THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY

REFERENCE

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL, THEOLOGICAL and ECCLESIASTICAL LITERATURE

Prelate - Priscillian

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

Prelate

(Lat. *praelatus*, i.e. *pronoted*) is an ecclesiastic who has direct authority over other ecclesiastics. The term is a general one, and includes not merely bishops of various degrees, but also in Roman Catholic countries the heads of religious houses or orders and other similar ecclesiastical dignitaries. These, for the most part, are privileged to wear the insignia of the episcopal rank. In the Roman court many of the officials, although not possessing episcopal or quasi-episcopal jurisdiction, have the insignia and the title of prelate. They are of two classes-the higher, called *del mantelletto* ("of the little mantle"), and the secondary, called *del mantellone* ("of the great mantle"), from the robe which they respectively bear. The same root underlies other ecclesiastical terms in which all the clergy are on an equality, and are governed by a representative body or by the local church; *prelatic* and *prelatical*. i.e. pertaining to a prelacy or a prelate, as prelatical authority. Prelates are confined to those churches which recognize in the bishop (q.v.) a distinct and superior order of clergy. *SEE PRELACY*.

Premare, Joseph-Henri

a French Jesuit, was born about 1670 in Normandy. March 7, 1698, he embarked with several other Jesuits at La Rochelle to preach the Gospel in China. He arrived Oct. 6 at Suneian, and addressed, Feb. 17, 1699, a relation of his journey to pere La Chaise, with a descriptive notice of the countries he had visited. As soon as lie had mastered the Chinese language he made a careful study of the antiquities and literature of the country. Though he expressed some strange ideas, it cannot be denied that his erudition was considerable, and that he thoroughly knew the philosophical works of the Chinese. He died at Peking about 1735. He left, *Recherches sur les Temps anterieurs a ceux dont parle le Chou-King et sur la Mythologie Chinoise*, published by Deguignes in the translation of the *Chou-King*, by pere Gaubii, in the form of a preliminary discourse (Paris, 1770, 4to): — a number of other works, three of them in Chinese: — *The Life of St. Joseph*, the *Lou-chou-chii*, or true sense of the six classes of characters, and a small treatise on the attributes of God, inserted in the *Notitia linguae sinicae*, which is the best of all those composed hitherto by Europeans on this subject: — several other treatises in Latin and in French, preserved among the manuscripts of the National Library of Paris, where we find also the originals of several letters of pere Premare. Three letters of

this missionary were published in the *Lettres edifiantes*, and a fourth in the *Annales encyclopediques* of Klaproth. He translated also a drama, *Tchao chi Kou-cul* (the Orphan of the House of Chao) which furnished to Voltaire some ideas for his *Orphelin de la Chine*. See *Lettres edifiantes*, vols. 16 and 21; *Catalogue de Fourmont l'aine*. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Géneralé*, s.v.

Premice

(*primitiae* or *prima missae*) is the first mass celebrated by the newly ordained priest (neomysta), with the help of an assistant. The solemnity begins thus: the new priest sings on the steps of the altar "Veni Sancte Spiritus," performs the corresponding ovation, and then distributes the holy water, if this is prescribed by the rubrics of the day. It is an open question among the rubricists if at a premice the mass of the day or a votival mass is to be read. The probable solution of the difficulty is that, on simple Sundays and ordinary "festis duplicibus," a votival mass may be said, such a mass being permitted on such days *pro re gravi et publica*, to which a premice solemnity may be said to belong; but the mass of the day must be preserved on high feasts, and on such Sundays on which votive masses are never admissible. The solemnity ends with the sacerdotal benediction, given by the new priest to the people by the imposition of hands (Lohner, *Instructio practica de SS. Missae saccrificio*, pt. 4:tit. 5; and Vogt, *Instructio practica de Missis votivis*, p. 197 sq.). The festivities connected with a premice, and not belonging directly to the ecclesiastical celebration, vary with the customs of countries and places, and are not seldom regulated by special prescriptions of the ecclesiastical authorities.

Premice Sermons

are discourses preached on the occasion of the first mass of an incipient priest. Their aim is to call the attention of both ecclesiastics and laymen to the dignity and importance of the sacerdotal state, and the duties which it imposes on both classes. Therefore the object of the sermon can only be some truth which relates to the clerical state: e.g. the dignity, the importance, of the priestly career; the priesthood of the Romish Church, its destination, or the duties arising from it, etc. According to the theme chosen, the sermon enlarges upon the object of the priestly functions, or the qualities, conditions, mode of action of the priesthood, or its duties and

beneficial influences, etc. At the end of the sermon there may be a prayer, or an exhortation to prayer.

Premonstratensians or Premonstrants

Picture for Premonstratensians

is the name of a monastic order which was founded at Premontre (Lat. Praemomstratum), *in* the diocese of Laon, France, about 1120, by St. Norbert of Cleves, afterwards archbishop of Magdeburg, with a view to restore the discipline of the regular canons, which had greatly deteriorated. The order followed the rule of St. Augustine, and was confirmed by popes Honorius II and Innocent III. The ground on which the order was established was given to St. Norbert by the bishop of Laon, with the approbation of Louis the Gross, king of France, who gave the Premonstratensians a charter of privileges. The place was called Praemonstratum, because it was pretended that the Blessed Virgin herself pointed out (*praemonstravit*) beforehand the site for the principal house of the order. According to these legendary authorities, the members of the order were at the same time commanded to wear a white habit, and consequently the *White Canons* wore a white cassock and rochet and a long white cloak. The abbots never wore pontificals; and any member promoted to the cardinalate or popedom retained his habit. At the time of the founding of the order St. Norbert had thirteen companions, but as the popes and kings of France granted it many privileges, and were very liberal to the Premonstratensians, they rapidly increased, and counted among their number many persons of distinguished birth, deep piety, and great scholarship. In the early history of the order there was such strict adherence to the rule of poverty that they had nothing they could call their own but one ass, which served them to carry wood, cut down by them every morning and sent to Laon, where it was sold to purchase bread; but in a short time they received so many donations, and built so many monasteries, that thirty years after the foundation of this order they had above a hundred abbeys in France and Germany. The order has likewise given the Church a great number of archbishops and bishops. It once had 1000 abbeys and 500 nunneries (until 1273 their monasteries were double, a house of women always adjoining the convent of men), but it is now the mere skeleton of what it was. Of the sixty-five abbeys which they had in Italy not one now remains. These monks, vulgarly called White Canons, went first to England in the year 1146, where the first monastery, called

Newhouse, was built in Lincolnshire by Peter de Saulia, and dedicated to St. Martialif. In the reign of Edward I, when that king granted his protection to the monasteries, the Premonstratensians had twenty-seven houses in different parts of the country. They were commonly called "White Friars." They had six monasteries in Scotland-four in Galloway, one at Dryburgh, and one at Ferne, in Ross-shire. They had also several houses in Ireland. In England their churches and conventual buildings were at Eastby, Leiston, Bayham, Wendling, and Eggleston. They were very irregular in plan, the greater portion of the minster being aisleless and the transept unimportant, as they eschewed all processions. There is a fine ruin at Ardaines, near Caen which gives a vivid illustration of the farming arrangements of the order-homely and retired lovers of the country, and enterprising farmers. The principal houses were Torre, East Dereham, and Hales Owen. They carried the almuce over the right arm; the Canons of St.Victor wore it like a tippet round the neck. See Fosbroke, *Ancient Monachism* (see Index); Herzog, *Real-Encykl*. 12:82 sq.; Helyot, *Hist. des Ordres,* s.v.

Premord, Charles-Leonard

a French priest, was born at Honfleur July 30, 1760. lie obtained in 1790 a canonry in the college of St. Honore at Paris. Deprived of it soon afterwards, he retired to England, where he began by giving French lessons. Madame de Levis-Mirepoix went with some French Benedictine nuns to establish herself at Cannington Court, and entrusted Premord with the spiritual direction of the community. In 1816 he established himself at Paris, where cardinal Talleyrand - Perigord appointed him honorary canon of Notre Dame and chaplain of Charles X (1825). Premord was also appointed vicar-general of Strasburg and of Quimper. After the Revolution of July he returned to England to rejoin the Benedictine community which he had so long directed. He left an English edition of *Rules of a Christian Life,* and a publication of the *Aeuvres choisies de Al. Asseline, eveque de Boulogne* (Paris, 1823, 6 vols. 12mo), accompanied with an incomplete notice. He died Aug. 26, 1837, at Colwich, Staffordshire. See *L'Ami de la Religion*, 1837. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé,* s.v.

Prenorman Architecture

In a large class of English ecclesiastical structures reared anterior to the Norman invasion the style is so peculiar that it should be classified as

distinctively Prenorman. The walls are of rag or rubble, frequently of herring-bone work, and unbuttressed; the quoins present long and short work; strips of stone or pilasters bisect or relieve the towers; the imposts of the shafts are rude, massive, and ornamented either with classical moldings or rude carvings; the arches are round or angled, and sometimes constructed of bricks; and baluster-like pillars are introduced in the windows, which are often deeply splayed within and without. Two pillars from Reculver Basilica are standing in the Green Court of Canterbury. The churches of Lyminge, Barnack, Bosham, Bradford (Wilts), Brixworth (the oldest remaining church in England, and possessing a basilican type), Stanton Lacy, Dover Castle, Brytford, Corhampton, Dunham Magna, Caversfield, and part of the crypt of York, those of Ripon and Hexham, the towers of Deerhurst, Barton, St. Benet's (Cambridge and Lincoln), Cholsey, St. Mary (York), Bolam, Brigstock, Earl's Barton, and the steeples of Bosham and Sompting, and portions of many other churches, exhibit some or other of these peculiarities. The base story of the tower of Barnack formed a judicial and council chamber, with an angle-headed sedile on the west, with stone benches for the assessors on either side. They were erected either by the English, or possibly by the Danes under Canute, as that king ordered churches of stone and lime to be built in all places where the minsters had been burned by his countrymen, and out of the hundred, which is the number of these buildings, two thirds are in the eastern counties and Lincolnshire, where the compatriots of the French Normans settled before the latter arrived. Ill the first half of the 1lthi century churches so rapidly multiplied in France and Italy that a chronicler says the world seemed to be putting on a new white robe. Westminster Abbey was built by the Confessor in the Norman style; while in Lincolnshire the Prenorman mode was preserved late in the 11th century, just as the Perpendicular lingered in Somerset in the time of Elizabeth, and produced Wadham College chapel by the aid of west country masons.

Prentiss, Erastus L.

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born at New London, Conn., in 1825, was converted at the age of fifteen, and, after joining the Methodists, was licensed to preach in 1848. Seeing the necessity of thorough educational training for the great work of the Gospel, he prepared for college at Amenia Seminary, and then entered Wesleyan University. Failing health interrupted his studies for a time, but he finally graduated at Amherst College in 1855. The following year he entered New

York Conference, and took a position from the first which he ever maintained, as will be seen in reviewing his fields of labor. His first appointment, 1856, was the Second Methodist Church in Kingston; the next year, 1857, at St. Paul's, New York City, as assistant to the lamented Dr. John M'Clintock, the late editor of this *Cyclopaedia*. In 1858 and the following year Prentiss was stationed at the Second Methodist Church in Newburgh; in 1860 and 1861 at Chester; in 1862 and 1863 at Matteawan; in 1864, 1865, and 1866 at Tuckahoe; in 1869 and 1870, Cannon Street Church, Poughkeepsie; in 1870 and 1871, St. Paul's Church at Peekskill. In the spring of 1872 he received his last appointment, which was Warwick. There he was received with open arms, engaged in his ministerial duties with great delight, and was exceedingly useful, as his name was "like ointment poured forth," until the day of his death, Feb. 28, 1873. Prentiss possessed rare outward attractions. His fine and delicate form, his noble brow, his bright eye, and his genial features made him a beautiful specimen of humanity that ii was refreshing to behold; but they were far surpassed by the inward adorning, his childlike spirit, the kindness of his heart, the gentleness of his disposition, the warmth of his affections, and his pure and unspotted life. His ministry was evangelical and practical in its character to a pre-eminent degree, and was a success. Heaven put the broad seal of its approbation upon his labors. See *Christian Advocate* (N. Y. May 8, 1873); *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1873.

Prentiss, Thomas, D.D.

a Congregational minister, was born Oct. 27, 1747, at Holliston, Mass. He graduated at Harvard College in 1766, entered the ministry in 1769, and was ordained Oct. 30, 1770, pastor in Medfield, where he continued until his death, Feb. 28, 1814. During the Revolutionary struggle he was for a time chaplain in the army. He was also identified with different reform movements, and was a leader in temperance reform. He established a public library in the place of his pastorate, and greatly benefited the community in many ways. He published, *A Sermon on the Duty of Offending and Offended Brethren* (1773): *Religion and Morality United in the Duty of Man, two sermons* (1802): — *Professed Christians Cautioned, and Evil Speakers Admonished, a sermon* (1804): — *The Sin and Danger of Strengthening the Hands of Evil-doers, a sermon* (1805); and several occasional *Sermons*. Sprague, *Annals of the Amer*. Pulpit, 1, 678.

Preparation

(Παρασκευή) in <41542>Mark 15:42; <42354>Luke 23:54; <43192>John 19:42, and <41762>Matthew 27:62, is doubtless the day or evening before the commencement of the Sabbath, with which, at that time, according to the Synoptical Gospels, coincided the first day of the Passover. (But Schneckenburger [*Beitrage Zür Einleit. ins N.T.* p. 1 sq.] supposes the "preparation" in Matthew to mean the feast-day of the Easter period, and which was viewed as a preparatory festival to the Passover.) This day was devoted to preparation for the holyday -especially preparing food for the Sabbath. Mark explains the word by "the day before the Sabbath" (προσάββατον; comp. Judith 8:6; Josephus, *Ant.* 16:6, 2). The Jewish expression for it is atbwr[(see Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* col. 1660). So, too, the Peshito renders in the places quoted above. Every feast, like the Sabbath, had a preparation-day before it, which is often mentioned by the Talmudists (Deyling, *Observ.* 1, 162; with this may be compared παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα, <43914>John 19:14; *Preparation for Easter*, the 14th of Nisan; comp. Bleek, *Beiträge zur Evangelienkritik,* p. 114 sq.). See Passover.

Prepon

an early Marcionite, was a native of Assyria, and flourished at the close of the 2nd century. The Marcionites were then divided into several factions, some of which admitted two original principles, as Potitus and Basilicus; others three (Rhodon, in Eusebius, *Hist. Ecclesiastes* 5, 13). To the latter belonged Prepon, who held that, besides what is good and evil, there is what constitutes a third principle, viz. what is just. This intermediate principle Hippolytus identifies with the "Musa," or impartial Reason of Empedocles, a myth to whom is attributed the restoration to the good power Unity of what is disturbed by the wicked power Discord (Hippol. *Haer. Refut.* 7:19). A letter from Prepon to the Armenian Bardesanes is mentioned (*Philos.* I. 8:253).

Prerogative Court

of the archbishop is, in Roman Catholic countries where the Church is granted extraordinary privileges, a court of that ecclesiastic wherein all testaments are proved and all administrations granted, when a party dying within the province has *bona notabilia* in some other diocese than where

he dies; and is so called from having a prerogative throughout his whole province for the said purposes.

Presanctified

SEE PRAESANCTIFICATIO.

Presburg, Council of

(Concilium Presoniense), an ecclesiastical gathering which convened on Nov. 10, 1309, and was presided over by the papal legate cardinal Gentil, of Hungary. Nine canons of discipline were published, of which the eighth forbids Christian women to marry infidels, heretics, or schismatics. See Labbé, *Concil*. 9:2453.

Presbyter

(Gr. πρεσβύτερος) is the title of an office or dignity in the Jewish synagogue (ˆqz). It was introduced into the Christian Church, and designated an officer whose functions in the apostolic period are disputed by different ecclesiastical bodies. In the Roman Catholic and in the English hierarchy, the title has been the occasion of a protracted controversy as to the respective claims of the bishop (q.v.) and the presbyter. Those who maintain the presbyter as on equality with the episcopes argue as follows: With respect to the successors of the apostles, they seem to have been placed on a footing of perfect equality, the διάκονοι, or deacons, not being included among the teachers. They were inferior officers, whose province it originally was to care for the poor, and to discharge those secular duties arising out of the formation of Christian communities which could not be discharged by the ministers without interfering with the much higher duties which they had to perform. These ministers are sometimes in the New Testament styled πρεσβύτεροι, or presbyters, at other times ἐπίσκοποι, or bishops; but the two appellations were indiscriminately applied to all the pastors who were the instructors of the different churches. Of this various examples may be given from the sacred writings. The apostle Paul, upon a very affecting occasion, when he was convinced that he could never again have an opportunity of addressing them, sent for the elders, or presbyters, of Ephesus the persons to whom the ministry in that Church had been committed; and after mentioning all that he had done, and intimating to them the sufferings which awaited him, he addressed to them what may be considered as his dying advice, and as comprehending in

it all that he judged it most essential for them to do: “Take heed, therefore, unto yourselves, and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you bishops or overseers, to feed the Church of God” (Acts 20:17, 28). Here they whose duty it was to feed the Church of God, as having been set apart through the Holy Spirit for that interesting work, are termed by the apostle presbyters and bishops, and there is not the slightest reference to the existence of any other ἐπίσκοπος, or bishop, superior to those ἐπισκοποι, or bishops, to whom he gives the moving charge now recorded. In his epistle to Titus, Paul thus writes: “For this purpose I left thee in Crete,” where, as yet, it is probable that no teachers had been appointed,” that thou shouldest ordain elders, or presbyters, in every city.” He then points out the class of men from which the presbyters were to be selected, adding, as the reason of this, “for a bishop must be blameless as the steward of God” (Titus 1:5, 7). It is quite plain that the term bishop is here applicable to the same persons who were a little before styled elders, and both are declared to be the stewards of God, the guardians and instructors of his Church. The apostle Peter, in his first epistle addressed to the Jewish converts, has these words: “The elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder, ὁ συμπρεσβύτερος , and a witness of the sufferings of Christ: feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight of it, ἐπισκοποῦντες, being bishops of it, not by constraint, but willingly” (1 Peter 5:1, 2). This passage is a very strong one. The apostle speaks of himself in his extraordinary capacity, a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and in his ordinary capacity as a teacher; showing, by the use of a very significant term, that as to it he was on a footing of equality with the other pastors or presbyters. He gives it in charge to them to feed the flock of God; the charge which, under most particular and affecting circumstances, he had received from the Lord after the Resurrection, and which includes in it the performance of everything requisite for the comfort and the edification of Christians; and he accordingly expresses this by the word ἐπισκοποῦντες, being bishops over them. It cannot, with any shadow of reason, be supposed that the apostle would exhort the elders, or presbyters, to take to themselves the office, and to perform the duties, of a bishop, if that term really marked out a distinct and higher order; or that he would have considered the presbyters as fitted for the discharge of the whole ministerial office, if there were parts of that office which he knew that it was not lawful for them to exercise. *SEE ELDER*.

It seems, by the passages that have been quoted, to be placed beyond a doubt, that, in what the apostles said respecting the ministers of Christ's religion, they taught that the ἐπίσκοποι and the πρεσβύτεροι were the same class of instructors; and that there were, in fact, only two orders pointed out by them, bishops or presbyters, and deacons. This being the case, even although it should appear that there were bishops, in the common sense of that term, recognized in the apostolic age, all that could be deduced from the fact would be, that the equality at first instituted among the teachers had, for prudential reasons, or under peculiar circumstances, been interrupted; but it would not follow either that the positive and general declarations on the subject by the inspired writers were not true, or that it was incumbent at all times, and upon all Christians, to disregard them. It has been strenuously contended that there were such bishops in the infancy of the Church, and that allusion is made to them in Scripture; but, without directly opposing the assertion, this much must be admitted, that the proof of it is less clear than that bishops and presbyters were represented as the same in rank and in authority. Indeed, there does not appear to have been any occasion for this higher order. To presbyters was actually committed the most important charge of feeding the Church of God, that is, of promoting the spiritual improvement of mankind; and it is remarkable that their privilege of separating from the people by ordination the ministers of religion is explicitly acknowledged in the case of Timothy, whom the apostle admonishes not to neglect the gift that was in him, and which had been given by prophecy, and by the laying-on of the hands of the presbytery; by which can be meant only the imposition of the hands of those who were denominated presbyters or bishops. But although all the parts of the ministerial duty had been entrusted to presbyters, it is still contended that the New Testament indicates the existence of bishops as a higher order. There has, however, been much diversity of opinion in relation to this point by those who contend for the divine institution of EPISCOPACY *SEE EPISCOPACY* (q.v.). Some of them maintain that the apostles, while they lived, were the bishops of the Christian Church; but this, and upon irrefragable grounds, is denied by others. Some urge that Timothy and Titus were, in what they call the true sense of the term, bishops; but many deny this, founding their denial upon the fact that these evangelists did not reside within the bounds, and were not limited to the administration, of any one church, but were sent wherever it was resolved to bring men to the knowledge of divine truth. Many conceive that the question is settled by the epistles in the book of Revelation being addressed

to the angels of the respective churches named by the apostle. But it is far from being obvious what is implied under the appellation angel. There has been much dispute about this point, and it is certainly a deviation from all the usual rules by which we are guided in interpreting Scripture to bring an obscure and doubtful passage in illustration of one about the import of which, if we attend to the language used, there can be no doubt.

It may, therefore, be safely affirmed that there is nothing clear and specific in the writings of the New Testament which qualifies the positive declarations that bishops and presbyters were the same officers; that the ground upon which the distinction between them is placed is, at least, far from obviously supporting it; and that there is not the slightest intimation that the observance of such a distinction is at all important, much less absolutely essential, to a true Christian Church, insomuch that where it is disregarded the ordinances of divine appointment cannot be properly dispensed. If, therefore, it be established-and some of the most learned and zealous advocates for the hierarchy which afterwards arose have been compelled to admit it — that Scripture has not recognized any difference of rank or order between the ordinary teachers of the Gospel, all other means of maintaining this difference should be with Protestants of no force. Says Coleman, “Even the most zealous advocates of the episcopal system in the Greek, Roman, and English Church are constrained to recognize and admit the identity of the terms ἐπίσκοπος and πρεσβύτερος, according to the *usus loquendi* of the ancient Church. They are constrained to admit that the distinction between the office of bishop and presbyter, which prevailed about the 3rd and 4th centuries, and to a period still later, was unknown in the first two centuries.” It may be shown that the admission of the distinction is not incompatible with the great ends for which a ministry was appointed, and even in particular cases may tend to promote them; but still it is merely a matter of human regulation, not binding upon Christians, and not in any way connected with the vital influence of the Gospel dispensation. The whole of the writers of antiquity might be urged in support of it, if that could be done; and, after all, every private Christian would be entitled to judge for himself, and to be directed by his own judgment, unless it be maintained that where Scripture has affirmed the existence of equality, this is to be counteracted and set at naught by the testimonies and assertions of a set of writers who, although honored with the name of fathers, are very far, indeed, from being infallible, and who have, in fact, often delivered sentiments which even they who, upon a

particular emergency, cling to them must confess to be directly at variance with all that is sound in reason or venerable and sublime in religion. It also follows, from the Scriptural identity of bishops and presbyters, that no Church in which this identity is preserved can on that account be considered as having departed from the apostolic model, or its ministers be viewed, at least with any good reason, as having less ground to hope for the blessing of God upon their spiritual labors; because if we admit the contrary, we must also admit that the inspired writers, instead of properly regulating the Church, betrayed it into error by omitting to make a distinction closely allied with the essence of religion. What is this but to say that it is safer to follow the erring direction of frail mortals than to follow the admonitions of those who, it is universally allowed, were inspired by the Holy Spirit, or commissioned by him to be the instructors of the world? It is to be observed, however, that although bishops and presbyters were the same when the epistles of the New Testament were written, it would be going too far to contend that no departure from this should ever take place; because, to justify such a position, it would be requisite that a positive injunction should have been given that equality must at all times be carefully preserved. There is, however, no such injunction. Unlike the Old Testament, which specified everything, even the most minute, in relation to the priesthood, the New only refers in general terms, and very seldom, to the ministry; and the reason probably is, that, being intended for all nations, it left Christians at liberty to snake such modifications in the ecclesiastical constitution as in their peculiar situation appeared best adapted for religious edification. The simple test to be applied to the varying or varied forms of Church government is that indicated by our Lord himself: “By their fruits ye shall know them.” Wherever the regulations respecting the ministry are such as to divert it from the purposes for which it was destined, to separate those who form it from the flock of Christ, to relax their diligence in teaching, and to destroy the connection between them and their people, so as to render their exertions of little or of no use, there we find a Church not apostolical. But wherever the blessed fruits of Gospel teaching are in abundance produced, where the people and the ministers are cordially united and where every regulation is calculated to give efficacy to the labors of those who have entered into the vineyard, we have an apostolical Church, or, to speak more properly, a Church of Christ built upon a rock, because devoted to the beneficent objects for, which our Savior came into the world.

Schaff, in his *Hist. of the Christian Church* (1, 418 sq.), adduces, in favor of the view which denies the apostolic origin of the episcopate as a *separate* office or order, the following facts:

"**1.** The undeniable identity of presbyters and bishops in the New Testament, conceded even by the best interpreters among the Church fathers, by Jerome, Chrysostom, and Theodoret.

2. Later, in the 2nd century, the two terms are still used in like manner for the same office. The Roman bishop Clement, in his first epistle to the Corinthians, says that the apostles, in the newly founded churches, appointed the first fruits of the faith, i.e. the first converts. ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακονους. He here omits the πρεσβύτεροι, as Paul does in Philippians 1, 1, for the simple reason that they are in his view iden. tical with ἐπίσκοποι; while, conversely, in ch. 57, he enjoins subjection to presbyters, without mentioning bishops. Clement of Alexandria distinguishes, it is true, the deaconate, the presbyterate, and the episcopate; but he supposes only a twofold official character, that of presbyters and that of deacons-a view which found advocates so late as the Middle Ages, even in pope Urban II, A.D. 1091. Lastly, Irenseus, towards the close of the 2nd century, though himself a bishop, makes only a relative difference between *episcopi* and *presbyteri*; speaks of successions of the one in the same sense as of the other; terms the office of the latter *episcopatus*; and calls the bishops of Rome πρεσβύτεροι. Sometimes, it is true, he appears to use the term πρεσβύτεροι, in a more general sense, for the old men, the fathers. But, in any case, his language shows that the distinction between the two offices was at that time still relative and indefinite.

3. The express testimony of the learned Jerome is that the churches originally, before divisions arose through the instigation of Satan, were governed by the common council of the presbyters, and not till a later period was one of the presbyters placed at the head to watch over the Church and suppress schisms. He traces the difference of the office simply to ecclesiastical custom as distinct from divine institution.

4. The custom of the Church of Alexandria was, from the evangelist Mark down to the middle of the 3rd century, that the twelve presbyters elected one of their number president and called him bishop. "This fact rests on the authority of Jerome, and is confirmed independently by the *Annals* of the Alexandrian patriarch Eutychius of the 10th century."

Killen, in his *Ancient Church*, asserts: “Though the senior presbyter presided in the meetings of his brethren, and was soon known by the name of bishop, it does not appear that he originally possessed any superior authority. He held his place for life; but as he was sinking under the weight of years when he succeeded to it, he could not venture to anticipate an extended career of official distinction. In all matters relating either to discipline or the general interests of the brotherhood, he was expected to carry out the decisions of the eldership; so that, under his presidential rule, the Church was still substantially governed by ‘the common council of the presbyters.’ The allegation that presbyterial government existed in all its integrity towards the end of the 2nd century does not rest on the foundation of obscure intimations or doubtful inferences. It can be established by direct and conclusive testimony. Evidence has already been adduced to show that the senior presbyter of Smyrna continued to preside until the days of Irenaus, and there is also documentary proof that meanwhile he possessed no autocratical authority. The supreme power was still vested in the council of the elders. This point is attested by Hippolytus, who was now just entering on his ecclesiastical career, and who, in one of his works, a fragment of which has been preserved, describes the manner in which the rulers of the Church dealt with the heretic Noetus. The transaction probably occurred about A.D. 190.” It shows that the presbyters then exercised episcopal functions, even to excommunication.

Says Dr. Blakie (*The Presbyterian Churches throughout the World* [Edinb. 1877], p. 1): “It is admitted even by many Episcopalians that, so far as Scripture indicates, the primitive Church constituted under the apostles was governed by elders. The office of apostle was temporary, and some other temporary arrangements were resorted to in the peculiar circumstances of the Church. But everywhere in settled churches there was a body of presbyters or elders; the terms presbyter and bishop were applied freely to the same individuals; and when the presbyters were addressed together, as those of Ephesus were addressed at Miletus, there was no hint of one of them having authority over the rest; they were called equally to feed and care for the Church over which the Holy Ghost had made them overseers.”

The offices of presbyter and bishop, according to the Roman Catholic theory, belong both, though in different degrees, to what Roman Catholics regard as the priesthood of the New Law. They teach that the presbyter is, in the sacerdotal order, an intermediate degree between the deacon and the

highest functionary of the hierarchy, the episcopos. They also maintain stoutly that Scripture and tradition attest alike the divine institution of the presbyteriate. “Besides the apostles, the Lord marked out of the troop of his followers seventy (according to the Vulg. seventy-two), whom he sent out before him, two by two, into the cities and towns he intended to visit, with the mission of healing the sick and proclaiming the kingdom of God. These seventy men were, in consequence, the assistants of the apostles, but subordinated to them. Soon their number proved insufficient, and the apostles established in every city of some importance, at the foundation of the community, or when it had reached a certain degree of development, besides the bishop, whom they intended for their permanent representative and successor, a number of presbyters, who assisted the bishop in his functions.” The Roman Catholic Church, as she considers the bishops the successors of the apostles, so she holds the presbyters to be the successors of the seventy assistants chosen by Christ himself. Inasmuch as they are entitled to perform the highest function of the priesthood, the administration of the Eucharist, they are called also *sacerdos* (ιΕπΕ χ); yet this denomination, if not specified, applies only to the bishop: therefore we find frequently the *summus sacerdos*, or *sacerdos primi ordinis*. i.e. the bishop, thus distinguished from the simple priest, who is *sacerdos secundi* ordinis. The presbyters of an episcopal church had a share in the government, not individually, but as a college, presided over by the bishop; they had no jurisdiction of their own, and were merely assistants to the bishop. The bishop took their advice on the admission of higher clerical functionaries, on the management of discipline, especially of penitence, etc. They were themselves amenable to the spiritual jurisdiction of the bishop, and depended on him in the discharge of their duties as teachers and as priests. According to Roman Catholics, the bishop alone possesses the priesthood in its fullness, while the presbyter possesses it only in part. The functions, however, which belong to that part are discharged alike by the bishop and the presbyter. What those functions are will be detailed under the head PRIEST *SEE PRIEST* (q.v.). It is, of course, an easy matter for the prelatical churchmen to prove that by the end of the 2nd century the bishop was above the presbyter. Even before the end of the 2nd century the Church had departed from her early simplicity, and soon the episcopacy became the only prevalent government of the Church, although in some cases, as among the Culdees or the Waldenses, government by presbyters continued to prevail during the Middle Ages. The Church fathers of the 3rd and 4th centuries point to the superiority of the episcopos. Thus Clement

of Rome points out clearly three different hierarchical degrees; bishops, priests, and deacons; and Ignatius of Antioch lays particular stress on the superior power of the bishops (*Epist. ad Magnes*. c. 6; *Smyrn*. c. 8, etc.). Affirmations of the same kind are given by Tertullian, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Cyprian, etc. "It is true," say the Romanists, "that the bishops, in the fathers as well as in Scripture, are sometimes called merely priests, but there is not one passage in which a simple priest is called bishop." Those who accept the authority of St. Jerome for the equality of the bishop and presbyter because he says (*Comment. on the Epistle to Titus*), "Noverint episcopi, se magis consuetudine quam dispositione Dominica presbyteris esse majores, et in commune debere ecclesiam regere, imitantes Moysen, qui cum haberet solus praeesse populo Israel, septuaginta elegit, cum quibus populum judicaret," are replied to by Romanists that (1) "even this parallel between Moses and his seventy, and the bishop and his presbyters, implies the pre-eminence of the bishop," and (2) that, "in the passage in question, St. Jerome is upbraiding a number of deacons who, in several places, and especially at Rome, had committed several encroachments on the rights of the presbyters in the administration of the ecclesiastical possessions. He, on this occasion, exalts the presbyters as much as he can, and in such cases where an abuse is to be eradicated, it frequently happens to this father to fall into the opposite extreme, as he does in his treatise *De Virginitate adv. Jovinianum*, in which, as an encomiast of virginity, he deems fit to treat matrimony with the most cruel contempt. He shows in other places his sense of the superiority of the episcopate: 'Quod Aaron et filii ejus atque Levitoe in temple, hoc sibi episcopi et presbvteri et diaconi vindicant.' The bishops have the same authority over priests and deacons that Aaron had over his sons and Levites. He speaks still more pointedly in his work against the Luciferians: 'Ecclesiae salus in summi sacerdotis (i.e. episcopi) dignitate pendet, cui si non exsors qubedam et ab omnibus eminens detur potestas, tot in ecclesiis efficientur schismata, quot sacerdotes.' But even if Jerome's opinion were contrary to the episcopal supremacy, what could it avail against the uninterrupted and unanimous tradition of so many fathers and ecclesiastical writers of the early centuries? If really the episcopate had not been originally distinct from the presbyteriate, we should then have to understand that a sudden and uniform change in the constitution of the Church took place in the whole extent of its expansion-that in all the communities, and at the same time, some ambitious and proud individualities set themselves above their colleagues." "But how," ask

Romanists, "could this have come to pass without a long and desperate struggle; and how could this struggle, if it did take place, end so uniformly, in all the churches without exception, with the victory of the usurpers? History does not mention the least fact that anything of that kind ever took place. When several presbyters were attached to a single church, of which there were some instances, one of the number received the title of *proto-presbyter*, or *arch-presbyter*; but it is quite certain that this office bore no analogy to that of the bishop." To these arguments of Roman Catholics it is readily replied that the New Testament (as above seen) does explicitly refer to the original equality of presbyters and bishops, and that history contains not a few nor obscure indications of the usurpation of exclusive prerogatives by the latter. See, for Roman Catholic views, Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*; for High Church Anglican views, Blunt, *Dict. Hist. Theol*.; for Low-Church views, Herzog, *Real-Encyklop*., the authorities already quoted, and the *Lond. Quar. Rev*. Jan. 1878, art. 5; *Princeton Rev*. Jan. 1878, art. 4. *SEE PRELACY*.

Presbyterial Consecration

in the Roman Catholic Church, comprises the ceremonies and religious acts by which a deacon is invested with the presbyterial power-the power over the *true* and the *symbolic* body of Christ. The exterior apparatus of the ceremony consists in the oil of the catechumens, a chalice with wine and water, a paten with a host, some crumbs of bread, a vessel for the washing of the hands, some linen towels. The ceremony performed is as follows: The bishop, after consecrating the deacons, reads the Tractus (and the Sequence) to the last verse, exclusively. Then he advances with the infula to the middle of the altar, where he sits down on the faldistorium (chair). At this moment the archdeacon calls all to be ordained priests with the words. "Accedant qui ordinandi sunt ad ordinemr presbyterats." The notary reads their names; they proceed, each with taper in hand, to form a half-circle (*in modum coronae*) in front of the bishop, to whom they are introduced by the archdeacon with the words, "Reverend father, the holy Catholic Church requires that you consecrate the deacons here present for the burdensome office of priesthood." Whereupon the bishop asks, "Doest thou know that they are deserving of it?" The archdeacon answers. "So far as human weakness allows me a knowledge of it, I know and declare that they are worthy to take upon them the burden of that office." The bishop says, "God be thanked!" and turns to the clergy and people with these words: "Beloved brethren! as the pilot of a ship and those who travel on it

share together both security and danger, they must in matters concerning their common interest share the same convictions. Not without good reason, the fathers have directed that the people also should be consulted on the choice of those who are to be admitted to the service of the altar; for sometimes a few can give information about the way of life and habits of those who present themselves for consecration not known to the masses, etc. If, therefore, any one have objections of importance, let him step out before God, and for God's sake speak fearlessly; yet let him not forget that he is only a man (that he may err)." After a short, expectant pause, the people assenting by their silence the bishop turns to the candidates and addresses them thus: "Consecrandi, filii dilectissimi, in presbyteratas officium, illud digne suscipere, ac susceptum lautabiliter exequi studeatis," etc. In the course of this allocution, mention is made of the high purpose of the New-Testament priesthood, and after a comparison with the priesthood of the Old Covenant, follow these words: "Hac certe mira varietate ecclesia sancta circumdatur ornatur et regitur: cum alii in ea pontifices, alii minoris ordinis sacerdotes, diaconi et subdiaconi, diversorum ordinum viri consecrantur, et ex multis et alternae dignitatis membris unum corpus efficitur." If no deacons or subdeacons have been consecrated, the Litany of All Saints is recited, while the ordinands are on their knees. Hereupon they step, in pairs, into the presence of the bishop, who, standing erect (with the infula), lays both his hands on the head of each of them, without speaking or singing. The same is done by all the priests present, dressed in the stola, and of whom there must be at least three. Then the priests and the bishop hold their right hands extended over the ordinands, and the bishop, standing with the infula, thus addresses the clergy: "Beloved brethren! let us implore God Almighty that he may pour over these, his servants, whom he has chosen for the office of priesthood, heavenly gifts in abundance, so that, with his help, they may be able to perform the duties which they have been deemed worthy of assuming. Amen." The bishop lays down the infula, turns towards the altar, and says, "Oremus." The ministri add, "Flectamus genua." The responsorium is "Levate!" Then he turns to the ordinands, saying, "Exaudi nos, queesumus, Domine Deus noster." After the conclusion — "in unitate ejusdem spiritils sancti Deus"— he extends his hands, saying, "Per omnia soecula," etc. Now follow long prayers, after which the bishop sits down with the miter, seizes that part of the stola which hangs backwards from the left shoulder of the ordinand lays it over his right shoulder, and puts both parts crosswise over each other on the chest, saying, "Take the yoke of the Lord

upon thee; for his yoke is easy and his burden is light." Hereupon the bishop dresses each of them in the missal garment, which hangs loose in front, but is rolled or pinned up behind, saving, "Take the priestly garment, which means love; for God is mighty to increase love in thee and make thy work perfect." Response, "Thanks to God." Now the bishop rises, lays down the infula, and prays, while all kneel, "Deus sanctificationum omnium auctor," etc. After this the bishop kneels, facing the altar, and begins the hymn, "Veni Creator Spiritus," etc., which the choir sings. As soon as the first verse is sung the bishop rises, sits down on the chair, with the infula on his head, pulls off his gloves, puts on his ring, takes a white linen towel on his knees, and anoints the hands of each of the ordinands kneeling before him with the oil of the catechumens, passing with his thumb dipped into the holy oil crosswise from the thumb of one hand to the index of the other, with this prayer: "Consecrate and sanctify, O Lord, these hands by this anointment and our blessing." Then, with his right hand, he makes the sign of the cross over the hands of the candidate whom he consecrates, and continues: "In order that everything that they bless may be blessed, and what they consecrate may be consecrated and sanctified, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ." Each of the ordinands says "Amen." (From this anointment the thumbs and forefingers of a priest are called the canonic fingers; and as this anointment is performed on the inner side of the hand, the priests to whom the last sacraments are administered are anointed on the outside of the hand.) Then the bishop joins the hands of each of them, and one of the ministrants ties them together with a piece of linen. When all hands are anointed, the bishop wipes his thumb with crumbs of bread; then he presents to each of them a chalice with wine and water, with the paten placed over it, and containing a host. The ordinands touch the top of the chalice and the paten with the index and middle finger, and the bishop says to each in particular, "Receive the power of offering God the sacrifice and to say mass for the living as well as for the dead, in the name of the Lord." Response: "Amen." Now the bishop washes his hands, returns to his chair, and reads the last verse of the Tractus, and then the Gospel. Meanwhile one of the newly consecrated deacons steps in front of the altar with the book of the Gospels, prays the "Munda cor meum," and reads the Gospel, after receiving the benediction thereto. The newly consecrated priests wipe their hands with breadcrumbs, wash them, and dry them with the linen with which they were bound. The water used for washing is poured into the piscina. As all consecrated receive the Eucharist at the hands of the bishop, there must be as many hosts prepared as there are candidates for

ordination. After the reading of the offertorium (short prayer preceding the sacrifice of the bread and wine), all those who have been consecrated-first the priests, then the deacons, then the others according to their rank-step in pairs into the presence of the bishop, who sits on his chair with the infula on his head, kneel down, kiss his hand, and present a burning taper as an offering. The bishop, after receiving the offerings, washes his hands, lays down the infulla, rises, and, the chair being removed, continues the ceremony of the mass. The consecrated priests kneel down behind the bishop on the prie-dieus prepared for them, each his mass-book open before him; they say with the bishop the prayers accompanying the offering of the bread and the wine, and the whole mass. The bishop speaks slowly and somewhat loud, so that the consecrated priests can at the same time pronounce the same words, especially the words of consecration. The "secreta" (silent prayer) for the consecrated ones is pronounced with the secreta of the mass of the day under one formula of conclusion: "Per Dominum nostrum," etc. The *secreta pro ordinandis* is, "We ask thee, O Lord! let thy holy mysteries effect that we offer thee these offerings with a worthy disposition, through our Lord Jesus Christ, thy Son," etc. After the paternoster and the prayer "Domine Jesu Christe, qui," etc., which follows the "Agnus Dei," the bishop kisses the altar; and after the first of the newly consecrated has done the same, he kisses him at each step, with the words "Peace be with you." The new priest answers, "And with your mind." Each of the consecrated ones gives the kiss of peace to the other person ordained to the same rank and standing next. After the communion of the bishop, the deacons and subdeacons (if there are any) pray "Confiteor" in a subdued voice, the bishop, facing them, pronouncing the "Misereatur vestri" and "Indulgentiam." If priests only have been ordained, they do not receive absolution, as they perform the sacrifice together with the bishop. All proceed, two by two, to the highest step of the altar, and receive the sacrament in the form of the bread. The bishop says, "The body of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve you for eternal life." Each answers "Amen." When all have partaken of the communion, the bishop removes the paten from his chalice, moistens his fingers, takes the ablution, puts on the infula, and washes his hands. Then he lays down the infula again, and, standing at the epistle side of the altar, sings the responsorium, "Henceforward I shall no more call you my servants, but my friends, because you have known everything which I have done among you. Alleluia," etc. Then the bishop, with the infula, turns to the newly consecrated priests, who recite the credo. This done, the bishop sits down on his chair in the middle of the

altar, and puts both hands on the head of each of them, who kneel before him, saying, “Take the Holy Spirit; they whom thou shalt forgive their sins, they shall be forgiven; and they,” etc. Then he pulls down the missal garment, saying, “In the garment of innocence the Lord dresses thee.” Then each of the young priests approaches again, kneels before the bishop, puts his folded hands into the bishop’s hands; and he, if he is the diocesan bishop, says to each, “Doest thou promise to me and my successors reverence and obedience?” Answer: “I promise.” If the newly consecrated belongs to another diocese, the bishop says, “Doest thou promise to the bishop,” etc. After the answer “I promise,” the bishop kisses each of them, holding still his hands in his, and says, “‘The peace of the Lord be with thee always.” Now the bishop takes his cross and gives, sitting, the following admonition to the new priests: “Quia res quam tractaturi estis satis periculosa est,” etc. Finally he pronounces, standing, the triple benediction over the kneeling priests: “The blessing of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost come upon you, that you may be blessed in your priesthood, and offer expiatory sacrifices for the sins and transgressions of the people of God, to whom glory and praise be given in all eternity. Amen.” The bishop continues the mass, and connects with the last missal prayer the prayer for the consecrated ones: “Quos tuis, Domine, reficis sacramentis,” etc., under one formula of conclusion. Then follows the “Ite, missa est” or the “Benedicamus Domino,” as the time may require. This is followed by the “Placeat tibi sancta Trinitas;” and the bishop, the infula on his head and the cross in his hand, pronounces the benediction in the usual manner: “The name of the Lord be blessed.” etc. Response: “Now and in all eternity.” “Our help comes in the name of the Lord.” Response: “Who hath created heaven and earth.” “The blessing of the Almighty God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost descend upon you and remain with you. Amen.” Then the bishop holds a parting address to the newly consecrated: “Beloved sons, consider earnestly what consecration you have received and what burden has been put on your shoulders. Let it be your foremost endeavor to lead a holy, godly life, and to please God Almighty,” etc. Finally the archdeacon turns to the clergy and people and announces an indulgence. Hereupon the bishop reads the last Gospel, returns to his seat, and lays down the pontifical robes. The consecrated priests repair to the vergery and put down the missal garments. It must not be overlooked that the ordained priests, after the offertorium, from the sacrificial act, “Suscipe, sancte Pater,” say all the missal prayers with the bishop — concelebrate with him. This concelebration is in use also in the Greek Church. It is difficult to

ascertain the age of this custom. It seems to have been adopted at different times in different places. The Synod of Carthage, in 398, in the accurate description it gives of the consecration, does not mention the anointment, neither does Isidore of Spain; but the rite was known to Theodulph of Orleans and Amalarius of Treves. The rite of the consecration differs considerably in the Eastern Church from the account given above; but the imposition of the hands is also the essential part of it. According to Goar's description, the principal parts of the Greek rite are the following: Two deacons lead the ordinand to the church-door; here they leave him; he is received by two priests, who walk thrice with him around the communion-table, singing, "Sancti martyres praeclare praeliati." Passing before the bishop, they bow, and the ordinand kisses his knee. The bishop rises, the ordinand approaches, and the bishop makes three times the sign of the cross over the candidate's head. The deacon exclaims, "Attendants!" and the bishop lays his right hand on the candidate's head, saying, "Divina gratia, quoe semper infirma curat, et ea quie desunt adimplet, promovet N. devotissimum diaconum in presbyterum: oremus pro eo, ut veniat super eum sanctissimi Spirituis gratia." The people present say thrice, "Domine, miserere." The bishop makes again the sign of the cross and puts his right hand on the candidate, saying, in an undertone, while the deacon exclaims "Dominum precemur," the prayer, "Deus principio et fine carens, omni creatura antiquior . . . ipse omnium Domine, istum quem tibi a me promoveri complacuit, in conversatione inculpati, et fide indeficiente ingentem etiam hane gratiam Sancti tui Spirituis recipere complaceat," etc. Again the bishop implores the gift of the Holy Ghost for the newly consecrated, extending his hand over him with the words, "Deus in virtute magnus, intellectu investigabills . . . ipse Domine, etiam et istum, quem tibi presbyteri gradum subire complacuit, dono sancto tui Spiritus adimple, ut inculpate sancto tuo altari assistere dignus fiat," etc. This short extract shows that the Greek rite resembles greatly the Latin ceremony and diverse from it specially in this, that it prescribes only the imposition of *one* hand. The *traoditio instrumentorum* is not part of the Greek rite. — Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen Lexikon*, s.v. Presbyteriatsweihe. See Foye, *Romish Rites* (Lond. 1851).

Presbyterian Churches

The different bodies into which the Presbyterians are divided will here be treated as nearly in the historical relation which they sustain towards each other as it is possible to place them. We begin with the Presbyterians of

Scotland, because they are, among all English-speaking nations, the only ones directly allied with the state by establishment, and because it is from Scotland that English and American Presbyterianism has obtained nourishment and succor, rather than from the Continent, however true it be that Presbyterianism had there its origin. *SEE PRESBYTERIANISM*; *SEE PRESBYTERIANS*.

1. PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN SCOTLAND. — A history of the Presbyterian Church in Scotland would be, in effect, a history of that country; for since its establishment by the Reformation its political and religious history have flowed on in one and the same channel. Christianity was planted in Scotland about the beginning of the 3rd century; and it is claimed that the early churches, particularly those of the ancient Culldees, were non-prelatical. Under the vigorous missions of Palladius and Augustine they were, however, reduced to conformity with the rule of Rome, and so remained until the period of the Reformation. At that time the corruption of the hierarchy, its encroachments on the civil power, and its greedy appropriation of the right of patronage to benefices, had created a wide-spread dissatisfaction, and prepared the way for the favorable reception of the principles of the Reformation. For twenty years persecution followed, and many were burned at the stake, among whom were Patrick Hamilton and George Wishart. The first general and public movement leading to the organization of the Presbyterian Church of Scotland was the drawing-up of a common bond or covenant, known as "The First Covenant," and subscribed at Edinburgh, Dec. 3,1557, by several of the most powerful of the Scotch nobility and a large number of lesser barons and influential country gentlemen, known subsequently (on account of their frequent use of the word congregation to designate those for whom they professed to act) as lords of the congregation. The signing of the covenant was followed by a proclamation from the queen regent forbidding any one to preach or administer the sacrament without the authority of the bishop. At length, however, the party of the Reformers triumphed, and in the year 1560 (Aug. 17-24) the Parliament abolished the Roman Catholic worship, adopted a confession of faith agreeing with the confessions of the Reformed churches on the Continent, appointed ministers of the Protestant religion in eight principal towns, and assigned the remaining portions of the country to five other ministers as superintendents who were to take temporary charge of the interests of religion in their several districts.

On Dec. 20, 1560, the first General Assembly of the Church of Scotland was constituted in Edinburgh, consisting of six ministers and thirty-four laymen. Up to this period, the Scottish Reformers had followed, as their rule of worship and doctrine, the Book of Common Order used by the English Church at Geneva. In April, 1560, however, the Privy Council appointed a committee of five persons, including Knox, "to commit to writing their judgments touching the reformation of religion." This *First Book of Discipline*, setting forth a polity adapted to the existing condition of affairs, though adopted by the Church, was rejected by the nobles, who wished to appropriate to themselves the patrimony of the old Church. In 1581 the *Second Book of Discipline*, drawing its system directly from the Scriptures, was adopted by the Assembly, and this-confirmed in 1592 by King James, along with the Westminster documents-is still in force. Nothing but the undaunted perseverance of those two eminent men, John Knox and Andrew Melville, succeeded at last in procuring the complete recognition of the Calvinistic faith and the Presbyterian form of government as the established religion of Scotland, which was finally and formally effected by act of Parliament and with the consent of king James (I of England and VI of Scotland) in the year 1592.

The duplicity of the king, however, soon became apparent, for within a few years he intrigued to bring about the establishment of Episcopacy, and to assimilate the two national churches of Scotland and England. In this he was followed by his successors, Charles I, Charles II, and James II. The resistance of the people, the bloody persecutions that ensued, the civil turmoil, and the subsequent downfall of the Stuart dynasty, are matters of history. From 1660 to 1688, the Church was in the wilderness, scourged by such men as Claverhouse (q.v.) and Dalziel (q.v.), but leaving the record of many noble martyrdoms-as given in the story of the *Scots Worthies* and the *Cloud of Witnesses*. *SEE COVENANT AND SOLEMN LEAGUE*. Under William and Mary, Presbyterianism again became ascendant. In 1690 an "Act of Settlement" was passed, prelacy was abolished, and the Westminster Confession recognized as the creed of the Church. But the settlement of the Church on this basis was objected to by a small body of earnest men, the "Reformed Presbyterians," who had already distinguished themselves in zeal for the "Covenants" as securities alike for the freedom of the Church and the Christianity of the State, and who now felt unable either to enter into the Church or to give their unqualified adherence to the constitution of the State. Many of the more earnest descendants of the

Covenanters (q.v.) protested against the reception of such men into the Church, and, finding their protest in vain, withdrew, and organized the *Reformed Presbyterian Church*. (See below.) Though this secession took place in 1681, the churches were not finally organized into a presbytery till 1743. Upon the union of the two kingdoms in 1707, Presbyterianism obtained every guarantee that could be desired. Since that time it has continued to be the established religion of Scotland, as much as Episcopacy is that of England.

The only confession of faith legally established before the Revolution of 1688 was that which is published in the *History of the Reformation in Scotland*, attributed to John Knox. It consists of twenty-five articles, and was the confession of the Episcopal as well as of the Presbyterian Church. The Parliament, however, during the Commonwealth, adopted the Westminster Confession. At the Revolution this confession was declared to be the standard of the national faith; and it was ordained by the same acts of Parliament which settled Presbyterian Church government in Scotland, "that no person be admitted or continued hereafter to be a minister or preacher within this Church unless he subscribe the [that is, this] confession of faith, declaring the same to be the confession of his faith." By the act of union in 1707 the same is required of all professors, principals, regents, masters, and others bearing office.

The Westminster Confession of Faith, then, and what are called the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, contain the publicly recognized doctrines of this Church; and it is well known that these formularies are an embodiment of the Calvinistic faith. No liturgy or public form of prayer is used in the Church of Scotland, the minister's only guide being the *Directory for the Public Worship of God*. The administration of the Lord's Supper, as a general thing observed four times a year, is conducted with simple forms, but is accompanied, usually preceded and followed, by special religious services, consisting of prayers and exhortations. A metrical version of the Psalms on the basis of that of Rous (died 1659) is used, and supplementary hymns have recently been introduced.

The provision which has been made by the law of Scotland for the support of the clergy of the Established Church consists of a stipend, a small glebe of land, and a manse (parsonage house) and office houses. By an act of Parliament passed in 1810, £10,000 per annum were granted for augmenting the smaller parish stipends in Scotland. By this act the lowest

stipend assigned to a minister of the establishment is £150 sterling, with a small sum, generally £8 6s. 8d., for communion elements. Patronage, in part abrogated at the Revolution, was restored in 1712 by act of Parliament. Scottish independence rebelled at this, the people claiming the right to elect their own clergy, or at least to exercise a veto over the appointment of an unsatisfactory one; and the controversy which ensued led to secession, which was ushered in first by indifference, and was helped on by the renewal of the old interest. From that time a worldly spirit crept into the Church; men of talents, but lax in principle, obtained possession of influential positions; the leaven of moderatism— ridiculed in Dr. Witherspoon's *Characteristics*— set extensively to work; and in the course of time Arminian, Pelagian, and even Socinian tenets were propagated, with little attempt at concealment. The result was the secession of several important bodies from the Church. The first who formally withdrew were the Covenanters, or Cameronians, who objected to the interference of the state authorities in Church affairs, and to the Erastian principle involved in the existing establishment, as inconsistent with the covenant to which the Church had sworn. *SEE CAMERONIANS*. A few faithful men, led by Ebenezer Erskine, endeavored to breast the tide; but, being deposed by the commission of the Assembly, who were Moderates, they seceded in 1733, and formed themselves into a distinct body, called the Associated Presbytery, more commonly known as Seceders. They became known as the *Secession Church*. This secession proved a severe blow, and shook the establishment to its foundations. Another secession arose in 1760, and from it was formed the *Presbyterians of Relief*, better known as "The Relief Synod." These bodies have since been united, and constitute the *United Presbyterian Church of Scotland*. Those who remained in the Established Church were divided in opinion on the subject of lay patronage. The sentiment against it continued to grow because of the indifference of the clergy. For a while moderatism held the upper hand, but its reign was dreary. Under the dominant influence of principal Robertson, whose studies were more devoted to elegant literature than to the Holy Scriptures, the preaching of tie Gospel was superseded by moral essays, and Dr. Blair's cold and polished sermons were regarded as models of the highest excellence. This state of things continued till near the close of the 18th century, when Christians in Scotland began to share *in* that general reviving of evangelical principles which then pervaded Great Britain. A positive reaction set in, and gradually new life began to animate the frozen limbs of the Established Church. The evangelical party took heart, and

constantly increased in strength. Dr. Andrew Thomson, Dr. Chalmers, and others came upon the stage of action, and under their vigorous lead a new era was inaugurated. The Assembly entered with zeal into the subject of foreign missions, while it multiplied churches to supply the need at home. The burden of patronage was felt to be a great hindrance to the progress of vital piety and active effort, and the autonomy or independent jurisdiction of the Church became a topic of earnest debate.

In 1834 the General Assembly passed the celebrated "Veto Act," giving to the Church courts the power of rejecting a presentee if judged by them unfit. This act was set aside by the civil court, and subsequently, on appeal, by the House of Lords, in the Auchterarder case, in 1839. The Assembly yielded so far as the temporalities were concerned, but at the same time unequivocally maintained the principle of non-intrusion as one that could not be given up consistently with the doctrine of the headship and sovereignty of Christ. The Strathlbogie case next occurred, bringing the civil and ecclesiastical courts into direct collision, which ended at last in the *Disruption* of 1843, under the lead of Chalmers, Cunningham, Welsh, Candlish, and Dunlop; 470 members signed an "Act of Separation and Deed of Demission," and the *Free Church of Scotland* was organized. Soon after the separation of 1843 an act of Parliament was passed, called "Lord Aberdeen's Act," to define the rights of congregations and presbyteries in the calling and settlement of ministers. But in 1874 this was suspended by another act, whereby patronage was abolished, and the right of electing ministers was vested in the people. Government still reserves, however, the appointment of theological professors. The Free Church carried off about one half the communicants of the Established Church, and became a rival communion in most of the parishes of Scotland. The three denominations-the *Established Presbyterian Church,* the *United Presbyterian Church,* and the *Free Church* (in which the Reformed Presbyterian Church merged in 1876) -constitute the chief Presbyterian churches of Scotland at the present time. *SEE SCOTLAND, PRESBYTERIAN CHURCHES OF*.

The government, discipline, and worship of the Established Church of Scotland are in all respects the same as those of other Presbyterian churches. According to the constitution of the Church, there is a kirksession in every parish, consisting of the minister and a body of lay elders. All the ministers within a certain district, with one lay elder from each session, constitute the Presbytery of that district. The next higher

court is the Provincial Synod, which embraces several neighboring presbyteries. The highest court of all is the General Assembly. It is a representative court, consisting of 247 members and 178 elders, the greater part chosen by the presbyteries, but a considerable number of elders chosen by the town-councils and universities. It meets early in May, is presided over by its moderator, and has the presence of a lord high commissioner, appointed by the crown, who, however, is not a member, and has no authoritative voice in the court. A "Commission of Assembly" meets in August, November, and March, consisting of the members of Assembly, and a minister named by the moderator, to attend to matters remitted to it by the Assembly, or that may arise in the intervals. In consequence of the connection with the state, there are certain peculiarities connected with the support of the ministers which it may be proper to notice. Dr. Jamieson, in his interesting sketch of the "Church of Scotland" contributed to the *Cyclopaedia of Religious Denominations*, thus describes these peculiarities: — "The provision made for parish ministers by the law of Scotland consists of a stipend arising from a tax on land. It is raised on the principle of commuting tithes or teinds into a modified charge-the fifth of the land produce, according to a method introduced in the reign of Charles I, ratified by William III, and unalterably established by the treaty of union. To make this intelligible, we may observe that at the Reformation the teinds were appropriated by the crown, with the burden of providing for the minister. In after-times they were often bestowed as gifts on private individuals totally unconnected with the parish, and who thus came so far in place of the crown. These persons received the name of titulars, from being entitled to collect from the heritors the unappropriated teinds; but they were also bound on demand to sell to any heritor the titularship to his own teinds at nine years' purchase. From the collective land-produce of a parish the court of teinds determines how much is to be allotted for the support of the minister. This general decree having fixed the amount, a common agent, appointed by the court, proceeds to divide it proportionally among the landholders, and this division, when fully made, is sanctioned by the court. It is called a *decreet of modification*, and forms the authority or rule according to which alone the minister collects his stipend. According to this system, which has proved a very happy settlement of a *quaestio vexata*, the burden falls not on the farmer or tenant, as in other countries where tithing exactions are made, but on the landholder or titular of the teinds, to whom a privilege of relief is opened by having them *fixed*. He may value them that is, to use the words of principal Hill, 'lead a proof of

their present value before the Court of Session, and the valuation, once made by authority of that court, ascertains the quantity of victual or the sum of money in the name of teind payable out of his lands in all time coming.' The advantage of this system is that it enables proprietors to know exactly the extent of the public burdens on their estate; and the teind appropriated to the maintenance of the minister or to educational and other pious uses, being sacred and inviolable, is always taken into account, and deducted in the purchase or sale of lands. But that would not be so advantageous to the minister by fixing his income at one invariable standard were it not that provision is made for an augmentation of stipend every twenty years in parishes where there are free teinds. This is done by the minister instituting a process before the judges of the Court of Session. who act as commissioners for the plantation of kirks and valuation of teinds; and in this process the act of 1808 requires that he shall summon not only the heritors of the parish, but also the moderator and clerk of presbytery as parties. In the event of the minister being able to prove a great advance in the social and agricultural state of the parish, the judges grant his application, allocating some additional chalders; but where the arguments pleaded appear to them unsatisfactory, they give a small addition, or refuse altogether. In many parishes, however, from the teinds being exhausted, ministers had no prospect of augmentation in the ordinary way; but redress was afforded through the liberality of Mr. Percival's government in 1810, who used his influence in procuring an act of Parliament to be passed according to which all stipends in the Establishment should, out of the exchequer, be made up to £150. This, though but a poor and inadequate provision for men of a liberal profession, was felt and gratefully received at the time as a great boon. But such is the mutability of human society that these stipends, which in 1810 formed the minimum, are now greatly superior to many which at the same period were considered, for Scotland, rich benefices; but which, being wholly paid in grain, have, through the late agrarian law, fallen far below that standard. The incomes of city ministers are paid wholly in money. Besides the stipend, every parish minister has a right to a manse or parsonage-house, garden, and offices-the style as well as the extent of accommodation being generally proportioned to the value of the benefice and the character of tie neighborhood. According to law, the glebe consists of four acres of arable land, although, in point of fact, it generally exceeds that measure; and, besides, most ministers have a grass glebe, sufficient for the support of a horse and two cows. All these, by a late decision of the Court of Session,

are exempt from poor-rates and similar public burdens. Ministers in royal burghs are entitled to manses only."

The statistics of the Established Church of Scotland vary very slightly from year to year. The number of parish churches was in 1877, 1222. In addition to these there are forty-two Parliamentary churches, and a considerable number of chapels of ease and quoad sacra churches, which, under a scheme efficiently organized by the Rev. Prof. Robertson, are in course of being endowed and erected into new parishes in the terms of Sir James Graham's Act, passed in 1846. Altogether there are about 1500 congregations and 1384 ministers.

The following are the chief missionary and other benevolent undertakings of the Church:

1. *The Home Mission Scheme*. — It has three departments:

(1.) *Church Extension*. Local efforts in places requiring additional church accommodation are supplemented by grants from the funds of the scheme. In 1876, thirty-three churches, providing nearly 32,000 sittings, were thus aided.

(2.) *Mission Churches*, designed to be centers of mission work in destitute localities or in the more populous parishes of Scotland. These churches or chapels number ninety-three, with upwards of 22,000 worshippers. The Home Mission Committee insist that they shall be served with invariable regularity.

(3.) *Mission Stations*, not having the permanent character of churches, intended as points of evangelical work among the lapsed, non-church-going, or far-scattered people. There are seventy-seven such stations supplied by licentiates, or students in divinity, or qualified evangelists. Besides these operations, aid is given in certain cases towards the employment of Scripture-readers in the Highlands and Islands. The revenue of the scheme in 1876 from church-collections and legacies amounted to £11,780.

2. Of undertakings more especially affecting the clergy of the Church may be noticed the *Association for Augmenting the Smaller Livings*, i.e. livings under £200 per annum. For this purpose the sum of £7305 was reported to last General Assembly. Also the *Ministers and Professors Widows Fund*, to which every parish minister and every professor in the national

universities is bound to subscribe. The capital sum of the fund amounts to upwards of £212,000. Ministers and professors may subscribe according to one or other of four rates, viz. £3 3s., £4 14s. 6d., £6 6s., or £7 17s. 6d.

3. A report is yearly presented to the Assembly as to the condition of the *Sabbath-schools* in connection with the Church. Between 15,000 and 16,000 persons are engaged in the work of teaching 167,000 juvenile scholars, and upwards of 24,000 adults of both sexes.

4. *Colonial Missions* seek to provide means of grace for Scottish colonists in the various British dependencies and elsewhere. When the scattered communities are organized into churches-some large and influential, as in the dominion of Canada-the aid given by the Home Church is curtailed, if not wholly withdrawn. But the committee have a great sphere of labor in the ever-enlarging and developing colonial empire of Great Britain. Agents of the mission report from British Columbia, the South American continent, Fiji, New Zealand, Australia, Ceylon, India. Under the Colonial Mission are also included European stations, such as Paris and Dresden, where ministrations are maintained for the benefit of resident Presbyterians. The total income of the scheme in 1877 was upwards of £15,000.

5. *Jewish Missions*. — The efforts put forth in connection with this mission are concentrated on Turkey and Egypt. It has agents in Constantinople, Smyrna, Alexandria, Beyrut, and Salonica. The sum of the charge on which it operates is upwards of £7000.

6. *Missions to the Heathen*. — The scenes of these missions, comprehended under the word “Foreign Missions,” are India, Africa, and China. It can scarcely, indeed, be said that a mission exists in China; but steps have been taken to originate a Christian work in that vast empire. The agency in Africa is not yet complete. A station has been formed and is partly occupied by a company of Christian artisans, headed by a medical missionary, in the Highlands of East Africa-the station having received the name of Dr. Livingstone’s birthplace, Blantyre. The Indian missions retain the mixed character which Scotch missions in India have hitherto borne-educational and evangelistic. In the three great Presidency towns, the educational institutions are still maintained, and are at present in a state of efficiency. Evangelical efforts are also carried on in connection with the institutions and in native churches. In the Punjab there are stations at Sealkote, Gûjrat, and Wazirabad. An interesting work is also promoted among the Highlanders of India at Darjeeling, and outside the British

territory an agency is maintained at Chumba, whose feature is that the mission, conducted by Europeans, is kept apart from the Church, presided over by natives. The income of these foreign missions for the year ending January, 1876, was upwards of £19,000.

7. Two other agencies may be briefly noted:

(1.) *Continental and Foreign Churches Committee*. — Established as the medium of communication between the churches and other Reformed churches of Christendom. It is charged with the duty of cultivating friendly relations with such churches, and administering such sums as the liberality of the Church bestows on societies and agencies abroad seeking to spread the pure Gospel of Jesus Christ. For many years the committee have been able to aid the *Central Society of the French Reformed Church*, and the *Evangelization Commission of the Waldensian Church in Italy*. From time to time it has aided other agencies. The care of certain chaplaincies on the Continent intended for the benefit of Presbyterians temporarily resident there also devolves on this committee. Its income in 1876 was £1205.

(2.) *The Army and Navy Chaplains Committee* are entrusted with the oversight of chaplains laboring in garrison towns or at the camps. The convener of the committee communicates, in behalf of the Church, with the naval and military authorities.

No Church in Europe has taken more prompt and energetic steps for the general diffusion of school education than the Presbyterians of Scotland. As early as 1695 it was enacted “that there be a school founded and a school-master appointed in every parish by advice of the presbyteries, and to this purpose that the heritors do, in every congregation, meet among themselves, and provide a commodious house for a school, and modify a stipend to the school-master, which shall not be under ten merks (£6 13s. 4d.) nor above twenty merks.” As almost all the population of the country is Presbyterian, the common-school system long sustained a parochial character. When, in 1843, the Free Church of Scotland was organized, it was resolved to erect schools in connection with the congregations of the Free Church, and the educational scheme which in consequence sprang up was co-extensive with the parochial system of the Established Church. In 1873, of 2108 schools inspected by the government inspectors, 1379 belonged to the Established and 577 to the Free Church; while of non-Presbyterian schools there were eighty-six belonging to the Episcopal and sixty-six to the Catholic Church. The introduction of the new national

system of education has in a great measure superseded the operations of the educational scheme of the Church of Scotland. Few schools now remain in relation to it. The care of the committee is now chiefly occupied with providing religious instruction in all schools desiring it, and giving grants for excellence in religious instruction. The Scottish universities of Edinburgh, Glasgow, and Aberdeen are in organic connection with the Church of Scotland by means of theological professorships; while at St. Andrew's an entire college, St. Mary's, is appointed solely to the teaching of theology and the languages connected with it. The theological institutions are the theological faculties of the several national universities. The number of professors is, at Edinburgh, four; Glasgow, four; St. Andrew's, three; Aberdeen, four. Students, 198. Students of divinity are required to attend a full course of arts at the university, and three years more at the Divinity Hall. The sessions in both cases last about five months. Students in this and the other Presbyterian churches of Scotland have often assistance from bursaries or scholarships, which are allotted chiefly by competition. See Hetherington, *Hist. of the Church of Scotland*; M'Crie, *Lives of Knox and Melville*; id. *Sketches of Church History*, and *Review of Scott*; Fessenden, *Encycl. of Relig. Knowledge*; *Cyclop. of Relig. Denominations* (Lond. and Glasg.); Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac;* Schem, *Ecclesiastes Year Book.*

2. UNITED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH. — In 1732 the Rev. Ebenezer Erskine, as retiring moderator of the Synod of Stirling and Perth, preached a sermon on Christ as the Cornerstone, in which he sharply inveighed against the corruptions and abuses that had crept into the Scottish Church. His sermon gave great offence, and incurred the censure of the synod. He appealed to the General Assembly, who condemned and rebuked him. Upon entering his protest, they handed his case over to the Commission. The Commission summarily suspended Erskine and three other ministers — Wilson, Moncrieff, and Fisher, who had joined in his protest cast them out of ministerial communion. The four brethren, deeming this treatment unconstitutional and unscriptural, immediately organized themselves into a presbytery, to which they gave the name of the *Associate Presbytery*, and published their testimony. or vindication. of their secession. The next Assembly showed a disposition to make concessions, but the seceders refused to listen. How far they were right in this has been debated. That they were not satisfied to return to the bosom of the Establishment is clear, for they went on to gather congregations and appoint a professor of

theology; and, in consequence of their activity and the popular sympathy, they increased rapidly. The Assembly next proceeded to harsher measures, and in 1740 deposed the seceding ministers, now eight in number. The doors of the churches were closed against them, and some of them, as Moncrieff, preached all winter in the open air. Great difficulty was found in procuring sites for houses of worship. Still they grew, and in 1745 the presbytery expanded into a synod with thirty settled congregations and sixteen vacancies. But now a dissension arose about the burgess oath, and in 1747 they split into two synods. The General Associate Synod, or Anti-burghers, denounced the oath as sanctioning the Establishment with all its corruptions; the Associate Synod maintained that it only referred to the true Protestant faith, in opposition to popery. After seventy-three years of separation, during which each throve and sent offshoots to other parts of the world, both branches reunited (a few only standing aloof) in 1820, under the name of the *United Secession Church*, when the new body embraced 373 congregations.

The *Relief Church* was the result of Mr. Gillespie's deposition by the General Assembly in 1752. He had refused to assist in intruding an obnoxious presentee over the parish of Inverkeithing. After his deposition he continued to preach in Dunfermline, but labored alone for several years. At length, being joined by Messrs. Boston and Colier, the three constituted the Relief Presbytery. Soon after another presbytery was necessary, and in 1775 (Eadie says 1773) the two met at a synod. It was characteristic of the Relief Church to maintain free communion with all true Christians, and to disapprove of the very principle of establishments. They founded a divinity hall, and increased to seven presbyteries, 114 congregations, and 45,000 communicants.

These two bodies, the United Secession and the Relief, having so much in common, for some time contemplated a union, which was at last consummated in Edinburgh, May 10, 1847, in Tanfield Hall, Canonmills. They took the title of the *United Presbyterian Church.* In common parlance, they are often familiarly spoken of as the "U. P. Church." They constitute a very popular and powerful body of Christians in Scotland, reporting, as the statistics of May, 1876: number of congregations, 620; of elders, 5075; members, 190,242; Sunday-school teachers, 12,129; Sunday-school scholars, 92,502; total income for 1875, £419,965. In the synod held at Edinburgh May 11, 1876, its sanction was given by a vote of 373 to 45 for the union of the United Presbyterian congregations in England with

the English Presbyterian Church; and an animated discussion took place in advocacy of separation of the Church from the State. The following are the articles of the basis as adopted by the two synods:

"**1.** That the Word of God contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments is the only rule of faith and practice.

"2. That the Westminster Confession of Faith, and the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, are the confession and catechisms of this Church, and contain the authorized exhibition of the sense in which we understand the Holy Scriptures, it being always understood that we do not approve of anything in these documents which teaches, or may be supposed to teach, compulsory or persecuting and intolerant principles in religion.

"**3.** That Presbyterian government, without any superiority of office to that of a teaching presbyter, and in a due subordination of Church courts, which is founded on and agreeable to the Word of God, is the government of this Church.

"**4.** That the ordinances of worship shall he administered in the United Church as they have been in both bodies of which it is formed; and that the Westminster Directory of Worship continue to be regarded as a compilation of excellent rules.

"**5.** That the term of membership is a credible profession of the faith of Christ as held by this Church-a profession made with intelligence, and justified by a corresponding character and deportment.

"**6.** That with regard to those ministers and sessions who think that the second section of the twenty-sixth chapter of the Westminster Confession of Faith authorizes free communion (that is, not loose or indiscriminate communion, but the occasional admission to fellowship in the Lord's Supper of persons respecting whose Christian character satisfactory evidence has been obtained, though belonging to other religious denominations), they shall en)joy what they enjoyed in their separate communions— the right of acting on their conscientious convictions.

"**7.** That the election of office-bearers of this Church, in its several congregations, belongs, by the authority of Christ, exclusively to the members in full communion.

“**8.** That this Church solemnly recognizes the obligation to hold forth, as well as to hold fast, the doctrine and laws of Christ; and to make exertions for the universal diffusion of the blessings of his Gospel at home and abroad.

“**9.** That as the Lord hath ordained that they who preach the Gospel, should live of the Gospel; that they who are taught in the Word should communicate to him that teacheth in all good things: that they who a e strong should help the weak; and that, having” freely received, they should freely give the Gospel to those who are destitute of it— this Church asserts the obligation and the privilege of its members, influenced by regard to the authority of Christ, to support and extend, by voluntary contentions, the ordinances of the Gospel.

“**10.** That the respective bodies of which this Church is composed, without requiring from each other an approval of the steps of procedure by their fathers, or interfering with the right of private judgment in reference to these, unite in regarding as still valid the reasons on which they have hitherto — maintained their state of secession and separation from the judicatories of the Established Church, as expressed in the authorized documents of the respective bodies; and in maintaining the lawfulness and obligation of separation from ecclesiastical bodies in which dangerous error is tolerated, or the discipline of the Church or the rights of her ministers or members are disregarded.

“The United Church, in their present most solemn circumstances, join in expressing their grateful acknowledgment to the great Head of the Church for the measure of spiritual good which he has accomplished by them in their separate state, their deep sense of the many imperfections and sills which have marked their ecclesiastical management, and their determined resolution, in dependence on the promised grace of their Lord, to apply more faithfully the great principles of Church-fellowship, to be more watchful in reference to admission and discipline, that the purity and efficiency of their congregations may be promoted, and the great end of their existence as a collective body may be answered with respect to all within its pale land to all without it, whether members of other denominations or ‘the world lying in wickedness.’

> "And, in fine, the United Church regard with a feeling of brotherhood all the faithful followers of Christ, aid shall endeavor to maintain the unity of the whole body of Christ by a readiness to co-operate with all its members in all things in which they are agreed."

The United Presbyterian Church is a voluntary Church. The doctrine of its voluntary condition is not formally contained in any portion of her standards, but it is distinctly implied. She holds to the theology of the Westminster Confession of Faith, and of the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, but she objects to every part of the Westminster Confession "which teaches, or is supposed to teach, compulsory or persecuting and intolerant principles in religion." "Her creed," says Eadie, "is that the exalted Jesus is the only King and Head of his Church, and that this headship wholly supersedes the patronage and endowment of the Church by civil rulers. She believes, indeed, that Christ is King of nations, and that therefore nations should serve God, and that all rulers and magistrates are bound to glorify him in their respective spheres and stations. But such service and such glorification of God must be in harmony with the revealed mind of Christ; and the duty of endowing Christianity nowhere appears among the statutes of the New Testament States which establish Christianity venture beyond divine enactment, and contravene the spirituality of that kingdom which 'is not of this world.' It is plain, too, from recent events in Scotland and England, that neither purity nor freedom can exist as it ought in an established Church. Spiritual independence can flourish only in a Church which has no connection with the State." Ebenezer Erskine said in his day, "There is a great difference to be made between the Church of Scotland and the Church of Christ in Scotland; for I reckon that the last is to a great extent drawn into the wilderness by the first; and since God in his adorable providence has led us into the wilderness with her, I judge it our duty to tarry with her for a while there, and to prefer her afflictions to all the advantages of a legal establishment." Christ's house, according to Ebenezer Erskine, is "the freest society in the world." It should bear no trammels, and it bore none for 300 years. Accordingly the United Presbyterian Church is a free Church, and will not submit to any law of patronage. The Relief Church had its origin in this grievance; and the Secession Church, while it had a special struggle for doctrine, no less distinctly vindicated the rights of the people. Pastors are therefore chosen by the united voice of the members in

full communion; for Christ's ordinances are meant solely for Christ's people. The Presbytery exercises no control whatever over the popular suffrage. It sends one of its members to *moderate* in the call, and sees that the call is gone about in a regular way. No canvassing is allowed, and the whole work of the Presbytery is, in fact, to guard and preserve purity of election. The Presbytery *sustains* the call after being convinced- that there is nothing to vitiate it as a free expression of the mind of the people. The minister so called may either be one who is or has been in a charge, or he may be what is called a probationer. The vacant churches are supplied by these probationers— a body of men who have finished the educational curriculum appointed by the Church, been examined by their respective presbyteries, and licensed as persons qualified to preach the Gospel, and fit, if they shall be called, to take the pastoral charge of a congregation. The probationers are thus a body of lay preachers, authorized candidates for the ministry. They are sent among the vacant churches without partiality and by rotation, that their gifts may be tried, and sometimes they are located for months together at a missionary station. When a probationer is called, and accepts the call, he appears before the Presbytery in whose bounds the Church calling him is situated, and preaches what are called trial discourses. Such appearance in the Presbytery on the part of the pastor elect is to win the confidence of his brethren. After all the prescribed trials have been gone through and sustained, a day for the ordination is fixed. One of the ministers of the Presbytery is appointed to preside and ordain, and another is appointed to preach. An edict*[1] is at the same time appointed to be publicly served in the congregation by the officiating minister or preacher at least ten days before the day of ordination. Upon the day fixed, the Presbytery meets at the appointed time and place, and is constituted by the moderator. The officer is then sent to the assembled congregation to intimate that the Presbytery has met, and requiring all who have any valid objections to the ordination being proceeded with immediately to appear before the Presbytery and state them. The officer having returned, and no objectors appearing, the Presbytery then proceeds to the place of worship. If objections are made, they must be decided upon before the ordination takes place. After sermon, the moderator gives a brief narrative of the different steps of procedure regarding the call. He then calls on the candidate for ordination to stand up, and in presence of the congregation puts to him the questions of the formula. But before proposing the ninth question, he asks the members of the congregation to signify their adherence to the call by holding up their right hands. These

steps being taken, the moderator comes down to the platform, where the candidate kneels, and, surrounded by the other brethren of the Presbytery, he engages in solemn prayer, and towards the conclusion of the prayer, or after it is concluded, he, by the imposition of hands (in which all the brethren of the Presbytery join), ordains him to the office of the holy ministry, and to the pastoral inspection of the congregation by whom he has been chosen and regularly called, commending him for countenance and success to the grace of God in all the duties incumbent upon him as a minister of the Gospel. After the ordination is thus completed, the members of Presbytery give to the newly ordained pastor the right hand of fellowship, and appropriate addresses are then delivered to minister and people. These services being concluded, the moderator accompanies the newly ordained pastor to some convenient place, where the members of the congregation may acknowledge him as their minister by taking him by the right hand. The Presbytery then returns to its place of meeting, when the newly ordained minister's name is entered on the roll, and he takes his seat as a member of the Presbytery, on which the commissioners for the congregation crave extracts. A member of Presbytery is also appointed to constitute the session of the congregation and introduce the minister to his seat there. The whole procedure of the dar is entered on the Presbytery's record.

*[1]: The form of edict is as follows: "Whereas the Presbytery of — of the United Presbyterian Church have received a call from this congregation, addressed to A. B., preacher (or minister) of the Gospel, to be their minister, and the said call has been sustained as a regular Gospel call, and been accepted by the said A. B., and he has undergone trials for ordination; and whereas the said Presbytery, having judged the said A. B. qualified for the ministry of the Gospel and the pastoral charge of this congregation, have resolved to proceed to his ordination on the day of , unless something occur which may reasonably impede it. Notice is hereby given to all concerned that if they, or any of them, have anything, to object why the said A. B. should not be ordained pastor of this congregation, they may repair to the Presbytery which is to meet at on the said day of with certification that, if no valid objection be then made, the Presbytery will proceed without further delay. By order of the Presbytery. A. B., Moderator. C. D., Clerk."

The formula put to ministers on their ordination is as follows:

"**1.** Do you believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the Word of God, and the only rule of faith and practice?

"**2.** Do you acknowledge the Westminster Confession of Faith, and the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, as an exhibition of the sense in which you understand the Holy Scriptures; it being understood that you are not required to approve of anything in these documents which teaches, or is supposed to teach, compulsory or persecuting and intolerant principles in religion?

"**3**. Are you persuaded that the Lord Jesus Christ, the only King and Head of the Church, has therein appointed a government distinct from and subordinate to civil government? And do you acknowledge the Presbyterian form of government, as authorized and acted on in this Church, to be founded on and agreeable to the Word of God?

"**4.** Do you approve of the constitution of the United Presbyterian Church as exhibited in the Basis of Union and while cherishing a spirit of brotherhood towards all the faithful followers of Christ, do you engage to seek the purity, edification, peace, and extension of this Church?

"**5.** Are zeal for the glory of God, love to the Lord Jesus Christ, and a desire to save souls, and not worldly interests or expectations, so far as you know your own heart, your great motives and chief inducements to enter into the office of the holy ministry?

"**6.** Have you used any undue methods, by yourself or others, to obtain the call of this Church?

"[The members of the Church being requested to stand up, let this question be put to them:

"Do you, the members of this Church, testify your adherence to the call which you have given to Mr. A. B. to be your minister? And do you receive him with all gladness, and promise to provide for him suitable maintenance, and to give him all due respect, subjection, and encouragement in the Lord?

"An opportunity will here be given to the members of the Church of signifying their assent to this by holding up their right hand.]

"**7.** Do you adhere to your acceptance of the call to become minister of this Church?

"**8.** Do you engage, in the strength of the grace that is h in Christ Jesus, to live a holy and circumspect life, to rule well your own house, and faithfully, diligently, and cheerfully to discharge all the parts of the ministerial work to the edifying of the body of Christ?

"**9.** Do you promise to give conscientious attendance on the courts of the United Presbyterian Church, to be subject to them in the Lord, to take a due interest in their proceedings, and to study the things which make for peace?

"**10.** All these things you profess and promise through grace, as you shall be answerable at the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ with all his saints, and as you would be found in that happy company?"

The Church has one theological institution, with a staff of seven professors, including the principal. The number of students for 1876-77 was 107, and the average for the ten preceding years 136. Students have to pass through a full course of arts at the university before joining the theological hall and the theological curriculum is over three years, with a session each year from the beginning of November to the middle of April. Very recently a change was made in the management of the theological hall, with a view to the more efficient training of the students. It was agreed that the means of maintaining the hall should be partly by a capital fund and partly by annual contributions, and the capital fund of £40,000 has already been nearly realized. In connection with the theological hall there is a scheme of scholarships, and a committee who have charge of the distribution of these on competitive examination of applicants. In 1876 eleven special scholarships were awarded of the aggregate value of £275; and from the ordinary fund two of £20 each, ten of £15, and forty-one of £10. In 1876 the number of young people under religious instruction in Sabbath-schools and Bible classes was 103,750.

The following are among the other undertakings of the United Presbyterian Church:

Home Mission Fund. — This fund is under the direction more immediately of the Home Committee of the Board of Missions. Its object is to supplement the stipends of the weaker congregations, to support

missionary stations, to aid in the support of catechists, and maintain a scheme of home evangelization.

By the *Stipend Augmentation Scheme* and its *Surplus Fund*, including arrangements which have been made with certain congregations in reference to allowances for house-rent where manse accommodation has not been provided, the following general results in regard to the stipends of ministers for the year 1877 have been obtained:

104 Stipends have been raised to £200 per annum, with manse or allowance for rent of £20.

38	Stipends are less than		£200	but not under		£197	10s.
37	"	"	197	10s.,	"	"	190
32	"	"	190		"	"	180
14	"	"	180		"	"	170
10	"	"	170		"	"	160
8	"	"	160		"	"	157 10s

13 Stipends are under the former minimum of 157 10s.

All the other Stipends in the Church are upwards of £200 per annum.

In evangelistic effort and home evangelization £5047 were expended in 1876 under the direction of the Home Committee of the Board of Missions.

The *Aged and Infirm Ministers Fund* has a capital fund of £35,593, with a reserve fund of £1000, and provides an annuity of not less than £50 per annum to aged and infirm ministers and missionaries of the Church.

Manse Fund. — For this scheme £52,772 have been raised by subscriptions and donations up to December, 1876, and £49,449 expended up to April, 1877, in grants to 232 congregations; and the conditions on which these grants were offered required the congregations to raise not less than £90,341, as it is stipulated where grants are given that the manse shall be free of debt when the last installment of the grant has been paid.

The *Foreign Mission Fund* is to defray the expenses of the foreign missionary operations of the Church. The missions supported out of the find, nine in number, are situated in Jamaica, Trinidad, Old Calabar, Kaffraria, India, China, Spain, Japan, and Algeria. In these nine missions there are 61 ordained missionaries, 7 European medical missionaries, 2 European male teachers, 21 European female teachers, 22 ordained native missionaries, 91 native evangelists, 212 schoolmasters, 44 native female teachers, 86 other agents, 84 principal stations, 13-l out-stations, 13.212 communicants, 2033 inquirers, 197 week-day schools, 13,387 pupils, with a total educated agency of 384. The income of the Foreign Mission Fund for 1887 was £56,872 17s. 4d.

Under the direction of the synod, the Foreign Mission Board voted, during 1876, the following grants, viz.:

(1) To the Union of Evangelical Churches of France, £500;

(2) to the Evangelical Society of Lyons, £150;

(3) to the Evangelical Society of Geneva, £250;

(4) to the Belgian Missionary Society, £200;

(5) for evangelical work in Bohemia. £150;

(6) to the Waldensian Church, £350 (including £100 towards the salary of the Rev. J. Simpson Kay of Palermo);

(7) to the Free Church of Italy, £100;

(8) for evangelical work at Aix-les-Bains, Savoy, £50;

(9) to the French Canadian Missionary Society, £100;

(10) for Rev. Ferdinand Cesar’s work in Moravia, £75;

(11) for outfit and passage of two ministers to Australia, £340;

(12) to Rev. David Sidney, Napier, New Zealand, for salary of evangelist (three years), £150; and

(13) salary of Rev. Dr. Laws, of the Nyassa mission of the Free Church.

These grants amount in all to £2715. Besides these special grants made directly by the Foreign Committee, the following special contributions by individuals were sent through the hands of the synod's treasurer:

(1) £1530 from the Theological Hall Students' Missionary Society, for pastor Yakopian's work in Cesarea, Cappadocia;

(2) £5 for Protestant churches in Bithynia;

(3) £1 6s. 3rd. for Mount Lebanon Schools;

(4) £100 for Protestant Church in Bohemia;

(5) £50 5s. for Rev. F. Cesar's work in Moravia;

(6) £20 for the Union of Evangelical Churches in France;

(7) £45 4s. 4d. for evangelical work at Aixles-Bains, Savoy;

(8) £44 for Christian work in Paris;

(9) £25 for Reformed Church in the Netherlands;

(10) £131 2s. 4d. for the Waldensian Church;

(11) £50 for the Free Italian Church;

(12) £4 2s. for Rev. J. S. Kay, Palermo;

(13) £5 for Mrs. Boyce's Orphanage, Bordighera;

(14) £33 6s. 8d. for Freedmen's Missions Aid Society; and

(15) £606 18s. 7d. for the Agra Medical Mission (Dr. Valentine's scheme).

These donations, destined by the donors for the objects specified, amounted in all to £2631 5s. 2nd., which, added to the grants administered by the Board-viz., £2715-make the total contribution of the Church during 1876, for objects outside the Foreign Mission, £5346 5s. 2nd. The ordinary congregational income of the Church for the year 1876 was £233,114; the missionary and benevolent income £82,927; and the benevolent income not congregational £62,226 -the total, including the English congregations, up to June, 1876, being £406,204. See Hetherington, *Hist. of the Church of Scotland; Cyclop. of Religious Denominations* (Lond. and Glasgow); Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*. *SEE UNITED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH*.

3. FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND. — This large and useful body of Christians, now numbering nearly a million of people, was organized into a separate religious denomination in May, 1843. The circumstances which led to its formation as a Church distinct from the Establishment have already been detailed in a previous article. The conflict which at length terminated in the Disruption had its origin in the two reforming acts passed by the General Assembly of 1834, the one of which, the Act on Calls, asserted the principle of non-intrusion, and the other, usually called the Chapel Act, asserted the right of the Church to determine who should administer the government of Christ's house. Both of these acts gave rise to lawsuits before the civil tribunals, thus bringing into discussion the whole question as to the terms of the connection between the Church and the State. As the various processes went forward in the courts of law, it became quite plain to many, both of the Scottish clergy and laity, that attempts were made by the civil courts to coerce the courts of the Church in matters spiritual. Every encroachment of this kind they were determined to resist, as being contrary to the laws and constitution of the Church of Scotland, as well as an infringement on the privileges secured to her by the Act of Security and Treaty of Union.

Matters were evidently fast hastening onward to a crisis, and in the Assembly of 1842 a Claim of Rights was agreed upon to be laid before the Legislature, setting forth the grievances of which the Church complained in consequence of the usurpations of the courts of law, and declaring the terms on which alone she would remain in connection with the State. This important document was adopted by a majority of 131. The claim, however, which it contained, was pronounced by government to be "unreasonable," and intimation was distinctly made that the government "could not advise her majesty to acquiesce in these demands." This reply on the part of the supreme branch of the legislature was decisive, and put an end to all hope of averting the impending catastrophe. At the next meeting of Assembly, accordingly, the moderator, instead of constituting the court in the usual form, read a solemn protest, which he laid upon the table, and withdrew, followed by all the clerical and lay members of Assembly by whom it was subscribed. This document protests against the then recent decisions of the courts of law on the following grounds:

> "**1.** That the courts of the Church by law established, and members thereof, are liable to be coerced by the civil courts in the exercise of their spiritual functions; and in particular in the admission to the office

of the holy ministry, and the constitution of the past moral relation, and that they are subject to be compelled to intrude ministers on reclaiming congregations in opposition to the fundamental principles of the Church, and their views of the Word of God, and to the liberties of Christ's people.

"**2.** That the said civil courts have power to interfere with and interdict the preaching of the Gospel and administration of ordinances as authorized and enjoined by the Church courts of the Establishment.

"**3.** That the said civil courts have power to suspend spiritual censures pronounced by the Church courts of the Establishment against ministers and probationers of the Church, and to interdict their execution as to spiritual effects, functions, and privileges.

"**4.** That the said civil courts have power to reduce and set aside the sentences of the Church courts of the Establishment deposing ministers from the office of the holy ministry and depriving probationers of their license to preach the Gospel, with reference to the spiritual status, functions, and privileges of such ministers and probationers— restoring them to the spiritual office and status of which the Church courts had deprived them.

"**5.** That the said civil courts have power to determine on the right to sit as members of the supreme and other judicatories of the Church by law established, and to issue interdicts against sitting and voting therein, irrespective of the judgment and determination of the said judicatories.

"**6.** That the said civil courts have power to supersede the majority of a Church court of the Establishment, in regard to the exercise of its spiritual functions as a Church court, and to authorize the minority to exercise the said functions, in opposition to the court itself, and to the superior judicatories of the Establishment.

"**7.** That the said civil courts have power to stay processes of discipline pending before courts of the Church by law established, and to interdict such courts from proceeding therein.

"**8.** That no pastor of a congregation can be admitted into the Church courts of the Establishment, and allowed to rule, as well as to teach, agreeably to the institution of the office by the Head of the Church, nor

> to sit in any of the judicatories of the Church, inferior or supremeand that no additional provision call be made for the exercise of spiritual discipline among the members of the Church, though not affecting any patrimonial interests, and no alteration introduced in the state of pastoral superintendence and spiritual discipline *in* any parish, without the sanction of a civil court.
>
> "All which jurisdiction and power on the part of the said civil courts severally above specified, whatever proceeding may have given occasion to its exercise, is, in our opinion, in itself inconsistent with Christian liberty, and with the authority which the Head of the Church hath conferred on the Church alone."

The document goes on to protest that in the circumstances in which the Church was thereby placed, "a free Assembly of the Church of Scotland, by law established, cannot at this time beholden, and that an Assembly in accordance with the fundamental principles of the Church cannot be constituted in connection with the State without violating the conditions which must now, since the rejection by the Legislature of the Church's Claim of Right, be held to be the conditions of the Establishment." At the close of this solemn protest, the subscribers claim to themselves the liberty of abandoning their connection with the State, while retaining all the privileges and exercising all the functions of a section of Christ's visible Church. "And finally," they declare, "while firmly asserting the right and duty of the civil magistrate to maintain and support an establishment of religion in accordance with God's Word, and reserving to ourselves and our successors to strive by all lawful means, as opportunity shall in God's good providence be offered, to secure the performance of this duty agreeably to the Scriptures, and in implement of the statutes of the kingdom of Scotland and the obligations of the Treaty of Union as understood by us and our ancestors, but acknowledging that we do not hold ourselves at liberty to retain the benefits of the Establishment while we cannot comply with the conditions now to be deemed thereto attached— *we protest* that, in the circumstances in which we are placed, it is, and shall be, lawful for us, and such other commissioners chosen to the Assembly appointed to have been this day holden as may concur with us, to withdraw to a separate place of meeting, for the purpose of taking steps for ourselves and all who adhere to us— maintaining with us the Confession of Faith, and standards of the Church of Scotland as heretofore understood-for separating in an orderly way from the Establishment, and

thereupon adopting such measures as may be competent to us, in humble dependence on God's grace and the aid of the Holy Spirit, for the advancement of his glory, the extension of the Gospel of our Lord and Savior, and the administration of the affairs of Christ's house, according to his holy Word; and we do now, for the purpose foresaid, withdraw accordingly, humbly and solemnly acknowledging the hand of the Lord in the things which have come upon us, because of our manifold sins, and the sills of this Church and nation; but, at the same time, with an assured conviction that we are not responsible for any consequences that may follow from this our enforced separation from an Establishment which we loved and prized, through interference with conscience, the dishonor done to Christ's crown, and the rejection of his sole and supreme authority as King in his Church." This document, embodying the protest against the wrongs inflicted on the Church of Scotland by the civil power, was signed by no fewer than 203 members of Assembly. When the moderator had finished the reading of the protest, he retired, followed by a large majority of the clerical and lay members of the court; and the procession, joined by a large body of ministers, elders, and others who adhered to their principles, moved in solemn silence to Tanfield Hall, a large building situated at the northern extremity of the city, in the valley formed by the Water of Leith. Here was constituted the Free Church of Scotland, which, while renouncing the benefits of an Establishment, continues to adhere to the standards and to maintain the doctrine, discipline worship, and government of the Church of Scotland. Dr. Chalmers was chosen as their first moderator, and the ordinary business was proceeded with according to the usual forms. On Tuesday, the 23d of May, the ministers and professors, to the number of 474, solemnly subscribed the Deed of Demission, formally renouncing all claim to the benefices which they had held in connection with this Establishment, declaring them to be vacant, and consenting to their being dealt with as such. Thus, by a regular legal instrument the ministers completed their separation from the Establishment; and the Free Church of Scotland assumed the position of a distinct ecclesiastical denomination, holding the same doctrines, maintaining the same ecclesiastical framework, and observing the same forms of worship as had been received and observed in the National Church. In fact, they had abandoned nothing but the endowments of the State, and even these they had abandoned, not from any change in their views as to the lawfulness of a Church Establishment, but solely because in their view the State had

altered the terms on which the compact between the Church and the State had been originally formed.

The Free Church, strong in the conviction that her distinctive principles were sound and scriptural, entered upon her arduous work with an humble but confiding trust in her great and glorious Head. In the course of her history she has become united with two other bodies. In 1852 the majority of the Original Seceders, with whom the name of Dr. Thomas M'Crie, father and son, was so honorably connected, joined the Free Church; and in 1876 a union was formed with the Reformed Presbyterian Church, consisting of thirty-six ministers and thirty-six congregations. The General Assembly of the Free Church consists of 730 members, half being ministers and half ruling elders, and all appointed by the presbyteries. Each Presbytery returns one third of its ministers, and an equal number of ruling elders. The temporal affairs of each congregation are managed by a body called "The Deacons' Court." This court is composed of the minister, the ruling elders, and a body of deacons chosen, like the elders, by the members of the congregation. The spiritual interests of each congregation are attended to by the kirk-session, consisting only of the minister and elders.

In preparation for the new position in which the Church would be placed when deprived of state support, Dr. Chalmers had made arrangements some months previous to the Assembly of 1843 for establishing associations throughout the country with the view of collecting funds for the support of the ministry. With such energy and activity had these preparations been carried forward that before the day of the Disruption came 687 separate associations had been formed in all parts of the country. So extensive and ardent was the sympathy felt with the movement, not in Scotland only, but throughout the kingdom, and even throughout the world, that funds were liberally contributed from all quarters in support of the cause, and at the close of the first year of the history of the Free Church her income amounted to the munificent sum of £366,719 14s. 3rd. Nor has the source of her supply afforded the slightest symptoms of being exhausted even after the lapse of thirty-five years. On the contrary, she raised £10,250,000 in her first thirty years and has now an annual income of over £500,000. The Sustentation Fund for the support of the ministry reached in 1877 the gratifying sum of £172,641 13s. 3rd., yielding an annual salary to nearly 800 ministers of about £150 each. The Building Fund for the erection of churches and manses amounted in 1877 to

£41.179 2s. 0 ¼ d. This year (1878) a Church Extension scheme of £100,000 has been entered upon with spirit. The Congregational Fund, composed of ordinary collections at the church-doors on Sabbaths, and a great part of which goes to supplement the ministers' stipends, is £94,481 19s. 6d. The Fund for Missions in 1887-8 amounted to £83,813. There are various other objects connected with the Free Church which it is unnecessary to detail, but the sum total of the contributions for the last year was £565,195 10s. 4d., an amount which plainly indicates that its friends and supporters are still animated with an intense and undiminished attachment to the principles on which this peculiar section of the Christian Church is based. Upwards of 800 churches have been reared by the liberality of her people, who are calculated to amount to somewhere about 1,000,000. To the large majority of the churches, manses, or parsonage-houses, have also been added. The Free Church has established a divinity school in Edinburgh, called the New College, which was completed at a cost approaching £40,000, is provided with a more complete staff of professors than any similar institution in Scotland, and with more effectual means of training an educated ministry than is to be found elsewhere in Great Britain. The Free Church has also built a divinity hall in Aberdeen, and a third in Glasgow. The number of theological students in attendance on these colleges amounts in 1878 to 230.

In connection with the Free Church, a fund was instituted in 1848 for Aged and Infirm Ministers, which already exceeds £39,000. In addition to the home ministry, which in 1878 numbered 1059, there are nearly 300 settled ministers belonging to this Church in the different departments of the colonial field.

The *Widows and Orphans Funds* are chiefly made up of yearly contributions (compulsory) from each minister otf£5 to the Widows and £2 to the Orphans fund. At present the fund gives an annuity of £42 to each widow and £15 to each child under eighteen. Larger sums are given to the children when their mother is dead. The accumulated fund of the two schemes is upwards of £224,000. There is a society for sons and daughters of the clergy, not under the General Assembly, designed to aid ministers in the education of their families. In 1876 it paid £1758 in 125 grants, from £10 to £18 each.

The *Home Mission and Church Extension Scheme.* Its purpose is to keep stations supplied by preachers or catechists in thinly peopled districts; also

to foster missions in mining and manufacturing localities, and other populous places, and form them into regular charges; to aid such charges until they are taken on the equal dividend platform to maintain lay evangelists, and send out ministerial evangelists from time to time; and to encourage the employment of students and others as missionaries in necessitous districts in large towns. To encourage ministers of experience to undertake mission congregations in populous places, grants of £200 a year are given for a limited time; the grant diminishing gradually from year to year, till it is extinguished. In other cases the grants are smaller. The income of the fund, derived from a church-door collection thrice in two years, donations, legacies, etc., is between £9000 and £10,000 a year. This year a special Church Extension Fund, amounting to £100,000, is being raised, and the greater part of it has been contributed in a few months.

Highland Mission. — This is a somewhat similar scheme, managed by a separate committee of the General Assembly, for districts of the country where Gaelic is spoken. It has a collection every second year. Its average revenue is about £3000.

Church and Manse Building Fund. — This is intended to help congregations in their building operations. At first it was very large, Dr. Guthrie having raised for a General Manse Fund alone about £100,000, but of late years its income has been only about £1500. A special Building Fund is contemplated for new charges.

Education Scheme. — Till recently a large proportion of the congregations had day-schools, for which grants were given. Most of these are now absorbed in the national scheme of education. There are still some schools receiving grants; but the chief remaining part of the scheme is the Normal Schools of which there are two at Edinburgh and Glasgow. The instructors receive a salary from a general fund, which is raised by monthly contributions in all the congregations, and which is divided at the end of the year according to a certain scale, proportioned to the qualifications of the respective teachers. The number of normal students, male and female for 1876-77 was 494.

College Scheme. — This provides for the support of the three theological institutions, partly by interest of endowments and partly by an annual collection at church door, donations, legacies, etc. For 1876-77 the revenue was a total of £8995. There are large Bursary and Scholarship Funds for the encouragement of students, from £10 to £100 annually.

Continental Scheme. — For aiding stations, societies, and churches on the continent of Europe. Revenue about £4000.

Colonial Scheme. — For sending out ministers to the colonies and aiding colonial churches, especially in their earlier stages. Revenue about £4000.

The Foreign Missions Scheme. — The late Rev. Dr. Duff; tile first missionary to the heathen from the Church of Scotland, went to Calcutta in 1829, and founded the India Mission of the Church of Scotland. In the previous year Dr. Wilson went to Bombay, and later, the Rev. John Anderson to Madras. In 1843 all the missionaries in India adhered to the Free Church and the old localities were continued. The Foreign Missions of the Free Church embrace India, Africa, Syria, and New Hebrides. In India, there are 6 principal and 12 branch stations in Bengal; 3 principal and 10 branch stations in Western India; 2 principal and 3 branch stations in Central India; and 1 principal and 7 branch stations *in* Southern India. Ill South Africa there are 6 principal and 31 branch stations in Kaffraria; 2 principal and 2 branch stations in Natal; and 1 principal station at Livingstonia. In New Hebrides, where the Reformed Presbyterians (who joined the Free Church in 1876) had their field, are 4 stations, on three islands; and in Syria, the headquarters are at Shweir, about twenty miles from Beyrut. In all, the Free Church missions embrace 107 stations, 38 European missionaries, 3 European medical missionaries, 21 European teachers, 19 European artisans, 15 native missionaries, 327 Christian teachers, and Christian laborers of various sorts. In the native churches are 3350 communicants, and about 3000 baptized adherents. The number of institutions and schools is 223, and the total number of scholars is 13,109. In the principal Indian stations many of the pupils are undergraduates of the universities. The revenue of this scheme for 1876-77 was £51,217.

Mission to Jews. — This mission was begun in 1839, and in 1843, it was continued by the Free Church, all the missionaries having adhered. At present it has stations at (l) Amsterdam, (2) Prague, (3) Pesth, (4) Breslau, (5) Constantinople. The Pesth mission has been especially blessed. The amount raised for the scheme in 1876-77 was £13,468.

The following is a summary of the contributions of the Free Church for 1876-77:

Sustentation fund .....£.170,209

Local buildings fund 86,291

Congregational fund 176,290

Missions and education 104,325

Miscellaneous .....…… 28079

Total .....…….…..... 565,194

In all its operations, indeed, whether at home or abroad, the Free Church exhibits a vitality and energetic power which have gained for it a high place among Christian churches. *SEE SCOTLAND, CHURCHES IN*.

4. REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF SCOTLAND. — This is the only Church which claims to be legitimately descended from the Covenanted Church of Scotland in her period of greatest purity, that of the Second Reformation. It was that memorable period of Scottish history between 1638 and 1650 which formed the sera of the Solemn League and Covenant, of the Westminster Assembly, of the revolution which dethroned the first Charles and asserted those principles of civil and religious liberty which all enlightened Christians and statesmen are now ready with one voice to acknowledge and to admire. For their strict adherence to these principles Cameron, Cargill, and Renwick shed their blood, and to these principles the Reformed Presbyterian Church gloried in avowing her attachment. As has already been noticed in the article COVENANTERS *SEE COVENANTERS* , on the day after the execution of Charles I was known at Edinburgh, his son, Charles II, was proclaimed king at the public cross by the Committee of Estates, with this proviso, however, that “before being admitted to the exercise of his royal power, he shall give satisfaction to this kingdom in the things that concern the security of religion according to the National Covenant and the Solemn League and Covenant.” This condition or proviso was considered as so necessary to the maintenance of the constitution of the country, as well as the promotion of the great principles of civil and religious liberty, that it was enacted both by the Parliament and the General Assembly. The document issued by the latter body exhibits, in the clearest manner, their design in insisting upon the subscription by the king. It is dated July 27, 1649, and contains the following important statements: “But if his majesty, or any having or pretending power and commission from him, shall invade this kingdom upon pretext of establishing him in the exercise of his royal power-as it will be a high provocation against God to be accessory or assisting thereto, so it will be a necessary duty to resist and oppose the same. We know that

many are so forgetful of the oath of God, and ignorant and careless of the interest of Jesus Christ and the Gospel, and do so little tender that which concerns his kingdom and the privileges thereof, and do so much dote upon absolute and arbitrary government for gaining their own ends, and so much malign the instruments of the work of reformation, that they would admit his majesty to the exercise of his royal power upon any terms whatsoever, though with never so much prejudice to religion and the liberties of these kingdoms, and would think it quarrel enough to make war upon all those who for conscience' sake cannot condescend thereto. But we desire all those who fear the Lord, and mind to keep their Covenant, impartially to consider these things which follow:

"**1.** That as magistrates and their power is ordained of God, so are they inl the exercise thereof not to walk according to their own will, but according to the law of equity and righteousness, as being the ministers of God for the safety of his people; therefore a boundless and unlimited power is to be acknowledged in no king or magistrate; neither is our king to be admitted to the exercise of his power as long as he refuses to walk in the administration of the same according to this rule and the established laws of the kingdom, that his subjects may live under him a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty.

"**2.** There is one mutual obligation and stipulation betwixt the king and his people; as both of them are tied to God, so each of them is tied one to another for the performance of mutual and reciprocal duties. According to this, it is statute and ordained in the eighth act of first Parliament of James VI, 'That all kings, princes, or magistrates whatsoever, holding their place, which hereafter shall happen in any time to reign and bear rule over this realm, at the time of their coronation and receipt of their princely authority, make their faithful promise by oath, in the presence of the Eternal God, that during the whole course of their lives they shall serve the same Eternal God to the utmost of their power, according as he hath required in his most holy Word, contained in the Old and New Testaments; and, according to the same Word, shall maintain the true religion of Christ Jesus, the preaching of his most holy Word, and due and right ministration of his sacraments now received and preached within this realm; and shall abolish all false religion contrary to the same; and shall rule the people committed to their charge according to the will and the command of God revealed in his Word, and according to the laudable laws and

constitutions received within this realm; and shall procure to the utmost of their power to the Kirk of God, and the whole Christian people, true and perfect peace in all time coming, and thus justice and equity be kept to all creatures without exception;' which oath was sworn first by king James VI, and afterwards by king Charles at his coronation, and is inserted in our National Covenant, which was approved by the king who lately reigned. As long, therefore, as his majesty who now reigns refuses to hearken to the just and necessary desires of State and Kirk propounded to his majesty for the security of religion and safety of his people, and to engage and to oblige himself for the performance of his duty to his people, it is consonant to Scripture and reason, and the laws of the kingdom, that they should refuse to admit him to the exercise of his government until he give satisfaction in these things.

"**3.** In the League and Covenant which hath been so solemnly sworn and renewed by this kingdom, the duty of defending and preserving the king's majesty, person, and authority, is joined with, and subordinate unto, the duty of preserving and defending the true religion and liberties of the kingdoms; and therefore his majesty, standing in opposition to the just and necessary public desires concerning religion and the liberties of the kingdoms, it will a manifest breach of Covenant, and preferring of the king's interest to the interest of Jesus Christ, to bring him to the exercise of his royal powers which he — walking in a contrary way, and being compassed about his malignant counsels, cannot but employ to the prejudice and ruin of both."

The stipulation was made known to Charles while he was still in Holland, where he had been for some time residing, but he refused to accede to it. The following year (1650) he set sail for Scotland, and before landing on its shores he consented to subscribe the Covenant, and the test was accordingly administered to him with all due solemnity. On the following August he repeated an engagement to support the Covenant. Yet the unprincipled monarch was all the while devising schemes for the subversion not only of Presbyterianism, but even of Protestantism in Scotland. Again, when crowned at Scone on Jan. 1, 1651, Charles not only took oath to support and defend the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, but, the National Covenant and the Solemn League and Covenant having been produced and read, the king solemnly swore them. The imposing ceremonial, however, was only designed, on the part of the profligate Charles, to deceive his Scottish subjects. Nor did the calamities in which he was subsequently

involved — his dethronement and exile for several years in France — produce any favorable change upon his character. No sooner was he restored to his throne in 1660, than he forthwith proceeded to overturn the whole work of reformation, both civil and ecclesiastical, which he had solemnly sworn to support. The first step towards the execution of this project was the passing of the Act of Supremacy, whereby the king was constituted supreme judge in all matters civil and ecclesiastical. To this was afterwards added the Oath of Allegiance, which declared it to be treason to deny the supremacy of the sovereign both in Church and State. The crowning deed of treachery, however, which Charles perpetrated, was his prevailing upon his Scottish counselors to pass the Act Rescissory, by which all the steps taken from 1638 to 1650 for the reformation of religion were pronounced rebellious and treasonable; the National Covenant and the Solemn League and Covenant were condemned as unlawful oaths; the Glasgow Assembly of 1638 was denounced as an illegal and seditious meeting; and the right government of the Church was alleged to be the inherent prerogative of the crown. The result of these acts was, that the advances which the Church and the country had made during the period of the Second Reformation were completely neutralized, and the Church of Scotland was subjected for a long series of years to the most cruel persecution and oppression. With such flagrant and repeated violations of the solemn compact into which Charles had entered with his subjects, it is not to be wondered at that, on high constitutional grounds, this body of the Covenanters, headed by Cameron, Cargill, and others, should have regarded the treacherous sovereign as having forfeited all title to their allegiance. They felt it to be impossible to maintain the principles of the Reformation, and yet own the authority of a monarch who had trampled these principles under foot, and that, too, in violation of the most solemn oaths, repeated again and again. The younger M'Crie, in his *Sketches of Scottish Church History*, alleges that the principle laid down by Cameron's party was, "that the king, by assuming an Erastian power over the Church, had forfeited all right to the civil obedience of his subjects-a principle which had never been known in the Church of Scotland before.' Such a view of the matter, however, is scarcely fair to the Cameronians. It was not because Charles had usurped an Erastian authority over the Church that they deemed it their duty to renounce their allegiance, but because he had broken the solemn vows made at his coronation. On that occasion he had entered, as they held, into a deliberate compact with his subjects, and yet, in the face of all his vows, he had openly, and in the most flagrant manner,

broken that compact, thus setting his subjects free from all obligation to own him as king. It is quite true, as the Westminster Confession of Faith alleges, that “infidelity or difference in religion doth not make void the magistrate’s just and legal authority, nor free the people from their due obedience to him;” but this remark does not meet the case as between Charles and the Cameronian party. They renounced their allegiance not because the sovereign was an infidel, or differed from them in matters of religion, but solely and exclusively because he had broken a civil compact entered into between him and his Scottish subjects on receiving the crown, and confirmed by a solemn religious vow. By his own deliberate deeds the traitorous monarch had forfeited his right to rule before they had renounced their obligation to obey. Such were the simple grounds on which Cameron, Cargill, Renwick, and their followers considered themselves justified in disowning the authority of the king, and bearing arms against him as a usurper of the throne and a traitor to the country.

This earnest and intrepid band of Covenanters brought down upon themselves, by the fearless avowal of their principles, the special vengeance of the ruling powers. One after another their leaders perished on the scaffold, and thus the people who held Cameronian principles found themselves deprived of religious instructors, and wandering as “sheep without a shepherd.” In these circumstances they resolved to form themselves into a united body, consisting of societies for worship and mutual edification, which were formed in those districts where the numbers warranted such a step. To preserve order and uniformity, the smaller societies appointed deputies to attend a general meeting, in which was vested the power of making arrangements for the regulation of the whole body. The first meeting of these united societies was held on Dec. 15, 1681, at Logan House, in the parish of Lesmahagow, Lanarkshire, where it was resolved to draw up a public testimony against the errors and defections of the times. The name which this body of Covenanters took to themselves was that of the “Persecuted Remnant,” while the societies which they had formed for religious improvement led them to be designated the “Society People.” “They had taken up no new principles,” as Dr. Hetherington well remarks: “the utmost that they can be justly charged with is, merely that they had followed up the leading principles of the Presbyterian and Covenanted Church of Scotland to an extreme point, from which the greater part of Presbyterians recoiled; and that in doing so they had used language capable of being interpreted to mean more than

they themselves intended. Their honesty of heart, integrity of purpose, and firmness of principle cannot be denied-and these are noble qualities; and if they did express their sentiments in strong and unguarded language, it ought to be remembered that they did so in the midst of fierce and remorseless persecution, ill adapted to make men nicely cautious in the selection of balanced terms wherein to express their indignant detestation of that unchristian tyranny which was so fiercely striving to destroy every vestige of both civil and religious liberty."

The first manifestation of the views held by the Society People took place during the dissensions at Bothwell Bridge, when a body of the Covenanters refused to make a public avowal of their allegiance to the king in their declaration. A rude outline of the declaration was drawn up by Cargill, assisted by Henry Hall, of Haughhead, who was mortally wounded at Queensferry, and the document, being found on his person, received the name of the "Queensferry Paper." It contained some of the chief points held by the Society People; but it unfortunately embodied in it an avowal of dislike to a hereditary monarchy, as "liable to inconvenience, and apt to degenerate into tyranny." Though the paper in question emanated from only a few persons, and its errors, therefore, could not be charged upon the whole of the strict Presbyterian party, yet it was quoted without reserve by their enemies as a proof of disloyal and even treasonable intentions. To counteract the prejudices thus excited against them, the leaders of the Society People drew up deliberately a statement of their principles, which is usually known by the name of the "Sanquhar Declaration." This document, which carefully excluded all reference to a change in the form of government, was, nevertheless, classed by the persecutors along with the Queensferry Paper in all their proclamations, as if they had been identical, and made an excuse for issuing to the army the most ruthless and cruel commands to pursue to the death all who were suspected of being connected with these bold declarations. Cameron, Cargill, and ten other persons were proclaimed traitors, and a price was set upon their heads. Nothing daunted, Cargill in 1630 boldly pronounced what is known as the Torwood Excommunication. In a meeting held at Torwood, in Stirlingshire, the intrepid Covenanter, after divine service, solemnly excommunicated Charles and his chief supporters, casting them out of the Church, and delivering them up to Satan. This bold act of a Christian hero roused the government to greater fury, and a series of civil and military executions followed, down to the Revolution in 1688.

In the persecutions of this eventful period, the Society People had been subjected to painful discouragement by the loss of their able and devoted leaders. Cameron and Cargill, and many others, had sealed their testimony with their blood, but in this time of sore trial Providence graciously raised up one admirably calculated to take a prominent part in promoting Christ's cause in days of bloody persecution. The individual to whom we refer was Mr. James Renwick, who, having himself witnessed the execution of Mr. Donald Cargill, resolved from that moment to engage with his whole soul in the good cause. Having studied for the ministry in Holland, and received ordination, he returned to his native land that he might share with his persecuted brethren in their trials, and preach among them the unsearchable riches of Christ. Often, accordingly, were the Society People encouraged amid their severe hardships by his faithful instructions. Danger and persecution everywhere awaited him, but he was ready to endure hardness as a good soldier of Jesus Christ. In 1683, at the early age of twenty-six, he died on the scaffold with a heroism and unflinching fortitude worthy of the last of that noble band of martyrs who sealed with their blood their devoted attachment to the work of Covenanted Reformation in Scotland.

The deeper the darkness, the nearer the dawn. On the death of Charles II in 1685, his brother James ascended the throne. At heart a bigoted adherent of the Church of Rome, he sought to restore popery to the ascendant both in England and Scotland. In making the attempt, however, he rushed upon his own ruin. He fell a victim to his own infatuated policy. After bearing for a time with his tyranny, an indignant people rose as one man, and hurled him from his throne, substituting in his place William and Mary, prince and princess of Orange, who, in the Revolution of 1688, restored civil and religious liberty to an oppressed and persecuted people, tc a greater extent than had ever before been enjoyed.

The arrival of the prince of Orange in England was hailed by all classes of Presbyterians in Scotland as an event likely to be fraught with blessings to their distracted country. Lord Macaulay, in his *History of England*, indeed, strangely accuses the Society People of eagerness to disown William. So far is this charge from being well founded, that they were the first to own and hail him as their deliverer. Thus in the "Memorial of Grievances" issued by the societies, they declare, "We have given as good evidence of our being willing to be subject to king William as we gave before of our being unwilling to be slaves to king James. Upon the first report of the prince of Orange's expedition, we owned his quarrel, even while the

prelatic faction were in arms to oppose his coming. In all our meetings we prayed openly for the success of his arms, when in all the churches prayers were made for his ruin; nay, when, even in the indulged meetings, prayers were offered for the popish tyrant whom we prayed against, and the prince came to oppose. We also associated ourselves, early binding ourselves to promote his interest, and were the first who openly armed and declared our desire to join with him." But while the Society People welcomed William as an expected deliverer, they openly dissented from the Revolution settlement as detective in various points. In particular, the Covenant, so far from being adopted either in the letter or in the spirit by the State, was not even owned by the Church; and the monarch took oaths in express contradiction to it. Presbyterianism, so far from being established in all his majesty's dominions, was only established in Scotland, and that under Erastian conditions, while prelacy was established in England and Ireland, and the king himself became an Episcopalian. The establishment of these different forms of Church government in different parts of the British dominions was effected by the sole authority of the king and Parliament, even before the Assembly of the Church was permitted to meet; and thus the principle of the royal supremacy over the Church continued to be asserted, and was even incorporated with the Revolution settlement. The principal objections, then, which the Society People alleged against the Revolution settlement were.

(1) that as it left the Acts Rescissory in full force, it cancelled the attainments of the Second Reformation together with the Covenants; and

(2) that the civil rulers usurped an authority over the Church which virtually destroyed her spiritual independence, and was at variance with the sole headship of the Redeemer himself.

The defects of the Revolution settlement were due partly to William's Erastian policy, and his desire to retain the prelatic clergy within the Established Church of Scotland, but partly also to the temporizing policy of the Church itself. "'Though the acts of Parliament," as Dr. Hetherington justly remarks, "made no mention of the Second Reformation and the National Covenants, it was the direct duty of the Church to have declared her adherence to both; and though the State had still refused to recognize them, the Church would, by this avowal, have at least escaped from being justly exposed to the charge of having submitted to a violation of her own

sacred Covenants. In the same spirit of compromise, the Church showed herself but too ready to comply with the king's pernicious policy of including as many as possible of the prelatic clergy within the National Church. This was begun by the first General Assembly, and continued for several succeeding years, though not to the full extent wished by William, till a very considerable number of those men whose hands had been deeply dyed in the guilt of the persecution were received into the bosom of that Church which they had so long striven utterly to destroy. It was absolutely impossible that such men could become true Presbyterians; and the very alacrity with which many of them subscribed the Confession of Faith only proved the more clearly that they were void of either faith or honor. Their admission into the Presbyterian Church of Scotland was the most fatal event which ever occurred in the strange, eventful history of that Church." It was not to be expected that the Society People could approve of the conduct either of the king or of the Church in the matter of the Revolution settlement. They occupied, accordingly, an attitude of firm and decided protest against the principles avowed by William and acted on by the Church; and they maintained that there had been a decided departure on the part of both the one and the other from the principles of the Second Reformation and the obligations of the Covenant.

Holding such views, it was impossible for the Society People to incorporate themselves with the Established Church of Scotland. They were compelled, therefore, to occupy a separate position as Dissenters from a Church whose constitution was radically vitiated, and as protesters against a professedly national government which had violated the most solemn national obligations. Three Cameronian ministers, it is true— Messrs. Shields, Linning and Boyd— applied for admission into the National Church for themselves and their people, on condition that they might acknowledge breach of Covenant, and purge out the ignorant and heterodox and scandalous ministers who had taken part in shedding the blood of the saints. But every proposal of this nature was rejected. After unsuccessful efforts to obtain redress, they at last submitted and the people who had adhered to them remained in a state of dissent.

For upwards of sixteen years after the avowal of their peculiar principles, the strict Presbyterians had remained without a stated ministry, or without any separate organization as a Church. In 1681, however, societies were formed which, though exercising no ecclesiastical functions, tended to give unity to the body, and to make such arrangements as were necessary for

the maintenance of worship and ordinances, encouraging at the same time among the people a devoted attachment to Reformation principles. Availing themselves of these praying societies for nearly twenty years after the Revolution, the people waited patiently until the Lord should send them pastors. At length, in 1707, their wishes and prayers were answered, the Rev. John M'Millan, of Balmnaghie, having resigned connection with the Established Church, and joined himself to their body. For a few years before, he had been contending within the pale of the Church for the whole of the Covenanted Reformation; but instead of meeting with sympathy from his brethren, he was hastily and irregularly deposed. Having joined the Society People, he labored for many years in the work of the ministry among them with indefatigable earnestness and zeal, maintaining the principles of the Second Reformation till his dying day.

Soon after the secession of Mr. M'Millan from the Established Church. he was joined by Mr. John M'Neil, a licentiate, who, having adopted Cameronian views, had also seceded. These two faithful and zealous servants of Christ traversed the country, preaching everywhere, and encouraging the adherents of the Covenant. In 1712 the Covenants were renewed at Auchensaugh. Amid many trials and persecutions the cause went steadily forward; and in 1743 Mr. M'Millan, who had hitherto stood alone as an ordained minister, Mr. M'Neil never having been ordained for want of a presbytery, was joined by the Rev. Thomas Nairn, who had left the Secession Church in consequence of his having embraced Cameronian views. There being now two ministers, a meeting was held at Braehead on Aug. 1, 1743, when a presbytery was for the first time formed under the name of the "Reformed Presbytery."

One of the first acts of the newly organized Church was to dispatch missionaries to Ireland, and by the blessing of God upon the labors of these men, and others who speedily followed, a fully organized and independent section of the Reformed Presbyterian Church was formed in the sister isle.

In Scotland a Declaration and Testimony was published in 1741, and the Covenants were renewed in1 1745, at Crawford-John, in Lanarkshire; but notwithstanding these steps, which were so well fitted to promote unity of sentiment and feeling, a few years only had elapsed when a division took place in the Reformed Presbytery, two of the brethren, Messrs. Hall and Innes, having separated from their communion in consequence of their having imbibed heretical opinions on the subject of the atonement. The two

brethren, after seceding from the Presbytery, forted themselves into a new presbytery at Edinburgh, which at length became extinct. The Reformed Presbytery, in reply to their misrepresentations, found it necessary to issue a treatise in defense of their proceedings in the case of the erring brethren, as well as in refutation of the doctrine of an indefinite atonement. In 1761 a very important step was taken by the Reformed Presbytery, the emission of a Testimony for the whole of the Covenanted Reformation as attained to and established in Great Britain and Ireland, particularly between the years 1638 and 1649 inclusive.

From this time the Reformed Presbyterian Church went steadily forward, adhering to their peculiar principles with unflinching tenacity; and amid much obloquy, misunderstanding, and even misrepresentation, from the other religious denominations around them, witnessing boldly, and without compromise, for a Covenanted Reformation. Their numbers in many parts of Scotland increased beyond the means of supplying them with ministers. This was unhappily the case, for a considerable time, in various districts of the country. But at length such was the increase of ministers connected with the body that in 1810 three presbyteries were formed, and in the year following a general synod was constituted for the supervision of these presbyteries. Since that time so rapidly has the denomination advanced in numbers that in tile year 1859 the synod included six presbyteries, which consisted in all of thirty-six ordained ministers and eight vacant congregations. The synod met annually either in Edinburgh or Glasgow. The Divinity Hall met during the months of August and September, when the students, in five sessions, received the instructions of two professors, one for systematic theology, and the other for Biblical literature and Church history.

In the year 1830 the synod resolved to commence the prosecution of missionary operations. Their attention was first directed to the colonial field, particularly to Canada. Nor have they been unmindful of foreign missions, three missionaries in connection with the synod being employed in New Hebrides. There has also been a missionary laboring since 1846 among the Jews in London.

These Presbyterians have been sometimes called Cameronians, from Richard Cameron; but they are otherwise called M’Millans,” or “M’Millauites,” from the name of the first minister who espoused their cause after the Revolution. But these, as well as the terms “Whigs” and

"Mountain Men," which are also occasionally applied to them, they regard as accidental epithets. They are sometimes also called "Covenanters," from their adherence to the National Covenant of Scotland, and to the Solemn League and Covenant of the three kingdoms. Their proper designation, however, or that which they themselves adopt, is that of "Reformed Presbyterians." They hold the Holy Scriptures to be the absolute rule of faith and conduct, and to contain the standard of these both in Church and State. Next to this they adopt the early standards of the Church of Scotland, the Westminster Confession of Faith, the Larger and Shorter Catechisms of the Church, the Books of Discipline, and the Westminster Directory for Public Worship. And, lastly, they regard the National Covenant of Scotland as a continuing obligation. To these are to be added the documents published by the body itself in explanation of their principles: namely, their *Judicial Act and Testimony*, the 5th edition of which was published at Glasgow in 1818; *A Short Account of the Old Presbyterian Dissenters*, published by authority of the Presbytery in 1806; and an *Explanation and Defense of the Terms of Communion* adopted by the Reformed Presbyterian Church. According to the statistical report made at the Synod in Glasgow, March 13, 1876, the Church included 42 congregations with 7500 members, and its annual contributions were £14,000. The synod then, by a vote of 57 to 6, adopted a resolution in favor of union with the Free Church, and such union was finally consummated in the General Assembly of that body, May 25, 1876.

The residuary Reformed Presbyterian Church musters in 1878 eight ministers who held back, and are still contending about their Church property. Thus the *Original Seceders*, popularly known as "Auld Lichts" (Old Lights), are a more considerable body. Though most of these joined the Free Church (as the true Church of Scotland free) in 1852, they have still some thirty congregations of poor but very worthy people, who consider it their mission to hold up the banner of the Covenants, and to *protest* against the all but universal defection of their time and country. At the union in 1852, Drs. Candlish and Thomson, of Edinburgh, White, of Haddington, and the younger M'Crie (whose father had been in former days the great pillar of the Old-Light community) were added to the Free Church. The present Old Lights are notably strict both in doctrine and practice. Unlike the New Lights, who ultimately went to form the United Presbyterian Church in 1847, they are stanch supporters of the Establishment principle, which the Free Church also upholds in theory. It is

chiefly the faithlessness of the latter with respect to the Covenants which prevents the residuary “Auld Lichts” from joining the communion. *SEE SCOTLAND, CHURCHES IN*; also Nos. 12 and 13 below.

5. UNITED ORIGINAL SECESSION CHURCH. — In common with all true Protestants, the Synod of United Original Seceders acknowledges the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the supreme and only rule of faith and practice. They claim to be a branch of the Reformed and Covenanted Church of Scotland, and adhere to the whole of the Westminster standards as these were received by the Church of Scotland as standards of union and uniformity for the churches in the three kingdoms, and feel themselves bound by the sacred pledge given in the Solemn League and Covenant to adhere to them as such. They thus take their stand upon the principles of the first and particularly of the second Reformation, which took place between the year 1638 and 1650, and which embodied in its proceedings and settlement all the valuable attainments of the first Reformation and carried them to a greater extent. They own the morality of public covenanting, and the continued and perpetual obligation of the National Covenant of Scotland, and of the Solemn League and Covenant, upon all ranks and classes in these lands, and acknowledge the duty of renewing these covenants in a bond suited to the circumstances. As Presbyterians, they hold that the Lord Jesus Christ, the alone king and head of his Church, has appointed a particular form of government to take place therein, distinct from civil government and not subordinate to the same, and that Presbyterial Church government is the only form laid down and appointed by the Lord Jesus Christ in his Word. As they believe that Church communion consists in the joint profession of the truths and observance of all the ordinances which Christ has appointed in his Word, and that the visible unity of the Church lies in the unity of her visible fellowship, they regard free communion as an obvious violation of that unity, and hold it to be unscriptural, and that the practice encourages persons to continue in corrupt communions, by leading them to conclude that there is no conscientious ground of difference between them and the persons who make no scruple of occasionally joining with them in the intimacies of Church fellowship. In the worship of God they make use of the Psalms of David only, believing that they were delivered to the Church by the Holy Spirit to be used as the matter of public praise, and they regard hymns of human composition as unsuitable to the worship of God, and

tending to endanger the purity both of the worship and the doctrines of the Church.

The Original Secession Synod dates its rise from 1733, and claims to represent the first seceders who in their testimony published in 1737 were careful to make it known that they were not dissenters from the National Church because of her civil establishment, but seceders from a corrupt and prevailing party in her judicatories, who carried on a general course of defection from the reformed and covenanting principles. The Original Secession Testimony, published in 1827, applies the principles of the Judicial Testimony to public events that had occurred up to the date of its publication, and like it was designed to be a declaration of the sense of the standards, and of the way in which they were received by the Reformed and Covenanted Church of Scotland. It is a term of ministerial and Christian communion in the body-that is, office-bearers are required to signify their approval of its principles, and members to accede to them, so far as they know and understand them.

The synod has from time to time been lessened by the separation of brethren. At present it consists of 41 congregations in Scotland, England, and Ireland; of these 29 (including one in England) are in connection with the synod in Scotland, and 12 constitute the Secession Synod in Ireland, in full communion with the Scottish Synod. The members and adherents are estimated at 6500. The income of the Scottish Synod last year amounted to about £5400.

The synod has several Home Mission stations, and also a prosperous Foreign Mission agency at Seoni, in India, under the immediate charge of Rev. George Anderson, who is assisted by two catechists. There is an orphanage in connection with the mission, having eleven children, who are well fed, clad, and educated, and it is expected that the number will shortly be materially increased. A school is also carried on, having 170 scholars, and four teachers in addition to the missionary, and one catechist; the children are instructed in English, Urdu, and Hindi. The synod is desirous of obtaining, and has ample funds for maintaining, another ordained missionary in India. The synod supports a divinity hall, which is carried on under the superintendence of the Rev. Prof. W. F. Aitken, A.M., and the Rev. Prof. James Spence. The library in connection with the hall has 1400 volumes. Under the editorship of the Rev. John Sturrock a bimonthly magazine is published having a circulation of 1200 copies.

6. PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN ENGLAND. — In the reign of queen Elizabeth there were two well-defined parties—the Prelatists, favored by the queen, who were satisfied with the reforms begun by king Edward; and the Presbyterians, who desired a simpler form of worship and government, like that set up by Calvin in Geneva. The first adherents of this form of Church government in England were those Protestants who returned from Frankfort, to which place they had fled for refuge in the reign of queen Mary. There they became acquainted with the Geneva platform, and, returning to their native country in the time of Elizabeth, they at first met in private houses, and afterwards more publicly, on which occasions the worship was conducted agreeably to the forms of the Geneva service-book. These latter were called Nonconformists, from their aversion to the established liturgy and hierarchy, and Puritans, from their anxiety for purity of life and worship. At the Convocation in 1562, the proposition to dispense with all ceremonies that had not the clear warrant of Scripture was lost by only one vote. Hallam says that the Puritan party outnumbered either the Roman Catholic or the Church of England, and that they composed the majority of Parliament under Elizabeth and her two successors (*Const. Hist. Engl*. ch. 4, n.). *SEE PURITANS*. They were taken up at the time with questions of doctrine and discipline, and with resistance to power exercised, as they believed, contrary to the Word of God. But they felt so much the constraint of circumstances, that they paid little heed to the development of their principles in Church government, and certainly had no thought of attempting to constitute a Church on the principles which they maintained, resting satisfied in giving effect to these principles by mere resistance in particular cases in which their consciences were aggrieved. Yet in 1572 a presbytery was formed at Wandsworth, in Surrey, by ministers of London and its neighborhood, separating from the Church of England; and other presbyteries were soon formed notwithstanding the extreme hostility of queen Elizabeth. Synods were now held occasionally. The court, looking to the episcopate as the support of its own supremacy, strove with all its might to maintain it unweakened, and enforced with reckless energy the bloody laws enacted against the Catholics on one side and the radical Protestant sects on the other. The king having established a liturgy calculated to set limits to the arbitrary freedom of Puritan worship, the Presbyterians set it down as a “worship of Baal” and a quenching of the Spirit of God. The dissension threatened to take the form of civil war, for the Presbyterians of England united with those of Scotland. On July 1, 1643, in obedience to a summons from

Parliament (which summons had been issued in consequence of a remonstrance of the Presbyterian divines against prelacy), the Westminster Assembly met in Westminster Abbey. This Assembly was composed of 121 English divines, 10 lords, 20 commoners, with 5 ministers and 5 elders representing the Church of Scotland. They drew up a Confession of Faith, commonly known as the Westminster Confession, a Form of Church Government, a Directory for Public Worship, and two Catechisms, the Larger and the Shorter, which were all approved by Parliament in 1648. Parliament then enacted an ordinance making Presbyterianism the established religion of England, but without attaching any penalties to nonconformity. A loud cry has been raised against the English Presbyterians on the alleged ground that, at this period of their history, their whole efforts were directed towards the attainment of Church power. "Now, what was this Church power," says the younger M'Crie, "which the Presbyterians were so anxious to secure, and which Neal would represent as 'a civil authority over men's persons and properties? Will it be believed that it was neither more nor less than the power of keeping back scandalous and unworthy persons from the ordinances of baptism and the Lord's Supper? This was, in fact, the great point in dispute between them and the Parliament; for the Parliament had insisted on having the supreme power in ecclesiastical matters, and had passed a law to the effect that if any person were refused admission to sealing ordinances by the Church courts, he might appeal to Parliament, which might, by virtue of its authority, compel the Church courts to receive him, whatever his character might be. The Presbyterians, as Neal himself admits, 'were dissatisfied with the men in power, because they would not leave the Church independent of the State.' And would Mr. Neal, himself an Independent, have had the Church to be dependent on the State? Would he have had the Presbyterians tamely submit to see the royal prerogatives of Christ assumed by a Parliament, after they had succeeded in wresting them out of the hands of a monarch against whom, for this very reason, the nation had long been engaged in a bloody war?"

The ordinance which they had secured from Parliament in 1648, however, never 'went into practical operation, for as soon as Cromwell and the Independents rose into power, they showed an uncompromising hostility to the Presbyterians. This was partly owing to the resistance the latter had made to the trial and execution of Charles I, insomuch that they had to be driven out of the House of Commons by force before those measures could

be effected. London and its neighborhood were, meanwhile, formed into twelve presbyteries, constituting the Provincial Synod of London, which continued to hold regular half-yearly meetings till 1655, the meetings of presbyteries being continued till a later date; but the whole Presbyterian system was overturned by Cromwell's Committee of Triers composed of thirty-eight persons of different sects, who were appointed in place of the Assembly for the examining and approving of all persons elected or nominated to any ecclesiastical office. Cromwell's policy aimed at bringing all ecclesiastical matters under the immediate control of the civil power.

On the Restoration. Charles II no sooner found himself firmly seated on the throne than he proved false to the Solemn League and Covenant which he had sworn to observe, restored prelacy to its former power, and gave ip the Presbyterians, who had exerted themselves for his return to persecution. The fruitless Savoy Conference (q.v.) was followed by the Act of Uniformity, which was carried into effect on St. Bartholomew's Day, Aug. 24, 1662. Two thousand conscientious ministers who would not consent to be episcopally re-ordained, to assent to the Book of Common Prayer, or to abjure the Solemn League and Covenant, were then ejected from their benefices, and wandered forth to a life of poverty. Sixty thousand of the laity were imprisoned or fined, 5000 of whom died in prison, and the fines, confiscations, and other consequent losses of property amounted to £2,000,000 sterling. *SEE NONCONFORMISTS*.

After the Revolution, and the passage of the Act of Toleration in 1689, Presbyterianism revived, chapels sprang up in every part of the kingdom, and within twenty-five years the Presbyterians numbered 800 congregations. They became one of the "three denominations" who received the recognition of the State and were permitted to petition the crown in a corporate capacity, and in the business meetings of deputies from these denominations the Presbyterians had two representatives for one Baptist and one Independent.

Prosperity, however, proved more injurious than persecution, and there was an abatement of zeal and spirituality. Besides this, another cause operated disastrously. In 1691 the Presbyterians were induced to enter into Articles of Agreement with the Independents. As a consequence, Presbyterian discipline began to be relaxed, the system was not carried out, the office of ruling elder was allowed to be dropped, the disuse of Church sessions naturally followed, presbyteries and synods were given up, the

churches became virtually independent, and finally Arian and Socinian errors infected the ministers and congregations to such all alarming extent that the name Presbyterian became synonymous in England with Socinian or Unitarian; old endowments, legacies of Presbyterians, being in many instances enjoyed by Unitarians. Notwithstanding the numerous Presbyterian houses of worship which had been erected, the organization of Presbyterianism was very imperfectly kept up. The “discipline” which has flourished so well in Scotland under the form of” Kirk Session” never obtained a firm footing in England, nor have the English Presbyterians ever possessed a completely organized system of presbyteries, synods, and General Assembly. Along with the extensive deviation from sound doctrine among the English Presbyterians there arose a strong feeling of discontent with the compulsory subscription of the Thirty-nine Articles which the Toleration Act required from all Dissenters. The subject was discussed in various pamphlets; and at length, constrained by the force of public opinion, government passed an act in 1779 by which every preacher or teacher of any congregation who scrupled to declare and subscribe his assent to any of the articles was allowed to make and subscribe instead thereof the declaration of Protestant belief, and was thereby entitled to similar exemptions. A subsequent statute renders qualifying in the case of Dissenters for the exercise of ministerial functions unnecessary, except in obedience to a legal requisition. But although forced subscription to the Articles was no longer required, the Protestant Dissenters, including the Presbyterians, still retained their own symbolic books which coincided in doctrine with the Thirty-nine Articles. Up to this time both Presbyterians and Congregationalists were in the habit of requiring confessions of faith at ordinations, and on such occasions ministers of both denominations frequently took part in the religious services. At the present day numbers of churches exist in England originally planted on a Presbyterian foundation, which are only Presbyterian in name, being, in fact. Socinian in faith and Independent in government. Probably there are not less than 170 such churches; but, protected by acts of Parliament and decisions of the lord-chancellors, they remain unmolested in the enjoyment of their endowments.

There existed, however, for some time in England a few congregations connected with the Church of Scotland and with the Scottish Secession Church. The former organized into a separate ecclesiastical body in 1836, but in 1843 a portion of this adhered to the Scottish Established Church,

while a portion, in sisterly alliance with the Free Church of Scotland, prosecuted its work in England on the footing of a Church with separate and independent jurisdiction. In 1872 the two bodies into which the English Presbyterians finally divided-the one then called The Presbyterian Church in England, the other United Presbyterians-presented the following relative strength:

	English Pres'b.	United Presb.	Total.
Presbyteries	7	5	12
Churches	132	105	237
Seitted ministers	123	90	213
Ruling elders	546	560	1,106
Communicants	23,966	17,861	41,827
Missionary and benevolent collections	£7,308	£7,781	£15,0S9
Stipends	£27,525	£18,487	£46,012

In 1876 the statistics presented at the fortieth meeting of the Synod of the English Presbyterian Church showed that the number of communicants was 29,045, the total amount of receipts for the year £98,484, and the amount of stipends paid £38,069. The income for home missions had been £2133. Seven new fields of labor had been occupied. The expenditures of the Foreign Mission Committee had been £8268 for the support of 12 missionaries in China, besides 3 at home for rest, 56 native evangelists, and 23 students. On June 18, 1876, the first Synod of The Presbyterian Church of England was constituted by the union of the two bodies. The United Church then consisted of 11 presbyteries, with 263 congregations; 50,000 members, with a yearly income of £160.000. Il 1877 the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of England comprised 258 congregations, distributed into 10 presbyteries, with a membership of 43,434 communicants. The entire income of the Church during that year, both congregational and synodical, inclusive of £6210 2s. from special sources, was £157,455 12s.

The schemes of the Church, placed under the charge of standing committees, are as follows:

1. *Home Missions*, including Church Extension, Evangelization, Temperance.

2. *Foreign Missions*. — Principally in China, where there are 15 European missionaries and 85 native evangelists, and 35 students in training. There are 106 stations in all, many of which have been organized as churches, situated in the districts of Amoy and Swatow and the island of Formosa. In connection with these there were, at the close of 1888, 3553 communicants. There is one missionary station in India. Many of the late United Presbyterian congregations maintain more or less their connection meanwhile, as was understood at the union, with the foreign missions ot their former Church. The committee aids missions in Germany, France, Belgium, Spain, Portugal, Italy, Bohemia, and Russia.

3. *Jewish Mission.* — The sphere of this work, with one missionary, the Rev. Thomas Meyer, is London, There is a mission-hall, with reading-room. The means used are domestic visitations, public meetings in the hall, prayer-meetings, and meetings with inquirers. Thirty-seven Jews, besides casual inquirers, were more or less under regular instruction in 1877. There were three baptisms.

4. *Education*. — A theological seminary is maintained in London. It has three professors: the Revs. Dr. Lorimer, Dr. Chalmers, and the Rev. Mr. Gibb (resident). A generous member of the Church, R. Barbour, Esq., of Manchester, having made provision for the endowment of an additional chair, the Church is taking steps for making appointment of another professor in 1878. The committee also takes charge of superintending and aiding a number of schools, especially in rural districts.

5. *Sabbath-schools*. — The committee reported to the Synod in 1877 348 schools, 5382 teachers, 51,185 scholars on the roll, of whom 20,271 are children of parents belonging to the Church, and 4510 are in senior classes. Much Christian work is done among the young by other means.

6. *Sustenation Fund*. — This was a scheme in operation, at the date of the union, in the Presbyterian Church in England only-the United Presbyterian Church aiding its weaker congregations by another plan. This necessitates now some transitional and imperfect action. The equal dividend for last

year to the congregations on the fund was £200, raising the minimum ministerial stipend to that amount. The whole sum paid as salaries was £63,214, of which forty percent passed through this fund.

7. *Publications*. — This committee issues the *Messenger* and *Children's Messenger*, monthly periodicals of the Church, and during the past year has prepared a memorial volume containing records of the union. It contemplates the continuance of instructive manuals, of which two have been published for the use of the Church.

Other provisions are: (a) Widows and Orphans Fund; (b) Church Building Committee; and (c) Aged and Infirm Ministers Fund. See Hume, *Hist. of England*; Neal, *Hist. of the Puritans*; *Sketch of the History and Principles of the Presbyterian Church in England* (Lond.); Hallam, *Constitutional History of England*; Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*; M'Crie, *Annals of English Presbyterianism* (1872).

7. PRESBYTERIAN CHURCIH IN IRELAND. — In Ireland as well as in England there was a strong Puritan section of the clergy holding Presbyterian principles during the earlier years of the 17th century, and the party was considerably strengthened by the settlement of Ulster by Scottish colonists during the reign of James I. Scottish ministers also carried over to Ireland their peculiar views. But the Presbyterian party was not consolidated into a separate community until the civil war broke out. The first Presbyterian minister who appeared in Ireland after the Reformation was the Rev. Walter Travers, the first regular provost of Trinity College, Dublin. He entered on his official duties in 1594; but, owing to the civil war in which the country was then involved, he did not remain long at the head of the university. Of those ministers who went to Ireland in the reign of James I, the earliest was Mr. Edward Brice, who became rector of Templecorran, near Carrickfergus, in the county of Antrim. About that time a number of Scotchmen obtained bishoprics in Ulster. These prelates, who had been brought up in the Presbyterian Church, and who had themselves been originally ordained by presbyters, were not at first disposed to exact conformity to the Episcopal ritual from the Scottish ministers settled around them. Thus it was that the ministers, though refusing to use the Liturgy, were permitted to preach in the parish churches and enjoy the tithes. But when the imperious Wentworth was placed at the head of the government of Ireland, a new policy was inaugurated. All the clergy were obliged to strict conformity; and in a few years all the

Presbyterian ministers were driven into exile. At the time of the horrid massacre in 1641, not one of them was in the country. Thus they most providentially escaped that catastrophe. In 1642, when a Scottish army arrived in Ulster to put down the rebellion, Presbyterianism obtained a permanent footing in Ireland, and, after various struggles, a Presbyterian Church was founded by the formation of a presbytery at Carrickfergus on the 10th of June, 1642. The Presbyterian population of Ulster was greatly increased in number by immigration from Scotland about the middle of the 17th century; and notwithstanding many difficulties, from the opposition of prelates and of the civil power, the Church continued to increase. While the civil war was going on in Scotland great numbers of the Scotch emigrated to the north of Ireland, and these made a still larger addition to the Presbyterian population, a strong bond being also established between the two communicants. For a time their ministers in Ireland were silenced by Cromwell because they refused to take the “engagement” of fidelity to the commonwealth; but for the last five or six years of his administration he treated the Irish Presbyterians with less severity, and at the Restoration they numbered nearly eighty congregations, with seventy ministers. Sixty-one of these were obliged to give up the benefices into which they had been placed (Jeremy Taylor deprived thirty-six in one day), and only seven out of the seventy conformed to the Episcopal establishment. Within a few years, however, the Presbyterians organized into a compact body as the Synod of Ulster, and it is a curious fact that the Presbyterian ministers received a pension from government, under Charles II, in 1672, which *regium donum* (q.v.), however, was not regularly paid, and soon ceased to be expected by the Presbyterian ministers. In the reign of William the *regium donum* was augmented, although only to the paltry amount in all of £1200 a year. The sum has since, however, been repeatedly augmented. With the disestablishment of the Episcopal Church of Ireland, under Gladstone’s ministry, the *regium donum* was discontinued, and the Presbyterian Church of Ireland is entirely relieved from State dependence. It was valued at fourteen years’ purchase, and the sum of nearly £600,000 was paid over therefore, thus securing the division among the ministers of nearly £30,000 a year of interest. In 1710 the synod of the Presbyterian Church resolved to institute the preaching of the Gospel to the Irish in their own language. During this period of its history the Irish Presbyterian Church experienced the utmost opposition from the High-Church party. Afterwards dissensions sprang up within it, and these with reference to the most important doctrines. Irish Presbyterians could not escape the

influence of the latitudinarian spirit which prevailed during the 18th century. Early in the reign of George I, some of their ministers began to speak ambiguously on doctrinal subjects, and to oppose subscription to the Westminster Confession of Faith. In consequence, in 1726, a schism took place among them, and the non-subscribers formed themselves into what was called "The Presbytery of Antrim." The separatists did not obtain much support from the mass of the Presbyterian population; but not a few who remained connected with the larger body, known as "The Synod of Ulster," exhibited very little zeal in upholding and propagating the sound theology of their forefathers. Meanwhile the Scotch Seceders, who appeared in Ireland shortly before the middle of the 18th century, did much to maintain purity of doctrine in the Northern province. Their congregations rapidly multiplied, and within little more than sixty years after the organization of their first church, there were upwards of ninety Secession ministers in Ulster. In 1761 the Rev. Matthew Lynd, the first Irish Covenanting minister, was ordained at Vow, near Rasharkin, in the county of Antrim. Owing very much to the growing laxity of doctrine and discipline in the Synod of Ulster, the Covenanters, or Reformed Presbyterians, continued, from this date till the close of the century, to make steady progress; and in 1792 their first Irish Presbytery was constituted. But early in the present century indications of a religious revival appeared in the Synod of Ulster, and when Arianism was openly avowed an earnest protest was raised against it. In 1829 the Arian controversy issued in the separation of the Unitarians from the great Northern Synod and immediately afterwards the Irish Presbyterian Church, as if invigorated with new life, commenced a prosperous career. Its congregations rapidly increased; its ministers exhibited new zeal and enterprise; and some of them attracted attention all over the empire as platform-speakers and pulpit orators. In 1835 the Synod of Ulster adopted an overture requiring unqualified subscription to the Westminster Confession of Faith from all its licentiates and ministers; and as the grounds of separation between this body and the Secession Synod were now removed, a union between them was happily consummated in 1840. The united body, which assumed the designation of "The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland," consisted, at the time of its incorporation, of 433 congregations. Ever since the date of this union, the Irish Presbyterian Church has occupied a more commanding position in the country. It has at present under its care about half a million of people, including a large proportion of the substantial farmers and merchants of

Ulster. Very few of the aristocracy were ever attached to it; but of late its members have been advancing steadily in social position; and at the present time it has in its communion seven members of Parliament, several considerable landed proprietors, and many gentlemen holding the commission of the peace.

The Remonstrant or Arian body has not increased in like proportion. After their withdrawal from the orthodox majority in 1829, the Unitarians formed themselves into an association which assumed the name of "The Remonstrant Synod of Ulster." This body has since maintained a lingering existence in the north of Ireland; but doctrinal laxity does not flourish among Presbyterians; and though the Unitarians call reckon some forty congregations in the island, their numbers, including the adherents of the Presbytery of Antrim, amount, according to the government census of 1871, only to 9373 individuals.

The Covenanters, or Reformed Presbyterians, who are all strict Calvinists, are considerably more numerous. There are besides a few congregations in Ireland connected with the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland, as well as a few others known by the designation of Seceders; but they form a very small item in the national census. The Irish Presbyterian Church now consists of about 600 congregations, and has not only displayed much zeal for the advancement of Protestantism in Ireland, but also of Christianity in other parts of the world. Immediately after its formation, the General Assembly inaugurated a Foreign Mission. India was selected as the scene of its missionary operations, and its agents have ever since been laboring there with encouraging success in Gujarat and Kattiawar. Connected with it there are now 10 ordained European missionaries, assisted by a staff of native catechists, colporteurs, and schoolteachers. Within the year 1888 there were 201 baptisms, and the total number connected with the native Church amounted to 2158 individuals. The mission has been maintained during the year 1888 at an expense of £13,054. Its operations have been recently extended to China, where three mission stations have been established. In addition to this mission the Presbyterian Church of Ireland supports a Jewish mission, a Continental and Colonial mission, and a mission for Soldiers and Sailors. In 1876 the Presbyterian Church in Ireland reported five synods, thirty-six presbyteries, 639 ministers, 78,445 families, and 107.262 communicants. The sustentation fund amounted to £122,000; the total ministerial income for the previous year was £513,000. The average salary of the ministers was £870. In the schools of the

National Board of Education, the Presbyterian children, in 1874, numbered 115,258, equal to about 11 per cent. A Presbyterian college (Magee College) was opened at Londonderry Oct. 10, 1865. In 1846, Mrs. Magee, widow of the Rev. William Magee, a Presbyterian minister, left £20,000 in trust for the erection and endowment of a Presbyterian college. This sum was allowed to accumulate for some years, until eventually the trustees were authorized, by a decree of the lord-chancellor, to select a convenient site at or near Londonderry. The Irish Society have granted an annual endowment of £250 to the chair of natural philosophy and mathematics, and £250 for five years towards the general expenses of the college. The Rev. Richard Dill, who died in 1858, bequeathed £5000 to establish two professorships. The appointment of the trustees is vested in the General Assembly. The professors are required to sign the Westminster Confession of Faith, but no religious test is prescribed for students. The majority of the Irish Presbyterian ministers are educated in the General Assembly's Theological College at Belfast. It has a faculty of six professors, but provides only a theological curriculum. The students attending it receive their undergraduate education in the adjoining Queen's College. The Assembly College has an attendance of from 70 to 150 students; the students of the younger college are not yet nearly so numerous. Previous to the passing of the Irish Church Act in 1869, a parliamentary grant of £1750 per annum sufficed for the maintenance of six professors, at £250 each, leaving £250 to defray the expense of management. The government, on the passing of the act, granted a sum of £43,976 as compensation; and the interest of this sum together with that on £5000 subscribed by friends of the institution, and the fees of the students, make up the annual income. Patrons have recently added prizes, worth from £20 to £50 per annum. A most valuable agency sustained by the Church and of comparatively recent establishment is the *Orphan Society*, which already supports 2400 poor children deprived of one or both of their parents, and has an annual revenue of about £9000. *SEE IRELAND*.

8. PRESBYTERIAN SYNOD OF SECEDERS IN IRELAND. — This denomination of Christians was formed by a union, which was effected in 1818, between the two sections of the Secession Church in Ireland, the Burghers and Antiburghers. From the commencement of the present century negotiations had been carried on with a view to the accomplishment of this most desirable object; but such negotiations had uniformly failed, from the circumstance that the Antiburghers, who were

subject to the general synod in Scotland, had been prevented by that court from taking effective steps in the matter. At length, however, they resolved to act independently of the Scottish judicatory, and the two synods of Seceders in Ireland, having agreed upon a basis of union, met at Cookstown July 9,1818, and formed themselves into one body under the designation of "The Presbyterian Synod of Ireland, distinguished by the name Seceders." The ministers of the united synod at this period amounted in number to 97. The basis on which the union rested consisted of the six following points:

"**1.** To declare their constant and inviolable attachment to their already approved and recognized standards; namely, the Westminster Confession of Faith, Larger and Shorter Catechisms, Directory for Worship, and Form of Presbyterian Church government, with the Original Secession Testimony.

"**2.** That, as they unite under the banner of a testimony, they are determined, in all times coming, as their forefathers have set them the example, to assert the truth when it is injured or opposed, and to condemn and testify against error and immorality whenever they may seem to prevail.

"**3.** To cancel the name of Burgher and Antiburgher forever, and to unite the two synods into one, to be known by the name 'The Presbyterian Synod of Ireland, distinguished by the name Seceders.'

"**4.** To declare their insubordination to any other ecclesiastical court, while, at the same time, they do hereby signify their hearty inclination to hold a correspondence with their sister Church in Scotland or elsewhere, for their mutual edification; but think it expedient not to lay themselves under any restrictions as to the manner of said correspondence.

"**5.** To allow all the presbyteries and congregations in their connection to bear the same name, and, in the meantime, stand as they were before the coalescence.

"**6.** Carefully to preserve all the public records of the two synods from their formation in this kingdom till the present day."

This union was the means of imparting considerable strength and vigor to the Secession Church in Ireland. A home mission was now commenced,

and the cause of Presbyterianism began to flourish in various towns and villages where it had been hitherto unknown. The whole proceedings of this Church were characterized by a high regard to purity of doctrine and the advancement of vital religion. The Irish Presbyterian Church, on the contrary, had long been hindered in its progress by the prevalence of Arian and Socinian doctrines, both among its ministers and people. By the divine blessing, however, they were at length enabled to rid themselves of the New-Light party; and, to secure uniformity of teaching in the Church, they passed an overture requiring absolute subscription to the Confession of Faith. The general synod was now, in almost all respects, assimilated to the Irish Secession Church, and the proposal of a union between the two was seriously entertained. An arrangement in regard to the *regium donum* made in 1838 paved the way for its completion, government having in that year agreed to equalize the bounty, and on certain conditions to grant £75, late Irish currency, per annum, to every minister connected with the two synods. Being thus placed on an equal footing by the government, and agreed both in doctrine and Church polity, the great obstacles to a complete incorporation of the two churches were thus removed.

The first movement towards union had taken place among the theological students of both churches attending the Belfast Academical Institution, who had established among themselves a united prayer-meeting. The desire for union, and a strong feeling of its propriety, rapidly spread both among ministers and people. Memorials on the subject, accordingly, were presented to the Synod of Ulster, and the Secession Synod, at their respective meetings in 1839. Committees were appointed by the two synods, and, the matter having been fully considered and preliminaries adjusted, the final act of incorporation took place at Belfast on July 10, 1840, the united body taking to itself the name of the *Presbyterian Church in Ireland*. *SEE IRELAND*.

9. WELSH CALVINISTIC METHODISTS. — This body of believers is sometimes ranked among Presbyterians, because its form of Church government is a *modified* Presbyterianism. Each Church manages its own affairs, admits or expels members by the vote of the majority of those who belong to it, but this is rather Congregational than Presbyterian. It, however, allows an appeal from the decision of the individual Church to the monthly meeting of the county or presbytery to which it belongs, and then there is an appeal from the monthly meeting to the quarterly association of the province. Matters are finally disposed of as follows:

those relating to South Wales by the South Wales Association, and so of the North; but a few years ago a General Assembly of the whole connection was established, and the two associations may agree to refer matters to that body, which meets once a year, for final decision. Its Confession of Faith is, of course, strictly Calvinistic. *SEE METHODISM* (vol. 6:p. 156, col. 6).

10. PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES. — The denomination commonly known by this name, both on account of its numerical superiority and its priority of organization, derived its origin from the Presbyterians of Scotland and Ireland, and particularly the latter, with a considerable infusion of French Huguenots, Dutch and German Reformed emigrants. Many fugitives from persecution in the mother country took refuge in the more liberal colonies of Pennsylvania, Maryland, New Jersey, Virginia, and the Carolinas. Francis Makemie, who may be called the founder of American Presbyterianism, was an Irishman, who several years before the close of the 17th century had gathered churches in Maryland. For several years before the organization of the first presbytery, his most intimate ministerial friend was Jedediah Andrews. The earliest traces of Church organizations of a trustworthy character indicate a congregation gathered in Upper Marlborough, Md. in 1690, and others collected by Mr. Makemie in the same colony about the same date, if not as early as 1684-one in Freehold, N. J., called the Scotch Meeting-house, in 1692; and one in Philadelphia, under the care of Mr. Andrews, in 1698. The Presbytery of Philadelphia is supposed to have been formed about the year ‘1705, if not before, this uncertainty arising from the first page of the manuscript minutes being lost. It was composed of seven ministers-Samuel Davis, John Hampton, Francis Makemie, and George M’Nish, from Ireland; Nathaniel Taylor and John Wilson, from Scotland; and Jedediah Andrews, from New England. The growth of the body was so rapid as to justify, in 1716, the formation of the Synod of Philadelphia, consisting of three presbyteries. The presbytery of Philadelphia had six ministers and six churches; that of Newcastle six ministers and churches; that of Snowhill three ministers and churches; and that of Long Island two ministers and several churches — in all twenty-three ministers and more than that number of congregations.

The Adopting Act was passed in 1729, designed to announce the Westminster Confession and Catechisms as the standards of the Church more formally than had ever yet been done. The bearing of this act has

been of late years sharply discussed. It may be found in the printed minutes. It was a compromise measure accepted in consequence of the agitation which had been occasioned by the Irish presbyters. These had been in the midst of an exciting controversy against the intrusion of Arian principles into the Presbyterian Church of Ireland, and had come over determined to suffer no looseness of subscription to the standards of faith. The Adopting Act occasioned, therefore, not a little controversy. The non-subscribers in sentiment disliked even the general terms of the Adopting Act, while the others desired the adoption of the *ipsissima verba* of the standards. Though the measure was finally a compromise, it failed to set differences at rest. They continued to develop, and became manifest in connection with certain synodical action on ministerial education, and ripened until they resulted in one or two secessions, which prepared the way for the establishment in this country of a branch of the *Associate Presbyterian Church*. In 1739, party feelings were revived by the visit of Whitefield, and the synod was divided into those who were known as friends or enemies of the revival. By 1741 the controversy resulted in a schism, by which the body was rent into two synods-that of the Old Side party, called the Synod of Philadelphia; that of the New, called the Synod of New York. The principal cause of the division was the insisting of the Old Side on a thoroughly educated ministry, while the New laid more stress on piety and zeal. There was no difference of opinion as to doctrine or discipline. Gilbert Tennant, the friend of Whitefield, was the leader and master spirit of the New branch, and published several sermons and pamphlets, very severe in their tone. After a separation of thirteen years, passion and party feeling cooled down, the leaders were disposed to make mutual concessions, past errors and mistakes were frankly confessed, and the two synods became again united, May 29, 1758, under the style and title of “the Synod of New York and Philadelphia,” comprising ninety-four ministers. During the half century of existence that had now closed, the Church had taken some important steps. It had committed itself, for instance, to a polity distinctly Presbyterian, it had adopted Calvinistic doctrinal standards, and had set up a high standard of ministerial education. Nor were these things needless, or done too soon. A stream of population was rapidly flowing westward, having on its front line settlers of very diverse characters. Some were men of such lawless habits that they could no longer stay in orderly communities; others loved the wild excitements of frontier life, and others thought only of bettering their temporal condition by obtaining homes in the new lands. All classes were very poor. Indians

were numerous, causing the preacher to carry his rifle as well as his Bible-while State Church opposition added to the difficulties of the Presbyterian evangelist. Only men of education-men of energy, fill of zeal and of varied resource, could have even held their own in the face of such hindrances. Such men the Presbyterian Church desired to have in its ministry, nor desired in vain. Many of its early preachers-the Tennants of New Jersey, Brainerd of the Indian Mission, Davies of Virginia, and a host of others, have been pre-eminent for ministerial efficiency, and will assuredly be held in everlasting remembrance. While the Church was thus supplying the Gospel in sparsely peopled districts and forming new presbyteries in every direction, it was led to enter into such relations with the Congregationalists as materially influenced its after-course. For some years before the Revolution, the Colonial Episcopal Church had sought to obtain a legal Establishment. Fearing the success of its efforts, the synod agreed in 1766 to meet in annual convention with the General Association of Connecticut, "to unite their endeavors and counsels for spreading the Gospel and preserving the religious liberties of the churches." This arrangement was carried out until the outbreak of I war in 1776 interrupted the intercourse.

When the war of the Revolution broke out, the Presbyterians, to a man, arrayed themselves on the side of the patriots-which may, at least in part, be explained by the fear, which they shared in common with the Congregationalists of New England, that there was a design to introduce bishops and establish an oppressive and odious hierarchy in the colonies. During the Revolutionary war, in common with all religious interests, the Presbyterian Church suffered greatly. Many of its church buildings were destroyed, and not a few congregations disorganized, yet its vitality remained unbroken. Rallying quickly on the return of peace new interest in religious ordinances was manifested by the people, and synodical meetings were better attended by the ministers.

In 1785, steps were taken for revising the standards of the Church and organizing a General Assembly. A committee consisting of Drs. Witherspoon, Rodgers, Robert Smith, Patrick Allison, Samuel Stanhope Smith, John Woodhull, Robert Cooper, James Latta, George Duffield, and Matthew Wilson, was appointed "to take into consideration the constitution of the Church of Scotland and other Protestant churches," and to form a complete system for the organization of the Presbyterian Church in the United States. In May, 1788, the synod convened and resolved itself into a General Assembly, which had its first meeting the following year,

embracing four synods (New York and New Jersey, Philadelphia, Virginia, and the Carolinas), 17 presbyteries, 419 congregations, and 180 ministers. By this assembly the Westminster Confession of Faith was adopted with three slight alterations (in chapters 20:23:and 31), and the Larger and Shorter Catechisms with but a single alteration, while the form of government and discipline of the Scottish Church was so modified as to discountenance the right of the civil magistrate to interfere in the affairs of the Church except for the purpose of protection alone. Shortly after the war, the Presbyterian ministers renewed their friendly relations with the Congregationalists. In 1792 the General Assembly and the Association of Connecticut agreed that each denomination should be represented in the annual meetings of the other by three commissioners, an agreement that afterwards embraced the general associations of Vermont, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts. In 1794 these representatives were allowed to vote on all matters under discussion. All these measures prepared the way for the adoption, in 1801, by both parties of the "Plan of Union." Under this arrangement a congregation, Congregational in polity, might have installed as its pastor a Presbyterian minister who still retained his seat in the presbytery, and was personally responsible thereto, and be itself represented in that court not by an elder, but by a committeeman or delegate chosen from its membership. On the other hand, a congregation Presbyterian in its polity, connected with a presbytery and represented therein by an elder, might have installed over it as pastor a Congregational minister who remained a member of some Congregational association. This procedure was the fruit partly of the co-operations of the previous years, but it made Presbyterianism less systematic in its movements and less authoritative in its administration, as we shall see presently. During the earlier years of the present century, there appeared in the southern and western portions of the Church striking manifestations of religious interest, having, in many cases, singular physical accompaniments. In connection with these, zeal outran discretion; strange doctrines were soon taught; presbyterial order was violated, and confusion became widespread. Ultimately these things led to the withdrawal of some of the offenders and the removal of others from the Presbyterian Church, and the formation in 1811 of what is now known as "The Cumberland Presbyterian Church." (See No. 11 below.)

The increase of the Church was rapid, and by 1834 it contained 22 synods, 111 presbyteries, and about 1900 ministers. But only four years later (in

1838) Presbyterianism suddenly encountered a severe reverse by a widespread schism, for which the materials had been gathering for several years. In 1822, the Synod of the Associate Reformed Church having been brought, under the lead of Dr. John M. Mason, to favor union with the Presbyterian Church, that union took place; but a very considerable minority refused to acquiesce in the measure, and retained a separate existence. During the fifteen years that followed, the growth of the Church was unprecedentedly rapid. New churches and presbyteries were multiplied in the Middle and Western States, Already measures had been adopted (1812) which re suited in establishing Princeton Seminary, Union Seminary in Virginia, and, though unendowed, the Southern and Western at Marysville, Tenn. Auburn followed in 1816; the Western at Allegheny City and Lane at Cincinnati in 1726-27; Columbia, S. C., and Danville, Ky., in 1828; and Union at New York in 1836. The accessions from New England, at the time in full theological sympathy with the Presbyterian Church, were provided for by the "Plan of Union" agreed to by the General Association of Connecticut and the General Assembly in 1801. It aimed to secure the rights and the harmonious co-operation of two denominations entering the same field. For nearly a quarter of a century no fault was found with it; but it led to the representation in Presbytery and General Assembly of committeemen from Congregational churches, and these were found to favor voluntary missionary societies not under the Assembly's control. Of these societies, that for home missions, within a few years after its organization in 1826, had several hundred missionaries under its patronage. Most of these were from New England, and many of them were alike opposed to Church boards and in sympathy with "New Haven theology." Parties were thus formed in the Church, and the agitation on the subject of slavery, springing up at that time, tended to increase the alienation.

The crisis came in 1837. Two parties were arrayed against each other, known as the Old and New Schools. In general, it may perhaps be said that the division was one of sentiment between the more progressive and the more conservative members of the Church. In the Old there was more of a leaning to the strict views of the Scotch Church on doctrine and discipline; in the New, the preference was as decidedly in favor of the laxer and more latitudinarian practice of New England, from which region many of the party had originally come. The New Lights wished to bear a decided testimony against slavery; the Old Lights thought that duty did not require any action of the Church on that subject; the former wished to unite with

other denominations in Christian work through voluntary societies; the latter believed that such work could be more efficiently and economically conducted by their denomination through boards which should be under its own control. Instead of brotherly love, bickerings and heart-burnings now prevailed; the General Assembly was an arena of constant strife; each party, as it obtained an accidental majority, set itself to work to nullify the measures of its opponents. The Old School made ineffectual attempts to try and condemn Drs. Barnes, Beecher, and Duffield for publishing heterodox opinions; the New School stood up for "substance of doctrine," and for the Great Voluntary or National Societies in opposition to denominational action. Confident in superior numbers and strategy, the latter anticipated an easy victory, and refused any concessions. The Old School, crippled on every side, and chagrined at being cast into the shade, held conventions to decide upon their future course. In 1834 appeared "The Act and Testimony," drafted by Rev. Robert J. Breckinridge, complaining of the prevalence of doctrinal errors, the relaxation of discipline, and the violation of Church order. The signatures amounted to 2075. In 1837 another convention, meeting a week before the General Assembly, prepared a testimony and memorial to be laid before the Assembly, in which they testified against sixteen doctrinal errors, ten variations from Presbyterian order, and five declensions in Christian discipline, and proposed a method of reform. The Old-School party, finding themselves that year (the first for five years) in the majority, adopted the suggestions of the memorial as a basis of action, and pressed matters to a speedy issue. They established a Board of Foreign Missions, dissolved the Elective Affinity Presbytery, abrogated the Plan of Union of 1801 with the Congregational bodies, and disowned (or, as the New-School party termed it, exscinded) the four synods of Genesee, Geneva, Utica, and Western Reserve as un-Presbyterian in their composition. The next year (1838) both parties made strenuous exertions for the ascendency in the Assembly. Upon calling the roll, it was found that the delegates from the four synods were not recognized, nor would the moderator, Dr. Elliott, entertain any motion in their behalf. Hereupon, according to a concerted plan, the commissioners from the four synods and those who sympathized with them protested against the moderator's decision, and proceeded to make a new organization and elect new officers, after which they withdrew in a body to another place, and there held their sittings as the true Constitutional Assembly, and, among other things, elected several trustees of the property of the corporation. These trustees, being subsequently

refused admission into the board, instituted legal proceedings, and received a verdict in their favor. The case being taken up to the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, chief justice Gibson ordered a new trial. This, however, was never had, the rulings being such as to completely set aside the decision of judge Rogers in the inferior court, and after a few years the suit was withdrawn. The New School declared themselves satisfied with the moral effect of the trial, and with a later decision of the chief justice in the York case. The two bodies went on as separate denominations, though each claimed to have the genuine constitutional succession, and employed the same style and title, "The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America." Both of these churches were extended over the whole of the United States, and both of them had missions in different parts of the heathen world, their collections for missions forming a large part of the contributions for that object from the United States of America. The Old-School Presbyterians possessed the following theological seminaries: Princeton (Princeton, N. J.), Western (Allegheny City, Pa.), Columbia (Columbia, S. C.), Danville (Danville, Ky.), and Northwest (Chicago, Ill.). The New- School Presbyterians held the Union (New York City), Auburn (Auburn, N.Y.), Lane (near Cincinnati, O.), Blackburn (Carlinville, Ill.), and Lind (Chicago, Ill.). The Old and New School Presbyterian churches were reunited in 1871. At that time the former comprised 2381 ministers, 2740 churches, and 258,903 communicants; and the latter, 1848 ministers, 1631 churches, and 172,560 communicants.

The theological history of the Old-School Presbyterian Church for the thirty-two years of its separate existence may be presented in a very few words. It was left by the separation in a state of almost unprecedented doctrinal homogeneity. One may well doubt whether any other Christian communion of equal size has ever excelled it as to unity in the reception of an evangelical creed of such extent as the Westminster Confession and Catechisms. Differences of opinion, even among its ministers, have, of course, existed; but these differences were comparatively trifling, or of very little prominence or prevalence. If in any quarter serious error was adopted, for the most part it must have been kept secret, or have been known to but a few. No agitating discipline on this ground was exercised, or, to the knowledge of the Church at large, needed. "Princeton theology," as it has often been called, was, beyond question, almost universally prevalent among the Old-School Presbyterians. If opposing systems must take a modern nomenclature, there may be no harm in making Princeton

and New Haven respectively the synonyms of the Old and the New Divinity; but it should be remembered that the text-books of Princeton have constantly been the simple Westminster symbols, and such long and generally approved systematic presentations of the reformed theology as the *Institutio Theologic Eclenchticae* of Franciscus Turretin. Old-School men have been slow to admit the idea of any possible improvement in the generally received system of Gospel truth. Recognizing fully the recent progress made in Biblical criticism and exegesis—the fact, too, that from time to time fuller and more exact statements of Christian doctrine may be, as they have been, elaborated—and by no means maintaining that any uninspired man has been wholly free from error, they have, nevertheless, rejected with singular unanimity the assumption that any part of the substance of the Gospel had lain hidden in Holy Scripture until modern times, or that the Church of Christ has new discoveries to make as to the system of truth in Jesus. A well-known Presbyterian quarterly publication-one identified with it from the beginning -has lately said, “It has been the honest endeavor of its conductors to exhibit and defend the doctrines of our standards, under the abiding conviction that they are the doctrines of the Word of God. They have advanced no new theories, and have never aimed at originality. Whether it be a ground of reproach or of approbation, it is believed to be true that an original idea in theology is not to be found on its pages from the beginning until now.” And this praise or blame may be said to belong to the Old-School Church in general as distinctively as to the publication from which it has been quoted. The interval of separation was one of very marked literary activity in the Old-School body. Some thirty original volumes, from this source, of comment upon various portions of Holy Scripture appeared; and a very large number of important works, biographical, historical, dogmatical, practical, and miscellaneous. Probably no other denomination in the United States has produced within the same period so many theological books of standard value.

A deep conviction of the Church’s duty to carry on, through strictly ecclesiastical agencies, the work of foreign missions, had led the Synod of Pittsburgh, as early as 1831, to organize itself for this purpose as the Western Foreign Missionary Society. The New School had refused to consummate the desires and plans of the Old, by taking this enterprise under the care of the whole Church; but the Assembly of 1837 accepted the trust, establishing in New York City the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions. By the Assembly of 1838 a Board of Publication was appointed,

to which were transferred the property and business of the Presbyterian Tract and Sabbath-school Book Society, organized by the Synod of Philadelphia a few years before. The Assembly of 1839, the fiftieth year having now been completed since this supreme judicatory had first convened, recommended the second Sabbath of December for a semi-centenary celebration, a day of jubilee and thanksgiving for past mercies, and the offering at that time, by all the members of the Church, of gifts for the endowment of the new board. The fund raised reached the sum of $40,000. This sum, with about $28,000 donated for building purposes a few years later, has been the nucleus of all that board's permanent property. Before the division, two boards had been organized the Board of Missions, now of Domestic Missions, for the home work, in 1816; and, in 1819, the Board of Education, to aid candidates for the ministry; both located in Philadelphia. These had been fostered by the Old School, while, as a party, the New School had preferred the American Home Missionary Society and the American Education Society, voluntary associations, in which Congregationalists participated. The Board of Missions had, in 1844, the business of church extension or church erection added to its other operations. This was carried on by a special committee, which, ten years afterwards, for greater effect, was enlarged. But in 1855 an independent committee of church extension was established at St. Louis, the name of which was changed, in 1860, to that of the Board of Church Building, then the Board of Church Extension. Two other departments of Christian liberality and effort have been committed to similar agencies. For more than a century and a half the Presbyterian Church has systematically raised funds for the relief of disabled ministers and their families. But in 1849 the General Assembly ordered collections for this purpose to be disbursed by the Board of Publication, a business transferred in 1852 to its own trustees; and in 1861 a secretary was appointed to devote his time mainly to this enterprise, which has since more prosperously advanced. In 1864, the condition of the freedmen at the South demanding immediate attention, two committees — one in Philadelphia, the other in Indianapolis- were appointed to take charge of educational and general evangelistic work among this class; and the next year, in place of the two, a single committee on freedmen was established and located at Pittsburgh. Various arrangements and changes have been made to secure to the boards the advantage of periodical publications to disseminate intelligence of their work through the churches. The latest accounts show a circulation of 16,000 copies of the Monthly Record; nearly 100,000 of the Sabbath-

School Visitor of the Month; and 3500 of the pamphlet, with almost 52,000 of the newspaper edition, both monthly, of the Foreign Missionary; besides many thousands of the several yearly reports and of various occasional issues. From about 1849 the project of a weekly religious paper, like the Methodist Advocate, was pressed upon the Assembly for several years successively, but without effect. Yet the Church has always acknowledged the unspeakable importance of religious papers, many of which have been established by private enterprise.

The several departments of self-development in the New-School section at the time of union were as follows:

(1.) "The Presbyterian Committee of Horne Missions." It steadily increased in efficiency. Its receipts the first year were $27,244, and the number of its missionaries 195. In 1889 it had 1592 missionaries and an income of $885,518. Its missionaries reported 160 new churches formed during the year; 12,000 hopeful conversions, and 10,490 added to the churches on profession of their faith. The freedmen's department, organized in 1865, received and expended during the year 1888 $113,082; and reported 375 teachers employed and 20 others under appointment, all in the Southern States.

(2.) The "Trustees of the Church Erection Fund", appointed in 1854 were incorporated by the Legislature of the State of New York in the year following. The original basis of their operations was the permanent fund of $100,000, raised by contributions from the churches, most of it in the year 1854, the *interest* to be employed in promoting the object *chiefly* in the way of loans. The establishment of this fund operated as a strong bond of union in the Church. In the year 1866 the basis was enlarged and an annual contribution and freer disbursements were ordered. Since that time this organization has been rapidly growing in importance, and now stands in the very first rank of the evangelizing agencies of the Church. In 1889 it reported an income of $125,202, and number of churches aided 185.

(3.) The "Permanent Committee on Education for the Ministry," organized in 1856, came slowly into operation, molding its plans gradually and embarrassed by the remains of the old voluntary system. In 1889 its income amounted to $155,843, and the number of its beneficiaries to 772-viz., 326 in the theological, 387 in the collegiate, and 59 in the preparatory department.

(4.) The "Committee on Doctrinal Tracts," organized in 1852, became the "Presbyterian Publication Committee." In 1889 its income from all sources was $337,787, of which $37,057 was expended in its purely benevolent work.

(5.) The "Trustees of the Presbyterian House," located in Philadelphia, and incorporated by the Legislature of Pennsylvania to care for a valuable property purchased chiefly by donations made by individuals in the city of Philadelphia, now estimated to be worth more than $100,000. Under their charge has been placed the Ministerial Relief Fund, managed by an executive committee which commenced its operations in 1864. In 1889 they reported $127,502 received from ordinary sources, and $595,734 as a special donation towards a permanent fund; also 223 disabled ministers, 341 widows, and 33 families of orphans aided. The average age of the ministers was 76 years, and the time of their ministry 40 years. The Assembly sustained also a Permanent Committee on Foreign Missions, whose functions were not the raising and distributing of funds or the conducting of missions, but the supervising of the work and reporting the results to the Assembly. From their report in 1889 it appears that contributions for that year to the American Board were, in money, about $709,735, and in laborers 71-viz. 52 male and 19 female missionaries. In 1867 the contributions were $110,725; in 1868, $110,602.

The beginning of a theological school for the education of ministers for the Germans, in which instruction is to be given both in German and English, has been made at Bloomfield, N. J., with encouraging success. The periodical literature of the New-School Church deserves honorable mention. Besides other local papers, the *American Presbyterian*, at Philadelphia, has shown a warm zeal for Church interests, and the *New York evangelist* has done excellent service. Much credit is due to the *Presbyterian Reporter*, a monthly published at Alton, Ill., for the ability and faithfulness with which it served the interests of the Church in the Northwest. During the ten critical years from 1852 to 1862, the *Presbyterian Quarterly Review*, ably conducted by an association of ministers in Philadelphia, defended the Church's cause and was an honor to Christian intelligence. The *American Theological Review*, founded in 1859 on a basis not distinctly denominational, united with the Presbyterian Review in 1863, combining the names and objects of both, under the charge of the late Prof. H. B. Smith. It was merged in the *Princeton*

Review, published since 1878 in New York City. The *New Presbyterian Review* was founded in 1890.

Prior to tile separation of the Church in 1838, a secession had taken place from it in Kentucky (1810), in consequence of a dispute between the Presbytery of Cumberland, in that state, and the Kentucky Synod of the Presbyterian Church in America, concerning the ordination of persons who had not passed through the usual educational curriculum, but whose services the Presbytery regarded as demanded for the ministry by the exigencies of the times. In doctrine this branch of the Church does not very materially differ from the New-School Presbyterian Church, but its symbols of faith are a modification of the Westminster Confession of Faith. It still exists as a separate organization. (See No. 11 below.)

In 1858 the New School experienced a defection of its Southern adherents. In 1857 the commissioners from the Southern section, who had attended the Assembly at Cleveland, O., proposed to withdraw and constitute the United Synod. This was organized at Knoxville, Tenn., April 2, 1858. In connection with the synod were over 100 ministers and about 200 churches, widely scattered over the Southern States. This body continued a separate organization until Aug. 24,1864, when it was merged in the General Assembly formed by Southern ministers and churches previously in the Old-School connection. In 1861 the Old School suffered a like defection by the outbreak of the civil war. The entire Southern body of Old-School Presbyterians, aggrieved by the Assembly's resolution on the state of the country, withdrew their connection and united to the organization of a "General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America," Dec. 4, 1861, at Augusta, Ga. The Second Assembly convened at Montgomery, Ala., May 1, 1862, since which time the meetings of the Assembly have been annually held contemporaneously with those of the Northern assemblies. In 1876 fraternal relations were sought for the first time between the two bodies. (See No. 17 below.)

Presbyterianism has never prevailed extensively in New England; but it has had such a distinct and independent existence there from a very early period that we speak of it here by itself. The French Church in Boston, formed of Huguenots about 1687, was the first Church organized on a Presbyterian basis, but was continued no longer than while its service was conducted in the French language. The first Presbyterian organization in

New England of any permanence dates back to about the year 1718, when a large number of Presbyterians, with four ministers, emigrated to this country from the north of Ireland. For some time, in cases of difficulty, the ministers and elders were wont to assemble informally, and hold what might be called pro re nata meetings; and where they were unable to reach a satisfactory result, they sometimes asked advice of the Synod of Ireland. On April 16, 1745, the Rev. Messrs. John Morehead, of Boston; David M'Gregor, of Londonderry, N. H.; and Ralph Abercrombie, of Pelham, with Messrs. James M'Keen, Alexander Conkey, and James Hughes, met in Londonderry, and "constituted themselves into a presbytery, to act, as far as their present circumstances will permit them, according to the Word of God and the constitution of the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, agreeing to that perfect rule." The body was called the Boston Presbytery, and met, according to adjournment, in that town Aug. 13,1745. From the close of the year 1754 till October, 1770, there is a chasm in the records; but at the last-mentioned period the Presbytery consisted of twelve congregations and as many ministers. At a meeting held in Seabrook, N.H., on May 31, 1775, the Presbytery resolved to divide itself into three distinct bodies, viz., the presbyteries of Salem, of Londonderry, and of Palmer: these were then formed into the Synod of New England, which held its first meeting at Londonderry Sept. 4, 1776. At Boothbay, Me., on June 27, 1771, a new presbytery was erected called the Presbytery of the Eastward, consisting of three ministers and four ruling elders, representing four churches. It had no connection with the Boston Presbytery, and its origin is said to have been in some way connected with the removal of the Rev. John Murray to Boothbay. It never exhibited on its roll more than eight ministers. Its last recorded adjournment now known was to meet at New Boston, N. H., on the first Wednesday of October, 1792. The only relic of this presbytery known to exist is a curious volume printed in 1783, with the following title: *Bath-Kol. A Voice from the Wilderness. Being an humble Attempt to support the sinking Truths of God against some of the principal Errors raging at this time. Or a joint Testimony to some of the Grand Articles of the Christian Religion, judiciously delivered to the Churches under their care. By the First Presbytery of the Eastward.* In September, 1782, the Synod of New England, finding their numbers considerably reduced in consequence of existing difficulties, agreed to dissolve and form themselves into the Presbytery of Salem. For two succeeding years this Presbytery met regularly in Massachusetts proper, but after this its meetings were held in the district of Maine. Its last meeting was held at

Gray Sept. 14, 1791. The Third Associate Reformed Presbytery, afterwards called the Associate Reformed Presbytery of Londonderry, was formed in Philadelphia Oct. 31, 1782, and held its first meeting at Londonderry on Feb. 11, 1783. It ceased to belong to its original denomination in 1802, and was thereafter an independent presbytery till 1809, when it was received into the Synod of Albany, and has since continued under the name of the Presbytery of Londonderry. The Presbytery of Newburyport was formed by the concurrent action of the Presbytery of Londonderry and the Synod of Albany. It held its first session in Boston on Oct. 27, 1826, and its last on Oct. 20, 1847, when it became reunited to the Presbytery of Londonderry. The Presbytery of Connecticut, consisting of several ministers and churches previously belonging to the Presbytery of New York, was constituted by the Synod of New York Oct. 15, 1850, and held its first meeting at Thompsonville, Oct. 29.

Missions. —

(a.) *Home Missions*. — The home mission work of the Presbyterian Church may date from the year 1707, when it was resolved "that every minister of the Presbytery supply neighboring destitute places where a minister is wanting and opportunity of doing good offers." Since that period this work has continued to be one of its most important enterprises. At the beginning in the hands of the presbyteries, the Assembly took charge of it in 1802, appointing a "Standing Committee of Missions," to which the presbyteries were to report. During the fourteen years that followed this appointment the Church sent out 311 missionaries, and collected $49,349. In 1816 this committee was changed into a board, "with full power to transact all the business of the missionary cause," reporting annually to the General Assembly. Under this arrangement the home missions of the Church entered on a new course of prosperity, congregations multiplying till presbyteries were formed, and these in turn growing into synods. So vigorous was the Church life now developed that even the great division of 1838 was unable to hinder its continuous activity. During these twenty-two years the board collected $231,504, and sent out 2486 missionaries, while during the years 1838 to 1870 the Old-School Church alone collected $2,805,375, and sent out 16,113 missionaries. For a few years after the division of 1838, the New-School Assembly continued to carry on its mission work through the American Home Missionary Society. In 1852 the Assembly appointed a "Church

Extension Committee," following this up in 1862 by assuming "the responsibility of conducting the work of home missions within its bounds," forming "The Presbyterian Committee on Home Missions." During the years 1838 to 1869 the New-School Church is considered to have sent out 8800 missionaries. After the reunion, the agencies of both churches were united under the name I of "The Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church," by which, since that period, the whole home mission and church-extension work of the Church has been conducted, $1,840,997 having been collected and 6529 missionaries sent out, making a total since 1802 of $6,132,167 contributed for home missions and of 37,968 missionaries sent out. During the year 1875-76, 1035 ministers (or missionaries, as they are called) were aided to the extent, on an average, of $250 each.

Closely connected with this home mission is the *Sustentation Scheme*, organized in 1871 for the purpose of increasing the number of pastors in the Church, and of securing to these a larger measure of support. Under this plan, congregations paying not less than $700 a year of salary, and at the rate of $750 per member annually, and increasing their pastor's salary at the rate of $50 a year, receive grants-in-aid, so that the salary may be raised to $1000 a year.

(b.) *Foreign Missions*. — As early as 1742 the Church commenced her great work of preaching the Gospel to the heathen, in the ordination, by the Presbytery of New York, of a missionary to labor among the Indians. This work engrossed all her means and sympathies until 1817. In that year the General Assembly united with the Dutch Reformed and Associate Reformed Churches in forming "The United Foreign Missionary Society," a society whose object was "to spread the Gospel among the Indians of North America, the inhabitants of Mexico and South America, and in other portions of the heathen and anti-Christian world." In 1826 this society made over all its missions and property to the American Board, which thus became almost the National Foreign Mission Society of America. In 1831 the Synod of Pittsburgh formed itself into "The Western Foreign Missionary Society," and invited the co-operation and support of such as preferred Church action to that of so-called union societies. Before eighteen months had elapsed, twelve missionaries had been appointed to different fields of heathen labor. Ill the following year sixteen more were sent out, while $16,246 had been contributed towards their expenses. In 1837, mission stations in Northern India, West Africa, Smyrna, China, and

among the Indian tribes of the West were under its charge, conducted by forty-four agents, for whose support $40,266 were contributed during that year. Such results strengthened the hands of those in the Church that desired denominational agencies. In 1837, therefore, the Assembly severed its connection with the American Board, and established its own "Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church," to which the Western Society at once transferred all its agencies and property. During the period of the division, the Old- School Assembly extended its foreign mission staff, forming, on heathen soil, synods and presbyteries by means of native converts. The New-School Church at first continued to send its contributions of men and money to the American Board, but in 1854 appointed a standing committee on missions, changing this in 1855 into a permanent committee, who should "superintend the whole course of foreign missions in behalf of the Assembly." On the reunion, in 1869, these agencies were brought together, while the reunited Church received from the American Board a number of mission stations that previously it had sustained.

SUMMARY VIEW OF THE FOREIGN MISSION OPERATIONS OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

The Presbyterian Church, from the earliest period, has been an earnest worker and strenuous advocate for education; and one of the chief causes of the secession of the Cumberland branch was the tenacity with which the General Assembly insisted on high educational qualifications for ministers. As early as 1739, a proposition was brought before the Synod of Philadelphia for the erection of a school or seminary of learning. The synod approved of the design and appointed a committee to carry it into effect, and in 1744 a synodal school was established. The College of New Jersey at Princeton. chartered in 1746 and opened in 1747, was founded under the auspices of the Synod of New York. Other institutions have been organized under Presbyterian auspices, as follows: Washington and Jefferson College (Washington, Pa., 1802), Hamilton College (Clinton, N. Y., 1815), Maryville College (Maryville, Tenn., 1819), Center College (Danville, Ky., 1823), Hanover College (Hanover, Ind., 1827), Lafayette College (Easton, Pa., 1831), Wabash College (Crawfordsville, Ind., 1832), Lincoln University (Oxford, Pa., 1853), University College (San Francisco, Cal., 1859), Blackburn University (Carlinville, ll., 1867), King College (Bristol, Tenn., 1868), University of Wooster (Wooster, Ohio, 1870), Evans University (Evans, Col., 1874), and Parsons College (Fairfield, la.,

1875). Three colleges are jointly under Presbyterian and Congregational control: namely, Knox, at Galesburg, Ill., 1841; Beloit, at Beloit, Wis., 1847; and Olivet, at Olivet, Mich., 1828. The academies and ladies' colleges under the auspices of the denomination are numerous.

Not until 1812 did the Presbyterian Church make any provision for the theological education of persons seeking the ministry. In that year it organized its first theological seminary, locating it at Princeton, N. J., already well known for its college, which had been founded in 1746. Since then seminaries have been established in different parts of the country by presbyteries or by synods. Of these institutions the appointing the professors, the arranging the length of the curriculum, and the prescribing the course of study-the entire control, in fact-has remained in the hands of their founders. This state of things was so unsatisfactory and so unpresbyterian that, on the reunion in 1869, the directors of the different seminaries agreed that, while reserving to themselves the general control, the Assembly should in future have a veto power over the appointment of every professor, and should receive from the directors an annual report of their administration.

The Church has thirteen theological seminaries, as follows: at Princeton, N. J., 1812; at Auburn, N. Y., 1820; Western, Allegheny City. Pa., 1827; Lane, Cincinnati. O., 1832; Union, New York City, 1836; at Danville, Ky., 1853; Theological Seminary of the Northwest, Chicago, Ill., 1859; Blackburn University (theological department), 1867; at San Francisco, Cal., 1871; German, Bloomfield, N. J., 1869; German, Dubuque, Ia., 1870; Lincoln University (theological department), 1871; and Biddle Memorial Institute (theological department), Charlotte, N. C., 1867. Of these, the last two are for colored people, and the two immediately preceding them for Germans. In 1875-76 they had, in all, 56 professors and 578 students. The number graduating that year was 134. The board of education of the Church in 1876 received $72,040, and gave financial aid to 458 students (222 theological, 218 collegiate, and 18 academical). In the same year the Church maintained, for freedmen, 39 day schools, with 65 teachers and 3176 pupils and 5 higher schools, with 903 students, of whom 43 were preparing for the ministry. See Gillett, *Hist. of the Presb. Church* (2 vols. 12mo, rev. ed., Phila. 1875); Hodge, *Constitutional Hist. of the Presb. Church* (terminates in 1788; Phila. 1840-41, 2 vols.); Webster, *Hist. of the Presb. Church till 1758* (Phila. 1857, 8vo); *Presb. Reunion Memorial Volumae*, 1837-71 (N. Y. 1871, 8vo); Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac;*

Minutes of the General Assembly (ibid. 1877, new series, vol. 4); Blaikie, *Sketch of the Presb. Churches throughout the World* (Edinb. 1877), p. 38 sq.

11. CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH. — In the beginning of the present century there was a very extensive revival of religion in the south-western part of Kentucky, within the bounds of the Presbytery of Transylvania. It is frequently called "the Great Western Revival of 1800," and is regarded by some as one of the most important religious movements in the history of the Protestant Church of the United States, as it firmly fixed the people of the valley of the Mississippi in the Christian faith. The supply of preachers being inadequate, the Presbytery appointed at different times a number of lay exhorters, and, after trial of their gifts, licensed some to preach. They did not require of them the usual course of classical studies, and permitted them to except to the doctrine of the divine decrees as involving the idea of Fatalism. In October, 1802, the Presbytery was divided, and the Presbytery of Cumberland was formed, covering the region just named. In April, 1803, the new Presbytery met, and ordained two of the licentiates— Finis Ewing (who had formerly been an elder) and Samuel King— and licensed other persons. In 1805, the synod, finding complaints laid before them of irregularity on the part of the Presbytery, appointed a commission of tell ministers and six elders, clothed with full synodical powers, to visit this remote region and investigate the whole matter. Accordingly the commission, when convened, summoned the Presbytery and the irregularly licensed or ordained persons, and endeavored to induce the latter to submit to an examination. This, with the sanction of the Presbytery, they refused; whereupon the commission prohibited them from preaching or administering ordinances in virtue of any authority derived from Cumberland Presbytery until they should submit. It was afterwards contended that, as the authority to preach had been originally conferred by the Presbytery of Transylvania, this prohibition was technically powerless in the case. It may also be observed that it seems now generally agreed by writers on both sides that the main objection was not to the illiterate character of the licentiates, but to their alleged unsoundness in doctrine. The Revival members (as they were called) of the Cumberland Presbytery after this met as a council and abstained from presbyterial acts. They memorialized the General Assembly, but in vain. The assembly sustained the synod, and exhorted the recusants to submit and act regularly. The synod, being directed to review their proceedings,

complied, and on review confirmed all that had been done, and further dissolved the Cumberland Presbytery and re-annexed its members to the Presbytery of Transylvania. The council made an ineffectual effort to bring about a reconciliation, and offered to submit the licentiates to an examination; but as they required that all should be received in a body, the proposal was not accepted by the synod. On Feb. 4, 1810, Finis Ewing and Samuel King (ordained ministers, but silenced by the commission), and Samuel M'Adow, an aged minister, met and organized themselves into a presbytery under the name of the Cumberland Presbytery. In April following the Presbytery of Transylvania suspended Mr. M'Adow for his schismatical conduct.

The progress of the new body was rapid. In three years a synod was necessary, with 3 presbyteries and 60 congregations, and in 1829 a General Assembly was constituted. The statistics of 1859 reported in the connection 96 presbyteries, 927 ministers, 1188 churches, 82,158 communicants, and 24 educational institutions. In 1814 the synod published an edition of the Westminster Confession and Catechisms, altered to suit their system, which is understood to be an attempt to steer between Calvinism and Arminianism. It rejects eternal reprobation, limited atonement, and special grace, teaching that the atonement was made for all mankind, and that the operation of the Spirit is coextensive with the atonement. Other points of Calvinism, as the necessity of the Spirit's work in regeneration and the perseverance of the saints, are retained. The Cumberland Presbyterians are warm advocates of revivals and camp-meetings.

As an evidence of the altered state of feeling towards this body of Christians as contrasted with the deliverance of the General Assembly of 1814-to the effect that they could be treated with not as a body, but only as individuals-it may be added that first the New-School General Assembly entered into correspondence with the Cumberland Presbyterian General Assembly, and in 1860 the Old-School Assembly also took this step. The Cumberland Presbyterians have increased very rapidly. The minutes of the forty-sixth General Assembly, 1876, show 26 synods, including nearly 125 presbyteries, extending over the territory between the Great Lakes and the Gulf of Mexico, and reaching from the Appalachian Mountains, on the east, to the Pacific Ocean, on the west. The following statistical summary is approximately correct: Ministers, 1275; licentiates, 280; candidates, 220; congregations, 2000; elders, 6750; deacons, 2000; total communicants,

100,000; persons in the Sabbath-schools, 55,000; value of church property, $2.250,000; contributed during the year, $350,000. The following are the principal institutions of learning under the control of this Church: Cumberland College (Princeton, Ky., founded in 1829, discontinued in 1861), Cumberland University (Lebanon, Tenn., founded in 1842, which has the leading law-school in the South), Bethel College (M'Kenzie, Tenn., 1847), Waynesburg College (Waynesburg, Pa., 1850), M'Gee College (College Mound, Mo., 1853, now suspended), Lincoln University (Lincoln, Ill., 1866), Trinity University (Tehuacana. Texas, 1876), Cane Hill College, Boonsborough, Ark., 1852). The General Assembly, in 1876, approved the establishment of a Union Medical College, in connection with the three universities of the Church: namely, Cumberland, Lincoln, and Trinity. It is to be located at St. Louis, or some other large city. Waynesburg, Lincoln and Trinity admit young ladies on equal terms with young men. There are also several institutions exclusively for girls, owned by, or under the patronage of, the Church.

The *Colored Cumberland Presbyterian Church* has been formed by the amicable separation of colored members from the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, and their organization into an independent body. The first number of their newspaper organ, The Ba3nner of Light, was published in September, 1876. It stated that the number of members of the Colored Cumberland Presbyterian Church in the states of Kansas, Missouri, Illinois, Mississippi, Tennessee, Alabama, and Kentucky was, in May, 1874, 3925; that the number of ministers at that time was seventeen; and that the value of church property was $12,550. Since that time the Presbytery of Missouri had added 240 members, and the same presbytery had raised $529.25 in 1874. Later reports than for 1874, had not been received from the other states.

12. THE REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN SYNOD. — During "the persecuting times," some members of the Covenanting or Reformed Presbyterian Church of Scotland settled in Pennsylvania. In 1743 these met at Middle Octorara, and again solemnly subscribed the Old Scottish Covenant. In 1752 the Scottish Church sent the Rev. John Cuthbertson to be their minister. In 1774 he was joined by the Rev. Messrs. Linn and Dobbit, from the Reformed Presbytery of Ireland, when a Reformed Presbyterian Presbytery was formed. In 1782 these three ministers and a portion of the people joined with the Associate Church in forming "The Associate Reformed Church." The members who were opposed to this

union kept together as praying societies until 1792, when the Scottish Church had appointed a committee of their number to take the oversight of them judicially. In 1798 a presbytery was organized at Philadelphia, and in 1800 the question of slavery forced itself upon the consideration of the newly organized "Reformed Presbytery of the United States of America," when it enacted that no slaveholder should be retained in its communion, a position since then faithfully maintained. In 1806 it issued a Testimony defining its position on several points not mentioned in the Westminster Confession. In the following year it undertook the theological education of its ministry by opening a seminary at Philadelphia, and in 1809 organized itself into "The Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church in America," with three constituting presbyteries. Subsequent to the war of 1812 the relations of the Covenanting Church to the national government were much discussed. A variety of sentiments was apparent as to the extent to which the severance between the Church and that other ordinance of God-the State-should be carried. The result of these discussions was a rending of the Church in 1833, and the formation of an independent synod. The large losses which the synod-a representative, not delegated court-sustained in 1833 no ways disheartened it. More homogeneous than ever through the separation, it thenceforth proceeded rigidly to enforce the principles and practices that have at all times been accepted by the Church. Members of this Church therefore neither become nor act as American citizens: they neither vote at political elections, enlist in the army, accept of government situations, serve on juries, nor in any way identify themselves with the political system of the United States. In 1871 this Church, in accordance with its principle of the moral duty of religious covenanting, by its ministers and members entered into a solemn covenant with God and with each other to serve faithfully the great God and to keep his commandments, and to adhere to the Reformed Presbyterian principles and testimony. The theological seminary of the synod was organized in 1840, and is situated at Allegheny City, Pa., having at present a faculty of three professors.

Missions. — In 1856 the synod commenced a foreign mission at Latakiyeh, in Syria. Since then stations and schools have been opened in different localities. The missionary and benevolent contributions for the year 1876-77 were as follows:

Foreign missions ... $8,522
Home Missions..... 3,068

Freedmen 3,409
Education 2,565
Church election 27,391
Total $44,955

13. THE GENERAL SYNOD OF THE REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH. — The minority of the Reformed Presbyterian Church at the disruption of 1833 is now known by this name. (See No. 12 above.) Steadily adhering to the other distinctive principles of the Covenanters, it yet allows its members to discharge the duties and enjoy the privileges of citizens, and is popularly known as the New-Light Covenanting Church. The theological seminary, organized in Philadelphia in 1809, adhered to this portion of the Church at the time of the separation, and is still in connection with it. Recently a number of its ministers and congregations have withdrawn from its fellowship, leaving the General Synod greatly enfeebled. *SEE REFORMED PRESBYTERIANS*.

14. UNITED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF NORTH AMERCA. — This body is composed of the Associate and the Associate Reformed churches which were united in 1858. We give here an outline of the history of each of these bodies up to the time of their union.

1. *Associate Church.* — This Church in the United States had its origin from a number of Scotch and Irish Covenanters exiled for conscience' sale to the American colonies, where they maintained worship in a distinct form to the best of their ability. In 1680 Lord Cardross took measures for the establishment of a colony in South Carolina, with a view to furnish a place of refuge to his persecuted brethren. This was formed at Port Royal; but, in consequence of an invasion by the Spaniards, the colony was abandoned inm 1688. Many, however, remained in Carolina, who were gathered into congregations under the care of a presbytery, which existed until about the close of the 18th century. The only one of these churches now remaining is the old Scots' Church in Charleston. From 1660 to 1688 a large number of Presbyterians (amounting, according to Wodrow, to about 3000) were transported to the American plantations and sold as slaves. 'hey were for the most part sent to Virginia, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey; but scarcely any traces of their history now remain. As early as 1736 those American Presbyterians who sympathized with the Scottish Seceders applied to them for a minister, but at that time none could be sent. The application was renewed in 1750, but the first minister sent to this country by the Secession

Church of Scotland, the Rev. Alexander Gelatly, did not arrive until 1753. In 1753 a presbytery was organized under the name of “The Associate Presbytery of Pennsylvania, subordinate to the Associate Synod of Scotland.” While heartily accepting the Westminster standards as their symbolical books, this Presbytery gave prominence to the distinctive doctrines of the Marrow divines. *SEE MARROW CONTROVERSY*. Its members held the Gospel offer to be a free grant and promise of Christ and his salvation to sinners of mankind as such — all having a common interest in him-faith to be a person’s real persuasion that Jesus Christ is his-that he shall have life and salvation by Christ, and that whatever Christ did for the redemption of mankind he did for him. Stress was also laid on the doctrine of the binding obligation of the Scottish covenants-National and Solemn League. While the origin and doctrinal views of the Associate Presbytery restricted its sphere of labor, inside of that sphere it grew rapidly, congregations being formed in New York, Virginia, and the Carolinas. In 1776 a second presbytery, that of New York, was formed -like that of Pennsylvania, in subordination to the Scottish Synod. In 1764 the Rev. Thomas Clark, minister of Ballybay in Ireland, belonging to the Burgher Synod of Scotland, with the greater part of his congregation, emigrated to this country, and settled in Salem, Washington County, N. Y. Two other ministers of the same communion followed them two years after, though one of them subsequently returned to Scotland. The Burgher ministers, not being disposed to keep up a separate organization on this side of the Atlantic, united with their brethren; but the union was disturbed by the refusal of the Scottish synod to approve of it. The revolution of 1776 was chiefly instrumental in bringing about the existence of the Associate Reformed Church.

During the progress of the war several conventions were held between the members of the Associate and the Reformed presbyteries with a view to union. Their three presbyteries met in Philadelphia in October, 1782, and formed themselves into a synod, under the name of “The Associate Reformed Synod of North America,” on a basis consisting of the following articles:

“**1.** That Jesus Christ died for the elect.

“**2.** That there is an appropriation in the nature of faith.

“**3.** That the Gospel is addressed indiscriminately to sinners of mankind.

"**4.** That the righteousness of Christ is the alone condition of the covenant of grace.

"**5.** That civil government originates with God the Creator, and not with Christ the Mediator.

"**6.** The administration of the kingdom of Providence is given into the hand of Jesus Christ the Mediator: and magistracy, the ordinance appointed by the moral Governor of the world to be the prop of civil order among men, as well as other things, is rendered subservient by the Mediator to the welfare of his spiritual kingdom, the Church, and has sanctified the use of it and of every common benefit, through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ.

"**7.** That the law of nature and the moral law revealed in the Scriptures are substantially the same, although the latter expresses the will of God more evidently and clearly than the former, and therefore magistrates among Christians ought to be regulated by the general directory of the Word as to the execution of their office.

"**8.** That the qualifications of justice, veracity, etc., required in the law of nature for the being of a magistrate, are also more explicitly revealed as necessary in the Holy Scriptures. But a religious test, any farther than an oath of fidelity, can never be essentially necessary for the being of a magistrate, except when the people make it a condition of government.

"**9.** That, both parties, when united, shall adhere to the Westminster Confession of Faith, the Catechisms, the directory for worship, and propositions concerning Church government.

"**10.** That they shall claim the full exercise of Church discipline without depending upon foreign judicatories."

On this basis all the members of the Reformed presbytery, and all the Associate ministers with the exception of two members of the presbytery of Pennsylvania, united. A small minority of the people in the two communions also declined to enter into it; and in these minorities have been preserved the Covenanter or Reformed Presbyterian denomination, on the one hand, and the Associate, on the other. (See No. 12 above.) From 1782, the period of the formation of the Associate Reformed Church, the Associate Church was gradually increased by ministers sent out from

Scotland, and also by the return of a considerable part of those who had previously joined the union. In 1784 this Church put forth a Testimony intended to supplement the Westminster Confession, and containing special articles in favor of close communion, public covenanting, the exclusive use of the Psalms in praise, and against private oaths, that is, secret societies. The first institution for the purpose of educating students in theology by this body was established in 1793, under the care of the Rev. John Anderson, D.D., of Beaver County, Pa. The Presbytery of Pennsylvania, being unable to meet the applications for preaching which were made from Kentucky and Tennessee, directed the applicants to apply directly to the Synod of Scotland for missionaries. They did so; and Messrs. Armstrong and Andrew Fulton arrived in Kentucky in the spring of 1798, and in November formed the Presbytery of Kentucky. This accession of strength enabled these presbyteries to form themselves into a synod; and accordingly the synod, or court of review, designated as "The Associate Synod of North America" was constituted at Philadelphia in May, 1801. The synod consisted of seventeen ministers, who were divided into the presbyteries of Philadelphia, of Chartiers, of Kentucky, and of Cambridge. Until the year 1818 appeals might be taken from the synod to that of Scotland; but at that time it was declared a coordinate synod by the General Associate Synod of Scotland. Between the years 1838 and 1840 serious ecclesiastical difficulties arose, and several ministers were deposed or suspended. These, with a number of ministers and congregations in sympathy with them, at once organized separately, having several presbyteries, who constituted a synod and claimed to be the true Associate Synod. This painful division was afterwards adjusted, and a reunion was effected in 1854. To the Associate Church belongs the distinction of being one of the earliest churches on the American continent to take up a decided position on the subject of slavery. As early as the year 1800 the Presbytery of Pennsylvania issued a warning on the subject to the members of its churches, declaring slaveholding to be a moral evil and unjustifiable. This declaration was repeated in 1811, while in 1831 the synod judicially excluded slaveholders from its communion— an action which cost it all its congregations in the Southern States. The loss thus sustained was made up by the formation of new congregations and new presbyteries in Indiana, Illinois, and the far West. In 1858, previous to the union with the Associate Reformed Church, the Associate Synod comprised 21 presbyteries, 231 ministers and licentiates, 293 congregations and 23,505 communicants.

2. *Associate Reformed Church*. — The earliest settlements of the Associate Reformed Church were in Pennsylvania, within the Cumberland valley; but colonies from these emigrated to South Carolina and Georgia, New York, Kentucky, and even to New Hampshire and Maine. One of the first acts of the synod, after its organization in 1782, was the adoption of a series of articles, afterwards published under the name of *The Constitution of the Associate Reformed Church*; but these articles were severely attacked both by the Seceders and Covenanters, and were finally laid aside for a fuller exposition of the Church's faith. The result was that the Westminster Confession and Catechisms, after a careful revision at several successive meetings of synod, in the articles relating to the power of the magistrate, were published in a volume in 1799, entitled *The Constitution and Standards of the Associate Reform Church in North America*. In 1802 the synod organized itself into a general synod, with four subordinate synods New York, Pennsylvania, Scioto and the Carolinas. In 1804 the plan of the theological seminary was framed. Dr. John M. Mason was chosen professor of theology; and the sessions of the seminary began in the autumn of the same year in the city of New York. This was the second theological seminary established in the United States. Dr. Mason's work on Catholic Communion, published in 1816, was regarded as being in conflict with the Church's principles and practice; and this, in connection with some other grounds of complaint, led the entire synod of Scioto in 1820 to withdraw from the superintendence of the General Synod. In 1821 the Synod of the Carolinas petitioned the General Synod to be erected into an independent synod, on the ground that they were so distant from the place at which the General Synod usually assembled that it was impossible that they should be represented in it. The request was granted. For many years after that the Southern Synod gained but little in numbers, though in later years it became more prosperous; while the Scioto Synod rapidly extended itself and became more vigorous every year. About the time of the separation of this Western Synod, an unsuccessful attempt was made to unite the Associate Reformed and the Reformed Dutch churches, under the name of" The Reformed Protestant Church of North America." Immediately after this, that is, in 1821, a union was effected between the Associate Reformed and the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church; the consequence of which was that a portion of the former Church became incorporated with the latter, and the library of the Associate Reformed Church was immediately removed from New York to Princeton; though, as the result of a legal process, it ultimately fell back into the hands of its

original owners. The act of union by the General Synod of the Associate Reformed Church was irregular, being contrary to the express will of a majority of the presbyteries. However, many of the ministers and congregations who had remained under the care of the General Synod went into this union. The Synod of Pennsylvania with but few exceptions was merged in it, and that synod never met again. The Synod of New York, however, survived the dissolution of the General Synod, becoming separate and independent, like its two sister synods of the West and South. But its interests languished till 1829, when it resolved to revive the seminary, whose operations had been suspended in 1821, and to establish it at Newburgh, under the care of the Rev. Joseph M'Carroll, D.D., who was at the same time chosen professor of theology. An attempt was made in 1827 to revive the General Synod on the old footing, but it proved a failure. However, the Synod of the West, having divided into two, erected a General Synod, which first met in 1841, and under which a union was formed with the New York Synod in 1855. This united body numbered 4 synods, 28 presbyteries, 253 ministers and licentiates. 367 congregations, and 31,284 communicants. Its name then became "The General Synod of the Associate Reformed Church." They adhered to the Westminster standards as adopted in the Testimony of 1799, and held the doctrines of close communion, anti-slavery, and the exclusive use of the Psalms in praise.

In May, 1858, the Associate Reformed and the Associate churches, having been separated for more than three quarters of a century, were reunited upon a common basis, under the name of "The United Presbyterian Church in North America," a Church which is now the largest representative of those distinctive Views for which all the preceding churches have more or less contended. In addition therefore to its acceptance of the Westminster standards, which it modified, it has issued a Testimony whose adoption is a condition of communion both with ministers and members. In this Testimony are articles adverse to slavery and to secret societies, and in favor of close communion, the exclusive use of the Psalms, and of the moral duty of covenanting. A few years ago a new metrical version of the book of Psalms was adopted by this body. A small number protested against the union, and have since then continued under the name of" The Associate Synod of North America." (See No. 15 below.) In 1890, "The United Presbyterian Church of North America" embraced a General Assembly, 8 synods, 56 presbyteries, 753 ministers, 866 congregations,

and 101,858 communicants. It has theological seminaries at Newburgh, N.Y.; Allegheny, Pa.; and Xenia, O.; and missionary seminaries at Osioot and Ramleh, Egypt. Westminster, Monmouth, and Ohio Central colleges are also under its charge. It has boards of Foreign Missions, of Home Missions, of Publication, of Church Extension, of Freedmen, and of Education, with mission stations in India, Egypt, and Syria. The Mission to China, which was instituted as a memorial of the "'union "of the different bodies in 1858, has been transferred to California. Its missionary contributions were, in 1876-77, for foreign, $77,126; home, $29,750. Its periodical publications are one monthly, one semimonthly, and two weekly newspapers.

The *Associate Reformed Synod of the South* has still its separate organization. Cordial in its relations with the United Presbyterian Church it has one missionary now laboring together with the missionaries of the latter Church in Egypt; and, slavery having ceased to be an object of contention, is now considering the propriety of organic union with that body. In 1875 a plan of co-operation was proposed between this Church and the United Presbyterian Church, North, which provides that '"the presbyteries of each Church shall sustain the same relation to those of tile other that they do to the co-ordinate courts of their own body, and that the ministers and licentiates of each shall be eligible to appointments and settlements in congregations of the other;" that the courts of each shall respect the discipline of the other; that ministers and members of the two bodies be recommended to cultivate friendly relations and Christian fellowship with each other; that the existing relations of the two churches (actual cooperation) in the work of foreign missions be continued; that a friendly co-operation of help and non-interference be practiced in the fields of home missions and Church extension; that the two bodies co-operate in building and sustaining the Normal or Training School of the United Presbyterian Church for the Freedmen, established at Knoxville, Tenn.; and that in the work of publication the Associate Reformed Synod co-operate with the Board of Publication of the United Presbyterian Church. These provisions were adopted by the synod. The committee on correspondence with the United Presbyterian Church was reappointed, but was instructed to take no direct steps towards union without further instruction. The Southern Church has a literary institution named Erskine College and a theological school, both at Due West, S. C. It numbers about 70 ministers,

nearly one third of whom are in South Carolina, the rest in other Southern states.

15. THE ASSOCIATE SYNOD OF NORTH AMEMRICA is composed of some who declined to enter into the union with the Associate Reformed Synod in 1858 (see No. 14 above), and consists of the presbyteries of Iowa, Clarion, Muskingum, and Northern Indiana; and had, in 1876, 12 ministers, 2 licentiates, 34 congregational charges or stations, and 1115 communicants. The total contributions were $679.85.

16. THE UNITED SYNOD OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, SOUTH. — In 1857 the New-School Presbytery of Lexington affirmed slavery to be right and scriptural in principle. The Assembly (1857) replied by condemning the position, and refused to allow either the principle or the practice. The delegates from the Southern churches protested, and, declaring this action to be an "indirect excision" of their congregations, withdrew, and in 1858, at Knoxville, Tenn., organized themselves as "The United Synod of the Presbyterian Church, South," consisting of some 100 ministers and about 200 congregations. A proposal for union with the Old School Presbyterian Church was declined by this latter body because coupled with the condition that the Assembly set aside its doctrinal decisions of 1838. In 1859 the United Synod reported 14 presbyteries, 118 ministers, 187 churches, and 12,125 communicants, of whom 323 were colored. In 1864 the synod joined the Presbyterian Church, South.

17. THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, SOUTH, dates its organization from Dec. 4, 1861, when the commissioners from all the presbyteries of the Presbyterian Church within the Confederate States met in Augusta, Ga., and organized as a General Assembly. The style and title then chosen was, *The Presbyterian Church of the Confederate States of America*; but after the overthrow of the Confederacy the word *united* was substituted for *Confederate*, and *of America* was dropped. The *Presbyterian Church, South*, disavows all connection with political matters, and holds to strictly ecclesiastical labor. In 1876, at the Assembly held in Savannah, Ga., when the appointment of delegates to the Pan-Presbyterian Council of Edinburgh in 1877 was considered, all expressions used in the different courts during the exciting times of the civil strife were rescinded as inconsistent with the platform of 1862. The report then adopted closed with the following declarations:

> "**1.** We solemnly reaffirm the explicit and formal statement set forth at the time of the organization of our General Assembly in 1861, in an 'Address to the Churches of Jesus Christ throughout the Earth.' This document clearly and forcibly details our position concerning the nature and functions of the Church as a spiritual body, and, therefore, 'non-secular and 1non-political.'
>
> "**2.** Inasmuch as some incidental expressions, uttered in times of great public excitement, are found upon our records, and have been pointed out in the report of the committee aforesaid, which seem to be ambiguous or inconsistent with the above declarations and others of like import, this Assembly does hereby disavow them wherever found, and does not recognize such as forming any part of the well - considered, authoritative teachings or testimony of our Church."

At that time this Church consisted of 12 synods, 62 presbyteries, 1821 churches, 1079 ministers, and 112,183 communicants. Their contributions amounted to $1.138,681. The Assembly conducts its benevolent operations through three general committees (the work of foreign missions and of sustentation being united under the same committee), viz. the Executive Committee of Foreign Missions and Sustentation, of Education, and of Publication. Foreign missions are maintained in the Indian Territory, Mexico, South America, Greece, Italy, India, and China, and domestic missions in new and destitute localities in the South, at an annual cost of $71,121, supporting 75 missionaries in foreign fields, of whom 26 are ordained ministers, 4 licentiates, and 21 assistant missionaries, all from the United States; 9 ordained ministers and 25 assistant missionaries are natives of the countries in which they labor. With these foreign missions are connected 22 churches, with 1200 communicants; also 13 training schools of various grades, containing 250 pupils. The Sustentation Board extends aid to the amount of $20,000 in support of their ministers to 185 churches in 57 presbyteries; $6000 to the support of evangelistic labor, and $10,000 to relieve disabled ministers and families of deceased ministers. A publishing house is maintained at Richmond, Va., and, with a capital of about $40,000, issues Presbyterian books for ministers and congregational and Sunday school libraries. It also aids in the education for the ministry of young men of limited means, and in the publication and dissemination of a religious and doctrinal literature.

In all educational work, this branch of the Presbyterian Church has always held very advanced ground. It declares in its constitution that "because it is highly reproachful to religion, and dangerous to the Church, to entrust the holy ministry to weak and ignorant men, the Presbytery shall try each candidate as to his knowledge of the Latin language and the original languages in which the Holy Scriptures were written. They shall also examine him in the arts and sciences." The first written test required of the candidate is "a Latin *exegesis* on some common head in divinity." The common requirement in its presbyteries is equal to the *curriculum* in most American colleges. The demands of the Church for the education of its ministry and its own youth have everywhere made it the patroness of learning and engaged it in the founding of institutions for higher education. It has been the pioneer of education in nearly all the older Southern communities. During the civil war, many of the institutions of learning founded and endowed by the Presbyterian Church in the South perished by the loss of endowments in the general financial wreck. Among them were Oglethorpe University, Ga.; Oakland College, Miss.; La Grange College, Tenn.; and other valuable institutions of less prominence. Center College, Ky., was lost through decisions of the United States courts in favor of a minority adhering to the old Assembly. Others were suspended by the enlistment of the students in the armies, and were crippled by the partial loss of endowments. The following, founded and endowed by Presbyterians, survived the disasters of the war, and now, under Presbyterian control or auspices, are rendering valuable service to the country: Hampden Sidney College, Va.; Davidson College, N.C.; Stewart College, Tenn.; Westminster College, Mo.; King College, Tenn.; and Austin College, Texas. Central University, at Richmond, Ky., has been founded and successfully opened since the war. The synods of Nashville, Memphis, Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, and Texas, conjointly, have also projected a university (the South-western) to be strictly under Presbyterian control, for which they are now soliciting an endowment. It has been located at Clarkesville. Tenn. Stewart College has been merged in it. The financial prostration of the South since the war has rendered the endowment of its institutions of learning slow and difficult. Of academies and schools competent to prepare boys for college or young men for the university, or to give a good mathematical and classical education, thorough so far as it goes, to those whose means do not admit of more elaborate courses, there is a great insufficiency throughout the South. Those which had previously acquired success and reputation were

generally broken up through the disastrous effects of the war, and the poverty and depression of the people have operated to the discouragement of efforts to establish others. Of such institutions there are some of a high character, maintained under Presbyterian auspices; as the Bingham School, Mebanesville, N. C.; Pleasant Ridge Academy, Green County, Ala.; Edgar Institute, Paris, Ky.; Military and Classical Institute, Danville, Ky.; Finlay High School, Lenoir, N. C.; and Kemper Institute, Booneville, Mo. The Southern Presbyterian Church has two theological seminaries, each endowed and furnished with buildings, libraries, and four professors of eminent ability and learning -Union Seminary, at Hampden Sidney, Va.; and Columbia Seminary, at Columbia, S. C. It has recently established a third, at Tuscaloosa, Ala., for the education and training of colored men for the ministry; and for this it is now gathering an endowment. There are no Presbyterian schools or colleges for girls in the South endowed beyond the provision of buildings, apparatus, and libraries; but there are many institutions under Presbyterian control or auspices in which every reasonable comfort is combined with advantages for the thorough education and accomplishment of girls. Among these are many colleges, collegiate institutes, and seminaries which afford a high grade of instruction to young ladies, and are widely esteemed for general excellence and efficiency.

The work of education for the ministry is conducted by the General Assembly, through an executive committee located at Memphis, Tenn. In the last ecclesiastical year, the committee received from the churches, for this purpose, $15,131, from which 95 young men, prosecuting their studies at various colleges and theological seminaries, received assistance.

The standards of the Southern Presbyterian Church are the Westminster Confession (with the chapter “Of the Civil Magistrate” amended), the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, and the Westminster Form of Government and Directory, somewhat altered to suit the circumstances of the Church, with “Rules of Discipline,” or “Forms of Process,” gathered from the usages and laws of the Scottish Church. These standards are adopted by every minister at his ordination, in answer to the questions put to him publicly by the presiding minister, but are not required to be adopted by subscription to any written formula.

Anterior to the division of the Church into Northern and Southern churches, the Southern churches were disposed to adhere more closely to

the standards, and were more *churchly* in their ideas, after the fashion of the Westminster Era, than a large portion of the Northern churches, who came nearer the Congregational influence of New England. It was the united opposition of the Southern churches to what claimed to be a more liberal Presbyterianism which in large part caused the division of 1837 into Old and New School bodies. Since the separation in 1861, the Southern body has grown even more strict in its views of the standards, and the *jure divilo* character of Church government. But, with all their zeal for a strict construction of the standards of doctrine and order, the Southern churches have ever been distinguished for their interest in protracted meetings and services of religion. The custom is almost universal of holding protracted services of several days or weeks duration in the churches at one or more communion services in the year, as the indication of the special presence of the Holy Spirit may suggest; and most frequently at such meetings there is a revival in the hearts of God's people, and awakenings of greater or less extent among the unconverted. The special labors of evangelists such as Moody and Sankey, and Whittle and Bliss, have not been enjoyed to any great extent in the Southern churches. It is an opinion generally accepted among the Southern ministry that there is great advantage, especially in a sparsely populated region but partially supplied with the means of grace, in bringing the Gospel to bear for successive days upon the minds of men. In this way their thoughts can be more effectually withdrawn from their worldly connections and pleasures, and fixed more intently upon the great matter of salvation. Hence the evangelists found that neither their methods nor their preaching of the Gospel of salvation by grace only, through faith, was much of a novelty to the Southern Presbyterian churches.

It has proved to be a great drawback to the proper influence of the Southern Presbyterian Church that, owing partly to its poverty, partly from lying out of the chief lines of the travel and commerce with Europe, and partly from lack of great commercial cities with their accumulated capital, its learned men are able to publish very little, and its journals are of necessity provincial in their character, and therefore the world at large knows little of them. Besides, so vast is the territory covered by this Church, and so diverse the local interests, that instead of patronage being concentrated upon one or two great religious journals, it is divided between some seven or eight, none of which has power enough to make itself felt abroad. The *Southern Presbyterian Review*, a quarterly journal of thirty years' standing, now published under the supervision of the

professors in the two theological seminaries, compares most favorably in learning and ability with any theological quarterly in this country; yet, being published in the interior of South Carolina, without the aid of the machinery of a great publishing-house to bring it before the world, it is little known outside the circle of its local patrons and admirers.

In view of the calamities which have befallen this body of Presbyterians during the sixteen years of its history, bringing poverty and distress upon so large a part of its people, its success, so far, has been remarkable. In view of the vast territory to be evangelized which is covered by it, and the hundreds of thousands of poor ignorant Negroes, ever tending backward to heathenism, who must depend upon this Church very largely for a form of the Gospel that will enlighten and civilize them, no body of Presbyterians in the world has a greater work to do, or, in proportion to the work to be done, less financial ability to sustain it.

18. PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN CANADA. — In this British dominion the Presbyterians are in point of numbers the third among the religious denominations, being only exceeded by the Roman Catholics and the Church of England. Presbyterianism dates in Canada at least from the conquest, in 1759. Its first exponent is supposed to have been the Rev. George Henry. He appeared in Quebec as early as 1765, and was the chaplain of a British regiment stationed there. In 1784 the Rev. Alexander Spark went there, and in 1787 the first Presbyterian congregation was organized. It was composed principally of soldiers. In 1780 the Rev. Thomas Bethune, a minister of the Kirk who had come from Scotland as chaplain of a Highland regiment, preached first in Montreal, and afterwards organized several congregations in the county of Glengary. In Montreal itself, the first Presbyterian Church was organized in 1790. They built St. Gabriel Street Church, which is still used as a Presbyterian church, and is the oldest Protestant church in Canada. Previous to the completion of their own structure they worshipped, by permission of the Recollet Fathers, in a Roman Catholic Church. In recognition of these kind offices. “The Society of Presbyterians,” as they were then called, presented the good fathers with “two hogsheads of Spanish wine and a box of candles,” which were “thankfully accepted” — a manifestation of friendly feeling between Romanists and Protestants which continues to this day. In 1803 the first Presbytery of Montreal was organized by two ministers and one elder; and for years after the development of Presbyterianism was slow. In Upper Canada, now known as the Province of Ontario, the pioneers of

Presbyterianism were sent out by the Reformed Dutch Church. One of the principal laborers thus sent was the Rev. Robert M'Dowell, who was appointed by the classis of Albany as their missionary to Canada in 1798. He itinerated throughout the greater part of Upper Canada, forming and fostering congregations in various places. He (died at a very advanced age in 1841. The Rev. W. Smart, who was sent out from England in 1811, and who labored long and faithfully in Brockville; the Rev. W. Bell, sent out from Scotland in 1817; the Rev. William Jenkins, originally from Scotland, who went to Canada from the United States in 1817; the Rev. Robert Boyd, from the Synod of Ulster, ordained in 1821; and the Rev. James Harris, also from Ireland, who began his labors in 1820 as pastor of the first Presbyterian church in York (now Toronto), were among the founders of the Presbyterian Church in Canada. To Kingston and a few other places ministers were, on application, sent out by presbyteries in Scotland, the Rev. John Barclay being the first minister of Kingston. In 1825, the Glasgow Colonial Society was formed, which sent out many ministers to Lower and Upper Canada, as well as to Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. These ministers were all of the Church of Scotland. In 1827 bishop Strachan, of Toronto, published an ecclesiastical chart of Upper Canada, in which the Church of England was said to have thirty ministers, while two only belonged to the Church of Scotland-" one of whom," it was further alleged, "had made application to be received into the Anglican Communion." A change, however, was at hand. The tide of immigration had begun to flow in the direction of Canada, bringing large numbers of Presbyterians from Scotland and the north of Ireland. Societies also began to be formed in Scotland "for promoting the religious interests of Scottish settlers in British North America." Presbyterianism had taken root in Canada; it now began to make rapid progress. The supply of Scottish ministers being necessarily cut off, owing to the ecclesiastical condition of the country, these provinces were at this time thrown almost entirely on their own resources. In 1831 was formed "The Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland." On its first roll were 25 ministers. "The United Synod of Upper Canada," consisting chiefly of ministers of the Associate Church of Scotland, with some from Ireland, had formed about 1819, but in 1840 was amalgamated with the synod in connection with the Church of Scotland, and then numbered 82 ministers. Several ministers from the Secession Church of Scotland came to Canada about 1832, and the number was increased from time to time. They were organized as the Missionary Synod of the United Secession

Church, and known afterwards as the Synod of the United Presbyterian Church in Canada. In 1844, the year after the disruption of the Church of Scotland, a division took place in the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland; 25 ministers agreeing with the Free Church of Scotland withdrew, and formed themselves into 'The Presbyterian Church of Scotland." The synod formed immediately founded a theological hall at Toronto under the name of "Knox College." The United Presbyterians also instituted a theological hall at London. The synod in connection with the Church of Scotland, having in 1841 obtained a royal charter for Queen's University and College at Kingston, set themselves to work for its better equipment. Then began a struggle for pre-eminence between three vigorous branches of the Church. With varying success, each maintained a separate existence for seventeen years. To Nova Scotia and New Brunswick the first Presbyterian ministers were sent from Scotland by the Burgher and Antiburgher synods. A missionary was also sent in 1768 by the united synods of New York and Philadelphia. About 1769 the real work of building up a Presbyterian Church in Nova Scotia may be said to have begun the Rev. David Smith and the Rev. Daniel Cock having been sent out by the Burgher or Associate Synod of Scotland. Seventeen years afterwards, the Rev. James M'Gregor was sent out by the Antiburgher or General Associate Synod. From these beginnings grew up the Presbytery of Truro (Burgher), established in 1786, and the Presbytery of Pictou (Anti-Burgher), in 1795. In 1817 these united, forming "The Presbyterian Church of Nova Scotia." This was the first colonial union of which there is any record. Ministers from the Church of Scotland came at a later date. This Church Was first represented in these provinces by the Rev. Samuel Russel, called to be minister of St. Matthew's Church, Halifax, in 1784. But thirty-two years intervened before it could be said to have effected a permanent lodgment. In 1833 seven ministers of the Church of Scotland formed themselves into the Synod of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward's Island (the Presbytery of New Brunswick, however, declined to enter into the compact, and in 1835 constituted itself the Synod of New Brunswick). The Synod of Nova Scotia grew apace, and when the division came, in 1844, it had outnumbered its elder sister. But now it was well-nigh extinguished. Some of its ministers returned to Scotland, others joined the Free Church in these provinces. Three only maintained their former connection. The synod became defunct in 1843, and was not resuscitated till 1854, when it again put forth energetic efforts to recover its lost ground. In Canada the new

body, founded in 1844, in sympathy with the Free Church of Scotland, took, as we have said, the name of “The Presbyterian Church of Canada.” In 1861, after several years spent in negotiations, this body and the United Presbyterian Church in Canada united under the designation of “The Canada Presbyterian Church,” the corresponding bodies in the Lower Provinces uniting under the name of “The Presbyterian Church of the Lower Provinces.” “The Synod of the Canada Presbyterian Church” entered on a prosperous career, with a roll of 226 ministers, of whom 128 had belonged to the Canada Presbyterian Church and 68 to the United Presbyterian Church. In 1870 the supreme court of this Church was for the first time constituted as a General Assembly. In 1868 the synods of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick in connection with the Church of Scotland were united into one synod. The synods of the United Presbyterian Church and the Free Church had already united, namely, in 1860. Thus the way was prepared throughout the Dominion of Canada for comprehensive union. In September, 1874, there were (omitting a few congregations connected with organizations in the United States) four Presbyterian bodies in the Dominion of Canada, viz.: the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland; the Canada Presbyterian Church; the Church of Scotland in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and adjoining provinces; and the Presbyterian Church of the Lower Provinces. In the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland there were 11 presbyteries and 122 ministers; in the Canada Presbyterian Church, 19 presbyteries and 329 ministers; in the Church of Scotland in Nova Scotia, etc., 6 presbyteries and 31 ministers; and in the Presbyterian Church of the Lower Provinces, 10 presbyteries and 124 ministers. There were theological colleges in Toronto and Montreal belonging to the Canada Presbyterian Church; at Kingston and Quebec, to the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland; and at Halifax, to the Presbyterian Church of the Lower Provinces. Nearly one half of the ministers in the several provinces have been supplied by the theological colleges of the country. From the date of the union above referred to, overtures having reference to a yet more comprehensive union began to engage the attention of the supreme courts of all the churches in British North America. Increased facilities for intercommunication helped to make the proposal at least possible of accomplishment. The confederation of the provinces which now form the Dominion of Canada having been consummated in 1867, there naturally followed a strong desire for that ecclesiastical union which had long been contemplated. This desire

was shared by many who had previously opposed such a union. Formal negotiations were commenced in 1870 in all the provinces, culminating in the union which was happily consummated June 15, 1875, in the city of Montreal, when the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, the Canada Presbyterian Church, the Church of the Maritime Provinces in connection with the Church of Scotland, and the Presbyterian Church of the Lower Provinces, declaring their belief that it would be for the glory of God and the advancement of the cause of Christ that they should unite, and thus form one Presbyterian Church in the Dominion, were formally united under the name of "The Presbyterian Church in Canada." The aggregate of the United Church at that date was 634 ministers, 1119 congregations, 90,658 communicants, and a population under its instruction of about 650,000. Statistics of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, as they were reported to the General Assembly in June. 1876, then showed it to contain 4 synods, 33 presbyteries, 1076 congregations, 664 ministers, 82,186 communicants, and 59,949 Sabbath scholars. The contributions for all purposes amounted to $939,690; of this sum $418,058 were paid for the support of the ministry, $25,472 for home mission work, $16,173 for foreign missions, and $11,219 for missions among the French Canadians.

1. The *home missions* of the Church are co-extensive with this vast dominion. Their history is simply the history of the Church itself-one of continuous, steady progress. In the early years of Presbyterianism in Canada, owing chiefly to the lack of ministers, many cast in their lot with those branches of the Church whose missionaries first supplied them with the means of grace. Others, filled with romantic attachment to the Church of their fathers, waited long and patiently, and instances are not wanting of "vacant congregations" assembling themselves for public worship for years together to hear sermons read by one of their elders, or to be exhorted by "the men" whom they recognized as their temporary leaders. The work divides itself into two distinct departments: 1, the opening up of new fields, and supplying ordinances to purely mission stations; 2, to aid weak congregations in the support of their ministers. The number of purely mission fields occupied in the western section in 1876 was 130, including 300 preaching-stations, with 3000 communicants. The average Sabbath attendance at these stations was about 16,000 in the aggregate. There were also 78 supplemented congregations with settled pastors receiving grants from $50 to $300 each per annum from the home mission fund. The

number of missionaries employed was as follows: 35 ministers and licentiates; 59 theological students; 44 catechists; 12 lay catechists — in all 150 missionaries. The grants made for 1877 to home mission fields amounted to about $20,000, to supplemented congregations $10,000, and for contingencies $2500, making in all $32,500. The eastern sections, although small in comparison with the immense territory assigned to the Western Committee, have a mission field which is neither very limited, very compact, nor very easily wrought. It embraces some nine or ten groups of stations requiring missionary services. The greater part of the work is done by student catechists, of whom many were employed in 1877. In addition to these, eight Gaelic catechists are employed in Cape Breton, and other parts of Nova Scotia. An interesting mission field was recently entered upon in New Brunswick. It is known as “The New Kincardine Colony,” and is described as “a little bit of Scotland transplanted bodily into the forests of New Brunswick.” Another has been opened in a long-neglected part of Newfoundland. “The annual expenditure for home missions in this section is about $3500, and for supplementing the stipends of ministers in weak congregations about $4000.

In addition to the work above mentioned, missions of a special character are maintained. Of such is the mission to the lumbermen, instituted seven years prior to the union by the branch of the Church in connection with the Church of Scotland. The object of this mission is to supply the ordinances of religion to the large number of men employed in the forests during the winter. These are visited by ministers, and supplied with copies of the Scriptures, tracts, and other literature in French and English. The average number annually employed in this branch of industry, in the valley of the Upper Ottawa, is about 5000 men. The amount expended on their behalf is about $650 per annum.

Perhaps in no department of Church work are there more hopeful and encouraging signs of progress than in that under the care of the Assembly’s Board of French Evangelization, which has for its Herculean task the emancipation of 1,250,000 French Roman Catholics. Previous to 1875 missionary efforts in this direction had been conducted on a limited scale by the several churches. Since the union a great impetus has been given to the work, which is now assuming large proportions. In the service of the board there are at present forty missionaries, colporteurs, and teachers. several of whom were at one time priests of the Church of Rome. In Nova Scotia an ordained missionary labors in a wide field with a fair measure of success.

He reports 125 Romanists having embraced Protestantism through his instrumentality during the year 1876. In the province of New Brunswick there are three French missions, each making steady progress. In the province of Quebec there are twelve rural missions, maintaining Sabbath schools, besides the ordinary services. In Ottawa, the capital of the Dominion, the board employs two missionaries, who minister to about 250 persons. In Quebec city-the stronghold of popery in Canada-a church was erected in 1876, the first French Protestant church built in the city.

2. The staff of *foreign* missionaries consists at present of ten ordained ministers, one catechist, who acts as superintendent of schools, and three female missionaries. These are assisted by a large number of trained native teachers. The salaries of the ordained missionaries average about $1200 each; their assistants receive from $400 to $600 each per annum. The Church contributes annually towards the expenditure, in connection with the mission-ship *Day-spring*, $1200. The fields are four in number:

(1.) *The New Hebrides*. — This is the oldest and most distant. It originated with the late Dr. John Geddie, formerly a minister of the United Presbyterian Branch of the Church at Cavendish, Prince Edward Island, who landed on the island of Aneityum on July 13, 1848. This is no place to enter upon the details of Dr. Geddie's life's work. Few missionaries have been more successful, and no higher encomium need be associated with his name than these touching words inscribed on a tablet recently erected to his memory on the wall of the chapel where he was wont to preach: "When he came here there were no Christians, and when he went away there were no heathens." Since the commencement of this mission twelve missionaries, with their wives, have gone from Nova Scotia to labor in this field.

(2.) *Trinidad*. — The mission to the Coolies of Trinidad was begun in 1869 by the Revelation John Morton, also a minister of the Church of the Lower Provinces. In 1871 he was joined by the Rev. R. J. Grant, and more recently by the Rev. Thomas Christie. Fifteen schools have been opened. Churches have also been built, and a number of native assistants take part in the work, which, notwithstanding many difficulties, is making satisfactory progress. The number of Coolie children under instruction is 500, and the missionary reports that 15 in one school can repeat the whole of the Shorter Catechism. The number of Coolies on the island is about 15,000.

(3.) *Formosa*. — This is one of the Church's most promising foreign mission fields. It was begun in 1872 by the Rev. G. L. M'Kay, of the Canada Presbyterian Church. In 1875 he was joined by the Rev. J. B. Fraser, M.D., as a medical missionary. In these five years there have been erected ten chapels and two mission houses. Five hundred of the natives have renounced idolatry, and regularly attend Christian services. Seventy-five have, after careful preparation and examination, been admitted as communicants. There are five schools with native teachers, and nine native students are under training for missionary work.

(4.) *India*. — Previous to the union the Canada Presbyterian Church and the Church in the Maritime Provinces in connection with the Church of Scotland had each broken ground in India by sending female missionaries. In 1874 the Rev. J. F. Campbell, a minister of the last-named Church, offered himself for foreign mission work. He has since proceeded to Madras as a missionary of the Presbyterian Church in Canada. At the same time the Rev. James Douglas also accepted an appointment to labor at Indore.

Next to the New Hebrides, the Juvenile Mission to India, instituted by the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, is the oldest foreign mission of the Church. It was originated twenty-five years ago, and has always been supported by a number of Sabbath-schools and the voluntary offerings of a few friends. The annual contributions received by the treasurer have been steadily increasing for some years. Besides supporting four Zenana day schools and a Bible-woman, this juvenile agency provides for the education of about forty orphan children in India.

3. *Colleges*. — Queen's University and College at Kingston, founded in 1840, is the oldest. It was projected by the branch of the Church formerly in connection with the Church of Scotland, and is the only one that possesses the power of granting degrees. It combines the faculties of arts and theology. Since its establishment Queen's has educated more than 100 ministers for the Presbyterian Church. The combined resources and equipment of the Canadian Presbyterian colleges may be summed up as follows:

The General Assembly authorizes an annual collection to be made in all the congregations on behalf of its theological colleges. In addition to the above-mentioned theological colleges, there is a collegiate institute at

Winnipeg, the capital of the province of Manitoba; it is controlled by the General Assembly, and supported by the Church at large. This institution has two professors-one of science and literature, and one of classics; also a lecturer in philosophy.

4. *Periodicals*. — Each of the churches previous to 1875 published a monthly magazine for the diffusion of missionary information and general religious intelligence. So that at the time of the union there were four such magazines-two in the maritime provinces, one in the province of Ontario, and one in the province of Quebec. Three of these had outlived more than a quarter of a century. The General Assembly agreed that there should be but one periodical for the whole Church, issued under its sanction, to be called *The Presbyterian Record*, and to be published monthly in the city of Montreal, at the rate of twenty-five cents per copy per annum. The first number of this periodical was published in January, 1876. Before the close of the year it had attained a circulation of 36,000 copies monthly.

5. A few ministers of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland refused to enter into the union with the Canada Presbyterian Church, and, after the union was consummated, declared themselves to constitute the Synod in connection with the Church of Scotland. This synod met in Montreal in June, 1876. The Rev. David Watson was appointed moderator. Trustees were appointed for the various funds of the synod, and the usual committees were also appointed. A petition was presented from the congregation of West King, praying for ordinances in connection with the Church of Scotland, and complaining of the proceedings which had resulted in their being deprived of their Church property. A list was presented of congregations in similar circumstances. It was agreed that a commission with synodical powers be appointed to watch such cases, and if that were called for, to appoint a deputation to proceed to Edinburgh and attend the next General Assembly, or the meetings at any time of the Colonial Committee of the Church of Scotland. See, besides the article in Blaikie, *Sketch of the Presb. Church throughout the World*, p. 49 sq., the references at the end of the article *SEE PRESBYTERIANISM*.

19. PRESBYTERIAN CHURCHES OF COLONIES OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE. — Besides the above in Canada, there are the following. In the account of these we chiefly follow the report of the late Pan-Presbyterian Council of Edinburgh, which we have largely used in the preceding details:

1. *Australian Presbyterian Church.* — In 1836, while this country was still used for penal colonization, the Presbyterian doctrine found its exponent in Victoria in the person of the Rev. Mr. Clow, a retired chaplain of a Highland regiment. In 1838 a missionary preacher was sent by the Church of Scotland to Melbourne, and soon others went over, and, until 1846, Presbyterianism in this colony was wholly dependent on the Kirk. After the discovery of gold in 1851, and the consequent rapid settlement of the colony, the Irish Presbyterian Church sent a number of ministers; and, by 1859, when a union of the different Presbyterian churches was proposed, there were congregations representing the regular Kirk, the Free Church, and the United Presbyterian, besides many smaller bodies. A complete union of all these various Presbyterians was finally effected in 1867, on the abolition of state aid.

The Presbyterian Church in Victoria has been formed on the Scottish model. In all its distinctive principles it remains loyal to the parent Church. While it has asserted an independent position for itself, it has adopted the Westminster Confession and Catechisms, and the Second Book of Discipline, as its standards. Some variations have been admitted on administration. For example—

(1.) The General Assembly is not a representative body.

(2.) The Commission, which meets six months after the Assembly, deals not only with matters sent to it, but with all matters of which due notice has been given; but its decisions in these latter are subject to review by the next General Assembly.

(3.) It has no synods.

(4.) And no deacons courts. The secular affairs are entrusted to a committee elected by the congregation, one half of whom retire every year.

(5.) Adherents as well as communicants are allowed to vote for the first minister of a newly formed congregation.

(6.) The use of hymns and of instrumental music has been allowed, and congregations have almost without exception, and with wonderful unanimity, availed themselves of the allowance. The hymnbook of the English Presbyterian Church has been sanctioned and recommended.

(7.) Further, the Assembly has sanctioned a "Book of Prayers for Social Worship," which has been compiled with the view of assisting Christian men in the bush to hold service where a minister is not available.

The following statistics will give an approximate view of the present numerical and financial state of the Church:

Presbyterian population.....……..…130,000
Pastoral charges .....……..….....145
Ministers settled in pastoral charges…….....122
Unattached ministers supplying vacancies and new stations……...19
Elders ...…….....…..... 400
Attending divine service .....…….....….. 60,000
Communicants.....…….....…..... 15,000
Churches (besides halls and school-houses)……..... 234
Sittings in churches.....……..... 38,000
Sabbath-schools.....……..... 264
Teachers.....……..... 2,100
Scholars.....……..... 23,000
Bible classes ... .……..... 73
Scholars .....…….....……..... 1,800
Income for all purposes, 1875-76 .....……..£80,000
Capital funds held in trust for various schemes……..….... £60,632

The schemes of the Church embrace two departments, ministerial and missionary:

(I.) *Ministerial.* — In order to make suitable provision for the ministry, the following funds have been established—

(a.) A capital fund for the endowment and support of a theological hall, established in 1865, with four chairs-Systematic Theology, Apologetics, Church History, and Exegetics-held provisionally by four ministers of the Church, and attended by fifteen students, of whom five are studying with a view to mission work. £50,000 will be required for the endowment of these four chairs. £14,000 are now in the hands of the Church, yielding an annual revenue of £900. Two university scholarships of £50 and £25 respectively have been founded for intending theological students, and two theological scholarships of the same amounts. But the larger of these is not confined to

Presbyterian students. It is open to all denominations. The Assembly raises additional scholarships, when needed, by subscription.

(b.) A sustentation fund, for the more adequate support of the ministry, aims at securing a minimum stipend of £300 to every minister. Congregations lodge their moneys monthly in the post office savings bank. Their ministers draw the deposits once a quarter to the extent of £300 a year. The balance that remains undrawn, if any, accrues to the general sustentation fund, which is distributed among ministers whose stipend falls short of the minimum, with the proviso, however, that no congregation receives more than £50. Last year 38 out of 122 ministers participated in the fund. The income was derived from the following sources: Congregational subscriptions, £866; donations of £100 each from eight gentlemen, £800; small donations and legacy, £374; interest from savings bank, £35, in all £2075.

(c.) A capital fund, for the support of aged and infirm ministers; instituted not only in the interest of ministers, but as emphatically of congregations, to relieve them, in some measure, at least, from a very painful burden, and to insure their enjoying the ministrations of men in the prime and vigor of life. It is raised by voluntary contributions, and by a payment of £25, spread over five years, from every minister. The allowance is £50 per annum, with £2 for every year beyond five that the annuitant has hell a charge.

(d.) A fund for the support of the widows and orphans of deceased ministers, raised by a minister's rate of £5 per annum, and an annual congregational collection. In 1876 these two sources of income yielded £990. Interest on capital, £1063; in all £2053. Annuities to twenty widows and twenty four orphans, £965. The annuity is £50, with £10 for each child below eighteen. The latter sum is doubled when both parents are dead. By these respective agencies provision is made for the ministry in its four stages -when training for work, when at work, when past work, and when finally done with work.

(II.) *Missionary*. — Comprised under two branches home and heathen missions:

(a.) The home mission is charged with—

(1) securing a supply of ministers;
(2) admitting accredited ministers from other churches;
(3) assisting presbyteries in supplying vacancies; and
(4) fostering mission-stations.

As the Church, in planting itself in a new land, is essentially a home mission, and as the demand for ministers has always been ahead of the supply, little has been attempted outside its own community. One or two of the larger congregations have, however, been vigorously prosecuting, while others are commencing, territorial work at their own hand. The committee have received generous assistance from the home churches in the way of ministerial supply. But the need is by no means abated. At this moment at least twelve men are urgently required.

(b.) The heathen mission embraces three departments:

(1.) The Chinese, of whom there are about 17,000 in Victoria. They are scattered in groups of two or three hundred over the colony. They are generally of an inferior type, but are very accessible to the teachings of the Gospel, which are given them at various points by the Christian churches. The Presbyterian Mission has taken the form for the present of a seminary for training Chinese catechists. It is conducted by one of the ministers of the Church, assisted by Mr. Cheong, a Chinese student.

(2.) The Aborigines, now reduced to about 1600. Charles Kingsley and others have put the natives of Australia at the bottom of the scale of rational beings, “if indeed they are entitled to be called men.” It seemed as if they were likely to furnish a link in the ascending development of humanity. The Presbyterian Mission at Rosmali has exploded this notion. It is under the charge of two Moravian brethren, and furnishes delightful proofs of the elevating influence of Christianity even upon the most degraded savage, while the children of the school have outstripped all their competitors in the State schools of Victoria.

(3.) The New Hebrides, in conjunction with other churches in Scotland, Canada, and Nova Scotia. The Presbyterian Church of Victoria maintains a contingent of two missionaries on this interesting field. The children of the Sabbath-schools are pledged to collect £500 per annum for the maintenance of the Day-spring, mission-ship. The total contributions to the home and heathen missions in 1876 amounted to £2220. The capital invested funds of the Church, Sept. 30, 1876, were as follows:

1. Theological Hall endowment .....….....£14,220

2. Ornmond and Patrick Hamilton scholarships….. 2,000

3. Rokewood Church endowment.....…….. 1,000

4. Infirm Ministers' Fund .....……..... 8,209

5. Widows and Orphans' Fund .....…..... 18,203

6. Brodie Bequest (Home-mission work).....….. 2,000

7. Loan Fund for church and manse building (being the accumulation of five years' state aid).

15,000 Total .....….....……..... £60,612

There are two colleges in connection with this Church -one for boys, under the principalship of Dr. Morison, which has run a long and prosperous career; the other for girls under the charge of the Rev. George Tait, was but recently opened.

2. *Presbyterian Church of New South Wales*. — In 1802 about a dozen Presbyterian families, living on the banks of the Hawkesbury River, resolved to meet for the worship of God according to the forms of their fathers, though they had no minister. A Mr. James Mein ministered to them as catechist. At a cost of £400 they built a church, which bears the appropriate name of Ebenezer. In 1823 Dr. Lang went to the colony, the first Presbyterian minister. Considerable additions were made thereafter, but the history of the Church was not harmonious, and various divisions took place. At length, in 1865, a general union took place, through the amalgamation of separate bodies corresponding to the Church of Scotland, the Free Church, and the United Presbyterian; the new body being called "The Presbyterian Church of New South Wales."

According to the articles of union the Word of God is the supreme and only authoritative rule of faith and practice for the Church; the Westminster Confession of Faith, Larger and Shorter Catechisms, the Form of Presbyterial Church Government, the Directory for the Public Worship of God, and the Second Book of Discipline, are the subordinate standards of this Church; explanations are then given as to the relative authority of the subordinate standards, the renunciation of intolerant principles, and the recognition of the spiritual independence of the Church;

the jurisdiction of the Church is declared to be independent of other churches, and ministers and probationers from other Presbyterian churches are admissible if they afford satisfactory evidence of their qualifications and eligibility, and on their subscribing the formula. The Church has prospered since the union, but not in proportion to the growth of the colony. It now consists of 7 presbyteries, 68 ministers, 70 charges, and 108 church-buildings. It has schemes for Church Extension, Foreign Missions, Sabbath-schools, Sustentation Fund, and Church and Manse Fund; its foreign missions are to the New Hebrides and the Chinese; it has three theological tutors, and its estimated total income for 1875 was £15,000. The minimum stipend is £200 with, or £250 without, a manse. It is expected that £300 will now be reached through the Sustentation Fund. The legislature having passed an act for the establishment of denominational colleges affiliated to the University of Sydney, St. Andrew's Presbyterian College has sprung into existence. It affords a home for young men attending the university. and the means of theological education for students of divinity. The General Assembly has enacted that after 1878 none but graduates shall be admitted as candidates for the office of the ministry.

Mission Work. — Three classes are recognized: the aborigines, the Polynesian tribes, and the Chinese in the gold-fields. The aborigines are so widely scattered that efforts among them have been chiefly desultory. A devoted Chinese catechist labors successfully among his countrymen at Sydney. The New Hebrides Mission has a share of support from this Church, which at one time supported the Rev. James D. Gordon, who, after returning to Eromanga, was murdered in 1872.

3. *The Synod of Eastern Australia* is formed of those who stood aloof from the general union of 1865, on the ground that Free-Church principles were not sufficiently maintained. It consists of two presbyteries, having nine ministers and charges.

4. *Presbyterian Church of Queensland.* — In 1859 the district of Moreton Bay was declared a separate colony, called Queensland. The first Presbyterian minister had arrived in 1847. In 1863 the separate congregations belonging to the different sections of Presbyterianism united as "The Presbyterian Church of Queensland." The basis of union was the Westminster Confession, and all the Presbyterian congregations in the colony were embraced. There are 3 presbyteries, 24 charges, and 20

ministers. The General Assembly meets the first Monday of May. There are committees for Sabbath-schools (2410 scholars), Home Mission and Church Extension, Sustentation, Training Young Men for the Ministry, and the Support of Aged and Infirm Ministers. The Presbyterian population of the colony is 22,090. The annual contributions are about £9000.

5. *Presbyterian Church of Tasmania*. — The first Presbyterian minister arrived at Hobart Town in 1822 or 1823. In 1835 there was constituted the Presbytery of Van Diemen's Land, and the Scotch Church was placed on an equality with the English. In 1845 an attempt was made by the bishop of the English Church in Van Diemen's Land to obtain authority over all the inhabitants, but the Presbyterians succeeded in checking this, and in getting a rule recognized limiting the power of the English bishop in these colonies to the superintendence of his own clergy. The Presbyterian Church has not been equally prosperous in this as in other colonies, and there is still a division in the ranks. The Presbytery of Tasmania and the Free Presbytery of Tasmania indicate this division. There are 17 charges in all, and 13 ministers.

6. *Presbyterian Church of South Australia*. — The first Presbyterian Church began in Adelaide in 1839, and for some years ministers from the different Presbyterian bodies continued to drop in. In 1865 a union was effected. There are now 11 ministers and 13 charges. Union College is supplied by an Independent professor of Church history; a Baptist, of the Greek Testament; and a Presbyterian, of theology.

7. *New Zealand Presbyterian Church*. — Presbyterianism was first planted here about the year 1840; at least the first minister went there then. The Church has made good progress, and has been geographically divided into *The Presbyterian Church of New Zealand* and *The Presbyterian Church of Otago*. In 1876 the Church in the northern section had 7 presbyteries, 57 ministers in charges, and 4 unattached. The Otago branch, founded in 1848 by a Free Church colony from Scotland, had 45 ministers, but in both sections there is a great demand for more. Besides the ministers there are a considerable number of evangelists who strive in some degree to make up for the want of a stated ministry. The New Zealand Churches present the same interesting spectacle as other young colonial churches, striving after an organization on the model of Scotland, and having committees and schemes organized for that purpose. Much has been done by the Presbyterian Church for general education, and the chair of moral

philosophy in the University of Otago was endowed by them. The effort to obtain a well-educated ministry is conspicuous in its struggles, and in Otago a beginning has been made of a theological institution, and a professor of divinity and various tutors appointed. In other parts of the colony efforts have likewise been made to supply an educated ministry. But the difficulties in this direction have been great; many Presbyterians have joined other churches, and little has been done by the churches at home. Much is done in the way of Sunday-schools. Young Men's Christian Associations abound. Some congregations do little or nothing for missions; others are much interested in them. The New Hebrides Mission receives a good share of help, and recently something has been attempted for Fiji. There are committees for Sustentation, Church Extension, Mission, Temperance, Psalmody, and similar objects in both sections of the Church, betokening no small amount of activity and earnestness.

8. *Presbyterian Church it South Africa*. — When the Cape became an English colony in 1804, an application was made to the Church of Scotland for ministerial supply, and in 1822 and following years eleven ministers joined the Cape Church. In 1860 eight more Scotch ministers joined this Dutch Reformed body. There are, besides, nine Independent Presbyterian congregations in Cape Colony and Natal, numbering about 1000 members.

9. *Other Colonial Churches*. — In connection with the Church of Scotland, there are:

	Congregations.	Ministers.
In South America	14	13
In West Indies	4	4
In Ceylon	9	8

Connected with the Free Church of Scotland are:

	Congregations.	Ministers.
In South Africa	5	3
In Natal	4	3
In other places	10	9

10. *Presbyterian Church in Japan*. — This body was organized in 1878 by a union of all Presbyterian missionaries in Japan. For doctrine, the Westminster Catechism, the canons of the Synod of Dort, the Shorter Catechism, and the Heidelberg Catechism were adopted. The constitution of the American Presbyterian Church was chosen as the model for administration.

See, besides the works already quoted in different sections of this article, Smith, *Tables of Church History*; Gardner, *Faiths of the World*, vol. 2; *The American Cyclop*. 13:809 sq.; Schem, *Cyclop. of Education*, s.v.; Marsden, *History of Christian Churches and Sects*, 2, 109 sq.; and *Blaikie's Report*, all of which we have freely used.

Presbyterianism

in its narrowest sense, is commonly understood as the synonym of Anti-Prelacy. But, in truth, there are three systems of religious opinion, by no means necessarily affiliated, which are, with a noticeable uniformity, found in combination under this name. These are, a Calvinistic theology, the Parity of the Clergy, and Paedobaptism. *SEE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCHES*. All branches of Presbyterianism organized themselves into a *Presbyterian Alliance* in London in 1875 on the basis of the Consensus of Reformed Confessions and Presbyterian government, and held the first council at Edinburgh in 1877. The next will convene in Philadelphia in 1880.

I. *Doctrines*. — The doctrines espoused by Presbyterians, in Great Britain and America, are found in the Confession of Faith of the Westminster Assembly of Divines, together with the Catechisms, Larger and Shorter, thereto appended. As a system, they are the doctrines generally known as Augustinian or Calvinistic. Presbyterians coincide with other orthodox bodies in the reception of the Apostles Creed, the Trinity, Redemption through Christ, Regeneration by the Holy Spirit, the Resurrection, and Eternal Judgment. They are distinguished specifically by opposition to Arminian, Pelagian, and semi-Pelagian tenets. The decisions of the Synod of Dort on the "five points" of Predestination, Particular Atonement, Original Sin, Special Grace, and the Perseverance of the Saints, have usually been acknowledged as setting forth their views. But while there is a substantial unity on these points, there are shades of difference, from High or Hyper Calvinism to Moderate Calvinism; from Supralapsarianism to

Sublapsarianism; from Hopkinsianism to Baxterianism; from the unbending Covenanters to the laxer Cumberlands; from the strict Old School with Scottish predilections to the more flexible New School with New England leanings. Though consenting to be called Calvinistic for purposes of convenience, Presbyterians do not receive all Calvin's views without qualification; neither do they admit that they owe their system to the Genevese reformer, for they claim for it a higher antiquity, reaching even beyond the great champion Augustine to no less an authority than St. Paul. They assert that the Reformers of the 16th century were agreed upon the points named, as appears from the harmony of the Augsburg Confession, the Heidelberg Catechism, tile Helvetic Confession, the Scotch Confession, the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, the French Confession presented to Francis II, the Belgic Confession, and the Decrees of the Synod of Dort in 1618.

The Westminster Confession, rejecting the Apocrypha, recognizes Holy Scripture as the only infallible rule of faith and practice. Hence every position is supported by proof-texts. The Confession teaches that there are in the godhead three persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, the same in substance, equal in power and glory. To God are ascribed the works of creation, providence, and redemption. Man having fallen, the Covenant of Works is replaced by the Covenant of Grace, of which Christ is the Mediator and Administrator for his elect people. Divine sovereignty and man's free agency are both fully and equally admitted, without attempting to explain this high mystery, but rather requiring it to be handled with special providence and care. The doctrine of the Divine Purpose, Decree, Predestination, or Fore-ordination, is guarded from fatalism or perversion in several ways: it is explicitly stated that neither is God the author or approver of sin; nor is violence offered to the will of the creature; nor is the liberty or contingency" of second causes taken away, but rather established; and they who perish are punished for their sins. The Covenant of Works having been broken by the first man, who was the federal head, representative, and root of his race, a consequent corruption of nature, a disability of the will to spiritual good, and a liability to suffering and death, temporal and eternal, were conveyed to all his posterity. Effectual calling consists in the special grace of God operating on the minds and hearts of all those whom he has predestinated to eternal life, in the reception of which grace men are passive, yet submit most freely, being made willing by his power. Elect infants dying in infancy, and

other elect persons who are incapable of the outward call, are nevertheless regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit, who worketh when, where, and how he pleaseth. That all infants dying in infancy come under the above conditions and are saved is a general sentiment of Presbyterians, so far as can be collected from their published writings. (See Chalmers, *Rom*. lect. 14:26; Cumming, *Infant Salv*. p. 25; Smyth, *Bereaved Parents*, p. 13; Junkin, *Justificatitio*, p. 143; Hodge, System of Theology [see Index].) Justification consists, not in inherent righteousness, nor in imputing the act of faith or any other act as righteousness, but in the pardon of sin for Christ's sake, and the accepting as righteous by imputing the righteousness of Christ received by faith. Adoption and sanctification accompany justification. Saving faith is a fiducial belief of the truth, and is shown to be sincere and active by repentance and good works, as evidential of regenerating grace. The perseverance of the saints is not owing to anything in them, but to the grace of God, which will not suffer them finally to fall away. Personal assurance does not belong to the essence of faith, and may be dimmed or lost, but it is a high privilege, and every believer should strive to attain it. It does not lead to laxity of morals, for the law, though no longer a covenant of works, is still binding as a rule of life and conduct.

II. *Worship*. — The Presbyterian forms of worship are extremely simple. The reading of a portion of Scripture, extemporaneous prayers, the singing of two or three psalms or hymns, a sermon or exhortation, and the pronouncing of the apostolic benediction at the close by the minister, comprise the entire service.

When no preacher is present, the people conduct the meeting themselves, an elder presiding and directing the several parts of reading, prayer, and praise. Nothing can be simpler or more flexible, capable of adapting itself to the necessities of the missionary or the street preacher, as well as to the wants of the most cultivated audiences. But while the Presbyterian Church neither uses nor condemns a liturgy, she provides for the dignity and propriety of divine service by means of a Directory for Public Worship as a guide, and by requiring ministers to qualify themselves for this duty, no less than for that of preaching, by reading, premeditation, and habitual communion with God in secret.

Presbyterians keep the Sabbath-day strictly as a day of rest and devotion; but they have conscientious scruples against the obligatory observance of

such days as Christmas, Good Friday, and Easter. The key to their practice in this and other respects (as declining to bow at the name of Jesus, avoiding the sign of the cross in baptism and its form in church architecture, refusing sponsors and confirmation, not marrying with a ring, discountenancing clerical vestments, etc.) is to be found in the adoption by the early Presbyterians of the principle that nothing is allowable in divine worship but what is divinely commanded, in opposition to the principle that everything is allowable except what is forbidden, and only two sacraments are recognized as of divine warrant-baptism and the Lord's Supper. Dipping or immersion is not in so many words forbidden, but is pronounced not necessary, and the ordinance is considered to be rightly administered by pouring or sprinkling -purification, not burial, being the idea symbolized thereby. The infant children of one or both believing parents have a right to baptism in virtue of the Abrahamic covenant, which, being anterior to Moses, was unaffected and unrepealed by the abrogation of the Mosaic law. Baptism being regarded as a public Church ordinance, private baptisms, except in cases of absolute necessity, are discouraged. The Lord's Supper is only a commemoration with bread and wine, and the idea of a sacrifice or of the real presence is carefully repudiated. At the same time, the spiritual presence of Christ, his special nearness to worthy receivers, and a peculiar blessing are as strongly maintained. To avoid the appearance of adoration of the elements, as well as better to conform to the supposed original posture of the apostles, this sacrament is taken sitting, either in the adjacent pews or around long tables provided for the purpose. To this ordinance such only are admitted as have on profession of their faith in Christ been received into the membership of the Church by the session, or such other persons as are known to be in good Church standing elsewhere. During the field preaching of the Scottish Reformation period and subsequently, several neighboring congregations often joined together to observe the communion. On such occasions there were several successive celebrations of the Supper, called the first, second, or third "table," and so on. A small pewter token bearing a certain number was given to each worshipper, and specified the table or service at which its bearer was expected to communicate. Settled congregations thus came to employ the token in their own services. Latterly the token has been replaced by a card on which the communicant writes his name and address, keeping in this manner the pastor aware of his residence. This using of a card at the same time exhibits the Presbyterian opposition to *open* or indiscriminate communion, while the welcome given to members of other

evangelical churches shows equally opposition to *close* communion, so that the doctrine of the Church is that of restricted communion, restricting or confining this privilege to brethren of known Christian character.

III. *Government*. — Presbyterianism is the government of elders, being derived from the Greek πρεσβύτερος, presbyter, or elder. It is conceived to be analogous to the eldership of the Hebrews, the δημογεγόντες of the Greeks, the *senatus* of the Romans, and the aldermen or eldermen of the Anglo-Saxons, and, so, to be founded in the necessities, instincts, and common-sense of human nature as well as in Scripture itself. Presbyterians acknowledge no other head of the Church than Christ. Instead of recognizing, like episcopacy, a *bishop* as different from and superior to *presbyter*, and maintaining a distinction of ranks among the ministers of religion, it holds, on the contrary, that both in Scripture and the constitution of the Primitive Church *bishop* and *presbyter* are convertible terms and that there is complete equality in point of office and authority among those who preach and administer the sacraments, however they may differ in age, abilities, or acquirements. The argument as between the *Presbyterians* and *Episcopalians* is treated in the articles BISHOP *SEE BISHOP* and PRESBYTER *SEE PRESBYTER* , and as between the *Presbyterians* and *Congregationalists*, or *Independents*, in the articles ELDER *SEE ELDER* and ORDINATION *SEE ORDINATION* .

According to the views of Presbyterians, there ought to be three classes of officers in every completely organized Church -viz. at least one teaching elder, the bishop or pastor, a body of ruling elders, and deacons. The first is designed to minister in word and doctrine and to dispense the sacraments, the second to assist in the inspection and government of the congregation, and the third to manage its financial affairs. They disallow all jurisdiction or interference on the part of the civil magistrate, except for protection. They are no less jealous of ecclesiastical encroachments, and boldly assert that synods and councils may err, and have erred; that all Church power is only ministerial and declarative; that no Church judicatory has the right to make laws to bind the conscience by virtue of its own authority; that God alone is lord of the conscience; and that the right of private judgment is universal and inalienable. They maintain the parity of the clergy, and protest against prelacy or episcopacy, or the one-man power, as a usurpation finding no warrant in the writings of the apostles or of those of the early fathers nearest to their time. They no less disapprove of the opposite extreme of Independency, or the complete autonomy of

each separate congregation. They view the whole collection of believers as one body, constituting the universal or catholic Church (meaning by "catholic" not confined to one nation, as before under the law), though distributed into particular congregations for the purpose of meeting together more conveniently.

Though Presbyterian churches hold the doctrine of a parity of ministers, they have, when fully organized, a gradation of Church courts for the exercise of government and discipline, and the Presbyterian system is thus further distinguished from others by this ascending series of appellate courts. The first or lowest court is the Church Session, consisting of the pastor and ruling elders chosen by a particular congregation. The elders are chosen and ordained for life, although, either of their own motion or that of the people, they may resign and cease to be acting elders. The next court above is the Presbytery, which is the only ordaining body, meeting twice or oftener in the year, and consisting of all the ministers and one elder from each Church session within a given district. The Synod, which meets but once a year, comprises a number of adjacent presbyteries (those within a state, for instance), and is composed of all the ministers, and one elder from each Church session, within those bounds. (For the peculiar authority and character of the synods in the state establishments of the Continent, see the article *SEE SYNOD*.) The General Assembly, which meets annually, is the fourth and highest court in order, and embraces all the presbyteries in the connection. It is entirely a delegated body, composed of an equal proportion of ministers and ruling elders elected by the presbyteries to represent them, the ratio being determined by the size of the body, and care being taken to prevent its becoming unwieldy. Each superior court or judicatory has the constitutional right of reviewing and controlling, confirming or reversing, the doings and decisions of the court below. A mooted question or a judicial case may thus be removed successively from one court to another, till the collective wisdom of the whole Church, represented in the court of final resort, free from local prejudices or partialities, has an opportunity of deciding upon it. The General Assembly enjoys also, through its trustees, directors, boards, or committees, a general jurisdiction over the common finances, theological seminaries, foreign and domestic missions, education for the ministry, publication, church building, and correspondence with foreign churches.

It only remains to add that though Presbyterians maintain that truth is in order to goodness, and are tenacious of what they understand to be the

teaching of Scripture, they are, at the same time, neither bigoted nor exclusive, and to represent them as such they consider unfair in the extreme. They do not unchurch other denominations, but are ready to extend the hand of fellowship wherever they discern substantial truth and the image of Christ. Their standards explicitly say, "We embrace in the spirit of charity those Christians who differ from us, in opinion or practice, on these subjects.... There are truths and forms with respect to which men of good character and principles may differ; and in all these they think it the duty, both of private Christians and societies to exercise mutual forbearance towards each other" (*Form of Gov*. bk. 1, ch. 1, p. 8). See Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doct*. 2, 178; Schaff, *Harm. of the Ref. Conf*. (1877); Lewis, *Presb. Manual, containing Forms for the Records of the Session Presbytery and Synod, and the Judicial and other Ecclesiastical Proceedings required by the Polity of the Presb. Church*; Shedd, *Hist. of Doctrines* (see Index); Neander, *Hist. of Dogmas* (see Index); *Hist. of the Westminster Assembly; Hist. of Confessions*; Miller, *on Presbyterianism*; Smyth, *Works and Tracts on Presbyterianism*; Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom*, vol. 3; and the *Theol. Index* by Malcom, p. 378-380. (E.H.G.)

Presbyterians

Picture for Presbyterians

a name derived from the peculiar Church government which is advocated (*SEE PRESBYTER* and *SEE PRESBYTERIANISM*), designates a large body of Protestant Christians not bound together in one large denomination, but associated in independent churches. As, however, the term Congregationalist embraces not merely the denomination which assumes that title, but also those whose principles of government are the same though their doctrines may be diverse, as the Baptists, the Christians or Campbellites, the Unitarians, etc., so the term Presbyterian properly embraces all those that accept the Presbyterian principles of government, even though there be some differences in their theological beliefs. All Protestant or Reformed churches may in general be said to be divided into three classes-those who hold to government by or through bishops, i.e. to an Episcopal government; those who hold to government directly by the members of the Church without the mediation of any representatives, i.e. to a Congregational or Independent form of government; and those who hold to government by a board of elders or presbyters, i.e. to a Presbyterian form of government. Presbyterianism, variously modified, is the form of Church government observed by many Protestant churches, but

is most perfectly developed in Britain and America. In Britain it prevails chiefly in Scotland, although during the Commonwealth in the 17th century it was for a very short time in the ascendant in England also. In the "General Presbyterian Council" held at Edinburgh in July, 1877, the German state establishments and the French and Dutch Reformed churches, as well as other bodies that admit of certain features of Presbyterianism in government, were represented; and Dr. Blaikie, in his *Report on Presbyterian Churches*, which was submitted and approved by the Pan-Presbyterian Council at Edinburgh, treats of all these churches as Presbyterian bodies. In most, if not all of those churches, while there is a consistorial system that connects them with the state, giving the latter considerable control, there is also a true Presbyterian and synodal constitution. In virtue of the former, these churches have in some cases a general oversight of all matters affecting the moral and religious well being of the community, and in the exercise of the latter they deal more especially with spiritual questions. This was substantially the system advocated by the Scottish Reformers, and still exhibited to some extent by the presence in the General Assembly of the Scottish Established Church of a representative of the sovereign called the lord high commissioner, authorized to bring its sessions at any time to a close should the proceedings conflict with the royal prerogatives — by the presence as members of the Assembly not only of elders chosen by the churches, but of elders appointed to be there by the town councils of such places as are possessed of royal charters, and hence called royal burghs, and by the wide range of social as well as of religious questions that it considers. In Presbyterian churches not connected with the state, whether in Great Britain, on the continent of Europe, in this country or elsewhere, the jurisdiction being over only their own members and civil representatives unknown, the discussions are confined to matters directly affecting the interests of religion, and a more purely spiritual type of Presbyterianism in consequence prevails. *SEE BELGIUM*; *SEE BOHEMIA*; *SEE FRANCE*; *SEE HOLLAND*; *SEE HUNGARY*; *SEE ITALY*; *SEE PRUSSIA*; *SEE RUSSIA*; *SEE SPAIN*; *SEE SWITZERLAND*. The French consistorial system is more nearly Presbyterian than the German, and is not perfectly so only from the pressure of the civil power. In other churches, also, as well as in the Protestant Church of France, Presbyterianism is more or less modified by the relations of the Church to the State. *SEE REFORMED CHURCHES*.

The Presbyterians are for the most part Calvinistic in doctrine. They generally accept the Westminster Assembly's Confession of Faith as their symbol of belief, and every minister in the Presbyterian Church of the United States is required to declare his personal belief in it as an embodiment of the truths taught in the Scriptures. I hey do not agree, however, in their interpretation of that standard, and are divided into strict Calvinists and moderate Calvinists. *SEE CALVINISTS*. This division in sentiment, combined with other circumstances, divided the Presbyterian Church of the United States into two bodies for a time, as we have already seen; but the division has been healed and a reunion effected, the theological differences having abated. *SEE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCHES*. The chief Presbyterian Church in America not Calvinistic is the Cumberland Presbyterian. There was at one time, however, a serious defection in England, many of the churches becoming Socinian in doctrine; but the Unitarian churches in England at the present day are nearly all Congregational in their polity. Calvin is generally regarded as the founder of Presbyterianism; but it should be borne in mind that government by a board of elders was maintained by certain bodies, as the Waldensians, from a very early age. Of course, we are ready to grant that he adopted the form known as Presbyterianism because he believed it to be "founded on and agreeable to the Word of God." Calvin may be regarded as the founder of Presbyterianism in the sense that he was the first to organize the Reformed Church on a Presbyterian model, just as he was the first to frame the Reformed faith of Southern Europe in a clear, distinct, and affirmative form. Says Blaikie: "It is not correct to say that Calvin originated the Presbyterian system. But in connection with it he rendered very essential service both in theory and in practice; he unfolded the idea more lucidly than it had been set forth before, and with much struggle he set it in actual operation in Geneva. What he thus established became the model on which the Reformed Church in France and other countries was formed" (*Report*, p. 7).

The tables on the following page are from Blaikie's *Report*.

Presbyterium

(1.) A name sometimes given to the bema, or inner portion of an ancient church, because it was the place in which the presbyters sat and discharged their functions. *SEE CHANCEL*.

(2.) The name also of the senate formed by the presbyters and deacons of the episcopal residence, with whom the bishop deliberated about the most important affairs of his diocese. Although the government of the Church was claimed by the episcopate, as inherited from the apostolate, yet the spirit of community, κοινωνία, which prevailed in the Church required that the bishop, when important business was to be transacted, should take the advice of the presbyters and deacons. The limits of the respective attributes, however distinctly they might be traced, were neglected where the common care of the interests of the Church made it desirable, and the superiority of the episcopal dignity stood the less in the way, as even the apostles, in their humility, had called themselves presbyters (<60501>1 Peter 5:1, ὁ συμπρεσβύτερος; <63001>2 John 1:1; <64001>3 John 1:1, ὁ πρεσβύτερος). Irenaeus gives the name of presbyters not only to the disciples of the apostles (Papias, in Eusebius, *Hist. Ecclesiastes* 3, 39, even the apostles), but also to the bishops of his time (Iren. Ep. ad Florin. ap. Euseb. 5, 20): ταῦτα τὰ δόγματα οἱ πρὸ ἡμῶν πρεσβύτεροι, οἱ καὶ Ἀποστόλοις συμφοιτήσαντες, οὐ πρέδωκάν σοι (Πολυκάοπος) ὁ μακάριος καὶ ἀποστόλικος πρεσβύτερος. Id. Ep. ad Victor. ep. Rom. (ap. Euseb. 5, 24): Οἱ πρὸ Σωτῆρος πρεσβύτεροι, οἱ προστάντες τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἧς νῦν ἀφήγη Ἀνίκητον λέγομεν καὶ Πίον, Ὑγινόν τε καὶ Τελέσφορον καὶ Ξύστον. According to the literal meaning of presbyter, it applies to men rather advanced in years. The languages of all nations show us that the members of such assemblies were chosen from among persons of a certain age. (Xenophon [Cyropned. 1, c. 2] speaks of οἱ γεραίτεροι ὄντες τε καὶ καλούμενοι. Livy [34, 49] says of the Carthaginians, “Seniores ita senatum vocabant.” The Greeks had γερουσία, συνέδριον ἐν Σμύρνα, γερόντων; the Romans had their senatus; the Germans their aldermen. We find this counsellorship of the elders in the Greek translation of the Old Testament: [<051116>Deuteronomy 11:16] Sept. πρεσβύτεροι τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ γραμματεῖς; [<244901>Jeremiah 19:1] ἀρὸ πρεσβυτέρων τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ πρεσβυτέρων τῶν ἱερέων; [<261811>Ezekiel 8:11] ἑβδομήκοντα ἐκ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων οικου Ἰσραήλ; [<111206>1 Kings 12:6, 8] τὴν βουλὴν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων; [20, 8] οἱ πρεσβύτεροι καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαός.) The Jewish synedrium was also taken as a model (συνέδριον, i.e. college of judges, Sanhedrin); and it is expressly stated that the presbyterium is a copy of the “synedrium” of the apostles (εἰς τόπον συνεδρίου τῶν ἀποστόλων). St. Ignatius (110), who, more than any other writer, insists upon the distinction between the episcopate and presbyterate, and the superiority of the former, points out most

decidedly the connection of the presbyterium, as an episcopal council, with the episcopate. We read in the *Ep. ad Smmyrn*. c. 8: Πάντες τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ἀκολουθεῖτε ὡς Ἰησοῦ Χριστὸς τῷ πατρὶ καὶ τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ ὡς τοῖς ἀποστόλοις τοὺς δὲ διακόνους ἐντρέπεσθε ὡς θεοῦ ἐντολήν. *Ad Magnes*. c. 2: ὑποτάσσεται (ὁ διάκονος) τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ὡς Χάριτι θεοῦ καὶ τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ ὡς νόμῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. *Ad Philad*. c. 4: μία γὰρ σὰρξ τοῦ κυρίου-καὶ ἓν ποτήριον εἰς ἕνωσιν τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ, ἓν θυσιαστήριον, ὡς εἷς ἐπίσκοπος ἅμα τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ καὶ διακόνοις. *Ibid*. c. 8: Πᾶσιν μετανοοῦσιν ἄφιει ὁ κύριος, ἐὰν μετανοησώσιν εἰς ἑνοτήτα θεοῦ καὶ συνέδριον τοῦ ἐπισκόπου. In all these passages we find the name πρεσβυτέριον; in other passages the father uses πρεσβύτεροι, although he means the presbyters united in a college, and not the same as individuals (*Ep. ad Polycarp*. c. 6): τῶν ὑποτασσομένων τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ, πρεσβυτέριος, διακόνοις. Ad Philad. p-roomn: ἐὰν ἐν ἑνὶ ὠσὶν σὺν τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ καὶ τοῖς σὺν αὐτῷ πρεσβυτέροις καὶ διακόνοις ἀποδειγμένους ἐν γνώμῃ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Ad Magnes. c. 6: ἑνωθήτε τῷ ἐπισκόπω καὶ τοῖς προκαθημένοις . Ad Triall. c. 3: Πάντες ἐντρεπεσθῷσαν τοὺς διακόνους ὡς ἐντολὴν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ὡς Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τοὺς δὲ πρεσβυτέρους ὡς συνέδριον θεοῦ καὶ ὡς συνδεσμὸν ἀποστόλων. Ad Magnes. c. 6: Σπουδάζετε πάντα πράσειν προκαθημένου τοῦ ἐπισκόπου εἰς τόπον θεοῦ καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων εἰς τόπον συνεδρίου τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τῶν διακόνων—πεπιστευμένων διακονίαν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Thus a natural want led to the foundation of the presbyterium, as a college of presbyters and deacons of the episcopal city, to advise the bishop in the most important ecclesiastical affairs of the diocese.

The form of this college had a positive model in the “synledrium” of the Old Testament, the judiciary competenlcy of which was, in the presbyterium, increased by the addition of the most important questions of administration. Chrysostom (*De Sacerdot*. lib. 3, c. 15) calls the presbyterium τὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων συνέδριον. The purpose of the institution was to secure efficiency in the workings of the Church, as is proved by the phrase βουλὴ ἐκκλησίας θεοῦ, by which Origen (*In Joann*.) designates the presbyterium. In this simple constitution the presbyters and deacons of the archiepiscopal city formed in the first five centuries the higher clergy, which, with its bishops, was considered as one body, as Thomassin says, Vetus et Nova Ecclesice Disciplina (Mogunt. 1787), 3, 32: “Ergo presbyteri diaconique civitatum episcopalium, qui

clerus erat superior dioeceseos in unum corpus, in unum senatum consiliumque cum episcopo coibat, cum eoque principe et capite suo, clericis populisque dioeceseos omnibus moderabatur." As this presbyterium forms the council of the bishop, it is said to be at the head of the Church, along with the bishop. Thus, in the Council of Antiochia, can. 1: "Si quis eorum, qui praesunt ecclesiae, aut episcopus, aut presbyter, aut diaconus, εἴ τις τῶν προεστώτων." The Council of Sardica, can. 13, prohibits the elevation of neophytes to the highest dignities: to the episcopate, presbyterate, and diaconate; consequently to the governing clergy. In the ecumenical Council of Ephesus, pt. 1, c. 31, 34, and act 1, we find several letters of the bishop Cyril of Alexandria, addressed to the presbyters and deacons, and to the people of Alexandria. When pope Siricius prepared to condemn the heresy of Jovinian, he took the advice of his priests and deacons: "Facto ergo presbyterio constitit Christianas legi esse contraria. Omnium nostrum, tam presbyteroruum quam diaconorum, quam etiam totius cleri una suscitata fuit sententia." Pope Felix proclaimed his sentence against Petrus Enopheus, the unlawful bishop of Antioch, under the formula: "Firma sit hec tua depositio a me et ab his, qui mecuom apostolicum thronum regunt." The presbyters and deacons of Rome deliberated in the Roman synods with the bishops who happened to be at Rome on all matters which were of interest to the Roman see. In a Roman council under pope Hilary, the transmutation of a Spanish bishop being in question, the account says: "Residentibus etiam universis presbyteris, adstantibus quoque diaconibus;" and at the end of the council: "Ab universis episcopis et presbyteris acclamattm est, ut disciplina servetur, ut canones custodiantur, rogamus." The college of the cardinals is by the Romanists claimed to be a true picture of these presbyteries of the apostolic Church. If in the transaction of affairs concerning the Church in general the advice of the presbyteries was requested, this was still more natural where the special business of the several bishoprics was concerned. The fourth Council of Carthage prescribes, can. 22: "Ut episcopus sine consensu clericorum suorum clericos non ordinet;" and in can. 23: "Ut episcopus nullius causam audiat absque pr esentia clericorum suorum. Alioqui irrita erit sententia episcopi, nisi clericorum suorum majorumn sententia cofirmetur." St. Jerome says (In Jesa, 1, 3): "Et nos habeamus senatum nostrum, ccetum presbyterorum;" and *Basil*, *Ep*. 310, calls this senate τὸ συνέδριον τοῦ πρεσβυτερίου τοῦ κατὰ τὴν πόλιν . St. Cyprian transacted no business of any consequence without consulting his presbytery. In the matter of the fallen ones, he says: "Deinde sic collatiole

consiliormum cum episcopis, presbyteris. diaconis, confessoribus pariter astantibus laicis facta, lapsorum tractare rationem." In lib. 3, ep. 10: "Ad id vero, quod scripserunt compresbyteri nostri, solus rescribere nihil potui, cum a primordio episcopats mei statuerim, nihil sine consilio vestro et sine consensu plebis, me privatim sententia gerere. St. Ignatius (*Ep. cad Trallianos*) calls the presbyters the counselors of the bishop: σύμβουλοι καὶ συνεδρεύται τοῦ ἐπισκόπου εἰς τόπον συνεδρίου τῶν ἀποστόλων. The difference between the presbyteries and the cathedral chapters, which were of later institution, is thus defined by Thomassin (c. I, p. 36, nr. 8 sq.):

"**1.** Non constabat clerus ille nisi presbyteris et diaconis.

2. Presbyteri et diaconi hi, parochi ipsi erant et pastores omnium civitatis ecclesiarum, aut si necdum essent divulsae a cathedrali parochiae, in eo ipsi parochorum munia omnia implebant.

3. Ipsa sua ordinatione hlunc gradum et hunc dignitatem consequebantur. Nam presbyteratus et diaconatus peraeque ac episcopatus beneficia erant, non ordines tantum; et id genus erant beneficia, quibus incumberet salutis animarum cura, pro suo certe modo.

4. Clerus etiam nunc Romanae ecclesiae formam proe se fert splendidissimam expressissimamque ejus cleri, qui olim singulis in cathedralibus ecclesiis episcopo copulabatur. Constat enim Romani pontificis clerus presbyteris, diaconisque cardinalibus, seu titularibus ecclesiarum omnium Romoe parochialium parochis, cum pontifice, et sub pontifice conspirantlbus et collaborantibus Romano in consistorio, de negotiis omnibus, quae ex pontifioia spirituali ditione, ex universo, inquam, christiano orbe referuntur."

A consequence of the participation of the presbyters in the administration during the lifetime of the bishop was that they governed alone during the vacancy of the see. After the death of pope Fabian, the clergy of Rome wrote to the clergy of Carthage (*Ep*. 29 *ap. Cypr*.): "Omnes nos decet, pro corpore totius ecclesiae, cujus per varias quasque provincias membra digesta sunt, excubare." Oilly the decisions about the most momentous concerns were postponed till after the new occupancy of the see. Thus the clergy of Rome say (*Ep*. 31): "Quanquam nobis differendoe hujus rei major necessitas incumbat, quibus post excessum Fabiani nullus est episcopus propter rerum et temporum difficultates constitutus;" and in another

passage: “Ante constitutionem episcopi nihil innovandum putavimus, ut interim, dum episcopus dari a Deo nobis sustinetur, in suspensu eorum causa teneatur, qui moras possunt dilatione sustinere.” It was the same when the bishop was for a longer period of time absent from his residence. Thus St. Ignatilus says: “Pascite presbyterieum, qui in vobis est, gregem, usquequo Dominus ostendat eum qui vobis principabitur.” And St. Cyprian (*Ep*. 10) says to his presbyters and deacons: “Hortor et mando, ut vos vice mea, quem abesse oportet, fungamini circa ea gerenda quse administratio religiosa deposcit;” and lib. 4 ep. 6: “Officium meum diligigentia vestra praesentet, et faciat omnia, quae fieri oportet circa eos,” etc. Thus St. Hilarius, in his petition to the emperor Constanitus, states that he has administered his diocese through his presbyters: “Licet in exilio permanens et ecclesiae adhuc communioner per presbyteros meos distribuens.” But at an early period the bishops commenced to appoint vicars for the dispatch of all their business at the time of their absence. The institution of the old presbyteries melted organically into the cathedral chapters. St. Eusebius of Vercelli and St. Augustine, to promote Christian life in their presbyteries. had already given them monastical constitutions. Other cathedral churches imitated this arrangement; and in the empire of the Franks the institution of common life, after the model of the institutions founded by bishop Chrodegang of Metz, spread rapidly. In consequence of the confirmation of the rule proposed by the deacon Amalarius at the Council of Aix-la-Chapelle (816), the innovation was accepted in all episcopal churches. The bishops of those times, in imitation of those of the first centuries, did nothing of importance without their canons. We have an example of it in the business transacted concerning the lease of some real estate between Hincmar of Rheims and a Thuringian abbot. But if the cathedral chapter was the privileged part of the clergy in this respect, yet the bishop was free to take the advice of the other members both of the secular and regular clergy. Thus bishop Jonas of Autun, who wished to raise the income of his canons, insured the “consensum presbyterorum, diaconorurn, ac totius sequentis ordinis ejusdem ecclesie.” When, in the 10th century, the canonic common life was given up, the canons continued to form the senate of the bishop. According to the decretals, the canons are the born counselors of the bishops. Calixtus II forbids archpriests and archdeacons to interdict clerks: “‘Preter episcopi et totius capituli commune consilium.” Alexander III blames the patriarch of Jerusalem for appointing and deposing abbots and other prebendaries without consulting his chapter, and upon the mere advice of foreigners. Yet, as a rule, the bishop is not bound by the vote of

the chapter, although there are questions which cannot be decided without its consent. The Council of Trent also, in sess. 24, c. 13, calls the cathedral chapter *the senate* of the bishop. He has to take its advice for the appointment of a lector oh the Holy Scriptures (*Cone. Trid.* sess. 5, c. 1); for the fixing of the holy orders, to be requested in those who are to be promoted to the dignities and canonries of the cathedrals (sess. 24:c. 12); for the establishment of seminaries (sess. 23:c. 18); for any addition to the number of the canonries (sess. 24:c. 15), etc. But the presumption is always in favor of the episcopal independence. Thus, when the chapters of the ecclesiastical province of Milan endeavored to increase to an unlawful extent the number of the *causse majores,* in which the bishop has to obtain the consent or take tie advice of the canons, St. Borromaeus declared, in the fourth Council of Milan, that the bishop was bound to have the approbation or to take the advice of his chapter only in such cases as are stated by law. The litigations about these cases had become of quite frequent occurrence since the dissolution of the community of goods I n the chapters, and the latter had often conducted themselves in regard to the bishop as independent corporations. In many places the bishop had become a simple member of the chapter. Up to the year 1803 the chapters of Germany held at the same time two sharply defined positions: they constituted, first, as of old the senate of the bishop, and subordinate to him; and, secondly, they were independent corporations. The secularization of 1803 destroyed this latter position. The reorganization of the Church in Germany makes the chapter simply an episcopal council. The papal see has resolutely set its face against all pretensions of binding the bishops to the consent of the chapters. Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex*. s.v. See Buss, *Gesch. des National u. Territorial-Kirchenthums in der Katholischen Kirche* (Schaff. 1851).

Presbytery

is (1) the space in the choir of a church in which the high-altar is placed; the name is sometimes extended to the whole choir. *SEE CHANCEL*. It is (2), in Scotch law, an ecclesiastical division of the country, as well as a court. (On the Continent this is known as the *classis*.) In its local sense it includes a combination of parishes, varying from four to thirty, and the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland has power to vary the size. — Chambers, s.v. *SEE SCOTLAND, CHURCH OF*. The presbytery is composed of the teaching elders of the churches of a given geographical district, together with one of the ruling elders elected for that purpose by

the Session from each church. Besides being a court of appeal from the inferior judicatory, it is bound to inspect carefully the personal conduct and pastoral labors of every minister within its bounds, and, when necessary, to admonish, suspend, or even depose. It belongs to presbyteries to grant licenses to preach the Gospel, to take cognizance of all preachers within its borders, to give certificates of character, etc., to those removing, and to furnish supplies where needed for the pulpit. Ally Church member who feels himself aggrieved by the act of the Session may appeal from its decisions to the Presbytery. Superior in authority to the Presbytery is the *Synod*, which is composed of the teaching elders and one ruling elder from each church of a larger district than that represented by the Presbytery. Still above the Synod is the *General Assembly*. This embraces representatives, both lay and clerical, from every Presbytery, and is the supreme authority in all ecclesiastical matters. To it an appeal lies from the Presbytery in all ecclesiastical proceedings of a disciplinary character, and its decision is final. Its authority, however, though supreme, is not unlimited. In legislating for the churches it is required to refer the laws which it passes to the presbyteries for their approval; and the law does not become of binding force upon the churches until it receives the sanction of at least a majority; in certain cases two thirds are required. The Presbytery holds frequent and stated meetings, according as circumstances may require. In any emergency it is in the power of the *moderator* (q.v.), on his own responsibility, or on receiving a written requisition from several members, to call a pro re nata meeting of the Presbytery. In Presbyterian churches, where the supreme court consists of delegates, it belongs to each Presbytery to elect ministers and elders to represent them in that court. All the proceedings of the Presbytery must be duly minuted by the clerk, and are subject to the review of the Provincial Synod. *SEE PRESBYTERIANISM*.

Presbytis

(*presbytress*). This word, in the various forms πρεσβύτερα, presbytera, presbyterissa, is of frequent occurrence in ancient writers, and denotes either the wife of a presbyter or a deaconess in the Church. Sometimes it denotes the matron of a cloister, and an abbess. *SEE DEACONESS*.

Prescience

(Lat. *praescio*, to know before it happens) is all attribute of God popularly known under the term Foreknowledge, and ascribed to him in different

degrees and extent by Arminians and Calvinists. The doctrine is deduced from the perfection of God's nature. But as man has no analogous faculty, it is difficult, if not impossible for us to conceive of God's prescience. Man's knowledge of what is future is so obscure and inferential that it is in vain to fathom God's beholding of all things. Yet in the attempt made there arises the great question, how to reconcile the prescience of God with the liberty of man; and hence the doctrine becomes of vast importance to theologians of both the Arminian and the Calvinian schools.

I. *False Theories*. — Three leading theories have been resorted to in order to evade the difficulties which are supposed to be involved in the opinion commonly received.

1. Chevalier Ramsay (*Philosophical Principles of Natural and Revealed Religion* [Glasgow, 1748, 2 vols. 4to]) among his other speculations, holds it a matter of choice in God to think of finite ideas; and similar opinions, though variously worded, have been occasionally adopted. In substance these opinions are that though the knowledge of God be infinite as his power is infinite, there is no more reason to conclude that his knowledge should be always exerted to the full extent of its capacity than that his power should be employed to the extent of his omnipotence; and that if we suppose him to choose not to know some contingencies, the infiniteness of his knowledge is not thereby impugned. To this it may be answered

(1) that the infinite power of God is in Scripture represented, as in the nature of things it must be, as an infinite capacity, and not as infinite in act; but that the knowledge of God is, on the contrary, never represented there to us as a capacity to acquire knowledge, but as actually comprehending all things that are and all things that can be.

(2) That the notion of God's choosing to know some things and not to know others supposes a reason why he refuses to know ally class of things or events, which reason, it would seem, can only arise out of their nature and circumstances, and therefore supposes at least a partial knowledge of them, from which the reason for his not choosing to know them arises. The doctrine is therefore somewhat contradictory. But

(3) it is fatal to this opinion that it does not at all meet the difficulty arising out of the question of the consistency of divine prescience and tile free actions of men, since some contingent actions-for which men have been made accountable, we are sure-have been foreknown by God, because by

his Spirit in the prophets they were foretold; and if the freedom of man can in these cases be reconciled with the prescience of God, there is no greater difficulty in any other case which can possibly occur.

2. A second theory is that, the foreknowledge of contingent events being in its own nature impossible, because it implies a contradiction, it does no dishonor to the divine Being to affirm that of such events he has, and can have, no prescience whatever, and thus the prescience of God as to moral actions being wholly denied the difficulty in question is got rid of. To this the same answer must be given as to the former. It does not meet the case so long as the Scriptures are allowed to contain prophecies of rewardable and punishable actions. The great fallacy in the argument that the certain prescience of a moral action destroys its contingent nature lies in supposing that contingency and certainty are the opposites of each other. It is, perhaps, unfortunate that a word which is of figurative etymology, and which, consequently, can only have an ideal application to such subjects, should have grown into common use in this discussion, because it is more liable, on that account, to present itself to different minds under different shades of meaning. If, however, the term *contingent* in this controversy has any definite meaning at all, as applied to the moral actions of men, it must mean their freedom, and stands opposed, not to certainty, but to necessity. A free action is a voluntary one; and an action which results from the choice of the agent is distinguished from a necessary one in this, that it might not have been, or have been otherwise, according to the self-determining power of the agent. It is with reference to this specific quality of a free action that the term contingency is used: it might have been otherwise-in other words, it was not necessitated. Contingency in moral actions is, therefore, their freedom, and is opposed, not to certainty, but to constraint. The very nature of this controversy fixes this as the precise meaning of the term. The question is not, in point of fact, about the certainty of moral actions-that is, whether they will happen or not-but about the nature of them, whether free or constrained, whether they must happen or not. Those who advocate this theory care not about the certainty of actions simply considered, that is, whether they will take place or not; the reason why they object to a certain prescience of moral actions is this: they conclude that such a prescience renders them necessary. It is the quality of the action for which they contend, not whether it will happen or not. If contingency meant *uncertainty*, the sense in which such theorists take it, the dispute would be at an end. But though an uncertain action

cannot be foreseen as certain, a free, unnecessitated action may, for there is nothing in the knowledge of the action in the least to affect its nature. Simple knowledge is in no sense a cause of action, nor can it be conceived to be causal, unconnected with exerted power: for mere knowledge, therefore, an action remains free or necessitated, as the case may be. A necessitated action is not made a voluntary one by its being foreknown; a free action is not made a necessary one. Free actions foreknown will not, therefore, cease to be contingent. But how stands the case as to their certainty? Precisely on the same ground. The certainty of a necessary action-foreknown does not result from the knowledge of the action, but from the operation of the necessitating cause, and, in like manner, the certainty of a free action does not result from the knowledge of it, which is no cause at all, but from the voluntary cause-that is, the determination of the will. It alters not the case in the least to say that the voluntary action might have been otherwise. Had it been otherwise, the knowledge of it would have been otherwise; but as the will which gives birth to the action is not dependent upon the previous knowledge of God, but the knowledge of the action upon foresight of the choice of the will, neither the will nor the act is controlled by the knowledge, and the action, though foreseen, is still free or contingent. The foreknowledge of God has then no influence upon either the freedom or the certainty of actions, for this plain reason, that it is knowledge, and not influence; and actions may be certainly foreknown without their being rendered necessary by that foreknowledge. But here it is said, “If the result of an absolute contingency be certainly foreknown, it *can* have no other result, it *cannot* happen otherwise.” This is not the true inference. It will not happen otherwise; but it may be asked, Why can it not happen otherwise? Can is an expression of potentiality-it denotes power or possibility. The objection is that it is not possible that the action should otherwise happen. But why not? What deprives it of that power? If a necessary action were in question, it could not otherwise happen than as the necessitating cause should compel; but, then, that would arise from the necessitating cause solely, and not from the prescience of the action, which is not causal. But if the action be free, and it enters into the very nature of a voluntary action to be unconstrained, then it might have happened in a thousand other ways, or not have happened at all; the foreknowledge of it no more affects its nature in this case than in the other. All its potentiality, so to speak, still remains, independent of foreknowledge, which neither adds to its power of happening otherwise nor diminishes it. But then we are told that “the

prescience of it in that case must be uncertain." Not unless any person can prove that the divine prescience is unable to dart through all the workings of the human mind, all its comparison of things in the judgment, all the influences of motives on the affections, all the hesitances and haltings of the will, to its final choice. "Such knowledge is too wonderfuil for us," but it is the knowledge of him "who understandeth the thoughts of man afar off." "But if a contingency *will* have a given result, to that result it *must* be determined." Not in the least. We have seen that it cannot be determined to a given result by mere precognition, for we have evidence in our own minds that mere knowledge is not causal to the actions of another. It is determined to its result by the will of the agent; but even in that case it cannot be said that it must be determined to that result, because it is of the nature of freedom to be unconstrained: so that here we have an instance in the case of a free agent that he will act in some particular manner, but it by no means follows from what *will* be, whether foreseen or not, that it *must* be.

3. The third theory amounts, in brief, to this: that the foreknowledge of God must be supposed to differ so much from anything of the kind which we perceive in ourselves, and from any ideas which we can possibly form of that property of the divine nature, that no argument respecting it can be grounded upon our imperfect notions, and that all controversy on subjects connected with it is idle and fruitless. But though foreknowledge in God should be admitted to be something of a "very different nature" from the same quality in man; yet as it is represented as *something* equivalent to foreknowledge, whatever that something may be, since in consequence of it prophecies have actually been uttered and fulfilled, and of such a kind, too, as relate to actions for which men have, in fact, been held accountable, all the original difficulty of reconciling contingent events to this something, of which human foreknowledge is a "kind of shadow," as "a map of China is to China itself," remains in full force. The difficulty is shifted, but not removed.

II. *Extent of Prescience*. — It may, therefore, be certainly concluded, if, at least, the Holy Scriptures are to be our guide, that the omniscience of God comprehends his certain prescience of all events, however contingent; and if anything more were necessary to strengthen the argument above given, it might be drawn from the irrational, and, above all, the unscriptural consequences which would follow from the denial of this doctrine. These are forcibly stated by president Edwards: "It would follow from this notion

(namely, that the Almighty doth not foreknow what will be the result of future contingencies) that as God is liable to be continually repenting what he has done, so he must be exposed to be constantly changing his mind and intentions as to his future conduct-altering his measures, relinquishing his old designs, and forming new schemes and projections. For his purposes, even as to the main parts of the scheme (namely, such as belong to the state of his moral kingdom), must be always liable to be broken through want of foresight, and he must be continually putting his system to rights, as it gets out of order, through the contingence of the actions of moral agents: he must be a Being who, instead of being absolutely immutable, must necessarily be the subject of infinitely the most numerous acts of repentance and changes of intention of any being whatsoever, for this plain reason, that his vastly extensive charge comprehends an infinitely greater number of those things which are to him contingent and uncertain. In such a situation he must have little else to do but to mend broken links as well as he can, and be rectifying his disjointed frame and disordered movements in the best manner the case will allow. The supreme Lord of all things must needs be under great and miserable disadvantages in governing the world which he has made and has the care of, through his being utterly unable to find out things of chief importance which hereafter shall befall his system, which, if he did but know, he might make seasonable provision for. In many cases there may be very great necessity that he should make provisions in the manner of his ordering and disposing things for some great events which are to happen of vast and extensive influence and endless consequence to the universe, which he may see afterwards, when it is too late, and may wish in vain that he had known beforehand, that he might have ordered his affairs accordingly. And it is in the power of man, on these principles, by his devices, purposes, and actions thus to disappoint God, break his measures, make him continually to change his mind, subject him to vexation, and bring him into confusion."

III. *Speculations on the Subject*. — Some of the ancient philosophers denied that God could foreknow events depending on free will (see Cicero, *De Divinate*, 2, 5, 7; answered by Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*, 5, 9, 10). Socinus (*Praelect. Theol*. c. 8-11) and his early followers would not allow that God possesses any knowledge of future contingencies. The schoolmen, in reference to this species of knowledge in God, invented that called *scientia media* (q.v.; *SEE FONSECA* and *SEE MOLINI*), which they define as "that by which God knows, *sub conditione*, what men or

angels will do according to the liberty which they have when they are placed in these or those circumstances, or in this or in that order of things." When Gomarus, the opponent of Arminius, found that his opinion concerning the object of reprobation was clogged with this absurdity — that it made God to be the author of Adam's sin — he very astutely took refuge in this conditional foreknowledge, and in his corrected theses on predestination, published after the death of Arminius, he describes it as "that by which God, through the infinite light of his own knowledge, foreknows some future things, not absolutely, but as placed under a certain condition." Waleas, the celebrated antagonist of Episcopius, had recourse to the same expedient. This distinction has been adopted by very few of those who espouse the doctrines of general redemption, and who believe that every event, how contingent so ever to the creature, is, with respect to God, certainly foreknown. An old English divine thinks that "in the sacred Scriptures certain not obscure vestiges are apparent of this kind of knowledge of things that will happen thus or otherwise, on the supposition of the occurrence of this or that circumstance. Omitting the well-known example of David in Keilah (<09>1 Samuel 22:12), and of Chorazin and Bethsaida (<40>Matthew 11:21; <42>Luke 10:13), consult, among other sayings of the same description, Christ's answer to the chief priests and scribes who had asked 'Art thou the Christ? Tell us.' And he said unto them, 'If I tell you, ye will not believe.' In the subsequent verse he adds, 'If I also ask you, ye will not answer me, nor let me go' (<42>Luke 22:67, 68). You have here three events specified which yet will not occur even on the supposition of Christ our Lord himself." This kind of knowledge might very well be included in that of *scientia visionis*, because the latter ought to include, not what God will do and what his creatures will do under his appointment, but what they will do by his permission as free agents, and what he will do, as a consequence of this, in his character of Governor and Lord. But since the predestinarians had confounded *scientia visionis* with a predestinating decree, the *scientia media* well expressed what they had left quite unaccounted for, and which they had assumed did not really exist-the actions of creatures endowed with free will and the acts of Deity which from eternity were consequent upon them. If such actions do not take place, then men are not free; and if the rectoral acts of God are not consequent upon the actions of the creature in the order of the divine intention, and the conduct of the creature is consequent upon the foreordained rectoral acts of God, then we reach a necessitating eternal decree, which, in fact, the predestinarian contends for; but it unfortunately

brings after it consequences which no subtleties have ever been able to shake off-that the only actor in the universe is God himself, and that the only distinction among events is that one class is brought to pass by God directly and the other indirectly, not by the agency, but by the mere instrumentality, of his creatures. — Watson. See also Watson, *Theol. Institutes*, 1, 375; 2, 357, 429; *Works*, 7:298,309; Pope, *Compendium of Christian Theology* (Lond. 1875), p. 145-149,191 sq.; Raymond, *Systematic Theology* (see Index in vol. 2); Knapp, *Theology*, § 22; Fletcher, *Works*; *Presbyterian Confession*; *Church Remembrancer* (Jan. 1856); B1ulletimz *Theol*. (Oct. 1868), p. 26 sq.; Hodge, *Systematic Theology* (see Index); Bromley, *Divine Prescience*; Clarke, *Boyle Lectures for 1705; King, Sermons on the Divine Prescience*; Tillotson, *Sermons*; Waterland, *Works*, vol. 6; Haag, *Histoire des Dogmes* (see Index in vol. 2; Graves, *Works*, vol. 4; *Bib. Sacra*, July, 1868, p. 455; Neander, *Dogm*. p. 568 sq.; Callisen, *Essay with a View to bring into Harmony the Doctrine of the Omniscience of God and the Freedom of Man*, in Schmidt u. Schwarz, Theol. Bibliothek, vol. 8; Reid, *On the Active Powers*, essay 4: ch. 11; Pye Smith, *First Lines of Christian Theology*, p. 148, 149. *SEE ELECTION*; *SEE PREDESTINATION*.

Prescription

I. This expression, borrowed from the civil law, has in the Roman Catholic Church a canonistic meaning. In order to put limits to the contests about mine and thine in rights, obligations, and possessions, that Church has fixed terms which invest with legality the possession of rights and goods, unless proof be produced that these rights or goods are of an alienable kind, or have been acquired by illegal means (usurpation or theft time does not consecrate). If the lawful term be elapsed, the possessor is confirmed in the possession of said rights or goods, and he who is bound by certain obligations cannot call them in question. ‘The term of prescription varies with the nature of the object: movable property prescribes quicker than immovable, the property of adults quicker than that of minors, the property of those present quicker than that of absentees; ecclesiastical property is prescribed only after forty years. According to the rules of the papal chancery, the possessor of an ecclesiastical office, after a three years’ possession, if it be not obtained by violence or simony, cannot be lawfully expelled from it. There is prescription in his favor.

II. Tertullian transplanted this expression to the theological domain by his work on prescriptions against heretics, a kind of argument against erroneous doctrine. This is what he means: The Catholic Church enjoys, in her doctrines and discipline, the right of prescription; what she teaches and practices at the present hour she has taught and practiced from times immemorial-learned it from the apostles, as the apostles learned from Christ, as Christ had it from the Father. The catholic doctrine is the true one, because it is the old and original one, and rests on the divine revelation; the doctrines of heretics and sectarians, on the other side, are false, because new, because they have not prescription in their favor, and consequently are not founded on divine revelation. Irenaeus taught similarly. It is easy to see that this proof by prescription is much the same as the proof by tradition, and that this mode of arguing can have no acceptability in Protestantism, where the Bible alone is regarded as the true test, and the apostolic or early Church practices have only an advisory influence, not authority. Of course, High-Churchmen, by their ritualistic tendency, can hardly be said to come under the full influence of Protestantism, and are therefore not to be considered as included in the exponents of evangelical Christianity. See Elliott, *Delineation of Roman Catholicism*, p. 61, 95, 407. *SEE AUTHORITY*.

PRESCRIPTION is also a law adopted in Presbyterian churches. If a scandal is not noticed for five years after it happens, it cannot be revived, but is then said to be prescribed.

Presence

means, in canonical law, the uninterrupted personal residence of every regularly prebended ecclesiastic at the seat of his office; a duty emphatically imposed on him by the laws of the Church. It means also the personal attendance at the common choral prayer, to which the laws of the Church obligate all members of a monastic community, as well as the canons and choir-vicars of the cathedral and collegiate congregations.

Presence-money

is the small daily payment in specie made by Roman Catholics to the canons for their presence in the choir at defunct cathedral or collegiate churches. After the dissolution of the communal life of those ecclesiastics, the bulk of the revenue of the chapters was divided into individual portions, to be distributed partly as daily stipends, called *distributiones*

quotidiance, or *quotidiana stipendia*, in opposition to the prebends, which went by the name of *fructus grossi* or *annui*. The purpose of this daily distribution was to induce the canons to a stricter obedience to the law of residence, and to more assiduous attendance to the public choir-prayers, as only those canons came in for their share who were either present in the choir or officiated during the service. Yet there were some grounds on which their absence could be excused without loss of their share. (These legal exceptions are formulated in the canonic regulations in *De cler. aegr.* 3, 6; *De cler. non resid.* 3, 3; *Conc. Trid.* sess. 22:c. 3, and sess. 24:c. 8 fin. *De ref.*) The Council of Trent directed that in those cathedral or collegiate congregations where there existed no presence-money, or where it reached but an insignificant amount, a third of the whole revenue of the chapter should be set apart and used for such distributions (*Conc. Trid.* sess. 21:c. 3, *De ref.*). The portions of the canons absent without reasonable excuse were to be divided among the members present *pro rata*, or given to the fabric of the church, if it stood in need of such help, or employed for any pious purpose the bishop might devise (sess. 22:c. 3, *De ref.*). It was not always the negligence of the canons, but also the peculiar- and partly abusive-composition of the chapters, which was the cause that their members so frequently dispensed with personal service in the choir, and were represented in it by simple vicars. The personal obligation of the canons has been insisted upon by the most ancient canonic rules, by the Council of Trent, and by the last circumscription bulls for the reorganization of the German bishoprics. Special presence-money is no more in use; for as the dotation of the restored bishoprics and chapters is not founded on immovable property, as the prebends flow, in the form of fixed salaries, out of the public treasure, the direction of the Council of Trent that a part of the revenue should be set apart and used for such distributions is not acted upon. See Schmidt, Thesaurus jut. [2001]Ecclesiastes 4:195 sq.

Presence, Real

SEE TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

Present

SEE GIFT.

in ecclesiastical law, is,

I, in the state-established churches, one of those forms of canonic collation of the prebends by which the rights of the bishop are limited, inasmuch as he cannot himself nominate an occupant to the vacant office, but must be content with confirming the nominee of the *patronus beneficii*. The *right of presentation* is therefore the right of the patron to designate to the bishop the successor elected by him of a deceased beneficiary, the bishop being obliged to confirm the candidate if he be worthy, capable, and proposed according to canonical rules. This right of presentation is the first and most important of all patronal rights. The patron, in the exercise of his right, is bound by the general conditions of a canonical provision: he has to propose a capable and worthy person gratuitously, and within the legal limits of time. If the patronate be an ecclesiastical or a mixed one, the time is six months; if it be a worldly one, four months: yet there are departures from this rule. In Austria the patron must choose his nominee out of a list drawn up by the ordinariate: if he be at home, within six months; if he be abroad, within three months, from the day of the receipt of the list. In Prussia six months are allowed to the lay patron, as well as to the ecclesiastical patron, from the day of the vacation of the office; or, if the beneficiary die abroad, from the day on which the news of his death is received. In Baden the time is limited to three months, except in the case of insurmountable hindrances. If the right of presentation belong to several persons individually, they can agree upon a common choice, or designate each his own candidate, leaving the choice to the bishop; or the matter may be decided by the majority of the votes; and in case of an equality of votes in favor of each candidate, the decision may be left again to the bishop. The same rules obtain when the right of a patron has been transmitted to several heirs, in which case, of course, the heirs of one patron can give only one vote. If the right of presentation belong to a college or a juridical person, the case is settled by the statutes of the corporation; or if regulations on the subject be wanting, by a collegiate vote. In the remainder, the right of the patron is unlimited: he can propose his nearest relation, but not himself, although he could, “via gratiae,” present a request for his own admission (*gratiosam petere admissionem*). He can submit several candidates to the choice of the bishop; if he be a layman, he can, so long as the legal term is not elapsed and the canonic collation has not taken

place, propose successively several other names. This *jus variandi* is not allowed to an ecclesiastical patron. Here the first presentation, according to the principle "Tempore prior potior jure," makes null and void all subsequent nominations. If the legal term is passed without presentation, or if the presentation has not been made gratuitously, the nomination in that case is lost to the patron, and belongs exclusively to the collator. The same happens when an ecclesiastical patron wittingly proposes an unworthy subject, while the lay patron is allowed another presentation in the legal four months. But if the patron, whether layman or ecclesiastic, have unwittingly proposed an unworthy candidate, he obtains a new term of four or of six months. The Prussian law allows, after the expiration of the primitive term, only a supplementary term of six weeks. In Baden the patron, if his proposition have been rejected by the ordinariate, is allowed another presentation, to be made in the space of four weeks, and the same term is allowed him a second time, but not further. The presentation is made by letter, for which many ordinariates prescribe fixed formulas to the private patrons. The contests about the patronal rights are, according to decretal law, subject to the ecclesiastical courts; but modern legislation has almost everywhere added it to the competency of the worldly tribunals. If the patronal right itself be contested, the actual possessor has the "jus prasentandi," and the nomination resulting from the use he makes of it is not invalidated by his being afterwards defeated in the lawsuit. But if the right to hold the goods with which the patronate is connected should itself' be questioned, then the right of presentation is suspended, and the bishop in this case enjoys a free right of collation. The winner of the suit may then, to insure his privilege, confirm the nomination made by the bishop; but if he should refuse his consent, this can have no influence on the situation of the nominee. See Schulte, *Kirchenrecht*, p. 67 sq.; Rosshirt, *Kanonisches Recht*, p. 437 sq.; Pachmann, *Kirchenrecht*, 1, 268 sq.; Richter, *Kirchenrecht*, § 193; Gerlach, *Das Prisentationsrecht* (Regensb. 1855).

II. In the Established Church of Scotland the minister intended for a living by a patron must be presented to the presbytery for inquiry into his qualifications, and for induction if these are satisfactory. If the patron fail to present within six months, the right then devolves on the presbytery, *tanquam jure devoluto*. *SEE JUS DEVOLUTUM*. When a presentee was objected to by the major part of the congregation, whether with or without reason, the General Assembly of the Church formerly claimed the right to declare that he should not be inducted or entitled to the benefice. This

declaration was contained in an act of Assembly, dated 1835, called the Veto Act. But after much litigation it was decided by the courts of law that such Veto Act was *ultra vires* and void; and this decision led to a secession of many ministers and people from the Established Church, and to the formation of a new dissenting Church, called the Free Church (q.v.). The law is now settled that it is the presbytery, and not the people, who are to judge of the reasonableness of any objections made to the presentee, for which purpose reasons and objections are heard on both sides, and a wide discretion is exercised by the presbytery. If the presbytery dismiss the objections, they then proceed to the trial and induction (q.v.) of the presentee. The following is the form of a Scotch presentation, and is a copy, indeed, of the one which led to the disputes and processes that ended in the disruption of the Scottish Church:

"The right honorable Thomas Robert Drummond Hay, earl of Kininoull, undoubted patron of the parish church and parish of Auchterarder, lying within the presbytery of Alchterarder and sheriffdom of Perth, considering that the said church and parish is now vacant and become at my gift and presentation by and through the death of the Rev. Charles Stewart, late minister of the Gospel at the said church of Auchterarder and I being sufficiently informed of the literature, loyalty, qualifications, good life and conversation of Mr. Robert Young, preacher of the Gospel, residing at Seetield Cottage, Dundee, do therefore, by these presents, nominate and present the said Robert Young to lie minister of the said parish and church of Auchterarder during all the days of his lifetime, giving, granting, and dispensing to him the constant, localled, and modified stipend, with the manse and glebe, and other profits and emoluments belonging to the said church, for the crop and year 1835, and during his lifetime, and his serving the cure of the said church, requiring hereby the reverend moderator and presbytery of Auchterarder to take trial of the qualifications, literature, good life, and conversation of the said Robert Young; and having found him fit and qualified for the function of the ministry at the said church of Auchterarder, to admit and receive him thereto, and give him his act of ordination and admission in due and competent form, recommending hereby to the lords of council and session, upon sight of this presentation and the said presbytery's act of ordination and admission, to grant letters of holming, on a simple charge of two days only, and other executorials necessary at the instance of the said Robert Young, against all and sundry the heritors, life-renters, felars, tacksmen, tenants, possessors, and

occupiers of lauds within the said parish, subject and liable in payment of the said localled and modified stipend, for causing the said Robert Young, and others in his name, be readily answered and paid thereof in such due and competent form as effeirs. And I consent to the registration thereof in the Books of council and session, or others competent, therein to remain for preservation: and for that effect I constitute _______ _______ my procurators. In witness whereof, etc., (signed) Drummond Kinnoul. R. A. Yates, *witness*. Thomas Neatham, *witness*."

SEE PATRONAGE.

Presentation of the Virgin, Feast of,

a Romish festival held on Nov. 21. It is not older than the 13th century. *SEE MARY*.

President

(Ërïs; *sarák*, or)k;r]s; *sareka*; Sept. τακτικός; Vulg. *princeps*), only used in Daniel 6; the Chaldee equivalent for Hebrew *shotêr*, probably from *Sara*, Zend. a "head" (see Strabo, 11:331). Σαραπάρας -κεφαλοτόμος is connected with the Sanskrit *siras* or *çiras*, and is traced in *Sargon* and other words (Eichhoff, *Vergl. Spr*. p. 129, 415; see *Her*. 3, 89, where he calls *satrap* a Persian word). — Smith. *SEE GOVERNOR*.

President in Choir

is the name given to the English dean's deputy, usually the senior residentiary or vice-dean, who in his absence corrects offences, besides acting as president in chapter (q.v.), and choragus, or director of the services, when there is no dignitary; also the precentor.

Presiding Elder

is the name given in the Methodist Episcopal Church to an officer whose functions are those of a superintendent within limited jurisdiction. These elders serve under the bishops, and, together with them, constitute in their respective conferences a cabinet, in which resides the appointing power over the membership of itinerant preachers. The office is one of very great responsibility and far-reaching influence. Within the territory over which such an elder presides every minister is amenable to this officer, who visits the different charges three or four times during the year, usually at what is

called the holding of the Quarterly Conference (q.v.), over which he presides, and by which all the business of the charge is disposed of. He also presides at the District Conferences, where literary and ecclesiastical culture is aimed at, and the licensing of candidates for the ministry takes place. Usually the territory is confined to an eighth or sixth of the Conference boundaries, and corresponds somewhat in extent to the average county in an Eastern state.

The office of presiding elder was created in the early history of Methodist economy in this country, and appears to have had its origin in the assistants whom John Wesley employed as helps. He had what we might call junior preachers at the circuits or districts into which he divided his work, and an assistant in charge of the whole. These assistants were then invested with nearly the same authority over the helps which the great founder of Methodism himself exercised, and hence they had an authority akin more to the bishopric of American Methodism. When, in 1784, Mr. Wesley caused the election of Asbury and Coke as superintendents or bishops, there were several assistants in office thus made subject to these two general superintendents. The question has arisen whether the twelve elders who were elected at the Christmas Conference of 1784 were simply traveling elders or assistants of the superintendents. *SEE METHODISM*.

As the presiding elders are now episcopal appointees, the answer to this query becomes important. There are two opinions. One party, advocating the elective eldership, insist that these twelve men were then elected by the Conference for the assistants work, and base their decision on Dr. Emory's interpretation. He says, in his *History of the Discipline*, p. 125, "All elders were at first presiding elders," and the distinction between presiding elders and "traveling elders" was not made until 1792. Section 5, of 1789, it would seem, proves the correctness of Dr. Emory's statement. The following is a part of the section on elders:

"**Ques. 2.** What is the duty of an elder?

"**Ans. 1.** To travel through his appointed district.

"**2.** To administer baptism land the Lord's Supper, and perform all parts of divine service.

"**3.** In the absence of a bishop to take charge of all the deacons, traveling and local preachers, and exhorters.

"**4.** To change, receive, or suspend preachers.

"**5.** To direct in the transaction of the spiritual business of his circuit.

"**6.** To take care that every part of our discipline be enforced.

"**7.** To aid in public collections.

"**8.** To attend his bishop when present, and give him, when absent, all necessary information by letter of the state of his district."

That every elder, in the absence of the bishop, was equal in point of supervisory office and duty is evident also from the fact that the third duty in this section gives an elder no authority to take charge of elders, but simply of deacons traveling, and local preachers, etc., seeing they were equal in authority. It was not until 1792 that a distinction was made between presiding elders and traveling elders, and these were then put under the charge of presiding elders. It was at this date that presiding elders were chosen by the bishop from the body of elders, and those elders not chosen by the bishops were disrobed of office as presiding elders, and placed for the first time under the care of presiding elders (see p. 126, 1792).

"**Ques**. By whom are the presiding elders to be chosen?

"**Ans**: By the bishop. Among the duties of the presiding elder, one is to take charge of all the elders, deacons, etc., of his district."

At this date, then, there was made a distinction between presiding elders and traveling elders, and not before. All the elders previous to 1792, therefore, were elected and appointed to the office and duties of presiding elder by the Conference, and each had equal authority in charge in the absence of the bishop.

Against this position, those who approve of the existing practice of the appointing of presiding elders by the bishop urge, first, that from 1785 to 1792 there were each year more elders than presiding elders; secondly, that the presiding elders were appointed to their districts, and that the *appointment* was by the bishop; and, thirdly, that if the bishops did appoint elders to preside over other elders, the Conferences not calling the bishops to account consented to the change, and thereby made it valid; and that it was the practice of the Church from 1784 to 1792, notwithstanding the disciplines required otherwise (see letter by Dr. D. Sherman in *Zion's*

Herald, March, 1876); and that Dr. Emory and others interpreted falsely the *action* of the early Methodist Church in America (comp. Stevens. *Hist. of the M. E. Church*, 2, 222, 224). The presiding duties which made of an elder a presiding elder did not, in the practice of the Church, belong to this new order in the ministry as soon as it was constituted. They belonged to the assistants, and were gradually transferred to the elders; and when, after the practice of nearly two years, they were actually transferred, the custom was legalized, the office of assistant was abolished, and the word disappeared from the minutes (see the *Minutes and Discipline*, A.D. 1786). The idea of this transfer originated in the mind of bishop Asbury, who found, after the eldership was instituted, as he says in his *Notes on the Discipline*, "that this order was so necessary" that he would make them rulers. Even his idea of the presiding eldership was not contemporaneous with the instituting of the order of elders, but came, as he says, when he "afterwards found that" they would be useful in ruling (see *Notes on the Discipline*, by Coke and Asbury). His idea was not put in practice until the Annual Conferences of 1785, when, as Lee (*History*, p. 120) states, the presiding eldership originated, but only in an inchoate form. This was months after the order of elders had been instituted. When, in 1786, the first *law* was made relative to the presiding eldership, it was made possible by the Discipline for every elder to become a presiding elder, so far as the duties were concerned, and here is where Emory and others have been misled. But as the bishop always appointed the ruling or presiding elders from the order of elders (Lee, *History*, p. 150), the practice was never to make all the elders ruling or presiding elders. Hence, from 1786 to 1792, the law of the Discipline never entirely agreed with the *practice* in the appointments, for there were hosts of elders who were never presiding elders. In the Conference of 1702, however, the law was made to harmonize with the practice. In the ancient Church the chorepiscopi (περιοδευταί) filled an office which must have given Mr.Wesley the suggestion for the assistant he called into office. See Emory, *Hist. of the Discipline*, p. 136 sq.; Sherman, *Hist. of the Discipline*, p. 153; Bingham, *Ecclesiastes Antiquities*, 1, 56, 69; Porter, *Compendium of Methodism*; Jeth. *Quar. Rev*. Jan. 1875, art. 4; April, 1876, art. 4; *National Repository*, May, 1876, *Editor's Study*. See also *Rural Deans*, in the article DEAN *SEE DEAN* of this *Cyclopaedia*, 2, 711.

Press

(hrWP, *purâh*; ληνός). Among the Israelites this was a large trough, usually hewn out of stone (<23512>Isaiah 5:2; <40213>Matthew 21:33; comp. Nonni, *Dionys*. 12:330) or dug in the earth and walled up (Harmer, 3, 117). It had a trellised opening below. This trough was called *gath*, tGi(in the Talmud also htg), or *purâh*, hrWP (<23503>Isaiah 63:3); and in it the grapes were trodden by men (five usually work together in Persia still; Kämpfer, *Aemen*. p. 377). Hence the phrase to tread the wine-press (<18241>Job 24:11; <25015>Lamentations 1:15; <23502>Isaiah 63:2). The juice (Heb. *tirôsh*, vryTi) flowed through the opening into a vat, usually in the earth (called *yekeb*, bqy,Gr. προλήνιον , <23512>Isaiah 5:2, or ὑπολήνιον, <23160>Isaiah 16:10, Mark 12:and simply ληνός, <40213>Matthew 21:33; Lat. *lacus vinarius*, Colum. 12:18: in <18241>Job 24:11, this word means, however, the trough or press itself). From this it is taken for fermentation in earthen vessels. These presses, which are still common in the East and the Levant (Arvieux 4:272 sq.; Kämpfer, *ut sup*.), were almost always outside of the towns, either in the vineyards or on mountains (<38140>Zechariah 14:10; <23512>Isaiah 5:2; <40213>Matthew 21:33; <41201>Mark 12:1; <66140>Revelation 14:20). The slaves must usually have trodden the press, as it was hard labor (<23501>Isaiah 63:1 sq.). They were cheered in it by singing and music (see <23160>Isaiah 16:10; <24530>Jeremiah 25:30; <07027>Judges 9:27; <24530>Jeremiah 25:30; 48, 33). See Ugolino, *De Re Rust*. Vet. <58164>Hebrews 6:14 sq., in his Thesaur. 29. *SEE OIL*; *SEE WINE*.

Pressly, Ebenezer Erskine, D.D.

a Presbyterian divine, was born near Cedar Spring, Abbeville District, S. C. in 1808. His parents, of the good old Scotch-Irish stock. were remarkable for their piety and intelligence, and early dedicated their only son to the work of the Christian ministry. He pursued his preparatory studies at Union Academy, graduated at Miami University, Ohio, in 1826, was received as a student of theology by the Second Associate Reformed Presbytery, and studied under John T. Pressly, D.D., who was then professor of theology for the Southern Synod, was licensed at Due West in 1829, and on Aug. 7,1830, was settled as pastor of Due West and Generostee churches. In 1837 he resigned the latter charge, and continued pastor of Due West alone; in 1838 he was chosen the successor of Dr. John T. Pressly. In 1839 he was elected president of the Clark and Erskine Seminary, which

afterwards took the name of Erskine College, in which position he remained until the spring of 1848. He died July 26, 1860. Dr. Pressly was a man of more than ordinary talent, and a good general scholar. In the position of president of the college he was greatly beloved by his pupils. Possessed of excellent executive ability, and of special aptness to teach, much of the success of the college and seminary, in the early periods of their history, was traceable to his influence. Though an interesting writer, he had a singular aversion to appearing before the public as an author, and hence he never published anything except an occasional sermon. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1861, p. 226. (J.L.S.)

Pressly, John S.

a Presbyterian minister, noted also as a classical teacher, was born in Abbeville District, S. C., in 1794. His means for acquiring the rudiments of a literary education were very limited. Until the years of manhood he had not enjoyed very fully the advantages of the common school. In 1812, however, he moved to the State of Ohio, and during a stay of three years in the Northwestern States he underwent much privation and hard labor in his endeavors to acquire knowledge. About the close of the year 1815 he was prostrated on a bed of suffering with a painful illness; a kind Providence brought him the medical services of Dr. Joseph Gilbert, who. on his recovery, suggested to him the desirableness of a classical education, and proposed to furnish him with the necessary books. Thus encouraged, and accepting the doctor’s kind offer, he entered Church Hill Academy June 19, 1816; in 1819 he entered South Carolina College, and spent two years there. In 1822 his career of classical teacher began, and in this field of usefulness, in which he labored during the balance of his life, he attained an enviable reputation. His first charge was Union Academy, in the southern part of Abbeville District, S. C. Among his pupils here were the late Rev. E. E. Pressly, D.D., Re. J. T. Pressly, D.D., Hon. T. C. Perrin, and J. A. Calhoun, Esq. In 1824-27 he taught at Cambridge and Beaver Dam — the latter in Laurens District. In 1828 he took charge of Church Hill Academy, but his labors there were soon interrupted by his being elected to the State Legislature of South Carolina by the people of Abbeville District. In 1835, at the close of his political career, he was invited to tale charge of the high school at Due West, S. C., just founded by the Associate Reformed Synod of the South, where he continued to labor till 1839 with great success. At last released from all engagements connected with teaching, he turned his attention to the study of theology; studied one session in the seminary of

the Associate Reformed Church at Oxford, Ohio; was licensed in 1840; and after attending during the ensuing session in the Associate Reformed Seminary at Alleghany City, Pa., he was employed until 1842 as a missionary to destitute churches within the bounds of the synod. Subsequently he was settled for five years as pastor of Bethel and Ebenezer churches, Ga.; the remainder of his life until 1851 was spent in teaching and missionary work. He (lied June 1. 1863. Mr. Pressly as a man wuas social and companionable; as a teacher he was a strict disciplinarian, and in the capacity to impart classical knowledge had few superiors. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Alm*. (1867), p. 398. (J. L. S.)

Pressly, John T., D.D.

a Presbyterian minister, noted as a professor in divinity and an author, was born in Abbeville District, S. C., in 1803. He studied for the ministry at the Theological Seminary in New York under Dr. John Mason. His first pastorate was in his native village, from which he was called to a professorship in the Theological Seminary, and the charge of the First Associate Reformed (now United Presbyterian) Church in Alleghany, Pa., both of which stations he filled with distinguished ability and success for nearly forty years. He died at Alleghany Aug. 13, 1870. — *Appletons' Annual Cyclopaedia*, 10, 573.

Pressy, François-Joseph-Gaston de Partz de

a French prelate, was born in 1712 at the castle of Ecuire (diocese of Boulogne). He was one of the most distinguished pupils of Saint-Sulpice. He was called, Dec. 25, 1742, to the episcopal see of Boulogne. He administered his diocese during nearly forty-seven years with unremitting zeal, and spent considerable sums for the ransom of the Christians captive among the Mohammedans, and for the expansion of the faith by foreign missions. In 1752 he joined a protestation addressed to the king (June 11), by twenty-one bishops, against parliamentary encroachments on ecclesiastical authority. A mandement which he subsequently published on the subject was suppressed. He died at Boulogne Oct. 8, 1789. His principal writings are, *Statuts synodaux* (1746, 4to): — *a collection of Instructions pastorales and Dissertations theologiques* (2 vols. 4to): — *a Rituel du Diocese de Boulogne* (Boulogne, 1780, 4to): — and a prayer-book in French, under the title of *Heures* (Lille, 1820, 8vo). See *Gallia*

Christiana, t. 10; *Gazette de France*, 1742-89; Fisquet, *France Pontifcale* (not published). Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Géneralé*, s.v.

Prester, John

SEE JOHN, PRESTER.

Preston, John, D.D.

a noted English Puritan divine, was born at Heyford, Northamptonshire, in 1587, and educated at King's College and Queen's College, University of Cambridge, was made fellow and tutor of Queen's College, and finally became chaplain to Prince Charles. In 1622 he was appointed preacher of Lincoln's Inn, and subsequently lecturer in Trinity Church, Cambridge. He became so celebrated as a speaker that the towns-people went to his lectures on week-days as they would to his sermons on Sunday, and he was complained of by those who looked with envy upon his fast-growing reputation. He also became noted as an able advocate of Calvinism, and in a controversy with the famous Arminian, Dr. Montague, sustained the elective theory with much adroitness and boldness. He was certainly a man of great learning, a popular preacher, and a powerful writer. He died in 1628, greatly lamented not only by Calvinists, but by all lovers of the good cause. He wore himself out with work; and when his friends would remonstrate, his answer was always, "Our life, like iron, consumes with rust, as much without as by employment; that every one cannot be said to have lived long that is old, as seven years in the life of some men are as much as seventy in others; and therefore the question is not so much How long I have lived as How I have lived." He was naturally reserved and only figured in public because his zeal for the doctrines of Calvin would not suffer him to let go unanswered those who maintained the opposite theories. Of his works (published 1615-58) which have never been collected, an abridgment by William Tennent was published in 1658 (1648 also [?]), 12mo. The best-known of his publications are, *The New Covenant, fourteen sermons* (Lond. 1629, 4to; ninth ed. 1639, 4to; again in 1655, 4to): — *The Breastplate of Faith and Love, eighteen sermons* (1630, 4to; 5th ed. 1634, 4to): — *Life Eternal, eighteen sermons* (1631, 4to; 4th ed. 1634, 4to): — *The Saint's Daily Exercise, five sermons on Prayer* (1633, 4to; 9th ed. 1635, 4to): — *The Saint's Qualifications, ten sermons on Humiliation, nine on Sanctification, and three on the Sacrament* (1634, 4to; 3rd ed. 1637, 4to). — Four Treatises (sermons): 1.

Covetousness; 2, *Spiritual Death and Life* (separate in 1633, 4to); 3, *Self Denial* (separate in 1632, 4to); 4, *Lord's Supper* (together in 1635, 4to; 4th ed. 1636, 4to): — *Sermons before his Majesty*, etc. (5th ed. 1637, 4to): — *Sinner's Overthrow, or Mortification* (1635, 4to; 4th ed. 1641, 4to): — *Remacins* (three treatises): 1, *Judas his Repentance*; 2, *Saint's Spiritual Strength*; 3, *Paul's Conversion and Sermons*, etc. (2nd ed. 1637,4to): — *The Golden Sceptre*, etc. (1638, 4to): — *Doctrines of the Saints' Infirmities, a sermon* (1638, 4to): — *A Lifeless Lie*, a sermon (4th ed. 1641, 4to): — *Fullness of Christ for Us*, a sermon (1640, 4to): *Divine Love of Christ*, five sermons (1640, 4to): — *Two Treatises* (1641, 4to): — *Thesis de Gratice Convertendis Irresistibilitate* (1652, Svo; in English, 1654): — *Riches of Mercy to Men in Misery* (1658, 4to). See Dr. R. Sibbs's preface; Middleton, *Evangel. Biog*. 2, 460 sq.; Perry, *Hist. Ch. of England* (see Index); Clark, *Lives*; Neal, *Hist. of the Puritans*; Burnet, *Own Times*; Fuller, *Worthies*; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibl*.; Jonathan Edwards, *Works*; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v. (J. H. W.)

Preston, Willard, D.D.

an eloquent American divine and noted educator, was born at Uxbridge, Mass., May 29, 1785, and was educated at Brown University, where he graduated in 1806. After having studied law and practiced in that profession for a few years, he studied for the ministry, and was in 1811 ordained and became pastor of a church at Providence, R. I., where lie preached until 1825, when he was chosen president of the University of Vermont. In 1829 he removed South for the benefit of his health, and in 1831 accepted the pastorate of the Presbyterian Church in Savannah, Ga., and there remained until his death in 1856. He published, Farewell Sermon at St. Alban's (1815): — Sermons (1817). — Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.: Drake, *Dict. of Amer. Biog*. s.v.

Presumption

as it relates to the mind, is a supposition formed before examination. As it relates to the conduct or moral action, it implies arrogance or irreverence. As it relates to religion in general, it is a bold and daring confidence in the goodness of God, without obedience to his will.

Presumptuous sins must be distinguished from sins of infirmity, or those failings peculiar to human nature (<20720>Ecclesiastes 7:20; <620108>1 John 1:8, 9); from sins done through ignorance (<422248>Luke 12:48); and from sins into

which men are hurried by sudden and violent temptation (<480601>Galatians 6:1). The ingredients which render sin presumptuous are knowledge (<431522>John 15:22), deliberation and contrivance (<201614>Proverbs 6:14; <191904>Psalm 36:4), obstinacy (<244416>Jeremiah 44:16; <051013>Deuteronomy 1:13), inattention to the remonstrances of conscience (<440751>Acts 7:51), opposition to the dispensations of Providence (<142822>2 Chronicles 28:22), and repeated commission of the same sin (<197817>Psalm 78:17). Presumptuous sins are numerous, such as profane swearing, perjury, theft, adultery, drunkenness, Sabbath-breaking, etc. These may be more particularly considered as presumptuous sins, because they are generally committed against a known law, and are so often repeated. Such sins are most heinous in their nature and most pernicious in their effects. They are said to be a reproach to the Lord (<041503>Numbers 15:3); they harden the heart (<540402>1 Timothy 4:2); draw down judgments from heaven (<041531>Numbers 15:31); and even when repented of, they are seldom pardoned without some visible testimony of God's displeasure (<101210>2 Samuel 12:10). As respects professors of religion, one observes, they sin presumptuously

(1) when they take up a profession of religion without principle;

(2) when they profess to ask the blessing of God and yet go on in forbidden courses;

(3) when they do not take religion as they find it in the Scriptures;

(4) when they make their feelings the test of their religion, without considering the difference between animal passion and the operations of the Spirit of God;

(5) when they run into temptation;

(6) when they indulge in self-confidence and self-complacency;

(7) when they bring the spirit of the world into the Church;

(8) when they form apologies for that in some which they condemn in others;

(9) when, professing to believe in the doctrines of the Gospel, they live licentiously;

(10) when they create, magnify, and pervert their troubles;

(11) when they arraign the conduct of God as unkind and unjust.

See Walker, *Sermons*, vol. 1, ser. 3; South, *Sermons*, vol. 7:ser. 10, 11, 12; Tillotson, *Sermons*, ser. 147; Saurin, *Sermons*, vol. 1, ser. II; Goodwin, *On the Aggravations of Sin*; Fuller, *Works*; Paley, *Sermons*; Bishop Hopkins, *On the Nature, Danger, and Cure of Presumptuous Sins*.

Pretas

sprites or hobgoblins among the Buddhists in Ceylon. They are believed to inhabit a hell called Lokantarika. In appearance they are extremely attenuated, like a dry leaf. There are some pretas that haunt the places near which they once lived as men; they are also found in the suburbs of cities, and in places where four ways meet. Their bodies are represented as being twelve miles high, and they have very large nails. On the top of the head there is a mouth about the size of a needle's eye. They continually think with sorrow on their fate, from not having acquired merit in former births; they are now tormented without ceasing by hunger and thirst, and have not the power of obtaining merit.

Preternatural

stands generally for supernatural, because we suppose that that which is *praeter naturam* is also *supra naturam*. Yet the former stands sometimes for unnatural, *praeter naturam* being the synonym of *contraa nacturam*. Neither *praeternaturale* nor *supernaturale*, or, as some say, *supernaturale*, is a good Latin word. They are, at least, not to be found in the classics.

Pretextatus, St.

a Gallic prelate of the 6th century, occupied towards 555 the metropolitan see of Rouen, and was godfather to Mérovée, the second son of Chilleric. Towards 576 Brunehaut, the widow of Sigebert, was exiled to Rouen by Chilperic, who was under the influence of Frédégonde. Mérovée, who was in that city, fell violently in love with the charms of the queen of Austrasia, his aunt, and Pretextatus was induced to grant a dispensation for their union, and married them. At this intelligence Chilperic repaired to Rouen, transported with wrath, and ordered the bishop to be arrested. A council assembled at Paris in 577, and in spite of the exertions of Gregory of Tours, who ventured alone to defend him, Pretextatus was deposed by the vote of forty-four prelates. He was banished to the island of Jersey. where he devoted his time to prayer and study. In the meantime a creature of Frédégonde, the Gaul Melantius, was established in the episcopal see of

Rouen. After the murder of Chilperic, September, 584, a deputation of the clergy and people of Rouen repaired to Jersey to request Pretextatus to resume the administration of his diocese. On the 5th of May an assembly of Frankish noblemen, held at Rouen, pronounced his rehabilitation. Frédégonde, who lived in a kind of retirement at Loiuviers, went often to Rouen; she found herself frequently face to face with the bishop, whom she accused of not showing her much deference. In her wounded pride she once let escape some threatening allusions to the past: Pretextatus improved the occasion to exhort her to repentance and reformation. The enraged queen avenged herself in a manner worthy of her past life. She, Melantius, and an archdeacon of the cathedral, gave two hundred gold dollars to one of the serfs of the domain of the church, and promised him his own emancipation and that of his wife and children, for the murder of Pretextatus. On Easter-Sunday, while in prayer at the foot of the altar, he was stabbed, and died an hour afterwards in a chamber contiguous to the church, whither a few of the faithful had carried him, and where Frédégonde, in the company of the dukes Beppolen and Ansowald, enjoyed the spectacle of his last moments, April 14, 586. Pretextatus had attended the third Council of Paris in 557, the second Council of Tours in 566, and the second Council of Macon in 585. During his exile he composed some writings, which have not reached us. His name is inscribed in the Martyrologium under the date of the 24th of February, although he did not shed his blood for the faith. See Gallia *Christiana*, t. 11; Pommeraye, *Hist. des Archeveques de Rouen*; Fisquet, *France Ponfficale* (not published). — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Géneralé*, s.v.

Preti, Mattia

called *il Calabrese*, a painter of the Neapolitan school, was born in 1613 at Taverna, in Calabria. His brother Gregorio, about whom very little is known, who was honored in his life-time with the title of prince of the Academy of St. Luke, was Mattia’s first master; subsequently he studied with Lanfranc and Guerino. Preti took from Caravaggio those dark and violent hues, which impair the charm of his compositions. He delighted in retracing martyrdoms, murders, and other scenes of desolation. He painted with prodigious rapidity: a contemporary says that to see him handle the brush one would have thought that he was drumming. He painted the frescos of the church of Carmine in Modena, which are in a very good state of preservation. In 1657 he returned to Rome, but was compelled to flee, having killed one of his rivals. At Naples, again, whither he repaired, he

killed a soldier who had stopped him on some forbidden ground, and was ordered for his punishment to paint the patron saints of Naples on the doors of the city. From Naples he went to Malta, where his works were rewarded with the title of knight and the commandery of Syracuse. In his last years he worked only, but with unremitting diligence, for the poor. He died at Malta in 1699. His works are met with in great number in Italy. The Louvre has his *Martyrdom of St. Andrew, St. Paul, and St. Anthony the Hermit*; the Museum of Dresden *the Martyrdom of St. Bartholomew, the Incredulity of St. Thomas, and the Deliverance of St. Peter*; the Pinakothek of Munich a *Repenting Magdalen*; the Museum of Vienna an *Incredulity of St. Thomas*, etc. See Spooner. *Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts*, s.v. (J. H. W.)

Pretorium

SEE PRAETORIUM.

Prevent

(some form of μdῃ; φθάνω, both meaning to *precede* or *anticipate*) is understood, in our translation of the Scriptures, only in the old Latin sense, as denoting—

1. To *come before* one is expected or sought (<18027>Job 30:27);

2. To *go before*, or be sooner (<19947>Psalm 119:147). One is happily disappointed when favors come unasked (<18312>Job 3:12; <19818>Psalm 18:18), or unhappily, when snares and afflictions come unexpectedly (<10206>2 Samuel 22:6).

Prevention

is an ecclesiastical term denoting the right of a superior dignitary of the Church to interfere in the business of his subordinate; but it is more specially the right of the pope, in the nomination to ecclesiastical offices, to pass over the proper collators and give away the benefices himself. The Gallican Church has never recognized this papal prerogative. *SEE PROVISORS*.

Prevost, Claude

a French monk, was born at Auxerre Jan. 22,1693. He taught philosophy and theology in the abbey of Sainte-Genevieve, and the care of the library was afterwards entrusted to him. In this employment, which he retained to the end of his life he made use of the knowledge which he had acquired in the Greek, Italian, and English languages, and collected abundant materials, which he did not, however, publish. They were prepared for the instruction of Louis, duke of Orleans, son of the regent, who lived at the abbey of Sainte-Genevieve. The principal MSS. which this monk has left concerning the history of the regular canons, of which he had made a special study, are, *Library of Regular Canons: — Lives of Holy Canons, both Secular and Regular: — and History of all the Houses of Regular Canons.* His last work was *A History of the Abbey of Sainte-Genevieve*. It is from this last work that the Benedictines have extracted nearly all that they have said of this house in vol. 7 of the new *Gallia Christiana*. Prevost furnished the material to the abbot Lebeuf, his countryman, for the catalogue of the writers of Auxerre inserted in Tile History of A uxerree. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, s.v.

Prevost, Pierre Robert le

a French pulpit orator of some note, was born at Rouen in 1675. From his youth he displayed a marked propensity for preaching, and proceeded to Paris to improve himself after the model of celebrated orators. Sought after with eagerness in the city, he was no less a favorite at court, where he preached statedly during Advent from 1714 to 1727, and in 1718 during Lent. At this last date he was provided with a canonship at Chartres. The record of his funeral sermons, published by Lottin (Paris, 1765), contains those of the cardinal of Fürstenberg (of which Flechier speaks with eulogy), of Godet of Marais, bishop of Chartres, of Louis XIV and of the duke of Berri; sermons, and a panegyric of St. Louis. He died in 1736 at Chartres. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, s.v. See Vinet, *French Lit*. p. 116 sq.

Price, Henry

a minister of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Ireland, was born in Dromore, Antrim County, Ireland, Jan. 30, 1802; was converted at seventeen, was made a local preacher about the year 1821, and entered the itinerant ministry at the Conference of 1823. He soon became an able and

judicious preacher; “he was mighty in the Scriptures,” reasoning out of them, and having a remarkable talent for apposite and convincing quotations from Holy Writ. He was a zealous and effective advocate for Christian missions, a section of evangelical work to which British and Irish Methodists pay more attention and devote more labor than does any other Christian Church. While Mr. Price adorned the Gospel of God our Savior in all things, there were especially noticeable in him a childlike simplicity, a transparent sincerity, an uprightness which scorned to countenance anything low or mean, a charity “which thinketh no evil,” and an unselfishness “which seeketh not its own.” Sweeping revivals occurred on many of the circuits on which he was stationed. He was especially attentive to the sick and afflicted, and his visits to them were frequent, sympathizing, and consolatory. He was truly “a brother beloved,” and his brethren in the ministry manifested their high appreciation of his character and talents by electing him repeatedly to fill the highest offices in their gift, and on all occasions he proved himself worthy of their esteem and confidence. He was cautious and practical, always ready to carry out every arrangement entrusted to his care with punctilious exactness. Never had Irish Methodism a more faithful son, or a minister of more perfect singleness of aim, purity of intention, or exemplary fidelity. Mr. Price died in the sixty-eighth year of his age.

Price, John (1)

an English scholar of much renown, was born about the year 1600, and was educated at Christ Church, Oxford. He was of Protestant parentage, but after leaving college he joined the Romanists and went to Italy during the civil ‘wars, as he found himself the object of much hatred and persecution. He settled in Florence, after having resided for a while in Paris; but when a professorship was offered him at Pisa. he removed thither, and there lived for some time. He subsequently retired to the St. Augustine Convent at Rome, where he died in 1676. He was the author of the following works: Notae et Observationes in *Apologitam L. Apuleii Madcaurensis Philosophi Platonici* (Paris, 1635, 4to; very rare, but republished in the Gouda ed. of Apuleius, 1650, 8vo): — *Matthaeus ex Sacra Pagina, Sanctis Patribus, etc., illustratus* (Paris, 1646, 8vo): — *Adnotationes in Epist. Jacobi* (1646, 8vo): *Acta Apostolorum, ex Sacra Pagina, Sanctis Patribus, etc., illustrata* (1647, 8vo): — *Commentarii in Vaitios Novi Testamenti Libros; his accesserunt Adiotafiones in Psalmorun Librum* (Lond. 1660, fol. The notes on the New Testament, or

some of them, had been published before separately [suprac], and Orme says that those on the Psalms had also appeared before). Price brought to his expositions of the Scriptures an extensive knowledge of classical literature, and, imitating Grotius's method, frequently illustrated by profane authors, especially the Greek and Roman. See Orme, *Bibl. Biblica*. s.v.; *Crit. Sacri*, vol. 5; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth*. s.v.:

Price, John (2), D.D.

an English clergyman, flourished in the second half of the 17th century, and was chaplain to general Monk during the civil wars. Dr. Price published, *Serm. of Thanksgiving for the Success of General Monk* (Lond. 1660, 4to): — *Serm. on* <4054>*Matthew 5:47* (Oxon. 1661, 8vo): — *Serm. on* <4846>*Galatians* 4:16 (1661, 8vo): — *Serm. on* <2107>*Ecclesiastes 10:17* (1661, 8vo): — *Serm. on* <5816>*Hebrews 13:16* (1661, 8vo): — *Serm. on* <5045>*Philippians 4:5* (1663, 4to): — *The Mystery and Method of his Majesty's Happy Restauration laid open to Publick View* (Lond. 1660, 8vo).

Price, Jonathan D.

a physician and missionary to Burmah in the first half of this century, was ordained in Philadelphia May 20, 1821, and immediately after set out for his field of labor. He arrived early in the next year at Rangoon. When his medical knowledge became known at court, he was ordered to repair to Ava, the capital, where he was introduced to the king, who gave him a house. When the British invaded Burmah he and Mr. Judson were thrown into prison June 8, 1824. He was confined and subjected to dreadful sufferings till February or March, 1826, when he was released and employed to negotiate a treaty with the British, who had advanced near to the capital. After the war he resided at Ava, and was in favor with the emperor. Price taught several native scholars, and by his lectures hoped to shake the foundation of Buddhism. He fell a victim to pulmonary consumption Feb. 14, 1828, dying in the hope of that precious Gospel he wished to impart to the heathen. See *Amer. Bapt. Mtg.; Memoir of Mrs. Judson*; Allen, *Biog. Dict*. s.v.

Price, Rice

SEE PRICE, THOMAS.

Price, Richard, D.D.

an eminent English divine noted for his scholarly attainments, his philosophical and mathematical contributions, his general devotion to truth in its highest forms, and a most consistent life, was born at Tynton, Glamorganshire, Wales, Feb. 23, 1723. His father, of whose second marriage Richard was the sole offspring, was a rigid Calvinistic minister, remarkable for his intolerance, who spared no pains to imbue his son with sound Calvinistic doctrine. Richard, however, began early to claim the privilege of free opinion, and by his scruples often incurred the anger of his parent. The latter died in 1739, and by his will the bulk of the property, which appears to have been considerable, came into the possession of one son; the widow and six other children being left in straitened circumstances to provide for their own maintenance. The widow and her eldest son lived, however, only a few months longer, and shortly after their death Richard, then in his eighteenth year, set out for London in the hope of qualifying himself for the clerical profession. The heir of his father's fortune provided him with both horse and servant as far as Cardiff, but left him without the means of performing the rest of the journey except on foot or in a wagon. He chose the former as the most ready means, and thus made his wav to the metropolis of England. His education during his father's lifetime had been superintended by several Dissenting ministers, and on reaching London he obtained, through the kindness of a paternal uncle, admission to a Presbyterian academy, where he pursued studies in mathematics, philosophy, and theology. In 1743 he was engaged as chaplain and companion to the family of Mr. Streathfield, of Stoke-Newington, where he resided for thirteen years, the death of his employer only terminating the engagement, but not without a recognition of faithful service rendered. In the disposition of Mr. Streathfield's property Price came in for a share, and by this aid and his appointment as morning preacher of the chapel at Newington-Green, he was placed in independent circumstances. He had previously been made pastor of a congregation at Hackney, but he preferred the appointment at Newington-Green, married in 1757, and lived there until the death of his wife (in 1786), when he removed again to Hackney. Meanwhile his life had been one of considerable literary and scientific activity. His *Review of the Principal Questions and Difficulties in Morals* (Lond. 1758), though somewhat heavy, and designated by Brown as "very elaborate, very tedious, and not very clear," seems to have established his reputation as a metaphysician and a moralist. It is

considered the ablest defense of the system of Cudworth and Clarke. It is an attempt to revive the intellectual theory of moral obligation, which seemed to have fallen under the attacks of Butler, Hutcheson, and Hume, and was made before that of Smith. Sir J. Mackintosh has briefly noticed it in his *Preliminary Dissertation to Encyclop. Brit.* (republished in his *Works* [ed. 1854], 1, 158, 159). In 1769 Price published his *Treatise on Reversionary Payments*; this was followed by the compilation and publication of the celebrated *Northampton Mortality Tables*, and various other works relating to life-assurance and annuities, forming most valuable contributions to the branch of science to which they refer. In 1776 appeared his *Observations on Civil Liberty and the Justice and Policy of the War with America*. Of this work 60,000 copies are said to have been sold in a few months. So greatly was it admired in the United States that, in 1778, the American Congress, through Franklin, communicated to him their desire to consider him a fellow-citizen, and to receive his assistance in regulating their finances-an offer declined principally on the ground of age. On the termination of the war with the colonies, Mr. Pitt sought Mr. Price's advice as to the best mode of liquidating the British national debt, the result of which, it is said, was the adoption of the sinking fund. When the French revolution broke out, the doctor distinguished himself by a sermon, "On the Love of Country," in which he hailed that event as the commencement of a glorious era. This drew upon the preacher some strong animadversions from Mr. Burke in his celebrated *Reflections*. Besides many papers in the *Transactions of the Royal Society*, of which he was a fellow, he published sermons and pamphlets, which established his character as a sound advocate for civil liberty and a profound master of financial calculation. He died April 19, 1791. One other of his publications of interest to our readers is his *Four Dissertations on Providence. Prayer, the State of Virtuous Men after Death, and Christianity* (1766-68). His views respecting the Son of God were what was called Low or semi-Arian. Mr. Price was a believer in the immateriality of the soul, holding that, according to the teaching of the Sacred Scriptures, it remains in a dormant state between death and resurrection; and because of these opinions he was led into a controversy of some celebrity with his friend Dr. Priestley, maintained by correspondence in 1778, and given to the public by the latter under the title of *A Free Discussion of the Doctrine of Materialism and Philosophical Necessity*. This friendly controversy shows how decided were his views on the philosophical aberration of the age, and how earnestly he desired to place moral and metaphysical truth upon a deeper

and truer foundation. “Almost the only writer,” says Morell, “of this (the rationalistic) school whose works are likely to form a part of our standard philosophy is Dr. Richard Price.” In this high estimate of the merits of Price’s philosophical writings, Mr. Morell is not alone. “Price investigated with acuteness and ability many important questions relative to morals, and controverted the doctrine of a moral sense as irreconcilable with the unalterable character of moral ideas, which, as well as those of substance and cause, he maintained to be eternal and original principles of the intellect itself, independent of the divine will” (Tennemann). “If, in England, you only look at London in the 18th century, you will doubtless there see little else than sensualism. But even at London you would find, by the side of Priestley, Price, that ardent friend of liberty-that ingenious and profound economist, who renewed and brilliantly sustained the Platonic idealism of Cudworth. I know that Price is an isolated phenomenon at London, but the whole Scotch school is more or less spiritualistic” (Cousin). But Mackintosh (*ut sup*.) by no means shares in this enthusiasm; nor can it be expected that the admirers of Locke should discover much merit in his opponent. Sir James’s estimate of the characteristics of Price will be found in the *Edinburgh Review*, June, 1815, p. 171, 172. See also *The London Mon. Rev*. 83, 77; and *Boston Christ. Disciple*, 2, 134. Dr. Price’s moral character appears to have been a singularly beautiful one. “Simplicity of manners,” says Dr. Priestley, “with such genuine marks of perfect integrity and benevolence, diffused around him a charm which the forms of politeness can but poorly imitate.” See Morgan, *Memoirs of the Life of Richard Price, D.D.* (Lond. 1815); Hook, *Ecclesiastes Biog*. 8:162; Stephen, Hist. of Engl. Thought (1877, 2 vols. 8vo), vol. 1 and 2, especially 2, 3 sq.; Leckey, *Hist. of the 18th Century* (1878, 2 vols. 8vo), vol. 2. See also Tennemann, *Hist. of Philos*. (Johnson’s transl. 1832) p. 384; Cousin, *Hist. of Mod. Philos*. (Wright’s transl. 1854) 2, 132; Morell, *Hist. of Mod. Philos*. (2nd ed. 1848) 1, 215; Blakey, *Hist. of the Philos. of Mind* (1850) 3, 313-15; *Blackwood’s Magazine*, 39:803.

Price, Thomas

one of the most distinguished Welsh scholars of his age, was born Oct. 2, 1787, at Pencaerelin, in the parish of Llanafan Fawr, near Builth, in Brecknockshire. His father, the Rev. Rice Price, originally a stonemason, at the age of seventeen formed an attachment to Mary Bower, the descendant of a long line of clergymen; acquired, by incessant diligence and frugality, the means of attending the college-school at Brecknock; and finally

obtained ordination from the bishop of St. Davids, and, in 1784, the hand he sought, after a courtship of twenty years. He was so fortunate as afterwards to be presented to three livings; but his income, like that of some other Welsh pluralists, was never believed to exceed fifty pounds a year. He had two sons, both of whom were brought up to the Church, the elder taking his degree at Oxford, while the second, Thomas, was obliged to finish his studies at the college of Brecknock. Welsh was the language the two boys heard constantly in the family; English they acquired at their second school; the elements of Latin and Greek were learned subsequently; and, from some French officers who were prisoners of war at Brecknock, Thomas acquired an excellent knowledge of French. In 1812 he received holy orders, and in 1825, after performing for thirteen years the duties of various curacies near Crickhowel, he was appointed to the vicarage of Cwmdu. This was his last preferment. The rest of his life was passed in historical and archaeological studies of his country. He was regarded by his countrymen as one of the most accomplished champions of the Welsh language and literature. He died at Cwmdu Nov. 7, 1848. His writings are not of special interest to theological readers. Many of his English compositions are collected under the title of *Literary Remains of the Rev. Thomas Price, with a Memoir by Jane Williams* (Llandovery, 1854-55, 2 vols. 8vo). A memoir of Price is found in the *Lond. Gentleman's Mag.* Feb. 1849, p. 212; see also *Engl. Cyclop*. s.v.

Pricked Song

is, in music, a term applied to a composition used in ecclesiastical service. It is divided into descant, pricksong, counterpoint, and faburden, the last being a highly pitched key.

Pricket

an ecclesiastical term designating a spike on which candles were fixed. There are specimens from Kirkstall Abbey in the collection of the Society of Arts, London; and another, of Limoges enamel of the 13th century, is in the British Museum.

Prickett, Marmaduke

an English clergyman, was born about the year 1805. He was educated at Cambridge University, and held the appointment of chaplain to Trinity College, where he died in 1839. He published, *Some Account of Barnwell*

Priory, in the Parish of St. Andrew the Less (Camb. 1837, 8vo): — *A Historical and Architectural Descriptions of the Priory Church of Bridglington* (Lond. 1831, 8vo; 1846, 8vo). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Pricks

(Numbers 33:55; Acts 9:5). *SEE GOAD*; *SEE THORN*.

Pridden, John

an English clergyman, was born in the vear 1758 in London, and was edulcated at Queen's College, Oxford. After filling various appointments, he finally became rector of St. George's, Botolph Lane, London. He died in 1825. His publications are of a secular character only, and those interested may consult *Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, 2, 1681.

Pride

is inordinate and unreasonable self-esteem, attended with insolence and rude treatment of others.

1. "It is sometimes," says a good writer, "confounded with vanity, and sometimes with dignity; but to the former passion it has no resemblance, and in many circumstances it differs from the latter. Vanity is the parent of loquacious boasting, and the person subject to it, if his pretences be admitted has no inclination to insult the company. The proud man, on the other hand, is naturally silent, and wrapped up in his own importance, seldom speaks but to make his audience feel their inferiority." Pride is the high opinion that a poor, little, contracted soul entertains of itself. Dignity consists in just, great, and uniform actions, and is the opposite of meanness.

2. Pride manifests itself by praising ourselves, adoring our persons, attempting to appear before others in a superior light to what we are; contempt and slander of others; envy at the excellences others possess; anxiety to gain applause; distress and rage when slighted; impatience of contradiction, and opposition to God himself.

3. The evil effects of pride are beyond computation. It has spread itself universally in all nations, among all characters; and as it was the first sin, as some suppose, that entered into the world, so it seems the last to be

conquered. It may be considered as the parent of discontent, ingratitude, covetousness, poverty, presumption, passion, extravagance, bigotry, war, and persecution. In fact, there is hardly an evil perpetrated but pride is connected with it in a proximate or remote sense.

4. To suppress this evil, we should consider what we are. "If we could trace our descents," says Seneca, "we should find all slaves to come from princes, and all princes from slaves. To be proud of knowledge is to be blind in the light; to be proud of virtue is to poison ourselves with the antidote; to be proud of authority is to make our rise our downfall." The imperfection of our nature, our scanty knowledge, contracted powers, narrow conceptions, and moral inability are strong motives to excite us to humility. We should consider, also, what punishments this sin has brought on mankind. See the cases of Pharaoh, Haman, Nebuchadnezzar, Herod, and others; how particularly it is prohibited (<20168>Proverbs 16:18; 1 Peter 5, 5; <59406>James 4:6; <20229>Proverbs 29:23); what a torment it is to its possessor (<17513>Esther 5:13); howl soon all things of a sublunary nature will .end; how disgraceful it renders us in the sight of God, angels, and men; what a barrier it is to our felicity and communion with God; how fruitful it is of discord; how it precludes our usefulness, and renders us really contemptible. Comp. Blackie, *Morals*, p, 244; Edwards, *Works*; Robert Hall, *Works*; Bates, *Works*; Brown, *Philosophy of the Mind*; Wesl. *Mag*. 1846, p. 1113; 1847, p. 548 sq.; Malcom, *Theol. Index*, s.v. See Humility.

Prideaux, Humphrey, D.D.

a learned English divine, noted as a historian, was born at Padstow, in Cornwall; May 3, 1648. He was educated first at Westminster School and later at Christ Church, Oxford, where he took his degree in 1672. While at the university he published the ancient inscriptions from the Arundelian Marbles, under the title of *Marmorett Oxoniensia*, which recommended him to the patronage of the lord chancellor Finch, afterwards earl of Nottingham, who gave him in 1679 a living near Oxford, and afterwards a prebend in Norwich cathedral. While there he became engaged in some severe contests with the Roman Catholics, the result of which was the publication of his work *The Vallidiy of the Orders of the Church of England made out* (1688). He also took an active part in resisting the arbitrary proceedings of James II which affected the interests of the Established Church. In 1688 he was promoted to the archdeaconry of Suffolk; but it was not without much consideration that he could bring

himself to take the oath of allegiance to William and Mary. But when once decided, he acted in good faith, and treated all non-jurors with kindness and respect. In 1691, upon the death of Dr. Pococke, the Hebrew professorship at Oxford was offered to Dr. Prideaux, but lie refused it, though he afterwards repented of his refusal. In 1697 he published *The Life of Mahomet*, which was so well received that three editions of it were sold the first year. This *Life* was only a part of a greater work which he had long designed to write, and that was *A History of the Saracen Empire*, and with it *The Decay and Fall of Christianity in the East*; but, for certain reasons, lie dropped this design, and only published that part which contained *The Life of Mahomet*, to which lie annexed *A Letter to the Deists*, wherein he undertook to prove the truth of Christianity by contrasting it with the impostures of Mohammedanism. In 1702 he was made dean of Norwich. He died Nov. 1, 1724. He published, *The Original Right of Tythes: — Directions for Church-wardens*, and other small pieces for the service of the Church; also two tracts of Maimonides, with a Latin version and notes, under the title of *De Jure Pauperis is et Peregrini apud Judaeos*, as an introduction for Hebrew students to Rabbinical language. But Dr. Prideaux's great work was *The Connection of the History of the Old and New Testament*, the first part of which was published in 1715, the second in 1718. Both parts were received with the greatest approbation, and went through eight editions in London, besides two or three in Dublin, before the end of 1720. The best of the many excellent editions which have appeared of this work since the death of its author are probably the 22nd, with *An Account of the Rabbinical Authorities* by Rev. A. M'Caul, D.D. (1845, 2 vols. 8vo), and the 25th, which in addition, has *An Account*, etc., with notes and analysis, and *Introductory Review* by J. Talboys Wheeler (Lond. 1858, 2 vols. 8vo). The last named is by far the most desirable of all, as it contains, in addition to the excellent work done by M'Caul, the notes, etc. by Wheeler, who also edited Shuckford's *Connection of Sacred and Profane History* (1858, 2 vols. 8vo) and *Russell's Collection of Sacred and Profane History* (1865, 2 vols. 8vo), the three embracing the entire period from the Creation to the time of Christ. Prideaux's Co0nnection was translated into French (Amst. 1728, 6 vols. 12mo), and, with John Dierberghe's annotations, into Dutch. Le Clerc published a critical examination of it, which appeared in *English* (Lond. 1722, 8vo). "The Connection," says Orme, "contains a large mass of erudition, and accurate information on every topic of Jewish history and antiquities, and on all the links which connected that peculiar people with the surrounding

nations. It is indispensable to the Biblical and interesting to the general scholar… Le Clerc's exceptions are not of great importance" (*Bibl. Bib.* s.v.). 'This history takes in the affairs of Egypt, Assyria, and all the other Eastern nations, as well as of the Jews; and likewise those of Greece and Rome, so far as was necessary for giving a distinct view of the completion of the prophecies which relate to the times comprehended in it. The author has also set in the clearest light some passages of profane history which before lay dispersed and buried in confusion, and there appears throughout the whole work such an amiable spirit of sincerity and candor as sufficiently atones as well for the few mistakes which escaped his diligence as for some weaknesses arising from his individual temperament. About three years before his death he presented his collection of Oriental books, more than three hundred in number, to the library of Clare Hall, Cambridge. Several of his posthumous Tracts and Letters, with a Life of Dr. Prideaux, the author of which is not named, were published in 1748 (8vo). Dr. Prideaux was tall, well-built, and of a strong and robust constitution. His qualities were very good, solid rather than lively, and his judgment excellent. He possessed great moral worth, and more ardent piety than was usual in his generation. As a writer he is clear, strong, intelligent, and learned. See, besides the works above mentioned, *Biog. Brit*. s.v.; Gentleman's Magazine, vol. 70; and especially the excellent article in Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, 2, 1681, 1682.

Prideaux, John, D.D.

an English prelate of much note, was born of humble parentage at Stowford, near Ivybridge, in Devonshire, Sept. 17,1578. While yet in his boyhood he was a candidate for the office of parish clerk at Ugborough, a neighboring village; but he did not succeed, and to his failure he used to attribute his elevated position in after-life. He was then noticed by a lady of the parish, who, seeing that a boy of only common educational training attempted so much, felt persuaded that he would surely rise if given greater facilities; and she supported him at school till he had acquired a knowledge of Latin, and was ready to go to Oxford, where he was admitted a poor scholar at Exeter College in 1596. He was elected probationer fellow of his college in 1602, being then a B.A. In the following year he received holy orders, and, having become noted for his profound knowledge of divinity as well as his great learning in general, he was elected rector of his college upon the death of Dr. Thomas Holland in 1612. In 1615 he succeeded Dr. Robert Abbott, then promoted to the see of Salisbury, as regius professor

of divinity, canon of Christ Church, and rector of Ewelme. He afterwards held the office of vice-chancellor for several years. “In the rectorship of his college,” says Wood, “he carried himself so winning and pleasing by his gentle government and fatherly instruction that it flourished more than any house in the university with scholars, as well of great as of mean birth; as also with many foreigners that came purposely to sit at his feet to gain instruction.” He no less distinguished himself in the divinity chair, which he occupied for twenty-six years. Although he maintained his decided convictions against the Socinians and Arminians, and was a most stout defender of the Calvinistic tendency, he was yet popular with all his hearers, and none failed to do him reverence, however widely they might differ from him. Though the university was agitated deeply by the controversy of those times, Prideaux happily escaped all partisan imbroglio, and in 1641 was elevated to the bishopric of Worcester. On account of his adherence to the king, he found his dignity neither pleasant nor profitable. He became so impoverished as to be compelled to sell his books, and so was, as Dr. Gauden says, “verus librorum helluo.” “Having,” continues Wood, “first, by indefatigable studies, digested his excellent library into his mind, he was afterwards forced again to devour all his books with his teeth, turning them, by a miraculous faith and patience, into bread for himself and his children, to whom he left no legacy but pious poverty, God’s blessing, and a father’s prayers.” He died at Bredon, in Worcestershire, July 12, 1650. He was a man of most unassuming and gentle manners; of excellent conduct, and great integrity and piety of mind; quite regardless of worldly concerns, and careless and often imprudent in worldly matters. He was an excellent linguist, possessing a wonderful memory, and so profound a divine that some have called him “Columna Fidei Orthodoxae et Malleus Haereticorum,” “Patrum Pater,” and “Ingens Scholue et Academiae Oraculum.” His works were as much esteemed as his learning. They were numerous, and mostly written in Latin— upon grammar, logic, theology, and other subjects. Those specially interested will find a list in Middleton’s *Evangel. Biog*. 3, 203 sq. Though he died before the publication of the *London Polyglot*, he was well known to the editor, Brian Walton, who appeals to Prideaux’s authority, on the nicer points of Hebrew criticism, in vindicating the *Polyglot* from certain cavils that had been raised against it. See Hook, *Ecclesiastes Biog*. 8:163; Perry, *Hist. of the Church of England*, 3, 239; *English Cyclopaedia*, s.v.; Wood, *Athenae Oxoniensis* (Bliss ed.), 3, 267; Fuller, *Worthies*, 1, 408 sq.; Nicholls, 2, 456; and Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Prie, René de

a French cardinal, was born in Touraine, in 1451, of a noble family. He was successively, by the favor of cardinal George D'Amboise, his cousin, grand archdeacon of Bourges, archdeacon of Blois, dean of St. — Hilaire-de-Poitiers, apostolic prothonotary, abbot commendatory of Landais, of Loroux, of Issoudun, etc., and, at last, almoner to the king. He was raised to the bishopric of Bayeux, on the express recommendation of Louis XII, Sept. 17, 1498. He was shortly after sent to Staples to subscribe to the treaty concluded in 1499 with Henry VII, king of England. He accompanied, a little while after this, Louis XII in his expedition against the Genevese, and was promoted to the cardinalate by Julius II (May 17,1507). When that pope took up arms against Louis XII, he prevented De Prie from leaving Rome, under pain of being deprived of his livings (1509). In spite of the pontifical interdict, the cardinal quitted Rome, and, together with some other prelates attached to the interests of France, opened at Pisa (Nov. 1, 1511) a council against Julius II, who, on Oct. 24, had declared him deposed from the cardinalate. In the interval he had been raised to the bishopric of Limoges (in 1510), and two years after he was provided with the bishopric of Lectoure. Seeing the chair of Limoges contested, De Prie made an arrangement with his competitors (Aug. 18,1513) by which he relinquished his rights to the bishopric of Lectoure to William of Barton, who in his turn waived in De Prie's favor his claim to the chair of Limoges; Foucauld de Bonnival then obtained the bishopric of Soissons. Rene de Prie, who had in the meantime been created cardinal by pope Leo X, celebrated at St. Denis the funeral ceremonies of Anne of Brittany (Jan. 20, 1514); blessed the marriage of Louis XII and Mary of England (Sept. 14); held at Bayeux a diocesan synod, where he published the laws (April 15, 1515); and resigned his two bishoprics of Limoges and of Bayeux Sept. 1516. While at Milan, in 1512, whither the Council of Pisa had been transferred, the University of Paris declared against him in a work of Thomas de Vio (cardinal Cajetan), *On the Authority of the Pope*, wherein the doctrine of Gerson was attacked, which he had espoused. Cardinal De Prie died at Lyre Sept. 9, 1519. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Géneralé*, s.v.

Prie-Dieu

is a term in ecclesiastical architecture designating a small lectern (q.v.), or book-desk, which was introduced in the 15th century.

Prierias, Sylvester

a Roman Catholic theologian of the time of the Reformation, and noted for his antagonism to the new movement, was born in 1460. His family-name was Mazolini, but he was called De Prierio, or Prierias, from the place of his birth (Prierio, in the county of Asti, in Piedmont). At the age of sixteen he entered the Dominican order, and was soon received as baccalaureate. As he had the gift of a singularly clear and ready exposition, he was surrounded by a crowd of pupils at the Gymnasium of Bologna, of which he had become the director. At the request of the Senate of Venice he accepted for a few years a professorship of theology at Padua, and was then prior at Milan, Verona, and Como. In 1508, in an assembly of the members of his order from both Lombardys, held at Mantua, he was elected vicar-general; two years later he was elected prior at Bologna. His renown and the recommendation of Dominico Grimani, bishop of Porto, induced pope Julius II to call him to Rome in 1511 as public lecturer on theology. Upon the death of the *Magister Sacrti Palatii*, Frater Joannes de Rafanellis (generally called De Ferraria), in 1515, Prierias was promoted to the vacant dignity by pope Leo X. Prierias died in 1523, and was buried in the church of St. Mary ad Minervam. He was the first non-German theologian who took up the pen against Luther. In 1518 he published *Dialogus it praesumptuosas Alarstini Lutheri conclusiones de potestate Papee* and his *Replica in Lutherum*; then in the following years his *Errata et Argumenta Lutheri recitata, detecatat, et copiosissimn trita, and his Epitona Responsionis cad eundem Lutherum.* The style is quite scholastic, and his defense of the papal primacy not without ability from a Romanist standpoint. But Luther, in his blunt and telling manner, laid so bare all the weaknesses of papal pretension as to make the defense of Prierias contemptible. The pope himself saw the inferiority of his defender in the contest, and admonished Prierias to silence; though he appointed him one of the judges of Luther at a later time. Some writings attributed falsely to Prierias are the works of a later magister of the order, Franciscus Sylvester. After his death appeared under his name some satires, composed after the fashion of the *Epistolce obscur*. — viz., Modus solennis et authenticus ad inquirendum et convincendum Lutheranos valde necessartits, and the *Tractatus de arte et modo inquirendi haereticos*. See Echard and Quetif, *Bibliotheca Pradicatorum*; Pressel (in Herzog), *Real-Encyklopädie*, for the Protestant, and Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, for the Roman Catholic

estimate of this man. See also Fisher, *Hist. of the Reformation*, p. 96; Alzog, *Kirchengesch*. 2, 262. (J. H. W.)

Priest, Hebrew

(ˆhkokoh, ἱερεύς). We base the following article upon the Scriptural information, with important additions from other and more modern sources.) *SEE SACERDOTAL ORDER*.

I. *General Considerations*. —

1. *The Name*.

(1.) The English word priest is generally derived from the New Test. term *presbyter* (πρεσβύτερος, *elder*), the meaning of which is, however, essentially different from that which was intended by the ancient terms. It would come nearer if derived from προΐστημι or προΐσταμαι "to preside," etc. It would then correspond to Aristotle's definition of a priest, "presiding over things relating to the gods" (Polit. 3, 14), and with the very similar one in <580501>Hebrews 5:1: "Every high-priest taken from among men is constituted on the behalf of men, with respect to their concerns with God, that he may present both gifts and sacrifices for sins." It would then adequately represent the ἱερεύς (ὁ ἱερὰ ῥέζων) of the Greeks, and the sacerdos (*a sacris faciundis*) of the Latins. *SEE PRESBYTER*.

(2.) It is unfortunate that there is nothing like a consensus of interpreters as to the etymology of the above Hebrew word *kohên*. Its root-meaning, uncertain as far as Hebrew itself is concerned, is referred by Geseniuls (Thesaurus, s.v.) to the idea of prophecy. The *kohên* delivers a divine message, stands as a mediator between God and man, represents each to the other. This meaning, however, belongs to the Arabic, not to the Hebrew form, and Ewald connects the latter with the verb ˆykhe(*hekin*), to array, put in order (so in <236110>Isaiah 61:10), seeing in it a reference to the primary office of the priests as arranging the sacrifice on the altar (*Alterthüm*. p. 272). According to Saalschütz (*Archaöl. der Hebr*. c. 78), the primary meaning of the word is to minister, and he thus accounts for the wider application of the name (as below). Bahr (*Symbolik*, 2, 15) connects it with an Arabic root=brq, to draw near.

Of these etymologies, the last has the merit of answering most closely to the received usage of the word. In the precise terminology of the law, it is

used of one who may “draw near” to the Divine Presence (<02192>Exodus 19:22; 30:20) while others remain afar off, and is applied accordingly, for the most part, to the sons of Aaron, as those who were alone authorized to offer sacrifices. In some remarkable passages it takes a wider range. It is applied to the priests of other nations or religions, to Melchizedek (<01418>Genesis 14:18), Potipherah (<01445>Genesis 41:45), Jethro (<02216>Exodus 2:16), to those who discharged priestly functions in Israel before the appointment of Aaron and his sons (<02192>Exodus 19:22). A case of greater difficulty presents itself in <10818>2 Samuel 8:18, where the sons of David are described as priests (*kohanim*), and this immediately after the name had been applied in its usual sense to the sons of Aaron. The writer of <13817>1 Chronicles 18:17, as if reluctant to adopt this use of the title, or anxious to guard against mistake, gives a paraphrase, “the sons of David were first at the king’s hand” (A. V. “chief about the king”). The Sept. and A.V. suppress the difficulty by translating *kohanim* into αὐλάρχαι and “chief officers.” The Vulg. more honestly gives “sacerdotes.” Luther and Coverdale follow the Hebrew strictly, and give “priests.” The received explanation is that the word is used here in what is assumed to be its earlier and wider meaning, as equivalent to rulers, or, giving it a more restricted sense, that the sons of David were *Vicarii Regis*, as the sons of Aaron were *Vicarii Dei* (comp. Patrick, Michaelis, Rosenmüller, *ad loc*., Keil on <13817>1 Chronicles 18:17). It can hardly be said, however, that this accounts satisfactorily for the use of the same title in two successive verses in two entirely different senses. Ewald accordingly (*Alterthüm*. p. 276) sees in it an actual suspension of the usual law in favor of members of the royal house, and finds a parallel instance in the acts of David (<10614>2 Samuel 6:14) and Solomon (1 Kings 3, 15). De Wette and Gesenius, in like manner, look on it as a revival of the old household priesthoods. These theories are in their turn unsatisfactory, as contradicting the whole spirit and policy of David’s reign, which was throughout that of reverence for the law of Jehovah and the priestly order which it established. A conjecture midway between these two extremes is perhaps permissible. David and his sons may have been admitted not to distinctively priestly acts, such as burning incense (<04640>Numbers 16:40; <14618>2 Chronicles 26:18), but to an honorary, titular priesthood. To wear the ephod in processions (<10614>2 Samuel 6:14), at the time when this was the special badge of the order (<09218>1 Samuel 22:18), to join the priests and Levites in their songs and dances, might have been conceded, with no deviation from the law, to the members of the royal house. There are some indications that these functions (possibly this

liturgical retirement from public life) were the lot of the members of the royal house who did not come into the line of succession, and who belonged, by descent or incorporation, to the house of Nathan, as distinct from that of David (Zechariah 12:12). The very name Nathan, connected as it is with Nethinim, suggests the idea of dedication. *SEE NETHINIM*. The title *kohên* is given to Zabud, the son of Nathan (1 Kings 4:5). The genealogy of the line of Nathan in Luke 3 includes many names-Levi, Eliezer, Malchi, Jochanan, Mattathias, Heli-which appear elsewhere as belonging to the priesthood. The mention in 1 Esdr. 5, 5 of Joiakim as the son of Zerubbabel, while in Nehemiah 12:10 he appears as the son of Jeshua, the son of Josedek, indicates either a strange confusion, or a connection, as yet imperfectly understood, between the two families. The same explanation applies to the parallel cases of Ira the Jairite (2 Samuel 20:26), where the Sept. gives ἱερεύς. It is noticeable that this use of the title is confined to the reigns of David and Solomon, and that the synonym "at the king's hand" of 1 Chronicles 18:17 is used in 25:2 of the sons of Asaph as "prophesying" under their head or father, and of tie relation of Asaph himself to David in the choral service of the Temple.

2. *Essential Idea of the Hebrew Priesthood*. — This may be called *mediation*; hence the fact that in the epistle to the Hebrews mediator and priest are considered as synonymous. Yet by this the specific object of the priesthood, in contradistinction to the two other theocratical offices of prophet and king, is by no means sufficiently expressed. The prophet is also a mediator between God and man, since he *speaks* to the latter in the name of tie former; while the king is the mediator of the judicial and executive power of God among his people, acting in the name of Jehovah. The priest also was clothed with representative power (Deuteronomy 18:5); but this power was mainly directed to represent the people as a holy people in the presence of Jehovah, and to prepare a way by which they themselves might approach God.

Israel was the full-grown *family* of God, and the domestic priesthood was to become a nation of priests, a royal priesthood (Exodus 19:3-6; Deuteronomy 7:6; Numbers 16:3). But that Israel was chosen to be the royal priesthood with respect to other nations, like many other things, was only expressed in idea, and not actually realized in fact. Israel was incapacitated by its natural sinfulness, and by its incessant transgressions of the very law through the fulfillment of which it was to be sanctified, to

penetrate into the immediate presence of God (<19921>Exodus 19:21). Hence the necessity of the nation having individual representatives to mediate between them and Jehovah. As a separate element the priesthood represented the nation as yet unfit to approach God. The people offered their gifts to God by means of a separated class from among themselves, and in connection with the propitiatory sacrifices this was calculated to keep alive the consciousness of their estrangement from God. The very place assigned to the priests in the camp was expressive of this idea, that they keep "the charge of the sanctuary for the charge of the children of Israel" (<04038>Numbers 3:38).

The insufficiency of the priesthood was expressed by their being excluded from the most holy place. Only the high-priest, in whom the idea of this typical institution concentrated, could penetrate thither; and he only as the type of the future Mediator who was absolutely to lead us into the most holy of the world of spirits. Because the priests were not altogether removed from the sins of the people, even the chief-priest had access only once a year to the most holy, and that just on the day when the entire guilt of the nation was to be atoned for. He had on that occasion to confess his own sin, and bring a sin-offering; to lay aside his magnificent robes of office, and to officiate in a plain linen garment. Moreover, when he entered the dark, narrow space of the most holy, the cloud of incense was to cover the mercy-seat "that he die not" (<03163>Leviticus 16:13).

The idea of mediation between God and the people is expressed by the priest presenting the atonement for the congregation, and the gifts of a reconciled people (byrqh, <03207>Leviticus 21:7; <04165>Numbers 16:5; 17:5). Again, he brings back from God's presence-the blessing of grace, mercy, and peace (<03912>Leviticus 9:27, etc.; <04062>Numbers 6:22-27). In the earliest families of the race of Shem the offices of priest and prophet were undoubtedly united; so that the word originally denoted both, and at last the Hebrew idiom kept one part of the idea and the Arabic another (Gesenius, *Hebraisches und Chalddisches Handworterbuch* [Leips. 1823]). It is worthy of remark that all the persons who are recorded in Scripture as having legally performed priestly acts, but who were not strictly sacerdotal, come under the definition of a prophet, viz. persons who received supernatural communications of knowledge generally, as Adam, Abraham (<01207>Genesis 20:7), Isaac, Jacob, Moses, Job, Samuel, Elijah (comp. <42170>Luke 1:70). The following definition of a priest may be

found sufficiently comprehensive: A man who officiates or transacts with God on behalf of others, statedly, or for the occasion.

3. *Origin of the Sacerdotal Order*. — The idea of a priesthood connects itself, in all its forms, pure or corrupted, with the consciousness, more or less distinct, of sin. Men feel that they have broken a law. The power above them is holier than they are, and they dare not approach it. They crave for the intervention of some one of whom they can think as likely to be more acceptable than themselves. He must offer up their prayers, thanksgivings, sacrifices. He becomes their representative in "things pertaining unto God." He may become also (though this does not always follow) the representative of God to man. The functions of the priest and prophet may exist in the same person. The reverence which men pay to one who bears this consecrated character may lead them to acknowledge the priest as being also their king. The claim to fill the office may rest on characteristics belonging only to the individual man, or confined to a single family or tribe. The conditions of the priesthood, the office and influence of the priests, as they are among the most conspicuous facts of all religions of the ancient world, so do they occupy a like position in the history of the religion of Israel.

No trace of a hereditary or caste priesthood meets us in the worship of the patriarchal age. (For its occasional appearance in a general form, see § 3.) Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob perform priestly acts, offer sacrifices, "draw near" to the Lord (<01208>Genesis 12:8; 18:23; 26:25; 33:20). To the eldest son, or to the favored son exalted to the place of the eldest, belongs the "goodly raiment" (<01275>Genesis 27:15), the "coat of many colors" (<01303>Genesis 37:3), in which we find perhaps the earliest trace of a sacerdotal vestment (comp. Blunt, *Script. Coincid.* 1, 1; Ugolino, 13:138). Once, and once only, does the word *kohên* meet us as belonging to a ritual earlier than the time of Abraham. Melchizedek is "the priest of the most high God" (<01418>Genesis 14:18). The argument of the Epistle to the Hebrews has a historical foundation in the fact that there are no indications in the narrative of Genesis 14 of any one preceding or following him in that office. The special divine names which are connected with him as the priest of "the most high God, the possessor of heaven and earth," render it probable that he rose, in the strength of those great thoughts of God, above the level of the other inhabitants of Canaan. In him Abraham recognized a faith like his own, a life more entirely consecrated, the priestly character in its perfection. *SEE MELCHIZEDEK*. In the worship of the

patriarchs themselves, the chief of the family, as such, acted as the priest. The office descended with the birthright, and might apparently be transferred with it. As the family expanded, the head of each section probably stood in the same relation to it. The thought of the special consecration of the first-born was recognized at the time of the Exodus (see below). A priesthood of a like kind continued to exist in other Shemitic tribes. The Book of Job, whatever may be its date, ignores altogether the institutions of Israel, and represents the man of Uz as himself "sanctifying" his sons, and offering burnt-offerings (<18105>Job 1:5). Jethro is a "priest of Midian" (<02216>Exodus 2:16; 3:1). Balak himself offers a bullock and a ram upon the seven altars on Pisgah (<04232>Numbers 23:2, etc.).

In Egypt the Israelites came into contact with a priesthood of another kind, and that contact must have been for a time a very close one. The marriage of Joseph with the daughter of the priest of On — a priest, as we may infer from her name, of the goddess Neith (<01445>Genesis 41:45) *SEE ASENATH* the special favor which he showed to the priestly caste in the years of famine (<01476>Genesis 47:26), the training of Moses in the palace of the Pharaohs, probably in the colleges and temples of the priests (<44722>Acts 7:22)—all this must have impressed the constitution, the dress, the outward form of life upon the minds of the lawgiver and his contemporaries. Little as we know directly of the life of Egypt at this remote period, the stereotyped fixedness of the customs of that country warrants us in referring to a tolerably distant past the facts which belong historically to a later period, and in doing so we find coincidences with the ritual of the Israelites too numerous to be looked onl as accidental, or as the result of forces which were at work independent of each other, but taking parallel directions. As circumcision was common to the two nations (Herod. 2, 37), so the shaving of the whole body (ibid.) was with both part of the symbolic purity of the priesthood, once for all with the Levites of Israel (<04807>Numbers 8:7), every third day with those of Egypt. Both are restricted to garments of linen (Herod. 2, 37, 81; Plutarch, *De Isid*. 4; Juven. 6:533; <02839>Exodus 28:39; Ezekiel 44, 18). The sandals of byblus worn by the Egyptian priests were but little removed from the bare feet with which the sons of Aaron went into the sanctuary (Herod. 2, 37). For both there were multiplied ablutions. Both had a public maintenance assigned, and had besides a large share in the flesh of the victims offered (ibid. *1. c*.). Over both there was one high-priest. In both the law of succession was hereditary (ibid.; comp. also Spencer, *De Leg. Hebr*. 3, 1,

5, 11; Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt*. 3, 116). They were exempt from taxes. Wine was allowed to them only in the strictest moderation, and entire abstinence from it was required during the fasts, which were frequent (Plutarch, *De Isid*. 6). Each grade of the priests was distinguished by its peculiar costume. The high-priests, who, among other official duties, anointed the king, wore a mantle made of an entire leopard-skin; as did the king, when engaged in priestly duties. The sacerdotal order constituted one of the four principal castes, of the highest rank, next to the king, and from whom were chosen his confidential and responsible advisers (comp. <10818>2 Samuel 8:18; <13817>1 Chronicles 18:17; <23911>Isaiah 19:11; Diodorus, 1, 73); they associated with the monarch, whom they assisted in the performance of his public duties, to whom they explained from the sacred books those lessons which were laid down for his conduct (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* 1, 237, 257-282). *SEE EGYPT*.

Facts such as these leave scarcely any room for doubt that there was a connection of some kind between the Egyptian priesthood and that of Israel. The latter was not, indeed, an outgrowth or imitation of the former. The faith of Israel in Jehovah, the one Lord, the living God, of whom there was no form or similitude, presented the strongest possible contrast to the multitudinous idols of the polytheism of Egypt. The symbolism of the one was cosmic, "of the earth earthy," that of the other, chiefly, if not altogether, ethical and spiritual. But looking, as we must look, at the law and ritual of the Israelites as designed for the education of a people who were in danger of sinking into such a polytheism, we may readily admit that the education must have started from some point which the subjects of it had already reached, must have employed the language of symbolic acts and rites with which they were already familiar. The same alphabet had to be used, the same root-forms employed as the elements of speech, though the thoughts which they were to be the instruments of uttering were widely different. The details of the religion of Egypt might well be used to make the protest against the religion itself at once less startling and more attractive. At the time of the Exodus there was as yet no priestly caste. The continuance of solemn sacrifices (<020501>Exodus 5:1, 3) implied, of course, a priesthood of some kind, and priests appear as a recognized body before the promulgation of the Law on Sinai (<021922>Exodus 19:22). It has been supposed that these were identical with the "young men of the children of Israel" who offered burnt-offerings and peace-offerings (<022405>Exodus 24:5) either as the first-born or as representing in the freshness of their youth the

purity of acceptable worship (comp. the analogous case of" the young man the Levite" in Judges 17:and Ewald, *Alterthümer*, p. 273). On the principle, however, that difference of title implies in most cases difference of functions, it appears more probable that the "young men" were not those who had before performed priestly acts, but were chosen by the lawgiver to be his ministers in the solemn work of the covenant, representing, in their youth, the stage in the nation's life on which the people were then entering (Keil, *ad loc*.). There are signs that the priests of the older ritual were already dealt with as belonging to an obsolescent system. Though they were known as those that "come near" to the Lord (Exodus 19:22), yet they are not permitted to approach the Divine Presence on Sinai. They cannot "sanctify" themselves enough to endure that trial. Aaron alone, the future high-priest, but as yet not known as such, enters with Moses into the thick darkness. It is noticeable also that at this transition-stage, when the old order was passing away, and the new was not yet established, there is the proclamation of the truth, wider and higher than both, that the whole people was to be "a kingdom of priests" (Exodus 19:6). The idea of the life of the nation was that it was to be as a priest and a prophet to the rest of mankind. They were called to a universal priesthood (comp. Keil, *ad loc*.). As a people, however, they needed a long discipline before they could make the idea a reality. They drew back from their high vocation (Exodus 20:18-21). As for other reasons, so also for this, that the central truth required a rigid, unbending form for its outward expression, a distinctive priesthood was to be to the nation what the nation was to mankind. The position given to the ordinances of the priesthood indicated with sufficient clearness that it was subordinate, not primary, a means and not an end. Not in the first proclamation of the great laws of duty in the Decalogue (Exodus 20:1-17), nor in the application of those laws to the chief contingencies of the people's life in the wilderness, does it find a place. It appears together with the ark and the tabernacle, as taking its position in the education by which the people were to be led towards the mark of their high calling. As such we have to consider it.

II. *Personal Characteristics of the Hebrew Priesthood*, -

1. *Consecration*. — The functions of the HIGH-PRIEST, the position and history of the LEVITES as the consecrated tribe, have been fully discussed under those heads. It remains to notice the characteristic facts connected with "the priests, the sons of Aaron," as standing between the two. Solemn

as was the subsequent dedication of the other descendants of Levi, that of the priests involved a yet higher consecration. A special word (vdq; *kadásh*) was appropriated to it. Their old garments were laid aside. Their bodies were washed with clean water (<02904>Exodus 29:4; <03306>Leviticus 8:6) and anointed with the perfumed oil, prepared after a prescribed formula, and to be used for no lower purpose (<02907>Exodus 29:7; 30:22-33). The sons of Aaron, it may be noticed, were simply sprinkled with the precious oil (<03330>Leviticus 8:30). Over Aaron himself it was poured till it went down to the skirts of his clothing (<03312>Leviticus 8:12; <19302>Psalm 133:2). The new garments belonging to their office were then put on them (see below). The truth that those who intercede for others must themselves have been reconciled was indicated by the sacrifice of a bullock as a sin-offering, on which they solemnly laid their hands, as transferring to it the guilt which had attached to them (<02910>Exodus 29:10; <03318>Leviticus 8:18). The total surrender of their lives was represented by the ram slain as a burnt-offering, a "sweet savor" to Jehovah (Exodus 29. 18; <03321>Leviticus 8:21). The blood of these two was sprinkled on the altar, offered to the Lord. The blood of a third victim, the ram of consecration, was used for another purpose. With it Moses sprinkled the right ear, that was to be open to the divine voice; the right hand and the right foot, that were to be active in divine ministrations (<02920>Exodus 29:20; <03323>Leviticus 8:23, 24). Lastly, as they were to be the exponents, not only of the nation's sense of guilt, but of its praise and thanksgiving, Moses was to "fill their hands" with cakes of unleavened bread and portions of the sacrifices, which they were to present before the Lord as a wave-offering. This appears to have been regarded as the *essential* part of the consecration; and the Heb. "to fill the hand" is accordingly used as a synonym for "to consecrate" (<02929>Exodus 29:9; <14309>2 Chronicles 13:9). The whole of this mysterious ritual was to he repeated for seven days, during which they remained within the Tabernacle, separated from the people, and not till then was the consecration perfect (comp. on the meaning of all these acts, Bähr, *Symbolik*, vol. 2, ch. 5, § 2). Moses himself, as the representative of the Unseen King, is the consecrator, the sacrificer throughout these ceremonies; as the channel through which the others receive their office, he has for the time a higher priesthood than that of Aaron (Selden, *De Synedr*. 1, 16; Ugolino, 12:3). In accordance with the principle which runs through the history of Israel, he, the ruler, solemnly divests himself of the priestly office and transfers it to another. The fact that he had been a priest was merged in his work as a

lawgiver. Only once in the language of a later period is the word *kohên* applied to him (<19916>Psalm 99:6).

The consecrated character thus imparted did not need renewing. It was a perpetual inheritance transmitted from father to son through all the centuries that followed. We do not read of its being renewed in the case of any individual priest of the sons of Aaron. Only when the line of succession was broken, and the impiety of Jeroboam intruded the lowest of the people into the sacred office, do we find the reappearance of a like form (<14139>2 Chronicles 13:9) of the same technical word. The previous history of Jeroboam and the character of the worship which he introduced make it probable that, in that case only, the ceremonial was, to some extent, Egyptian in its origin. In after-times the high-priest took an oath (<19723>Hebrews 7:23) to bind him, as the Jews say, to a strict adherence to established customs (Mishna, *Yoma*, 1, 5).

2. *Dress*. — The "sons of Aaron" thus dedicated were to wear during their ministrations a special apparel at other times apparently they wore the common dress of the people. The material of the sacred garments was to be linen, and not wool (Ezekiel 44, 17; <032101>Leviticus 21:1-10); but Ewald (*Alterthümer*, p. 317), Josephus (*Ant.* 4:8), and the rabbins (*Mass. Kilaim*, p. 9) maintain that the holy garments were made of a mixture of wool and linen, called שַׁעַטְנֵז (*shaatnez*); and a typical meaning is found in this by Braun (*Vest. Sac. Hebr.* § 30), as if it was to signify the imperfection of the Levitical priesthood; while <264417>Ezekiel 44:17, which restricts the material to linen, was considered significant of the simplicity of the New Test. *SEE HETEROGENEOUS*. The prohibition in <031919>Leviticus 19:19; <052211>Deuteronomy 22:11 against the people generally wearing any garments of such "mingled" material was hence explained by Josephus that they might not assume what was characteristic of the priests (*Ant.* 4:11). But the more satisfactory and natural view is that the priests only wore linen, and that the Israelites were prohibited from wearing the mixture to teach them that even in garments they should avoid all needless artificiality, and to respect the creation of God in the simplicity of the material. *SEE LINEN*. It is well known that the Roman poets speak of the Egyptian priests as the *linigeri*, the wearers of linen (Juvenal, *Sat.* 6; Ovid, Met. 1). The reason for fixing on this material is given in <264418>Ezekiel 44:18; but the feeling that there was something unclean in clothes made from the skin or wool of an animal was common to other nations. Egypt has already been mentioned. The Arab priests in the time of Mohammed wore linen only

(Ewald, *Alterthüm*. p. 289). As there were some garments common both to the priests and the high priest, we shall begin with those of the former, taking them in the order in which they would be put on. *SEE APPAREL*.

(1.) The first was be db;ysen]k]mi, "linen breeches," or *drawers* (<022842>Exodus 28:42; Sept. περισκελῆ λινά; Vulg. *feminalia linea*). These extended from the loins to the thighs, and were "to cover their nakedness." The *verecundia* of the Hebrew ritual in this and in other places (<022026>Exodus 20:26; 28:42) was probably a protest against some of the fouler forms of nature-worship, as e.g. in the worship of Peor (Maimonides, *Moreh Nebochim*, 3, 45; Ugolino, 13:385), and possibly, also, in some Egyptian rites (Herod. 2, 60). According to Josephus, whose testimony, however, of course relates only to his own time, they reached only to the middle of the thigh, where they were tied fast (*Ant*. 3, 7, 1). Such drawers were worn universally in Egypt. In the sculptures and paintings of that country the figures of workmen and servants have no other dress than a short kilt or apron, sometimes simply bound about the loins and lapping over in front; other figures have short loose drawers; while a third variety of this article, fitting closely and extending to the knees, appears in the figures of some idols, as in the cut. This last sort of drawers seems to have been peculiar in Egypt to the gods, and to the priests, whose attire was often adapted to that of the idols on which they attended. The priests, in common with other persons of the upper classes, wore the drawers under other robes. No mention occurs of the use of drawers by any other class of persons in Israel except the priests, on whom it was enjoined for the sake of decency. *SEE BREECHES*.

Picture for Priest 1

Picture for Priest 2

(2.) Over the drawers was worn the "coat of fine linen" (vve tn,toK], *kethôneth shesh, tunica byssina*, <023927>Exodus 39:27), a close-fitting shirt or cassock, such as was worn by men in general (<013703>Genesis 37:3), also by women (<101318>2 Samuel 13:18; Song of Solomon 5, 3), next to the skin. It was white, but with a diamond or chess-board pattern on it (Bahr, *Symb*. vol. 2, ch. 3, § 2). This came nearly to the feet (ποδήρης χιτών, Josephus, *Ant*. 3, 7, 1), and was to be woven in its garment-shape (not cut out and then sewed together), like the χιτὼν ἄῤῥαφος of <431923>John 19:23, in which some interpreters have even seen a token of the priesthood of him who

wore it (Ewald, *Gesch*. 5, 177; Ugolino, 13:218). Here also modern Eastern customs present an analogy in the woven, seamless *ihram* worn by the Mecca pilgrims (Ewald, *Alterthüm*. p. 289). Josephus further states that it sat close to the body, and had sleeves, which were tied fast to the arms, and was girded to the breast a little above the elbows by a girdle. It had a narrow aperture about the neck, and was tied with certain strings hanging down from the edge over the breast and back, and was fastened above each shoulder (*Ant*. 3, 7, 2). But this garment. in the case of the priests and high priest, was to be broidered (<02804>Exodus 28:4), /Bve]Ti tn,tK], "a broidered coat," by which Gesenius understands a coat of cloth worked in checkers or cells. Braun compares it to the reticulum in the stomach of ruminant animals (*De Vestitu*, 1, 17). The Sept. gives χιτὼν κοσυμβωτός, which seems to refer to the tassels or strings; Vulg. *linea stricta*, which seems to refer to its close fitting.

Picture for Priest 3

(3.) The whole tunic was gathered at the waist by the "girdle" (fnebai, *abnet*, <02840>Exodus 28:40; Sept. ζώνη; Vulg. *balteus*; comp. <264417>Ezekiel 44:17-19). This was also worn by magistrates (<232221>Isaiah 22:21). The girdle for the priests was to be made of fine twined linen, and blue and purple and scarlet of needlework (<233902>Isaiah 39:29). Josephus describes it as often going round, four fingers broad, but so loosely woven that it might be taken for the skin of a serpent; and that it was embroidered with flowers of scarlet and purple and blue, but that the warp was nothing but linen. The beginning of its circumvolution was at the breast, and when it had gone often round it was there tied, and hung loosely down to the ankles while the priest was not engaged in any laborious service, for in that position it appeared in the most agreeable manner to the spectators; but when he was obliged to assist at the offering of sacrifices and to do the appointed service, in order that he might not be hindered in his operations by its motion, he threw it to the left hand and bore it on his right shoulder (*Ant*. 3. 7, 2). The mode of its hanging down is illustrated in Fig. 4, where the girdle is also richly embroidered, while the imbricated appearance of the girdle (hce[}ni µqer o) may be seen very plainly in Fig. 1. The next cut (Fig. 3), of a priestly scribe of ancient Egypt, offers an interesting specimen of both tunic and girdle. *SEE GIRDLE*.

(4.) Upon their head they were to wear a *turban* (h[;B;g]mi, *migbeâh*; <022840>Exodus 28:40; Sept. κίδαρις; Vulg. *tiara*; A… "cap" or "bonnet," which two words are there synonymous) in the form of a cup-shaped flower, also of fine linen (<023928>Exodus 39:28). In the time of Josephus it was circular, covering about half the head, something like a crown, made of thick linen swathes doubled round many times and sewed together, surrounded by a linen cover to hide the seams of the swathes, and sat so close that it would not fall off when the body was bent down (*Ant*. 3, 7, 3).

These garments they might wear at any time in the Temple, whether on duty or not, but they were not to sleep in them (Josephus, *War*, 5, 5, 7). When they became soiled they were not washed or used again, but torn up to make wicks for the lamps in the Tabernacle (Selden, *De Synedr*. 13:11). In <264214>Ezekiel 42:14; 44:17-19, there are directions that the priests should take off their garments when they had ministered, and lay them up in the holy chambers, and put on other garments; but these directions occur in a visionary representation of a temple, which all agree has never been realized, the particulars of which, though sometimes derived from known customs, yet at other times differ from them widely. The garments of the inferior priests appear to have been kept in the sacred treasury (Ezra 2, 69; <160770>Nehemiah 7:70). They had besides them other "clothes of service," which were probably simpler, but are not described (<023110>Exodus 31:10; Ezra 42, 14). In all their acts of ministration they were to be barefooted. This is inferred

(a) from the absence of any direction as to a covering for the feet;

(b) from the later custom;

(c) from the universal feeling of the East. Shoes were worn as a protection against defilement. In a sanctuary there was nothing that could defile.

Then, as now, this was the strongest recognition of the sanctity of a holy place which the Oriental mind could think of (<020305>Exodus 3:5; <060515>Joshua 5:15), and throughout the whole existence of the Temple service, even though it drew upon them the scorn of the heathen (Juven. *Sat*. 6, 159), and seriously affected the health of the priests (Ugolino, 8:976; 13:405), it was scrupulously adhered to.

Picture for Priest 4

Picture for Priest 5

The dress of the *high-priest* was precisely the same with that of the common priests in all the foregoing particulars; in addition to which he had

(1.) a *robe*, לי[מ], *meil* (Exodus 28:4, ποδήρη, *tunica*). This was not a mantle, but a second and larger coat without sleeves; a kind of surtout worn by the laity, especially persons of distinction (Job 1:20; 2, 12, by kings; 1 Samuel 15:27; 18:4; 24:5-12). This garment, when intended for the high-priest, and then called "the robe of the ephod," was to be of one entire piece of woven work, all of blue, with an aperture for the neck in the middle of the upper part, having its rim strengthened and adorned with a border. The hem had a kind of fringe, composed of tassels, made of blue, purple, and scarlet, in the form of pomegranates; and between every two pomegranates there was a small golden bell, so that there was a bell and a pomegranate alternately all round (Exodus 28:31-35). The use of these bells may have partly been that by the high-priest shaking his garment at the time of his offering incense on the great day of expiation, etc., the people without might be apprised of it, and unite their prayers with it (comp. Ecclus. 45, 9; Luke 1, 10; Acts 10:4; Revelation 8:3, 4). Josephus describes this robe of the ephod as reaching to the feet, and consisting of a single piece of stuff parted where the hands came out (John 19:23). He also states that it was tied round with a girdle embroidered with the same colors as the former, with a mixture of gold interwoven (*Ant.* 3, 7, 4). It is highly probable that this garment was also derived from Egyptian usage. There are instances at Thebes of priests wearing over the great-coat a loose sleeveless robe, which exposes the sleeves of the inner tunic. The fringe of bells and pomegranates seems to have been the priestly substitute for the fringe bound with a blue ribbon, which all the Israelites were commanded to wear. Many traces of this fringe occur in the Egyptian remains. The use assigned to it, "that looking on this fringe they should remember the Lord's commandments," seems best explicable by the supposition that the Egyptians had connected some superstitious ideas with it (Numbers 15:37-40).

(2.) The ephod, דפא, ἐπωμίς, *superhumerale* (Exodus 28:4). This was a short cloak covering the shoulders and breast. It is said to have been worn by Samuel while a youth ministering before the Lord (1 Samuel 2, 18); by David while engaged in religious service (2 Samuel 6:14); and by inferior priests (1 Samuel 22:18). But in all these instances it is

distinguished as a linen ephod, and was not a sacred but an honorary vestment, as the Sept. understands it in 2 Samuel 6:14, στολὴν ἔξαλλον. The ephod of the high priest was to be made of gold, of blue, of purple, of scarlet, and fine twined linen, with cunning work, bvj. Though it probably consisted of one piece, woven throughout, it had a back part and a front part, united by shoulder-pieces. It had also a girdle; or, rather, strings went out from each side and tied it to the body. On the top of each shoulder was to be an onyx stone, set in sockets of gold, each having engraven upon it six of the names of the children of Israel, according to the precedence of birth, to memorialize the Lord of the promises made to them (Exodus 28:6-12, 29). Josephus gives sleeves to the ephod (*Ant.* 3, 7, 5). It may be considered as a substitute for the leopard-skin worn by the Egyptian high-priests in their most sacred duties, as in Fig. 4, where the ephod appears no less plainly. In other figures of Egyptian priests, the shoulder-pieces were equally apparent. They are even perceptible in Fig. 1. The Egyptian ephod is, however, highly charged with all sorts of idolatrous figures and emblems, and even with scenes of human sacrifices. The Sept. rendering of bvj, "cunning work," is ἔργον ὑφαντὸν ποικιλτοῦ, a woven-work of the embroiderer, a word which especially denotes a manufacturer of tissues adorned with figures of animals (Strabo, 17 p. 574, Sieb.). In the earlier liturgical costume, the ephod is mentioned as belonging to the high-priest only (Exodus 28:6-12; 39:2-5). At a later period it is used apparently by all the priests (1 Samuel 22:18), and even by others, not of the tribe of Levi, engaged in religious ceremonial (2 Samuel 6:14). *SEE EPHOD*. Then came

(3.) the *breastplate*, ˆv,j, *chôshen* (Sept. περιστήθιον; Vulg. *rationale*); a gorget ten inches square, made of the same sort of cloth as the ephod, and doubled so as to form a kind of pouch or bag (Exodus 29:9), in which were to be put the Urim and Thummim, which are also mentioned as if already known (Exodus 28:30). The external part of this gorget was set with four rows of precious stones-the first row a sardius, a topaz, and a carbuncle; the second, an emerald, a sapphire, and a diamond; the third, a ligure, an agate, and an amethyst; and the fourth, a beryl, an onyx, and a jasper-set in a golden socket. Upon each of these stones was to be engraven the name of one of the sons of Jacob. In the ephod, in which there was a space left open sufficiently large for the admission of this pectoral, were four rings of gold, to which four others at the four corners of the breastplate corresponded; the two lower rings of the latter being

fixed inside. It was confined to the ephod by means of dark-blue ribbons, which passed through these rings; and it was also suspended from the onyx stones on the shoulder by chains of gold, or, rather, cords of twisted gold threads, which were fastened at one end to two other *larger* rings fixed in the upper corners of the pectoral, and by the other end going round the onyx stones on the shoulders, and returning and being fixed in the larger ring. The breastplate was further kept in its place by a girdle, made of the same stuff, which Josephus says was sewed to the breastplate, and which, when it had gone once round, was tied again upon the seam and hung down. Here is another adaptation and correction of the costume of the higher Egyptian priests, who wore a large, splendid ornament upon the breast, often a winged scarabaeus, the emblem of the sun, as in the cut, Fig. 5, which exhibits the connecting ring and chain to fasten it to the girdle.

(4.) The remaining portion of dress peculiar to the high-priest was the *mitre*, tbnex]mi, *mitsnebeth* (Sept. χιΣαπλχ; Vulg. *cidaris*, <022804>Exodus 28:4). The Bible says nothing of the difference between this and the turban of the common priests. It is, however, called by a different name. It was to be of fine linen (ver. 39). Josephus says it was the same in construction and figure with that of the common priest, but that above it there was another, with swathes of blue, embroidered; and round it was a golden crown, polished, of three rows, one above another, out of which rose a cup of gold, which resembled the calyx of the herb called by Greek botanists hyoscyamus lie ends a most labored description by comparing the shape of it to a poppy (*Ant.* 3, 7, 6). Upon comparing his account of the bonnet of the priests with the *mitre* of the high-priest, it would appear that the latter was conical. The cut, Fig. 6, presents the principal forms of the *mitres* worn by the ancient priests of Egypt, and affords a substantial resemblance of that prescribed to the Jews, divested of idolatrous symbols, but which were displaced to make way for a simple plate of gold, bearing the inscription, “Holiness to Jehovah.” This plate (/yxi, *tsits*; Sept. πέταλον; Vulg. *lamina*) extended from one ear to the other, being bound to the forehead by strings tied behind, and further secured in its position by a blue ribbon attached to the mitre (<022836>Exodus 28:36-39; 39:30; <030809>Leviticus 8:9). Josephus says this plate was preserved to his own day (*Ant.* 8:3, 8; see Reland, *De Spol. Templi*, p.]32). Such was the dress of the high priest: see a description of its magnificence in corresponding terms in Ecclus. 1, 5-16.

Picture for Priest 6

Josephus had an idea of the symbolical import of the several parts of the pontifical dress. He says that being made of linen signified the earth; the blue denoted the sky, being like lightning in its pomegranates, and in the noise of its bells resembling thunder. The ephod showed that God had made the universe of four elements, the gold relating to the splendor by which all things are enlightened. The breastplate in the middle of the ephod resembled the earth, which has the middle place of the world. The girdle signified the sea, which goes round the world. The sardonyxes declare the sun and moon. The twelve stones are the twelve months or signs of the zodiac. The mitre is heaven, because blue (*Ant.* 3, 7, 7). He appears, however, to have had two explanations of some things, one for the Gentiles, and another for the Jews. Thus in this section he tells his Gentile readers that the seven lamps upon the golden candlesticks referred to the seven planets; but to the Jews he represents them as an emblem of the seven days of the week (*War*, 7:5, 5; Whiston's notes *ad loc*.). It was not always worn by the high-priest. It was exchanged for one wholly of linen, and therefore white, though of similar construction, when on the day of expiation he entered into the holy of holies (<031604>Leviticus 16:4, 23); and neither he nor the common priests wore their appropriate dress, except when officiating. It was for this reason, according to some, that Paul, who had been long absent from Jerusalem, did not know that Ananias was the high-priest (<442305>Acts 23:5). Bahr (*Symbolik*, vol. 2, ch. 3, § 1, 2) finds a mystic meaning in the number, material, color, and shape of the priestly vestments, discusses each point elaborately, and dwells in § 3 on the *differences* between them and those of the Egyptian priesthood. According to Fairbairn (*Typol. of Script*.), the garments represent the office, and the person who was officially invested was to have them sprinkled with a mixture of oil and sacrificial blood (Kurtz, *Opfercultus*, p. 292). These garments, which were first worn at the consecration, and which were preserved in the Temple when not actually required, were not allowed except to such as were legally consecrated for service, though they belonged to the house of Aaron. These garments were "holy garments" (<022804>Exodus 28:4), made 'for glory and for beauty;" but they were not only for a glorious ornament, for the whole of the vestments bore a symbolical meaning, and the inscription on the golden plate which adorned the brow of the high-priest, "Holiness to Jehovah," might be properly applied to all the holy garments. The four pieces of the priestly attire were each and all

of them required none was to fail; nor was it permitted to wear more than was prescribed; and the warning— "that he die not" (ver. 35, 43) seems to bear upon an exact fulfillment of the divine command in this, no less than in other things. The shining white of the linen garments typified that the servants of him who covers himself with light as with a garment (<19402>Psalm 104:2; Daniel 2, 22; 7:9), and who dwelleth "in light which no man can approach unto" (<540616>1 Timothy 6:16), are clothed typically in light (<023429>Exodus 34:29); so that the ministers should minister in the earthly sanctuary in the same livery as his ministers wear in the heavenly sanctuary (<271206>Daniel 12:6; <261002>Ezekiel 10:2, 7; <401702>Matthew 17:2; 28:3; <441003>Acts 10:30). But light (consequently *white*, as the most perfect *reflection* of light) is universally the type of salvation (<183305>Job 18:5, etc.; <192701>Psalm 27:1; <235919>Isaiah 59:9), of righteousness (<193706>Psalm 37:6; <390402>Malachi 4:2), of purity and holiness (1 John 1, 5, 7); just as darkness, black, is the type of wickedness, uncleanness, etc. (Isaiah 5, 20; <250407>Lamentations 4:7, 8; <430319>John 3:19; <450132>Romans 3:12; <470614>2 Corinthians 6:14). It is not without meaning that the priests, like the angels, are specially called the holy ones.

3. *Regulations*. — The idea of a consecrated life, which was thus asserted at the outset, was carried through a multitude of details. Each probably had a symbolic meaning of its own. Collectively they formed an education by which the power of distinguishing between things holy and profane, between the clean and the unclean, and so ultimately between moral good and evil, was awakened and developed (Ezekiel 44, 23). Before they entered the tabernacle the priests were to wash their hands and their feet (<022017>Exodus 30:17-21; 40. 3032). During the time of their ministration thiey were to drink no wine or strong drink (<031009>Leviticus 10:9; Ezekiel 44, 21). Their function was to be more to them than the ties of friendship or of blood, and, except in the case of the nearest relationships (six degrees are specified, <032101>Leviticus 21:1-5; Ezekiel 44, 25), they were to make no mourning for the dead. The high-priest, as carrying the consecrated life to its highest point, was to be above the disturbing power of human sorrow even in these instances. Public calamities seem to have been an exception, for Joacim the high-priest, and the priests, in such circumstances, ministered in sackcloth with ashes on their mitres (Judith 4:14, 15; comp. <290113>Joel 1:13). Customs which appear to have been common in other priesthoods were (probably for that reason) forbidden them. They were not to shave their heads. They were to go through their ministrations with the serenity of a reverential awe, not with the orgiastic wildness which led the

priests of Baal, in their despair, to make cuttings in their flesh (<03928>Leviticus 19:28; <111838>1 Kings 18:28), and carried those of whom Atys was a type to a more terrible mutilation (<052301>Deuteronomy 23:1). The same thought found expression in two other forms affecting the priests of Israel. The priest was to be one who, as the representative of other men, was to be physically as well as liturgically perfect. The idea of the perfect body, as symbolizing the holy soul, was, as might be expected, wide-spread among the religions of heathenism. “Sacerdos non integri corporis quasi mall ominis res vitanda est” (Seneca, *Controv*. 4:2). As the victim was to be without blemish, so also was the sacrificer (comp. Bahr, *Symbol*. vol. 2. ch. 2, § 3). The law specified in broad outlines the excluding defects (<032117>Leviticus 21:17-21), and these were such as impaired the purity, or at least the dignity, of the ministrant. The morbid casuistry of the later rabbins drew up a list of not less than 144 faults or infirmities which involved permanent, and of twenty-two which involved temporary deprivation from the priestly office (Carpzov. *App. Crit*. p. 92, 93; Ugolino, 12:54; 13:903); and the original symbolism of the principle (Philo, *De Vict*. and *De Monarch*. 2, 5) was lost in the prurient minuteness which, here as elsewhere, often makes the study of rabbinic literature a somewhat repulsive task. If the Christian Church has sometimes seemed to approximate, in the conditions it laid down for the priestly character, to the rules of Judaism, it was yet careful to reject the Jewish principles, and to rest its regulations simply on the grounds of expediency (*Constt. Apost*. 77, 78). The marriages of the sons of Aaron were, in like manner, hedged round with special rules. There is, indeed, no evidence for what has sometimes been asserted, that either the high priest (Philo, *De Monarch*. 2, 11; 2, 229, ed. Mang.; Ewald, *Alterthüm*. p. 302) or the other sons of Aaron (Ugolino, 12:52) were limited in their choice to the women of their own tribe, and we have some distinct instances to the contrary. It is probable, however, that the priestly families frequently intermarried, and it is certain that they were forbidden to marry an unchaste woman, or one who had been divorced, or the widow of any but a priest (<032107>Leviticus 21:7,14; Ezekiel 44, 22). The prohibition of marriage with one of an alien race was assumed, though not enacted in the law; and hence the reforming zeal of a later time compelled all who had contracted such marriages to put away their strange wives (<151018>Ezra 10:18), and counted the offspring of a priest and a woman taken captive in war as illegitimate (Josephus, *Ant*. 3, 10; 11:4; *c. Apion*. 1, 7), even though the priest himself did not thereby lose his function (Ugolino, 12:924). The high-priest was to carry the same idea to a yet higher point, and was to marry none but a

virgin in the first freshness of her youth (Leviticus 21:13). Later casuistry fixed the age within the narrow limits of twelve and twelve and a half (Carpzov. *App. Crit*. p. 88). It followed, as a matter of necessity, from these regulations that the legitimacy of every priest depended on his genealogy. A single missing or faulty link would vitiate the whole succession. To those genealogies, accordingly, extending back unbroken for 2000 years, the priests could point, up to the time of the destruction of the Temple (Josephus, *c. Apion*. 1, 7). In later times, wherever the priest might live-Egypt, Babylon, Greece-he was to send the register of all marriages in his family to Jerusalem (ibid.). They could be referred to in any doubtful or disputed case (Ezra 2:62; Nehemiah 7:64). In them was registered the name of every mother as well as of every father (*ibid*.; comp. also the story already referred to in Suidas, s.v. Ἰησοῦς). It was the distinguishing mark of a priest, not of the Aaronic line, that he was ἀπάτωρ, ἀμήτωρ, ἀγενεαλόγητος (Hebrews 7:3), with no father or mother named as the ground of his title.

The age at which the sons of Aaron might enter upon their duties was not defined by the law, as that of the Levites was. Their office did not call for the same degree of physical strength; and if twenty-five in the ritual of the Tabernacle (Numbers 8:24) and twenty in that of the Temple (1 Chronicles 23:27) was the appointed age for the latter, the former were not likely to be kept waiting till a later period. In one remarkable instance, indeed, we have an example of a yet earlier age. The boy Aristobulus at the age of seventeen ministered in the Temple in his pontifical robes, the admired of all observers, and thus stirred the treacherous jealousy of Herod to remove so dangerous a rival (Josephus, *Ant.* 15:3, 3). This may have been exceptional, but the language of the rabbins indicates that the special consecration of the priest's life began with the opening years of manhood. As soon as the down appeared on his cheek the young candidate presented himself before the Council of the Sanhedrim, and his genealogy was carefully inspected. If it failed to satisfy his judges, he left the Temple clad in black, and had to seek another calling; if all was right so far, another ordeal awaited him. A careful inspection was to determine whether he was subject to any one of the 144 defects which would invalidate his priestly acts. If he was found free from all blemish, he was clad in the white linen of the priests, and entered on his ministrations. If the result of the examination was not satisfactory, he was relegated to the half-menial office of separating the sound wood for the altar from that which was decayed and

worm-eaten, but was not deprived of the emoluments of his office (Lightfoot, *Temple Service*, ch. 6).

4. *Functions*. — The work of the priesthood of Israel was, from its very nature, more stereotyped by the Mosaic institutions than any other element of the national life. The functions of the Levites-less defined, and therefore more capable of expansion-altered, as has been shown, *SEE LEVITE*, from age to age; but those of the priests continued throughout substantially the same, whatever changes might be brought about in their social position and organization. The duties described in Exodus and Leviticus are the same as those recognized in the books of Chronicles, and those which the prophet-priest Ezekiel sees in his vision of the Temple of the future. They, assisting the high-priest, were to watch over the fire on the altar of burnt-offerings, and to keep it burning evermore both by day and night (<03062>Leviticus 6:12; <14131>2 Chronicles 13:11); to feed the golden lamp outside the veil with oil (<02720>Exodus 27:20, 21; <03242>Leviticus 24:2); to offer the morning and evening sacrifices, each accompanied with a meal-offering and a drink offering, at the door of the tabernacle (<02938>Exodus 29:38-44). These were the fixed, invariable duties; but their chief function was that of being always at hand to do the priest's office for any guilty, or penitent, or rejoicing Israelite. The worshipper might come at any time. If he were rich and brought a bullock, it was the priest's duty to slay the victim, to place the wood upon the altar, to light the fire, to sprinkle the altar with the blood (<03105>Leviticus 1:5). If he were poor and brought a pigeon, the priest was to wring its neck (<03115>Leviticus 1:15). In either case he was to burn the meal-offering and the peace offering which accompanied the sacrifice (<03212>Leviticus 2:2, 9; 3:11). After the birth of every child, the mother was to come with her sacrifice of turtle-doves or pigeons (<03206>Leviticus 12:6; Luke 2, 22-24), and was thus to be purified from her uncleanness. A husband who suspected his wife of unfaithfulness might bring her to the priest, and it belonged to him to give her the water of jealousy as an ordeal, and to pronounce the formula of execration (<04511>Numbers 5:11-31). Lepers were to come, day by day, to submit themselves to the priest's inspection, that he might judge whether they were clean or unclean, and when they were healed perform for them the ritual of purification (<03134>Leviticus 13:14; comp. <41044>Mark 1:44). All the numerous accidents which the law looked upon as defilements or sins of ignorance had to be expiated by a sacrifice, which the priest of course had to offer (<03501>Leviticus 15:1-33). As they thus acted as mediators for those who were laboring under the sense of guilt, so

they were to help others who were striving to attain, if only for a season, the higher standard of a consecrated life. The Nazarite was to come to them with his sacrifice and his wave-offering (<04601>Numbers 6:1-21). In the final establishments at Jerusalem it belonged to the priests to act as sentinels over the holy place, as to the Levites to guard the wider area of the precincts of the Temple (Ugolino, 13, 1052).

Other duties of a higher and more ethical character are hinted at, but were not and probably could not be, the subject of a special regulation. They were to teach the children of Israel the statutes of the Lord (<03011>Leviticus 10:11; <05330>Deuteronomy 33:10; <14153>2 Chronicles 15:3; <26423>Ezekiel 44:23, 24). The “priest’s lips” (in the language of the last prophet looking back upon the ideal of the order) were to “keep knowledge” (<39207>Malachi 2:7). Through the w hole history, with the exception of the periods of national apostasy, these acts, and others like them, formed the daily life of the priests who were on duty. The three great festivals of the year were, however, their seasons of busiest employment. The pilgrims who came up by tens of thousands to keep the feast came each with his sacrifice and oblation. The work at such times was, on some occasions at least, beyond the strength of the priests in attendance, and the Levites had to be called in to help them (<14234>2 Chronicles 29:34; 35:14). Other acts of the priests of Israel, significant as they were, were less distinctively sacerdotal. They were to bless the people at every solemn meeting, and that this part of their office might never fall into disuse, a special formula of benediction was provided (<04622>Numbers 6:22-27). During the journeys in the wilderness it belonged to them to cover the ark and all the vessels of the sanctuary with a purple or scarlet cloth before the Levites might approach them (<04405>Numbers 4:5-15). As the people started on each day’s march they were to blow “an alarm” with long silver trumpets (<04001>Numbers 10:1-8)-with two if the whole multitude were to be assembled, with one if there was to be a special council of the elders and princes of Israel. With the same instruments they were to proclaim the commencement of all the solemn days, and days of gladness (<04010>Numbers 10:10); and throughout all the changes in the religious history of Israel this adhered to them as a characteristic mark. Other instruments of music might be used by the more highly trained Levites and the schools of the prophets, but the trumpets belonged only to the priests. They blew them (but in that case the trumpets were of rams’ horns) in the solemn march round Jericho (<06004>Joshua 6:4), in the religious war which Judah waged against Jeroboam (<14312>2 Chronicles

13:12), when they summoned the people to a solemn penitential fast (<29201>Joel 2:1, 15). In the service of the second Temple there were never to be less than twenty-one or more than eighty-four blowers of trumpets present in the Temple daily (Ugolino, 13:1011). The presence of the priests on the field of battle for this purpose, often in large numbers, armed for war, and sharing in the actual contest (<132312>1 Chronicles 12:23, 27; <142021>2 Chronicles 20:21, 22), led, in the later periods of Jewish history, to the special appointment at such times of a war-priest, deputed by the Sanhedrim to be the representative of the high-priest, and standing next but one to him in the order of precedence (comp. Ugolino, 12:1031 [*De Sacerdote Casfrensi*]; 13:871). Jost (Judenth. 1, 153) regards the war-priest as belonging to the ideal system of the later rabbins, not to the historical constitution of Israel. <051902>Deuteronomy 20:2, however, supplies the germ out of which such an office might naturally grow. Judas Maccaboeus, in his wars, does what the war-priest was said to do (I Mace. 3, 56).

Other functions are intimated in Deuteronomy which might have given them greater influence as the educators and civilizers of the people. They were to act (whether individually or collectively does not distinctly appear) as a court of appeal in the more difficult controversies in criminal or civil cases (<051708>Deuteronomy 17:8-13). A special reference was to be made to them in cases of undetected murder, and they were thus to check the vindictive blood-feuds which it would otherwise have been likely to occasion (21, 5). It must remain doubtful, however, how far this order kept its ground during the storms and changes that followed. The judicial and the teaching functions of the priesthood remained probably for the most part in abeyance through the ignorance and vices of the priests. Zealous reformers kept this before them as an ideal (<141707>2 Chronicles 17:7-9; 19:8-10; Ezekiel 44, 24), but the special stress laid on the attempts to realize it shows that they were exceptional. The teaching functions of the priest have probably been unduly magnified by writers like Michaelis, who aim at bringing the institutions of Israel to the standard of modern expediency (*Comm. on Laws of Moses*, 1, 35-52), as they have been unduly depreciated by Saalschütz and Jahn.

At first Aaron was to burn incense on the golden altar every morning when he dressed the lamps, and every evening when he lighted them, but in later times the common priest performed this duty (<420108>Luke 1:8, 9); to offer, as the Jews understand it, daily, morning and evening, the peculiar meal-

offering he offered on the day of his consecration (Exodus 29); to perform the ceremonies of the great day of expiation (Leviticus 16); to arrange the shewbread every Sabbath, and to eat it in the holy place (<3249>Leviticus 24:9); but he must abstain from the holy things during his uncleanness (<3201>Leviticus 22:1-3); also if he became leprous, or contracted uncleanness (ver. 4-7). If he committed a sin of ignorance, he must offer a sin offering for it (<0403>Leviticus 4:3-13); and so for the people (ver. 12-22). He was to eat the remainder of the people's meal offerings with the inferior priests in the holy place (<0616>Leviticus 6:16); to judge of the leprosy in the human body or garments (<1302>Leviticus 13:2-59); to adjudicate legal questions (<5172>Deuteronomy 17:12). Indeed, when there was no divinely inspired judge, the high-priest was the supreme ruler till the time of David, and again after the Captivity. He must be present at the appointment of a new ruler or leader (<0427>Numbers 27:19), and ask counsel of the Lord for the ruler (ver. 21). Eleazar, with others, distributes the spoils taken from the Midianites (<0421>Numbers 21:21, 26). To the high-priest also belonged the appointment of a maintenance from the funds of the sanctuary to an incapacitated priest (<0926>1 Samuel 2:36, margin). Besides these duties, peculiar to himself, he had others in common with the inferior priests. Thus, when the camp set forward, "Aaron and his sons" were to take the tabernacle to pieces, to cover the various portions of it in cloths of various colors (<0405>1 Samuel 4:5-15), and to appoint the Levites to their services in carrying them; to bless the people in the form prescribed (<0602>1 Samuel 6:23-27), to be responsible for all official errors and negligences (<0801>1 Samuel 18:1), and to have the general charge of the sanctuary (ver. 5).

5. *Maintenance*. — Functions such as these were clearly incompatible with the common activities of men. At first the small number of the priests must have made the work almost unintermittent, and, even when the system of rotation had been adopted, the periodical absences from home could not fail to be disturbing and injurious, had the priests been dependent on their own labors. The serenity of the priestly character would have been disturbed had they had to look for support to the lower industries. It may have been intended (see above) that their time, when not liturgically employed, should be given to the study of the law, or to instructing others in it. On these grounds, therefore, a distinct provision was made for them. The later rabbins enumerate no less than twenty-four sources of emolument. Of these the chief only are given here (Ugolino, 13:1124). They consisted,

(1) of one tenth of the tithes which the people paid to the Levites— i.e. one percent on the whole produce of the country (<04826>Numbers 18:26-28).

(2.) Of a special tithe every third year (<05428>Deuteronomy 14:28; 26:12).

(3.) Of the redemption-money, paid at the fixed rate of five shekels a head, for the first-born of man or beast (<04814>Numbers 18:14-19). It is to be noticed that the law, by recognizing the substitution of the Levites for the first-born, and ordering payment only for the small number of the latter, in excess of the former, deprived Aaron and his sons of a large sum which would otherwise have accrued to them (Numbers 3, 44-51).

(4.) Of the redemption-money paid in like manner for men or things especially dedicated to the Lord (Leviticus 27).

(5.) Of spoil, captives, cattle, and the like, taken in war (<04125>Numbers 31:25-47).

(6.) Of what may be described as the perquisites of their sacrificial functions, the shewbread, the flesh of the burnt-offerings, peace-offerings, trespass-offerings (<04808>Numbers 18:8-14; <03026>Leviticus 6:26, 29; 7:6-10), and, in particular, the heave-shoulder and the wave-breast (<03102>Leviticus 10:12-15).

(7.) Of an undefined amount of the first-fruits of corn, wine, and oil (<02319>Exodus 23:19; Leviticus 2, 14; <05401>Deuteronomy 26:1-10). Of some of these, as “most holy,” none but the priests were to partake (<03029>Leviticus 6:29). It was lawful for their sons and daughters (<03104>Leviticus 10:14), and even in some cases for their home-born slaves, to eat of others (<03211>Leviticus 22:11). The stranger and the hired servant were in all cases excluded (<03210>Leviticus 22:10).

(8.) On their settlement in Canaan the priestly families had thirteen cities assigned them, with “suburbs” or pasture-grounds for their flocks (<06213>Joshua 21:13-19.) While the Levites were scattered over all the conquered country, the cities of the priests were within the tribes of Judah, Simeon, and Benjamin, and this concentration was not without its influence on their subsequent history. *SEE LEVITE*. These provisions were obviously intended to secure the religion of Israel against the dangers of a caste of pauper-priests, needy and dependent, and unable to bear their witness to the true faith. They were, on the other hand, as far as possible removed from the condition of a wealthy order. Even in the ideal state

contemplated by the book of Deuteronomy, the Levite (here probably used generically, so as to include the priests) is repeatedly marked out as an object of charity, along with the stranger and the widow (<05212>Deuteronomy 12:12, 19; 14:27-29). During the long periods of national apostasy, tithes were probably paid with even less regularity than they were in the more orthodox period that followed the return from the Captivity (<16130>Nehemiah 13:10; <390308>Malachi 3:8-10). The standard of a priest's income, even in the earliest days after the settlement in Canaan, was miserably low (<071710>Judges 17:10). Large portions of the priesthood fell, under the kingdom, into a state of abject poverty (comp. <090236>1 Samuel 2:36). The clinging evil throughout their history was not that they were too powerful and rich, but that they sank into the state from which the law was intended to preserve them, and so came to "teach for hire" (<330311>Micah 3:11; comp. Saalschütz, *Archäologie der Hebriaer*, 2, 344-355).

It will be noticed that neither the high-priest nor common priests received "any inheritance" at the distribution of Canaan among the several tribes (<041820>Numbers 18:20; <051801>Deuteronomy 18:1, 2), but were maintained, with their families, upon certain fees, dues, perquisites, etc., arising from the public services, which they enjoyed as a common fund. Perhaps the only distinct prerogative of the high-priest was a tenth part of the tithes assigned to the Levites (18, 28; comp. <161038>Nehemiah 10:38); but Josephus represents this also as a common fund (*Ant.* 4:4, 4).

6. *Classification and Statistics.* — The earliest historical trace of any division of the priesthood and corresponding cycle of services belongs to the time of David. Jewish tradition indeed recognizes an earlier division, even during the life of Aaron, into eight houses (Gem. Hieros. *Taanith*, in Ugolino, 13:873), augmented during the period of the Shiloh-worship to sixteen, the two families of Eleazar and Ithamar standing in both cases on an equality. It is hardly conceivable, however, that there could have been any rotation of service while the number of priests was so small as it must have been during the forty years of sojourn in the wilderness, if we believe Aaron and his lineal descendants to have been the only priests officiating. The difficulty of realizing in what way the single family of Aaron were able to sustain all the burden of the worship of the tabernacle and the sacrifices of individual Israelites may, it is true, suggest the thought that possibly in this, as in other instances, the Hebrew idea of sonship by adoption may have extended the title of the "Sons of Aaron" beyond the limits of lineal descent, and, in this case, there may be some foundation for the Jewish

tradition. Nowhere in the later history (to we find any disproportion lile that of three priests to 20.000 Levites. The office of supervision over those that "kept the charge of the sanctuary," entrusted to Eleazar (Numbers 3, 32), implies that some others were subject to it besides Ithamar and his children, while these very keepers of the sanctuary are identified in ver. 38 with the sons of Aaron who are encamped with Moses and Aaron on the east side of the tabernacle. The allotment of not less than thirteen cities to those who bore the name, within little more than forty years from the Exodus, tends to the same conclusion, and at any rate indicates that the priesthood were not intended to be always in attendance at the tabernacle, but were to have homes of their own, and therefore, as a necessary consequence, fixed periods only of service. Some notion may be formed of the number on the accession of David from the facts (1) that not less than 3700 tendered their allegiance to him while he was as yet reigning at Hebron over Judah only (<1327>1 Chronicles 12:27), and (2) that one twenty-fourth part were sufficient for all the services of the statelier and more frequented worship which he established. To this reign belonged, accordingly, the division of the priesthood into the four-and-twenty "courses" or orders t/q l]j}mi(Sept. διαιρέσεις, ἐφημερίαι, <1340>1 Chronicles 24:1-19; <1438>2 Chronicles 23:8; <4005>Luke 1:5), each of which was to serve in rotation for one week, while the further assignment of special services during the week was determined by lot (<4009>Luke 1:9) under a subordinate prefect (<1205>2 Kings 11:5, 7), but all attended at the great festivals (<1451>2 Chronicles 5:11). The first of these courses was that which had Jehoiarib at the head of it. It was reckoned the most honorable. Josephus values himself on his descent from it (*Life*, § 1). Mattathias, the father of the Maccabees, descended from it (1 Macc. 2:1). Abijah was the head of the eighth course, to which Zacharias, the father of the Baptist, belonged (<4005>Luke 1:5). Each course appears to have commenced its work on the Sabbath, the outgoing priests taking the morning sacrifice, and leaving that of the evening to their successors (<1438>2 Chronicles 23:8; Ugolino, 13:319). In this division, however, the two great priestly houses did not stand on an equality. The descendants of Ithamar were found to have fewer representatives than those of Eleazar (a diminution that may have been caused partly by the slaughter of the priests who accompanied Hophni and Phinehas [Psalm 78, 64], partly by the massacre at Nob), and sixteen courses accordingly were assigned to the latter, eight only to the former (<1340>1 Chronicles 24:4; comp. Carpzov. App. Crit. p. 98). The division thus instituted was confirmed by Solomon, and continued to be

recognized as the typical number of the priesthood. It is to be noted, however, that this arrangement was to some extent elastic. Any priest might be present at any time, and even perform priestly acts, so long as he did not interfere with the functions of those who were officiating in their course (Ugolino, 13:881), and at the great solemnities of the year as well as on special occasions like the opening of the Temple, they were present in great numbers. On the return from the Captivity there were found but four courses out of the twenty-four, each containing, in round numbers, about a thousand (<15026>Ezra 2:36-39). The causes of this great reduction are not stated, but large numbers must have perished in the siege and storm of Jerusalem (<25046>Lamentations 4:16), and many may have preferred remaining in Babylon. Out of these returning exiles, however, to revive, at least, the idea of the old organization, the four-and twenty courses were reconstituted, bearing the same names as before, and so continued till the destruction of Jerusalem (Josephus, *Ant*. 7:14, 7). If we may accept the numbers given by Jewish writers as at all trustworthy, the proportion of the priesthood to the population of Palestine during the last century of their existence as an order must have been far greater than that of the clergy has ever been in any Christian nation. Over and above those that were scattered in the country and took their turn, there were not fewer than 24,000 stationed permanently at Jerusalem and 12,000 at Jericho (Gemar. Hieros. *Taanith*. fol. 67, in Carpov. *App. Crit*. p. 100). It was a Jewish tradition that it had never fallen to the lot of any priest to offer incense twice (Ugolino, 12:18). Oriental statistics are, however, always open to some suspicion those of the Talmuld not least so; and there is, probably, more truth in the computation of Josephums, who estimates the total number of the four houses of the priesthood, referring apparently to <15026>Ezra 2:36, at about 20,000 (c. *Apion*. 2, 7). Another indication of number is found in the fact that a “great multitude” could attach themselves to the “sect of the Nazarenes” (<44607>Acts 6:7), and so have cut themselves off, sooner or later, from the Temple services, without any perceptible effect upon its ritual. It was almost inevitable that the great mass of the order, under such circumstances, should sink in character and reputation. Poor and ignorant, despised and oppressed by the more powerful members of their own body, often robbed of their scanty maintenance by the rapacity of the high-priests, they must have been to Palestine what the clergy of a later period has been to Southern Italy dead weight on its industry and strength, not compensating for their unproductive lives by any services rendered to the higher interests of the

people. The rabbinic classification of the priesthood, though belonging to a somewhat later date, reflects the contempt into which the order had fallen. There were

(1) the heads of the twenty-four courses, known sometimes as ἀρχιερεῖς;

(2) the large number of reputable officiating but inferior priests;

(3) the *plebeii*, or (to use the extremest formula of rabbinic scorn) the "priests of the people of the earth," ignorant and unlettered;

(4) those that, through physical disqualifications or other causes, were non-efficient members of the order, though entitled to receive their tithes (Ugolino, 12:18; Jost, *Judenth*. 1, 156).

Prideaux (*Connection*, 1, 129), following the Jewish tradition, affirms that only four of the courses returned from Babylon— Jedaiah, Immer, Pashur, and Harim (for which last, however, the Babylonian Talmud has Joiarib)— because these four only are enumerated in <15026>Ezra 2:36-39; <16073>Nehemiah 7:39-42. He accounts for the mention of other courses, as of Joiarib (1 Macc. 2, 1) and Abiah (<42105>Luke 1:5), by saying that those four courses were subdivided into six each, so as to keep up the old number of twenty-four, which took the names of the original courses, though not really descended from them. But this is probably an invention of the Jews, to account for the mention of only these four families of priests in the list of Ezra 2 and Nehemiah 7. However difficult it may be to say with certainty why only those four courses are mentioned in that particular list, we have the positive authority of <13910>1 Chronicles 9:10, and <16110>Nehemiah 11:10, for asserting that Joiarib did return; and we have two other lists of courses, one of the time of Nehemiah (<16102>Nehemiah 10:2-8), the other of Zerubbabel (<16201>Nehemiah 12:1-7); the former enumerating twenty-one, the latter twenty-two courses; and the latter naming Joiarib as one of them, and adding, at ver. 19, the name of the chief of the course of Joiarib in the days of Joiakim. Thus there can be no reasonable doubt that Joiarib did return. The notion of the Jews does not receive any confirmation from the statement in the Latin version of Josephus (c. *Apion*. 2, 8) that there were four courses of priests, as it is a manifest corruption of the text for twenty-four, as Whiston and others have shown (note to *Life of Josephus*, § 1). The preceding table gives the three lists of courses which returned, with the original list in David's time to compare them by. The courses which

cannot be identified with the original ones, but which are enumerated as existing after the return, are as follows:

For some account of the courses, see Lewis, *Orig. Hebr*. bk. 2, ch. 7.

III. *Historical Review of the Hebrew Priesthood*. —

1. *In Patriarchal Times*. —

(1.) We accede to the Jewish opinion that Adam was the first priest. The divine institution of sacrifices, immediately after the fall, seems connected with the event that "the Lord God made coats of skins to Adam and his wife, and clothed them" (<010321>Genesis 3:21)-that is, with the skins of animals which had been offered in sacrifice, for the permission to eat animal food was not given till after the Deluge (<010129>Genesis 1:29; 9:3)—expressive of their faith in the promise of the victorious yet suffering "seed of the woman" (ver. 15); and judging from the known custom of his immediate descendants, we infer that Adam, now also become the head and ruler of the woman (ver. 16), officiated in offering the sacrifice as well on her behalf as his own. Judging from the same analogy, it seems further probable that Adam acted in the same capacity on behalf of his sons, Cain and Abel (and possibly of their children), who are each said to have "brought" his respective offering, but not to have personally presented it (<010403>Genesis 4:3-5). The *place* evidently thus indicated would seem to have been the situation of "the cherubim," at the east of the garden of Eden (<010324>Genesis 3:24), called "the face" (<010414>Genesis 4:14), and "the presence of the Lord" (ver. 16; comp. Hebrew of <023424>Exodus 34:24; <030905>Leviticus 9:5), and from which Jehovah conferred with Cain (<010409>Genesis 4:9): circumstances which, together with the name of their offering, hj;n]mi, which, sometimes at least, included bloody sacrifices in after-times (<090217>1 Samuel 2:17; 26:19; <390113>Malachi 1:13, 14), and the appropriation of the skins to the offerer (comp. <030708>Leviticus 7:8), would seem like the rudiments of the future Tabernacle and its services, and when viewed in connection with many circumstances incidentally disclosed in the brief fragmentary account of things before the Exodus-such as the Sabbath (<010202>Genesis 2:2, 3), the distinction observed by Noah, and his burnt-offerings upon the altar of clean and unclean beasts (<010820>Genesis 8:20), the prohibition of blood (<010904>Genesis 9:4), tithes (<011420>Genesis 14:20), priestly blessing (ver. 19), consecration with oil, and vows (<012818>Genesis 28:18-22), the Levirate law (<013808>Genesis 38:8), weeks (<012927>Genesis 29:27), distinction

of the Hebrews by their families (Exodus 2:1), the office of elder during the bondage in Egypt (Exodus 3:16), and a place of meeting with Jehovah (Exodus 5:22; comp. 25. 22)-would favor the supposition that the Mosaic dispensation, as it is called, was but an authoritative re-arrangement of a patriarchal Church instituted at the fall. The fact that Noah officiated as the priest of his family, upon the cessation of the Deluge, is clearly recorded in Genesis 8:20, where we have an altar built, the ceremonial distinctions in the offerings already mentioned, and their propitiatory effect, "the sweet savor," all described in the words of Leviticus (Leviticus 1, 9; 11:47). These acts of Noah, which seem like the resumption rather than the institution of an ordinance, were doubtless continued by his sons and their descendants, as *heads of their respective families*. Following our arrangement, the next glimpse of the subject is afforded by the instance of Job, who "sent and sanctified his children" after a feast they had held, and offered burnt-offerings, t/l[ρ"according to the number of them all," and "who did this continually," either constantly or after every feast (Job 1:5). A direct reference, possibly to priests, is lost *in* our translation of Job 12:19, "he leadeth *princes* (µynhKρSept. ἱερεῖς;' Vulg. *sacerdotes*; a sense adopted in Dr. Lee's *Translation* [Lond. 1837]) away spoiled." May not the difficult passage, Job 33:23, contain an allusion to priestly duties? A case is there supposed of a person divinely chastised in order to improve him (19, 22): "If then there be a *messenger* (Ëal;m; which means priest, Ecclesiastes 5:6; Malachi 2:6) with him," "an interpreter" (/yl;mεor mediator generally, 2 Chronicles 32:31; Isaiah 43:27, one among a thousand, or of a family, Judges 6:15, "my family," literally "my thousand," comp. Numbers 1:16, "to show to man his uprightness," or, rather, "duty," Proverbs 14:2, part of the priest's office in such a case, Malachi 2:7; comp. Deuteronomy 24:8), then such an individual "is gracious," or, rather, will supplicate for him, and saith, "Deliver him from going down into the pit," or grave, for "I have found a ransom," a cause or ground in him for favorable treatment, namely, the penitence of the sufferer, who consequently recovers (25:29). The case of Abraham and Abimelech is very similar (Genesis 20:3-17), as also that of Job himself, and his three misjudging friends, whom the Lord commands to avert chastisement from themselves by taking to him bullocks and rams, which he was to offer for them as a burnt-offering, and to *pray* for them (Job 42:8). The instance of Abram occurs next in historical order, who upon his first entrance into

Canaan, attended by his family, "built an altar, and called upon the name of the Lord" (<01207>Genesis 12:7, 8). Upon returning victorious from the battle of the kings, he is congratulated by Melchizedek, the Canaanitish king of Salem, and "priest of the most high God" (<01418>Genesis 14:18). For the ancient union of the royal and sacerdotal offices, in Egypt and other countries, see Wilkinson's *Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians* (Lond. 1842), 1, 245. Abram next appears entering into covenant with God as the head and representative of his seed; on which occasion those creatures only are slain which were appointed for sacrifice under the law (<01509>Genesis 15:9-21). Isaac builds an altar, evidently as the head of his family (<01512>Genesis 15:26, 25), his *younger* son Jacob offers a *sacrifice*, jbz,(<01531>Genesis 15:31, 54), and "calls his brethren to eat of it" (comp. <03175>Leviticus 7:15); builds an altar at Shalem (<01320>Genesis 33:20), makes another by *divine command*, and evidently as the head of his household, at Bethel (<01301>Genesis 35:1-7), and pours a *drink-offering*, Ësn,(comp. <04507>Numbers 15:7, etc.), upon a pillar (ver. 14).

(2.) We next find Jethro, priest of Midian, the father-in-law of Moses, probably a priest of the true God (<02301>Exodus 3:1), and possibly his father also (<02216>Exodus 2:16), in the same capacity. In <02501>Exodus 5:1, 3, the whole nation of the Israelites is represented as wishing to sacrifice and to hold a feast to the Lord. The first step, though very remote, towards the formation of the Mosaic system of priesthood was the consecration of the first-born, in memory of the destruction of the first-born of Egypt (<02302>Exodus 13:2, 14-16); for, instead of these, God afterwards took the Levites to attend upon him (<04312>Numbers 3:12). As to the popular idea, both among Jews and Christians, that the right of priesthood was thus transferred from the first-born generally to the tribe of Levi, or, rather, to one family of that tribe, we consider, with Patrick, that it is utterly groundless (*Commentary on* <02192>*Exodus* 19:22; <04312>Numbers 3:12; see Vitringa, *Observationes Sacrae*, 2, 33; Outram, *De Sacrificiis*, 1, 4). The substance of the objections is that Aaron and his sons were consecrated before the exchange of the Levites for the first-born; that the Levites were afterwards given to minister unto them, but had nothing to do with the priesthood; and that the peculiar right of God in the first-born originated in the Exodus. The last altar, before the giving of the law, was built by Moses, probably for a memorial purpose only (<02715>Exodus 17:15; comp. <06226>Joshua 22:26, 27). At this period the office of priest was so well understood, and so highly valued, that Jehovah promises as an inducement

to the Israelites to keep his covenant, that they should be to him "a kingdom of priests" (Exodus 19:6), which, among other honorable appellations and distinctions originally belonging to the Jews, is transferred to Christians (1 Peter 2:9). The first introduction of the word *priests*, in this part of the history, is truly remarkable. It occurs just previous to the giving of the law, when, as part of the cautions against the too eager curiosity of the people, lest they should "break through unto the Lord and gaze" (Exodus 19:21), it is added, "and let *the priests which come near unto the Lord* sanctify themselves, lest the Lord break through upon them" (ver. 22). Here, then, priests are incontestably spoken of as an already existing order, which was now about to be remodified. Nor is this the last reference to these anti-Sinaitic priests. Selden observes that the phrases "the priests the Levites" (Deuteronomy 17:9) and "the priests the sons of Levi" (Deuteronomy 21:5), and even the phrase "the Levites alone" (Deuteronomy 18:6; comp. 1), are used to include all others who had been priests before God took the sons of Aaron peculiarly to serve him in this office (*De Synedr*. 2, 8, p. 2, 3). Aaron is summoned at this juncture to go up with Moses unto the Lord on Mount Sinai (Exodus 19:24). Another remarkable circumstance is then recorded. Moses, now acting as "mediator," and endued with an extraordinary commission, builds an altar under the hill, and sends "young men of the children of Israel, who offered burnt-offerings, and sacrificed peace-offerings of oxen unto the Lord": (24, 5). Various interpretations are given to the phrase "young men;" but, upon a view of all the circumstances, we incline to think that they were young *laymen*, purposely selected by closes for this act, in order to form a complete break between the former priesthood and the new, and that the recommencement and re-arrangement of the priesthood under divine authority might be made more palpably distinct. In the same light we consider the many priestly acts performed by Moses himself, at this particular time, as in Exodus 29:25; 40:25, 27, 29; like those of Gideon (Judges 6:25-27), of Samuel (1 Samuel 7:9), and of David (1 Chronicles 21:26). Yet these especial permissions, upon emergencies and extraordinary occasions, had their limits, as may be seen in the fate of "the men of Bethshemesh" (1 Samuel 6:19), and of Uzzah (2 Samuel 6:7).

2. *The Aaronic Priesthood*. —

(1.) *Early Period*. — The next event in the history of the subject is the public consecration of Aaron and his sons, according to the preceding

regulations (Leviticus 8). At their first sacerdotal performances (Leviticus 9) the divine approbation was intimated by a supernatural fire which consumed their burnt-offering (ver. 24). The general satisfaction of the people with these events was, however, soon dashed by the miraculous destruction of the two elder sons of Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, for offering strange fire (<03001>Leviticus 10:1), probably under the influence of too much wine, since the prohibition of it to the priests when about to enter the Tabernacle seems to have originated in this event (ver. 9). Moses forbade Aaron and his sons to uncover their heads, or to rend their clothes on this occasion; but the whole house of Israel were permitted to bewail the visitation (ver. 6). The inward grief, however, of Eleazar and Ithamar caused an irregularity in their sacerdotal duties, which was forgiven on account of the occasion (ver. 16-20). Aaron now appears associated with Moses and the leading men of the several tribes in taking the national census (Numbers 1, 3, etc.), and on other grand state occasions (<04602>Numbers 26:2, 3; 31:13-26; 32:2; 34:17). The high-priest appears ever after as a person of the highest consequence. The dignity of the priesthood soon excited the emulation of the ambitious; hence the penalty of death was denounced against the assumption of it by any one not belonging to the Aaronic family (ver. 10), and it was soon after miraculously inflicted for this crime. This instance proves that the Aaronic line did not establish itself without a struggle. The rebellion of Korah, at the head of a portion of the Levites as representatives of the first-born, with Dathan and Abiram as leaders of the tribe of the first-born son of Jacob (<04601>Numbers 16:1), showed that some looked back to the old patriarchal order rather than forward to the new, and it needed the witness of “Aaron’s rod that budded” to teach the people that the latter had in it a vitality and strength which had departed from the former. It may be that the exclusion of all but the sons of Aaron from the service of the Tabernacle drove those who would not resign their claim to priestly functions of some kind to the worship (possibly with a rival tabernacle) of Moloch and Chiuti (<30525>Amos 5:25, 26; <26016>Ezekiel 20:16). The death of Aaron introduces the installation of his successor which appears to have simply consisted in arraying him in his father’s pontifical garments (<04028>Numbers 20:28). Thus also Jonathan the Asmonaean contented himself with putting on the high-priest’s habit, in order to take possession of the dignity (1 Macc. 10:21; comp. Josephus, *Ant.* 13:2, 3). The high esteem in which the priesthood was held may be gathered from the fact that it was promised in perpetuity to Phinehas and his family as a reward for his zeal (<04253>Numbers 25:13). Prominent as was

the part taken by the priests in the daily march of the host of Israel (<04108>Numbers 10:8), in the passage of the Jordan (<06314>Joshua 3:14, 15), in the destruction of Jericho (<06612>Joshua 6:12-16), the history of Micah shows that within that century there was a strong tendency to relapse into the system of a household instead of an hereditary priesthood (Judges 17). The frequent invasions and conquests during the period of the Judges must have interfered (as stated above) with the payment of tithes, with the maintenance of worship, with the observance of all festivals, and with this the influence of the priesthood must have been kept in the background. If the descendants of Aaron, at some unrecorded crisis in the history of Israel, rose, under Eli, into the position of national defenders, it was only to sink in his sons into the lowest depth of sacerdotal corruption. For a time the prerogative of the line of Aaron was in abeyance. The capture of the ark, the removal of the Tabernacle from Shiloh, threw everything into confusion, and Samuel, a Levite, but not within the priestly family, *SEE SAMUEL*, sacrifices, and "comes near" to the Lord; his training under Eli, his Nazaritish life, his prophetic office, being regarded apparently as a special consecration (comp. Augustine, c. *Faust.* 12:83; *De Civ. Dei*, 17:4). For the priesthood, as for the people generally, the time of Samuel must have been one of a great moral reformation; while the expansion, if not the foundation, of the schools of the prophets at once gave to it the support of an independent order, and acted as a check on its corruptions and excesses, a perpetual safeguard against the development from it of any Egyptian or Brahminic caste-system (Ewrald, *Gesch. Isr.* 2, 185), standing to it in much the same relation as the monastic and mendicant orders stood, each in its turn, to the secular clergy of the Christian Church. Though Shiloh had become a deserted sanctuary, Nob (<09101>1 Samuel 21:1) was made for a time the center of national worship, and the symbolic ritual of Israel was thus kept from being forgotten. The reverence which the people feel for the priests, and which compels Saul to have recourse to one of alien blood (Doeg the *Edomite*) to carry his murderous counsel into act, shows that there must have been a great step upwards since the time when the sons of Eli "made men to abhor the offerings of the Lord" (<09217>1 Samuel 22:17, 18). The reign of Saul was, however, a time of suffering for them. He had manifested a disposition to usurp the priest's office (<09139>1 Samuel 13:9). The massacre of the priests at Nob showed how insecure their lives were against any unguarded or savage impulse. (It is to be noticed that while the Hebrew text gives eighty-five as the number of priests slain, the Sept. increases it to 305, Josephuus [4 nt. 6:12] to 385.)

They could but wait in silence for the coming of a deliverer in David. One at least among them shared his exile, and, so far as it was possible, lived in his priestly character, performing priestly acts, among the wild company of Adullam (<09236>1 Samuel 23:6, 9). Others probably were sheltered by their remoteness, or found refuge in Hebron as the largest and strongest of the priestly cities. When the death of Saul set them free, they came in large numbers to the camp of David, prepared apparently not only to testify their allegiance, but also to support him, armed for battle, against all rivals (<13127>1 Chronicles 12:27). They were summoned from their cities to the great restoration of the worship of Israel, when the ark was brought up to the new capital of the kingdom (<13504>1 Chronicles 15:4). For a time, however (another proof of the strange confusion into which the religious life of the people had fallen), the ark was not the chief center of worship; and while the newer ritual of psalms and minstrelsy gathered round it under the ministration of the Levites, headed by Benaiah and Jahaziel as priests (<13605>1 Chronicles 16:5, 6), the older order of sacrifices was carried on by the priests in the Tabernacle on the high-place at Gibeon (<13637>1 Chronicles 16:37-39; 21:29; 2 Chronicles 1, 3). We cannot wonder that first David and then Solomon should have sought to guard against the evils incidental to this separation of the two orders, and to unite in one great temple priests and Levites, the symbolic worship of sacrifice and the spiritual offering of praise.

The reigns of these two kings were naturally the culminating period of the glory of the Jewish priesthood. They had a king whose heart was with them, and who joined in their services dressed as they were (<13527>1 Chronicles 15:27) while he yet scrupulously abstained from all interference with their functions. The name which they bore was accepted (whatever explanation may be given of the fact) as the highest title of honor that could be borne by the king's sons (<10818>2 Samuel 8:18). They occupied high places in the king's council (<11042>1 Kings 4:2, 4), and might even take their places, as in the case of Benaiah, at the head of his armies (<13127>1 Chronicles 12:27; 27:5), or be recognized, as Zabud the son of Nathan was, as the "king's friends," the keepers of the king's conscience (<11045>1 Kings 4:5; Ewald, *Gesch.* 3, 334).

The account here given has been based on the belief that the books of the Old Test. give a trustworthy statement of the origin and history of the priesthood of Israel. Those who question their authority have done so, for the most part, on the strength of some preconceived theory. Such a

hierarchy as the Pentateuch prescribes is thought impossible in the earlier stages of national life, and therefore the reigns of David and Solomon are looked upon, not as the restoration, but as the starting-point of the order (Von Bohlen, *Die Genesis*, Einl. § 16). It is alleged that there could have been no tribe like that of Levi, for the consecration of a whole tribe is without a parallel in history (Vatke, *Bibl. Theol*. 1, 222). Deuteronomy, assumed for once to be older than the three books which precede it, represents the titles of the priest and Levite as standing on the same footing, and the distinction between them is therefore the work of a later period (George, *Die älteren Jüd. Feste*, p. 45, 51; comp. Bahr, *Symbolik*, bk. 2, ch. 1, § 1, whence these references are taken). It is hardly necessary here to do more than state these theories.

(2.) *Middle Period*. — The position of the priests under the monarchy of Judah deserves a closer examination than it has yet received. The system which has been described above gave them for every week of service in the Temple twenty-three weeks in which they had no appointed work. Was it intended that they should be idle during this period? Were they actually idle? They had no territorial possessions to cultivate. The cities assigned to them and to the Levites gave but scanty pasturage to their flocks. To what employment could they turn?

1. The more devout and thoughtful found, probably, in the schools of the prophets that which satisfied them. The history of the Jews presents numerous instances of the union of the two offices. *SEE LEVITE*. They became teaching-priests (<14153>2 Chronicles 15:3), students, and interpreters of the divine law. From such as these, men might be chosen by the more zealous kings to instruct the people (<14708>2 Chronicles 17:8), or to administer justice (<14918>2 Chronicles 19:8).

2. Some, perhaps, as stated above, served in the king’s army. We have no ground for transferring our modern conceptions of the peacefulness of the priestly life to the remote past of the Jewish people. Priests, as we have seen, were with David at Hebron as men of war. They were the trumpeters of Abijah’s army (<14312>2 Chronicles 13:12). The Temple itself was a great armory (<14239>2 Chronicles 23:9). The heroic struggles of the Maccabees were sustained chiefly by their kindred of the same family (2 Macc. 7:1).

3. A few chosen ones might enter more deeply into the divine life, and so receive, like Zechariah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, a special call to the office of a prophet.

4. We can hardly escape the conclusion that many did their work in the Temple of Jehovah with a divided allegiance, and acted at other times as priests of the high-places (Ewald, *Gesch*. 3, 704).

Not only do we read of no protests against the sins of the idolatrous kings, except from prophets who stood forth, alone and unsupported, to bear their witness, but the priests themselves were sharers in the worship of Baal (<240208>Jeremiah 2:8), of the sun and moon, and of the host of heaven (<240801>Jeremiah 8:1, 2). In the very Temple itself they "ministered before their idols" (<264412>Ezekiel 44:12), and allowed others, "uncircumcised in heart and uncircumcised in flesh," to join them (ibid. 7). They ate of unclean things and polluted the Sabbaths. There could be no other result of this departure from the true idea of the priesthood than a general degradation. Those who ceased to be true shepherds of the people found nothing in their ritual to sustain or elevate them. They became as sensual, covetous, and tyrannical as ever the clergy of the Christian Church became in its darkest periods; conspicuous as drunkards and adulterers (<232807>Isaiah 28:7, 8; 56:10-12). The prophetic order, instead of acting as a check, became sharers in their corruption (<240531>Jeremiah 5:31; <250413>Lamentations 4:13; <360304>Zephaniah 3:4). For the most part, the few efforts after better things are not the result of a spontaneous reformation, but of conformity to the wishes of a reforming king. In the one instance in which they do act spontaneously-their resistance to the usurpation of the priest's functions by Uzziah— their protest, however right in itself, was yet only too compatible with a wrong use of the office which they claimed as belonging exclusively to themselves (<142617>2 Chronicles 26:17). The discipline of the Captivity, however, was not without its fruits. A large proportion of the priests had either perished or were content to remain in the land of their exile; but those who did return were active in the work of restoration. Under Ezra they submitted to the stern duty of repudiating their heathen wives (<151018>Ezra 10:18, 19). They took part-though here the Levites were the more prominent-in the instruction of the people (<150312>Ezra 3:2; <160809>Nehemiah 8:9-13). The root-evils, however, soon reappeared. The work of the priesthood was made the instrument of covetousness. The priests of the time of Malachi required payment for every ministerial act, and would not even "shut the doors" or "kindle fire" for naught (<390110>Malachi 1:10). They "corrupted the covenant

of Levi” (Malachi 2:8). The idea of the priest as the angel, the messenger, of the Lord of Hosts was forgotten (ibid. 7; comp. Ecclesiastes 5:6). The inevitable result was that they again lost their influence. They became “base and contemptible before all the people” (Malachi 2:9). The office of the scribe rose in repute as that of the priest declined (Jost, *Judenth*. 1, 37, 148). The sects that multiplied during the last three centuries of the national life of Judaism were proofs that the established order had failed to do its work in maintaining the religious life of the people. No great changes affected the outward position of the priests under the Persian government. When that monarchy fell before the power of Alexander they were hearty enough to transfer their allegiance. Both the Persian government and Alexander had, however, respected the religion of their subjects, and the former had conferred on the priests immunities from taxation (Ezra 6:8, 9; 7:24; Josephus, *Ant.* 11:8). The degree to which this recognition was carried by the immediate successors of Alexander is shown by the work of restoration accomplished by Simon the son of Onias (Ecclus. 1, 12-20); and the position which they thus occupied in the eyes of the people, not less than the devotion with which his zeal inspired them. prepared them doubtless for the great struggle which was coming, and in which, under the priestly Maccabees, they were the chief defenders of their country’s freedom. Some, indeed, at that crisis were found among the apostates. Under the guidance of Jason (the heathenized form of Joshua) they forsook the customs of their fathers; and they who as priests were to be patterns of a self-respecting purity left their work in the Temple to run naked in the circus which the Syrian king had opened in Jerusalem (2 Macc. 4:13, 14). Some, at an earlier period, had joined the schismatic Onias in establishing a rival worship (Josephus, *Ant.* 12:3, 4). The majority, however, were true-hearted; and the Maccabean struggle which left the government of the country in the hands of their own order, and, until the Roman conquest, with a certain measure of independence, must have given to the higher members of the order a position of security and influence. The martyr-spirit showed itself again in the calmness with which they carried on the ministrations in the Temple, when Jerusalem was besieged by Pompey, till they were slain even in the act of sacrificing (Josephus, *Ant.* 14:4, 3; *War*, 1, 7, 5). The reign of Herod, on the other hand, in which the high-priesthood was kept in abeyance, or transferred from one to another at the will of one who was an alien by birth and half a heathen in character, must have tended to depress them.

(3.) *Closing Period*. — It will be interesting to bring together the few facts that indicate the position of the priests in the New-Testament period of their history. The division into four-and-twenty courses is still maintained (<4001>Luke 1:5; Josephus, *Life*, 1), and the heads of these courses, together with those who have held the high priesthood (the office no longer lasting for life), are "chief priests" (ἀρχιερεῖς) by courtesy (Carpzov. *App. Crit*. p. 102), and take their place in the Sanhedrim. The number scattered throughout Palestine was, as has been stated, very large. Of these the greater number were poor and ignorant, despised by the more powerful members of their own order, not gaining the respect or affection of the people. The picture of cowardly selfishness in the priest of the parable of <4210>Luke 10:31 can hardly be thought of as other than a representative one, indicating the estimate commonly and truly formed of the character of the class. The priestly order, like the nation, was divided between contending sects. The influence of Hyrcanus, himself in the latter part of his life a Sadducee (Josephus, *Ant*. 13:10, 6), had probably made the tenets of that party popular among the wealthier and more powerful members, and the chief-priests of the Gospels and the Acts, the whole ἀρχιερατικὸν γένος (<4401>Acts 4:1, 6; 5:17), were apparently consistent Saddlucees, sometimes combining with the Pharisees in the Sanhedrim, sometimes thwarted by them, in persecuting the followers of Jesus because they preached the resurrection of the dead. The great multitude (ὄχλος), on the other hand, who received that testimony (6, 7) must have been free from or must have overcome Sadducean prejudices. It was not strange that those who did not welcome the truth which would have raised them to a higher life should sink lower and lower into an ignorant and ferocious fanaticism. Few stranger contrasts meet us in the history of religion than that presented in the life of the priesthood in the last half century of the Temple — now going through the solemn sacrificial rites and joining in the noblest hymns, now raising a fierce clamor at anything which seemed to them a profanation of the sanctuary, and rushing to dash out the brains of the bold or incautious intruder, or of one of their own order who might enter while under some ceremonial defilement, or with a half-humorous cruelty setting fire to the clothes of the Levites who were found sleeping when they ought to have been watching at their posts (Lightfoot, *Temple Service*, ch. 1). The rivalry which led the Levites to claim privileges which had hitherto belonged to the priests has already been noticed. *SEE LEVITE*. In the scenes of the last tragedy of Jewish history the order passes away, without honor, "dying as a fool dieth." The high-priesthood is given to the lowest

and vilest of the adherents of the frenzied Zealots (Josephus, *War*, 4:3, 6). Other priests appear as deserting to the enemy (*ibid*. 6:6, 1). It is from a priest that Titus receives the lamps, and gems, and costly raiment of the sanctuary (*ibid*. 6:8, 3). Priests report to their conquerors the terrible utterance “Let us depart” on the last Pentecost ever celebrated in the Temple (*ibid*. 6:5, 3). It is a priest who fills up the degradation of his order by dwelling on the fall of his country with a cold-blooded satisfaction, and finding in Titus the fulfillment of the Messianic prophecies of the Old Test. (*ibid*. 6:5, 4). The destruction of Jerusalem deprived the order at one blow of all but an honorary distinction. Their occupation was gone. Many families must have altogether lost their genealogies. Those who still prided themselves on their descent were no longer safe against the claims of pretenders. The jealousies of the lettered class, which had been kept under some restraint as long as the Temple stood, now had full play, and the influence of the rabbins increased with the fall of the priesthood. The position of the priests in mediaeval and modern Judaism has never risen above that of complimentary recognition. Those who claim to take their place among the sons of Aaron are entitled to receive the redemption-money of the firstborn, to take the law from its chest, and to pronounce the benediction in the synagogues (Ugolino, 12:48).

IV. *Relation of the Jewish Priesthood to the Christian Ministry*. — The language of the New-Test. writers in relation to the priesthood ought not to be passed over. They recognize in Christ the first-born, the king, the Anointed, the representative of the true primeval priesthood after the order of Melchizedek (<580708>Hebrews 7:8), from which that of Aaron, however necessary for the time, is now seen to have been a deflection. But there is no trace of an order in the new Christian society bearing the name and exercising functions like those of the priests of the older Covenant. The synagogue, and not the Temple, furnishes the pattern for the organization of the Church. The idea which pervades the teaching of the Epistles is that of a universal priesthood. All true believers are made kings and priests (<660106>Revelation 1:6; <600209>1 Peter 2:9), offer spiritual sacrifices (<451201>Romans 12:1), may *draw near*, may enter into the holiest (<581019>Hebrews 10:19-22), as having received a true priestly consecration. They, too, have been washed and sprinkled as the sons of Aaron were (<581022>Hebrews 10:22). It was the thought of a succeeding age that the old classification of the high priest, priests, and Levites was reproduced in the bishops, priests, and deacons of the Christian Church. The history of language presents few

stranger facts than those connected with these words. Priest, our only equivalent for ἱερεύς, comes to us from the word which was chosen because it excluded the idea of a sacerdotal character. *Bishop* has narrowly escaped a like perversion, occurring as it does constantly in Wiclif Häersion as the translation of ἀρχιερεύς (e.g. John 18:15; Hebrews 8:1). The idea which was thus expressed rested, it is true, on the broad analogy of a threefold gradation, and the terms "priest," "altar," "sacrifice," might be used without involving more than a legitimate symbolism; but they brought with them the inevitable danger of reproducing and perpetuating in the history of the Christian Church many of the feelings which belonged to Judaism, and ought to have been left behind with it. If the evil has not proved so fatal to the life of Christendom as it might have done, it is because no bishop or pope, however much he might exaggerate the harmony of the two systems, has ever dreamed of making the Christian priesthood hereditary. We have perhaps reason to be thankful that two errors tend to neutralize each other, and that the age which witnessed the most extravagant sacerdotalism was one in which the celibacy of the clergy was first exalted, then urged, and at last enforced.

V. *Literature*. — For the similarity in the religion of ancient Greece, see Potter, *Archaeologia* (Lond. 1775), 1, 202; of ancient Rome, Adam, *Antiquities* (Edinb. 1791), p. 293, § Ministri Sacrorum. For the resemblances between the religious customs of the ancient Egyptians and those of the Jews, we refer especially to Kitto, *Pictorial History of Palestine* (Lond. 1844). On the Hebrew priesthood in general, see Kiper, *Das Priesterthum des Alten Bundes* (Berl. 1865). For particular topics, see Kiesling, *De Leibus Mos. circa Sacerd. Vitio Corporis laborantes*; Kall, *De Morbis Sacerdot. V. T. ex Ministerii eor. Conditione oriundis* (Hahn. 1745); Jablonskii *Pantheon, Proleg*. § 29, 41, 43; Munch. *De Matrimonio Sacerd. V. T. cum Filiab. Sacer*. (Nuremb. 1747); Kohl, *De State, etc.* (Lips. 1735); Rechenberg, *id*. (*ibid*. 1760); Stiebritz, *De Sacerdotum Vitiis Corpore* (Hal. 1742); Curtiss, *The Levitical Priests* (Lond. 1877). For the theology of the subject, see Dr. J. P. Smith, *Discourses on the Sacrifice and Priesthood of Christ* (Lond. 1842); Jardine, *Christian Sacerdotalism* (*ibid*. 1871). See also the works cited by Danz, *Wörterbuch*, s.v. *Priester*; Darling, *Cyclopaedia Bibliographica*, vol. 1, col. 1812.

PRIEST is a contraction of the word *presbyter* (Greek πρεσβύτερος), and is derived probably from the old French or Norman *prestre*. It was in the Saxon, first *preost*, later *prest*. The German and Dutch words are *priester*;

the modern French, *prêtre*; the Italian, *prete*; but the Spanish is most like the original form it is *presbitero*. In its most general signification, the word is the title of a minister of public worship, but is specially applied to the minister of sacrifice or other mediatorial offices. In the early history of mankind, the functions of the priest seem to have commonly been discharged by the head of each family; but, on the expansion of the family into the state, the office of priest became a public one, which absorbed the duties as well as the privileges which before belonged to the heads of the separate families or communities. It thus came to pass that in many instances the priestly office was associated with that of the sovereign, whatever might be the particular form of sovereignty. But in many religious and political bodies, also, the orders were maintained in complete independence, and the priests formed a distinct, and, generally speaking, a privileged class. *SEE EGYPT*; *SEE HINDUISM*. The priestly order, in most of the ancient religions, included a graduated hierarchy; and to the chief, whatever was his title, were assigned the most solemn of the religious offices entrusted to the body. Compare the preceding article.

In the Christian Church the word has been used in place of the two Greek words (1) πρεσβύτερος, which really signifies an *elder*, and (2) ἱερεύς, which corresponds to the Latin *sacerdos*, i.e. one who offers sacrifice-words which are exceedingly dissimilar in meaning, but, used in this indiscriminate manner, convey a false idea as to the respective offices of priest and preacher. The Christian preacher or minister answers rather to the ancient prophet than to the Old-Testament priest. As ἱερεύς; means *one who offers sacrifices*, and as sacrifices have been abolished since the offering of the one perfect and all-sufficient Sacrifice, it follows that, in the strict and official sense, there are no "sacrificers" under the New-Testament or Christian dispensation. If, therefore, the claims of the ministers of the Church are made to rest upon a precise analogy to those founded upon the priestly functions of an abrogated dispensation, it surely becomes the advocates of such claims to prove from the Christian Institute that the conceived analogy exists. But where is the proof? There is not a single passage in "the book" of apostles and evangelists to support the assumption. Nowhere are the ministers of the Gospel represented as "sacrificers;" nowhere is provision made for such a succession, as in any respect similar to the Levitical, and still less the Aaronical priesthood. To the prophets, and rulers of the synagogues, it is admitted that there are allusions descriptive of ministerial duties; for the work of instruction was

the appropriate business of these ecclesiastical functionaries, and not performing the services of a prescribed ritual. But sacerdotal dignities are nowhere ascribed to Christian presbyters.

The priesthood, as a religious order, perished with Judaism. The priesthood was the shadow, and disappeared when the substance came. As a mediator, Jesus Christ is the only priest; as a servant of God, whose duty it is to consecrate his full time and energies and thoughts to the divine service, every Christian is a "priest unto God." The New Testament, therefore, contains no hint of any priest, nor of any officer answering to a priest, in the early Church; and, on the contrary, contains many passages which teach more or less directly and distinctly that the priesthood of the class is merged in the priestly character of Jesus Christ and that of the whole discipleship (comp. <58217>Hebrews 2:17; 3:1; 4:14; 5:5-10; 7:27, 28; 10:11, 12; <66510>Revelation 5:10). It is very clear that the apostles, when they so plainly assert the abolition of sacrifices since the offering of the one perfect and all-sufficient Sacrifice, could never intend to institute such an office as a *sacrificing priest*. When they use the term, they apply it to Christ alone. The office of a Christian pastor is not to atone, but to preach the atonement. In <45516>Romans 15:16 the application of the term by the apostle Paul is figurative. The modern minister answers rather to the ancient prophet than to the ancient priest. At least this is the universal opinion of nearly all Protestant Christendom, though some relics of the old priestly idea of a special sacerdotal order, with peculiar privileges and prerogatives, and possessing peculiar holiness, still linger in the Church.

The advocates of hierarchical claims, whether Romish, Greek, or Protestant Christians, assume that ministers are entitled to be regarded as succeeding to the same relation to the Church with that which was sustained by the priesthood under the Jewish economy. Hence the terms and offices peculiar to the ancient priests are conceived to be analogous to the functions and designations of the Christian ministry. On this assumption, it is contended that the duties performed and the authority exercised under the direct sanction of the Most High are now transferred to those who are duly qualified, by a certain order of succession, to discharge the offices of the ministry under the present dispensation. In the grades of the hierarchy the priesthood is second in order only to that of bishop. Bishops and priests possess the same priestly authority, but the bishop has the power of transmitting it to others, which an ordinary priest cannot do. 'he priest is regarded as the ordinary minister of the Eucharist,

whether as a sacrament or as a sacrifice; of baptism, penance, and extreme unction; and although the contracting parties are held in the modern schools to be themselves the ministers of marriage, the priest is regarded by all schools of Roman divines as at least the normal and official witness of its celebration. The priest is also officially charged with the instruction of the people and the direction of their spiritual concerns, and, by long established use, special districts, called parishes (q.v.), are assigned to priests, within which they are entrusted with the care and supervision of the spiritual wants of all the inhabitants. The holy order of priesthood can only be conferred by a bishop, and he is ordinarily assisted by two or more priests, who, in common with the bishop, impose hands on the candidate. The rest of the ceremonial of ordination consists in investing the candidate with the sacred instruments and ornaments of his order, anointing his hands, and reciting certain prayers significant of the gifts and the duties of the office. Dens defines the priesthood as "a sacred order and sacrament, in which power is conferred of consecrating the body of Christ, of remitting sins, and of administering certain other sacraments." Accordingly, at the consecration of a priest, after unction and prayer, the chalice, with wine and water, and the paten upon it with the host, are given to him, with these awful words, "Receive power to offer the sacrifice of God, and to celebrate mass for the living and the dead." Moreover, he receives formally the power to forgive sins. The distinguishing vestment of the priest is the *chasuble* (Lat. *plareta*). In Roman Catholic countries, priests wear even in public a distinctive dress.

Picture for Priest 7

In some portions of the Episcopal Church the idea is maintained that the modern clergyman is the successor of the ancient priest, because this term is used in the Prayer-book to designate the clerical office. Says Fluyter: "The Greek and Latin words which we translate *'priest'* are derived from words that signify holy; and so the word priest, according to the etymology, signifies him whose mere charge and function are about holy things, and therefore seems to be a most proper word to him who is set apart to the holy public service and worship of God, especially when he is in the actual ministration of holy things. If it be objected that, according to the usual acceptation of the word, it signifies him that offers up a sacrifice, and therefore cannot be allowed to a minister of the Gospel, who hath no sacrifice to offer, it is answered that the ministers of the Gospel have sacrifices to offer (1 Peter 2:5): 'Ye are built up a spiritual house, an

holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices of prayer, praises, thanksgiving,' etc. In respect of these, the ministers of the Gospel may safely, in a metaphorical sense be called priests; and in a more eminent manner than other Christians, because they are taken from among men to offer up these sacrifices for others. But besides these spiritual sacrifices mentioned, the ministers of the Gospel have another sacrifice to offer, viz. the unbloody sacrifice, as it was anciently called, the commemorative sacrifice of the blood of Christ, which does as really and truly show forth the death of Christ as those sacrifices under the law did; and in respect of this sacrifice of the Eucharist the ancients have usually called those that offer it up priests." See Killen, *Ancient Church*, p. 644; Martensen, *Dogmatics*; Fairbairn, *Typology*; Calvin, *Institutes*; Coleman, *Manual on Prelacy and Ritualism*, p. 167 sq.; Stratten, *Book Of the Priesthood*; Howitt, *On Priestcraft*; Dwight, *Theology*; Schaff, *Hist. of the Apost. Church*; Elliott, *Delineation of Romanism* (see Index); Sumner, *Principles at Stake* (Lond. 1868, 8vo), ch. 3; *Christian Quar*. April, 1873, art. 4; Meth. *Quar. Rev*. July, 1873, art. 2; *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1862, No. 1; *Bapt. Quar*. Oct. 1870; *Christian Monthly*, Feb. 1865, p. 188. *SEE BISHOP*; *SEE CLERGY*; *SEE PREACHER*.

Priestley, Joseph, LL.D.

one of the most noted of the English deists of the 18th century, and a scientist of great celebrity, was born of humble but honorable parentage at Fieldhead, March 13. 1733, old style. His mother dying when he was six years of age, he was adopted by a paternal aunt, Mrs. Keigihley, by whom he was sent to a free grammar-school in the neighborhood, where he was taught the Latin language and the elements of the Greek. Hs vacations were devoted to the study of Hebrew under a dissenting minister; and when he had acquired some proficiency in this language he commenced and made considerable progress in the Chaldee, Syriac, and Arabic. Ill-health, however, led him to abandon for a while his classical studies, land he gave himself to mercantile pursuits. Though obliged to leave school, he yet continued his studies. Without the aid of a master, he acquired some knowledge of French, Italian, and German. At the age of nineteen (1752) he resumed work as a theological student in the dissenting academy at Daventry. His parents, who were both of the Calvinistic persuasion, as well as his aunt, had omitted no opportunity of inculcating the importance of the Calvinistic doctrine. At the academy he found both the professors and students greatly agitated upon most theological questions which were

deemed of much importance, such as liberty and necessity, the sleep of the soul, etc., and kindred articles of orthodoxy and heresy. These were the topics of animated and frequent discussion. The spirit of controversy thus excited was in some measure fostered by the plan for regulating their studies, drawn up by Dr. Doddrige. It specified certain works on both sides of every question which the students were required to peruse and form an abridgment of for their future use. Before the lapse of many months Priestley conceived himself called upon to renounce tile greater number of the theological and metaphysical opinions which he had imbibed in early youth and thus, he himself observes, "I came to embrace what is generally called the heterodox side of the question; . . . but notwithstanding the great freedom of our debates, the extreme of heresy among us was Arianism, and all of us, I believe, left the academy with a belief, more or less qualified, of the doctrine of the Atonement." His waywardness did not interfere with his graduation, and in 1755 he became assistant minister to an Independent congregation at Needham-Market, in Suffolk. Here he made himself unpopular by renouncing the doctrine of the Atonement, and in three years left, in rather bad repute because of his heresy. He found a temporary engagement at Nantwich, in Cheshire, but was again unpopular, and next engaged in teaching with some success, and was finally chosen professor of belles-lettres in Warrington Academy. During the ten years following he produced half a dozen thoughtful works on widely varying subjects-works which of themselves would have given him enduring fame. He busied himself in politics, too, and became known as a vigorous lecturer. He was still poor, but by dint of strict economy he had secured an air pump and an electrical machine, and had already begun his scientific researches.

While at Needham he composed his work entitled *The Scripture Doctrine of Remission, which shows that the Death of Christ is no proper Sacrifice nor Satisfaction for Sin; but that Pardon is dispensed solely on account of a Personal Repentance of the Sinner.* It was published in 1761. He seems to have rejected all theological dogmas which appeared to him to rest solely upon the interpretation put upon certain passages of the Bible by ecclesiastical authority. It does not, however, appear that these doctrinal errors produced any morally evil results. A visit to the metropolis was the occasion of his introduction to our own celebrated countryman, Dr. Franklin, Dr. Price, and others. To the first of these he communicated his idea of writing a historical account of electrical discoveries, if provided with the requisite books. These Dr. Franklin undertook to procure, and

before the end of the year in which Priestley submitted to him the plan of the work he sent him a copy of it in print, though five hours of every day had been occupied in public or private teaching, besides which he had kept up an active philosophical correspondence. The title of this work is *The History and Present State of Electricity, with Original Experiments* (1767; 3rd ed. 1775). By his devotion to learning and his persistent scrutiny of nature, Priestley now unraveled many a tangled web of science, and it was his to make the most valuable discovery in science of the last century; but as he drew nearer natural truth, he became more and more, though perhaps unconsciously, estranged from revealed truth, and by a hot temper and hasty utterances alienated his best friends. A disagreement between the trustees and professors of the academy led to his relinquishing the appointment at Warrington in 1767. His next engagement was with a large congregation at Mill-Hill Chapel, Leeds, where his theological inquiries were resumed, and several works of the kind composed, chiefly of a controversial character. The vicinity of his dwelling to a public brewery was the occasion of his attention being directed to pneumatic chemistry, the consideration of which he commenced in 1768, and subsequently prosecuted with great success. His first publication on this subject was a pamphlet on *Impregnating Water with Fixed Air* (1772); the same year he communicated to the Royal Society his Observations on Different Kinds of Air, to which the Copley medal was awarded in 1773. He originated other modes of investigation now pursued, and, indeed, nearly ail that is known of the gases has its foundation in the discoveries he made. He discovered oxygen gas, nitrous gas, nitrous-oxide gas, nitrous vapor, carbonic-oxide gas, sulfurous-oxide gas, fluoric-acid gas, muriatic gas, and ammoniacal gas. The discovery of oxygen alone rivaled in importance the great discovery of gravitation by Newton in the preceding century. The pneumatic trough, a vessel by means of which chemists collect gas, was also in good part invented by Priestley. He experimented untiringly, and gave to the world a detailed account of almost every observation he made. For a time he was the idol of men of science. All Europe did him honor. At the height of his reputation he became companion to the earl of Shelburne, with whom he traveled extensively on the Continent. He remained with that nobleman seven years, at the end of which, in 1789, receiving a pension, he settled in Birmingham where he proceeded actively with his philosophical and theological researches, and was also appointed pastor to a dissenting congregation. Having been told by certain Parisian savans that he was the only man they had ever known, of any understanding, who

believed in Christianity, he wrote, in reply, the *Letters to a Philosophical Unbeliever* (1780), and various other works containing criticisms on the doctrines of Hume and others.

His public position was now rather a hard one; for while laughed at in Paris as a believer, at home he was branded as an atheist. To escape the odium arising from the latter imputation, he published his *Disquisition relating to Matter and Spirit*. In this work, while lie partly materializes spirit, he at the same time partly spiritualizes matter. He holds, however, that our hopes of resurrection must rest solely on the truth of the Christian revelation, and that scientifically they have no demonstration whatever. The doctrines of a *Revelation and a Resurrection* appear with him to have supported one another. He believed in a Revelation, because it declared a Resurrection; and he believed in a Resurrection, because he found it declared in the Revelation. Yet in his *Introductory Dissertation to Hartley's Observations on Man* he expressed doubts again concerning the immateriality of the sentient principle in man; and in the Doctrine of Necessity-another elucidation of Hartley (q.v.)— published about the same time, largely denied the Christian doctrine of Revelation. But among the many points of Church dogma called in question or altogether repudiated, Dr. Priestley thus far had not openly touched the doctrine of the Trinity. In 1782 he published his History of the Corruptions of Christianity (2 vols. 8vo). A refutation of the arguments contained in this work was proposed for one of the Hague prize essays; and in 1785 the work itself was burned by the common hangman in the city of Dort. Next came a *History of Early Opinions concerning Jesus Christ* (1786, 4 vols. 8vo), but it failed to make any impression in the literary or theological world. His previous writings, however, gave rise to a lively literary warfare between Priestley and Dr. Horsley. The principal subjects discussed were the doctrines of *Free Will, Materialism, and Unitarianism*. The victory in this controversy will probably be awarded by most men in accordance with their own preconceived views on the questions at issue. In a letter to Dr. Price, dated Jan. 27,1791, Priestley says: "With respect to the Church, with which you have meddled but little, I have long since drawn the sword and thrown away the scabbard, and am very easy about the consequences." While it was a source of wonder to the savans of the Continent that such a man could believe in a God at all, his want of belief shocked the better class of his countrymen, who, although at the time sadly lax in morals, were scrupulous in their adherence to orthodoxy. But he did not confine himself

to dealing with churchmen: his object was to obtain for the dissenters what he considered to be their rights, and in the pursuit of which he published about twenty volumes. He attacked certain positions relating to the dissenters in Blackstone's *Commentaries* with a vigor and acrimony which seems to have surprised his adversary. At the same time he was avowedly partial to the French Revolution, and as he was a man of strong speech and stinging pen, he soon excited the hatred of the High-Church and Tory party. The agitation of the populace had already found vent in riots, and in the month of July Dr. Priestley's house, library, manuscripts, and costly apparatus were committed to the flames by an angry mob. His papers, torn in scraps, carpeted the roads around his desolated home, and he was exposed to great personal danger. He quitted Birmingham foe Hackney, where he became the successor of his deceased friend Dr. Price (q.v.), and so far as money could restore what he had lost, it was liberally given. But his sentiments were unchanged, and he was none the less outspoken because of misuse; and at last, conceiving himself to be insecure against popular rage, he embarked for America.

In the United States he was received with enthusiasm as a martyr to republican principles. He was offered a professor's chair in Philadelphia, which, however, he declined-for, notwithstanding his unparalleled attainments, he modestly felt the want of an early systematic training in the sciences-and, retiring to Northumberland, he was soon again absorbed in his studies. But even here before long he was in the midst of bitter controversy. He had contemplated no difficulty in forming a Unitarian congregation in America; but in this he was greatly disappointed. He found that the majority disregarded religion, and those who paid any attention to it were more afraid of his doctrines than desirous of hearing them. By the American government, the former democratic spirit of which had subsided, he was looked upon as a spy in the interest of France. The democracy he espoused was unpalatably French, the inconsistency of his religious doctrines laid him open to ridicule, and, as he could not long remain silent, a host of critics was soon arrayed against him. His later writings were mostly in defense of his doctrines and discoveries, and his experiments in America did not prove as successful as those of his earlier years. To the day of his death he continued to pursue his literary and scientific pursuits with as much ardor as he had shown at any period of his active life. He died Feb. 6, 1804, expressing the satisfaction he derived from the consciousness of having led a useful life and the confidence he felt in a

future state in a happy immortality. When his death became known in Paris, his *éloge* was read by Cuvier before the National Institute.

Priestley has given us his autobiography down to March 24,1795. He was a man of irreproachable moral and domestic character, remarkable for zeal, for truth, patience, and in his maturer years for serenity of temper. He appears to have been fearless in proclaiming his convictions, whether theological, political, or scientific. Few men in modern times have written so much, or with such facility; yet he seldom spent more than six or eight hours a day in any labor which required much mental exertion. A habit of regularity extended itself to all his studies. He never read a book without determining in his own mind when he would finish it; and at the beginning of every year he arranged the plan of his literary pursuits and scientific researches. He labored under a great defect, which, however, was not a very considerable impediment to his progress. He sometimes lost all ideas both of persons and things with which he had been conversant. He always did immediately what he had to perform. Though he rose early and dispatched his more serious pursuits in the morning, yet he was as well qualified for mental exertion at one time of the day as at another. All seasons were equal to him, early or late, before dinner or after. He could also write without inconvenience by the parlor fire, with his wife and children about him, and occasionally talking to them. In his family he ever maintained the worship of God. See the *Memoirs*, continued by his son, with observations by T. Cooper; also *Life by John Corry* (1805); and by Rutt (1832).

Rarely has a man been more variously estimated than Priestley. In *Blackwood* (1835) he was characterized as “a shallow scholar, an empirical philosopher — who stumbled on his discoveries and lacked the logical capacity to usefully apply them-a malcontent politician, and a heretical religionist.” Dr. Parr, on the contrary, speaks of Priestley’s attainments as numerous without a parallel, his talents as superlatively great, and his morals as correct without austerity and exemplary without ostentation. These estimates are certainly diverse, but possibly they are equally near the truth. Priestley was much more of an experimentalist than a philosopher. In religion as well as in science he sought novelties. Facts, and facts only, could satisfy him. But his caprice was as noticeable as his positiveness, and his logical inconsistencies were gross. A queer instance of this is found in his adherence to the theory of “phlogiston” — the supposed principle of inflammability, or the matter of fire in composition with other bodies, the

absurdity of which was shown by his own discovery of oxygen. In theology, as we have seen, while maintaining the immortality of the soul, he denied its immateriality. He was never widely trusted as a religious leader; although, because of his ability and unimpeachable morality, and his eminence in science, his pulpit services were eagerly sought. His fame rests principally on his pneumatic inquiries. But he was encyclopedic in the range of his writings, which extend to between seventy and eighty volumes. Among them are works on general and ecclesiastical history and biography, on language, on oratory and criticism, on religion and metaphysics. Although many of his opinions were fanciful and manifestly erroneous, there was hardly a subject touched by his pen that was not the brighter and shapelier because of his genius. It is not now, — however, for the first time remarked that the minds best fitted for prosecuting the labors of experimental philosophy are by no means those from which we expect light to be cast into the more obscure region of metaphysical analysis. "Priestley's mind was objective to an extreme; he could fix his faith upon nothing which had not the evidence of sense in some way or other impressed upon it. Science, morals, politics, philosophy, religion, all came to him under the type of the sensational. Tile most spiritual ideas were obliged to be cast into a material mould before they could commend themselves to his judgment or conscience. His intellect was rapid to an extraordinary degree; lie saw the bearings of a question according to its principles at a glance, and embodied his thoughts in volumes, while many other men would hardly have sketched out their plan. All this, though admirable in the man of action, was not the temperament to form the solid metaphysician; nay, it was precisely opposed to that deep, reflective habit, that sinking into one's own inmost consciousness, from which alone speculative philosophy can obtain light and advancement." As a man of science, he has left his mark upon the intellectual history of the century; but besides being a man of science, he aimed at being a metaphysician, a theologian, a politician, a classical scholar, and a historian. With an amazing intrepidity he plunged into tasks the effective performance of which would have demanded the labors of a lifetime. With the charge of thirty youths on his hands, he proposes to write an ecclesiastical history, and soon afterwards observes that a fresh translation of the Old Test. would "not be a very formidable task" (*Rutt*, Life, 1, 42). He carried on all manner of controversies upon their own ground with Horsley and Badcock, with his friend Price, with Beattie and the Scotch philosophers, with Gibbon and the skeptics, and yet often labored for hours a day at his

chemical experiments. So discursive a thinker could hardly do much thorough work, nor really work out or co-ordinate his own opinions. It would be in vain, therefore, to anticipate any great force or originality in Priestley's speculations. At best he was a quick reflector of the current opinions of his time and class, and able to run up hasty theories of sufficient apparent stability to afford a temporary refuge amid the storm of conflicting elements. With such tendencies of mind, therefore, and living in an age the whole bearing of which was away from the ideal to the sensational, it is not surprising that Priestley entered with energy into those principles of Hartley from which he hoped to reduce all mental science to a branch of physical investigation.

The metaphysical position he assumed may be fully seen in his *Examination of Reid, Beattie, and Oswald*: in fact, it is summed up in one extraordinary sentence, where he affirms that" something has been done in the field of knowledge by Descartes, very much by Mr. Locke, but most of all by Hartley, who has thrown more useful light upon the theory of the mind than Newton did upon the theory of the natural world." Priestley rested the truth of materialism upon two deductions. The first was that thought and sensation are essentially the same thing— that the whole variety of our ideas, however abstract and refined they may become, are, nevertheless, but modifications of the sensational faculty. This doctrine had been more fully maintained in France by Condillac, and is a crude anticipation of the positive view. The second deduction was that all sensation, and, consequently, all thought, arises from the affections of our material organization, and, therefore, consists entirely in the motion of the material particles of which the nerves and brain are composed. It is but justice, however, here to add that Priestley did not push his materialism so far as to evolve any conclusions contrary to the fundamental principles of man's natural religion, or to invalidate the evidence of a future state; for in the full conviction of these truths he both lived and died. And instead of distinctly inferring with modern positivists that we can show nothing of the ultimate nature either of mind or body, Priestley adopted the view that the soul is itself material. According to his quaint illustration, it resembles a razor. The power of thought inheres in it as the power of cutting in the razor. The razor dissolved in acids is annihilated; and, the body destroyed by putrefaction, the power of thinking ceases. But the particles remain in each case; and the soul, like the razor, may again be put together (*Price and Priestley On Materialism*, p. 82). The advantage of this doctrine,

according to Priestley, was that it confirmed bishop Law's theory of the seat of the soul. The soul being, in fact, a piece of mechanism, is taken to pieces at death, and though it may afterwards be put together again by divine power, there is no ground for the superstitions embodied in the doctrine of purgatory. Moreover, it strikingly confirms the Socinian doctrine by removing all pretext for a belief in the pre-existence of Christ. To sum up, then, the precise influence of Priestley upon the progress of sensationalism in a few words, we may say that he succeeded in cutting the last tie which had held Hartley to the poor remains of spiritualism; that he reduced the whole phenomena of mind to organic processes-the mind itself to a material organization, and mental philosophy to a physical science. The whole existing order of things being an elaborate piece of mechanism, we infer the Almighty mechanist by the familiar watch argument (*Disquisitions*, 1, 187). Indeed, the Deity himself becomes almost phenomenal, and Priestley has considerable trouble in saving him from materiality he denies that a belief in his immateriality would increase our reverence for him (*ibid*. 1, 185), and declares that he must be in some sense extended, and have some common property with the matter upon which he acts. It would seem, indeed, that God is rather matter of a different kind from the ordinary than in any strict sense immaterial.

Priestley's *History of the Corruptions of Christianity* led to the most exciting controversy in the latter half of the 18th century. His position may be easily defined. He writes as a Protestant, and, charging the papacy with corrupting tendencies, he pushes one step farther the arguments already familiar in the great controversy of the Protestant world of Christianity with Rome. He is by no means original in his position. Zwicker and Episcopius had anticipated his main theory. There is but a question of degree between Priestley and other Protestant writers upon the early ages of Christianity. He endeavors to draw the limits of the supernatural still more closely than his predecessors. All Protestants admitted that at some early period Christianity has been corrupted. Priestley includes among the corruptions the Trinitarian doctrines, which, as he argues, showed themselves, though in a comparatively undeveloped state, among the earliest of the post-apostolic writers. He continues the attack upon the authority of the Church fathers, as begun by David, and which had then been recently carried on by Middleton and Jortin. He makes Christ a mere man, and places the writers of the New Test. on the same level with Thucydides or Tacitus, while he still believes in the miracles, and quotes

texts after the old unhistorical fashion. He is compelled, moreover, to accept the Protestant theory that there was in the earliest ages a body of absolutely sound doctrine, though, in the effort to identify this with Unitarianism he is driven to great straits, and forced to discover it in obscure sects, and to make inferences from the negative argument of silence rather than from positive assertions. Though he makes free with the reasoning of the apostles, he cannot give up their authority; and, accepting without question the authenticity of the Gospels, labors to interpret them in the Unitarian sense. He did not see that the real difficulty is the admission of supernatural agency, and that to call a miracle a very little one is only to encounter the whole weight of rationalistic and of orthodox hostility. His aim, as he explains in his Preface, is to show "what circumstances in the state of things" (notice this slipshod style), "and especially of other prevailing opinions and prejudices," favored the introduction of new doctrines. He hopes that this "historical method will be found to be one of the most satisfactory modes of argumentation" (*Corruptions*, vol. 1, Preface, p. 14).

Priestley asserts that corruptions appeared, but in practice seems to attribute them to perverse chances rather than to the influence of contemporary opinion, which he professes to trace. Thus in discussing theories of grace, he says, 'It is not easy to imagine *a priori* what could have led men into such a train of thinking" (*ibid*. 1, 284), as is exhibited in the speculations about grace, free will, and predestination. After some vague handling of the problem, he remembers that the "principal parts" of the system "were first suggested in the heat of controversy" (*ibid*. p. 285)— an explanation which seems to him to throw some light upon the question. Obviously, a writer thus incompetent to appreciate the bearings of the most vital doctrines of Christianity was not a very competent historian of thought. Priestley, however, perceives, what was indeed sufficiently palpable, that Platonism had played a great part in the development of Christian dogma. The Platonists, he tells us, "pretended to be no more than the expositors of a more ancient doctrine;" which he traces through Parmenides, the Pythagoreans, and Orpheus, to "the secret lore of the Egyptian priests." Another stream of tradition had reached the Romans from "their Trojan ancestors," who had received it from Phrygia, where it had been planted by Dardanus "as early as the 9th century after Noah's flood." Dardanus brought it from Samothrace, where the "'Three Mighty Ones" were worshipped under the name of the Cabirim. Thus the

Platonic Trinity, and the Roman Jupiter, Juno, and Minerva, were shown to be simply faint reflections of an early revelation communicated to the patriarchs before the days of Moses (Horsley, *Tracts*, p. 43-45). See, besides the works above referred to, Brougham, *Lives of Philosophers of the Time of George III*, p. 83 sq.; De Quincey, *Philosophical Writers*, 2, 262; Mackintosh, *Miscell. Works*. 3, 170; *Lond. Gentlemaln's Magazine*, April, 1804, p. 375 sq.; Edinb. Rev. 1806, p. 136 sq.; Norton, Views of *Christian Truth, Piety, and Morality* (Lond. 12mo); *Lond. Qu. Rev.* Dec. 1812, p. 430; Lindsey, *Vindiciae Priestleianae* (1785, 2 vols. 8vo); *Christian Examiner*, 12:257 sq.; Stevens, *Hist. of English Thought in the 18th Century*, 1, 429 sq.; Leckey, *Hist. of Rationalism, and his Hist. of the 18th Century*; Morell, *Hist. of Modern Philosophy*, p. 101 sq.; Taylor, *Retrospect of Religious Life in England* (1845); Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, 2, 441 sq.; *N. Y. Christian Advocate*, 1877; Perry, *Hist of the Church of England*, 3, 432-434; Blakey, *Hist. of the Philosophy of Mind*, 3, 230 sq., 302 sq.; Cousin, *Hist. of Modern Philosophy*, lect. 13:14.

Priestley, Thomas

an English divine of the Independent body, flourished near the close of the last century. He was the brother of Joseph Priestley (q.v.), but their theological tenets differed widely. Thomas was the editor of the *Christian Magazine*, and published, *Evangelical Bible, or Paraphrase, Exposition, and Commentary, with copious Notes and suitable Reflections* (1791, fl.): — Rev. Mr. Scott's *Life and Death* (1791, 8vo): — a *Funeral Sermon* (1791, 8vo): — *Family Exercises* (1792, 8vo; 1793, 8vo).

Priests, Marriage of

The obligation of perpetual virginity imposed by the Church of Rome upon those who receive higher orders has been spoken of in another article. *SEE CELIBACY*. In the ancient Church married men (but no bigamists) were sometimes received into priesthood, without dissolution of their matrimony; but it was never allowed to one who had received higher orders to marry. If such a case occurred, the service of the Church had to be renounced. In the West we find, in the middle of the 10th century (*Conc*. August. can. 1), the ordinance that the bishops, priests, deacons, and subdeacons who contract marriage are to be deposed from their functions. Hence it would seem plain that the orders were not then considered as an impediment to marriage, while the solemn vow was

considered as such (*Conc*. Troisliens, cap. 1, a, 909). The Lateran Council of 1123 declares the matrimony contracted by a priest, etc., as one to be dissolved (*disjungi*, can. 21); that of 1139 declares it not existing at all (*matrimonium non esse censemus*, can. 7). The Council of Trent (sess. 24:can. 9) repeated the same declaration, and, in virtue of the powers of the Church (can. 4, 1. c.), puts the orders again into the number of the dissolving impediments to matrimony. The same council decreed, further, that sons of clergymen cannot discharge a clerical function in a place where their father is or was in office (sess. 25:cap. 15, *De ref.*). 'The Greek Church imposes celibacy on the higher dignitaries-the bishops-but not on the priests and lower functionaries of the Church. The latter cannot, it is true, marry after receiving the orders, but are allowed to continue in the matrimonial relations contracted before ordination. But no second marriage is tolerated. The Russian Church, however, refuses ordination to her priests as long as they are unmarried, i.e. ordains only married men. If the priest becomes a widower, he retires to monastic life. In the Greek Oriental Church there are unmarried priests: they remain in office after the death of their wives, unless they prefer to marry again. In Greece married priests are distinguished from the unmarried ones by their head-gear: the former wear very low round hats. See Lea, *Sacerdotal Celibacy* (Index, under Marriage).

Priests Rooms

The chaplains in Great Britain frequently had chambers over porches or sacristies, as at St. Peter's-in-the-East. Oxford; in Ireland, over the vault of the church, as at Cashel, Mellifont, Holy Cross, and Kilkenny; in Scotland, at Iona, over the aisles.

Prileszky, John Baptist

a learned Hungarian Jesuit, was born at Priless March 16, 1709, and, after attaining to the doctorate in philosophy and theology, taught in several colleges of his order. He was for five years chancellor of the University of Tyrnau. He died after 1773. He wrote, *Acta Sanctorum Hungarics* (Tyrnau. 1743-44, 8vo): — *Notitia Sanctorum, Patrum trium priorum Saeculorum* (ibid. 1759): — *Acta et Scripta S. Cypriani* (ibid. 1761, fol.): — *Acta et Scripta S. Theophili, Patriarchae Antiocheni et Minutii Felicis* (Vienna, 1764, 8vo): — *Acta et Scripta S. Irencei* (Kaschau, 1765, 8vo):

— *Acta e Scripta S. Gregorii Neo-Caesariensis, Douyeii Alexandrini et Methodii Lycii* (ibid. 1766, 8vo) Hoefer. *Nouv. Biog. Généralé, s.v.*

Primacy

is the office held

(1) by him who is the pope of Rome, and therefore highest in the Christian Church, according to those who accept the assertions of the papacy; and

(2) by him who is next in rank to the patriarch (1. 5.). *SEE PRIMATE*.

The *primacy of Peter*, as the pope's office is sometimes styled, Romanists claim to be of divine appointment. They assert that the apostle Peter, by Christ's authority, had a primacy or sovereign authority and jurisdiction over the other apostles. Since the Godman Jesus the Christ, they say, has himself willed the continuance of the Church and her fundamental unity, Peter and his successors were also established by the will of God. The power to bind and to loose, *SEE KEYS, POWER OF THE*, was given to the apostles in a body (<4018B>Matthew 18:8); but, in order to preserve their power and unity, Peter was put at their head and endowed with higher honors (<4016B>Matthew 16:16-18; 17:4, etc.). He became the primus inter pares, not so much for his own sake as for a precedent; "for it would be unreasonable," says Sauter, "to consider the primacy he held to have died with him, in view of the end for which Christ had appointed him to it. It appears, on the contrary, that Christ instituted the primacy more in view of the future than to meet the requirements of the apostolic times, when the personal purity of each of the apostles rendered such a measure less necessary" (*Fundamenta juris ecclesiastici Catholicorum* [3(1 ed. Rotwile, 1825], § 62; see also *Zeitschrift für Phil. und kath. Theologie* [Cologne, 1832], 4:121, 122). By the example of Peter, Christ showed, in a general way, that some one of the bishops was always to be considered as primate by the others; but, add those who put a liberal interpretation on the Romish assertion of supremacy, it is by no means clear from the writings of the primitive fathers that the primacy was attached to a particular bishopric. Circumstances favored Rome, whose bishop was acknowledged by the other bishops as the successor of Peter (in the primacy). The bishops of Rome cannot have the primacy by divine appointment, but in a mediate manner, so that, when the good of the Church demands it, it can be transferred to another of the bishops (*Sauter*, § 63, 64). But the

Ultramontanes maintain that by the same authority by which Peter was set apart for the supremacy his own successors were also established. Peter, it is true, founded different communities and provided them with bishops, yet no other can be considered as his true successor than he who succeeded him after his death, and this is the bishop of Rome. The Roman bishop had, by his Roman episcopal dignity, a right similar to that in virtue of which the next relation succeeds in worldly principalities, and the Ultramontanes assert that Peter himself chose for his successor, in all his dignities, the same Linus mentioned by Paul in his Second Epistle to Timothy, 4:21 (Phillips, *Kirchenrecht*, 1, 146). This system of ideas, so simple in appearance, has only by degrees developed itself and obtained dogmatical sanction in the Latin Church. It is based on facts which have been variously appreciated, and on decisions which have by no means received the same interpretation at all hands. The whole deduction is founded on arbitrary declarations, inasmuch as the bishops were, and are still, party and judge in the same cause; they, whose title is in question, claim the exclusive right of explaining words and facts, and consider any one who doubts their assertions as being disobedient to Christ and to God. Impartial thinkers of the Roman Church itself cannot help acknowledging that before the middle of the 3rd century there was no primacy perceptible in the Church (see Mohler, *Die Einhteit der Kirche, oder das Principe des Katholicismmus, dargestellt im Geiste der Kirchenvelfaissung der drei ersten Jahrhunlderte* [2nd ed. Tübingen, 1843]); while others, by arbitrary arrangement of historical facts, arrive at the conclusion “that the Roman bishops not only claimed the highest authority in all ecclesiastical matters since the first times of Christianity, but that these pretensions, founded on Christ’s declarations were acknowledged by the whole Church, especially by the episcopate” (see Phillips, *Kirchenrecht*, p. 156). This is not the place to show, by the history of the Roman bishops of the first centuries, how indefensible such an assumption must appear: we must leave this to the special articles of this work, contenting ourselves with calling the attention of the reader to the principal features of the development of the primacy.

Among the numerous works written on the subject, we mention in favor of it: *Bibliotheca maximan Pontificica, in qua authores melioris notce qui hactenus pro S. Romanall Sede scripserunt, fere omnes continentur, promovente Fr. H. Tom. de Roceaberti* (Romae, 1689. 21 vols. fol.); A. Daude, *Majestas Hierarchicea cul. Sulmmi Pontificis* (Bamb. 1761, 2 vols. 4to); Peter Ballerini, *De Tiac Ratione Primatuus, etc*. (Augsb. 1770,

2 vols. 4to; ed. nov. by Westhoff); J. Roskovany, *De Primatu Romani Pontficis ejusque Juribus* (ibid. 1834, 8vo); Rothensee, *Der Primat des Papsles in allen Jahrhunderten, herausgegeben von Räss und Weiss* (Mainz, 1836, 4 vols. 8vo). Against it: Ellendorf, *Der Primlat der romischen Päpste* (Darmst. 1841 and 1846, 2 vols. 8vo); Barrel, *Du Pape et ses Droits religieux* (Paris, 1803); Le Maistre, Du Pope (ibid. 1820); Gosselin, *Pouvoir due Pape au Moyen Age* (Louvain, 1845, 2 vols. 8vo). These and other works have been extensively used by Phillips in his *Canon Law*, the fifth volume of which (Ratisbon, 1857) is entirely devoted to the subject of primacy.

Generally the testimony of Irenaeus (d. 202) and of Cyprian (d. 258) are specially invoked to show that the primacy of the Roman bishops was accepted in the 21 century. But the former (*Adversus Haeres*. lib. 3, cap. 3), in order to demonstrate the truth of the Catholic doctrine, appeals to the tradition of all the sees founded by the apostles; for Italy and the West, he names especially Rome as being the only Occidental see of undisputed apostolic foundation. The *potior principalitas* mentioned by Irenieus designates the political situation of the city, which could not fail to enhance its ecclesiastical importance. In the same way, Constantinople, at a later period, took the second place in the hierarchy, as being a second Rome (*Concil. Constantinop*. ann. 381, can. 3; comp. Bickell, *Geschichte des Kirchenrechts*, 1, 209 sq.). The ideas of Cyprian about the unity of the Church logically led to primacy, yet the relations lie himself maintained to the Roman bishop do not imply the acknowledgment of a prerogative like that which is supposed to be advocated in his book *De Unitate Ecclesiae*, and in his letters in favor of Rome. Its foundation by an apostle, and the authority of the first metropolis of the Roman Empire, gave at an early period a great importance to the see of Rome; but the same importance is attributed to the bishop of Alexandria and of Antioch, in the 3rd canon of the Council of Nice, in 325. At that council the Roman bishop did not exercise a higher authority than the other bishops. This is clearly shown by the acts of the council, signed by two presbyters, “instead of our pope,” i.e. bishop (see *Analecta Nicceana*— fragments relating to the Council of Nice-by Harris Cowpers [London and Edinburgh, 1857]). It was at a later period attempted to give can. 6 Nic. Cone., another form than the primitive by adding at the beginning the words “Quod ecclesia Romana semper habuit primatum” (see Gieseler, *Kirchengeschichte*, 1, § 91). The struggle for the maintenance of the orthodox doctrine o as extremely advantageous

to the bishops of Rome, and the Council of Sardica (343) emphasized most decidedly the pre-eminence of the Roman see in the Western Church: the Oriental bishops on that occasion protested and left the assembly. lThe resolutions of Sardica were not at once accepted even in the Western Church. At the request of the bishop Damasus, and of a Roman synod of 378, the emperor Gratian issued a rescript in favor of Rome (Gieseler, 1. c. § 92, n. 1). In 445 an edict of Valentinian III proclaims the primacy of the bishop of Rome over the whole Church— a primacy which, besides the higher rank over the bishops, includes a supreme ecclesiastical legislation and jurisdiction. The emperor founds this preference on the primacy of Peter ("sedis apostolicee primatum, sancti Petri meritum, qui princeps est episcopalis coronae"), on the political importance of Rome ("Romanae dignitas civitatis"), and on the Synod of Sardica ("sacrae synodi auctoritas") (comp. Richter, *Kirchenrecht* [6th ed.], § 22, n. 3). But the Church of the East was by no means subordinated to the Roman see; the Council of Chalcedon, 451, in can. 28, declares that the see of Constantinople has the same privileges in the Eastern Church which in the Western Church belong to Rome (τὰ ἴσα πρεσβεῖα ἀπέμειναν τῷ τῆς νέας ῾Ρώμης ἁγιωτάτῳ θρόνῳ). If, in later times, the first place in the Roman empire is acknowledged to belong to Rome (c. 7, pr. c. 8, C. *de Summa Trinitate* [1, 1]; Justinian, a. 533, No. 9, 131, c. 2, a. 535, 545, etc.), this was only a distinction of honor without any practical consequences; for the patriarch of Constantinople was also the highest instance (c. 29, C. *de Episcop. Audientia* [1, 4], a. 530, No. 137, c. 5, a. 564, etc.). The ecclesiastical authority of Rome was not contested after that, but its relation to the worldly powers passed through many vicissitudes. Its connection with the newly founded Germanic churches was at first prevented by their Arianism, but became the closer after their conversion to the orthodox faith. The Roman principles about the relations of the Church to the apostolic see prevailed in the Frankish empire by the exertions of Boniface, although their practical consequences were impeded by the independent exercise of the rights of the State in Church matters. With Charlemagne the pope was nothing but the first metropolitan, over whom the emperor had jurisdiction. The king is the supreme judge and legislator, a protector and ruler given to the Church by God, who corrects or approves the resolutions of the synods, and issues himself ecclesiastical ordinances, after taking the advice of the clergy. The proof of this is afforded by a large number of capitularies. Under the weak successors of the great emperor there was a change, which the decretals of Pseudo-

Isidore turned to the advantage of Rome. It was in conformity with these principles that Nicholas I administered the Church (from 858). The German kings of the house of Saxony regained the lost power, and the Roman bishops were again reduced to the primacy of honor. We see the German bishops, under Otto I, appointed by the emperor himself, governing their dioceses independently, and the episcopate, in their synods, presided over by the emperor, exercise jurisdiction over the Roman bishop (deposition of John XII, in 963, by the Roman council). These principles were in force until the middle of the 11th century. The bishop of Rome was then subordinated to the emperor and to the body of the episcopate (in 1046, at the Synod of Sutri, by which Benedict VIII, Sylvester III, and Gregory VI were deposed). Under Gregory VII a reaction took place, and the papacy was enabled to obtain the whole extent of authority which Pseudo-Isidore claimed as its own. The hierarchical system of papacy was completed by this Gregory and his successors-Alexander III (1159-1181), Innocent III (1198-1216), Gregory IX (1227-1241), Innocent IV (1243-1254), and Boniface VIII (1294-1303). The so-called *Dictatus Hildebrandini*, the authenticity of which is proved by the regests of Gregory VII (comp. Gieseler, *Kirchengesch*. II 1, § 47, n. d; Giesebrecht, *De Gregorii VII registro emendando* [Regimont. 1858], p. 5), and the decretals of the popes mentioned, contain the propositions peculiar to this system, the most essential of which are: The bishop of Rome is the vicar of Christ on earth ("Romanus Pontifex vicarius Jesu Christi, quod non puri hominis, sed veri Dei vicem gerit in terris" [Innoc. III, in c. 2, 3, 10:*De Translat*. Episcop. 1, 7]), the universal bishop ("solus universalis" [*Gregorii Dict*. No. 2]), to whom alone belongs the title of pope ("quod unicum est nomen in mundo" [ibid. c. 11]). He is possessed of full powers, and he grants parts of them to the rest of the clergy, as his assistants ("Quia diversitatem corporum diversitas saepe sequitur animorum, ne plenitude ecclesiasticae jurisdictionis in plures dispensata vilesceret, sed in uno potius collata vigeret, apostolicae sedi Dominus in B. Petro universam ecclesiarum et cunctorum Christi fidelium magistrium contulit et primatum, quae, retenta sibi plenitudine potestatis, ad implendum laudabilius officium pastorale, quod omnibus eam constituit debitricem, multos in partem sollicitudinis evocavit, sic suum dispensans onus et honorem in alios, ut nihil suo juri subtraheret, nec jurisdictionem suam in aliquo minoraret" [Innoc. III, in c. 5, 10: *De Concess. Praebendae*, 3, 8]). It is, of course, his own business how he chooses his assistants; the rights of appointing, deposing, permuting bishops belong to him exclusively; he can draw every cause

before the apostolic see, judge it himself, or take it back from the judge he had appointed, and give it to another one, especially to his personal lieutenant, a legate, who, of course, has pre-eminence over all other dignitaries (‘Quod ille solus possit deponere episcopos vel reconciliare. — Quod legatus ejus omnibus episcopis preesit in concilio, etiam inferioris gradus, et adversus eos sententiam depositionis possit dare. — Quod illi liceat de sede ad sedem necessitate cogente episcopos transmutare.Quod de omni ecclesia, quacunque voluerit, clericum valeat ordinare. — Quod majores causue cujuscunque ecclesiae ad sedem apostolicam referri debeant” [*Dictatus Gregorii VII*, Nos. 3, 4, 13, 14, 21, 25, etc.]). The Roman bishop is the legislator of the Church (“Quod illi soli licet pro temporis necessitate novas leges condere,” etc. [1. c. No. 7]). Without his consent, no synod can take place (“Quod nulla synodus absque praecepto ejus debet generalis vocari” [1. c. 16]). He is infallible, and decides what is true (“Quod nullum capitulum nullusque liber canonicus habeatur absque illius auctoritate. — Quod Romana ecclesia nunquam erravit, nec in perpetuum, scriptura testante, errabit” [1. c. 17, 22]). He recognizes no authority, while all are subordinated to his authority (“Quod sententia illius a nullo debeat retractari, et ipse omnium solus retractare possit.Quod a nemine ipse judicari debeat. — Quod nullus audeat condemnare apostolicam sedem appellantem” El. c. 18-20]).

The papal system, a product of feudalism, according to which all authority rests in the sovereign, involves, in its last consequence, the political domination. The *Dictatus Gregorii* contain the following declarations: “Quod solus Papa possit uti imperialibus insigniis” (No. 8); “Quod solius Papae pedes omnes principes deosculentur (No. 9); “Quod illi libeat imperatores deponere” (No. 12); “Quod a fidelitate iniquorum subjectos possit absolvere” (No. 27). Boniface VIII, trying to act up to these principles, involved himself in a terrible conflict with France, which ended in the defeat of the Roman see. Now people began to bethink themselves again of the principles which had prevailed before Gregory VII, on the relations of the Church, and the council which represents her, to the bishop of Rome, and the old principles were reinstated in vigor. The result of the war which has since been waged, with many interruptions and vicissitudes, between the pope and the bishops is a modification and practical attenuation of the strict papal or curial system; yet the latter has been victorious, and is now generally acknowledged. The consequences of this system in regard to the relations of the Roman Catholic Church to the

State, the right of granting royal titles (Phillips, 1. c. 5, 684 sq.), and other prerogatives, by which the rights of sovereigns were limited or even denied, have long disappeared from practice; yet the pope never retracted the principle, and never failed to avail himself of such circumstances as allowed him to proclaim it and to apply it to special cases (see A. de Roskovany, *Monunmenta Catholica pro Independentia Potestatis Ecclesiasticae ab Imperio Civili* [Quinque Ecclesiis, 1847], vol. 2). The Austrian Concordat of Aug. 18, 1855, art. 2, says: "Cum Romanus pontifex primatum tam honoris quam jurisdictionis in universam, qua late patet, ecclesiam jure divine obtineat, episcoporum, cleri, et populi mutuo cum Sancta Sede communicatio in rebus spiritualibus et negotiis ecclesiasticis nulli placetum regium obtinendi necessitas suberit, sed prorsus libera erit;" and the allocution of Pius IX, at the publication of the Concordat, says: "Cum Romanus pontifex Christi his in terris vicarius et beatissimi apostolorum principis successor primatum . . . divino obtineat jure, tumr Catholicum hoc dogma in ipsa conventione luculentissimis fuit verbis expressum, ac propterea simul de medio sublata et radicitus evulsa peccatusque deleta falsa perversa illa et funestissima opinio eidem divino primatui ejusque juribus plane adversa et ab hac Apostolica Sede semper damnata atque proscripta, de habenda scilicet a civili gubernio venia, vel executione eorum, quee res spirituales et ecclesiastica negotia respiciunt." The principle is also saved in those cases where it is allowed to the State, only in consideration of the circumstances (*temporum tratione habita*). to decide by worldly procedure, in merely civil affairs of the clergy, or even in criminal matters in which they are involved (Austr. *Conc. art*. 12:etc.).

The papal rights relate to the supreme government of the Roman Catholic Church, and to the honors derived from it. Distinction is made between rights essential to the existence of the primacy (*jura essentialia, primigenia, natulalia*) and those which have been gradually added to the others, but are not absolutely indispensable to the primacy (*jura accidentalia, acquisita, secundaria*) (Sauter, § 466; Droste-Hiilshoff, *Grundsistze des gemeinen Kirchenrechts*, 2, pt. 1, § 132 sq.; Eichhorn, *Kirchenrecht*, 1, 579 sq.; Roskovany, *De Primatut Pontiflcis Romani* [Augustae Vindelicor. 1834]. § 44 sq.; § 54 sq.). As essentials we find, first, the primacy of honor and of jurisdiction, of the highest consideration and of general government, including discipline, the right of legislation, devolution, and protection. Among the additional rights or privileges are

the jurisdiction in *causae arduae ac majores*, the decision in last resort of the reserved cases, etc. The primacy of the papal jurisdiction comprises

(1.) *The Representation of the Roman Catholic Church*. — As the representative head, the pope has, partly in proper person, partly in co-operation with the cardinals, to defend the general interests and special concerns of the Church with the exterior powers. He has to make conventions with the different states concerning the clerical institutions existing in them and directly subordinated to the papal see.

(2.) *The Supreme Ecclesiastical Legislation*. — The pope issues decrees as well about subjects of discipline as of doctrine, and secures the approbation of the Church by the convocation of a council or by other means. The necessity of the approbation of the council is not recognized by the pope. As the pope, speaking ex cathedra, cannot err according to the doctrine of the Church, all members of the Catholic Church are bound in such case to submit to the decision of the sovereign pontiff. This principle was solemnly recognized at the proclamation of the dogma of the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary. But the papal infallibility does not extend to matters of fact. Bellarmine himself says (*De Romano Pontifice*, lib. 4, cap. 2), "Conveniunt omnes posse Pontificem, et cum ccetu consiliorum vel cum generali concilio, errare in controversiis facti particularibus, quue ex informatione testimoniisque hominum pruecipue pendent." Appeals from Pontifice male informnato ad melius imfoirmnandum have always been in use. In virtue of his legislative powers, the pope can dispensate and authentically interpret; and in virtue of the same he orders the resolutions of the provincial synods to be re-examined and approved by the Congregatio Concilii (Benedict XIV, *De Synodo Dioecesana*, lib. 13:cap. 3, No. 6).

(3.) *The Highest Ecclesiastical Supervision*. — Reports from all dioceses are regularly sent to the pope. The bishops, by the oath they have to take before their consecration, are bound to appear in person ("Limina apostolorum singulis annis aut per me aut per certum nuntium visitabo, nisiabsolvar"); but the *visitatio liminum* can be replaced by a *relatio status diceceseos*, which must take place in conformity with an instruction of Benedict XIV (*De Synodo Diaecesana*, lib. 13, cap. 7 sq.).

(4.) *The Highest Ecclesiastical Administration* (Regimen Ecclesiae). — It comprises the decision in the *causae arduce ac majores*. To these belong the *causae episcopoani*—namely, the confirmation of elected, the

admission of postulated bishops; the consecration, permutation, deposition; acceptation of resignations; appointment of coadjutors; foundation, division, fusion of dioceses; collation of the pallium; confirmation and suppression of clerical orders and ecclesiastical institutions; beatification and canonization; the acknowledgment of relics; the establishment and abrogation of general religious feasts; the right of decision in reserved cases. In virtue of his supremacy, the pope has also a right, in case of insufficient, faulty administration of the clerical dignitaries, to take the government in his own hands, and do everywhere what is wanted. On the right of administration is also founded the right of imposing ecclesiastical taxes.

I. *Primacy of Honor*. —

(1.) The pope has not only preeminence over the clerical dignitaries, but is traditionally recognized even by the worldly powers. The political authorities, in their conventions with him, allow his name to stand first.

(2.) The title and the qualifications connected with it underwent some changes. The name of pope belongs, since Gregory VII's time, exclusively to the bishop of Rome; likewise the designation of Summus Pontifex. Pontifex Maximus was only at a later period reserved for him. Gregory I declined the title of Patriarcha Universalis (see cap. 4, 5, (list. 99), and preferred being called Servus Servorum Dei, a designation which has since become official (comp. Thomassin, *Vetus ec Nova Ecclesie Disciplina*, lib. 1, pt. 1, cap. 4, 50. No. 14; Ferraris, *Bibliotheca Canonica*, s.v.; Papa, art. 2, No. 33-35; Phillips, 1. c. 5. 599 sq.). The qualification of sanctus is also, in early times, specially applied to the Roman bishops. In the *Dictatus Greqorii VII*, No. 23, we read, "Quod Romanus Pontifex, si canonice fuerit ordinatus, meritis B. Petri indubitanter efficitur sanctus, testante S. Ennodio Papiensi Episcopo, ei multis SS. Patribus faventibus. sicut in decretis B. Svmmachi P. continetur." Therefore the usual address is "sanctissime pater" (holy father). (For the homage formerly paid him and his pastoral ensigns, *SEE POPE*; for the supremacy of the pope over councils, *SEE SUPREMACY*; for the relation of the papacy to temporal possessions, *SEE TEMPORAL POWER OF THE POPE*; *SEE ROMANISM*.)

In answer to the Roman Catholic doctrine of the primacy we here subjoin the heads of Barrow's famous argument against it in his treatise *On the*

Supremacy (*Works* [Lond. 1841], vol. 3). He says there may be "a primacy of worth or personal excellency; a primacy of reputation; a primacy of order or bare dignity and precedence; a primacy of power and jurisdiction.

1. The first — a primacy of worth — we may well grant to Peter, for probably he did exceed the rest of his brethren in personal endowments and capacities.

2. A primacy of repute, which Paul means when he speaks of those who had a special reputation, of those who seemed to be pillars of the supereminent apostles (<4801 06>Galatians 2:6, 9; <4701 05>2 Corinthians 11:5; 12:11). [This advantage cannot be refused him, being a necessary consequence of those eminent qualities resplendent in him, and of the illustrious performances achieved by him beyond the rest. This may be inferred from that renown which he has had from the beginning; and likewise from his being so constantly ranked in the first place before the rest of his brethren.]

3. As to a primacy of order or bare dignity, importing that commonly, in all meetings and proceedings, the other apostles did yield him the precedence, it may be questioned; for this does not seem suitable to the gravity of such persons, or their condition and circumstances, to stand upon ceremonies of respect; for our Lord's rules seem to exclude all semblance of ambition, all kind of inequality and distance between his apostles. [But yet this primacy may be granted as probable upon divers accounts of use and convenience; it might be useful to preserve order, and to promote expedition, or to prevent confusion, distraction, and dilatory obstruction in the management of things.]

4. As to a primacy importing a superiority in command, power, or jurisdiction, this we have great reason to deny upon the following considerations:

(1.) For such a power it was needful that a commission from God, its founder, should be granted in absolute and perspicuous terms; but no such commission is extant in Scripture.

(2.) If so illustrious an office was instituted by our Savior, it is strange that nowhere in the evangelical or apostolical history there should be any express mention of that institution.

(3.) If Peter had been instituted sovereign of the apostolical senate, his office and state had been in nature and kind very distinct from the common

office of the other apostles, as the office of a king from the office of any subject [and probably would have been dignified by some distinct name, as that of arch-apostle, arch-pastor, the vicar of Christ, or the like; but no such name or title was assumed by him, or was by the rest attributed to him].

(4.) There was no office above that of an apostle known to the apostles or primitive Church (<40411>Ephesians 4:11; <46128>1 Corinthians 12:28).

(5.) Our Lord himself declared against this kind of primacy, prohibiting his apostles to affect, to seek, to assume, or admit a superiority of power, one above another (<42214>Luke 22:14-24; <41035>Mark 9:35).

(6.) We do not find any peculiar administration committed to Peter, nor any privilege conferred on him which was not also granted to the other apostles (<40223>Matthew 20:23; <41615>Mark 16:15).

(7.) When Peter wrote two catholic epistles, there does not appear in either of them any intimation or any pretence to this arch-apostolical power.

(8.) In all relations which occur in Scripture about controversies incident to doctrine or practice, there is no appeal made to Peter's judgment or allegation of it as decisive, no argument is built on his authority.

(9.) Peter nowhere appears intermeddling as a judge or governor paramount in such cases [yet where he does himself deal with heretics and disorderly persons, he proceeds not as a pope, decreeing, but as an apostle, warning, arguing, and persuading against them].

(10.) The consideration of the apostles proceeding in the conversion of people, in the foundation of churches, and in administration of their spiritual affairs will exclude any probability of Peter's jurisdiction over them. [They went about their business, not by order or license from Peter, but according to special direction of God's Spirit.]

(11.) The nature of the apostolic ministry-their not being fixed in one place of residence, but continually moving about the world-the state of things at that time, and the manner of Peter's life, render it unlikely that he had such a jurisdiction over the apostles as some assign him.

(12.) It was indeed most requisite that every apostle should have a complete, absolute, independent authority in managing the duties and concerns of the office, that he might not anywise be obstructed in the

discharge of them, not clogged with a need to consult others, not hampered with orders from those who were at a distance.

(13.) The discourse and behavior of Paul towards Peter are evidence that he did not acknowledge any dependence on him, or any subjection to him (Galatians 2:11).

(14.) If Peter had been appointed sovereign of the Church, it seems that it should have been requisite that he should have outlived all the apostles; for otherwise the Church would have wanted a head, or there must have been an inextricable controversy who that head was. But Peter died long before John, as all agree, and perhaps before divers others of the apostles."

From these arguments we must see what little ground the Church of Rome has to derive the supremacy of the pope from the supposed primacy of Peter. *SEE POPE*.

Primas

SEE PRIMATE.

Primat, Claude-François-Marie

a French prelate, was born at Lyons July 26, 1747. He studied, at the expense of the Chapter of St. John, at Lyons, and entered the brotherhood of the Oratorians. From the college at Marseilles he went to that of Dijon, where he became professor of rhetoric and theology. At the age of twenty-eight he was ordained a priest, and became a successful preacher. In 1786 he was made curate of St. James at Douai. During the revolutionary agitation he gave his support to the republican cause by taking the required oath. He was made constitutional bishop of the North March 27, 1791, and established the seat of his episcopacy at Cam bray. He resigned office Nov. 13, 1793, and had even the weakness to return to the convention his letters of priesthood. But this step did not prevent him from presiding over a diocesan synod held at Lille in 1797. He assisted at the council held at Paris at the end of that year, and was transferred by his associates to the bishopric of Rhone and Loire Feb. 1798. At this time he composed a paper to justify his oath of hatred to royalty, which was found in the actions of that council. After the Concordat, he was chosen, April 9, 1802, archbishop of Toulouse, where by his mild measures he triumphed over all obstacles. As primate he was present at the coronation of Napoleon I, and the pallium was conferred upon him Jan. 16, 1805. He was finally chosen

senator and count of the empire May 19, 1806; and during the Hundred Days he was called to a seat in the Chamber of Peers, June 4,1815. He died at Toulouse Oct. 10, 1816. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, s.v.

Primate

(Lat. *primus*; Fr. *primat*, first) is the title of a grade in the hierarchy immediately below the rank of patriarch (q.v.). In point of jurisdiction the primacy was, historically, developed out of the episcopate by papal communication of primatial rights. The primates, in this sense of the word, are more particularly an institution of the West; for although the Greek denomination ἔξαρχος is generally translated by *primuus*, there are unmistakable differences. The exarchs of the East were subordinated to no patriarch, and were, so far as rights are concerned, their equals in their dioceses and only in rank were they their inferiors. Such relations were out of the question in the Western Church, where the patriarchate was held by the papal primate in the person of the bishop of Rome, who was recognized as possessing universal supreme jurisdiction. The primates, as such, were metropolitans who enjoyed a preeminence of jurisdiction over the other bishops of a country. This pre-eminence was founded on their right of consecrating the other metropolitans and bishops, of convoking national councils, of receiving appeals, etc. Originally this dignity was connected with the nomination to a pontifical vicariate, as was the case with the bishop of Arles, and it rested, in general, on an explicit appointment by the pope. There was one exception to that in the person of the bishop of Carthage, who, though not assuming the primatial title, exerted all the rights implied by it in Africa. The relation in which the primacy almost everywhere stood to the national interests, which obliged its bearers, as the first bishops of the State, to take some share in the political concerns, exercised a detrimental influence, and led some of them to assert overbearing pretensions contrary to the authority of the head of the Church. The importance of the primacy has melted away in the course of time, and in most cases nothing remains of it but some exterior distinctions. The chief primatial sees of the West were: in Spain — Seville and Tarragona (afterwards united in Toledo); in France-Arles. Rheims, Lyons, and Rouen (among whom the archbishop of Lyons claims the title of *primat des primats*, “primate of the primates”); in England-Canterbury; in Germany — Mainz, Salzburg, and Trier; in Ireland — Armagh, and for the Pale, Dublin; in Scotland — St. Andrews; in Hungar — Gran; in Poland-Gnesen; and in the Northern kingdoms-Lund.

In the Church of England the archbishop of Canterbury is styled primate of all England; the archbishop of York, primate of England. In Ireland, the archbishop of Armagh is primate of all Ireland, and the archbishop of Dublin, primate of Ireland. The title of primate in England and Ireland confers no jurisdiction beyond that of archbishop. The name prinus is applied in the Scottish Episcopal Church to the presiding bishop. He is chosen by the bishops out of their own number, without their being bound to give effect to seniority of consecration or precedency of diocese.

Prime

(Lat. *prima*, the first—i.e. hour), the first of the so-called "lesser hours" of the Roman Breviary (q.v.). It may be called the public morning prayer (of that Church, and corresponds in substance with the morning service of the other ancient liturgies, allowance being made for Latin peculiarities. Prime commences with the beautiful hymn of Prudentius. Joam luais oato sidere, which is followed by three and occasionally four psalms (22, 26:54, 118); but the last portion consists of the opening verses of the 118th (in the A.V. the 159, 1-3-2) Psalm, which is continued throughout the rest of the "lesser hours." Prime concludes with prayers appropriate to the beginning of a Christian's day. See Procter, *Commentary on the Book of Common Prayer*, p. 187. *SEE CANONICAL HOURS*.

Prime, Ebenezer

a Presbyterian minister, was born at Milford, Conn., July 21, 1700, graduated at Yale College in 1718, and at the age of nineteen was assistant of the Rev. Eliphalet Jones, pastor at Huntington, L.I., whose colleague he became four years after. He remained in charge of this congregation until his death, Sept. 25, 1779 (according to another account, Oct. 3). For a period of nearly seven years, from 1766 to 1773, he had an assistant, but during the troubled times of the Revolution the whole charge rested with him, and he was even obliged at one time to flee from his dwelling, and live in retirement for a season in a solitary neighborhood of his congregation. He is the progenitor of a family of eminent Presbyterian divines. Mr. Prime published a *Discourse on the Nature of Ordination*. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 3, 30 sq.

Prime, John

an English divine of some note, flourished in the second half of the 16th century. He was educated at Oxford University, and held at one time a fellowship. He published, *The Sacraments* (Lond. 1582, 8vo): — *Nature and Grace* (ibid. 1583, 8vo): — *Sermons* (Oxon. 1585, 8vo): — *Exposition and Observations upon St. Paul to the Galatians* (Lond. 1587, 8vo): — *The Consolations of David, a sermon on* [1234]*Psalm 23:4* (ibid. 1588, 8vo): — *Sermons* (ibid. 1588, 8vo).

Prime, Nathaniel Scudder, D.D.

an American divine, was born at Huntington. L. I., April 21, 1785, and educated at Princeton, where he graduated in 1804. He was licensed to preach in the following year in the Presbyterian Church, and was subsequently stationed at Sag Harbor, Freshpond, Smithtown, Cambridge, New York, and other places. He also acted as principal of literary institutions at Cambridge, Sing Sing, and Newburgh, and gained distinction as a teacher. He died suddenly at Mamaroneck, N. J., March 27,1856. Dr. Prime published three single *Sermons* (1811, 1817, 1825), an *Address* (1815), and a *Charge to the Rev. Samuel Irenaeus Prime* (1837), many statistical and other articles in periodicals, and the two following works, *Familiar Illustration of Christian Baptism* (1818.12mo), in which lie defends infant baptism: — *A History of Long Island from its first Settlement by the Europeans to the Year 1845* (N.Y. and Pittsburgh, 1845, 12mo). “He had a mind of uncommon force and discrimination, a noble and generous spirit, simple and engaging manners, an invincible firmness in adhering to his own convictions, an earnest devotion to the best interests of his fellowmen, an excellent talent for the pulpit, great tact at public business, and a remarkably graceful facility at mingling in a deliberative body.”—Sprague. *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 3, 32: Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Primer, King’s

is an English ecclesiastical document published in 1545, containing the Calendar, the Ten Commandments, the Creed, the Lord’s Prayer, the Salutation of the Virgin, the seven penitential psalms, a litany, and prayers for various occasions. It was edited by the authority of King Henry VIII, and hence derives its title. A prefatory admonition to the reader complains of several books calculated to mislead the people in their application to the

saints, and to set God and his creatures on the same level. Though many divines had made a special distinction between λατρεία and δουλεία, and appropriated the first only to God, yet in practice this distinction was too often forgotten.

Besides the King's Primer, there is also the *Goodly Prymer* of 1535, drawn up by Marshal, archdeacon of Nottingham, and the *Manual of Prayers* or the *Primer in English*, of 1539. Primer means first book, and was used often as analogous to the term prayer-book, though it contained selections of services made according to the discretion of the compiler. *The Prymer of Salisbury Use* bears the date of various years, the first edition being published in 1527. — Eadie, s.v. See Collier, *Eccles. Hist*. pt. 2, bk. 2; Procter, *Commentary on the Book of Common Prayer*, p. 12, 75; Wheatly, *On the Book of Common Prayer*, p. 23.

Primerose, Gilbert, D.D.

a Scotch divine, flourished in the first half of the 17th century, first as minister of the French Church in London, later as chaplain to James I, and still later as canon of Windsor. He died in 1642. His works are, *La Trompette de Sion, etc., en XVIII Sermons* (Berger, 1610, 8vo; and in Latin by Joan Anchoranum Dantis, 1631, 8vo): — *Le Veu de Jacob oppose aux Voeux de Moines* (ibid. 1610, 4 vols. 8vo; in English by John Buteel, Lond. 1617, fol.): — *La Defense de la Religion reformee contre M. François Blovin* (Berger, 1619, 8vo): — *Panegyrique au tres-grand Prince Charles, Prince de Galles* (Paris, 1624, 8vo): *Nine Sermons on* <193419>*Psalm 34:19* (Lond. 1625, 4to): *Two Sermons on* <400504>*Matthew 5:4, and* <420621>*Luke 6:21* (1625, 8vo).

Primicerius

i.e. *the chief of his order* (from Lat. *primus*, first, and *cera*, wax), one whose name was first inscribed on the tablet of the church, which was covered with wax. The word does not always signify priority of power or jurisdiction; sometimes only priority of time, or precedency of honor or dignity in respect of place. Augustine calls Stephen *primicerius martyirum*. Bernard calls many *primiceria virginitatis*. The word is frequently met with in mediaeval Latin, and designates an officer in monasteries. In the *Liber Ronmani Ordinis* the duties of the office are thus described: *Primicerius sciat se esse sub archidiacono*, etc.: "The primicerius must understand that he is subordinate to the archdeacon; and to his office it

specially belongs to preside over the deacons during the time that they are communicating instruction; to maintain proper discipline, as one who must render account to God; to furnish the deacons with subjects on which they must discourse," etc. Du Cange gives various meanings of the term, dependent on the word with which it happens to be connected; as *prinicesrius subdiaconorumn, notariorum*, lectorum, etc. But in a more restricted sense, primicerius designates the holder of a chapter dignity, andis employed with this specific meaning in Chrodegang's rule, and in the statutes of Amalarius, confirmed by the Synod of Aix-la-Chapelle in 817, where the primicerius appears at the head of the capitulary register, immediately after the archdeacon and archpresbyter. The functions of the primicerius were specially to instruct the deacons, subdeacons, and minorists in the choral song (hence his name of *Praecentor; De consuet.* 1, 4), in the liturgy, and in the functions of the Church; to inform the canons of the order of the office in the choir; to explain to the younger ones the management of the Breviary, etc. There is a very circumstantial enumeration of the duties of the primicerius in the *Epistola Isidori Spal. ad Landefredum Cordub*., "De omnibus eccl. gradibus" (comp. c. 1, § 13. Dist. 25 and the fragment of the *Ordo Ronanus in c. un. 10*: De off. primicerii," 1, 25). When the archdeacons, in the progressive extension of their importance, obtained the lower jurisdiction over the priests and archpriests, the primicerius obtained also the full disciplinary power over the minorists. His situation in the chapter was therefore one of importance; it is sometimes called a *dignity* (*De consuet.* 1, 4), sometimes a *personale* (*De constit.* 1, 2), sometimes it is put simply among the offices (*officia nudu*). There was, in general, no unliform distribution of ranks in the different chapters. When the institution of the Minorites was suppressed, the office of the primicerius was also extinguished.

Primitiae, Premices

Primitise is, with the ancient pagans, the name given to the first-fruits of the fields and gardens, which were annually brought as offerings to the temples or abodes of the priests. We find this custom among almost all nations of antiquity and also among the Israelites. Like many other religious customs and institutions of the Jews, this kind of exterior worship, considered as a tribute of gratitude for God's blessings, was adopted by the Christian Church, and urgently recommended by the fathers, the kind and quantity of the gifts being left to be determined by the pious feelings of the individual: "Non erant speciali nomine diffinitae, sed

offerentium arbitrio derelictae" (*De decim. et prim*. 3, 30). They certainly bore the character of free offerings, while the tithe-with the Jews always, since Moses's time; with the Christians at least since Charlemagne's time-represents a strict right; for, that the premises should not remain below the sixtieth part, and not exceed a fortieth of the complete harvest, is only an approximate indication, to be found in Jerome, *Comment. in Ezech*. c. 46. With the more general and stricter execution of the laws about the tithe, in the Carlovingian age, the premises disappeared, little by little, or were preserved only in part, and in a changed form.

Primitive Christianity

is the religion of the New Testament as first exemplified after the establishment of the new faith by that ecclesiastical organization called the Church, under State patronage. *SEE PRIMITIVE CHURCH*. In distinction from this, we have apostolic Christianity, the period that immediately succeeded the labors of the founder of the New-Testament dispensation. *SEE APOSTOLIC CHURCH*; *SEE CHRISTIANITY*.

Primitive Church

An expression used to denote the condition of the Church, as respects doctrine and discipline, in the early stages of its history. Though this term is employed with little precision by ecclesiastical writers, it most frequently refers to the Church of the first three centuries. *SEE CHURCH*.

Primitive Doctrine

It is the opinion of some persons that there is a "primitive doctrine," independent of Scripture, "always to be found somewhere in the Catholic traditions;" by which language, apparently, they mean to teach that the whole doctrine of the Church is not to be found in the Scriptures, nor yet in the writings of the early fathers; but they seem to suppose that some part of the oral teaching of the apostles might, though in an *unwritten* form, be yet in the possession of the' Church, so that the Church might at any time declare a doctrine not opposed to Scripture, on what is called the unanimous consent of antiquity, to have come down by successive oral delivery from the apostles. The opponents of such views consider that they are incapable of abiding the test of sober examination, because it is not possible for us, at this distance of time from the days of the apostles, to know what they did or did not teach orally, or how far what they really did

teach may not since have been corrupted. They contend, therefore, that to the ancient apostolical writings alone can we look for that which is without doubt to be regarded as ancient apostolical teaching. *SEE DOCTRINE*; *SEE TRADITION*.

Primitive Methodist Connection

is the name of a Wesleyan body of believers principally in England and the British colonies.

During the first decade of the present century stirring reports floated across the Atlantic of the power of God marvelously displayed in the camp meetings of America. The practice of holding religious services in the open air had much declined among British Methodists, as in all the large towns and many of the villages they now had commodious chapels, and the tidings of Pentecostal gatherings in Western forests renewed the memory of the days of Wesley and Whitefield. This renewed interest was increased by the visits of Lorenzo Dow to England and Ireland. On the threshold of this period, a young man of studious habits, named Hugh Bourne, was suffering intensely through an agonizing conviction of sin. From his sixth to his twenty-sixth year, he seldom went to bed without a dread of being *in* hell before morning; and morning brought him no relief, for he thought he would be in hell before night. He pursued his studies, year after year, with intense zeal, but nowhere in his learning did he find saving knowledge. In 1799, when twenty-seven years of age, there fell in his way a volume containing the *Life of Fletcher*, some of Wesley's *Sermons*, Alleine's *Alarm*, and Baxter's *Call to the Unconverted*. In one of Wesley's sermons he found "more real light than in anything else he had ever read." It taught him that "opinion is not religion; . . . even right opinion is as distant from religion as east is from west." The time of his redemption drew nigh. As he read Fletcher's letters on the manifestation of the Son of God, light flooded his soul. He rapturously tells us, "I was born in an instant; yea, passed from death unto life.... I was filled with joy, love, and glory, which made full amends for the twenty years' suffering." Soon after his conversion he joined the Wesleyans, and zealously sought the salvation of the rough lumbermen who were in his employment. On May 31, 1807, Mr. Bourne, assisted by Messrs. William Clowes, Thomas Cotton, and others afterwards prominent in the Primitive Methodist Connection, held a camp meeting at Mow Cap, a mountain on the borderline between Staffordshire and Cheshire. Though the Connection did not really exist till three years

later, this is looked upon as the initial point in its history, and its annalists delight to quote the lines,

"The little cloud increases still
Which first began upon Mow Hill."

The immediate spiritual results of this meeting more than equaled the hopes of its founders, and during the following summer several meetings of a like character were held in the same neighborhood. The novelty of these proceedings roused much opposition among the Wesleyan Methodists, who feared the rise of a fanaticism that might throw ridicule on true religion; and the preachers of the surrounding circuits issued handbills disclaiming all connection with the movement. At the next session of the Wesleyan Methodist Conference the following resolution was passed: "It is our judgment that, even supposing such meetings to be allowed in America, they are highly improper in England, and likely to be productive of considerable mischief; and we disclaim all connection with them." This declared judgment of the conference had naturally much weight with the societies in general, and most of the leading Methodists held aloof from the camp-meeting movement. Bourne and a few others, however, held on firmly, having their meetings recognized by civil authority and taking precautions for preserving order.

Matters now came to a crisis. The Church authorities felt they could no longer bear with such contumacy, and Bourne and Clowes were expelled from the Connection. The untrammelling of these men from Church bonds, so far from silencing them, had rather the effect of increasing their active zeal. At this time there lived in Cheshire an old man, named James Crawfoot, "noted as a man of extraordinary piety and faith." He believed himself called to the ministry, and had prayed and watched for the leading of Providence. In 1809 Hugh Bourne and his brother James hired him to preach in neglected places, for three months, at a salary of ten shillings a week. "This is generally looked upon as the commencement of the Primitive Methodist ministry." In the spring of 1810 several persons were converted in meetings held by Hugh Bourne, and formed into a class. ‘"This class was offered to the Burslem Circuit (Wesleyan); but as they declined to accept them unless they pledged to sever their connection with Hugh Bourne, and as they respectfully declined acceding to this demand, their application was refused." Bourne then took it under his charge as a distinct society, and the formation of this class may be considered the birth

of the Connection. The camp-meeting agency was now more extensively employed, and numerous societies were formed. In September, 1810, there were 10 preachers, 13 preaching places, and 136 members. Next year the first general meeting was held, composed probably of preachers and leaders. This conference resolved that money should in future be regularly collected in the societies, in order to meet the necessary expenses; "and if this should prove insufficient, recourse should again be had to the benevolence of private individuals. The two traveling preachers, Messrs. Crawfoot and Clowes, were to receive their salaries from the societies, and Mr. James Steele was appointed the circuit steward, the first officer of that kind in the Connection." In 1812 the Connection, then employing 23 preachers, formally took the title of Primitive Methodist, and two years later a comprehensive body of rules was for the first time adopted. From that time till the present the increase of the denomination has been very rapid, being from 1851 to 1872, in the 108 towns of Great Britain, over 108 per cent.

The three following extracts, from John Angell James, Dr. Beaumont, and Dr. Campbell, respectively, explain the peculiar genius of this denomination:

> "In cottages, in barns, and in theatres, and in public houses, in market-places, in streets, in lanes, and in fields, they (Primitive Methodist preachers) held meetings for prayer and exhortation. They were assailed by personal violence, and put in peril of their lives; but they persevered, in meekness and in gentleness, and have conquered by their passive power."

> "The Primitive Methodists are a *laborious*, and not an *idle* community; they are a *plain*, and not an *artificial* community; they are a *useful* community."

> "Every day serves but to confirm us that it is less talents, less culture, less intelligence that is required than a thorough knowledge of the Gospel-a perfect acquaintance with the Word of God-simplicity, affection, fervor, activity, tact, and flexibility, facility in adapting actions to circumstances, and such other things as these imply."

The latest statistics of the Connection are, 17,000 ministers and local preachers, 10,000 class-leaders, 59,000 Sunday - school teachers, and 180.000 Church members. They publish several periodicals.

The doctrine of the Connection may be said to be identical with that of other Methodist churches. The form of Church government is substantially Presbyterian, but with a larger mixture of the lay element than is found in Presbyterian or in other Methodist denominations. The official business is transacted by the leaders' meeting, composed of the class-leaders, the society steward, and the traveling preachers of the circuit. No such meeting "can be legally held without the presence of the minister or traveling preacher, extraordinary cases excepted." As in other Methodist bodies, there are traveling and local preachers. The latter usually follow some worldly occupation for a maintenance, "and preach on the Sabbath as opportunities permit, but receive no pecuniary remuneration for their services. They are chosen to their office by the representatives of the united societies to which they minister; and should their labors prove unacceptable to the people generally, their services are discontinued." "In the transaction of the business of the circuit's quarterly meeting, traveling and local preachers are equal." Between the quarterly meetings, the ordinary business of the circuit is transacted by the "circuit committee," composed of such local preachers, class-leaders, or stewards as are appointed by the preceding quarterly meeting to represent the respective societies. The traveling preachers are *ex-oficio* members of this court. Circuits are sometimes divided into branches, each having its own officials and its regular meetings for business, but subordinate to the quarterly meeting. "Places visited through missionary labors, and united in one station, are called a 'mission,'" most of which are under the control of the general missionary committee. A "district" consists of a number of circuits, branches, and missions. Its court, called a "district meeting," has an annual session. It is composed of one delegate from each circuit, the circuits sending a traveling preacher one year and a layman the two following years, so as to secure, as nearly as possible, two laymen to one traveling preacher. This meeting receives statistical reports of all the circuits, inquires into the state of each, and stations the traveling preachers within the district, "subject, however, to appeals from the stations or preachers, and to alterations at conference."

"The 'conference' is a yearly meeting of delegates from all the districts in the Connection, of twelve permanent members, and of four persons

appointed at the preceding conference in the proportion of two laymen to one traveling preacher. This is the highest court in the Connection, from whose decisions there is no appeal."

A "general committee," composed of ministers and laymen, holding its sessions in London, is appointed to transact the business of the Connection in the intervals of the sessions of conference. A district committee, subordinate to the general committee, is appointed for each district, and adjudicates on certain cases submitted to its examination by the stations within the district.

The Connection is represented in the United States by two Conferences, Eastern and Western, having, for the last six years, only fraternal relations with the parent Conference in Great Britain. There are also separate conferences in Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, strictly associated with England. The statistics for the American Conferences for 1876 are as follows:

The foreign work is chiefly in British colonies and among English-speaking people. The missionary income for the year was £45,234. The most striking peculiarities of the Connection are lst, the vast amount of unpaid labor performed by laymen; 2nd, the influence of the laity in Church government; 3rd, the devoted and zealous attention paid to the lower classes. In the United States also, the Primitive Methodist Connection has established itself, and has, especially near the borders of Canada and in the Eastern States, gained a strong footing, so that the American Church is about of equal strength with the Canadian. They support a paper called the *Primitive Methodist* and the *Christian Patriot*, a semi-monthly journal. See Petty, *History of the Primitive Methodist Connection*; Church, *History of the Primitive Methodists* (3rd ed., revised and enlarged); Herod, *Sketches of Primitive Methodist Preachers: Memorial of the Centenary of Hugh Bourne*; Barran, *Gallery of Deceased Ministers*; Articles by Rev. W. H. Yarrow, in *Primitive Methodist Record* for 1877.

Primitive Wesleyan Methodist Church of Ireland

This body was formed in 1816, and was the result of a division in the Wesleyan Methodist Connection in Ireland. In that year tile Irish Conference, by a majority of thirty-six in a house of eighty-eight, resolved to authorize the preachers of the Connection to administer the sacraments. As a result of this decision, most of the minority separated from the parent

body, and, being followed by a large section of the lay members, organized the Primitive Wesleyan Methodist Connection. Until a few years ago they did not assume to be a Church, but merely a society composed of members of the Established Church of Ireland. The great changes produced by the disendowment and disestablishment of this Church in 1870, together with an increasing desire in the society for the administration of the sacraments at the hands of their own preachers, led to a complete change in the constitution of the body, and the members have now the option of partaking of the ordinances from their own ministers in their churches. The statistics printed in the Conference minutes of 1876 are, 58 effective ministers, 13 superannuates, 144 churches, and 7518 members of society. An annual missionary income of $70,000 in gold is now devoted to the support of the ministers on the poorer circuits. Over $75,000 in gold is invested as a fund for the support of superannuated ministers. Negotiations are at present in progress to effect a union with the Wesleyan Methodist Church of Ireland, the constitution pf the two churches being now almost identical.

Primogeniture

(denoted in Hebrews by hrykoB] Sept. πρωτοτόκια, <012531>Genesis 25:31, 34; 27:26; <052117>Deuteronomy 21:17; 1 Chronicles 5, 1; in the New Test. only in <581216>Hebrews 12:16; A. V. “birthright”). Πρωτότοκος, always rendered “first-born” in the English version, is found in the Sept. in <010404>Genesis 4:4; <052117>Deuteronomy 21:17, and several other passages of the Old Test., as the representative of the Hebrew r/kB] signifying “one who openeth the womb,” whether an only child, or whether other children follow. “Primogenitus est, non post quem alii, sedl ante quem nullus alius genitus” (Pareus). Πρωτότοκος is found nine times in the New Test. — viz. <400125>Matthew 1:25 (if the passage be genuine, and not introduced from the parallel passage in Luke); <420207>Luke 2:7; <450829>Romans 8:29; <510115>Colossians 1:15, 18; <580106>Hebrews 1:6; 11:28; 12:23; <660105>Revelation 1:5. Except in the Gospels, and <581128>Hebrews 11:28, the word always bears a metaphorical sense in the New Test., being generally synonymous with heir or lord, and having, in <580106>Hebrews 1:6, an especial reference to our Lord’s Messianic dignity. In <581223>Hebrews 12:23, “the assembly of the first-born,” it seems to be synonymous with “elect,” or “dearly beloved,” in which sense it is also used on one occasion in the Old Test. (<243109>Jeremiah 31:9). In the 4th century, Helvidius among the Latins, an. Eunomius among the Greeks,

wished to attach a signification to πρωτότοκος, in Matthew 1 and Luke 2, different from the Old-Test. usage, maintaining, in order to support their hypothesis-viz. that Joseph and Mary had children after the birth of our Lord-that the word πρωτότοκος, by reason of its etymology, could not be applied to an *only child*. Jerome replied to the former by appealing to the usage of the word in the Old Test. (*Adv. Helvid. in* <40109>*Matthew* 1:9). The assertion of Eunomius was equally refuted by the Greek fathers Basil (*Hom. in Nat*.), Theophylact (*in Luc*. 2), and Damascenus (*De Fid. Othod*. 1. 4). In reference to this controversy, Drusius (*Ad difficiliora loca Num* c. 6) observes: “Sic sane Christus vocatur Πρωτότοκος, licet mater ejus nullos alios postea liberos habuerit. Notet hoc juventus propter Helvidium, qui ex ea voce inferebat Mariam ex Josepho post Christum natum plures filios suscepisse.” “Those entitled to the prerogative” (viz. of birthright), observes Campbell (*On the Gospels*), “were invariably denominated the first-born, whether the parents had issue afterwards or not.” Eunomius further maintains, from <51015>Colossians 1:15, that our Lord was “a creature;” but his arguments were replied to by Basil and Theophylact. Some of the fathers referred this passage to Christ’s pre-existence, others to his baptism. In <231430>Isaiah 14:30, the ‘“first-born of the poor” signifies the poorest of all; and in <181813>Job 18:13. the “first-born of death” means the most terrible of deaths. It is noteworthy that in our Lord’s genealogy the line is frequently- carried through a younger son (Seth, Shem, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Judah, David, Solomon, Nathan, etc.). *SEE FIRST-BORN*.

Primum Mobilè

the primitive moveable element, is, in its proper signification, the original matter of the world (*primae materia*). The ancients understood by it the exterior hollow sphere, which was supposed to include and put in motion the remainder of the universe (fixed stars and planets): a quite arbitrary supposition. Primal mover would l)e the principle of all motion, or the first moving cause. According to Aristotle, this cause is God, who, while motionless himself, puts all the rest in motion, and is therefore called by the philosopher τὸ πρῶτον κινοῦν. See Aristotle, *Phys*. 8:5; *De generat. et corrupt*. 1, 7: 2, 7.

Prince

is the rendering of several Heb. and Gr. words in the A. V. *Sar*, r ci(from r ric; *to rule, to have dominion*; Sept. ἄρχων; Vulg. princts), *the chief of*

any class, the master of a company, a prince or noble; used of Pharaoh's chief butler and baker (<01402>Genesis 40:2 sq.); of the taskmasters set over the Israelites in Egypt (<02011>Exodus 1:11); even of chief herdsmen (<01406>Genesis 47:6). It is frequently used for military commanders (<02182>Exodus 18:21 ["rulers"]; <12209>2 Kings 1:9 ["captain"]; <23303>Isaiah 3:3, etc.), and or princes both supreme and subordinate (<09243>1 Samuel 29:3; <18291>Job 29:1, 9; Isaiah 49, 7; <24659>Jeremiah 51:59, etc.). In <27811>Daniel 8:11 God is called הָצָבָא שַׂר (*Sar hatstaba*), Prince of the host; and in ver. 25 the title שַׂר שָׂרִים (*Sar sarim*), Prince of princes, is applied to the Messiah. The "princes of the provinces" (מְדִינַת הַשָּׂרֵי, *sarey ham-medinoth*, <12014>1 Kings 20:14) were probably the district magistrates who had taken refire in Samaria during the invasion of Benhadad, and their "young men" were their attendants, παιδάρια, *pedisseqiui* (Thenius, Ewall. *Gesch*. 3, 495). Josephus savs, υἱοὶ τῶν ἡγεμόνων (*Ant*. 8:14, 2). There is a peculiar sense in which the term "prince" is used by the prophet Daniel: thus, "Prince of the kingdom of Persia" (<27013>Daniel 10:13), "Michael your prince" (ver. 21). In these passages the term probably means a tutelary angel; and the doctrine of tutelary angels of different countries seems to be countenanced by several passages of Scripture (<38301>Zechariah 3:1; 6:5; <65009>Jude 1:9; <66127>Revelation 12:7). Michael and Gabriel were probably the tutelary angels of the Jews. These names do not occur *in* any books of the Old Test. that were written before the captivity; and it is suggested by some that they were borrowed from the Chaldaeans, with whom and the Persians the doctrine of the general administration and superintendence of angels over empires and provinces was commonly received. *SEE ANGEL*.

2. *Nagid*, דָּגִיד; (from, דָּגַד; *to be in front, to precede*; Sept. ἄρχων or ἡγούμενος; Vulg. *dux*), *one who has the precedence, a leader, or chief,* used of persons set over any undertaking, superintending any trust, or invested with supreme power (<11407>1 Kings 14:7; <19701>Psalm 76:13; <13624>1 Chronicles 26:24 ["ruler"]; <09916>1 Samuel 9:16 ["captain"], etc.). In <27925>Daniel 9:25 it is applied to the Messiah; and in 11:22 to Ptolemy Philometor, king of Egypt.

3. *Nadib*, נָדִיב; (from נָדַב, which in Hithp. signifies to *volunteer, to offer voluntarily or spontaneously;* chiefly in poetry; Sept. ἄρχων; Vulg. *princeps*), *generous, noble-minded, noble by birth* (<09118>1 Samuel 2:8; <19401>Psalm 47:10; 107:40; 113:8; 118:9; <21707>Proverbs 27:7, etc.). This word is the converse of the preceding; נָגִיד; means primarily a chief, and

derivatively what is morally noble, excellent (8, 6); bydn means primarily what is morally noble, and derivatively one who is noble by birth or position.

4. *Nasi*, aycæn;(from açn; *to lift up*, Niph. *to be elevated*; Sept. ἄρχων, ἡγούμενος, ἡγεμών, βασιλεύς Vulg. *princeps*, *dux*), *one exalted*; used as a general term for princes, including kings (<111124>1 Kings 11:24; <261210>Ezekiel 12:10, etc.), heads of tribes or families (<040144>Numbers 1:44; 3:24 [A. V. “chief”]; 7:10; 34:18; <011720>Genesis 17:20; <130740>1 Chronicles 7:40, etc.). In the A.V. it is often rendered “ruler” or “captain.” In <012306>Genesis 23:6 Abraham is addressed by the sons of Heth as µyhilÞa‘ aycæn;(*nasi Elohim*), a prince of God, i.e. constituted, and consequently protected, by God [A.V. “mighty prince”]. This word appears on the coins of Judas Maccableus (Gesenius, *Thesaur*. p. 917).

5. *Nasik*, Ëysin;(from Ësn; *to pour out, anoint*; Sept. ἄρχων; Vulg.*princeps*; <198311>Psalm 83:11; <263230>Ezekiel 32:30; <271105>Daniel 11:5; “duke,” <061308>Joshua 13:8; “principal,” Mic. 5:5).

6. *Katsin*, ˆyxiq;(from hxq; *to cut, to decide*; Sept. ἀρχηγός, ἄρχων; Vulg. *princeps*; <202515>Proverbs 25:15; <271118>Daniel 11:18; <330301>Micah 3:1, 9; elsewhere “captain,” “guide,” “ruler”).

7. *Rab*, b r i(usually an adj. great; Sept. ἄρχων, ἡγεμών; Vulg. *optimus*); only occasional; but used in compounds, e.g. Rab-mag, Rab-saris (q.v.). So its Chald. reduplicature *Rabreban*, ˆb;r]b]r i, in the plur. (<270502>Daniel 5:2, 3; elsewhere “lords”).

8. *Rozen*, ˆzeræ(participle of ˆzir ; *to rule*; Sept. (σατράπης, δυνάστης; Vulg. *princeps*, *legum conditor*), a poetical word (<070503>Judges 5:3; <200815>Proverbs 8:15; 31:4; <234023>Isaiah 40:23; <350110>Habakkuk 1:10 “ruller,” <190202>Psalm 2:2).

9. *Shalish*, vy l iv;(apparently from v/ l ç; *three*; only <262313>Ezekiel 23:13; elsewhere “captain” [q.v.]).

10. Achashdarpenaya (Chald. plur. ŸŋP]r Þiv]j ia} <270302>Daniel 3:2, 3:27; 6:1-7; Sept.; ὕρατοι), a Persian word. Those mentioned in <270601>Daniel 6:1 (see Esth. 1, 1) were the predecessors, either in fact or in place, of the satraps of Darius Hystaspis (Herod. 3, 89). *SEE SATRAP*.

11. *Chashmannim*, µyNmiv]j i(plur. literally *rich*, only in <196813>Psalm 68:13).

12. *Segen*, ˆg;s,(a Persian word, used only in the plur. <231102>Isaiah 11:25; elsewhere “rulers”).

13. *Partemim*, only in the plur. µymiT]r Pi(another Persian word, <270103>Daniel 1:3; elsewhere “rulers”).

14. ῎Αρχων, which in the Sept. appears as the rendering of all the Hebrew words above cited, in the New Test. is used of earthly princes (<402025>Matthew 20:25; <460206>1 Corinthians 2:6), of Jesus Christ (<660105>Revelation 1:5), and of Satan (<400934>Matthew 9:34; 12:24; Mark 3, 22; <431231>John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11; <490202>Ephesians 2:2). On the phrase “prince of the power of the air” in this last passage, see AIR.

15. Ἀρχηγός, which in Theodotion is the rendering of aycin;(<041303>Numbers 13:3; 16:2); and in the Sept. is the rendering of r ci(Judges 5, 15; Nehemiah 2, 9; <233004>Isaiah 30:4), in the New Test. is applied only to our Lord (<440315>Acts 3:15; 5:31; <580210>Hebrews 2:10 [A. V. “captain”]; <581202>Hebrews 12:2 [A. V. “author”]).

16. ῾Ηγεμώv is used (<400206>Matthew 2:6) in a general sense for a chief or ruler. *SEE GOVERNOR*; *SEE KING*; *SEE RULER*.

Prince, John (1)

an English divine, was born at Axminster, Devonshire, in 1643; was educated at Brazenose College, Oxford, and became successively curate of Bideford, minister of St. Martin’s Church, Exeter, vicar of Totnes, and vicar of Berry-Pomeroy. He died in 1723. He published, *Sermons* (Lond. 1674, 4to): *The Beauty of God’s House, a Discourse on* <198401>*Psalm 84:1* (1710, 4to): — *Dammonii Orientales Illustres* (1810, 4to): — *Sermons on* <19D401>*Psalm 134:1* (1722, 8vo).

Prince, John (2)

an American minister of the Congregational Church, was born at Boston, Mass., in 1751; was educated at Harvard College, where he graduated in 1776; was ordained minister of the Congregational Church in Salem, Mass., in 1779, and retained that post until his death in 1836. He published, *Fast Sermon* (Salem, 1798): — *Sermons before a Charitable Society* (1806): — *Sermon on the Death of Dr. Barnard* (1814): — *Sermon before the Bible Society* (1816). See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit,* 8:128 sq.; and for other references, Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Auth*. s.v.

Prince, Nathan

an American clergyman of the Church of England, was a native of Massachusetts, and was born about the beginning of the last century. He was educated at Harvard College, where he graduated in 1719, in: 1723 was made a tutor in his alma mater, in 1727 fellow, and held that honor until 1742. Subsequently he took orders in the Church of England, was sent as a missionary to the Mosquitos, and died in the island of Ruatan, Bay of Honduras, in 1748. Dr. Chauncey, in his *Sketches of Eminent Men in New England,* says that "Prince deserves a place among the great men in this country." He is the author of an *Essay to Solve the Difficulties attending the several Accounts given of the Resurrection, etc*. (Boston, 1734, 4to). See Elliot, *Biog. Dict*. p. 393. n.; *Report of the Mass. Hist. Society*, 10:165; Pierce, *Hist. of Harvard University*, p. 191-196; Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Auth.* s.v.

Prince, Thomas (1)

an American Congregational minister, was born May 15, 1687, at Sandwich, Mass. He graduated at Harvard College in 1707, and after traveling for some years in Europe, during which time he preached in England and was invited to take a station, he returned home in 1717, and was ordained, Oct. 1, 1718, colleague pastor of the Rev. Joseph Sewall at the Old South Church, Boston, where he remained until his death, Oct. 22, 1758. He was an eminent preacher, for his sermons were rich in thought, perspicuous, and devotional, and he inculcated the doctrines and duties of religion as one who felt their importance. In private life he was amiable and exemplary. It was his constant endeavor to imitate the perfect example of his Master and Lord. He was ready to forgive injuries and return good for

evil. He published, *An Account of the First Appearance of the Aurora Borealis: — A Chronological History of New England in the Form of Annals* (1736): — Ditto, vol. 2, Nos. 1, 2, 3 (1755): — *Account of the English Ministers on Martha's Vineyard* (1749): — *An Improvement of the Doctrine of Earthquakes, containing an Historic Summary of the most renmarkable Earthquakes of New England* (1755): — *The New England Psalm-book, revised and improved* (1756): — and a number of occasional Sermons; besides which there were six Sermons published from his MSS. by Dr. Erskine, of Edinburgh (1785); and twenty-nine single Sermons which Prince published from 1717 to 1756. For an extended notice of his publications, see Sewall, *Funeral Discourse*. A large portion of his most valuable library is now in the Boston Public Library. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 1, 304; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Prince, Thomas (2)

an American writer and editor, son of the preceding, was born in 1722, and was educated at Harvard College, where he graduated in 1740. He edited the earliest American periodical, *The Christian History*, containing *Accounts of the Revival and Propagation of Religion in Great Britain and America for 1743* (Boston, 1744-45, 2 vols. 8vo), which was published weekly. He died in 1748. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Princeps Sacerdotum (Chief Of Priests)

This is a title sometimes applied by Tertullian, Augustine, and others to a bishop, but used in the same sense as archiepiscopus, pontifex maximus, that is, high -priest. *SEE BISHOP*; *SEE PRIEST*.

Princess

(הרּשׂ; *sarah*) occurs but seldom in the Scriptures (1 Kings 11:3; Lamentations 1:1; elsewhere "lady." *SEE SARAH*); but the persons to whom it alludes, the daughters of kings, are frequently mentioned, and often with some reference to the splendor of their apparel. Thus we read of Tamar's "garment of divers colors" (2 Samuel 13:18), and the dress of the Egyptian princess, the wife of Solomon, is described as "raiment of needlework," and "clothing of wrought gold" (Psalm 45:13, 14). *SEE EMBROIDERY*.

Princeton Theology

SEE PRESBYTERIANISM; *SEE THEOLOGY*.

Principalities and Powers

SEE POWER.

Pringle, Francis

a minister of the Associate Presbyterian Church, was a native of Ireland, and was born about the year 1750. He came to this country some time near the close of the last century, and died in New York City in 1833. He preached a *Sermon on the Qualifications and Duties of the Ministers of Christ before the Associate Synod of Ireland* (1796), which was published in Ireland and America; and a sermon of his on *Prayer for the Prosperity of Zion* appeared in the *Religious Monitor* after his death. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 9:64 sq.

Pringle, Sir John

a Scotch philosopher and physician, was born in Roxburghshire in 1707. He settled in Edinburgh about 1734, and after 1748 resided in London, where he distinguished himself greatly, and became president of the Royal Society in 1773. He was for a time professor of pneumatology and ethical philosophy in Edinburgh University. He died in 1782. He divided pneumatics into the following parts:

1. A physical inquiry into the nature of such subtle and material substances as are imperceptible to the senses, and known only from their operations.

2. The nature of immaterial substances connected with matter, in which is demonstrated, by natural evidence, the immortality of the human soul.

3. The nature of immaterial created beings not connected with matter.

4. Natural theology, or the existence and attributes of God demonstrated from the light of nature. Ethics, or moral philosophy, he divided into the theoretical and practical parts, in treating of which the authors he chiefly uses are Cicero, Marcus Antonius, Puffendorf. and lord Bacon. Carlyle describes him as “an agreeable lecturer, though no master of the science he taught.” “His lectures were chiefly a compilation from lord Bacon’s works; and had it not been for Puffendorf’s small book, which he made his text,

we should not have been instructed in the rudiments of the science." Nevertheless, we see that he discussed topics which must issue, sooner or later, in a scientific jurisprudence and political economy. See M'Cosh, *Scottish Philosophy*, p. 109.

Pringle, William

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Perth, Scotland, in 1790. His parents paid great attention to his early culture, and, after a successful study at the best schools and at the Academy in Perth, he finished his collegiate studies at the University of Edinburgh. He then studied medicine, and, as soon as admitted to practice, emigrated to Canada; but, concluding not to practice, he returned to Scotland, studied theology in Glasgow under the Rev. John Dick, D.D., was licensed April 15,1823, and entered upon his labors as a probationer, and as such preached for some time in Scotland, when he again left his native land, and came to the United States in the year 1827, and soon after joined the Associate Presbytery of Cambridge. In June, 1830, he was ordained and installed pastor of the Associate Congregation of Ryegate, Vt. He labored faithfully in behalf of this his only charge, and when his health failed him he resigned, June 21, 1852, after a ministry of twenty-two years. He died Dec. 14, 1858. Mr. Pringle was a good writer, and some of his sermons bear marks of scholarly attainments. He was engaged during the last few years of his life upon a work called *The Cosmography of Scripture*. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1860, p. 159. (J. L. S.)

Prior, Prioress

are, according to the constitution of several ecclesiastical orders, the heads of their monasteries and nunneries. The prior is either the first or sole authority in the monastery, or he is subordinated, as second leader, to a higher officer of the same monastery, the abbot (q.v.). The latter case happens when the abbot makes use of his right to appoint in his place an assistant, a temporary vicar (q.v.), who is trusted with part of the prelate's attributes. Sometimes the statutes of the order prescribe that the prior shall be as the second head of the monastery, elected by the members, they assigning him a power of his own more or less independent (*De Stat. Monast.* 3, 35). In other orders, as in that of the Benedictines, and even in some regular congregations, we find only one, or a few, principal monasteries-the mother abbeys, to which the others owe their origin, or

whose subsequent reform they have adopted-subject to the direction of abbots or prelates, i.e. local superiors of the first rank, while the inferior monasteries are administered by priors: the latter exercise the regular jurisdiction over the monks, and are bound only in important matters to obtain the consent of the prelate of the mother abbey. The same distinction subsists in the nunneries. — Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* s.v.

Prior, Matthew

an English poet, writer of verse both sacred and profane, whose period of authorship was contemporary with the last years of Dryden and the earliest stage of Pope, was possessed of little vigor or originality, but was remarkable for his skill in versification and his gay and easy grace of imagery and diction. His occasional epigrams, and his lively but indecent tales, are his best productions; though there is merit, also in his semi-metaphysical poem *Alma, or the Progress of the Soul*, and in his attempt at religious poetry in *Solomon*, a work which has been compared to Pope's *Essay on Man*. It was greatly preferred to Pope's poem by John Wesley, because more consistent with the orthodox theory of human corruption. The design is certainly more poetical, because less tending to the argumentative; though the inferior execution has prevented Prior from attaining the occasional success which redeems parts of Pope's poem from oblivion. Prior's poems were only the recreations of a man actively engaged in public life. He was born July 21,1664, and was the son of a joiner in London. Accident having directed the attention of lord Dorset to the boy's studious habits, education was procured for him; and, on leaving Oxford, he distinguished himself, under the government of king William, as a dexterous diplomatist in several foreign missions. Deserting his political party, like so many men of higher rank in that slippery time, he shared, in the latter part of his life, the vicissitudes and danger of the Tories. He died Sept. 18,1721. See the excellent article in Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v., and the references there given. (J. H. W.)

Priory

is a religious house occupied by a society of monks or nuns, the chief of whom is termed a prior (q.v.) or prioress; and of these there are two sorts: first, where the prior is chosen by the convent, and governs as independently as any abbot in his abbey; such were the cathedral priors, and most of those of the Augustine order. Secondly, where the priory is a

cell subordinate to some great abbey, and the prior is placed or displaced at the will of the abbot. There was a considerable difference in the regulation of these cells in the mediaeval times; for some were altogether subject to their respective abbots, who sent what officers and monks they pleased, and took their revenues into the common stock of the abbeys; while others consisted of a stated number of monks, under a prior sent to them from the superior abbey; and those priories paid a pension yearly, as an acknowledgment of their subjection, but acted in other matters as independent bodies, and had the rest of the revenues for their own use. The priories or cells were always of the same order as the abbeys on which they depended, though sometimes their inmates were of a different sex; it being usual, after the Norman Conquest, for the great abbeys to build nunneries on some of their manors, which should be subject to their visitation.

Alien priories were cells, or small religious houses, in one country dependent on large foreign monasteries. When manors or tithes were given to distant religious houses, the monks, either to increase the authority of their own order, or perhaps rather to have faithful stewards of their revenues, built convenient houses for the reception of small fraternities of their body, who were deputed to reside at and govern those cells. — Hook, s.v. In the fourth year of Henry V, during the war with France, all the alien priories (that is, those cells of the religious houses in England which belonged to foreign monasteries) which were not conventual were dissolved by act of Parliament and granted to the crown. About the year 1540 the cathedrals founded for priories were turned into deaneries and prebends.

Pris’ca

(2 Timothy 4:19). *SEE PRISCILLA*.

Priscil’la

(Πρίσκιλλα, dim. from Prisca, Lat. ancient), the wife of Aquila, and probably, like Phoebe, a deaconess. She shared the travels, labors, and dangers of her husband, and is always named along with him (Romans 16:3; 1 Corinthians 16:19; 2 Timothy 4:19), A.D. 55-64. The name is Prisca (Πρίσκα) in 2 Timothy 4:19, and (according to the true reading) in Romans 16:3, and also (according to some of the best MSS.) in 1 Corinthians 16:19. Such variation in a Roman name is by no means unusual. We find that the name of the wife is placed before that of

the husband in <451603>Romans 16:3; <550419>2 Timothy 4:19, and (according to some of the best MSS.) in <441826>Acts 18:26. It is only in <441802>Acts 18:2 and <461619>1 Corinthians 16:19 that Aquila has unequivocally the first place. Hence we should be disposed to conclude that Priscilla was the more energetic character of the two; and it is particularly to be noticed that she took part, not only in her husband's exercise of hospitality, but likewise in the theological instruction of Apollos. Yet we observe that the husband and the wife are always mentioned together. In fact, we may say that Priscilla is the example of what the married woman may do, for the general service of the Church, in conjunction with home duties, as Phoebe is the type of the unmarried servant of the Church, or deaconess. Such female ministration was of essential importance in the state of society in the midst of which the early Christian communities were formed. The remarks of archdeacon Evans on the position of Timothy at Ephesus are very just. "In his dealings with the female part of his flock, which, in that time and country, required peculiar delicacy and discretion, the counsel of the experienced Priscilla would be invaluable. Where, for instance, could he obtain more prudent and faithful advice than hers in the selection of widows to be placed upon the eleemosynary list of tie Church, and of deaconesses for the ministry?" (*Script. Biog*. 2, 298). It seems more to our purpose to lay stress on this than on the theological learning of Priscilla. Yet Winer mentions a monograph *De Priscilla, Aquilae uxore, tamquam feminarum e gente Judaica eruditarum specimine*, by G. G. Zeltner (*Altorf*, 1709). *SEE AQUILA*.

Priscillian

the noted originator or propagator of a heretical body of Christians who bore his name, was the first heretic who was executed after the establishment of Christianity by the Roman state. He was a native of the Iberian Peninsula, and of noble birth. He flourished in the second half of the 4th century, possessed much wealth, had great reputation for learning, and was generally revered for his severe austerity. 'What his early occupation was is not known. He first figures in history as the propagator of the heretical dogmas which a certain Egyptian called Marcus, from Memphis, came to Spain to teach there. Priscillian, by his personal influence, succeeded in spreading the heresy of Marcus all over Spain, making a number of proselytes of the female sex, convincing many priests, and even some bishops; among others, two bishops, Instantius and Salvianus, who became zealous defenders of the imported doctrines, which

were substantially those of the *Manicheans* (q.v.). He taught expressly the Dualism and the Docetism of that sect, and it is charged that he adopted the strictest ascetic austerities in regard to celibacy, etc., by which they had rendered themselves obnoxious even to the civil authorities in the East and in Africa. There is some doubt as to the precise doctrines which Priscillian taught. As reported, his dogmas are a strange mixture of Gnostic and Manichean absurdities combined with allegorical interpretations and mystical rhapsodies. He was also Sabellian in tendency in his rejection of a personal distinction in the Godhead, for he denied the reality of Christ's birth and incarnation. Among other things, he maintained that the visible universe was not the production of the Supreme Deity, but of some demon or malignant principle who derived his origin from chaos or darkness; he adopted the doctrine of aeons, or emanations from the divine nature; he considered human bodies as compounded according to the twelve signs of the zodiac, and as prisons formed by the author of evil to enslave the mind; he also condemned marriage, and denied the resurrection of the body. The rule of life and manners which the Priscillianists adopted was so rigid and severe that the charges of dissolute conduct brought against them by their enemies appear to be groundless. That they were guilty of dissimulation, and deceived their adversaries by cunning stratagems in order to accomplish what they deemed a sacred purpose, is true. Their doctrine was, according to St. Augustine, that deception is allowed to hide one's faith, and to simulate Catholic belief ("jura, perjura, secretum prodere noli"). Neander (*Ch. Hist.* 2, 711) observes that the reproach of immorality rests on insufficient proofs. It is, however, a fact that at least a part of the Priscillianists were addicted to unnatural turpitudes, to which such a system must logically lead; but there is no evidence that they avowed that lying and perjury were lawful under all circumstances.

The bishop Hyginus of Cordova was the first to enter the lists against this heresy, and he strove, although without success, to gain back to the orthodox Church the bishops Instantius and Salvianus. Hyginus apprised Idacius, the bishop of Merida, of the Priscillianic disorders; but the hot-blooded zeal of this prelate was still more unsuccessful, and so were the efforts of all the other Catholic bishops. The boldness of the heretics increased every day, and bishop Hyginus himself, displeased with the severe measures inaugurated against them, became their protector. To arrest their progress, a synod was held in October, 380, at Saragossa, to which Instantius, Salvianus, Elpidius, and Priscillian were also invited. The

heresiarchs failed to appear. The synod condemned their doctrines and resolved upon measures to stop their expansion. Catholic women were prohibited from attending the Priscillianist meetings; fasting on Sundays was interdicted; the anathema was launched against such as stayed from Church during the forty days of Lent and the three weeks of Epiphany, or received the Eucharist in the Church without partaking at once of the sacrament: the same penalty was pronounced against those who should assume the name and functions of teachers without episcopal approbation; and every clerk who should, out of pride and vanity, clothe himself in the monastical garment, was put under ban. The execution of the decrees against Priscillianists was committed to the bishop Ithacius of Sosuba. No worse choice could possibly have been made. He was a mere voluptuary, and utterly destitute of all sense for spiritual things.

Excluded from the Church, the Priscillianists now took more decided measures for establishing themselves, and they had the boldness even to cause the consecration of Priscillian as their bishop of Avilla by the bishops Instantius and Salvianus. Of course, by this step the Spanish Catholic prelates were greatly embittered, and the Idacius above mentioned, together with Ithacius, bishop of Ossonova, who is represented by Sullpicius Severus as a troublesome zealot, were dispatched to the emperor Gratian for the purpose of obtaining an order of banishment against Priscillian, Instantius, and Salvianus. Gratian having issued the rescript thus demanded, the three heresiarchs repaired to Rome, in order to vindicate themselves before pope Damasus. But the pope refused to justify them. Salvianus died at Rome, and his two companions went to Milani, where they tried, as unsuccessfully, to persuade St. Ambrose of their innocence. However, they succeeded in bribing an influential functionary (magister officiorum) named Macedonius, who obtained for them an imperial decree which allowed them to return to Spain and take possession of their sees, and ordered Volventius, vicar of Spain, to examine further into the matter. Priscillian and Instantius returned to Spain, as in triumph; and Ithacius, now in turn accused as a disturber of the public peace, was driven out of Spain. The latter was even on the very point of being arrested in Treves, where he had established himself, and of being transported back to tie peninsula for trial, when things assumed, under the usurping emperor Maximus, a different aspect. As soon as this new Caesar arrived at Treves, Ithacius appeared before him against the Priscillianists. Maximus, who desired the whole matter to be disposed of as a purely ecclesiastical affair,

ordered a synod to be held, in 384, at Bordeaux, to which the heresiarchs were summoned. Instantius was deposed by the vote of the assembly, and Priscillian, foreseeing a similar fate, tried to prevent it by appealing to the emperor. This step was the cause of his ruin. The emperor now took the matter in hand: Priscillian and his associates were brought to Treves, where Maximus resided at the time, and the most violent adversaries of the sect, Idacius and Ithacius, appeared as accusers. The latter of these two prelates, if Sulpicius Severus is to be trusted, suspected of Priscillianism any man whom he saw studying and fasting much; and, against all precedents, appeared as anl impassioned accuser, before a worldly tribunal, in a religious affair. St. Martin, bishop of Tours. a truly pious man, also at the time at the imperial court, held it to be an unspiritual innovation that an ecclesiastical matter should be tried by a secular court-that heretics should become liable to punishment with torture and death— and besought the emperor to leave the affair in the hands of the bishop, or, at least, to decide it without bloodshed. As long as Martin was present, the trial was delayed; on his departure, Maximus promised there should be no bloodshed, but he was induced by Ithacius and two other Spanish bishops, Rufus and Magrnus, to break his word. The prefect who tried the case probably employed tortures to obtain avowals. Priscillian, the rich widow Euchrocia, and several others were accused of criminal disorders, and condemned not only as false teachers, but also as violators of the civil laws. They were either beheaded or punished with confiscation and exile (365).

The execution of Priscillian by the sword, and of several of his associates, did not ruin the sect, but seemed rather to give it new life and vigor. The Priscillianists got possession of the bodies of their dead, and brought them to Spain, where Priscilla was honored as a martyr. People swore by his name. The most distinguished bishops, Martin of Tours, St. Ambrose, Theognistus, and pope Siricius, sternly blamed the cruelty with which Ithacius and his friends had treated the heretics, and marked their abhorrence of the cruelty by separating from the communion of Ithacius and the other bishops who had approved the death penalty for heresy in the Christian Church. But the emperor Maximus went on until his death (387) persecuting the Priscillianists as criminal Manichueans, and was even on the point of sending to Spain a military commission with unlimited powers to pursue the accused and punish the guilty with confiscation and death; and only abandoned this project by intercession of St. Martin.

The gravity of the measures adopted for the punishment of heresy at the time to which we here refer obliges us to turn aside to remark

(1.) that heresy was declared against by the State for the first time under Theodosius the Great, the first emperor who was baptized in the Nicene faith. He was determined to put an end to the Arian interregnum, and therefore proclaimed the exclusive authority of the Nicene Creed, and at the same time enacted the first rigid penalties not only against the pagan idolatry, the practice of which was thenceforth a capital crime in the empire, but also against all Christian heresies and sects. The ruling principle of his public life was the unity of the empire and of the orthodox Church. In the course of fifteen years this emperor issued at least fifteen penal laws against heretics (comp. *Cod. Theodos*. 16, tit. 5, leg. 6-33), by which he gradually deprived them of all right to the exercise of their religion, excluded them from all civil offices, and threatened them with fines, confiscation, banishment, and in some cases (as the Manicheans, the Audians, and even the Quarto decimanians) with death. From Theodosius, therefore, dates the State-Church theory of the persecution of heretics and the embodiment of it in legislation. His primary design, it is true, was rather to terrify and convert than to punish the refractory subjects (so Sozomen asserts, *Hist. Ecclesiastes* lib. 7 c. 12). From the theory, however, to the practice was a single step; and this step his rival and colleague, Maximus, took when he inflicted capital punishment on Priscillian and some of his followers. This was the first shedding of the blood of heretics by a Christian prince for religious opinions.

(2.) We wish to note also that, while the execution of the Priscillianists is the only instance of the bloody punishment of heretics in this period, as it is the first in the history of Christianity, the propriety of violent measures against heresy was thenceforth vindicated even by the best fathers of the Church (see on this point Augustine’s position as marked out by Neander, *Ch. Hist*. 2, 217 sq.; Schaff, *Ch. Hist*. 2, 144,145), and soon none but the persecuted parties were heard to protest against religious persecution. We need hardly add that in due time the Church of Rome, with Leo the Great as its first and clearest representative, became the advocate and executioner of the death penalty for heresy. *SEE HERESY*; *SEE INQUISITION*; *SEE ROMANISM*.

After the death of Maximus, the emperor Theodosius ordered a synod to be held in 389, to settle the difficulties that had arisen among the bishops of

Gaul Spain, and Italy on account of Ithacius. The latter and bishop Idacius were deposed by that assembly. But the disputes which had been called up by them continued in some parts of Spain, fostered especially by the Priscillianists, who were still numerous. In the year 400 the sect appears in a decaying condition. At the synod held in that year at Toledo, several Priscillianist bishops, among others Symphosius and Dictinnlius, returned to the Church. The latter wrote a work entitled the Scules, in which the principles of the Priscillianists are expounded, but as he was an apostate he can hardly be regarded as a safe expositor of Priscillianism. The sect revived iu the middle of the 5th century, especially in Gallicia. The active exertions of bishop Turibius, of Astorga, succeeded in extinguishing it gradually. He punished and imprisoned heretics, etc., but he was also busy in their instruction, both orally and by his writings. The same bishop sent to Leo the Great a refutation of Priscillianism, which Leo honored with an answer, praising his zeal and recommending the holding of a Spanish synod, which he consequently convened in Gallicia in 448. Leo's letter is important for the refutation of Priscillianism contained in it. Among the most noteworthy literary attacks upon Priscillianism in the first half of the 5th century, we may mention here, besides, *Ad Paulum Orsium contra Priscillinistas et Origenistas* (411); *Costra mendacium*, addressed to Consentius (420); and in part the 190th Epistle (alias Ep. 157), to the bishop Optatus, on the origin of the soul (418), and two other letters, in which he refutes erroneous views on the nature of the soul, the limitation of future punishments, and the lawfulness of fraud for supposed good purposes. The Priscillianists, notwithstanding the severest measures inaugurated against them and the polemics that were written against them, continued to exist, and at all times during the mediaeval period we find their traces under various names and forms, especially in the north of Spain, Languedoc (France), and Northern Italy. The Synod of Braga, in 563, condemned several Priscillian errors, about which we owe to this assembly most interesting information. See Sulp. Severus, *Hist. Sacra*, 2, 46-51; *Dial*. 3, 11 sq.; *Orosius Comumitorium de Errore Priscillianistarum, etc*.; Leonis Magni Ep. 15, ad *Turibium*; Walch, *Ketzerhistorie*, 3. 378 sq.; Alex. *Natalis, Hist. Ecclesiastes*; Fleury, *Hist. Eccl*.; Van Fries, *Dissertatio Critica de Priscill*. (Ultraj. 1745); Lübkert, *De Haeresi Priscill*. (Havn. 1840); Mandernach, *Gesch. des Priscillianismus* (Treves, 1851); Hefele, *Conciliengesch*. 1, 719; 2, 27 sq.; 3, 13 sq.; Milman, *Lat. Christianity*, 1, 276-78; Pusey, *Hist. of the*

Councils A.D. 51-381 (1875); Alzog, *Kirchengesch*. 1, 372 sq.; Neander, *Ch. Hist*. 2, 710, 718.