God, for the purpose of carrying on their work, the feeble powers of junior members being directed and strengthened by those of a higher class. To those who entered these unions the Divine Spirit had already been imparted, which was the imperative condition of their reception. SEE PROPHETS, SONS OF.

III. The Prophetic Functions. — These have already been in part glanced at, but the importance of the subject demands a fuller exposition. To belong to the prophetic order and to possess the prophetic gift are not convertible terms. There might be members of the prophetic order to whom the gift of prophecy was not vouchsafed. There might be inspired prophets who did not belong to the prophetic order. As we have seen above, the inspired prophet generally came from the college of the  prophets, and belonged to the prophetic order; but this was not always the case. In the instance of the prophet Amos, the rule and the exception are both manifested. When Amaziah, the idolatrous Israelitish priest, threatens the prophet and desires him to “flee away into the land of Judah, and there eat bread and prophesy there, but not to prophesy again any more at Bethel,” Amos in reply says “I was no prophet, neither was I a prophet's son; but I was an herdsman, and a gatherer of sycamore fruit: and the Lord took me as I followed the flock, and the Lord said unto me, Go prophesy unto my people Israel” (Amo 7:14). That is, thought called to the prophetic office, he did not belong to the prophetic order, and had not been trained in the prophetical colleges; and this. he indicates, was an unusual occurrence (see J. Smith On Prophecy, ch. 9).

1. In a general way, we may indicate that the sphere of action of the prophets was absolutely limited to Israelites, and there is only one case of a prophet going to the heathen to preach among them — that of Jonah sent to Nineveh. He goes, however, to Nineveh to shame the Hebrews by the reception which he meets with there, and acting upon his own nation w as thus even in this case the prophet's ultimate object. Many predictions of the Old Test. concern, indeed, the events of foreign nations, but they are always uttered and written with reference to Israel, and the prophets thought not of publishing them among the heathens themselves. The conversion of the pagans to the worship of the true God was indeed a favorite idea of the prophets; but the Divine Spirit told them that it was not to be effected by their exertions, as it was connected with extensive future changes, which they might not forestall.

That the Lord would send such prophets was promised to the people by Moses, who by a special law (Deu 18:1) secured them authority and safety. As his ordinary servants and teachers, God appointed the priests: the characteristic mark which distinguished the prophets from them was inspiration; and this explains the circumstance that, in times of great moral and religious corruption, when the ordinary means no longer sufficed to reclaim the people, the number of prophets increased. The regular religious instruction of the people was no part of the business of the prophets: their proper duty \ as only to rouse and excite. ‘The contrary — viz. that a part of the regular duty of the prophets was to instruct the people-is often argued from 2Ki 4:23, where it is said that the Shunamitess on the sabbaths and days of new moon used to go to the prophet Elisha; but this passage applies only to the kingdom of Israel, and  admits of no inference with respect to the kingdom of Judah. As regards the latter, there is no proof that prophets held meetings for instruction and edification on sacred days. Their position was here quite different from that of the prophets in the kingdom of Israel. The agency of the prophets in the kingdom of Judah was only of a subsidiary kind. These extraordinary messengers of the Lord only filled there the gaps left by the regular servants of God, the priests and the Levites: the priesthood never became there utterly degenerate, and each lapse was followed by a revival of which the prophets were the vigorous agents. The divine election always vindicated itself, and in the purity of the origin of the priesthood lay the certainty of its continued renewal. On the contrary, the priesthood in the kingdom of Israel had no divine sanction, no promise; it was corrupt in its very source: to reform itself would have been to dissolve itself. The priests there were the mercenary servants of the king, and had a brand upon their own consciences. Hence in the kingdom of Israel the prophets were the regular ministers of God: with their office all stood or fell, and hence they were required to do many things besides what the original conception of the office of a prophet implied-a circumstance from the oversight of which many erroneous notions on the nature of prophecy have sprung. This led to another difference, to which we shall revert below, viz. that in the kingdom of Judah the prophetic office did not, as in Israel, possess a fixed organization and complete construction.

In their labors, as respected their own times, the prophets were strictly bound to the Mosaic law. and not allowed to add to it or to diminish aught from it. What was said in this respect to the whole people (Deu 4:2; Deu 13:1) applied also to them. We find, therefore, prophecy always takes its ground on the Mosaic law to which it refers, from which it derives its sanction, and with which it is fully impressed and saturated. There is no chapter in the prophets in which there are not several references to the law. The business of the prophets was to explain it, to lay it to the hearts of the people, and to preserve vital its spirit. It was, indeed, also their duty to point to future reforms, when the ever-living spirit of the law would break its hitherto imperfect form, and make for itself another: thus Jer 3:16 foretells days when the ark of the covenant shall be no more, and (Jer 31:31) days when a new covenant will be made with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah. But for their own times they never once dreamed of altering any, even the minutest and least essential precept, even as to its form; how much less as to its spirit, which  even the Lord himself declares (Mat 5:18) to be immutable and eternal! The passages which some interpreters have alleged as opposed to sacrifices as instituted by the Mosaic law have been misunderstood; they do not denounce sacrifices generally, but only those of the Canaanites, with whom sacrifice was not even a form of true worship. but opposed to the genuine and spiritual service of God.

2. More specifically, the sixteen prophets whose books are in the Canon have that place of honor because they were endowed with the prophetic gift as well as ordinarily (so far as we know) belonging to the prophetic order . There were hundreds of prophets contemporary with each of these sixteen prophets; and no doubt numberless compositions in sacred poetry and numberless moral exhortations were issued from the several schools, but only sixteen books find their place in the Canon. Why is this? Because these sixteen had what their brother collegians had not — the divine call to the office of prophet, and the divine illumination to enlighten them. It was not sufficient to have been taught and trained in preparation for a future call. Teaching and training served as a preparation only. When the schoolmaster's work was done, then, if the instrument was worthy, God's work began. Moses had an external call at the burning bush (Exodus 3, 2). The Lord called Samuel so that Eli perceived, and Samuel learned, that it was the Lord who called him (1 Samuel 3, 10). Isa 6:8, Jer 1:5, Eze 2:4, Amo 7:15, declare their special mission. Nor was it sufficient for this call to have been made once for all. Each prophetical utterance is the result of a communication of the divine to the human spirit, received either by “vision” (Isa 6:1) or by “the word of the Lord” (Jer 2:1). (See Aids to Faith, essay 3, “On Prophecy.”) What, then, are the characteristics of the sixteen prophets thus called and commissioned, and intrusted with the messages of God to his people?

(1.) They were the national poets of Judaea. We have already shown that music and poetry, chants and hymns, were a main part of the studies of the class from which, generally speaking, they were derived. As is natural, we find not only the songs previously specified, but the rest of their compositions, poetical, or breathing the spirit of poetry. Bishop Lowth “esteems the whole book of Isaiah poetical, a few passages excepted, which, if brought together. would not at most exceed the bulk of five or six chapters,” “half of the book of Jeremiah,” “the greater part of Ezekiel.” The rest of the prophets are mainly poetical, but Haggai is “prosaic,” and Jonah and Daniel are plain prose (Sacred Poetry, lect. 21). The prophetical  style differs from that of books properly called poetical, whose sublimity it all but outvies, only in being less restrained by those external forms which distinguish poetical language from prose, and in introducing more frequently than prose does plays upon words and thoughts. This peculiarity may he explained by the practical tendency of prophetical addresses, which avoid all that is unintelligible, aid studiously introduce what is best calculated for the moment to strike the hearers. The same appears from many other circumstances, e.g. the union of music with prophesying, the demeanor of Saul when among the prophets (1Sa 10:5), Balaam's description of himself (Num 24:3) as a man whose eyes were opened, who saw the vision of the Almighty, and heard the words of God, the established phraseology to denote the inspiring impulse, viz. “the hand of the Lord was strong upon him” (Eze 3:14; comp. Isa 8:11; 2Ki 3:15), etc. (See § 6, below.)

(2.) They were annalists and historians. A great portion of Isaiah, of Jeremiah, of Daniel, of Jonah, of Haggai, is direct or indirect history.

(3.) They were preachers of patriotism; their patriotism being founded on the religious motive. To the subject of the theocracy, the enemy of his nation was the enemy of God, the traitor to the public weal was a traitor to his God: a denunciation of an enemy was a denunciation of a representative of evil; an exhortation in behalf of Jerusalem was an exhortation in behalf of God's kingdom on earth, “the city of our God, the mountain of holiness, beautiful for situation, the joy of the whole earth, the city of the great King” (Psa 48:1-2).

(4.) They were preachers of morals and of spiritual religion. The symbolical teaching of the law had lost much of its effect. Instead of learning the necessity of purity by the legal washings, the majority came to rest in the outward act as in itself sufficient. It was the work, then, of the prophets to hold up before the eves of their countrymen a high and pure morality, not veiled in symbols and acts, but such as none could profess to misunderstand. Thus, in his first chapter, Isaiah contrasts ceremonial observances with spiritual morality: “Your new moons and your appointed feasts my soul hateth: they are a trouble unto me; I am weary to bear them... Wash ye, make you clean; put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil; learn to do well; seek judgment; relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow” (Isa 1:14-17). He proceeds to denounce God's judgments on the oppression and  covetousness of the rulers, the pride of the women (ch. 3), on grasping, profligacy, iniquity, injustice (ch. 5), and so on throughout. The system of morals put forward by the prophets, if not higher or sterner or purer than that of the law, is more plainly declared, and with greater, because now more needed, vehemence of diction. “Magna fides et grandis aldacia prophetarum,” says St. Jerome (In Ezekiel). This was their general characteristic, but that gifts and graces might be dissevered is proved by the cases of Balaam, Jonah, Caiaphas, and the disobedient prophet of Judah.

(5.) They were extraordinary, but yet authorized, exponents of the law. As an instance of this we may take Isaiah's description of a true fast (Isa 58:3-7); Ezekiel's explanation of the sins of the father being visited on the children (ch. 18); Micah's preference of “doing justly, loving mercy, and walking humbly with God,” to “thousands of rams and ten thousands of rivers of oil” (Mic 6:6-8). In these, as in other similar cases (comp. Hos 6:6; Amo 5:21), it was the task of the prophets to restore the balance which had been overthrown by the Jews and their teachers dwelling on one side or oil the outer covering of a truth or of a duty, and leaving the other side or the inner meaning out of sight.

(6.) They held, as we have shown above, a pastoral or quasi-pastoral office.

(7.) They were a political power in the state. Strong in the safeguard of their religious character, they were able to serve as a counterpoise to the royal authority when wielded even by an Ahab.

(8.) But the prophets were something more than national poets and annalists, preachers of patriotism, moral teachers, exponents of the law, pastors, and politicians. We have not yet touched upon their most essential characteristic, which is that they were instruments of revealing God's will to man; as in other ways, so, specially, by predicting future events, and, in particular, by foretelling the incarnation of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the redemption effected by him. There are two chief ways of exhibiting this fact — one is suitable when discoursing with Christians, the other when arguing with unbelievers. To the Christian it is enough to show that the truth of the New Testament and the truthfulness of its authors, and of the Lord himself, are bound up with the truth of the existence of this predictive element in the prophets. To the unbeliever it is necessary to show that facts have verified their predictions.

(a.) In Matthew's Gospel, the first chapter, we find a quotation from the prophet Isaiah, “Behold a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel;” and, at the same time, we find a statement that the birth of Christ took place as it did “that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet,” in those words (Isa 1:22-23). This means that the prophecy was the declaration of God's purpose, and that the circumstances of the birth of' Christ were the fulfilment of that purpose. Then, either the predictive element exists in the book of the prophet Isaiah, or the authority of the evangelist Matthew must be given up. The same evangelist testifies to the same prophet having “spoken of” John the Baptist (Joh 3:3) in words which he quotes from Isa 40:3. He says (Joh 4:13-15) that Jesus came and dwelt in Capernaum “that” other words “spoken by” the same prophet (Joh 9:1) “might be fulfilled.” He says (Joh 8:17) that Jesus did certain acts “that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet” (Isa 53:4). He says (Joh 12:17) that Jesus acted in a particular manner “that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet” in words quoted from Isa 42:1. Then, if we believe Matthew, we must believe that in the pages of the prophet Isaiah there was predicted that, which Jesus some seven hundred years afterwards fulfilled. This conclusion cannot be escaped by pressing the words ἵνα πληρωθῆ , for if they do not mean that certain things were done in order that the divine predestination might be accomplished, which predestination was already declared by the prophet, they must mean that Jesus Christ knowingly moulded his acts so as to be in accordance with what was said in an ancient book which in reality had no reference to him, a thing which is entirely at variance with the character drawn of him by Matthew. and which would make him a conscious impostor, inasmuch as he himself appeals to the prophecies. Further, it would imply (as in Mat 1:22) that God himself contrived certain events (as those connected with the birth of Christ), not in order that they might be in accordance with his will, but in order that they might be agreeable to the declarations of a certain book- than which nothing could well be more absurd.

But further, we have not only the evidence of the evangelist; we have the evidence of the Lord himself. He declares (Mat 13:14) that in the Jews of his age “is fulfilled the prophecy of Esaias, which saith —” (Isa 6:9). He says (Mat 15:7), “Esaias well prophesied of them” (Isa 19:13). Then, if we believe our Lord's sayings and the  record of them, we must believe in prediction as existing in the prophet Isaiah. This prophet, who is cited between fifty and sixty times, may be taken as a sample; but the same argument might be brought forward with respect to Jeremiah (Mat 2:18; Heb 8:8), Daniel (Mat 24:15), Hosea (Mat 2:15; Rom 9:25), Joel (Act 2:17), Amos (Act 7:42; Act 15:16), Jonah (Mat 12:40), Micah (Mat 12:7), Habakkuk (Act 13:41), Haggai (Heb 12:26), Zechariah (Mat 21:5; Mar 14:27; Joh 19:37), Malachi (Mat 11:10; Mar 1:2; Luk 7:27). With this evidence for so many of the prophets, it would be idle to cavil with respect to Ezekiel, Obadiah, Nahum, Zephaniah; the more so as “the prophets” are frequently spoken of together (Mat 2:23; Act 13:40; Act 15:15) as authoritative. The Psalms are quoted no less than seventy times, and very frequently as being predictive.

(b.) The argument with the unbeliever does not admit of being brought to an issue so concisely. Here it is necessary

[1] to point out the existence of certain declarations as to future events, the probability of which was not discernible by human sagacity at the time that, the declarations were made;

[2] to show that certain events did afterwards take place corresponding with those declarations;

[3] to show that a chance coincidence is not an adequate hypothesis on which to account for that correspondence. SEE PROPHECY

Dr. Davidson pronounces it as “now commonly admitted that the essential part of Biblical prophecy does not lie in predicting contingent events, but in divining the essentially religious in the course of history... In no prophecy can it be shown that the literal predicting of distant historical events is contained... . In conformity with the analogy of prophecy generally, special predictions concerning Christ do not appear in the Old Testament.” Dr. Davidson must mean that this is “now commonly admitted” by writers like himself, who, following Eichhorn, resolve “the prophet's delineations of the future” into, “in essence, nothing but forebodings — efforts of the spiritual eye to bring up before itself the distinct form of the future. The prevision of the prophet is intensified presentiment.” Of course, if the powers of the prophets were simply “forebodings” and “presentiments” of the human spirit in “its preconscious region,” they could not do more than  make indefinite guesses about the future. But this is not the Jewish nor the Christian theory of prophecy. See Basil (In Esai. c. iii), Chrysostom (Hom. 22 t. v, 137, ed. 1612), Clem. Alex. (Strom. lib. ii), Eusebius (Dem. Evang. v, 132, ed. 1544), and Justin Martyr (Dial. cum Tryph. p. 224, ed. 1636). See Suicer, s.v. προφήτης.

The view commonly taken of the prophets is, indeed, that they were mere predictors of future events; but this view is one-sided and too narrow; though, on the other hand, we must beware of expanding too much the acceptation of the term prophet. Not to mention those who, like Hendewerk, in the introduction to his Commentary on the Prophet Isaiah, identify the notion of a prophet with that of an honest and pious man, vet we see from the above considerations that the conception of those is likewise too wide who place the essential feature of a prophet in his divine inspiration. That this does not meet the whole subject appears from Num 12:6 sq.. where Moses, who enjoyed divine inspiration in its highest grade, is represented as differing from those called prophets in a stricter sense, and as standing in contrast with them. Divine inspiration is only the general basis of the prophetic office, to which other elements must be added, especially the gift of that inspiration in a formal manner and for a specific purpose. This will become still more clear from the considerations adduced under the next heads.

IV. Test of the Prophetic Character. — As Moses had foretold, a host of false prophets arose in later times among the people, who promised prosperity without repentance, and preached the Gospel without the law. The writings of the prophets are full of complaints of the mischief done by these impostors. Jeremiah significantly calls them “prophets of the deceit of their own heart” — i.e. men who followed the suggestions of their own fancy in prophesying (Jeremiah 23, 26 comp. Jeremiah 23, 26:16, and ch. 14:14). All their practices prove the great influence which true prophetism had acquired among the people of Israel. But how were the people to distinguish between true and false prophets? This is decided partly by positive or negative criteria, and partly by certain general marks.

1. In the law concerning prophets (Deu 18:20; comp. 13:7-9) the following enactments are contained:

(1.) The prophet who speaks in the name of other gods — i.e. professes to have his revelations from a god different from Jehovah — is to be  considered as false, and to be punished capitally; and this even though his predictions should come to pass.

(2.) The same punishment is to be inflicted on him who speaks in the name of the true God, but whose predictions are not accomplished.

These enactments established a peculiar right of the prophets. He who prophesied in the name of the true God was, even when he foretold calamity, entitled to be tolerated, until it happened that a prediction of his failed of accomplishment. He might then be imprisoned, but could not be put to death, as instanced in Jer 26:8-16, who is apprehended and arraigned, but acquitted: “Then, said the princes and the people unto the priests and the prophets, This man is not worthy to die, for he has spoken to us in the name of the Lord our God.” Ahab is by false prophets encouraged to attack Ramoth-gilead, but Micaiah prophesied him no good; on which the king becomes angry, and orders the prophet to be confined (1Ki 22:1-27): “Take Micaiah and put him in prison, and feed him with bread of affliction, and with water of affliction, until I come in peace.” Micaiah answers (1Ki 22:28), “If thou return at all in peace, the Lord has not spoken by me.” Until the safe return of the king, Micaiah is to remain in prison; after that, he shall be put to death. The prophet agrees to it, and the king goes up to Ramoth-gilead, but is slain in the battle.

(3.) From the above two criteria of a true prophet flows the third, that his addresses must be in strict accordance with the law. Whoever departs from it cannot be a true prophet, for it is impossible that the Lord should contradict himself.

(4.) In the above is also founded the fourth criterion that a true prophet must not promise prosperity without repentance; and that he is a false prophet, “of the deceit of his own heart,” who does not reprove the sins of the people, and who does not inculcate on them the doctrines of divine justice and retribution.

2. In addition to these negative criteria there were positive ones to procure authority to true prophets. First of all, it must be assumed that the prophets themselves received, along with the divine revelations, assurance that these were really divine. Any true communion with the Holy Spirit affords the assurance of its divine nature, and the prophets could, therefore, satisfy themselves of their divine mission. There was nothing to mislead and delude them in this respect, for temporal goods were not bestowed upon  them with the gift of prophesying. Their own native disposition was often much averse to this calling, and could be only conquered by the Lord forcibly impelling them, as appears from Jer 20:8-9 : “Since I spake, the word of the Lord was made a reproach unto me, and a derision daily. Then I said, I will not make mention of him, nor speak any more in his name, but his word was in mine heart as a burning fire shut up in my bones, and I was weary with forbearing, and I could not stay.” Now, when the prophets themselves were convinced of their divine mission, they could in various ways prove it to others whom they were called on to enlighten.

(1.) To those who had any sense of truth, the Spirit of God gave evidence that the prophecies were divinely inspired. This testimonium Spiritus Sancti is the chief argument for the reality of a divine revelation; and he who is susceptible of it does not, indeed, disregard the other proofs suiting the wants of unimproved minds, but lays less stress on them.

(2.) The prophets themselves utter their firm conviction that they act and speak by divine authority, not of their own accord (comp. the often recurring phrase גְאֻם יְהָֹוה, “a prophecy of Jehovah,” Jer 26:12, etc.). Their pious life bore testimony to their being worthy of a nearer communion with God, and defended them from the suspicion of intentional deception; their sobriety of mind distinguished them from all fanatics, and defended them from the suspicion of self-delusion; their fortitude in suffering for truth proved that they had their commission from no human authority.

(3.) Part of the predictions of the prophets referred to proximate events, and their accomplishment was divine evidence of their divine origin. Whoever had been once favored with such a testimonial, his authority was established for his whole life, as instanced in Samuel. Of him it is said (1Sa 3:19): “The Lord was with him, and let none of his words fall to the ground (i.e. fulfilled them); and all Israel knew (from this) that Samuel was established to be a prophet of the Lord.” Of the divine mission of Isaiah no doubt could be entertained after, for instance. his prophecies of the overthrow of Sennacherib before Jerusalem had been fulfilled. The credentials of the divine mission of Ezekiel were certified when his prediction was accomplished, that Zedekiah should be brought to Babylon, but should not see it, for the king was made prisoner and blinded (Eze 12:12-13); they were further confirmed by the fulfilment of his prediction concerning the destruction of the city (ch. 24). Jeremiah's claims  were authenticated by the fulfilment of his prediction that Shallum, the son of Josiah, king of Judah, should die in his prison, and see his native country no more (Jer 22:11-12).

(4.) Sometimes the divine mission of the prophets was also proved by miracles; but this occurred only at important crises, when the existence of the kingdom of Israel was in jeopardy, as in the age of Elijah and Elisha. Miracles are mentioned as criteria of true prophets (Deu 13:2), still with this caution, that they should not be trusted alone, but that the people should inquire whether the negative criteria were extant.

(5.) Those prophets whose divine commission had been sufficiently proved bore testimony to the divine mission of others. It has been observed above that there was a certain gradation among the prophets; the principals of the colleges of prophets procured authority to the “sons” of prophets. Thus the deeds of Elijah and Elisha at the same time authenticated the hundreds of prophets whose superiors they were. Concerning the relation of the true prophets to each other, the passage 2Ki 2:9 is remarkable; Elisha says to Elijah, “I pray thee, let a double portion of thy spirit be upon me.” Here Elisha, as the first-born of Elijah in a spiritual sense, and standing to him in the same relation as Joshua to Moses, asks for a double portion of his spiritual inheritance, alluding to the law concerning the hereditary right of the lawfully begotten first-born son (Deu 21:17). This case supposes that other prophets also of the kingdom of Israel took portions of the fulness of the spirit of Elijah. It is plain, then, that only a few prophets stood in immediate communion with God, while that of the remaining was formed by mediation. The latter were spiritually incorporated in the former, and, on the ground of this relation, actions performed by Elisha, or through the instrumentality of one of his pupils, are at once ascribed to Elijah, e.g. the anointing of Hazael to be king over Syria (1Ki 19:15; comp. 2Ki 8:13); the anointing of Jehu to be king over Israel (1Ki 19:16; comp. 2Ki 9:1 sq.); the writing of the letter to Joram, etc. Thus in a certain sense it may be affirmed that Elijah was in his time the only prophet of the kingdom of Israel. Similarly of Moses it is recorded, during his passage through the desert, that a portion of his spirit was conveyed to the seventy elders (Num 11:17). The history of the Christian Church itself offers analogies; look, e.g. at the relation of the second-class Reformers to Luther and Calvin.

(6.) It hardly needs to be mentioned that before a man could be a prophet he must be converted. This clearly appears in the case of Isaiah, “whose iniquity was taken away and his sin purged” previous to his entering on his mission to the people of the covenant.

For a single momentary inspiration, however, the mere beginning of spiritual life sufficed, as instanced in Balaam and Saul.

3. As to prophecy in its circumscribed sense, or the foretelling of future events by the prophets, some expositors would explain all predictions of special events; while others assert that no prediction contains anything but general promises or threatenings, and that the prophets knew nothing of the particular manner in which their predictions might be realized. Both these classes deviate from the correct view of prophecy: the former often resort to the most arbitrary interpretations, and the latter are opposed by a mass of facts against which they are unable successfully to contend: e.g. when Ezekiel foretells (Eze 12:12) that Zedekiah would try to break through the walls of the city and to escape, but that he would be seized, blinded, and taken to Babylon. The frailty of the people, under the Old lest., required external evidence of the real connection of the prophets with God, and the predictions of particular forthcoming events were to them σημεῖα, signs. These were the more indispensable to them, because the ancients generally, and the Orientals in particular, showed the greatest tendency towards the exploration of futurity, which tended to foster superstition and forward idolatry. All other methods of knowing future events by necromancy, conjuration, passing through the fire. etc., having been strictly forbidden (Deu 18:10-11), it might be expected that the deep-rooted craving for the knowledge of forthcoming events would be gratified in some other and nobler manner. The success of a prophet depended on the gift of special knowledge of futurity; this, it is true, was granted comparatively to only few, but in the authority thus obtained all those shared who were likewise invested with the prophetic character. It was the seal impressed on true prophecy, as opposed to false. From 1Sa 9:6, it appears that, to inspire uncultivated minds with the sense of divine truths, the prophets stooped occasionally to disclose things of common life, using this as the means to reach a higher mark. On the same footing with definite predictions stand miracles and tokens, which prophets of the highest rank, as Elijah and Isaiah, volunteered or granted. These also were requisite to confirm the feeble faith of the people; but Ewald justly remarks that with the true prophets they never appear as the  chief point; they only assist and accompany prophecy, but are not its object, not the truth itself; which supersedes them as soon as it gains sufficient strength and influence.

Some interpreters, misunderstanding passages like Jer 18:8; Jer 26:13, hare asserted, with Dr. Koster, (p. 226 sq.), that all prophecies were conditional; and have even maintained that their revocability distinguished the true predictions (Weissagung) from soothsaying (Wahrsagung). But beyond all doubt, when the prophet denounces the divine judgments, he proceeds on the assumption that the people will not repent, an assumption which lie knows from God to be true. Were the people to repent, the prediction would fail; but because they will not, it is uttered absolutely. It does not follow, however, that the prophet's warnings and exhortations are useless. These serve “for a witness against them;” and besides, amid the ruin of the mass, individuals might be saved. Viewing prophecies as conditional predictions nullifies them. The Mosaic criterion (Deu 18:22), that he was a false prophet who predicted “things which followed not nor came to pass,” would then be of no value, since recourse might always be had to the excuse that the case had been altered by the fulfilment of the condition. The fear of introducing fatalism, if the prophecies are not taken in a conditional sense, is unfounded; for God's omniscience, his foreknowledge, does not establish fatalism, and from divine omniscience simply is the prescience of the prophets to be derived. The prophets feel themselves so closely united to God that the words of Jehovah are given as their own, and that to them is often ascribed what God does, as slaying and reviving (Hos 6:5), rooting out nations and restoring them (Jer 1:10; Jer 18:7; Eze 32:18; Eze 43:3); which proves their own consciousness to have been entirely absorbed into that of God.

V. The Prophetic State of Inspiration. — WE learn from Holy Scripture that it was by the agency of the Spirit of God that the prophets received the divine communication. Thus, on the appointment of the seventy elders, “‘The Lord said, I will take of the Spirit which is upon thee, and will put it upon them... And the Lord... took of the Spirit that was upon him, and gave it unto the seventy elders; and it came to pass that when the Spirit rested upon them, they prophesied and did not cease... And Moses said Would God that all the Lord's people were prophets, and that the Lord would put his Spirit upon them” (Num 11:17; Num 11:25; Num 11:29). Here we see that what made the seventy prophesy was their being endued with the  Lord's Spirit by the Lord himself. So it is the Spirit of the Lord which made Saul (1Sa 10:6) and his messengers (1Sa 19:20) prophesy. Thus Peter assures us that “prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake, moved (φερόμενοι) by the Holy Ghost” (2Pe 1:21), while false prophets are described as those “who speak a vision of their own heart, and not out of the mouth of the Lord” (Jer 23:16), “who prophesy out of their own hearts,... who follow their own spirit, and have seen nothing” (Eze 13:2-3). Hence the emphatic declarations of the Great Prophet of the Church that he did not speak of himself (Joh 7:17, etc.). The prophet held an intermediate position in communication between God and man. God communicated with him by his Spirit, and he, having received this communication, was “the spokesman” of God to man (comp. Exo 7:1; Exo 4:16). But the means by which the Divine Spirit communicated with the human spirit, and the conditions of the human spirit under which the divine communications were received, have not been clearly declared to us. They are, however, indicated. On the occasion of the sedition of Miriam and Aaron, we read, “And the Lord said, Hear now my words: It there be a prophet among you, I the Lord will make myself known unto him in a vision, and will speak unto him in a dream. My servant Moses is not so, who is faithful in all mine house: with him will I speak mouth to mouth, even apparently, and not in dark speeches, and the similitude of the Lord shall he behold” (Num 12:6-8). Here we have an exhaustive division of the different ways in which the revelations of God are made to man: 1. Direct declaration and manifestation — “I will speak mouth to mouth, apparently, and the similitude of the Lord shall he behold;” 2. Vision; 3. Dream. It is indicated that, at least at this time, the vision and the dream were the special means of conveying a revelation to a prophet, while the higher form of direct declaration and manifestation was reserved for the more highly favored Moses. Joel's prophecy appears to make the same division, “Your old men shall dream dreams, and your young men shall see visions,” these being the two methods in which the promise, “your sons and your daughters shall prophesy,” is to be carried out (Joe 2:28). Of Daniel we are told that “he had understanding in all visions and dreams” (Dan 1:17). Can these phases of the prophetic state be distinguished from each other? and in what did they consist?

According to the theory of Philo and the Alexandrian school, the prophet was in a state of entire unconsciousness at the time that he was under the  influence of divine inspiration, “for the human understanding,” says Philo, “takes its departure on the arrival of the Divine Spirit, and on the removal of the latter again returns to its home, for the mortal must not dwell with the immortal” (Quis Rer. Div. Hoer. 1, 511). Balaam is described by him as an unconscious instrument through whom God spoke (De Vita Mosis, lib. 1, vol. 2, p. 124). Josephus makes Balaam excuse himself to Balak on the same principle: “When the Spirit of God seizes us, it utters whatsoever sounds and words it pleases, without any knowledge on our part,... for when it has come into us, there is nothing in us which remains our own” (Ant. 4:6, 5). This theory identifies Jewish prophecy in all essential points with the heathen μαντική, or divination, as distinct from προφητεία, or interpretation. Montanism adopted the same view: “Defendimus, in causa novae propheti e, gratiae exstasin, id est amentiam, convenire. In spiritu enim homo constitutus, praesertim cum gloriam Dei conspicit, vel cum per ipsum Deus loquitur, necesse est excidat sensu, obumbratus scilicet virtute divina; de quo inter nos et Psychicos (catholicos) questio est” (Tertullian, Adv. Marcion. 4:22). According to the belief, then, of the heathen, of the Alexandrian Jews, and of the Montanists, the vision of the prophet was seen while he was in a state of ecstatic unconsciousness, and the enunciation of the vision was made by him in the same state. The fathers of the Church opposed the Montanist theory with great unanimity. In Eusebius's History (v, 17) we read that Miltiades wrote a book Περὶ τοῦ μὴ δεῖν προφήτην ἐν ἐκστάσει λαλεῖν. St. Jerome writes: “Non loquitur propheta ἐν ἐκστάσει, ut Montanus et Prisca Maximillaque delirant, sed quod prophetat liber est visionis intelligentis universa quae loquitur” (Prolog. in Nahum). Again: ‘ Neque vero ut Montanus cum insanis fenminis somniat, prophetae in ecstasi locuti sunt ut nescierint quid loquerentur, et cum alios erudirent ipsi ignorarent quid dicerent” (Prolog. in Esai.). Origen (Contr. Celsum, 7:4) and St. Basil (Commentary on Isaiah, Prooem. c. 5) contrast the prophet with the soothsayer, on the ground of the latter being deprived of his senses. St. Chrysostom draws out the contrast: Τοῦτο γὰρ μάντεως ἴδιον, τὸ ἐξεστηκέναι, τὸ ἀνάγχην ὑπομένειν, τὸ ὠθεῖσθαι, τὸ ἕλκεσθαι, τὸ σύρεσθαι éσπερ μαινόμενον. ῾Ο δὲ προφήτης οὐχ οὕτως, ἀλλὰ μετὰ διανοίας νηφούσης καὶ σωφρονούσης καταστάσεως, καὶ εἰδώς ἃ φθέγγεται, φησὶν ἃπαντα· éστε καὶ πρὸ τῆς ἐκβάσεως κἀντεῦθην γνώριζε τὸν μάντιν καὶ τὸν προφήτην (Hom. 29 in Epist. ad Corinth.). At the same time, while drawing the distinction sharply between heathen soothsaying and Montanist prophesying in the one side, and Hebrew prophecy on the  other, the fathers use expressions so strong as almost to represent the prophets to be passive instruments acted on by the Spirit of God. Thus it is that they describe them as musical instruments — the pipe (Athenagoras, Leg. pro Christianis, c. ix; Clem. Alex. Cohort. ad Gent. c. i), the lyre (Justin Martyr, Cohort. ad Graec. c. viii; Ephraem Syr. Rhythm. 29; Chrysostom, Ad Pop. Antioch. Haom. i, t. ii), or as pens (St. Greg. Magn. Praef: in Aaor. in Job). Expressions such as these (many of which are quoted by Dr. Lee, On Inspiration, Appendix () must be set against the passages which were directed against the Montanists. Nevertheless, there is a very appreciable difference between their view and that of Tertullian and Philo. Which is most in accordance with the indications of Holy Scripture?

It does not seem possible to draw any very precise distinction between the prophetic “dream” and the prophetic “vision.” In the case of Abraham (Gen 15:1) and of Daniel (Dan 7:1), they seem to melt into each other. In both the external senses are at rest, reflection is quiescent, and intuition energizes. The action of the ordinary faculties is suspended in the one case by natural, in the other by supernatural or extraordinary causes (see Lee, Inspiration, p. 173). The state into which the prophet was, occasionally, at least, thrown by the ecstasy, or vision, or trance, is described poetically in the book of Job (Job 4:13-16; Job 33:15), and more plainly in the book of Daniel. In the case of Daniel, we find first a deep sleep (Dan 8:18; Dan 10:9) accompanied by terror (Dan 8:17; Dan 10:8). Then he is raised upright (Dan 8:18) on his hands and knees, and then on his feet (Dan 10:10-11). He then receives the divine revelation (Dan 8:19; Dan 10:12). After this he falls to the ground in a swoon (Dan 10:15; Dan 10:17); he is faint, sick, and astonished (Dan 8:27). Here, then, is an instance of the ecstatic state; nor is it confined to the Old Test., though we do not find it in the New Test accompanied by such violent effects upon the body. At the Transfiguration, the disciples fell on their face, being overpowered by the divine glory, and were restored, like Daniel, by the touch of Jesus' hand. Peter fell into a trance (ἔκστασις) before he received his vision, instructing him as to the admission of the Gentiles (Act 10:10; Act 11:5). Paul was in a trance (ἐν ἐκστασει) when he was commanded to devote himself to the conversion of the Gentiles (Act 22:17), and when he was caught up into the third heaven (2Co 12:1). John was probably in the same state (ἐν πνεύματι) when he received the message to the seven churches (Rev 1:10). The prophetic trance, then, must be acknowledged as a scriptural account  of the state in which the prophets and other inspired persons, sometimes, at least, received divine revelations. It would seem, in such particular cases, to have been of the following nature:

(1.) The bodily senses were closed to external objects as in deep sleep;

(2.) The reflective and discursive faculty was still and inactive;

(3.) The spiritual faculty (πνεῦμα) was awakened to the highest state of energy.

Hence it is that revelations in trances are described by the prophets as “seen” or “heard” by them, for the spiritual faculty energizes by immediate perception on the part of the inward sense, not by inference and thought. Thus Isaiah “saw the Lord sitting” (Isa 6:1). Zechariah “lifted up his eyes and saw” (Zec 2:1); “the word of the Lord which Micah saw” (Mic 1:1); “the wonder which Habakkuk did see” (Hab 1:1). “Peter saw heaven opened... and there came a voice to him” (Act 10:11). Paul was “in a trance, and saw him saying” (Act 22:18). John “heard a great voice... and saw seven golden candlesticks” (Rev 1:12). Hence it is, too, that the prophets' visions are unconnected and fragmentary, inasmuch as they are not the subject of the reflective, but of the perceptive faculty. They described what they saw and heard, not what they had themselves thought out and systematized. Hence, too, succession in time is disregarded or unnoticed. The subjects of the vision being, to the prophets' sight, in juxtaposition or enfolding each other, some in the foreground, some in the background, are necessarily abstracted from the relations of time. Hence, too, the imagery with which the prophetic writings are colored, and the dramatic cast in which they are moulded; these peculiarities resulting, as we have already said, in a necessary obscurity and difficulty of interpretation.

But though it must be allowed that Scripture language seems to point out the state of dream and of trance, or ecstasy, as a condition in which the human instrument occasionally received the divine communications, it does not follow that all the prophetic revelations were thus made. We must acknowledge the state of trance in such passages as Isaiah 6 (called ordinarily the vision of Isaiah), as Ezekiel 1 (called the vision of Ezekiel), as Daniel 7, 8, 10, 11, 12 (called the visions of Daniel), as Zechariah 1, 4, 5, 6 (called the visions of Zechariah), as Acts 10 (called the vision of St. Peter), as 2 Corinthians 12 (called the vision of St. Paul), and similar instances, which are indicated by the language used. But it does not seem  true to say, with Hengstenberg, that “the difference between these prophecies and the rest is a vanishing one, and if we but possess the power and the ability to look more deeply into them, the marks of the vision may be discerned” (Christology, 4:417). This view is advocated also by Velthusen (De Optica Rermum Futuraruum Descriptione), Jahn (Einleit. in die gottlichen Biicher des A. B.), Tholuck (Die Propheten und ihre Weissagungen). St. Paul distinguishes “revelations” from “visions” (2Co 12:1). In the books of Moses “speaking mouth to mouth” is contrasted with “visions and dreams” (Num 12:8). It is true that in this last-quoted passage “visions and dreams” alone appear to be attributed to the prophet, while “speaking mouth to mouth” is reserved for Moses.

But when Moses was dead, the cause of this difference would cease. During the era of prophecy there were none nearer to God, none with whom he would. we may suppose, communicate more openly than the prophets. We should expect, then, that they would be the recipients, not only of visions in the state of dream or ecstasy, but also of the direct revelations which are called speaking mouth to mouth. The greater part of the divine communications we may suppose to have been thus made to the prophets in their waking and ordinary state, while the visions were exhibited to them either in the state of sleep or in the state of ecstasy. “The more ordinary mode through which the word of the Lord, as far as we can trace, came, was through a divine impulse given to the prophet's own thoughts” (Stanley, p. 426). Hence it follows that. while the fathers in their opposition to Montanism and μανία were pushed somewhat too far in their denial of the ecstatic state, they were yet perfectly exact in their descriptions of the condition under which the greater part of the prophetic revelations were received and promulgated. No truer description has been given of them than that of Hippolytus and that of St. Basil: Οὐ γὰρ ἐξ ἰδίας δυνάμεως ἐφθέγγοντο, οὐδὲ ἃπερ αὐτοὶ ἐβούλοντο ταῦτα ἐκήρυττον, ἀλλὰ πρῶτον μὲν διὰ τοῦ Λόγου ἐσοφίζοντο ὀρθῶς, ἔπειτα δἰ ὁραμάτων προεδιδάσκοντο τὰ μέλλοντα καλῶς· ειθ᾿ οὕτω πεπεισμένοι ἔλεγον ταῦτα ἃπερ αὐτοῖς ην μόνοις ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀποκεκρυμμένα (Hippol. De Antichristo, c. ii). Πῶς προεφήτευον α‰ καθαραὶ καὶ διαυγεῖς ψυχαί; οἱονεὶ κάτοπτρα γινόμενα τῆς θείας ἐνεργείας, τὴν ἔμφασιν ῥανὴν καὶ ἀσύγχυτον καὶ οὐδὲν ἐπιθολουμένην ἐκ τῶν παθῶν τῆς ταρκὸς ἐπεδείκνυντο· πᾶσι μὲν γὰρ πάρεστι τὸ ῞Αγιον Πνεῦμα (St. Basil, Conm. in Esti. Procem.). The state of ecstasy, though ranking high above the ordinary sensual existence, is still not the highest, as appears from  Numbers 12, and the example of Christ, whom we never find in an ecstatical state. To the prophets, however, it was indispensable, on account of the frailty of themselves and the people. The forcible working upon them by the Spirit of God would not have been required, if their general life had already been altogether holy; for which reason we also find ecstasy to manifest itself the stronger the more the general life was ungodly; as, for instance, in Balaam, when the Spirit of God came upon him (Num 24:4; Num 24:16), and in Saul, who throws himself on the ground, tearing his clothes from his body. With a prophet whose spiritual attainments were those of an Isaiah, such results are not to be expected. As regards the people, their spiritual obtuseness must be considered as very great to have rendered necessary such vehement excitations as the addresses of the prophets caused.

Had the prophets a full knowledge of that which they predicted? It follows from what we have already said that in many cases they had not, and could not have. They were the “spokesmen” of God (Exo 7:1), the “mouth” by which his words were uttered, or they were enabled to view, and empowered to describe, pictures presented to their spiritual intuition; but there are no grounds for believing that, contemporaneously with this miracle, there was wrought another miracle enlarging the understanding of the prophet so as to grasp the whole of the divine counsels which he was gazing into, or which he was the instrument of enunciating. We should not expect it beforehand; and we have the testimony of the prophets themselves (Dan 12:8; Zec 4:5), and of St. Peter (1Pe 1:10) to the fact that they frequently did not fully comprehend them.

The passage in Peter's epistle is very instructive: “Of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you: searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow. Unto whom it was revealed, that not unto themselves, but unto us they did minister the things which are now reported unto you by them that have preached the gospel unto you with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven.” It is here declared (1) that the Holy Ghost through the prophet, or the prophet by the Holy Ghost, testified of Christ's sufferings and ascension, and of the institution of Christianity; (2) that after having uttered predictions on those subjects, the minds of the prophets occupied themselves in searching into the full meaning of the words that they had  uttered; (3) that they were then divinely informed that their predictions were not to find their completion until the last days, and that they themselves were instruments for declaring good things that should come not to their own but to a future generation. This is exactly what the prophetic state above described would lead us to expect. While the divine communication is received, the human instrument is simply passive. He sees or hears by his spiritual intuition or perception, and declares what he has seen or heard. Then the reflective faculty, which had been quiescent but never so overpowered as to be destroyed, awakens to the consideration of the message or vision received, and it strives earnestly to understand it, and more especially to look at the revelation as in instead of out of time. The result is a comparative failure, but this failure is softened by the divine intimation that the time is not vet. The two questions. What did the prophet understand by this prophecy? and What was the meaning of this prophecy? are somewhat different in the ultimate estimation of every one who believes that “the Holy Ghost spake by the prophets,” or who considers it possible that he did so speak. It is on this principle rather than as it is explained by Dr. M'Caul (Aids to Faith) that the prophecy of Hos 11:1 is to be interpreted. Hosea, we may well believe, understood in his own words no more than a reference to the historical fact that the children of Israel came out of Egypt. But Hosea was not the author of the prophecy — he was the instrument by which it was promulgated. The Holy Spirit Intended something further, and what this something was he informs us by the evangelist Matthew (Mat 2:15).

The two facts of the Israelites being led out of Egypt and of Christ's return from Egypt appear to Prof. Jowett so distinct that the reference by Matthew to the prophet is to him inexplicable except on the hypothesis of a mistake on the part of the evangelist (see Jowett, Essay on the Interpretation of Scripture). A deeper insight into Scripture shows that “the Jewish people themselves, their history, their ritual, their government, all present one grand prophecy of the future Redeemer” (Lee, p. 107). Consequently “Israel” is one of the forms naturally taken in the prophetic vision by the idea “Messiah.” It does not follow from the above, however, that the prophets had no intelligent comprehension of their ordinary vaticinators. These, so far at least as the primary reference is concerned, were plain to their own mind, although the future and full significance was of necessity dim and imperfectly apprehended. Time, in the order of providence, is God's own best expounder of prophecy.  While the prophets were under the influence of inspiration, the scenery might produce deep, absorbing, or elevated emotion, which would sometimes greatly affect their physical system (Gen 15:12; Num 24:16; Dan 10:8; Eze 1:28; Rev 1:17). Still they had an intelligent consciousness of what they were describing, they retained their distinct mental faculties; they did not utter frantic ravings like the prophets of Baal. Undoubtedly, as the prophecies are a revelation from God, the prophets well understood, at least in a general way, the predictions they uttered; but they did not necessarily testify or know anything respecting the time when the events predicted should happen (Dan 12:8-9; 1Pe 1:10-12). Occasionally even this was revealed to them (Jer 2:10). The symbols which were often exhibited to the prophets they described as they came before them in succession, and in some instances they were subsequently favored with a more full and particular explanation of the scenery which passed before them (Eze 37:11). Though the prophetic office was generally permanent, it need not, and should not, be supposed that at all times and on all occasions the prophets spoke and acted under the special aid and guidance of the Holy Spirit. So much was not true of even the apostles of Christ. It is enough that at all due times, and in appropriate circumstances, they were specially guided and aided by the Spirit of God. Nor is it necessary to assume that all the prophets were endowed with miraculous powers. Such was not the case even with Christian prophets (1Co 12:10). SEE INSPIRATION

VI. Form and Peculiarities of the Prophetic Utterances. —

1. Verbal Modes of Delivery. — Usually the prophets promulgated their visions and announcements in public places before the congregated people. Still some portions of the prophetic books, as the entire second part of Isaiah and the description of the new Temple (Ezekiel 40-48), probably were never communicated orally. In other cases the prophetic addresses first delivered orally were next, when committed to writing, revised and improved. Especially the books of the lesser prophets consist, for the greater part, not of separate predictions, independent of each other, but form, as they now are, a whole — that is, they give the quintessence of the prophetic labors of their authors. In this case it is certain that the authors themselves caused the collection to be made. But it is so likewise in some cases where their books really consist of single declarations, and in others it is at least highly probable. Further particulars concerning the manner in  which prophetic rolls were collected and published we have only respecting Jeremiah, who, being in prison, called Baruch “to write from his mouth his predictions, and to read them in the ears of the people” (Jeremiah 38:41). There is evidence that the later prophets sedulously read the writings of the earlier, and that a prophetic canon existed before the present was formed.

The predictions of Jeremiah throughout rest on the writings of earlier prophets, as Kiiper has established (in his feremias Librorum Sacrorum Interpres atque Vindlex, Berlin, 1837). Zechariah explicitly alludes to writings of former prophets; “to the words which the Lord has spoken to earlier prophets, when Jerusalem was inhabited and in prosperity” (Zec 1:4; Zec 7:7; Zec 7:12). In all probability we have complete those predictions which were committed to writing; at least the proofs which Ewald gives (p. 43 sq.) for his opinion, of prophecies having been lost, do not stand trial. The words “as the Lord hath said,” in Joe 2:32, refer to the predictions of Joel himself. In Isaiah 2 and Micah 4 nothing is introduced from a lost prophetic roll, but Isaiah borrows from Micah. Hosea alludes (Hos 8:12), not to some unknown work, but to the Pentateuch. In Isaiah 15, 16 the prophet repeats, not another's prediction, but his own, previously delivered, to which he adds a supplement. Obadiah and Jeremiah do not avail themselves of the written address of a former prophet, but Jeremiah makes the prophecy of Obadiah the groundwork of his own. The opinion that in Isa 56:10; Isa 57:11, there was inserted, unaltered, a long remnant of an older roll is founded on erroneous views respecting the time of its composition. The same holds good of Isaiah 24, where Ewald would find remnants of several older rolls. The very circumstance that in the prophets there nowhere occurs a tenable ground for maintaining that they referred to rolls lost and unknown to us, but that they often allude to writings which we know and possess, clearly proves that there is no reason for supposing, with Ewald, that a great number of prophetic compositions have been lost, “and that of a large tree, only a few blossoms have reached our time.” In consequence of the prophets being considered as organs of God, much care was bestowed on the preservation of their publications. Ewald himself cannot refrain from observing (p. 56), “We have in Jer 26:1-19 a clear proof of the exact knowledge which the better classes of the people had of all that had, a hundred years before, happened to a prophet — of his words, misfortunes, and accidents.”

2. Symbolic Actions. — In the midst of the prophetic declarations symbolic actions are often mentioned which the prophets had to perform. The opinions of interpreters on these are divided. Most interpreters hold that they always, at least generally, were really done; others assert that they had existence only in the mind of the prophets, and formed part of their visions. SEE HOSEA. Another symbolic action of Jeremiah prefigures the people's destruction. He says (Jer 8:1-10) he had been by the Lord directed to get a linen girdle, to put it on his loins, to undertake a long tour to the Euphrates, and to hide the girdle there in a hole of the rock. He does so, returns, and after many days the Lord again orders him to take the girdle from the place where it was hidden, but “the girdle was marred and good for nothing.” In predicting the destruction of Babylon and a general war (Jer 25:12-38), he receives from the Lord a wine-cup, to cause a number of kings of various nations, among whom the sword would be sent, to drink from it till they should be overcome. He then goes with this cup to the kings of Egypt, Arabia, Persia, Media, and many other countries. When the prophet Ezekiel receives his commission and instructions to prophesy against the rebellious people of Israel, a roll of a book is presented to him, which he eats by the direction of the Lord (Eze 2:9; Ezekiel 3, 2, 3). He is next ordered to lie before the city of Jerusalem on his left side three hundred and ninety days; and when he had accomplished them, on his right side forty days. He must not turn from one side to the other, and he is ordered to bake with dung of man the bread which he eats during this time (Eze 4:4; Eze 4:8; Eze 4:12). Isaiah is ordered to walk naked and barefoot, for a sign upon Egypt and Ethiopia (Isa 20:2-3). But, however we may understand these directions, we cannot refer all symbolic actions to internal intuition; at least, of a false prophet we have a sure example of an externally performed symbolic action (1Ki 22:11), and the false prophets always aped the true ones (comp. Jer 19:1 sq.). These undoubted instances of a literal action warrant the presumption that in the other cases likewise there was a substantial fact as the basis of a spiritual symbolism. SEE VISION.

In the case of visions the scenery passed before their mind, something like a panoramic view of a landscape, gradually unfolding, in symbolical imagery, forms of glory or of gloom; accompanied with actions of a corresponding character, not unfrequently exhibiting, as in actual occurrence, the future and distant events. The prophets occasionally beheld themselves as actors in the symbolical scenery. In the visionary pageant  many objects would appear to be grouped, or lying near together, which were in fact separated by considerable intervals of time; so that it is not to be expected that the prophets would describe what they saw in their connections and relations. SEE SYMBOL.

3. Prophetic Style and Diction. — The idea of prophecy as anticipated history has given rise to many erroneous views of prophetic language. No prophecy can be rightly interpreted which does not illustrate the name of God in the elements of his character, the principles of his government, his purposes of mercy and judgment towards men. The human race presents the only proper object of moral treatment. When judgments or blessings are announced upon states and kingdoms, to have respect to the territory rather than the inhabitants is to merge the spiritual in the natural. The promises which are associated with Mount Zion, and the threatenings uttered against Edom, belong not to the locality, but to the people, and to all who imbibe their spirit and walk in their steps.

The mission of the prophets was the religious education of the Jewish people. They were raised up, according to the exigencies of the times, to preserve them from error, and to prepare their minds for the future development of the kingdom of God. Their object was twofold — to maintain the Church in due allegiance to prescribed rites, institutions, ordinances, and yet to prepare the people for a further manifestation of the blessings of the new covenant. By their writings they designed to impart to future ages an explanation of the vanishing-away of the system under which they lived, and to confirm the divine origin and authority of the new order of things. The prophetic style and diction exactly accords with this view of their design. This will account for the various hues of light and shade which streak the scroll of prophecy.

If the future course of events had been clearly marked out and formally laid down, all motives to present duty would have been obliterated; no room would have been left for the exercise of faith, of hope, of fear, and love; all thoughts, all feelings, all desires, would have been absorbed in the overpowering sense of expectation. But enough is revealed to support faith and animate hope. The remoter future is seen afar off in promises indistinct yet glorious. Confidence is bespoken for these distant predictions, by the clear and precise terms which portray some nearer event, fulfilled in that generation as a sign and token that all shall be accomplished in its season. Heathen divination, when it refers to any event which is near at hand, uses  language remarkable for its ambiguity, but speaks distinctly of those matters which are reserved for the distant future. Those who spake in the name of Jehovah pursue the directly opposite course. Their language is much more express, distinct, and clear when they speak of events in the nearer future than in describing what shall take place in the latter days. Prophecy of this nature would not raise its voice at all times, lest that voice from its familiarity should be unheeded; but at every critical and eventful period prophecy led them on “a pillar of cloud in the brighter daylight of their purer and better times; a pillar of fire gleaming in the darker night of their calamity or sin” (Dean Magee).

The moral results of prophecy would have been lost if the historical element had been clear prior to the occurrence of the prefigured events. A certain veil must necessarily hang over the scene until its predictions passed into realities. The best form in which a prophecy can be delivered is to leave the main circumstances unintelligible before the fulfilment, yet so clear as to be easily recognised after the event. It was necessary as a touchstone for the faith and patience of the Church that a certain disguise should veil the coming events till they become facts in providence. “Whatever private information the prophet might enjoy, the Spirit of God would never permit him to disclose the ultimate intent and particular meaning of the prophecy” (Bishop Horsley).

4. Prophetical Language. — This takes its hue and coloring from the political condition of the kingdom, from the local standpoint of the writer, from the position of those to whom the message was delivered.

To say that prophetical language is figurative is simply to say that it is used for a spiritual purpose, and directed to spiritual ends. Our ordinary language in reference to mental and moral subjects is founded on analogy or resemblance. In early times language is nearly all figure; natural symbols are employed to denote common facts. It is the necessity of man's state that scarcely any fact connected with the mind or with spiritual truth can be described but, in language borrowed from material things. The visible world is the dial-plate of the invisible. God has stamped his own image on natural things, which he employs to describe and illustrate his own nature and his dealings with the Church. The Author of the spiritual kingdom is also the Author of the natural kingdom, and both kingdoms develop themselves after the same laws. Nature is a witness for the kingdom of God. Whatever exists in the earthly is found also in the heavenly kingdom.  The religious teachers of the Hebrew nation might adopt the apostle's language, “We see through a glass;” we consider, we contemplate by means of a mirror in a dark saying (1Co 13:12). All who held the prophetical office could in a measure adopt the language of our Lord, “I will open my mouth in similitudes; I will give vent to things kept secret from the foundation of the world” (Mat 13:35).

While prophecy frequently employed natural objects and scenery as the means of impressing the memory, instructing the judgment, interesting the heart, and charming the imagination, it made large use of the present and past condition of the nation, of the Levitical institutions and ceremonies, as symbols in representing good things to come. Thus we may observe

(1.) The future is described in terms of the past. The known is made use of to give shape and form to the unknown. We have a striking instance of this in Hosea (Hos 8:13; Hos 9:3): “They shall return to Egypt.” “Ephraim shall return to Egypt. and shall eat unclean things in Assyria.” The old state of bondage and oppression should come back upon them. The covenant whereby it was promised that the people should not return was virtually cancelled. They had made themselves as the heathen; they should be in the condition of the heathen. For in Hos 11:5 we read: “He shall not return into the land of Egypt, but the Assyrian shall be his king; because they refused to return.” They would not have God for their king; therefore the Assyrian should be their king, and a worse captivity than that of Egypt should befall them. In accordance with this, the teachers of false doctrine and the abetters of corruption in the Asiatic churches are spoken of as a resuscitation of Jezebel and Balaam (Rev 14:20).

(2.) Prophecy made great use of the present, and especially of the standpoint and personal circumstances of the agent, to illustrate the future. Ezekiel describes the coming glory of the Church under the gorgeous and elaborate description of a temple. All the images in the nine concluding chapters are taken from this one analogy. He sums up his minute and precise representation with the significant hint, “The name of the city from that day shall be, The Lord is there.” The Apocalyptic seer, living when the Temple was laid waste, and all its rites and institutions were superseded, describes the glory of the new Jerusalem in language that seems to be directly contradictory (Rev 21:22), “I saw no temple therein;” but in entire harmony with Eze 48:35, the Spirit testifies, “the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it.” Both Ezekiel and John  speak of the same glorious future in language and imagery perfectly natural and appropriate to the times and circumstances in which they were placed.

(3.) Frequently the prophetic style received its complexion and coloring from the diversified circumstances of the parties addressed, as well as from the standpoint of the prophet. This is peculiarly the case with the language of Daniel, which presents such an approximation to the style of history that some have rashly assigned his writings to a date long posterior to the captivity of Babylon. The specific form which a portion of his prophecies assumes may be accounted for by considering the great feebleness and depression of the people on resuming their residence in Judaea; the anomalous and shattered condition of the theocratic constitution when the ark of the covenant, the Urim and Thummim, the kingly rule and government, were gone, when the vision was sealed, and no one of the prophetic order remained. This is the time selected for setting forth the external aspect of God's kingdom to one who was well conversant with political revolutions, who stood at the centre of the world's power and glory when earthly monarchies began to aspire after universal dominion. The visions granted to Daniel (8, 9), though plain to us who read them after the event, were far from being clear to himself or to others (Dan 8:27; Dan 12:4; Dan 12:8-9). In the symbols he employs we have a reflection of his own peculiar position and political experience; and in the detailed exhibition of the coming future, in the explicit predictions of the changes and vicissitudes which were at hand, the children of faith felt that the God of their fathers was still in the midst of them. Prophecy is always a revelation of specific events, when the events spoken of are to be fulfilled in the nearer future. The picture presented to the Church was minutely portrayed in a historical dress whenever the hope of the faithful required special and immediate support. (See § 8, below.)

(4.) The divine impulse under which the prophets spoke, though it was supernatural, acted in harmony with personal characteristics and native susceptibilities. The supernatural ever bases itself upon the natural. Constitutional tendencies are moulded by the plastic influence of divine grace, but are never entirely obliterated. The prophets never lost personal consciousness, or any distinctive characteristic of thought and feeling, even when they were raised into an ecstatical condition. Extraordinary impressions of divine light and influence affected the rational as well as the imaginative power. The false lights which pretended to prophecy were impressions made on the imagination exclusively, “whose conceptions ran  only in a secular channel, as the sect of diviners, enchanters, dreamers, and soothsayers” (J. Smith). The lowest degree of prophecy is when the imaginative power is most predominant, and the scene becomes too turbulent for the rational faculty to discern clearly the mystical sense. The highest is where all imagination ceases-as with Moses, “whom God knew face to face” — where truth is revealed to the reason and understanding.

(5.) The poetical element of prophecy arises from the ecstatical condition of the prophet, from the action of spiritual influences on constitutional tendencies. But as the primary aim of the religious teachers of the Hebrews was to influence the heart and conscience, the poetical element, though never entirely suppressed, was held in restraint, to further the higher ends of spiritual instruction. Hence, as Ewald remarks, “Prophetical discourse has a form and impress of its own, too elevated to sink to simple prose, too practical in its aim to assume the highest form of poetry.” Of the two ideas involved in vates, the prophetical ruled the poetical. The distinction between the poet and the prophet may be thus expressed: as the prophet's aim was to work upon others in the most direct and impressive manner, he was at liberty to adopt any form or method of representation; but as the immediate aim of the poet is to satisfy himself and the requirements of his art, he cannot vary his definite manner, and change his mode of address at pleasure, in order to work upon others. The poetical elevation appears most vividly in the idealistic and imaginative form, when the patriarchal heads of the Jewish nation, their several families, Zion, Jerusalem, their religious and political centre, are addressed as living personalities present to the mind and eve of the prophet. A vivid instance of this personification occurs in Jer 31:15, Rachel weeping for her children, refusing to be comforted. It was at Ramah that the Chaldean conqueror assembled the last band of captives (40:1): the prospect of perpetual exile lay before them. On their departure the last hope of Israel's existence seemed to expire. In the bold freedom of Eastern imagery, the ancestral mother of the tribe is conceived of as present at the scene, and as raising a loud wail of distress. This scene was substantially repeated in the massacre at Bethlehem. The cruel Edomite who then held the government of Judaea aimed what was meant to be a fatal blow against the real hope of Israel. Though it was but a handful of children that actually perished, yet as among these the Child of Promise was supposed to be included, it might well seem as if all were lost” (Fairbairn). SEE POETRY,

VII. Interpretation of Predictions. — In addition the hints given above and below, we here have only space for a few rules, deduced from the account which we have given of the nature of prophecy. They are,

(1.) Interpose distances of time according as history may show them to be necessary with respect to the past, or inference may show them to be likely in respect to the future, because, as we have seen, the prophetic visions are abstracted from relations in time.

(2.) Distinguish the form from the idea. Thus Isa 11:15 represents the idea of the removal of all obstacles from before God's people in the form of the Lord's destroying the tongue of the Egyptian sea, and smiting the river into seven streams.

(3.) Distinguish in like manner figure from what is represented by it, e.g. in the verse previous to that quoted do not understand literally “They shall fly upon the shoulders of the Philistines” (Isa 11:14).

(4.) Make allowance for the imagery of the prophetic visions, and for the poetical diction in which they are expressed.

(5.) In respect to things past, interpret by the apparent meaning, checked by reference to events; in respect to things future, interpret by the apparent meaning, checked by reference to the analogy of the faith.

(6.) Interpret according to the principle which may be deduced from the examples of visions explained in the Old Test.

(7.) Interpret according to the principle which may be deduced from the examples of prophecies interpreted in the New Test. SEE INTERPRETATION

VIII. Use of Prophecy. — Predictions are at once a part and an evidence of revelation: at the time that they are delivered, and until their fulfilment, a part; after they have been fulfilled, an evidence. An apostle (2Pe 1:19) describes prophecy as “a light shining in a dark place,” or “a taper glimmering where there is nothing to reflect its rays,” that is, throwing some light, but only a feeble light as compared with what is shed from the Gospel history. To this light, feeble as it is, “you do well,” says the apostle, “to take heed.” And he warns them not to be offended at the feebleness of the light, because it is of the nature of prophecy until its fulfilment (in the case of Messianic predictions, of which he is speaking, described as “until  the day dawn, and the day star arise in your hearts”) to shed only a feeble light. Nay, he continues, even the prophecies are not to be limited to a single and narrow interpretation, “for the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man,” i.e. the prophets were not affected by personal considerations in their predictions, “but holy men of old spake by the impulse (φερόμενοι) of the Holy Ghost.” This is in entire keeping with the above views (§ vi) of the character of the prophetic utterances, and was the use of prophecy before its fulfilment — to act as a feeble light in the midst of darkness, which it did not dispel, but through which it threw its rays in such a way as to enable a true-hearted believer to direct his steps and guide his anticipations (comp. Act 13:27). But after fulfilment, Peter says, “the word of prophecy” becomes “more sure” than it was before, that is, it is no longer merely a feeble light to guide, but it is a firm ground of confidence, and, combined with the apostolic testimony, serves as a trustworthy evidence of the faith; so trustworthy that even after he and his brother apostles are dead, those whom he addressed will feel secure that they “had not followed cunningly devised fables,” but the truth.

As an evidence, fulfilled prophecy is as satisfactory as anything can be, for who can know the future except the Ruler who disposes future events; and from whom can come prediction except from him who knows the future? After all that has been said and unsaid, prophecy and miracles, each resting on their own evidence, must always be the chief and direct evidences of the truth of the divine character of a religion. Where they exist, a divine power is proved. Nevertheless, they should never be rested on alone, but in combination with the general character of the whole scheme to which they belong. Its miracles, its prophecies, its morals, its propagation, and its adaptation to human needs, are the chief evidences of Christianity. None of these must be taken separately. The fact of their conspiring together is the strongest evidence of all. That one object with which predictions are delivered is to serve in an after-age as an evidence on which faith may reasonably rest is stated by our Lord himself: “And now I have told you before it come to pass, that when it is come to pass, ye might believe” (Joh 14:29). SEE PROPHECY.

As prophecy came πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως, in many portions and in many modes (Heb 1:1), we need not be surprised to find a relative disregard of time in its announcements. The seers beheld things to come much as wee look upon a starry sky. To the natural eye all the orbs that bespangle the firmament seem to be at the same distance from the  earth. Though the monarchies of Daniel are successive, yet in a certain way they are described as co-existent; for it is only on the establishment of the last that they seem to disappear. As the precise time of individual events is not revealed, prophecy describes them as continuous. The representation is rather in space than in time; the whole appears foreshortened; perspective is regarded rather than actual distance; as a common observer would describe the stars, grouping them as they appear, and not according to their true positions. Prof. Payne Smith well observes, “The prophets are called seers, and their writings visions. They describe events passing before their mental eye as simple facts, without the idea of time. A picture may represent the past. the present, or the future; this we may know from its accessories by the inference of the judgment, but not by the sight as such. If time is revealed, as in the seventy weeks of Daniel, time is the idea impressed upon the mind. But where time is not itself the thing revealed, the facts of revelation are not described as connected with or growing out of one another, as in the pages of history, but are narrated as facts merely, which future ages must arrange in their proper place, as one by one they are fulfilled.” The first conquest and the complete destruction of Babylon are spoken of together (Jeremiah 1:41), though nearly a thousand years elapsed between them. Zechariah connects the spiritual salvation of the Church in the distant future with the temporal deliverance of the Jews under Alexander and the Maccabees. In the description which is given of the humiliation and glory of the Messiah, notice is seldom taken of the interval which is to elapse before the full and final establishment of his kingdom. So Paul in the fulness of his faith, which realized the object of his hope, and brought vividly before the eve of his mind the consummation of all things. has used language respecting the coming of Christ which some have misinterpreted as implying that he expected the day of Christ to arrive in his lifetime. Occasionally the precise time was revealed, as in the case of the sojourn of Abraham and his posterity in Egypt (Gen 15:13); the disruption of Ephraim (Isa 7:8), and the captivity in Babylon (Jer 29:10). But usually the prophets were entirely ignorant of the time, and only ascertained. after careful inquiry, that they spoke of the distant future (1Pe 1:10-12). At evening-time it shall be light (Zec 14:7). The faithful in the land will discern the period when the events are upon the eve of fulfilment. SEE ESCHATOLOGY

IX. Development of Messianic Prophecy. — Prediction, in the shape of promise and threatening, begins with the book of Genesis. Immediately  upon the fall, hopes of recovery and salvation are held out, but the manner in which this salvation is to be effected is left altogether indefinite. All that is at first declared is that it shall come through a child of woman (Gen 3:15). By degrees the area is limited: it is to come through the family of Shem (Gen 9:26), through the family of Abraham (Gen 12:3), of Isaac (Gen 22:18), of Jacob (Gen 28:14), of Judah (Gen 49:10). Balaam seems to say that it will be wrought by a warlike Israelitish King (Num 24:17); Jacob, by a peaceful Ruler of the earth (Gen 49:10); Moses, by a Prophet like himself, i.e. a revealer of a new religious dispensation (Deu 18:15). Nathan's announcement (2Sa 7:16) determines further that the salvation is to come through the house of David, and through a descendant of David who shall be Himself a king. This promise is developed by David himself in the Messianic Psalms. Psalms 18, 61 are founded on the promise communicated by Nathan, and do not go beyond the announcement made by Nathan. The same may be said of Psalms 89, Which was composed by a later writer. Psalms 2, 110 rest upon the same promise as their foundation, but add new features to it. The Son of David is to be the Son of God (Psa 2:7), the anointed of the Lord (Psalms 2, Psa 110:2), not only the King of Zion (Psalms 2, Psa 110:6; Psa 110:1), but the inheritor and lord or of the whole earth (Psa 2:8; Psa 110:6), and, besides this, a Priest forever after the order of Melchizedek (Psa 110:4). At the same time he is, as typified by his progenitor, to be full of suffering and affliction (Psalms 22, 71, 102, 109): brought down to the grave, yet raised to life without seeing corruption (Psalms 16). In Psalm 45:72, the sons of Korah and Solomon describe his peaceful reign. Between Solomon and Hezekiah intervened some 200 years, during which the voice of prophecy was silent. The Messianic conception entertained at this time by the Jews might have been that of a King of the royal house of David who would arise, and gather under his peaceful sceptre his own people and strangers. Sufficient allusion to his prophetical and priestly offices had been made to create thoughtful consideration, but as yet there \was no clear delineation of him in these characters. It was reserved for the prophets to bring out these features more distinctly.

The sixteen prophets may be divided into four groups: the Prophets of the Northern Kingdom — Hosea, Amos, Joel, Jonah; the Prophets of the Southern Kingdom — Isaiah, Jeremiah, Obadiah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah; the Prophets of the Captivity — Ezekiel and Daniel;  the Prophets of the Return — Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi. In this great period of prophetism there is no longer any chronological development of Messianic prophecy, as in the earlier period previous to Solomon. Each prophet adds a feature, one more, another less clearly: combine the features, and we have the portrait; but it does not grow gradually and perceptibly under the hands of the several artists. Here, therefore, the task of tracing the chronological progress of the revelation of the Messiah comes to an end: its culminating point is found in the prophecy contained in Isa 52:13-15, and Isaiah 53. We here read that there should be a Servant of God, lowly and despised, full of grief and suffering, oppressed, condemned as a malefactor, and put to death. But his sufferings, it is said, are not for his own sake, for he had never been guilty of fraud or violence: they are spontaneously taken, patiently borne, vicarious in their character; and, by God's appointment, they have an atoning, reconciling, and justifying efficacy. The result of his sacrificial offering is to be his exaltation and triumph. By the path of humiliation and expiatory suffering, he is to reach that state of glory foreshown by David and Solomon. The prophetic character of the Messiah is drawn out by Isaiah in other parts of his book as the atoning work here. By the time of Hezekiah therefore (for Hengstenberg, Chrtistology, vol. 2, has satisfactorily disproved the theory of a Deutero-Isaiah of the days of the captivity) the portrait of the θεάνθρωπος — at once King, Priest. Prophet, and Redeemer — was drawn in all its essential features. The contemporary and later prophets (comp. Mic 5:2; Dan 7:9; Zec 6:13; Mal 4:2) added some particulars and details, and so the conception was left to await its realization after al interval of some 400 years from the date of the last Hebrew prophet.

The modern Jews, in opposition to their ancient exposition, have been driven to a non-Messianic interpretation of Isaiah 53. Among Christians the non-Messianic interpretation commenced with Grotius. He applies the chapter to Jeremiah. According to Doderlein, Schuster, Stephani, Eichhorn, Rosenmuller, Hitzig, Itandewerk, Kister (after the Jewish expositors Jarchi, Aben-Ezra, Kimchi, Abarbanel, Lipmann), the subject of the prophecy is the Israelitish people. According to Eckermann, Ewald, Bleek, it is the ideal Israelitish people. According to Paulus, Ammon, Maurer, Thenius, Knobel, it is the godly portion of the Israelitish people. According to De Wette, Gesenius, Schenkel, Umbreit, Hofmann, it is the prophetical body. Augusti refers it to king Uzziah; Konynenburg and  Bahrdt to Hezekiah; Statudlin to Isaiah himself; Bolten to the house of David. Ewald thinks that no historical person was intended, but that the author of the chapter has misled his readers by inserting a passage from an older book, in which a martyr was spoken of. “This,” he says, “quite spontaneously suggested itself, and has impressed itself on my mind more and more;” and he thinks that “controversy on ch. 53 will never cease until this truth is acknowledged” (Propheten, vol. 2, p. 407). Hengstenberg gives the following list of German commentators who have maintained the Messianic explanation: Dathe, Hensler, Kocher, Koppe, Michaelis, Schmieder, Storr, Hansi, Kruger, Jahn, Steudel, Sack, Reinke, Tholuck, Havernick, Stier. Hengstenberg's own exposition, and criticism of the expositions of others, is well worth consultation (Christology, vol. ii). Riehm has given a very good outline of these prophecies in their origin, historical character, and relation to New Test. fulfilment in the Studien und Kritiken for 1865 and 1869 (transl. by Jefferson, Messianic Prophecy, Edinb. 1876, 12mo). Drummond's work on The Jewish Messiah is a semi- rationalistic view drawn chiefly from apocryphal literature (Lond. 1877, 8vo). Prebendary Row has shown (Bampton Lecture for 1877, p. 234 sq.) the insufficiency of the Messianic elements of the Old Test. as an ideal model for the delineation of the Christ of the New Test. SEE MESSIAH.

X. Prophets of the New Testament. — So far as their predictive powers are concerned, the Old-Test. prophets find their New-Test. counterpart in the writer of the Apocalypse; but in their general character, as specially illumined revealers of God's will, their counterpart will rather be found, first in the Great Prophet of the Church, and his forerunner John the Baptist, and next in all those persons who were endowed with the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit in the apostolic age, the speakers with tongues and the interpreters of tongues, the prophets and the discerners of spirits, the teachers and workers of miracles (1Co 12:10; 1Co 12:28). The connecting link between the Old-Test. prophet and the speaker with tongues is the state of ecstasy in which the former at times received his visions and in which the latter uttered his words. The Old-Test. prophet, however, was his own interpreter: he did not speak in the state of ecstasy: he saw his visions in the ecstatic, and declared them in the ordinary state. The New-Test. discerner of spirits has his prototype in such as Micaiah, the son of Imlah (1Ki 22:22), the worker of miracles in Elijah and Elisha, the teacher in each and all of the prophets. The prophets of the New  Test. represented their namesakes of the Old Test. as being expounders of divine truth and interpreters of the divine will to their auditors.

That predictive powers did occasionally exist in the New-Test. prophets is proved by the case of Agabus (Act 11:28), but this was not their characteristic. They were not an order, like apostles, bishops or presbyters, and deacons, but they were men or women (Act 21:9) who had the χάρισμα προφητείας vouchsafed them. If men, they might at the same time be apostles (1 Corinthians 14); and there was nothing to hinder the different χαρίσματα of wisdom, knowledge, faith, teaching, miracles, prophecy, discernment. tongues, and interpretation (ch. 12) being all accumulated on one person, anti this person might or might not be a presbyter. Paul describes prophecy as being effective for the conversion, apparently the sudden and immediate conversion, of unbelievers (Act 14:24), and for the instruction and consolation of believers (Act 12:31). This shows its nature. It was a spiritual gift which enabled men to understand and to teach the truths of Christianity, especially as veiled in the Old Test., and to exhort and warn with authority and effect greater than human (see Locke, Paraphrase. note on 1 Corinthians 12, and Conybeare and Howson, 1, 461). The prophets of the New Test. were supernaturally illuminated expounders and preachers.

XI. Literature. — On the general subject of prophecy no comprehensive or altogether satisfactory treatise has yet been produced. Among the old works we may mention Augustine, De Civitate Dei, lib. 18:cap. 27 sq. (Op. 7:508, Paris, 1685); Carpzov, Introd. ad Libros Canonicos (Lips. 1757). Some good remarks will be found in the essay of John Smith, On Prophecy (Select Discourses, disc. 6:p. 181, Loud. 1821, 8vo), which was translated into Latin and reprinted at the end of Le Clerc's Commentary on the Prophets (Amsterd. 1731). It contains interesting passages on the nature of the predictions in the Old Test., extracted from Jewish authors, of whom Maimonides is the most distinguished.

Of less importance is the essay of Hermann Witsius, De Prophetia et Prophetis (in vol. 1 of his Miscellan. Sacra [Utrecht, 1692], p. 1-392): he digresses too much and needlessly from the main question, and says little applicable to the point; but he still supplies some useful materials. The same remark also applies in substance to Knibbe's History of the Prophets. Some valuable remarks, but much more that is arbitrary and untenable, will be found in Crusius's Hypomnnemata ad Theologiam Prophet. (Lips. 1764, 3 vols.). In the Treatise on Prophecy inserted by Jahn in his Introduction to the Old  Testament, he endeavors to refute the views of the Rationalists, but does not sift the subject to the bottom. Kleuker's work, De Nexu Proph. inter utrumque Foedus, possesses more of a genuine theological character. The leader of the Rationalists is Eichhorn, Die Hebraischen Propheten (Getting. 1816); also in his Introduction to the Old Testament, and in his dissertation De Prophet. Poes. Hebr. Their views on this subject are most fully explained by Knobel in his Prophetismus der Hebriaer vollstiindig darqestellt (Breslau, 1837, 2 vols.): the work contains. however, little original research, and is valuable only as a compilation of what the Rationalists assert concerning prophecy. The work of Koster, Die Propheten des A. und N.T. (Leipsic, 1838), bears a higher character: on many points he approaches to sounder views; but he is inconsistent and wavering, and therefore cannot be said to have essentially advanced the knowledge of this subject. Of considerable eminence is the treatise by Ewald on prophecy, prefixed to his Propheten des Alten Buzndes (Stuttg. 1840; 1867, 3 vols.).

But to the important question, whether the prophets enjoyed supernatural assistance or not, an explicit answer will there be sought for in vain. His view of the subject is in the main that of the Rationalists, though he endeavors to veil it: the Spirit of God influencing the prophets is, in fact, only their own mind worked up by circumstances; their enthusiasm and ecstasy are made to explain all. Finally, the work of Hoffmann, Weissagun iq tnd Erfullungq im A. und N.T. (Nbrdlingen, 1841, vol. 1), is chargeable with spurious and affected originality: his views are often in their very details forced and strained, and it is to be regretted that the subject has by this work gained less than from the author's talent might have been expected. Many of the elements of prophecy have been very ably and a soundly discussed by Hengstenberg, Christology of the Old Testament, in T. T. Clark's transl. (Edinb. 1854). Other German works of importance on the subject are those of Umbreit, Die Propheten des A. Test. (in the Stud. u. Krit. 1833, p. 1040 sq.); Tholuck, Die Propheten und iahe Weissayungen (1860; tranlsl. in the Bibliotheca Sacra, 1833, p. 361 sq.). The subject is likewise discussed more or less fully in all the introductions (q.v.) to the Old Test. See also Bible Educator (Index, s.v.). One of the latest and most specious productions of the Rationalistic school is that of Prof. Kuenen (of the University of Leyden), The Prophets and Prophecy in Israel (transl. by Milroy, Lond. 1877, 8vo); it reiterates with ingenious array all the difficulties, contradictions, and failures alleged by hostile writers, and refuted or explained again and again by orthodox scholars. SEE SEER.

Among writers in English we may especially name the following: Sherlock. discourses on the Use and Intent of Prophecy (1755, 8vo); Hurd, Introd. to the Study of the Prophecies, etc. (17/72, 8vo); Apthorp, Discourses on Prophecy (1786, 2 vols. 8vo); Davison, Discourses on Prophecy (1821, 8vo); Smith (J. Pye), Principles of Interpretation as applied to the Prophecies (of Holy Scripture (1829, 8vo); Brooks. Elements of Prophetical Interpretation (1837, 12mo); Alexander, Connection of the Old and New Testaments (1841, 8vo), lect. 4-7, p. 168-382; Lowth, De Sacra Presi Hebrceorum (Oxon. 1821, and transl. by Gregory, Lend. 1835); Horsley, Biblical Criticism (Lond. 1820); Horne, Introduction to Holy Scripture (Loud. 1828), ch. 4:§ 3; Van Mildert, Boyle Lectures (Lond. 1831), § 22; Fairbairnl, Prophecy: its nature, Functions, and Interpretation (Edinb. 1856); M'Caul, Aids to Faith (Lond. 1861); Smith (K. Payne), Messianic Interpretation of the Prophecies of Isaiah (Oxf. 1862); Davidson, Introduction to the Old Testament (Lond. 1862), ii, 422; Stanley, Lectures on the Jewish Church (Lond. 1863); Maurice, The Prophets and Kings of the Old Testament (rep. Bost. 1853); Stuart, Hints on the Interpretation of Prophecy (Andover, 1844); Arnold, On the Interpretation of Prophecy (in his Works, Lond. 1845, i, 373 sq.); Taylor, Spirit of Hebrew Poetry (rep. N.Y. 1862). See also Journ. Sacred Literature, Oct. 1862; Meth. Qaur. Rev. April, 1862; Alford, Greek Test. (note on “Acts” 13:41); the monographs cited by Volbeding, Index Programmatum, p. 22, 43, 44; by Hase, Leben Jesu, p. 103; by Danz, Worterb. p. 793; by Darling, Cyclopedia Bibliograpihica, col. 1785 sq.; and under the art. SEE PROPHETS, MAJOR AND MINOR.

## Prophetess[[@Headword:Prophetess]]

             (נְבַיאָה, nebiah, προφῆτις, Exo 15:20; Luk 2:36). Among the remarkable women who appear to have exercised the gift of prophecy, we find Miriam (Exo 15:20); Deborah; Hannah (1Sa 2:1); Huldah (2Ki 22:14); the wife of Isaiah (Isa 8:3); Anna (Luk 2:36); and the four daughters of Philip (Act 21:8-9). Miriam, Deborah, Huldah, and others were called prophetesses, not because they were supposed to be gifted with a knowledge of futurity, like the seers, but because they possessed a poetical inspiration; and inspired (especially sacred) poetry was always deemed of supernatural and divine origin. SEE PROPHET.

## Prophets, False[[@Headword:Prophets, False]]

             As Moses had foretold, a host of false prophets arose in later times among the Hebrews, who promised prosperity without repentance, and predicted after “the deceit of their own hearts” (Deu 13:1-5; Jer 14:14-16; Jer 23:9-27). According to Deu 18:20-22, a false prophet was punished capitally, being stoned to death. There were two cases in which a person was held convicted of the crime, and consequently liable to its punishment:

1. If a prophet spoke in the name of Jehovah, he was tolerated, so long as he remained unconvicted of imposture, even though he threatened calamity to the state. He might be imprisoned (Jer 26:8-16; 1Ki 22:1-28), but could not legally be put to death, unless a prediction of his failed of accomplishment; then he was regarded as all impostor, and stoned.

2. If a person prophesied in the name of any other god, whether his prediction was accomplished or not, he was, at all events, considered a false prophet, and, as such, capitally punished. In the kingdom of Israel, Ahab could muster four hundred prophets of Baal at a time (1Ki 22:6). In still later times false prophets, uttering the suggestions of their own imagination, abounded in the Church, and did much mischief (Mat 7:15; Mat 24:11; Mar 13:22; Luk 6:26; 2Pe 2:1; 1Jn 4:1). SEE MESSIAHS, FALSE.

## Prophets, French[[@Headword:Prophets, French]]

             SEE CAMISARD.

## Prophets, Major And Minor[[@Headword:Prophets, Major And Minor]]

             We have in the Old Testament the writings of sixteen prophets; that is, of four greater and twelve lesser prophets. The four greater prophets are Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel. The Jews do not properly place Daniel among the prophets, because (they say) he lived in the splendor of temporal dignities, and led a kind of life different from other prophets. The twelve lesser prophets are Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi. The collectors of the canon arranged the prophets chronologically, but considered the whole of the twelve lesser prophets as one work, which  they placed after Jeremiah and Ezekiel, inasmuch as the last three lesser prophets lived later than they. Daniel, as above observed, was placed in the Hagiographa, because be had not filled the prophetic office. The collection of the lesser prophets themselves was again intended to be chronologically disposed; still Hosea is on account of the extent of his work, allowed precedence before those lesser prophets who, generally, were his contemporaries, and also before those who flourished at a somewhat earlier period. It is the opinion of Hengstenberg (Christology, 4:235) and of Pusey (Minor Prophets, pt. 1, introd.) that the writings of the Minor Prophets are actually placed chronologically. Accordingly, the former arranges the list of the prophets as followers: Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Isaiah (“the principal prophetical figure in the first or Assyrian period of canonical prophetism”), Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Jeremiah (“the principal prophetical figure in the second or Babylonian period of canonical prophetism”), Ezekiel, Daniel, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi. Calmet (Dict. Bibl. s.v. “Prophet”) as follows: Hosea, Amos, Isaiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Jeremiah, Zephaniah, Joel, Daniel, Ezekiel, Habakkuk, Obadiah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi. Stanley (Lect. 19) in the following order: Joel. Jonah, Hosea, Amos, Isaiah, Micah, Nahum, Zechariah, Zephaniah, Habakkuk, Obadiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Isaiah, Daniel, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi. Hence it appears that Stanley recognises two Isaiahs and two Zechariahs, unless “the author of Isaiah 40-66 is regarded as the older Isaiah transported into a style and position later than his own time” (p. 423). Obadiah is generally considered to have lived at a later date than is compatible with a chronological arrangement of the canon, in consequence of his reference to the capture of Jerusalem. But such an inference is not necessary, for the prophet might have thrown himself in imagination forward to the date of his prophecy (Hengstenberg), or the words which, as translated by the A.V., are a remonstrance as to the past, may be really but an imperative as to the future (Pusey). For the various questions relating to each person and book, see the several names in their alphabetical places. SEE BIBLE.

Commentaries — The following are the special exegetical helps on the prophets in general: Jerome, Commetarii (in Opp. vol. 5, ed. Basil.); Abrabanel, פֵּרוּשׁ(written in 1497, and frequently printed and translated in various forms and portions); Kimchi, David (first printed in the Rabbinical Bible, Yen. 1548, fol.); (Ecolampadius, Commentarii (Basil. 1558, 2 vols. fol.); Peyron, Commentaire (Par. 1673, 12mo); Lowth, Commentary  (Lond. 1714, 4 vols. 4to; embraced in the commentary of Patrick, Lowth, etc.); Van Til, Conmmentaria (L. B. 1744, 3 vols. 4to); Vogel, Unmschreibung (Halle, 1771-73, 4 vols. 8vo); Weitenauer, Metaphrasis (Aug. Vind. 1768, 8vo); Dathe, Notee [on Maj. Proph. only] (Halle, 1779, 1785, 8vo); Smith (J.), Explanation [chiefly compiled] (Edinb. 1787, 1840, 12mo); Vaupel, Erklaiung (Dresd. 1798-80, 2 vols. 8vo); Eichhlorn, Erklarung (Gotting. 1816-19, 3 vols. 8vo); Agier, Des Explications (Par. 1820-22, 10 vols. 8vo); Cole, Commentary [includ. N.T.] (Lond. 1826, 2 vols. 8vo); Hengstenberg, Christologie (Berlin, 1829-35, 1854-57, 3 vols. 8vo; transl. N. Y. 1853-59, Edinb. 1854-58, 3 vols. 8vo; abridgm. Lond. 1847, 8vo); tiickert, Erliiut. [on certain parts] (Leips. 1831, 8vo); Tegg's ed. Notes [chiefly compiled] (Lond. 1836, 5 vols. 8vo); Hoffmann, Auslegung [on the Maj. Proph., compiled] (Stuttg. 1839, 8vo); Stephenson, Christology (Lond. 1839, 2 vols. 8vo); Ewald, Erklrlung (Stuttg. 1840-42, Gbtting. 1867-69, 2 vols. 8vo); Maurer, Commentarius (Lips. 1841, 8vo); Herxheimer, פֵּרוּשׁ[includ. the Hagiog.] (Berl. 1841-44, in parts, 8vo); Delitzsch and Caspari, Exeg. Hundb. (Leips. 1842, 8vo); Umbreit, Commentar (Hamb. 184246, 5 vols. 8vo); Noyes, Translation (Bost. 1843, N. Y. 1849, 3 vols. 12mo); Hitzig, Uebersetz. (Leips. 1854, 8vo); Smith (G. V.), Prophecies relating, to Assyria (Lond. 1857, 12mo); Williams, Prophets during the Assyrian Empire (ibid. 1866, 8vo). SEE OLD TESTAMENT

The following are exclusively on the Minor Prophets: Cyril of Alexandria, Commentarii (in Opp. 3, 1870; also Ingolst. 1607, fol.); Theodoret, Interpretatio (in Opp. II, ii); Theodore of Mopsuestia, Commentarii (in Mai's Nov. Collectio, 1, i, 41-104); Remigius Antissiod. Einarmrationes (in Bibl. Max. Patr. vol. 16); Rupertus Tuitiensis, Commentarii (in Opp. i, 651); Albertus Magnus, Conmmentarii (Basil. 1525, fol.); Tarnon, Commentarius (Rost. 1522, 4to; Lips. 1688, 1706, 4to); Lambert, Commentarii (Argent. 1525-26, 5 vols. 8vo; Francf. 1589, 1605, 3 vols. 8vo); Calvin, Praelectiones (Genev. 1559,1581, 1612, fol.; in Opp. vol. ix; in French, ibid. 1560, etc., 4to; transl. by Owen, Edinb. 1846-49, 5 vols. 8vo); Forer, Commentarii (Ven. 1565, 8vo); Wigand, Explicatio (Francf. 1566, 8vo); Hemming, Explanationes (Lips. 1568, 4to); Strigel, Scholia (ibid. 1561, 1570, 1571, 8vo); Montanus [Rom. Cath.], Commentarius (Antw. 1571, fol., 1582, 4to); De Ribera [Rom. Cath.], Commentarii (ibid. 1511 and often, fol.); Gualter, Commentarii (‘igur. 1572, fol.); P. de Palacio [Rom. Cath.], Commenturius (Colon. 1583, 1588, 8vo); Danaeus,  Commentaria (Genev. 1586, 1594, 8vo; transl. by Stockwood, Lond. 1594, 4to); Livelie, Annotutiones [on a part only] (Lond. 1587, 8vo; also in the Critici Sacri, vol. iv); Heilbrunn, Loci communes (Lauing. 1588, 8vo); M. de Palacio [Rom. Cath.], Explanationes (Salam. 1593, fol.); Alscheich, מִרְאוֹת, etc. (Venice, 1595 and later, fol.); A Messana [Rom. Cath.], Pararphrasis (Antw. 1597. 4to); Winckelmann, Commentarius (Francof. 1603.1620, 2 vols. 8vo); Thuan and Rittenhaus, Metaphrasis (Amberg. 1604, 8vo); Maldonatus, Commentarius (Colon. 1611, fol.); A Castro [Rom. Cath.], Comnentarii (Lugd. 1615, Magunt. 1617, fol.); A Figeiro [Rom. Cath.], Commentarii (in his Opp. Lugd. 1615, fol.); Wolder, Disputationes (Wittemb. 1617, 4to); Sanctius [Rom. Cath.], Commentarius (Ligd. 1621, fol.); A Lapide, Commentarius (Antw. 1625, fol.); Drusius, Commentarius (Amst. 1627, 4to; also in the Critici Sacri); Philippaeus [Rom. Cath.], Commentarii (Par. 1633, 4 vols. fol.); Fabricins, Conciones (Bern. 1641, fol.); Lightfoot, Versiones (in Works, 10:453); Colona [Rom. Cath.], Commentarii (Panorm. 1644, fol.); Macorps [Rom. Cath.], Pararphrase (Par. 1644, 1645, 2 vols. 12mo); Cocceius, Commentarius (L. B. 1652. fol.); Hutcheson, Exposition (Lond. 1655, 3 vols. 8vo; 1657, fol.); Stokes, Explication (ibid. 1659, 8vo); Kunad, Commentarius (Dresd. 1677, 4to); De Veil, Explicatio (Lond. 1680, 8vo); Schmid and Baldwin, Commentarius (Lips. 1685, 1698, 4to); Pocock, Commentaries [on a part] (Oxf. 1685, fol.; also in Works); Mercer, Commentarius [on the first five only] (Giess. 1695, 4to); Marck, Commentarius (Amst. 1696-1701, 5 vols. 4to; Tubing. 1734, 2 vols. fol.); Tauler, Predigten (Ulm, 1699, 4to); Lyser, Prcelectiones (Goslar, 1709, 4to); Perterslen, Er/kla'iung (F. ad NI. 1723, 4to); Gebhard, Erklarung (at various places, 1723-28, 10 pts. 4to; Brunsw. 1737, 4to); Almosino, פֵּרוּשַׁים, (in Frankfurter's Rabbin. Bible, Amst. 1724-27, fol.); Patronus [Rom. Cath.], Commentarii (Neap. 1743, fol.); Burke, Gnomon (Heidelb. 1753, 4to); Atschul, מְצוּחִת, etc. [includ. the Hagiogr.] (Leghorn, 1753 and later, 8vo); Vogel, Umschreib. (Hal. 1773, 8vo); Struensee, Uebersetz. (Halberst. 1777, 8vo); Walther, Uebersetz. (Steud. 1777, 8vo); Vollborth, Annmerk. (Getting. 1783, 8vo): Newcome, Notes (Lond. 1785, 4to; 1836, 8vo); Bauer, Erklar. (Leips. 1786, 8vo); Staudling, Eu laut. [on parts] (Stutttg. 1786, 8vo); Heusler, Animadversions [on passages] (Kilon. 1786, 4to); Moldenhauer. Erklr. [includ. Dan.] (Quedl. 1787, 4to); Vampel, Erkl'. (Dresd. 1793, 8vo); Dahl, Observations [on passages] (Neostr. 1793, 8vo); Wolf (of Dessau), מַנְחָה, etc. (Dessau, 1805, 8vo, and later);  Vater, Observationes [on passages] (Hal. 1815, 4to); Schrider, Erlaut. (Leips. 1823, 8vo); Rosenmuiller, Scholia (Lips. 1827, 4 vols. 8vo); Ackerman, Annotationes (Viennase 1830, 8vo); Zadel, Annotationes (Hal. 1830, 8vo) Scholz, Erkla'r. (F. ad M. 1833, 8vo); Pick, Translation (2d ed. Lond. 1835, 12mo); Jeitteles, פֵּרוּשׁ(Vienna, 1835, 8vo); Rieger, Betrchtuungen (Stuttg. 1835, 8vo), Hesselberg, Auslegung (Konigsb. 1838, 8vo); Henderson, Commentary (Lond. 1845, Andover, 1866, 8vo); Hitzig, Erklar. (Leips. 1852, 8vo); Schregg [Rom Cath.], Erklar. (Regensb. 1854, 8vo); Pusey, Commentary (Lond. 1860, 4to); Kohler, Die nachexil. Projheten (Erlang. 1861, 8vo); Schlier, Predigten (Stuttg. 1861, 8vo); Whish, Paraphrase (Lond. 1864,12mo); Shrewsbury, Notes (Edinb. 1865, 8vo); Cowles, Notes (N. Y. 1867, 12mo); Keif and Delitzsch, Commentar (Leips. 1866, 8vo; transl. Edinb. 1868, 2 vols. 8vo); Kelly, Lectures (Lond. 1871. 8vo). SEE COMMENTARY.

## Prophets, Schools Of The[[@Headword:Prophets, Schools Of The]]

             These were places where young men were educated under the care of a master, who was commonly, if not always, an inspired prophet. Godwin observes that for the propagation of learning colleges and schools were in divers places erected for the prophets. The first intimation we have in Scripture of these schools is in 1Sa 10:5, where we read of “a company of prophets coming down from the high place with a psaltery, and a tabret, and a pipe, and a harp before them; and they shall prophesy.” They are supposed to be the students in a college of prophets at Gibeah of God, or. as we render it, “the hill of God,” which is another name for Gibeah of Benjamin (1Sa 13:15; 1Sa 11:4). This place seems to have been reckoned among the ancient sanctuaries of Palestine. We afterwards read of such another company of the prophets at Naioth in Ramah “prophesying, and Samuel standing as appointed over them” (1Sa 19:19-20). The students in these colleges were called “sons of the prophets.” We read of the “sons of the prophets that were at Bethel;” and of another school at Jericho; and of the sons of the prophets at Gilgal (2Ki 2:3-5; 2Ki 4:38). It appears that these sons of the prophets were very numerous; for of this sort were probably the prophets of the Lord whom Jezebel cut off; “but Obadiah took a hundred of them, and hid them by fifty in a cave” (1Ki 18:4). In these schools young men were educated under a proper master in the knowledge of religion and sacred music (1Sa 10:5; 1Sa 19:20), and were thereby qualified to be public preachers,  which seems to have been part of the business of the prophets on the Sabbath-days and festivals (2Ki 4:23). It would seem that God generally chose the prophets whom he inspired out of these schools. Amos, therefore, speaks of it as an extraordinary case that though he was not one of the sons of the prophets, but a herdsman, “yet the Lord took him as he followed the flock, and said unto him, Go, prophesy unto my people Israel” (Amo 7:14-15). That it was usual for some of these schools, or at least for their tutors, to be endued with a prophetic spirit, appears from the relation of the prophecies concerning the ascent of Elijah, delivered to Elisha by the sons of the prophets, both at Jericho and at Bethel (2Ki 2:3; 2Ki 2:5). See Bible Educator, 3, 64. SEE PEDIAGOGICS; SEE SCHOOL.

## Prophets, Sons Of The[[@Headword:Prophets, Sons Of The]]

             The disciples, or scholars, of the prophets were thus called, agreeably to the Hebrew idiom; they were instructed in the knowledge of religion and in sacred music, and were thus qualified to become public teachers (1Sa 10:11). SEE PROPHET.

## Prophets, Tombs Of The[[@Headword:Prophets, Tombs Of The]]

             “The excavations commonly known under this name,” Professor Robinson observes,” are situated on the western declivity of the Mount of Olives, a little south of the footpath leading over from St. Stephen's gate to Bethany. Pococke describes them as ‘very large, having many cells to deposit bodies in; the farther end of them they call the Labyrinth, which extends a great way; I could not find the end of it;' this part seems to have been a quarry. Doiibdan compares them with the tombs of the judges and kings; but says the chambers are not square, as in these, but consist of two large and high galleries, cut strictly one within the other in a continued curve; the holes or niches for the bodies being on a level with the floor” (Bibl. Res. 1, 529; comp. Latter Res. p. 233). See De Saullcy, Dead Sea, ii, 107; Williams, Holy City, 2, 215. SEE OLIVET. It is ordinarily supposed (but with no good reason) that it is of these tombs our Lord speaks when he says: “Woe unto you! for ye build the sepulchres of the prophets, and your fathers killed them” (Luk 11:47). SEE TOMB.

## Propitiation[[@Headword:Propitiation]]

             The Greek word ἱλαστήριον (or ἱλασμός), rendered propitiation (Rom 3:25; 1Jn 2:2; 1Jn 4:10) and mercy seat (Heb 9:5), is used in the Septuagint as the translation of the Hebrew word כִּפֹּרַת, i.e. covering, properly the lid or cover of the ark of the covenant in the most holy place, which was overlaid with pure gold, over which the cherubim stretched out their wings, and where Jehovah communed with the representatives of his people (Exo 25:17-22; Exodus 37; in the Sept. Exo 38:6-9). Into the holy place the high-priest entered but once a year, when he sprinkled upon the mercy seat or covering of the ark the blood of an expiatory victim, in order to make propitiation for the sins of the people (Lev 16:11-15). In the common Greek idiom, ἱλαστήριον properly designates an expiatory or propitiatory victim, SEE PROPITIATORY SACRIFICES; and in Rom 3:25; 1Jn 2:2; 1Jn 4:10, Christ is represented as the propitiatory sacrifice for the sin of the world. His blood alone atones for and covers our guilt. When faith is exercised in the blood of this sacrifice, its propitiatory effect is produced. In other words, Christ makes expiation which is effectual for such, and only such, as trust or put confidence in his atoning blood.

The idea of the legal reconciliation of God and all sinners who cordially receive the Gospel plan of salvation is presented under two aspects. 1. Expiation: this denotes the doing of something which shall furnish a just ground or reason in a judicial administration for pardoning a convicted offender. 2. Propitiation: anything which shall have the property of disposing, inclining, or causing the judicial authority to admit the expiation — i.e. to assent to it as a valid reason for pardoning the offender. Expiation, therefore, regards the condition of the offender; propitiation, that of the judge or sovereign. “We can conceive cases,” says Dr. J. Pye Smith, “in which an expiation, good and reasonable in its kind, might be offered, and yet a wise and good government might not be willing to accept it — i.e. might not be propitious to the offender and to the proposal for his being forgiven. We call also conceive of a wise and good government being cordially disposed and greatly desirous to pardon an offender, but unable to gratify this gracious disposition because it can find no just grounds for such an act, and it is aware that a pardon arbitrary and destitute of unexceptionable reason would relax the obligations of law, bring dishonor upon public justice, and prove of pernicious example. It is also obvious that the same thing may be, and is most naturally fit and likely to be, both an expiation and a  propitiation i.e. both a valid reason for pardoning, and a determining motive to the will of the competent authority to admit and act upon that reason.” SEE ATONEMENT.

Now, in applying these terms to the great and awful case of ourselves, the whole world of justly condemned sinners, and our judge, the infinitely perfect God, there are some cautions of great importance to be observed. Nothing can be admitted that would contradict incontrovertible first principles. But there are two such principles which are often violated by inconsiderate advocates of the doctrine of salvation by the mediation of Christ; and the violation of them has afforded the advantage of all the plausible arguments urged against that doctrine by its adversaries. The first is the immutability of God. His moral principles — that is, his rectitude, wisdom, and goodness, as expressed by his blessed and holy will — can undergo no alteration; for to admit such a supposition would be destructive of the absolute perfection of the divine nature, as it would imply either an improvement or a deterioration in the subject of the supposed change. We cannot, therefore, hear or read without unspeakable disapprobation and regret representations of the Deity as first actuated by the passions of wrath and fury towards sinful men, and as afterwards turned, by the presentation of the Saviour's sacrifice, into a different temper-a disposition of calmness, kindness, and grace. The second foundation principle is that the adorable God is, from eternity and in all the glorious constancy of his nature, gracious and merciful. He wants no extraneous motive to induce him to pity and relieve our miserable world. No change in God is necessary or desirable, even if it were possible. This is abundantly evident from many parts of the divine Word (Exo 34:6-7; Joh 3:16; Joh 6:39; Joh 10:17; Eph 1:3-10; 2Co 5:18-19).

The question whether sinners shall be pardoned is not one that can be referred to arbitrary will or absolute power. It is a question of law and government, and it is to be solved by the dictates of wisdom, goodness, justice, and consistency. God's disposition to show mercy is original and unchangeable: in this sense nothing is needed to render him propitious. But the way and manner in which it will be suitable to all the other considerations proper to be taken into the account that he should show mercy, none but himself is qualified to determine. “God is the righteous judge, and God is angry [with the wicked] every day.” But this anger is not a commotion or a mutable passion: it is the calm, dignified, unchangeable, and eternal majesty of the judge; it is his necessary love of righteousness and hatred of iniquity.  Pardon, when on any consideration it takes place, brings the true and just idea of a change; but that change, in the great case before us, is not in the mind or character of the Supreme Ruler, but it is in the administration of his government, and in those outward acts by which that administration is indicated. This change is, in the order of moral right, the effect of an adequate cause. This cause lies in the whole mediatorial work of Christ, but most particularly and essentially in his sufferings and death, and these have constituted the expiation. SEE ATONEMENT, DAY OF MEDIATION.

The Romish Church believes the mass (q.v.) to be a sacrifice of propitiation for the living and dead; while the Reformed churches, justified by the express declarations of Scripture, allow of no propitiation but that one offered by Jesus on the cross, whereby divine justice is appeased and our sins atoned for (Rom 3:20; 1Jn 2:2). SEE SACRIFICE.

## Propitiatory Sacrifices[[@Headword:Propitiatory Sacrifices]]

             include both trespass-offering and sin-offering. SEE SACRIFICE. In this place we are to examine the disputed question what the Israelites held before them as their object in offering their beasts of sacrifice; that is, whether they wished merely to offer a gift to the offended Deity (Welker, p. 288), or (as Michaelis. los. Rit. p. 64, urges) it was considered as a municipal penalty, a kind of fine; or, finally, as a substitute for the sinners presenting it, who had themselves properly deserved death. The last is the view of many rabbins (see Outram, De Sacrific. p. 251 sq.) and Church fathers (Theodor. Quaest. 61 ad Exodus; Euseb. Delm. Ev. i, 10, etc.), and lately of Bauer (Theol. d. N.T. 4:124 sq.), De Wette (Bibl. Theol. p. 98 sq.; comp. Opusc. p. 23 sq.), Gesenius (Zu. Is. ii, 189), Hengstenberg (Christol. i, 265), Scholl (in Klaiber's Stud. etc. V, ii, 143 sq.), and Tholuck (2. Beit. z. Brief. c. d. Hebr. p. 78 sq.; comp. Collul's Bibl. Theol. i, 270 sq., for many others). This meaning of the sin-offerings seems at first view the most natural, significant, and most accordant with ancient testimonies. Yet Klaiber (Studien der Wurtemb. Geistl. VIII, ii, 10 sq.) has recently combated it with acuteness, and Bohllr (Symbol. ii, 277 sq.) has offered several objections to it. Many other interpretations, some very monstrous, but offered with philosophical pretension, are referred to by Scholl (op. cit. p. 133 sq.). Early opposition to the usual view is found in Sykes (Vebs. iub. die Opfer, p. 128 sq.) and Steudel (Glaubenslehre, p. 256 sq.). Certainly some of the grounds on which it is often based are of no  weight. The formula in Lev 4:20, “And the priest shall make an atonement for them, and it shall be forgiven them,” repeated in 26:5, 10, or that in Lev 5:13, “And the priest shall make an atonement for him as touching his sin that he hath sinned in one of these, and it shall be forgiven him,” or the similar words in the 18th verse, do not make it certain that a substitution is to be thought of in the case of the sin-offering. The laying of the hand on the animal, too, though on the day of atonement (Lev 16:21) it certainly implies the laying of guilt upon it, does not in general determine this point, since it was also customary in other sacrifices. Further, that the sin-offering was considered unclean, which would only be possible in case the uncleanness of sin were considered to have passed over to it, is not to be inferred from Exo 29:14; Lev 16:28, etc. (as Klaiber has well shown), but would seem to contradict Lev 4:12; Lev 6:27 (see below). On the other hand,

(1.) Lev 17:11, unless it be interpreted in a very forced manner, can scarcely be understood to mean anything else than that the life of the sacrifice, which is in the blood, and is poured out with the blood, was offered instead of the life of him who presented it. It is not necessary to lay stress upon the rendering of כַּפֵּר(kipper, to expiate, to atone); but the parallelism between the nephesh or “life of the flesh” and the nephesh or soul for which it is given as an atonement is certainly not without force.

(2.) The sprinkling of the blood of the sin-offering shows that the mere death of the sacrifice, and the burning of pieces of its flesh on the altar, were not the object here as in other sacrifices. What other meaning could the sprinkling have than that in the blood the life is sprinkled, scattered, and so utterly destroyed? The pouring-out of the blood was not in this case, as elsewhere, merely a means of killing the animal, but was the real object in view. But it could only become an object when the sprinkling of the blood symbolizes the Substitution of the sacrifice for the offerer, who has forfeited his life by sin.

(3.) The idea that one man could suffer as a substitute for another (and hence, according to the Israelitish view, even be punished by God in his stead) is not only expressed by 2Sa 12:15 sq.; 2Sa 24:10 sq.; Isa 53:4 sq. (not Pro 21:18), but the representation of a transmission of guilt appears in Deuteronomy 21, especially Deu 21:8; in the symbolic meaning of the covenant-sacrifice (Jer 34:18 sq.; comp. Gen 15:17), and in the ritual service with the scapegoat  (Lev 16:21). See especially also Isa 43:3, where, too, the word כֹּפֶר(kophesr, ransomo), so common where the sin-offerings are mentioned, is used. (Klaiber is right in saying that כַּפֶּר, kipper-, from כָּפִר, kaphar, properly means cover; and hence points out the removal of guilt, without determining the method. Yet it remains noteworthy that this word kepher [covering over], elsewhere only used in the sense of expiation, is used here when the subject is penal substitution. Was it so easy and natural for the Israelites to view expiation as an act of substitution?) Nor must we omit to remark that חַטֵּא(chitteh [Gen 31:39], meaning properly to atone for) is used for making compensation, and Klaiber's explanation of the passage is awkward.

(4.) There can be no doubt that the representation of expiatory substitution by sacrifices was prominent among other ancient nations (Herod. 2, 39; Caesar, Bell. Gal 6:16; Ovid, Fast. 6:160; Porphyr. Abstin. 4:15). The remark of De Wette, Tholuck, and Scholl that the remnants of the sin- offerings were accounted unclean seems to have no great weight, since the eating of pieces of flesh from most of sin-offerings might be urged for the contrary view; and certainly that idea did not appear in the case of the trespass-offerings (see Bahr, op. cit. p. 393 sq.).

On the offering of men for propitiation, in case of public misfortune (2 Kings 3:37) among the Greeks. comp. Schol. in Aristoph. Plut. 454; Wachsmuth, Hele Aterth. ii, 550 sq. The self-offerings of the Romans belong here too. Kindred is the illegal hanging of the children of Saul (2Sa 21:6 sq., comp. Lassaulx, Die Siihnolfer der Griechen und Rbmer [Wurzburg, 1841]).

(5.) Lastly, a circumstance which speaks strongly for the common explanation of these sin-offerings is that all others which have been suggested are far less natural, simple, and appropriate. We need not refer especially to the homely interpretation of Michaelis. The idea that blood passed for the principle of sensuality, and hence of sin, and that thus the shedding of blood became the symbol of the putting-away of sins, does not appear in the Old Test., nor, indeed, in the New. Steudel's supposition is that the gracious acceptance by God of the offering of reconciliation was the essential element, and that the various forms of sacrifice were only intended to impress on the mind the abominable nature of sin and to lead to a true repentance; but this view is strangely barren. Klaiber supposes that  clean animals without blemish were to awaken in the worshipper the sense of the law's requirement from him and of his imperfection. But this leaves out of sight all the peculiar forms appropriated to the sin-offering, and dwells on a single circumstance which was common to all the other sacrifices, and not even confined to sacrifices. It is impossible to sacrifice the common view, which is quite satisfactory, in favor of such schemes as these. The interpretation of Menken has been sufficiently answered by Bahr (op. cit. p. 292 sq.). SEE PROPITIATION

## Proportion of Faith[[@Headword:Proportion of Faith]]

             SEE ANALOGY (of Faith).

## Propositiones Damnatae[[@Headword:Propositiones Damnatae]]

             is, in theological language. every thesis which contains either a dogmatical assertion or one intimately related to dogma. in the form of an authoritative reprobation, supported by the usual arguments afforded by Scripture, tradition, decisions of the Church, etc. The doctrinal opinions of those who diverge in any way from the belief of the Romish Church are also called propositions, and the degree of divergence is indicated by corresponding qualifications. If the authorities of the Church (general councils, or the pope himself) positively reject those propositions, they are condemned propositions, i.e. propositiones damnatae. The doctrines expounded, especially in writings, can be rejected summarily (in globo) without specification, or with special mention of each single proposition. In the latter case each condemned proposition is described by an adjective, which indicates its relation to the belief of the Church: heretical, bordering on heresy, erroneous, false, blasphemous, dangerous, immoral, etc. Such sentences have been pronounced, since the Reformation, among others, against the works of Luther, M. Bajus, Jansenius, Quesnel, etc. SEE HERESY; SEE INDEX EXPUIGATORIUS.

## Proproctors[[@Headword:Proproctors]]

             are assistants of proctors (q.v.). Prorowit, a Slavic deity, was represented with four heads on a common trunk. He carried a fifth head on his chest, and held it in such a way that his eyes could see through the intervals of the fingers. Many explanations of this extraordinary figure have been proposed, but none that is at all concordant with the spirit of the Slavic  religions: all these surmises are based on the similitude of the image with that of Janus Quadrifrons.

## Prosar[[@Headword:Prosar]]

             is the service-book containing the form of the prose (q.v.).

## Prosbol Or Prozbul[[@Headword:Prosbol Or Prozbul]]

             ( פרוזבולor פרוסבול) is the name of a legal enactment instituted by Hillel I, or the Great (q.v.). Whether the word is equivalent to the Greek προβουλή or προσβολή, or, as Sachs prefers, πρὸς βουλῇ πρεσβευτῶν, which latter is preferred by Jost and Gritz, cannot be decided. The reason for this curious legal provision, which, though contrary to the law of Moses, was necessitated by the time, and on the whole a very wholesome one, was that because, according to the law (Deuteronomy 15), the claiming of debts was unlawful during the Sabbatical year, the rich would not lend to the poor during that year, which seriously impeded commercial and social intercourse. Hillel found that under these circumstances the warning contained in Deu 15:9 was disregarded, and in order to do away with this evil he introduced the prosbol or prozbul, i.e. a declaration made before the court of justice at the time of lending not to remit the debt in the Sabbatical year. The formula of this legal declaration was as follows: שיש לי אצל פלוני שאגכנו כל זמן שארצה מוסרני לכם פלוני דייניו שבמקים פלוני שכל חוב— i.e. “I, A B, deliver to you, the judges of the district C, the declaration that I may call in at any time I like all debts due to me;” and it was signed either by the judges or witnesses. Comp. Jost, Geschichte d. Judenth. 1. s. Secten, i, 265 sq.; Gratz, Geschichte der Juden, 3, 172; Edersheim, Hist. of the Jewish Nation, p. 395: Frankel, Hodegetica in Mishnam (Leips. 1859), p. 39; Weiss, Zur Geschichte der jiid. Tradition (Wien, 1872), i, 172; Sachs, Beitrsae zur Sprach- u?. Alterthums. frschungq (Berlin, 1854), No. 2, p. 70; AMishna, Shebiith, 10:1-5; Gittin, 4:3; Peah, 3, 6; Schiirer, Lehrbuch der neutesftmenftlichen Zeitgeschichte (Leips. 1874), p. 457 sq.; Buxtorfii Lexicon Talmnudicum et Chaldaicum, col. 1806 (revised edition by B. Fischer [Leips. 1869-74], col. 898); Derenbourg, Essai sur I'Histoire et la Geographie de la Palestine (Paris, 1867), p. 188 sq.; Low, Beitriaqe zur jiidischen Alterthumskunde (Leips. 1871), vol. i, pt. ii, p. 88 sq. (B. P.)

## Prose[[@Headword:Prose]]

             (Lat. Prosa), the French name for the Sequence.

(1.) The prayer sung in the Mass after the Gradual and before the Gospel on great festivals. It required the license of the diocesan or the superior of a monastery before it could be used.

(2.) A canticle in which no metre is defined. An expression, in loose measure, of the principal circumstances of a festival to be added to the pneuma or adapted to its notes. St. Cmasarius of Aries required the laity in the diocese to sing proses and antiphons in church — some in Greek and some in Latin — aloud like the clergy, in order to introduce among the people a love of psalmody and hymns. These compositions, called prosce, are in rhyme, but ignore the law of measure and quantity established by the ancient Greeks and Romans. As they were sung after the Gradual or Introits, they were likewise called Sequatio (q.v.). The use of prosing began near the close of the 9th century. Notker, abbot of St. Gall, cir. 880, composed and favored the use of proses, but certainly did not invent them. He says that lie found one in an antiphonar brought from a Benedictine abbey near Rome, which had been burned by the Normans in 841. Pope Nicholas first authorized their use. Proses in the Middle Ages were written in the vulgar tongue for the edification of the people. These proses, having become exceedingly numerous, and in some places even ridiculous, were retrenched by the Council of Cologne in 1536, and of Rheims in 1564. The four proses used since the time of Pius V are Victimae Paschali Laudes, for Easter: leni Creator Spiritus, appointed by pope Innocent 3, at Whitsuntide; Lautda Sion Staletoremn, for Corpus Christi Day, writ ten either by Bonaventura or St. Thomas Aquinas; and the Dies irae, Dies illa, used in the commemorations of the dead, and attributed to Thomas de Cellano, or Salerno, a Franciscan, cir. 1230, cardinal Ursin (who died 1204), cardinal D'Aquasporta (who died 1302), Humbert, general of the Dominicans (who died 1277), Auguslus Biuzellensis, or Bonaventura. The Stabat Malter Dolorosa, written by pope Innocent 3, or Giacomo da Toda, a Minorite, in the 14th century, is a prose. Possibly the chants used by St. Allhelm, bishop of Sherborne, sitting on the bridge of Malmesbury, to win the attention of the passers-by, were of the nature of proses. In the 12th, 13th, and 14th centuries rhythmical chants were sung at the end of a banquet which the pope gave to his clergy. At Sens, Lyons, Paris, and Rouen proses were in frequent use (unlike the Roman custom), but they  were mere rhapsodies, as we have in one instance preserved to us “Alle — necnon et perenne celeste — luia.” After the prose, the Mass-book is removed from the Epistle to the Gospel side, to represent the translation of authority from the Aaronitish to the apostolical priesthood. — Walcott, Sacred Archceology, s.v.; Burney, Hist. of Music, s.v.

## Proselyte[[@Headword:Proselyte]]

             (προσήλυτος, one who has joined a new faith) occurs only in the A.V. of the New Test. (Mat 23:15; Act 2:10; Act 6:5; Act 13:43); but, the Greek word is occasionally used in the Sept. (1 Chronicles 22:22, etc.) as a rendering of the Heb. גֵּר, ger (a stranger, as usually rendered; sometimes Graecized in the Sept. γειώρας [Exo 2:19] from the Aramaic form גַיּוֹרָא). (The following article is substantially based upon Levrer's treatment of the subject in Herzog's Real Encyklopadie, with additions from other sources.) SEE ALIEN.

I. Historical Development of this Class. — The existence, through all stages of the history of the Israelites, of a body of men, not of the same race, but holding the same faith and adopting the same ritual, is a fact which, from its very nature, requires to be dealt with historically.

1. During the Patriarchal Age. — The position of the family of Israel as a distinct nation, with a special religious character, appears at a very early period to have exercised a power of attraction over neighboring races. The slaves and soldiers of the tribe of which Abraham was the head (Gen 17:27), who were included with him in the covenant of circumcision, can hardly perhaps be classed as proselytes in the later sense. The case of the Shechemites, however (ch. 34), presents a more distinct instance. The converts were swayed partly by passion, partly by interest. The sons of Jacob then, as afterwards, required circumcision as an indispensable condition (Gen 34:14). This, and apparently this only, was required of proselytes in the pre-Mosaic period.

2. From the Exodus to the Monarchy. — The life of Israel under the law, from the very first, presupposes and provides for the incorporation of men of other races. The “mixed multitude” of Exo 12:38 implies the presence of proselytes more or less complete. It is recognised in the earliest rules for the celebration of the Passover (Exo 12:19). The “stranger” of this and other laws in the A.V. answers to the word which  distinctly means “proselyte,” and is so translated in the Sept, and the prominence of the class may be estimated by the frequency with which the word recurs: nine times in Exodus, twenty in Leviticus, eleven in Numbers, nineteen in Deuteronomy. The laws clearly point to the position of a convert. The “stranger” is bound by the law of the Sabbath (20:10; 23:12; Deu 5:14). Circumcision is the condition of any fellowship with him (Exo 12:48; Num 9:14). He is to be present at the Passover (Exo 12:19), the Feast of Weeks (Deu 16:11), the Feast of Tabernacles (Deu 16:14), the Day of Atonement (Lev 16:29). The laws of prohibited marriages (Lev 18:26) and abstinence from blood (Lev 17:10) are binding upon him. He is liable to the same punishment for Molech-worship (Lev 20:2) and for blasphemy (Lev 24:16); may claim the same right of asylum as the Israelites in the cities of refuge (Num 35:15; Jos 20:9). On the other side he is subjected to some drawbacks. He cannot hold land (Lev 19:10). He has no jus connubii with the descendants of Aaron (Lev 21:14). His condition is assumed to be, for the most part, one of poverty (Lev 23:22), often of servitude (Deu 29:11). For this reason he is placed under the special protection of the law (10:18). He is to share in the right of gleaning (Lev 19:10), is placed in the same category as the fatherless and the widow (Deu 24:17; Deu 24:19; Deu 26:12; Deu 27:19), is joined with the Levite as entitled to the tithe of every third year's produce (14:29; 26:12). Among the proselytes of this period the Kenites (q.v.), who under Hobab accompanied the Israelites in their wanderings, and ultimately settled in Canaan, were probably the most conspicuous (Jdg 1:16). The presence of the class was recognised in the solemn declaration of blessings and curses from Ebal and Gerizim (Jos 8:33).

The period after the conquest of Canaan was not favorable to the admission of proselytes. The people had no strong faith, no commanding position. The Gibeonites (ch. 9) furnish the only instance of a conversion, and their condition is rather that of slaves compelled to conform than that of free proselytes. SEE NETHINIM.

3. The Period of the Monarchy. — With the introduction of royalty, and the consequent fame and influence of the people, there was more to attract stragglers from the neighboring nations, and we meet accordingly with many names which suggest the presence of men of another race conforming to the faith of Israel. Doeg the Edomite (1Sa 21:7),  Uriah the Hittite (2Sa 11:3), Araunah the Jebusite (2Sa 22:23), Zelek the Ammonite (2Sa 23:37), Ithmah the Moabite (1Ch 11:46) — these two in spite of an express law to the contrary (Deu 23:3) — and at a later period Shebnah the scribe (probably; comp. Alexander on Isa 22:15), and Ebed-Melech the Ethiopian (Jer 38:7), are examples that such proselytes might rise even to high offices about the person of the king. The Cherethites and Pelethites (q.v.) consisted probably of foreigners who had been attracted to the service of David, and were content for it to adopt the religion of their master (Ewald, Gesch. i, 330; 3, 183). The vision in Psalms 87 of a time in which men of Tyre, Egypt, Ethiopia, Philistia, should all be registered among the citizens of Zion can hardly fail to have had its starting-point in some admission of proselytes within the memory of the writer (Ewald and De Wette, ad loc.). A convert of another kind, the type, as it has been thought, of the later proselytes of the gate (see below), is found in Naaman the Syrian (2Ki 5:15; 2Ki 5:18) recognising Jehovah as his God, yet not binding himself to any rigorous observance of the law.

The position of the proselytes during this period appears to have undergone considerable changes. On the one hand, men rose, as we have seen, to power and fortune. The case for which the law provided (Lev 25:47) might actually occur, and they might be the creditors of Israelites as debtors, the masters of Israelites as slaves. It might well be a sign of the times in the later days of the monarchy that they became “very high,” the “head” and not the “tail” of the people (Deu 28:43-44). The picture had, however, another side. They were treated by David and Solomon as a subject class, brought (like Periceci, almost like Helots) under a system of compulsory labor from which others were exempted (1Ch 22:2; 2Ch 2:17-18). The statistics of this period, taken probably for that purpose, give their number (i.e. apparently the number of adult working males) at 153,600 (ibid.). They were subject at other times to wanton insolence and outrage (Psa 94:6). As some compensation for their sufferings they became the special objects of the care and sympathy of the prophets. One after another of the “goodly fellowship” pleads the cause of the proselytes as warmly as that of the widow and the fatherless (Jer 7:6; Jer 22:3 : Eze 22:7; Eze 22:29; Zec 7:10; Mal 3:5). A large accession of converts enters into all their hopes of the divine kingdom (Isa 2:2; Isa 11:10; Isa 56:3-6; Mic 4:1). The sympathy of one of them goes still further. He sees, in  the far future, the vision of a time when the last remnant of inferiority shall be removed, and the proselytes, completely emancipated, shall be able to hold and inherit land even as the Israelites (Eze 47:22).

4. From the Babylonian Captivity to the Destruction of Jerusalem. — The proselytism of this period assumed a different character. It was for the most part the conformity, not of a subject race, but of willing adherents. Even as early as the return from Babylon we have traces of those who were drawn to a faith which they recognised as holier than their own, and had “separated themselves” unto the law of Jehovah (Neh 10:28). The presence of many foreign names among the Nethinim (7:46-59) leads us to believe that many of the new converts dedicated themselves specially to the service of the new Temple. With the conquests of Alexander, the wars between Egypt and Syria, the struggle under the Maccabees, the expansion of the Roman empire, the Jews became more widely known, and their power to proselytize increased. They had suffered for their religion in the persecution of Antiochus, and the spirit of martyrdom was followed naturally by propagandism. Their monotheism was rigid and unbending. Scattered through the East and West, a marvel and a portent, wondered at and scorned, attracting and repelling, they presented. in an age of shattered creeds and corroding doubts, the spectacle of a faith, or at least a dogma, which remained unshaken. The influence was sometimes obtained well, and exercised for good. In most of the great cities of the empire there were men who had been rescued from idolatry and its attendant debasements, and brought under the power of a higher moral law. It is possible that in some cases the purity of Jewish life may have contributed to this result, ant attracted men or women who shrank from the unutterable contamination in the midst of which they lived. The converts who were thus attracted joined, with varying strictness (see below), in the worship of the Jews.

They were present in their synagogues (Act 13:42-43; Act 13:50; Act 17:4; Act 18:7). They came up as pilgrims to the great feasts at Jerusalem (Act 2:10). In Palestine itself the influence was often stronger and better. Even Roman centurions learned to love the conquered nation, built synagogues for them (Luk 7:5), tasted and prayed, and gave alms, after the pattern of the strictest Jews (Act 10:2; Act 10:30), and became preachers of the new faith to the soldiers under them (Act 10:7). Such men, drawn by what was best in Judaism, were naturally among the readiest receivers of the new truth which rose out of it, and became in many cases the nucleus of a Gentile church.  Proselytism had, however, its darker side. The Jews of Palestine were eager to spread their faith by the same weapons as those with which they had defended it. Had not the power of the empire stood in the way, the religion of Moses, stripped of its higher elements, might have been propagated far and wide by force, as was afterwards the religion of Mohammed. As it was, the Idumeans had the alternative offered them by John Hyrcanus of death, exile, or circumcision (Josephus, Ant. 13:9, 3). The Itureans were converted in the same way by Aristobulus (ibid. 13:11, 3). In the more frenzied fanaticism of a later period, the Jews under Josephus could hardly be restrained from seizing and circumcising two chiefs of Trachonitis who had come as envoys (Josephus, Life, 23). They compelled a Roman centurion, whom they had taken prisoner, to purchase his life by accepting the sign of the covenant (Josephus, War, ii, 11, 10).

Where force was not in their power (the “veluti Judaei, cogemus” of Horace, Sat. i, 4, 142, implies that they sometimes ventured on it even at Rome), they obtained their ends by the most unscrupulous fraud. They appeared as soothsayers, diviners, exorcists, and addressed themselves especially to the fears and superstitions of women. Their influence over these became the subject of indignant satire (Juvenal, Sat. 6:543-547). They persuaded noble matrons to send money and purple to the Temple (Josephus, Ant. 18:3, 5). At Damascus the wives of nearly half the population were supposed to be tainted with Judaism (Josephus, War, ii, 10, 2). At Rome they numbered in their ranks, in the person of Poppaea, even an imperial concubine (Josephus, Ant. 20:7, 11). The converts thus made cast off all ties of kindred and affection (Tacitus, Hist. v, 9). Those who were most active in proselytizing were precisely those from whose teaching all that was most true and living had departed. The vices of the Jew were ingrafted on the vices of the heathen. A repulsive casuistry released the convert from obligations which he had before recognised, while in other things he was bound hand and foot to an unhealthy superstition. The Law of the Corban may serve as one instance (Mat 15:4-6). Another is found in the rabbinic teaching as to marriage. Circumcision, like a new birth, cancelled all previous relationships, and unions within the nearest degrees of blood were therefore no longer incestuous (Maimon. ex Jeban. p. 982; Selden, De Jutre Nat. et Gent. ii, 4; Uxor Hebr. ii, 18). It was no wonder that the proselyte became “twofold more the child of Gehenna” (Mat 23:15) than the Pharisees themselves.  The position of such proselytes was indeed every way pitiable. At Rome, and in other large cities, they became the butts of popular scurrility. The words “curtus,” “verpes,” met them at every corner (Horace, Sat. i, 4, 142; Martial, 7:29, 34, 81; 11:95; 12:37). They had to share the fortunes of the people with whom they had cast, in their lot, might be banished from Italy (Act 18:2; Suet. Claud. 25), or sent to die of malaria in the most unhealthy stations of the empire (Tacitus, Ann. ii, 85). At a later time, they were bound to make a public profession of their conversion, and to pay a special tax (Sueton. Domit. xii). If they failed to do this and were suspected, they might be subject to the most degrading examination to ascertain the fact of their being proselytes (ibid.) Among the Jews themselves their case was not much better. For the most part, the convert gained but little honor even from those who gloried in having brought him over to their sect and party. The popular Jewish feeling about them was like the popular Christian feeling about a converted Jew. ‘They were regarded (by a strange rabbinic perversion of Isa 14:1) as the leprosy of Israel, “cleaving” to the house of Jacob (Jebam. 47:4; Kiddush. 70:6). An opprobrious proverb coupled them with the vilest profligates (“proselyti et poederastae”) as hindering the coming of the Messiah (Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. in Mat 23:5). It became a recognised maxim that no wise man would trust a proselyte even to the twenty-fourth generation (Jalkuth Ruth, f. 163 a).

The better rabbins did their best to guard against these evils. Anxious to exclude all unworthy converts, they grouped them, according to their motives, with a somewhat quaint classification:

“1. Love-proselytes, where they were drawn by the hope of gaining the beloved one. (The story of Syllaeus and Salome [Josephus, Ant. 16:7, § 6)] is an example of a half-finished conversion of this kind.)

“2. Man-for-woman, or Woman-for-man proselytes, where the husband followed the religion of the wife, or conversely.

“3. Esther-proselytes, where conformity was asnsumed to escape danger, as in the original Purim (Est 8:11).

“4. King's-table proselytes, who were led by the hope of court favor and promotion, like the converts under David and Solomon.  “

5. Lion-proselytes, where the conversion originated in a superstitious dread of a divine judgment, as with the Samaritans of 2Ki 17:26”

(Gemara Hieros. Kiddush. 65:6; Jost, Judenth. i, 448). None of these were regarded as fit for admission within the covenant. When they met with one with whose motives they were satisfied, he was put to a yet further ordeal. He was warned that in becoming a Jew he was attaching himself to a persecuted people, that in this life he was to expect only suffering, and to look for his reward in the next. Sometimes these cautions were in their turn carried to an extreme and amounted to a policy of exclusion. A protest against them on the part of a disciple of the Great Hillel is recorded, which throws across the dreary rubbish of rabbinism the momentary gleam of a noble thought. “Our wise men teach,” said Simon ben-Gamaliel, “that when a heathen comes to enter into the covenant, our part is to stretch out our hand to him and to bring him under the wings of God” (Jost, Judenth. i, 447).

Another mode of meeting the difficulties of the case was characteristic of the period. Whether we may transfer to it the full formal distinction between proselytes of the gate and proselytes of righteousness (see below) may be doubtful enough, but we find two distinct modes of thought, two distinct policies in dealing with converts. The history of Helena, queen of Adiabene, and her son Izates, presents the two in collision with each other. They had been converted by a Jewish merchant, Ananias, but the queen feared lest the circumcision of her son should disquiet and alarm her subjects. Ananias assured her that it was not necessary. Her son might worship God, study the law, keep the commandments without it. Soon, however, a stricter teacher came-Eleazar of Galilee. Finding Izates reading the law, he told him sternly that it was of little use to study that which he disobeyed, and so worked upon his fears that the young devotee was eager to secure the safety of which his uncircumcision had deprived him (Josephus, Ant. 20:2, 5; comp. Jost, Judenth. i, 341). On the part of some, therefore, there was a disposition to dispense with what others looked upon as indispensable. The centurions of Luke 7 (probably) and Acts 10 — possibly the Hellenes of Joh 12:20 and Act 13:42 — are instances of men admitted on the former footing. The phrases οἱ σεβόμενοι προσήλυτοι (Act 13:43), οἱ σεβόμενοι (Act 17:4; Act 17:17; Josephus, Ant. 14:7, 2), ἄνδρες εὐλαβεῖς (Act 2:5; Act 7:2), are often, but inaccurately, supposed to describe the same class — the proselytes of the gate (see  Cremer, Worterb. der neutest. Gricitat, ii, 476). The probability is either that the terms were used generally of all converts, or, if with a specific meaning, were applied to the full proselytes of righteousness (comp. a full examination of the passages in question by N. Lardner, On the Decree of Acts 15, in Works, 11:305). The two tendencies were, at all events, at work, and the battle between them was renewed afterwards on holier ground and on a wider scale. Ananias and Eleazar were represented in the two parties of the Council of Jerusalem. The germ of truth had been quickened into a new life, and was emancipating itself from the old thraldom. The decrees of the council were the solemn assertion of the principle that believers in Christ were to stand on the footing of proselytes of the gate, not of proselytes of righteousness. The teaching of St. Paul as to righteousness and its conditions, its dependence on faith, its independence of circumcision, stands out in sharp, clear contrast with the teachers who taught that that rite was necessary to salvation, and confined the term “righteousness” to the circumcised convert.

5. From the Destruction of Jerusalem downwards. — The teachers who carried on the rabbinical succession consoled themselves, as they saw the new order waxing and their own glory waning, by developing the decaying system with an almost microscopic minuteness. They would at least transmit to future generations the full measure of the religion of their fathers. In proportion as they ceased to have any power to proselytize, they dwelt with exhaustive fulness on the question how proselytes were to be made. To this period accordingly belong the rules and decisions which are often carried back to an earlier age, and which may now be conveniently discussed. The precepts of the Talmud may indicate the practices and opinions of the Jews from the second to the fifth century. They are very untrustworthy as to any earlier time.

II. Debatable Questions. — The points of interest which present themselves for inquiry are the following:

1. The Classification of' Proselytes. — The whole Jewish state was considered as composed of the two classes — Jews, and strangers within their gates, or proselytes. In later years this distinction was observed even to the second generation; a child of pure Jewish descent on both sides being designated ῾Εβραῖος ἐξ ῾Εβραίων, a “Hebrew of the Hebrews” (Phil. 3, 5), while the son of a proselyte was denominated בֵןאּגֵּי, ben-ger, “son of a stranger;” and if both parents were proselytes, he was styled by  the rabbins בגבג, a contraction for ובןאּגרה בןאּגר(Pirke Aboth, c. 5). Subordinate to this, however, was a division which has been in part anticipated, and was recognised by the Talmudic rabbins, but received its full expansion at the hands of Maimonides (Hilc. Mel. i, 6). They claimed for it a remote antiquity, a divine authority.

(1.) The term Proselytes of the Gate (גֵּרֵי הִשִּׁעִר) was derived from the frequently occurring description in the law, “the stranger (גֵּר) that is within thy gates” (Exo 20:10, etc.). They were known also as the sojourners (גֵּרֵי תוֹשָב), with a reference to Lev 25:47, etc. To, them were referred the greater part of the precepts of the law as to the “stranger.” The Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan give this as the equivalent in Deu 24:21. Converts of this class were not bound by circumcision and the other special laws of the Mosaic code. It was enough for them to observe the seven precepts of Noah (Otho, Lex. Rabb. s.v. Noachida; Selden, De fur. Nat. et Gent. i, 10), i.e. the six supposed to have been given to Adam —

(1) against idolatry,

(2) against blaspheming,

(3) against bloodshed,

(4) against uncleanness,

(5) against theft,

(6) of obedience, with

(7) the prohibition of “flesh with the blood thereof” given to Noah.

The proselyte was not to claim the privileges of an Israelite, might not redeem his first-born, or pay the half-shekel. He was forbidden to study the law under pain of death (Otho, l.c.) The later rabbins, when Jerusalem had passed into other hands, held that it was unlawful for him to reside within the holy city (Maimon. Beth-haccher. 7:14). In return they allowed him to offer whole burnt-offerings for the priest to sacrifice, and to contribute money to the Corban of the Temple. They held out to him the hope of a place in the paradise of the world to come (Leyrer). They insisted that the profession of his faith should be made solemnly in the presence of three witnesses (Maimon. Hilc. Mel. 8:10). The Jubilee was the proper season for his admission (Muller, De Pros. in Ugolino, 22:841).

All this seems so full and precise that we cannot wonder that it has led many writers to look on it as representing a reality, and most  commentators accordingly have seen these proselytes of the gate in the σεβόμενοι, εὐλαβεῖς, φοβούμενοι τόν θεόν of the Acts. It remains doubtful, however, whether it was ever more than a paper scheme of what ought to be, disguising itself as having actually been. The writers who are most full, who claim for the distinction the highest antiquity, confess that there had been no proselytes of the gate since the two tribes and a half had been carried away into captivity (Maimonides, Hilc. Mel. i, 6). They could only be admitted at the jubilee, and there had since then been no jubilee celebrated (Muller, l.c.). All that can be said therefore is, that in the time of the New Test. we have independent evidence (ut supra) of the existence of converts of two degrees, and that the Talmudic division is the formal systematizing of an earlier fact. The words “proselytes” and οἱ σεβόμενοι τὸν θεόν were, however, in all probability limited to the circumcised.

(2.) In contrast with these were the Proselytes of Righteousness (גֵּרֵי הִצֶּדֶק), known also as Proselytes of the Covenant, perfect Israelites. By some writers the Talmudic phrase proselyti tracti (גְּרוּרַים) is applied to them as drawn to the covenant by spontaneous conviction (Buxtorf, Lex. s.v.), while others (Kimchi) refer it to those who were constrained to conformity, like the Gibeonites. Here also we must receive what we find with the same limitation as before. That there were, in later times especially, many among the Jews who had renounced the grosser parts of heathenism without having come over entirely to Judaism, is beyond all doubt; but that these were ever counted proselytes admits of question. Certain it is that the proselytes mentioned in the New Test. were all persons who had received circumcision, and entered the pale of the Jewish community; they were persons who, according to the phraseology of the Old Test. had become Jews (מַּתְיִחֲדַים, joined, Est 8:17). It is probable that the distinction above mentioned was introduced by the later rabbins for the sake of including among the conquests of their religion those who, though indebted probably to the Jewish Scriptures for their improved faith, were yet not inclined to submit to the ritual of Judaism, or to become incorporated with the Jewish nation. That this, however, was not the ancient view is clearly apparent from a passage in the Babylonian Gemara, quoted by Lightfoot (Hor. Heb. et Talmn. in Mat 3:6), where it is said expressly that “no one is a proselyte until such time as he has been circumcised.” Furst, himself a Jew, confirms our suggestion; for in a note upon the word גֵּר, in his Concordantioe Libb. V. T., he says: “The Jews, interpreting  dogmatically rather than historically, refer the word to him who has abandoned heathen superstitions.” Maimonides, indeed, speaks of such a distinction, but the lateness of the period at which he flourished (A.D. 1160), and the absence of any scriptural authority, require us to consider his assertions as referring to a time much later than that of the apostles. “According to my idea,” says bishop Tomline, “proselytes were those, and those only, who took upon themselves the obligation of the whole Mosaic law, but retained that name till they were admitted into the congregation of the Lord as adopted children. Gentiles were allowed to worship and offer sacrifices to the God of Israel in the outer court of the Temple; and some of them, persuaded of the sole and universal sovereignty of the Lord Jehovah, might renounce idolatry without embracing the Mosaic law; but such persons appear to me never to be called proselytes in Scripture, or in any ancient Christian writer” (Elements of Christian Theology, 1. 266, 267). Dr. Lardner has remarked that the notion of two sorts of proselytes is not to be found in any Christian writer before the fourteenth century ( Works, 6. 522-533, 8vo. and 11:313-324; see also Jennings, Jewish Antiquities, bk. 1, ch. 3). The arguments on the other side are ably stated in Townsend, Chronological Arrangements of the New Testament, 2, 115, etc., Lond. ed.

2. Ceremonies of Admission. — Here all seems at first clear and definite enough. The proselyte was first catechised as to his motives (Maimonides, ut sup.). If these were satisfactory, he was first instructed as to the divine protection of the Jewish people, and then circumcised. In the case of a convert already circumcised (a Midianite, e.g., or an Egyptian), it was still necessary to draw a few drops of “the blood of the covenant” (Gem. Bab. Shabb. f. 135 a). A special prayer was appointed to accompany the act of circumcision. Often the proselyte took a new name, opening the Hebrew Bible and accepting the first that came (Leyrer, ut sup.).

All this, however, was not enough. The convert was still a “stranger.” His children would be counted as bastards, i.e. aliens. Baptism was required to complete his admission. When the wound caused by circumcision was healed, he was stripped of all his clothes, in the presence of the three witnesses who had acted as his teachers, and who now acted as his sponsors, the “fathers” of the proselyte (Ketubh. 11; Erubh. 15:1), and led into the tank or pool. As he stood there, up to his neck in water, they repeated the great commandments of the law. These he promised and vowed to keep, and then. with an accompanying benediction, he plunged  under the water. To leave one hand-breadth of his body unsubmnerged would have vitiated the whole rite (Otho, Lex. Rabb. s.v. Baptismus; Keisk. De Bapet. Pros. in Ugolino, vol. 22). Strange as it seems. this part of the ceremony occupied, in the eyes of the later rabbins, a co-ordinate place with circumcision. The latter was incomplete without it, for baptism also was of the fathers (Gem. Bab. Jebam. f. 461, 2). One rabbin appears to have been bold enough to declare baptism to have been sufficient by itself (ibid.); but, for the most part, both were reckoned as alike indispensable. They carried back the origin of the baptism to a remote antiquity, finding it in the command of Jacob (Gen 35:2) and of Moses (Exo 19:10). The Targum of the pseudo-Jonathan inserts the word “Thou shalt circumcise and baptize” in Exo 12:44. Even in the Ethiopic version of Mat 23:15 we find “compass sea and land to baptize one proselyte.” Language foreshadowing, or caricaturing, a higher truth was used of this baptism. It was a new birth (Jebam. f. 62, 1; 92, 1; Maimonides, Issur. Bich. c. 14; Lightfoot, Harm. of the Gospels, 3:14; Exerc. on John 3). The proselyte became a little child. This thought probably had its starting-point in the language of Psalms 87. There also the proselytes of Babylon and Egypt are registered as “born” in Zioti. SEE REGENERATION. The new convert received the Holy Spirit (Jebam. f. 22 a, 48 b). All natural relationships, as we have seen, were cancelled.

The baptism was followed, as long as the Temple stood, by the offering or corban. It consisted. like the offerings after a birth (the analogy apparently being carried on), of two turtle-doves or pigeons (Leviticus 12:18). When the destruction of Jerusalem made the sacrifice impossible, a vow to offer it as soon as the Temple should be rebuilt was substituted. For women-proselytes, there were only baptism and the corban, or, in later times, baptism by itself. The Galilaean female proselytes were said to have objected to this, as causing barrenness.

3. Antiquity of these Practices. — Was this ritual observed as early as the commencement of the 1st century? If so, was the baptism of John or that of the Christian Church in any way derived from or connected with the baptism of proselytes? If not, was the latter in any way borrowed from the former? This point has been somewhat discussed above, but it will be enough to sum up the conclusions which seem fairly to be drawn from the extant information on the subject, especially the question of the baptism of proselytes.

(1.) There is no direct evidence of the practice being in use before the destruction of Jerusalem. The statements of the Talmud as to its having come from the fathers, and their exegesis of the Old Test. in connection with it, are alike destitute of authority.

(2.) The negative argument drawn from the silence of the Old Test., of the Apocrypha, of Philo, and of Josephus, is almost decisive against the belief that there was in their time a baptism of proselytes with as much importance attached to it as we find in the Talmudists.

(3.) It remains probable, however, that there was a baptism in use at a period considerably earlier than that for which we have direct evidence. ‘The symbol was in itself natural and fit. It fell in with the disposition of the Pharisees and others to multiply and discuss “washings” (βαπτισμοί, Mar 7:4) of all kinds. The tendency of the later rabbins was rather to heap together the customs and traditions of the past than to invent new ones. If there had not been a baptism, there would have been no initiatory rite at all for female proselytes. The custom of baptizing proselytes thus arose gradually out of the habit which the Jews had of purifying by ablution whatever they deemed unclean, and came to be raised for the first time to the importance of an initiatory ordinance after the destruction of the Temple service, and when, in consequence of imperial edicts, it became difficult to circumcise converts. This latter opinion is that of Schneckenburger (Ueb. das AIter d. jud. Proselyten-Taufe [Berlin, 1828]), and has been espoused by several eminent German scholars.

To us, however, it appears exceedingly unsatisfactory. The single fact adduced in support of it, viz. the difficulty of circumcising converts in consequence of the imperial edicts against proselytism, is a singularly infelicitous piece of evidence; for, as the question to be solved is, How came the later rabbins to prescribe both baptism and circumcision as initiatory rites for proselytes? it is manifestly absurd to reply that it was because they could only baptize and could not circumcise: such an answer is a contradiction, not a solution of the question. Besides, this hypothesis suggests a source of proselyte baptism which is equally available for that which it is designed to supersede; for, if the practice of baptizing proselytes on their introduction into Judaism had its rise in the Jewish habit of ablution, why might not this have operated in the way suggested two hundred years before Christ as well as two hundred years after Christ.? In fine, this hypothesis still leaves unremoved the master difficulty of that side of the question which it is designed to support, viz. the great improbability of the Jews adopting for  the first time subsequently to the death of Christ a religious rite which was well known to be the initiatory rite of Christianity. Assuming that they practiced that rite before, we can account for their not giving it up simply because the Christians had adopted it; but, trace it as we please to Jewish customs and rites, it seems utterly incredible that after it had become the symbol and badge of the religious party which of all others, perhaps, the Jews most bitterly hated, any consideration whatever should have induced them to begin to practice it. On the other hand we have, in favor of the hypothesis that proselyte baptism was practiced anterior to the time of our Lord, some strongly corroborative evidence.

1. We have, in the first place, the unanimous tradition of the Jewish rabbins, who impute to the practice au antiquity commensurate almost with that of their nation.

2. We have the fact that the baptism of John the Baptist was not regarded by the people as aught of a novelty, nor was represented by him as resting for its authority upon any special divine revelation.

3. We have the fact that the Pharisees looked upon the baptism both of John and Jesus as a mode of proselytizing men to their religious views (Joh 4:1-3). and that the dispute between the Jews and some of John's disciples about purifying was apparently a dispute as to the competing claims of John and Jesus to make proselytes (3, 25 sq.).

4. We have the fact that on the day of Pentecost Peter addressed to a multitude of persons collected from several different and distant countries, Jews and proselytes, an exhortation to ‘“repent and be baptized” (Act 2:38), from which it may be fairly inferred that they all knew what baptism meant, and also its connection with repentance or a change of religious views.

5. We have the fact that, according to Josephus, the Essenes were accustomed, before admitting a new convert into their society, solemnly and ritually to purify him with waters of cleansing (War, 2, 8, 7), a statement which cannot be understood of their ordinary ablutions before meals (as Stuart proposes in his Essay on the Mode of Baptism, p. 67); for Josephus expressly adds that even after this lustration two years had to elapse before the neophyte enjoyed the privilege of living with the proficients. 6. We have the mode in which Josephus speaks of the baptism of John, when, after referring to John's having exhorted the people to  virtue, righteousness, and godliness, as preparatory to baptism, he adds, “For it appeared to him that baptism was admissible not when they used it for obtaining forgiveness of some sins, but for the purification of the body when the soul had been already cleansed by righteousness” (Ant. 18:5, 2); which seems to indicate the conviction of the historian that John did not introduce this rite, but only gave to it a peculiar meaning. Yet John's proceeding was not an act of initiation into any new system of faith, much less comparable to a conversion from paganism; for the subjects were Jews already. It was rather a general ablution, in token of wiping off a long- accumulated score of offences. SEE JOHN THE BAPTIST

(4.) The history of the New Test. itself suggests the existence of such a custom. A sign is seldom chosen unless it already has a meaning for those to whom it is addressed. The fitness of the sign in this case would be in proportion to the associations already connected with it. It would bear witness on the assumption of the previous existence of the proselyte- baptism that the change from the then condition of Judaism to the kingdom of God was as great as that from idolatry to Judaism. The question of the priests and Levites, “Why baptizest thou then?” (Joh 1:25), implies that they wondered, not at the thing itself, but at its being done for Israelites by one who disclaimed the names which, in their eyes, would have justified the introduction of a new order. In like manner the words of Christ to Nicodemus (3, 10) imply the existence of a teaching as to baptism like that above referred to. He, “the teacher of Israel,” had been familiar with “these things” — the new birth, the gift of the Spirit — as words and phrases applied to heathen proselytes. He failed to grasp the deeper truth which lay beneath them, and to see that they had a wider, a universal application. SEE REGENERATION BY WATER.

(5.) That the Jews directly borrowed this custom from the Christians is an opinion which, though supported by De Wette (in his De Morte Christi expiatoria), cannot be for a moment admitted by any who reflect on the implacable hatred with which the Jews for many centuries regarded Christianity, its ordinances, and its professors. It is, however, not improbable that there may have been a reflex action in this matter from the Christian upon the Jewish Church. The rabbins saw the new society, in proportion as the Gentile element in it became predominant, throwing off circumcision, relying on baptism only. They could not ignore the reverence which men had for the outward sign, their belief that it was all but identical with the thing signified. There was everything to lead them to give a fresh  prominence to what had been before subordinate. If the Nazarenes attracted men by their baptism, they would show that they had baptism as well as circumcision. The necessary absence of the corban after the destruction of the Temple would also tend to give more importance to the remaining rite. The reader will find the whole subject amply discussed in the following works: Selden, De Jure Natt. et Gent. 2, 2; Otho, Lex. Rabb. p. 65; Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. et Talm. in Mat 3:6; Danz in Meuschenii Nov. Test. ex Talm. Illust. p. 233 sq., 287 sq.; Witsius, (scon. Fed. 4:15; Kuinll, Comin. in Libros N.T. Histor. ap. Mat 3:6; and Dr. Halley's recent volume on the Sacraments (Lond. 1844), p. 114 sq., all of whom contend for the antiquity of Jewish proselyte-baptism, while the following take the opposite side: Wernsdorff, Controv. de Bapt. Recent. § 18; Carpzov, Apparat. p. 47 sq.; Paulus, Comment. i, 279; Bauer, Gottesdienstl. Velfitssung der Alien Heb. ii, 392; Schneckenburger, Lib. sub. cit.; and Moses Stuart, in the American Bib. Rep. No. 10. See also Bible Educator, ii, 38 sq. SEE BAPTISM.

4. Two facts of some interest remain to be noticed in this connection.

(1.) It formed part of the rabbinic hopes of the kingdom of the Messiah that then there should be no more proselytes. The distinctive name, with its brand of inferiority, should be laid aside, and all, even the Nethinim and the Mamzerim (children of mixed marriages), should be counted pure (Schottgen, Hor. Heb. ii, 614).

(2.) Partly, perhaps, as connected with this feeling, partly in consequence of the ill-repute into which the word had fallen, there is, throughout the New Test., a sedulous avoidance of it. The Christian convert from heathenism is not a proselyte, but a νεόφυτος (1Ti 3:6).

III. Literature. — In addition to the works cited above, see, in general, Buxtorf, Lex. Talmn. et Rabb. s.v. גר; Otho, Lex. Rabb. p. 65; Bodenschatz, Kirchl. Verfaiss. der Juden, 4:70 sq.; Schrider, Sattzunsgen untd Gebrauche des talm.-reabb. Judenth.; the archgeologies of Jahn (3, 215 sq.), De Wette (p. 348 sq.), Keil (i, 316 sq.), Carpzov, Lewis, and Bauer; Saalschiitz, Mosaisches Recht, ii, 690 sq., 704 sq., 730 sq.; Leusden, Phil. Hebr. Misc. p. 142 sq.; the monographs by Slevogt, Alting, and Muller, in Ugolini Thesaur.; those cited by Danz, Worterb. p. 797 sq.; append. p. 88; by Winer, Renalworterb. s.v.; by Filrst, Biblioth. Jud. i, 146; 3, 345, 392, 459, 471, 488, 555; and by Volbeding, Index Programmatum,  p. 22; and those written by Zorn (Lips. 1703) and Wihner (Gitting. 1743); also Lubkert in the Stud. u. Krit. 1835, p. 681 sq.; and Schneckenburger. Jiid. Proselyten-Taufe (Berl. 1828).

## Proselytes[[@Headword:Proselytes]]

             This word is employed in modern language to designate such individuals as have abandoned their faith and embraced another, and who, in general, devote all their energy to the expansion of their new creed. The endeavor to gain others to one's own convictions. either by licit or illicit means, is called proselytism. Biblical representatives of this unfair system are the Pharisees. to whom Christ said, “Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte; and when he is made, ye make him twofold more the child of hell than yourselves.” Every religion that believes in itself must feel impelled to propagate its creed; the followers of a doctrine to whom it is indifferent whether the number of those who share it with them increases or decreases have no true faith. The Christians are especially active in winning converts to their religion, but this spirit is due entirely not to a selfish desire to enlarge their borders and increase their numbers, but to give to all the world the great truths to establish which Christ came into the world in the form of man and suffered death upon the cross. It is, moreover, because of the direct command given by the Saviour of mankind that Christians feel impelled to make converts of all non-believers. SEE CHRISTIANITY; SEE MISSIONS.

A very different thing it is, however, for anybody, or for bodies of men, to force conversion upon their fellows. The Jews were the chosen people of God. They had a right to consider themselves the armor-bearers of divine truth, and if they felt impelled to carry “the law and the prophets” to the strangers (גֵּרַים), it was only a reasonable consequence of the divine revelation which they had enjoyed. But it was by the fair means employed that they could best indicate the moral sublimity of divine teachings over philosophic schemes and heathenish systems of religion. When, therefore, the Jews, after the establishment of Maccaboean rule, conpelled, under Hyrcanus, the Idumeans, and, under Aristobulus, the Iturians, no embrace the Jewish faith and to subject themselves to circumcision, there was an adoption of measures for which the Old-Test. dispensation furnished no warrant; and though it may be conceded that their object was probably to advance the interests of true religion, they yet, by the adoption of unauthorized measures, evinced an unrighteous zeal which must have been  underlaid by a selfish purpose. Thus the Roman Catholics have constantly striven for the propagation of the Christian faith by measures wholly unwarranted and not in uniformity with the lofty state of its ethics.

The Jesuit Sambuga says, in defence of the Jesuitic proselytism: “The mania of proselytism in priests is no mania, but a holy zeal.” The prince- cardinial von Hohenlohe approves of this defence in his Lichtblicke und E'rlebnlisse aus der Welt und desm Priester-leben (Ratisbon, 1836, 8vo), p. 39. But this defence is, after all, a simple Jesuitic sophism. The mania of proselytism is a mania, and because priests are subject to it, it does not become therefore a holy zeal; or else we must admit that anything done by avaricious and ambitious priests of all persuasions (Christians and pagans) was holy, or was the result of a holy zeal, and therefore not blameworthy, but, on the contrary, praiseworthy and commendable. When proselytes are gained in such a wily or violent manner as that resorted to by Jesuits; when the means employed are money and promotions on one side, threats and persecutions on the other, we perceive in it the evidence of a most, unholy zeal, against which the founder of Christianity pronounced his anathema in his condemnation of the priests of his time, the doctors of the law, and Pharisees. For this very reason Christ called them “children of hell.” SEE ROMANISM. It is a curious fact worth remembering that one of the main features of the times of the Messiah was to be, according to Jewish tradition, the utter abolition of proselytism, and the entire ceasing of all distinctions of an opprobrious nature among men. The evil repute into which the term proselyte had fallen in the times of Christ also caused the early converts to Christianity to adopt the name of Neophytes (newly planted) instead. SEE NEOPHYTE. (J. H. W.)

## Proseucha[[@Headword:Proseucha]]

             (προσευχή), a word signifying “prayer,” and always so translated in the A.V. It is, however, applied, per meton., to a place of prayer-a place where assemblies for prayer were held, whether a building or not. In this sense some hold it to be mentioned in Luk 6:12, where it is said that our Savior went up into a mountain to pray and continued all night in the proseucha of God (ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ τοῦ θεοῦ),which can very w-ell bear the sense our translators have put upon it — “in prayer to God.” Yet Whitby and others infer, from the use of parallel phrases, such as “the mount of God.” “the bread of (God,” “the altar of God,” “the lamp of God,” etc., which were all things consecrated or appropriated to the  service of God, that this phrase might here signify “an oratory of God,” or a place that was devoted to his service, especially for prayer. In this sense the word must certainly be understood in Act 16:13, where we are informed that Paul and his companions, on the Sabbath day, went out of the city, by the river side, ου ἐνομίζετο προσευχὴ ειναι, which the A.V. renders “where prayer was wont to be made.” But the Syriac here has, “because there was perceived to be a house of prayer;” and the Arabic, “a certain place which was supposed to be a place of prayer.” In both these versions due stress is laid upon ου ἐνομίζετο, where there was taken, or supposed to be — or where, according to received custom, there was, or where there was allowed by law — a proseucha, oratory, or chapel; and where, therefore, they expected to meet an assembly of people. Bos contends (Lxercit. Ihilol. ad loc.), however, that the word ἐνομίζετο is redundant, and that the passage ought simply to be, “where there was a proseucha;” but in this he is ably opposed by Elsner (Observ. Sacr. ad loc.). SEE PHILIPPI.

That there really were such places of devotion among the Jews is unquestionable. They were mostly outside those towns in which there were no synagogues, because the laws or their administrators would not admit any. This was, perhaps, particularly the case in Roman cities and colonies (and Philippi, where this circumstance occurred, was a colony); for Juvenal (Sat. 3, 296) speaks of proseuchae. not synagogues. at Rome. They appear to have been usually situated near a river or the seashore, for the convenience of ablution (Josephus, Ant. 14:10, 23). Josephus repeatedly mentions proseuchoe in his Life, and speaks of the people being gathered into the proseucha (44, 46). Sometimes the proseucha was a large building, as that at Tiberias (l.c. 54), so that the name was sometimes applied even to synagogues (Vitringa, Synmag. Ver. p. 119). Proseuchae are frequently mentioned as buildings by Philo, particularly in his oration against Flaccus, where he complains that the proseuchse of the Jews were pulled down, and that no place was left them in which to worship God and pray for Caesar (Philo, ie Flacc. in Op. p. 752). But, for the most part, the proseuchae appear to have been places in the open air, in a grove, or in shrubberies, or even under a tree, although always, as we may presume, near water, for the convenience of those ablutions which with the Jews always preceded prayer, as, indeed, they did among the pagans, and as they do among the Moslems at the present day. The usages of the latter exhibit something answering to the Jewish proseuchae in the shape of small oratories, with a  niche indicating the direction of Mecca, which is often seen in Moslem countries by the side of a spring, a reservoir, or a large water-jar, which is daily replenished for the use of travellers (Whitby, De Dieu, Wetstein, Kuinil, on Act 16:13; Jennings, Jewish Antiquities, p. 379382; Prideaux, Connection, ii, 556). — Kitto.

“Questions have been raised,” says the late Dr.M'Farlan, of Renfrew, “as to the origin of these, and their being or not being the same with the synagogue. Philo and Josephus certainly speak of them and the synagogues as if they were substantially one. The former expressly declares that they were places of instruction. ‘The places dedicated to devotion,' says he, ‘and which are commonly called proseuchae, what are they but schools in which prudence, fortitude, temperance, righteousness, piety, holiness. and every virtue are talight everything necessary for the discharge of duty, whether human or divine?' As the writer's observations were chiefly confined to the Jews of Alexandria and other parts of Egypt, this description will chiefly apply to these. But there is no doubt, on the other hand. that where synagogues existed, and especially in Judea, they did to some extent differ. We are therefore very much disposed to concur in the opinion that the oratory was substantially and in effect a synagogue. But the latter was the more perfect form, and required, for its erection and support, special means. There was in every synagogue a local court, deriving its authority, at least in Judea, from the Sanhedrim; and there were office-bearers to be maintained; whereas in the oratory there does not seem to have been any very fixed or necessary form of procedure. These might, for aught that appears, have been all or substantially all which belonged to the synagogue, or it might be little more than what we would call a prayermeeting. Hence, perhaps, the reason of the prevalence of the one — the synagogue — in Judaea, and of the other in Egypt and other countries not subject to Jewish laws.”

It is highly probable that proseuchce existed long before synagogues. “It is remarkable,” continues Dr. M'Farlan, “that the only places where Daniel is said to have been favored with visions, during the day, were by the sides of rivers (Dan 8:2; Dan 8:16; also Dan 10:4; Dan 12:5; Dan 12:7; and Dan 9:21), the very places where oratories were wont to be. Ezekiel also received his commission by one of the rivers of Babylon, and when ‘among the captives' of Israel (Eze 1:1). And he afterwards mentions his having received visions in the same circumstances (Eze 3:15-16). And Ezra, also, when leading back Israel to the land of their fathers, proclaimed and observed a  fast with them by the way; and, as if to keep up the same tender associations, he assembled them by the river Ahaya, where they remained three days (Ezr 8:15; Ezr 8:32). But the very finest illustration which occurs is that contained in the 137th Psalm — ‘By the rivers of Babylon, there we sat down; yea, we wept, when we remembered Zion. We hanged our harps upon the willows in the midst thereof. For there they that carried us away captive required of us a song; and they that wasted us required of us mirth, saying, Sing us one of the songs of Zion' (1-3). The people of Israel were accustomed, in after-times, to make choice of the banks of rivers for their oratories, and this point of agreement is one of the grounds on which we are proceeding. But it will hold equally good, whether the Israelitish captives followed, in this, the example of their fathers, or whether, as is more probable, their circumstances in Babylon led to this choice. It is not unlikely that this led to a similar choice in aftertimes, and particularly in foreign countries. The poor captives of Babylon had perhaps no other covering or even enclosure than the willows of the brook; and thus may they have been driven, when seeking to worship the God of their fathers, into the woody margins of Babylon's many rivers. Meeting in such places, as they had been accustomed to do in the oratories of their native land, it is not wonderful that many tender associations should be renewed.”

After the return of the Jews from the Babylonian captivity, synagogue worship was much enlarged and improved, while oratories gradually diminished in number and importance. Hence, in later times, oratories were chiefly found in countries beyond the land of Israel. Under the Roman government synagogues were discountenanced, but oratories, or places of meeting for devotional exercises, were generally permitted all over the empire. Dr. Lardner thinks that the synagogue mentioned in Act 6:9 was really an oratory; and Josephus speaks of a very large one in the city of Tiberias. But it was chiefly in foreign parts that proseuchoe in later times were found. Josephus, in detailing the decree passed in favor of the Jews at ‘Halicarnassus, says, “We have decreed that as many men and women of the Jews as are willing so to do may celebrate their Sabbaths and perform their holy offices according to the Jewish laws; and may make their proseuchoe at the sea-side, according to the custom of their forefathers.” See Riddle, Christian Antiquities (see Index): Stillingfleet, Works, vol. i; and the monographs cited by Volbeding. Index Programmatum, p. 76. SEE CHAPEL; SEE ORATORY.

## Prosper[[@Headword:Prosper]]

             ST., surnamed Aquitanus or Aquitanius, from the country of his nativity, was a distinguished theologian of Gaul, and flourished in the first half of the 5th century. He settled as a young man in Provence, and there became the intimate companion of a certain Hilary, who on this account is called Hilarius Prosperianus. The two friends studied and wrote together in defence of orthodox Christianity in general, and of Augustinianism in particular. Yet, although a stanch defender of the doctrines and person of St. Augustine, he was no priest, still less a bishop. as has been frequently asserted since the 7th century, but a married layman, pious and well versed in divine lore, who had been impelled by the miseries of his time to devote himself to an austere way of life (see Sirmondi, not. ad 8, ep. 15; Sidon. Apol. and Bolland. ad 25 Jun. in comment. praev. § 1, ad vit. s. Prosperi episc. in AEmilia). Constant readers and zealous disciples of St. Augustine, especially in the doctrine of grace, Prosper and Hilary displayed great zeal in defending his doctrines against the attacks of the Semi-Pelagians, SEE PELAGIANISM; but finding that they were making very little headway against the heretics, who had largely weakened orthodoxy in Southern Gaul, Prosper wrote, about 427 or 428, a letter entitled Epistola ad Augustinusm de Reliquiis Pelagiance Hcereseos in Gallia (considered of importance in affording material for the history of Semi-Pelagianism), in which he informed the illustrious bishop of Hippo that a number of priests and monks at Marseilles asserted, contrary to the Augustinian theory, that man must himself take the first step towards his justification and salvation (ep. 225 and 226 inter Ep. Aug.). Thus Prosper not only himself acted as defender of the catholic doctrine against the Semi-Pelagians, but gave occasion to St. Augustine to write his two works on the predestination of the saints and on the gift of constancy (De Predesfinatione Sanctorum, and De Dono Perseverantice).

But not all those whom Prosper names as adversaries of St. Augustine were, like Cassian, Semi-Pelagians. The heresies of this Cassian Prosper exposed in a work which he subsequently (about A.D. 430) composed: De Gratia Dei et Libero Arbitrio contra Collaforem. Prosper, still before St. Augustine's death, wrote several works against the Pelagians, and especially the Semi-Pelagians. To these works of controversy belong his poem De Ingratis, so highly admired by the Jansenists, and a letter to a certain Rufinus. After the death of St. Augustine, his master and friend, Prosper resumed with increased ardor his struggle against the Semi-Pelagians and the defence of Augustine. For this  purpose he wrote Responsiones ad capitula calumnlnicantiumss (i.e. Auqustinum) Gallorum; Responsiones (td catpitula objectionum Tincentianarum, and Pro Augustino Responsiones ad Ercerpta quce de Genuensi Ciritate sunt missia. In 431 Prosper, with his friend Hilary, made a journey to Rome, where they saw pope Celestine I, and complained that several priests at Marseilles taught erroneous doctrines without being rebuked by the Gallican bishops, whereupon the pontiff addressed his well- known letter of censure to those dignitaries (Epistola ad Episcopos Gallorum), praising highly the doctrine of St. Augustine, and denouncing the heresy of Cassian, as well as those who should either favor it by adoption or by suffering its propagation. Armed with this authority, Prosper and Hilary returned home, and from the numerous controversial tracts which they issued about this time, it appears that they must have been constantly watchful and active in defence of orthodoxy. Nothing very definite is known of Prosper after his return from Rome with Hilary, except that we encounter controversial tracts of which he wars the author. Among these are De Gratia Dei et Libero Abitrio Liber. in reply to the doctrines of Cassian respecting free-will, as laid down in the thirteenth of his Collationes Patrum, whence the piece is frequently entitled De Gmratia Dei adversus Collatorem, written about A.D. 432: — Psalmorum a Cusque ad CL Expositio, assigned by the Benedictine editors to A.D. 433, but placed by Schloinemann and others before A.D. 424: — Sententuia unm ex Operibus S. Augustiui ddlibuturum Liber unus, compiled about A.D. 451. He is commemorated by the Church of Rome on June 25. The whole of the above will be found in the Benedictine edition of the works of Augustine; the epistle is numbered 225, and is placed immediately before another upon the same subject by Hilary; the remaining tracts are all included in the appendix to vol. 10. If we believe Gelnnadius (De Vir. Illust. c. 84), Prosper was, after 440, called to Rome by pope Leo I, and became the secretary of that ponitiff. We have no positive knowledge of the year of his death: it falls between 455 and 463.

There are other writings of Prosper, among which we mention 106 small poems (epigrammata), in which an equal number of moral and other passages of St. Augustine are poetically developed; a universal history, which teaches to the year 455, and of which we find the best and most complete reproduction aiud explanation in lect. Antiq. Basnag. Cunis. vol. i, etc. ‘The treatise De vocationle Gentilom belongs probably to those Maiks which have been erroneously attributed to Prosper: it gives a milder color to the hard assertions of Augustine and Prosper. For a list and description of the  character of these spurious writings, see Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol. s.v. The best edition of Prosper's works is the Benedictine by Lebrun de Marette and Manugeamnt (Par. 1711, fol.). For a record of the time when Prosper's different monographs first appeared in print, see also Smith's Dictionary. Full information with regard to the interminable controversies arising out of the works of Prosper is contained in the notes and dissertations of the Benedictines, in the dissertations of Quesnel and the Ballerini in their respective editions of the works of Leo the Great, and in a rare volume, De Viris Operibus SS. Patrumo Leonis Mogni et Prosperi Aquitani Dissertationes criticae, etc. (Par. 1689, 4to), by Josephus Antelmius, to which Quesnel put forth a reply in the hphemeriides Parisienses, vol. 8 and 15 (August, 1639), and Antelmius a reply in two Epistoloe Duabus Epistolce P. Quesnelli Partibus Responsorim (Par. 1690, 4to). See Tillemont, Melnm. vol. 16; Oudin, De Script. Eccl.; Schrockh, Kirchengesch. vol. 15-18; Fleury, Hist. Eccl.; Dollinger, Lehr buch der Kirchengqeschichte; Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines (see Index); Neander, Ch. Hist. ii, 630 sq.; Hist. of Dogmas, ii, 375 sq.; Gieseler, Ch. Hist. i, 226 sq.; Schaff, Ch. Hist. 3, 859 sq.; Baihr, Die christl.-romische Theol. p. 366 sq.; Wiggers, Aug. et Pelag. ii, 136 sq. (J. H. W.)

## Prosper (2)[[@Headword:Prosper (2)]]

             a Scotch prelate, was elected bishop of the see of Caithness about 1461, but resigned in favor of John Sinclair. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 214.

## Prosperity[[@Headword:Prosperity]]

             the state wherein things succeed according to our wishes, and are productive of affluence and ease. However desirable prosperity be, it has its manifest disadvantages. It too often alienates the soul from God, excites pride, exposes to temptation, hardens the heart. occasions idleness, promotes effeminacy, lamps zeal and energy, and in general has a baneful relative influence. It is no wonder, therefore, that the Almighty in general withholds it from his children, and that adversity should be their lot rather than prosperity. Indeed, adversity seems more beneficial on the whole, although it be so unpleasant to our feelings. “The advantages of prosperity,” says Bacon, “‘are to be wished, but the advantages of adversity are to be admired. The principal virtue of prosperity is temperance; the principal virtue of adversity is fortitude, which in morality is allowed to be the most heroical virtue. Prosperity best discovers vice; adversity best discovers virtue, which is like those perfumes which are most fragrant when burned or bruised.” It is not, however, to be understood that prosperity in itself is unlawful. The world, with all its various productions, was formed by the Almighty, for the happiness of  man, and designed to endear him to us, and to lead our minds up to him. What, however, God often gives us as a blessing, by our own folly we pervert and turn into a curse. Where prosperity is given, there religion is absolutely necessary to enable us to act under it as we ought. Where this divine principle influences the mind, prosperity may be enjoyed and become a blessing; for “while bad men snatch the pleasures of the world as by stealth, without countenance from God, the proprietor of the world, the righteous sit openly down to the feast of life, under the smile of heaven. No guilty fears damp their joys. The blessing of God rests upon all they possess. Their piety reflects sunshine from heaven upon the prosperity of the world; unites in one point of view the smiling aspect both of the powers above and of the objects below. Not only have they as full a relish as others of the innocent pleasures of life, but, moreover, in them they hold communion with God. In all that is good or fair they trace his hand. From the beauties of nature, from the improvements of art, from the enjoyments of social life, they raise their affections to the source of all the happiness which surrounds them, and thus mn iden the sphere of their pleasures by adding intellectual and spiritual to earthly joys.”

Spiritual prosperity consists in the continual progress of the mind in knowledge, purity, and joy. It arises from the participation of the divine blessing; and evidences itself by frequency in prayer, love to God's Word, delight in his people, attendance on his ordinances, zeal in his cause, submission to his will, usefulness in his Church, and increasing abhorrence of everything that is derogatory to his glory (3Jn 1:2). See Blair, Sermons, vol. i, ser. 3; Bates, Works, i. 297.

## Prosphora[[@Headword:Prosphora]]

             (Gr. προσφορά, i.e. on oblation), one of the words by which some of the early ecclesiastical writers designate the Lord's Supper. The literal meaning of the word is a sacrificial offering, and especially the matter for a sacrifice: it has this signification in the Epistle to the Hebrews. In Christian antiquity it is used principally for the elements or “species” in the Lord's Supper. Later Greek writers use the word ἀναφορά as synonymous with προσφορά, and rather in a moral and spiritual than in a physical sense, and with allusion to the exhortation, “Lift up your hearts.” The Latin word offertorium, which means a gift brought as an offering, was formerly applied to the consecrated bread. The words ἀναφορά and προσφορά were introduced by Justin Martyr, and brought into common use by  Irenaeus. Irenmaus contends that the Eucharist should be regarded as a sacrifice; he did, however, distinguish it from the Mosaic sacrifices, and speaks of a symbolical presence of Christ in the elements. See Coleman, Primitive Christianity. p. 414; Riddle, Christian Antiquities, p. 546.

## Prosser, Lorenzo D.[[@Headword:Prosser, Lorenzo D.]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was a native of New York State, and was born in 1805. He was early converted, and joined the Church as a mere youth. In 1827 he was received into the Pittsburgh Conference, and successively appointed to the following circuits, namely: Butler, Grand River, Mercer, Hartford, Twinsburg, Windsor, and Columbiana. In 1836, when the Erie Conference was formed, he fell into its bounds, and received from it his appointment to the following fields of labor, namely: Ellsworth, Cleveland, Harmonsburg. M'Kean, Wesleyville, Chardon, Chagrin Falls, Wesleyville, Edinborough Mission, M'Kean, Albion, and Springfield. This last appointment he held in 1862. The next year lie became superannuated, and continued in that relation until his death, April 13, 1869. He was of a nervous temperament, and his burning zeal led him often to exert himself beyond his strength. His preaching was with power, and at times his exhortations were overwhelming. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1869.

## Prostitute[[@Headword:Prostitute]]

             (a) female, in Hebrew זָרָה זוֹנָה, נָכְריָּה, קדֵַשָׁה(on the last see Gesen. Thes. 3, 1197);

(b) male, in Hebrew קָדֵשׁ. While all sexual intercourse between others than married persons was forbidden by the Mosaic law, especial prohibition was laid upon Israelitish women from hiring themselves as prostitutes (Lev 19:29; comp. 21:9); and, with special reference to the Phoenicians, they were forbidden to abandon themselves to the use of men (Deu 23:17). The “hire of a whore” (אֶתְנִן זוֹנָה; comp. also Eze 16:33, and Rosenmuller, ad loc.) must not be accepted by the priests as the subject of a vow, or a gift of devotion in the Temple (Deu 23:18); this hire, consisting in a piece of money or a kid (Gen 38:17), if presented at the Temple for a sacrifice, and received as among other ancient nations, would have seemed to allow prostitution (comp. Mishna, Terumoth, 6:2; Movers, Phonic. i, 680). In Paphos, a kid  was offered to the goddess of love (Tacitus, Hist. ii, 3). The Hetaerae used to bring to Aphrodite Pandemos the sacrifice of a goat (Lucian, Dial. Meret. 7:1). The trade of prostitution was sometimes very profitable among the ancients (Herod. i, 93). In spite of all prohibitions, there were always public prostitutes among the Hebrews who, probably, as among the Arabs and Persians, practiced dancing and music (Bar 6:8; Bar 6:43; Wis 9:4; 1Ki 3:16; Pro 6:26 sq.; Pro 7:10 sq., Pro 7:23; Pro 7:27; Amo 2:7; Amo 7:17; Hos 1:2), and may have been in part foreigners (Movers, Phonic. i, 53), as Phoenicians and Syrians (Jdg 16:1). Syrian harlots travelled in the time of the Roman empire. and were called Ambubajoe (Suteton. Nero, 27; Horace, Sat. i, 2, 1), because they were sometimes skilled in playing on the harp (see Heindorf, on Horace, l.c.; comp. Apuleieus, letam. 8:p. 182, ed. Bip.). But the Hebrew name נָכְרַיָּבperhaps means, not a stranger, but the strange women, like זָרָה; hence, adulteress.

The harlots walked in public, adorned and veiled (Gen 38:14; Petron. Satyr. 16; but see Pococke, East, 1, 76), or seated themselves by the wayside, and, with seductive gestures, strove to lead aside travellers (Gen 38:14; Bar 6:43; comp. Dougtnei Analect. i, p. 42 sq.). We may well suppose that the harlots could be in some way recognised in dress, gait, etc.. even when they put on a show of modest behavior (comp. Hartmann, Hebr. ii, 495 sq.). It is not probable that the veiling ever distinguished the harlots from chaste women. SEE VEIL. (Comp. Buckingham, Mesop. p. 55.) In the brothels the girls bore peculiar names which had become by some chance attached to them (Senec. Controv. i, 2, p. 84, ed. Bip.). Some would interpret in allusion to this the words in Rev 17:5, but see Ewald, ad loc. At the time of the division of the Hebrew kingdom, whoredom was practiced, especially among the ten tribes, under the Syrian influences then pouring in (comp. Num 25:1 sq.), often even in service of the gods, especially of Astarte (Hos 4:14; 1Ki 14:24; 1Ki 15:12; 1Ki 22:47; 2Ki 23:7; comp. Bar 6:43; Herod. 1, 199; Justin, 18:5; Strabo, 8:378; 12:559; Val. Max. ii, 6, 15; Augustine, Civ. Dei. 4:10; Heyne, in Commentat. Soc. Goetting. 16, and see Gesen. on Isaiah 2, 339 sq.). The law did not establish municipal and police penalties against notorious harlots, and the toleration of those from abroad (which certainly was not the design of the law-giver, though it is easily explicable among an Oriental people when polygamy was allowed) seems to have been unconditional (see Porter, Greek Antiquities, i, 354; Wachsmulth, Hellen. Alterth. II, ii, 48). The existence of companies of  prostitutes in the sacred groves and high-places of the ancient Jews may serve to account for the rendering which the Sept. gives to the expression “high-places” in Eze 16:39, by a term which in Greek denotes a place of indecent resort. The Sukkoth benoth, literally “tabernacles of daughters,” which the men of Babylon are mentioned in 2Ki 17:30 as having made, are probably places of the same kind, being haunts of wickedness. According to Josephus (Ant. 4:8, 23), all intercourse with a prostitute was illegal, which is natural, since even the sons of public harlots could never attain citizen's rights among the Jews (Deu 23:2), and had no claim to share in their father's inheritance (comp. Jdg 11:1).

Among the Greeks and Romans, at the time of the appearance of Christianity, prostitution had become a great public evil. The cause of this lay by no means alone in the excessive worship of certain divinities (Wisdom of Solomon 14:26 sq.), but in the frivolity of the times and the general decay of morals. In Rome harlots were legally tolerated (Zimmerm. Rom. Rechtsalterth. I, ii, 489 comp. Schuttgen, Hor. Hebr. i, 468 sq.). The laxer the principles of men in general were on this subject in its various forms, and the more boldly they avowed it (comp. Terence, Adelph. i, 2, 21 sq.; Eunuch. 3, 5, 35 sq.), the more vigorously were the apostles compelled to oppose unchastity where it had entered the Christian Church (1Co 5:1 sq.; 2Co 12:21; 1Th 4:3; 1Ti 1:10). The apostolic decree in Act 15:20; Act 15:29 (comp. 21:25), which has often been denounced as not genuine (Deyling, Observ. ii, 469 sq.; Kuinol, Comment. p. 521 sq.), was sufficiently called for by the character of the times (comp. Tholuck, in Neander's Denkwi'rd. i, 143 sq.). The practice of prostitution was then prevalent, too. among the Jews, especially the higher classes (Rom 2:22; Joh 8:7; see in general Michaelis, Iuos. Recht, v, 281 sq ). Among the Romans, the abominable practice of combining immorality with the worship of the gods appears to have continued down to the days of Constantine, as is evident from a passage in his life, written by Eusebius, where he mentions it in connection with the temple of Venus at Apheca on Mount Libanus. Sacred prostitution forms a part in the religious rites of heathen nations both in ancient and modern times. Among the Phoenician Babylonians, and other Eastern nations, it was the custom to erect adjoining the temples of their gods residences for courtesans. who were supposed to be pleasing to the deities. Strabo says that no fewer than 1000 of these abandoned females  were attached to the temple of Aphrodite in Corinth, and were considered as an indispensable part of the retinue of the goddess. Among the Hindus we have the Linga worship (q.v.). SEE ADULTERY; SEE FORNICATION; SEE HARLOT; SEE SODOMITE.

## Prostration[[@Headword:Prostration]]

             SEE ATTITUDE.

## Prostration In Prayer[[@Headword:Prostration In Prayer]]

             SEE POSTURE.

## Protagoras[[@Headword:Protagoras]]

             (Πρωταγόρας), the first of that class of Greek philosophers who took the name of Sophists (q.v.), flourished near the opening of the 5th century B.C. He was a native of Abdera, according to the concurrent testimony of Plato and several other writers (Proftag. p. 309, c; De Rtep. 10:p. 606, c; Heraclides Pont. ap. Diog. Laert. 9:55; Cicero, De Nat. Deor. i, 23, etc.). There seems to be no ground for the story that he was in early life employed in manual labor, nor for the supposition that he was a disciple of Democritus, with whom in point of doctrine he had absolutely nothing in common. Protagoras must have been older than Democritus, as it is certain that Protagoras was older than Socrates, who was born B.C. 468 (Plato, Protag. p. 317, c; 314, b; 361, e; comp. Diog. Laert. 9:42, 56), and died before him at the age of nearly seventy (Plato, Meno, p. 91, e; comp. Thecet. p. 171, d; 164, e; Euthyd. p. 286, c), after he had practiced the sophistic art for forty years in various Greek cities, especially at Athens. Frei places the death of Protagoras in B.C. 411, assuming that Pythodorus accused him of teaching atheism during the government of the Four Hundred (Quest. Protag. p. 64), and accordingly assigns about B.C. 480 as the date of his birth.

That Protagoras had already acquired fame during his residence in Abdera cannot be inferred from the doubtful statement that he was termed by the Abderites λόγος, and by Democritus φιλοσοφία or σοφία ( Elian. etsr. Hist. 4:20; comp. Suid. s. vv. Πρωταγ. Δημόκρ., etc. Phavorinus, in Diog. Laert. 9:50, gives to Protagoras the designation of σοφία). He was the first who called himself a sophist and taught for pay (Plato, Protag. p. 349. a; Diog. Laert. 9:52). He must have come to Athens before B.C. 445,  since, according to the statement of Heraclides Ponticus (Diog. Laert. 9:50), lie gave laws to the Thurians, or, what is more probable, adapted for the use of the new colonists, who left Athens for the first time in that year, the laws which had been drawn up at an earlier period by Charondas for the use of the Chalcidic colonies (for, according to Diod. 12:11, 3 and others, these laws were in force at Thurii likewise). Whether he himself removed to Thurii, we do not learn, but at the time of the plague we find him again in Athens, as he could scarcely have mentioned the strength of mind displayed by Pericles at the death of his sons in the way he does (in a fragment still extant, Plutarch, De Consol. ad Apoll.c. 33. p. 118, d) had he not been an eye-witness. He had also, as it appears, returned to Athens, after a long absence (Plato, Protag. p. 301, c), at a time when the sons of Pericles were still alive (ibid. p. 314, e; 329, a). A somewhat intimate relation between Protagoras and Pericles is intimated also elsewhere (Plut. Penicles, c. 36 p. 172, a). His activity, however, was by no means restricted to Athens. He had spent some time in Sicily, and acquired fame there (Plato, Hipp. Maj. p. 282, d), and brought with him to Athens many admirers out of other Greek cities through which he had passed (Plato, Protag. p. 315, a). He was accused of atheism by one of his scholars, and was consequently impeached for what he had written in his book On the Gods, which began with the statement, “Respecting the gods, I am unable to know whether they exist or do not exist” (Diog. Laert. 9:51, etc.). The impeachment was followed by his banishment (ibid. 9:52; Cicero, De Nut. Deolr. i, 23; Euseb. Praep. Evang. 14:19, etc.), or, as others affirm, only by the burning of his book (Philost. Vif. Soph. l.c.; Josephus, C. Apion. ii, 37; Sext. Emnp. Adv. Math. 9:56; Cicero, Diog. Laert. 11. cc.). Uelerweg says that it would seem Protagoras left for Sicily after his condemnation and was lost at sea (Hist. of Philos. i, 74).

Writings. — From the list of the writings of Protagoras, which Diogenes Laertius (9:55) doubtless borrowed from one of his Alexandrine authorities (he describes them as still extant, ἐστὶ τὰ σωζόμενα αὐτοῦ βιβλία ταῦτα: comp. Welcker's account of Prodicus, in his Kleine Sch7 ifjen. ii, 447, 465), and which he gives probably with his accustomed negligence, one may see that they comprised very different subjects: ethics (Περὶ ἀρετων and Περὶ τῶν οὐκ ὀρθῶς τοῖς ἀνθρώποις πρασσομένων, Περὶ φιλοτιμίας); politics (Περὶ πολιτείας, Περὶ τῆς ἐν ἀρχῇ καταστάσεως: comp. Frei, p. 182, etc.); o heforic (Α᾿ντιλογιῶν δύο, τέχνη ἐριστικῶν), and other subjects of different kinds (Προστακτικός,  Περὶ μαθημάτων, Περὶ πάλης. Περὶ τῶν ἐν Αἵδου). The works which, in all probability, were the most important of those which Protagoras composed Truth (Α᾿λήθεια), and On the Gods (Περὶ θεῶν) — are omitted in that list, although in another passage (ix, 51) Diogenes Laertius refers to them. The first contained the theory refuted by Plato in the Theetetus (p. 161, c; 162, a; 166, c; 170, e), and was probably identical with the work on the Existent (Περὶ τοῦ ὄντος), attributed to Protagoras by Porphyry (in Euseb. Praep. Evang. 10:3, p. 468, Viger). This work was directed against the Eleatics (Πρὸς τοὺς ἕν τὸ ×ν λέγοντας), and was still extant in the time of Porphyry, who describes the argumentation of the book as similar to that of Plato, though without adding any more exact statements.

Doctrines. — With the peculiar philosophical opinions of Protagoras we obtain the most complete acquaintance from the Theoetetus of Plato, which was designed to refute it, and the fidelity of the quotations in which is confirmed by the much more scanty notices of Sextus Empiricus and others. The sophist started from the fundamental presupposition of Heracutus that everything is motion, and nothing besides or beyond it, and that out of it everything comes into existence; that nothing at any time exists, but that everything is perpetually becoming (Plato, Theoet. p. 156, 152: Sextus Empiricus inaccurately attributes to him matter in a perpetual state of flux, ὕλη ῥευστή, Pyrrhonm. Iyp. i, 217, 218). He then distinguished two principal kinds of the infinitely manifold motions, an active and a passive; but premised that the motion which in one concurrence manifested itself actively will in another appear as passive, so that the difference is. as it were, a fluctuating, not a permanent one (Thecet. p. 156, 157). From the concurrence of two such motions arise sensation or perception, and that which is felt or perceived, according to the different velocity of the motion; and that in such a way that where there is homogeneity in what thus meets, as between seeing and color, hearing and sound (ibid. p. 156), the definiteness of the color and the seeing, of the perception and that which is perceived, is produced by the concurrence of corresponding motions (ibid. 156, d; comp. 159, c). Consequently, we can never speak of Being and Becoming in themselves, but only for something (τινί), or of something (τινός), or to something (πρός, p. 160, b; 156, c; 152, d; Arist. Metaph. 9:3; Sext. Emp. Hyp. i, 216, 218). Therefore there is or exists for each only that of which he has a sensation, and only that which he perceives is true for him (Theoet. p. 152, a; comp. Crat.yl. p.  386; Aristocles, in Euseb. Praep. Evang. 14:20; Cicero, Acad. ii, 46; Sext. Emp. l.c. and Adv. Month. 7:63, 369, 388, etc.); so that as sensation, like its objects, is engaged in a perpetual change of motion (Theoet p. 152, b; Sext. Emp. Hyp. i, p. 217, fol.), opposite assertions might exist, according to the difference of the perception respecting each several object (Aristlletaph. 4:5; Diog. Laert. 9:5; Clem. Alex. Stron. v, 674, a; Senec. Epist. 88). The conclusions hitherto discussed, which he drew from the Heraclitean doctrine of eternal becoming, Protagoras summed up in the well-known proposition: ‘The man is the measure of all things; of the existent, that they exist; of the non-existent, that they do not exist (Theoet. p. 152, a; 160, d; Cratyl. p. 385. e; Arist. Metaph. 10:1; 11:6; Sext. Emp. Adv. Math. 7:60; Pyrrhon. Hyp. i, 216; Aristocles, in Euseb. Price. Evanq. 14:20; Diog. Laert. 9:51); and understood by the man, the perceiving or sensation-receiving subject. He was compelled, therefore, likewise to admit that confutation was impossible, since every affirmation, if resting upon sensation or perception, is equally justifiable (Plato, Euthyd. p. 185, d, etc.; Isocr. Helene Enc. p. 231, Bekk.; Diog. Laert. 9:53); but, notwithstanding the equal truth and justifiableness of opposite affirmations, he endeavored to establish a distinction of better and worse, referring them to the better or worse condition of the percipient subject, and promised to give directions for improving this condition, i.e. for attaining to higher activity (Theoet. p. 167; comp. Sext, Emp. Hyp. i, 218). Already, before Plato and Aristotle (Metaph. 4:4; comp. the previously quoted passages), Democritus had applied himself to the confutation of this sensualism of Protagoras, which annihilated existtence, knowledge, and all understanding (Plutarch, Adv. Colot. p. 1109, a; Sext. Emp. Adv. Math. 7:389).

It is not every pleasure, but only pleasure in the beautiful, to which Protagoras, in the dialogue which bears his name (p. 351, b), allows moral worth; and he refers virtue to a certain sense of shame (αἰδώς) implanted in man by nature, and a certain conscious feeling of justice (δίκη), which are to serve the purpose of securing the bonds of connection in private and political life (ibid. p. 322, c, etc.); and, accordingly, explains how they are developed by means of education, instruction, and laws (p. 325, c, etc.; comp. 340, c). He is not able, however, to define more exactly the difference between the beautiful and the pleasant, and at last again contents himself with affirming that pleasure or enjoyment is the proper aim of the good (p. 354, etc.). In just as confused a manner does he express himself with respect to the virtues, of which he admits five (holiness, ὁσιότης —  and four others), and with regard to which he maintains that they are distinguished from each other in the same way as the parts of the countenance (ibid. p. 349, b; 329, c, etc.). As in these ethical opinions of Protagoras we see a want of scientific perception, so do we perceive in his conception of the Heraclitean doctrine of the eternal flow of all things, and the way in which he carries it out, a sophistical endeavor to establish, freed from the fetters of science, his subjective notions, setting aside the Heraclitean assumption of a higher cognition and a community of rational activity (ξυνὸς λόγος) by means of rhetorical art. That he was master of this in a high degree, the testimonies of the ancients leave indubitable. His endeavors, moreover, were mainly directed to the communication of this art by means of instruction (Plato, Protag. p. 312, c), to render men capable of acting and speaking with readiness in domestic and political affairs (ibid. p. 318, e). He would teach how to make the weaker cause the stronger (τὸν ἣττω λόγον κρείττω ποιεῖν, Aristot. Rhet. ii, 24; A. Gellius, V. A. v, 3; Eudoxus, in Steph. Byz. s.v. ῎Αβδηρα: comp. Aristoph. Nub. 113, etc., 245, etc., 873, 874, 879, etc.). By way of practice in the art he was accustomed to make his pupils discuss theses (communes loci) on opposite sides (antinomically) (Diog. Laert. 9:52, etc.; comp. Suid. s.v.; Dionys. of Halic., Isocr., Timon, in Diog. Laert. 9:52; Sext. Emp. Adv. ltath. 9:57; Cicero, Brut. 12); an exercise which is also recommended by Cicero (Ad Afftt. 9:4), and Quintilian (x, 5, § 10). The method of doing so was probably unfolded in his Art of Dispute τέχνη ἐριστικῶν; see above). But he also directed his attention to language, endeavored to explain difficult passages in the poets, though not always with the best success (Plato, Protag. p. 388, c, etc.; comp. respecting his and the opposed Platonic exposition of the wellknown lines of Simonides, Frei, p. 122, etc.). See Plato, Hipp. Haj. p. 282, c; Meno, p. 91, d; Theoet. p. 161, a; 179, a; Quintilian, 3, 1, § 10; Diogenes Laertius, 9:52, 50, etc.; Zeller, Philos. der Griechen, i, 244 sq.; Fisher, Beyginnings of Christianity, p. 117; Butler, Hist. of Ancient Philos. (see Index in vol. ii); Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol. s.v., which we have principally used; Ueberweg, Hist. of Philos. i, 73 sq.; Geist, De Protatgora Sophista (Giessen, 1827); Sprengel, in his Συναγωγὴ τεχνῶν (Stuttg. 1828), p. 152 sq.; Herbst, Protagoras in “Philos.-hist. Studien” (Hamb. 1832), p. 88 sq.; Krische, Forschungen, i, 130 sq.; Frei, Qucestiones Protagorece (Bonn, 1845); Weber, Qucest. Prot. (Marb. 1850); Bernays, in Rhein. Muts. f. Phil. 1850 (7), p. 464 sq.; Vitringa, De Prot. Vita et Phil. (Gron. 1853); Grote, Plato (Lond. 1865, 3 vols.); and his Hist. of  Greece, ch. 67; Mallet, Etudes Philosophiques, vol. ii; and the literature under Sophists, especially Schanz, Vorsokratische Philosophie (Gotting. 1867).

## Protais And Gervais, Sts.[[@Headword:Protais And Gervais, Sts.]]

             flourished in the first century of the Christian era, and were martyred at Milan towards the year 68. These two brothers were sons of St. Vital and St. Valeria, and their martyrdom appears to have taken place in the last years of the reign of Nero. Their memory was forgotten, until a vision revealed the place of their sepulture to St. Ambrose, when about to dedicate the Cathedral of Milan. The two martyrs were buried in the Church of St. Nabor and St. Felix, and upon the representations of St. Ambrose their coffins were discovered. Their names were plainly inscribed upon them, as St. Ambrose announced only what he had learned by revelation. The bones were transferred to the Basilica, and legends report many miracles done by them during their transfer, which from the 5th century was celebrated at Milan and in the African Church. The worship of these two saints spread rapidly, and in the 6th century a church was built and dedicated to them at Paris. This church has been several times restored, and exists yet in that city. The feast of St. Gervais and of St. Protais is celebrated on the 19th of June. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generalle, s.v. See Bollandus, Acta Sanctorum, Jun.; Tillemont, Memoires Ecclesiastiques; Baillet, Vies des Saints, 19 Juin. SEE GERVAISE.

## Protasof, Ambrose[[@Headword:Protasof, Ambrose]]

             a Russian prelate, distinguished by a talent of oratory unusual in the Russian Church, was born in 1769 at Moscow. He became a monastic at twenty-five, and was made archimandrite of a monastery near St. Petersburg; subsequently rector of the seminary of that capital, and in 1804 was elevated to the episcopal see of Seula, from whence he was transferred in 1807 to Kazan and Smirsk. He died in 1830 in Tver. His sermons evince a tolerant spirit. Some have been published in Le Messager de l'Europe, others in Le Fils de la Patrie, but have never been collected in separate form. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v. See Otto, Hist. of Russian Literature, s.v.

## Protection of the Church[[@Headword:Protection of the Church]]

             a sort of right of asylum within or near sacred precincts, which prevailed in 1064 in England from Advent to the octave of Epiphany, from Septuagesima to the octave of Easter, from Ascension to the octave of Pentecost, in Ember weeks, throughout Sunday, on the vigils and feasts of apostles and saints which were bidden on the previous Sunday, All-Saints', the dedication-day of a church, in going to synods, chapters, on pilgrimage, to a consecration, or to church.

## Protectores, Cardinales[[@Headword:Protectores, Cardinales]]

             Every Roman Catholic state of first rank enjoys the right of being represented in the College of Cardinals at Rome by one or several members who have been exalted to that high dignity as natives or naturalized citizens of that state. At the time of the universal domination of the popes, when the Roman see was mixed in all the political concerns of the European states, and before the permanent office of the nuncio had become the regular channel of communication between Rome and the Catholic rulers, the cardinals were the natural representatives of the ecclesiastical and political interests of their respective countries, and their position was, of course, one of considerable importance. But even in recent times their influence has not entirely vanished; for as they are supposed to be best acquainted with the institutions, manners, customs, and language of the nations they represent, and therefore more capable of giving the necessary information about the ecclesiastical situation of those nations, they are still, in the different congregations of which they are members, intrusted with the revision of all accounts and reports on the religious affairs of their provinces, but especially of the references about the worthiness of the elected or nominated archbishops and bishops. Hence their name protectores nationum. With these must not be confounded the clerici mationales, or prelates, who occupy in the College of Cardinals the situation of secretaries, and must be alternately French, Spaniards, Germans; nor the crown-cardicals, i.e. the archbishops and bishops who are proposed for the cardinalate by the ruler of their country, nominated by the pope, and who received the red baret from the hand of their Catholic sovereign, but must go to Rome to receive the red hat out of the pope's own hands. The cardinal protectors reside in their metropolitanate, but have a right, on the decease of the pope, to give their vote in the election of his successor, and are themselves eligible to the papacy. As not every  country has one of its natives in the College, one cardinal frequently unites in his hands the protectorate of several countries. — Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. s.v.

## Proterius[[@Headword:Proterius]]

             (also called Bertares-probably his name, but euphonized into the name by which he is better known), an Eastern prelate of some note because he provoked a schism which continues to the present day in the sects known as the Jacobites (q.v.) and Melchites (q.v.). He flourished about the middle of the 6th century, and suffered martyrdom for the Church. He had been made a priest by Cyril, bishop of Alexandria, who was well acquainted with his virtues. On the death of Cyril, the see of Alexandria was filled by Dioscorus knowing the reputation of Proterius, did all in his power to gain his confidence and interest, that he might, through him, accomplish his designs. But Proterius was not to be corrupted; the welfare of the Church was next his heart, and no worldly preferment could bribe him to forego his duty. Dioscorus, being condemned by the Council of Chalcedon for having embraced the errors of Eutyches, was deposed, and Proterius was chosen to fill the vacant see. and approved by the emperor. This occasioned a dangerous insurrection, and the city was divided into two factions. Much mischief was done on both sides, and Proterius was brought into the most imminent danger. The civil authority was set at naught, violence was resorted to, nor was peace restored until a detachment of two thousand men was despatched by the emperor to quell the sedition. The discontented party, however, still beheld Proterius with an eye of resentment; the attendance of a guard became necessary; and, although of a mild temper, he was compelled to procure the banishment of several from the city. Upon the emperor Marcian's death, the exiles returned to Alexandria, and seemed resolved to be revenged for what they had suffered in the last reign. Timothy, the head of the conspirators against him, in the absence of Dionysius, seized on the great Church, and was uncanonically consecrated to the see by two bishops of his faction, who had been deposed for heresy. On the return of Dionysius, the incendiary Timothy was driven from the city, which so enraged the Eutychians that they assaulted the house of Proterius, who fled to the neighboring church and took refuge in the baptistery, thinking that the holiness of the place and of the season (for it was Good-Friday) would protect him. But he was pursued to the church, treated with every indignity, murdered in cold blood, and his body was dragged about the city, torn in pieces, burned, and the ashes scattered in  the sea. Proterius was so highly esteemed that his writings were collected at once and recommended as profitable for study to the clergy. His memory is celebrated on Feb. 28; possibly on that day, says Neale, because his name was then restored to the diptychs. See Neale, Hist. of the East. Ch. (Patriarchate of Alex.), ii, 5-13; Fox, Book (of Martyrs, p. 77. (J. H. W.)

## Protestant Church of Jerusalem[[@Headword:Protestant Church of Jerusalem]]

             SEE JERUSALEM.

## Protestant Confessions[[@Headword:Protestant Confessions]]

             SEE CONFESSIONS.

## Protestant Episcopal Church[[@Headword:Protestant Episcopal Church]]

             This is the legal title of one portion of the Church of Christ which has its local habitation in the United States of America. The first part indicates its position relatively to the Roman Catholic Church, as protesting against the errors and repudiating the claims of that Church to supremacy in doctrine, discipline, and worship; the second part of the title expresses its attitude towards other Christian bodies who have rejected episcopacy on the ground that it is not of divine origin, and. therefore, not of universal and permanent obligation. The history of the Protestant Episcopal Church is consequently of more than ordinary interest, since, on the one hand, it has been compelled to resist the Roman Catholics and their progress, and, on the other, has been forced to maintain its position among Protestants, without being able to form any union or engage in any concert of action with them. In the present article it will be the writer's aim to give a tolerably full account of the history and progress of this Church, together with some supplementary statements and remarks in regard to its peculiar claims and adaptedness for the great work of evangelizing our country and helping to make the Gospel known throughout the dark places of the earth where heathenism prevails.

I. History. — Here a natural division suggests itself at once, viz.:

(1.) History of the period during colonial times to the close of the Revolutionary war. This period covers rather more than a century and a half, and during it Church people looked directly to the mother country for ministerial supply and religious privileges in general.

(2.) The period after the Revolution, when efforts were successfully made to obtain the episcopal succession from England, the Protestant Episcopal Church was duly organized, its liturgy, articles, constitution, etc., were adopted, and its bishops and clergy in different parts of the country were brought into union as one body, with the General Convention as its central legislative power. This period covers the years 1783 to about 1808.

(3.) The later history of the Church, marking its growth, increase in wealth and numbers, educational efforts, missionary labors, and the like, with as full and accurate statistics as call be obtained of its present position and work.

1. Early and Colonial History. — In the latter part of the 16th century, Sir Humphrey Gilbert left England to endeavor to form a settlement in America. Among the motives avowed as influencing him were “the honor of God, compassion of poor infidels captivated by the devil (it seeming probable that God hath reserved these Gentiles to be reduced into Christian civility by the English nation), advancement of his honest and well- disposed countrymen willing to accompany him in such honorable actions, and reliefe of sundry people within this realme distressed.” Though Gilbert met with no success and was lost at sea, other efforts were made by his half-brother, Sir Walter Raleigh, in 1584, in Carolina and Virginia. These too, though in the main unsuccessful, were not wholly without fruit. In 1606 the Virginia Company obtained its charter, and in 1607 the settlement at Jamestown was begun. Among the articles and order of the charter it was expressly required that “the presidents, councils, and ministers should provide that the true word and service of God be preached, planted, and used, according to the rites and doctrine of the Church of England, not only in the said colonies, but also as much as might be among the savages bordering upon them.” A clergyman of the English Church, Rev. R. Hunt, accompanied the expedition, and with unwearied zeal, and with piety and devotion worthy the highest praise, labored in his vocation to the end of his life. Other godly men followed, especially Rev. A. Whitaker. who has been honored with the title “Apostle of Virginia.”

Through his agency the Indian maiden Pocahontas was converted and baptized. and proved herself of great service to the colony. “As the first colonists of Virginia were exclusively members of the Church of England, the legislature of the colony decreed a provision for the clergy, at the rate of fifteen hundred pounds of tobacco and sixteen barrels of flour annually for each clergyman.  As each new borough was formed, it was ordered that a portion of glebe land should be set apart for the use of the incumbent. Tithes were afterwards instituted. Discipline was enforced by laws which. it must be admitted, were unjustifiably severe; and a peremptory enactment was passed that none but ministers episcopally ordained should be allowed to officiate in the colony” (Hawkins). Early efforts were made to provide for the education of English and Indian youth by founding a college, and ten thousand acres of land were set apart, and large sums of money collected. In 1619, when Sir Thomas Yeardley became governor of Virginia, the legislature manifested commendable zeal in the same direction. The officers and agents of the Company were urged to train up the people in true religion and virtue, and also “to employ their utmost care to advance all things appertaining to the order and administration of divine service according to the form and discipline of the Church of England, carefully avoiding all factious and needless novelties, which only tend to the disturbance of peace and unity.”

The most earnest desire was shown to convert the Indians to the faith of Christ, and to educate them in accordance with this faith. Mr. G. Thorpe, a man of good parts and breeding, was appointed head of the new institution, and it was confidently hoped and expected that the red men would ere long become Christians and members of a civilized community; but a rude shock was given to this hope by the Indians, who, hating and fearing the intruders, as they considered the whites to be, resorted, in 1622, to a bloody massacre; this, it may be noted, would have been complete extermination, had not a Christian Indian disclosed the plot the night before, and thus prevented its entire fulfilment. The deplorable result was, the embittering the feelings of all towards the Indians and a fierce war of retaliation; so that, for the time, the college, missionary labors, and Christian education were abandoned. In 1625 Virginia became a royal colony, and though its religious concerns were not so zealously looked after as under the charter, yet the people as a whole remained steadfast in their attachment to the Church of England, and their determination to sustain it in every way in their power. Virginia, too, where many cavaliers sought refuge, was loyal to the exiled monarchy when Cromwell came into power, while New England, on the other hand, sympathized heartily with the “lord protector” and his work. After the Restoration, in 1660, the colonial legislature, under Berkeley, the royal governor, gave early attention to the repairs and building of churches, the canonical performance of the liturgy, the ministration of God's word, the baptizing and Christian education of the young, etc. It is, however, sadly  true that religion had greatly declined among the people; violent contests occurred between the governors and the assembly of the people; the ruling party was intolerant; popular discontent increased; and rebellion actually broke out. So injurious were these disturbances and the wicked passions to which they gave rise that almost of necessity piety and godly life and conversation declined; and the Church became weakened to such an extent that, it is recorded, out of fifty parishes, nearly all were destitute of glebe, parsonage, church, and minister, and there were not more than ten in holy orders left. In 1685 Rev. James Blair came as missionary to Virginia. Four years later he was appointed commissary of the bishop of London, a position of great responsibility and trust, especially with regard to discipline of both clergy and laity. He also held a seat in the council, and continued at his post as commissary for more than half a century, exercising a most beneficial influence in every way, and particularly in restoring and enlarging the good work of the Church. It was through his energetic efforts and well-directed zeal that the College of William and Mary was chartered in 1692. Its design was “that the Church in Virginia may be furnished with a seminary of ministers of the Gospel; that the youth may be piously educated in good letters and manners; and that the Christian faith may be propagated among the Western Indians, to the glory of Almighty God.” Blair became president of this the second college founded in America, and lived to a very advanced age.

The neighboring colony of Maryland, founded in 1633 by lord Baltimore, a Roman Catholic, with some two hundred families and two or more priests of that Church, was noted for freely opening its doors to “every person professing to believe in Jesus Christ.” The colonial assembly in 1639 declared, in the words of Magna Charta, that “Holy Church within this province shall have all her rights and privileges.” Whether by this term was meant the Church of England or not, it is certain that the influence and membership of that Church were largely extended. The general progress of the colony was so successful that at lord Baltimore's death, in 1676, there were in Maryland ten counties and about sixteen thousand inhabitants, the largest part of whom were Protestants. At this date a letter was addressed to the archbishop of Canterbury by a clergyman named Yeo, complaining of the low state of morals in the colony, and of the fact that the clergy of the Church of England had no settled incomes like their brethren in Virginia, and that consequently their position was neither so respectable nor so well calculated to effect good as it ought to be. Efforts were made  to induce the proprietary to provide maintenance for the Church; this, however, he wholly refused. Seditious movements thereupon were set on foot against him as being a “papist,” and it was maliciously rumored that the Roman Catholics, in complicity with the Indians, were purposing to massacre the Protestants. On the accession of William of Orange in 1688, a so-called “Protestant revolution” took place, and for three years the government was in the hands of the insurgents. Lord Baltimore having been deprived of his rights as proprietary, a royal governor was sent into Maryland, and in 1692 the Church of England was established by law; the province was divided into thirty parishes, and tithes were imposed for support of the clergy upon every inhabitant, no matter what might be his religious opinions. The Roman Catholics and Quakers opposed this with all their might, and with more or less success. In 1696 new laws were made, which still, however, recognised the Church of England as by law established as entitled to all its rights, privileges. and freedom.

The clergy, feeling the need of aid from home, begged the bishop of London to send them a commissary at least (since they were not allowed to have a bishop), “to redress what was amiss and supply what was wanting in the Church.” Dr. Thomas Bray, a very estimable and truly godly man, was the one chosen to fill this important position. At great personal sacrifice he accepted it. He secured as many pious and devoted clergymen as he could to go with him to America, and was soon enabled to increase the number of those laboring in Maryland from three to sixteen. He began the formation of colonial libraries, and as one step led to another, and as he perceived how great was the need and how important was the result of combined action on the part of the members of the Church, he conceived the noble idea of founding the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, and that for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. The latter was chartered in June, 1701, the former in 1698. Early in March, 1700, Dr. Bray arrived in Maryland, and entered at once with zeal and diligence upon his work. He assembled the clergy, delivered charges, administered discipline, and was active in having a bill passed by the legislature for the settlement and maintenance of the parochial clergy. By this bill it was provided “that the Book of Common Prayer and administration of the sacraments, with the rites and ceremonies of the Church, according to the use of the Church of England, the Psalter and Psalms of David, and morning and evening prayer, therein contained, be solemnly read by all and every minister or reader in every church or other place of public worship within this province.” Despite some opposition, the king gave the  enactment his consent, and it became law. Although Dr. Bray's stay in Maryland was terminated in 1701, he never ceased his efforts in behalf of the Church there; and it is on record that out of some thirty thousand inhabitants in Maryland at this date, the majority were in communion with the Church of England.

The Carolinas and Georgia were among the later colonies in the southern part of America. Several ineffectual efforts had been made from 1630-60 to found settlements in the region of Albemarle Sound; but it was not till after the restoration of Charles II that a body of noblemen (Clarendon, Albemarle, etc.) undertook the task, and met with success. “Being excited,” as they declared, “by a laudable and pious zeal for the propagation of the Gospel, they begged a certain country in the parts of America not vet cultivated and planted, and only inhabited by some barbarous people who have no knowledge of God.” The charter allowed entire freedom of religious opinion, and no one was to be disturbed on these matters by the public authorities. We are sorry to say, however, that, notwithstanding the pious and proper language quoted above, the noble proprietaries made no provision for the spiritual interests of the colonists or for the conversion of the Indians. The famous John Locke's “grand model” of government (1670) turned out to be a grand failure, and was abolished in 1693. George Fox, the founder of the Quaker denomination, visited Carolina and gave quite an impulse to the peculiar notions in religion which he entertained. The religious condition of the colony at the close of the century was on the whole very unsatisfactory, and ungodliness prevailed to a lamentable extent. Early in the 18th century the majority of the colonists were dissenters, yet acts were passed in 1704-6, establishing the Church of England as the religion of the province. This produced trouble and resistance of course, and was of no real advantage to the Church.

The Society for Propagating the Gospel sent missionaries into the Carolinas, and some, though mostly ineffectual, struggles were made to stay the floods of ungodliness, fanaticism, and semi-heathenism; it was a hard and almost hopeless contest during the greater part of the century. Georgia owed its origin to Oglethorpe's benevolent designs and efforts from 1732 onward. Religious privileges were freely accorded. The German Lutherans and Moravians were early in the field. A small company of Jews came also; and a body of Scotch Highlanders founded New Inverness in 1736. At this date, too, John and Charles Wesley were in Georgia. John Wesley was parish minister in Savannah, and for a while matters went on  very well and satisfactorily; but ere long the strictness of Wesley in enforcing the rubrics, and the dissatisfaction of the colonists who were very restive under Church discipline, led to dissension and irreconcilable differences; so that Wesley “shook off the dust of his feet,” as he phrases it, and left Georgia in disgust. George Whitefield soon after came to Georgia, and though he was continually itinerating to and from England and through the northern colonies, stirring up great excitement by his fiery zeal and energy, yet his labors in Georgia as a clergyman of the Church of England met with fair success. The same statement may here be made as in the case of the Carolinas, that missionaries of the Society for Propagating the Gospel did what they could in behalf of religion and the Church; but they were far too few and ill-supported to accomplish much.

Turning our attention from the southern colonies where, as in Virginia, the Church of England was planted at the date of the earliest settlement in America, and where it flourished despite the fact of being deprived of an essential element in the life and growth of the Church, viz. episcopal presence and supervision, we may next glance at the more northerly portion of the continent. New York (formerly New Netherland) was first colonized by the Dutch in 1615 onward, and of course was in its religious character presbyterian, like the Hollanders at home. In 1664 it was seized by the English, and became a part of the colonial empire of England. After a time the Church of England obtained precedence, and for a while was supported by public tax. Trinity Church was founded in New York city in 1696; the Rev. W. Vesey was its first rector, and was also for fifty years commissary of the bishop of London; it is probably the wealthiest church corporation in the United States. New Jersey (New Sweden), in like manner, and the banks of the Delaware from the mouth inland, were settled by Swedes in 1638. Later (1676), the Quakers came in as colonists, and though in religious profession the inhabitants were principally Presbyterians and Quakers, yet there was open toleration to all other Christian believers. Missionaries of the Society for Propagating the Gospel were at an early day earnestly and zealously at work, at several points in New Jersey, and besides the names of Talbot, Beach, and others, that of Dr. T . B. Chandler, of Elizabethtown, must ever be held in grateful memory by churchmen. The Protestant Episcopal Church has always been comparatively strong in New Jersey Pennsylvania was founded by William Penn in 168182, and, so far as religion was concerned, was tolerant to all of every name. It deserves to be mentioned, too, that, as in the early history  of Virginia, kindness and gentleness were displayed towards the native tribes, and no Quaker blood was ever shed by the Indians. ‘The first Episcopal Church founded in Pennsylvania was Christ's Church, Philadelphia, in 1695; and at various points the missionaries of the Society for Propagating the Gospel were, during the early part of the 18th century, actively engaged in preaching the Gospel. Great ungodliness prevailed in all directions. and fanaticism, in its most offensive, hurtful form, displayed itself; but the clergy labored on, amid every discouragement, and their labors were blessed to a large extent.

In all the colonial enterprises thus far, as we have seen, the Church of England was allowed a reasonably fair and just privilege of ministering to the wants of its own people, and extending its boundaries and influence, as best it could in accordance with the rights of others. But when we look at New England, and see what treatment the Church met with there, the contrast is striking indeed. Here, as is well known, the first settlers were those called in the ecclesiastical history of the time Puritans. They were men who had been engaged in long and fierce contentions with the established Church in England. They were men also of stern and unyielding natures, and among them, the leading ones at least, for good reasons, as they held, hated the Church with as nearly a perfect hatred as is possible for man to attain. There was no term in the vocabulary of reproach which they did not heap upon the Church and its clergy and members, as well as its liturgy and services. They refused to allow two clergymen of the Church, who were in New England in 1623-24, to preach and labor in any way in their vocation; and the brothers Browne, two of the original patentees of the Massachusetts Bay Company, who desired to enjoy the services of the Church of England, and that too only in a private dwelling, were shipped off in 1629, without ceremony, by Endicott, the governor, on the ground that they were “factious and evil- conditioned.”

Thus was begun that series of oppressive actions and intolerant disregard of the rights of others which resulted later in the judicial murder of the Quakers. In a letter, dated April 7, 1630, when a large body of Puritans were embarking from England under Winthrop and Saltonstall, they spoke of themselves as men “who esteem it an honor to call the Church of England, whence we rise, our dear mother; and we cannot part from our native country, where she specially resideth, without much sadness of heart, and many tears in our eyes; ever acknowledging that such hope and part as we have obtained in the common salvation we have received in her bosom, and  sucked it from her breasts.” Yet these same men and their successors, with strange and painful disregard of the plain meaning of their words, resolved upon and put in practice intolerance in its most vengeful form. They had suffered, as they averred, bitter persecution and grievous wrong in England from the “lord bishops” in authority there, who gave no heed to their conscientious scruples in Church matters; but, so far from showing forth love and gentleness and kindness and liberality as regards other people's consciences, they seem, when the power fell into their hands, to have become, in all matters relating to religion, harder than the granite rock; and, with a spirit as unpitying and hateful as that of the Inquisition itself, they determined that no man, woman, or child, where they had strength to stop it, should ever hold any opinion or have any religious faith which they, the “lord brethren” of New England, did not approve. They fined, imprisoned, or banished recusants of all sorts. “God forbid,” said they, through Endicott, an impersonation of bigotry, “that our love of truth should be so cold that we should tolerate errors!” They allowed no one who differed from them to live among them. Convicted Anabaptists were “whipped unmercifully.” Quakers, who with fanatical violence defied the magistrates and ministers, were sentenced, after the first conviction, to lose one ear; after the second, another; after the third, to have the tongue bored through with a red-hot iron; and several of them were put to death; but in 1661 Charles II, by a peremptory order, forbade further outrage of this kind. As to the Indians, though the colonists were under chartered obligation to treat them well and endeavor to convert them to Christianity these were looked upon as having no rights to be respected, as wolves, savages, heathen. and doomed, like the Canaanites of old, to utter excision as speedily as possible. It was only such men as Roger Williams in Rhode Island, and the estimable John Eliot, the Apostle to the Indians, and the comparatively few who sympathized with them, that helped to relieve New England bigotry and intolerance from being denounced as utterly detestable.

The Puritans, in carrying out their principles, organized what they called churches on the same plan of independency as that employed in civil matters. They looked upon themselves as under no restraint. and as owing no obligation or courtesy to their “dear mother, the Church of England,” and they thought and acted as if they could just as readily have — to use a pet phrase of later days — a church without a bishop as a state without a king. Of course, under such a condition of affairs, and with such antagonism and prejudice against the Church and all appertaining to it. it could make little or no progress in New England; and it is a fact to be  noted that for some sixty years after the landing on Plymouth rock there was not a single Episcopal church in all that part of the country. It was not till the year 1679 that Charles II, on the earnest representation of some of the inhabitants through the bishop of London, caused a church to be built in Boston. William of Orange subsequently settled an annual bounty of £100 for endowment.

From this time onward, however, owing to the unwearied and judicious efforts of the Society for Propagating the Gospel, something began to be accomplished, in despite of penal enactments and bitter, uncompromising hatred. Missionaries were sent out to various points in New England, as well as the other colonies (except Virginia and Maryland)); and as they were honest, faithful men, abounding in labors, travelling over large districts, and ministering the Gospel to all whom they met with, they deserve all honor, and their labors were not without fruit. Had the Church of England listened to that supplication for bishops which went up continually and earnestly, and had she been permitted to send out worthy men for the episcopal office, the growth and prosperity of the Church in America would have been vastly greater and more secure; but the ungodliness of men in power, the hampered condition of the Established Church, and the active opposition of the Puritans in New England and of the dissenters in England as well as their special friends in America, always succeeded in overpowering the cry of the destitute and the numerous and powerful remonstrances of the Society for Propagating the Gospel. At one time there were two nonjurihig bishops in America, viz. Dr. R. Welton and Dr. J. Talbot (1722), the former in Philadelphia. the latter in Burlington, N. J.; but they were not allowed to exercise episcopal functions except by stealth, and the government soon after interfered and put an entire stop to all action on their part. As early as 1704, a missionary of the society took up his residence in Newport, R. I., and continued there nearly half a century. During his ministry, and that of several helpers in the work, he could not but note the depressing effects of schism and heresy, there being then quite as many denominations in Rhode Island as there have been in subsequent days. Bishop Berkeley deserves to be named in this connection for his noble disinterestedness and zeal.

In 1725 he entered upon his great philanthropic and Christian enterprise of' erecting a college at Bermuda. to serve as an institution for educating the children of the planters, and suitable ones from among the natives as missionaries in order to convert the savages to Christianity. In 1728 Berkeley was in Rhode Island, and had  not the government of Walpole kept him out of the £20,000 voted, he would probably have accomplished his benevolent design. The next year he returned to England, and reluctantly gave up his cherished plan. Some eighteen years later lie caused to be sent as a gift to the library of Harvard College a very valuable collection of books, containing such authors as Hooker, Pearson, Barrow, Hammond, Clarendon, etc., and these no doubt helped to leaven the minds of some in New England, who, weary of the despotism of independency, and grieved and distressed at there being multitudinous sects of all kinds and characters, were disposed to seek, and did seek, refuge in the sober, staid, and godly ways of the Church of England. It is also worthy of note here that early in the 18th century, about thirty-five years before Berkeley's donation to Harvard College, a library of books. similar in character and value to those just named, had been sent to Yale College, which was now established in New Haven. At this date there was not a single Episcopal Church in Connecticut, and very few families of Church people.

There were, however, in this region, several earnest seekers after truth, dissatisfied and cheerless in their then position, among whom may be named especially Timothy Cutler, an accomplished scholar, and president of Yale College; Daniel Brown, one of the tutors; and Samuel Johnson, a Congregational preacher at West Haven. These, in company with others in like condition of mind, set to work to examine into the important subject of the ministry and doctrines of the apostolic and early Church. The result was, rather to the astonishment and alarm of most of their associates, a thorough conviction on their part that there was no valid ministry except through the laying-on of the hands of a bishop, and that the doctrines set forth in the Prayer-book are the true and full expression of the truth of the Gospel. Of course, Messrs. Cutler and Brown could not stay any longer in Yale College, which neither recognised nor tolerated the Church of England in any shape, but, in common with Congregationalists generally, as we are gravely told, “entertained fears lest the introduction of Episcopal worship into the colony should have a tendency gradually to undermine the foundations of civil and religious liberty.” Accordingly these gentlemen resigned their positions, and, accompanied by Mr. Johnson, they sailed for England in November. 1722, were ordained to the ministry, and (except Mr. Brown, who died of smallpox) returned to America as missionaries of the society the following year. Dr. Cutler became rector of Christ's Church, Boston, and Dr. Johnson was settled at Stratford, Conn. Both of them were among the foremost men in the colonial Church, and were of especial service in  defending its claims, warding off attacks, and promoting its growth and welfare. Both, too, lived till nearly the close of the colonial period, Dr. Cutler dying in 1765, Dr. Johnson in 1772. In fact, the Church in Connecticut was more than ordinarily blessed, and we find that, prior to the Revolution, it was comparatively vigorous and zealous in good works. The names of Beach, Seabury, Jarvis, Hubbard, and others abundantly evince this. Without attempting to go into details, it may here be stated that down to the outbreak of the Revolution, the Society for Propagating the Gospel maintained, on an average, thirty clergymen in the New England states, and about fifty in the other colonies. One list of churches which was sent home by a missionary in 1748 makes the number in New Hampshire two, in Rhode Island five, in Massachusetts twelve, in Connecticut seventeen-total, thirty-six. It must be borne in mind, too, that each missionary was placed in the centre of an extensive district, and supplied as far as possible the spiritual wants of the people, whom ofttimes he could reach only by long and even dangerous journeys to and from distant settlements. The Society did all that its means allowed in sending missionaries in all practicable directions, and it may justly and properly be noted of its work that when it began its operations in the colonies, it found but five churches; and when compelled by the revolt of the colonies to close its labors, it left the country with some two hundred and fifty churches.

The Church of England in America was peculiarly unhappy in its position just before anti at the period of the revolution. It had no popular favor to fall back upon in those days of trial. It was small in proportion to other Christian bodies, especially in the north, and it was hated and despised by the ill-informed multitude, who regarded it as virtually identical with priestcraft and tyranny. A considerable number of its clergy, particularly those who were English-born, felt compelled by their ordination vows to adhere to the cause of the king. This was sure to bring distress and trouble upon them and the Church likewise; for when the disputes with the mother country reached that crisis which culminated in the war of the revolution, there could be no longer any hesitation as to the side which every man must take. Then it became a necessity for a man to side with his country or with the king's party; he must be a patriot, heart and soul, or he must he ranked with and suffer with the odious Tories. The result was the abandonment of their fields of labor by most of the clergy in the employ of the Society for Propagating the Gospel, who found their only safety in  flight to England or the British provinces; the closing of nearly all the churches; and, worse than all, the disgraceful ruin and defilement heaped upon many church edifices. It was none the less hard and unjust to American churchmen to be forced to bear all this in addition to the trials of war, inasmuch as it is only simple justice to put it on record, to the perpetual honor of the Church and the vindication of its members against the freely circulated charge of lack of patriotism in the great struggle against the tyranny of the English government, that the commander-in-chief of our army was a churchman, and the first chaplain of Congress was William White, a clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

2. History subsequent to the Revolution, including the full organization and entrance on its work of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States. — When, at last, the war was over, and the independence of the United States was acknowledged (1783), it became a matter of immediate concern to those who had heretofore been dependent on England for ordination of clergy, and for efficient and steady help from the Society for Propagating the Gospel, to ascertain what was now to be done. Here they were, few in numbers comparatively; cut off from all direct connection with the English Church; having not even the small comfort of being considered as any longer in the diocese of London; with no means of helping themselves; no bishops, few clergy, and these scattered over a large surface of country; in great perplexity as to the proper course to be pursued; and reduced pretty nearly to the condition of hopeless uncertainty.; In Virginia, for instance, at the beginning of the Revolution, there were 164 churches and chapels and 91 clergymen; at the close of the great struggle a large number of these churches had been destroyed; 95 parishes were extinct or forsaken; of the remaining 72, there were 34 without ministerial services; while of the 91 clergy only 28 remained. But, bad and distressing as was the state of affairs, it was not altogether desperate. The great Head of the Church did not abandon his people in their trouble.

Those brave and honest men who had tried for years and years to induce the government and Church of England to allow them to have a bishop — were thoroughly conscious that they must not now give up in despair. The mean and paltry reasons of state, and the venomous prejudice that had been stirred up from this side of the water against the continuous supplication for a bishop during nearly a century just past — these could certainly no longer have any force; for now there was a new nation in the  world, in no wise hampered by any union of Church and State; now it could not be pretended that there was any danger to public liberty from the Episcopal Church having and enjoying what it regards as essential to its very life and growth. To us, at this day, when a century of existence has been granted to the United States, and the Protestant Episcopal Church has proved its right to be what it has now become, it seems almost incredible that it could ever have been seriously urged against that Church that its having bishops of its own was (in some strange, unaccountable way) hurtful and dangerous to liberty and true patriotism. However singular it may appear that such an opinion should prevail among fair-minded, intelligent persons, the fact is indisputable; this opinion did prevail, and did cause great trial and suffering to the Church in America. All that can be said is, that as prejudice is usually utterly unreasoning, and will listen to nothing which militates against its preconceived conclusions, so we have no alternative but to attribute some, at least, of the opposition to the Episcopal Church to this hard, stony prejudice; while it is almost certain that a large part of the opposition arose from settled hatred towards the Church and a determination to prevent its growth and influence. Bishop White's testimony is instructive in this connection. Writing in 1836, he says, “What a wonderful change has the author lived to witness in reference to American episcopacy! He remembers the ante-revolutionary times, when the presses profusely emitted pamphlets and newspaper disquisitions on the question whether an American bishop were to be endured; and when threats were thrown out of throwing such a person, if sent among us, into the river, although his agency was advocated for the sole purpose of a communion submitting itself to his spiritual jurisdiction.... The order has existed among us for nearly the half of a century, and not a single complaint has been heard, either of usurpation to the injury of any other denomination, or of arbitrary government within our own.”

Organization and union, as far as practicable, were now of first importance. It was no new thing for the clergy to meet in their several districts from year to year. This had been done at intervals all through the 18th century, up to the end of the colonial period. In Virginia and Maryland, where the Church of England was established by law, meetings, consisting of a large number of the clergy and laity, were held in the spring of 1784-85. In Virginia, the chief effort was to rid the Church of State control, to obtain liberty to act freely in ecclesiastical matters, and to have the Episcopal Church incorporated in accordance with the laws of the state, so as to hold and retain its rights of property in churches, glebe lands, etc. A general  willingness was expressed of uniting with Episcopal churches in other states; but ground was taken in regard to bishops and their office and position which alarmed the Northern churches. The Virginia notion was to reduce a bishop to the lowest possible point, to use him simply for ordaining and confirming, to make him serve as a parish minister, and be amenable to the convention, etc. In Maryland, a special effort was made to secure a bill of rights for the Episcopal Church, for objects similar to those just named in the case of Virginia; “a declaration of certain fundamental rights and liberties of the Protestant Episcopal Church of Maryland” was set forth; and Dr. William Smith was chosen to go to England for the purpose of obtaining episcopal orders. It may be mentioned here that, for various and sufficient reasons, Dr. Smith did not obtain the proper papers, and was never consecrated. Farther south, a convention, consisting of a small number of clergy and laity, was held in Charleston, S. C., in 178586. The feeling against the Church of England was very bitter in that part of the country, which had suffered greatly from the ravages of the British armies. This convention, acknowledging the need of the three orders in the ministry, was willing to go so far as a general approval of union, but stipulated that there was to be no bishop settled in that state without the consent of the Church there.

In January, 1784, Dr. Beach, of New Brunswick, N. J., made a suggestion to Dr. White, of Philadelphia, and Dr. Provoost, of New York, that a conference of as many of the clergy as could be conveniently got together be held, to take into consideration the condition of Church affairs. Previously to this, in August, 1782, before the recognition of American independence, and when it seemed as if the ministry of the Church were almost annihilated, Dr. White had issued a pamphlet, entitled “The Case of the Episcopal Churches in the United States Considered.” In this pamphlet, which excited considerable attention, the writer, apprehending the possibility of the Church being compelled to go forward without obtaining the succession from England, advocated the formation of a new body, without bishops in the regular line — in fact, a new presbyterian denomination. This, however, was only in case absolute necessity required such a course, and, as bishop White himself subsequently stated, it was suggested only for such a possible state of affairs. The writer was, in reality, too good a churchman not to embrace joyfully the opportunity which was offered three years later of obtaining the succession in the English line. A meeting of several clergymen from New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey, members of the Corporation for the Relief of Widows and Children of Clergymen, was held in New  Brunswick, May 11, 1784.

At this meeting a number of laymen were also present, and another meeting was appointed for October in the same year in New York. Accordingly, Oct. 6.1784, some fifteen clergymen from New England, New York, New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland, and eleven laymen from the same states, assembled in New York. The principal result was the making of several important recommendations, such as, that there be a General Convention of the Episcopal Church; that each state send clerical and lay deputies; that the doctrines held by the Church of England be adhered to; that the Prayer-book be altered only in so far as civil changes demand: that in any state having a bishop, he be, ex officio, a member of the convention; that the clergy and laity deliberate together, but vote separately; that the first meeting of a general convention be held in Philadelphia on Tuesday before the Feast of St. Michael, in 1785, etc. Probably the most important benefit secured by the action of this body was a recognition of the value and need of lay representation as not only right in itself, but also in admirable harmony with the constitution of a republican form of government. The New England feeling was quite strong against the having a lay element in Church councils, and for a few years it appeared as if serious discord might arise, and hinder the union of the churches in the several states; but, happily the point was conceded, though with some reluctance, by the Connecticut bishop and clergy in 1789. One other point of difference existed at the time. The Connecticut sentiment was decidedly in favor of securing a bishop first, and then proceeding to act as a fully organized Church, in passing laws, revising the liturgy, etc., and such was the course adopted in that state. Dr. Samuel Seabury, bishop-elect, meeting with annoying difficulties and delays in England, was consecrated by Scotch bishops, in November, 1784, and, on his return home early in the summer of 1785, entered at once upon his duties as bishop of Connecticut. The churches in the middle and more southerly portions of the country held an opposite opinion to that entertained in Connecticut and Massachusetts, and in accordance therewith went forward, and took various steps antecedent to the obtaining of the succession from England.

The first meeting of clergy and laity which can properly be considered as approaching to a general convention was held in Philadelphia in September and October, 1785. Seven states were represented by 16 clergymen and 26 laymen. It was hoped that bishop Seabury and some of the New England clergy might be present; but, as they were not satisfied as yet on several points, they declined attending. Dr. White was chosen president, and Dr.  Griffith, of Virginia, secretary, and the convention proceeded promptly to the work of organization and revision. A plan for obtaining the episcopal succession, and an address to the archbishops and bishops of the Church of England were discussed and agreed upon. These papers were mainly the production of Dr. White, and were manly and dignified in tone and statement. A draft of alterations of the liturgy, in order to adapt it to the existing condition of civil affairs, and to get rid of certain offensive features, was submitted, as was also an “Ecclesiastical Constitution;” and the work went on vigorously till the close of the session, Oct. 7. The committee on altering and improving the Prayer-book were Drs. White, W. Smith, and Wharton. They were authorized to make changes of various kinds, “but in such a manner that nothing in form or substance be altered;” to accompany the volume with “a proper preface or address. setting forth the reason and expediency of the alterations;” and to publish the work for the use of Episcopal churches. The result of their labors was the “Proposed Book,” as it is known in Church history. The major part of the alterations were made by Dr. Smith; and these alterations, both as to matter and spirit, deserve the attention of every student of our history. Besides a large number of verbal changes, the article “He descended into hell,” in the Apostles' Creed, and the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds, were ejected; the “Articles of Religion” were reduced to twenty; a calendar and table of holydays were set forth; a long preface (the basis of the preface to the Book of Common Prayer as it now is) was added, etc. The volume proved to be quite unsatisfactory. Its changes were looked upon as too radical by many of the clergy and conventions; and hardly had the book been issued before it became evident that the Church was not ready or willing to accept it. From every quarter, when state conventions met, amendments were proposed and urged upon the attention of the Church; and nowhere was the book adopted, except in a few churches for temporary use. Bishop White says it was “a great error” to print the book at all in its then condition, and still more to print a large edition in hope of getting, by its sale, pecuniary returns to be used for charitable purposes. It was a crude and ill-digested affair, and it never received the first sanction of the Church. Subsequent general conventions ignored it altogether, and it will ever remain as the “Proposed Book,” not the Book of Common Prayer which was later adopted, and is the Church's permanent heritage.

At the meeting of the next convention in Philadelphia, June 20, 1786, ten clergy and eleven laymen were present. The prospect was by no means  encouraging. Indeed, as bishop White states, “the convention assembled under circumstances which bore strong appearances of a dissolution of the union in this early stage of it.” The correspondence with the archbishops and bishops in England made it evident that there was an apprehension existing in their minds that the American Episcopal Church was scarcely sound in the faith, and they answered cautiously and with reserve in regard to the application for the episcopate. This was quite natural, and it need occasion no surprise that they objected to many of the alterations in the Prayer-book and to various features in the “Ecclesiastical Constitution,” as it was then arranged. Renewed and distinct assurances were expected from the American Church that there was no intention whatever on its part of departing from the Church of England in doctrine or in discipline and worship, except in so far as changed civil relations made it necessary, before the venerable prelates were willing to act as they were asked to do.

There was also considerable unpleasant feeling excited by an expressed determination of several members of the convention (Provoost and R. Smith especially) to throw doubt upon the validity of bishop Seabulry's orders, obtained from the line of the Scotch nonjuring bishops. The convention showed its good sense and discretion by refusing to take any action inimical to the bishop of Connecticut or his position; a resolution simply was passed advising the churches then represented in convention not to receive ministers ordained by any bishop in America, during the application pending to the English bishops for episcopal consecration. “A General Constitution of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States,” freed from some serious former objections, was agreed upon, as also an answer to the letter from the archbishops and bishops of the Church of England. This latter, with the constitution. it was hoped and expected would give entire satisfaction. At an adjourned meeting held in Wilmington, Del., in October, 1786, the letter just before received from the archbishops and bishops, with forms of testimonials and the act of parliament authorizing the consecration of bishops for foreign countries, were read, and appropriate action was taken. A declaratory “Act of the General Convention of Clerical and Lay Deputies of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the States of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, and South Carolina” was passed; and it was determined, in accordance with the earnest recommendation of the archbishops and bishops, to restore the omitted article (descent into hell) in the Apostles' Creed, and to put back in its proper place in the Prayer-book the Nicene Creed. At the same time it was resolved that the Athanasian Creed be  omitted altogether, only one clergyman voting in its favor.

Testimonials were signed in behalf of Dr. White, Dr. Provoost, and Dr. Griffith, bishops elect respectively of Pennsylvania, New York, and Virginia. The convention refused to give a like testimonial in favor of Dr. W. Smith, bishop elect of Maryland. On Nov. 2, 1786, Drs. White and Proroost embarked for England, and arrived on the 20th; Dr. Griffith, for personal reasons, was unable to accompany them. When they reached London, they were introduced to the archbishop by the American minister, John Adams, who, as bishop White says, in his Memoirs, “in this particular, and in every instance in which his personal attentions could be either of use or as an evidence of his respect and kindness, continued to manifest his concern for the interests of a Church of which he was not a member.” After some little delay, owing to Parliament not being in session, the consecration took place, Sunday, Feb. 4, 1787, in Lambeth chapel. The two archbishops, and the bishops of Bath and Wells and of Peterborough, united in the solemn act of giving the apostolic succession to the American Church.\* The new bishops very soon left England for home, and, after a long voyage of some seven weeks, arrived in New York on the afternoon of Easter-day, April 7. Thus, at last, was secured for the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States the long and earnestly sought-for privilege of having its organization rendered complete; thus, too, from this date it took its place as a distinct national branch of the Church of Christ, with all the privileges and duties and responsibilities thereunto attached.

\*This was certainly a connection by ordination with the Established Church of England, but whether it was truly an “apostolic succession,” is a very different question, which we do not think this the proper place to discuss. — ED.

The General Convention of 1789 assembled, July 28, in Philadelphia, bishop White presiding; bishop Provoost was absent. There were seventeen clergymen and sixteen laymen present from seven states, including South Carolina; but none came from New England. An application was made by the clergy of Massachusetts and New Hampshire, asking for the consecration of the Rev. Edward Bass as bishop. This application was placed on the ground that there were now three bishops (the proper canonical number) in America, and that consequently they were fully able to act in the premises. A resolution was unanimously passed “that, in the opinion of this convention, the consecration of the Right Rev. Dr. Seabury to the episcopal office is valid,” and the general sentiment was strongly in  favor of compliance with the request of the Massachusetts clergy. There was, however, an obstacle which hindered this compliance at this time, viz., the obligation which bishops White and Provoost felt themselves to lie under to the English bishops, not to consecrate any to the episcopal office until there were three in the English line in the United States. Dr. Griffith, in May, 1789, relinquished his appointment as bishop elect of Virginia, and died in Philadelphia during the session. Hence, it was thought best not to act at present upon the application from Massachusetts. A body of canons, ten in number, was adopted; a General Constitution of the Church was agreed upon in substance; an appropriate address was prepared, thanking the archbishops of Canterbury and York for their good offices in regard to the episcopate; also, an address was sent to the President of the United States, which was courteously answered by Washington; and the convention adjourned. August 8, to meet again in the same place, Sept. 29. An important part of the object of this adjourned session was to secure the union of the churches in New England with those already joined together.

This was now happily accomplished. Bishop Seabury appeared, and took his place as a member of the convention, as did also deputies from Connecticut, Massachusetts, and New Hampshire. The third article of the constitution was modified so as to secure to the bishops the right to assemble and act as a separate house, in originating measures, etc.; they also were to have from this time a negative on the action of the lower house, unless adhered to by a four-fifths vote. The bishops then withdrew and organized as a house. Bishop Provoost being absent on account of illness, bishop Seabury took the chair. From this date there have been two houses, whose concurrent action is necessary to the adoption of any legislation, the bishops also (since 1808) having the full negative on the action of the other house. The convention now entered upon its most important work, which was to provide and place on a firm foundation the Book of Common Prayer for the American Church. The English liturgy was made the basis, and though entire independence of action was claimed by the House of Deputies, as if there were no book of any authority or obligation now in existence, yet there was, after all, a sense of the propriety and fitness of varying as little as possible from the Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England. Five committees were appointed, to whom were assigned different portions of the work, and they discharged their duties with as much expedition as was practicable. The result, as soon as agreed upon by the house, was sent to the bishops for their action.

The alterations were principally verbal, and for the purpose of adapting the  services to the needs and uses of a Church situate as the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States was and is. An office of Visitation of Prisoners, a service for Thanksgiving Day, and an order of Family Prayer were added, as also Selections of Psalms to be used instead of those for the day, Tate and Brady's version of the Psalms, and some hymns in metre. One noticeable change was made in the Communion Office, i.e. putting in their proper place the oblation and the invocation of the Holy Spirit, as found in the first Prayerbook of Edward VI. and also in the Scotch Communion Service. This was due mainly to bishop Seabury, who was under something of a pledge to the Scottish bishops to secure this change, if possible. The meekness and wisdom of bishop White were clearly evident in this matter, as in everything. He was always ready to yield where principle was not violated, and he puts it on record that his discussions with bishop Seabury were entirely amicable and satisfactory to both parties. “To this day,” he says, “there are recollected with satisfaction the hours which were spent with bishop Seabury on the important subjects which came before them, and especially the Christian temper which he manifested all along.” The Apostles' and Nicene Creeds were adopted with hearty assent by the convention. A rubric was prefixed to the former, as follows: “And any churches may omit the words ‘he descended into hell,' or may, instead of them, use the words ‘he went into the place of departed spirits,' which are considered as words of the same meaning in the Creed.” Bishop Seabury desired much to have the Athanasian Creed inserted not as obligatory on all, as in the Church of England, but as permissory for those wishing to use it; but, as bishop White states, the House of Deputies “would not allow of the creed in any shape.” The consideration of the “Articles of Religion” was postponed to a subsequent convention. The Book of Common Prayer was formally ratified by the bishops, clergy, and laity in convention, Oct. 16, 1789: “This Convention having, in their present session, set forth A Book of Common Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, do hereby establish the said Book; and they declare it to be the Liturgy of this Church, and require that it be received as such by all the members of the same; and this Book shall be in use from and after the first day of October, in the year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred and ninety.” A number of canons were passed in regard to episcopal visitations, publishing a list of the clergy, observance of the Lord's day, etc. The consecration of Dr. Bass was deferred. Dr. Madison, of Virginia, was consecrated bishop in England, Sept. 19, 1790; and thus the full number of bishops was secured  through the English line. Two years later the consecration of Dr. Claggett as bishop of Maryland united both lines in the American episcopate, bishop Seabury being present and joining in the solemn act.

The convention of 1792 met in New York Sept. 11. There were five bishops, nineteen clerical and fourteen lay deputies in attendance, and the session lasted seven days. The Ordinal was revised and set forth, the alterations being few. An alternate form at the ordination of priests was furnished; instead of “Receive the Holy (host for the office and work of a priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands; whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained. And be thou,” etc.; the bishop ordering is allowed to say, “Take thou authority to execute the office of a priest in the Church of God, now committed to thee by the imposition of our hands. And be thou,” etc. The consideration of the Articles was further postponed. An act was passed “for supporting missionaries to preach the Gospel on the frontiers of the United States,” in which it was recommended that annual sermons be preached in all the churches, that collections be made, and missionaries be sent out as soon as may be, these being under the canonical jurisdiction of the bishop of Pennsylvania. “Agreeably to the requirement of a canon adopted at the last convention, a list of the clergy of the Church is printed in the appendix to the journal. Including the bishops, the number given is one hundred and eighty-four, no lists having been handed in from New Hampshire and Massachusetts, and there being no mention of the number of clergymen at that time in North Carolina and on the Western frontiers.

With every allowance there could not have been more than two hundred, the representatives of nearly two thousand who, with English orders, had labored on the American continent since its earliest attempted settlement, two hundred and fifty years before” (Perry). One other matter deserves to be put on record here, not only because of the importance of the object had in view both as regards one of the most influential denominations in the United States and the Protestant Episcopal Church, but also because of the entire failure at that date of so earnest and truly catholic a movement. We give it in the language of bishop White: “Bishop Madison had communicated to the author, on their journey from Philadelphia to New York, a design which he had much at heart-that of effecting a reunion with the Methodists; and he was so sanguine as to believe that by an accommodation to them in a few instances, they would be induced to give up their peculiar discipline, and conform to the leading  parts of the doctrine, the worship, and the discipline of the Episcopal Church. It is to be noted that he had no idea of comprehending them, on the condition of their continuing embodied, as at present. On this there was communicated to him an intercourse held with Dr. Coke, one of the superintendents of that society which might have shown to bishop Madison how hopeless all endeavors for such a junction must prove.

Nevertheless, he persisted in his well-meant design. The result of this was his introducing into the House of Bishops a proposition, which his brethren. after some modifications, approving of the motive, but expecting little as the result of it, consented to send to the other house.” The proposition (as given by bishop White) was placed on a broad and liberal basis, leaving most of matters to future discussion and settlement at a subsequent convention. “On the reading of this in the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, they were astonished, and considered it as altogether preposterous; tending to produce distrust of the stability of the system of the Episcopal Church, without the least prospect of embracing any other religious body. The members generally stated, as a matter of indulgence, that they would permit the withdrawing of the paper, and no notice to be taken of it. A few gentlemen, however, who had got some slight intimations of the correspondence between Dr. Coke and the author, who would have been gratified by an accommodation with the Methodists, and who thought that the paper sent was a step in measures to be taken to that effect, spoke in favor of the proposition. But it was not to be endured; and the bishops silently withdrew it, agreeably to leave given.” Bishop White gives, in addition, the letter of Dr. Coke, and an account of several interviews had with him. The letter is an instructive one in many respects, and shows what Dr. Coke thought of his supposed “episcopal” character, derived from John Wesley; bishop White's remarks and statements also are worthy of grave consideration. The subject has been more than once agitated, and sometimes men have become sanguine of being able to effect the end desired; but as the question of ordination still holds the place which it did in Dr. Coke's day, and the Methodist ministers almost certainly cannot be brought to acknowledge the obligation of being ordained by our bishops in order to officiate in our churches, we apprehend that there never has been any real probability of bringing the Methodists to a sense of the duty and propriety of becoming reunited to the Church at whose altars John Wesley always ministered, and which he at least was never willing to abandon.

Owing to the prevalence of epidemic disease in Philadelphia and its vicinity, the convention of 1795 was but thinly attended, and from the same cause no convention was held in 1798. A special convention, however, met in Philadelphia, June 11, 1799. Eight states were represented, nineteen clerical and ten lay deputies being present. Bishop Seabury, who had died in 1796, was succeeded by bishop Jarvis, consecrated Sept. 18, 1797. Dr. R. Smith was made bishop of South Carolina in 1795, and Dr. Bass of Massachusetts in 1797. At this convention an attempt was made to obtain its approval of Dr. U. Ogden, bishop elect of New Jersey; but it failed entirely, and Dr. Ogden a few years later joined the Presbyterians. A proposition was made to hold General Convention every five years; a form of consecration of a church or chapel was set forth; and seventeen articles were reported and read. These were ordered to be laid over, and printed in the journal. The clergy-list gives seven bishops and two hundred and twelve clergymen. At the convention of 1801, held at Trenton, N. J., Sept. 8, it was announced that bishop Provoost had resigned his jurisdiction as bishop of New York. Under the circumstances it was deemed right to consecrate Dr. Benjamin Moore as his assistant, the principle being distinctly stated that bishop Provoost was bishop during his life, and that bishop Moore was simply assistant or coadjutor, competent to all episcopal duty, but still to act in concurrence with bishop Provoost. The principal work of the convention was the final settlement of the question as to articles of religion. The printing of the seventeen articles, in the journal of 1799, produced one good result, viz., showing how difficult it was and would be to agree upon a new set of articles for the Protestant Episcopal Church, and leading the minds of the convention to a ready acceptance of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England. It was bishop White's view that these articles were really “the acknowledged faith of the Church” all along, and that the safest and most satisfactory course was to make certain necessary changes, arising out of the actual condition of affairs, and then to adopt the Thirty-nine entire.

This was accordingly done, and, as bishop White states, the articles “were adopted by the two houses of convention, without their altering even the obsolete diction in them; but with notices of such changes as change of situation had rendered necessary.” Article VIII was amended by leaving out the Athanasian Creed. Article XXI, on general councils, was omitted, the reason being given in a note, “because it is partly of a local and civil nature, and is provided for, as to the remaining parts of it, in other articles.” The XXXVth Article, on the homilies, was retained, with a note added suspending “the order for the  reading of said homilies in churches until revision of them may conveniently be made, for the clearing of them, as well from obsolete words and phrases as from the local references.” Article XXXVI was altered in so far as to set forth that the ordinal of 1792 contained the Church's views and principles on this important point. Article XXXVII in the English Prayer-book was omitted, and a new one substituted, “Of the Power of the Civil Magistrate.” The articles as a whole were then ratified by both houses of convention, and they have ever since held their place in the Prayer-book and standards of the Church. Bishop White's remarks, in this connection, deserve to be quoted: “‘The object kept in view, in all the consultations held, and the determinations formed, was the perpetuating of the Episcopal Church on the ground of the general principles which she had inherited from the Church of England; and of not separating from them, except so far as either local circumstances required, or some very important cause rendered proper. To those acquainted with the system of the Church of England, it must be evident that the object here stated was accomplished on the ratification of the Articles.”

3. History of the Protestant Episcopal Church since the beginning of the century.— The standards of the Church having thus been adopted and secured, in the final setting-forth of the Book of Common Prayer, its history and progress since that date are those of a completely organized branch of the Catholic Church. That it did not at once expand itself and cover the land is sadly true, and that it has had in later years its times of sore trial and despondency is equally true. There was unhappily in the early part of the century a lack of thorough education in Church principles; there were the prevalence of sectarianism, jealousy felt by the various Protestant denominations, the sleepless enmity of the Roman Church towards the Protestant Episcopal Church, and wide-spread ungodliness on every hand, resulting in spiritual torpor and almost death. For a time it seemed (as Dr. Hawks says of Virginia) as if naught but “gloomy darkness” enveloped the Church. By a strange combination of circumstances, the act of the legislature of Virginia confiscating the glebes and Church property, which was resisted on the ground of being clearly illegal, became law by the death of the presiding judge in the court of appeals the night before he was to deliver the decision, all written out, securing to the Church its just rights. The effect upon the Church in Virginia was fearful and well-nigh disastrous, especially in the ruin and utter abandonment of church edifices and the dyingout of religion in every shape among the people. Even when,  in 1814, a brighter day began to dawn, “the journals of the convention by which bishop R. C. Moore was elected show the presence of but seven clergymen and seventeen laymen. We look back upon the past, and are struck with the contrast. Seven clergymen were all that could be convened to transact the most important measure which our conventions are ever called upon to perform, and this in a territory where once more than ten times seven regularly served at the altar.

We look back still farther, and find the Church, after the lapse of two hundred years, numbering about as many ministers as she possessed at the close of the first eight years of her existence” (Hawks). In Maryland and its neighbor Delaware, matters were hardly any better. “In 1803 there was a spirit of indifference to religion and the Church too extensively prevalent in the parishes; nearly one half of them were vacant; in some, all ministerial support had ceased. Some few of the clergy had deserted their stations; and of the residue, several, disheartened and embarrassed by inadequate means of living, had sought subsistence in other states. Infidelity and fanaticism were increasing; and, on the whole, there never was a time when ministers were more needed, or when it was more difficult to obtain them” (Hawks). Such was the state of things in general at the South in the early part of the 19th century. Further North, in New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, and much of New England, the prospects were more cheering. The consecration of John Henry Hobart as assistant to bishop B. Moore of New York, May 29, 1811, and of Alexander Viets Griswold for the eastern diocese (i.e. Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Hampshire, and Vermont) at the same date, were indications of healthy growth. The former became especially prominent, during his episcopate of nearly twenty years, as the representative of what are called “High-Churchmen”\* in the Protestant Episcopal Church, and his influence on the character, claims, and position of the Church in the United States, in the estimate of his own people as well as the various Christian bodies among whom he lived, can hardly be overvalued. No one could possibly, or did, misunderstand him, and he was so resolute withal in the open avowal of his principles and convictions, and so ready to defend them on all occasions, even that “unchurching” dogma, as many like to call it, that it may be doubted if any bishop or clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church has ever done so much as John Henry Hobart in defining the position and claims, and educating, so to speak, the whole Church to the adoption of fixed and settled views on this important subject. Bishop Hobart's personal character and devotion to his work, his unquestioned purity of purpose in all that he did, his lifelong free and cordial  correspondence with bishop White (whom no one ever charged with being a High-Churchman), strengthened, undoubtedly, his influence; and even those who differed with him, and represented what are called “Low- Church” views and principles, could not but respect a high-toned, conscientious advocate of principles to which they were, with equal conscientiousness, totally opposed. It is not, probably, too much to affirm that the steadfast adherence of the Protestant Episcopal Church to its standards of doctrine, discipline, and worship, and its fixed and often expressed determination (through the General Convention and its action), never to recede from its attitude towards either Rome or Protestants of various names, are due in great measure to the labors, teaching, and publications of bishop Hobart, and the large number of clergymen and laymen who have been educated in the Church principles with which his name is associated.

\* Perhaps it may be well to say here that the terms or appellations “High- Churchman.” “Low-Churchman,” “evanglelical,” “ritualist or ritualistic,” etc., are used simply for convenience, and to save repeated periphrases. The writer of these pages neither affirms nor denies the applicability of the words to or about those specially concerned. No disrespect is meant to any one, on the one hand, by the use of terms, and, on the other, is any claim of superiority made in behalf of those to whom the word is applied. — ED.

The action of the General Convention, from this time onward, has been devoted to legislating for the best interests of the Church, and as far as possible to taking such steps as are calculated, under God's blessing, to promote the increase of faith and holy obedience, to guard against the intrusion of error and unsound doctrine, and to place various matters of doubt or difference of opinion on such a footing that the largest toleration be allowed, in these respects, consistent with preserving the faith once delivered to the saints and the maintenance of apostolic truth and order. In 1804 a “Course of Ecclesiastical Studies” was set forth by the bishops, and it still remains in its original shape, notwithstanding that many and valuable works, in the several departments of theology, have since been published, and are in use in our seminaries and schools of divinity. The General Convention of 1871, in its canon on examinations for orders, says: “In all these examinations reference shall be had, as closely as possible, to the course of study established by the House of Bishops, and to the books therein recommended, or equivalent works of more recent date.”

In 1808  the bishops, in a message to the House of Deputies, who had asked for the enactment of the English canon concerning marriages, expressed their doubts as to the propriety of entering upon the question: and at a later date (1841) there were two reports of committees presented on this subject, the majority adverse to legislation, the minority in favor of enacting the canon. Thus the matter stands, the civil law being supreme, except in regard to marriage of divorced persons, which is as follows: “No minister of this Church shall knowingly, after due inquiry, solemnize the marriage of any person who has a divorced husband or wife still living, if such husband or wife has been put away for any cause arising after marriage; but this canon shall not be held to apply to the innocent party in a divorce for the cause of adultery, or to parties once divorced seeking to be united again” (see Hoffman, Law of the Protestant Episcopal Church, p. 71-84). The words of bishop White ought to be quoted in this connection: ‘ On a retrospect of the transactions of this convention there is entertained the trust that it did not end without a general tendency to consolidate the communion; although, in the course of the business, there had been displayed, more than in any other convention, the influence of some notions leadlinlg far wide of that rational devotion which this Church has inherited from the Church of England. The spirit here complained of was rather moderated than raised higher during the session. But it being liable to be combined with schemes of personal consequence, there is no foreseeing to what lengths it may extend in future.” In 1814 the subject of a theological seminary was discussed, and the need of such an institution began to be evident. Three years later its organization was resolved upon, and initiatory measures were adopted. Its officers, course of study, etc., were finally agreed upon in 1820, and it began its work. The seminary was removed from New Haven to New York, and the next year it was finally established as “The General Theological Seminary of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States.” By this action, however, it was distinctly understood that there was to be no hindrance to any state or diocese establishing a seminary of its own. Time has shown the wisdom of this policy of non-interference; for, in consequence of the vast extent of territory of the United States, it is found to be simply impossible to gather all the candidates for orders in the Church within the walls of the seminary in New York.

We may mention here that there are divinity schools or seminaries in Massachusetts, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Ohio, Wisconsin, and other Western states and dioceses. — At this convention the identity of the Protestant Episcopal Church with the Church of England was declared in the  following terms: “It having been credibly stated to the House of Bishops that on questions in reference to property devised, before the Revolution, to congregations belonging to the ‘Church of England,' and to uses connected with that name, some doubts have been entertained in regard to the identity of the body to which the two names have been applied, the House think it expedient to male the declaration, and to request the concurrence of the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies therein, that ‘The Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America' is the same body heretofore known in these states by the name of ‘The Church of England;' the change of name, although not of religious principle in doctrine, or in worship, or in discipline, being induced by a characteristic of the Church of England, supposing the independence of Christian churches, under the different sovereignties to which, respectively, their allegiance in civil concerns belongs.

But that, when the severance alluded to took place, and ever since, the Church conceives of herself as professing and acting on the principles of the Church of England is evident from the organizations of our conventions, and from their subsequent proceedings as recorded in the journals, to which, accordingly, this convention refer for satisfaction in the premises. But it would be contrary to fact were any one to infer that the discipline exercised in this Church, or that any proceedings therein, are at all dependent on the will of the civil or of the ecclesiastical authority of any foreign country.” The result of this declaration was, some twelve years later in Vermont, where the Society for Propagating the Gospel had formerly owned lands, “that all the material points of law were settled in favor of the Church.” — At this session also the constitution of the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Church was perfected, and the American Church has since done much — though not so much as it might and ought to have done — in preaching the Gospel in the waste places in our own land, and in sending the light of Christian truth and power to heathen lands and peoples. From this date the Church seems to have experienced more fully than before the goodness and mercy of God in sending his grace upon it, and to have given plain indications of healthy increase in the various parts of our country.— Following the uniform plan, adopted under bishop White's gentle but firm guidance and influence, of keeping clear of entanglements, the convention, in 1820, refused to allow the officiating of persons not regularly ordained; and such is the law at the present day: “No minister in charge of any congregation of this Church, or, in case of vacancy or absence, no churchwardens, vestrymen, or trustees of the congregation, shall permit any person to officiate therein without  sufficient evidence of his being duly licensed or ordained to minister in this Church.”

Hence, whatever individual clergymen may venture to do in such cases in the way of inviting ministers of various sorts into their churches, it is always to be borne in mind that they do it of their own will and pleasure, and in violation of the canon which they have promised to obey. As a further illustration of the Church's policy, it may be noted that, in 1823, an offer was made by the Colonization Society that the Episcopal Church should send a delegate to act with that society in its benevolent plans. It was deemed inexpedient to accept the offer, the bishops holding that the objects of this society were “more of a political than religious nature.” — At the convention of 1826 bishop Hobart presented a plan for shortening the morning service, in respect to the Psalter, the Lessons, Litany, etc., and also for improving and rendering more effective the confirmation service in the Prayerbook. Quite unexpectedly, considerable excitement followed this proposal, and three years later, when the sense of the state conventions became known as adverse to any changes in the services, the plan was quietly dismissed from all further consideration. So strong is the conservative element in the councils of the Church, and so great is the unwillingness to make any — even the least-changes in the Prayer-book, that daily morning and evening prayer, with all that belong to them, have continued to be, and are, obligatory in their entire fulness. It is tolerably certain, however, that some, if not many, of the wisest and most devoted among the clergy would gladly welcome a permissory use of a shorter form of daily service for certain occasions, and under certain circumstances, where it would tend to greater edification and obviate some of the vulgar objections against liturgical forms and services. Something looking to this result was accomplished by an expression of the views of the bishops, at the General Convention of 1856; but at the next convention (1859) it was evident, from the course of debate on the “Memorial,” as it was called, and the general sense of the House of Deputies, that the Church was not then, nor has it since been, ready to make any ventures in the direction of liturgical relaxation and Church comprehension.

In the “Great West,” as it used to be called, it became plain at this date that the Protestant Episcopal Church had a work of no ordinary interest and importance to perform. The rapid filling-up of the states west of the Alleghanies, and the sad fact that, in the race for life and increase of wealth and power, religion, in any and every form, was almost wholly ignored. caused no little anxiety and concern to thoughtful men in the older states;  for it was too certain not to be clearly seen that if the West were to be abandoned to chance efforts and the zeal of a few religious men here and there, the result would be that that portion of the country would grow up into might and wealth virtually heathen or infidel, and would be without the restraining bonds of Christian faith and morals, and the civilizing and elevating influences of the Gospel of Christ. In the good providence of God, there was a man, named Philander Chase, whose heart was turned in this direction. After considerable experience in missionary labors in various quarters, Chase set out for Ohio in 1817, determined to give himself to the work of an evangelist in that part of the United States. His labors were blessed, and he seemed to be the very man for the work to be (lone; hence, in 1819 he was consecrated bishop of Ohio.

Every kind of labor and toil came upon him, but he bore tip under it all. Yet the deep consciousness that, if the Gospel was to be preached, there must be men to do it — men, too, educated and trained for this special work, in a new country and among new settlers — pressed heavily upon his mind, and caused him to revolve anxiously what he was to do in such a state of affairs. le concluded to visit England, and to beg for means to found a college and seminary in Ohio for the education of young men for the ministry. The voyage was undertaken (though its expediency was doubted by many), and bishop Chase obtained in all some thirty to forty thousand dollars in aid of his much-cherished object. He returned home in July, 1824, ands during the next two years was busily engaged in laying the foundation of Kenyon College and the Theological Seminary at Ganmbier (both names being derived from prominent donors to the cause). In due time the college went into operation, bishop Chase assuming the presidency. Not long after, however, there arose differences of opinion between him and the professors as to the ex tent of the bishop's powers in this office. The convention of the diocese sustained the professors, which led to an immediate resignation by the sturdy old man, not, only as president of the college, but also as bishop of Ohio. This was in September, 1831, and the case of his resignation of the diocese came before the General Convention of 1832. The House of Bishops pointedly censured abandonment of the diocese under such circumstances; but, in order that the Church should not suffer harm, the bishops united with the other House in approving the election of Dr. C. P. McIlvaine, who was consecrated bishop of Ohio, Oct. 31, 1832. Bishop Chase, we may mention here, continued his course westward, and was elected to the episcopate of Illinois in 1835. He visited England again, received further liberal donations in aid of the cause of  Christian education, and founded another institution, which he called Jubilee College. For this he obtained, in 1847, a charter to his mind on the point of the bishop's control in its affairs. Since those days, headed by the venerable Jackson Kemper, missionary bishop of the North-west, sent out in 1835, the Protestant Episcopal Church has not been altogether unmindful of its duty and privilege; and all through that vast field beyond the Mississippi, even to the Pacific Ocean, there are heralds of the cross engaged in their sacred vocation. The episcopate, since 1859, has been coextensive with the boundaries of the United States; and the Church, in its complete organization, has been, and is, striving to bring men to the obedience of the faith of Christ.

The venerable William White, in the fiftieth year of his episcopate, was called away to his rest, July 17, 1836. His name will ever be held in grateful memory by the Church in America, as well for the long-continued and earnest labors in its behalf which he was permitted to perform, as for the wisdom and judgment of his course on all occasions during a life extended far beyond the ordinary limit allotted to man. Meekness and gentleness, a large-hearted liberality, a spirit of genuine toleration, a willingness to yield for peace' sake in all matters where principle was not, in his judgment, clearly involved — these and the like qualities fitted him admirably for the station he was called upon, in God's providence, to fill; and we may with reverent thankfulness trace the indications of God's goodness and mercy to his Church in America, that such a man was raised up to take large share in its early struggles and history, and to live to so great an age as to see the “little one become a thousand,” and the grain of mustardseed grow up, and become a tree, and shoot out great branches. Bishop White's biographer and intimate friend, Dr. B. Wilson, classes him among “the Low Church divines, as they were called in England, of the established Church in that country,” and the good bishop has been claimed as representing that portion of the clergy in the Protestant Episcopal Church to whom the same title has been applied.

Doubtless, bishop White was not what is termed a “High-Churchman;” for, though he was on terms of great intimacy with bishop Hobart (of whom we have before spoken), and entertained for him warm affection and sincere respect, yet he was never willing to express his assent to all the views of bishop Hobart on the subject of the ministry, and the necessity of the apostolic succession in order to constitute a lawful ministry in the Church. He held episcopacy to be of divine origin, and therefore, of course, the best form and mode of Church government; but,  in view of the condition of the Protestant world, he did not consider it to be absolutely necessary, or that those who depart from or reject it are guilty of causing and perpetuating schism in the body of Christ. On the other hand, he was not at all a “Low-Churchman,” in the sense of undervaluing episcopal organization and responsibility, or looking upon it as a matter of little or no moment. This was very evident by his steadfast adherence to the Church's ways and course in all matters where it was needful to take a stand in regard to other Christian bodies. His courtesy and kindness of heart, and his truly charitable estimate of the views held by pious people not connected with the Protestant Episcopal Church, and of the sincerity of their motives and aims, naturally led him to look with favor upon what might be proposed where it is usually thought Christians of all names can work together for the common good; but, practically, in all such matters he maintained his ground as stoutly as any High-Churchman ever did.

He held steadily to the opinion that the Protestant Episcopal Church was much better off by keeping to itself in all ecclesiastical affairs, and that it was entirely inexpedient to form unions or alliances of any kind, or to “exchange pulpits,” as the phrase is, or. in fine, to run the risk of any sort of possible entanglements with other denominations. This was the result of settled conviction on bishop White's part, and it was well understood to be so on all hands. It did not, however, prevent his having and preserving personal intercourse with Christians of every name; it did not lead him to indulge in denunciations of or interference with others, however far they may, in his judgment, have wandered from the true path; and it did not produce any ill feeling towards him by those who might have complained, in his case as well as that of others, of what is often termed “exclusiveness,” or “bigotry,” on the part of the Protestant Episcopal Church. If ever there have been any who have gone down to their graves without a single enemy, or without even a whisper against their characters for purity and integrity of life, bishop White certainly deserves to be ranked among these. Since the venerable patriarch passed away, the Protestant Episcopal Church has continued to go forward, increasing in numbers year by year, and growing, it is trusted, in grace and deeper and truer devotion to the Lord and Master of us all. It has had its seasons of controversy and earnest struggles (as what Church has not?) between men of differing views, conscientiously and sincerely held on both sides; and it has seemed at times as if controversy were eating into the very heart of the Church, and arousing passions and tempers far from accordance with the spirit of the Gospel. Some notice of these must here be given, not only as a part of  the history of the Protestant Episcopal Church, but also as illustrating its present position and its probable future in the great work of evangelizing this nation.

The Oxford Tract movement (begun at the University in 1833, culminating in Tract No. XC in 1841, and extending over some ten years in addition) was one which was warmly, even hotly, debated, and produced for the time a controversy of no small magnitude and bitterness. The excitement in England, and the results flowing from the movement there, were transferred to America. Party spirit lifted its head on high. Energetic supporters of the tracts and their teaching entered the arena, and equally energetic opponents ranged themselves against the tracts and all who favored them. On the one side it was urged that the tracts taught nothing more than the well-established High-Church doctrines of the old English divines, and it was claimed that this teaching was legitimately within the limits allowed by the standards of the Church of England. It was also said that there was great need of rousing the minds of Church people to the importance of doctrines which had fallen greatly, if not quite, out of sight, such as the apostolic succession, the value and obligation of the holy sacraments, the real presence in the Lord's Supper, the importance of priestly absolution, the necessity of securing a return to the unity of the primitive Church, etc. On the other side, the whole movement and the entire teaching of the tracts were fiercely denounced as tending directly to Romanizing and unprotestantizing the Church. When in England numerous perversions to Rome took place at this time, and especially when John Henry Newman, the coryphaeus of the whole undertaking, gave in his adhesion to the Roman Church (1845), it was triumphantly affirmed that a similar result would happen in the Protestant Episcopal Church, and thus prove to the world how pernicious was the teaching of these tracts, No. XC last and worst of all. Quite a number of persons did abandon the communion of the Church, and submit themselves to Rome; but there was not anything like the exodus which had been predicted, since between 1842 and 1852, including one bishop only Ives, of North Carolina, in 1852), there were less than thirty who left the Church's ministry for the sake of Roman Catholic inducements, and these, with two or three exceptions, were men of little or no influence in the Church or community. SEE OXFORD TRACTS.

In connection with the Oxford Tract movement, and more or less infected with the unhappy spirit of discord existing at the time, there occurred what is ordinarily known as “the Carey Ordination.” Arthur  Carey was a student in the General Theological Seminary, a young man of excellent character and good ability. He graduated in 1843. It was thought and generally understood that he was strongly inclined to the ultra teaching of the tracts in the direction of Romanism; and Drs. Hugh Smith and Henry Anthon, both of New York, who took some pains to ascertain Carey's views and sentiments, deemed him to be unfit for ordination in the Protestant, Episcopal Church. The bishop of New York, however (B. T. Onderdonk), after an examination of the young man, held by six presbyters in conjunction with Drs. Smith and Anthon. decided that he was worthy to obtain orders. Drs. Smith and Anthon publicly protested in the church at the time of the ordination, but bishop Onderdonk went forward and ordained Mr. Carey, July 2, 1843. (He died in March, 1844.) As was to be expected, this action of the bishop of New York gave offence in various parts of the Church. It was much discussed in religious journals and in pamphlets, and bishops Chase, McIlvaine, and Hopkins commented upon it in public, and with much severity of language. In January, 1844, bishop Onderdonk addressed a pastoral letter to his diocese, in which he protested against the course adopted by the above bishops, and called for a trial, if they saw fit to initiate it. A trial, accordingly, was begun at the close of the year; but it was based, as we shall see, on charges entirely diverse from theological unsoundness. Meanwhile, the General Convention of 1844 met in Philadelphia in October. Twenty-four bishops were present, and ninety- three clerical and( eighty-four lay deputies.

In addition to its other labors, the whole matter of the Oxford Tract movement, and its effects upon the American Church, came up for consideration. Several days were spent in the discussion of the general subject of errors in doctrine and practice in the Church, and an earnest effort was made to obtain from the convention a distinct and positive condemnation of the error and false teaching which, it was charged, were rife in the Church. We need not go into details. In the lower house resolutions were offered asking the bishops to ‘“promulgate a clear and distinct expression of the opinions entertained by this convention respecting the rule of faith, the justification of man, the nature, design, and efficacy of the sacraments,” etc. It was also stated, in an amendment, that “the minds of many of the members of this Church throughout its union are sorely grieved and perplexed by the alleged introduction among them of serious errors in doctrine and practice, having their origin in certain writings emanating chiefly from members of the University of Oxford in England;” and, further, that ‘ it is exceedingly desirable that the minds of such persons should be calmed, their anxieties allayed, and the Church  disabused of the charge of holding, in her Articles and Offices, doctrines and practices consistent with all the views and opinions expressed in said Oxford writings, and should thus be freed from a responsibility which does not properly belong to her.” But the house did not agree to any of the resolutions offered in this shape. It was, however, finally “Resolved, That the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies consider the Liturgy Offices, and Articles of the Church sufficient exponents of her sense of the essential doctrines of Holy Scripture; and that the canons of the Church afford ample means of discipline and correction for all who depart from her standards; and, further, that the General Convention is not a suitable tribunal for the trial and censure of, and that the Church is not responsible for, the errors of individuals, whether they are members of this Church or otherwise.”

Thus the house disposed of the question; and the bishops, on their part, in compliance with certain memorials sent to them, gave expression to their godly counsel and warning in the pastoral letter which was soon after issued. In December, 1844, bishops Meade, Otey, and Elliott made a formal presentment against bishop Onderdonk, of New York, “as being guilty of immorality and impurity.” The trial was held in the city of New York. There were seventeen bishops present, constituting the court, viz. P. Chase, Brownell, Ives, Hopkins, Smith, McIlvaine, Doane, Kemper, Polk, Delancey, Madsden, Whittingham, Lee, Johns, Eastburn, Henshaw, Freeman; also the three presenters, and bishop Onllerdonk as respondent. The trial began December 10, and was continued from day to day till January 3, 1845, when bishop Onderdonk was pronounced guilty by eleven votes, and sentenced to suspension from the office of a bishop and from all the functions of the sacred ministry. Bishop Onderdonk protested in the strongest terms his innocence, and published a Statement of facts and Circumstances in regard to his trial. It may be mentioned that the condemned bishop never acknowledged himself to be in any wise guilty (died 1861). The “Prayer of the Diocese of New York to the House of Bishops for relief from sufferings consequent upon the sentence of the Episcopal Court, January, 1845,” was made September 25, 1850; but this and all other efforts put forth to have him restored tailed; and a new canon having been adopted applicable to the case of a diocese with a suspended bishop, Dr. J. M. Wainwright was consecrated provisional bishop of New York, in November, 1852. During these years, since the General Convention of 1844, the tractarian controversy gradually subsided. Both sides became weary of the struggle. Nearly everything had been said which could be said. A number of eminent men in the Church had  put their views into written shape (as Jarvis, Seabury, Hawks, McIlvaine, Hopkins, Stone, and others); and after a while, the storm was lulled, the atmosphere became purified, and the Church was gladdened with a return of sunshine and comparative peace and quiet.

The disturbed condition of the country, in consequence of the secession from the Union of several of the Southern States, caused no little anxiety to the hearts of many of the Church's members, lest the Protestant Episcopal Church too should suffer harm in the great and terrible struggle which had been begun in 1860-61, and was to be tiolght out to the bitter end. It was but natural that the bishops in the southern dioceses should begin to meet and act separately, as if the dismemberment of the United States were a completed fact. They did so by organizing a council, framing a constitution and canons, etc.; and for a time there was grave apprehension lest the Church should be deprived of its union and communion as heretofore. The General Convention of 1862 met in New York, with much reduced numbers, of course; and this subject came before the convention, and was fully debated. Resolutions pledging support to the government were adopted; and a day of fasting, humiliation, and prayer was observed, October 8, 1862, in view “of the present afflictive condition of the country.” At the next convention, however, held in Philadelphia, October, 1865, the Church was entirely reunited; harmony and concert of action were restored; and those who for some years had been acting apart gladly joined again in combined efforts for the good of the whole Church in the United States. There was held a service of thanksgiving to Almighty God for the restoration of peace to the country and unity to the Church. At this convention resolutions were adopted, urging that Christian parents, in the discharge of their bounden duty, should not only train their children in the ways of truth and godliness; should not only furnish them with sound, healthful reading and education in the Church's schools and colleges; but should also strive, by prayer and spiritual culture, to form in their sons a desire to serve God in the sacred ministry. In the House of Deputies it was also “Resolved, That, in the judgment of this house, there has never been a time in the history of our Church when the demand for missionary effort, at home and abroad, was so urgent and imperative as at the present moment; and that we earnestly call upon our constituents, in every diocese of this Church, to arouse themselves to realize the exigencies of the hour, and to labor and give and pray with a freer heart and more fervent zeal.” Further  resolutions advocated a system of itinerancy. and the due use of lay aid in carrying forward the work of the Church.

The most recent controversy through which the Protestant Episcopal Church has been called upon to pass, or, perhaps, more exactly speaking, is still passing, is that which is familiarly known as “ritualism.” The question took a definite shape as early as the General Convention of 1868. Two reports, a majority and minority, were made in the House of Deputies, on the conduct of public worship. The former pleaded for “liberty in things indifferent or unessential, so long as unity can be maintained, and spiritual edification promoted, in any other way;” it also deprecated “the enactment of any canon on the subject of ritual as unwise and inexpedient at the present time.” The minority report urged strongly “the maintenance of our wonted uniformity and simplicity in public worship,” and denounced “all innovations on the common order of the Church which wound the consciences of many of its true and loving members,” such as, “the burning of lights in the order for the Holy Communion, the burning of incense, reverences to the holy table or the elements thereon, the elevation of the elements,” etc.

After much debate, the action of the convention resulted in referring all matters of doubt in these respects to the godly counsel and judgment of the bishops in their respective dioceses, and the appointment of a committee of five bishops (viz. bishops A. Lee, Williams, Clark, Odenheimer, Kerfoot), to consider whether any additional provision for uniformity in matters of ritual, by canon or otherwise, is practicable and expedient, and to report to the next General Convention. In October, 1871, the convention again came together, on this occasion in Baltimore, Md. The attendance was very full; distinguished visitors from England and from some of the colonial churches were present; and a spirit of forbearance and good-will seemed to prevail, notwithstanding so exciting a subject as “ritualism” was before the convention. A very elaborate report was presented by the committee of five, in which, after much sound reasoning on the importance and value of uniformity in the public services of the Church, and the statement of the fact that “diversities of use” had grown and spread, the committee urged that some legislation was certainly necessary. They specified the various additions in the way of ornaments in the Church and novel practices, such as having a crucifix or carrying a cross in procession, bowings, prostrations, mixing wine and water for the Holy Communion, solitary communions, surpliced choirs, additional vestments freely used in some churches. and such like; and they  recommended the appointment of a joint committee of three bishops, three presbyters, and three laymen to consider and report upon these matters to the convention then in session. Such a committee, consisting of able and well-tried men, was appointed, and, through bishop Whittingham and Dr. W. C. Mead on Lehalf of the committee, reported a “canon of ritual.”

In this proposed law it was affirmed that “this Church recognises no other law of ritual than such as it shall itself have accepted or provided;” and the provisions for ritual in this Church were stated to be (1) the Book of Common Prayer, with the offices and ordinal thereto appended; (2) the laws of the Church of England in use in the American provinces before 1789, and not subsequently superseded, altered, or repealed by legislation, general or diocesan, of this Church; (3) the legislative or judicial action or decisions of this Church in its conventions, general or diocesan, or by its duly constituted authorities. Animated discussions followed in the House of Deputies. Amendments and substitutes were proposed again and again, and though the House of Bishops passed the canon reported by the joint committee, the lower house did not succeed in coming to any agreement as to this canon. It was attempted to postpone indefinitely the whole matter, but without success. The favorers of ritualism endeavored to get the convention committed to some action in accordance with their views; the opponents of ritualism were equally urgent in seeking to obtain legislation directly condemnatory of numerous acts and observances peculiar to the ritualistic party. A very prominent advocate of the system (Dr. De Koven, of Wisconsin) made a speech against the canon as adopted by the House of Bishops. He used strange and even offensive language in support of his sentiments and opinions, and challenged any one who pleased so to do to present him for trial, he having boldly adopted and uttered as his own the words of one of the most ultraritualists in England: “I believe in the real, actual presence of our Lord, under the form of bread and wine, upon the altars of our churches. I myself adore, and would, if it were necessary or my duty, teach my people to adore, Christ present in the elements under the form of bread and wine.” The discussions, though exciting and continued from day to day, were conducted with good temper and general fairness. As. on the whole, where neither side in a controversy is willing to yield, it is usually found to be the easiest way to get out of present difficulty to pass some comprehensive resolutions, which may mean more or less according to the mode of looking at them by different parties, such was the course now adopted.

It was finally “Resolved, the House of Bishops concurring, That this convention hereby expresses its decided  condemnation of all ceremonies, observances, and practices which are fitted to express a doctrine foreign to that set forth in the authorized standards of this Church. Resolved, That, in the judgment of this house, the paternal counsel and advice of the right reverend fathers, the bishops of the Church, are deemed sufficient, at this time, to secure the suppression of all that is irregular and unseemly, and to promote greater uniformity in conducting the public worship of the Church and in the administration of the holy sacraments.” Thus, as we have intimated above, the real question at issue was postponed rather than adjudicated. Ritualism went on its course with additional vigor and confidence, and its opponents became more and more dissatisfied with the existing state of things. Consequently the struggle, as was to be expected, was renewed again when the General Convention met in New York in October, 1874. Memorials were presented from various quarters on this subject, resolutions were introduced bearing directly upon it, and legislation was earnestly called for in order to restrain what was termed excess of ritual in the public service of the Church. In the House of Deputies the question of confirmation of the bishop elect (Dr. G. F. Seymour) of Illinois came up. He was charged with being an active member of the advanced ritualistic party; his case was discussed for a whole week in secret session, and, though Dr. Seymour energetically denied the imputations cast upon him, after a long struggle confirmation was refused by a close vote — viz. nineteen to twenty-two clerical, thirteen to twenty-seven lay. (Four years later Dr. S. was elected to the episcopate, and is now [1878] bishop of the diocese of Springfield. Ill.) This result in the Seymour case was looked upon as virtually a victory of the anti- ritualists, and after much debate in both houses agreement was had to the following effect. A canon was passed, almost unanimously (tit. i. can. 22), requiring every bishop to summon the standing committee as a council of advice, in case complaint is made to him in writing, by two or more presbyters, that ceremonies or practices not authorized by the Book of Common Pravel and symbolizing erroneous or doubtful doctrines, have been introduced into any Church, specifying, in regard to the Holy Communion, “the elevation of the elements in such manner as to expose them to the view of the people as objects towards which adoration is to be made; any act of adoration of or towards the elements in the Holy Communion, such as bowings, prostrations, or genuflections; and all other like acts not authorized by the rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer;” further, if' after investigation it is found that such practices have been introduced, the bishop shall admonish, in writing, the offending minister to  discontinue such practices or ceremonies; and if he disregard such admonition, it shall be the duty of the standing committee to cause him to be tried for a breach of his ordination vow.

Every minister charged with violation of this canon is to have opportunity to be heard in his own defence; the charges and findings are to be in writing, and a record is to be kept by the bishop and the standing committee of the proceedings in the case. Such was the latest direct action of the highest legislative authority of the Church on this subject. The opponents of ritualism have apparently settled down in the conviction that the present canon is sufficient to enable the bishops effectually to repress, when necessary. all unseemly practices in this direction. The favorers of ritualism, on the other hand (at least, the more outspoken of them), have treated with scant courtesy the action of the convention of 1874, and affirm that “the canon is flagrantly unconstitutional, and that no bishop has ever dared to put it in use, and none ever will.” At the General Convention of 1877 the matter was hardly at all alluded to. This the anti-ritualists interpret as in their favor, in the confidence that the Church has become weary of the dispute, and is disposed for the future to adhere to the old-fashioned, simpler, less ornate ways of conducting public services. The ritualists hold the opposite view, and it was rather exultingly proclaimed in a letter to the New York Tribune, by Dr. John Henry Hopkins (just after the convention of 1877 had adjourned), that the result of the war against the system, of which he is one of the ablest advocates, “is victory all along the line for the ritualistic advance, and that this victory is so complete that the renewal of hostilities hereafter is hopeless.” As a party, it is certain that the ritualists have shown themselves to be bold, confident, energetic, and full of zeal in behalf of the cause which they have undertaken to maintain. In the American Church they are probably not so numerous in proportion as in the Church of England; but, as an offset to this. it is to be noted that they have enlisted in their ranks numbers of the younger clergy, and, in view of what they have already accomplished, they not unnaturally look forward to ultimate and complete success. The bishops, to whom are committed the oversight and regulation of this whole matter under the canon, are in a rather difficult and delicate position. As, on the one hand, they are compelled to tolerate much that is regarded as defective and in violation of the plain meaning of the rubrics and canons, so, on the other, they may reasonably be expected to shrink from pressing too severely upon those who carry ritualistic practices to more or less of excess. The opinion may here be expressed — simply as an opinion, without reference to the merits of the questions at issue — that  ritualism has had its day, and that, while it may be admitted that considerable, perhaps even great, good has resulted and may yet further result from this movement, it will not be likely again to assume any special prominence in the history of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

The bringing of this topic before the reader in continuous order, from its rise to the present time, has necessarily led to the omission of a number of interesting historical facts and incidents in the progress of the Church of late years: these are herewith succinctly presented in their proper sequence and connection. On a previous page has been noted the action of the General Convention on the subject of liturgical relaxation and Church comprehension. This was in 1856 and 1859. At the convention of 1868 various “memorials” were presented pleading for larger latitude in the use of the Prayer-book. This was reported against by the House of Bishops, and the following resolution was unanimously adopted: “Resolved, That. in the opinion of this house, such latitude in the use of the Book of Common Prayer as the memorialists ask could not be allowed with safety, or with proper regard to the rights of our congregations.” In 1874 the question of shortened services came up, but no definite action was had. The convention expressed its sense by resolution simply, “‘that nothing in the present order of Common Prayer prohibits the separation, when desirable, of the Morning Prayer. the Litany, and the Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper into distinct services, which may be used independently of each other, and either of them without the others: provided that when used together they be used in the same order as that in which they have commonly been used and in which they stand in the Book of Common Prayer.” At the next convention (October, 1877), the committee on canons in the House of Deputies reported in favor of an “order concerning divine service,” more especially for shorter services on other days than Sundays and the greater festivals and fasts.

To this the bishops declined to agree, and by general consent a joint committee was appointed to sit during the recess on the matter of providing shortened services, by rubric or otherwise, this committee to report in 1880. — In a country such as ours, where the laws regulating marriage and divorce differ considerably in different states, this subject must necessarily cause much perplexity and annoyance to the clergy, unless they have some law of the Church to guide and control their action. This was long felt throughout the Protestant Episcopal Church, and in hope of some remedy or aid the matter was brought before the General Convention of 1868. A canon was enacted  forbidding a clergyman to solemnize matrimony where there is a divorced wife or husband of either party still living, with a proviso in favor of the innocent party in a divorce for the cause of adultery. In 1877 the canon was put in its present shape, as follows: ‘No minister, knowingly after due inquiry, shall solemnize the marriage of any person who has a divorced husband or wife still living, if such husband or wife has been put away for any cause arising after marriage; but this canon shall not be held to apply to the innocent party in a divorce for the cause of adultery, or to parties once divorced seeking to be united again. If any minister of this Church shall have reasonable cause to doubt whether a person desirous of being admitted to holy baptism, or to confirmation, or to the holy communion, has been married otherwise than as the Word of God and discipline of this Church allow, such minister, before receiving such person to these ordinances, shall refer the case to the bishop for his godly judgment thereupon: provided, however, that no minister shall, in any case, refuse the sacraments to a penitent person in imminent danger of death.” Questions touching the facts of any case named in the former part of the canon are to be referred to the bishop, and he is required to make inquiry such as he deems expedient, and to deliver his judgment in the premises. At the same convention (1877), an effort was made to have the Table of Prohibited Degrees, contained in the English Prayer-book, inserted in the American Book of Common Prayer, but it did not meet the approval of the convention. — Some extravagant and unwarranted assertions having been made at various times as to the meaning of “regeneration,” and its effects, etc., in the offices for infant baptism, there was issued, at the General Convention of 1871, the following “declaration of the bishops in council:” “We, the subscribers, bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, being asked, in order to the quieting of the consciences of sundry members of the said Church, to declare our conviction as to the meaning of the word regenerate in the offices for the ministration of baptism of infants, do declare that, in our opinion, the word regenerate is not there so used as to determine that a moral change in the subject of baptism is wrought in the sacrament” (signed by all the bishops present, forty-eight in number).

The movement begun in Germany in 1870-71 by Dr. Dollinger and others has been watched by the Protestant Episcopal Church with deep interest and earnest hope that it may tend ultimately to solid reform in the Continental churches now in communion with Rome. In the convention of  1871, the bishops recorded their hearty sympathy with the heroic struggle then being made for religious liberty on the part of the Old-Catholic Congress recently assembled in Munich; and in 1874 it was “Resolved, That this house, with renewed confidence, reiterates the expression of its sympathy with the bishop and synod of the Old-Catholic communion in Germany, and the promise of its prayers for the divine blessing and direction on their work; also, that three bishops be appointed a commission of this house to keep up fraternal correspondence with the bishop and synod, for exchange of information and consideration of overtures for reconciliation and intercommunion between sundered churches.”

The course pursued by the highest legislative authority on the subject of churches or congregations established in foreign lands in communion with the Protestant Episcopal Church illustrates the views and principles on which this Church deems it right to act. Twenty years ago, the Rev. W. O. Lamson began services in Paris, specially for the benefit of Church people sojourning in or visiting that city. The General Convention of 1859 recognised the propriety and lawfulness of having Protestant Episcopal churches abroad. Congregations accordingly have been organized during the interim since 1859 in Rome, Florence, Dresden, Geneva, and Nice, making six in all at this date (1878). At the General Convention of 1877 the matter was carefully regulated by canon, which says, “It shall be lawful, under the conditions hereinafter stated, to organize a church or congregation in any foreign country (other than Great Britain and Ireland, and the colonies and dependencies thereof), and not within the limits of any foreign missionary bishop of this Church.” In order to secure proper and legitimate action, and also suitable control over these foreign churches or congregations, the canon goes on to state fully the mode in which they may be organized and conducted — viz. they must recognise their allegiance to the constitution of the American Church; must produce proper certificates; must be in canonical submission to a bishop, who is in charge of all such churches and is aided by a standing committee duly appointed; and they must conform to the provisions laid down for discipline, in case it become necessary. The bishop in charge at this date (1878) is the Rt. Rev. Dr. Littlejohn, of Long Island.

An association taking its rise in Europe, and calling itself the “Evangelical Alliance,” held its sixth General Conference in New York, Oct. 2-12, 1873. It was composed of delegates from various Protestant denominations, foreign as well as American, who claim to be considered “evangelical” in  the proper and precise sense of that word. Among its delegates from abroad was the Very Rev. R. Payne Smith, D.D., dean of Canterbury, who brought with him a letter of sympathy from his grace, Dr. Tait, archbishop of Canterbury. The dean took part in the work of the Alliance, as did also a very few of the American Episcopal clergy; having fraternized with the Presbyterians at a public communion service, he was called to account by Dr. Tozer (recently an English missionary bishop in Africa, and just then on a visit to New York), and was censured through the papers of the day. The assistant bishop of Kentucky, Dr. Cummins, likewise joined in this irregular service, and thereby foreshadowed what soon after took place — viz. the commencement of the schism to which his name has been attached. He had become greatly dissatisfied with the state of affairs in the Protestant Episcopal Church; he was impressed with the fact, as he esteemed it, that this Church is too exclusive and in continual danger of going over to Rome, and so he made up his mind to abandon it to its fate and set up a new organization of his own, a sort of half-and-half Episcopal and Presbyterian arrangement.

Under date of Nov. 10, 1873, he addressed a letter to bishop Smith, his diocesan, in which he enumerated various reasons or causes for the course he had resolved upon. He declared that his conscience was burdened with being compelled to officiate as bishop in ritualistic churches in Kentucky; that he had lost all hope of seeing eradicated from the Church's standards and services sacerdotalism and ritualism; that he was much hurt at being blamed for sharing in the service above alluded to in a Presbyterian place of worship, and that, consequently, he had determined to transfer his “work and office” to another sphere. Dr. Cummins was entirely right in abandoning the Church if he could not stay in it with a clear conscience, and labor in it in accordance with his solemn vows at ordination, one of which was especially, “with all faithful diligence to banish and drive away from the Church all erroneous and strange doctrine contrary to God's Word.” Inasmuch, however, as he had abandoned his post, and was soon after degraded from the ministry, he had no “office” to carry with him, though he assumed that he had, and undertook to act as a bishop when he was no longer a bishop. Bishop Smith of Kentucky (who was also senior bishop), on receiving Dr. Cummins's letter, immediately instituted proceedings in accordance with the canon; Dr. Cummins was at once suspended from all exercise of the ministry; and the six months of grace allowed for retraction having passed away, the formal deposition took place June 24, 1874 (ratified afterwards  in full House of Bishops at General Convention in October, 1874). SEE REFORMED EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

The “Cheney case,” as it has been called, may properly be dealt with in this connection. especially as Mr. Cheney has become quite prominent in the schismatical body which Dr. Cummins originated. The case, in substance, is as follows: The Rev. C. E. Cheney, of Christ's Church, Chicago, Ill., having mutilated the service for public baptism by omitting the words regenerate and regeneration wherever they occur, was brought to trial and suspended by bishop Whitehouse, February 18, 1871, the suspension to last until he should repent and amend. Mr. Cheney refused obedience; and the vestry of Christ's Church having invited him to continue with them, despite the sentence, he acceded to their wish. The result was that he was tried by an ecclesiastical court for contumacy, and, on the 2d of' June, was finally degraded. But the vestry continuing to hold on to the property of Christ's Church, contrary to law and justice, Mr. Cheney remained where he was, until he joined the followers of Dr. Cummins and his movement.

The question of the right to the property being a very serious one, as involving the whole subject of the right of religious bodies to hold property and prevent its alienation, the case of Christ's Church, Chicago, was carried into the courts, where, in accordance with precedent in like cases, it was decided in favor of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the diocese of Illinois. Not satisfied with this, the parties interested in getting possession of the church had the case taken by appeal to the Supreme Court of the state, where, early in 1878, singularly enough, the decision of the lower court was reversed, and judgment was given in favor of the vestry and congregation as against the diocese. So far as this particular piece of property is concerned, the matter is of no great importance; but the principle involved is of the gravest consequence. It has been decided, over and over again, that all ecclesiastical organizations shall possess the power to be governed by their own laws, so long as those laws do not interfere with the established law of the land; and, consequently, that all property belongs, of right, to those who adhere to and sustain the laws and principles of their respective organizations. If church property, by the action of vestries and congregations, call be legally diverted from its rightful ownership, in the way in which this in Chicago has been taken away from the Church, then there is no tenure of property anywhere which is safe. The subject has aroused attention among other Christian bodies, who are quite as much interested as the Protestant Episcopal Church can  be in the fundamental question at issue. It is to be hoped that the Supreme Court of the United States will be called upon to interpose, and settle fully and clearly a point of so great moment to all Christians or religious associations of every name.

In regard to the “provincial system,” so called, we may briefly state that, as early as 1850, a motion was made in the House of Bishops by bishop Delancey to appoint a committee of five bishops, five clergymen, and five laymen, “to report to the next triennial General Convention on the expediency of arranging the dioceses, according to geographical position, into four provinces, to be designated the Eastern, Northern, Southern, and Western Provinces, and to be united under a General Convention or Council of the Provinces, having exclusive control over the Prayer-book, Articles, Offices, and Homilies of this Church, to be held once every twenty years.” In 1853 no action was had, but the committee was continued, and the matter handed over to the next convention. It came up in 1856, but was indefinitely postponed by the bishops. The subject was brought up again in 1874, was warmly discussed, and again indefinitely postponed. In 1877 a preamble and resolution were offered in the House of Deputies expressing a desire to obtain “an authoritative recognition of the provincial system,” and referring to the committee on canons “to inquire into the expediency of repealing the prohibition against suffragan bishops, and making such canonical provisions as will enable dioceses (just before described) to give the name and style of provincial or coprovincial bishops to all such bishops who may be elected and consecrated to assigned districts within their respective jurisdictions.” The resolution was adopted; but in the House of Bishops the entire subject was again committed to a special committee, to report at the convention of 1880. There the matter stands for the present. It remains to be seen whether the Church will deem it best to adopt this system, or to continue under the arrangement now in existence. A canon was adopted in 1868 authorizing federate councils, as follows: “It is hereby declared lawful for the dioceses now existing, or hereafter to exist, within the limits of any state or commonwealth, to establish for themselves a federate convention, or council, representing such dioceses, which may deliberate and decide upon the common interests of the Church within the limits aforesaid; but before any determinate action of such convention, or council, shall be had, the powers proposed to be exercised thereby shall be submitted to the General Convention for its approval. Nothing in this canon shall be construed as forbidding any  federate council from taking such action as they may deem necessary to secure such legislative enactments as the common interests of the Church in the state may require.” No definite action under this canon has as vet been carried into effect in any state. The subject has been discussed quite largely, and the various propositions connected with it now rest with the same committee who have the provincial system in hand and are to report in 1880.

An earnest and interesting communication to the presiding bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church was made, in 1871, by bishop Wilberforce, of Winchester, in relation to the work then commenced in England for the revision of the authorized version of the Holy Scriptures. At the General Convention held the same year, it was, in the House of Bishops, “Resolved, That the Rt. Rev. the Presiding Bishop be, and hereby is, requested to return to the Rt. Rev. the Lord Bishop of Winchester a courteous and brotherly acknowledgment of his communication relating to a revision of the English of the Holy Scriptures, stating that this house, having had no part in originating or organizing the said work of revision, is not at present in a condition to deliver any judgment respecting it, and at the same time expressing the disposition of this house to consider with candor the work undertaken by the Convocation of Canterbury, whenever it shall have been completed and its results laid before them.” The attitude thus taken by the bishops in behalf of the Church is one of cautious reserve, but perhaps not too much so, considering the importance of the subject.

The Protestant Episcopal Church having made considerable progress in Hayti (numbering eleven clergy in 1874), and needing episcopal supervision and aid, was supplied with a bishop, under the arrangement of a “Covenant” entered into with the Church in that republic, and the Rev. Dr. J. T. Holly was consecrated as first bishop, in November, 1874. The terms of the covenant made it the duty of the Church in the United States to extend its nursing care to the Church in Hayti during its early growth and development; and four bishops, with the bishop of Hayti, were constituted a commission to take episcopal charge of the Church in Hayti, and secure its maintenance of the doctrine, worship, and discipline of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, until such time as there should be three bishops resident in Hayti. and exercising jurisdiction in the Church there. When that time arrives, this Church will cease from all further charge or care of the Haytian Church.  The General Convention of 1877 met in Boston, Mass., on Oct. 3 for the first time that it met in that city since its organization after the civil war. It was very largely attended, and was marked by a spirit of good-will and earnest effort to promote in every way the interests of Christ's kingdom here on earth. There were no specially exciting topics on hand (as ritualism, etc.); and the action of the convention, so far as our present purpose is concerned, can be summed up in brief space. Probably the most important step taken was the reorganization of tine Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society. Heretofore there had been a Board of Missions (a very large and rather cumbrous body), appointed triennially, and acting in the respective departments at home and abroad. After much discussion, the following canon was adopted: “Constitution of the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, as established in 1820, and since amended at various times.

“ART I. This society shall be denominated,” etc.

“ART. II This society shall be considered as comprehending all persons who are members of this Church.

“ART. III. There shall be a Board of Missions of such society, composed of the bishops of this Church, and the members for the time being of the House of Deputies of this Church, bishops and deputies sitting apart as in General Convention, or together when they shall so decide. The Board of Missions thus constituted shall convene on the third day of the session of the General Convention, and shall sit from time to time as the business of the board shall demand.

“ART. IV. There shall be a Board of Managers, comprising all the bishops as meinbeis ex officio, and fifteen presbyters and fifteen laymen, to be appointed by the Board of Missions at every triennial meeting of the General Convention, who shall have the management of the general missions of this Church, and shall remain in office until their successors are chosen, and shall have power to fill any vacancies that may occur in their number. Eight clerical and eight lay members shall constitute a quorum. This board shall, during the recess of the convention, exercise all the corporate powers of the Domnestic and Foreign Missionary Society. The Board of Managers shall report to the General Convention, constituted as a Board of Missions, on or before the third day of the session of the General Convention

“ART. V. The Board of Managers is authorized to form, from its own members, a committee for domestic missions and a committee for foreign missions, and such other committees as it may deem desirable to promote special missionary work, and is also authorized to appoint such officers as shall be needful for carrying on the work.

“ART. VI. The Board of Managers is intrusted with power to establish and regulate such missions as are not placed under episcopal supervision, and to enact all bylaws which it may deem necessary for its own government and for the government of its committees: provided always that, in relation to organized dioceses and missionary jurisdictions having bishops, the appropriations shall be made in gross to such dioceses and missionary jurisdictions, to be disbursed by the local authorities thereof. The board shall notify to the several bishops the gross sum so appropriated, and those bishops shall regulate the number of mission stations, appoint the missionaries, and assign to them their stipends, with the approval of the Board of Managers.

“ART. VII. No person shall be appointed a missionary who is not at the time a minister of the Protestant Episcopal Church of regular standing; but nothing in this section precludes the committees from making pecuniary appropriations in aid of missions under the care of other churches in communion with this Church, or of employing laymen or women, members of this Church, to do missionary work.

“ART. VIII. The Board of Managers is authorized to promote the formation of auxiliary missionary associations, whose contributions, as well as those specially appropriated by individuals, shall be received and paid in accordance with the wish of the donors, when expressed in writing. It shall be the duty of the Board of Managers to arrange for public missionary meetings, to be held at the same tine and place as the General Convention, and at such other times and places as may be determined upon, to which all auxiliaries approved by the Board of Managers may send one clerical and one lay delegate.

“ART. IX. This constitution may be altered or amended at any time by the General Convention of this Church. All canons, and all action by or under the authority of the General Convention, so far as inconsistent with the provisions of this canon and such amended constitution, are hereby repealed: provided always that nothing herein shall in any  manner impair or affect any corporate rights of the said society, or any vested right whatever. This canon shall take effect immediately.”

The principal and immediate effect of this reorganization was, on the part of the Board of Managers, a resolution to reduce central expenses connected with the mission work. Thus the department of home missions to colored people was assigned to the care of the committee on domestic missions; a very considerable reduction of expenses was made in carrying on the work among the Indians; several officers were dispensed with, and a general reduction of salaries took place, the result being a saving of some $12,000 per annum. It deserves also to be stated here that the American Church Missionary Society, the especial agency of those of the clergy and laity who declined in former years to act in conjunction with the Board of Missions, now acceded to the wish long before expressed by the board. The society continued its organization as a society; the work in Mexico, which had been very largely sustained by it, was handed over to the foreign committee; and it was resolved that, in general, its members should hereafter act in concert with the Board of Managers of the newly organized Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church. This was deemed a happy resolve on their part, and excellent results are expected to follow in consequence.

For some years past there has been a growing desire to add greater effectiveness to the labors of godly and devoted women in the Church. The matter was brought up at the General Convention of 1874, but no action was obtained. In 1877 it came again before the convention. and a canon of “Deaconesses or Sisters” was proposed. After much discussion, however, the convention, apparently not feeling quite sure of its ground, refused to pass the proposed canon, and the following resolution was adopted: “That it be referred to a joint committee of three bishops, three clerical and three lay deputies, to inquire and report to the next General Convention what legislation may be necessary and expedient for the authorization and regulation of women working in this Church under the name of deaconess or sister.” Thus the matter lies over till 1880.

As the Church of England recently adopted a new Lectionary, it was deemed advisable by the convention of 1877 to place this revised Table of Lessons for Sundays and holydays before the Protestant Episcopal Church. Accordingly, it was formally resolved by both houses that the Lectionary be permitted to be used until the next General Convention. This Table,  therefore, not only of Lessons for Sundays and holydays, but also of Daily Lessons, and Lessons for Lent and for Ermber Days and Rogation Days, is allowed to be used by ally clergyman in place of those in the calendar in the Prayer-book, and a copy has been sent to every clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church. Whether it will be found to be so great an improvement upon the existing Table of Lessons as has been supposed by many may be doubted. The trial, however, of three years will lead to some settled agreement upon a matter so largely affecting the question of how to obtain the greatest edification in the reading of Holy Scripture in the public worship of the Church.

At the close of the convention of 1877 a joint resolution was adopted, which is worthy of being quoted in this connection, inasmuch as it shows the spirit and cresire of this Church in regard to the very important as well as difficult subject of public-school education:

“Resolved, That it, is the solemn conviction of this General Convention, in both houses, that it is the duty of the clergy and laity of the Church to take, so far as the opportunity is afforded them, an active interest in the public schools provided by the state for the purpose of extending the important benefits of a secular education to all our citizens, and of diffnsing side by side with these as much of religious influence and instruction as is possible; to supplement them with thorough Christian teaching else-where, and to add proper Church schools and institutions for the whole, and more complete work of esncation, wherever they are needed and the means for their support can be commanded;

“Resolved, That, with the concurrence of the House of Deputies, a joint committee, consisting of two bishops, two presbyters, and two laymen, be appointed to consider this whole matter during the recess of the convention, to collect facts and prepare suggestions for the next General Convention, and to promote, by any means deemed advisable, the general work of Christian education.”

II. Fundamental Principles, Constitution, Government, etc. — From what has already been stated, it is clear that the Protestant Episcopal Church, while holding in common with other Christians evangelical doctrines — as the incarnation, the divinity of our Lord, the atonement, the inspiration of Holy Scripture, salvation through faith in Christ, and all such like — at the  same time takes the ground that it is the American branch of the “one holy Catholic Church” spoken of in the Nicene Creed. It was planted on these Western shores, under God's good providence, to be what it aims to be — the National Church of the United States. It is a historical Church. It traces its lineage through the Church of England directly back to the apostles of our Lord; and it gives, as its deliberate judgment, that “it is evident unto all men, diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient authors, that from the apostles' time there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's Church- bishops, priests, and deacons.” It is not a new or recently formed denomination, and in this respect differs from the great bulk of Protestant Christian bodies, whatever titles they may give to their respective organizations. Its creed is the same creed which has been in use substantially in the same form since the very beginning — viz. that which is commonly called the Apostles' Creed and the Nicene Creed as finally set forth by the General Councils in the 4th century, and received everywhere and by all throughout the Catholic Church. Its liturgy is the very concentration of the deep piety, soundness in the faith, earnestness, zeal, and fervor of the wise and holy and good of all the early as well as later ages; and its services of prayer and praise, combining the use of this liturgy with the continual and frequent reading of Holy Scripture in men's ears, are in the truest and highest sense of the word evangelical, and calculated to meet all the longings of the pious soul for spiritual communion with God our Father, through our Lord Jesus Christ, and through the quickening energy of the Holy Ghost.\*

\*This statement of course represents our contributor's opinion; but the paragraph contains several points upon which much might be said on both sides. — ED.

The position of the Protestant Episcopal Church relatively to Protestantism, on the one hand, and Romanism, on the other, is somewhat peculiar, but yet clearly marked out and defined. It cannot, consistently at least, recognise the validity of the ministry of the great body of Protestant denominations, whether Presbyterian or Congregational, for it distinctly enunciates that the only lawful ministry is that in the three orders. Hence it cannot have communion with them, or interchange of services, or union of action in undertaking to spread the Gospel throughout the world. It recognises, it is true, the validity of the episcopate in the Roman Catholic Church, but at the same time it positively and unqualifiedly repudiates the errors in doctrine and worship of that corrupt Church, not only in its own  proper home in Italy, but also wherever, in violation of the ancient canons, it has spread itself. The Protestant Episcopal Church has no sympathy with, but is in direct antagonism to, the claims of Rome in regard to the denial of the sufficiency of Holy Scripture for salvation, transubstantiation, sacrifice of the mass, purgatory, celibacy of the clergy, elevation of the Virgin Mary into a sort of goddess to be worshipped, the absolute supremacy of the pope by divine right over all the world in civil as well as religious matters, etc. Hence it cannot act in any concert with the Roman Church, or further its plans and purposes in any wise.

The constitution, framed for the purpose of uniting the Church in working together as one body, we give in full. It was adopted in October, 1789, and has remained the same ever since, with the exception of a few alterations which became necessary in consequence of the growth of the Church, the increase of the episcopate, and the formation of several dioceses within the limits of the larger and more populous states.

“ART. I. There shall be a General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America on the first Wednesday in October in every third year, from the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and forty-one, and in such place as shall be determined by the convention; and in case there shall be an epidemic disease, or any other good cause to render it necessary to alter the place fixed on for any such meeting of the convention, the presiding bishop shall have it in his power to appoint another convenient plaice (as near as may he to the place so fixed on) for the holding of such convention: and special meetings may be called at other times, in the manner hereafter to be provided for; and this Church, in a majority of the dioceses which shall have adopted this Constitution, shall be represented before they shall proceed to business, except that the representation from two dioceses shall be sufficient to adjourn; and in all business of the convention freedom of debate shall be allowed.

“ART. II. The Church in each diocese shall be entitled to a representation of both the clergy and the laity. Such representation shall consist of not more than four clergymen and four laymen, communicants in this Church, residents in the diocese, and chosen in the manner prescribed by the convention thereof; and in all questions, when required by the clerical or lay representation from any diocese, each order shall have one vote; and the majority of suffrages by  dioceses shall be conclusive in each order, provided such majority comprehend a majority of the dioceses represented in that order. The concurrence of both orders shall be necessary to constitute a vote of the convention. If the convention of many diocese should neglect or decline to appoint clerical deputies, or if they should neglect or decline to appoint, lay deputies, or if many of those of either order appointed should neglect to attend, or be prevented by sickness or any other accident, such diocese shall nevertheless be considered as duly represented by such deputy or deputie as may attend, whether lay or clerical. And if, through the neglect of the convention of any of the churches which shall have adopted, or may hereafter adopt, this Constitution, no deputies, either lay or clerical, should attend at any General ‘Convention, the Church in such diocese shall nevertheless be found by the acts of such convention.

“ART. III. The bishops of this Church, when there shall be three or more, shall, whenever general conventions are held, from a separate house, with a right to originate and propose acts for the concurrence of the House of Deputies, composed of clergy and laity; and when asty proposed act shall have passed the House of Deputies, the same shall be transmitted to the House of Bishops, who shall have a negative thereupon; and all acts of the convention shall he authenticated by both houses. And in all cases, the House of Bishops shall signify to the convention their approbation or disapprobation, (the latter with their reasoning in writing) within three days after the proposed act shall have been reported to them for concurrence; and in failure thereof, it shall have the operation of a law. But until there shall be three or more bishop's, as aforesaid, any bishop attending a General Convention shall be a member ex officio, and shall vote with the clerical deputies of the diocese to which he belongs; and a bishop shall then preside.

“ART. IV. The bishop or bishops in every diocese shall be chosen augieelaly to such rules as shall be fixed by the convention of that diocese and every bishop of this Church shall confine the exercise of his episcopal office to his proper diocese, unless requested to ordain, or confirm, or perform any other act, of the episcopal office, by any Church destitute of a bishop.

“ART. V. A Protestant Episcopal Church in any of the United States, or any territory thereof, not now represented, may, at any time  hereafter, be admitted on acceding to this Constitution; and a new diocese, to be formed from time or more existing dioceses, may be admitted under the following restrictions, viz.:

“No new diocese shall be formed or elected within the limits of any other diocese, nor shall any diocese be formed by the junction of two or more dioceses, or parts of dioceses, unless with the consent of the bishop and convention of each of the dioceses concerned, as well as of the General Convention; and such consent shall not be given by the General Convention until it has satisfactory assurance of a suitable provision for the support of the episcopate in the contemplated new diocese.

“No such new diocese, shall be formed which shall contain less than six parishes, or less than six presbyters who have been for at least one year canonically resident within the bounds of such new diocese, regularly settled in a parish or congregation, and qualified to vote for a bishop. Nor shall such new diocese be formed, if thereby any existing diocese shall be so reduced as to contain less than twelve parishes, or less than twelve presbyters who have been residing therein, and settled and qualified as above mentioned: pnovided that no city shall form more than one diocese.

“In case one diocese shall be divided into two or more dioceses, the diocesan of the diocese divided may elect the one to which he will be attached, and shall thereupon become the diocesan thereof; and the assistant bishop, if there be one, may elect the one to which he will be attached: and if it be not the one elected by the bishop, he shall be the diocesan thereof.

“Whenever the division of a diocese into two or more dioceses shall be ratified by the General Convention, each of the dioceses shall be subject to the constitution and canons of the diocese so divided, except as local circumstances may prevent, until the same may be altered in either diocese by the convention thereof. And whenever a diocese shall be formed out of two or more existing dioceses, the new diocese shall he subject to the constitution and cannons of that one of the said existing dioceses to which the greater number of clergymen shall have belonged prior to the erection of such new diocese, until the same may be altered by the convention of the new diocese.  “ART. VI. The mode of trying bishops shall be provided by the General Convention. The court appointed for that purpose shall be composed of bishops only. In every diocese, the mode of trying presbyters and deacons may be instituted by the convention of the diocese. None but a bishop shall pronounce sentence of admonition, suspension, or degradation from the ministry, on any clergyman, whether bishop, presbyter, or deacon.

“ART. VII. No person shall be admitted to holy orders until he shall have been examined by the bishop and by two presbyters, and shall have exhibited such testimonials and other requisites as the canons in that case pro vided may direct. Nor shall any person be ordained until he shall have subscribed the following declaration:

“‘I do believe the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the Word of God, and to contain all things necessary to salvation; and I do solemnly engage to conform to the doctrines and worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States.'

“No person ordained by a foreign bishop shall be permitted to officiate as a minister of this Church until he shall have complied with the canon or canons in that case provided, and have also subscribed the aforesaid declaration.

“ART. VIII. A Book of Common Prayer, administration of the sacraments, and other rites and ceremonies of the Church, articles of religion, and a form and manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating bishops, priests, and deacons, when established by this for a future General Convention, shall be used in the Protestant Episcopal Church in those dioceses which shall have adopted this Constitution. No alteration or addition shall be made in the Book of Common Prayer, or other offices of the Church, or the articles of religion, unless the same shall be proposed in one General Convention, and by a resolve thereof made known to the convention of every diocese, and adopted at the subsequent General Convention. Provided, however, that the General Convention shall have power, from time to time, to amend the Lectionary; but no act for this purpose shall be valid which is not voted for by a majority of the whole number of bishops entitled to seats in the Huse of Bishops, and by a majority of all the dioceses entitled to representation in the House of Deputies.

“ART. IX. This Constitution shall be unalterable, unless in General Convention, by the Church, in a majority of the dioceses which may have adopted the same; and all alterations shall be first proposed in one General Convention, and made known to the several diocesan conventions, before they shall be finally agreed to or ratified in the ensuing General Convention.

“ART. X. Bishops for foreign countries, on due application therefrom, may be consecrated, with the approbation of the bishops ,of this Church, or a majority of them, signified to the presiding, bishop, he thereupon taking order for the same, and they being satisfied that the person designated for the office has been duly chosen and properly qualified; the Order of Consecration to be conformed, as nearly as may be, in the judgment of the bishops, to the one used in this Church. Such bishops, so consecrated, shall not be eligible to the office of diocesan or assistant bishop in any diocese in the United States, nor be entitled to a seat in the House of Bishops, nor exercise any episcopal authority in said states.”

From the constitution just given it is evident that the General Convention is the highest legislative authority in the Church, and its legislation is for the benefit of the whole Church throughout the United States. There is as yet no Court of Appeals, although it is felt that there is need of such a court. It is believed that it will ere long be constituted, so as to adjudicate upon all those matters which a body, made up as the General Convention is, cannot adequately judge or act upon. Each diocese, whether a whole state or a portion of a state, is independent of all control except that of the general laws of the Church enacted by the General Convention. Each bishop, and the clergy and laity under his jurisdiction, meet in annual convention and legislate upon all subjects which specially concern the diocese and the preaching of the Gospel within its limits. Each parish also, consisting of its rector, vestry, and congregation, is independent in its sphere of labor, subject only to the canons of the diocese and of the whole Church, and to a visitation, at least yearly, of the bishop of the diocese. Thus freedom of thought and action is secured to all, with a due and proper subordination to higher authority in all cases where higher authority must needs supervene.

The laws which regulate Church affairs are contained in the “Digest of the Canons for the Government of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States,” as passed and adopted in the general conventions from  1859 to 1877. The canons are arranged in the most methodical and approved style of legal enactments; they have been prepared by some of the ablest canonists and lawyers in the communion of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and they cover the entire ground respecting which the Church can legislate as a whole or united body. They are distributed into Four Titles, Canons of each Title, and Sections of Canons. Historical notes as to dates are added, so that any particular canon upon any subject legislated upon by the Church may be traced from its origin through all its modifications to the present time. Title I is “Of the Orders in the Ministry and of the Doctrine and Worship of the Church.” There are twenty-four canons under this Title, and they cover fully and explicitly all questions relating to candidates for orders, examinations, ordination of deacons, ordination of' priests, general regulation of ministers and their duties, qualifications, consecration and work of bishops, domestic and foreign missionary bishops, mode of securing an accurate view of the Church, the use of the Book of Common Prayer, etc. Title II is “Of Discipline.” There are thirteen canons under this Title, relating to offences for which ministers may be tried and punished, dissolution of pastoral connection, renunciation of the ministry, abandonment of the communion of the Church by a bishop, the trial of a bishop, judicial sentences, regulations respecting the laity, etc. Title III is “Of the Organized Bodies and Officers of the Church.” There are nine canons under this Title, having reference to meetings of General Convention, standing committees, trustees of the General Theological Seminary, congregations and parishes, organization of new dioceses, etc. Title IV relates to “Miscellaneous Provisions.” It has four canons, in reference to repealed canons, enactment, etc. of canons, time when new canons take effect. Our limits do not admit of printing these canons in full, nor is it necessary, inasmuch as they are readily accessible to all interested in their contents.

III. Statistics. — As showing the steady increase and spread of the Protestant Episcopal Church, we give the bishops, clergy, and dioceses by decades since 1820, as follows:

YearsBishopsPresbyters and DeaconTotalDioceses18209301310151830115145252018401910401059271850321557158929186043211321563318705227862838391890724028410051From the Church Almanac, we learn that in 1889 there were nearly 3800 parishes, with churches and chapels, in the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States.

Baptisms during the year (infant and adult) — 58,536

Confirmations — 38,868

Marriages — 15,830

Sunday-school teachers — 41,325

Sunday-school scholars — 376,710

Communicants — 484,059

Contributions for missionary and church purposes — $11,468,841

Home missionary bishops nine, exercising jurisdiction in the great territories as well as several of the Western states, in Texas. and on the Pacific coast. Their salaries and travelling expenses (amounting to at least $30,000 per annum) are paid by the domestic committee. There are over 200 missionaries at work in these fields. Foreign missionary bishops three- one in China, one in Japan, one in Africa (to which add bishop in Hayti). There are in these jurisdictions, in addition to the bishops, thirty-five other clergymen (foreign and native), together with about 200 assistants, mostly native catechists, lay readers, and teachers. The missionary work in Greece is simply educational, and is conducted by one lady, assisted by 12 native teachers. In the Mexican Church there are at work the Rev. H. C. Riley, D.D., and P. G. Hernandez (bishops elect), with four other presbyters, two ladies, and 79 lay readers. The number of communicants in foreign fields is about 4000. There are also 31 day schools with 1800 scholars, and 18 Sunday-schools with 861 scholars.  Theological seminaries and schools (in 15 dioceses and 1 missionary jurisdiction) — 16

Church colleges (in 12 dioceses and 2 missionary jurisdictions) —14

Academic institutions (in 26 dioceses and 6 missionary jurisdictions): — 81

Other educational institutions (in 13 dioceses) — 32

Church hospitals (in 20 dioceses and 2 missionary jurisdictions —27

Church orphan asylums (in 20 dioceses and 2 missionary jurisdictions) — 30

Church homes (in 21 dioceses) — 34

Periodicals devoted to the interests, support, and defence of the Protestant Episcopal Church: The Churchman (weekly), New York; The Southern Churchman (weekly), Alexandria, Va.; The Episcopal Register (weekly), Philadelphia, Pa.; The Standard of the Cross (weekly), Cleveland, 0.; The Western Church (weekly), Milwaukee, Wis.; The Pacific Churchman (weekly), San Francisco, Cal.; Our Dioceses (weekly), Detroit, Mich.; The Spirit of Missions (monthly), New York; The Church Magazine (monthly), Brooklyn, N. Y.; The Church Eclectic (monthly), Utica, N. Y.; The American Church Review (quarterly), New York.

IV. Authorities. — Works used in the preparation of the present article: White [Bp.], Memoirs of the Protestant Episcopal Church (1836, 8vo); Wilson, Life of Bishop White (1839, 8vo); Wilberforce [Bp.], History of the Protestant Episcopal Chutch (1849. 12mo); Anderson. History of the Church of England in the Colonies (1856, 3 vols. 12mo); Hawkins, Missions of the Church of England in the North American Colonies (1845, 8vo); Hawks, Contributions to the Ecclesiastical History of the United States (1836, vol. i, 8vo, Virginia; 1839, vol. ii, 8vo, Maryland); id. Constitution and Canons of the Protestant Episcopal Church (1841, 8vo); Sprague, Annals of the American Pulpit [Episcopalian] (1859, vol. v, 8vo); Coit, Puritanism (1845, 12mo); Hoffman [Murray], Law of the Protestant Episcopal Church (1850, 8vo); id. Ecclesiastical Law in the State of New York (1868, 8vo), and The Ritualistic Law of the Church (1872, 8vo); Vinton, Canon Law and the Constitution of the Protestant Episcopal Church (1870, 8vo); Perry [Bp.], Handbook of the General  Conventions, 1785-1877 (1877, 12mo); Hawks and Perry, Journals of General Convention from 1785 to 1853 (1861, vol. i, 8vo, with notes).\*

\*The above article was originally written for our pages by the Rev. J. A. SPENCER, D.D., of New York city, and was afterwards reprinted by its author, from advance proofs, in another work which he was then editing. We have slightly modified one or two expressions to which many of our readers might take exception. — ED.

## Protestant Episcopal Church of Ireland[[@Headword:Protestant Episcopal Church of Ireland]]

             Until 1871 this body formed an integral part of the United Church of England and Ireland. It is still called by a majority of its members the Church of Ireland. Its official title is “The Irish Church.”

Of the first introduction of Christianity into Ireland we have written under the article IRELAND SEE IRELAND (q.v.). It has been shown there that the Roman Catholic Church succeeded in establishing her hierarchical power in the 12th century, and that even after the Reformation in England the Irish Church remained attached to Rome, and only by the influence of the bishop of Rome, first felt in the island through the Danes, who made their earliest settlements on the east coast at the close of the 8th century. Bishop Malachy, who filled successively several sees in Ireland, and who was full of enthusiasm for papal authority, strove hard to induce the Irish bishops to accept palls from the pope. But it was not till after his death, in 1152, that, at the Synod of Kells, the four archbishops received these honors, which, though ostensibly marks of distinction, were in reality badges of servitude, binding Ireland to the footstool of the papacy. Three years later, pope Adrian IV, the only Englishman who ever wore the triple crown, sent Henry II of England a bull, authorizing him to invade Ireland. What the papal see then thought of the religious condition of the Church of Ireland may be learned from a bull published in 1172, confirming that of 1155. The pope states the object of permitting the invasion of Ireland to be that “the filthy practices of the land may be abolished, and the barbarous nation which is called by the Christian name may, through your clemency, attain unto some decency of manners; ant that when the Church of that country, which has hitherto been in a disordered state, shall have been reduced to better order, that people may by your means possess for the future the reality as well as the name of the Christian profession.”  In the reign of Henry VIII., papal supremacy was abolished in Ireland, the bishops and clergy all accepting the king as head of the Church. Queen Mary re-established the pope's authority, but Elizabeth's reign gave a distinctively Reformed character to the Church. Many rebellions occurring among the native Irish during this reign, and Rome astutely throwing all her weight against England, the Reformation came to be regarded as essentially English, though the leading clergy of the time assented to the change.

The pope took advantage of the anti-English feeling by sending to the island multitudes of missionary bishops and priests, who succeeded in holding the native Irish within the pale of Roman Catholicism. During the two following centuries, the Protestant Episcopal Church (to which we now give this name, as during this period the Presbyterian Church of Ireland rose to importance), suffered many vicissitudes; but by the Revolution of 1688 and the battle of the Boyne it was placed in a position of assured stability as a Protestant body. Still, the very intimate connection between the Church and the government, necessitated by the hostile elements with which both had been surrounded, had exercised upon the former a very unwholesome influence. The Church had been treated as little more than a mere department of government. “Many of the bishops, during this period, seem to have held High-Church views; and, with some bright exceptions, a general deadness in religious matters prevailed, and along with it an indisposition to tolerate dissent in any shape whatever. This deadness of religious life characterized all the churches in the reigns of Anne and the Georges, though bright examples may be cited of the contrary spirit.

The names of Richardson, Atkins, and Brown may be mentioned with honor as those of clergymen who, in the early part of the 18th century, took an active interest in the work of evangelizing the native Irish through the medium of their own language. Archbishop Boulter, bishop Berkeley, and others may be noted among the members of the Episcopal bench who exhibited an earnest spirit of devotion and practical godliness. Wesley and his followers among the Methodists did much by their labors, first inside and then outside the Church, to awaken evangelical life among all ranks of the national clergy. But English influence was, during this period, too often used in a wrong direction. English clergymen were frequently thrust into the best Church livings in Ireland, and Irish bishoprics were filled with Englishmen, while the earnest parochial clergymen of the land were neglected and despised. Dean Swift's witty description of the honest clergymen nominated to Irish bishoprics being waylaid and murdered by highwaymen on Hounslow Heath, who then  seized on their ‘letters patent,' came to Ireland, and got consecrated in their room, shows what was thought, in some quarters, of many of the men who, at this dark Tera, bore spiritual rule in the Church of Ireland” (Wright's Lecture on the Church of Ireland).

Perhaps no other Church in Christendom was so much influenced by the Wesleyan revival of religion. The evangelical leaven imparted at that time, assisted by an intense antipathy to Romanism, has spread through the whole Church, so that ritualistic and Broad-Church elements are almost unknown within its bounds. This fact is the more striking as some of the most influential prelates have been, and are, Englishmen of High-Church tendencies.

By Gladstone's disendowment act, known as the “Irish Church Act, 1869,” it was provided that on and after Jan. 1, 1871, the “Church of Ireland” should cease to be established by law. A corporate body, named “The Commissioners of Church Temporalities in Ireland,” was appointed, to which body were intrusted all the temporal affairs of the Church until such time as the representative body of the Church should supersede them. This corporation was endowed with extensive powers for carrying out the purposes of the act. They were freed from all restraints of the courts of law, and received all the powers and privileges of the High Court of Chancery. The Commissioners were ordered to ascertain the amount of yearly income which any person, lay or clerical, derived from the Church, and “to pay each year to every such holder an annuity equal to the amount of yearly income so ascertained.” This annuity was to continue, even though the annuitant should become disabled from attending to the duties of his office, “by age, sickness, or permanent infirmity, or by any cause other than his own wilfull default.” All laws were repealed which would hamper the Church in exercising the utmost freedom in sell-government. The ecclesiastical laws existing at the time of the disestablishment, including “articles, doctrines, rites, rules, discipline, and ordinances,” were to continue binding on the members of the Church, as if subsisting “by contract;” except that nothing in these laws “should be construed to confer on any bishop, etc., any coercive jurisdiction whatsoever.” It was also provided that no change should be made in the laws of the Church, so as to deprive any person of his annuity.

By a convention of bishops and representatives of the Church, held in Dublin in 1870, a constitution was agreed upon. The preamble asserts a  belief in the inspiration of the Bible, and a determination to preserve the “three orders of bishops, priests or presbyters, and deacons in the sacred ministry.” It contains also a protest “against all those innovations in doctrine and worship which. at the Reformation, this Church did disown and reject.”

The supreme court of the Church is the General Synod. It consists of three orders, viz., bishops, clergy, and laity. It is also divided into two houses, viz., the House of Bishops and the House of Representatives; the former consisting of all archbishops and bishops, the latter of 208 representatives of the clergy and 416 representatives of the laity, all these to be elected for three years. “‘The bishops shall vote separately from the representatives; and no question shall be deemed to have been carried, unless there be in its favor a majority of the bishops present, if they desire to vote, and a majority of the clerical and lay representatives present, voting conjointly or by orders; provided always that if a question affirmed by a majority of the clerical or lay representatives, voting conjointly or by orders, but rejected by a majority of the bishops, shall be reaffirmed at the next ordinary session of the General Synod by not less than two thirds of the clerical and lay representatives, it shall be deemed to be carried, unless it be negatived by not less than two-thirds of the then entire existing order of bishops.” The General Synod has power to alter, abrogate, or enact canons, and to control any regulation made by a diocesan synod, so far as may be necessary to provide against the admission of any principle inexpedient for the common interest of the Church.

The Diocesan Synod consists of the bishop, of the beneficed and licensed clergymen of the diocese, and at least one layman, called synodsman, for each parish in the diocese. The bishop, clergy, and laity sit and debate and vote together; but six members of either order may call, upon any question, for a vote by orders. If the bishop dissent from the other two orders with respect to any proposed act of the synod, all action thereupon is suspended until the next annual meeting of the synod; and should such act be then reaffirmed by two thirds of each of the other orders, and the bishop still dissent, it is submitted to the General Synod, whose decision is final.

The representative body consists of the archbishops and bishops, of one clerical and two lay members for each diocese, and of such number of other persons elected as shall be equal to the number of dioceses. This body is a Board of Trustees, holding the temporalities of the Church.  There is a Committee of Patronage in each diocese, consisting of the bishop, one lay and two clerical members. In each parish there are three persons named parochial nominators. When an incumbent is to be appointed, the Committee of Patronage and the parochial nominators form a Board of Nomnination, presided over by the bishop, who has an independent and also a casting vote. This board nominates a clergyman to the bishop, who, if he decline to institute the nominee, must give him, if so required, his reasons in writing for so declining. Bishops are nominated by the diocesan synods, and confirmed by the Bench of Bishops.

The disestablished Church has already taken advantage of its freedom to revise carefully the Book of Common Prayer. Some extracts from the preface to the Revised Prayer-book, to be printed during this year (1878), will show the object and animus of the revision: “When this Church of Ireland ceased to be established by law, and thereupon some alteration in our public liturgy became needful, it was earnestly desired by many that occasion should be taken for considering what changes the lapse of years or exigency of our present times and circumstances might have rendered expedient.” “We now afresh declare that the posture of kneeling prescribed to all communicants is not appointed for any purpose of adoration of Christ's body and blood under the veils of bread and wine, but only for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgment, and for the avoiding of such profanation and disorder as might ensue if some such reverent and uniform posture were not enjoined.” “In the Office for Visitation of the Sick we have deemed it fitting that absolution should be pronounced to penitents in the form appointed in the Office for the Holy Communion.” The portions of the Apocrypha which were in the Table of Lessons have been expunged, and the rubric has been omitted which directed the use on certain days of the Athanasian Creed.

The Church has no official voice in the management of this school, but until very lately no one could obtain a theological degree from it without signing the Thirty-nine Articles. In Nov., 1876, a statute was passed by the senate of the university  abolishing this test and admitting even laymen to degrees. The board of Trinity College has also lately provided that any Christian Church of the land may establish a theological faculty alongside that of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

The act of disestablishment technically decreed also disendowment, but by far the greater part of the endowment of the Church was absorbed by the compensations granted. Most of those who were entitled to annuities commuted their income, or compounded with the ecclesiastical commissioners for a fixed sum, so arranged as to leave a large capital sum for church endowment, and this endowment was augmented by lame donations, amounting, in the first five years of disestablishment, to £1,180.108. As an example of composition, the bishop of Derry was entitled to an annual income of £13,781. Upon compounding, he received £101,493, leaving a balance to the Endowment Fund of the Church of £100,288. The present endowment of the Church is upwards of £7,000,000.

See Dr. Todd, St. Patrick; Killen, Ecclesiastical History of Ireland; King, Church History of Ireland; Froude, History of England; Godkin, Ireland and her Charches; pamphlets by Dr. C. H. H. Wright, on The Divinity School of Trinity College, The Church of Ireland, etc.; The Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette, from 1871 to 1878; The Irish Church Directory; Lanigan, Ecclesiastical History of Ireland. (G. C. J.)

## Protestant Episcopal Free-Church Association[[@Headword:Protestant Episcopal Free-Church Association]]

             This body, formed in 1875 within the pale of the Protestant Episcopal Church, advocates the freeseat system for houses of worship, and has grown to such large proportions in the short time of its existence that it now goes beyond its originally intended mission and assumes the work of Church extension also, i.e. it affords help to feeble churches, provided they do not rent or sell pews. The secretary of the society reported at its third annual meeting (May 13, 1878) 285 clerical, 13 life, and 126 annual contributors. Twenty-one of the bishops of the Church are patrons.

## Protestant Friends[[@Headword:Protestant Friends]]

             SEE FREE CONGREGATIONS; SEE RATIONALISM.

## Protestant Methodists[[@Headword:Protestant Methodists]]

             SEE METHODISM; SEE METHODIST PROTESTANTS.

## Protestant Union of Germany[[@Headword:Protestant Union of Germany]]

             is a body composed of the members of the Evangelical Protestant Church. It has been in existence since 1863. Its aim is the complete separation of the Church from the State; a synodical Church system for all Protestant Germany; the union of religion and intellectual culture, faith and science, i.e. the advancement of the Christian religion in harmony with free investigations and ever-advancing intellectual culture, and the warning against everything hierarchical as well as against the radical denials of religion. It was projected in 1863 in the duchy of Baden, and in 1864 its headquarters were established at Heidelberg where the annual meetings of the Union, called the Protestantentag, were held and all business of the body was transacted. At present the headquarters of the Union are at Berlin, and since the unification of Germany the purpose is to organize a German National Church, for which the State shall apportion a tax upon every member and recognise the organism by collecting the tax so obtained. Every person belonging to this Church of the nation is to enjoy liberty of thought and utterance, giving even greater breadth of freedom than the members of the Anglican communion enjoy. See Dr. Lindsay's Letter from Germany in Zion's Herald, Boston, Oct. 5,1876. SEE PRUSSIA. (J. H. W.)

## Protestantentag[[@Headword:Protestantentag]]

             SEE PROTESTANT UNION OF GERMANY.

## Protestantism[[@Headword:Protestantism]]

             is the advocacy of the authority of the Sacred Scriptures above and without any other. The Romanist and Jew hold to tradition (q.v.) as having the warrant of authority, but the Protestants refuse to yield to any arguments not clearly and directly drawn from the sacred Word of God. There arise, of course, various questions as to what this Word is, and how it is to be interpreted. In regard to the former, the Protestant holds that the Holy Bible is composed only of the canonical writings of the Old and New Testament, SEE CANON, while the Roman Catholics also ascribe canonical authority to the so-called Apocrypha of the Old Testament. SEE  APOCRYPHA.

The right of interpretation the Roman Catholic Church claims to be hers alone, while the Protestant Church concedes this right in a stricter sense to every one who possesses the requisite gifts and attainments, but in a more comprehensive sense to every Christian who seeks after salvation, proceeding upon the principle that Scripture is its own interpreter according to the analogia fidei. SEE INTERPRETATION.

With this is connected the assumption of the Roman Catholic Church that the Vulgate version, which it sanctions, is to be preferred to all other versions as the authentic one, and is thus to a certain extent of equal importance with the original, while Protestants regard the original only as authentic.

The object of Protestant Christianity is freedom from that ecclesiasticism which the primitive Church was unacquainted with, and which owes its origin and development to the mediaeval Church. “The Reformation, viewed in its most general character,” says Ullmann (Reformers before the Reformulation, 1, 13), “was the reaction of Christianity as Gospel against Christianity as law.” It is therefore inconsistent for Anglican High- churchmen and their followers on this side of the Atlantic to assert that Protestantism is simply negative, It is positive as well, for it not only discards one interpretation of Christianity, but espouses another. It denies the right of the Church to stand in authority of the individual, but it gives a circumscribed and well-defined liberty to the individual — not absolute license. “The liberty which the Reformers prized first and chiefly,” says Prof. Fisher (Hist. of the Ref p. 9), “was not the abstract right to choose one's creed without constraint. but a liberty that flows from the enforced appropriation by the soul of truth in harmony with its inmost nature and its conscious necessities.” The nature of Protestantism, the essence of Protestantism, the principle of Protestantism, is freedom, but freedom only from the restraints of man, from a tyranny of conscience, from all systems which had( previous to the great Reformation been imposed upon man without any divine warrant.

It is freedom on the basis of obedience to God and to his holy Word. It is that freedom which consists in the cheerful and ready obedience to the divine Word and to the divine Will. It is the freedom of the republic, and not the license of the commune; it is the liberty of common-sense, and not the enthusiasm of the idealist. “The principle of Protestantism,” says Dr. Schaff, “is evangelical freedom in Christ, its aim to bring every soul into direct relation to Christ. Romanism puts the Church first and Christ next; Protestantism reverses the order.  Romanism says, Where the Church is (meaning thereby the papal organization), there is Christ; Protestantism says, Where Christ is, there is the Church; Romanism says, Where the Catholic tradition is, there is the Bible and the infallible rule of faith; Protestantism says, Where the Bible is. there is the true tradition and the infallible rule of faith; Romanism says, Where good works are, there are faith and justification; Protestantism says, Where faith is, there are justification and good works. Romanism throws Mary and the saints between Christ and the believer; Protestantism goes directly to the Saviour. Romanism proceeds from the visible Church (the papacy) to the invisible Church; Protestantism from the invisible Church, (the true body of Christ) to the visible; Romanaism works from without, and from the general to the particular; Protestantism from within, and from the individual to the general. Protestantism is a protest against the tyranny of man on the basis of the authority of God. It proclaims the Bible to be the only infallible rule of Christian faith and practice, and teaches justification by grace alone, as apprehended by a living faith. It holds up Christ as all in all, whose word is all-sufficient to teach, whose grace is all-sufficient to save. Its mission is to realize the universal priesthood and kingship of all believers by bringing them all into direct union and fellowship with Christ” (Christian Intelligencer, Jan. 14, 1869). Dr. Hagenbach objects to this reduction of Protestantism to one fundamental principle, and offers three as its basis — viz. (1) the real principle, living faith in Christ; (2) the formal principle, the authority of the Scriptures as a rule of faith; (3) the social principle, forming a community, of which Christ is the individual head, and of which all the members are priests unto God (see Theol. Studien t. Kritiken, January, 1854, art. 1). In this division every essential characteristic of Protestantism seems to have been considered by this master theologian.

Romanists charge against Protestantism that its resistance of dogmatism makes it synonymous with scepticism (q.v.) and unbelief. This is very unfair. Protestantism reposes implicitly on what it believes to be the divine authority of the inspired writers of the books of Holy Scripture; whereas scepticism and unbelief acknowledge no authority external to the mind, no communication superior to reason and science. Protestantism, although by its attitude of independence it seems similar to the other two systems, is really separated by a difference of kind, and not merely of degree. “The spiritual earnestness which characterized the Reformation,” says Farrar (Crit. Hist. of Free Thought, p. 7), “prevented the changes in religious  belief from developing into scepticism proper; and the theology of the Reformation is accordingly an example of defence and reconstruction as well as of revulsion.” Protestantism was a form of free thought, but only in the sense of a return from human authority to that of Scripture. It was equally a reliance on a historic religion, equally an appeal to the immemorial doctrine of the Church with Roman Catholicism, but it conceived that the New Testament itself contained a truer source than tradition for ascertaining the apostolic declaration of it.

Some writers — Romanists, and even some within the Protestant fold, but hardly of the faith — have declared “Protestantism a failure.” They have attempted to show that its territory is principally within the limits it acquired in the period of the great Reformation, and that its prospects for extension are lessening every day. Macaulay has treated this question in a spirited essay. in which with certain reasons which are pertinent and valuable is coupled a singular denial that the knowledge of religion is progressive, or at all dependent upon the general enlightenment of the human mind. Apart from his paradoxical speculation on this last point, his statement of the grounds of the arrest of the progress of Protestantism, though eloquent and valuable, is quite incomplete. The principal causes of this arrest have been thus ably pointed out by Prof. Fisher (Hist. of the Ref. p. 415 sq.):

(1.) The ferment that attended the rise of Protestantism led to a crystallizing of parties, and thus incited to raise a barrier in the way of its further progress.

(2.) The political arrangements which were adopted in different countries, in consequence of the religious division, all tended to confine Protestantism within the limits which it had early attained.

(3.) The want of the spirit of propagandism. Romanism is always aggressive; Protestantism, generally speaking, maintains only that which comes within its sphere.

(4.) The counter-reformation of the Romish Church and its avowed determination to remove gross abuses have stayed but too often the step of aggression from the Protestants.

(5.) The disjointed condition of Protestantism; its constant warfarings of brother with brother; the absence of a tolerant spirit for difference of  opinion in non-essentials, have facilitated the advance of their common enemy, still further strengthened by perfect organization.

(6.) The inability of Protestantism to turn to the best account the wide diversity of talents and character which is constantly developing in evangelical Christianity. In Romanism Ignatius and Bellarmine can labor side by side. In Protestantism Wesley and Whitefield must become the founders of new sects.

(7.) The disposition of races. Montesquieu, in his Esprit des Lois, remarks that Protestantism is prevalent in Northern, Catholicism in Southern Europe, and explains most judiciously, “C'est que les peuples du nord out et auront toujours un esprit d'independance et de liberte, que n'ont pas les peuples du midi.”

If Protestantism be a failure, it has its failure in its successes. These are well set forth in the following extract from Prof. Fisher's address at the Evangelical Alliance Congress in 1874:

“(1.) Its whole character is favorable to civil and religious freedom and the promotion of the multiplied advantages which freedom brings in its train. Under Roman Catholicism man was deprived of his personal rights; under Protestantism he regained them. The progress of civilization, in the long course of history, is marked by the growing respect paid to the rights of the individual, and the ampler room afforded for the unfolding of his powers, and for the realizing of his aspirations. There was something imposing in those huge despotisms — Egypt, Assyria, Balylon, Persia — in which a multitude of human beings were welded together under an absolute master. Such empires were an advance upon a primitive state of things, where every man's hand was against his neighbor. Yet they were a crude form of crystallization, and they were intrinsically weak. The little cities of Greece, with their freer political life, and the larger scope which they allowed for the activity and the culture of the individual — communities of citizens — proved more than a match for the colossal might of the East. Among the Greeks and Romans, however, although governments of law had supplanted naked force, the State was supreme, and to the State the individual must yield an exclusive allegiance. It was a great gain when the Christian Church arose, and when the individual became conscious ,of an allegiance of the soul to a higher kingdom — an allegiance which did not supersede his loyalty to  the civil authority, but limited while it sanctioned this obligation. But the Church itself at length erected a supremacy over the individual inconsistent with the free action of reason and conscience, and even stretched that supremacy so far as to dwarf and overshadow civil society. It reared a theocracy, and subjected everything to its unlimited sway. The Reformation gave back to the individual his proper autonomy. The result is a self-respect, an intellectual activity, a development of inventive capacity and of energy of character, which give rise to such achievements in science, in the field of political action, and in every work where self-reliance and personal force are called for, as would be impossible under the opposite system. In the period immediately following the Reformation signal proofs were afforded of this truth. The little states of Holland, for example, proved their ability to cope with the Spanish empire, to gain their independence, and to acquire an opulence and a culture which recalled the best days of the Grecian republics. They beat back their invaders from their soil, and sent forth their victorious navies upon every sea, while at home they were educating the common people, fostering science and learning, and building up nunivel sites famous throughout Europe. England, in the age of Elizabeth, proved that the native vigor of her people was reinforced in a remarkable degree by the stimulus derived from the peculiar genius of the Protestant religion. It was the period when she was acquiring her naval ascendency; the period, likewise, of Shakespeare, Bacon, and Raleigh. Who can doubt that the United States of America are, not indeed wholly, but in great part, indebted for their position, as contrasted with that of Mexico and the political communities of South America, to this expansion of the power of the individual, which is the uniform and legitimate fruit of Protestant principles?

“(2.) The spirit of Protestantism favors universal education. The lay Christian, who is to read and interpret the Scriptures, and to take part in the administration of government in the Church, must not be an illiterate person. Knowledge, mental enlightenment, under the Protestant system, are indispensable. The weight of personal responsibility for the culture of his intellectual and spiritual nature which rests on every individual makes education a matter of universal concern. Far more has been done in Protestant than in Roman Catholic countries for the instruction of the whole people. It is enough to refer  to the common-school system of Holland and of New England, and to Protestant Germany, to show how natural it is for the disciples of the Reformation to provide for this great interest of society.

“The free circulation of the Bible in Protestant lands has disseminated an instrument of intellectual as well as of religious improvement, the good effect of which is immeasurable. As a repository of history, biography, poetry, ethics, as well as a monitor to the conscience and a guide to heaven, the Bible has exerted an influence on the common mind, in all Protestant nations, which it would be difficult to exaggerate. The practice of interpreting the Bible and of exploring its pages for flesh truth affords at mental discipline of a very high order. How often have the Scriptures carried into the cottage of the peasant a breadth and refinement of intellect which otherwise would never have existed, and which no agency employed by the Roman Catholic system, in relation to the same social class, has ever been able to engender!

“(3.) That Protestantism should be more friendly to civil and religious liberty than the Roman Catholic system would seem to follow unavoidably from the nature of the two forms of faith. Protestantism involves, as a vital element, an assertion of personal rights with respect to religion, the highest concern of man. Moreover, Protestantismn casts off the yoke of priestly rule, and puts ecclesiastical government, in due measure, into the hands of the laity. As we have already said, it is a revolt of the laity against a usurped ecclesiastical authority: The Church of Rome teaches men that their first and most binding duty is to bow with unquestioning docility and obedience to their heaven-appointed superiors. How is it possible that Protestantism should not foster a habit of mind which is incompatible with a patient endurance of tyranny at the hands of the civil power? How can Protestantism, inspiring a lively sense of persona rights, fail to bring with it, eventually at least, a corresponding respect for the rights of others, and a disposition to secure their rights in forms of government and in legislation? How can men who are accustomed to judge for themselves and act independently in Church affairs manifest a slavish spirit in the political sphere? On the contrary, the habit of mind which the Roman Catholic nurture tends to beget leads to servility in the subject towards the ruler as long as an alliance is kept up between sovereign and priest. It is true that the Church of Rome can accommodate itself to any of the various  types of political society. Her doctors have at times preached an extreme theory of popular rights and of the sovereignty of the people. While the State is subordinate to the Church any form of government may be tolerated; and there may be an interest on the part of the priesthood in inculcating political theories which operate, in their judgment, to weaken the obligations of loyalty towards the civil magistrate, and to exalt by contrast the divine authority of the Church. When the civil magistracy presumes to exercise prerogatives, or to ordain measures, which are deemed hurtful to the ecclesiastical interest, a radical doctrine of revolution, even a doctrine of tyrannicidle, has been heard from the pulpits of the most conservative of religious bodies. Generally speaking, however, the Church of Rome is the natural ally and supporter of arbitrary principles of government.

The prevailing sentiment, the instinctive feeling, in that Church is that the body of the people are incapable of self-guidance, and that to give them the reins in civil affairs would imperil the stability of ecclesiastical control. To this reasoning it is often replied by advocates of the Roman Catholic system that Protestantism opens a door to boundless tyranny by leaving the temporal power without any check from the ecclesiastical. The State, it is said, proves omnipotent; the civil magistrate is delivered from the wholesome dread of ecclesiastical censure, and is left free to exercise all kinds of tyranny, without the powerful restraint to which he was subject under the mediaeval system. He may even violate the rights of conscience with impunity. The State, it is sometimes said, when released from its subordinate relation to the Church, is a godless institution. It becomes, like the pagan states of antiquity, absolute in the province of religion as in secular affairs, and an irresistible engine of oppression. It must be admitted that Protestant rulers have been guilty of tyranny; that, in many instances, they cannot be cleared of the charge of unwarrantably interfering with the rights of conscience, and of attempting to govern the belief and reculate the forms of worship of their subjects in a manner destructive of true liberty. The question is, whether these instances of misgovernment are the proper fruit of the Protestant spirit, or something at variance with it, and therefore an evil of a temporary and exceptional character. The imputation that the State, as constituted under Protestantism, is heathen depends on the false assumption that the Church and the priesthood, as established in the Roman Catholic system, are identical, or so nearly identical that one cannot subsist without the other. It is  assumed that when the supervision and control which the Church of Rome aspires to exercise over the civil authority are shaken off, nothing is left but an unchristian or antichristian institution. The fact that a layman can be as good a Christian as a priest is overlooked. The Christian laity who make up a commonwealth, and the Christian magistrates who are set over them, are quite as able to discern and quite as likely to respect personal rights, and to act for the common weal, as if they were subject to an organized priesthood. Since the Reformation a layman has been the head of the English Church and State, and civil magistrates in England have borne a part in ecclesiastical government. Without entering into the question of the righteousness or expediency of establishments, or broaching any of the controverted topics connected with this subject, we simply assert here that the civil government of England is not to be branded as unchristian or antichristian on account of this arrangement. As far as the administration of public affairs in that country has been characterized by justice and by a regard for the wellbeing of all orders of people, the government has been Christian — as truly Christian, to say the least, as if the supremacy had been virtually lodged with the pope, or with an aristocracy of priests.

“History verifies the pi position that Protestantism is favorable to civil and religious freedom. The long and successful struggle for independence in the Netherlands, the conflict which established English liberty against the despotic influence of the house of Stuart, the growth and establishment of the Republic of the United States, are events so intimately connected with Protestantism, and so dependent upon it, that we may point to them as monuments of the true spirit and tendency of the Reformed religion. Tht igiuos pThat e persecution has darkened the annals of the Protestant faith, and that the earliest leaders in the Reformation failed to recognise distinctly the principle of liberty of conscience, must be admitted. But Protestantism, as is claimed at the present day both by its friends and foes, was illogical, inconsistent with its own genius and principles, whenever it attempted to coerce conscience by punishing religious dissent with the sword and the fagot. Protestants illustrate the real character and tendency of their system by deploring whatever acts of religious persecution the predecessors who bore their name were guilty of, and by the open and sincere advocacy of  religious liberty. Liberty of thought and freedom of speech and of the press, however restricted they nay have been by Protestants in times past, it is the tendency of Protestantism to uphold.”

See Schenkel, Das Wesen des Protestantismus (2d ed. Schaffh. 1862); Frank, Gesch. der prof. Theol. (Leips. 1862-65, 2 vols.); Wylie, Hist. of Prof. (Lond. 1874 sq.); Gieseler, Ecclesiastes Hist. iv. 131 sq.; Hase, Ch. Hist. p. 437 sq.; Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctr. (see Index).

## Protestants[[@Headword:Protestants]]

             is a collective name for all genuine believers in evangelical Christianity — those who protest against the errors and renounce the communion of the Romish Church. It was originally applicable to the followers of Luther, but is now generally applied to all Christians not embraced in the Roman Catholic, Greek, or Oriental churches. SEE REFORMATION.

At first those who, in consequence of the religious innovations of Luther and his consorts in Germany and Switzerland, stepped out of the Catholic community were designated by no general name; they were called Lutherans, Zwinglians, Anabaptists, etc., etc. They received their collective name only in 1529 at the second Diet of Spires. The first Diet of Spires had been held in 1526. There it had been resolved, “Let every state of the empire conduct its affairs in such a way as it thinks justifiable before God and the emperor.” It was an edict of tolerance, with reservation of the imperial rights. The Roman Catholic party had been compelled to make concessions by the ambiguous attitude of the house of Wittelsbach. As soon, however, as the Bavarian dukes embraced more unequivocally the Catholic cause, and had made a close alliance with the ecclesiastical princes, the emperor Charles V, in order to satisfy the Romanists, resolved upon more energetic measures against the innovators. In the spring of 1527, the Romanists had already formed a secret league at Breslau, yet until the emperor was successful in Italy no overt measures could be thought of. After he had gained a complete victory in Italy, the policy of repression was boldly avowed, and in March, 1529, the second Diet of Spires was convoked for this purpose by the emperor. Ostensibly it was called to secure aid from the German princes against the Turks, and to devise the most effectual means by which to allay the religious disputes. Its real object, however, appeared when Ferdinand, archduke of Austria, and other popish princes, decreed that in the countries which had embraced the new religion it should be lawful to continue in it till the meeting of a  council, but that no Roman Catholic should be allowed to turn Lutheran, and that the reformers should deliver nothing in their sermons contrary to the received doctrine of the Church. It was furthermore specially decreed,

(1) that it shall be forbidden nowhere in Germany to say or attend mass;

(2) the preaching of the doctrine of Zwingli about the Eucharist shall be prohibited;

(3) the Anabaptists shall not be tolerated;

(4) libels against religious parties and about religious matters are interdicted.

These articles did not meet the pretensions of Luther's followers. The Lutheran states asserted that in matters of faith a majority of votes was not decisive, and that the resolutions of 1526, unanimously voted, could only be abrogated by a unanimous vote. They, in consequence, protested against the resolutions of the diet, and it was thus that the followers of the Reformation were in derision called Protestants. They declared their readiness to obey the emperor and the diet in all “dutiful and possible matters.” but against any order considered by them repugnant to “God and his holy Word, to their soul's salvation, and their good conscience,” they appealed to the emperor, to the free council, and to all impartial Christian judges. The essential principles involved in the protest against this decree and in the arguments on which it was grounded were (1) that the Catholic Church cannot be the judge of the Reformed churches, which are no longer in communion with her; (2) that the authority of the Bible is supreme, and above that of councils and bishops; (3) that the Bible is not to be interpreted and used according to tradition, or use, and wont, but to be explained by means of itself, its own language, and connection. As this doctrine — that the Bible, explained independently of all external tradition, is the sole authority in all matters of faith and discipline — is really the foundation-stone of the Reformation, the term Protestant was extended from those who signed the Spires protest to all who embraced the fundamental principle involved in it.

The protesting parties were as follows: John, the elector of Saxony, the landgrave of Hesse, the margrave of Brandenlburg-Bayreuth. a duke of Brunswick Lineburg, a prince of Anhalt, a number of Frankish and Snabian imperial cities — Nuremberg, Ulm, Kempten, Nordlingen, Heilbronn,  Reutlingen, Isny, St. Gall, Weissenburg. Windsheim, Strasburg, Constance, Lindau, and Memmingen. The four last named had joined the protest on account of the interdiction of Zwingli's doctrine, which interdiction met with the entire approval of Luther and his zealous followers. The latter also accepted the article against the Anabaptists, and, while Luther approved of the protest, he exhorted at the same time the Protestant powers to destroy the impious Anabaptists with fire and sword, and accept the resolutions of the diet in this respect. Now, the new doctrines being in possession of a name which indicated their common hostile relation to the Roman Church, the schism became less curable, and reconciliation was thenceforth less practicable than ever. SEE REFORMATION.

The term Protestant, which thus came to be synonymous with non- Romanist, was applied, first, as a convenient historical term designating collectively all who deny the usurped supremacy of the pope; secondly, as a term of controversy implying (1) a condemnation of alleged Romish errors and superstitions, and sometimes (2) a yet further assertion of certain tenets supposed to be of the essence of Protestantism. This essential principle of Protestantism is the sufficiency and authority of the Scriptures as a religious rule of faith and practice. Those, on the one hand, who deny its sufficiency are not in principle Protestants. The former include not only the Roman Catholics, but all those who maintain the authority of the Church to speak for God, either in adding to the doctrines of the Bible or in giving them a binding and authoritative interpretation; and those, on the other hand, who deny its divine authority are not properly Protestants; and the latter embrace all those who hold that man's unaided reason is the all- sufficient guide and standard in religious faith and practice, and that the Bible is only to be used like other books-as a light, but not as an authority. In 1659 it was stated in Milton's Treatise of Civil Power in Ecclesiastical Cases: “It is the general consent of all sound Protestant writers that neither traditions, councils, nor canons of any visible Church, much less edicts of any magistrate or civil session, but the Scripture only, can be the final judge or rule in matters of religion, and that only in the conscience of every Christian to himself... With the name of Protestant hath ever been received this doctrine, which prefers the Scripture before the Church, and acknowledges none but the Scripture sole interpreter of itself to the conscience. If by the Protestant doctrine we believe the Scripture — not for the Church's saying, but for its own as the Word of God-then ought we to believe what in our conscience we apprehend the Scripture to say,  though the visible Church with all her doctors gainsay ... To interpret the Scripture convincingly to his own conscience none is able but himself, guided by the Holy Spirit; and not so guided, none than he to himself can be a worse deceiver... This is not the doctrine of the Church of England. If the Church have authority in controversies of faith, it is a matter of conscience to submit one's private judgment to that authority. There coexist in the Church of God two authorities mutually corroborative of each other, and, so far as individual interpretation of each, mutually corrective of each other — the inspired Word and the inspired Church; the inspired Word receiving its canonicity, its interpretation, from the inspired Church, and the inspired Church tested in its development by the inspired Word” (Bishop Forbes, on Thirty-nine Ant. p. 95). Of course, since Protestantism recognises the right of private judgment in the interpretation of Scripture, it allows a wide divergence of theological views, and such a divergence actually exists. At the same time, the differences in the belief of the various Protestant sects generally relate to minor points, as of worship, ceremonial, and form of ecclesiastical government, nearly all the great Protestant denominations being substantially agreed respecting the fundamental points of doctrine as taught by the Word of God. Mr. Chillingworth, addressing himself to a writer in favor of the Church of Rome, speaks of the religion of the Protestants in the following excellent terms:

“Know then, sir, that when I say the religion of Protestants is in prudence to be preferred before yours, on the one side, I do not understand by your religion the doctrine of Bellarmine, or Baronius, or any other private man among you, nor the doctrine of the Sorbonne, of the Jesuits, or of the Dominicans, or of any other particular company among you, but that wherein you all agree, or profess to agree, the doctrine of the Council of Trent; so accordingly, on the other side, by the religion of Protestants, I do not understand the doctrine of Luther, or Calvin, or Melancthon, nor the Confession of Augsburg, or Geneva, nor the Catechism of Heidelberg, nor the Articles of the Church of England — no, nor the harmony of Protestant confessions; but that in which they all agree, and which they all subscribe with a greater harmony, as a perfect rule of faith and action — that is, the Bible. The Bible I say the Bible only-is the religion of Protestants. Whatsoever else they believe beside it, and the plain, irrefragable, indubitable  consequences of it, well may they hold it as a matter of opinion; but as a matter of faith and religion, neither can they with coherence to their own grounds believe it themselves, nor require belief of it of others, without most high and most schismatical presumption. I, for my part, after a long, and, as I verily believe and hope, impartial, search of the true way to eternal happiness, do profess plainly that I cannot find any rest for the sole of my foot lint upon this rock only. I see plainly, and with my own eyes, that there are popes against popes and councils against councils; some fathers against other fathers, the same fathers against themselves; a consent of fathers of one age against a consent of fathers of another age; traditive interpretations of Scripture are pretended, but there are few or none to be found: no tradition but that of Scripture can derive itself from the fountain, but may be plainly proved either to have been brought in in such an age after Christ, or that in such an age it was not in. In a word, there is no sufficient certainty but of Scripture only for any considering man to build upon. This, therefore, and this only, I have reason to believe. This I will profess; according to this I will live; and for this, if there be occasion, I will not only willingly, but even gladly, lose my life, though I should be sorry that Christians should take it from me. Propose me anything out of this book, and require whether I believe or no, and, seem it never so incomprehensible to human reason, I will subscribe it with hand and heart as knowing no demonstration can be stronger than this God hath said so, therefore it is true. In other things, I will take no man's liberty of judging from him; neither shall any man take mine from me.”

The body of Protestants consists, generally speaking, of Sweden, Denmark, and Norway — all Lutheran; the larger half of the population of the Netherlands; about half of the population of Switzerland, including the cantons of Aargau, Zurich, Berne, most of Vaud — all Calvinistic; the English, Irish, and Scottish churches, with their colonial and American daughters; the Scottish Presbyterians; the large bodies of Lutherans, Calvinists, Huguenots, in the other countries of Europe; the English and Irish Nonconformists and their descendants in the United States and the colonies.

Of the chief of these Protestant denominations we give here a brief narrative of the process of their separate formation, referring the reader for  fuller information to the separate articles under their respective titles. “The Lutherans took the name and accepted the teachings of Luther, who, while maintaining the doctrine of justification by faith alone, and the authority and sufficiency of the Scriptures, also maintained, in a modified form, the doctrine of the real presence of Christ in the communion, and allowed the use of images and pictures in the churches. Zwingli, the Swiss reformer, denied that the Lord's Supper was anything more than a commemorative ordinance. Many of the Reformers in other countries shared his views, and out of the controversy between him and Luther sprang the Reformed churches of Germany and Holland. Meanwhile John Calvin had commenced his labors as the organizer of the Reformation. The product of his literary labor was the Institutes; of his executive labor, the Presbyterian form of government. For both he found, eventually, a free field in Geneva, and his labors there not only gave to the Reformed churches of Switzerland their final character — a character which they bear to this day — but furnished the model of doctrine and government which the Presbyterian churches of Great Britain and the United States have since largely adopted. This, also, is substantially the form of government of the Reformed Church of France. Certain tenets peculiar to this form of theology were repudiated by other leaders among the Reformers. Arminius, in Holland, denied that the Scriptures taught the doctrine of predestination and others connected intimately, if not necessarily, with it. From him sprang the Arminians, who, as a sect, are reduced to an insignificant number, but whose doctrines are accepted in the main by the Methodists, by most of the Episcopalians, and by many in other denominations. The Socinians denied that the doctrines of the Trinity, the atonement, and the proper deity of Jesus Christ were to be found in the Bible. They thus revived the views of the earlier Arians, while at the same time they carried their denials much further.

Their views have found expression in one wing of the Unitarian and Universalist churches of the present day. Their most general acceptance is in New England and in parts of Great Britain; but there are Socinian churches in nearly if not quite all Protestant communities. The Reformation in England was partly religious, partly political. Henry VIII did not intend to modify the doctrine of the Church, but only its government, and its government, only so far as to secure its independence of the papacy. The movement was too deep and popular for him to control; but the loyal and ecclesiastical influence combined to retain the Episcopal form of government and the union of Church and State. Both are still preserved in the Church of England, and the former in the Episcopal Church of this country. Its symbols of doctrine  allow equal liberty to Arminians and to Calvinists. The civil and religious controversies which, a few centuries later, plunged England into civil war, gave impetus and organization, though not birth, to the idea of absolute ecclesiastical independence. The result was the organization of churches which were mainly Calvinistic in belief, but in which the absolute right of the people of each Church to manage their own affairs was maintained. In England they took the name of Independents, in the United States that of Congregationalists. As early as the days of Luther, the Reformers were divided on the question of baptism; those who maintained that baptism should be administered only by immersion and to adults took the name of Baptists, which they retain to this day. The 18th century witnessed a general revival of religious spirit, especially in England and the United States, differing from that which characterized the Reformation in that it was less a battle against error in doctrine, and more a simple awakening of Christian zeal to use for the redemption of the masses the truths which the Reformation had brought to light. Out of this awakening grew Methodism, which is substantially Arminian in doctrine and Episcopal in government, and differs from the Episcopal Church, from which it came out, rather in the spirit and character of its adherents than in theology. These churches represent the chief forms of Protestantism. There is also a large number of minor denominations, but most of them are offshoots from these great branches.”

The total Protestant population of the world is estimated in 1890 to be more than 120,000,000, a little more than half the Roman Catholic population. It is thus divided:

United States .............................. 3,000,000

British America .......................... 3,000,000

Mexico.................................... 9,000

South America ........................... 70,000

Dutch American possessions............ 35,000

Danish and Swedish possessions .......... 5,000

Hayti...................................... 12,000

Spain ... . .............. .......... 9,000

Portugal ................................. 11,000

France .................................... 2,000,000

Austria ........... ..... ................... 3,400,000

Prussia ................................... 18,249,539

West of Germany proper ................... 11,134,440

 Italy .................. .................... 103,000

Switzerland ........... ........... l,667,109

Holland ................................ 2,831,539

Belgium .. ................. 15,0010

Great Britain and Ireland . ................. 24,500,000

Denmark .................................. 2,0S9,000

Sweden and Norway ...................... 6 589,000

Russia ......... ............... 4,000,000

Turkey .......... ........................ 15,000

Greece .................................... 2,000

Asiatic Russia ............................. 45,000

China ..................................... 34,555

Japan .................................... 30,000

East and Farther India ................... 4110,000

Archipelago ............................... 55,000

Pesia ..................................... 1,500

Arabia ................................. 2,000

English African possessions ............. 1,000,00

Algeria .................................... 9,000

Egypt ..................................... 3,500

Liberia ................................... 50,000

Madagascar ............................... 100,000

Australia and Polynesia ..................2,000,00

The population connected with or under the influence of Protestant churches at the close of 1874 was about as follows:

DivisionsProtestantsTotal PopulationAmerica33,000,00084,500,000Europe71,800,000301,600,000Asia1,800,000798,000,000Africa1,200,000202,500,000Australia2,200,0004,400,000Total110,000,0001,391,000,000

## Protesters[[@Headword:Protesters]]

             SEE RESOLUTIONERS; SEE SCOTLAND, CHURCHES IN.

## Protevangelium[[@Headword:Protevangelium]]

             a spurious gospel ascribed to James, containing an account of the birth of Mary and of Christ. It is supposed to have been originally composed in Hebrew. Postellius brought the MS. of this gospel from the Levant, translated it into Latin, and sent it to Oporinus, a printer at Basle, where Bibliander, a Protestant divine, and the professor of divinity at Zurich, caused it to be printed in 1552. Postellius asserts that it was publicly read as canonical in the Eastern churches. SEE GOSPEL, SPURIOUS.

## Prothade[[@Headword:Prothade]]

             ST., a French prelate who flourished near the opening of the 7th century; he died before 625. He has been called son of the patrician Prothade, but without proof. It is at least certain that he was the successor of St. Nicet in the metropolitan see of Besanlon. He compiled a ritual for the use of the two cathedral churches at Besanlon-St. Itienne and St. Jean, which has not reached us without interpolations; it has recently been published by the abbe Richard.

## Prother, Amos Summers[[@Headword:Prother, Amos Summers]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Clarke County, Ind., April 17, 1832. He went to Iowa when quite young, and with his parents settled near Libertyville, Jefferson County. He was converted in 1846, and at once joined the Methodist Episcopal Church. His convictions of duty pointed him to the ministry as a life-work, and, the better to fit himself for the sacred office, he entered the Mount-Pleasant Collegiate Institute, afterwards the Iowa Wesleyan University, in 1852, where he continued his studies until 1857, when he graduated. He was licensed to preach while at college. After graduating he was immediately employed on the Dodgeville Circuit by the presiding elder, and in 1857 joined the Iowa Conference. His appointments were Denmark, Wapello, Dodgeville, Grand View, Crawfordsville, New London, Kossuth, Montezuma, New Sharon, and Birmingham, At the last-named place he died, April 1, 1873, greatly respected by his own people and the Church generally.

## Prothesis[[@Headword:Prothesis]]

             (1), a small altar in Greek churches corresponding to the credence table. The name is taken from the shew-bread, which was called ἡ πρόθεσις  τῶν ἄρτων — the setting-out of the loaves. (2.) A small side-altar in a Clugniac church, on the epistle side, at which the ministers of the altar, on Sundays and festivals, partook of both kinds, using a silver calamus to drink of the chalice.

## Prothonotary[[@Headword:Prothonotary]]

             a word that has a different signification in the Greek Church from what it has in the Latin; for in the first it is the name of one of the great officers of the Church of Constantinople, who takes rank next to the patriarch, and writes all despatches he sends to the grand seignior; besides which lie is empowered to have an inspection over the professors of the law, into purchases, wills, and the liberty given to slaves; but in the Roman Church they were formerly called prothonotaries who had the charge of writing the acts of the martyrs and circumstances of their death, a title of honor whereunto are ascribed many privileges, as legitimizing bastards, making apostolic notaries, SEE PROTONOTARIUS APOSTOLICUS, doctors of divinity and of the canon and civil law: they are twelve in number.

## Proto[[@Headword:Proto]]

             (first). This adjective is prefixed to the name of several officers in the Greek Church, denoting that he who holds it is the chief of his class such as prothonotary, protoppaas, protopsaltes, protosyncellus.

## Protodiacon[[@Headword:Protodiacon]]

             The protodiacon, or archdeacon, holds the first rank among the deacons employed in the Episcopal Church to assist the bishop during worship and in the exercise of his pontificalia. He is constantly near the person of the bishop or archbishop, and stands at his side while he is performing the liturgical rites or conferring holy orders. The splendor of the episcopal dignity reflected on this office, and the influence which the archdeacons in all times exercised upon the bishops, made of the proto- or arch-deacon, in the Greek-Russian Church, a very important person. In larger parishes several deacons are employed, but only the first deacon of an episcopal church is distinguished by the honorary title of archi- or proto-diaconus.

## Protonotarius Apostolicus[[@Headword:Protonotarius Apostolicus]]

             is a notary appointed by the papal see. The qualification of 7irpLTro (primus) is but honorary. In the apostolic chancery rules the word  “prothonotary” is regularly employed, but the papal bulls and rescripts call the same functionary “notarius apostolicus.” The papal notaries appointed in the city of Rome (in curia), and forming, twelve in number, a special college of prelates, are distinguished by the addition [Notarii] “de numero participantium” from those appointed abroad (extra curiam), who are simply notarii or protonotarii, sometimes with the specification “extra numerum.” The former are the regular and paid, the latter the extraordinary and titular notaries. The origin of the papal notariate is assigned to the 1st century, for pope Clement I is said to have employed seven of them in noting the memorabilia of the Church, and composing trustworthy accounts of the various manners in which the martyrs were brought to death. In later times it became the business of the prothonotaries to write the biographies of the popes, to draw up authentic minutes of the debate in the Consistory of Cardinals, especially in cases of beatification, canonization, etc. Their college was increased to twelve members and endowed with great privileges by pope Sixtus V.

They precede in the papal chapel at different solemnities the Auditores S. Rotae, all cameral ecclesiastics and lower prelates, and the generals of orders. Formerly they even enjoyed precedence over bishops, but Paul II decreed that at Rome and abroad they should step after the episcopate. Only in public consistories and in processional cavalcades four prothonotaries take their place immediately after the assistant bishops of the pontifical chapel, and consequently in front of the episcopate. They are, moreover, not subject to the jurisdiction of the ordinaries, but are placed under the immediate protection of the pope; they can freely dispose by testament even of their beneficial fortune to the amount of 2000 ducats; they receive all messages and graces of the pope free of tax and stamp; they have free access to the papal chancery, to the public consistories, and to the cardinal consistories, debating cases of beatification or canonization. They are entitled, under certain restrictions, to use portable altars in saying mass, and at certain festivals to wear the pontifical badges (comp. Sixt. V, Constt. “Romanus Pontifex” and “Laudabilis”). They have also the peculiar privilege of creating annually six doctors, who enjoy all the rights of regularly graduated doctors; but only residents of Rome can be thus promoted (Bened. XIV, Const. Inter Conspicuos, d. iv Cal. Septbr. 1744). These distinctions belong exclusively to the regular prothonotaries appointed by the pope himself. Those “extra statum,” and the titular notaries, who can be appointed not only by the pope, but also by his legate a latere, and, with some restrictions, by the college of real prothonotaries, occupy in the scale  of rank the degree next to the canons of a cathedral, and only if they are themselves provided with a canonry have they precedence over the other members of chapters. They wear the violet talarium, with the mantlet of the same color. In the performance of Church functions they are permitted the ring, but without jewel. — Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, s.v.

## Protopapa[[@Headword:Protopapa]]

             is the archpriest in the Greek Church who stands on the left hand of the patriarch (q.v.). His dignity is entirely ecclesiastical: he administers the holy sacrament to the patriarch at all high and solemn masses, and receives it from him. He is the head ecclesiastical dignitary, not only with respect to his peculiar privileges, but to his right and title to precedence.

## Protopresbyter[[@Headword:Protopresbyter]]

             (πρῶτος ἱερεύς, usually called protopope) is in the Russo-Greek Church an intermediate degree between the bishop and the simple priests. The situation and functions of the protopresbyter are essentially the same as those of the former archpriests of the episcopal cathedrals, and of the deans in the country. Each cathedral has its protopresbyter, but the same dignity exists in other important churches of large cities where several popes are employed. This title belongs also to such popes of the first rank as exercise some rights of supervision and administration over several surrounding parishes; for every diocese or eparchy in Russia is divided into several protopopates (as in the Roman Catholic Church into deaneries). This class of dignitaries forms, in litigious and disciplinary matters of ecclesiastical resort, the first instance in the diocese. In important cities the protopopes are generally employed as counsellors, assessors or secretaries in the episcopal consistories or other ecclesiastical colleges. The distinguishing garment of the protopopes is the so-called epigonaticon. The protopresbyterate is the most influential of the lower clerical functions, and the highest degree open to a secular ecclesiastic; for in the Greek Church the episcopate, and the still higher dignities, can only be occupied by unmarried priests, or such as are separated from their wives by death or voluntary renunciation, and who belong to the monastical order, mostly archimandrites (abbots) and hegemons (priors). — Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, s.v.

## Protopsaltes[[@Headword:Protopsaltes]]

             is the chief singer or master of the choir in Greek churches.

## Protosyncellus[[@Headword:Protosyncellus]]

             is the vicar or assistant of a Greek patriarch, who generally resides along with himn in his palace.

## Protothronus[[@Headword:Protothronus]]

             is, in the Greek Church, the name of the first bishop of an ecclesiastical province; he holds the first rank after the patriarch or after the metropolitan. At the death of either of these latter dignitaries, the protothronus assumes his jurisdiction until a successor is installed.

## Prototype[[@Headword:Prototype]]

             is a term used in theology to designate the original type (q.v.) or form of anything, and especially in the following dogma: The prototypal form in which Adam was created was the image of God; in Christ that image is restored; and it is the hope of the Christian that this form will be his also when he wakes up after God's likeness and is satisfied (Psalm 15:17). It is a term, therefore, that has an anthropological, Christological, and an eschatological character, as referring to Adam, to the Redeemer, and to the redeemed. Now, in what does that likeness consist? Not surely in outward form, but in spiritual attributes, for God is Spirit. But those attributes pertain to the soul invested in body, which God has not; therefore the likeness of God must be restricted to such divine attributes as are reflected in man independently of his material nature, such as a love for all that is good and holy, right, reason, and free-will, which constitute in him the “likeness and glory” of God (1Co 11:7; SEE GLORY ), and exclusive of other attributes that serve only to mark the imperfection of the creature. When Irenaeus, therefore (c. Hoer. v, 6); speaks of the image of God as being sua natura of a bodily character, he may express correctly the philosophical notion of the Deity, and therefore of the divine likeness, as derived from ancient schools, but he hardly speaks with the authority of Catholic antiquity on a point which had as yet received but little consideration. Our only safe guide is the apostle, who expresses himself with sufficient explicitness. With him Christ is the very “image of God” (2Co 4:4), “in the form of God” (Php 2:6), and “the  express image of his Person,” as well as “the brightness of his glory” (Heb 1:3), “the image of the invisible God” (Col 1:15).

He is now to us as the prototypal form in which Adam was created full of grace and truth; and man's hope of having that form restored in him hereafter depends on the genuineness with which some few rays of that glory are reflected in his soul now. So it has been decreed from everlasting that all who are called according to God's sanctifying purpose should be “conformed to the image of his Son” (Rom 8:29); that “as we have borne the image of the earthy,” we may also “bear the image of the heavenly” (1Co 15:49); that having his high exemplar before us, and “beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord,” by a continually progressive, sanctifying process, we “may be changed into the same image from glory to glory as by the Spirit of the Lord” (2Co 3:18). It is of this “renewing in the spirit of our minds,” according to the prototypal likeness of Christ, that the apostle speaks when he exhorts his charge to “put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image” of the Creator (Col 3:10), and “after God (כרמות) is created in righteousness and in the holiness of truth” (Eph 4:24). According to Roman Catholic doctrine, original righteousness was not this prototypal likeness, but a superadded gift conferred after the act of creation was complete. So the Tridentine Catechism says, “Quod ad animam pertinet, eam ad imaginem et similitudinem suam formavit I)eus, liberumque ei tribuit arbitrium; omnes praeterea motus animi atque appetitiones ita in eo temperavit, ut rationis imperio nunquam non parerent. ‘Tum originalis justitiae admirabile donum addidit,” etc. (ed. Colon. 1565, p. 63). The council purposed, in the first instance, to express its meaning as “justitiam et sanctitatem in qua Adam conditus fuerat,” but accepted the correction of Paceco, and wrote “constitutus fuerat” (Pallavicini, Hist. Conc. Trid. 7:9). For the teaching of the schools on this point, SEE SCHOLASTIC THEOLOGY; for the whimsical noutions of Judaism, SEE CABALA

## Protracted Meetings[[@Headword:Protracted Meetings]]

             SEE REVIVAL.

## Proud, Joseph[[@Headword:Proud, Joseph]]

             an English minister of the New Jerusalem Church, who was born in the second half of the last century, is noted as the author of several of the ablest polemics ever issued by the Church of which he was a much  esteemed member. He died about 1860. His works are: Reply to Dr. Priestley's Letters on Swedenborg (1792, 8vo): — Hymns for the New Church (12mo): — Jehovah's Mercy, a poem (8vo): — Unitarian Doctrine Refuted (Lond. 1806, 8vo): — Letters on the Fundamental Doctrines of the Unitarian Religion (1808, 8vo): — The Aged Minister's Last Legacy to the New Church (Birm. 12mo; 2dc ed. Lond. 1855). See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 9:67.

## Proudfit, Alexander Moncrief[[@Headword:Proudfit, Alexander Moncrief]]

             D.D., an American divine of much celebrity, was born at Pequa, Pa., in 1770, and was educated at Columbia College, New York (class of 1792). He entered the ministry of the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church, and was made pastor of the congregation at Salem, N. Y., in 1795, where he lived until 1835, when he became agent of the American Colonization Society. He resigned that post in 1842, and died in 1843. He published: Discourses on the Ruin and Recovery of Man (Salem, 1806, 12mo; again, 1813, 12mo): — Discourses on the Leading Doctrines and Duties of Christianity (1815, 4 vols. 12mo): — a work on the Parables (1820, 12mo): — and a number of single Sermons, Tracts, etc. (1798-1836). See Memoir of the late A. M. Proudfit, D.D., etc., by John Forsyth, D.D., minister of the Union Church. Newburgh, N. Y. (12mo), reviewed in the Meth. Quar. Rev. 6:358, by R. W. Dickinson; Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 9:67; Memorial Volumne A. B. C. F. iM. 1862, p. 114; Pincet. Rev. Oct. 1846, p. 609. Proudfit, John Wilbur, D.D., son of the preceding, was born at Salem, N.Y., Sept. 22, 1803, graduated at Union College in 1821, and at Princeton Theological Seminary in 1826. After a brief pastorate at Newburyport, Mass., he was elected professor of ancient languages in the University of the City of New York, where he remained from 1833 until 1838. He then spent some time in Europe. and in 1841 accepted the professorship of Latin and Greek literature in Rutgers College. In 1854 his chair was confined to Greek literature alone. He resigned in 1861, and transferred his ecclesiastical relation in 1864 to the Presbyterian Church. After a second protracted residence in Europe, he enlisted in the service of his country, and during the war was an exceedingly devoted and useful chaplain to the soldiers of the U.S. Army, being located on Bedloe's Island, in New York Harbor. After his return from the war he lived in New York City. He was a sincere and devout believer in the religion which he preached. His daily walk seemed to be “close with God,” until, at last, “God took him.” He died of pneumonia,  March 9, 1870, after a very short illness, perfectly submissive to the will of the Lord and happy in the prospect of heaven. Dr. Proudfit was an eminent classical scholar and divine. His mind was highly cultivated, his tastes were refined, and his public life was distinguished by his devotion to literary and theological pursuits. He was a frequent contributor to religious newspapers, and to the Princeton Review and other serial publications. For some time he was editor of the New Brunswick Quarterly Review. In these periodicals he was actively engaged in the discussion of the exciting controversies connected with what is known as “Mercersburg theology.” He edited an edition of Plautus and other classical works. His scholarship was far greater than his ability as a practical teacher of youth. His sermons were always carefully elaborated in style. elegant in expression, and evangelical in spirit, but his quiet delivery failed to give them the power to which their real merits entitled them. Some of these were published by request, among which is A Baccalaureate Discourse to the Graduating Class of 1841 in Rutgers College, one of the best specimens of his pulpit efforts. Dr. Proudfit was unusually tall and slender, dignified in appearance, with an intellectual head, benevolent face, and polished manners. He excelled as a conversationalist, being full of anecdote and illustration, and happily interweaving his reminiscences of public men and incidents of travel in foreign lands. He took a deep interest in the evangelization of the papal nations of Europe, and was familiar with the great religious questions of those lands. (W. J. R. T.)

## Proudfit, Robert[[@Headword:Proudfit, Robert]]

             D.D., an eminent American divine and educator, was born at Hopewell, Pa., June 6, 1777, and graduated at Dickinson College, Pa., in 1798. In 1801 he was ordained, and installed as pastor of the Associate Reformed Church at Broadalbin, N. Y., in which charge he continued until 1818, when he accepted an invitation to the professorship of Greek and Latin at Union College, Schenectady, which situation he filled with distinguished ability until 1849, when, by an act passed by the board of trustees of that college, he was relieved from active duty, and assumed the title of emeritus professor in the same institution. During the whole time he was in active duty as professor, Dr. Proudfit did not neglect the call of his sacred profession, and, while his health permitted, he ceased not to preach the Gospel whenever he had opportunity. The zeal and earnestness with which he labored for the Master's cause gained many souls to the Church, and Dr. Proudfit's memory is in the hearts of many made happy by his agency.  He died at Schenectady, N. Y., Feb. 11, 1862. See Wilson, Presbyt. Hist. Almanac (1862), p. 306.

## Proudhon, Pierre Joseph[[@Headword:Proudhon, Pierre Joseph]]

             a noted French socialist, was born of humble parents, July 15, 1809, at Besancon. After a rudimentary education, he engaged in printing, and soon became an author — especially of an Essai de Grarnmaire Generale, for which he received a pension. In 1840 he published his work entitled Qu'estce que ia Propriete, which eventually became infamous from the answer which it gave to that question — “La Propriete, c'est le Vol!” and caused him the loss of his pension. During the Revolution he edited an inflammatory paper, which was soon suppressed, but gave him such popularity that he was elected to the Assembly. His notorious principles of anarchy prevented his being heard in the debates, and the papers which he issued in revenge were suppressed for their scurrility. In 1849 he started a Banque du Peuple to carry out his communistic ideas, but it was closed by the authorities, and he fled to Geneva, but on his return to Paris he was imprisoned. During his three years of incarceration he married, and issued several remarkable political works. He died in obscurity at Paris, Jan. 19. 1865. His social theories are of the most extravagant and dangerous character, greatly resembling the radical and immoral principles of the communistic revolutionists who are now agitating Europe and this country. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Provender[[@Headword:Provender]]

             (מַסְפּוֹא, mispo), fodder for cattle (Gen 24:25; Gen 24:32). In the account of king Solomon's stables, in 1Ki 4:28, we read, “Barley, also, and straw for the horses and dromedaries, brought they unto the place where the officers were, every man according to his charge.” Harmer remarks upon this passage: “Besides provisions for themselves, the Orientals are obliged to carry food for the beasts on which they ride or carry their goods. That food is of different kinds. They make little or no hay in these countries, and are therefore very careful of their straw, which they cut into small bits, by an instrument which at the same time threshes out the corn; this chopped straw, with barley, beans, and balls made of bean and barley meal, or of the pounded kernels of dates, are what they are wont to feed them with. The officers of Solomon are accordingly said to have brought, every man in his month, barley and straw for the horses and dromnedaries;  not straw to litter them with, there is reason to think, for it is not now used in those countries for that purpose, but chopped straw for them to eat, either alone or with their barley. The litter they use for them is their own dung, dried in the sun, and bruised between their hands, which they heap up again in the morning, sprinkling it in summer with fresh water, to keep it from corrupting. In some other places we read of provender and straw, not barley and straw; because it may be other things were used for their food anciently, as well as now, besides barley and chopped straw. בְּלַיל, belil, one of the words used for provender (Isa 30:24), implies something of mixture, and the participle of the verb from which it is derived is used for the mingling of flour with oil; so the verb in Jdg 19:21 may be as well translated ‘he mingled [food] for the asses' as ‘he gave them provender,' signifying that he mixed some chopped straw and barley together for the asses. Thus also barley and chopped straw, as it is just after reaping, unseparated in the field, might naturally be expressed by the Hebrew word we translate provender, which signifies barley and straw that had been mingled together, and accordingly seems to be so. ‘They reap every one his corn in the field' (Job 24:6), ‘Hebrew, mingled corn or dredge,' says the margin. What ideas are usually affixed to secondary translation I do not know, but Job apparently alludes to the provender, or heap of chopped straw, lying mingled together in the field, after having passed under the threshing instrument, to which he compared the spoils that were taken from passengers so early as his time by those that lived somewhat after the present manner of the wild Arabs, which spoils are to them what the harvest and vintage were to others. With this agrees that other passage of Job where this word occurs (Job 6:5), ‘Will the ox low in complaints over his provender?' or ‘fodder,' as it is translated in our version, when he has not only straw enough, but mixed with barley.” Travellers in the East, wherever they mention the subject, use much the same terms as Walpole, who, in his Journal, remarks, “Neither hay nor oats are known to the Turks; nor has any nation in the East ever used them for their horses.” SEE FODDER.

## Provenzale, David Ben-Abrahaim[[@Headword:Provenzale, David Ben-Abrahaim]]

             who flourished in the 16th century, was a preacher at Mantua, and was so eloquent that he was styled שבדויו ראש הדרשנים, i.e. the prince of preachers in his generation. He wrote: עַיר דָּוַד, a commentary on the Pentateuch from an archaeological point of view: — באור שיר השירים,  a commentary on the Song of Songs: — הפלגה דור, a comparative lexicon, Hebrew, Latin. Greek, and Italian: — and מגדל דוד, a Hebrew grammar. See Furst Bibl. Jud. 3, 123; De Rossi, Dizionario Storico deyli Autori Ebrei, p. 272 (Germ. transl. by Hamberger); Etheridge, Introduction to Hebrew Literature, p. 288, Steinschneider, Jewish Literature, p. 239. (B. P.)

## Proverb[[@Headword:Proverb]]

             מָשָׁל, nmashal, rendered in the A.V. “byword,” “parable,” “proverb” (παραβολή, παροιμία), expresses all and even more than is conveyed by these its English representatives. It is derived from a root מָשִׁל, mashdl, “to be like” (Arab. mathala, to “resemble”), and the primary idea involved in it is that of' likeness, comparison. This form of comparison would very naturally be taken by the short, pithy' sentences which passed into use as popular sayings and proverbs, especially when employed in mockery and sarcasm, as in Mic 2:4; Hab 2:6, and even in the more developed taunting song of triumph for the fall of Babylon in Isa 14:4. Probably all proverbial savings were at first of the nature of similes, but the term mashal soon acquired a more extended significance. It was applied to denote such short, pointed sayings as do not involve a comparison directly, but still convey their meaning by the help of a figure, as in 1Sa 10:12; Eze 12:22-23; Eze 17:2-3 (comp. παραβολή, Luk 4:23). From this stage of its application it passed to that of sententious maxims generally, as in Pro 1:1; Pro 10:1; Pro 25:1; Pro 26:7; Pro 26:9; Ecc 12:9; Job 13:12, many of which, however, still involve a comparison (Pro 25:3; Pro 25:11-14, etc.; Pro 26:1-3, etc.). Such comparisons are either expressed, or the things compared are placed side by side, and the comparison left for the hearer or reader to supply. Next we find it used of those larger pieces in which a single idea is no longer exhausted in a sentence, but forms the germ of the whole, and is worked out into a didactic poem. Many instances of this kind occur in the first section of the book of Proverbs; others are found in Job 27, 29, in both which chapters Job takes up his mashal, or “parable,” as it is rendered in the A.V. The “parable” of Balaam. in Num 23:7-10; Num 24:3-9; Num 24:15-24, are prophecies conveyed in figrmes; but mashal also denotes the “parable” proper, as in Eze 17:2; Eze 20:49 (Eze 21:5); Eze 24:3. Lowth, in lis notes on Isa 14:4, — speaking of mashal, says: “I take this to be the general name for poetic style among the Hebrews, including  every sort of it, as ranging under one, or other, or all of the characters, sententious, figurative, and sublime; which are all contained in the original notion, or in the use and application of the word mashal. Parables or proverbs, such as those of Solomon, are always expressed in short, pointed sentences; frequently figurative, being formed on some comparison, both in the matter and the form. Such, in general, is the style of the Hebrew poetry. Balaam's first prophecy (Num 23:7-10) is called his mashal, although it has hardly anything figurative in it; but it is beautifully sententious, and, from the very form and manner of it, has great spirit, force, and energy. Thus Job's last speeches, in answer to the three friends (ch. 27-31), are called mashals, from no one particular character which discriminates them from the rest of the poem, but from the sublime the figurative, the sententious manner which equally prevails through the whole poem, and makes it one of the first and most eminent examples extant of the truly great and beautiful in poetic style.” Sir W. Jones says, “The moralists of the East have in general chosen to deliver their precepts in short, sententious maxims, to illustrate them by sprightly comparisons, or to inculcate them in the very ancient forms of agreeable apologues: there are, indeed, both in Arabic and Persian, philosophical tracts on ethics written with sound ratiocination and elegant perspicuity. But in every part of the Eastern world, from Pekin to Damascus, the popular teachers of moral wisdom have immemorially been poets, and there would be no end of enumerating their works, which are still extant in the five principal languages of Asia.” SEE PARABLE.

Our Lord frequently employed proverbs in his public instructions; and the illustration of these proverbs as occupied many learned men, who proceed partly by the aid of similar passages from the Old Test., and partly from the ancient writings of the Jews, especially from the Talmud,. whence it appears how much they were in use among that people, and that they were applied by Christ and his apostles agreeably to common usage. The proverbs contained in the Old and New Tests. are collected and illustrated by Drusius and Anireas Schottus, whose works are comprised in the ninth volume of the Critici Sacri, and also by Joachim Zehner, who elucidated them by parallel passages from the fathers, as well as from heathen writers, in a treatise published at Leipsic in 1601. The proverbs which are found in the New Test. have been illustrated by Vorstius and Visir. as well as by Lightfoot and Schottgen in their Horoe Hebraioe et Talmudicoe, and by Buxtorf in his Lexicon Chaldicumn Talmudicum et Rabbinicum, from which last- mentioned works Rosenmuller, Kuinol, Dr. Whitby, Dr. Adam Clarke, and  other commentators, have derived their illustrations of the Jewish parables and proverbs. See Kelly, Proverbs of all Nations (Lond. 1859, 8vo); Sterling, Literature of Proverbs (ibid. 1860, 8vo); Bohn, Book of Proverbs. SEE PROVERBS, BOOK OF.

## Proverbs, Book Of[[@Headword:Proverbs, Book Of]]

             the 20th book of the Old Test., according to the arrangement of the English Bible, where it is placed between the Psalms and Ecclesiastes, doubtless from its presumed relation to the other works of Solomon; and in the Hebrew Bible it likewise follows the Psalms as part of the Kethubim, or Hagiographa. In the German MSS. of the Hebrew Old Test. the Proverbs are placed between the Psalms and Job, while in the Spanish MSS., which follow the Masorah, the order is Psalms, Job, Proverbs. This latter is the order observed in the Alexandrian MS. of the Sept. Melito, following another Greek MS., arranges the Hagiographa thus: Psalms. Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Job, as in the list made out by the Council of Laodicea; and the same order is given by Origen, except that the book of Job is separated from the others by the prophets Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, and Ezekiel. But our present arrangement existed in the time of Jerome (see Prtf. in Libr. Regum, iii: “Tertius ordo ἁγιόγραφα possidet. Et primus liber incipit ab Job. Secundus a David....' Tertius est Solomon. tres libros habens: Proverbia, quae illi parabolas, id est Masaloth appellant: Ecclesiastes, id est,'Coeleth: Canticum Canticorum, quem titulo Sir Asirim prmnotant”). In the Peshito Syriac, Job is placed before Joshua, while Proverbs and Ecclesiastes follow the Psalms, and are separated from the Son Song Songs by the book of Ruth. Gregory of Nazianzum, apparently from the exigencies of his verse, arranges the writings of Solomon in this order: Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Proverbs. Pseudo Epiphanius places Proverbs, Ecclesiastes. and Song of Songs between the 1James , 2 d books of Kings and the minor prophets. The following article treats of the book both from an internal and an external point of view. SEE BIBLE.

I. Title. — As in the Pentateuch, the book of Proverbs takes its Hebrew title from its opening words — מַשְׁלֵי, שְׁלֹמֹה, or מַשְׁלֵי, mishly, simply. From this are directly derived the titles it bears in the Sept. παροιμίαι, Σαλομῶντος) and Vulgate (Libel Proverbiorum, quem Hebraei “Misle” cappellant), and the name by which it is universally known in English. Another title, perlalps more appropriate to the book as a whole, is derived from its chief subject, “Wisdom.” In the Tosaphoth to Baba Bathra (fol. 14  b), we find Proverbs and Ecclesiastes combined under the name סֵפֶר חָכְמָה, “the book of wisdom,” and this title appears to have passed thence into the early Church. Clemens Roman. (Lj. ad Coo-. i, 57) when quoting i, 23-31 says, οὕτως λέγει ἡ πανάρετος σοφία, a name which, according to Eusebius (H. E. 4:22), was adopted by Hegesippus. Irenteus, and “the whole band of the ancients,” following the unwritten Jewish tradition, and by Clem. Alex. (Strom. ii, § 22). It is styled by Gregory Naz. (Orat. xi) παιδαγωγικὴ σοφία, and by Dion. Alex. σοφὴ βίβλος. In the catalogue of canonical books compiled by Melito of Sardis preserved by Eusebius (H. E. 4:26), we find Παρ. Σαλομ. ἡ καὶ Σοφία, a name which, as well as Sopientia, is of frequent occurrence in the early fathers (see Cotelerius in Clem. Rom. l.c.; Vales. ad Euseb. l.c.), though by no means restricted to the book of Proverbs, being equally used. as Cotelerius proves, of ‘ Ecclesiasticus” and “The Wisdom of Solomon,” a circumstance from which some confusion has arisen.

The word מָשָׁל, mashal. by which the so-called “Proverbs” of Solomon are designated (Pro 1:1; Pro 1:6; Pro 10:1; Pro 25:1; and 1Ki 4:32 [5:12]), is more appropriately translated in the Vulgate “parabola.” It is akin to the verb מָשִׁל, corresponding with the Arabic mnathala and the Syriac methal, “to be like,” and primarily signifies “a comparison,” “similitude,” “parable” (Eze 17:2; Eze 24:3); whence it easily passed to those pithy, sententious maxims so often in the East appearing in the form of a terse comparison, of which many are to be found in the book before us e.g. Pro 26:1-3; Pro 26:6-9; Pro 26:11; Pro 26:14; Pro 26:17 — and then to “proverbs” in general, whether containing a similitude or not (1Sa 10:12; 1Sa 24:13 [14]; Ecc 12:9). Its scope was still further enlarged by its application to longer compositions of a poetical and figurative character — e.g. that of Balaam (Num 23:7; Num 23:18, etc., and Job 27:1; comp. Psa 49:5; Psa 78:2), and particularly to taunting songs of triumph over fallen enemies-e.g. against the king of Babylon (Isa 14:4), the Chlalleans (Hab 2:6 : comp. also Mic 2:4; Deu 28:37; 1Ki 9:7). SEE PROVERB.

But the book of Proverbs, according to the introductory verses which describe its character, contains, besides several varieties of the mashal, sententious sayings of other kinds, mentioned in 1:6. The first of these is the חַידָה, chidah, rendered in the A.V. “dark saying,” “dark speech,” “hard question,” “riddle,” and once (Hab 2:6) “proverb.” It is  applied to Samson's riddle (Judges 14), to the hard questions with which the queen of Sheba plied Solomon (1Ki 10:1; 2Ch 9:1), and is used almost synonymously with marshal in Eze 17:2, and in Psa 49:4 (5); Psa 78:2, in which last passages the poetical character of both is indicated. The word appears to denote a knotty, intricate saying, the solution of which demanded experience and skill: that it was obscure is evident from Num 12:8. In addition to the chidah was the מְלַיצָה, melitsah (Pro 1:6, A.V. “the interpretation,” marg. “an eloquent speech”), which occurs in Hab 2:6 in connection both with chidch and marshal. It has been variously explained as a mocking, taunting speech (Ewald); or a speech dark and involved, such as needed a melits, or interpreter (comp. Gen 42:23; 2Ch 32:31; Job 33:23; Isa 43:27); or again, as by Delitzsch (Der Prophet Htbclukmk, p. 59), a brilliant or splendid saying (“Glanz-oder Vohlrede, oratio splendida, elecyas, lumninibus ornata”). This last interpretation is based upon the usage of the word in modern Hebrew, but it certainly does not appear appropriate to the Proverbs; and the first explanation, which Ewald adopts, is as little to the point. It is better to understand it as a dark, enigmatical saying, which, like the mashal, might assume the character of sarcasm and irony, though not essential to it. SEE PARABLE.

As might be expected from the nature of the work contemplated, the proverbs before us almost exclusively bear reference to the affairs of this life; but while a future existence is not formally brought to view, yet the consciousness of such an existence runs throughout, and forms the basis on which many of the strongest, most decisive. and oft-repeated declarations are made. For example, Pro 11:7 has no meaning except on the supposition that the writer believed in a future life, where, if not here, the hope and expectation of good men should be realized. If death were, in his judgment, annihilation, it would be equally the overthrow of the expectation of the righteous as of the wicked. See also, as affording similar indication, Pro 14:32; Pro 23:17-18. SEE IMMORTALITY.

II. Canonicity. — The canonical authority of the book of Proverbs has never been called in question, except among the Jews themselves. We learn from the Talmud (Shabbath, fol. 30 b) that the school of Shammai, thus early adopting the principle of the free handling of Scripture, was led by some apparent contradictions in the book (e.g. Pro 26:4-5) to question its inspiration, and to propose to cast it out of the canon. It is  indeed certain, if we credit the Jewish tradition, that it did not at once take its place on a level with the other canonical Scriptures, but, like the Antilegomena of the New Test., remained for a time in suspense. According to Wolf (Bibl. Hebr. 2, 119) and Zunz (Gott. Vor'traag. p. 14), it was not till the period of the Persian rule that “the men of the great synagogue” admitted it to an equal rank with the other Hagiographa. In the remarkable passage of the Talmud, however, which contains the most ancient opinion of the Jews on the formation of the Old-Test. canon (Baba Bathra, p. 14, apud Westcott, Bible in the Church, p. 36), its recognition is fixed earlier: the Proverbs (“ Meshalim”) being included with Isaiah, Canticles (“ Shir Hashirim”), and Ecclesiastes (“ Koheleth”) in the memorial word Jamshak, specifying the books “written” — i.e. reduced to writing-by Hezekiah and his learned men. With the trifling exception mentioned above, its right to a place in the canon has never been questioned since its admission into it, and there is no book of Holy Scripture whose authority is more unshaken. The amount of inspiration in the book has been a matter of speculation since the days of Theodore of Mopsuestia, who believed that the wisdom contained in it was that of Solomon only, not of the Spirit of God; even as some of the rabbins found in Ecclesiastes no divine wisdom, but merely that of Solomon. Leaving such vain and impracticable distinctions, the canonical authority of the book is attested to us by the frequent use of it in the New Test. The following is a list of the principal passages:

Pro 1:16          Rom 3:10; Rom 3:15.

 Pro 3:7          Rom 12:16.

Pro 3:11-12       Heb 12:5-6; Rev 3:19.

Pro 3:34          Jam 4:6.

Pro 10:12         1Pe 4:8. \*

Pro 11:31         1Pe 4:18.

Pro 17:13         Rom 12:17; 1Th 5:15; 1Pe 3:9.

Pro 17:27         Jam 1:19.

Pro 20:9          1Jn 1:8.

Pro 20:20         Mat 15:4; Mar 7:10.

Pro 22:8 (Sept.)  2Co 9:7. \*

Pro 25:21-22            Rom 12:20. \*

Pro 26:11         2Pe 2:22.

Pro 27:1          Jam 4:13-14; Jam 4:16.

Of these only those marked with an asterisk are actual quotations; in the others there is a more or less direct allusion. SEE WISDOM PERSONIFIED.

III. Divisions. — The thirty-one chapters of the book of Proverbs may be roughly divided into four sections:

1. The hortatory introduction (1-9);

2. The first collection of “the Proverbs of Solomon,” properly so called, with its appendices (10-24);

3. The second collection, compiled by Hezekiah's scribes (25-29);

4. An appendix by different writers.

1. The first of these sections has no continuous connection, and is hardly capable of any very accurate subdivision. The separate chapters form in some instances a connected whole (e.g. 2, 5, 7, 8, 9); sometimes the connection does not extend bevond a few verses (e.g. Pro 3:1-10; Pro 3:13-26; Pro 4:14-19; Pro 6:1-11). There is little coherence between the separate chapters, and little unity beyond that of the general subject or the mode of treating it; so that if one chapter were to be removed, the organization of the whole would not be affected, and it would hardly be missed. Ewald, however, who, somewhat in defiance of the internal evidence, looks on this portion as “an original whole, thoroughly connected, and cast, as it were, at one gush,” after the general introduction (Pro 1:1-7) discovers three subdivisions, marked as well by the contents as by the position of the imperative verb at the beginning of the sections (e.g. Pro 1:8; Pro 4:1; Pro 6:20); while in the smaller divisions “mi son” stands before the verb (e.g. Pro 1:10; Pro 1:15; Pro 2:1; Pro 3:1; Pro 3:11; Pro 3:20; Pro 4:21, etc.). Ewald's subdivisions are —

(1) a general admonition to the pursuit of wisdom, not fully completed, but running off into particulars (Proverbs 1:8-3);

(2) an exhaustive enumeration of the particular points of his admonition (Pro 4:1 to Pro 6:29), until

(3) the discourse, gradually rising in power and grandeur, at last attains an almost lyrical flight (Pro 6:20-29). According to Delitzsch (in Herzog's Encyklop.) this section is divisible into fifteen separate strains —

(1) Pro 1:7-19;

(2) Pro 1:20-33;

(3) Proverbs 2,

(4) Pro 3:1-18;

(5) Pro 3:19-26;

(6) Pro 3:27-35,

(7) Pro 4:1 to Pro 5:6;

(8) Pro 5:7-23;

(9) Pro 6:1-5,

(10) Pro 6:6-11,

(11) Pro 6:12-19;

(12) Pro 6:20-35;

(13) Proverbs 7;

(14) Proverbs 8;

(15) Proverbs 9.

2. The second section (10-24) evidently contains three subdivisions —

(a) the collection of unconnected proverbs or gnomes (Pro 10:1-22; Pro 10:16);

(b) “the words of the wise” (comp. Pro 1:6; Ecc 9:7; Ecc 12:11), consisting of a more connected series of maxims, with a hortatory preface recalling the style of the first section (Pro 22:17; Pro 24:22);

(c) a shorter appendix of proverbial sayings, with the title “these also belong to the wise,” ending with a description of a sluggard (Pro 24:23-34).

3. The third section is a continuous series of gnomic sayings without any subdivision (Proverbs 25-29).

4. The fourth section, like the second, separates into three parts —

(a) “the words of Agur,” a collection of proverbial and enigmatical sayings (30),

(b) “the words of king Lemuel” (Pro 31:1-9); and

(c) a short alphabetical poem in praise of a virtuous woman (Pro 31:10-31).

IV. History of the Text. — The variations from the existing Masoretic text of the book of Proverbs presented by the versions of the Sept., the Peshito- Syriac, the ‘‘argum, and to some extent by the Vulgate, bear witness to the former existence of copies differing in many and not unimportant points from that which has become the authoritative text. The text, as preserved in these ancient versions, differs from that of our Hebrew Bibles both in excess and defect. They contain clauses, verses, and sometimes paragraphs not to be found in our extant copies, for the existence of which it is difficult to account, unless they formed part of the book which was before the translators; while other portions are wanting, for the absence of which no sufficient account can be given, except that they were not read in the ancient Hebrew MSS. they employed. The very large number of minor discrepancies, both in language and arrangement, which we meet with, all tend to confirm this view, and it well deserves consideration what influence these variations, which every student knows are not confined to this book, should have on the ordinarily received hypothesis of the integrity and purity of the present Hebrew text. This, however, is not the place for the prosecution of this investigation. We shall content ourselves with pointing out the principal points of variation.

1. To commence with the Sept., the earliest of the existing versions. The translation of this book, like that of Job, proves a more competent acquaintance with the Greek language and literature than is usual with the Alexandrine translators. The rendering is more free than literal, giving what the writer conceived to be the general spirit of the passage without strict adherence to the actual words. Bertheau remarks that the version of this book appears to have been undertaken rather with a literary than a religious object, as it was not read in the synagogues or required for their internal regulation. It is to this freedom of rendering that not a few of the apparent discrepancies are due, while there are others which are attributable to carelessness, misconception of the writer's meaning, or even possibly to arbitrary alterations on the part of the translators. In some cases, also, we find two incompatible translations fused into one — e.g. Pro 6:25; Pro 16:26; Pro 23:31. Of the majority, however, of the variations no explanation can be offered but that they represent a different original, and therefore deserve consideration for the history of the text.

In the first division (1-9) these variations are less considerable than in the second. Two verses appended to ch. 4 remove the abruptness of the close and complete the sense. To the simile of the ant (6:8), that of the bee is  added. The insertion after 8:21 seems out of place, and disturbs the continuity. In ch. 9 there are two considerable additions to the description of the wise and foolish women, which seem to complete the sense in a very desirable manner. The variations are much more considerable in the section 10-24. A large number of verses are wanting (Pro 11:4; Pro 13:6; Pro 16:1-4; Pro 18:23-24; Pro 19:1-2; Pro 20:14-19; Pro 21:5; Pro 22:6; Pro 23:23 — which comes in very awkwardly in the Hebrew text; Pro 24:8); the arrangement of others is dislocated — e.g. ch. 15 closes with Pro 24:29, Pro 24:30; Pro 24:32-33 standing at the beginning of ch. 16, while a verse very similar to Pro 24:31 is found after Pro 16:17; Pro 19:3 stands as the last verse of ch. 18; in ch. 20 Pro 19:20-22 come between Pro 19:9-10. The most extraordinary dislocation, hardly to be ascribed to anything but an error of the scribe, appears in ch. 24. After Pro 19:22 is introduced Pro 29:27, to which succeed four distichs descriptive of the wrath of a king and urging attention to the writer's words, not found in the Hebrew. We then find 30-31, 9 (i.e. the prophecy of Agur and of Lemuel), with the remainder of ch. 24 foisted in between Pro 29:14-15 of ch. 30. The remainder of ch. 31, the acrostic on a virtuous woman, stands in its right place at the end of the book. The additions in this section are also numerous and important. We find proverbs intercalated between the following verses: Pro 10:4-5; Pro 11:16-17 (by which a very imperfect antithesis in the Hebrew is rectified); Pro 12:11-14; Pro 13:9-10; Pro 13:13-14 (found in the Vulgate, Pro 14:15-16); Pro 14:22-23; Pro 15:5-6; Proverbs 18, 19, 27, 28; Proverbs 28, 29; Pro 17:6-7; Proverbs 16, 17; Pro 18:22-23; Pro 19:7-8; Pro 22:8-9 (found with slight variations 2Co 9:7); 2Co 9:9-10; 2Co 9:14-15. In the dislocated ch. 16 five or perhaps six new proverbs appear. Intercalated proverbs are also found in the section 25-29 — e.g. Pro 25:10-11; Proverbs 20, 21; Pro 26:11-12 (found also in Ecclesiastes 4:21), Pro 27:20-21; Pro 21:22; Pro 29:25-26. Besides these, a careful scrutiny will discover a large number of smaller interpolations throughout, many of which are only explanatory clauses.

To specify the words and clauses which vary from the Hebrew would carry us far beyond our limits. For these and the comparison of the two versions generally, the student may be referred to Jager, Observ. in Prov. Salom. vers. Alex., and Schleusner, Opusc. Critic. In many of these cases the Sept. has probably preserved the true reading (e.g. 10:10, b); but, on the whole, Ewald and Bertheau agree that the Masoretic text is the better and purer.

2. The Peshito-Syriac version, like the Sept., while it agrees with the Hebrew text generally, presents remarkable deviations in words and clauses, and contains whole verses of which there is no trace in the Hebrew. Some of the variations only prove a different interpretation of the text, but others are plainly referable to a difference in the text itself (e.g. Pro 7:22 sq.; Pro 15:4-15; Pro 19:20; Pro 21:16; Pro 22:21, etc.), and thus confirm the view that at the time the version was executed — i.e. anterior to the 4th century — the present Hebrew text was not universally recognised.

3. The Vulgate translation of Proverbs, hastily executed by Jerome in three days (together with Ecclesiastes and Canticles), offers largely the same phenomena as the Sept. version. Many of the additions of the Sept. are to be found in it — e.g. Pro 10:4; Pro 12:11; Pro 12:13; Pro 15:5; Pro 15:27 (comp. Pro 16:6); 16:5, etc.; and in one or two instances it has indepenennt additions — e.g. Pro 14:21; Pro 18:8. There can be little doubt that in these points it preserves an authentic record of the state of the text at a period anterior to any existing Hebrew MS.

4. We may conclude this hasty review with the Targum. That on the Proverbs is considered by Zunz (p. 64), on lingutistic grounds, to be nearly contemporaneous with those on the Psalms and Job, and is assigned by Bertheau to the latter half of the 7th century, though it is not quoted before the 12th. The version is close, and on the whole follows the original text very faithfully, though with some remarkable deviations (the following are quoted by Bertheau — Pro 7:22; Pro 10:3; Pro 14:14; Pro 25:1; Pro 25:20, etc.). Its similarity to the Peshito is too remarkable to be accidental (Pro 1:2-3; Pro 1:5-6; Pro 1:8; Pro 1:10; Pro 1:12-13; Pro 2:9-10; Pro 2:13-15; Pro 3:2-9, etc.), and is probably to be accounted for by the supposition of a subsequent recension of the text, which is very corrupt, based upon that version. See Wolf, Biblioth. Hebrews 2, 1176; Dathe, De Rat. Consens. rems. Chald. et Syr. Proverbs Salom.; Zunz, Gottesdienst. Vortrag.

V. Form and Style. —

1. The difference of style and structure between the first and second divisions is apparent on the most cursory perusal. Instead of the detached gnomes of the latter, we find a succession of hortatory addresses, varying in length and differing in subject, though for the most part on the same plan and with the same general object, in which the writer does not so much define wisdom as enlarge upon the blessings to be derived from its  possession, and the lasting misery which is the consequence of the violation of its precepts, and in the most powerful and moving language urge the young to the earnest pursuit of it as the best of all good things. Whether originally written as a proem or introduction or not, it is certainly well fitted to occupy its present place, and prepare the mind of the reader for the careful consideration of the moral and practical precepts which follow. The style is of a much higher and more dignified character than in the succeeding portions; the language is more rhetorical; it abounds in bold personifications and vivid imagery. The concluding chapters (8, 9) are cast in the grandest mould of poetry, and are surpassed in true sublimity by few portions of Holy Scripture. At the same time, when this portion is viewed as a whole, a want of artistic skill is discoverable. The style is sometimes diffuse and the repetitions wearisome. The writer returns continually on his steps, treating of the same topic again and again, without any apparent plan or regular development of the subject.

As regards the form, we find but little regularity of structure. The paragraphs consist sometimes of no more than two or three verses (Pro 1:8-9; Pro 3:11-12; Pro 6:1-19); sometimes the same thought is carried through a long succession of verses, or event an entire chapter (Pro 2:1-22; Pro 5:1-20; Pro 6:20-35; Proverbs 7, 8, 9). A very favorite arrangement is a paragraph of ten verses (Pro 1:10-19; Pro 3:1-10; Proverbs 11-20; Pro 4:10-19; Pro 8:12-21; Proverbs 22-31), a form which, if we may trust the Sept. version, existed also in the copies employed by them in Pro 4:20-27; Pro 5:6-11; and, according to the Peshito-Syriac, in Pro 4:1-9. The parallelism of members is sometimes maintained, but frequently neglected. The parallels are usually synonymous (e.g. Pro 1:8-9; Pro 1:11-12, etc.). The antithetical parallels found in Pro 3:32-35 belong to a series of gnomes which disturb the harmony of the passage, and appear scarcely in their appropriate place. It may be remarked that the name “Elohim” occurs only six times in the whole book, and thrice in this section (Pro 2:5-17; Pro 3:4). The other places are, Pro 25:2; Pro 30:5-9. Other unusual words are חָכְמוֹת, “wisdoms,” for wisdom in the abstract (Pro 1:20; Pro 9:1; found also in Pro 24:7); זָרָה“the strange woman,” which occurs repeatedly (e.g. Pro 2:16; Pro 5:3; Pro 5:20, etc., found nowhere else save in Pro 22:14; Pro 23:23); and נָכְרַיָּה, “the stranger” (Pro 2:16; Pro 7:5, etc.; found also in Pro 20:16; Pro 23:27; Pro 27:13); i.e. the foreign prostitute, then as now lurking at the dark corners of the streets, taken as the  representative of the harlot sense seducing the youlng and inexperienced from true wisdom. Ewald also notices the unusual construction of שְׁפָתִיַם, a dual fem. with a verb in the masc. plur. (Pro 5:2); while in the next verse it has properly a fern. plur., and the unusual plur. אַישַׁים(Pro 8:4).

2. In the second division, “the Proverbs of Solomon,” which form the kernel of the book, (Pro 10:1 to Pro 22:17), we find a striking similarity of structure throughout. Every verse (reckoned by Delitzsch at 375) in its normal form consists of two members, each containing three, four, or more rarely five short words. (The one exception to this rule [19:7] is probably due to the loss of a member, which is supplied by the Sept.) Every verse is independent, with no necessary connection with those that precede or follow, and, generally speaking, no attempt at arrangement. Ewald's theory of a continuous thread of connection running through this collection in its original form, and binding together the scattered sayings, has absolutely no evidence in its favor, and can only be sustained by supposing an almost total dismemberment of this portion of the book. It is true there are cases in which the same subject recurs in two or three successive verses (e.g. Pro 10:2-5; Proverbs 18-21; Pro 11:4-8; Proverbs 24-26), but these are the exceptions, and only occur, as Ewald elsewhere allows, when, from the studied brevity of the proverbial form, a thought cannot be expressed in all its fulness in a single verse. The cases in which the same characteristic word or words recur in successive proverbs are more frequent (e.g. Pro 10:6-7; Pro 8:10; Pro 11:5-6; Proverbs 10, 11, etc.). But in every instance each verse gives a single definite idea. nor do we ever meet with two verses so connected that the latter contains the reason of the counsel, or the application of the illustration given in the former.

Nearly the whole of the proverbs in the earlier part of this division are antithetical; but after the middle of ch. 15 this characteristic gradually disappears, and is almost entirely lost in the concluding chapters. A large number are synonymous (e.g. Pro 11:7; Pro 11:25; Pro 11:30; Pro 12:14; Pro 12:28; Pro 14:13; Pro 14:17; Pro 14:19, etc.), some aphoristic (e.g. Pro 11:31; Pro 13:14), especially with the comparative and מַן(e.g. Pro 12:9; Pro 15:16-17; Pro 16:8-9, etc.), or אִ כּיַ, “much more” (e.g. Pro 11:31; Pro 15:11; Pro 17:7). Others are synthetic (Pro 10:18; Pro 11:29; Pro 14:17, etc.); only two are parabolic (Pro 10:26; Pro 11:22).  The style is lower and more prosaic than in the former section. Ewald regards it as an example of the most ancient and simplest poetical style, full of primeval terseness, and bearing the visible stamp of antiquity in its language and imagery without any trace of later coloring. He remarks very justly that the proverbs in this collection are not to be looked upon as a collection of popular sayings, embodying mere prudential wisdom. but that they belong to the higher life, and are as broad in their grasp of truth as in their range of thought. The germ of many of them may have been found in popular sayings; but the skill and delicacy with which they have been fashioned into their present shape, though of the simplest kind, display the hand of a master.

Ewald remarks the following peculiar phrases as occurring in this section. “Fountain of life,” Pro 10:11; Pro 13:14; Pro 14:27; Pro 16:22 (comp. Psa 36:9 [10]): “tree of life,” Pro 3:18; Pro 11:30; Pro 13:12; Pro 15:4 : “snares of death,” Pro 13:14; Pro 14:27 (comp. Psa 18:5 [6]): and the following favorite words — מִרְפֵּא, “healin in” in various similes and applications, Pro 12:18; Pro 13:17; Pro 16:24 (but this also occurs in the former section, Pro 4:22; Pro 6:15) מְחַתָּה, “destruction,” Pro 10:14-15; Pro 10:29; Pro 13:3; Pro 14:28; Pro 18:7; Pro 21:15; and only in four other places in the whole Bible: יָפַיחִ, part from פּוּחִ, “to blow,” Pro 12:17; Pro 14:5; Pro 14:25; Pro 19:5-9 (comp. Pro 6:19; Psa 12:6; Psa 27:11): the unfrequent roots סֶלֵ, “perverseness,” Pro 11:3; Pro 15:4, and the verb סַלֵּ, “to pervert,” “destroy,” Pro 13:6; Pro 19:3; Pro 21:12; Pro 22:12 : the phrase לאֹ יַנָּקֶה, “shall not go unpunished,” Pro 11:21; Pro 16:5; Pro 17:5 (comp. Pro 28:20; Pro 6:29): רַדֵּ, “he that pursueth,” Pro 11:19; Pro 12:11; Pro 13:21; Pro 15:9; Pro 19:7 (comp. Pro 28:19), and nowhere else. Ewald instances also as archaic phrases not met with elsewhere, עִד אִרְגַּיעָה, “but for a moment,” Pro 12:19 : יָד לְיָד, “hand join in hand,” Pro 11:21; Pro 16:5 : הַתְגִּלִּע, “‘meddled with,” Pro 17:14; Pro 18:1; Pro 20:3 : נַרְגָּן, “whisperer,” “talebearer,” Pro 16:28; Pro 18:8 (comp. Pro 26:20-22). The word יֵשׁ, “there is,” though frequent elsewhere, scarcely occurs in Proverbs, save in this section, Pro 11:24; Pro 12:18; Pro 13:7; Pro 13:23; Pro 14:12, etc.

3. With Pro 22:17, “the words of the wise” (comp. Pro 1:6), we are carried back to the style and language of the proem (ch. 1-9), of which we are also reminded by the continued address in the second  person singular, and the use of “my son.” There is, however, a difference in the phraseology and language; and, as Maurer remarks, the diction is not unfrequently rugged and awkward, and somewhat labored. Parallelism is neglected. The moral precepts are longer than those of ch. 10-22, but not so diffuse as those of the first section. We find examples of the distich, Pro 22:28; Pro 23:9; Pro 24:7-10 : the tristich, Pro 22:29; Pro 24:29 : but the tetrastich is the most frequent, the favorite form being that in which the second member gives the ground of the first, Pro 22:22-23; Proverbs 24, 25; Proverbs 26, 27, etc. We also find proverbs of five members, Pro 23:4-5; Pro 24:3-4 : several of six, Pro 23:1-3; Pro 23:12-14; Pro 23:19-21; Pro 24:11-12 : and one of seven, Pro 28:6-8. We have a longer strain, Pro 23:29-35, against drunkenness.

4. The short appendix, Pro 24:23-34, comprising more “words of the wise,” can hardly be distinguished in style or form from the preceding. It closes with a “proverb-lay” of five verses on the evils of sloth.

5. The second collection of “the Proverbs of Solomon” (ch. 25-29), transcribed (הֶעְתַּיקוּ, Sept. ἐξεγράψαντο, Aq. μετῆραν; Gr. Ven. μετήνεγκαν; comp. Pusey, Daniel, p. 322 note) by the scribes of Hezekiah, closely resembles the former one. They are, according to Pusey, “identical in language.” It has, however, some very decided points of difference. The “parabolic” proverb is much more frequent than the “antithetical,” the two members of the comparison being sometimes set side by side without any connecting link (e.g. Pro 25:12-13), which is in other cases given merely by ו, “and,” or כֵּן, “so” (Pro 26:1-2; Pro 26:18-19; Pro 27:8, etc.). The parallelism is sometimes strict, sometimes lax and free. There is a want of the sententious brevity of the former collection, and the construction is looser and weaker. The proverbs are not always completed in a single verse (Pro 25:6-7; Pro 25:9-10; Pro 25:21-22; Pro 26:18-19); and more frequently than in the former section we have series of proverbs with an internal connection of subject (Pro 26:23-25; Pro 27:15-16; Pro 27:23-27), and others in which the same key-word recurs (Pro 25:8-10; Pro 26:3-12; Proverbs 13-16). This is not foumnd so often after Pro 27:5; but a close examination of the text suggests the idea that this may be due to a disturbance of the original order (comp. Pro 27:7; Pro 27:9; Pro 28:4; Pro 28:7; Pro 28:9; Pro 29:8; Pro 29:10, etc.). Ewald discovers a want of the figurative expressions of the earlier collection, and a difference of language and phraseology, while Rosenmüller remarks that the meaning of the proverbs  is more obscure and enigmatical. The greater part of them are moral precepts. “The earlier collection may be called ‘a book for youth;' this ‘a book for the people'“ (Delitzsch); “the wisdom of Solomon in the days of Hezekiah” (Stier).

6. The three supplemental writings with which the book closes (ch. 30, 31) are separated from the other portions and from one another no less by style and form than by authorship. Ewald somewhat arbitrarily divides ch. 30 after Pro 29:14 (a division, however, sanctioned by the Sept.), and thinks it not improbable that ch. 30 and Pro 31:1-9 are from the same pen. He also regards the opening verses of ch. 30 as a dialogue, Pro 31:2-4 being the words of an ignorant disciple of Agur, to which the teacher replies. The difference between the enigmatical savings of Agur (which find a counterpart in the collections of Oriental proverbs) and the simple admonitions of Lemuel's mother is very great if we assign them to one author. In ch. 30 we have, in Ewall's words, instead of moral aphorisms, a succession of elegant little pictures illustrative of moral truths, evidencing a decay of creative power, the skill of the author being applied to a novel and( striking presentation of an old truth. The ancient terse proverbial form is entirely lost sight of, and the style rises to a height and dignity warranting the use of the term מִשָּׂא(comp. Isa 13:1; Hab 1:1, etc.) applied to both. In “the words of king Lemuel” we find much greater regularity. The parallelism is synonymous, and is maintained throughout. The alphabetical ode in praise of a virtuous woman — “a golden A B C for women” (Doderlein) — has all its verses of about the same compass. The parallelism is very similar to that of the Psalms, especially those in which the same alphabetical arrangement is found.

VI. Authorship and Date. — On these points the most various opinions have been entertained, from that of the rabbins and the earlier school of commentators, with whom some modern writers (e.g. Keil) agree, who attribute the whole book to Solomon (even Pro 30:31 are assigned to him by Rashi and his school), to those of Hitzig and other representatives of the advanced critical school, who, however widely at variance with one another, agree in reducing to a minimum the wise king of Israel's share in the book which from the remotest antiquity has borne his name. In the face of such wide discrepancies, where the same data lead careful investigators (e.g. Ewald and Hitzig) to exactly opposite conclusions, a satisfactory decision of the question of authorship and date  is hardly to be hoped for. It may rather be doubted whether the evidence at present before us is such as to admit of an absolute determination of the question at issue. Where so much indefiniteness exists, all we can do is to balance probabilities and to abstain from dogmatic decisions.

The evidence in favor of a composite origin of the book appears, we must confess, irresistible. No unprejudiced person, we think, accustomed to the consideration of such questions, could read the book for the first time, even in English, without seeing in it the traces of several different authors, or at least editors. Irrespective of the two concluding chapters, the express reference to other sages (חֲכָמַים, in Pro 22:17; Pro 24:23; comp. Pro 1:6) indicates a diversity of authorship, while the difference of style between various divisions of the work strengthens the hypothesis. Indeed, a careful observer will find at the very outset an indication of the composite character of the book in the introductory verses which profess to give the contents and character (Pro 1:1-7). These prepare us to find in it, not merely “proverbs” and “eloquent speeches” (margin, A.V.: “interpretation”), but also such “words of the wise” as those we have just referred to, and “dark sayings” like those of Agur.

Are we, then, to discard the title, “the Proverbs of Solomon,” and to consider that the designation has been given to the book erroneously? To us this appears rash in the extreme. We know from historical sources that Solomon was the author of a very large number of proverbs; and nothing but that restlessness of speculation which discards old beliefs simply. as it would seem, because they are old, and seeks to unsettle all that hias hitherto been held certain, can discover any sufficient reason for questioning that Solomon was the composer of the greater part of those contained in our present book, especially in the sections Pro 10:1 to Pro 22:16; Proverbs 25-29. However much these collections may have been modified in successive redactions, though too much has probably been conceded to this hypothesis, of which there is no definite trace, and by which a work may be made to assume any form that may suit the theory to be supported, we have no sufficient reason for doubting that Solomon was the originator of the peculiar style of poetry in which they are composed, and that, even if they are not all to be referred to him, the mass are his, and that they are all pervaded with his spirit, and may be assigned to his epoch. Even those attributed to “the ancients” may have been found by Solomon already floating in a semi-gnomic form, and recast by him in a more distinctly proverbial dress. Eichhorn finds in them no trace of language or thought  subsequent to the time of Solomon. Even Ewald, who insists most on the collection as we have it having suffered from abbreviations, transpositions, and unauthorized additions, remarks that the proverbs all breathe the happy peace and growing civilization of Solomon's age; nor is there any epoch either earlier or later to which we could preferably assign them.

The proverbs in the later collection (ch. 25-29), though they present some diversities, do not differ so essentially from the earlier ones as to give any sufficient grounds for questioning the accuracy of the superscription (Pro 25:1). The title itself informs us that the compilation was not made till four centuries after Solomon, and the differences are not greater than might be looked for in sayings that had been so long floating about among the common people, and thereby subjected to disfigurement and change. The indications of an altered state of society and a decrease of confidence in the rulers, in which Ewald discovers such unmistakable proofs of a later date, are hardly so evident to others as to himself. We know too little of the internal economy of Solomon's reign to enable us to pronounce authoritatively that such and such expressions are inconsistent with the state of the people and tone of thought at that period.

The objection brought by Eichhorn and others against assigning the proverbs in the two collections to Solomon, that the genius of no one man, not even one as divinely gifted with wisdom as Solomon, is sufficient for the production of so large a number, is puerile in the extreme. Those we possess are but a portion of the three thousand ascribed to him (1Ki 4:32), and scarcely give twenty for each of the forty years of his reign.

The general didactic tone of the book is asserted to be more consistent with the character of a prophet or priest than that of a king (Davidson). To this it is replied that this is true of kings in general. but not of such a king as Solomon, to whom God gave a wise and understanding heart, whose proverbs are eminently didactic, and who has in 1 Kings 8 discoursed on the divine economy towards mall in a way that no prophet or priest could well surpass. The praises of monogamy, and the strict illjunctions against adultery, are urged by Bertholdt as reasons why Solomon, a polygamist himself, and Bathsheba's son, could not be the author of this section. It is, however, a remarkable feature of the Old Test. in general, and not peculiar to this place, that polygamy, however generally practiced, is never praised; that invariably where the married state is spoken of in terms of praise it is the union of one man to one woman that is held up to  honor. Beside the force of this objection is considerably modified by the reflection that precepts are here given for the mass of men, with whom monogamy is the general rule, though polygamy may be common among the richer classes (Wilkinson's Egypt, 2, 62); and also that the contrast here drawn (Pro 5:18, etc.) is not between monogamy and polygamy, but between the marriage tie and adulterous connection. As to the supposition that the repeated warnings against adultery could not come from one whose own mother fell into that sin, no great weight can be attached to it; for a moral and religious teacher must disregard considerations which would influence other men. The allusions to deeds of violence (Pro 1:11-19; Pro 2:12, etc.) are supposed by Ewald to indicate a state of confusion inconsistent with that state of peace and social security which marked the reign of Solomon (1Ki 4:25). To this it is replied that a condition of great private wealth, such as was the condition of Solomon's times, always tempts needy and unprincipled men to acts of unlawful violence; and that nothing bevond crimes which now are committed in the most civilized and best-regulated countries are referred to in the passages in question. Besides, Judaea always afforded in its caverns and wildernesses peculiar facilities for robbers (Jdg 6:2; 1Sa 24:1). From a supposed degeneracy of style, Ewald attributes this section to the earlier part of the 7th century B.C. But other critics do not see this. Davidson thinks it indicates a flourishing state of Hebrew literature, and refers it probably to the 9th century B.C., an opinion in which he coincides with Hitzig. The grounds on which Ewald relies for his alleged degeneracy of style seem weak. Thus, he asserts that the plural ishim (Pro 8:4) is so unusual as to indicate a very late date. It is certainly very unusual, for it occurs only three times (Furst). From these, however, we cannot argue as to the (late, as one of them is in Isaiah, another in Psa 141:3, attributed to David, and the third in the passage above referred to.

Similar and equally futile objections have been based, by Bertholdt and others, on the familiarity displayed in the proverbs with circumstances and conditions in life with which it is supposed that Solomon as a king could have had no experimental acquaintance. For example, it is maintained that Pro 10:5; Pro 12:10-11; Pro 14:4; Pro 20:4, must have been written by a landowner or husbandman: Pro 10:15, by a poor man: Pro 11:14; Pro 14:19, by a citizen of a well-ordered state: Pro 11:26, by a tradesman: Pro 12:4, by one who was not a polygamist: Pro 14:1; Pro 15:25; Pro 16:1; Pro 17:2; Pro 19:13-14; Pro 20:10; Pro 20:14; Pro 20:23,  by an ordinary citizen: Pro 25:2-7, not by a king, but by one who had lived some time at a court: Pro 27:11, by a teacher of youth: Pro 17:23-27, by a sage who lived a nomadic life: Pro 28:16, by one free from those errors which weakened Solomon's throne, and robbed his son of his kingdom. It is needless to point out the weakness of these fancied arguments which would affect no one who had not a theory of his own to support. They are akin to those which have been used with as little success to prove that no one man could have written the plays of Shakespeare, and they display the most marvellous ignorance of that many-sidedness and keenness of perception and insight which are characteristic of the highly gifted among mankind.

As little weight is to be assigned to the objections drawn from the repetitions. It is true that we find the same idea, and even the same words, recurring not only in the two collections (e.g. Pro 21:9; Pro 25:24; Pro 18:8; Pro 26:22; Pro 22:3; Pro 27:12; Pro 22:13; Pro 26:13; Pro 19:24; Pro 26:15; Pro 19:1; Pro 28:6), but in the same collection (e.g. Pro 14:12; Pro 16:25; Pro 10:1; Pro 15:20; Pro 16:2; Pro 21:2; Pro 10:2; Pro 11:4; Pro 13:14; Pro 14:27; Pro 26:12; Pro 29:20). This latter is, however, no more. as Umbreit remarks, than is natural in such a compilation, in the formation of which one is very apt to forget what had already been set down; while the former class of repetitions is easily to be accounted fir by the anxiety of the collectors to lose nothing which had the stamp of Solomon's authorship, even though the same idea had already been expressed in the earlier collection; and it goes far to confirm the view that Solomon was the composer of the whole.

The internal evidence — derived from language, construction, ideas, historic background, and the like — varies with every successive critic, and is entirely inadequate to varrant any decisive verdict. Its precariousness is proved by the opposite results to which the same data lead various commentators. Keil maintains that every part of' the book, with the exception of the last two chapters, corresponds to the epoch of Solomon, and that only. Eichhorn agrees with this to a certain extent, but limits the correspondence to ch. 1-24; while Ewald, Hitzig, and Bertheau, and other minor critics, arrive at conclusions expressed with equal confidence and at variance with these and with one another. There is, however, one evidence which speaks strongly in favor of an early date — the entire absence of all reference to idolatry. The form of religion appearing throughout is purely Jehovistic (as we have noticed above, Elohim occurs only four times in the  body of the work), and false gods and foreign faiths are not even referred to.

The above remarks refer chiefly to the collection of proverbs properly so called, which we have no Difficulty in ascribing, on the whole, to Solomon as their ultimate author. We may, if we choose, suppose that the men of Hezekiah made a collection of unwritten proverbs current among the people, and by them supposed, truly or not, to have come down from Solomon; but the men of Hezekiah, or whoever wrote the superscription of 25:1, declare those they put forth to have been copied from written records. Assuming this to be the correct view, the difference between these proverbs and those which went before is, that whereas in Solomon's time the latter were arranged as we have them, the former were in Hezekiah's time selected from more ancient written records and added to the existing collection. It gives us the idea, which is itself an extremely probable one, that voluminous records were made in Solomon's time of the wise king's sayings, either by himself or by scribes. This idea derives considerable confirmation from the notice in 1Ki 4:30-34, where we are told of the accurate account taken of his compositions and sayings, and even of the precise number of his proverbs and songs. We are led to suppose, then, that in Solomon's time a selection (Pro 10:1 to Pro 22:16) was made bv himself, or under his immediate supervision, while in Hezekiah's time a further selection was made, and an exact transcript taken. A comparison of the proverbs in these two collections lends strong confirmation to this view, In selecting or arranging a collection in Solomon's time, and under his inspection, the choice would naturally fall upon the most perfect, and as alterations might he freely made by their actual author, these would tend to bring them into a still more finished form. Accordingly, we find in the more ancient collection a certain tastefulness and polish which the others do not possess. In the former each verse contains its own perfect sense, and this usually comprised in a certain number of words, varying from seven to nine, beyond which they very rarely extend. In the latter, while the sense is generally contained in one verse, it not unfrequently runs through two or more verses. Examples from these might easily be produced as concise and perfect in form as the others (e.g. Pro 25:2-3; Pro 25:14); but very commonly the sense is brought out in a much more diffuse manner (e.g. Pro 25:6-7; Pro 25:9-10; Pro 25:21-22; Pro 26:18; Pro 26:20; Pro 27:15-16; Pro 27:23-27). In the individual verses also we find occasionally a far greater number of words than are ever admitted into those of the older collection (e.g. Pro 25:7; Pro 25:20); and the parallelism, which never fails in the verses of the earlier, is often wanting in those of the later division (Pro 25:8; Pro 25:21-22; Pro 26:10; Pro 27:1). This agrees with the idea which we think warranted by a comparison of Pro 25:1 with 1Ki 4:32-33, that the proverbs in this collection are probably much as they fell from Solomon's lips, and were first committed to writing by himself or others under him; and that while the former collection received his own final corrections, the men of Hezekiah simply copied from the text before them, but did not venture upon any alteration in the form.

The case is somewhat different with regard to the introductory chapters (1- 9), and there is more ground for the diversity of opinion as to their date and authorship. It is certainly quite possible that the whole or a considerable portion of this section may have been written by Solomon. The differences of style, of which Ewald makes much, are, as Bertheau has shown, somewhat exaggerated by him, and are not perhaps greater than may be accounted for by the different nature of the compositions. The terse simplicity of a proverb would be out of place in a series of hortatory addresses such as those which characterize this section. Ewald dwells with emphasis on the internal evidence of a late date afforded by the state of society, and the tone of feeling as portrayed here. But we repeat our former remark, that we know too little of the internal history of Judaea at this time to allow us to speak with so much confidence on these points, and express our conviction that the conclusions drawn by Ewald are not warranted by the premises. The imagery all points to a large and profligate city, such as Jerusalem may well have become during the middle of Solomon's prosperous reign; and the vivid representation of the habits of the foreign prostitutes and lawless freebooters who roamed its streets is hardly more than could have been attained by one who, lilke Harun Alraschid, was fond of laying aside his kingly state and visiting his city in disguise.

It is evident, from what we have remarked in a former section, that we regard the proem (ch. 1-9) in its present form as a composite work, though very possibly proceeding from one pen. The similarity of style, subject, and treatment, is strongly in favor of unity of authorship, while the internal evidence favors the view that it is compiled of various unconnected members, collected and arranged subsequently to the time of their composition. The date of this compilation it is impossible to fix. The evidence on this point is faint and untrustworthy, and has led different  investigators to very opposite conclusions. Ewald places it in the 7th, Hitzig in the 9th century B.C., while Keil, as we have seen, ascribes it to the time of Solomon. The resemblance that may be traced in this portion of the work to the spirit and teaching of the book of Job, and the recurrence of some of the words arid images found there, is employed both by Hitzig and Ewald to aid in determining the date of this section (comp. Job 15:7 with Pro 8:25; Job 21:17, Pro 13:9; Job 28:18, Pro 8:16; Job 5:17, Pro 3:11; see Pusey, Daniel, p. 323, note 7). But as there is no unanimity as to the date of the composition of Job, little help is to be expected from this source, nor can we be surprised at the diversity of opinion among those who have employed it: Ewald maintaining that the writer of Proverbs had read and made use of Job: Hitzig, on the contrary, believing that the former is the earlier work, and that the author of Job borrowed from Proverbs. The adoption of such expedients proves most forcibly the cormplete want of any decisive testimony which will enable us to arrive at any trustworthy conclusion as to the date of this section. In the midst of this uncertainty, the above solution is as probable as any other —namely, that it is due to Solomon's authorship out of materials existing at his time.

The similarity in style between 1-9 and the appendix to the first collection of proverbs (Pro 22:17-24) appears to favor the view that this supplement is due to the same person by whom the proem was prefixed to the book. Ewald enumerates several reasons for ascribing the two to the same writer (p. 42), but finally decides against the unity of authorship. The proverbs themselves, designated as “words of the wise,” are evidently distinguished from those Qf Solomon, and are probably to be regarded as the adages of other sages, which the compiler of the work thought too valuable to be lost, and therefore appended to his larger collection. The short supplement (Pro 24:23-34) is accounted for by Umbreit on the supposition that the compiler had laid aside his work for a time, and took it up again on the discovery of fresh sayings worthy of preservation. He renders לְחֲבָמַים, “for,” not “of the wise,” and regards them as directed to the compiler's scholars. Ewald, Bertheau, Delitzsch, etc., defend the received translation.

It only remains for us to speak of the threefold supplement (30, 31), with regard to the authorship and date of which again nothing can be determined. It would be hardly profitable to discus the marvellous fabric of fanciful history and biography which has been evolved from the scantiest  materials by Hitzig, Bunsen, and Bertheau. Those who desire it may refer to their works to see the grounds on which “Massa” (A.V. “the prophecy”) is identified with a district in Arabia (Gen 10:30; Gen 25:14; 1Ch 1:30) of which Lemuel was king, and Agur with a descendant of the Simeonites, who in the reign of Hezekiah drove out the Amalekites from Mount Seir (1Ch 4:42); or, again, on which it is sought to prove that Agur and Lemuel were brothers, sons of the reigning queen of Massa. We would rather commend to our reader Eichhorn's sensible words that “Agur should remain Agur, and belong to the wise men of the old world of whom history gives us no further information,” and with him deprecate “spinning a long thread of tedious conjectures alout a name, which do not advance us an inch in our insight into the literature of the old world, or any profitable learning.” As little to the purpose is the fancv of Doderlein that the opening part of ch. 30 is a dialogue that Ithiel is a heathen; Agur a much valued servant of Ithiel, to whom, as his master, his praver (Pro 5:7-9) is addressed. Manv are content with saying that Agur was an unknown Hebrew sage, the teacher of Ithiel and Ucal — names from which, also, many unprofitable speculations have been built — and that he lived subsequently to the reign of Hezekiah. Still more probable do we regard the view which identifies him with Solomon himself under a fanciful name. SEE AGUR; SEE MASSA.

Lemuel — “to God,” “devoted to God,” after the analogy of לָאֵל, Num 3:24 (Pusey) — may certainly be regarded as a figurative name descriptive of an ideal king, “a monarch as he should be” (Ewald; Eichhorn; comp. Pusey, Lect. on Daniel, p. 13 note 1, p. 323, note 5). SEE LEMUEL

The alphabetical lay which concludes the whole has usually been thought to belong to the latest period of Hebrew poetry, and hardly to be placed higher than the 7th century. Its style and language seem to distinguish it from the words of Lemuel, with which it has sometimes been confounded; but we are again warned against the precariousness of such grounds of argument as to authorship.

The results of our inquiry may be thus summed up. The nucleus of the book is the larger collection of proverbs (Pro 10:1 to Pro 22:16). These may safely be regarded as really what they profess to be, “the proverbs of Solomon.” Whether they were arranged as we now have them and published by him, there is not sufficient evidence to determine. It is  probable, however, that the collection was either contemporaneous with or not long subsequent to him. The greater part of the hortatory introduction (1-9) may also be, with great probability, ascribed originally to Solomon, though we incline to the belief that its present form is due to a later compiler, who collected the admonitions of the wise king, and prefixed them to his book of proverbs. The same author also appears to have added the appendix (Pro 22:17; Pro 24:22), containing proverbs of which Solomon was not the proper author. but perhaps only the earliest collector, and after this from similar sources were supplied the few supplementary sayings (Pro 24:23-34). The time when this was done cannot be fixed, but there are cogent arguments in favor of a latate date. The second collection, as its name declares, was formed by the scribes of Hezekiah, cir. B.C. 725. The last two chapters contain compositions of the dates and authors of which nothing certain can now be known. They, too, may have been in some important sense due to Solomon, but were probably inserted by a later editor.

It will not be worth while to enumerate the many and widely varying theories of recent critics as to the dates of the composition of the different parts of this book, and the time when it assumed its present form. One or two of the most characteristic may be specified. Suffice it to say that Ewald would place the publication of Pro 10:1 to Pro 22:16 about two centuries after Solomon, and 1-9 in the first half of the 7th century. Not much later the second collection of proverbs (25-29) was added, the sections Pro 22:17-24 being due to the same compiler. Hitzig, on the contrary, views 1- 9 as the earliest part of the book; 10-22, 16 and Pro 28:17-28 being added about B.C. 750. Twenty-five years later Hezekiah's collection followed; the gaps being filled up and the volume completed by some unknown compiler at a later period. The theory of Delitzsch (Herzog, Encyklop., s.v. Spruche) is marked by more calm sense, but even this is in parts not a little fanciful or conjectural. Rightly regarding 10-22. 16 as the kernel of the book, and mainly composed by Solomon, he divides the whole into two portions —

(1) 1-24, 22 put forth in the time of Jehoshaphat; the introduction (1-9) and appendix (Pro 22:16-24; Pro 22:22) being written by the compiler, whom he regards as “a highly gifted didactic poet, and an instrument of the spirit of revelation;” and

(2) Pro 24:23-31, published in the reign of Hezekiah; the introductory and closing portions (Pro 24:23-34; Pro 30:31) being set on either side of the collection of Soiomon's proverbs to serve as a kind of foil.

The two periods which are generally selected in opposition to the above views of the Solomonic authorship for the composition of various parts of the book are the reign of Hezekiah and the times subsequent to the captivitv. Neither of these periods seems to suit the general character of Proverbs at all so well as the reign of Solomon. Hezekiah found his kingdom in great domestic miserv-immersed in idolatry and subject to foreign rule. At home his pre-eminent character was that of a social and religious reformer, struggling against the sins and evils of his times; abroad the most active period of his reign was distinguished by a series of wars, during some of which his kingdom was reduced to the verge of ruin, the whole land overrun by hostile armies, its fenced cities taken, and the king forced to submission. The terror of an Assyrian invasion also hung over the land for years. The later period of his reign, indeed, was peaceful; but the evils of preceding reigns were far from being eradicated, and he had before him the certain prospect, conveyed by prophecy, of the utter prostration of his kingdom. His chief works seem to have been the making a pool and conduit to bring water to Jerusalem. On his death Judah relapsed into idolatry. The times subsequent to the captivity were marked by equally strong characteristics, and chiefly of a mournful kind — a feeble, struggling, and too often languid and depressed remnant, striving amid many difficulties to maintain their ground and bear up amid manifold discouragements. With neither of these periods does the general character of Proverbs agree. Royalty marks it throughout, sharply distinguishing it from any period subsequent to the captivity; as by other marked features it bears the impress of a time different from Hezekiah's. Its warnings are not against the public sins which disgraced that period, nor are its consolations suited to the public trials which were threatening to bring both king and kingdom to the ground. Its pointed allusions to a powerful monarchy, a numerous and wealthy people, and such sins as readily spring up in a time of plenty; its fine linens of Egypt, its high places thronged, its roads covered with travellers, its gates and cities crowded and rejoicing, its precious stones and fine gold and architectural illustrations, its people living beneath the eye of their monarch and dependent on his good-will, all seem to mark a reign when an absolute monarch ruled over a great and  wealthy people, who lived at ease at home, and had no dreaded'eenemy io their borders; who traded to distant lands and brought their products into common use; when the worship of Jehovah prevailed through the landl, and men had leisure for learningl; when wisdom sat on the throne, personified in Solomon, and the evils which must ever exist while man is a fallen being were evils inseparable from any condition of humanity, and especially from one abounding with the elements of material prosperity. SEE SOLOMON.

VII. Commentaries. — The following are the special exegetical helps on the whole book; a few of the most important of them are designated by an asterisk — Origen, Commentarii (in Opp. vol. 3); also Scholia (in Bibl. Patr. Gallandii, vol. xiv); Basil, Commentarii (in Opp. II. i); Bede, Expositio (in Opp. vol. iv; also in Works, vol. ix); Honorius, Commentarius (in Opp. p. 1140); Ralbag [Levi ben-Gershon], פֵּרוּשׁ[with Ben-Meira's commentary], by Baholes (Leiria, 1492, fol.; afterwards in the Rab. Bibles; also [with Aben-Ezra, etc.] in Latin by Ghiggheo, Amst. 1638, 4to); Arama, יִד אִבְשָׁלוֹם(Constantinop. s.a. 4to; with notes by Berlin, Leips. 1859, 8vo); Imm. ben-Salomo, פֵּרוּשׁ[with Kimchi on Psalm] (Naples, 1486. fol.); Shalom ben-Abraham, קִב וְנָקַי(Salonica, 1522, fol.; also in Frankfurter's Bible); Melancthon, Explicatio (Hag. 1525, and elsewhere later, 8vo); Munster, Adnotatione, (Basil. 1525, 8vo); Jos. ibn-Jachja, פֵּרוּשׁ[with Job, etc.] (Bologna, 1538, fol.; also in Frankfurter's Bible); Cajetan [Rom. Cath.], Enarratio (Lugd. 1545, fol.); Fobian, תִּרְגּים(Constantinop. 1548, 4to); Arboreus [Rom. Cath.], Commnentarius (Par. 1549, fol.); Malvenda [Rom. Cath.], Exrplicatio (in Opp. Lugd. 1550, fol.); Bayne, Commentarii (Par. 1555, fol.; also in the Critici Sacri, vol. iii); Lavater, Commentarii (Tigur. 1562, 4to, 1565, 1572, 1586, fol.); Strigel, Scholia (Lips. 1565, Neost. 1571, 8vo); Jansenius [Rom. Cath.], Adnotationes (Lovan. 1568. 8vo, and elsewhere later, with Psalm, etc.) Sidonius [Rom. Cath.], Commentarii (Mog. 1570, fol.); Mercer, Commentarii (Genev. 1573, fol.; also [with Job] Amst. 1651, fol.); Cope, Exposition (transl. by Outrerd, Lond. 1580,4to); aard. ben-Jakob, מַשְׁלֵי(Cracow, 1582, 4to); Is. ben-Miose, תָּמַים יִחְדָּיר(Lublin, 1592, 4to); Drabit, Auslequngq (Erf. 1595, 8vo); Musselt Commentaire (Lond. 1596, 8vo); Wilcocks, Commentary (in Works); Alspach, רֹב פְּנַינַים(Ven. 1601, 4to; and later elsewhere, fol.); Cleaver, Explanation (Lond. 1608, 1615, 4to); Dod, Exposition [on ch. ix-xvii] (Lond, 1609, 4to); Agell  [Rom. Cath.], Commentarius (Par. 1611, fol.); Cartwright, Commnentarii (L. B. 1617, anli later elsewhere, 4to); Imninuts, Exipositio (Par. 1619, 2 vols. fol.); De Salazar [Rom. Cath.], Expositio (ibid. 1619-21, and elsewhere later, 2 vols. fol.); Jizchaki, פֵּרוּשׁ[with Aben-Ezra's and others] (in Latin by Ghiggheo, Mail. 1620, 4to; by Breithaupt, Gotha, 1714. 4to); Duran, חֵשֶׁק שְׁלֹמֹה(Ven. 1623, 4to); Egard, Christenthum, etc. [on ch. i- ix] (Lub. 1624, 8vo); Guillebert [Rom. Cath.], Paraphrasis (Par. 1626, 1637, 8vo); A Lapide, Commentarius (Antw. 1635, fol.); Jermin, Commentary (Lond. 1638, fol.); Bohll, Commentarius (Rost. 1640, 4to); Maldonatus [Rom. Cath.], Commentarius [includ. Psalm, etc.] (Par. 1643, fol.); Geier, Curac (Lips. 1653 and later, 4to); Gorse [Rom. Cath.], Explication (Par. 1654, 12mo); Taylor, Exposition [on ch. iix] (Lond. 1655-57, 2 vols. 4to); Leigh, Annotations [includ. Job, etc.] (ibid. 1657, fol.); Deckey, Handbuch (Magdeb. 1667, 4to); Anon. [Rom. Cath.], Recueil [patristic] (Par. 1677, 1704, 8vo; also in Germ., Chemn. 1707. 12mo; Dresd. 1720, 8vo); David ben-Mose, דָּוַד מָגֵּן(Amst. 1683, 4to); Bossuet [Rom. Cath.], Notac [includ. Ecclesiastes, etc.] (Par. 1693. 8x-o; also in (Euvres, vol. xxi); Oier, Verklacaring [on ch. i-ix] (Amst. 1698, 4to); Anon. [Rom. Cath.], Analyse [with Ecclesiastes] (Par. 1702, 12mo); )u iHamel [Rom. Cath.], Adnotattiones (ibid. 1703, 12mo); Goldschmidt, אִבְנֵי צֶדֶק(Wilmersd. 1714, 8vo); also מַשְׁלֵי(F. a. Mi. 1713, 12mo); Pinto, כֶּסֶ צָרוּ(Amst. 1714, 1735, 8vo); C. B. Alichaelis, Adnotationes (Hal. 1720, 4to; also in Comment. in Hagiog. vol. i); Meiri, פֵּרוּשׁ(first in Frankfurter's Bible, Amst. 1724-27; separately, Fiirth, 1844, 8vo); Wolle, Auslegung (Leips. 1729, 8vo); Is. ben-Elija, מַשְׁלֵי(Wandsb. 1731, 8vo); Kortum, Auflosung (Goriz 1735, 4to); Grey, Notes (Lond. 1738, 8vo); Hansen, Betrachtungen (Lib. 1746, 4to); \*Schultens, Conmentarius (L. B. 1748, 4to; abridged, with additions by Vogel and Seller, Hal. 1768, 8vo); Gavison, עֹמֶר הִשַּׁכֵּחָה(Legh. 1752, 4to); Lsnser, Observationes (Lips. 1761, 4to; also in Velth. and Kuinil's Commentt. ii, 270); De Witt, Dissertationes (Amst. 1762, 8vo); Dathe, Prolusio (Lips. 1764, 8vo; Lond. 1838, 18mo; also in Opitsc. Lips. 1796); Judetnes, שְׁנוֹת חִיַּים[with Ecclesiastes] (Amst. 1765, 4to); Vogel, U.,nschreibung (Leips. 1767, 8vo); Hirt, Eklarung (Jen. 1768, 4to); Durel, Remarks [includ. Job, etc.] (Oxf. 1772, 4to); Hunt, Observations (ibid. 177 5,4to); Schnurrer, Observationes (Tiibing. 1776, 4to; also in Disserf. Goth. 1790); Bode, Versio [includ. Ecclesiastes and Cant.] (Helmst. 1777, 4to; also in Germ.,  Quedlinb. 1791, 8vo); Moldenhauer, Erlaut. [with Ecclesiastes and Cant.] (ibid. 1777, 4to); J. D. Michaelis, Anmerk. (G(tt. 1778, 8vo; also in Bibliothek, 7:168); Doderlein, Anmerk. (Altd. 1778 and later, 4to); also his Scholia [on poet. books] (Hal. 1779, 4to); Reiske, Conjecturc [with Job] (Lips. 1779, 8vo); Zinck, Commentarius [includ. other books] (Augsb. 1780, 4to); Arnold, Anmerk. (Frckft. and Leips. 1781, 8vo); Schleusner, Collatio (Lips. 1782, 4to); also Commentarius (ibid. 1790-94, 4to); Troschel, Salomon's Moral (Berl. 1782, 8vo); Struensee, Erlaut. [includ. Psalm] (Hal. 1783, 8vo) Schoinhdeder, Erklar. (from the Danish by Wolff, Flensb. 1784, 8vo); De Vilioisin, Versio [from the Veneto-Greek, includ. other books] (Argent. 1784, 8vo); also Dahler's Animadversiones [on the same] (ibid. 1788, 8vo); Knis, De Usu Proverbs (Giess. 1787, 4to); Hodgson, Notes (Oxf. 1788, 4to); Juger, Observationes [on the Sept.] (Meld. and Lips. 1788, 8vo); Euchel, תִּרְגּוּם(Berl. 1789, and later elsewhere, 8vo); Reichard, Smrklar. (Hal. 1790, 8vo); Ziegler, Erlalt. (Leips. 1791, 8vo); reviewed by Hasse (in the latter's Biblioth., Regensb. 1793, No. 5); Castalio, Notce (Havn. 1793, 8vo); Hensler, Erlaut. [includ. 1 Samuel] (Hamb. and Kiel, 1795, 8vo); Hammond, Paraphrase [on ch. i- ix] (in Works, vol. iv); Wilna, פֵּרוּשׁ(Sklov, 1798, and later elsewhere, 4to; Konigsb. 1857, 8vo); Rhode, De Poet. Gnomnica (Havn. 1800, 8vo); Tingstadt, Vamice Lectt. (Upsal. 1800, 4to); Wistinitz, זַרִע יִעֲקֹב(Wilna, 1800, 4to); Muntinghe, Anmerk (fromn the Dutch by Scholl, F. a. M. 1800-2, 3 vols. 8vo); Schellillg, Notce [includ. other books] (Stuttg. 1806, 8vo); Dahler, Uebersetz. [from the Sept.] (Strasb. 1810, 8vo); Mard. Kohen, מֵאמִר(Grodno, 1811, 4to); Kelle, Anmerlk. (Freyb. 1815, 8vo); Holden, Notes (Liverp. 1819, 8vo); Melsheimer, Ammerk. (Mannh. 1821, 8vo); Lawson, Exposition (Edinb. 1821, 1855, 2 vols. 12mo); Case, Commnentary (Lond. 1822, 12mo); \*Umbreit, Conmmentura (Heidelb. 1826, 8vo); \*Gramberg, Annmerk. (Leips. 1828, 8vo); \*Rosenmüller, Scholia (Lips. 1829, 8vo); Bockel, Em laut. (Hamb. 1829, 8vo); Bridges, Exposition (Lond. 1830 and later, 2 vols. 8'vo); French and Skinner, Notes (ibid. 1831, 8vo); Stern, בַּאוּר(Pressb. 1833, 8vo); Lowenstein, Erklar. (Frckft. 1838,8vo); Freund, מוּסָר אָב(Vien. 1839,8vo); Newman, Version (Lond. 1839, 18mo); Maurer, Commentarius (Lips. 1841, 8vo); Nichols, Explanation (Lond. 1842, 12mo); Noyes, Translation [includ. Ecclesiastes and Cant.] (Bost. 1846, 1867, 8vo); \*Bertheau. Erklar. (Leips. 1847 8vo); Binney, Lectures (Lond. 1851,18mo); \*Stuart, Commentary (N. Y. 1852, 8vo); Gaussen, Reflexions (Toulouse, 1857,  8vo); \*Hitzig, Auslegun (Ztir. 1858, 8vo); Elster, Commentar (Gitt. 1858, 8vo); Stein, Bearbeit. (Brilon, 1860, 8vo); Anon., Exposition (Lond. 1860, 12mo); Schulze, Biblische Spruchwoirte (Gott. 1860, 8vo); Brooks, Arrangement (Lond. 1860, 12mo); Wardlaw. Lectures (ibid. 1861, 3 vols. 8vo); Diedrich, Erklar. [includ. other books] (Neu-Rupp. 1665, 8vo); Mtuscher, Version (Gambier, 0., 1866, 12mo); Conant, Translation (N. Y. 1872, 4to); Miller, Commentary (Lond. 1874. 8vo). SEE OLD TESTAMENT.

## Providence[[@Headword:Providence]]

             (Lat.providentia; Gr. πρόνοια; both signifying foresight), a term importing the wisdom and power which God continually exercises in the preservation and government of the world, for the ends which he proposes to accomplish.

I. The Doctrine Proved. —

1. From Reason. —

(1.) From the existence of a Supreme Creator. If there be a Supreme Being who created all things, it is reasonable to infer that he upholds and governs all things; hence, nearly all men concur in the belief of a superintending providence.

(2.) From the perfections of the Supreme Creator, viz., knowledge, power, wisdom, goodness, justice, and righteousness, all of which reason teaches us to ascribe to him in infinite measure. All things being known to him, and all things being possible to him (if not essentially contradictory), and he being able to discern the best plan, and preinclined to execute that plan, a providence becomes the natural and proper sphere for the activity of his attributes. Moreover, being just and righteous, his government of his rational creatures will necessarily be by the principles of justice and righteousness; for the end and perfection of these attributes consist in their exercise. Hence power must uphold, wisdom direct, goodness bestow, righteousness discriminate, and justice adjudge; and this constitutes a providence.

(3.) From the dependence of God's creatures. That which is not self- existent is contingent. The contingent may cease to be, there being nothing in the nature of things to insure its continuance; therefore, the perpetuity of the contingent is dependent upon the will of the self-existent. The Supreme  Creator alone is self-existent: hence, upon his will the existence of the created depends; and that will, in exercise, implies a providence.

(4.) From the order, harmony, and regularity observable in the course of nature. The course of nature is that wise adjustment and counterpoise of natural forces by which the planets swing in their orbits, the seasons revolve with the year, the tides ebb and flow in their intervals, the currents of the atmosphere shift to their ever-changing conditions, the endless procession of life keeps pace with the dead-march of decay, and all the varied phenomena of the universe appear. Viewing these wonderful complications in the light of their necessary dependence upon the self- existent, God's handiwork is plainly evident in the complexities of their multiform evolutions, the equipoise of their contending forces, and the continuity of adjustment, which proclaim unceasing watchfulness and care.

(5.) From the moral faculties of men. Conscience, which utters its authoritative “ought” or “ought not” concerning suggested actions, must be delusive, if there be no providence to note its verdict. But if our sense of responsibility be false, and we must hence discredit the affirmations of our highest faculties concerning ourselves, then is all truth visionary and all knowledge misleading.

Further, we have a faculty the legitimate expression of which is worship; hence all nations have their forms of devotion. But to stand in awe of the Creator's justice, to trust in his goodness, to submit to his will, to pray to him for the supply of our wants, to depend upon his wisdom for direction- all these acts of worship are not only unauthorized but absurd, and our noblest instincts are false to fact if there be no superintending providence by which his responses may be indicated.

(6.) From the system of compensations which prevails, embracing recompense for suffering, compensation for loss, and retribution for wrong. In this system, the recompense includes the natural benefits of discipline, and such compensative provisions of grace as the reason recognizes as matters of fact in present human experience. The compensation comprises the reparative processes by which loss in one direction is made up by increased efficiency in another, as in the added keenness of the senses of hearing and touch attending the loss of sight. The retribution comprehends not only the natural operation of the law, “As a man soweth, so also shall he reap,” but all those special illustrations of that law in marked and mysterious judgments upon wrongdoing which  occasionally occur, and which bear such likeness to the sin that men agree to call them retributive. In all these a providence is implied. The doctrine is further proven —

2. From the Scriptures. —

(1.) By a class of passages which declare in general his preserving power Gen 48:15; Neh 9:6; Job 7:20; Job 10:12; Job 33:18; Psa 16:5; Psa 36:6; Psa 46:9; Isa 46:3-4; Mat 10:29; Luk 12:6; Act 17:28; Col 1:17).

(2.) By a class of passages which assert God's control of the regular operations of nature (Exo 9:18; Exo 23:26; 1Ki 18:1; Job 5:10; Job 9:5-6; Job 28:24-27; Job 36:29-32; Job 37:6-16; Job 38:25; Psa 74:17; Psa 89:9; Psa 104:10; Psa 104:13-15; Psa 104:19-21; Psa 104:24-30; Psa 105:32; Psa 135:6-7; Psa 136:25; Psa 145:15-16; Psa 147:8-9; Psa 147:18; Psa 148:8; Isa 45:7; Isa 1:3; Jer 5:22-24; Jer 10:13; Jer 14:22; Jer 31:35; Jer 33:20; Jer 33:25; Jer 51:16; Eze 32:7-8; Eze 38:22; Joe 2:23; Amo 4:6-10; Amo 4:13; Zec 10:1; Mat 6:26; Mat 6:28-32; Act 14:17).

(3.) By a class of passages which specifically declare his sovereignty over birth (Gen 33:5; Gen 48:9; Jos 24:3-4; 1Sa 1:27; Job 10:18; Psa 71:6; Psa 139:15-16; Isa 46:3); life (Jos 14:10; 2Sa 12:22; Job 7:1; Job 14:5; Psa 66:8-9; Psa 91:3-16; Isa 38:1-5; Php 2:27; Jam 5:14-15); disease (Exo 9:15; Exo 23:25; Job 2:10; Job 5:6; Job 5:17-18; Psa 39:9; Psa 39:13; Joh 9:3); death (1Sa 2:6; 1Sa 25:29; Job 1:21; Job 12:10; Job 14:5-6; Job 34:14-15; Psa 68:20; Psa 90:3; Psa 104:29; Psa 118:8); afflictions (Deu 8:5; Job 5:17; Job 10:17; Psa 66:10-12; Psa 69:26; Psa 94:12-13; Psa 119:75; Pro 3:12; Isa 26:16; Isa 48:10; Jer 2:30; Lam 1:12-14; Lam 3:1; Lam 3:32-33; Amo 8:10; Heb 12:5-6); prosperity (Deu 8:18; 1 Samuel 2:78; 2Sa 7:8-9; 2Sa 12:7-8; 1Ch 17:7-8; 1Ch 29:12; 1Ch 29:16; Ezr 5:5; Job 1:10; Job 34:24; Psa 30:7; Psa 75:6-8; Psa 113:7-8; Pro 29:26; Ecc 9:11, compared with Pro 16:3; Pro 16:33; Luk 1:52-53; 1Co 16:2).

(4.) By a class which aver his government of chance and accident (Exo 21:12-13, compared with Deu 19:4-5; 1Ki 22:34; 1Ki 22:38, compared with 21:19; Pro 16:33).

(5.) By a class which proclaim his use of noxious animals for the purposes of his government (Exo 23:28; Lev 26:21-22; Deu 7:20; Jos 24:12; Job 5:23; Jer 5:6; Hos 2:18; Joe 2:25; Amo 4:9; Amo 7:1).

(6.) By a class which affirm his righteous retributions (Lev 10:1-3; Lev 26:14-39; Deu 25:17-19; Deu 28:23-24; 2Sa 3:39; 2Ki 9:30-37; 2Ki 19:25-28; 2Ch 6:26-27; Job 5:13; Job 10:14; Job 34:11; Psa 35:6-8; Psa 75:6-8; Psa 89:30-32; Psa 94:23; Psa 107:33-34; Isa 5:11-16; Isa 5:22-25; Isa 9:13-14; Isa 13:11; Isa 28:15. Comp. Isa 29:6; Jer 22:21-22; Eze 11:21; Eze 26:2-21; Eze 35:1-15; Dan 5:18-30; Amos : 5; Oba 1:10-15; Zephanaiah 1:17; 2:8-10; Hag 1:10-11).

(7.) By a class which ascribe deliverances to God (Jos 24:5-11; 2Ki 5:1; Eze 34:12; Eze 34:16; Eze 34:30; Eze 36:22-24; Eze 37:21-23).

(8.) By a class which declare his supreme authority over men (Psa 7:8; Psa 9:8; Psa 10:16; Psa 22:28; Psa 47:2; Psa 47:7-8; Psa 75:7; Psa 76:10; Psa 96:10; Psa 96:13; Psa 97:1; Psa 103:19; Psa 139:9-10; Ecc 9:1; Isa 10:15; Isa 14:26-27; Eze 18:4; Dan 4:35; Rom 9:19-21).

(9.) By a class which affirm his dominion over national prosperity and adversity (Exo 17:14; Exo 23:25-30; Deu 7:13; 2Sa 22:15; Ezr 5:12; Psa 18:13-14; Isa 5:3-30; Isa 13:1; Isa 13:6; Isa 13:9-22; Isa 45:7; Jer 27:2-8; Jer 27:12-13; Jer 49:36; Dan 2:20-21; Dan 2:25; Dan 2:37-38; Dan 5:21; Amo 3:6; Oba 1:1-4; Hag 2:17; Zep 1:14-18; Zep 2:1-15; Zep 3:14-20; Act 17:26).

(10.) By a class which declare that he sends bad laws and base rulers, stirs up adversaries, and sends adversity (Jdg 9:22-23; 1Ki 11:14; 1Ki 11:23; 1Ki 19:15; 2Ki 8:12; 2Ki 18:25; 2Ki 19:25; 2Ki 24:20; 2Ch 15:5-6; Psa 105:25; Isa 22:17-19; Isa 37:26-27; Jer 27:6-7; Jer 28:14; Jer 48:11-12; Jer 52:3; Lam 2:7; Eze 20:24-26; Dan 4:17; Hos 13:11; Mic 1:12).

The teaching of the more than five hundred passages cited might be confirmed, were it necessary, by nearly as many thousands more, showing with what emphasis the Scriptures proclaim the doctrine of divine providence.

II. The Doctrine Explained. —

1. As Preservation, or that by which all things are kept in being, with their several essences and faculties, and are enabled to act according to their respective natures (Heb 1:3).

2. As Government, or the control of all things in their several spheres of being and acting, and directing them to the ends which he proposed to himself in their creation. This government is —

(1.) Immediate; as in the direct control of the material universe by those modes of operation called forces of nature, such as gravitation, electricity, etc.

(2.) Mediate; as

(a) in the vegetable world, by the laws which regulate the germination, growth, and decay of its organizations;

(b) in the animal kiingdom, by their controlling instincts;

(c) in intelligent and moral creatures, by means of motives. This last is evidently the most important, as well as the most incomprehensible field of divine providence.

The motives which a righteous and benevolent Being places before his creatures can be only those which will directly tend to secure their holiness and happiness. But, as freedom of the will, in the sense of possible alternative moral action, is one of the endowments of such creatures, and as preservation, secures the functional activity of such will, whatever may result; hence it follows that those holy motives mav be disregarded, and, in such an event, moral government must be abandoned, or punitive and reformatory measures must be instituted that will originate a different class of motives to reinforce those which have proved insufficient. Hence, the system of natural evil is placed over against creature-freedom, both as a check and a corrective, and is in itself no arraignment of God's goodness, since it is a necessary means to a higher good. But the problem of God's concurrence in moral evil is the vexed question of the ages; yet, in point of principle, it is settled in the fact of the creation of intelligent beings with a capacity to sin and liability to become sinners. Hence the vindication of the divine character is legitimately the work of Theodicy, while the doctrine of providence need only explain God's conduct.  All moral evil consists in a wrong determination of a free will. God's purpose to preserve his creatures pledges his concurrence in such action of the will only so far as such concurrence may be necessary to enable the will to act according to its freedom. The moral character of the determination is fixed by the creature and he alone is responsible for it. But when the choice is made, the moral character of the determination is complete; and neither the occurrence nor non-occurrence of a resulting outward action can change, add to, or take from the moral quality of the original volition wherein the sin originated and was completed. As soon, however, as the execution ef a determination is attempted, the creature steps outside of his own independent and responsible sphere, and enters the realm of God's providence, where he assumes the control of all events. The actions of men (in distinction from their determinations), his control of the Church and of nations, special providences, the course of nature, and the works of grace are all included under the general term events, for which God takes the absolute responsibility. Hence it will be seen that the distinction often drawn between the permissive and active providences of God is of no practical value; and if any such distinction be allowed, it must be by confining the word “permissive” strictly to the free volitions of the will, and extending the word “active” to all events, as explained above.

In this way alone can the emphatic statements of the Scriptures, as classified above, be explained in harmony with other passages which distinctly deny his complicity with evil, i.e. in the sense of moral wrong. We first bring fully into view the seeming impeachment of his attributes contained in the classes of passages above referred to, which may be epitomized, in principle, as follows: Exo 4:21; Exo 7:13; Exo 10:1; Exo 10:20; Exo 14:7; Deu 2:30; Deu 13:1-3; Jos 11:20; 1Sa 16:14; 1Sa 18:10; 1Sa 19:9; 1Ki 12:15; 1Ki 22:20-22; 2Ch 18:22; 2Ch 25:20; Psa 78:49; Psa 105:25; Isa 6:9-10; Isa 19:14; Isa 44:18; Isa 66:4; Jer 6:21; Eze 3:20; Eze 14:9; Amo 3:6; Zec 8:10; 2Th 2:11-12; 1Pe 2:8; Rev 17:17. In striking contrast with these stands the revelation of his character and works in the following: Lev 11:45; Deu 32:4; 1Sa 6:20; Job 8:3; Job 34:10; Job 34:12; Job 34:23; Job 36:3; Psa 5:4; Psa 11:7; Psa 33:5; Psa 89:14; Psa 92:15; Psa 97:2; Psa 119:137; Isa 5:16; Eze 18:29; Hab 1:13; Zep 3:5; Rom 2:2; Rom 2:5-6; Jam 1:13; 1Pe 1:15-16; Rev 16:7.  Truth cannot be inharmonious, much less contradictory; therefore, there must be some possible reconciliation of these apparently conflicting statements. We find that reconciliation in the divided sovereignty which allows man to be supreme within the sphere of his volition, and attributes all outside of the mere mental fact of free-will determinations to the will and operation or co-operation of God. Upon any other hypothesis it is not possible to draw the dividing line between divine and human responsibility; and therefore, if this be denied, the hope of constructing any consistent doctrine of divine providence must be abandoned.

III. Some Objections Considered. —

Objection

1. If providence be the care exercised over his creatures by a God of infinite goodness and purity, he cannot be implicated in the wicked actions of men. Answer. As a matter of fact, he is concerned in them. else they could not exist; for, were he to refuse the concurrence of his upholding power, men would drop into non-existence. Again, the objection is destroyed by considering that actions have no moral character whatever, as between the creature and the Creator, such character being vested entirely in the volitions of the will from which the actions result. Therefore, God can use the wicked actions of men as he does any other indifferent thing, provided that his own 1pupose in using them be right, which no one disputes.

Objection

2. God's majesty is degraded by the assumption contained in the doctrine of providence, viz. that he is interested in all the minutiae of nature. Answer. If he has created faculties or forces, nothing that they can evolve can be unworthy of his care; besides, things which seem to men most insignificant are often causatively linked with stupendous results. Again, the revelations of the microscope prove that the infinitesimal are embraced within the sweep of the same laws that pervade the infinite, and hence are under the same benign care. Further, the impression of the grandeur of the Infinite Intelligence, comprehensive as it may be, from the contemplation of the rolling spheres and interlocking systems of the universe, is, after all, less profound than that which results from tracing his handiwork in the conformation of the beautifully wrought shells of the animalcula, and their exquisite life-appliances and adjustments, which only the most powerful glasses can reveal to human sight.

Objection

3. The prosperity of the wicked and the afflictions of the righteous are inconsistent with the supposition of a just and holy providence. Answer. The equal dispensation which the objection assumes to be necessary under the government of God is an impossibility; for the affections and interests of men are so interlocked that exact justice could rarely, if ever, be meted to the transgressor without involving consequences to others which would be undeserved. Again, the prosperity of the wicked, if they continue in their evil courses, is always a curse to them in the end; and God's processes should not be condemned until their final issue is known. On the other hand, the adversities of the righteous have attending or following compensations which satisfy them that all is right; and if those who are chiefly interested are content, the objection of the mere observer should be esteemed of little weight.

Objection

4. It is alleged that the laws of nature sufficiently account for the order of nature; therefore, a providence is not necessary. Answer. The laws of nature are only the regular order which is found to subsist, termed laws because of the uniformity of the changes which occur, and signify certain results of power, but not power itself — effects, but not their causes. These uniformities are, therefore, only modes in which the self- existent controls the contingent, the manner in which God manipulates his material creation.

IV. History of the Doctrine. — The idea of a superintending or controlling Providence has appeared under various forms, sometimes scarcely recognisable, depending largely upon the culture of the age and the state of philosophical speculation at the time.

1. The primitive view, held during the childhood of superstition, identified the gods with the elements of nature. Thus Zeus, or Dis, originally meant sky, and was worshipped as a god, afterwards known as Jupiter, or Jove, and by the Canaanites and Babylonians called Baal, Bel, or Belus. The earth was also worshipped as Demeter and Cybele, called by the Anglo- Saxons Hertha; the sea as Neptune; the sun as Phaebus, or Apollo; the moon as Diana; light as Indra. Fire as Agni and summer heat as Dormer, or Thor, are other instances, in various localities, of the worship paid to the elements or forces of nature as gods, each being accredited a providence of its own. In the childhood of Occidental philosophy also, the Ionian philosophical physicists of Greece, in their search for the principle whose existence should give a rational explanation of all things (called the  Beginning, or First Cause), identified it with some elements of nature, as the “Water” of Thales and Hippo of Samos; the “Air” of Anaximenes; the “Air-Intelligence” of Diogenes of Apollonia and Idaeus of Himera. Her mathematical philosophers, the Pythagoreans, looked for this first cause in incorporeal elements, as in the “Numbers” of Pythagoras and the “Infinite” of Anaximander. The Eleatics — metaphysical philosophers — regarded the world as the manifestation of God, as ill the “Sphere” of Xenophanes, Parmenides, and Zeno; while the dualism of the “Fire-ether” of Heraclitus, and the “Love-mingler” of Empedocles and Anaxagoras, and the materialism of the “Atoms” of Leucippus and Democritus were similar in their pantheistic notions, and contained the idea of a providence in but a very crude and unsatisfactory form. The Stoics taught that the working force in the universe is God; the consciousness of the universe is Deity; the human soul is a part of the Deity, or an emanation from him.

2. When the distinction between irregular and fortuitous “phenomena and the uniformities of nature became clear, the last were regarded as independent processes, broken in upon by the interferences of the gods, who were endowed with human passions; such interferences being the chances, accidents, irregularities, etc., of nature.” Thus Minerva was the goddess of wisdom; Mars, the god of war; Mercury, the god of eloquence and traffic; Pan, the god of terror; Laverna, the goddess of thieves; Venus the goddess of beauty; Cupid, the god of love; Nemesis, of vengeance, etc.

3. The next advance was to the conception of one supreme God, infinite in his perfections and works; a sovereign Ruler bestowing rewards and inflicting penalties by using nature as the instrument of his will, he being a power above nature, and interfering with its processes at his pleasure. This seems to have been in part the view of Socrates, and was the Judaical notion modified into special or general providences according to personal interest in the event. That the Christian Church adopted this view in the main is evident from the fact that the Apostles' Creed, and the confessions of faith of Irenaeus and Tertullian, and the NiceenoConstantinopolitan symbol (A.D. 325 and 381. the only general confession covering the whole field of systematic divinity during 1500 years), contain no restatement of the doctrine.

The Catholic Church added to this view the dogma of Church infallibility, for which the Protestants substituted that of the infallibility of the Scriptures, both presupposing special providential watchfulness.

4. The doctrine of determinate concursus advocated by John Scotus Erigena in the middle of the 9th century holds that there are two causes in all effects, the first being in and not merely with the second, so that the first cause, and not the second, makes the act what it is. Augustine, the Schoolmen, the Thomists, and Dominicans in the Latin Church, the Lutherans, Reformed, and most Calvinistic divines in the Protestant Church have supported it, but in such sense that the moral quality of a sinful act is referred to the creature, and the effectual cause of the act only to God. General concursus is a modification of the foregoing view, and holds that God sustains creatures and their powers, and excites them to act according to their nature. The Franciscans and Jesuits, among the Romanists, and the Remonstrants and later Arminians, among the Protestants, have advocated this theory.

5. Cartesius, Malebranche, and Bayle developed the concursus into the occasionalism of philosophers, which represents God as the sole actor, the creature only furnishing him an occasion to act, and being merely the instrument by which he absolutely and irresistibly accomplishes his own designs. The dependence of the creature upon the Creator, superseding all efficiency of second causes, as held by Schleiermacher and the school to which he belongs, Schweizer and Dr. Emmons, classifies them practically with the Occasionalists.

6. Leibnitz rejected the concursus and Cartesian views, and propounded the theory of Pre-established Harmony, somewhat akin in its radical idea to the “Anima Mundi” of Pythagoras, Plato. and the Alexandrian School; the “Archaeus” of Cornelius Agrippa, Paracelsus, and Von Helmont; the “principium hvlarchicunm” of Henry More; the “plastic nature” of Cudworth, and the “unconscious organizing intelligence” lately advocated by Dr. Laycock and Mr. Murphy. This theory holds that there are two worlds, matter and mind, each incapable of acting upon the other, yet both so adjusted to each other by a divinely pre-arranged harmony that volition and muscular contraction are contemporaneous. The volition would exist just the same without the contraction, and the muscular movement would take place just the same without the volition, each being moved by a force within, but the prearranged harmony secures that they shall seemingly stand related as cause and effect. God is a being of infinite perfections, and the imperfections of creation are accounted for by the nature of the monads of which souls and bodies are composed.

7. Durandus, in the 14th century, proposed the mechanical theory, which affirms the independent activity of God's creatures in the use of powers given to them at their creation — like a wound-up clock which goes of itself. It has been advocated by Scotus, Richard Baxter, and others. Closely akin to this is the theory of such writers as Prof. Tyndall, Dr. H. Bence Jones, and Dr. Bastian, concerning “molecular attractions and repulsions communicated to matter at the creation.” Its extreme pantheistic development is found in the “self-evolving powers of nature” of Owen, Huxley, and Baden Powell.

8. Another view represents God as an all-perfect being, the upholder of all things, but denies his interference with the laws of nature in miracles, and maintains that his only interposition is by using natural causes to effect his purposes. Thus providence is law, and no interppsitions are possible unless provided for in the nature of the uniformities. Thus Hippocrates, the contemporary of Socrates, regarded all phenomena as both divine and scientifically determinable. Anaxagoras, in his “Arranging Intelligence,” held substantially to this view. Duncanson (Providence of God) is a strong modern advocate of this theory.

9. The Mind-efficiency Theory denies that there are any physical forces apart from mind, either divine or created. The only efficiency in the material universe is the ever-operating will of God. Dr. Samuel Clarke, Dugald Stewart, John Wesley, Nitzsch. Muller, Chalmers, Harris, Young, Whedon, Channing, Martineau, Hedge, Whewell, Bascom. Prof. Tulloch, Sir John Herschel, the duke of Argyll, Mr. Wallace, Proctor, Crocker, and many among the ablest recent writers have defended this view.

10. The true doctrine represents God as a being of infinite perfections, upholding all things by a direct exercise of his potency; the uniformities of nature as his ordinary method of working; its irregularities his method upon occasional conditions; its interferences, his method under the pressure of a higher law, which law is the necessary manifestation of his own nature. It thus adopts the Judaic view of God's perfections, and the complete subservience of nature to his will; admits the general concursus, especially as relates to the freedom of the finite will, accepts the Law theory in its application to miracles, and sustains the Mind-efficiency theory, with the distinct disclaimer of pantheistic leanings in the admission of the separate existence of material substance.

V. Special or Particular Providence. — Providence has been defined as the wisdom and power which God continually exercises in the preservation and government of the world for the ends which he proposes to accomplish. Special providence consists in such particular exhibitions of his wisdom and power in emergencies as are calculated to awaken the conviction of his interest in and guardianship over his creatures.

1. Proof. — The doctrine in question is proved by the following considerations:

(1.) It is necessarily includel in the general providence already established. (See above.) The whole is made up of parts. If God has no care of the whole, he has none of the parts. If he has for the whole, the parts are included. Furtherthe end which he proposes to accomplish in providence is the revelation of himself as infinitely worthy of the love of his creatures. This needs a special providence. Moreover, a God who does not care for us as individuals is tantamount to no God.

(2.) Special providence is implied in the doctrine of prayer. Prayer is an instinct. The Scriptures direct that instinct by coupling with the encouragement to pray the announcement of a special providence that watches over the very hairs of our heads, thus making special providence the complement of prayer. Prayer without a special providence to note and reward would be a mere mockery of our impotence. Moreover, the enlarged charter of prayer-privilege given to believers under the (Gospel dispensation is a personal application of the Old-Test. doctrine of special providence over the Jewish nation. That providence had relation to the covenant detailed in Deuteronomy 26-30; this privilege is conveyed in such promises as Mat 7:7-11; Mat 18:19; Mat 21:22; Mar 11:24; Joh 15:7; Heb 4:16; Jam 5:15; 1Jn 5:14-15; and, being such, it necessarily implies such special watch-care as was involved in the Mosaic covenant cited above. SEE PRAYER.

(3.) The same doctrine is inferred from the fatherhood of God. The denial of his fatherhood changes him into a desolate abstraction, the contemplation of which pours an ice-floe over the tide of human trusts, and causes us to feel that we are “orphaned children in a godless world.” But “As a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him” comes to us genial with the warmth of a sympathy and care that we can appreciate and confide in.

(4.) It is involved in the atonement of Christ. The propitiatory sacrifice — as prefigured in the separate sacrifices for each — was for men, not en masse, but as individuals, thus furnishing the greatest possible evidence of care in the interests of utmost moment to the soul. The agency by which this sacrifice is conveyed to the mind — the Holy Spirit — is likewise personal in his ministry of impression, and as personal in his communication of the remedial efficacy of the one atonement, thus demonstrating in appeal and in succor the loving care of God.

(5.) It is revealed in the Scriptures as clearly as the biographies of its noted characters, such as Joseph. Samuel, Elijah, Ruth, Esther, Daniel, etc., can illustrate it, and proclaimed as strongly as such texts as Luk 12:6-7; Luk 12:22-31 can express it, and enforced as powerfully as such prayer-examples as The friend seeking bread and The unjust judge can impress it.

(6.) It is illustrated in the experiences of Christians of every age, until George Neumark's hymn “Leave God to order all thy ways,

And hope in him, whate’er betide;

Thou’lt find him in the evil days

An all-sufficient strength and guide.

Who trusts in God’s unchanging love,

Builds on the rock that naught can move” —

has become a type of a distinct class of literature both in verse and prose that is inexpressibly sweet to the experienced believer, and of untold value to those who are weak in faith.

2. The moral uses of the doctrine are —

(1.) It deters from sin. Theon of Alexandria taught that “a full persuasion of God's seeing everything we do is the strongest incentive to virtue;” and he advised the civil magistrate to place the inscription at the corners of the streets “God seeth thee, O sinner!”

A full belief in special providence places that inscription not upon the corners of the streets, but within the chambers of the memory.

(2.) It excites watchfulness for his interpositions. Abraham, after Mount Moriah; the three Hebrews, after the fiery furnace; Daniel, after the lions' den; Elijah, after Cherith's cave, never failed to look for other deliverances in the time of need.

(3.) It gives the assurance that all is right in our present circumstances, in view of the discipline needed, and the final adjustment of rewards and penalties.

(4.) It leads to cheerful trust in all trials, and thus sweetens the bitter draughts of life.

(5.) It inspires with hope in emergencies, and thus enables the believer to meet unforeseen exigencies with all his resources of mind and faith at hand, confident, buoyant, and if possible conquering.

(6.) It imparts a patience that outlasts adversities, a fortitude that yields to no disaster, and a confidence that emerges unscathed from all furnaces of trial.

VII. Literature. — We cite in alphabetical order a portion only of the very numerous works extant on this subject: Aquinas, Summa Theol. p. i, q. 15, art. iii; Backerus, De Dei Providentia circa Mal.; Bairus, De Proverbs Dei circa Peccata liominum; Beza, De Proverbs Dei circa Res Temporales; Bormann, Lehre der Vorsehung; the same, Betrachtungen iiber die wichtigsten Warheiten der Religion; Chrysostom, De Providentia Dei; Clement, Strom. 6:17, p. 821 sq.; De Maree, Gottesvertheidigung iiber die Zulassung des Bosenm; De Vries, Exercitationes Rationales; Feldmann, Moira oder iiber die ygttliche Vorsehung; Fur Anbeter Gottes (Loud. 1780); Gomari Conciliatio Doct. Orthodoxac de Providentia; Hugo of St. Victor, De Sacram. c. 19-21; Jacobi, Betrachtungen iiber die weisen Absichten Gottes; Jerome, Comment. in Abacuc, c. 1; Junilius, De Partibus Legis Divince, bk. ii, c. 3 sq.; Koppen, Die Bibel ein Werk der gottlichen Weisheit; Lactantius, De Via Dei, c. 13; the same, De Opificio Dei, vel Formatione lIom1inis, c. 5-17; Leibnitz, Essais de Theodicee; Martinii Corn. de Gubernatione Munci; Muller, Briefe uber das Studium der Wissenschtaften, besonders der Geschichie (Ziirich, 1798); Nemesius, De Natura Hominis, c. 42 sq.; Plutarch, De Sera Numinius Vindicta; Rechenbergius, De Proverbs Dei circa Minima; Salvianus Massiliensis, De Gubernatione Dei sive de Proverbs; Sanders, Ueber die Vorsehung; Schrickh, Disp. Historica circa Providentiamn Divinuam, quando et quam cldare loquatur (Vitembergge, 1776); Seneca, De Providentia, De Beneficiis; Theodoret, Sermones de Providentia; ‘Turrettini Dissertationes, diss. 4, 5, 6; Twisse, Vindicatio Providentice Dei; Viret,  De la Providence; Weismannus, De Proverbs Dei contra Malum; Zollikofer, Betrachtungemn iber das Uebel in der Welt. (S. H. P.)

## Providence, Nuns of[[@Headword:Providence, Nuns of]]

             a community of young women at Paris, established about the year 1647 by Madame Polaillon for the reception of poor virgins who might otherwise be exposed, through poverty, to the temptations of the world. This pious lady, having formed the design, was discouraged from prosecuting it by several persons, who represented to her that she had not a fund sufficient to carry it on; to whom she replied that Providence should be her fund; and accordingly, having succeeded in her undertaking, she gave to her community the name of The Nuns of Providence.

## Province[[@Headword:Province]]

             properly an outlying portion of an extended empire, such as the Persian or Roman. It is not intended here to do more than indicate the points of contact which this word presents with Biblical history and literature.

1. (מְדַינָה, medinah; Sept. χώρα; Vulg. provincia.) In the Old Test. this term first appears in connection with the wars between Ahab and Ben- hadad (1Ki 20:14-15; 1Ki 20:19). The victory of the former was gained chiefly “by the young men of the princes of the provinces,” i.e. probably of the chiefs of tribes in the Gilead country, recognising the supremacy of Ahab, and having a common interest with the Israelites in resisting the attacks of Syria. They are specially distinguished in 1Ki 20:15 from “the children of Israel.” Not the hosts of Ahab. but the younglest warriors (“armor-bearers,” Keil, ad loc.) of the land of Jephthah and Elijah, fighting with a fearless faith, were to carry off the glory of the battle (comp. Ewald, Gesch. 3, 492).

More commonly the word is used of the divisions of the Chaldaean (Dan 2:49; Dan 3:1; Dan 3:30) and the Persian kingdom (Ezr 2:1; Neh 7:6; Est 1:1; Est 1:22; Est 2:3, etc.). The occurrence of the word in Ecc 2:8; Ecc 5:8, has been noted as an indication of the later date now frequently ascribed to that book. The facts as to the administration of the Persian provinces which come within our view in these passages are chiefly these: Each province had its own governor, who communicated more or less regularly with the central authority for instructions (Ezra 4, 5). Thus Tatnai, governor of the provinces on the  right bank of the Euphrates, applied to Darius to know how he was to act as to the conflicting claims of the Apharsachites and the Jews (Ezra 5). Each province had its own system of finance, subject to the king's direction (Herodotus 3, 89). The “treasurer” was ordered to spend a given amount upon the Israelites (Ezr 7:22), and to exempt them from all taxes (Ezr 7:24). SEE TAX.

The total number of the provinces is given at 127 (Est 1:1; Est 8:9). Through the whole extent of the kingdom there was carried something like a postal system. The king's couriers (βιβλιόφοροι, the ἄγγαροι of Herod. 8:98) conveyed his letters or decrees (Est 1:22; Est 3:13). From all provinces concubines were collected for his harem (Est 2:3). Horses, mules, or dromedaries were employed on this service (Est 8:10). (Comp. Herod. 8:98; Xenoph. Cyrop. 8:6; Heeren's Persians, ch. 2.) The word is used, it must be remembered, of the smaller sections of a satrapy rather than of the satrapy itself. While the provinces are 127, the satrapies are only 20 (Herod. iii, 89). The Jews who returned from Babylon are described as “children of the province” (Ezr 2:1; Neh 7:6), and had a separate governor [SEE TIRSHATHA] of their own race (Ezr 2:63; Neh 5:14; Neh 8:9); while they were subject to the satrap (פִּחִת) of the whole province west of the Euphrates (Ezr 5:7; Ezr 6:6).

2. (Ε᾿παρχία) In the New Test. we are brought into contact with the administration of the provinces of the Roman empire. The classification given by Strabo (17, p. 840) of provinces (ἐπαρχίαι) supposed to need military control, and therefore placed under the immediate government of the Caesar, and those still belonging theoretically to the republic, and administered by the senate, and of the latter again into proconsular (ὑπατικαί) and praetorian (στρατηγικαί), is recognised, more or less distinctly, in the Gospels and the Acts. SEE PROCURATOR.

Cyrenius (Quirinus) was the ἡγεμών of Syria (Luk 2:2), the word being in this case used for prteses or proconsul. Pilate was the ἡγεμών of the sub- province of Judsea (Luk 3:1; Mat 27:2, etc.), as procurator with the power of a legatus; and the same title is given to his successors, Felix and Festus (Act 23:24; Act 25:1; Act 26:30). The governors of the senatorial provinces of Cyprus, Achaia, and Asia, on the other hand, are rightly described as ἀνθύπατοι, proconsuls (Act 13:7; Act 18:12; Act 19:38). In the two former cases the province had been originally an imperial one, but had been transferred-Cyprus by Augustus (Dio Cass. liv, 4), Achaia by Claudius (Sueton. Claud. 25)-to the senate. The στρατηγοί of Act 16:22 (A.V. “magistrates”), on the other hand, were the duumviri, or praetors, of a Roman colony. The duty of the legati and other provincial governors to report special cases to the emperor is recognised in Act 25:26, and furnished the groundwork for the spurious Acta Pilati. SEE PILATE.

The right of any Roman citizen to appeal from a provincial governor to the emperor meets us as asserted by Paul (Act 25:11). In the council (συμβούλιον) of Act 25:12 we recognise the assessors who were appointed to take part in the judicial functions of the governor. The authority of the legatus, proconsul, or procurator, extended, it need hardly be said, to capital punishment (subject, in the case of Roman citizens, to the right of appeal), and, in most cases, the power of inflicting it belonged to him exclusively. It was necessary for the Sanhedrim to gain Pilate's consent to the execution of our Lord (Joh 18:31). The strict letter of the law forbade governors of provinces to take their wives with them, but the cases of Pilate's wife (Mat 27:19) and Drusilla (Act 24:24) show that it had fallen into disuse. Tacitus (Ann. 3, 33, 34) records an unsuccessful attempt to revive the old practice. SEE PROCONSUL.

PROVINCE is, in ecclesiastical language, the jurisdiction of an archbishop. SEE DIOCESE.

## Provincial[[@Headword:Provincial]]

             The local superior of the monasteries (abbot, guardian, prior, etc.) stands under the supervision of the district superiors, or definitors; these are subordinated to the superiors of the province, or provincials, who are themselves under the direction of the general of the order, the head of the whole community.

## Provincial Councils[[@Headword:Provincial Councils]]

             is the name given to the synods held by the bishops of a single ecclesiastical province, and presided over by the metropolitan. The ecclesiastical superior of the province convokes the council. The resolutions of provincial councils in matters of discipline have legal force only within the limits of their own province. In respect to matters of faith, their resolutions, like those of the national councils, are decisive only when they have been confirmed by the pope and accepted by the whole Church.

## Provincial Synod[[@Headword:Provincial Synod]]

             SEE SYNOD.

## Provisio Canonica[[@Headword:Provisio Canonica]]

             SEE PROVISION.

## Provision[[@Headword:Provision]]

             (Lat. provisio) is, in canon law, the bestowal of an ecclesiastical benefice (q.v.).

I. In the Roman Catholic Church it involves the regular collation (q.v.) of the ecclesiastical functions. Any of its ecclesiastical offices can only be thus lawfully obtained from a competent superior.

1. Extent and Classification. —

(1.) The “provision” includes three stages

(a) the designation of the person on whom the benefice is bestowed (designatio personae);

(b) the collation of the office itself (collatio sice institutio canonica), for higher offices by papal confirmation, for inferior functions by episcopal institution; and

(c) the act of putting the nominee in possession of the office or the prebend, called, when he is bishop, inthronization, when he is a canon or other prebendary, installation. The election or designation confers on the candidate only a right of priority: the complete lawful possession can only be acquired by the canonic confirmation or institution.

(2.) There are an ordinary and an extraordinary, a free and an obligatory, a full and a partial provision.

(a) When, as the rule requires, higher functions are conferred by the pope, lower ones by the bishop, this is called ordinary provision (provisio ordinaria); but if by some special lawful title, a third person, or by the law of devolution the next superior clerical functionary, or in consequence of special reservation the pope is possessed of the right of collation, this is an extraordinary provision (provisio extraordinaria).

(b) If the ordinary collator is free and bound by no obligation as to the person of the nominee, the collation is free (provisio sive collatio libera); but if he is bound by the right of designation enjoyed by a third person, the provision is restricted, and inasmuch as the collator, if all canonic requirements are met, is held to admit the proposed person, it is an obligatory one (provisio necessaria).

(c) If the collator is entitled to all three acts of a full collation, his right of provision is called a full one (jus provisionisplenum); but if he enjoys only one or the other of these attributes, he has only a partial right (jus provisionis minus plenum).

2. Requisites. — An ecclesiastic function can only be bestowed on a person possessing certain qualities, and must be occupied within a certain period and in a canonic way.

(1.) In regard to the qualifications of the candidate, the canons require that he be capable and worthy (idoneus et dignus); that not only he have all untarnished reputation, but also the required age, the necessary orters, and the instruction demanded by the office.

(a) The required age varies with the functions. It is an extraordinary rule which, in Hanover, even for simple canonries, requires thirty years of age.

(b) The candidate must belong to the clergy, and, in consequence, must be at least tonsured, and be advanced enough to be able to get the necessary orders within a year (Clem. c. 2,” De Act. et Qual.” i, 6; Cone. Trid. sess. 22 c. 4, “De Ref.”). In ancient law the candidate, if his office required higher orders than those of a subdeacon, could receive a dispensation for seven years, to give him time to complete his scientific education, and the benefice meanwhile might be administered by a vicar (Sext. c. 34, “De Elect.” i, 6). The modern law reduces this term to one year, which runs from the day of possession fully obtained (Sext. c. 35, “De Elect.” i, 6). If during this period the orders have not been conferred, the benefice is lost, if it is a curacy, eo ipso (Sext. c. 14, 35:” De Elect.” i, 6), otherwise only after previous warning (c. 7, 10:” De Elect.” i, 6; Sext. c. 22, cod. i, 6); but in the latter case the bishop may grant a second dispensation of one year (Cone. Trid. sess. 7:c. 12, “De Ref.”). To get into possession of a bishopric, the elected person or nominee must have obtained the subdeaconate six months before his election or nomination (Conc. Trid. sess. 12:c. 2, “De Ref.”). Abbots, holders of dignities. and functions with  which jurisdiction and charge of souls are connected must be priests (c. 9, 10 “De Act. et Qual.” i, 14), and especially in cathedral clhpters half at least of the canons must be presbyters (Cone. Trid. sess. 24:c. 12, “De Ref.”), although in the time of the Council of Trent already many chapters — for instance, those of Cologne, Treves, etc. — were exclusively composed of priests, which is now always the case. (c) The candidate must possess the scientific acquirements required by the office. The Tridentine rule decrees that the bishop must have shown his capacity at some university (or lyceum) as a teacher, or by degrees obtained in theology or canon law, or other academical testimonies (Conc. Trid. sess. 22:c. 2, “De Ref.”). The functions of cathedral scholastics, of penitentiaries, and in general of all dignities and half of the canonries, can only be bestowed upon graduates (ibid. sess. 23 c. 18, sess. 24 c. 8, 12, “De Ref.”). For candidates to prebends implying charge of souls (curates, preachers) a trial is instituted, and held by the bishop or his vicar-general and at least three other examiners chosen by the diocesan synod and put under special oath (Conc. Trid. sess. 24:c. 18, “De Ref.;” comp. Pii V “In Conferendis,” d. 18 Maj. 1566, and Benedicti XIV “Cum illud,” d. 14 Dec. 1742). As the diocesan synods, after a long interruption, have only been revived of late, the papal see has conferred full powers on the bishop (modo provisorio), and, until the regular synods should be reestablished, to nominate, himself, these synodal examiners and take their oath. Besides this examination required by the Church, most civil governments in Germany prescribe a similar examination for the candidates to the functions of curate or preacher.

(2.) In regard to the time and manner of the provision, the following principles prevail:

(a) A newly established clerical function must first be endowed; an office subsisting already must be not only really, but lawfully vacant. Even to give expectancies, or promises of provision in case of vacancy, is prohibited. Every clerical office must be filled in a given period of time-higher offices within three months; inferior offices, the provision of which is left to the free collation of the bishops or chapters, six months (c. 2, 10:” De Concess. Preb.” iii, 8) from the day their vacancy was first known (c. 3, 10:” De Suppl. Negl. Prael.” i, 10). If the offices to be filled are patronal benefices, the lay patron is allowed a term of four months (c. 3, 10:”De Jure Patron.” iii, 38) for making his presentation. the clerical patron a term of six months; the latter being lawful even in cases where a layman has  transferred his right of presentation to a church or ecclesiastical corporation (Sext. c. un. “De Jur. Patron.” iii, 19), or where the patronate is nixed. However, the civil legislation of several countries disagrees in many cases with these rules. If the election, postulation, nomination, or presentation have not taken place within the allotted term, it is, for this case, lost to the patron, and devolves upon the superior clerical authority.

(b) The benefice must be filled according to the canons; consequently, with complete independence both of the collator and the receiver (c. 2, 10 “De his quae Vi,” i, 40), without diminution or heavier taxation of the prebend (c. un. 10 “Ut Benef. sine Diminut.” iii, 12), and without simony. The admission of the state, and often of individuals, to a share in the provision of ecclesiastical benefices gave rise in the mediaeval Church to the contention for investiture (q.v.), and remains as yet unsettled. In some countries it was set at rest by concordat; in others it is still unregulated, though the right of final and complete provision is admitted to belong to the pope. In most Roman Catholic countries the crown elects to bishoprics, and the pope is bound to confirm the nominee of the crown, unless canonical cause of rejection should appear. In Germany, the contest with the papacy has on this account left vacant several important provisions.

3. Form of the Provision. —

(1.) Concerning the ordinary collation

(a) of higher offices. Archiepiscopal and episcopal sees, abbacies, and other prelatures are filled by election, postulation, or nomination.

(b) The other clerical functions are disposed of by the bishop in the whole extent of his diocese. This right of filling the vacant places is either entirely free, or it is more or less circumscribed by the rights of third persons or by the peculiar situation of the chapter, especially by the right of presentation of the patrons.

(2.) An extraordinary provision takes place

(a) either jure devoluto, when the person entitled to fill the vacant office does not fulfil the canonic conditions of the provision, or

(b) jure reservato, when the prebend is one of those the collation of whom is reserved to the pope.

4. Institution or Installation. —

(1.) The lawful collation of the office in question by the competent clerical superior. whichi alone entitles to the possession of the office and to th e exercise of the rights of consecration and jurisdicLion connected with it, is made, for episcopates and prelatures, by the pope, by confirmation of the elected or postulated person or nominee; for other functions, by the bishop (c. 3, 10 “De Instit.” iii, 7; Conc. Trid. sess. 24:c. 13, “De Ref.”), through canonic institution. The phrase institutio canonica appears in Sext. c. 1, “De Reg. Jur.” 5:12, and has since prevailed; the expressions collatio, institutio collativa, institutio verbalis, institutio auctorisabilis, investitura, are somewhat erroneously employed as synonymous with it. Collatio beneficii ought to be used only for prebends freely conferred by the clerical superior, as here the collation of the office makes one with the designatio persone, both being included in the decree of collation. If the office belongs to that class to which third persons (physically and morally qualified) have a right of election or presentation, then institutio is the right word, and, better, institutio canonica, to indicate that this institution made by the competent clerical superior is alone the lawful collation; or institutio collativa, to indicate that the office is really conferred only by the institution; institutio verbalis, to distinguish this verbal delivery of the office from the act of putting a person in possession of it (installatio). While the libera collatio was always, and is still, an absolutely personal right of the bishop, neither the vicargeneral (sede plena) can perform it without special powers, nor the chapter, nor the capitular vicar appointed by them (sede vacante). The institutio canonica, or collutiva, or cerbalis, was formerly a regular official right of the archdeacon (c. 6, 10 “De Instit.” iii, 7), and is still a right comprised in the general powers of the vicar- general. This right of institution to offices connected with no charge of souls can exceptionally belong even to other ecclesiastical persons or corporations, either in consequence of special favor or of prescription (c. 18, 10 “De Praeser.” ii, 26; c. 2, § 2, “De Privil.” 5:33). By this canonical institution the nominee obtains the full right to his office and to the attributes of jurisdiction and honorary distinctions connected with it, but no right to take charge of souls: for this he needs a special authorization, for which he must apply within a period of two months from the day when the decree of presentation or collation has been received (Pii V “In Conferendis,” d. 8 Mart. 1867); and this is called the inlstitutio, in a narrower sense, or institutio auctorisabilis, i.e. the special collation of the charge of souls. The collation of the cura aninmarum is, again, so exclusively a right of the bishop that neither tle archdeacon nor formerly  the vicar-general, unless specially empowered, could confer it (c. 4, 10 “De Off. Archidiac.” i, 23), nor, in general, any third person even possessed of the fuill right of provision. Now the institutio auctorisabilis goes regularly together with the institutio collativa, and is given at the episcopal residence after previous examination (Cone. Trid. sess. vii; c. 13, “De Ref.”) and approbation, by means of symbolical performances, by dressing the candidate in the chasuble and barret (hence the name investiture), receiving his profession of faith and oath of obeisance, and delivering the beneficiary a deed thereof, called “letter of investiture.” This institutio auctorisabilis can be made by the bishop himself or his vicar-general, who needs no longer a special mandate for it (Benedicti XIV “De Syn. Diec.” lib. ii, c. 8), and, sede vacante, the chapter, or the capitular vicar appointed by them (Sext. c. 1, “De Instit.” iii, 6).

(2.) The introduction into the office and prebend, or putting into possession (institutio corporalis), is called

(a) for the bishop inthronization, and consists in this, that the consecrated bishop, in his badges, takes solemn possession of his cathedral and assigned residence. It is combined, if the bishop be consecrated in his own church, into one act with the consecration; but if the consecration take place extra diocesin — in the metropolitan church, or cathedral, of the consecrator delegated by the pope — then, according to the traditional custom, the bishop in pastoral habit, with crosier and mitre, is received at his arrival in the ban/ieue of his seat by the chapter and the clergy of the city and surrounding country, and escorted to some church situated in the neighborhood, where, after a short prayer, he is clothed in the pontifical robes and badges, hence to be led in solemn procession, all bells ringing, into his cathedral. Here he is greeted with the hymn Ecce sacerdos magnus, and while the clergy and the people sing the Te Deum, he takes his seat, gives the episcopal benediction, and is then escorted to his residence, the cross being carried before him.

(b) The solemn admission of a canon of a cathedral or collegiate chapter is called installation. The beneficiary, in the house of the chapter, is clothed in the choir garments, and the capitular cross is appended to his neck, whereupon he recites the Credo and swears the capitular oath. He is then led to his seat in the chapter (sedes in capitulo), escorted to the church, and here, also, shown his place in the choir (staltum in choro, hence installatio).

(c) With curates and other beneficiaries, the institutio corporalis (now also called installatio) is performed at the place of the prebend, the introduction into the office (immissio in spiritualia beneficii) by a legate of the bishop, and the putting in possession of the prebend (immissio in temporalia) by a commissary of the civil government.

In Austria, every ecclesiastic, upon getting into office, after receiving spiritual investiture at the hands of the bishop, has, before his installation, to sign a written declaration to the effect that he does not belong, nor will ever belong, to any secret society. The spiritual installation is performed, in the name of the ordinariate, by the vicar of the district or dean the first holyday after the arrival of the ecclesiastic at the place of his benefice; the worldly installation, in the name of the government, by a higher functionary commissioned thereto; in patronal prebends by the patron, according to the prevailing custom. In Prussia, the prebendary is generally put into possession by the archpriest (dean), in common with the patron or with the Landrath, if the curacy be one of those to which the government has the right of nomination. The deed of confirmation is read in the presence of the community, the curate is introduced, and put in possession of his residence with appurtenances. In Bavaria the oath is exacted, after which the dean proceeds to the spiritual performance in the church, where he introduces the new curate to his community. From the church he is led again to his residence, where he is introduced to the community by the royal commissary. Then the people are dismissed, and the same commissary, in the presence of the episcopal plenipotentiary and the civil functionaries and church trustees, delivers the keys of the house to the new curate. In Baden, the curate is put in possession, in the name of the grandduke, by the grand- ducal dean and the functionaries of the district, but only mediately, by a written order of these officers; but a solemn institutio corporalis takes place in the church in the presence of the archiepiscopal dean. Similar dispositions prevail in Wurtemberg, in the kingdom of Saxony, the grand- duchy of Hesse, and in Nassau. — Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. s.v.

II. In the Church of England, the bishop is nominally elected by the chapter; but, in reality, the members of the chapter are only permitted to name the particular person whom the crown presents to them for election with the conge d'elire. In the Roman Catholic Church of England and of Ireland, the parochial clergy, together with the canons, recommend three candidates, one of whom is commonly, although not necessarily, appointed by the pope.

III. In the Russo-Greek Church, the candidates are presented by the holy synod, and the czar names the bishop from among them. See Hardwick, Hist. of the Reformation, 1, 350.

## Provisor[[@Headword:Provisor]]

             (1) a chamberlain;

(2) the Clugniac bailiff of the ville or manor and receiver of rents. Walcott, Sacred Archceology, s.v.

## Provisors, Statute Of[[@Headword:Provisors, Statute Of]]

             Clement V, in the beginning of the 14th century, went beyond all his predecessors by declaring that the disposal of all ecclesiastical benefices belonged to the pope. The pope accordingly made reversionary grants, or provisions, as they were called, during the lives of the incumbents; and he reserved such benefices as he thought fit for his own peculiar patronage. England in particular suffered greatly from these papal encroachments during the reign of Henry III. The parliament assembled at Carlisle in the thirty-fifth year of Edward I sent a strong remonstrance to pope Clement V against the papal encroachments. But this remonstrance produced no effect. The first prince who was bold enough to assert the power of the legislature to restrain these encroachments was Edward III. After complaining ineffectually to Clement VI of the heinous abuse of papal reservations, he procured the famous statute of Provisors (25 Edw. III, stat. 6) to be passed (A.D. 1350). This act ordained that all elections and collations should be free according to law; and that in case any provision, collation, or reservation should be made by the court of Rome of any archbishopric, bishopric, dignity, or other benefice, the king should for that turn have the collation of such archbishopric or other dignities elective. This statute was fortified by several others in this and the succeeding reigns down to the 3 Henry V, c. 4.

## Provoost, Samuel, D.D[[@Headword:Provoost, Samuel, D.D]]

             an American prelate of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born in New York Feb. 26, 1742, and passed A.B. in King's College in 1758. Though educated in the Dutch Reformed Church, he early became a convert to Episcopacy, and, having entered Cambridge College, was ordained in 1766. On his return from England he became assistant minister of Trinitv  Church, also of St. George's and St. Paul's, New York. He subsequently retired to East Camp till the close of the Revolution, engaging chiefly in literary pursuits. In 1784 he was elected rector of ‘rinity Church, New York, and a regent of the university. He next acted as chaplain of Congress, and in 1786 was raised to the episcopate. He served also as chaplain to the United States, and died Sept. 6, 1815. He wrote a copious Index to the Historia Plantarum of John Bauhin. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, v, 240; Amer. Ch. Rev. Jan. 1872, p. 35, 46; July, 1862, p. 668.

## Provost[[@Headword:Provost]]

             (Lat. praepositus, set over) is, in ecclesiastical language, the chief dignitary of a cathedral or collegiate church, from which use the title has been transferred to the heads of other similar bodies, whether religious, literary, or administrative. Properly, however, the name is given to the highest dignitary in the metropolitan or diocesan chapter, and is often held conjointly with the archdeaconry. The provost is the next in dignity after the archbishop or bishop, a position which is also the right of the provost of a collegiate chapter. The name is also given to the superiors of certain religious houses of lesser rank, and the relation of which to the more important houses is analogous to that of the priory to the abbey. It was also given to certain lay officials, whose duties, in relation to the Church and the maintenance of its material condition, were similar to those of the modern churchwarden. In the Protestant Church in Germany, the name provost is sometimes used as synonymous with that of dean or archpriest; and occasionally, where several minor churches or chapels are attached to one chief clihrcli, the minister of the latter is called “provost.” In Egland, the heads of several colleges in the Ulliversitv ot Oxfird, andl the head of King's College, Cambridge, are designated provost. The head of Eton College is also so called.

## Prowe[[@Headword: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 banqliet 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[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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 menans of the former. See Watts, Sermons, ser. 28; Grove, Moral Philos. vol. ii, ch. ii; Mason, Christian Morals, vol. i, ser. 4; Evans, Christan Temper, ser. 38; Coleridge, Aids to Reflection, i, 13, 21 sq.

## Prudentius Hymns[[@Headword:Prudentius Hymns]]

             SEE SALVETE FLORES MARTYRUM.

## Prudentius St.[[@Headword: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 Godeschalcus (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 Gottschaik, 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 Fulgentiuls and Prosper of Aquitanius. 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 orthbdoxy, 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 μὴ ὄν, 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 Tractoia 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 gui 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[[@Headword: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, andl 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, Α᾿ποθέωσις (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, Α῾μαρτιγένεια (On the Origin of Evil, a polemic, in verse, against the Marcionites and Manichaeans).

4. Psychomatchia, 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 abomninations 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 cantunm”); 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 talle-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 Januarias”) 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 archteological 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-panegyrical 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 martyrum, 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 eves 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 (comlp.  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[[@Headword:Pruning-hook]]

             (מִזְמֵרָה, mazmerah; Sept. δρέπανον; Isa 2:4; Isa 18:5; Joel 4:10; Mic 4:3), a knife for pruning the vine. The manner of tzrimming the vine (זֵמִר, zamdr), signifying clipping, and also the singular instrument of the vine-dresser, were well known even in the time of Moses (Lev 25:3-4), and no doubt both were similar to those employed by the Egyptians. SEE KNIFE; SEE VINE; SEE VINEYARD).

## Prussia[[@Headword: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. Prussia24,8803,367,7042. Posen11,3301,715,6183. Pomerania12,1301,505,5754. Silesia15,6664,112,2195. Brandenburg15,5052,342,4116. Saxony9,7292,428,3677. Westphalia7,7712,204,5808. Rhine province10,2894,344,5279. Hesse-Nassau5,9431,592,45410. Hanover14,8462,172,70211. Sleswig-Holstein6,959995,87312. Principlity of Hohenzollern45366,72013. City of Berlin51,315,287About 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 mediatized 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 pursuitsare 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 Phoenician 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 iwhat 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 starsa 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 mwere held particularly holy. This god had, throughout the country, a number of sanctuaries, where he was attendmed 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. Jawvinna 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 wrathfiul 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, elfs, 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 kiingdom, 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 attendled 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 mwell 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, wurskaiti, 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 seiem 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 sacerdoral 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 mwas the sacrifice brought to them, which human handus 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 benedicticio 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 falmily of the Barons von Querfirt, who, after renonncing his canoiuny and entering the Benedictine congretgainmi 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 beginningr of the war all the knights, save five, were killed in lattle 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 stub epeciali Sedis Apostolicct protectione et defensione perpetuo tempore permanere sancimus.... Te Conrade magister ejus domus annulo, nostro de terra-investimus, ita quod ipsa... . ullius unquam slubjiciatur dominiio potestatis; quae vero in fnturnm... de terra pagailornm in eadem provincia vos contigerit adipisci, firma et illibata vobis vestrisque successoribus soub jure et proprietae 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 gainied 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 neighblors. 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 Teutomnic Order to engage in their expedition undier such unfavorable circumstances. They began the war wiithout 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 Pomeraneia, 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, disnmayed 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 exlpressed 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 tihe bishop should have olllv onne 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 dnke 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 Dobrii, 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 Doblrin with the Teutonic Order, mainly at the request of the bishop of Plock. The latter and the plnpal legate, after negotiating through the summer moiuths, succeeded in October in restoringg concord. The knights delivered to Conrad the castle of Dobrin, with its dependencies, and received in exclange 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 increaise 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 meeknsess 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 nalion. 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 Domininicans, 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 celebated 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 daughlter to another man in mnatrimonly, nor buy at wife for himself or his son: that nobody should henceforward marry his mother- in-law, or the widow of his brotther, 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 thenmselves, were to have theit 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 himiself, 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 distrlict of Lobau; the so-called Sassenlalnd 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 letgate, 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 Heidenleich, who had, like him, worked many years for the expansion of Chrisitianity, was selected to be the first bishop of Pomesania. A brother-priest of the Teutounic 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 unitil 1276. The chapter was established first at Schonewik, near Fischauseu, then (in 1285) at Konigsberg. The bishops, owing to various impedmnents, 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 airrived also at the court of Rome, anld 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 bishophric of Chiemsee, which had just becomme 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 recommentded 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 monoastery 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 Erlnland, 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 desireable. The popes displayed indefatiguable 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 inmprovement 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 estlablishlment 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 Konigsberg. But we have no historical datal on this point, and we may well admit that the protracted and savage warfare which made everything unustable 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 fonundation 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 anppeared at the appointed tine 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 revaulation: the decision about these matters was given in 1251. The bishops Peter of Albano and William of Sabina (the former legate) and cardinal Giovaniii 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 obhservance 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 Willian 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 achiepiscopal, and be transfered 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 himnself 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 Heidenzieich'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 older the bishop could pretend only to what must needs be done by a bishop (“salvis tamen episcopo in duabus fratrum 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 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 bishlps; 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 acccept 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 mangrave 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 inmmediately result, as the knights had hoped, in securing them allies powerful enough to aid them in emancipatitng 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 emporers, 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, afer 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 remainled 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 admlinistration 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 necessmary 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 enmperor — 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 miiles. 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 aganst 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 sirgnificant 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 Konigsberg 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 (Urachen 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 Konigsberg, 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 Konigsberg. 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 Konigsberg — 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, m hich 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 Konigsberg 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 Doctriince Prutenicum, also called Repetitio Corporis Doctrinoe Christianoe, 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 Kirchenordung u. Ceremonien wie es in Uebung Gottes Worts v. Reichung der hochwurdigen Sakramente in den Kirchen des Herzogthunes 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 educatioun 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 supervention, 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 andl 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 iunion 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 Rintein to the Reformed Church. But notwithstanding these conlcessions, 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 colloquiium in 16331 — 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 Landstande, 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, comnposed 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 ro al authority was exercised over the Church.

he 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 bv 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 thev 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 colltended 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 inew 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 frot; the proceedings of the provincial synods, presented its views of the existing wants of the Church. Its plan for a future ecclesiastical consitution 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 enactmlenits, 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 chanmber 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 othehe 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 trom 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 het 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 soverelgn 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, w.hile 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 verv 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. Conseqttently 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 Chnrch 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 welare. 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 Concordioe (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-Weinar, 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 Ultramontanism 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 (formnerly 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 kiingdom 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. Edcation. — Education is compulsory in Prussia, and its management and direction are under the control of the State. In no country are better or  ampler means supplied for the diffusion ot 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, andt 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 thle maintenance of which the State gives annually albout £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 thhe 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 govelrnmnent 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 fonrm 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 mnre 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 ministeres 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 impportant 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 suplerintendents 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 igeneral 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 (Kirchengemneindenrathe) of four dioceses send one layman, who, however, must be a memblr 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 Snpreme Church Council (Oberkirchenrath). The synod has a legislative, disciplinary, and consultative character, and it has the initiative in the grovernment in the Church. Without its concultence no law can be enacted bearing on the governnment, doctrine, and worship of the Church.

“In Wurtenmberg yearly diocesan synods welre 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 alre 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 geeneral 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, l885, 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 indepenedent members; in Wurtemberg, 1 congregation with 94 independent members; 56 ministers are connected with the Old Catholics; they have in Germanyy 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 gymnnasia (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 dunmb, 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 —

CountriesStationsMissionar iesCommuni cantsScholarsSouth Afr.5818036,7926,524West Afr.13420238,9518,987Eng. India6217631,19711,149Dutch India111173870China17342,485729Austr.1028305292West Indies485338,21612,129Esquimau Lands19723,073621Orient24553,1381,746“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 Barmem) 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 £l5,500.

“(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 Evanngelical 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 larner Hoime 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 uniions, 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 ot 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 Elbereld 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, aind other meetings. The Evangelical Society has now 22 colporteurs and city imissionaries, and some travelling preachers and evangelists. It has in the last year begun popular apologetical lectures in large towns with nmuch 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 manuy 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 congregatiouns, 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[[@Headword: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 prelatical 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 uinsympathizing 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 nere 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 autior 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 han-man, to be degraded from the bar and turned out of the society of Lincoln's Inn, to be degraded at Oxtford, 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 sergeant-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 anid 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, anld 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, thourgh 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[[@Headword: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.

## Przypcov, Samuel[[@Headword:Przypcov, Samuel]]

             a Socinian of Poland, who died June 19,1670, had studied at Leyden, and occupied high offices in his country. But being a Socinian, he had to leave Poland, and went to Brandenburg. He wrote, Cogitationes Sacrae ad Initium Evang. Matth. et Omnes Epistolas Apostolicas (Amsterdam, 1692 fol.): — Vita Fausti Socini (1636), etc., to be found in Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum. See Winer, Handbuch der theol Lit. 1:238, 771; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Psachasius[[@Headword:Psachasius]]

             a Roman Catholic divine of the 5th century, flourished at Rome as deacon of a Church about A.D. 490. He was a friend of the antipope Laurentius, and sided with him. Paschasius is reputed to have written De Spiritu Sancto libri duo, quibus symboli enarratio continetur, cadversus errores Macedonii (in “Bibl. Max. Patr.” 8:807). Casimir Oudin ascribes the work to Faustus Regiensis.

## Psalm[[@Headword:Psalm]]

             SEE PSALMODY; SEE PSALMS, BOOK OF.

## Psalmanazar, George[[@Headword: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 hlimself 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)[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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 bv 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? Sholuld 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 bv 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 Iymnulm; 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, andn 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 Chumrch. 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 wmords set to specific music, which seeks to bring out their special emphasis, and is incapable of beingr used to any other. The anthem is, characteristically, tlhe 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 boly 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 ot a mulch higher and more catholic character for the lwhole congregation to unite in the utterance of religious feeling. Hence, as a rule, no composition should be allowxed 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 (2Ch 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 (1Ch 23:5; 1 Chronicles 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. Psalms 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 ratlher a combination of fotur or five separate collections, of Helbrew poetry, of long and gradual accumulation, containinig the Temple psalms, but containing also many pieces nleither 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 1Sa 18:6; Nehemiah 9; Ezr 3:10; Isa 6:1-3; bishop Lowth On Hebreow Poetry, lect. xix; Wheatley On the Common Prayer, ch. iii, § 9.

From 1Ch 25:7 it appears that Church music was formally taught in the Jewish schools.

That Jewish song was celebrated tlroughout the East is implied in the ironical request of the Balblonians 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 whic 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 inlormation 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 bv 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 (Num 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 touchinigly 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” (ὑμνήσαντες) before they went out to the Mount of Olives (Mat 26:30; Mar 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 (Psalms 16-19). SEE HALLEL.

When Paul and Silas were imprisoned at Philippi, “at midnight they prayed and sang praises unto God” (ὕμνουν τὸν θεόν, Act 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 (Eph 5:19) and to the Colossians (Col 3:16), the apostle Paul recognises and enjoins the use of sacred song. So does the apostle James (Jam 5:13). Michaelis and others suppose that such passages as Act 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 Proefaitionibus, 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 Psalms 3; Basil. Mag. In Psalms 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 שׁירים, משׁמורים, תהלים, 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 Mat 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 extemporary 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 1Co 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 Annott. 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 Alexaundria; 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 wouldl 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 Eph 5:14; 1Ti 3:16; Jam 1:17; Rev 1:5-6; Rev 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 Temnple 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 Wurdigung 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 melolies 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, ῞Υμνος 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, Psalms 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, Obss. Sac. iii, 430; Walch, De Hymnis Eccl. Apostol. (1737); Ililliger, 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. Archaologie, 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 leqgono in tutto anno nella Santa Chiesa (Venet. 1567); Hymni Ecclesime e Breviario Parisiensi (Oxon. 1838); [Faber] Hymns translated frmom the Parisian Breviary (Lond. 1839); Daniel, Thesaurus Hymnologicus (Hal. et Lips. 1841-55, 3 vols.); Burgess. Select Metrical hymns and Homilies of Ephraenm Syrus (Lond. 1853); Trench, Sacred Latin Poetry (ibid. 1849); Mrs. Barrett Browning, The Greek Christian Poets (ibid. 1863). SEE HYMNOLOGY.

## Psalmody, Christian[[@Headword: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 delightfil 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 Armbrosian 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 Ambro.se 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 sinuging 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 poputlar 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 vas 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 estimat ion, 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 uunderwent 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 proficients 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 dale; 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 ildividual 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, sbme 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 Eylise 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 hymlnology, and that of his coadjutors Halls Sachs, Michael Weiss, Johann Kugelmann, 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, nand, 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 Frairum, 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 Convart, 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 thev 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 Brecsz, in Lithuania, about the year 1565, under the anspices 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-lautreate 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 Tallls, 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, andl 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 Deume 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 hynns 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 tor 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 befomre 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 tdid 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 nmodern 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 Elngland. 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 oln 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 woull 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 anthor 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 popularityand 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:

“Psalms 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 1755and 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.” Thev 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 diville 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 Pennsyvlvania. 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 Song of Solomon 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 Chope (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 Congregation al 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 (185O).

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 Kuowledge.

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 Epicopal. — 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, land 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, fur 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 Gemeine des Herrn (Hamburg, 1860).

2. Evangelical Association. — Gesangbuch der evangelischen Gemeinschaft (Cleveland, 1877).

3. Lutheran. — Das gemeinschaftliche Gesangbuch. Lutherisches Gesaunbuch.

4. Methodist. — Deulsches 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 hymn- books, 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[[@Headword: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; bunt we have thrown some new light, we trust, especially upon the difficult questions colnnected 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 תְּהַלּים, Tehillim, elsewhere rendered “Praises.” But in the actual superscriptions of the psalms the word תְּהַלָּה, is applied only to one, Psalms 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 מַזְמוֹר, mizmor, which signifies strictly a rhythmical composition (Lowth, Prcelect. 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, תְּהַלַּים(Rabbinic form,with הelided, תליםor תלין, 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 תהליםis ὕμνοι, and not ψαλμοί, which rather (as above noted) corresponds to

מַזְמוֹרַים, m? 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 מַזְמוֹר, while only one (Psa 145:1) is styled תהלה. That the name מזמוריםdid, however, obtain in ancient times, rather than the present title, תהלים, may be presumed from the use of ψαλμοί in the Sept. and the New Test., and of mizmera in the Peshito. SEE PRAISE.

In Psa 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 תְּפַלּוֹת, tephill th, “Prayers;” and, in fact, “Prayer” is the title prefixed to the most ancient of all the psalms, that of Moses (Psalms 90). But the same designation is in the superscriptions applied to only three besides, Psalms 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: שַׁיר, Shir, “Song,” the outpouring of the soul in thanksgiving, used in the first instance of a hymn of private gratitude (Psalms 30), afterwards of hymns of great national thanksgiving (Psalms 46, 48, 65, etc.); מִשְׂכַּיל, alskil, “Instruction” or “Homily” (Psalms 32, 42, 44 etc.; comp. the!צשכיל, “I will instruct thee,” in Psa 32:8); מַכְתָּם, Mliktim, “Private Memorial,” if from the root כתם(perhaps also with an anagrammatical allusion to the root תמ, “to support,” “maintain;” comp.  Psa 16:5) (Psalm 16:56-59); עֵדוּת, Eduth, “Testimony” (Psalms 60, 80); and שַׁגָּיוֹן, Shiggayon, “Irregular or Dithyrambic Ode” (Psalms 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 Svriac Psalters differ from the Hebrew. The Greek translators joined together Psa 9:10 and Psalms 114, 115, and then divided Psalms 116 and Psalms 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 Psalms 114, 115, and to divide Psalms 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 Psalms 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, Psalms 18, 68, 118, as also between the two psalms containing the praise of the Law, Psalms 19, 119. That Psalms 42, 43 were originally one is evident from the continuation of the refrain. There are also some discrepancies in the versual 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 Psalms 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 1Sa 1:9; 1Sa 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 (Job 42:10; Hos 6:11; Ezra 16:53); nor yet in the acrosticism of Psalms 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 Psa 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 (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 (Pro 25:1), and to  have comlmanded the Levites to sing the words of David (2Ch 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 Psalms 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 Psalms 53 is plainly the same as Psalms 14 with only a notable variation in the divine name, אֶלֹהַים, Elohim, God, being used in the former wherever יְהֹוָה, Jehovah, Lord, is found in the latter. So also Psalms 70 is but a repetition of Psa 40:13-17, with the same singular variation in the divine name. This division appears by the date of its latest psalm (Psalms 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 Psalms 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 Psalms 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 Psalms 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 Elohimn 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 Psalms 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 הִלְלוּיָה, hallelujah, a title in all the Psalms which commence with it. To each of these exceptions the Talmud (Babyl. Cod. Aboda Sarah, fol. 24, Colossians 2) gives the name מזמורא יתומא, 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 Psalms 60, which is 59 in his version, he gives only a Psalme 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 Isa 38:9, in Hab 3:1, and in 2Sa 1:17-18 (Tholuck, Psalmen, p. 24). The other instances commonly appealed to in Exo 15:1; Deu 31:30; Jdg 5:1; 2Sa 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 2Sa 23:1 and Num 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 Psalms 27), and sometimes giving a heading where the Hebrew has none (as in Psalms 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 Psa 14:7; Psa 25:22; Psa 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 Psalms 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 Psalms 30, unless, indeed, this refers to the dedication of the site of the Temple (1Ch 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 Psalms 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 לְ, 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. הִמְנִצֵּחִ, 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 patrticular: 39.

c. The object or special purpose of the writer:

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

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

3. עִנּוֹת, annoth (to reply, A.V. “Leannoth,” q.v.), responsive, perhaps a note of the style of recitation: 88.

4. תּוֹדָה, 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 בְּ, be- (with):

a. To designuate the orchestral accompaniment: only נְגַינוֹת, 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 עִל, al (upon), to denote the musical style of performance, as indicated by:

a. The instrument employed by the leader:

1. הִשֹּׁשִׁנַּים, hash-shoshannim (the lilies, i.e. lily-shaped, A.V. “Shoshannim,” q.v.), straight trumpets: 45, 69 [שׁוֹשִׁנַּים], 60 [שׁוּשִׁן, sing.].

2. מִחֲלִת, machaleth (the smooth-toned, A.V. “Mahalath,” q.v.), probably a lute or light stringed instrument: 53, 88.

3. נְגַינִת, neginzth, a stringed instrument in general: 61. SEE NEGINOTH.

4. הִגַּתַּית, 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. הִשְּׁמַינַית, hash-sheninith (the eighth), the octave, i.e. in a “tenor” voice: 6, 12. SEE SHEMINITH.

2. עֲלָמוֹת, 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. מוּת לִבֵּן, muth lab-ben (q.v.) (death to the son), i.e. a ditty so beginning or thus entitled: 9, and end of 48

2. אִיֶּלֶת השִּׁהִר, ayylieth hash-shahar (q.v.), (hind of the dawn), a popular song so called: 22.

3. יוֹנִת אֵלֶם רְחֹקַים, yonath elem rechokim (q.v.) (dove of silence of distant ones), an emblematic title of some well-known air: 56.

4. ( עִלomitted on account of the alliteration with אִל) אִלאּתִּשְׁחַית[or אּחֵת], al-tashchith [or- chth] (q.v.) (thou mayest not desntroy), the symbolical designation of some familiar measure: 57-59, 75, 81, 84.

IV. With the preposition אֵל(el, towards); in imitation of (French a la) some peculiar “quality” of tone (as we say, the stop of the organ):

1. הִנְּחַילוֹת, han-nechildth (q.v.) (the contracted), the flute or continuous sound: 5.

2. שֹׁשִׁנַּים, shoshaznnim (q.v.) (lilies), the trumpet blast: 80.

V. The species of poetical composition:

1. שַׁיר, shir (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 הִמִּעֲלוֹת, ham-maaloth (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 יְדַידוֹת, yedidoth (i.e. “loves”), i.e. an epithalamium: 45.

2. מַּזְמוֹר, mizmor (playing on an instrument), simply a hymn, to be sung with nmusical accompanimennt: 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. מַכְתָּם, miktAm (written, “michtam,” q.v.), perhaps i.q. a “set piece” or “mottet:” 16, 56-60.

4. תְּפַלָּה, tephaillah, a “prayer:” 17, 86, 90, 102, 142.

5. תְּהַלָּה, tehillah, a “psalm'“ simply: 145.

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

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

8.שַׁגָּיוֹן, shiggayon (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 contrib.ltor.

1. David, “the sweet psalmist of Israel” (2Sa 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 Psalms 10 as it forms part of Psalms 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” (Psa 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, howv 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 (1Ki 12:16; Hos 3:5; Isa 55:3; Jer 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 Psalms 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 — Psalms 86, 108, 144 — are compacted of passages from previous psalms of David. Lastly, the Hebrew text of many (see, above all, Psalms 139) is marked by grammatical Chaldaisms, which are entirely unparalleled in Psalms 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 2Sa 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 (ἤχου) 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 Psalms 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 (Psa 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 Amo 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 Habakkuk 3 is an exact imitation of his style as seen in Psalms 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 Psalms 74, 79, , 80 there are manifest allusions to very late events in the history of Israel. Either, then, the titles of these three psalms must he 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 Psalms 50, 73, 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” (2Ch 29:13; 2Ch 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 Psalms 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 (1Ch 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 (1Ch 6:33-38), and was therefore, probably a Korahite, for the Kohathites were continued and counted in the line of Korah; see 1Ch 6:22; 1Ch 6:37-38. Thus Heman was both an Ezraite and of the sons of Korah. That Psalms 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 Psalms 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 (1Ch 6:44; 1Ch 25:1; 1Ch 25:6). SEE ETHAN.

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

7. Moses is reputed the writer of Psalms 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 Psalms 95 the forty years' wandering in the wilderness is referred to as past; in Psa 97:8 mention is made of Zion and Judah, which proves that it cannot be dated earlier than the time of David; and in Psa 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 Psalms 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 Psalms 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 (Psalms 137), and Haggai and Zechariah (Psalms 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, 33 are somewhat doubtful.)

B. Exclusively Levitical —

a. Korahites ................42-49

b. Asaph . ....... 50

C. Chiefly Davidic —

a. David .. ...................51-64 .

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. Moses ............ .. .....90.

g. Uncertain ................... 91-100.

h. David ...................... .101.

i. Uncertain .....................101.

j. David ... ...... .............103.

k. Uncertain .....................104-107.

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) Psalms 83, setting forth the dangers of the nation, as we read in 2Ch 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 2Ch 20:14). In the days of Hezekiah, who was himself a poet (Isa 38:9-20), we may date, with great probability, the Korahitic Psalms 46, 48, which seem to celebrate the deliverance from Sennacherib (2Ki 19:35). In the period of the captivity were evidently written such laments as Psalms 44, 79, 102, , 137; and after its close, when the captives returned, we must manifestly date Psalms 85, 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, accorlding to all accounts, the Canon had been closed before that time.  SEE CANON.

Moreover, the hypothesis of a Maccabaean 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 Maccabaean 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 Maccabaean impress are Psalms 44, 60, 74; and, in fact, these, together with Psalms 79, are perhaps all that would, when taken alone, seriously suggest the hypothesis of a Maccabaean 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 Psalms 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 Maccabaean epoch. In Psalms 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 Maccabeean 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 Psalms 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 Psalms 79, the mention of “kingdoms” in Psa 79:6 ill suits the Maccabaean time; while the way in which the psalm is cited by the author of the first book of Maccabees (1Ma 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 impugners 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 (Luk 20:42 and Act 1:20) we find distinct mention of the Book of Psalms (Βίβλος ψαλμῶν). Once, however (Luk 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 HAGIOGRAPHA, 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 Heb 4:7, where the quotation is taken from the anonymous Psalms 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 (2Ti 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 ofChrist'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 1Co 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 ἑστίασιν, πρό τε τῆς κοίτης. Of their use at meals we find an example also in the institution of the Lord's Supper (Mat 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.

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 (Psalms 8, 19, 65, 93, 104, 145, 147); as the Protector and Helper of Israel (Psalms 20, 29, 33, 46, 47, 48, 66, 67, 75, 76, 135, 136); or as the Helper of individuals, with thanksgiving for deliverance (Psalms 18, 30, 34, 40, 138); while others refer to them or especial attributes of Jehovah (Psalms 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 (Psalms 15, 24, l68, 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 (Psalms 23, 42, 43, 62, 91, 121, 125, 127, 128); longing for the worship of the sanctuary (Psalms 42, 43); and prayers for the  forgiveness of sin (Psalms 51). So, also, didactic songs relating to religion, or the expression of some truth or maxim (Psalms 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 (Psalms 7, 17, 22, 51, 52, 55, 56, 109).

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

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

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

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

The Messianic psalms ought properly to constitute another separate class (Psalms 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 1Sa 2:1-10; and even David's lament over Saul and  Jonathan, in 2Sa 1:18-27. To these may be added the song of Hezekiah, in Isa 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 (Psalms 72, 127) are professedly given, though “his songs were a thousand and five” (1Ki 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 Psalms 2:45, 110, to which may, perhaps, be added Psalms 72.  It would be strange if these few psalms stood. in their prophetical 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 Psalms 73, although couched in the first person singular, is really a prayer of the Jewish faithful against the Assyrian invaders; and in Psalms 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: Psa 2:1-2; Psa 2:7-9; Psa 4:4; Psa 5:9; Psa 6:3; Psa 6:8; Psa 8:2; Psa 8:4-6; Psa 10:7; Psa 14:1-3; Psa 16:8-11; Psa 18:4; Psa 18:49; Psa 19:4; Psa 22:1; Psa 22:8; Psa 22:18; Psa 22:22; Psa 23:6; Psa 24:1; Psa 31:5; Psa 32:1-2; Psa 34:8; Psa 34:12-16; Psa 34:20; Psa 35:9; Psa 36:1; Psa 37:11; Psa 40:6-8; Psa 41:9; Psa 44:22; Psa 45:6-7; Psa 48:2; Psa 51:4; Psa 55:22; Psa 68:18; Psa 68:4; Psa 68:9; Psa 68:22-23; Psa 68:25; Psa 75:8; Psa 78:2; Psa 78:24; Psa 82:6; Psa 86:9; Psa 89:20; Psa 90:4; Psa 91:11-12; Psa 92:7; Psa 94:11; Psa 95:7-11; Psa 102:25-27; Psa 104:4; Psa 109:8;  Psa 110:1; Psa 110:4; Psa 112:9; Psa 116:10; Psa 117:1; Psa 118:6; Psa 118:22-23; Psa 118:25-26; Psa 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” (Psa 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 Psalms 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 (Psalms 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 (Psalms 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 (Psalms 4). The solemn “See that there is no idol-way (דרעִצב) in me” of  Psalms 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 (Psalms 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 (Psalms 40, 69): a broken and contrite heart is, from erring man, the genuine sacrifice which God requires (Psalms 51).

Similar depth is observable in the view taken by the psalmists of human sin. It is to be traced lnot only in its outward manitestations, but also in the inward workings of the heart (Psalms 36), and is to be primarily ascribed to man's innate corruption (Psalms 51, 58). It shows itself alike in deeds, in words (Psalms 17, 141), and in thoughts (Psalms 139); nor is even the believer able to discern all its various ramifications (Psalms 19). Colnnected with this view of sin is, on the one hand, the picture of the utter corruption of the ungodly world (Psalms 14); on the other, the encouragement to genuine repentance, the assurance of divine forgiveness (Psalms 32), and the trust in God as the source of complete redemption (Psalms 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 (Psalms 19). He needs an additional grace from above, the grace of God's Holy Spirit (Psalms 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 (Psalms 119).

The Psalms bear repeated testimony to the duty of instructing others in the ways of holiness (Psalms 32, 34, 51). They also indirectly enforce the duty of love, even to our enemies (Psa 7:4; Psa 35:13; Psa 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 Psalms 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 Psa 59:14; Psa 69:25; Psa 69:28; Psa 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 Mar 3:5). If the emotion and its utterance were essentially sinful, how could Paul (1Co 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” (2Ti 4:14); and, especially, how could the spirits of the just in heaven call on God for vengeance? (Rev 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 (Psalms 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 (Psa 37:25; Psa 109:12, etc.); and thus we find set forth in the Psalms, with sufficient distinctness, though in an unmatured, and consequently imperfect, form, the doctrine of a retribution after death.
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## Psalter[[@Headword: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 Praver, 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 ininister. The translation is not that of the King James Version (i.e. our common Biblle), 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 dividedl 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 Psalms 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 Psalms 120-134, 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 suing 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 Psalms 113-118, 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 sulng, (with three lections anil responsories and six anthems) on the nocturnus of ordinuary 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[[@Headword: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 Augsburg manuscript, now no more extant, in his Adversuaria Sacra (Lugd. 1626), and then again by Fabricius in his Codex Pseudepitrauphus 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 Judoeorum, 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 (οις οὐκ ἐπηγγείλω μετὰ βίας ἀφείλοντο, Psa 17:6). They did not give God the honor, but put on the royal crown and took possession of David's throne (Psa 17:7-8). In their time Israel sinned. The king was in transgression of the law (ἐν παρανομίᾷ), the judge was not in truth (οὐκ ἐν ἀληθείᾷ), and the people were in sin (καὶ ὁ λαὸς ἐν ἁμαρτίᾷ, 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 (Psa 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 (Psalm 8:15-20). Once in the city, he also took the castles and broke the walls of Jerusalem with the battering-rams (Psalm 8:21; 2:1). Jerusalem was trodden down by the heathen (Psalm 2:20); even the altar of God was ascended by foreign people (Psa 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 (Psalm 8:23). The inhabitants of the country were carried away as captives into the West, and the princes for a derision (Psa 17:13-14; Psa 2:6). At last, the dragon who took Jerusalem was killed at the mountain of Egypt on the sea (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. Thev 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 (Psa 14:1). After death man is judged according to his works. He is at liberty to choose between righteousness or unrighteousness (comp. especially Psa 9:7). By doing the former he will rise to eternal life (Psalm 3:16); by doing the latter, eternal damnation is his destiny (13, 9 sq.; 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 (Psa 17:1, Psa 17:5; Psa 18:6-10; comp. Psa 7:9; Psalms 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 (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, Zeitschrif fur wissenschaftl. Theologie (1868), p. 134-168; (1871), p. 383-418; Messias Judoruun 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 Colesti Dignitas sit Synopticorum Sententia exponitur (Gissae, 1868), p. 49 sq.; Movers, in Wetzer u. Welte's Kirchen-Lexicon, i, 340; Delitzsch, Psalmen (lst 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, Vorlesunyen iiber 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[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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 Psalms 92, 3, in his Pictorial Bible; Bible Educator, i, 70, 215; and SEE MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS.

1. נֵבֶל, or נֶבֶל, nebel, is so rendered in the A.V. in all passages where it occurs, except in Isa 5:12; Isa 14:11; Isa 22:24 marg.; Amo 5:23; Amo 6:5, where it is translated viol, following the Geneva Version, which has viole in all cases except 2Sa 6:5; 1Ki 10:12 (“psaltery”); 2Es 10:22; Sir 40:21 (“psalterion”); Isa 22:24 (“musicke”); and Wis 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.”

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 Neh 12:27 and Isa 5:12, and in all the passages of the Psalms, except Psa 71:22 (ψαλμός) and Psa 81:2 (κιθάρα), while in Amo 5:23; Amo 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. כַּנּוֹר, 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 Isa 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 nablo and nebel are the same; and that the nablet 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 μαγάδις.

The former had only two (ibid. 4:183) or three (ibid.) strings; the latter as manly 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 Origg. 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 Psalms 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 chitarronnato (the German mandolinle), the thirteen strings of which were of gut or sinew, and were struck with a quill. SEE HARP.

The nebel asor (Psa 33:2; Psa 92:3 [4]; Psa 144:9) appears to have been an instrument of the psaltery kind of a peculiar form or number of strings (Forkel, Gesch. der Mus. i, 133). Aben-Ezra (on Psa 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. (Psa 33:21; Psa 44:1). 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 mav be obscure concerning it, that the nebel was a stringed instrument. In the Mishna (Kelim, 16:7) mention is made of a case ( תיק= 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 (1Sa 10:5). Here it is clearly used in a religious service, as again (2Sa 6:5; 1Ch 13:8) when David brought the ark from Kirjath-jearim. In the Temple band organized by David were the players on psalteries (1Ch 15:16; 1Ch 15:20), who  accompanied the ark from the house of Obed-edom (1Ch 15:28). They played when the ark was brought into the Temple (2Ch 5:12); at the thanksgiving for Jehoshaphat's victory (2Ch 20:28); at the restoration of the Temple under Hezekiah (2Ch 29:25), and the dedication of the walls of Jerusalem after they were rebuilt by Nehemiah (Neh 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. Amo 5:23; 2Es 10:22). But it had its part also in private festivities, as is evident from Isa 5:12; Isa 14:11; Isa 22:24; Amo 6:5, where it is associated with banquets and luxurious indulgence. It appears (Isa 14:11) to have had a soft, plaintive note. The psalteries of David were made of cypress (2Sa 6:5), those of Solomon of algum or almug trees (2Ch 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' (פְּסנְתֵּרַין, Dan 3:5; Dan 3:10; Dan 3:15; פְּסִנְטֵרַין, 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 אּ יןcorresponding 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, μαγάδις ῥ(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[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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 Virdunense (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. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Psellus, Michael[[@Headword:Psellus, Michael]]

             one of the most famous Byzantine writers of the 11th century, was born about the year 1020 at Constantinople. He studied at Athens, and held for many years the first chair in philosophy in his native city. The emperor Constantine Ducas appointed Psellus tutor to the imperial princes. and when Michael Ducas, his former pupil, died, in 1078, Psellus retired to a  monastery, where he died in 1106. On account of his many writings Psellus was styled: πολογραφώτατος. His principal works are, De Omnisaria Doctrina 157, διδασκαλία παντοδαπή, a metaphysical exposition of the fundamental ideas of all science: — De Demonum Operatione περὶ ἐνεργείας δαιμόνων, a dialogue, edited by Boissonlade (Paris, 1838), and of special interest for the study of' the sect of the Euchites. A comparison between the ancient Christian and Attic orators is contained in Charakteres SS. Gregorii Theologi, Basilli Magni, Joh. Chrysostom, Gregorii Nysseni. All of Psellus's works are found in Migne, Patrologiae Graecae, volume 122. See Leo Allatius, Diatriba de Psellis (Paris, 1864; reprinted in Migne); Dimitracopoulos, Orthodox Greece (Leipsic, 1872, Greek), page 8; Sathas, Michel Psellus (Paris, 1874, 2 volumes); Lichtenberger, Encylop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v.; Plitt-Herzog, Real Encyclop. s.v. (B.P.)

## Pseudepigrapha[[@Headword: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.

## Pseudepigrapha Of The Old Testament[[@Headword:Pseudepigrapha Of The Old Testament]]

             After a careful examination of the scope of the Biblical canon, the ancient Church divided the mass of Biblical literature, in the widest sense of the word. into three classes: 1, the canonical and inspired; 2. the non- canonical, but on account of their long use, worthy of being read in the churches (ἀντιλεγόμενα and ἀναγιγνωσκόμενα, ἐκκλησιαζόμενα), and, 3, the other books of a Biblical character in circulation (Biblical nams in the title, a Biblical form, Biblical contents, but differing greatly in spirit and truth from the canonical books), called apocryphal, or such as should be kept secret (ἀπόκρυφα). Virtually the same books which the ancient Church called apocrypha are embraced under the name Pseudepigrapha by the Protestant Church. Since, after the example of Jerome, the non- canonical books of the Old Test. received the name apocrypha, it became necessary to find a new one for the third class. The name ψευδεπίγραφα is, indeed, taken only from a single and outward mark, namely, the spurious character of the author's name which they bear. It is neither sufficiently comprehensive, nor does it distinguish sufficiently this class of writings from the antilegomena; nor is it applicable to all the writings of the third class. For many reasons, however, it is probably the best term that could be found.

As there is an Old and a New Test., so likewise there are pseudo-epigrapha of each, all writings that claim either to have been written by or to treat of Old Test. personages, whether these writings are of Jewish or Christian  origin, being called psudepigrapha of the Old Test.; and those writings which pretend to be gospels, acts of the apostles, epistles of apostles, and revelations under a New-Test. name, being termed pseudepigrapha of the New-Test. The latter class might probably be better called apocrypha of the New Test. (in the old sense of the word).

In the following the pseudepigrapha of the Old Test., those that are extant as well as those of which only fragments are preserved, or which are only known by name, will be treated. We premise a few remarks on the origin and development of this whole class of literature. The rapid growth and spread of pseudepigraphic literature among the Chrtia the Jead Christi the last century before, and the early centuries after, Christ, is a peculiar phenomenon, for which other nations have only distant analogies: and it is all the more remarkable, because such writings are in direct contradiction to the duty of strict truthfulness demanded by both Mosaism and Christianity. That these books were used only in sectarian circles cannot be proved. It is true that heretics in early days of the Church frequently adopted this method of promulgating their errors, but this was in the period of the decay of this literature, and we must remember, on the other hand, that, in the course of the centuries during which it flourished, it generally was employed for honorable and usually noble purposes, and by members of the orthodox Church. There is no doubt that their origin is not to be explained as an imitation of the secret books in possession of the priests of the Gentile temples, but that they are the outgrowth of the peculiarity and life of the Jewish congregation, and were then transferred to the Christian Church.

Above all, it must be remembered that it was the custom of Jewish writers not to prefix their names to their productions, as these were written for the benefit of the congregation, not for the author's glorification. Different was the practice with the prophets, who, with their names, guaranteed the truth of the revelation. Thus the names of the authors of nearly all other books have been hidden from posterity. This custom of omitting the author's name explains, to some extent, the origin of writings under a strange name. The other weighty reason lies in the inner rupture in the spiritual life of the Jews, which began before the captivity, but showed itself in great potency in the first centuries of the new Jerusalem. With the ruin of the old political and religious organization. and the sufferings under heathen supremacy, the freedom of the national spirit was also broken, the Holy Spirit of revelation withdrew, the state of affairs and the teachings of former days became decisive for the new period; and as all this led to the  formation of a canon in the first centuries after the exile; it also increased the reverence for the old history, the old persons and writings, so much, that these ruled and decided the whole spiritual life of the people. The examination, study, and application of the sacred writings were the fundamental objects of these times.

Although, through association with other nations and educational forces (Persians, Greeks, Romans), and through a more systematic and deeper investigation of the old books, new knowledge and aims were born, and although, in extraordinary and dangerous times, prominent men felt themselves called upon to speak to the congregation, yet the lack of personal influence always induced such authors to put their thoughts and words into the mouth of some pious man of antiquity, and conform the shape and style of their writings to those of the Old Test. A thorough acquaintance with these latter facilitated the application of their contents to later circumstances. Such revivification of ancient person's, which makes them the bearers of later thoughts, was common to all literature; and it was but one step further to ascribe a whole book to them. In many respects this kind of literature can be compared with the dramatic works of other nations; but to call it intentionally fraudulent is hardly to be justified, for the multitude of such books shows that the knowledge of their late origin was constantly present to the minds of the readers.

Yet the danger of leaving a false impression, at least in the minds of the less cultivated part of the congregation, although for the contemporaries comparatively small, was constantly growing with time, especially when Christianity brought these later spiritual productions of the Jews to nations who did not understand them. The opposition of the early Christian Church against such books can thus be easily understood, but theological science must investigate, and make all possible use of them. The pseudepigraphical form was chiefly adopted for the purpose of instruction, exhortation, and consolation in the great trials and troubles of post-exilic days. What the prophets had been for the past, the later writings were intended to be for the present, by the prophetical character which they assumed. Most of the pseudepigraphical works are prophetical in their nature, some also apocalypses, in imitation of the book of Daniel.

Besides the pseudepigraphical literature, the so-called haggadic midrash, as we find it in the later Targumim, Midrashim, and Talmud, as well as in the Pseudepigrapha, was especially cultivated.

With the rise of Christianity, a new element was introduced into this literature, and contributed to its growth and development, not through the  Essenes, as modern Jewish writers would have it, but through the Judaizing sects, and the gnosticism arising from them, especially in Asia Minor and Egypt. In the hands of. the sects and heretics they later became instruments for dangerous purposes, which resulted in the antagonizing attitude of the Church. The number of Jewish and Christian pseudepigrapha was undoubtedly very large. Even in the apocalypse of Ezra (4 Ezra 14:46 Lat., 14:51 Ethiop.), seventy apocryphal writings are distinguished from the twenty-four canonical books, which, however, is probably a round number that became authoritative for later times. It is probable that those preserved are the best of their class. Of many we have only the titles, or short extracts in the Church Fathers. The last decades have discovered some that were regarded as lost, and the future may yet furnish us others. They have more than a passing interest, they have historical value, because they were the popular literature of their day. According to their contents, the pseudepigrapha maybe divided into different classes, viz.:

I. LYRICAL POETRY. To this class belong:

1. The Psalter of Solomon (q.v.). By way of supplement to the literature we add Pick, The Psalter of Solomon (Greek and English, in the Presbyterian Review, October, 1883), and an art. by Dean in the Expositor (Lond. December 1883).

2. A pseudepigraphon of Δαβίδ, mentioned in the Constit. Apost. 6:16. Whether this is Psalms 151 of the Greek Bible, or a larger, independent work, cannot now be decided.

II. PROPHETIC WRITINGS. Under this head we enumerate:

a. The so-called Apocalypses or Revelations. This is the name assigned to those books of fictitious prophecy which, after the spirit of prophecy had- departed from Israel, were written, in the manner of genuine prophetic books, to solve the problems suggested by the fate and sufferings of the people. They seek a solution of the intricacies of the present in predictions of the glory of the future. Accordingly, they do not imitate the old prophets in their chief peculiarity, namely, to counsel and warn the people on account of their sins, but they undertake a subordinate office, that of foreseeing and foretelling the future, their chief object, while they nevertheless endeavor to erect their prophetic building on the foundation of the inspired seers. The chief contents of these revelations are the Messianic times in their relation to the present time and circumstances. Not that the  fact that the Messianic time would come, but when and how, was the question for the waiting congregation. The books that seek to answer these questions are called apocalypses. Their contents are most varied and peculiar, their explanation manifold and strange; the topics discussed all referring directly or indirectly to the kingdom of God, and the fnture of the chosen people; their style enigmatical and highly figurative. A portion of these apocalypses have been treated by Lufcke, Einleitung in die Ofenbarung des Johannes (2d ed. Bonn, 1848); Hilgenfeld, Die judische Apocalyptik (1857); Langen, Das Judenthum in Paldestina zur Zeit Jesu (1866); Schurer, Lehrbuch der N.T. Zeitgeschichte (1874; 2d ed. with the title, Gesch. des. jud. Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi, 1886).

3. The Enoch and Noah Writings, combined in the Book qf Enoch (q.v.). We add, by way of supplement to the literature, Drummond, The Jewish Messiah (Lond. 1877), page 17 sq.; The Book of Enoch, in the British and Foreign Evangelical Review (Lond. July, 1879); Bissell, The Apocrypha of the Old Testament (New York, 1880), page 665 sq.; Schodde, The Book of Enoch Translated, with Introduction and Notes (Andover, 1882); Laurence Book of Enoch the Prophet, translated, with Text corrected by his Latest Notes. with an Introduction by the Author of Evolution and Christianity (Lond. 1883); Enoch's Gospel, in the Expositor, May 1184; Dictionary of Christian Biography (ed. Smith and Wace), s.v. Enoch Book of.

4. The Ανάληψις Μωϋσέως, Assumptio Mosis (q.v.).

5. The Fourth Book of Ezra, SEE ESDRAS, BOOK OF, and add Gildemeister, Esrae Liber IV, Arabice (Bonn, 1877); Bensley, The Missing Fragment of the Latin Translation of the Fourth Book of Ezra (Cambridge, 1875); Drummond, u.s. pages 84-117.

6. The present Jewish Ezra revelation found an entrance into the Church, but usually with some modifications. In the editions of the Vulgate it has, besides these, long additions in front and at the close. These in the MSS., are written as separate Ezra books, one of which, at least (chapter 1 sq.), is of Christian origin, to impress the importance of Christianity upon the stubborn Jews; the other, probably a portion of an independent Jewish work. Both are translations from the Greek.

7. The λόγος καὶ ἀπυκάλυψις τοῦ ἁγίου προφήτου Ε᾿σδράμ καὶ ἀγαπητοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ, published by Tischendorf, in Apocal. Apocr.  (Leipsic, 1866), pages 24-33, from a Paris MS., has no value. On other Ezra literature, see Tischendorf, Studien und Kritiken (1851), part 2; Lucke, l.c.

8. Closely related to the Ezra prophecies is the apocalypse of Baruch, published in a Latin translation from a Syriac MS. in the Anmbrosiana at Milan, by Ceriani (Monum. Sacra, I, 2, page 73 sq.), in 1866, and by Fritzsche (pages 654-699), also in Syriac, by the former, in 1871. It is a revelation to Baruch concerning the destruction of Jerusalem, the ensuing captivity, and the second destruction, to which are added visions of the Messianic future. It is allied in contents and style to 4 Ezra, and called forth by the same historical events, but is a later production. The original language is Greek. See Ewald, Gottingen Gelehrten Anzeige, 1867, page 1706 sq.; Ewald, Geschichte (3d ed.), 7:83 sq.; Langen, De Apoc. Baruch Comment. (Freiburg, 1867); Hilgenfeld, Messias Judaecorum, page 63 sq.: Fritzsche, u.s. page 30 sq.: Schurer, u.s. page 542 sq.; Renan, Journal des Savants; 1877, page 222 sq.; Drummond, u.s. 117-132; Kneucker, Das Buch Baruch, page 190 sq. (Leipsic, 18779).

9. Whether the Pseudepigraphon Baruch mentioned in the Synopsis Palmi Athanasiz is the same as the above is uncertain. We still, however, possess a Christian Baruch book, for which seen SEE BARUCH, BOOK OF, in the supplement of this Cyclopaedia.

10. Eliae Revelatio et Visio. SEE ELIAS, APOCALYPSE OF.

11. Ascensio et Visio Isaiae. SEE ASCENSION OF ISAIAH.

12. An apocalypse or prophecy of Zephaniah is mentioned in the four catalogues of the Apocrypha, and is also quoted by Cletenes Alexalnd. Stromata, 5:11, § 78.

13. An apocrypha of Jeremiah, in Hebrew, used by the Nazarenes, is mentioned by Jerome (see Fabricims, 2d ed. 1:1102 sq.), as the source of the quotation in Mat 27:9; but this is probably fictitious.

Concerning the apocalypses of, 14. Habakkuk 15. Ezekiel 16. Daniel; 17. Zechariah, the father of John the Baptist, we have no further information.

18. An apocalypse of Moses, distinct from the Book of Jubilees (No. 31), and the Asstumptio Mosis (No. 4), we know only from Syncellus, Protius  Amphil., and others (Fabricius, page 838), who mention it as the source of Gal 6:15.

19. A Lamech book is mentioned in the catalogues of Cotelier and Montfaucoll; and

20. The Gnostic Sethites possessed an apocalypse of Abraham (q.v.).

b. Testaments:

21. A διαθήκη τῶν πρωτοπλαστῶν, according to Fabricius, 2:83, contained the mention, that Adam was taken into Paradise when forty days osd. It is probably a portion of the Vita darri (No. 35).

22. The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (q.v.); to the literature must be added Pick, The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, in the Lutheran Church Review (Philadelphia, July 1885); Schapp, Die Testamente der wolf Patriarchen (Halle, 18S4).

23. An apocryphon, τῶν τριῶν πατριαρχῶν, is mentioned in the Const. Apost. 6:16.

24. An apocryphal testament of Jacob, mentioned in the Decretum Gelasii (Fabricius, 1:437, 799).

25. A προσευχὴ Ι᾿ωσήφ, "prayer or blessing of Joseph," is frequently mentioned, and is also counted among those read (παῤ ῾Εβραίοις) by Origen and others (Fabricius, 1:765-768). It seems to have been strongly cabalistic.

26. A διαθήκη Μωϋσέως is mentioned in the four catalomues and in the Catena of Nicephorns, 1, col. 175.

27. Concerning the διαθήκη Ε᾿ζεκίου, Asc. Jes. cap. 1-5, see No. 11.

28. The testaments of Adam and Noah are portions of the Vita Adami (No. 35).

c. Other books concerning the Prophets:

29. In the acts of the Nicene synod (Fabric. 1:845) mention is made of βίβλος λόγων μυστικῶν Μωϋσέως. What book is meant is uncertain. The later Jews had a work, P'etirat Moshe, the death of Moses.

30. Liber Eldad et Mledad is mentioned in Pastor Hermae, 1, vis. 2, 3, and cited as the holy writings generally are; later authorities mention it as an apocryihon of the Old Testament.

III. BOOKS ON HISTORICAL MATTERS AND HAGGADIC WRITINGS. These include:

31. The Book of Jubilees (q.v.). To the literature we add Drummond, page 143-147; Delane, The Book of Jubilees, in the Monthly Expositor, August and September 1885: Dillmann, Beitrage aus dem Buche der Jubilden zur Kritik des Pentateuch-Textes (Berlin, 1883, in reports of the Berlin Academy of Sciences); Schodde, The Book of Jubilees (translation, etc., in Bibliotheca. Sacra, October 1885, etc.).

32. Jannes et Mambres treats of the contest between Moses and the Egyptian sorcerers (Exo 7:11). Cf. 2Ti 3:8. See Health, Quar. Statement of the "Palest. Exploration Fund," October 1881, page 311 sq.

33. Manasseh's conversion (2Ch 33:11) early gave rise to an apocryphon of Manasseh, used both by Christian writers and by the Targum on Chronicles (Fabricins, 1:1000 sq.).

34. A novel based on Gen 41:45, we have in Asenath (q.v.).

35. Books of Adam, see ADAM, BOOK OF. To the literature we add, Trumpp, in Abhandlungen der bayrischen Akademie der Wissenachaften (Munich, 1880, 1882); Meyer, Vita Adae et Evae, in the same journal (1879); Malan, The Book of Adam and Eve (Loud. 1882).

36. A gnostic writing, called Noria, after the wife of Noah, is mentioned by Epiphanius, Haer. 26.

37. An Ebionitic book, ἀναβαθμοὶ Ι᾿ακώβου (Genesis 28), also mentioned by Epiphanius (Fabricius, 1:437).

On the Jewish Midrashim. See MIDRASH, in this Supplement.

Later, this class of literature was used for worldly and evil purposes, and stood in the service of quackery, witchcraft, and sorcery. The name of Solomon was, above all others, connected with this kind of works; sometimes, also, that of Joseph and Abraham (Fabricius, 1:1043, 390, 785). See Plitt-Herzog, Real Encyklop. s.v. (B.P.)

## Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals[[@Headword:Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals]]

             SEE DECRETALS, PSEUDO-ISIDORIAN.

## Pseudodoxy[[@Headword: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[[@Headword:Pseudolatry]]

             (ψευδολατρεία, from ψεῦδος, falsehood, and λατρεία, service) designates a false worship, of which the Christian writers, vho 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[[@Headword: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 woult be a mistake if we employed the latter word for false fables, although myth is synonymous with fable.

## Psilanthropists[[@Headword:Psilanthropists]]

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

## Psychici And Pneumatici[[@Headword: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 preteuded 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 Pneurnaticists, 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[[@Headword: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 ii 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 livides 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[[@Headword: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 (רוּחִ, πνεῦμα), and the animal, sensitive, and affectional spirit (נֶפֶשׁ, 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[[@Headword: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 ψυχόμαντις, 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[[@Headword: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 tell 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[[@Headword:Psychopannychism]]

             (ψυχή, soul; πᾶν, 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[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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.

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 Dan 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 Antigonus 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 colonyv was from the first disturbed by internal dissensions (Josephus, as above; Hecat. ap. Joseph. C. Ap. l.c.).

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” (Dan 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 Iather) 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 Ι᾿ουδαϊκῶν τραγῳδιῶν 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.

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” (Dan 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” (Dan 11:8). 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]” (Dan 11:9; Justin. 27:2). After this Ptolemy “desisted some years from [attacking] the king of the north” (Dan 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.

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 thousanzds (comp. Polyb. v, 86); but he was not vigorous” [to reap the fruits of his victory] (Dan 11:10-12; comp. 3Ma 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.l 11:10-12).

5. PTOLEMY V, Epiphanes (Ε᾿πιφάνες, 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'” (Dan 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] (Dan 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] (Dan 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.

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. 2Ma 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; 1Ma 1:16 sq.); and in the next year Antiochus, having secured the person of the young king, reduced almost the whole of Egypt (comp. 2Ma 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 1Ma 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.)

These campaigns, which are intimately connected with the visits of Antiochus to Jerusalem in B.C. 170, 168, are briefly described in Dan 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 oppointed 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. Num 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. 2Ma 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: 1Ma 10:51-58). Yet, according to 1Ma 11:1; 1Ma 11:10, 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. 1Ma 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 (1Ma 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 (1Ma 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 (Isa 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” (עַיר הִחֶרֶס) 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 πήχεις 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” (1Ma 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 ulnchanged 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 (Jer 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” (Jer 44:1). This colony, formed against the command of God, was devoted to complete destruction (Jer 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 (3Ma 4:15; 3Ma 4:17), 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.l 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, 2Ma 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” (1Ma 3:38; 2Ma 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 (2Ma 4:45-50), and afterwards took an active part in forcing the Jews to apostatize (2Ma 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 (1Ma 3:38).

8. The son of Agesarchus (Ath. 6 p. 246 C), a Megalopolitan, surnamed Macron (2Ma 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 (2Ma 8:8; 2Ma 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 (2Ma 10:13).

Ptolemy Macron is commonly identified with Ptolemy “the son of Dorymenes;” and it seems likely, from a comparison of 1Ma 3:38 with 2Ma 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 (2Ma 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 (1Ma 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 (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.

## Ptolemais[[@Headword:Ptolemais]]

             (Πτολεμαϊvς), 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 (1Ma 5:15; 1Ma 5:55; 1Ma 10:1; 1Ma 10:58; 1Ma 10:60; 1Ma 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 (Act 11:30; Act 12:25; Act 15:2; Act 15:30; Act 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 Act 21:7 as containing a Christian community, visited for one dav 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 (Act 21:3). From Ptolemais he proceeded, apparently by land, to Caesarea (Act 21:8), and thence to Jerusalem (Act 21:17). SEE PAUL.

2. A place described as ροοοφορος, rose-producing (3Ma 7:17), and supposed to be the ὅρμος Πτολεμαϊvς 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[[@Headword: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.

## Ptolemee, Ptolomaeus, Ptolomee[[@Headword:Ptolemee, Ptolomaeus, Ptolomee]]

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

## Ptolemy[[@Headword:Ptolemy]]

             SEE P'OLEMAEUS.

## Ptolemy (2)[[@Headword:Ptolemy (2)]]

             was a Gnostic philosopher, in whom, according to St. Irenaeus (Proef. ad lib. i, Adv. Hoer.), the system of Valentinus reached its bloom. Irenseus 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 (Hoar. 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 sys tem, and that neither the authenticity nor the integrity (except one marginal note in cap. 1, § 6) of the former can be questioned. — Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, s.v.

## Pu Lau, Jean Marie[[@Headword:Pu Lau, Jean Marie]]

             a French prelate and theologian, born October 30, 1738, was general agent of the clergy, and- became archbishop of Aries in 1775. Having opposed the French Revolution, he was arrested, after August 10, and imprisoned in the convent of the Carmelites, in Rue de Vaugirard, where he was assassinated, September 2, 1792. He wrote, Adresse au Roi (Paris, 1792): —Recueil de Mandements et Lettres Pastorales (Aries, 1795). His complete works were published by Jacques. Constant (ibid. 1817). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Pua[[@Headword:Pua]]

             (Num 26:23). SEE PHUVAH.

## Puah[[@Headword:Puah]]

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

1. (Heb. Puvvah', פּוָּה, 1Ch 7:1.) SEE PHUVAH.

2. (Heb. Pu'ah, פּוּעָה, thought by Gesenius and Farst to be for יְפוּעָה, 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 (Exo 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 Exo 1:19, “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 Exo 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 Isa 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 (Exo 1:17); that their names are Hebrew; and that though the words לִמְיִלְּדֹת הִעַבְרַיתּmay 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 לִמְ אֶת הִע,ַ reason will be found for preferring the opinion that they were Hebrew women.

3. (Heb. Pu'ah, פּיּאָה, perhaps i. q. פֶה, mouth; Sept. Φουά, Vulg. Phua.) The father of Tola, who was of the tribe of Issachar, and judge of Israel after Abimelech (Jdg 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 (υἱός) of his father's brother;” both versions endeavoring to render “Dodo” as an appellative, while the latter introduces a remarkable genealogical difficulty.

## Public Worship[[@Headword: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, changse, 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 publiclv 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 excommunnicated 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 Player, 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 himi 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 pre-ent 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 Player. 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 mann, 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, pileached, 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 ale 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, miand their eves, 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 comne 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[[@Headword: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 nnderstand 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 publicumn), 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 composedt 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 rounds, 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 (Luk 3:13). They brought false charges of smuggling in the hope of extorting hush-money (Luk 19:8). They detained and opened letters on mere suspicion (Terence, Phorm. i, 2, 99; Plautus, Trinumnn. iii, 3, 64). Thle injurice portitorum, rather than the porioria 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 (Stobeus, Serm. ii, 34). Πάντες τελῶναι, πάντες ἃρπαγες 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 Zacchoeus; 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” (1Ki 10:15). They included also the tribute or head-money levied from individuals, and the varicous 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 lnscrupulous 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 Judlea 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 (Mat 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 (Act 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 anmong 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 (Mat 9:11; Mat 11:19), with harlots (Mat 21:31-32), with the heathen (Mat 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 (Mat 9:11). They spoke in their scorn of our Lord as the friend of publicans (Mat 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 Jdg 5:11, a description of the τελῶναι 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 Mat 5:46; also Suicer's Thesaurus, s.v. Τελώνης; Grotius, Ad Matthew 18; Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. ad Matthew 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” (Luk 18:13), may be taken as the representative of those who had come under this influence (Mat 21:32). The Galilaean 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 (Luk 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 (Luk 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” (Luk 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 bevond 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 Programmantum, p. 52, 67. SEE TAX-GATHERER.

## Publicani[[@Headword: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 mailntained 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 Imnderstalund by it that them rejected the baptism of inlfints. 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[[@Headword:Publius]]

             (Graecized Πόπλιος), the chief manprobably the governor of Melita, or Malta, who received and lodged Paul and his companions on the occasion of their being shipwrecked off that island (Act 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[[@Headword: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 fulture 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 tookl 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[[@Headword:Puccianites]]

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

## Pucelle, Abbe[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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. Puchtawas one of the most excellent of modern hymnists, hishymnns 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[[@Headword: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[[@Headword:Pudas]]

             an Indian god whom we find frequently in the company of Ixora (one of the incarnationts 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 manv circles around his legs, chest, and arms; his right hand holds a staff.

## Pudens[[@Headword: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” (2Ti 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. Agicola, 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 Ruflna 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 Timotheuas, 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. 384398. 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 tlhe 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 (Llandovery, 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[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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. Volumnimts, 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.

## Pueri[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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.

## Puernatus in Bethlehem[[@Headword: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.)

## Pufendorf, Samuel[[@Headword:Pufendorf, Samuel]]

             a German historian, was born at Chemnitz, Saxony, in 1632. He lectured on jurisprudence at Heidelberg and Lund, and finally settled at Berlin as historiographer to the elector of Brandenburg. Pufendorf died in 1694. His principal work is De Jure Naturae et Gentiunm (Lund, 1672 and often; transl. into German, English, and French). Though essentially only an elaboration and systematization of the ideas of Grotius. it forms the foundation of the modern conception of the doctrine of natural and international rights. Previously that doctrine had been based on the decalogue and developed in accordance with the idea of the justice of God. But Pufendorf emancipated the natural law from theology, without opposing the dogmas of the latter, because he recognized in religion the means of realizing the right and God as its author. Pufendorf's work attracted great attention, but also met with much opposition; indeed, Buddlaeus and Wolff were the first who fully recognised it.

Among his other works, his De Habitu Religionis Christianae ad Vitum Civilem (Bremen, 1687) has also theological interest as a defence of his colleagues' system. In a work published after his death, in 1695, entitled Jus Feciale Divinum seu de Consensu et Dissensu Protestantium, he demonstrates the impossibility of uniting the Lutherans and Reformed as long as the latter retain the doctrine of absolute predestination. See Stahl, Die Philosophie des Rechts (3d ed. Heidelberg, 1854), 1:182; Hettuer, Literaturgeschichte des XVIII. Jahrhunderts (Brunswick, 1856-62), 3:83 sq.; Bluntschli und Brater, Deutsches Staats Wotfelrbuch, 8:424-439; Droysen, Zuro-Kritik Pufendorf's, in Abhundlugen zur neueren Geschichte (Leipsic, 1876); Franck, Geschichte der protestantischen Theologie, 2:62 sq.; Plitt-Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.; Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Puffer, Isaac[[@Headword:Puffer, Isaac]]

             a well-known pioneer preacher of American Methodism, was born in Westminster 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[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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 consee quence, 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'euv'e 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[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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), Killarnev, 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, overtasked 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 malny 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.

## Puhite[[@Headword:Puhite]]

             (Heb. only as a collective, and with the art. hap-Puthi', הִפּוּתַי, patronymic from some unknown primitive; Sept. ᾿Ηφιθείν v. r. Μιφιθίμ; Vulg. Aphuthei), a designation of the second named of the “families of Kirjath- jearim” descended from Shobel (1Ch 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[[@Headword: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 wias 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[[@Headword:Puk]]

             SEE PAINT.

## Pul[[@Headword:Pul]]

             (Heb. id. פּוּל[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 (Isa 66:19) between Tarshish and Lud: “The nations (הִגּוֹיַם), [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 פּוּט, Put, which is elsewhere joined with Lud (Eze 27:10; Jer 46:9; A.V. “Libyans”); and which is sometimes rendered in the Sept. Φούδ (Gen 10:6; 1Ch 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. פּוּל) that ΦΟΥΛ 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 (פילא). But it must be kept in mind that the othet 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 (2Ki 15:19-20; 1Ch 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 Tiphsah. 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 (2Ki 15:16; 2Ki 14:25; 2Ki 14:28; 1Ki 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 seenn 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 2Ki 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 Tiphsah, 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. Hie 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-zala- khus (Oppert, Hee-likhkhus), and who reckoned among the countries tributary to himself that of Khumri or Samaria (Rawlinson, Herodotus, i, 467). [Smith revives this theory (Assyrian Epoonym 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 1Ch 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 2 Kings 20:29, is manifest from the use of'the singular וִיִּגְלֵם. 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[[@Headword: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[[@Headword:Pulcheria, Aelia]]

             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 Theodoa sius 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 puritv 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 Cyrrhus, 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 Eutychianism 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[[@Headword:Pulear Or Ganesha]]

             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 daemnons. 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. Pulear is his name as god of matrimony: it was the natural question of his father at his first appearance in the world — Pulei- ar, i.e. Whose son?

## Pulgar, Isaac[[@Headword: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 ס תשובות, “The Book of Answers.” He also wrote, besides some other works which are still in MS., a work under the title וַכּוּחִ הִתּוֹנַי עַם הִפַּילוֹסוֹ, “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 טִעִם זְקֵנַיםof 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.)

## Puliahs[[@Headword:Puliahs]]

             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 regnlar 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.

## Pullen (Pulley, Puley, Pulby, or Bullen), Richard[[@Headword:Pullen (Pulley, Puley, Pulby, or Bullen), Richard]]

             SEE PULLTYN.

## Puller, Timothy, D.D.[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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 mrright, 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[[@Headword: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. Ile 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, lhoxbury, East Village, and Riverside. In 1876 failing health compelled him to take a superannuated relation. He died Jan. 12, 1878. See Minutes of Annual Conuferences, 1878, p. 50.

## Pulolah[[@Headword: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[[@Headword:Pulpit]]

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

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 (Neh 8:4); and Solomon prayed on a brazen scatfold (2Ch 6:13). In mediaeval times the word designates the rood-loft. Becon 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 bv Prutlentius. Epiphanius says that St. Chrvsostom 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 Roiament 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 Chalonssur-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 Novon 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 Rheilns, 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 doublle 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 alvays 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.

The church pulpit is usually hexagonal or octagonal, and of wood, possibly in allusion to Christ's preaching from the boat (Luk 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. lThere 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, Milanl; 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[[@Headword: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 Mat 28:19; Mar 3:14; Mar 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 jutdgment of the preaching of those early centuries is from the fruits following. Even Eusebiuls, 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 thev 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 alddress which primarily characterized that period. Volumninouss and valuable examples have come down to ius in the homilies of Athanasius, Ephraem Syrus, Basil, the Gregories, the Cyrils, Hilary, Ambrose, Chrysostom, mind 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 swould 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, throughh 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  lunder 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 Eugenuius 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 shoutt 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 bv the ordinary influences of papal power and kingly atithority, 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 offfering 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, tunder 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 mediaeval 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 mediseval 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. ant the Jesuit Antonio Vievra, 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, especiallv 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.

Vievra 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 mediaeval preachers.” The greater part of his life mwas spent in Brazil, though for a time he served as court preacher at Lisbon. During that period he visited various cities of Europe, and eveun 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 nnlike his book entitled The Art of Stealing, which is regarded as a species of classic in the Portuguese language. Vieyra 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 PeterWaldo 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 folloswed 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 Rloman 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 influeunces. 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  unklnown 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 preaclhing 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 vet fully recovered. The causes of that decline were numerous, invsoling 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, wvas a zealous patron of preaching. Through his commandl and example, attendance upon court preaching wias 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 knoswn to the Catholic Church of France in any age. The Protestant Church of France, including Switzerland, has furnished nany 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 hal 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 wanlting, 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 unsulrpassed 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 wnould 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, wiere 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 Elngland at that flay, came to America with the Pilgrim Fathers. Having been by them established on the Atlantic coast, it hias 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 eo 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 in. tention 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 (Exo 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 developmentf 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” (1Co 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, n a 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 workmana 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 Homiletilk; 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- Medievil 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 Mlodern 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[[@Headword:Pulse]]

             (זֵרַֹעים, zeroim, and זֵרְעֹנַים, zeronim; Sept. ὄσπρια; Theod. σπέρματα; Vulg. legumince) occurs only in the A.V. in Dan 1:12; Dan 1:16, as the translation of the above plural nouns, the literal meaning of which is “seeds” of anly 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 (2Sa 17:28). In this they are probably right. Leguminous seeds roasted are still used in the East; and in his commentary on Mat 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[[@Headword:Pulton, Andrew]]

             a Roman Catholic divine of the Society of Jesus, flourished in tlhe second half of the 17th century, and is noted as a zealous defender of lhis 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[[@Headword:Pumbaditha]]

             (מומבדיתא), 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 towvards 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 acalderny, prepared after a carefull 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. Jehndah 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. Nachmanl 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 Rlbba, who belonged to the so-called Gaonastic period, the chlronological 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 R. Joseph ben-Chija anti-Gaon.

26. R. Joseph ben-Chija sole Gaon. 828- 833

27. R. Joseph ben-Rabbi 833- 842

28. Paltoj ben-Abaji    842- 858

29. Menachem ben-Joseph ben-Chija  858- 860 Mala Mattathias anti-Gaon.

30. Mar attathias sole Gaon  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.; Monatsschrif fur 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 Cyclopoedia, arts. “Education” and “Scribes;” Jost, Gesch. der Judenth. u. s. Secten, vol. ii (see Index in vol. iii); Cassel, Leitfaden zulr 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[[@Headword:Punchao]]

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

## Pundeka[[@Headword:Pundeka]]

             (פונדקא), 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[[@Headword: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 Parvlis 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[[@Headword:Punishment]]

             (most properly expressed in Hebrew by some form of פָּקִד, 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 punishmnent 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 (Gen 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 (Gen 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 (Gen 42:21). The punishmenit of death appears among the legal powers of Judah, as the head of his family, andl he ordered his daughterin-law, Tamar, to be burned (Gen 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 (Gen 26:11; Gen 26:29). Similar power seems to have been possessed by the reigning Pharaoh in the time of Joseph (Gen 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 (Exo 21:12; Exo 21:14; Exo 21:28; Exo 21:36; Lev 24:17; Lev 24:21; Num 35:31; Deu 19:11-12; and see 1Ki 2:28; 1Ki 2:34). Moses, however, did not allow parents to be put to death for their children, nor children for their parents (Deu 24:16), as did the Chaldeans (Dan 6:24) and the kings of Israel (comp. 1Ki 21:9; 1Ki 21:26).

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 com munity of such transgressors, and this was ultimately resorted to in regard to all indiviluals above a certain age, in order that a better class might enter Canaan (Num 14:29; Num 14:32; Num 14:35). 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 revilinlg, a parent (Exo 21:15; Exo 21:17).

2. Blasphemy (Lev 24:14; Lev 24:16; Lev 24:23 : see Philo, V. M. 3:25; 1Ki 21:10; Mat 26:65-66).

3. Sabbath-breaking (Num 15:32-36; Exo 31:14; Exo 35:2).

4. Witchcraft, and false pretension to prophecy (Exo 22:18; Lev 20:27; Deu 13:5; Deu 18:20; 1Sa 28:9).

5. Adultery (Lev 20:10; Deu 22:22 : see Joh 8:5, and Josephus, Ant. iii, 12, 1).

6. Unchastity —

a. Previous to marriage, but detected afterwards (Deu 22:21).

b. In a betrothed mwoman with some one not affianced to her (ibid. Deu 22:23).

c. In a priest's daughter (Lev 21:9).

7. Rape (Deu 22:25).

8. Incestuous and unnatural connections (Lev 20:11; Lev 20:14; Lev 20:16; Exo 22:19).

9. Man-stealing (Exo 21:16; Deu 24:7).

10. Idolatry, actual or virtual, in any shape (Lev 20:2; Deu 13:6; Deu 13:10; Deu 13:15; Deu 17:2-7 : see Joshua 7 and Jos 22:20, and Num 25:8).

11. False witness in certain cases (Deu 19:16; Deu 19:19). 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) Gen 9:25; (5) Gen 12:17; Gen 20:7; Gen 39:19; (6) Gen 38:24; (8) Gen 19:38.

(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 (כָּרִת; 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 (Num 15:30-31). \*Fifteen cases of incestuous or unclean connection (Lev 18:29; Lev 20:9-21).

2. Breach of Covenant, as follows:

\*†Uncircumcision (Gen 17:14; Exo 4:24). Neglect of Passover (Num 9:13). \*Sabbath-breaking (Exo 31:14).

Neglect of Atonement-day (Lev 23:29).

†Work done on that day (Lev 23:30).

\*†Children offered to Molech (Lev 20:3).

\*†Witchcraft (Lev 20:6).

Anointing a stranger with holy oil (Exo 30:33).

3. Breach of Ritual, as follows:

Eating leavened bread during Passover (Exo 12:15; Exo 12:19).  Eating fat of sacrifices (Lev 7:25). Eating blood (Lev 7:27; Lev 17:14). \*Eating sacrifice in an unclean condition (Lev 7:20-21; Lev 22:3-4; Lev 22:9).

Offering too late (Lev 19:8).

Making holy ointment for private use (Exo 30:32-33). Making perfume for private use (Exo 30:38). Neglect of purification in general (Num 19:13; Num 19:20). Not bringing offering after slaying a beast for food (Lev 17:9). Not slaying the animal at the tabernacle door (Lev 17:4). Touching holy things illegally (Num 4:15; Num 4:18; Num 4:20; and see 2Sa 6:7; 2Ch 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 Lev 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 Hebews 10:28, the sentence of “cutting off” must be understood to be death-punishment of some sort. Saalschtitz 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 (1Sa 14:32); (2) that of Uzziah (2Ch 26:19; 2Ch 26:21), 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 (Lev 10:1-2); Korah and his company (Num 16:10; Num 16:33), who “perished from the congregation;” Uzzah (2Sa 6:7); and, further, that the leprosy inflicted on Uzziah might be regarded as a virtual death (Num 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 (Num 15:27-28). See Saalschtitz, Arch. Hebr. 10:74, 75, vol. ii, 299; Knobel, Calmet, Corn. a Lapide on Gen 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 (Exo 17:4; Luke 20 :$; Joh 10:31; Act 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 (Exo 19:13; Exo 21:29). The false witness, likewise, in a capital case  would, by the law of retaliation, become liable to death (Deu 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 (Deu 13:9; Deu 17:7; Joh 8:7; Act 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 (Deu 21:23; Jos 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 (Num 25:4; 2Sa 21:6; 2Sa 21:9), 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 (2Sa 21:9).

3. Burning, in pre-Mosaic times, was the punishment for unchastity (Gen 38:24). Under the law it is ordered in the case of a priest's daughter (Lev 21:9), of which an instance is mentioned (Sanhedr. 7:2); likewise in case of incest (Lev 20:14); but it is also mentioned as following death by other means (Jos 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 (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 (Exo 19:13; Exo 32:27; Num 25:7), although two of the cases may be regarded as exceptional; but it occurs frequently in regal and post-Babylonial times (Jdg 9:5; 1Sa 15:33; 1Sa 22:18; 2Sa 1:15; 2Sa 4:12; 2Sa 20:22; 1Ki 2:25; 1Ki 2:34; 1Ki 19:1; 2Ki 10:7; 2Ch 21:4; Jer 26:23; Mat 14:8; Mat 14:10) — 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 (Joh 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; Mat 18:6; Mar 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 (2Sa 12:31, and perhaps Pro 20:26; Heb 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 Pro 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 (2Ma 6:19; 2Ma 6:28; comp. 2Ma 6:30). In Josephus (De Macce.) the same instrument is called τροχός, or “wheel” (5, 9). Hence, to beat tupon the tympanum, to drum to death, is similar to “breaking on the wheel” (Heb 11:35). David inflicted this among other cruelties upon the inhabitants of Rabbath-ammon (1Ch 20:3).

5. Precipitstion, 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 (2Ch 25:12; 2Ma 6:10; Luk 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 (2Ma 13:4-6).

Criminals executed by law were buried outside the city gates, and heaps of stones were flung upon their graves (Jos 7:25-26; 2Sa 18:17; Jer 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. (Exo 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” (Lev 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 (Deu 19:19).

2. Compensation, identical (restitution) or analogous; payment for loss of time or of power (Exo 21:18-36; Lev 24:18-21; Deu 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 (Exo 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 (Exo 22:2-4). Damage done by an animal was to be fully compensated (Exo 22:5). Fire caused to a neighbor's corn was to be compensated (Exo 22:6). A pledge stolen, and found in the thief's possession, was to be compensated by double (Exo 22:7). All trespass was to pay double (Exo 22:9). A pledge lost or damaged was to be compensated (Exo 22:12-13); a pledge withheld, to be restored with 20 per cent. of the value (Lev 6:4-5). The “sevenfold” of Pro 6:31, by its notion of completeness, probably indicates servitude in default of full restitution (Exo 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 (Deu 22:18-19).

3. Stripes, whose number was not to exceed forty (Deu 25:3); whence the Jews took care not to exceed thirty-nine (2Co 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 (Lev 19:20; Deu 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 (Macccoth, 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 (Exo 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 (Pro 17:26; comp. 10:13; Jer 37:15-20). Hence it became the symbol for correction in general (Psa 89:32). Solomon is a zealous advocate for its use in education (Pro 13:24; Pro 23:13-14; comp. Sir 30:1). In his opinion, “the blueness of a wound cleanseth away evil, and stripes the inward parts of the belly” (Pro 20:30). It was inflicted for ecclesiastical offences in the synagogue (Mat 10:17; Act 26:11). Among torturing or tedious penalties,

4. Scourging with thorns is mentioned (Jdg 8:16). Reference to the scourge with scorpions, i.e. a whip or scourge armed with knots or thorns, occurs in 1Ki 12:11. So in Latin, scorpio means a knotted or thorny switch. The stocks are mentioned (Jer 20:2); passing through fire (2Sa 12:31); mutilation (Jdg 1:6; 2Ma 7:4; and see 2Sa 4:12); plucking out hair (Isaiah 1, 6; Neh 13:25); in later times, imprisonment, and confiscation or exile (Ezr 7:26; Jer 37:15; Jer 38:6; Act 4:3; Act 4:18; Act 12:4). Imprisonment, not as a punishment, but custody till the royal pleasure was known, appears among the Egyptians (Gen 39:20-21). Moses adopted it for like purposes (Lev 26:12). It appears as a punishment inflicted by the kings of Judah and Israel (1Ki 22:27; 2Ch 16:10; Jer 37:21); and during the Christian tera, as in the instance of John (Mat 4:12) and Peter (Act 12:4). Murderers and debtors were also committed to prison, and the latter “tormented” till they paid (Mat 18:30; Luk 23:19). A common prison is mentioned (Act 5:18); and also an inner prison, or dungeon, which was sometimes a pit (Jer 38:6), in which were “stocks” (Jer 20:2; Jer 29:26; Act 16:24). Prisoners are alluded to (Job 3:18), and stocks (13:27). Banishment was inflicted by the Romans on John (Rev 1:9). As in earlier times imprisonment formed no part of the Jewish system, the sentences were executed at once (see Est 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 (Deu 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 (Gen 40:3; Gen 40:22; Gen 42:20). Death might be commuted for slavery (Gen 42:19; Gen 44:9; Gen 44:33). 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 (Gen 37:36; Genesis 39; Genesis 40; Jer 39:13; Jer 41:10; Jer 43:6; Jer 52:15-16; Dan 2:14; Mar 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 (2Ki 25:7; Est 7:9-10; Jer 29:22; Dan 3:6; Dan 6:7; Dan 6:24; 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 (2Ki 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 (Act 16:23; Act 22:24; Act 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 (1Co 15:32; 2Ti 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[[@Headword: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 tha.t 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 Mat 12:32; Mat 25:26; Mar 3:29; Mar 9:43; Rev 14:11; Rev 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 sulffer so much heavier punishments after death (In Joann. 6:267). The doctrine of a general restoration he found explicitly in 1Co 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 fulture 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 fiture 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 Poenarul Infernalinum Duratione (Tiibingen, 1774, 8vo); Dietelmair, Antiq. Comment. Fanatici de ἀποκατάσεως πάντων (Altorf, 1769, 8vo); Tillotson, Sermons, vol. ii; Lewis, The Nature ofJ'ell (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.

## Punites[[@Headword:Punites]]

             (Heb. Puni', פּוּנַי, a Gentile term, from Puvvuah, פֻּוָּה; Sept. ὁ Φουᾶ δῆμος v. r. ὁ Φουαϊv), a collective term for the descendants of Phuvah or Pua (Num 26:23). SEE PHUVAH.

## Punjabi Or Sikh Version[[@Headword:Punjabi Or Sikh Version]]

             A version of the New Test. for the people inhabiting an extensive counnry 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.)

## Punjer, Georg Christian Bernard[[@Headword:Punjer, Georg Christian Bernard]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, was born at Friedrichs, Schleswig- Holstein, June 7, 1850. He studied at different universities took the degree of doctor of philosophy in 1874, and commenced his academical career at Jena in 1875. In 1880 he was made professor, and in 1883 doctor of theology. Punjer died May 13, 1885. He is the author of, Die Religionslehre Kant's (Jena, 1874): — De Michaelis Serveti Doctrina Commentatio Dogmatico-historica (1876): — Geschichte. der christlichen Religiosphilosophie seit der Reformation (Brunswick, 1880, 1883, 2 volumes): — Die Aufgaben des heutigemn Protestantismus (1885). Besides contributing to different encyclopaedic works and literary journals, he started in 1881 the Theologischer Jahresbericht, giving an annual review of all theological works published in German, French, English, Dutch, etc., a work indispensable to the student in spite of its many deficiencies. (B.P.)

## Punon[[@Headword:Punon]]

             (Heb. Punon', פוּנֹן, darkness [Gesenius], ore-pit [Fiirst]; Sept. Φινών v. r. Φινώ), a camp station of the Israelites on their journey to Canaan (Num 33:42), on the east side of the mountains of Edom, and perhaps belonging to that district, since a duke Pinon is mentioned (Gen 36:41; 1Ch 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 Enusebius and Jerome (Onomasticon, Φινῶν, “Fenon”) it is identified with Pinon, the seat of the Edomitish tribe of that name, and, further, with Phoeno, 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.

## Punshon, Williami Morley, LL.D[[@Headword:Punshon, Williami Morley, LL.D]]

             an eminent Wesleyan Methodist minister, was born at Doncaster, Yorkshire, England, May 29, 1824. His home influences were decidedly Methodistic, and at the age of seventeen he gave himself to Christ. He at once conscientiously devoted himself to a rigid course of selfculture and energetic usefulness, which he continued until his death. In 1840 he removed to Sunderland, where he became an accredited local preacher. In 1843 he began his preparation for the ministry, under that devoted missionary, Benjamin Clough, at Woolwich. He was accepted as a probationer by the conference in 1844, and went to the theological school at Richmond, but did not complete his course, as he was sent to Maidstone Circuit to supply a vacancy. In 1845 he was appointed to the Whitehaven Circuit. In 1867 he was appointed by the conference as its representative to the Canadian Conference, and also elected to its presidency.

He arrived in America in 1868, and met the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church at Chicago the same year, to which he was the representative of the Wesleyan Church. He visited the General Conference of 1872, and his speech before that body at that time was probably by far the best he ever delivered in America. The Wesleyan Church honored him by making him president of the conference in 1874. In 1875 he was appointed one of the secretaries of the Foreign Missionary Society, which position he held until his death, in London, April 14, 1881. Dr. Punshon  was undoubtedly the greatest orator which the Wesleyan body of England has produced in this century. He was by nature poetic, and his style was largely controlled by this tendency, highly ornate, with great beauty and variety of illustration. In early life his discourses were rhetorical rather than logical, but during the latter part of his career his efforts "combined, as far as would be possible, the Ciceronian and Demosthenic styles." These qualities, coupled with a wonderful voice and great personal magnetism, gave him a power over an audience which is seldom equalled. His character as a Christian was specially attractive. "A remarkable fact in the history of Mr. Punshon is that he displayed, in the important positions in which he was placed in later years, very great practical sagacity, and proved that a great semi-poetic orator may be a successful man of affairs." He published several volumes of sermons and addresses, also one of poems. See Minutes of the British Conference, 1881, page 36; (N.Y.) Christian Advocate, April 21, 1881; also his Biography (Lond. 1881).

## Punti Version[[@Headword:Punti Version]]

             The Punti, or Canton Colloqulial, 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 Volkesdialekte 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[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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 caln 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.); mand 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 Purinas, 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 Vishsnu-Purana, he adds, it belongs more than to any other Purana; but even in the case of this Purmna 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 Purtnas 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 svstem 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 Purinas 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,” savs 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 sectarial 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 Pursna 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 Purunas, sectarian; the Siva-Upapurdna, 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 Pturanas, 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. 18581863), 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[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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 Scarlati 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.

## Purcell, John Baptist, D.D[[@Headword:Purcell, John Baptist, D.D]]

             an eminent Roman Catholic prelate, was born of humble parents at Mallow, County Cork, Ireland, February 26, 1800. In his eighteenth year lie left his home for the United States, and in June 1820, entered Mount St. Mary's College, Emmittsburg, Maryland. After three years he received minor orders, and the following year was sent to France to complete his theological course at the seminary of St. Sulpice, Paris. On May 21, 1826, he was ordained priest by archbishop Queen in the Notre Dame cathedral. Immediately on his return to America he was appointed professor of philosophy at Mount St. Mary's College, and in 1828 he became president of it. On October 13, 1833, he was consecrated bishop of Cincinnati. By his unflagging zeal he saw his large diocese flourishing with its churches and charitable and religious foundations. In 1836 he had his great public debate, which lasted a week, with Alexander Campbell. In 1850 Cincinnati was made an archiepiscopal see, and Purcell and Hughes received the pallium together in the pope's private chapel. Bishop Purcell died at St. Martin's, Ohio, July 4, 1883. He was a man of great vigor, devotion, and labor, naturally generous and charitable. His latter years were made unhappy by the memorable financial disaster which overtook him, and which caused him to retire some time before his death to a monastery. He left debts to the amount of one million of dollars. He published several volumes, chiefly sermons and biographies. See Cath. Annual, page 34; Gilmour, Funeral Oration (N.Y. 1883).

## Purchas, John[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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 Hackluvt'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, Athenoe Oxonienses; Hallam, Lit. Hist. of Europe, iii, 227; Allibone, Dict. Brit. and Amer. Auth. S. V.

## Purdman[[@Headword: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.

## Purdy, James Souveraine, D.D[[@Headword:Purdy, James Souveraine, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal minister, was born at Rye, N.Y., September 1, 1825. He graduated from Trinity College, Hartford, Connecticut, in 1849, and from the General Theological Seminary, N.Y., in 1852; became rector at Southport, Connecticut, in 1853, of Calvary Chapel, N.Y., in 1860, and died at Saratoga, March 21, 1883.

## Purefoy, George W., D.D[[@Headword:Purefoy, George W., D.D]]

             a Baptist minister, was born in 1809. He was baptized in 1830, began to preach at once, labored in North Carolina, and died in 1880. He wrote some controversial tracts. See Cathcart, Baptist Encyclop. s.v.

## Purgation[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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 peniennce, 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 termpus csruciatce 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 Catholicsthough 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 Purgactorio, 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 juistice.

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 fot 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: 2Ma 12:43-45 (on which they relyon the supposition of its being inspired); Mat 5:25 (the “prison” therein referred to being interpreted by them to mean purgatory); 12:32; 1Co 3:11-15; 1Co 15:29; Rev 21:27; as well as on certain less decisive indications contained in the language of some of the Psalms, as 37 (in the A.V. 38), 1; 45:12 12; Isa 4:4; Isa 22:14; Mal 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 writ ers 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 Exodus 14 : Hom. in Levit.; 28: Hom. in Numbers; Eusebius, De Vita Constantinii, 4:71; Athanasius, Quaest. 34: ad Antioch.; Cyril of Jerusalem, Cat. Mystcag. v, 9; Basil, Hom. in Psa 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 fillness 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 defilned 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 (ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐν πίστει ἀναπαυσαμένων 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 fuilness 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” (Ecc 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 (1Sa 25:29; Mat 7:13-14; Mat 8:11; Luk 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” (1Jn 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 (Luk 16:22-23); Christ promised to the penitent thief upon the cross, “This day shalt thou be with me in paradise” (Luk 23:43); Paul exults in the prospect of a “crown of righlteousness after death” (2Ti 4:8); and he represents “to depart and to be with Christ” (Php 1:23), and “to be absent from the body and present with the Lord” (2Co 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 simnply 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 Mat 12:32 is explained as relating to the final judgment; and 1Co 3:11; 1Co 3:15, as relating to a trial of works, and not of persons; while 1Co 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 wide- spread 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 purificationfire — 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, vet so as by fire” (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 Psa 1:3; Isa 4:4; Dan 7:9; Zecharaih 12:9; Mal 3:2-3; Mal 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 Psalms 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 Psalms 118 i, 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 iqne], 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 sutffer 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 Clurch, 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 Psalms 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 τῶ 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 juldgment 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” (δαπανᾶ'/ πάσης κακίας κουφότητα) (Greg. Naz. Opera, t. ii, c. 358, Miigne). Also in one of his poems he speaks of standing in fear of the fiery river of judgment (μέσος φόβων ἕστηκα πυρωποτάμου) (ibid. t. iii, c. 1423). Gregory of Nyssa says, speaking of infants who die unbaptizeld: “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 accordinlg 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, Theoloqgy, 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 Romanismi, 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[[@Headword: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' (Mal 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 anda 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[[@Headword:Purification]]

             (prop. טָהַרָה, tohorah, καθαρισμός), a ceremony enjoined in the Mosaic law for the purpose of cleansing from pollution or defilement (Num 19:9). Purifications were, for the most part, perfortmed with water, sometimes with blood and with oil (Heb 9:21-22; Exo 30:26-29; Lev 8:10-11). Sometimes fire was used for the purpose of purging or purifying (Isa 1:25; Isa 10:26; Zec 13:9; Mal 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 Joh 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 (Lev 16:4; 2Ch 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 (Lev 15:18; 2Sa 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 (Lev 11:25; Lev 11:40); ablution both of the person and of the defiled garments in cases of gonorrhea dormientium (Lev 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 gonorrhea 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 (Lev 11:1-15; Lev 11:19-30). 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 (Lev 11:5-11; Lev 11:21-23), but in one particular case after an interval of seven days (Lev 11:24). 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 (Lev 11:8; Luk 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 heald we refer the two cases of (1) touching a corpse, or a grave (Num 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 (מֵיאּהִנַּדָּה, 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 (אֶלאּנֹכִח פְּנֵי) 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 manl 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 (חִטָּאת, A.V. “purification for sin”) applied to it (Num 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 canmp (comp. Lev 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 Lev 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 (Lev 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 (Lev 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 (Mar 7:4). The  washing of the hands before meals was conducted in a formal manner (Mar 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 (Joh 2:6). We meet with references to purification after childbirth (Luk 2:22), and after the cure of leprosy (Mat 8:4; Luk 17:14), the sprinkling of the water mixed with ashes being still retained in the latter case (Heb 9:13). What may have been the specific causes of uncleanness in those who came up to purify themselves before the Passover (Joh 11:55), or in those who had taken upon themselves the Nazarite's vow (Act 21:24; Act 21:26), 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[[@Headword: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 wuas 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 (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 Luk 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 Num 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 Muliesreme post Partum, and that in the Praverbook 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 ecclesice; 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 unctione, the imposition of hands, the reception of holy communion, the giving of incense, are parts of this rite. See Siegel, Christliche Alterthiumer (Index in vol. 4); Riddle, Christian Antiquities (see Index); Brit. Quar. Rev. July, 1871, p. 110. SEE ABLUTION

## Purification-offerings[[@Headword: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 (Lev 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. Luk 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) Lev 14:2-8. The healed leper brought to the priest for cleansing must present two small birds, alive and clean (according to the Neguaiml, 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 vas 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 hvssop, 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 witlhout 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. cif. p. 515 sq.).

(b) Lev 14:9-31. 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 Lev 14:9, in referring this washing to the eighth day). On the eighth day he presented two lambs and a yearling sheep. The lanmb 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” (Lev 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 lepiosy 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[[@Headword:Purification-waters]]

             (מֵיאּנַדָּה, mney - nid'dca', properly waters of uncleanness. i.e. of purification; Sept. ὕδωρ ῥαντισμοῦ , water of sprinkling, after the Chaldee usage; comp. nedach'. נְדָה: to sprinkle [see Rosenmuller, on oNmb. 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. Deu 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 (Num 19:2 sq.; Num 31:19 sq.; Heb 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 (Num 19:9; Num 19:17), 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 mav 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 (Num 19:5), on a fire fed with cedar-wood, scarlet wool, and hyssop (comp. Lev 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 (Num 19:7-8; Num 19:10). 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 Lev 16:24; Lev 16:26; Lev 16:28; 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 unfruitftul 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 (Lev 4:14), is used, perhaps (Bahr, p. 498) because the female sex is that which brings forth life (comp. Gen 3:20; otherwise Hengstenberg and Baumngarten — 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 uncleannless 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 (Lev 12:2 sq.; Lev 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[[@Headword: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 purificalion 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.). — Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. s.v.

## Purifier[[@Headword:Purifier]]

             SEE PURIFICATORIUM.

## Purim[[@Headword:Purim]]

             (פּוּרַים, Purim ; Sept. Φρουραί v. r. Φρουρίμ, etc.; also יְמֵי הִפּוּרַיםdays of the Purim, Est 9:26; Est 9:31), 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 פּוּרַים(singular פּוּר), which is derived from the Persian pari, cognate with pars, part, and which is explained in Esther (Est 3:7; Est 9:24) by the Hebrew גּוֹרָל, 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 (Est 9:24). The name Φρουρά, which, as Schleusner (Lex. in LXX, s.v.) and others rightly maintain, is a corruption of Φουραί , 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 (Est 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 (Est 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 (Est 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 Joh 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 (Est 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” (תִּעֲנַית אֶסְתֵּר), in accordance with the command of this Jewish queen (Est 4:5-6); and sundry prayers expressive of repentance, humiliation, etc. (סליחות), are introduced into the regular ritual for the day. As on all the fast-days, Exo 32:11-14; Exo 34:1-11, are read as the lesson from the law, and Isa 55:6 to Isa 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 syvnagogue, where, after the evening service, the book of Esther, called, κατ᾿ ἐξοχήν, the iegillah (מְגַלָּה, 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 dans 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 (Est 9:7; Est 9:9) 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, andt 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 Zoresh (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; Exo 17:8-16 is read as the lesson from the law, which relates the destruction of the Amalekites, the people of Agag (1Sa 15:8), the supposed ancestor of Haman (Est 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 Est 9:22, suspend the law of Deu 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 Ι᾿ουδαίων of Joh 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 Joh 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 Purin 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 Joh 6:4 (Stier).

The identity of the Passover with the feast in question has been maintained by Irenseus, 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 Joh 6:4, he must have absented himself from Jerusalem for a year and a half, that is, till the feast of Tabernacles (Joh 7:2). Against these points it is contended that the application of ἑορτή without the article to the Passover is countenanced by Mat 27:15; Luk 23:17 (comp. Joh 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” (Joh 7:1; cf. Joh 5:18); that this long period satisfactorily accounts for the surprise expressed by his brethren (Joh 7:3); and that, as it was evidently his custom to visit Jerusalem once a year, he went up to the feast of Tabernacles (Joh 7:2) instead of going to the Passover. A still more conclusive argumment in favor of the Passover is the use of the peculiar epithet δευτερόπρωτος in Luk 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 Joh 5:1, by Kepler (Ecloge 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 Hengstenlberg (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 Joh 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 Judaeorums (Crit. Sac. iii, col. 1184); Buxtorf, Syn. Jud. 29. The Mishnical 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 (Erlang. 1807); Bible Educator, iii, 26. SEE ESTHER.

## Purinton, Jesse M., D.D[[@Headword:Purinton, Jesse M., D.D]]

             a Baptist minister, was born at Coleraine, Massachusetts, August 12, 1809. He united with the Church at the age of eleven, studied at Hamilton, N.Y., and was ordained in 1834. His pastorates were in his native-place; Arcade, N.Y.; Forestville and Mount Moriah, Pa., and at Morgantown, West Virginia. For several years he was a missionary in north-western Virginia, and assisted pastors much in times of revival. He died at Morgantown, June 17, 1869. See Cathcart, Baptist Encyclop. page 950. (J.C.S.)

## Puritans[[@Headword: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 wrord “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 bv “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 conmmon 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 anltisacerdotal 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 lomnish 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 wvas 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 nof 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 conscinces,...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 himu 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 Lambethi 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 wvere 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 signling 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 Injulctions, 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 requiritng 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 Nonconfonmists, 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 HighChurch 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 relnounce 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. IHe 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 inmpart 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 theie be any imminent danger to be deprived, then this matter must be communicated to the Classis in which that Church is, that by the judgmment 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 sacramen ts. But, for many weighty causes, neither the rest of the Aiticles in that book nor the Book of Common Pranyer 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 Chiist's ordinance touchinig appointing of watchmen and overseers in his Church, who are to foresee that none offence or scandal do arise in the Chni ch; 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 mionished 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, comitial, 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 comitial 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 comitial 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 extravaganut 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 educcation 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 hare 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 appoilted day. This is well known as the Hampton Court Conference, which ended in convincing the Puritans that they were uttterlv 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 Elngland, 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 eves the principles of Cartwiright 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 prelatic 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; Rudyard, 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[[@Headword:Purity]]

             the freedom of anything from foreign admixture; but more particularly it signifies the temper directly opposite to criminal sensualities, or the ascendency 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 wihich 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 Catullhts, Petronius Arbiter, Johannes Secundus, etc., ablundantly 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 Justinialm, 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, Eccleso Dict. s.v.

## Purkhiser, Micah Gilbert[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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 Hebrorums (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[[@Headword: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[[@Headword:Purple]]

             (אִרְגָּמָן, aryaman, from the Sanscrit raga, red; see (esen. Thes. s.v.; Chald. אִרְגְּוָן, ayrevdn, from the same root, in 2Ch 2:7; Dan 5:7; Dan 5:16; Dan 5:29; Sept. and Greek Test. πορφύρα; Vulg. purpura) occurs in Exo 25:4; Exo 26:1; Exo 26:31; Exo 26:36; Exo 27:16; Exo 28:5-6; Exo 28:8; Exo 28:15; Exo 28:33; Exo 35:6; Exo 35:23; Exo 35:25; Exo 35:35; Exo 36:8; Exo 36:35; Exo 36:37; Exo 38:18; Exo 38:23; Exo 39:1-3; Exo 39:5; Exo 39:8; Exo 39:24; Exo 39:29; Num 4:13; Jdg 8:26; 2Ch 2:14; 2Ch 3:14; Est 1:6; Est 8:15; Pro 31:22; Son 3:10; Son 7:5; Jer 10:9; Eze 27:7; Eze 27:16; Sir 45:10; Bar 6:12; Bar 6:72; 1Ma 4:23; 1Ma 8:14; 1Ma 10:20; 1Ma 10:62; 2Ma 4:38; Mar 15:17; Mar 15:20; Luk 16:19, Joh 19:2; Joh 19:5; Act 16:14; Rev 17:4; Rev 18:12; Rev 18:16. 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 1Ma 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. ῾Ηρακλῆς, 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, Ononm. 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 profilsion (Exo 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 φοίνιξ, 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. Eze 27:7, “purple from the isles of Elisha,” supposed to mean Elis, “and from Syria,” Eze 27:16), yet violet purples and scarlet were nowhere dved 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 thev had spirals round. Michaelis thinks that Solomon alludes to their shape when he says (Son 7:5), “The hair of thine head is like purple,” meaning that the tresses (Sept. πλόκιον κεφαλῆς, Vulg. comoe 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 diblapha Tyria; so named, he says, because “bis tincta” (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 Tyriis iteratae vellera lanue” (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 Phcenicians 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).

Purple was employed in religious worship both among Jewns andl Gentiles. It was one of the colors of the curtains of the tabernacle (Exo 26:1); of the veil (Exo 26:31); of the curtain over the grand entrance (Exo 26:36); of the ephod of the high-priest (Exo 28:5-6), and of its girdle (Exo 28:8); of the breastplate (Exo 28:15); of the hem of the robe of the ephod (Exo 28:33); (comp. Sir 45:10); of cloths for divine service (Exo 39:1; comp. Num 4:13), resumed when the Temple was built (2Ch 2:7; 2Ch 2:14; 2Ch 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 Atticumtni, ii, 9). The Babylonians arrayed their idols in it (Jer 10:9; Bar. 12:72). It was at an early period worn by kings (Jdg 8:26). Homer speaks as if it were almost peculiar to them (II. 4:144; 1Ma 8:14). Pliny says it was worn bv Romulus and the succeedilg kings of Rome, and by the consuls and first nagistrates 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 (Est 8:15); to Daniel by Belshazzar (Dan 5:7; Dan 5:16; Dan 5:29). It was the dress of an ethnarch or prince, and as such given by  Alexander to Jonathan (1Ma 10:20; 1Ma 10:62; 1Ma 10:64-65; comp. 2Ma 4:38). In the last chapter of the Proverbs it is represented as the dress of a matron (2Ma 4:22). 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 (Luk 16:19). In Est 1:6, it appears as part of the royal furniture of Ahasuerus; and in Son 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 κοκκινη by Mat 27:28, and πορφύρα by Mar 15:17; Mar 15:20, and ἱμάτιον πορφυροῦν by Joh 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 Sacerdotun [Lugd. Bat. 1680], i, 14). Ovid applies the term “purpureus” to the cheeks and lips (Amor. i, 3). In Act 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 particlars 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, HistoricalResearches, translated (Oxford, 1833), ii, 8, etc. Steger, De Pupura, Sacroe Dignitatis Insigni (Lips. 1741).

Crimson (leb. karmiil', כִּרְמַיל, a Persian word akin to Sanscrit krimi, Eng. crimson. It occurs in 2Ch 2:7-14; 2Ch 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 (Son 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 mword 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, butt the larger ones were opened singly, the fluid carefully removed, and mingled with salt to prevent decomnposition. It was diluted with five or six times as mmuclh 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 Plinly was the Murex trunculus of Linnaeus from indirect evidence. The buccinum uof 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 conchyliu;m 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 whicl 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 slufficient, 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 tor a whole summer to the solar ravs 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 witllout 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 allso 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[[@Headword: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 Mat 26:57-65; Mat 27:26-34; Joh 14:2-10; Joh 15:15-22) are in the Cotton Library (Codex Cottonianus, the “J” of Wetstein) of the British Museum; two (containing Luk 24:13-21; Luk 24:34-39) are in the Imperial Library at Vienna (“N” of Wetstein and others); and six (containing Mat 19:6-13; Mat 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, andt 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[[@Headword: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 wsith less of prejudice sets forth the true scope of the divine government. SEE PREDESTINATION.

## Purpureus Codex[[@Headword:Purpureus Codex]]

             SEE PURPLE MANUSCRIPT.

## Purse[[@Headword:Purse]]

             (כַּיס, kis, Pro 1:14; a “bag” for money, Isa 46:6, or for weights, Deu 25:13 : Pro 16:11; Mic 6:11; βαλάντιον, Luk 10:4; Luk 12:23 [“ bag”;1 22:35, 36; but ζώνη, Mat 10:9; Mar 6:8, is the gin-dle, as elsewhere rendered). The Hebrews, when on a journey, were provideed with a bag, in which they carried their money (Genesis 43:35; Pro 1:14; Pro 7:20; Isa 46:6), and if they were merchants, also their weights (Deu 25:13; Mic 6:11). This bag is variouslv termed in Iheb. כַּים, kis (as above); צְרוֹר, tseror; and חָרַיט, charit. The last occurs only in 2 Kings v, 23 ( bags”); Isa 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 Luk 10:4; Luk 12:33; Luk 22:35-36), and γλωσσόκομον (peculiar to Joh 12:6; Joh 13:29). The former is a classical term (Plato, Coulit. p. 190, σύσπαστα βαλάντια); the latter is connected with the classical γλωσσοκομεῖον, 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 (2Ch 24:8; 2Ch 24:10-11), 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 Mat 10:9; Mar 6:8. SEE GIRDLE. Ladies wore ornamental purses (Isa 3:23). The Rabbinists 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[[@Headword:Purslain]]

             SEE MALLOWS; SEE WHITE OF AN EGG.

## Purtenance[[@Headword:Purtenance]]

             ( קֶרֶב, keeb, e'eb, midst, or inner part) stands improperly in one passage of the A.V. (Exo 12:9) f(or the viscera, or “inwards” (as elsewhere rendered), of a sacrificial victim.

## Puru[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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[[@Headword:Purver, Anthony]]

             a Quaker preacher of great note for his remarkable literary attainments, especially his exegetical knowlledge, 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 ANew Translation of the Old and New Testaments, with rotes, Critical cand 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 migsht have been expected from a member of the society whose language is so simple; while the notes, though contailning 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[[@Headword: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 thie 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. Ile 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 introduiced 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: Gen 9:13; Exo 29:2; Deu 32:2; Deu 33:7; Jos 5:15; Jos 6:25; Job 10:1; Job 11:12; Job 14:12; Mat 12:5; Mat 13:52; 1Co 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 Hexcapla. 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[[@Headword:Purveyor]]

             This word is not found in the A. V., although it would perhaps represent the meaning of the Heb. נַצָּב, nitstsdb', in 1Ki 4:5; 1Ki 4:7, rather than the word καθεσταμένοι, or the similar “officers” of our version. The Hebrew word, however, is the Niphal (passive) participle of the word נָצִב, 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.

## Purviance, James, DD[[@Headword:Purviance, James, DD]]

             a Presbyterian minister; was born at Baltimore, Maryland, February 19, 1807. He was educated at St. Mary's College and at the U.S. Academy at West Point, subsequently studied law, and graduated from Princeton Theological Seminary in 1835. He was ordained an evangelist by the Presbytery of Louisiana in 1837; served one year thereafter as stated supply at Baton Rouge; at Carmel, Mississippi, in 1841, and pastor from 1846 to 1854. He was president of Oakland College from 1855 to 1860; resided at Carrollton, Louisiana, from 1861 to 1862; at Natchez, Mississippi, in infirm health, from 1863 to 1871, and died there, July 14 of the latter year. See Genesis Cat. of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1881, page 90; Nevin, Presbyterian Encyclop. s.v.

## Pusey, Edward Bouverie, D.D., D.C.L[[@Headword:Pusey, Edward Bouverie, D.D., D.C.L]]

             an eminent Anglican divine, son of the late Hon. Philip Bouverie (half- brother of the first earl of Radnor), who assumed the name of Pusey by royal license, was born in 1800. He was educated at Christ Church College; Oxford, where he graduated with high honor in 1822, and the next year was elected to a fellowship in Oriel College. After studying in Germany for two years, he was appointed in 1828 regius professor of Hebrew at Oxford University, a position to which is attached a canonry in Christ Church, and he retained these offices until his death, September 16, 1882. His connection with the Tracts for the Times, and the controversies growing out of them, are detailed under PUSSYISMS SEE PUSSYISMS (q.v.). Dr. Pusey was a High-churchman of the purest morals and the stanchest orthodoxy, and also a scholar of no ordinary character. Besides his doctrinal writings, he published several exegetical works (on the minor prophets and Daniel), and a number of small volumes on Church-history.  See his Life, by Bigg (Lond. 1883); Memorial Sermon, by Liddon (ibid. 1884).

## Puseyism[[@Headword: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 wshich his name has been given, the Puseyites now form a very different class fron that which organizsed 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 vet a majority of them were at one time devoted to the Arian heresy. For example, Froude says, “Your trumpery 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 conmmunion.

“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 sacralmental 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 Cctholic, 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 fuindamental 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 ont 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 iwhich 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 pnlublication of writings called Tractsfor 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 wiich they acknowledged, such doctrines as the Romish Church has distinctively preserved. Newvman tried, in consequence, to conciliate the Thirty-nine Anglican Articles with the resolutions of the Council of Trent, in vwhich, 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 genlerally 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 poiints 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 ofjustification, 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 olbject most decidedly to being called Protestants. They regard the Church as one organic body, and primitive apostolic Christianitv 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 Trcct 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 Ennglish bishops with admonitions, speeches, and disciplinary measures. They do not tolerate the rites introduced bv 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 lde? 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.

## Puseyites[[@Headword:Puseyites]]

             a term often applied to the High-Church party in the Anglican Church, from their adherence to the views of Dr. Edward Pusey (q.v.), but repudiated both by him and by them.

## Pushtu Version[[@Headword: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 HIoly 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. Bellew, 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 Languarge, 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, fromi 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.)

## Pushtu Version Of The Scriptures[[@Headword:Pushtu Version Of The Scriptures]]

             By way of supplement we add here the following. The first attempt to produce a Pushtu version of Scripture seems to have been made by Dr. Leyden, who in 1811 furnished the corresponding committee of Calcutta with a translation of the gospels of Matthew and Mark. At his death the translation was continued by the Serampore missionaries, with the aid. of some learned natives previously in the employ of Dr. Leyden. In 1819 the New Test. was published at Serampore, and in 1832 the Pentateuch and the historical books of the Old Test. were also issued there. Considering the circumstances under which these versions were made, they were very fair productions, in spite of their deficiencies. A need for a new translation was, however, felt more and more, and efforts were made in that direction.

Previous to the mutiny in India, the gospel of John, translated by the Reverend R. Clark, and that of Luke, by captain James, had been placed in the hands of the North India Auxiliary Bible Society. But both were destroyed with the, press at Agra, in 1857. Copies, however, were soon ready for publication, to which were added the gospels of Matthew and Mark, and the Acts as translated by the Reverend J. Lowenthal (q.v.). In 1864 the entire Pushtu; New Test. was printed, the translation having been made by Mr. Lowenthal. He was not allowed to translate the Old Test. into the Pushtu. Before he had fairly entered upon the duty, he was killed, in 1864. The work of translating the Old Test. was taken up by the Reverend T.P. Hughes, of the Church Missionary Society, in 1873. Besides Mr. Hughes, the Reverend T.J.L. Mayer, also of the Church Missionary Society, has been engaged in translating the Old Test., and, assisted by Quazi Abdur Rahman, he translated the Psalms, which were printed in 1881. From the report of the British and Foreign Bible Society for 1885 we learn that considerable progress has been made in translation work, both in the Old and New Tests., and preparations are in progress for a revision of the New Test. The bishop of Lahore has arranged to have meetings of the  revision committee at Kohat and at Murri, when it is hoped that the different translations will be harmonized under the guidance of the bishop (B.P.)

## Pusillanimity[[@Headword:Pusillanimity]]

             is a feebleness of mind, by which one is terrified at mere trifles or imaginary dangers, unauthorized by the most distant probability.

## Puspadanta[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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 ihremz 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[[@Headword: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[[@Headword:Put]]

             (1Ch 1:8; Nah 3:9). SEE PHUT.

## Puteoli[[@Headword:Puteoli]]

             (Graecized Ποτίολοι [ Act 28:13], but in classical Greek often Πουτεόλοι; 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 (Act 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 Diccpiarchia; 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 διασωθεὶς εἰς τὴν Δικαιαρχίαν, ἣν Ποτιόλους Ι᾿ταλοὶ 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 (Act 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 latterbestowing 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 corn- ships 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.

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, Viuggio a Pozzuoli  (Naples, 1817); Jorio, Guida di Pozzuoli (ibid. 1830); Lowenigh, Die Landschajt Pozzuoli (Aachen, 1841); Lewin, St. Paul, 2, 218 sq. SEE ITALY; SEE PAUL.

## Putiel[[@Headword:Putiel]]

             Heb. Putiel', פּוּטַיאֵל, afflicted of God; Sept. Φουτιήλ), the father of the wife of Eleazar the priest and the mother of Phinehas (Exo 6:25). B.C. cir. 1619. In modern Jewish traditions Putiel is confounded with Jethro the Midianite, “who fatted the calves for idolatrous worship” (Targum Pseudojon. On Ezod. 6:25; Gemara of Sota by Wagenseil, c. viii. § 6).

## Putnam, Franklin[[@Headword: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 Presbvtery; 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[[@Headword: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 bv 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, Israel Warburton, D.D[[@Headword:Putnam, Israel Warburton, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Danvers, Massachusetts, November 24, 1786. He entered Harvard College in 1805, but left in his sophomore year, and graduated from Dartmouth in 1809. He began the study of law; in 1811 united with the Church in Salem, and not long afterwards began the study of theology, graduating from Andover Theological Seminary in 1814. In October of that year he preached at Brookfield and in various other places, and in January 1815, accepted a call to the First Church in Portsmouth, N.H. Some time after he engaged in a controversy on Unitarianism, with Dr. Nathan Parker, pastor of the South Parish Church in Portsmouth. In October 1835, he was installed pastor of the Old Pilgrim Church, Middleborough, Massachusetts, and continued in that relation until his death, May 3, 1868. See Cong. Quarterly, 1868, page 317.

## Putnam, Jonathan W[[@Headword: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.

## Puto (Pooto, Pouto, or Poo-Teon-Shan)[[@Headword:Puto (Pooto, Pouto, or Poo-Teon-Shan)]]

             is a small rocky island off the eastern extremity of Chusan, coast of China. It is about seventy miles from the mainland, near Ningpo, in latitude '30° 25' north, and longitude 122° 40' east, and is about five miles long and from one to two broad. It is famous in the annals of Chinese Buddhism, as having been devoted to the religious rites and services of that faith for more than a thousand years. It has numerous shrines and temples, and here Chinese Buddhism may be seen in its perfection, its rites being carefully practiced in the great temple.

## Putsha[[@Headword:Putsha]]

             in Hindiu 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[[@Headword: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[[@Headword:Puxis]]

             is the box in which the consecrated hosts for the sick are preserved. SEE PYX

## Puzza[[@Headword: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 beantiful 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[[@Headword:Pyer, John]]

             an English minister who labored successivelv with the Wesleyans and the Independlents, was born in 1790. He began his labors as a tent missionary, devoting himself entirely to the conlncted 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[[@Headword:Pygarg]]

             (דַּישׁוֹן. dishon, from dush, דּוּשׁ, to tread, or perhaps duts, דּוּצ, to leap; Sept. πύγαργος, Vulg. pygargus) occurs only (Deu 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 ot 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 salme 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 andl 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 mamny 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 pyqsargus, 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 euchore) 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- wayr 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 slurface of the thighs. The strong contrast of the two colors has a very singular effect, and wouuld 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 lhaving 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[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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 Meritiorious 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.[[@Headword: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.

## Pyraeum[[@Headword:Pyraeum]]

             a fire temple of the ancient Persians. It was simply an enclosure, in the centre of which was placed the sacred fire, and the building was so constructed that the rays of the sun could not fall on this fire. The first pyrmeum was built by Zoroaster, at Balk, in Persia; and thence the sacred fire was conveyed to other fire-temples both in Persia and India. SEE PARSEESK, ZOROASTER.

## Pyramid[[@Headword:Pyramid]]

             (πυραμίς, 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 bv 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.

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 fiom 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° 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 260 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 cf the top one being rather more than 69 feet above the roof of the King's Chamber. The end of  the horizontal passage was filnished 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 andi 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.

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.

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 anchvlosed right knee. This body and fragments of the coffin were removed to the British Museum; but the stone sarcophagus was unfortunately lost off Carthagena, 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.

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 Drah 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 Egyptianu pyramids, and generally hanve a sepulchral hall, or propylon, with sculptures, which faces thle 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.

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 Artemnisia 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 obeliskos and tombs as a kind of roof. Small models of pyramidnis, with inscribed adorations to the sun, or having royal names, were also placed in the tombs. See Lepsilus, 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 cand Work at the Great Pyramid (1867); also, Our Inheritance on the Great Pyramidi (Lond. 1864, 1866, 1877, a work full of fanciful theories); St. Day, Plates and Notes (Edinb. 1869).

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.

## Pyre[[@Headword:Pyre]]

             (πυρά, from πῦρ,fire), the funeral pile of wood on which the ancient Greeks often burned the bodies of their dead. The body was placed upon the top with oils and perfumes, and in the heroic age it was customary to burn animals and even slaves along with the corpse. When the body was consumed and the pyre burned down, the fire was extinguished by throwing wine upon it, and the bones were collected, washed with wine and oil, and placed in urns.

## Pyrker, Johann Ladislav Of Felso-Eor[[@Headword:Pyrker, Johann Ladislav Of Felso-Eor]]

             a Roman Catholic prelate, and a poet of some talent, wmas 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, anii 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 cminscientious and courageous priest, a Meecenas to thie arts, a father to the poor, an ornament to science, and enjoyed general esteem and affection. His heart rests in the cathedral at Eriaum; 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  heiligcen 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 (Vieinna, 1861), p. 340 sq.

## Pyrlaeus, John Christopher[[@Headword: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. whlither 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[[@Headword:Pyrrho]]

             (Πύῤῥων), a Greek philosopher of much eminence, is especially noted as the fomunder of the Pvrrhonian 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 iinactive 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 (ἀπαθια) 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 ftindamental 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 Athenaeus (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[[@Headword:Pyrrhonii]]

             SEE PYRRHO.

## Pyrrhonism[[@Headword:Pyrrhonism]]

             SEE PYRRHO.

## Pyrrhus[[@Headword:Pyrrhus]]

             (Πύῤῥος - haired, a common Greek name) is given in the best MSS. as the name of the father of Sopater, Paul's companion (Act 20:4). SEE SOPATER.

## Pyt, Henri[[@Headword:Pyt, Henri]]

             a Protestant theologian of France, was born April 5, 1796, at Sainte Croix, canton of Vaua, Switzerland. He studied at Geneva, and in 1818 went to Saverdun, France, where he acted as an evangelist. In 1819 he entered the services of the London Continental Society, and was ordained at London in 1821. He was pastor at Bayonne and Boarn, but most of his time he-spent in missionary work at Boulogne-sur-Mer, Versailles, and Paris. Pyt died at the latter place, June 24, 1835. Of his literary work we mention the revision of the New Test. into the French Basque, which he undertook at the instance of the British and Foreign Bible Society. See Guers, Vie de Henri Pyt (Paris, 1850); A. de Montet, Dict. Biogr. de Geneve et de Vaud, 2:344; Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Pythagoras[[@Headword: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 silnultaneously 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 asceldency 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 bv 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 lamblichus. 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 Olymnpiad (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 dow\n nearly forty years later bv 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; Dodlwell 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 secondl 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 mutltiply. 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 unnrestrained 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 Hermlodamas, 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 throlugh 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 Polvcrates, and to have renained 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 Chaldtaans, 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 jeputation, 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 discrepance in regard to the time mrhen 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. Ile is said to have united these, to the number of three hulndred 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 ascendency. That aristocratic rule was confirmed by the action of Pythagoras was the belief of later tines; 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 vet 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 esoterical, and the neophytes, or exoterical. Other divisions are also mentioned, as into Pythagorici, Pythagorei, and Pythagoristc, 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 (ἐχεμυθία), 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 scholarch 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. Accordling to some accounts, Pythagoras himself perished in the flames; accoreding 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 late 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 stuch 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,” savs 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 hiave succeedled him in the conduct of' the school. But the disciples appear to have been scattered, the school broken sup, and the sect utterly dissipated as a community, thoupgh 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, 1. 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 eigphth in the succession of the Pythagorean scholarchs. Yet the distinctive doctrines of Pythagoras must have been bruited abroad long before the publication of Philolaus; for we find among the fragments of Xenopehanes 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 figmentary 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.

ἢν δ᾿ ἀπολείψας σῶμα ἐς αἰθέῤ ἐλεύθερον ἔλθῃς, ἔσσεαι ἀθάνατος, 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 migraire 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 metensomatosis 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 muchl 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, equalily, conservation, and harmony (comp. Philolai Fragm. 15).

“2. Two, or the Dyad, is the oirigin of contrasts, the symbol of diversity, division, change, dissorder.  “

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 oriagin, of all things, whence the soul derives its eternal nature: hence it furnisles the Pythagorean oath.

Ναὶ μὰ τὸν ἁμετέρᾷ ψμχᾶ'/ παραδόντα τετρακτύν, 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 thev were generally employed in ea 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 eicosahedron, 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 traditionary 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 unscertainty in the chronlology 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 phlilosophy, 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; Ueberlreg 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 Pythargorte 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); Krische, De Societatis a Pythag. conduc Scopo 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, Pythagtore (Paris, 1873); Montle, Quelques Maots sur le Philosophe Pythagore (Douai, 1876). (G. F. H.)

## Pythia[[@Headword:Pythia]]

             the priestess of Apollo at Delphi, who gave forth the oracular responses of the god. At first there was only one Pythia, but afterwards there were always two, who alternately took their seat upon the tripod. SEE ORACLE.

## Pythian Games[[@Headword:Pythian Games]]

             one of the four great national festivals of the Greeks. They were celebrated on a plain in the neighborhood of Delphi in honor of Apollo, Artemis, and Leto, and on one occasion they were held at Athens. They are said to have originated in a musical contest, which consisted in singing a hymn in honor of Apollo, with an accompaniment on the cithara. The other exercises customary at the Grecian games were subsequently added. Originally they were celebrated at the end of every eighth year, but in the forty-eighth Olympiad they began to be held at the end of every fourth year, and were  regularly observed down to the end of the fourth century. Lesser Pythian games were celebrated in many other places where Apollo was worshipped. SEE GAMES.

## Python[[@Headword:Python]]

             occurs in the margin of Act 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 (Lev 19:31; 1Sa 28:3; 1Sa 28:7-9), 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[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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 ntensils connected with the administration of the Eucharist, it must be blessed by a bishop, or priest delegated by a bishop. See Walcott, Sacred Archceol. s.v.; Siegel, Christliche Alterthumer (see Index in vol. iv); Barnum, Romanism, p. 476; Elliott, Romanisim; Chambers's Encyclop . sv. SEE CIBORIUM.