

THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY
REFERENCE

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL,
THEOLOGICAL and
ECCLESIASTICAL
LITERATURE

Poole, Matthew - Prelacy

by James Strong & John McClintock

To the Students of the Words, Works and Ways of God:

Welcome to the AGES Digital Library. We trust your experience with this and other volumes in the Library fulfills our motto and vision which is our commitment to you:

MAKING THE WORDS OF THE WISE
AVAILABLE TO ALL — INEXPENSIVELY.

AGES Software Rio, WI USA
Version 1.0 © 2000

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 ~~John~~ John 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; *Généralé Biogr. Dict.* s.v.

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. ^{דַּל} *dal* (**πένης**; *pauper*);
3. ^{עֲשֵׂהֶלֶךְ} *echelekâh* (**πτωχός**; *pauper*);
4. ^{קַיִןִּסְקִין} *kanisken* (**πένης**; *pauper*), a word of later usage;
5. ^{אַנְרַח} *anrah*, Chald. (²⁰²⁷Daniel 4:27) (**πένης**; *pauper*); from same root as,
6. ^{זָנִי} *zani*, the word most usually “poor” in A. V. (**πενιχρός**, **πτωχός** **πένης**; *indigens*, *pauper*. Also ³⁰⁰⁹Zechariah 9:9, and ²³⁰⁶Isaiah 26:6, **πρύς**; *pauper*);
7. ^{רוֹשׁ} *rash*, part. of ^{וַר} *var* (**ταπεινός**; *pauper*). In ³⁰²¹2 Samuel 12:1, **var**; **πένης**, **πτωχός**.
8. Poverty; ^{רַשְׁיָמַחְסוֹר} *imachsor*, *lack* (**ἐνδεία**; *egestas*). In the N.T., **πτωχός**, *pauper*, and **πένης**; *egenus*, once only (⁴⁰⁰⁹2 Corinthians 9:9). “Poor” is also used in the sense of “afflicted,” “humble,” etc., e.g. ⁴⁰⁷⁸Matthew 5:3.

II. Jewish Enactments. — The general kindly spirit of the law towards the poor is sufficiently shown by such passages as ⁶¹⁵⁷Deuteronomy 15:7, for the reason that (ver. 11) “the poor shall never cease out of the land;” and a remarkable agreement with some of its directions is expressed in ⁸²⁰⁹Job 20:19; 24:3 sq., where among acts of oppression are particularly mentioned “taking (away) a pledge,” and withholding the sheaf from the poor (vers. 9, 10; 29:12, 16; 31:17), “eating with” the poor (comp. ⁶⁵¹²Deuteronomy 26:12, etc.). See also such passages as ²⁵⁸²Ezekiel 18:12, 16, 17; 22:29; ²⁴⁵⁸Jeremiah 5:28; 22:13, 16; ²³⁰²Isaiah 10:2; ³¹⁰⁷Amos 2:7; ³⁰⁷⁰Zechariah 7:10, and Eccus. 4:1, 4; 7:32; Tobit 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 (^{<0810>}Leviticus 19:9, 10; ^{<0819>}Deuteronomy 24:19, 21). Of the practice in such cases in the times of the Judges the story of Ruth is a striking illustration (^{<0810>}Ruth 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 (^{<0231>}Exodus 23:11; ^{<0216>}Leviticus 25:6).

3. Re-entry upon land in the jubilee year, with the limitation as to town homes (^{<0225>}Leviticus 25:25-30). *SEE JUBILEE.*

4. Prohibition of usury, and of retention of pledges, i.e. loans without interest enjoined (^{<0235>}Leviticus 25:35, 37; ^{<0225>}Exodus 22:25-27; ^{<0517>}Deuteronomy 15:7, 8; 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 (^{<0512>}Deuteronomy 15:12-15; ^{<0239>}Leviticus 25:39-42, 47-54). *SEE SLAVERY.*

6. Portions from the tithes to be shared by the poor after the Levites (^{<0513>}Deuteronomy 14:28; 26:12, 13). *SEE TITHES.*

7. The poor to partake in entertainments at the feasts of Weeks and Tabernacles (^{<0511>}Deuteronomy 16:11, 14; see ^{<0810>}Nehemiah 8:10).

8. Daily payment of wages (^{<0813>}Leviticus 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 (^{<0213>}Exodus 23:3; ^{<0815>}Leviticus 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 ^{<3815>}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; 14:13; ^{<4401>}Acts 6:1; ^{<820>}Galatians 2:10; ^{<5125>}James 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: ^{<4106>}Mark 10:46; ^{<2161>}Luke 16:20, 21; 18:35; ^{<3308>}John 9:8; ^{<4402>}Acts 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 (^{<2302>}Isaiah 10:2; ^{<3107>}Amos 2:7; ^{<3458>}Jeremiah 5:28; ^{<5229>}Ezekiel 22:29; ^{<3710>}Zechariah 7:10). Among the later Jews kindness to the poor was regarded as a prominent virtue (^{<3896>}Job 29:16; 30:25; 31:19 sq.; Tobit 2:15; 4:11; 12:9; ^{<2168>}Luke 19:8), and pharisaic self-righteousness often took this form (comp. ^{<4162>}Matthew 6:2; Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* p. 512). *SEE ALMS.* Beggars, in the proper sense, are unknown in the Mosaic economy (^{<6534>}Deuteronomy 15:4; comp. Michaelis. *Hos. Recht*, 2, 456 sq.), yet such extremity of want is threatened in ^{<9490>}Psalms 109:10 as a punishment from God. In the New Testament, however, they are mentioned, as ^{<4106>}Mark 10:46; ^{<2855>}Luke 18:35; ^{<3308>}John 9:8; ^{<4402>}Acts 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 *bureaux 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*. In 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 voluntary 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
pensione if they cannot answer to the Catechise*.

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, 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 he 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. He is the author of various publications in the Tamil and English languages. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 2, 617.

Poor Catholics

SEE WALDENSES.

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* .

Poor Men's 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* (*uniculus, 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 of Lyons

SEE WALDENSES.

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

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 Catholici* (q.v.), or the *Poor of Lyons*.

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 *servus 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 tua*, 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.)

Picture for Pope 1

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, vicarium salvatoris nostri Jesu Christi, cui est honor in saecula 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.

Picture for Pope 2

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 scribes, 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 the 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 successorem 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 Ecclesiam 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 can 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 cathedra*, 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 ~~of~~ Matthew 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 at Jerusalem (~~Acts~~ Acts 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 (~~Galatians~~ Galatians 2:11-14); and throughout the N.T. the apostles are all treated as co-equals (~~Matthew~~ Matthew 18:1; 19:28; 23:8; ~~John~~ John 15:1-5 ~~Revelation~~ Revelation 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 free 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 Dabonnaire, 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. The 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 Santissimo he 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, in 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. Iyginlus, 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... 468-483
50. St. Felix II... Rome... 483-492
51. St. Gelasius I... Africa... 492-496
52. St. Anastasius II... Rome... 496-498
53. St. Symmachus... 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... 590-604
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 Bamberg.)
- 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 Eichstid.)
- 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. Pius 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... Rome1670-1676

(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, 230-235.	

Felix, 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 an 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 11:20; 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 Papstwahlen* (1872). See also Camarda, *Synopsis constitutionum apost. cum ceremoniali Gregoriano de pertinentibus ad electionem Papae* (1732); Menschen, *Ceremonialia electionis et coronationis Pontif. Rom.* (Frankfort, 1732); Adler, *Ceremonien 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 the 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 ordained 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

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 didactic, 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, col. 1; *Westminst. Rev.* 92, 149; *Lond. Qu. Rev.* Oct. 1875, art. 3. (J. H. W.)

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

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

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 be 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 Lateran, 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 Lateran, A.D. 1215.

Purgatory and indulgences first set forth by the Council of Florence, A.D. 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, and all other constitutions and observances of the same Church. I also admit the sacred Scriptures according to the 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 are not necessary for every one — viz., baptism, confirmation, Eucharist, penance, 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 declared in the holy Council of Trent concerning original sin and 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, and substantially the body and blood, together with the soul 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 be 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

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

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.

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

(^{hnb}] ^æ*libneh*; Sept. **στυράκινος**, in ^{<0137>}Genesis 30:37; **λεύκη**, in ^{<3013>}Hosea 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. I, 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 $\hat{b}l$;(*to be white*), has been considered identical with the Greek $\lambda\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}κη$, 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 ^{ⲁⲓⲃⲧ}Genesis 30:37, the Sept. has $\rho\acute{\alpha}\beta\delta\omicron\nu\ \sigma\tau\upsilon\rho\alpha\kappa\acute{\iota}\nu\eta\nu$, “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 ~~צחצח~~ Hosea 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.”

Picture for Poplar

Storax (στόραξ) is mentioned in Ecclus. 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

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

Poppaea

SEE SABINA.

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

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

Poppie, Poppy, Poppy-head

Picture for Poppie

(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

SEE POPPIE.

Populonia

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

Por'atha

(Heb. *Poratha'*, *atr/P*, 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 (^{<1708>}Esther 9:8). B.C. 473.

Porch

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

1. *μῖ ἄμ* or *μῖ ἀμυλάμ* (from *ἰ ἄμ*, *before*), *a vestibule* or *hall* (Sept. *ἀὐλάμ*; Vulg. *porticus* [^{<1381>}1 Chronicles 28:11]; *ναός*; *porticus*). It is used of the entrance-hall of a building (^{<3407>}Ezekiel 40:7, 48); of the place where the throne was placed, and where judgment was administered (^{<1007>}1 Kings 7:7, *SEE PALACE*); and of the veranda surrounding a court (^{<3415>}Ezekiel 41:15). It is especially applied to the vestibule of the Temple (1 Kings 6, 7; ^{<2017>}Joel 2:17). *SEE TEMPLE*. “The porch of the Lord” (^{<4158>}2 Chronicles 15:8; 29:17) seems to stand for the Temple itself.

2. *ῥδῆμα* *midseron*, a sort of *colonnade* or balcony with pillars (^{<0823>}Judges 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. *Πυλὼν* (^{<4057>}Matthew 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 (^{<4148>}Mark 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 *στωά* is used for the colonnade or portico of Bethesda, and also for that of the Temple called Solomon's porch (^{<RRD>}John 5:2; 10:23; ^{<4RI>}Acts 3:11; 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 ceremonies. 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.

Picture for Porch 1

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. There 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.

Picture for Porch 2

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 were arranged in the porch on Palm-Sunday, on Holy-cross Day, and in Rogationins. 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

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

SEE FESTUS.

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.

Porcupine

SEE BITTERN.

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, day 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.

Pordage 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 “Philadelphians.” 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

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 fine 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.)

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.

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.

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. Eccles.* 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

(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 Silitas (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 seem 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 capable 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 **οὔτι ἕξω 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. Porphyry; 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. Augustine (*Retract.* 2, 31) styles him *Siculure illum cujus ceberima 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 (*l. 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 Longinus.

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, for he 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 παρ' Ἑλλησιν ἀπενηνεγμένον** (*Praep. Ev.* 3, 9); and Augustine styles him "hominem non mediocri ingenio praeditulum" (*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. Stobeum, *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 theurgy, 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 theurgic 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 periculiosam, et legibus prohibitam, cavendam monere, nunc autem velut ejus laudatoribus cedentem, utilem dicere esse mundanae parti animae, non quidem intellectuali qua rerum intelligibilium percipiatur veritas, nullas habentium similitudines corporum, sed spirituali, qua rerum corporalium capiuntur imagines.” The letter to Anebos 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 on 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 Chaldæa antecedently to the Macedonian conquest. The peculiarity alleged to belong to the prophetic part is its apocalyptic tone. It looks, it has been said, historical rather than prophetic. 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 ⁴¹⁸⁵Matthew 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 Matt. 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 Castrius.
4. Fragments of his epistle Πρὸς Ἀνεβῶ τὸν Αἰγύπτιον. Large quotations from this work are made by Eusebius in his *Praeparatio Evangelica*.
5. Πρὸς τὰ νοητὰ ἀφορμαὶ 1.
6. Ὀμηρικὰ ζητήματα, addressed to Anatolius.
7. Περὶ τοῦ ἐν Ὀδυσσεΐᾳ 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 προσφθιας (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 *ἐπιτομος διήγησις εἰς τὰς καθ' Ὁμήρου πλάνας τοῦ Ὀδυσσέως*, 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 εἶναι τὴν Πλάτωνος καὶ Ἀριστοτέλους αἵρεσιν (Suidas, s.v. Πορφ).
- 23.** A commentary on Aristotle's treatise Περὶ ἑρμηνείας (Boethius, ad loc. 2).
- 24.** Πρὸς Ἀριστοτέλην, περὶ τοῦ εἶναι τὴν ψυχὴν ἐντελέχειαν (Suidas).
- 25.** Ἐξήγησις τῶν κατηγοριῶν, dedicated to Gedalios (Eustath. *Ad Il.* 3, 293).
- 26.** Περὶ ἀρχῶν (Suidas).
- 27.** Περὶ ἀσωμάτων (ibid.).
- 28.** Περὶ τοῦ γνῶθι σεαυτόν (ibid.).
- 29.** Γραμματικὰ ἀπορίαι (ibid.).
- 30.** A reply to the Apology for Alcibiades in the *Symposium* of Plato, by Diophanes (Porph. *Vit. Plot.* 15).
- 31.** Ἐπιγράμματα (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 θεῶν ὀνομάτων (Suidas).
- 35.** Εἰς τὸ θεοφράστου περὶ καταφάσεως καὶ ἀποφάσεως (Boethius in Arist. *De Interpr.*).
- 36.** Εἰς τὸ θουκυδίδου πεσοίμιον, πρὸς Ἀριστείδην (Suidas).
- 37.** Περὶ ἰδεῶν, πρὸς Λογγίνον (Porph. *Vit. Plot.* 20).
- 38.** Ὁ ἱερὸς γάμος, a poem composed for the birthday of Plato (ibid. 15).
- 39.** Εἰς τὴν τοῦ Ἰουλιανοῦ Χαλδαίου φιλοσόφου ἱστορίαν (Suidas).
- 40.** Εἰς τὴν Μινουκιανοῦ τέχνην (ibid.).
- 41.** Ὁ πρὸς Νημέρτιον λόγος (Cyrill. *c. Julian.* 3, 79, etc.). It appears to have been a treatise on the providence of God.

42. Ὅτι ἔξω τοῦ ὑφέστηκε τὸ νόημα (Porph. *Vif. Plot.* 18).
43. Περὶ τῆς Ὁμήρου φιλοσοφίας (Suidas).
44. Περὶ τῆς ἐξ Ὁμήρου 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 the lives and doctrines of philosophers (Socrates, 11. E. 3, 23; Eunap. *Pr.* p. 10).
54. Περὶ ψυχῆς, in five books (Suidas; Euseb. *Prcep. 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 Mondes*, May 15, 1866, 1. 435; Farrar, *Critical History of Free Thought*, p. 56 sq.; *Journal*

of *Speculativae 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

SEE PORRETANI.

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

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

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 Gesangbücher* (Berl. 1856); id. *Die Gesangbücher Berlin's* (ibid. 1857). (B. P.)

Port

is the rendering in ^{<1623>}Nehemiah 2:13 of the Heb. *sha'uar*, ר [ו] 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*, ἄγορά, 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 (^{<1191>}Genesis 19:1; ^{<1048>}1 Samuel 4:18; 9:18; ^{<1827>}Job 29:7; ^{<457>}Jeremiah 37:7). There the people came together in great numbers when any public calamity occurred (2 Macc. 3:19), there the judges heard causes and complaints (^{<1219>}Deuteronomy 21:19 sq.; 22:15 sq.; ^{<2327>}Isaiah 29:21; ^{<1222>}Job 21:21; ^{<1376>}Psalms 137:5; ^{<1152>}Amos 5:12, 15; ^{<3816>}Zechariah 8:16; ^{<1222>}Proverbs 22:22), and there deeds which required legal sanction, especially important contracts, were performed (^{<1230>}Genesis 23:10, 18; ^{<1527>}Deuteronomy 25:7; ^{<1840>}Ruth 4:1, 11; comp. the early Germans, Grimm, *Deutsche Rechtsalterthümer*, p. 104 sq.; and see Hist, *Milarokko*, p. 239). There princes stood to receive homage (^{<1098>}2 Samuel 19:8; but see below), or for public discussion of important affairs (^{<1220>}1 Kings 22:10), and markets were held in the vicinity (^{<1200>}2 Kings 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 (^{<2479>}Jeremiah 17:19; ^{<3102>}Proverbs 1:21; 8:3). Idolatries, too, were sometimes practiced here (^{<1228>}2 Kings 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 (^{<1083>}2 Samuel 18:33) with watch-towers (ver. 24 sq.). Gate-keepers are mentioned, at least in Jerusalem, with some political duties and powers (^{<2473>}Jeremiah 37:13; ^{<1639>}Nehemiah 13:19). On the other hand, in 2 Samuel 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 ^{<1702>}Esther 3:2; ^{<1724>}Daniel 2:49, the word is used, according to a usage 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 (^{<1709>}Esther 2:19, 21; 4:2; 5:9, 13 sq.; 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*.

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 Raffaele and the other Umbrian 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 in 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 Raffaello 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. Raffaello instructed his monastic friend in perspective, and he in turn gave new ideas of drapery to Raffaello. Fra Bartolomeo was the first to employ lay figures in the study of drapery; he also imparted to Raffaello 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 Raffaello 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 Raffaello 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 Painters, 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

a Lutheran divine, as born in 1541 at Osterwick, near Halberstadt having completed his studies, he was called in 1566 as rector to Osterwick. 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 operum Lutheri* (ibid.), etc. See Winer, *Hundbuch der theolog. Literatur*, 2, 29; Jocher, *Gelehrten-Lexikon*, s.v. (B. P.)

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

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

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 fundati 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

([hyeair \[Mm\]](#)) 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 *μὴν Ἰσραὴλ* 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 *Thesaurus antiquitatum 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 Fürst, *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 Jubelfeier der Wiener Universität* (Wien, 1865), p. 172; Delitzsch and Zuniz, *Addit. ad Cod. Bibl. Senat.* (Lips.), 27. (B. P.)

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 *repositoir* 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

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 were 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. Iltid'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

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

(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, Sens, 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 aeternälès

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 aeternales,
Triumphales, principales,
Angeli, attollite.
Eja, tollite actutum,
Venit Dominus virtutum,
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.

Portatilè 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 portable 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

is the technical term applied to candlesticks used in churches and carried by hand.

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, he 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

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 ר [ֶב or ר [ֹשׁוֹר, from ר [ִי; *shaar*, a gate; once (^{<1372>}Ezra 7:24) Chald. [רִי; *tara'*, the same (Sept. **θυρωρός** and **πυλωρός**; Vulg. *portarius and janitor*). This meaning is evidently implied in (^{<1321>}1 Chronicles 9:21; ^{<1239>}2 Chronicles 23:19; 35:15; ^{<810>}John 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 (^{<1085>}2 Samuel 18:26; ^{<1270>}2 Kings 7:10, 11; ^{<1134>}Mark 13:34; ^{<810>}John 10:3; 18:16, 17. In two passages (^{<1353>}1 Chronicles 15:23, 24) the Hebrew word is rendered “doorkeeper,” and in (^{<816>}John 18:16, 17, **ἡ θυρωρός** is “she that kept the door.” Thus, in (^{<1270>}2 Kings 7:10, 11, and (^{<1085>}2 Samuel 18:26, we meet with the porter at the gates of a town. In the palace of the high-priest (^{<817>}John 18:17) the porter was a female, **ἡ παιδισκη, ἡ θυρωρός**. See also (^{<4123>}Acts 12:13. A porter seems to have been usually stationed at the doors of sheepfolds (^{<810>}John 10:3). According to Stier and others, this **θυρωρός** 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 (^{<1321>}1 Chronicles 23:5 no less than 4000 are mentioned. They were divided into courses (^{<1310>}1 Chronicles 26:1-19), and had their post assigned them by lot (ver. 13). Besides attending to the gates and keeping order there, they seem, as Lightfoot says, to have had charge of certain treasures (ver. 15, comp. with ^{<1252>}2 Chronicles 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 (^{<1216>}2 Kings 11:5; ^{<1317>}1 Chronicles 9:17-29; 16:42; ^{<1484>}2 Chronicles 8:14; 23:4; 31:14; 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. 15:16: “Blessed is he that watcheth and keepeth his garments” (*Temple Service*, c. 7 § 1). *SEE TEMPLE*.

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 his relation to this Church until 1831. He died in 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.

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 Inflections* (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.

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.

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 stately 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, 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.

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, 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, 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 pastorate at 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 he 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.

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)

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, he labored in that and other fields, chiefly in 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, 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

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

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

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).

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 the 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 *portio* (a *portio*), through the *French* *porte-hors*, hence *portasse*, *portas*. The foreign breviaries were divided according to the four seasons, but in England into winter and summer parts.

Porteus, Beilby

Picture for 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; and 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 year he 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

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 finisse 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 generalé 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. Généralé*, s.v.

Portico

Picture for Portico

is an architectural term designating a range of columns In the front of a building. When of four 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.

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

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

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 Aternalis*, 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 canonicuica* or *Quarta funeraria*.

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

(*q| j | 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 ⁽⁻¹⁰⁸⁰⁾Nehemiah 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” ⁽⁻¹⁰¹⁸⁻²⁾Samuel 11:8, 10). We likewise read in the book of Esther ⁽⁻¹⁷⁰⁹⁾Esther 9:19): “Therefore the Jews of the villages, that dwelt in the unwallled 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

(PAROCHIAL) is the mediety of a parish which was divided into several vicarages or parsonages.

Portionist

a term employed to designate a benefited 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

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!" 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.

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 stagnat* aqua). 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 eyes 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, Perefice, 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 für 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.

Portugal

Picture for Portugal

the most westerly kingdom of Europe, a part of the great Spanish peninsula, lies in $36^{\circ} 55' 42'' 8''$ N. lat., and $6^{\circ} 15' - 9^{\circ} 3' 0''$ 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), Colimbria (Coimbra), Egitanía (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 *in partibus 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 with 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, Braganca-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 in 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 von 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

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 Oracao commune Administracao dos Sacramentos e outros Ritos e Ceremonias da Igreja, conforme o Uso da Igreja de Inglaterra, iuxtamente como Salterio ou Salmos 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, isto he, todos os sacro sanctos Livros e Escritos evangelicos e apoticos do novo Concerto de nosso Fiel Senhor Solvador e Redemptor Jesu Christo: traduzido em Portugues pelo Padre 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, Exodo; 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, com 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, convert a saber, Hoseas, Joel, Amos, Obadias, Jonas, Micheas, Namhum, Habacuc, Sophonias, Haggeo, Zacharias, Malachias* (com toda diligentia traduzido na lingua Portugueza, pelos Padres Missionarios de Trangambar. 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 Nehemias, o Livro de Esther, traduzido na Lingoa Portugueza, pelo Reverendo Padre Joam- Ferreira 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.)

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

(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.

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. Généralé*, s.v.

Pöschel, 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 Gegenstände 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. Geistlichkeit*, 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.

Pöschel, 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 Pöschelians 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 of 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.)

Pöschelians

SEE POSCHEL.

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

a festival celebrated annually among the ancient Greeks in honor of Poseidon. It was kept chiefly in the island of Egina.

Poseidonius

SEE POSIDONIUS.

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 Inowracław. 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 German 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

is the term applied to the bishop's examining chaplain. The annual examiner at Winchester and Eton still bears this name.

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

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 he 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.

Posido'nius

(Ποσιδώνιος), an envoy of the Syrian general Nicanor to Judas Maccabeus (2 Macc. 14:19).

Posidonius

(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 Panetius, 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. Nat.* 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 the 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 Reliquiae Doctrinae; Collegit atque illustravit Janus Bake; Accedit D. Wytttenbachii 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

a recent scheme of philosophy, on the basis of phenomenalism, founded by Auguste Comte of Paris. *SEE COMTE*; *SEE POSITIVISM*.

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 as 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 can 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, but 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 universe (*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 causas,” 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 Corypheus, 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 faculties, 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 unphilosophical 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 pæraequo corrumpit, ac illa inquisitio parentum Cupidinis: hoc est, quod philosophi principia rerum, quemadmodum in natura inveniuntur, non receperunt et amplexi sunt, ut doctrinam quandam positivam, et tamquam fide experimentalis” (*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 (*νοούμενα*), 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 Königsberg 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 Progress* (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. *Exposé et Critique du Positivisme prolongé* (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 Synposium*, 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

(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. Strafstadt zu Sagan; Von einem 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

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 Erklärung der Epistel St. Pauli an die Rommer: — Nachricht von den in Hal'nden habenden biblischen Exeumplaren*. See Jocher, *Gelehrten Lexikon*, s.v.

Possessed with Devils

the usual rendering in the A.V. of the Greek **δαιμονιζόμενοι** (but also **δαιμονισθέντες**, ^{<4168>}Mark 5:18; comp. **δαιμόνια ἔχειν**, ^{<4167>}Luke 8:27; **πνεῦμα δαιμονίου ἀκαθάρτου ἔχειν**, 4:33), ^{<4161>}Matthew 4:24; 8:16; 15:22; ^{<4187>}Acts 8:7; ^{<4182>}Luke 8:2. These were persons afflicted with disease, as epilepsy (^{<4175>}Matthew 17:15; ^{<4169>}Luke 9:39), paralysis (^{<4131>}Luke 13:11, 16), dumbness (^{<4162>}Matthew 9:32; 12:22), and especially with melancholy and insanity (^{<4188>}Matthew 8:28; ^{<4162>}Mark 5:2 sq.; ^{<4187>}Luke 8:27 sq.); whence the healed are said to be *of sound mind* (**σωφρονοῦντες**, ^{<4165>}Mark 5:15; ^{<4185>}Luke 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 ^{<4108>}Acts 10:38; ^{<2136>}Luke 13:16; comp. Josephus, *Ant.* 6, 8, 2, on ^{<0164>}1 Samuel 16:14, 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 Corvantes 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 *Causa 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 ^{<0125>}Matthew 12:37; ^{<0199>}Luke 9:49; ^{<4093>}Acts 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 daemoniac 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, *Vachtraii e*, p. 185). On his method of healing,

comp. Paulus, 1, 423; 2, 621; and on ^{<4029>}Mark 9:29, against the view of Pautlus, Fritzsche on ^{<4072>}Matthew 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 (^{<4088>}Luke 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 ^{<4075>}Matthew 17:15, comp. Paul. *AEgin.* 3:13, where he speaks of a *morbus comitialis*, 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. ^{<4089>}Luke 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. **לפסו** or **הפכילאן 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, *Morb. 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 word **σεληνιάζεσθαι**, ^{<4094>}Matthew 4:24; 17:15; comp. Suicer, *Thesaur.* 2, 946. In Latin, too, epileptics were called *lulzatici*, or *moonstruck*. Again, epilepsy, in connection with partial insanity, was the disease of the man mentioned in ^{<4023>}Mark 1:23 sq.; ^{<4063>}Luke 4:33 sq.; comp. esp. ^{<4025>}Mark 1:26.

(b.) On ^{<4083>}Matthew 8:28, comp. Wetstein, 1, 354 sq. The proofs of vast strength, and of a violent rage against himself (^{<4074>}Mark 5:4, 5; comp. ^{<4096>}Acts 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 misanthropica*, 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 (^{<4079>}Mark 5:9; ^{<4080>}Luke 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 (**חפז**) 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 ⁴⁴⁶⁶Acts 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 Daeimoniis quorum in N.T. fit mentio* (Halle, 1760); *Umständliche Untersuchung der Damon-Leute* (ibid. 1762); Gruner, *De Daeimoniis 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 Daeemonicis 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. *Nachtiadg* 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

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 the 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 he 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 Sacrificio 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: — *Moscovia, seml de rebus Moscoviticis* (Wilna, 1586, 8vo; Cologne, 1587-95, fol.; Ital. transl. 1596, 4to): — *Judicium de quatuor scriptoribut* (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: — *Vita di Lodovico Gonzaga*, *Duca di Nevers*, *di Eleonora, Duchessa di Mantova* (1604, 4to). See Ranke, *Hist. of the Papacy*. 1, 434 sq.; 2, 21 sq.; Alzog, *Kircheengesch.* 2, 341, 425, 466; Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* vol. 3; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s.v.

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 Pelagius 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. Généralé, s.v.*; Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. s.v.*

Post

Picture for Post

(*courant*) is the rendering of /r; *râts* (Sept. βιβλιοφόρος. *Vulg. cursor*, ^{<4016>}2 Chronicles 30:6, 10; ^{<4783>}Esther 3:13, 15; 8:10, 14; ^{<8025>}Job 9:25; ^{<2513>}Jeremiah 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

(*stationary*) is the rendering in the A. V. of the following words:

1. **יַאֲיַי** *ayil* (Sept. **τὸ αἴθριον**, Vulg. *fronzs*), properly a ram (as in ^{<159>}Genesis 15:9, and often); hence perhaps a *pilaster* or buttress (^{<340>}Ezekiel 40:9-49; 41:1, 3; “lintel,” ^{<1061>}1 Kings 6:31). In the Sept. it is sometimes left untranslated (**אֵיל, אֵילֵּוּ, אֵילָאֵם**); 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 *byffrons*: which Gesenius quotes as favorable to his own view, provided that *byffions* be understood the projections in front of the building. The A. V. of ^{<1061>}1 Kings 6:31, “lintel,” is supported by the versions of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion of ^{<302>}Ezekiel 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 (^{<304>}Ezekiel 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 ^{<1068>}1 Kings 6:31, ^{<3409>}Ezekiel 40:9, 21, 24, 26, 29, 31, 33, 34, 36-38, 48, 49; 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 **מִלְיָאֵי עֵילָם**, “an arch,” only used in the plur. (^{<3406>}Ezekiel 40:16, etc.), probably a portico, and so rendered by Symmachus and Syriac versions (Gesen. *Thesaur.* p. 48).

2. **hMai** *ammâh* (Sept. **ὑπέρθυρον**, Vulg. *superliminare*), literally, *mother*, or *cubit*, as the fundamental relation; *foundation* (^{<2304>}Isaiah 6:4).
3. **hzwzmj** *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 (^{<1216>}Exodus 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 (^{<1063>}1 Kings 6:33).
4. **ās̄j** *saph* (Sept. **φλιά, πρόπυλον**; Vulg. *limen, superliniare*), the *threshold* (^{<4487>}2 Chronicles 3:7; ^{<3416>}Ezekiel 41:16; ^{<1000>}Amos 9:1; elsewhere “threshold,” “door,” or “gate”). **SEE DOOR**.

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, he 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

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

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 he was taken ill, and died Sept. 24, 1858. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1860, p. 77. (J. L. S.)

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 lingue et gentis antiquitate atque variarum linguarum affitate* (ibid. 1538, 4to): — *Grammatica Arabica* (ibid. 1538, 4to): — *Syrie descriptio* (ibid. 1540, 8vo): — *De magistratibus Atheniensium* (Basle, 1543, 8vo; Leipsic, 1591,

8vo, with the notes of John Frederick Hekelius): — *Alcoranti seu legis Mahometi et evangelistarum concordiae liber* (Paris, 1543, 8vo): — *Sacrarum 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 terris 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 futura et toti orbi ferrarum ins singulis ratione praeditis manifestanda opus* (ibid, 1547, 8vo): — *Absconditorum at constitutione mundi clavis, qua mens humana tam in divinis quam in humanis pertinet ad interiora velamina aetnae veritatis* (ibid. 16mo; and with appendix, Amst. 1646, 16mo): — *Candelabri typici in Mosis tabernaculo jussu divino expressi interpretatio* (Venice, 1548-Hebrew, Latin, and French): — *De Etruriae iringionis, que prima in orbe Europeo habitata est, originibus, 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): — *Eversiofaldorum Aristotelis dogmatum* (ibid. 1552. 16mo): — *L'histoire memorable des Expeditions depuis le Deluge, faites 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, seu de prisco Latine et Graecae linguae caractere* (ibid. 1552, 8vo): *Tabule in astronomiaem, in arithmeticaem theoreticam et in musicaem theoreticam* (ibid. 1552): — *La Loi Salique, livret de la premiere humaine Veuite* (ibid. 1552, 16mo; Lyons, 1559, 16mo): — *Prompto-Evangelium Jacobi, fratris et potissim 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 merveilleuses 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 Nouveau-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* (Poitiers, 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 premiers 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. Généralé*, 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, *Nouveaux Eclaircissements sur la Vie de Postel*; Collmieu, *Gallia Orientalis*; De Thou, *Eloges des Savants*; Sallengre, *Memoires de la Litterature*, vol. 1 and 2; Marrier, *Hist de Saint-Martin des Champs*; Nicéron, *Memoires*, vol 8; Chauffepie, *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

(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*, *postillare*). 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.

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

(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-Pridie* 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-Prædica* 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

SEE POST-PRÆDICA.

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

(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

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; bowing, 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

a surname of the Roman goddess *Carmenta*, indicating her knowledge of the past, just as *Altevorta* denotes her knowledge of the future.

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 (^{<04108>}Numbers 11:8; ^{<0769>}Judges 6:19; ^{<0124>}1 Samuel 2:14; ^{<1088>}2 Kings 4:38 sq.; ^{<4513>}2 Chronicles 35:13; ^{<2704>}Isaiah 65:4; ^{<3308>}Micah 3:3; ^{<5108>}Ezekiel 11:3; 24:3 sq.), derives its ordinary names from its use in boiling. It was commonly, among the Israelites, made of clay (Heb. רַמְיָו Gr. πῆλος; comp. ^{<2916>}Isaiah 29:16; 45:9; ^{<2480>}Jeremiah 18:4). But there were also brazen pots (^{<0838>}Leviticus 8:28), especially in the sanctuary (^{<1075>}1 Kings 7:45; ^{<1254>}2 Kings 25:14). The trade of the potters, called *μυράχο* (comp. Gesenius, *Monumenta Phoen.* p. 161) or *vrj ,ydxjç* (^{<2480>}Jeremiah 19:1), in Greek *κεραμείς*, was a separate pursuit, to whose mysteries allusions are often made (^{<2480>}Jeremiah 18:2 sq.; Sirach 38:30 sq., 33 sq.). It was necessary first to work the clay with the feet, to make it plastic (^{<2425>}Isaiah 41:25), and then to shape it with the hand (^{<2480>}Jeremiah 18:4, 6; Sirach 33:13; 38:30) and the Oriental potter's wheel (*μυαβῆ*; ^{<2480>}Jeremiah 18:3; see Gesenius, *Thesaur.* 1, 16). The vessels were glazed (Sirach 38:31; ^{<1075>}Proverbs 26:23), and then burned in the oven (*κάμινος*, Sirach, *l. c.*). BAhr (*Symbolik*, 2, 293) and Sommer (*Bibl. Abhandl.* 1, 213) assume, indeed, that the Hebrews were ignorant of glazing, and explain the passages (^{<0862>}Leviticus 6:21; 11:33; 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. **Ēwsa**; *asuk* (Sept. ἀγγεῖον), applied to holding oil (^{<1242>}2 Kings 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. **[y]bāe** *gabia* (Sept. κεράμιον, Vulg. *scyphaus*, ^{<3815>}Jeremiah 35:5; elsewhere “bowl” or “cup”), probably a bulging jar or bowl for liquids. **SEE BOWL.**
3. **dWD**, *dud* (Sept. κόφινος, ^{<1812>}Job 41:20; ^{<3806>}Psalms 81:6; elsewhere “basket,” “caldron,” “kettle”), a vessel for culinary purposes, mentioned (^{<9124>}1 Samuel 2:14) in conjunction with “caldron” and “kettle,” and so perhaps of smaller size. **SEE KETTLE.**
4. **crj**, *cheres* (“potsherd,” ^{<808>}Job 2:8; ^{<12215>}Psalms 22:15; ^{<1073>}Proverbs 26:23; ^{<2809>}Isaiah 45:9; elsewhere “earthen,” etc.), an earthen vessel for stewing or seething. Such a vessel was used for baking (^{<3009>}Ezekiel 4:9). It is contrasted in the same passage (^{<9168>}Leviticus 6:28) with a metal vessel for the same purpose. **SEE POTSHERD.**
5. **yl kē** *keli* (Sept. σκεῦος, ^{<9058>}Leviticus 6:28), a vessel of any kind (as usually elsewhere rendered). **SEE VESSEL.**
6. **ryK** *akir* (only once and in the dual, ^{<9115>}Leviticus 11:35, “ranges for pots”). **SEE RANGE.**
7. **rys** *asir* (Sept. λέβης, Vulg. *olla*, the most usual and appropriate word, ^{<1280>}Exodus 38:3; ^{<1048>}2 Kings 4:38-41; 25:14; ^{<14011>}2 Chronicles 4:11, 16; 35:13; ^{<1813>}Job 41:31; ^{<1809>}Psalms 58:9; ^{<2006>}Ecclesiastes 7:6; ^{<3013>}Jeremiah 1:13; ^{<2303>}Ezekiel 24:3, 6; ^{<3018>}Micah 3:3; ^{<3140>}Zechariah 14:10, 21). It is also used, combined with other words, to denote special uses, as with **j Wpn**; (^{<2013>}Jeremiah 1:13), “a seething-pot;” with **rcB**; “flesh” (^{<1048>}Exodus 16:3); **/j r**; “washing” (^{<1808>}Psalms 60:8) **ā rāḥi** “fining-pot” (^{<1272>}Proverbs 27:21).

The blackness which such vessels would contract is alluded to in Joel 2, 6.
SEE CALDRON.

8. ρῥρP; *parir* (Sept. χαλκείον, Vulg. *cacabus*, ^{<0769>}Judges 6:19; ^{<0924>}1 Samuel 2:14; “pan,” ^{<0408>}Numbers 11:8), apparently an open flat vessel.
SEE PAN.

9. τηχηκαε *asintse'neth* (Sept. σταμνός, Vulg. *vas*, ^{<0163>}Exodus 16:33), a covered vessel for preserving things (comp. ^{<3904>}Hebrews 9:4). *SEE MANNA.*

10. μυᾶῖν] *shephatta'yim* (Sept. κλήρος, ^{<3913>}Psalms 68:13; “hooks,” ^{<3503>}Ezekiel 40:43), opposite *rows*, as of sheepfolds.

11. ξέστης (^{<4074>}Mark 7:4, 8), properly a *sextarius* or sixteenth part of the *uiedius* or “bushel,” =nearly one pint English; hence a cup generally. *SEE MEASURE.*

12. στάμνος (^{<3904>}Hebrews 9:4), an earthen *jug* or jar, = No. 9 above.

13. ὕδρῖα (^{<4016>}John 2:6, 7; 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 (^{<1075>}1 Kings 7:45; 10:21; ^{<1446>}2 Chronicles 4:16; 9:20; ^{<4074>}Mark 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.*

Picture for 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

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

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 Potamius are, *Epistola ad Athanasium Episcopum Alexandrinum de Consubstantialitate Filii Dei*, in some MSS. entitled *Epistola Potainii ad Athanasium ab Aritais* (impetium?) *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 Scripturum* (Paris, 1661, 4to), 2, 366, or 3. 299 of the new edition by Baluze (1717, fol.), and will be found in its best form in Galland's *Bibliotheca Patrum* (Venice, 1769, fol.), 5. 96: — *Sermo de Lazaro*: — *Sermo de Martyrio Essice Prophetæ*. 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. Zenonis 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

(**Ποτάμων**, 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 laying 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 *Timaeus*, the other a treatise on the first principles, **Στοιχειώσις**. 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, **ἐκλεκτικὴ 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 (**τὴν τε ὕλην, καὶ τὸ ποιόν, ποίησίν τε, καὶ τόπον**); in other words, out of what, and by whom, how, and where a thing is done (**ἐξ οὗ γάρ, καὶ ὑφ' οὗ, καὶ πῶς, καὶ ἐν ᾧ**). 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. Graec.* 2, 109; Diogenes Laertius, *l'Poem.* § 21; but especially Brucker, *Historia Critica Philosophiae*, 2, 193 sq.; Glöckner. *De Potamounis Alex. Philosophiae Eclectica, recentiorum Platoniorum 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

Picture for 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

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

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 Dernieres 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. Généralé*, s.v.

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. Généralé*, 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

(Πόθος), a personification among the ancient Greeks of *love* or *desire*, and usually regarded as a companion of *Aphrolite*.

Pot'iphar

(Heb. *Potiphar'*, **רפֿיפֿר**, contraction of [**רפֿ,יפֿר**, *Potipherah* [q.v.]; Sept. **Πετεφρής**), an officer of Pharaoh, probably the chief of his body-guard (⁻⁰³⁰¹Genesis 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 (⁻⁰²⁷⁶Genesis 27:36; 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 (⁻⁰⁴¹⁸Genesis 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 (**μυρ βFhircih[οPιμυρϳ]**, an Egyptian” (⁻⁰³⁰¹Genesis 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 (^{<0412>}Genesis 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 (^{<0304>}Genesis 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 (ver. 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.*

Potiph'erah

Picture for Potiph'erah

(Heb. *Potiphera*, [r̄p,yfæ]), the priest of On, or Heliopolis, whose daughter Asenath became the wife of Joseph (^{<0445>}Genesis 41:45, 50; 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. Πετεφρή; Alex. Πετεφρή, 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

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

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 literis sicut 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 modo fieri posset, statui. Nec mea fefellit spes. Tantum namque me ab eis didicisse mihi persuadeo, ut deo duce Psalterium David in ipsa vera lingua Chaldecica 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; Romae per Marcellum 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 linguis, 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

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.

Potsherd

(*crj* , *chires*, from the root *srj* ; *to scrape* or *scratch*; Sept. ὄστρακον; Vulg. *testa, vas fictile*; “sherd” in two places, once “stone,” often “earthen vessel”), a bit of pottery ware (^{<K118>}Job 2:8), is figuratively used in Scripture to denote a thing worthless and insignificant (^{<K215>}Psalm 22:15; ^{<K163>}Proverbs 26:23; ^{<K819>}Isaiah 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.

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 Commentationum Theologicarum* (8 vols. 1800-7), and afterwards at Göttingen undertook, as joint continuator with Heinrich, an edition of Koppe’s *Testamentum 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

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

(*dyzænazid*, something boiled, ^{<0259>}Genesis 25:29, 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

Picture for Potter 1

Picture for Potter 2

(*ῥξέϋ*, *yotser*, a *fiashioner*; Chald. *ῥj P*, *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 (^{<0109>}Psalm 2:9; ^{<2314>}Isaiah 30:14; ^{<2491>}Jeremiah 19:11; ^{<0127>}Revelation 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 (^{<6021>}Romans 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 (^{<0076>}Judges 7:16,19). Pitchers and bottles are indeed mentioned earlier; but the "bottle" which contained Hagar's water (^{<0214>}Genesis 21:14, 15) was undoubtedly of skin; and although Rebekah's pitcher was possibly of earthenware (24:14, 15), we cannot be certain that it was so. The potter's wheel is mentioned only once in the Bible (^{<2482>}Jeremiah 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 (^{<6806>}Psalms 81:6). The clay, when dug, was trodden by men's feet so as to form a paste (^{<23425>}Isaiah 41:25; *Wisd.* 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; ^{<2483>}Jeremiah 18:3; *Ecclus.* 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 (^{<2304>}Isaiah 30:14; 45:9; ^{<4118>}Job 2:8; ^{<0216>}Psalms 22:16; ^{<1823>}Proverbs 26:23; *Ecclus.* 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 (³⁴²¹⁴Jeremiah 32:14). Tiles with patterns and writing were common both in Egypt and Assyria, and were also in use in Palestine (³⁰⁰¹Ezekiel 4:1). There was at Jerusalem a royal establishment of potters (¹³⁰²³1 Chronicles 4:23), from whose employment, and from the fragments cast away in the process, the Potter's Field perhaps received its name (²³⁰¹⁴Isaiah 30:14). Whether the term 'potter'" (³⁸¹¹³Zechariah 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.

bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born in the town of Beekman (now La Grange), Dutchess 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. Boorman 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 best 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

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.

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

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, 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

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.

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, 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).

Potter's 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 (ver. 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.

ⲘⲚⲓⲓ Matthew 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.

ⲘⲚⲓⲓ Zechariah 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” (רֶצֶפֶת) 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 ^{<6016>}Romans 10:6-9 (comp. with ^{<6017>}Deuteronomy 8:17; 30:11-14), ^{<6055>}1 Corinthians 15:45 (comp. with ^{<6017>}Genesis 2:7). See Jowett, *St. Paul's Epistles (Essay on Quotations, etc.)*.
2. That this portion of the book of Zechariah — a book 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 ^{<8112>}Zechariah 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, ^{<2485>}Jeremiah 48:45, comp. with ^{<0027>}Numbers 21:27, 28; 24:17; ^{<2427>}Jeremiah 49:27, comp. with Amos 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.*

Potters' Gate

(**tysæj hir [iv]**), a gate in Jerusalem which led to the valley of Hinnom (^{<2492>}Jeremiah 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 *srj æcheres*, 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 ^{<8113>}Zechariah 11:13 is probably not to this gate (Gesen. *Thesaur.* p. 619). **SEE JERUSALEM.**

Pottier, François

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. Généralé*, s.v. See Saint Martin, *Eloge de P. F. Pottier; Nouvelles Lettres edifiantes*, vol. 1 and 3.

Potts, George, D.D.

an eminent Presbyterian divine, was born in Philadelphia, Pa., March 15, 1802. In 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., 1823-35; 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

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.

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

(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.)

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. — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, s.v. See Le Cerf, *Bibl. des Auteurs de la Congreg. de St. Maur*; Fisquet, *Biog. (indite) de l'Illeault*.

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 Castelnaud Montratiér and canon of Saint-Sauvémur 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 Mühlendorf, 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. Générale*, s.v. See Aubery, *Hist. des Cardin.* vol. 1; Sismondi, *Hist. des Républiques Italiennes*.

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. Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, s.v. See Richard et Giraud, *Bibliothèque Sacrae; Journal de Dorsanne*, vol. 4; *Dict. des Ecrivains eccles.*; Fisquet, *Biog. (inedite) de l'Herault*; Haag, *Hist. des Dogmes* (see Index).

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 Saône-et-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 Clergé 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. — Hoefler, Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, s.v.

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 Boismon, 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 *Bibliothèque des Orateurs Chrétiens* edited a volume of *Œuvres Choisies* of the abbé Poulle (1828, 18mo), preceded by a biographical notice. He died at Avignon Nov. 8, 1781. Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s.v. See De Sainte Croix, *Eloge de Poulle* (Avignon, 1783, 8vo).

Pound

(*weight*) is the rendering of one Heb. and one Greek word in the A. V.

1. **חֶמֶךְ**; *maneh* (^{<1107>}1 Kings 10:17; ^{<1109>}Ezra 2:69; ^{<1071>}Nehemiah 7:71, 72).

SEE MANESH.

2. **λίτρα**, *litra* (^{<613>}John 12:3; 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, *arfyl* (Buxtorf, *Lex. Rabb.* col. 1138). *SEE WEIGHT.*

Pound

(*money*), a value (μνᾶ *mina*) mentioned in the parable of the Ten Pounds (^{<42192>}Luke 19:12-27), as the talent is in the parable of the Talents (^{<4254>}Matthew 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. ^{<4132>}Mark 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

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

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

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 Raffaele 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 Flamingo: 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

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 Toulouse 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 *Memoires 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. Généralé*, s.v.

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 (^{2R08}Proverbs 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 (^{4R17}Revelation 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 (^{4R03}Matthew 5:3). It is the effect of the operation of the Divine Spirit on the heart (^{4R08}John 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 (^{2R02}Isaiah 66:2), an evidence of true religion (^{4R03}Luke 18:13), and terminates in endless felicity (^{4R03}Matthew 5:3). *SEE POOR.*

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 and 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 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. How 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 for 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 *Aegyrtæ* 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

SEE POVERTY, MONASTIC.

Powell, Baden

an Anglican divine, noted rather as a scientific student than as a theologian, was the son of 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: “‘tes^timony, 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 Subserving 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.)

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.

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*.

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 Britannii, 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, 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

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, 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

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

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* ~~1~~ ¹ *Corinthians 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

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 (^{<BIB>}John 1:12); sometimes absolute authority (^{<BIB>}Matthew 28:18); sometimes the exertion or act of power, as of the Holy Spirit (^{<BIB>}Ephesians 1:19), of angels, or of human governments, magistrates, etc. (^{<BIB>}Romans 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” (^{<BIB>}1 Corinthians 15:43). The “prince of the power of the air” (^{<BIB>}Ephesians 2:2) is a figurative representation of Satan (q.v.). **SEE AIR.**

Power, Francis Herron

a Presbyterian minister, was born in 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, 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 and Power*; a discussion on the same subject: — *Domestic Piety: — and Letters to Dr. Smith on Slavery*) are all attractive in style, and are models of logical clearness. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1873, p. 103, 104. (J. H. W.)

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

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

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.

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.

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

Picture for Powtai

is the name of a Chinese divinity signifying contentment.

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

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.

Poynt (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

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

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

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 Raffaello 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.

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

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

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

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

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 *Encyclopédie*, 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 ecclésiastique de Fleuri* (Berlin, 1767, 2 vols. small 8vo), supposed to be translated from the English, and to which Frederick II wrote a preface. — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, 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

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

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

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. Généralé*, 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

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 actuelle 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 Contempoians*; Querard, *La France litter.* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, s.v.; *Lond. Qu. Rev.* Jan. 1816 *Monthly Rev.* vol. 80 (1816).

Praeadamites

SEE PREADAMITES.

Praebend

SEE PREBEND.

Praecentor

SEE PRECENTOR.

Praeconès

(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

is, in the mass, the prayer which immediately precedes the canon, an exhortation to thankfulness, commencing with the words “*Su^rsum 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 prefaiones, 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

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

(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 *secundarii*. 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 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

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*.

Premonstrants

SEE PREMONSTRATENSISANS.

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 up 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

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. — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, s.v.

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** (^{<5152>}1 Thessalonians 5:12) and **προεστῶτες** (^{<5157>}1 Timothy 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, Jacobus

SEE SPRENG.

Praepositus Domus

was the name applied to the person whose duty it was to manage the revenues of the Church. **SEE AECONOMI.**

Praesanctificatio

is in the Roman Catholic Church the mass celebrated on Green-Thursdays, when two hosts are consecrated, whereof the priest tastes one at the communion, reserving the other for the next day, when the *missa praesanctificationum* is to be solemnized. In the Greek Church *missapraesanctificationum* (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).

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.

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 *titulum beneficii*. Allowances to ecclesiastics given otherwise than as beneficial revenue for ecclesiastical duties, or to laymen even for ecclesiastical services, are no prebends in the canonic meaning of the word.

Praetorium

is the rendering in ^{<41516>}Mark 15:16 of the Greek notation **Πραιτώριον** of the Latin word *praetorium*, 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. Rom. Rechts*, 1, 340). In ^{<4177>}Matthew 27:27 the common version renders the same word *common hall*; in ^{<41113>}Philippians 1:13, *palace*; in ^{<41828>}John 18:28, *hall of judgment*; and

elsewhere, once in the same verse in John, in 5:33, in 19:9, and ~~4035~~ Acts 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 *praetorium* in a Greek dress, a derivative from *praetor*; which latter, from *praeo*, “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 *praetor* 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 (~~4052~~ Acts 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 (~~4035~~ Acts 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 praetor of Sicily resided in the *domus praetoria*, 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 (~~423~~ Acts 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 ἀυλίζεται*); 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 praetors” (*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 (~~421~~ Acts 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 *βάρης*, 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 Judaea, 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*, ^{<423>}Acts 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 (ὑπήρται) 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 (^{<404>}Acts 4:1; 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 ἔξουσία, a term perhaps the translation of the Latin *imperium*, and certainly its equivalent. It was inherent in the praetor or his representatives—hence themselves popularly called ἔξουσῖαι ἔξουσῖαι ὑπέρτεροι (^{<510>}Romans 13:1, 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 ἔξουσίᾳ—covered by the privilege of the *imperium* (^{<408>}Matthew 8:9). The forced purveyances (^{<415>}Matthew 5:40), the requisitions for baggage animals (5, 41), the summary punishments following transgression of orders (^{<413>}Matthew 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 (^{<415>}Matthew 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 **στρατηγού** as to the mode of effecting the object (^{<Q21>}Luke 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 (^{<B18>}John 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 (^{<Q25>}Luke 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 (^{<Q23>}Acts 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” (^{<B12>}John 18:12). The insults which Luke mentions (^{<Q26>}Luke 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 (^{<Q20>}Luke 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 (^{<4023>}Acts 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 (^{<4073>}Matthew 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 (^{<4077>}Matthew 27:27; ^{<4156>}Mark 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 (^{<4078>}Matthew 27:28-30; ^{<4157>}Mark 15:17-19; ^{<4340>}John 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 (^{<4304>}John 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 (^{<4007>}John 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 (^{<4013>}John 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 [^{<4185>}John 18:15]), and the nearest relatives of Jesus (^{<4192>}John 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 (^{<4199>}John 19:29) was set within the cordon for the benefit of the soldiers, whose duty it was to remain under arms (^{<4173>}Matthew 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 (^{<4192>}John 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” (^{<4275>}Matthew 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 ^{<3013>}Philippians 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 (η οἰκία Καίσαρος, ^{<3022>}Philippians 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 (^{<4216>}Acts 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 (^{<4231>}Acts 28:30), although still under the custody

of a soldier. See Olshausen, *Topogr. des alten Jerusalem*, § 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.**

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

was a general term (from *παράγμα*, *business*) for all important ordinances of Church or State—those perhaps more properly which were enacted in public assemblies with the counsel of eminent juriconsults 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

(*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

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, *Praef. View*, ch. 4 § 3; Smith, *Theory of Moral Sent.* 1, 233; Fitzosborne, *Letters*, No. 18.

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 Psalm 1*, 14; Saurin, *Sermons*, vol. 1, ser. 14; Tillotson, *Sermons*, ser. 146 (conclusion). **SEE THANKSGIVING.**

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.

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.

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

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

a name for *destiny* among the Lithuanians, which, according to immutable laws, directs the gods, nature, and men, and whose power knows no limit.

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.

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 (ynw [mçh 8yp) 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 Haptharoth, 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.

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 descritta 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. — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, s.v.

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

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.

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

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

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.

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, 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.

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*.

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 eam 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 Praxeian 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) *impassibilem sed compatientem*. 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

SEE PRAXEANS.

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

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

(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 Ἐπιφάνους). 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

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. Pray 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 annum Chr. MDLXI V deducti* (ibid. 1764-70, 5 pts. fol.): — *De sacra dextera divi Stephani Hungarice 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 archiepiscoporum et episcoporum Hungarice, cum diocesum delineatione* (Presburg, 1778, 4to): — *Index librorum rariorum bibliothecae universitatis Budensis* (Buda, 1780-81, 2 pts. 8vo): *Historia regum Hungariae, cum notitiis ad cognoscendum veterem regni staturam* (ibid. 1800-1, 3 pts. 8vo).— Hofer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, s.v. See Horanyi, *Memoriae Hungarorum*, vol. 3; Luca, *Gelehrtes Oesterreich*; Rotermond, supplement to Jicher, *Gelehrten-Lexikon*, s.v.

Prayer

The words generally used in the O.T. are **hNj æ** *tchinnah* (from the root **h nj** ; “to incline,” “to be gracious,” whence in Hithp. “to entreat grace or mercy;” Sept. generally, **δέησις**; Vulg. *deprecatio*), and ‘ **hLpæ** *tephillah* (from the root **l l p** ; “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 **h/hy] μvθ]αργ;** *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” (**<000>**Genesis 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. Dent. 26:10, 13, and the prayer of atonement offered by the high-priest, **<612>**Leviticus 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 Luke 1, 10). About the time of the exile our records begin of the custom of the Levites reciting prayers and leading others (**<330>**1 Chronicles 23:30; comp. **<6117>**Nehemiah 11:17; *Berach.* 26, 1; see Otho, *Lex. Rab.* p. 164). An extraordinary instance of public prayer occurs in 1 Kings 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. (<4910> Psalm 141:2; <4888> Revelation 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. Isaiah 1, 15; Credner, *On Joel*, p. 192, supposes from <4926> Joel 2:16, and <4888> Matthew 18:3; 19:14; <4888> Psalm 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 operatum*. Prayer and fasting were considered the two great divisions of personal piety (Tob. 12:9; Judith 4:12). It was customary to offer prayer before every great undertaking (Judith 13:7; comp. <4890> Acts 9:40; *Iliad*, 9:172; 24, 308; Pythag. *Carmen Aur.* 48); as in war before a battle (1 Mace. 5, 33; 11:71; 2 Mace. 15:26; comp. 8:29). Three times a day was prayer repeated (<4761> Daniel 6:11; comp. <4900> Psalm 4:18; *Tanchaum*, 9, 4, in Schöttgen, *Hor. Hebr.* 1, 419): namely, at the third hour (9 A.M., Acts 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. <4702> Daniel 9:21; Josephus, *Ant.* 14:4, 3; see also Acts 3, 1; 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 (<4856> Matthew 15:36; <4861> John 6:11; <4875> Acts 27:35; Philo, *Opp.* 2, 481; Porphyr. *Abstin.* 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 (<4865> Matthew 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 (<4800> Luke 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.; Vitranga, *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 (<4866> Matthew 6:6), especially in the "upper room" (<4761> Daniel 6:11; Judith 8, 5; Tob. 3, 12; Acts 1, 13; 10:9), and on the roof. If in the open air, an eminence was sought for (<4843> Matthew 14:23; <4866> Mark 6:46; <4862> Luke

6:12; comp. ^{<1182>}1 Kings 18:42). The inhabitants of Jerusalem were fondest of going to the court of the Temple (^{<2180>}Luke 18:10; Acts 3. 1; comp. ^{<2307>}Isaiah 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 (^{<2061>}Daniel 6:11; ^{<4634>}2 Chronicles 6:34; 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 (^{<1033>}1 Kings 8:38), to the Holy of Holies (Psalm 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, *Ho2n.* 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; ^{<1082>}1 Kings 8:22; ^{<2020>}Daniel 9:20; ^{<4005>}Matthew 6:5; ^{<4125>}Mark 11:25; ^{<2181>}Luke 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 (^{<4663>}2 Chronicles 6:13; ^{<1054>}1 Kings 8:54; Esdr. 9:5; ^{<2060>}Daniel 6:10; ^{<2244>}Luke 22:41; ^{<4494>}Acts 9:40), or the body was even thrown to the ground (^{<0245>}Genesis 24:26; ^{<4685>}Nehemiah 8:6; Judith 9:1; ^{<4053>}Matthew 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. ^{<5403>}1 Timothy 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 (^{<1082>}1 Kings 8:22; ^{<4687>}Nehemiah 8:7; Lamentations 2, 19; 3, 41; ^{<4202>}Psalm 28:2; 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 (Isaiah 1, 15; ^{<1505>}Ezra 9:5); and in humble prayers of penitence were laid meekly on the breast, or sometimes the breast was struck with them (^{<2183>}Luke 18:13). A posture peculiar to prayer was dropping the head upon the breast (^{<4953>}Psalm 35:13), or between the knees (^{<1182>}1 Kings 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 and conduct, 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; ^{<0207>}Genesis 20:7, 17; ^{<0221>}Exodus 32:11 sq.; ^{<0173>}1 Kings 17:20 sq.; Josephus, *Ant.* 14, 2, 1; ^{<0011>}2 Corinthians 1:11; 1 Timothy 2, 1 sq.; ^{<0019>}Philippians 1:19). Hence it was common to request the prayers of others (1 Thessalonians 5, 25; 2 Thessalonians 3, 1; Hebrews. 13:18; comp. Deyling, *Observ.* 2, 587 sq.). See Jonath. On ^{<0327>}Genesis 26:27; and esp. Suicer, *Observ. Sacr.* p. 149 sq.; Schroder, *Diss. de Precib. Hebræorum* [Marb. 1717]; Saubert, *De Precibus Heb.*; and Poleman, *De situ præcandi 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 ^{<0024>}Numbers 6:24-26, couched as it is in a precatory form; and the short prayers of Moses (^{<0035>}Numbers 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 (^{<0530>}Deuteronomy 32:1-43); his less important songs after the passage of the Red Sea (^{<0250>}Exodus 15:1-19) and at the springing out of the water (^{<0217>}Numbers 21:17, 18); the Song of Deborah and Barak (Judges 5); the Song of Hannah in ^{<0011>}1 Samuel 2:1-10 (the effect of which is seen by reference to the Magnificat); and the Song of David (Psalm 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 ^{<1295>}2 Kings 19:15-19; ^{<2380>}Isaiah 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 (^{<1083>}1 Kings 8:23-53) and of Joshua the high-priest and his colleagues after the captivity (^{<1495>}Nehemiah 9:5-38). The former is a prayer for God's presence with his people in time of national defeat (^{<1693>}Nehemiah 9:33, 34), famine or pestilence (^{<1495>}Nehemiah 9:35-37), war (^{<1694>}Nehemiah 9:44, 45), and captivity (Nehemiah 9: 46-50), and with each individual Jew and stranger (^{<1495>}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 ^{<0064>}Numbers 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 (*rWBXbaj yl æj 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 ^{<2100>}Luke 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 ^{<0184>}Ephesians 3:14-21; ^{<0165>}Romans 16:25-27; ^{<0108>}Philippians 1:3-11; ^{<0109>}Colossians 1:9-15; Hebrews. 13:20, 21; ^{<0150>}1 Peter 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 Acts 2, 42; and comp. 1, 24, 25; 4:24-30; 6:6; 12:5; 13:2, 3; 16:25; 20:36; 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 ^{<0124>}Acts 1:24, 25), dwelling as it does (^{<0124>}Acts 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 (^{<0152>}Genesis 15:2, 3); for Ishmael (^{<0157>}Genesis 15:17, 18); of Isaac for Rebekah (^{<0152>}Genesis 15:25, 21); of Abraham's servant in Mesopotamia (^{<0152>}Genesis 15:24, 12-14); although sometimes they take a wider range in intercession, as with Abraham for Sodom (^{<0182>}Genesis 18:23-32), and for Abimelech (^{<0182>}Genesis 18:20, 7, 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 (^{<0112>}Numbers 11:2; 12:13; 21:7); by Samuel (^{<0175>}1 Samuel 7:5; 12:19, 23); by David (^{<0147>}2 Samuel 24:17, 18); by Hezekiah (^{<0195>}2 Kings 19:15-19); by Isaiah (^{<0204>}2 Kings 19:4; ^{<0422>}2 Chronicles 32:20); by Daniel (^{<0202>}Daniel 9:20, 21); or of prayer for national victory, as by Asa (^{<0441>}2 Chronicles 14:11); Jehoshaphat (^{<0406>}2 Chronicles 20:6-12), More rarely are they for individuals, as in the prayer of Hannah

(1 Samuel 1, 12); in that of Hezekiah in his sickness (^{<1201>}2 Kings 20:2); the intercession of Samuel for Saul (^{<0951>}1 Samuel 15:11, 35), etc. A special class are those which precede and refer to the exercise of miraculous power, as by Moses (^{<1082>}Exodus 8:12, 30; 15:25); by Elijah at Zarephath (^{<1172>}1 Kings 17:20) and Carmel (^{<1183>}1 Kings 18:36, 37); by Elisha at Shunem (^{<1063>}2 Kings 4:33) and Dothan (6, 17, 18); by Isaiah (^{<1201>}2 Kings 20:11); by St. Peter for Tabitha (^{<4040>}Acts 9:40); by the elders of the Church (James 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 (^{<4024>}Acts 4:24-30); of the Apostles for their Samaritan converts (^{<4185>}Acts 8:15); of Cornelius for guidance (^{<4401>}Acts 10:4, 31); of the Church of St. Peter (^{<4125>}Acts 12:5); of St. Paul at Philippi (^{<4465>}Acts 16:25); of St. Paul against the thorn in the flesh answered, although not granted (^{<4717>}2 Corinthians 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, in 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 (^{<281>}Luke 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 (^{<4734>}2 Corinthians 13:14; ^{<3216>}2 Thessalonians 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 (^{<41218>}Ephesians 2:18; ^{<41826>}Romans 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 (^{<41518>}Matthew 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 (^{<21634, 35>}Daniel 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 (^{<41077>}Matthew 7:7); *intercession*, by which we pray for others (James 5, 16); and *thanksgiving*, by which we express our gratitude to God (^{<31016>}Philippians 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 (^{<12145>}Exodus 14:15; 1 Samuel 1, 13; ^{<41724>}Romans 7:24, 25; ^{<14439>}Genesis 43:29, ^{<07168>}Judges 16:28; ^{<2232>}Luke 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 (^{<4186>}Matthew 6:6). He himself set us an example of it (^{<4162>}Luke 6:12); and it has been the practice of the saints in every age (^{<1028>}Genesis 28:32; ^{<2760>}Daniel 6:10; ^{<4400>}Acts 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 (^{<2350>}Isaiah 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 (^{<1089>}Genesis 18:19), David (^{<1063>}2 Samuel 6:20), Solomon (^{<3276>}Proverbs 22:6), Job (^{<8004>}Job 1:4, 5), Joshua (^{<1645>}Joshua 24:15). (See also ^{<4164>}Ephesians 6:4; ^{<2161>}Proverbs 6:20; ^{<2405>}Jeremiah 10:25; ^{<4402>}Acts 10:2, 30; 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 (^{<1037>}Matthew 10:37, 38; ^{<1038>}Mark 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 (^{<418D>}Matthew 18:20), the benefit of mutual supplications, from the example of the most eminent primitive saints (^{<3016>}Malachi 3:16; ^{<412D>}Acts 12:12), the answers given to prayer (^{<412E>}Acts 12:1-12; Josh. 10; Isaiah 37:etc.), and the signal blessing they are to the churches (^{<3019>}Philippians 1:19; ^{<4011>}2 Corinthians 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 (^{<0045>}Genesis 4:56); it was also carried on by the Jews (^{<1296>}Exodus 29:43; ^{<0110>}Luke 1:10). It was a part of the Temple-service (^{<2507>}Isaiah 56:7; ^{<1089>}1 Kings 8:59). Jesus Christ recommended it both by his example and instruction (^{<418D>}Matthew 18:20; ^{<0116>}Luke 4:16). The disciples also attended to it (^{<4124>}Acts 2:41, 42), and the Scriptures in many places countenance it (^{<0224>}Exodus 20:24; ^{<1630>}Psalms 63:1, 2; 84:11; 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 Difficulties.* —

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 man 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 (~~1000~~ Matthew 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 reconciliation 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 reconciliation 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 (~~6141~~1 John 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” (~~6143~~John 14:13; 15:16; 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*” (~~6145~~Romans 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 an 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 (~~ERRS~~ John 3:8). Even the afflatus of inspiration is no exception to this rule (~~ERRS~~ 1 Corinthians 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" (^{<4172>}Matthew 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" (^{<4172>}Matthew 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" (^{<4343>}John 14:13, 14); and again, "Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give it you" (^{<4623>}John 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 if 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” (^{<516>}James 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 *passive* 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 (^{<816>}Romans 7:5); salvation is inwrought by endurance (^{<406>}2 Corinthians 1:6); death is inwrought (^{<402>}2 Corinthians 4:12); faith is inwrought by love (^{<816>}Galatians 5:6); God’s power is inwrought (^{<403>}Ephesians 3:20, precisely parallel with our text, as also in Colossians 1, 29), and similarly his word (^{<513>}1 Thessalonians 2:13), and on the other hand the “mystery of iniquity” (^{<517>}2 Thessalonians 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 (^{<1182>}1 Kings 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 (^{<387>}Hebrews 5:7) was effectual as to its main object (^{<424>}Luke 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” (^{<1172>}1 Kings 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, ^{<1064>}2 Kings 4:34). He has had a very shallow experience of “the deep things of God” (^{<4780>}2 Corinthians 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” (^{<6185>}Romans 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; *Contemp. Rev.* July, Aug., Oct. 1872; *South. Quar. Rev.* April, 1875, art. 4. Comp. **SEE MIRACLE.**

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, *passim*, 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 sepulchres 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 martyrdom, 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 (¹⁰¹⁷²Exodus 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 terracotta, 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 to 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 (~~4205~~ Acts 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 prayer to God. St. Jerome writes to the virgin Demetrias, "Frequently the sollicitude 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 (~~1085~~ 1 Kings 8:54), and that Daniel thrice a day knelt down in prayer (~~2760~~ Daniel 6:10). It is said also that St. Stephen,

while suffering martyrdom (~~417B~~ Acts 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 (~~422H~~ Luke 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 prayers acceptable to God by putting down their penulæ. *SEE ATTITUDES.*

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 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 Christian 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 for the Dead

SEE DEAD, PRAYERS FOR THE; SEE PURGATORY.

Prayer, Formula of

SEE FORMS OF PRAYER.

Prayer, Lord's

SEE LORDS PRAYER.

Prayer to Saints

SEE INVOCATION.

Prayer-test

This was a proposal anonymously put forth 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, and 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 prayer. 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 the 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 us 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.*

Preachers, Local

SEE LOCAL PREACHERS.

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 Character 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" (⁴¹⁰⁷Matthew 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" (⁴¹⁶⁵Mark 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" (~~400:~~ Acts 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 Tetzels 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 upon 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 the 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* (1st and 2d 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* (1st, 2nd, 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

SEE DOMINICNS.

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 in a work published anonymously in Paris, in 1655, and entitled *Praeadamitae: sive Exercitatio super versibus duodecimo, decimotertio et decimoquarto capituli quinti Epistolae S. Pauli ad Romanos, quibus inducuntur Primi homines ante Adam conditi*. Very soon afterwards appeared, from the same author, the following: *Systema Theologicum ex Praeadamitarum Hypothesi: Pars prima*. 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 Librum Praeadamitarum in quibus confutatur nuperus scriptor, et primum omnium fuisse Adamum defenditur, auctore Eusebio Romano* (Philippian 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 anonymus fingens, ante Adamum primum fuisse homines in mundo; auctore Ant. Hulssso* (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 preadamite men, may be condensed in the following propositions:

1. The “lone man” (Romans 5, 12) by whom “sin entered into the world” was Adam, for in ver. 14 that sin is called “Adam’s transgression.”
2. “Transgression” is a violation of “law;” therefore “the law” (ver. 13) signifies the law given to Adam natural law, not that given to Moses.
3. The phrase “until the law” (ver. 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 primis illos homines peccavisse in Adamo, ut sanctificarentur in Christo” (*Pread. cap. 19*). Nevertheless, death before Adam did not “reign.” “Peccatum tunc 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” (~~cf.~~ Romans 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 Peyrierus.

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 Hamites, 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 the 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 Hamites and Shemites developed their languages in a common primeval home, and hence are nearly related. This view is favored by Genesis, where (Shemitic) Sidon is described as the eldest son of Canaan, who was descended from Cush, and thus from Ham (~~from~~ Genesis 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 Hindu Kush, 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-Altai 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 prognathism 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 and the 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 .Ian?* 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 tribes 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 opinion that the Melanic races are descendants of real Preadamites.^{f5}

^{f3}: Such a conclusion, however, has in our judgment a very slender foundation, 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 statements of Scripture must stand or fall by themselves, when fairly expounded by the usual laws 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 Ossements fossiles decouverts dans le, Cavernes de la Province de Liege* [1833-34]), and others, more recently, by M. E. Dupont (*Les Temps Prehistoriques*; 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 Diluviacres*) 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 Hercul (Pondres), Ariège (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 Franconia (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 (in 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 Tinier 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 ten to thirty feet in depth, have afforded a large quantity of human remains, mingled with those of animals contemporary with man (Morlot, *Etudes Geologiques 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 *kjökkenmødding*). 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 “dolmens” 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, Pfahbauten*) 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 Pfahlbauten 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" (^{<0345>}Genesis 31:45; see further, ver. 46-52); and at Mount Sinai, Moses erected twelve pillars-menhirs (^{<0240>}Exodus 24:4; see also ^{<0921>}Joshua 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 (^{<1077>}1 Kings 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 in 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 Préhistoriques, 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.

Æsthetically, Palaeolithic 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 ladders, 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 (*Congrès 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 meridionalis*. 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, *Congrès 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 have 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, *Congrès 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 preadamite 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 sphagnum 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.⁷⁷ 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.^{f7} 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 Figuiet, *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. Figuiet, 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

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

(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 ill 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 canonicarum* or *praebendae*. 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, and 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

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

(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 reclamer. 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 *Actio prescriptis 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 presteries 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

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, praecentor, 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, canons, 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 rural deanery meeting or cathedral respectively.

Precentor

(Gr. *πρωτοψάλτης, κανονάρχης*; Lat. *domesticus cutorum*; Fr. *gruand chant-re*; Sp. *chanfre*, 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, candel 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 *aprocrisarius*. 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

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

(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, and 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

or $twxm\ gyrt$. In the preface to his *Jad Hachezaka* (fol. 2, col. 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*, $hç[twxm$, corresponding to the 248 members of the human body, and 365 negative precepts, or *precepts of omission*, $hç[t al twxm$, 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” (²³⁰²Isaiah 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 ¹³¹⁵Genesis 32:5: $ytrg \hat{b}l \mu[$, ‘I have sojourned with Laball’ the word $ytrg$, to the Gematria [comp. the art. *SEE CABALA*, vol. 2, p. 4], amounts to 613 (i.e. $y = 10$, $t = -400$, $r = -200$, $= g\ 3$, 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, $\mu[rmwl\ k\ gyrt\ 8ygb\ ytrg\ ytrml\ akw\ ytrmç\ twxm\ gyrtw\ ytrg\ [çrh\ \hat{b}l\ \mu y[rj\ wyç[mm$;” 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 $\hat{f}q\ trwt$, *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 Eybenschtütz, 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 heutigen Juden* (Erlangen, 1748), 4:181 sq. (where the Hebrew 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

(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

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 the *trice sextif*, 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, Maximilian

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 Jetndentl*, 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 Wiedervereinigung* (Salzb. 1810): — *Seitenstücke 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 aufz Hrmn. Chr. Buberts kritische Beleuchtung 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

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. — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, s.v.

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

(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

(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.)

Predestinarians

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 Predestinarians. 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

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 Tim. 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, col. 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 irrelative election in ~~8183~~Romans 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 ~~8185~~Romans 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” (*Augustinism and Pelagianism*, transl. by Prof. Emerson). Justin Martyr, Ireneo, 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, *al ría ro3 00εο*, 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 he 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 can choose what is good or the contrary.” In illustration of this he remarks, “God gave to man 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 Irenetus, 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. Marcion*, 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 Auliginism, declares, without reservation, that divine election is based upon foreknowledge. True, Augustine cites two passages (*De Dono Perseverantiae*, 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, Pelagius 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 Praedestinianos*. 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 Causa 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 *Diatribes 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 Holland, 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. Prædest.* 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 in 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. Overall, 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. Overall 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 Overall 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, 1st pt. 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 praescientiamum docente*, etc. (Mogunt. 1826); Anselm, *De concordia praescieltiae et praedestinationis 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 Evangelium*; 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* ~~883~~ *Romans 8:29, 30, and* ~~4015~~ *Ephesians 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.

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.

Pre-eminence of Christianity

i.e. the higher power and honor due to Jesus the Christ. This doctrine is laid down in ^{<5018>}Colossians 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 (^{<2089>}Ecclesiastes 3:19). See *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1863, p. 681; *Church Remembrancer*, Jan. 1856, p. 132 sq.

Pre-established Harmony

SEE LEIBNITZ.

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 ^{<8813>}John 3:13; 6:50, 62, etc.; 8:58; 17:5, 24; ^{<6101>}John 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 (~~<B17>~~ Hebrews 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 (~~<B17>~~ John 17:4, 5; ~~<B18>~~ 2 Corinthians 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 ⁵⁰¹⁵Colossians 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 (⁵⁰⁰⁰Genesis 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 man, 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" (^{<small>R17</small>} Hebrews 2:17): he partook of all our infirmities except sin. St. Luke says, "He increased in stature and wisdom" (^{<small>R15</small>} Luke 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

(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 now 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 preadamian 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 man 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 interdum 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 *Preexistanti* 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.)

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 (Psalm 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 (~~1~~1 Corinthians 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. The 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

SEE PREADAMITE.

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' Architettura*. He died at Nuremberg Feb. 17, 1771. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, s.v.

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 Bernstorff*; *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. Généralé*, s.v. See Will, *Nürnbergisches Lexikon*, and Supplement of Nopitsch. — Fuessli, *Allgeum. Kuinstlet lexikon*; Nagler, *Neues Allyem. Kunstle lexikon*.

Preiswerk, Samuel, Dr.

a Swiss theologian, was born Sept. 19, 1799, at Rümelingen, 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 Theologica*, 3, 1012; Steinschneider, *Bibliogr. Handbuch*, p. 112; Peck, *Samuel Preiswerk*, in the "Evangel. Messeiner" (Cleveland, Ohio, 1877); Koch, *Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes*, 7:99 sq.; Knapp, *Evangelischer Liederschatz*, s.v. (B. P.)

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. Rev.* 4 (1830), 280.

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* ep. 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 Spiritu 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 prelatival 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 *litterae formatae, 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 prelatival 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” (~~466~~¹ Corinthians 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 Gen.* 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 sons, 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; Sozom. *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, tit. 3, leg. 50; *Cod. Justin.* lib. 10:tit. 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. Can.* 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, tit. 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 of 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. Jahrhundert.* p. 439-454; Planck, *Gesell. — Verfass.* 1, 183). Against these encroachments of ecclesiastical ambition and power the 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. tit. 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.)